

Scottish Episcopal Church

Agenda and Papers



General Synod 2018

Scottish Episcopal Church

GENERAL SYNOD 2018

Agenda and Papers

CONTENTS

1. Agenda and Programme for Synod	1
2. Preliminary Synod Business	9
Minutes of General Synod Meeting 2017	11
Elections to Provincial Bodies	45
3. Standing Committee	
Budget Report	49
4. Faith and Order Board	
Exhibiting of Communicants' Rolls	71
Review of Canon 4	72
5. Administration Board	
Clergy Personnel Matters	73
Leave Policy	76
Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Parental & Shared Parental Leave Policy	79
Clergy Housing Policy	93
Retirement Policy	94
Clergy Expenses Guidance	96
Alterations to Canons – Voting Procedures.....	109
Canons for First Reading	
Canon 35 Proposed Alteration	110
Canon 35	113
6. Information and Communication Board	
Governance and Structure	114
Communications Strategy 2018	116
Canon 52.23	117
7. Mission Board	
Role of Mission Board	118
8. Church in Society Committee	
Child Poverty	121
The Work of the Committee	123

9. Pension Fund Trustees/Standing Committee	
Preliminary Results of Actuarial Valuation	132
Climate Change Action and Fossil Fuel Investments: Response from Pension Fund Trustees	134
10. Administration Board	
Composition of the Board	135

PINK PAGES

11. Rules of Order	137
12. A Reflection on Morning and Evening Prayer	143
15. Attendance Slip	144
16. Travel and Meals Claim Form	146
17. Synod Feedback Form	148

GENERAL SYNOD 2018 AGENDA AND PROGRAMME

UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED ALL MEETINGS WILL TAKE PLACE IN
ST PAUL'S & ST GEORGE'S CHURCH, YORK PLACE, EDINBURGH

A "Freshers' Meeting" will be held at 09:00 on Thursday 7 June for new members of Synod.

Thursday 7 June 2018

10:00 Coffee

10:30 Opening Eucharist at St Paul's & St George's Church, including Primus' Charge
Offering to support the work in Scotland of Child Poverty Action Group
Constitution of General Synod

SESSION ONE: THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS IN THE CHAIR

12:00 **Primus: Welcome to delegates and guests**

During this session Synod members will be invited to introduce themselves to each other in their table groups

Preliminary Business (Page 9)

Minutes of General Synod 2017 (Page 11)

***Motion 1:** That this Synod approve the minutes of the meeting of the General Synod held on 8-10 June 2017.*

Elections (Page 45)

Standing Committee membership
Institute Council membership
Administration Board membership
Clergy Discipline Tribunal

12:45 Lunch

SESSION TWO: THE VERY REV ALISON SIMPSON IN THE CHAIR

14:00 **Standing Committee – Strategic Direction**

Budgets and Quota Overview (Page 49)

14:50

Faith and Order Board

Committee on Canons

Communicants' Rolls

Canon 41, Resolution 1 (*Of Communicants' and Other Rolls*) (Page 71)

Motion 2: *That Resolution 1 under Canon 41 be deleted in its entirety and substituted by the following:-*

"The cleric shall keep privately the Communicants' Roll and may exhibit it to the members of the congregation at large or to individual members thereof only after the cleric is satisfied that to do so would not infringe any applicable laws relating to data protection. Subject to compliance with such laws, the Roll shall be exhibited to the Bishop upon request or to the Dean as provided by Resolution under Canon 42."

Review of Canon 4 (Page 72)

Motion 3: *That Canon 4 "Of the Election of Bishops to Vacant Sees" be revised and amended as necessary.*

SESSION THREE: THE RIGHT REV KEVIN PEARSON, BISHOP OF ARGYLL AND THE ISLES IN THE CHAIR

15:15

Administration Board

Clergy Personnel Matters (Page 73)

Resettlement Grants

Motion 4: *That:-*

- *in paragraph 4.1.1 of the Digest of Resolutions the words "Resettlement Grants" be deleted and the words "Administration Board" appearing opposite the words "Resettlement Grants" similarly be deleted;*
- *in paragraph 4.3.2 of the Digest of Resolutions the words "Grants shall be paid to individual clergy for the undernoted purposes:" be deleted,*

the designation “(a)” be deleted and the entirety of paragraph (b) be deleted;

- *notwithstanding the foregoing resettlement grants continue to be payable in respect of applications received prior to 31 December 2018 on the same basis as pertained immediately prior to changes effected by this motion.*

Personnel Committee

Adoption of HR policies (Pages 76-108)

Motion 5: *That the following policy, adopted by the Administration Board on the recommendation of the Personnel Committee, be ratified: Leave.*

Motion 6: *That the following policy, adopted by the Administration Board on the recommendation of the Personnel Committee, be ratified: Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Parental & Shared Parental Leave.*

Motion 7: *That the following policy, adopted by the Administration Board on the recommendation of the Personnel Committee, be ratified: Housing.*

Motion 8: *That the following policy, adopted by the Administration Board on the recommendation of the Personnel Committee, be ratified: Retirement.*

Motion 9: *That the following guidance, adopted by the Administration Board on the recommendation of the Personnel Committee, be ratified: Clergy Expenses.*

15:45 Tea

SESSION FOUR: THE RIGHT REV KEVIN PEARSON, BISHOP OF ARGYLL AND THE ISLES IN THE CHAIR

16:15 **Administration Board**

Personnel Committee (continued if necessary from previous session)

Buildings Committee

Canon 35 (Of the Structure, Furniture and Monuments of Churches, and the Due Care Thereof) (Page 110)

Motion 10: *That the amended text of Canon 35, sections 1 and 3 be read for the first time.*

Retirement Housing

17:00 Evening Prayer

19:15 Synod Dinner at the Principal Hotel, 19-21 George Street, Edinburgh
for 19:45

Friday 8 June 2018

SESSION FIVE: THE RIGHT REV DR JOHN ARMES, BISHOP OF EDINBURGH IN THE CHAIR

09:00 Morning Prayer

09:20 **Standing Committee**

Committee for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults

09:30 **Faith and Order Board**

Greetings from Ecumenical Delegate

Inter-Church Relations Committee

Liturgy Committee

Doctrine Committee

10:15 **Information and Communication Board**

Governance and Structure (Page 114)

Communications Strategy (Page 116)

Alteration to Canon 52, section 23 (*Of the General Synod*) (Page 117)

Motion 11: *That the amended text for Canon 52, Section 23 be read for the first time.*

10:45 Coffee

SESSION SIX: THE RIGHT REV DR GREGOR DUNCAN, BISHOP OF GLASGOW AND GALLOWAY IN THE CHAIR

11:15 **Mission Board**

Role of the Mission Board (Page 118)

***Motion 12:** That this Synod welcome the paper from the Mission Board setting out plans for future action.*

12:00 **Institute Council**

12:45 Lunch

SESSION SEVEN: MS JENNY WHELAN IN THE CHAIR

14:15 **Church in Society Committee**

Child Poverty (Page 121)

Rt Rev William Nolan, Roman Catholic Bishop of Galloway, will address Synod

***Motion 13:** That this Synod, remembering Jesus' saying that he came that we may have life in all its fullness and remembering his concern for children, support the 'Give me 5' campaign and call on the Scottish Government to pay a £5 a week top up on child benefit.*

Paper on other work of the Committee (Page 123)

***Motion 14:** That this Synod receive the paper from the Church in Society Committee contained in the Synod Papers.*

15:10 **College of Bishops**

15:45 Tea

SESSION EIGHT: THE REV JANE ROSS IN THE CHAIR

16:15 **Pension Fund Trustees/Standing Committee**

Report on Preliminary Results of the Triennial Valuation of the SEC Pension Fund as at 31 December 2018 (Page 132)

Motion 15: *That the contribution rate in relation to serving clerical and staff members of the Scottish Episcopal Church Pension Fund be maintained with effect from 1 January 2019 at 32.2% of standard stipend and salary respectively.*

17:00 Evening Prayer

Saturday 9 June 2018

SESSION NINE: THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS IN THE CHAIR

09:30 Morning Prayer

09:50 **Administration Board**

Composition of the Board (Page 135)

Motion 16: *That paragraph 2.3.1 of the Digest of Resolutions be altered so that it read as follows:-*

“The **Administration Board** shall consist of a Convener appointed by the General Synod, a Bishop (appointed by the College of Bishops), a representative appointed by the Mission Board, three members appointed by the General Synod on the nomination of the Standing Committee, a representative of each Diocese as appointed by each Diocesan Synod and the Conveners of the pendant committees of the Board.”

