DIOCESE OF CHELMSFORD
DIOCESAN SYNOD

There will be a meeting of the Diocesan Synod via Zoom on Saturday 21 November 2020

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

09:30 OPENING WORSHIP
Led by the Rt Revd Roger Morris

09:45 1. NOTICES

09:50 2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING 3 OCTOBER 2020
Attached

09:55 3. PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

10.10 4. RACIAL JUSTICE TASK AND FINISH GROUP UPDATE
Paper DS(2020)12 attached – Terms of Reference for noting

10.15 5. REFLECTIONS ON 2020 FROM THE YOUTH SYNOD

10.20 6. QUESTIONS see notes for details

10.40 BREAK

10:50 6. THE DEPLOYMENT AND AFFORDABILITY OF STIPENDIARY INCUMBENTS
Paper DS(2020)13 attached

The President to move:

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

12.00 BREAK
8. **2021 DIOCESAN SYNOD ELECTIONS**

Paper DS(2020)14 attached

The Chair to move:

“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 Chair to move:

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

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

Paper DS(2020)15 attached

12:30  

**CLOSE**

**NOTES**

Questions: In accordance with Standing Order 29 five days prior notice is required. Questions must be received no later than 9am on Monday 16 November 2020 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
DIOCESE OF CHELMSFORD
DIOCESAN SYNOD

Minutes of the 150th meeting of the Synod held on Saturday 3 October 2020

PRESENT : The President and 106 Members

The Archdeacon of Colchester led the opening worship.

1. NOTICES

The Chair reminded members to ensure the name displayed on zoom was their full name and that any members of the public should add ‘public’ next to their name.

Members noted the Bishop’s Instrument which made this meeting of Synod by virtual means lawful. Decisions could be taken with the same validity as a physical meeting. Formal voting would be conducted through the poll function and members were led in a test run to ensure they knew how it would function.

2. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING AND NOTES OF DIOCESAN SYNOD GATHERING HELD ON 6 JUNE 2020

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved and the record of the June Synod gathering were noted.

3. PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

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


4. RACIAL JUSTICE TASK GROUP UPDATE

The Acting Bishop of Chelmsford was invited to introduce this item. He stated the task of this group was ultimately to make the Church less biased. He thanked the Bishop of Colchester for agreeing to chair the group and also thanked the Revd Ade Eleyae and Revd Chigor Chike for their input in to the setting up of the group.

The Bishop of Colchester stated that the group was being set up in the wake of world events which had revealed systemic racism and the Church needs to address its past. Books such as ‘Ghost Ship’ demonstrate that the Church has fallen short in the past. The group aims to advance and tackle the issues presented to us, ensuring that the Church is actively anti-racist and celebrates its diversity. Change can only happen when we confront these issues, but we need to be accompanied by grace, openness and learning.
It was noted that the group was largely formed and a timeline will be drawn up. The aim was for an initial report to be given to the Synod in November with a full report to the first Synod in 2021.

The Acting Bishop of Chelmsford encouraged members to pray for the Revd Ade Eleyae and family as her husband was currently seriously ill.

5. QUESTIONS

The Chair reminded members of the Standing Orders relating to questions. He stated that two questions relating to deployment will be taken as part of item 8.

Q1. Revd David Lower (St Osyth) to the Chair of the CDBF:

Given the expected shortfall in parish share (over £3m in 2020) what is the diocese policy towards parishes who are unable to pay their share in full and has this policy been updated to recognise the financial hardships many parishes are now facing due to COVID19?

Answer:
Mission and Ministry Advisors have been working closely with parishes to support them during this difficult time. Other dioceses do have a policy of carrying over any share that is outstanding into the next year, we do not adopt such a policy. The diocese is keen to work with all parishes in exploring how parish share can be paid in full. We do recognise the significant financial challenge that parishes, dioceses and indeed the national church is facing at this time. The Chair added that he hoped that a more individualistic approach could be formed in 2021.

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

In our search for the next Bishop of Chelmsford, the Vacancy-in-See Committee is to be warmly commended for the Diocesan ‘Statement of Needs’ it has produced. On page 8, it has included excellent statistics for women in ministry in our diocese and anticipates that our next Diocesan Bishop ‘needs to be fully and warmly committed both to the ministry of women at every level and to the ongoing contribution of the Bishops of Maidstone and Richborough, as framed within the Five Guiding Principles and our clear commitment to Mutual Flourishing’. Would the House of Bishops and the Bishop’s Council be willing to consider that such a statement about the framework of the 5 Guiding Principles and the clear commitment to Mutual Flourishing is now explicitly included in the processes (esp advertisements and interviews) for all appointments at all levels, ie for all incumbents, priests-in-charge and senior posts, in this diocese?

Answer
I concur with Canon David Banting’s warm appreciation of the ‘Statement of Needs’ for our next Diocesan Bishop, produced by our Vacancy in See Committee.
As a Diocesan family it would now be appropriate to review how best to convey our continued and comprehensive commitment to the 5 Guiding Principles and Mutual Flourishing in the outworking of clergy appointments processes at all levels. I can therefore confirm that I will ask the Bishop’s Council Standing Committee to consider such an item on an upcoming Bishop’s Council Meeting agenda.

Supplementary questions
Q. Is there a group within the Diocese monitoring the working of mutual flourishing?
A. No and the Bishop’s Council may wish to consider this.

Q. Was there an undertaking from the previous Diocesan Bishop to roll out work on mutual flourishing in Deaneries?
A. The Acting Bishop of Chelmsford stated he did not recall such a commitment.

Q3. Mary Durlacher (General Synod) with President’s permission, to the Director of Communications:

With regard to the advice given on in Version 4 of COVID-19: opening cathedral and church buildings to the public relating to ventilation, ‘The cooler autumn and winter weather will promote some forms of natural ventilation, meaning that adequate ventilation will be achieved with a reduction in the number of windows open, and the amount they need to be open. If there is high level ventilation it will not usually be necessary to leave lower-level windows open. If your current Covid-safe practice relies on leaving doors fixed open to promote good ventilation now would be a good time to consider how you would operate with fewer (or no) doors fixed open.’ Please could you confirm that it is not required for doors to be left open during a service if there has been adequate ventilation beforehand?

Answer
Guidance was issued yesterday from both Church House and the Diocese on ventilation of churches and rather than repeat it now I’d refer you to that. In summary though, most churches have good natural ventilation and will be able to close their doors during services over the winter. But ventilating beforehand, whilst an important thing to do, is not an alternative to ventilation during the service. But as the situation changes there is no substitute for checking the most up to date guidance from the Diocese or Church House.

Supplementary question
Q. How do we ensure adequate ventilation of a listed building?
A. The solution will look different for different buildings. Hopefully the new guidance will help make an assessment. If further help is needed then people should refer to their Area Dean or Archdeacon.
Q4. John Bloomer (Chelmsford North) with President’s permission to the Interim Chief Operating Officer:

Is the share proposed to be assessed against a benefice in 2021 at the level AFTER any MSF grant awarded in 2020 and AFTER fee credits i.e. at the level of “net assessment”?

