



ARCHBISHOP'S COUNCIL

Minutes of a Meeting of the Archbishop's Council held on Saturday 7th October 2023
at St Paul's Parish Centre, Canterbury, CT1 1NH

Present	Rt Revd Rose Hudson-Wilkin (Chair)	<i>(Bishop of Dover)</i>
	Very Revd David Monteith	<i>(Dean of Canterbury Cathedral)</i>
	Ven Darren Miller	<i>(Archdeacon of Ashford)</i>
	Ven Will Adam	<i>(Archdeacon of Canterbury)</i>
	Ven Andrew Sewell	<i>(Archdeacon of Maidstone)</i>
	Ven Stephen Taylor	<i>(Diocesan Secretary)</i>
	Mr John Moss	<i>(Chair of the Board of Education)</i>
	Revd Andy Bawtree	<i>(Chair of the House of Clergy)</i>
	Mrs Miranda Ford	<i>(Chair of the House of Laity)</i>
	Revd Jeremy Worthen	<i>(Rector, Ashford Town Parish)</i>
	Revd Estella Last	<i>(Vicar, the Bridge Benefice)</i>
	Mr John Morrison	<i>(Reader, Canterbury Deanery)</i>
	Ms Amanda Boucherat	<i>(Co-Chair, Mission and Ministry Framework)</i>
	Mr Graham Codling	<i>(Lay Chair, Weald Deanery)</i>
In Attendance	Revd Richard Braddy	<i>(Chaplain to the Bishop of Dover)</i>
	Mr Quentin Roper	<i>(Director of Education)</i>
	Mr Jonathan Arnold	<i>(Director of Communities & Partnership)</i>
	Mr Neville Emslie	<i>(Director of Mission and Ministry)</i>
	Mrs Orla Garratt	<i>(Head of Media & Engagement)</i>
	Mr Colin Evans	<i>(Strategic Programme Manager)</i>
	Mrs Jo Manser	<i>(EA to the Diocesan Secretary)</i>

1. Opening Prayers

+Rose opened the meeting with a reading from 2 Kings

2. Apologies and Notices

Apologies from Gareth Dickinson and Peter Wyllie.

+Rose welcomed Amanda Boucherat as the newly appointed co-chair of the Mission & Ministry Framework and also Orla Garratt Head of Media and Engagement and her first Archbishop's Council meeting.

3. Declaration of Conflicts of Interest

None Declared.

4. Minutes of the Meeting of 10 June 2023

The minutes were approved and adopted.

5. Matters arising from the Minutes of the Meeting of 10 June

None.

6. Safeguarding Audit Preparations

John Morrison gave apologies from our Diocesan Safeguarding Advisors and reported on their behalf. He circulated the draft National Safeguarding Standards, there are 5 standards with Prevention and Victims and Survivors considered the most important.

INEQE have been appointed as the independent auditors. Canterbury Diocese and Canterbury Cathedral together will have their audit in November 2026. There are lots of things to be done between then and now. We are in position to present a good case for quality. There will be a single point of contact for the Diocese, Cathedral and Bishop's Office as we work closely together. It is possible that INEQE will request to audit parishes. There will be an initial meeting to plan the audit visit. The National Church are paying for the contract. During the audit the auditors will have total access to the case management system and the clergy blue files. Members of the council must keep up to date with safeguarding policies. It will take around 3.5 days for the audit, 15 working days to draft the reports, and then 15 days to review the report and correct factual errors only. We will prepare a good public facing statement in time for the report being published, 45 days later. It will go on our website, cathedral website, national level. All recommendations in the report will be advisory, as last time a small group will prepare an action plan to address the outcomes.

DM –We can be confident our safeguarding is in a good place, but we cannot be complacent. There are some challenges about maintaining the good practice, safer recruitment is a challenge in parishes - the diocese is not just our office it is entire the diocese.

JMoss – embedding of the culture is where the emphasis should be. As Archbishop's Council what would be helpful for us to hear is the programme of work to develop that culture, would like to hear further reports sooner rather than later, to get this on board in every parish.

JW asked if there in internal peer review because the victim survivor aspect is crucial, can the Safeguarding Executive Group (SEG) let us know what the processes are and how we are dealing with it? This is very sensitive and confidential information. DM responded that the DSAs give SEG a briefing. In terms of a peer review it is not a mini audit but internal inspection.

+Rose asked if safeguarding can be a standing item at deanery synods.

JMorrison SEG are looking at this. We will share good practice.