Investment Committee

FINAL SESSION: THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS IN THE CHAIR

10:15 **Mission Board**

Provincial Youth Committee

Global Partnerships Committee

Report on Attendance at the 62nd Session of the UN Commission on the Status of Women

10:40 **Standing Committee**

Accounts

Motion 17: *That this Synod accept the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church for the financial year ended 31 December 2017.*

Budget and Quota (Page 49)

Motion 18: *That this Synod, having examined the proposed budgets for the General Synod for the year 2019, agree to a quota figure of £763,773 for that year.*

Elections (Page 45)

Standing Committee membership
Institute Council membership
Administration Board membership
Clergy Discipline Tribunal

11:15 Coffee

11:45 SEI Valedictory Service

12:45 Confirmation of Acts of Synod and close of meeting

This page is intentionally blank

PRELIMINARY BUSINESS

1. Welcome to Delegates from other Churches and Faiths

Lieut-Colonel Carol Bailey (Thursday only), Major Steven Turner (Friday only):
Salvation Army
Rev John Bremner: United Reformed Church
Rev Ralph Dunn: United Free Church of Scotland
Rev Dr Liam Fraser: Church of Scotland
Mr Alan Kay: Interfaith Scotland
Mgr Philip Kerr: Action of Churches Together in Scotland
Very Rev Steven Mulholland: Roman Catholic Church
Mary Woodward: Religious Society of Friends
Methodist Church in Scotland: delegate to be announced

Guests from outwith Scotland

The Rev Canon Steven Kirk, Church in Wales

2. Prolocutors and Tellers

The Standing Committee recommends the following appointments:

Prolocutors:

Clerical Prolocutor:	Very Rev Andrew Swift
Clerical Vice-Prolocutor:	Rev Samantha Ferguson
Lay Prolocutor:	Ms Jenny Whelan
Lay Vice-Prolocutor:	Professor Alan Werritty

Tellers:

Daphne Audsley
Malcolm Bett
Michael Hull
Anne Tomlinson
Donald Urquhart
Miriam Weibye

3. Assessor

The Primus has appointed Professor Nicholas Grier, as Assessor

4. Minutes of General Synod 2017

5. Any Matters Arising from Minutes

6. Elections

Standing Committee Membership
Institute Council Membership
Administration Board General Synod Representatives
Clergy Discipline Tribunal Membership

7. Housekeeping Matters

8. Roll Call

Please detach the attendance slip towards the end of this document and place it in the box.

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GENERAL SYNOD OF THE SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CHURCH HELD AT ST PAUL'S & ST GEORGE'S CHURCH EDINBURGH FROM 8-10 JUNE 2017

Freshers' Meeting

A meeting was held prior to the start of Synod to introduce new members to the programme and to the Synod's business procedures.

Opening Eucharist

The Synod was constituted at the celebration of the Eucharist in St Paul's & St George's Church, Edinburgh at 10.30am on Thursday 8 June 2017.

The Most Rev David Chillingworth, Primus, delivered his charge to the Synod during the Eucharist. Referring to recent terrorist attacks in London, Manchester and abroad, he suggested that the current period through which people were living was particularly challenging. In all these locations, people had been living ordinary lives and the partition between trustworthy ordinariness and the most unimaginable horror had been dissolved in an instant. In the midst of that horror, ordinary people had acted with self-sacrificing heroism. Religiously motivated violence was one of the greatest challenges of the current period, as was the rise of the politics of populist nationalism, driven by a combination of anger and fear. In such times, he turned to the Scriptures, with relief. They were a challenge to enter a greater humanity rather than a lesser one; a heart of flesh rather than a heart of stone.

Referring to the debate which Synod would have later in the day about the Church's understanding of marriage, he suggested that the matter was one which had stressed and threatened to divide the Church almost as no other in current times. It was not for him to argue the issues but rather to call the Church to unity as it attempted once again to resolve the issue. God privileged agreement: "if two or three agree on Earth about anything in my name, it will be done for you by my Father in Heaven". Inability to agree closed off blessing. The challenge was whether the Church's oneness in Christ could sustain unity in the face of diversity of views. He referred to remarks made by the Very Rev Professor Iain Torrance at the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland the previous month who had described the moment when "suddenly the pieces of a long argument come together in a different way; where both sides can flourish, both may be protected and both may be celebrated". He had also talked of the need to enable and celebrate structures of faithfulness.

The Primus indicated that the current General Synod was his thirteenth. The fact that the Synod would address issues in the way it would was a sign of a growing maturity in the Church. The Scottish Episcopal Church was a distinctive church, widely respected in the wider Anglican Communion and had its own history and voice. In recent times, it had tempered radical independent-mindedness with a strengthened commitment to orthodoxy and that had only increased its influence.

The Primus' prayer was that Synod members would honour one another, and God, who was the source of unity, as the Synod met.

During the Eucharist, an offering was taken to support the work of Scottish Faiths Action for Refugees. The offering amounted to £1,339.

SESSION 1: THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS IN THE CHAIR

1.1 Welcome

The Primus welcomed all members of Synod including the following delegates representing other churches:

Lieut-Colonel Carol Bailey (Salvation Army), the Rev Ian Boa (United Free Church of Scotland), the Rev Mitchell Bunting (United Reformed Church), the Rev Dr David Easton (Methodist Church in Scotland), the Rev Dr Liam Fraser (Church of Scotland), Sue Lycett (Religious Society of Friends), the Rev Dr Peter McEnhill (Action of Churches Together in Scotland), the Very Rev Steven Mulholland (Roman Catholic Church) and the Rev Canon Jane Charman (Church of England).

Major Steven Turner (Salvation Army) and Mrs Ravinder Kaur Nijjar (Scottish Sikh Community) were welcomed to Synod subsequently on the days of their attendance.

The Baptist Union of Scotland had been unable to send a representative to the current Synod since dates clashed with a meeting of their own.

Synod members introduced themselves in table groups.

1.2 Election of Prolocutors

The Very Rev Frances Burberry and the Rev Canon Paul Watson were elected as Clergy Prolocutor and Vice Prolocutor respectively.

Dr Anthony Birch and Ms Jenny Whelan were elected as Lay Prolocutor and Vice Prolocutor respectively.

1.3 Tellers

Dr Daphne Audsley, Mr Malcolm Bett, the Rev Dr Michael Hull, the Rev Canon Dr Anne Tomlinson, Mr Donald Urquhart and Ms Miriam Weibye were appointed Tellers for the meeting.

1.4 Assessor

The Primus announced that Dr Nicholas Grier, solicitor, had been appointed as his Assessor.

1.5 Voting

The Secretary General reminded Synod members as to who was entitled to vote on Motions and in elections. In cases where an actual count of votes was required, Synod agreed that the facilitator at each table would complete a voting slip to record the votes on their table. The voting slips would then be collected by the Tellers who had been appointed earlier in the meeting so that the total number of votes could be ascertained.

1.6 Permission to Speak

The Synod granted its permission for each of the following to speak during the course of the meeting: Dr Donald Bruce, Ms Rachael Fraser, the Rev Dr Michael Hull, Mr Richard McIndoe, the Rev Canon Dr Anne Tomlinson, all ecumenical guests at Synod and members of the Provincial Youth Committee who would make a presentation later in the meeting.

1.7 Minutes of General Synod 2016

Mr Robert Gordon (Convener, Standing Committee) proposed, and Dr John Ferguson-Smith (Convener, Administration Board), seconded, the following Motion:

“That this Synod approve the minutes of the meeting of the General Synod held on 9-11 June 2016.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed.

1.8 Matters Arising

There were no matters arising from the minutes.

1.9 Elections

The Secretary General explained that the posts to be filled by the General Synod in 2017 included three vacancies for General Synod members on the Administration Board. No nominations had been received in respect of those vacancies by the deadline for submissions and it would therefore be for Standing Committee to determine whether to fill the vacancies for the year ahead. He invited expressions of interest from Synod members.

Mr Robert Gordon (Convener, Standing Committee) proposed, and the Rt Rev Kevin Pearson (Convener, Institute Council), seconded, the following Motion:

“That the appointment of the Rev Marjory McPherson as an additional member of the Institute Council for a period of three years be ratified.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed.

Mr Robert Gordon proposed, and Dr John Ferguson-Smith seconded, the following Motion:

“That the appointment of John Stirling as a member of the Preliminary Proceedings Committee be ratified.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed.

By general acclaim, the Synod appointed Mr Geoff Sage as Alternate Lay Member to the Preliminary Proceedings Committee.

By general acclaim, the Synod appointed the following to the Clergy Discipline Tribunal:

- Three practising lawyers: Lord Bannatyne, Lord McEwan and Mr George MacWilliam
- One cleric: the Rev Professor John Richardson
- Three lay members: Mr Fraser Falconer, Mrs Sue Horne and Mr John Whittall.

1.10 Roll Call

The Roll Call of Synod members was taken by completion of attendance slips. A total of 131 members attended.