Answer
The share proposed for 2021 is at the level after any MSF grant that was awarded in 2020 and a fee credit will be recalculated on the usual basis, i.e. it will reflect fee income from May 2019 to April 2020.

Q5. Mary Durlacher (General Synod) to the Interim Chief Executive Officer:

Has there been any progress in answering a question put at the last Synod? : What impact will this have on parishes who are currently trying to raise money for significant repairs and maintenance? The Chief Executive confirmed he was very aware of the tough balance between share payments and other costs parishes have. There are no immediate proposals on this point and the Archdeacons are looking at what could be done next. Buildings are an issue for all parishes in the Church of England and it is being considered nationally.

Answer
I recognise that balancing financial commitments is a real issue for many of our parishes. As has been said in the financial presentation today, the diocese, our parishes and the national church are all facing financial challenges as a result of COVID-19. We understand that whilst there are pressures on maintaining church buildings, there is a vital need to maintain payment of parish share to cover costs including the cost of ministry. Without the full payment of parish share we will be facing more severe cuts to our stipendiary clergy. The diocese and National Church continues to look at what can be done, but the best answer is the recognition that a growing and generous church can provide us with all the resources we need.

Q6 John Bloomer (Chelmsford North) with President’s permission to the Interim Chief Operating Officer:

Will MMUs be permitted/enabled in some way to provide mutual support within their MMU in meeting their share commitments i.e. by overpaying vs their assessed share to compensate for another parishes underpayment?

Answer
MMU’s are encouraged to provide mutual support in this way and indeed any parish who would wish to provide mutual support can do so through giving generously and paying above the share allocation. A letter will be issued to each parish, benefice and MMA by the end of October and it will give you information as to how to inform us of what you are proposing to do.
Supplementary question
Q. Is there any expectation that mutuality will be insisted when parishes are facing difficulty?

A. We would encourage people to be generous, encouragement is preferred.

6. STEWARDSHIP PROJECT UPDATE

The Chair invited the Archdeacon of Barking to address the Synod. He began by thanking the members of the Stewardship Task Group. In his presentation the following points were made:

- The paper summarised the proposed roll out of the stewardship programme. The reflections of Synod members would be welcomed.
- The three objectives of the programme were Promoting, Refreshing and Resourcing.
- The programme will be proposed to run over the Sundays between Advent and Candlemas. They fit well with the season of understanding who we are and who we are called to be.
- Whilst the programme will be intended for use in that period the resources can be used at any time and there is no expectation that people will stick to the proposed timeframe.
- It is hoped that we all use this as a platform for encouragement of stewardship.

Members were invited to comment on the proposed stewardship programme. The following members contributed:

Robin Stevens (Chelmsford North)
Revd Dr Susan Lucas (Newham)
Revd James Rodley (Harlow)
Revd Clive Hillman (Hadleigh)
Colin Setchfield (Waltham Forest)
Revd Canon Paul Norrington (Colchester)
Canon Christine Horton (Chelmsford South)
Revd Helen Gheorghiu Gould (Harlow)

The comments and questions submitted were:

- To what extent will this be tied in with the national stewardship network? Stewardship is often seen as difficult and dealt with in isolation. There needs to be a willingness to address the issue and there is no substitute for Biblical themes. It also needs to be rooted in prayer.
- There should be Biblical teaching and preaching on this issue. People should be treated as adults. Anxieties often get projected on to money so we need to engage pastorally and we need to apply principles locally.
- The paper recognises that some parishes will not rise to the challenge. The contributor spoke of previous experience of using stewardship programmes by the book and seeing the giving go down. Thought needs to be given as to how places can break out of cultural barriers.
• If this is rolled out it needs to be done in the context of a fairer shares system. A lot of people will say they are already being generous.
• How will this be used at all levels of the Church to encourage a generosity of ecclesiology.
• Many people do not understand the problem. We need to remember why this needs to happen and that it is not just a Diocesan problem.
• In small villages the parish church is still valued. People need to know the situation. Even those who do not attend worship can often be very supportive. It can be helpful to engage with local individuals and groups.
• Could we look at extending themes beyond Candlemas. Some people are giving as much as they can afford. Explaining Church finances is a challenge. The perception is that the Church has lots of money. We need to recognise that sacrificial giving is part of Church teaching.

The Archdeacon of Barking was invited to respond to the comments and questions. He stated that the stewardship group had been very keen to link stewardship and discipleship. This is not a fundraising campaign. Stewardship will not solve the dioceses problems in isolation, it forms part of the response. Yes, link it with wider resources. It is hoped the programme will be contextualised, it is also hoped people will work with Mission and Ministry Advisers. This work should not stop at Candlemas. Please get a hold of culture and please pray.

At this point the Chair invited Canon John Spence, a member of Archbishops’ Council and therefore an ex-officio member of this Diocesan Synod, to give a summary of the national church position.

Canon John Spence confirmed that whilst the Church Commissioners had billions at their disposal it had a legal commitment to intergenerational equity. Grants have been made to support Dioceses, including the Diocese of Chelmsford. He reminded members that he was the previous Chair of the CDBF and therefore understood the finances of this Diocese. He went on to say he was encouraged and hopeful for the future based on what he had experienced the Church doing during the pandemic. He had never seen a time of combined purpose and the National Church is aiming to strip out complexity. Thousands had accessed online worship and we need to acknowledge that the future will involve a blended model of both physical and online presence. Candidates for ordination are increasingly more youthful and diverse. The need is great, but we must not let COVID 19 stop the Church from being the centre of community.

The Acting Bishop of Chelmsford thanked Canon John Spence for his words of encouragement as well as the practical steps he is taking to support Dioceses and his service. It is incumbent upon us to look internally at what we can provide.

7. 2021 BUDGET

The Chair invited the Interim Chief Operating Officer to address the Synod. The Chief Operating Officer shared some slides setting out where Diocesan income came from and where that money is spent.
The following points were highlighted:

- SDF projects were currently mainly funded through grant money from the National Church and are kept separate from the budget.
- Support from the National Church will help us to manage until the end of 2020 and give us time to look at the internal management of finances.
- Bishops and most of the Cathedral clergy come are not costs borne by the Diocese.
- The Diocesan Office is about 10% more efficient in terms of costs than other Dioceses. The costs are low bearing in mind the size of the Diocese. However, we are looking at housekeeping and decreasing our spend.
- Further investments will be sold in 2021 if needed, but if we keep selling at the pace we have done we will exhaust our investments in 5 years.

To tackle this the Finance Executive are meeting fortnightly and overseeing an action plan. The action plan has five main objectives:

1. Strengthen the general fund
2. Increase income
3. Reduce costs
4. Improve the cash position
5. Avoid selling further investments

The Chair invited the Chair of the CDBF to move the motion.

The Chair of the CDBF clarified that parts a) and c) are required, part b) is about our future financial resilience.

The Chair of the CDBF then moved the motion that:

'This Synod
   a) approve the Diocesan Budget for 2021 with total budgeted expenditure of £21,686,000
   b) note the action plan for 2021 to address the budget deficit
   c) approve the apportionment of the total Share of £16,764,000 (before credits) on the same basis as 2020.'