7. To Approve the Updated Constitution for the Diocesan Mission and Pastoral Committee (DMPC)

ST reported that it was a few years ago when we reformed the constitution for DMPC. The headline has changed since last reviewed. Nigel Collins the Diocesan Pastoral Secretary has been across the detail to ensure we are compliant and the DMPC have reviewed this several times before confirming they are content with the attached.

Archbishop's Council approved the updated Constitution for Diocesan Mission and Pastoral Committee.

8. To Receive the Minutes of the Meeting of Diocesan Synod held on 4th July 2023

ST reported that this is the second occasion that Archbishop's Council are receiving the draft minutes of Diocesan Synod just as Diocesan Synod will receive our draft minutes. Synod have not

yet approved these minutes. There are no actions arising from Diocesan Synod for Archbishop's Council to take forward.

9. Reflections from Diocesan Synod

It was noted that the last two Synods had been quite difficult. In a wide-ranging discussion, the Council debated what might be the reasons and how it could enable Diocesan Synod to be a safe place for robust debate, discernment and decision making, all of which expressing our being the Body of Christ together despite differing views.

Some of the challenges raised by members included the anxiety expressed in the Church across the nation; how the different types of business (questions, decision making, presentations) need clear means of being conducted, which should be provided by the standing orders; and communication around some of the items being brought to Synod is not always clear, leading to misunderstanding.

Members debated some ways that could alleviate the problems Diocesan Synod was encountering. These included: good briefing for Chairs of the types of business and the approach needed in chairing these, clarity on standing orders to enable better differentiation of business, ensuring agendas are clear and well prepared with good supporting papers, allowing space for more involved discussion of some issues – with standing orders suspended, if appropriate, to allow different kinds of debate and to ensure more voices are heard.

+Rose thanked everyone for their contributions, noting there was value in everything that had been heard.

10. Parish Share Review Proposal

DG reported that we are carrying forward a motion from the Synod that Archbishop's Council carry out a wider ranging review of the Parish Share process. How do we move forward? Do we undertake a major review (Option A), which will be the third time in 10 years, or do undertake a minor review (Option B). We have worded the Proposal to cover as wide an area as possible, we are not closing down the discussion regarding the methodology. We have included a postscript for information from the National Church. They recognise that the time has come for a new model for diocesan finances, looking at Parish Share overall, incorporating a standardised or preferable method for Parish Share in the longer term, this is the first time that they have mentioned this.

Our diocese is not in a great position, but we are not the worst, another diocese is hitting the buffers and needs bailing out and that has highlighted some potential weaknesses in the current support system from the National Church, there is a recognition some dioceses have significant historic reserves and some do not. General Synod has allowed dioceses to support one another. This is what a sustainable future looks like for the Church of England.

ABawtree commented that he was a member of the Parish Share Review Group. It did take into account what other dioceses had done. A minor review seems more productive and gives something Synod to work with.

CE the slightly bigger implication is there is a disincentive to report AWA figures accurately. When CE has recently met with some Deaneries and when discussing parish attendance stats and growth, it would seem that the figures which have been provided are inaccurate.

EL asked if Option C could be added, to leave it as it is. Just stay as we are for a little while, the current system is working, unless there is driving need or pressure at this time to change then leave it as it is.

JW requested a modification to Option A, to focus initially on examining new factors since the last review, and whether in the light of that there is a case for changing our approach. One factor would be what change there had been in practice regarding parish share in other dioceses, what thinking they might have done in relation to that, and what we could learn from it. Another would be our new diocesan strategy, and how our approach to parish share can best align with it. The group looking at this could report back to Synod e.g. in July next year, when there would be a decision on whether to end the process at that point or proceed to explore one or more alternative models to current practice in detail.

JMoss added that members of Synod will want to have some sense of timeline implications, the proposal should include when the decision is to be made and when we expect the outcome for the decision to be made.

+Rose commented that there is an elephant in the room around Parish Share. CE has referred to attendance figures, parishes feel they are being punished for growth. Something going on in our church and our diocese. We think of Parish Share as voluntary. What do we do with leaders within the church who encourage people not to contribute to Parish Share? This creates havoc for those managing the budgets. There are bigger things around Parish Share, like a lack of sense of generosity.

ST referred to Bob Jackson's comments that wherever you align attendance with Parish Share reporting the figures are less accurate. We were in a grouping with 5 other diocese, and we were at the bottom of that 5, we were the only diocese out of the 5 who attached attendance to their Parish Share. Continuing to attach the Parish Share element to the attendance is seen as a weakness.