1.11 Procedural Motion

Mr Robert Gordon (Convener, Standing Committee) explained that in planning for General Synod 2017, the Standing Committee had in mind that the same arrangements for broadcasting as had applied in 2016 would apply again in 2017, namely that the proceedings would be captured by the fixed and unobtrusive cameras in St Paul's & St George's and would be live streamed on the internet and that the broadcast media, if they wished access to film with their own cameras, would be admitted only to cover the announcement of the result of the vote on Canon 31. Standing Committee's rationale had been that the arrangements adopted in 2016 had helped to foster a dignified, conciliatory and reflective atmosphere. In late April, representations had been received from one of the broadcasters arguing that their cameras should be admitted to Synod to film the whole debate. It had been noted that the Church of Scotland General Assembly and the General Synod of the Church of England allowed unrestricted access to their respective proceedings. Was the Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church trying to hide something? Having considered the issues carefully, the Standing Committee had concluded that it should accede to the broadcasters' request on this occasion and the Secretary General had communicated that position to all Synod members in his letter of 17 May. This had led to further representations from certain Synod members urging Standing Committee to think again and to revert to the 2016 arrangements on the grounds that the presence of cameras could inhibit full and open debate. Standing Committee had, therefore, thought again and had decided to bring a procedural Motion to Synod to enable the Synod itself to decide what should be done at the current Synod. The Committee would also invite the Information and Communication Board to consider in slower time and in depth the arrangements that should apply in 2018 and beyond and to bring recommendations to Standing Committee. The Convener of that Board and the Director of Communications would be happy to receive views and insights from members of Synod during the course of the current meeting.

Mr Gordon then proposed, and Dr John Ferguson-Smith, seconded the following Motion:

"That the same policy as applied in 2016 applied to Session 3, namely that TV cameras be admitted to the meeting to film only the announcement of the vote on Motion 6."

Mr Gordon explained that a vote in favour of the Motion supported the continuation of the arrangements which had applied in 2016. A vote against the Motion supported the introduction of TV cameras to film the debates in Session 3 and any other parts of the Synod which the broadcasters wished to film. He himself as Convener of the Standing Committee made no recommendation.

The Rev Canon Malcolm Round (Edinburgh) asked Synod to support the Motion. He explained the sensitivities which he felt as a priest and pastor in the local community. He considered there was a difference between livestreaming the debate and having TV cameras present in the debate. He considered that he would feel gagged if TV cameras were to be admitted. He did not wish to be misunderstood.

Ms Victoria Stock (Edinburgh) understood the fear of being quoted out of context but considered that being secretive would send an unhelpful message to the world. She thought it was a good opportunity to let people see what the Synod was about.

The Rev Canon Ian Paton (Edinburgh) wished to support Canon Round and supported the Motion.

The Rev Alastair MacDonald (Aberdeen and Orkney) supported the Motion. It was the case that one spoke differently to different audiences. Material captured by the TV cameras would be edited.

The Rev Neil Brice (Aberdeen and Orkney) was proud of the way the Scottish Episcopal Church had conducted its debates and considered it would be good for the world to see how it did this.

The Rev Markus Duenzkofer (Edinburgh) thanked the Standing Committee for listening to General Synod members. He wished to support the Motion.

The Rev Chris Mayo (Convener, Information and Communication Board) reported that certain broadcasters had indicated that they would in any event make use of the live video stream. Consequently, Synod members could expect the contents of the live stream to be used.

The Rev Peter Harris (Edinburgh) pointed out that whether or not the Motion was passed, it was the case that the Synod was speaking to the world. The only way not to be heard by the world would be not to speak.

The Rev Canon Ian Ferguson (Aberdeen and Orkney) raised the question of Facebook live. It would give a more accessible platform than any TV network. If the concern was that the Synod was not being open, matters would in fact be communicated through such other channels. He supported not admitting the TV cameras to the debate.

The Rev Captain Gerry Bowyer (Aberdeen and Orkney) shared the concerns of Canon Round. There was a need for Synod members to be sensitive to one another.

The Rt Rev Nigel Peyton (Diocese of Brechin) proposed, and Mrs Karen Willey (Brechin) seconded, that "the question now be put" after the following speaker. Synod agreed that Motion.

The Rev Professor Trevor Hart (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) indicated, as others had mentioned, that he placed a huge premium on the manner in which the debate had been conducted over the previous few years. He did not want anything to affect the continuation of the Synod discussion which had started two years previously. He supported the Motion and urged Synod to vote in favour.

The Motion was then put to the vote and passed.

SESSION 2: MS JENNY WHELAN IN THE CHAIR

2.1 Standing Committee – Strategic Direction; Budgets and Quota Overview

Mr Robert Gordon (Convener, Standing Committee), indicated that he wished to give an overview and financial context for much of the business which would be considered during the rest of the meeting. His presentation would identify emerging priorities for action and investment in the coming years and was also a response to points made at Synod 2016 where consideration of past, present and future financial matters had been limited to a single session on the Saturday morning of Synod.

Mr Gordon explained that the strategic thinking on the part of the Standing Committee and College of Bishops was summarised on pages 8-15 of the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church for the year ended 31 December 2016. Synod members would want to engage in discussion with members of Standing Committee and College of Bishops to ask questions, offer views and ideas on how the Church could together most effectively go about its mission in the Whole Church Mission and Ministry policy. In short, borrowing from the Bishop of Argyll and The Isles, "to provide opportunities for encounter with the living and life-changing God".

The Church faced continuing decline in members and attendance according to traditional measures. However, that had to be set against opportunities for innovation and growth evidenced by developments in different settings in different parts of the Province and revitalised arrangements for formation in the developing Scottish Episcopal Institute leading to an increasing number of ordinands.

Mr Gordon highlighted three emerging priorities: a continuing focus on mission including support of the development of new patterns of ministry to meet new needs and opportunities; planning and action to cope with an imminent retirement bulge and provide appropriate curacies and early incumbencies for the growing number of new ordinands, including those who would come through the new context-based stream; a thorough examination of the "machinery of governance" to identify what was needed and affordable for a denomination the size of the Scottish Episcopal Church in contemporary circumstances yet with aspirations for sustainable growth. A key consideration was to align resources with priorities.

Mr Gordon paid tribute to the Treasurer, Mr Malcolm Bett, who provided great support and both of them were happy to deal with any questions which Synod members might have on any financial matters. Mr Gordon then presented a number of PowerPoint slides. Referring to figures from 2015, he explained that the Scottish Episcopal Church was an organisation with a "turnover" in excess of £22.5 million. Of that, the provincially-generated resources were £1.6 million (7%). Inclusive of quota, the provincial share was £2.3 million (10%). The question for the Province was, therefore, how 10% of the Church's province-wide resources should be spent. Broadly speaking, two thirds of the income of the Province was derived from investments and one third was represented by quota. On the question of expenditure, approximately £630,000 was spent on salaries and £900,000 on grants. The Annual Report and Accounts gave more detail on how the main six "slices" of expenditure were applied. In 2016, 25% of expenditure had been on ministry support and training (including the Scottish Episcopal Institute) and it was expected that that segment would grow in future. Other categories included mission development and support (13%), ecumenical and church relations (6%), promotion, publication and communication (13%), support for retired clergy (6%) and support and advice to dioceses in congregations (37%).

The General Fund accounted for 80% of the resources of the General Synod. The remaining 20% represented restricted or designated funds with limited flexibility. He hoped to persuade Synod that Standing Committee was not wilfully malicious or incompetent. In 2016, the Standing Committee had set off planning to spend up to budget but there had been a number of subsequent developments. Investment yield had proved to be better than forecast which had produced an extra £10,000 and an unexpected donation of £8,000 had also been received. On the expenditure side, £56,000 of Building Grants had been spent against a budget of £120,000, because it had taken much longer to establish the new arrangements than had been expected. In 2017, the spend on Building Grants had been significantly higher than in the previous year. A further round of applications was currently underway and he encouraged submissions. SEI had also underspent by £31,000, partly because some funding had been received from other sources and £10,000 of the underspend related to the timing of curacy appointments. One of the matters to address in the future would be the timing of curacies and the level of grant available. The Information and Communication Board had also been underspent in the previous year but, in the current year, was spending significantly more because much was happening. The effect of all of this had been that at the end of 2016, the finances had been underspent by approximately £150,000. Recognising that there had been underspends in previous years, Mr Gordon indicated that a "war chest" had been built up and it was going to be needed in the period ahead. Many exciting developments were taking place in relation to SEI and account was being taken of how the Block Grant arrangements had worked during the first year of the new system. The total allocation to dioceses was being maintained at the £300,000 level and was being increased in line with inflation. Standing Committee would review whether more resource ought to be allocated to the Block Grant, particularly to encourage new kinds of ministry and mission.

Mr Gordon indicated that a further matter which would require attention would be the triennial valuation of the Pension Fund which was due at the end of 2017. Information at the present time suggested that the position of the Fund might not be as healthy as at the time of the previous valuation owing to developments in markets. The Chair of the Pension Fund would say more later in Synod.

In short, therefore, there were a number of matters that would require financial resourcing in the period to come which was why later in Synod a Motion proposing an increase of 3% in the level of provincial quota would be proposed.

Questions were invited.

Professor Alan Werritty (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) referred Synod members to page 52 of the Synod papers and asked for clarification on the level of support for curate funding and, in particular, whether the level of future curate funding was to be at 50% or 75% of stipend and related costs? He asked this as a treasurer of a charge which might support a curate commencing in the coming years and also on behalf of other charges which might be in a similar position.