Members were invited to contribute to the debate. The following members contributed:

Canon Adrian Smith (Maldon and Dengie)
Revd James Rodley (Harlow)
Pat Bash (Braintree)
Revd Canon Nick Rowan (Rochford)
Revd Clive Hillman (Hadleigh)
Richard Freeman (Saffron Walden)
Canon John Spence (Archbishops’ Council)

The contributions were as follows:
• This is our last chance. Other approaches have not worked. We need drastic action as we cannot keep going as we are.
• Ministers make the Diocese work, not an institution which requires separate funding. We need to move away from keeping institutions going and focus on local communities.
• Have options around renting out houses been explored? Could we look at expenditure on zero budgeting?
• Each parish starts the year at zero and tries to get the money in. Congregations are aging and newer members tend not to give as much. Movement and death can have a big impact on parish finances. We can’t assume parishes will have stable incomes.
• We may find we have been milking people to death. A lot of people budgeting with anxiety and job losses at the end of furlough.
• We need to rethink our business plan and may need outside support to do it.
• The National Church are looking at changes which will strip out unnecessary processes that avoid duplication or where it does not need to be done at all. The aim is to move to subsidiarity.

The Chair of the CDBF responded to the debate emphasising that the budget and apportionment needs to be approved. The Interim Chief Operating Officer commented that the pressures are understood and we do need to rethink some areas. We have to recognise the wide variety of parishes.

Members voted on the motion. The motion was carried with an overwhelming majority.

8. UPDATE AND DISCUSSION ON CLERGY DEPLOYMENT WORK

The Chair invited the Revd Canon Dr Roger Matthews to provide Synod with an update on the clergy deployment work.

The Revd Canon Dr Roger Matthews covered the following points in his update:

• He provided an update on the position at the Diocesan Office listing those roles where there were no immediate plan for replacement, roles where new appointments have been made on a part time basis instead, one where a vacancy was on hold and ones where appointments are being made as there is a strategic need. All posts in the Diocesan Office are under scrutiny and every effort being made to ensure flexibility and reduced expenditure.
• In terms of stipendiary clergy deployment, members were reminded that the 2025 target figures were being brought forward and therefore Archdeacons had been working with each Deanery on coding all posts in terms of their strategic importance.
• A limit had been placed on numbers of posts which could be allocated as ‘green’ so that it was not too easy to allocate green posts.
• The current numbers and summary predictions were provided at Diocesan level. It showed that there were still 28 posts which needed to be identified to reach the 2025 numbers.
The next steps involve consultation with the AMPCs, consideration by the DMPC and a report to the November Diocesan Synod. This is a priority and will have quarterly reviews.

Following that update the Chair directed that the two questions relating to this item would be taken.

Q7. Revd Susan Iskander (Chelmsford North) to ask the Interim Chief Executive Officer:

DS(2020)09 Paragraph 4 reads...Following the decision at the last Diocesan Synod, we are currently processing the outcomes of the review of Key Strategic Posts that the Archdeacons and Area Deans have been undertaking and will have a better picture in the next few weeks. This will inform our plan to reduce clergy posts and is expected to result in a further reduction in 2021 Ministry Costs. Please give a timetable for when the decisions on the review and reallocation of incumbency resources will be taken?

Answer
The presentation set out the position regarding the posts at Diocesan level. The Archdeacons will be sharing figures with the respective Area Mission and Pastoral Committees. It would be inappropriate to release too much details as pastoral sensitivities which require conversations to be had and situations where different options are available.

Supplementary questions
Q. Given the pressure on current vacancies, what is the timescale for this process?

A. A blanket answer cannot be given as it will depend on local circumstances. Some decisions could come about very quickly, others will take time. The pressure on existing vacancies was understood and it should be possible to clarify the positions soon.

Q. When will the categorisation of posts be communicated?

A. The work on posts is subjective and it is a matter for the Archdeacons to decide.

Q. Is there a masterplan to address the challenges facing the Diocese?

A. We are trying to integrate as much as possible.

Q8. Revd Susan Iskander (Chelmsford North) to ask the Interim Chief Executive Officer:

How and when will the output of the RAG rating process on stipendiary posts be communicated, as it was mentioned at the last Synod that this would be made public at some point?
Answer
This point had been answered in the update but the Interim Chief Executive confirmed he was happy to receive supplementary questions.

There being no supplementary questions the Chair invited comments and questions on the presentation from the Interim Chief Executive. The following members commented or asked questions:

Revd James Rodley (Harlow)
Canon Adrian Smith (Maldon and Dengie)
Revd Martin Bailey (Havering)
Revd Helen Gheorghiu Gould (Harlow)
Revd Canon John Dunnett (General Synod)
Revd Canon Nick Rowan (Rochford)
Mary Durlacher (General Synod)
Revd Susan Islander (Chelmsford North)
Revd Canon Lee Batson (Epping Forest and Ongar)
Revd Clive Hillman (Hadleigh)
Revd Canon Jane Richard (Basildon)
Canon Roger Ennals (Colchester)

The comments and questions were as follows:

- At the June meeting it was said that the target for stipendiary posts was 202, now it states that it is 215. How has this change happened? The Interim Chief Executive confirmed that the two figures were arrived using two different criteria, the former is due to availability of stipendiary clergy, the latter is due to affordability, particularly given the reduced income from the National Church.
- How are clergy with freehold being treated within this? The Interim Chief Executive stated he could not answer that question.
- It is incredibly expensive to make clergy redundant, the speaker estimated £100k per priest. The Interim Chief Executive commented that the coding of posts is not related to the quality of the clergy involved. The Chief Executive commented that the estimated figure was incorrect.
- It is important that notification occurs individually with parish priests and not to publicise it.
- The criteria being used for the coding of posts is still not clear. The Interim Chief Executive commented that it is very difficult to come up with uniform criteria.
- There are a huge number of vacancies, are their plans to ramp up vacancy development?
- We are in a place we don’t want to be, but we are in that place. There is a need for a balance between clarity, transparency, pastoral sensitivity and HR necessities. Could we have a detailed description of the process to be followed?
- There is a need to share this information as soon as possible as it is impacting morale and causing people to worry unnecessarily. The Interim Chief Executive commented that he understood the anxiety and that there was no reason why people could not, with guidance from the Archdeacon, have conversations with individuals if it would help.
- What encouragement is there for rural Churches?
- What about communication of this with lay members of Churches.
- There is no legal role for the MMU in this and there is a lot of concern the impact this will have on lay officers.
- It would be helpful if we committed to posts which are suitable for people coming out of curacy.
- The perception in other parts of the country is that this is not a Diocese to come to. We need to address low morale in the diocese and this perception. The Interim Chief Executive commented that all Dioceses are having to respond to the present challenges.
- One member spoke of a situation where a parish had had three stipendiary clergy and now have a House for Duty priest. Deanery meetings are very difficult.
- There are enormous tensions here but there needs to be central support.

