ARCHBISHOP’S COUNCIL

Minutes of a Meeting of the Archbishop’s Council held on Saturday 22\textsuperscript{nd} April 2023 at St Paul’s Parish Centre, Canterbury, CT1 1NH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rt Revd Rose Hudson-Wilkin (Chair)</td>
<td>(Bishop of Dover)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ven Darren Miller</td>
<td>(Archdeacon of Ashford)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ven Will Adam</td>
<td>(Archdeacon of Canterbury)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ven Andrew Sewell</td>
<td>(Archdeacon of Maidstone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ven Stephen Taylor</td>
<td>(Diocesan Secretary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Peter Wyllie</td>
<td>(Chair of the Finance &amp; Assets Committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr John Moss</td>
<td>(Chair of the Board of Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revd Andy Bawtree</td>
<td>(Chair of the House of Clergy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs Miranda Ford</td>
<td>(Chair of the House of Laity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revd Jeremy Worthen</td>
<td>(Rector, Ashford Town Parish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revd Estella Last</td>
<td>(Vicar, the Bridge Benefice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms Fiona Higgs</td>
<td>(Co-Chair CYP Network)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revd Gareth Dickinson</td>
<td>(Vicar, Maidstone St Luke)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Graham Codling</td>
<td>(Lay Chair, Weald Deanery)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Attendance</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revd Richard Braddy</td>
<td>(Chaplain to the Bishop of Dover)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Quentin Roper</td>
<td>(Director of Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Jonathan Arnold</td>
<td>(Director of Communities &amp; Partnership)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Neville Emslie</td>
<td>(Director of Mission and Ministry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Colin Evans</td>
<td>(Strategic Programme Manager)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs Jo Manser</td>
<td>(EA to the Diocesan Secretary)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apologies</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Morrison</td>
<td>(Reader, Treasurer Canterbury Deanery)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **OPENING PRAYERS**
   +Rose opened the meeting with a reading from John 21:15

2. **NOTICES AND WELCOME**
   +Rose welcomed Dean David, Revd Andy Bawtree and Nick Shepherd, Senior Vision and Strategy Consultant, Church of England.

3. **DECLARATION OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**
   None Declared.

4. **NICK SHEPHERD – STRATEGY UPDATE**
   Nick provided a brief introduction to his role at the Church Commissioners and his work in supporting dioceses with their strategies and funding.

   Nick announced that their Board had met last week to review recent funding applications and he was very pleased to say that our proposal has been approved with the usual conditions around
planning and implementation of the programme office function and Youth workers. The Diocese will receive just over £1million for this work. This announcement is to be kept confidential for the time being, there will be a press announcement in due course.

Nick went on to explain the framing around the Diocesan Investment Programme. A collective strategy focussing on engaging with younger and diverse communities, Net Zero, Racial Justice, Buildings for Mission and Missionary Disciples. The Diocesan Investment Programme is built around these principles.

Nick will work with us to identify next steps to enable us to move forward and the capacity to carry out this work (Programme Office Function). It is important to continue with our Strategic Programme approach. Youth ministry funding, the Church Commissioners recognise for a number of churches Covid has been a challenge and affected children and young peoples’ attendance but some churches are doing well. We have identified key churches where this money can be invested. The Diocese can also apply for further funds from national church or elsewhere. Wider work is required on revitalisation, church planting. The Church Commissioners Board has approved in principle for the Diocese to go back with a further application in Spring 2024 regarding revitalisation. This needs all deaneries in the Diocese to be active in the planning process. We will work out the best way the Church Commissioners funds can provide changes in Canterbury.

Nick to work with CE and ST on where this money will go and work on the wider strategy. Canterbury does have specific issues around historic assets or lack thereof – national church are limited on what they can due to the Diocese’s financial position. They can’t consider the overall historic assets of wealth, endowment, etc They look at the general financial picture, there is only so much that can be achieved until the longer term financial position is resolved.

Questions and Comments:

AS congratulated CE and QR on the work they had undertaken on the investment request application.

Q - Revitalisation - in particular in areas where the church is underrepresented – how will they decide which area that will be? Are there models from other dioceses that can used?