Mr Gordon responded that there needed to be some negotiation in particular cases as to what could be afforded. In relation to the curate due to start later in 2017, discussion had led to a conclusion that provincial funding would be at 75%. The province was feeling its way as it looked to identify appropriate places for curacies.

The Very Rev Andrew Swift (Argyll and The Isles) believed there was a need to be brave and take some risks. There had been a habit of underspending while indicating that, in future, deficits would arise. Charges self-financed themselves and there was a need for self-confidence in order to be able to do that. Even a small grant from the centre could help significantly to build such confidence. More charges should be encouraged to take up the availability of Building Grants, even if it were only for a small sum. He hoped that the weak dioceses would not be starved and similarly that small charges would be supported in the costs of ministry. It was encouraging that 75% or even 100%-funded curates were being discussed. A willingness to take risks would build the Church up.

Mr Gordon agreed wholeheartedly that innovative developments were to be encouraged. The Mission and Ministry Support Grant system placed the onus on dioceses to make decisions locally. When it had been introduced, it had been expected that the aggregate amount would be tapered down over time but that decision had been reversed and the overall level had been maintained, with increases for inflation. At the present time, the experience of the first year of the grant system was being assessed and that was important for good accountability and stewardship. It was to be hoped that the grants were being applied to situations which had the potential to grow. He personally believed that if the Fund was helpful in supporting innovative developments then more money should be channelled into the Block Grant. He was aware that some had suggested there should be a separate system for other grants to be made direct by the Province to local situations but such a step would be to defeat the purpose of the Block Grant. The question of whether the reporting arrangements were sufficiently light touch could be considered but it was important to know how resources were being applied and this could be a source of encouragement to Synod. He thanked Dean Swift for his contribution.

In closing the Session, the Chair thanked Mr Gordon and the rest of the Standing Committee.

SESSION 3: THE REV PROFESSOR TREVOR HART IN THE CHAIR

In opening the Session, the Chair acknowledged, because of Synod's previous history in debating the marriage Canon, that he could prevail upon Synod to conduct the forthcoming debate with mutual respect, humility and generosity of spirit.

3.1 Faith and Order Board: Process for Discussing Alteration to the Canon on Marriage

The Rt Rev Dr John Armes (Bishop of Edinburgh) explained that in presenting material during the current Session, he was acting on behalf of the Faith and Order Board, a position which had been filled eminently by the Rt Rev Dr Gregor Duncan at the previous two General Synods. Synod applauded Bishop Duncan's presence at Synod following his illness over the previous months.

Bishop Armes reminded Synod that when the process for change to Canon 31 had begun initially in 2015 the decision had been made at that point to vote by ballot. At the first reading debate of Canon 31 in 2016, the Synod had been similarly minded. The Faith and Order Board proposed that the vote on the second reading of the Canon should, once again, be by way of ballot. Since the Motion required a suspension of the Rules of Order, a two thirds majority of the whole of Synod was needed.

Bishop Armes then proposed, and Canon Helen Hood (Edinburgh) seconded, the following Motion:

"That voting in relation to the motion numbered 6 on the agenda be conducted by ballot."

The Motion was then put to the vote and passed.

3.2 Committee on Canons: Canons for Second Reading

3.2.1 Canon 22 – Of Divine Worship and Administration of the Sacraments and Other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church

Bishop Armes explained that the purpose of the amendment to Canon 22 was to make liturgical change subject to the same process as a change to Canons. At present, only a single resolution by Synod voting as one house was needed. Following first reading, the matter had been considered and accepted by all of the Diocesan Synods. Since the Scottish Episcopal Church had no confessional statement, beyond the historic creeds of the Church, it was necessary to look at the approved liturgies to know what the Church believed about other matters. If that was the case, then surely any change to liturgy ought to be treated with at least as much care as a change to the Church's Canons. The proposed amendment would, if passed, require liturgical change to receive two readings over two years with an opportunity for Diocesan Synods to make comment. The matter had been brought to a head by the proposed amendment to Canon 31 to remove the

definition of marriage from that Canon. That would mean that in future the Church's definition of marriage would be found only in its marriage liturgies. The specific amendment to Canon 22 had been recommended by a subgroup of the Faith and Order Board whose task had been to explore how change to Canon 31 might best be done in such a way as to keep everyone walking together. The Board had accepted the logic of that approach in the specific context of the Canon 31 debate but also more generally given the significance of liturgy in the life of the Church.

Bishop Armes then proposed, and Canon Helen Hood seconded, the following Motion:

"That the amended text for Canon 22, Sections 2 and 3 be read for the second time."

Contributions to debate were invited but there were none.

The Motion was then put to the vote in houses and passed by the requisite majorities as follows:

House of Clergy: passed *nem con*, one abstention
House of Laity: passed by majority, two against
House of Bishops: passed unanimously

3.2.2 Canon 31 – Of the Solemnisation of Holy Matrimony

Bishop Armes reminded Synod that in 2015 it had instructed the Faith and Order Board to work on a revised version of Canon 31, deleting section 1 and adding a conscience clause. That amendment had received its first reading in 2016. He drew attention to the text of the proposed amendments to the Canon and the reports from Diocesan Synods set out in the Synod papers.

The context for the debate was well-known. Bishop Armes reminded the Synod that both in the Scottish Episcopal Church and in wider society many had long campaigned for the acceptance of, stronger protection for, and openness towards LGBTQ people. The Marriage and Civil Partnership (Scotland) Act 2014 had made it possible for couples of the same gender to contract a marriage. That had been met with joy by some in the Scottish Episcopal Church and with sadness by others and it had led to long and careful conversations within the Church.

One of the consequences of the amendment would be that in certain circumstances clergy would be permitted to officiate at the marriages of same-sex couples. At present, the law allowed Scottish Episcopal Church clergy to officiate at the marriage of opposite sex couples but not at the marriage of couples of the same gender unless the Church itself agreed to opt in to the legislation.

At the present time, Canon 31.1 defined marriage as being between one man and one woman, hence the proposal to remove that section in its entirety. The former section 2 would be subsumed into a new section 1 which acknowledged that there were differing understandings of marriage in the Church. In context, those differences clearly concerned whether marriage could only be solemnised between a woman and a man or whether a same-sex couple could also be married. He noted, however, that there were other differences in understanding also: for example, whether marriage was a sacrament or whether someone could be married in church following their divorce.

The proposed new section 1 of the Canon underlined that no cleric would be obliged to solemnise a marriage against their conscience and that only "nominated" clergy (in terms of the Marriage Act) would be permitted to solemnise the marriage of same-sex couples.

Bishop Armes explained that the draft principles and guidelines from the College of Bishops, which were set out in the Synod papers, dealt with some of the practical and pastoral issues around the nominating procedure and how the Bishops expected them to be taken into account by clergy and vestries. Motion 8 on the Synod agenda would also deal with that if the amendment to Canon 31 were passed.

Bishop Armes recognised that the issue of marriage of same-sex couples was a matter on which the Church did not have a common mind. The new Canon, were it to be passed, would protect the consciences both of those who believed that they must not, and of those who believed that they must, offer God's blessing on a marriage of a same-sex couple. It would also continue to protect the conscience of those who believed that remarriage in church after divorce was wrong.

Bishop Armes emphasised that no one was being asked to change their theology of marriage. The change would be that the Church would officially recognise that it contained a diversity of viewpoints. A cleric who did not believe that they should officiate at the marriage of a same-sex couple need do nothing. Such clerics remained authorised to solemnise opposite sex marriages. On the other hand, if a cleric wished to officiate at the wedding of a same gender couple, then nomination would be required. Without such nomination, clergy could only officiate at opposite gender weddings.

Bishop Armes suggested it was important to be clear that divisions in Synod on the issue were not solely on the basis of either being passionately in favour, or being passionately against, the proposed change. Nor was the issue one on which all evangelicals and catholics ranged on one side and all liberals on the other. He suggested that Synod members might find many reasons to vote for or against the amendment. Some might vote for it even if they themselves were not in favour of the marriage of same-sex couples because they wished to protect the conscience of those who were in favour and because such people felt it was

important that the Church embodied honest diversity on the matter. Equally, some Synod members might vote against the amendment because even though they believed that God would bless same-sex couples in faithful and covenanted relationships they held that marriage *per se* is only for a man and a woman. Some Synod members would believe that physically expressed same-sex relationships were explicitly forbidden by Scripture and therefore could not possibly be permitted by the Church's Canons. Alternatively, members might be equally convinced that a consenting, covenanted relationship between two persons of the same gender might witness to the faithfulness and holiness of God.

Synod members who had participated in the previous Cascade Conversations would be well aware of the diversity of viewpoints and Bishop Armes hoped that people had learned that those who disagreed with them, whether they did so from a conservative or progressive view, disagreed with integrity. They read the same Bible but interpreted it differently; they worshipped the same Trinitarian God but came to different understandings of what God might bless in human relationships and they sought to love the Lord their God with all their heart and soul and mind and strength and their neighbour as themselves.

Bishop Armes explained that the amended Canon was intended to affirm and honour such diversity. It was permissive not directive. It did not deny disagreement but it did invite the Scottish Episcopal Church to be a church which was large-hearted enough to contain such disagreement. In seeking to be faithful disciples of Jesus, disagreements within the Church ought not to mean that people ceased to walk together in the Way.