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

Paper DS(2020)10 was received.

10. **DIOCESAN ENVIRONMENT GROUP AND REDBRIDGE DEANERY SYNOD MOTIONS**

The Chair suspended Standing Orders and invited the Archdeacon of Chelmsford, Chair of the Diocesan Environment Group and the Revd James Gilder, Diocesan Environmental Officer, to address the Synod. In their presentation they made the following points:

- We are told repeatedly about the crisis facing the earth. As God’s people we are called to consider creation. This is underpinned by the 5th Mark of Mission and is woven through the other four Marks.
- In February the General Synod debate and passed a motion committing to carbon neutrality by 2030, a link to this had been included in the paper for the meeting.
- The carbon output for the Diocese of Chelmsford is estimated to be about the equivalent of 40,000 double decker buses. The largest contributor to this was schools, but large parishes were also a significant contributor.
- This is not impossible to resolve. We have to accept this is a problem we can do something about. It doesn’t require a focus on big projects, a lot can be done simply and cheaply.
- A project management group had been put together to respond to the General Synod motion which included input from the education and property teams.
- A new website was being prepared to promote resources which Churches can use. A group of willing volunteers had been identified to take this forward.
- The Diocesan Environmental Officer had the ambition of visiting every Deanery Synod. There was much encouragement to be taken from what was already being done around the Diocese.
• It is not intended that this will be done at additional cost nor interfere with built heritage.
• In order for this to be successful this will require support from people ‘on the ground’.
• Why focus on this now? The answer is that it is a key part of our mission.
• This area is gaining a lot of support and interaction with the early stages of the ‘Greening the Church’ initiative has been positive.
• We will also benefit from the recognition our responsibility to God and our neighbours. We have a chance to choose to commit bravely to future generations, creation and God.

The Chair reinstated Standing Orders.

The Archdeacon of Chelmsford moved the motion that:

‘This Synod:
1) take note of the motion regarding Carbon Neutrality passed by General Synod.
2) ask the Diocesan Environmental Group to present to the next Bishops Council on 5th November a project plan which seeks to scope the task set by General Synod and outlines a strategy for engagement with deanery synods and chapters across the diocese as well as with the education department, property team and Diocesan Advisory Committee.
3) ask the Diocesan Environment Group to report annually to Diocesan Synod on progress towards net carbon zero emission, in order that Diocesan Synod can report to general Synod in 2022 and then subsequently every three years.’

The following members spoke during the debate:

Chris Luck (Brentwood)
Canon Wendy King (St Osyth)
Revd Helen Gheorghiu Gould (Harlow)
Mary Durlacher (General Synod)

The contributions were as follows:

• One member spoke of the experience of involving young people in this work. It will be important to do that here. The Archdeacon of Chelmsford confirmed that she agreed on the importance of involving young people. The Youth Synod had endorsed this motion in fact they asked if there was more that could be delivered.
• Is there financial support available for environmental measures?
• Electric cars are a viable option. The Archdeacon of Chelmsford commented that this was only one scheme offered in the Diocese of Sheffield.
• What effort can we make to reduce our dependency on fossil fuels? Many Churches cannot afford to make changes. Would it be possible for the Church of England to negotiate a plan for alternative heating systems? The Archdeacon of Chelmsford commented that this was important and that there was work being undertaken to look at green gas.
• The General Synod motion went beyond the original intention and may have prioritised desirability over achievability. Some Cathedrals have had their applications for solar panels turned down and, due to costs of maintenance, smaller Churches would need support in making this a viable option. It was acknowledged that the General Synod motion did go beyond the original intent. The achievability and sustainability will be part of the plan put to Bishop’s Council. Often there is a desire to jump to big proposals like solar panels but cheaper measures can make a difference. Smaller Churches would need help, however, their contributions to the carbon output are quite small.

The Synod voted on the motion. The motion passed with an overwhelming majority.

The Chair then suspended Standing Orders and invited the Area Dean of Redbridge to address the Diocesan Synod regarding the motion from Redbridge Deanery Synod. In his presentation he made the following points:

• He reminded members that this preceded the General Synod motion.
• The intention of this motion is to put the 5th Mark of Mission at the forefront.
• The Arocha Eco Diocese scheme is not the only way of proceeding, but it does involve the Diocese making a clear declaration. This involved the Diocesan Bishop registering, the commissioning of a group (which in could be the Diocesan Environment Group), and written policies.
• In order to obtain a gold rating 20% of the parishes in the Diocese would need to obtain a bronze rating.
• There will be consideration of ethical investment.
• It also involves recording and celebrating environmental initiatives.
• The motion is distinctive but supports the Diocesan motion.

The Chair reinstated Standing Orders and the Revd Gareth Jones moved the motion that:

‘This Synod:
1) encourage each Parochial Church Council in the Diocese of Chelmsford to engage with the A Rocha Eco Church scheme, aiming for at least a bronze award,
2) invite the Bishop of Chelmsford to register Chelmsford Diocese’s intent to become an Eco Diocese, and
3) commission the Diocesan Environmental Group to coordinate progress towards Eco Diocese status.’

The following members spoke in the debate:

The Acting Diocesan Bishop
The Bishop of Colchester

• Ruth Valerio says that creation has called 999 and the Church needs to answer.
• Essex has a climate commission and is looking at some far-reaching steps.
The Revd Gareth Jones thanked the speakers for their support. The Eco Church scheme is easy and free way of doing an audit. Some parishes in this Diocese have already achieved Gold and Silver ratings.

The Synod voted on the motion. The motion passed with an overwhelming majority.

CLOSE

The Chair thanked members for their engagement with important issues. We were all still learning how to hold these meetings virtually and will keep matters under review.

The President thanked the Vice Chairs. He emphasised the message of encouragement and generosity.