A - Starts from a grounded view from the Diocese, what the national church want to do is to identify the geographical areas where that focus is most important, traditionally urban, based on population size. It would start with the Diocese digging into where is the most urgent need, where parishes are declining year on year, from that basis look at what approach would work well. Alongside that Growing Faith, different expressions of church – not one size fits all solution. Long term project, over the next 8 to 9 years, where we might begin over that time to build a presence.

Q - We do have large towns but also a lot of countryside, are there examples of things we are seeing which are likely to attract funding or to attract growth that have a rural focus, the church in the countryside needs help?

A - Yes there are some good examples that can be built upon, some are new, some strategies around market towns. Growing faith having hubs in schools. In terms of attracting funding the challenge is there is a limited pot of funding, national church are open to look at specific rural projects but reasonable to say that population is the key guide when thinking about investment. It will be identified on our criteria as one of the most important places.
Q - When there is investment in youth workers it seems to be investment in new work. These workers are tender and fragile, is there consideration to keep such ministers well connected as youth workers tend to burn out quite quickly.
A - Funding would not have been granted without national church undertaking the due diligence eg quality of clergy leadership, unlikely to be place where there are significant challenges going in. How as a Diocese will you be part of a hub, not lone practitioners – we have already made plans for that. How are those churches linked to other churches around them. As we roll out the plan this is a Diocesan owned activity by enhancing the capacity of youth ministry more broadly.

Q - Is it possible to encourage national church to provide a library of stories as examples. We need to provide rural churches where they have become static with good ideas they can work with.
A- Yes part of our plans, SDF captured a lot of learning but did not necessarily get that out to the parishes. We have a monitoring and evaluation project in place but it will take 18 months to 2 years to get that moving, we are asking dioceses to share their stories.

Q – Are there people you can help us connect with, other models of resourcing, churches who have mission plans they can share, people we can sit and talk with, learning from people who have walked the journey?

Q - Endanger of reinventing the wheel, if there has been learning already where is that?
We need a paragraph to inspire people and a contact.
A - Yes we should connect you more clearly with those doing that work. Once we know more clearly what you are aiming for then they can provide the contacts.

DM if we are going to connect with what comes out of a mission plan that is going to be limiting, every single place needs to be engaged, everyone to look at what they can achieve.

5. THE THIRD BOLD OUTCOME – NEXT STEPS
Synod asked for more work to be done on the 3rd bold outcome, SPB has worked through this to address the queries raised. We still think we need the 3rd bold outcome, because:
a) Everywhere needs to have focus on growth and revitalisation. We don’t want any area not to feel encouraged that it does not involve them.
b) The 3rd bold outcomes give us strong linkage into the national vision and strategy which is important in terms of investment.

We have set out a draft basket of measures of what revitalisation might look like to share at the Area Deans and Lay Chairs meeting in May and the next Archbishop’s Council meeting and before Synod in July. Would like to set up a working group with members from the Archbishop’s Council.

The following comments were made:

The revised 3rd bold outcome addresses a lot of issues that were raised at Synod, shows some serious reflection from that meeting. Agrees the approach – a working group a very good idea. There needs to be more thinking about the relationship between the 3 bold outcomes and the relationship between that and the work we are seeking to do with children and young people. Would like to see a document providing a similar kind of definition of the first two bold outcomes.

The 3rd bold outcome is yet to be refined, does not think Synod wants to get rid of that. We want to be part of revitalisation, to have something so broad puts a burden on us. Let’s not constrict ourselves, we want to see new life.
The big question is what are going to do about an historic church building, we don’t have a big enough congregation to sustain that church building. Their missional energy is focused on the church building, etc.

Revitalisation might be letting go and it could be part of something bigger, this is an opportunity. This is building on what we should be doing, not an additional burden.

Do we need to embrace the language of death? Talking about closure is a good route to revitalisation, are we so focused on growth we have not been able to talk about death and closure? Burdens on our older congregations are unfair.

Links to process is not mentioned, what about strategic capacity? Who is going to come in to help us to do this work? Be realistic about revitalisation. Growth is what we are talking about, parishes engaging in and implanting in an intentional process. Two of the bold outcomes are really important, should we drop the word revitalisation?

In order to move this idea forward CE asked for members of the Board to be part of a sub-group who would need to meet before the Area Deans and Lay Chairs meeting in May. MF, AS, JW, JMoss and GD agreed to be members of the sub-group.