Bishop Armes then proposed the following Motion:

“That the amended text for Canon 31 be read for the second time.”

Canon Helen Hood (Edinburgh) seconded the Motion. Quoting from introductions to the Church's modern marriage liturgies, she noted that the liturgy spoke of those gathered coming together in the presence of God to witness the marriage and either to celebrate the couple's love for each other or to share their joy. However, they expressed slight differences in the Church's understanding of marriage. At times, the Scottish Liturgy was also used and it spoke in more traditional terms. Nothing which the Synod might do in the current session would alter the beliefs expressed in those liturgies. Speaking as someone happily married for almost 39 years, she felt very much blessed by God and could find no obstacle in her own understanding of Scripture to extending that blessing of marriage to same-sex couples who were committed to each other in a lifelong loving relationship. She respected the integrity of those who disagreed and valued being part of a denomination where members with strongly held divergent views had nevertheless been able to walk together. No one was being asked to change their theology of marriage but the passing of the amended Canon, setting out clearly and without value judgements, that there were differing understandings of marriage in the Scottish Episcopal Church, might allow everyone to walk together more honestly and openly in discerning a way forward for the Scottish Episcopal Church and the contribution it could make to the world.

The Rev Markus Duenzkofer (Edinburgh) also referred to the Church's wedding liturgies and in particular the statement that on journeys people stopped at significant moments and built cairns to which they could return. Life consisted not only in being but also in becoming. He suggested that the Church was now at one of those moments and the Church would decide what it was to become. The choice in the current debate was not whether to maintain the *status quo* or become something different since, whatever the outcome, the Church would not remain the same as it was at present. It would be changed. The new Canon would allow the Church to grow into the stature of Christ Jesus and be transformed by the Holy Spirit. He did not believe that the new Canon changed the definition of marriage, it simply expanded it. As such, it was part of the growing into the will of God for humankind, as the people of God had done since time immemorial. Others would argue that same gender relationships were contrary to the will of God. He suggested that for parts of the New Testament marriage was not the grandiose institution that some made it out to be – it was nothing more than a stopgap measure for people who could not help themselves falling in love with one another. Some would argue that the Church was caving in to cultural pressure. In fact, the Church would be doing exactly the opposite because it would be encouraging commitment. Those who advocated a change to Canon 31 did so out of a deep love and commitment to Jesus Christ. To doubt that was to violate Matthew 5:22. Others would argue that the proposed change would kill the Church. He was aware that the retired Archbishop of Sydney was in town. That Diocese had invested significant financial and human resources around the globe in those opposed to equal marriage. Was the Diocese of Sydney a glorious example of a missional church? In the past decade, the proportion of Anglicans in the general population of Sydney had dropped from 1.3% to 1%. Some would say that changing the Canon would jeopardise inter-church relationships. Mr Duenzkofer recognised that it would not be easy but the Anglican Communion and even the Global South was bigger than GAFCON Bishops. There were unnumbered LGBTQ brothers and sisters around the world working quietly for an expansive understanding of marriage. A number of sister Porvoo churches had already changed their marriage legislation and the Church of Scotland was also moving in that direction. More and more evangelical leaders were changing their minds. The Scottish Episcopal Church was not alone – God and brothers and sisters and other churches were with us. The vote at Synod would not just be about marriage but about what kind of family the Scottish Episcopal Church wished to be – a family into which he had been welcomed. In a dark period earlier in the year, he himself had been helped by connecting with a spiritual group at St Paul's & St George's – they were part of his family. Provost Kelvin Holdsworth was equally part of his family. The new Canon would allow everyone to stay together. He urged Synod to vote in favour of the new Canon.

The Rev Canon Ian Ferguson (Aberdeen and Orkney) explained that that day was one of the saddest and most painful for many both in Synod and throughout the Scottish Episcopal Church. The Scottish Episcopal Church was broken and there was a need to acknowledge that and to cry out to God. He was concerned that in the passing of the Canon the Church would be disagreeing with the teachings of Jesus. Jesus had

made it clear that marriage was the union of one man and one woman. The revisionist Canon deleted the biblical understanding of marriage and, as a result, the Synod would be saying that Jesus, the Lord of the Church and Son of God, had got it wrong when he had defined marriage in Matthew 19, quoting the creation narrative in Genesis. It was beyond belief to think that Jesus had only been talking to the culture he lived in and that his words were not relevant to the current time. The change would allow clergy to disobey the teachings of Jesus and would be a schismatic move that would cause serious harm to the Church's unity and its relations with the brothers and sisters in the Anglican Communion, the majority of whom held to an orthodox position. He was also concerned that if the Canon were passed it would deter those who held a traditional view of marriage from seeking discernment, vocation or ordination into the Scottish Episcopal Church. By passing the Motion, the Synod would not be helping those Christians who experienced same-sex attraction but who chose to pursue a celibate life in order to follow the teachings of the Lord Jesus. With loving concern for those who put them together, he believed that the guidelines from the College of Bishops were not fit for purpose because they had no legal authority and could be changed in the future. Synod was being told that the Church had a variety of understandings of marriage. Was it being told that all understandings of marriage were correct, acceptable and agreeable? What then was the teaching of the Scottish Episcopal Church on marriage? What would stop any person bringing a charge against him under Canon 54 for teaching an orthodox understanding of marriage. His own diocese, Aberdeen and Orkney, had voted overwhelmingly against the Canon and there were good people in congregations throughout Scotland who were deeply concerned and anxious about the trajectory being taken, in particular in relation to same-sex marriage. Such people believed their voice was not being heard. If the Canon were to be passed, some would feel that the Scottish Episcopal Church was leaving them. Some would quietly disappear seeking a church which held an orthodox doctrine of marriage and others would seek alternative episcopal oversight because they would be unable to live with the change. If possible, one wanted to avoid any such developments but few provisions had been made for priests, like himself, and congregations, like his, who held to orthodox Biblical teaching on marriage. He humbly asked that Synod vote against the Motion.

Ms Victoria Stock (Edinburgh) suggested that as people came to the debate they might feel that they had to stand up for what was right, that they had to follow the truth of God, that they had to maintain unity. Christians, and Anglicans, had never been a group living in harmonious agreement. Throughout history, people had wrestled with the fact that others might have a very different understanding of God. Had she spoken a couple of years previously, she probably would have said that standing up for what was right was more important than anything else. She would have spoken of the deep hurt and pain which she had experienced at being told that there was something wrong with her and that being attracted to women was a deep psychological flaw and against God's created order. She would have spoken about her struggle to feel accepted for who she was and reconciling that with her own faith and that of the Church. She would have expressed her anger at the apparent need to keep parts of the Anglican Communion on board, at the cost of doing what was right. Now, she still believed that the Church should allow same-sex marriage and she believed that if Jesus were present in the room he would tell the Synod to get on with it. However, it now seemed to her that the vote was far greater than simply allowing same-sex couples to marry in church. The debate was not about one side winning or triumphing over the other. Rather, it was about committing gracefully and bravely to walk alongside one another and of reaching out to one another with compassion and love. As the Church had come together to debate these matters in recent years, new relationships had been formed and she had seen God at work. She had learned that unity in Christ was not about everyone agreeing with one another but about learning to walk alongside one another. It was about grace and about stepping outside of oneself and valuing others. She believed the Scottish Episcopal Church had something special to offer to the world: generosity of heart. She was truly proud to be part of the small and rather feisty outpost of the Anglican Communion represented by the Scottish Episcopal Church. In a world of increasing fear and prejudice against the other, the Scottish Episcopal Church could be an example of unity and love. She urged the Synod to vote for the Motion.

Dr Christopher Johnston (Edinburgh) said that if Synod agreed the proposed change it would be hailed by the press, the political establishment and most of society as an enlightened, progressive affirmation of same-sex sexual relationships and would be seen as a proxy for God's approval. The Church would be praised for striking a blow for equality. He did not wish to hurt anyone's feelings but the issue of equality was a false notion and was being used against those who upheld a traditional view of Christian marriage and to silence that view. People had been arrested, taken to court, not allowed to follow their conscience in their workplace, lost jobs or been removed from university because they gently had repeated what the Bible said. They had been accused of hatred when in fact the hatred and intimidation was being directed towards them. There was no hatred in the Synod meeting and he hoped there would not be. He had great sympathy for those who called themselves gay. He did not wish to give offence but he believed that restricting sexual union to traditional marriage had protected women and children. Its disappearance from society was one of the causes of sexual abuse of all kinds and of violence against women. If the moral standard were removed, sexual anarchy was promoted. Making the change to the Canon would only follow suit. The Church existed to uphold God's life-giving and societal-supporting standards and it should not be ashamed to do that. To adopt a position where marriage meant anything one wanted it to be would remove an important protection for women, children and families. He was wearing black as part of the "Thursdays in Black" campaign for gender justice but he believed that violence against women would increase if the Synod voted in favour. Some would feel pushed out of their church and some in the Anglican Communion might be exposed to terrorism because of the Synod's decision. The Scottish Episcopal Church would be breaking itself off from the catholic apostolic tradition and the vast majority of Christians around the world. Christians were called to honour God but he believed that to make the change would deny and dishonour him. He respected and honoured everyone but did the Synod know what it was doing?