The President closed the Synod.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Isabel Adcock</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Mr Robert Edwards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revd David Anderton</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The Revd Ade Eleyae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revd Christiana Asinugo</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Mr Nicholas Ellis</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revd Faye Bailey</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Canon Roger Ennals</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revd Martin Bailey</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The Revd Marco Filipe Lopes</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revd Colin Baldwin</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The Revd Helen Flack</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Christine Ballard</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>The Revd Ola Franklin</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revd Canon David Banting</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The Revd Canon Jeremy Fraser</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revd Canon Darren Barlow</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Mr Richard Freeman</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr John Barnes</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>The Revd John Fry</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Patricia Bash</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Mr David Gentry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revd Canon Lee Batson</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The Revd Helen Gheorghiou Gould</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revd Iain Bendrey</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Revd Ray Gibbs</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Diana Benge-Abbott</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Canon Dean Gillespie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canon Lynne Bennett</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The Revd Stephanie Gillingham</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Maureen Best</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The Revd Ernie Guest</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canon Shirley Biro</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Revd Canon David Hague</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr John Bloomer</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>The Revd Michael Hall</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs John Bloomfield</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Michael Hall</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Wendy Boenke</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The Revd Stuart Halstead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revd Christopher Bolster</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The Revd Canon Paul Hamilton</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Sheila Bradley</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Canon Robert Hammond</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Harvey Braithwaite</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Frank Hawkins</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Christine Brown</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Mrs Jill Healey</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ven Christopher Burke</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Mrs Celia Heath</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Philip Carnelley</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Mrs Margaret Henning</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ven Elwin Cockett</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The Very Revd Nicholas Henshall</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revd Canon Jonathan Collis</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The Ven Vanessa Herrick</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Ann Colton</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Mrs Pam Higham</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revd Canon Martin Court</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Rt Revd Peter Hill</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Christine Cox</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>The Revd Clive Hillman</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Katia D'Arcy-Cumber</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Mr Andrew Holt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Alyson Davies</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Canon Christine Horton</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revd Chris Davies</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Mrs Heather Housden</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Ursula Davies</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The Asa Humphreys</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Gregory Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Revd Susan Islander</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revd Margaret Davis</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Canon Shirley Jeffery</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revd Katie de Bourcier</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Mark Jobin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canon Vevet Deer</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The Revd Gareth Jones</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revd Jack Dunn</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Mrs Lesley Judd</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revd Canon John Dunnett</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Mrs Diana Kennedy</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Mary Durlacher</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The Ven Robin King</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Nigel Dyson</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Canon Wendy King</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Mary Edwards</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The Revd Simon Law</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Revd Peter Edwards</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>The Revd Hilary Le Seve</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Canon Jill Leonard P
Mr Mac Leonard P
The Ven Mike Lodge P
Mr Percy Lomax P
The Revd Katharine Lovesey P
The Revd David Lower P
Dr Diana Lowry P
The Revd Dr Susan Lucas P
Mr Chris Luck P
Canon Harry Marsh P
Mr David Martins A
The Revd Canon Dr Roger Matthews P
The Revd Dr Adrian McConnaughie
Canon Ronald McLernon P
Mrs Judith Meaden A
Miss Hannah Mickleburgh-Gardham
Miss Mary Moore P
The Revd Shaun Moore
Mr Gwilym Morris P
Mr Larry Morris P
The Rt Revd Roger Morris P
The Revd Christine Newmarch P
The Revd Canon Paul Norrington P
Mr Piers Northam
The Revd Christian Okeke P
The Ven Ruth Patten P
The Rt Revd Dr John Perumbalath P
The Revd Dan Pierce P
Mrs Kathy Playle
Mr Andrew Podd
The Revd Peter Rabin
The Revd Canon Jane Richards P
Canon Mike Robinson P
The Revd James Rodley P
The Revd Canon Nick Rowan P
The Revd Clive Russell P
Revd Robert Ryan A
The Revd Mick Scotchmer P
The Revd Canon Marie Segal P
Mr Colin Setchfield P
The Revd Canon Margaret Shaw A
Canon Gordon Simmonds P
Canon Adrian Smith P
The Revd Lydia Smith P
The Ven Elizabeth Snowden P
The Revd Dr Anand Sodadasi P
Canon Dr John Spence P
Mr Robin Stevens P
Diocese of Chelmsford Racial Justice Task and Finish Group

Terms of Reference

A diversity is required, for if the body consisted of one single part, there wouldn’t be a body at all!

1 Cor 12:19 The Passion Translation

I. Purpose

The Task and Finish Group has been set up by the acting Bishop of Chelmsford to consider the implications for the Diocese of recent worldwide events which have brought racial injustice into sharp and disturbing focus, address immediate and long-term concerns about racism and inequality and make recommendations for reform which will secure positive outcomes for individuals of BAME heritage and advance the agenda for equality, diversity and inclusion in the Diocese.

We note that we have tried to tackle these issues before and have failed. There is no question that we can do better.

II. Vision

The timing is reactive but the Group’s objectives are not. We aim to move beyond being a mere echo chamber of the public response, and present concrete, measurable actions that will shape the type of church we should be in the Diocese of Chelmsford. A church which is actively anti-racist, where people are liberated by the presence of people of different ethnicities; where our rich diversity is celebrated for the blessing of God that it is; where people are not treated as ‘other’ in 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.

This can only happen when we confront the truth of the systemic racism that exists. But this has to be accompanied by grace, so we can move beyond dissecting and condemning and use this as a teachable moment so people in the Diocese can open up and learn. And ultimately be enabled to explore, in their own context, their stories of privilege, exclusion and ethnicity which will allow God’s redemptive work to continue.

III. Methods

To engage with humility and compassion as we examine issues of race theologically and pastorally, and provide a framework for a way forward.
IV. Objectives

1. Address issues of racial injustice and inequality in the Diocese by providing an understanding of racism and white privilege, highlighting the disparities and inequalities that exist within the church and the communities we serve.
2. Identify how the systems, structures and cultures in the Diocese disadvantage people of BAME heritage and propose ways to change this.
3. Consider ways of improving the under representation of individuals of BAME heritage in lay and ordained ministries and other leadership positions and governance roles across the Diocese.
4. Review the existing policies practices and procedures from across and outside the Diocese, to see whether there are disparities in the treatment of people of different ethnicities, identify areas of good practice and consider how various areas can be changed, developed or strengthened.
5. Consider ways in which the views and lived experiences of the marginalised and victims of racial injustice can be heard.
6. Explore the impact of the demographics on how racial injustice has been prioritised within the Diocese in the past and address how to engage communities in the Diocese with a low proportion of BAME individuals and encourage their participation.
7. Examine the range of physical and incorporeal property (e.g. patronages) with links to slavery within our churches and explore ways in which the Diocese can provide appropriate support to churches in dealing with them.
8. Identify ways in which the Diocese can develop approaches that work against systemic racism and embed them in every aspect of Diocesan life.
9. Establish concrete ways in which performance and progress on issues of systemic racism is measured and tracked.
10. Make recommendations for future action and strategies to be adopted across the Diocese to ensure that the Diocese of Chelmsford becomes a place of equality for people of all ethnicities.

V. Reporting

The group will begin work in September 2020 and provide an initial report to the acting Bishop of Chelmsford by 30 November 2020, with a second stage report by 1 Feb 2021.
History
Our work on Reimagining Ministry, one of the four strands of Transforming Presence, began in 2012 with a focus on ministry numbers, deployment, vocations, and the formation of Mission and Ministry Units. It was clear that our dependence on stipendiary incumbents would need to reduce, not on affordability grounds, but because of the reducing availability of stipendiary clergy in the period up to 2025 as a result of high average age and accelerating retirements. The recent increases of ordination candidates should mean the curve bottoms out in 2025/26 and could then potentially increase. The introduction of Mission and Ministry Units (MMUs) is enabling greater collaboration between parishes and between a greater variety of ordained and lay ministers.

Since 2012, we have been planning to reduce to 215 stipendiary incumbency posts by 2025 which was the number of clergy that we could reasonably assume would be available to us. We are very grateful to every deanery for the planning and action that has already been achieved and especially to those deaneries who have already reached their 2025 numbers and completed the formation of MMUs.