EL responded that this information needs to be provided to Synod, it is interesting and gives rise to a case on whether an investigation is required. If there is rationale that is really useful. There is wide lack of understanding that you pay for church, prioritising fuel bills over Parish Share. +Rose, education is needed, we as leaders, lay and ordained need to be having that conversation.

There was a vote on the Proposal, modifying Option A taking into JW's comments and wording and adding an Option C.

All approved, no abstentions.

JW recommended that this should be presented to Synod as a matter relating to diocesan vision and strategy in the first instance, rather than as primarily a financial matter.

11. Draft Agenda for Diocesan Synod on 18th November

ST reported that the Chairs of the Houses, DM, ST and Jo Manser met as the Agenda Committee in August and set a plan for Synod going forward. We are in the final year for this triennium, with the first Open Synod in November and the second being March next year at which the focus will be on evangelism and helping people to come to faith. ST has invited the Chief Executive of the Church Army and the Bishop of Islington to facilitate that meeting.

During the Agenda Committee there was a discussion around LLF and how to give Synod members the opportunity to explore it, especially as the timing of Diocesan Synod with General Synod has meant we have not been able to have a debate or presentation on this. It was agreed that in November we will have a closed Synod to allow an open discussion in the afternoon rather than the

morning. The Revd Dr Mark Betson has been invited to facilitate the session. Mark will be meeting with +Rose, Neville and Sam Keeler-Walker to explore the details of the session.

DMonteith referred to our earlier conversation with regarding to making things clearer on the agenda. He would find it very helpful as a member to know what he is doing e.g. list the topic and be very clear about as to whether it is to agree, discuss or note. What is the LLF discussion about and what is for, given this meeting is a few days after General Synod. If our discussion is about how we respond to the decisions, what is the thing we are going to do? ST responded that he had taken these comments on board concerning the agenda. The purpose of the LLF conversation, it is possible that GS will have decided to take to Diocesan Synod some particular proposals, this could be our first opportunity as DS to listen to each other on these issues and ask how do we communicate this in our parish churches without a discussion we are left with nowhere to speak and are left drifting, this will it will be more constructive.

The Council had a lively discussion, with a number of different views being voiced. There was a question about what this session is about – to agree, discuss or note the LLF process? It is to provide a safe space to hear others' views? It cannot be to come to a view on what General Synod may decide in November as there will be no time for any papers and briefings to come from General Synod to the dioceses. Some felt that if the session were to be meaningful, it must have longer than the time being currently timetabled. A member of the Council had been part of the facilitated conversations at General Synod and explained how it had opened them up to other views than their own which helped understand the wider debate. A number of members voiced their concerns that this process would need careful handling to avoid possible hurt.

Taking into account the various views put forward in the meeting, it was clarified that a time of facilitated conversations would not be for decision-making but for hearing each other in Synod and that this process should have a clear introductory note produced for Synod members.

It was agreed to proceed with facilitated LLF discussions in the afternoon, to re-order and re-word the agenda and to have a statement circulated to introduce this. This session would be after the formal meeting had closed before lunch and therefore standing orders would not apply.

During this item, a question was raised about the See of Maidstone as it had been withdrawn from the agenda at the July Synod. +Rose responded that in the light of the decision of the Diocesan Commission we have decided at this time not to take this any further.

12. Financial Reporting

Proposed Budget for 2024

DG reported on the Proposed budget for 2024 for Synod approval. This has changed slightly, the challenge we face is inflation. There is a 5% increase in stipends and 5% increase in staff salaries. The most significant increase of all is curate costs.

The budget overall has a 3.1% increase in ministry costs, 5.8% increase in shared costs which includes stipends and salaries including curate costs. The total shared costs fall by £21k next year compared to this year, a very good budget. We are on a minimum budget there is nothing we can cut, we have cut everything to the bone and there are only some things we can cut without effecting efficiency.

DM commented that this is an excellent budget. The 5.8% shared costs includes curates costs and this information needs to included in the proposal.

Forecasts for 2025 and 2026

As requested by Synod they wanted us to look ahead advising this information has not been provided in the past. These are very high level forecasts but there is limited value in doing a complex paper exercise which would have a similar result.

Forecast balance sheet, without anticipating any change in the fixed assets, investment values or working capital, other than cash.

We are setting a balanced budget for 2024, however, we know in reality we won't receive 100% Parish Share.

As we go into 2025 and 2026 this assumes the shortfall of Parish Share decreases slightly over time, an assumption tied into our strategy. This is conservative but is realistic, and trying to give a flavour of where we want to be going forward.