The Rt Rev Kevin Pearson (Bishop of Argyll and The Isles) said that one of the themes of the rest of the Synod meeting would be "intentional discipleship" – the move from being passive members of an organisation to being active disciples of Jesus Christ witnessing to God's love which encouraged individuals not only to grow but to flourish. The strap line of his Diocese's current programme was "from membership to discipleship". If the Motion were not to be passed by Synod it would be interpreted as the membership of the organisation deliberately excluding, as it had done in the past, present and potential disciples from the body of Christ represented in the Scottish Episcopal Church. Everyone was made in God's image and God's will was that people should flourish in His love. When issues such as sexuality, gender, colour or similar characteristics denied people the right to flourish in a relationship such individuals were denied their basic God-given dignity and the witness of the Church was diminished. The sign of the Holy Spirit at work in the life of the Church was turbulence and was to be lived with and rejoiced through. The Scottish Episcopal Church had a long history of living with deeply held but differing views which enabled the Church to flourish in the Spirit. The Scottish Episcopal Institute would present its report later in the Synod. It was flourishing because it held together people with vastly different views but who walked together. Mutual acceptance was a mark of disciples in a body which was flourishing. This was the time for a change to the marriage Canon to enable the Church to walk together and flourish. He urged Synod members to vote for the change.

The Rev Canon David Richards (Edinburgh) welcomed the change in the nature and tone of the debate which was taking place at the Synod. There had been a dramatic change in the way people talked to, and about, one another. He thanked those, including those with whom he disagreed, for the grace and warmth being shown. What was being discussed was not the attitude of the Church to the LGBTIQ community or whether gay and lesbian people would be welcomed into church since they were already part of the Scottish Episcopal Church. His own congregation of St Paul's & St George's included gay people some of whom were in partnerships, some of whom felt called to celibacy. A couple in his own church who were in a same-sex partnership had made a deliberate effort to find him the previous Sunday to reassure him of their prayers for him at the current Synod, as he had assured them of his prayers. What was being discussed at the current Synod was the doctrine of marriage. That there were many different understandings of marriage within the Scottish Episcopal Church was obvious. That the State could define and redefine marriage was also obvious but it could not expect the Church necessarily to agree with its definition or to perform marriages in its name. What was being debated in the current meeting was whether the Scottish Episcopal Church had the power and authority unilaterally to change the doctrine of marriage. For some, this was a question of justice, for others, one of holiness, compassion, integrity, inclusion or salvation. His 51 books on the subject gave differing opinions, sometimes on the same Biblical text. What he wished to question was something at the heart of the Church's liturgy. Each week, the Scottish Episcopal Church proclaimed its belief in the one holy, catholic and apostolic church. Could the Scottish Episcopal Church continue to claim to be a catholic and apostolic church if doctrine were changed unilaterally? In what sense was the Church apostolic if it departed from apostolic teaching within the Anglican Communion? In the Ordinal, candidates were asked whether they would be diligent ministers of the Word of God teaching the Christian faith and upholding catholic doctrine, founded on the Scriptures. If the Motion were to be passed and doctrine changed, there would be a question as to whether the Scottish Episcopal Church could continue to describe itself as a catholic and apostolic church. Or were those terms also being redefined? He asked Synod members to consider such matters and to continue the debate with warmth and mutual respect since, whatever the outcome, people were still stuck with one another for the future.

The Rev Canon John McLuckie (Edinburgh) asked what made a marriage Christian? One, reasonable, answer was that it was a marriage between Christians but there was more that could be said about Christian marriage as the Church celebrated it sacramentally. The idea of marriage as a sacrament of creation had been well explored. Nothing in the proposal being considered at the current meeting undermined the place of generative creativity in the wider understanding of marriage. If marriage was also a sacrament of the new covenant then surely it said something about the paschal mystery of Christ and must be at the heart of any Christian understanding of human relationships and society. It had something to do with the divine love as expressed in Jesus' own redemptive self-giving. He believed that that was the intent of Ephesians chapter 5 which spoke of the sacrificial relationship between Christ and the Church in marital language. As one contemporary eastern theological theologian had put it, mutual sacrifice played a significant role in the orthodox understanding of marriage since it was the existential space where each person received the freedom to be generous and forego the self out of a constant desire to enhance the happiness of the other. That was why marriage was a school of unconditional generosity because there could be no true love without giving. Such a pattern of loving was not, of course, limited to marriage but marriage sacramentally focused that giving in a particular way. It demanded much of people but it did not demand that the partners to marriage needed to be of a different sex. The pattern was not limited to a relationship between one man and one woman. In extending marriage to people of the same sex, the Church would expand its understanding of how the love of the Holy Trinity could be reflected in committed human relationships. There were strong arguments from a traditional theology of sacramental marriage which supported the move that would be brought about by the Motion and that was why he happily supported it. What made a marriage Christian was nothing more, nor less, than the self-giving love of Christ.

Dr Stephen Townsend (Aberdeen and Orkney) said that some had suggested that the proposed change would not alter in any significant way the Church's doctrine of marriage and that the only substantive change being proposed was to extend the scope of marriage. He believed such thinking to be incorrect. The proposed text that "there are differing understandings of the nature of marriage in this church" would become the official position enshrined in Canon. He suggested that the phrase "understanding" of marriage could not be distinguished from "theology" or "doctrine" of marriage. The Canon, if adopted, would therefore endorse multiple, and undefined, doctrines of holy matrimony. Some might argue that the statement was not one of aspiration but simply a recognition of the situation in which the Church found itself. Having differing understandings of marriage was not something seen as good or desirable – in which case why would the

Synod wish to enshrine something which was neither good nor desirable in Canon Law? The matter raised a challenging question. All were agreed that the Scottish Episcopal Church had but one head, Jesus Christ. If the Canon indicated there were differing understandings of marriage, was the Synod saying that Jesus, as head of the Church, could not make up his mind? He suspected not but then what was the Church saying? Was it saying that the Church had a different view of marriage from that of Jesus, its head? That could not be correct. If there were one thing which united the Church it was that Christ had commissioned it to make disciples and teach them to observe everything he had taught and commanded. If there was any uncertainty about marriage then it behoved the Church to seek a fresh understanding of Jesus' teaching. Secular society scrutinised the Church with an intensity which was unprecedented in recent times. What message was being sent to society? Was it to say that the Church was as confused as society. It was essential that the Church declared, as it had always done, that Jesus' teaching was upheld. If the Church did not adhere to his teaching then it was not the Church of Jesus Christ at all. There was no other reasonable and responsible decision to take but to reject the Motion and call upon the Faith and Order Board to articulate clearly the teaching of Jesus on marriage and derive appropriate guidelines to keep the Church faithful to that through future deliberations on the matter.

Mr Alistair Dinnie (Anglican Consultative Council representative) indicated that, since Synod 2016, he had preached his first sermon. He estimated he had probably heard about 3,000 sermons but he could not recall how many marriages at which, as a chorister, he had sung. These had included marriages of family, friends, church members and others whom he had never seen since. Whoever they had been, he had had the privilege of observing at close quarters the importance of the ceremony to them in the light of the Church. With that formative experience, he suggested that the surprise, even concern, would be if he were not to wish to marry – but he did. He had had the great fortune to meet someone to whom he wished to make a lifelong commitment and who similarly wished to make a commitment to him. Was their relationship some paradigm of perfection? Absolutely not. He and his partner had experienced exactly the same kind of ups and downs, empathy and understanding that could be experienced by anybody in a long-term relationship. Some years previously they had hit a point of profound crisis such that it had been far from clear whether the relationship would survive. His partner had attended evensong on his own and that had been very significant. He believed that, in that moment, God had been there and he hoped that God could be there when he and his partner made a lifelong commitment to each other. It was often said that in the act of choosing something was gained and something was lost. He was aware that there were those at the meeting and in the wider church who would feel that something had been lost if the Motion were to be passed. He would believe that much would be gained. Whatever might be decided, whatever might be gained or lost, he asked that those in the Church not lose each other.