Affordability became an issue when the national church decided to phase out the “Darlow” grants at the same time as parish share shortfall was increasing. Darlow contributed £2.64m in 2016 and is reducing over a 10-year period to zero in 2026 (although we will continue to receive about £1m Low Income Communities (LinC) grant for our most deprived parishes). A calculation in April 2019 estimated that, at then current giving levels, we could afford 202 posts in 2025.

The Effects of Covid-19
Income levels across the church have reduced in 2020. For the diocese, we are currently predicting a reduction of between 13% and 20% in parish share receipts (on top of last year’s record shortfall). This is likely to result in a budget deficit of over £3m in 2020 and 2021.

This led to the proposal to bring forward the implementation of our planned reductions from 2025 to the end of 2021. This was endorsed by Finance Committee in May and reported to Diocesan Synod in June.

We have now done a rough recalculation of affordability to update the 202 number estimated in 2019. Assuming our income continues at the current reduced level; all our Darlow income ceases from 2026; and all other expenditure remains unchanged - we may only be able to afford
166 stipendiary incumbent posts from the start of 2026. This is definitely not a figure we should plan to achieve but it serves to give a worst-case scenario until we have evidence of financial recovery.

We are not alone in facing the two issues of clergy availability and affordability. Our forecast reduction in parish share income is close to the national average and many dioceses are implementing significant reductions in their stipendiary posts. Our MMU strategy puts us in a strong position to adapt to new patterns of ministry but, it is recognised that reducing income may place greater strain on the developing partnerships between benefices.

**Categorisation of Posts**

To check the feasibility of bringing forward the 2025 plan, the Archdeacons were asked to work with Area Deans and Lay Chairs to produce a simple coding of each stipendiary incumbent-level post. This was deliberately done with limited consultation so that the results could be collated quickly. The Area Mission and Pastoral Committees have now provided valuable feedback on the process at their October meetings.

The coding used a simple RAG scheme, as follows:

- **Red**: This stipendiary post is not sustainable and alternative ministry provision should be discerned. When vacant, the post should be closed in its present form.
- **Amber**: This post is desirable, subject to affordability.
- **Green**: This post is missionally strategic and financially sustainable. If currently vacant, proceed with recruitment.

The results of the process for each archdeaconry are shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archdeaconry</th>
<th>Current Actuals and Targets</th>
<th>Current Predictions FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barking</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlow</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Ham</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barking Area Total</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>112.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelmsford</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southend</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradwell Area Total</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>90.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stansted</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester Area Total</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>73.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan Total</td>
<td>215.0</td>
<td>276.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the key things to note are:

1. The total number of Green posts (150) is less than our minimum affordable number (166), which means there is no expected risk to these posts.
2. The number of Red posts (45) is less than the number of posts we need to close (61) to achieve the 2025 target, this places 16 Amber posts at risk. Further work will be needed to identify these posts.

3. If giving levels do not increase and it is decided to cut posts to achieve the 2025/26 affordable number (166), it will place a further 49 Amber posts at risk, making a total of 65 out of 82.

4. The number of current and expected Red-post vacancies and retirements (32) will take us more than halfway to the 2025 target.

5. Among our current vacancies (44), a total of 16 are Red posts. Subject to any required pastoral reorganisation, these will not be filled.

6. House for Duty (HfD) posts are included at a notional 0.2 cost of a full-time equivalent (FTE) post. The actual cost of a HfD post is higher than this and work is underway to provide more accurate figures for both HfD and Half-time posts for future planning.

There is understandable demand for the detailed coding results to be known by post-holders, benefices, MMUs and deaneries. This has already happened in some deaneries but is not yet possible in others for a variety of different reasons. For example, some more rural deaneries have determined that they can operate with a particular number of Green posts, but these do not align with current benefice boundaries and so further work and pastoral reorganisation will be needed to locate these posts. In other deaneries, it is envisaged that two current Amber posts will become one Green and one Red posts but more work is needed to determine which. This means there will inevitably be developments of local plans and so it would be inappropriate to publish greater detail at this stage.

However, once Diocesan Synod have agreed the broad parameters for reducing posts, each post holder and benefice will be contacted to discuss the coding of their post and explore possible options for the future. The process and timetable for this will be set out by each Archdeacon before the end of 2020. Once this is completed, each deanery and Area Mission and Pastoral Committee will be able to start the formal work on pastoral reorganisation as required. The role and contribution of AMPCs is key to this overall process.

**Implications for Benefices**

The reduction of stipendiary incumbent posts will inevitably have an impact on the way that mission and ministry is exercised in each locality. These effects can only be planned for in, and between, deaneries and especially in each Mission and Ministry Unit. The aim will be to maintain a missional focus with a sustainable pattern of public worship and pastoral care in every locality.

Some of the inherited expectations about what stipendiary clergy do, the forms of public worship, the responsibilities of self-supporting lay and ordained ministers, and lay leadership etc. will all continue to change and develop. Maintaining every existing service in every building will not be possible and finding sustainable and fruitful ways forward will require prayer, grace, generosity and time.

Deaneries have been working on these issues for many years already and a renewed impetus will be needed in the next year or two. We cannot wait for 2025 to come, new expectations must start to be implemented now. The experience of ministering and worshipping in new ways during the Covid-19 pandemic has the potential to assist the process of establishing new patterns rather than reverting to previous normality.
The Faith and Order Commission’s recently published “Kingdom Calling - The Vocation, Ministry and Discipleship of the Whole People of God” provides timely theological insights for the task ahead.

Implications for Clergy Post Holders
It has been made very clear that the coding exercise is an assessment of the missional importance and sustainability of the post, not the quality or capability of the current post-holder. There will however be uncertainty for those in posts coded Red or Amber despite the security offered to incumbents by The Ecclesiastical Offices (Terms of Service) Regulations 2009 – often called the Common Tenure legislation.

No incumbent can be “made redundant” in the way provided in normal employment law. There are some limited provisions to deprive a clergyperson of their ecclesiastical office and provide statutory compensation. However, we hope the need for such provisions will be minimal and a last resort.

It would be inappropriate to try to implement a one-size-fits-all approach to those who find themselves in Red posts. Rather, individual pastoral and vocational conversations between the post-holder and their Bishop or Archdeacon is essential. A range of options could be considered, including:

1. Explore applying for a new post with greater strategic importance and security (including Green posts in this diocese).
2. Consider early retirement or house for duty arrangements for those close to retirement.
3. Consider alternative vocational pathways.

To be viable, options 2 and 3 are likely to require a package of financial support.

To prevent putting more clergy into a vulnerable position in the next few years, it is recommended that no permanent appointments should be made to any Red posts and great caution should be exercised in appointing to Amber posts. It is likely that more Amber posts will be filled with time-limited interim appointments while issues of sustainability are determined.

Implications for Ordinands and Curates
Our diocesan base-line number of stipendiary curates is 13 per year and we receive national support of 70% of the costs of deploying in excess of that number. In 2020 and 2021 we will deploy 15 or 16 curates. In 2022, there is a small reduction in those completing their ordination training and we expect 13 of our candidates will be looking for stipendiary posts. The diocese remains committed to maintaining curate numbers with a minimum of 13 new stipendiary deacons per year from 2022.