The Diocese needs to show that it is being revitalised also in line with the 3rd outcome.

Signs of life are a precursor to growth, death is a part of the life cycle. Net growth numbers need to go up rather than down. Initiatives are signs of life.

CE one interesting comment around the national church strategic priority of creating 10,000 new Christian communities, there are already 13,000 Christian communities, we will lose some of these. The principle of death is behind the 2nd bold outcome.

Might it be worth investing in a minister to enable the things to die? Preparing things for new life. Intention to do things well.

If the church congregation dies, the building will remain, de-couple the church from the parish.

+R – the point NE made about our own revitalisation whether lay or ordained, that sense of being revitalised of being nurtured and expectation of growth. We need to be focused, why are we here and what is it about?

6. **MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF 4TH FEBRUARY 2023**
   The minutes were approved and adopted. Diocesan Synod can see our minutes.
   Email to agree the minutes of this meeting prior to Synod.

7. **MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES OF 4TH FEBRUARY 2023**
   Living Well – ST commented that he attended a trustees’ meeting to discussing changing the Living Well’s remit, this had not been divulged outside of the trustees’ meeting and therefore not public knowledge. Rather than tweak the minutes it was suggested the paragraph be deleted as it was illustrative not material to the point being made. +Rose will sign the revised minutes for 8th October 2022.
8. **TO RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE DATA PROTECTION BOARD HELD ON 15TH FEBRUARY 2023**

   **Content.**
   It was noted that QR has done an extraordinary amount of work on creating policies on what we should and shouldn’t retain. Their next activities will be providing guidance to parishes. A notice is going go out in the Briefing. We hope to provide training for Church Wardens in the autumn.

9. **TO RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF MEETING OF DIOCESAN SYNOD**

   ST Apologised regarding the minute taking and that somethings were missed due to a number of issues one being too few microphones.

   +R asked for it to be noted that she was deeply unhappy with how Synod unfolded and to also register her concerns about correspondence subsequently received.

   +Rose mentioned that a simple A4 sheet of paper in relation to the process should be circulated prior to the next Synod.

10. **TO RECEIVE THE MINUTES OF THE FINANCE & ASSETS COMMITTEE HELD ON 24TH JANUARY 2023**

   **Content.**

11. **DRAFT TRUSTEES REPORT FOR 2022 AND VERBAL FINANCIAL UPDATE**

   The accounts are finished subject to financial review on 2nd May. Excluding investment gains, there was a deficit of £78K for the year. Parish Share was short by £69,000, we are in a good place compared to last year. Because we lack historic investments, we have to keep fiscal management and costs under control. To ensure we are not spending what we shouldn’t but investing in that we should. Buzzacott’s the auditors have advised that it is the best audit that they have undertaken for us.

   The reserves policy 1.4 – £1.7m, general reserves are around £5m, good place to be in. We have been asked to provide a plan to 2030.

   PW explained that the Finance & Assets Committee are aware of the need to manage our cash well and we note that CCLA offer good rates of interest. Reserves is not a budgetary available sum so we need to make sure we understand that. MF asked if we can use “designated” instead? DG confirmed that we do, this refers to general reserves but does not include property. We can use a word that makes it clear that is not available funds. DG to look at this and bring to the Finance & Assets Committee.

   GD raised a query regarding the budget for 2021/2022 and that they didn’t know about the grant. ST responded that we were asked to demonstrate our losses and include the losses going forward and put in an appropriate grant application which was then covered our covid shortfall. We received £375,000 in total and that money was never available to spend. The parish share received for this year is £1.6m which includes full payment by some parishes, we are a bit behind. We have £444k projected deficit this year.

   ST – at our last ABC we discussed direction of travel of parish share formula, the presentation to the Deanery Treasurers was made before the proposals were put to the Finance & Assets Committee, Area Deans and Lay Chairs and then be presented to Synod. The proposal is to set income against unrestricted reserves rather than parish attendance. The Deanery Treasurers were broadly content with that providing some helpful suggestions. We are building on stronger relationships with
Deaneries than we have previously. Parish share allocation will be broken down by parishes and provided to Deanery leadership teams including the Deanery Treasurer who will then work with the parishes on this. Good relationships are very important.

A different way of managing the occasional office fees, PTOs will be paid by parishes and will retain a % of the DBF Fee for crematorium funerals.