The Rev David Greenwood (Aberdeen and Orkney) said that amid warnings that some individuals or even congregations would feel compelled by conscience to leave if the proposed changes were adopted, the rhetoric on some websites of Scottish Episcopalians suggested to him that there was a view that the Province would be better off without such people. He recalled comments by Greta Garbo that as a result of mass trials in Russia there would be "fewer, but better, Russians". One could speculate on the viability to the Province of having fewer but better Episcopalians but he wished not to reduce the debate to a question of numbers. He wished to address the question of sacramental theology. For anyone who believed that marriage had sacramental value he urged consideration of the following scenario. What if in a small rural church it were discovered that the Communion wafers had run out and that the service proceeded with chocolate bars instead of wafers. In such circumstances, the people would not have communicated because Holy Communion had prescribed elements. The Church could not redefine sacraments without desacralizing them. The early church had taken the view that to celebrate Communion with bread and water (as the Gnostics wished) did not amount to Holy Communion. A similar issue was being set up in the proposal to change the definition of holy matrimony. He accepted that not everyone believed that holy matrimony had sacramental quality but for those who did take that view he urged them to consider that the Church did not have the power to change the elements that had been handed down, namely a man and a woman, opposites joined together by God in one mystical union. Altering the elements might produce a nice ceremony but it would not be the Christian sacrament of holy matrimony. It had been suggested to him that if the Holy Spirit moved the Synod to vote to redefine holy matrimony then the matter had God's imprimatur. However, he thought that that view was too narrow. The Holy Spirit was not hermetically sealed within the Province. Outside Scotland there were tens of millions of Anglicans the majority of whom apparently disagreed with the proposal. The Synod was not choosing to push the boundaries of wider discussion but rather to decide, with finality, without that wider consultation. He believed, therefore, that the decision was being taken in haste. He hoped and prayed that Synod would leave the Scottish Episcopal Church better and not fewer. He urged people to vote against the Motion.

Mrs Linda Whitby (Glasgow and Galloway) explained that she and her husband had been married for 55 years and had four sons. All were married with children but if one had grown up discovering that he was drawn to the same gender she and her husband would have supported him in his decision. Everyone, whatever their gender, needed love, support and companionship throughout life. Love came from God and she urged Synod to let everyone share in that love. She supported the Motion.

The Rev Dean Norby (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) said that he had been married for nearly 25 years and he and his wife had three children and they were very secure in their love for each other and love from God. That came from somewhere other than just him and his wife. Likewise, in his relationship with his wife there was something "other" which strengthened it. Another way of describing this was "holy". He feared that no matter what one's view on sexuality was, the proposed canonical change would remove the statement that marriage was "a holy, lifelong estate instituted of God". For that reason, he could not vote in favour of the proposed amendment. He urged the Committee on Canons to include reference to that holiness.

The Rev Liz Baker (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) noted that in his charge at the outset of Synod the Primus had quoted from the Very Rev Professor Iain Torrance regarding the celebration of structures of faithfulness. Marriage was a structure of faithfulness. For those who had been married in the Christian church, they had made vows which were lifelong and yet the Church now, if the priest agreed, married those who had been divorced. Decisions had to be based on scripture but it was also necessary to understand that the understanding of Scripture and of God had changed throughout the Bible. The patriarchs and prophets of the Old Testament had not married in the way people married today. Over her life and ministry she had encountered a situation where she had known and worked with several women who were transgender. Before their transition they might have been married in a church to their partner. However, if they wished to marry the same partner after the transition they would not be able to do so. They could not bring God into that structure of faithfulness called marriage. She asked Synod members to pray for the guidance of the Spirit and to seriously consider accepting the Motion.

The Rev Canon Malcolm Round (Edinburgh) apologised to any for whom his opposition to the proposed Canon might bring any sense of rejection, hurt or lack of honour. He was sorry that he was opposing something which had real personal impact on many in the Synod and in the Church and he hoped they would forgive him. Nevertheless, he asked Synod to reject the Motion because what was being debated was not sexuality directly but was about doctrine and Canon law. By changing doctrine, the Church would move away from the clear words of Jesus Christ. He quoted from Matthew 19, verses 4-5. The immediate context of those words was about marriage and divorce but they came in a wider context of statements from Jesus which the Church would never wish to change. Matthew 18 spoke of the absolute importance of forgiveness, Matthew 19 referred to the receiving and blessing of children and the importance of helping the poor and needy. The Church would never contemplate changing Jesus' teaching on such matters and, therefore, the Church was similarly not at liberty to change his teaching on marriage. Some might say that the Church had already changed its teaching on marriage by changing its position on divorce – ironically divorce was the context of Jesus' teaching on marriage. Others suggested that doctrine should be taken out of the Canons but his understanding was that the reference had been included originally as a protection following the change of view in relation to divorce. It was ironic that protections which had been incorporated were now being removed. Scripture should be used to define the boundaries of the Canons. This was not a culturally variable truth since the teaching of the Bible appeared to be consistent from Genesis to Revelation. Scripture had always taken precedence over tradition, reason or experience. The elements other than Scripture were there to help and support, not to contradict. Neither experience nor reason ought to be used to change Scripture. He asked whether it was the case legally and canonically that the doctrine of the Church was now found in liturgy. He urged Synod members to read the book of 1 John which described God as love but love itself was described as sacrifice and choice. The love of God was made complete in those who obeyed God's word. In John's Gospel, Jesus had said that anyone who loved him would obey his teaching. As an act of love, he asked Synod to vote against the Motion and support Jesus' words in Matthew 19.

The Rev Dr Kenneth Webb (Edinburgh) indicated that he would support the Motion because he considered that it represented the best chance of staying united. Keeping the Canon as it stood held a greater risk of division. What held the Church together was not agreeing on every point of doctrine or practice but rather having the same attitude of mind as Jesus had (as Paul had encouraged the Philippians to do). He had similarly encouraged the Church in Rome to be like-minded. Paul had been exhorting his readers not to have the same view but to have the same attitude. It was possible to be one while holding different convictions. Everyone needed to remain open to God with the possibility of receiving fresh insights. By doing so the Church would be modelling a way forward for the whole of the Anglican Communion even if, for the time being, the Scottish Episcopal Church might be marginalised. He believed it was also a model for the world.

Dr Beth Routledge (Glasgow and Galloway) said there were many people interested in what was happening at Synod and one might think the Synod was turning the world upside down. For all that she had said in debates in the previous few years, in all honesty, her love life was not that interesting. When she left Synod, she would resume a life in which her parents would continue to ask her why she had not produced a daughter-in-law thus far, her friend would continue to nudge her towards internet dating and perhaps, when she met the perfect woman, the director of music would continue to try to persuade her that the trumpets from the Verdi Requiem did not make a wedding processional. However, perhaps the Synod was after all trying to turn the world upside down and if the kingdom of heaven were to be built on earth, perhaps that was what the world needed. The question of repercussions within the Anglican Communion on any decision by the Synod had been raised many times. The Anglican Communion was a very broad church indeed and operated in a very wide world. There were many people who were in fact cheering the Scottish Episcopal Church on, praying for it to shine a light into places on earth where LGBT brethren lived, and too often died, in systems which oppressed and persecuted. To presume that brothers and sisters in the Anglican Communion were of one mind was to do them a disservice. Similarly, not to speak on the issue was also a disservice. It was possible to do better and she wished to be part of a Church, and a world, where everyone could flourish. Canon Ian Ferguson had referred to the fact that the decision today would break the Church. With respect, she suggested that the amended Canon could make the Church more whole than it had ever been. The Motion gave the opportunity for the Church to say that there was room for everyone, that all were welcome and that there was more than enough of God's love to encircle all God's children. She was proud to have walked the long road to the current debate with so many others some of whom agreed and some of whom profoundly disagreed with her. It had been a journey which had been transformational for everyone. The wording of the Canon gave room for all to flourish. She was proudest of the fact that in the current debate everyone was walking hand in hand. If the Motion were passed, the Church would become a more welcoming and inclusive place for people like her. It would allow her to say "yes" when she found the perfect

person and she did not wish Synod to underestimate the importance of that. The current debate, however, was about much more than that because it was an opportunity to show all the world that matters could be handled in this way. Anything was possible if there was love. God was love and love could turn the world upside down.

The Rev Sophia Marriage (Edinburgh) said there had been much prayer, reading and discussion. She wanted to return the debate to asking what kind of church people wanted to belong to. She took seriously Paul's admission that even he saw through a glass darkly, as in a mirror. Everyone was stumbling along in their faith in the great mystery of God. There was a choice before the Synod. The Synod could affirm that everyone was seeing partially and that no one had the full vision or understanding of God. Alternatively, the Synod could affirm something very different, namely that there is only one understanding of God. The different dioceses had prayerfully participated in the debate. There were people of great integrity and faith with widely differing views, and these were not dependent upon whether individuals were members of the homosexual or heterosexual community. If the amendment was rejected by Synod, it would be saying to everyone who had a different view that they were mistaken and that there was no room for them in the body of Christ. If the Synod accepted the amendment then people could continue together in their journey with integrity recognising that each person was only partly seeing the mystery of God. She believed in a church which admitted its failures and which admitted that it could not fully know and therefore did not close the door on people of integrity and faith who held different views. The proposed Canon recognised, as a fact, that there were differing views. She urged Synod to accept the Motion to help build a church which was not closed to those who held differing views.

Mrs Anne Jones (Glasgow and Galloway) said that she firmly believed that the issue was one of equality in law and in the eyes of God. Same-sex marriage was now legal in the law of the land but not in Canon law. Synod had an opportunity to put that right. Did the Church believe in some kind of Orwellian definition of equality – all are equal but some more equal than others? She herself had been married for 48 years and her relationship with her husband was based on love, friendship, mutual care, respect and equality. She viewed her relationship as normal and boring and wonderful and equal, like those relationships which she saw between her LGBT friends. If the Church believed that all were equal in God's sight and equal in his love, Synod should take the opportunity to change the Canon and make the members of the LGBT community equal with all the other members of the Scottish Episcopal Church.