It will be vital for us to have a similar number of suitable first incumbency posts available each year for those completing their curacies to move into. In most cases this will be provided for by

---

1 Available at: https://www.churchofengland.org/sites/default/files/2020-10/Kingdom%20Calling%20Web%20Version.pdf
the normal flow of retirements and clergy moves. Our current system of variable length curacies will also help some appointments to take place in less than the usual 3+ years.

**Financial Implications**
In the event that we do need to help clergy move from posts that are disappearing, the cost will be considerable. The standard Common Tenure compensation is one year’s stipend and housing.

It is much too early to estimate the total cost but we are starting to discuss with the Church Commissioners what support may be available from their Transitional Support fund for dioceses. It is hoped this support could make a significant contribution towards both the direct cost of the disappointments and the associated HR and legal costs.

**Recommended Next Steps**
The Diocesan Mission and Pastoral Committee commended the following recommendations at their meeting on 5 November 2020:

1. Each Archdeacon to set out a process of communication and consultation to disseminate the RAG coding of posts in each of their deaneries.
2. Vocational conversations with clergy in Red posts to be completed by March 2021.
3. Recommendations for any Pastoral Reorganisation required for Red posts to be considered by AMPCs, starting in February 2021.
4. Archdeacons, with Area Deans and Lay Chairs, to keep their Amber posts under regular review to adjust for changes in both local mission opportunity and sustainability, and changes in diocesan income.
5. Review the affordability figures in September 2021 and report back to Diocesan Synod in November 2021 with recommendations for when and if any further reductions in posts will be required.
6. The Interim CEO and COO to continue conversations with the Church Commissioners with a view to applying for Transition Funding for 2021 and 2022.

*Diocesan Synod are invited to discuss this paper and approve the strategic direction of travel and the recommended next steps.*

The Revd Canon Dr Roger Matthews
Interim Chief Executive and Diocesan Secretary
1. INTRODUCTION

This paper provides the timetable for the election to the Diocesan Synod in 2021, including subsequent committee elections. It also summarises the result of the consultation on the Diocesan Synod election formulae and voting system.

2. ELECTION TIMETABLE

The Acting Bishop of Chelmsford has agreed the following:

By 31 December 2020

a) Diocesan Synod to decide the formulae to be used to calculate the number of representatives elected from each Deanery and electoral system.
b) Bishop to appoint presiding Officers and agree timetable – Area Dean is to be the Presiding Officer for House of Laity and Lay Chair is to be the Presiding Officer for the House of Clergy, although they may delegate to another appropriate member of the same house.
c) Notify Deanery Officers of upcoming election.

By 30 April 2021

a) Register of electors sent to Deanery Secretaries for checking\(^1\). Deanery Synod Secretary must respond within 7 days,
b) Template forms for nomination and voting sent to presiding Officers.

Subject to approval from the Bishop, the suggested timetable for the election:

- No later than 7 May – electoral registers sent to Presiding Officers.
- 14 May – Nomination forms will be issued to members of Deanery Synod\(^2\).
- 8 June – closing date for nominations.
- 18 June – voting papers issued\(^3\).

---

\(^1\) Must be done 21 days prior to issue of nominations.
\(^2\) Nomination period must be at least 21 days.
\(^3\) Voting period must be at least 14 days.
• 13 July – closing date for voting papers and count takes place.
• 15 July\(^4\) – results will be announced and notified to the Head of Service Delivery.
• 1 August – members of the new Synod take office.

As soon as possible after 1 August – Nomination forms for the various Committees\(^5\) of the Synod are circulated along with the welcome pack.

By 30 October – Bishop’s Council elections to be completed.

By 31 December – elections to all other committees to be completed.

3. **CURRENT FORMULAE AND SYSTEM**

The current formulae used for determining lay and clergy reps for each Deanery are as follows:

- 1 lay rep for every 550 names on the total electoral roll number of parishes within the Deanery, using the ER numbers reported at the 2020 Annual Parochial Church Meetings.
- 1 clergy rep for every 6 members of the House of Clergy of the Deanery Synod

The electoral system used in this Diocese has always been simple majority. The other system permitted under the Church Representation Rules is the Single Transferable Vote (STV) system.

4. **CONSULTATION ON ELECTION FORMULA AND SYSTEM**

On 5 August Deanery Officers were emailed to invite them to consider the election formulae and the system for use in the election. A copy of the email is appended.

There were 12 responses in total. The responses were quite mixed. Overall there was a split on whether the present formulae should be retained or changed, with five each for change or no change, two did not express a view either way.

In respect of the electoral system four felt that we should change to the STV system and three felt that we should not. The others did not express a view either way.

There was a general sense from some that significant changes to this forthcoming triennium would not help given the great deal of change going on everywhere else.

5. **FORMULA**

Having modelled what it would look like to retain the formula from the current triennium (see Appendix 1), it was noted that this would lead to an intolerable

---

\(4\) Election must be completed by this date.

\(5\) These are the Bishop’s Council, the Vacancy in See Committee, the Area Mission & Pastoral Committees, the Houses Committee and the Diocesan Board of Education.
imbalance between the House of Clergy and the House of Laity. This is due to the
significant reductions in the total Electoral Roll numbers over the current triennium
during which new Electoral Rolls were formed). The Church Representation Rules
require the size of each House to be approximately equal (CRR 35 (5) (b)). The Articles
of Association of the CDBF also require a lay majority when the Synod is acting in its
capacity as the CDBF.

Therefore, two options were put forward to address this, simply amending either
formula so the total number of clergy are reduced, or the total number of laity are
increased. These are set out in Appendices 2 & 3.

6. STANDING COMMITTEE & BISHOP’S COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION

The consensus of the standing committee and the Bishop’s Council was that the formula
for the House of Clergy should be amended so that the total number of clergy
representatives are reduced to keep in line with the total number of laity (using the
same formula as the current triennium). They were also of the view that the simple
majority electoral system should be retained. Given the lack of contested elections and
the relative complexity of the STV election process (compared to the simple majority
system) it was felt this would place an unnecessary burden on presiding officers,
especially at this time of great change.

Therefore, following consideration by the Standing Committee the recommendations to
the Diocesan Synod are that they are asked to approve the following motions:

Motion 1
‘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’.

Motion 2
‘That this Synod approve the use of the simple majority voting system in the 2021 Diocesan
Synod election.’