JW commented that the headline for the increase in Parish Share percentage is not going to bring joy. DG has built in 5% stipends and salary increases.

ST – the only way we can increase our income is to increase in our numbers which is linked to mission. Somehow we have to reduce our anxiety and live out a life to attract people to faith.

RB added that 4 of the 8 deacons are on the Bishop's 1 year Dover Pathway, and will be ordained locally into the priesthood.

ABawtree thanked DG and the Finance Team.

EL made reference to the East Bridge deanery roadshow she had attended recently. What is good about the workshops is that they are about help and support to the parishes. We need more of that. How do we do the work to help the parishes make more money, much more than we can do? Can we find a way to replicate the workshop work in the parishes? +Rose responded that we will give some thought as to how we do that. Maybe put that on the Deanery agenda rather than just the roadshow.

Briefing Document on the Total Return on Investments for Permanent Endowments

DG talked through the Briefing Document he had prepared. We can release funds from endowments for various projects, we are looking at legacies and historical endowment funds. We have a Clergy Training Fund of £580k, if we look at the value of the fund and we revalue the investment this may release £320k which could fund clergy training. We do not need permission from the Charities Commission to do this. If Archbishop's Council approve this then it will then go back to the Finance & Assets Committee to agree and to arrange for the release of funds otherwise they will remain locked in.

ST – a number of other dioceses including Rochester are adopting the same approach. This money can make a difference, the Charities Commission are allowing charities to release the accrued monies to be used for what they were donated for. We can leave that to F&A but the principal has to be agreed by us as the Trustees.

JW – is there a case for not doing it? DG responded no.

WA – having the ability to do this does not necessarily mean it will be done. DG advised you can only draw down so much, there are safeguards in place.

All in favour – carried.

To Received the Minutes of the Finance & Assets Committed held on 19 September 2023

No comments were made.

ABoucherat, as a new member of Archbishop’s Council asked if there are Terms of Reference for the Finance & Assets Committee and if there is delegated Financial Authority, who make the decisions. ST gave an overview and asked Jo Manser to email a copy of the Terms to Reference to ABoucherat.

13. Strategy

Carbon Net Zero Action Plan

CE This Plan sets out key directions from the national church policy. The estimate for costs have been taken from our various teams, and at this stage are best guesses. The sums of money are quite eye watering. We need to weigh up balance in investment in net zero with investment in mission. This is not a budget.

There is a going to be quite a bit of support rolling out from the national programme, quite clear alongside that national support there will need to be fundraising at local level to raise this money.

This Plan needs to be approved by Archbishop’s Council and will then go to Diocesan Synod.

In terms of capacity, we are applying for £125k to cover 2024 and 2025, with Rochester. We would share a net zero programme manager, benefit of working in sync and shared learning. We are meeting with the national funding team together, and we will ask for as much funding as possible. We will also need to provide a figure for some match the funding, about £50k a year that would take into a part time funding raising post at some residual cost to us of £6k and the same for the building support officer. This funding request has to be approved by the Archbishop’s Council by November.

The Council were asked if they were content for the Carbon Net Zero Action with plan to go to Synod – all agreed.

The Council were asked to agree a spending cap of £50k for matched funding. Agreed, seconded by ABawtree.

Proposal Ospringe Deanery Youth Missioner

CE explained that the Proposal is self-explanatory. The question was raised whether this post could be funded by a funding request. CE responded that it could but that our next funding request is not until Spring 2024 and there would be potential delay.

We acknowledge that this is a partially untested as a model, but a pilot is worth testing out.

DM asked for the words “interim appointment” to be changed to “time limited appointment”.

JW asked for a bit more information on financial implication, we have financial resources to support this. But what happens at the end of year one if we have not received the income? Do we have break clause? Do we commit to years 2 and 3?

CE confirmed it will be monitored, if a significant project is not going to schedule we would highlight this as a risk to a reference group and we will keep track of that and manage it through risk management arrangements.

ST – there are funds for other deaneries and other places, this project has come at time after we submitted to our first bid to SMIB, another deanery could be included in a bid for 2024.

DM commented that he is picking up from parishes and deaneries that they would like youth ministry. This proposal could create a precedent. Clear response in that conversation, it is not clear what that funding will look like. How do we communicate to parishes about LaunchPad and youth ministers? We need to have some clarity about what that looks like, what that bidding process looks like.

QR reported that Jen Tobin, the new Lead Officer for Children & Young People’s Ministry, is working alongside the Youth Minister bid, Jen is supporting ministers, contacting parishes about support and working across the board.