We will also present a way for parishes to pay their parish share arrears pre 2020 These will go to to the next Finance & Assets Committee.

Generous Giving Adviser – we are interviewing this week and the outcome will be shared in due course.

AS commented on Jennifer Mulrooney and the exceptional work she has been doing and has become the face of Finance which has greatly improved relationships with the parishes.

EL wished to wave a flag for the Parish Giving Scheme, it makes a tremendous difference.

ST we need to build ambassadors in dearies, we have agreed to assist parishes until the end of the financial year. We are still processing claims for parishes in respect of gift aid. ST added that the Romney & Tenterden Deanery Treasurer has encouraged parishes who can pay their parish share to contribute to those parishes who can’t, another message of generosity.

GD commented with regard to the changing of the formula for parish share and their Deanery Treasurer was not able to give any clarity. The scenarios of part of that conversation would be helpful. ST advised that this was first in long line of conversations, and it will go to Diocesan Synod for their agreement in November.

12. LGTBIQ+ CHAPLAINCY REPORT
Content.

13. FRAMEWORKS – UPDATE
Mission and Ministry
NE provided the following brief update:

- Pastoral Supervisors – strength of the work is extremely vital for new incumbents, ideally would like more money to develop this. Extremely well received, good supervisors coming through.

- Distinctive Deacon – likely to have 6 ordained in 2024.

- Day for Lay People – was a successful day and plan to run this annually.

- Archdeacon Andrew will be our Co-Chair, hope to appoint Co Lay Chair.

- AB we do a lot of fire of fighting, does supervision help? NE – yes, fruitful.

- GD – excellent, very well delivered, exciting model, if we can find more investment to fund that. Could be a pastoral supervisor for youth minister?
• FH – it would be useful to have someone to go for those who don’t have an incumbent to go, key to retaining people.

**The Social Justice Network formerly Communities & Partnerships**
J.A confirmed that they now have officially become the Social Justice Network, all happened this week. Making a soft transition for now, thinking about a launch later in the year.

J.A referred to the specific reports circulated with the agenda – detailed report on Break the Cycle, which didn’t include the recent visit by Jonathan Ashworth MP who met with the residents, this attracted the press and the 8 residents were interviewed. ST this is an extraordinary story, should be offered to the Church Times and communicated across the Diocese.

• There is a week of refugee events in the Cathedral including CLUER, craft workshops, +Rose, Dean David.

• There will also be weekly talks on the words of Matthew with speakers from SJN. JA will advertise as soon as possible.

• Three excellent candidates have been shortlisted for the Calais Refugee Officer role, interviews will take place on 4th May, work around refugees and migration issue.

• GD is there some creative comms and the language of SJN being part of that? Might help with the softer launch. JA will talk to Sophia and Marilyn.

• ST reported that environmental work will no longer be part of SJN. The Environmental Working Group held their last meeting on 18th April. There will now be Deanery Echo Champions under the supervision of Joyce Addison our new Diocesan Environmental Officer. Tristan Oliver is our consultant on NetZero. CE holds the lead on NetZero as part of what SPB will be looking at.

**Children and Young People**
QR reported on two of three things to pick up on, context and work on supporting youth ministers not workers, important to keep that language. Quality assurance in terms of the churches who employ them, encouraging them to use the growing faith tool, Canterbury Diet, core courses, pastoral supervisors. Package of things available to them. Ben Hatfield’s job is being advertised, running for another week, good interest. Hopefully appoint in the next month. Cheryl Trice, Rochester Diocese Team Lead, Children and Young People’s Mission and Ministry Team will be part of the interview panel.

Work being done nationally on a flourishing school system. JMoss commented that QR has done some very good work, we are ahead in terms of understanding of what this means in comparison to the national church, a lot of work that needs to be done on the document is being produced nationally. Good we are thinking about this, the outcome should be something that represents what church education is about, offers alternative vision to the one you might get from Ofsted – along way to go.

Oftsed could learn from SIAMS.

AB – we could offer something different to what the government offers, looks like the Church of England is stepping forward.
14. ANY OTHER BUSINESS
   None identified.

15. Dates of next meeting:
    10\textsuperscript{th} June
    7\textsuperscript{th} October

The meeting closed with a blessing from +Rose.