7. RECOMMENDATION

That the Diocesan Synod APPROVE the above listed motions.
APPENDIX I

ALLOCATION OF SEATS FOR ELECTIONS IN 2021

[Minimum: 2 seats per Deanery House]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deanery</th>
<th>House of Clergy</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Electoral Roll totals</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2021 seats</td>
<td>2018 seats</td>
<td>1:6</td>
<td>1:6</td>
<td>2021 seats</td>
<td>2018 Seats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:550</td>
<td>1:550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barking &amp; Dagenham</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1196</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havering</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2745</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epping Forest &amp; Ongar</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2157</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlow</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newham</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbridge</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2364</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelmsford</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2476</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldon &amp; Dengie</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basildon</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1034</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadleigh</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1277</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southend</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1213</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurrock</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1055</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochford</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witham</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1472</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2115</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harwich</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Osyth</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1312</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinckford</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braintree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunmow &amp; Stansted</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saffron Walden</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diocesan Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 As at 30 October 2020
2 As notified to the Diocesan Office after the 2020 Annual Parochial Church Meetings
APPENDIX 2

ALLOCATION OF SEATS FOR ELECTIONS IN 2021

[Minimum: 2 seats per Deanery House]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deanery</th>
<th>House of Clergy</th>
<th>2021 seats</th>
<th>2018 seats</th>
<th>Electoral Roll totals</th>
<th>2021 seats</th>
<th>2018 Seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:6</td>
<td>1:6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barking &amp; Dagenham</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1196</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havering</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2745</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epping Forest &amp; Ongar</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2157</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlow</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newham</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbridge</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2364</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelmsford</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2476</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldon &amp; Dengie</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basildon</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1034</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadleigh</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1277</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southend</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1213</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurrock</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1055</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochford</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witham</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1472</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2115</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harwich</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Osyth</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1312</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinckford</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braintree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunmow &amp; Stansted</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saffron Walden</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan Totals</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 As at 30 October 2020
2 As notified to the Diocesan Office after the 2020 Annual Parochial Church Meetings
### APPENDIX 3

**ALLOCATION OF SEATS FOR ELECTIONS IN 2021**

*Minimum: 2 seats per Deanery House*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deanery</th>
<th>House of Clergy 1</th>
<th>2021 seats</th>
<th>2018 seats</th>
<th>Electoral Roll totals 2</th>
<th>House of Laity 1:550</th>
<th>2021 Seats</th>
<th>2018 Seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barking &amp; Dagenham</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1196</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havering</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2745</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epping Forest &amp; Ongar</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2157</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harlow</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newham</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redbridge</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2364</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltham Forest</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelmsford</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2476</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldon &amp; Dengie</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basildon</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1034</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadleigh</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1277</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southend</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1213</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurrock</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1055</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochford</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witham</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1472</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2115</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harwich</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Osyth</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1312</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinckford</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braintree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunmow &amp; Stansted</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saffron Walden</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Diocesan Totals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>57</strong></th>
<th><strong>76</strong></th>
<th><strong>57</strong></th>
<th><strong>76</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

1. As at 30 October 2020
2. As notified to the Diocesan Office after the 2020 Annual Parochial Church Meetings
Dear Area Deans, Lay Chairs and Deanery Secretaries (cc’d Diocesan Chair of House of Clergy and Diocesan Chair of House of Laity)

I hope you are all keeping well and, hopefully, able to take some sort of break this summer.

Before the end of the year the Diocesan Synod is to make certain provisions for the Diocesan Synod elections scheduled for 2021.

Therefore, I am consulting you on the proposals to put to the Diocesan Synod in November. There are two key points:

1. The formula used to determine the number of clergy and lay reps for each Deanery.
2. The system to be used for the vote – ‘First Past the Post’ or Single Transferable Vote

It would be helpful to have responses on the below by **9 October 2020** so I can present the result to the Standing Committee and Bishop’s Council meetings later that month. Please do feel free to share with others in your Deanery as appropriate.

**Formula**
The formula used for the 2018-2021 triennium is set out in the attached.

There are some requirements that the Diocesan Synod must take in to account when setting this formula:

a) The number of clergy in the Deanery House of Clergy and the total number of names on the electoral rolls of the parishes within the Deanery
b) That each Deanery must have no less than 2 clergy and 2 lay reps.
c) The total number of Synod members must be between 100-270
d) The total number of clergy and laity on the Synod must be approximately equal.

I’d be grateful of your views on whether we should change the present formula and, if so, in what way. A number of Deaneries have struggled to fill their full complements throughout the triennium (in some cases positions have been vacant throughout) and therefore there may be a case for shrinking the overall size of the Diocesan Synod (at present if all positions were filled the total membership of our Synod is 200)?

**Voting system**
The method used for this election has traditionally been the ‘First Past the Post’ system meaning those who get the most votes are elected as representatives e.g. if you have three seats and four candidates, the three candidates with the most votes are elected.

Over the duration of this triennium we have received an opinion that switching to the Single Transferable Vote method would be a fairer system. This method uses a series of preferences for voting (e.g. each voter orders the candidates in preference as far as they wish). For a simple explanation of STV please see the Electoral Reform website - [https://www.electoral-reform.org.uk/voting-systems/types-of-voting-system/single-transferable-vote/](https://www.electoral-reform.org.uk/voting-systems/types-of-voting-system/single-transferable-vote/).

I would be grateful if you could let me know if you have any views on which system should be proposed to the Diocesan Synod. It would be particularly useful to have views from Area Deans and Lay Chairs as they serve as presiding officers (Area Dean for laity and Lay Chair for clergy). I appreciate that these elections very rarely result in
a ballot as there are usually not enough candidates to require one. However, if a ballot is required and the STV system is used we would provide, through the National Church, software which would enable you all to conduct the counts.

Finally, I appreciate that this election can, in some respects, be complex and I am also aware that a number of you are new to your roles. Therefore, I would be prepared to offer training (in person or virtually) prior to this election. I would be grateful if you could confirm whether you would be interested in such training? In any case I would provide written instructions and the forms which need to be used.

And finally, finally, leaving aside all the legalities, it would be good to start encouraging people within your Deaneries to think about standing for election next year. If we can help with that, please let me know.

Blessings

Nathan

Nathan Whitehead
Head of Service Delivery
Tel 01245 294412
Mobile: 07972 101075
www.chelmsford.anglican.org

The Church of England in Essex and East London
Diocese of Chelmsford
This paper summarises the business of the Bishop’s Council since the report circulated to the October meeting.

**November 2020**

**Bishop’s Council**

- Approved the next steps in the goal to reach carbon neutrality by 2030, following the October approval of the environment motions.
- Approved a recommendation to the Diocesan Synod regarding the formulae and voting system for the 2021 Diocesan Synod elections.

**DMPC**

- Approved the recommendations regarding the deployment of stipendiary clergy to Diocesan Synod.
- Approved the commencement of formal consultations of four pieces of pastoral reorganisation:
  - Formation of a Bishop’s Mission Order for the Church at Beam Park,
  - Formation of a Bishop’s Mission Order for the Christ Church, Three Mills,
  - Union of the benefice of Finchingfield and Cornish Hall End and Wethersfield with Shalford with the benefice of Great and Little Bardfield.
  - Union of the parish of Orsett, the parish of Bulphan and the parish of Horndon on the Hill.
- Approved a recommendation to the Church Commissioners for the alternative use of the closed church of Holy Trinity Abridge.

**Finance Committee**

- Approved the financing of a replacement of parsonage house at Wescliff St Alban.
- Reviewed the draft action plan to address the Diocesan financial position.
- Noted the CDBF IT infrastructure renewal paper.

Synod is asked to NOTE this report.