DM – if there is another bid what does it look like? what is the process? – a gap we need to fix. Is there funding in our restricted income to cover this?

QR we can weave that into the self-evaluation that Jen can do.

JW – exciting news, it could be template going forward but remain not understanding why it can’t wait for the next round of SMIB funding. People need something in front of them to see what it can look like. An exciting proposal, a creative catalyst.

+Rose commented that she had been to deanery and seen the children in action, it is very rural with a significant number of children, this is about momentum. She understands the point that JW is making, in terms the light there not for it to go out. MF – thinks very much so in mission terms, to share that across our deanery. Strong reasons for not waiting until June 2024. MF endorsed +Rose’s comment on keeping up missional youth momentum in the Ospringe Deanery. Also our Diocese needs to be seen to invest funds in youth and families, this will show matched funding ready for the next submission to the Commissioners in June 2024.

ABawtree thoroughly endorses it as it is in line with our bold outcomes.

All in favour. Bringing back to the next meeting processes, policies relating to this.

Diocesan Central Staffing and Benchmarking Summary

CE explained that this is a comparative benchmarking exercise across all dioceses and DG and ST wanted this to be highlighted to the Archbishop’s Council.

We look a bit light around governance capacity that we have but we are slightly over in the financial team but we will look at this further once the new Diocesan Secretary and a new Financial Director are in post.

RB clarified that the staff in the Bishop’s office are not DBF employees.

NE commented that there a couple of errors that need rectifying.

14. Reflections on the Deanery Roadshows

ST reported on the Deanery Roadshows that had taken place so far. As EL has highlighted the roadshows have evolved and we have offered a choice of three workshops from six for all deaneries. Not every deanery selected the finance workshop. Planning next year's roadshows has already begun, we will be looking at lessons learnt from the existing roadshows.

OG reported that a feedback form has been created and link will be included in The Briefing, we have already received very positive feedback.

EL – it was a really good thing, not enough time, only able to attend one workshop. Is there scope for offering these out to Deaneries?

15. Frameworks – Update

ST referred to the Framework reports which had been submitted prior to the meeting.

Mission and Ministry

NE the Mission and Ministry Framework has been formally reconstituted AS and ABoucherat as co-chairs. Action Learning Sets are going well and is a strong mechanism of support,

Pastoral supervisors are offering incumbents virtual support.

We have begun some research on multi parish benefices.

We are exploring three key questions, (golden threads):

1. How are prayer and spiritual practices being developed?
2. How are we learning and reflecting on ministry practice?
3. How are we attending to good relationships and collaborative ministry?

The Social Justice Network

The SJN was formed in May as a result of blending C&P and Together Kent, we lost our administrator in May and we have temp cover until November. We are interviewing in October.

Our Anglican Support Refugee Lead in Calais, Bradon Muilenberg is now in post. In the 10 days that Bradon has been in post four people have died in the Calais area, that makes 378 deaths since 1999 and does not include the people who die at sea that we don't know about it. This is kind of story we deal with.

Domenica Pecararo works hard with refugees in our Diocese, the Clewer Initiative have asked if they can work with us as on a project and we are currently putting together a joint bid for £500k. Very little from Parish Share goes to SJN, most towards JA's post.

JA asked the Council to read through the reports from the various projects, with reference to Break the Cycle. It is smallest but most expensive project that we run, but worth doing.

We recently held a trustees' away day and formed a five year vision for the Network. OG is helping with the comms and branding on that. MF is doing some work with the Association of the Deaf. Hold us in your prayers our work is expensive, we are a charity that needs funding, the work is absolutely crucial. Bishop Rose mentioned the Bishop's Justice Appeal, at licensing services this is usually included in the notices, not sure if it is always being highlighted, we need to intentionally remind people.

EL asked if there are publicity materials that can be passed to parishes.

OG asked what would be useful? Please email thoughts to OG.

Children and Young People

QR highlighted two things in the report: of hope, 2 schools inspected – very good. Flagship schools St George's, Broadstairs – over 1000 young people in that school. Testament to what is going on in church schools.

St Nicholas school New Romney where 17 children, 6 staff are being confirmed, exceptionally exciting things are happening.

16. Any Other Business

DG requested that the Archbishop's Council approve QR and NE to be formally appointed as signatories with Lloyds Bank within Diocesan House, not only as bank signatories but also as trustees for operational issues.

All in favour – seconded by JMorrison

The meeting closed with a blessing from +Rose.