The Rev Professor David Atkinson (Convener, Church in Society Committee) was conscious that two of the things which defined the Scottish Episcopal Church were its emphases on hospitality and mission. It was important to look at the Canon with a missional focus. He asked whether adopting, or rejecting, the Canon would help the Church in its approach to mission and hospitality. In recent discussions regarding mission, there had been a focus on encouraging people to become disciples. Many of those who had spoken in the debate had referred to St Matthew's Gospel. In that Gospel there were two themes one of which was continuity but the other was change, growing out of continuity. Such change allowed the Church to relate to people and circumstances around it. Those people and circumstances changed over time. The final thing which Jesus had said at the end of St Matthew's Gospel was the command to go and make disciples – that included hospitality and fellowship. The question was whether passing the Canon would help the Church in its task of making disciples of all nations.

Mrs Pamela Gordon (Edinburgh) said that, with the greatest of respect to those who took a different view, she believed that there was ample evidence over 2,000 years of Christianity of moments of illumination and enlightenment. How could that be denied in the 500th anniversary year of the Reformation? She believed that during her lifetime it had been given to people both in secular society and in the Church to take a different view of things. The Church was privileged to have a moment to reassess matters, not simply because society had moved on (which it had) in terms of scientific knowledge and commitment to justice and equality. The great immutable truth was that God was love and that Christians were enjoined to love one another. Other things, she believed, were transitory and transitional. In that context, most of the western world had learned to embrace diversity and the Church was rightly part of that movement. There was a responsibility to put words into action and alter practices. The Church was learning to value the diversity of God's creation in a way which had not been so readily discerned in the past. There was a recognition of diversity in terms of people's sexual orientation, gender, natural talents and potential and she would like to see the Church proclaim this to the world by embracing the revised Canon which moved towards equality for all God's people in their diversity. In urging support for the Canon, however, it was necessary to continue to respect the diversity within the Scottish Episcopal Church. Whatever the outcome of the vote, there would be people in Synod and elsewhere who would be bitterly hurt who might question whether the Church was one in which they could see their future. Tolerance and the broadness of the Church had been its strength and she urged respect for those who disagreed.

Mrs Emma Barrie (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) said that the proposed change aimed at inclusiveness but would in fact be divisive on every level. She spoke about the implications of change. She suggested that it was not a minor consideration that the Scottish Episcopal Church would lose not only the interdependency of relationship within the Anglican Communion but also the strength and feeling of being part of a worldwide church. The aim of the Canon was inclusiveness but for someone who did not agree with same-sex marriage could such a person in conscience accept an invitation to become a Bishop? A Bishop would require to sign the necessary nomination form to allow clergy in their diocese to perform same-sex marriages and some might feel, in conscience, that they could not do that. How then would the College of Bishops represent the broad Church? On future, unconnected matters, the College would not be trusted to balance the weight of Scripture and tradition against the liberal view. The authority of a Bishop on a Board or Committee would not be seen to reflect the broad church of the bishopric. People might consider this to be a matter of perception, rather than reality, but perception was often more influential to lay people who felt that

the Church was changing too far in its beliefs and practices. "Broad church" was not the same thing as "liberal church". A broad church needed to reflect the variance of belief amongst the bishoprics. How would it feel to be part of a vestry where there was disagreement on the marriage question? Labels would stick and it would be the key question when choosing a new cleric and would keep coming up for decades. There would be no scope for compromise and each vestry member would become judge and jury and would come out of meetings feeling like the accused. Would vestry members continue to be chosen for the talents, energy and commitment which they offered or would this be overshadowed by whether their convictions on marriage aligned with those of others? She urged Synod members to spare a thought for volunteer organists and flower arrangers who would have the option to make a choice but the making of that choice would require a public display of their views. How would the changes affect members of a congregation which was divided on the issue? Would such members attend less frequently or decline to help out or join a different church? Individuals who might, or might not, have an interest in reading the Doctrine Committee paper would have to come to a view on same-sex marriage and articulate that view which would become known in their community. If the cleric wished to perform such rites or if a gay couple in the community asked if they could be married in the Church, their friends would ask their opinion. Views would be sought and known in the local community and, indeed, possibly put onto social media and commented on by those who thought differently. She asked whether, if a same-sex couple could not marry in their local church and were offered an alternative 40 miles away, that was likely to feel inclusive. It would be preferable to be told that Scottish Episcopal Church clergy did not officiate at such ceremonies but that people were welcome in churches. That had been the teaching of the Church from the beginning. The law of unintended consequences was such that whilst the Scottish Episcopal Church might find gay and liberal clerics queuing up to fill vacancies, many of the most committed members of the Church would be so concerned at these developments that they would choose to mow their lawns on Sunday morning or worship elsewhere. It was important that Synod understood it would affect everyone, not just the occasional cleric. Could disagreements within a vestry be managed without bitter words and departures? Could those with a deeply held traditional view of marriage continue to feel welcome? Many felt that the family and the holy estate of matrimony was being undermined.

Mr James Gardner (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) referred to comments he had made at General Synod 2016 about the Scottish Episcopal Church being a leading cog to effect change. He wished to reinforce that message to the current Synod. As someone who worked directly with young people in the Church, he asked Synod to bear in mind the personal effect of the proposed change. For some young people, and adults, who were deeply committed Christians and members of the Scottish Episcopal Church, the question was a big issue because they identified as LGBTI and the Church was a safe place for them. He suggested Synod should extend that safe place to allow same gender marriages. For some young people, the question was a big stumbling block in their faith because they did not feel they could bring before God the person with whom they had fallen in love. The decision would affect how people saw their future and how welcomed and included they felt in church life. In the liturgy, the Church acknowledged that God was love and that "we are his children". If God was love that same love was evident in same gender partnerships. God's love was for everyone irrespective of sexual orientation or gender identity. Some young people and adults were being physically hurt and hunted because the religion in the country where they lived did not accept them. He urged Synod not just to be a leading cog which effected change, including wider change in the Anglican Communion, but also to be a sign of hope and light in the darkness to young people in the Scottish Episcopal Church and around the world by indicating that the Scottish Episcopal Church was ready to welcome and marry them. He asked Synod to support the Motion.

The Rev William Shaw (Edinburgh) said that he had come on a journey on the matter. Originally, he had taken a simple Biblical interpretation that same-sex marriage was wrong but he had changed. He believed the matter was an Acts 10 moment. He considered that the law, the rules under which the Church lived, had been changed by the Spirit. Acts 10 spoke of Peter welcoming Gentile believers and not just Jewish ones. Peter had recognised that God had poured out the Holy Spirit on the Gentiles. He considered that God had poured out His Spirit on all those who had spoken in the debate. God was holding everyone's hands. He did not believe that the Church should divide. The proposed new Canon was similar to the letter to the Churches in Acts 15. The new Canon would create a safe place for all. The Church lived under grace and he encouraged the Synod to continue to do so.

The chair invited Bishop Armes to respond to the debate.

Bishop Armes thanked all those who had participated. It was not for him to further argue or debate the points which had been raised but some questions had been raised which he would attempt to address. On the question of whether those who held a traditional view were protected by the Canon, and whether the College of Bishops guidelines would be legally binding, he accepted that the guidelines were not legally binding but, equally, the guidance was based on the Canon which did clearly protect different viewpoints. He also wished to question the suggestion that a vote in favour of the Canon was a vote in favour of sexual anarchy. That was not the case and, indeed, the opposite was true. The Canon sought to raise the bar of the quality of same-sex relationships. It assumed that people in a same-sex relationship were just as capable of a lifelong committed relationship as those of the opposite gender. For too long there had been double standards within the Church, not just in Scotland, particularly in relation to clergy where there had been a degree of pretence. It was time to get beyond that and to raise the bar. At the current time, the Church offered neither blessing nor teaching on how a committed, faithful and lifelong relationship could fulfil the will of God when it was between two people of the same gender. The canonical amendment offered the opportunity to turn that round and for the Church to say to people it wanted them to aspire to something very special, in marriage. It would provide the opportunity to bless those relationships which had already achieved something special. Nothing in the proposal would undermine those who had chosen to live a celibate life. There had always been many reasons why some Christians had chosen to live that way and it

had been honoured and celebrated over many centuries and came from a particular gifting of God's grace. Much had been said about the Anglican Communion. Bishop Armes suggested that the Anglican Communion would want to know that the Synod had reached its decision on the basis of a sincerely believed and carefully prayed through understanding of God and of God's will for humanity. The Scottish Episcopal Church was not alone in having a diversity of different views within it. A similar diversity existed in many parts of the Anglican Communion. Whatever view one took in the debate, one was constrained by Christ. Unity in Christ transcended disagreement. That was a position he would wish the whole of the Anglican community to acknowledge. If the Anglican Communion was to survive, it needed to find a way of embracing its diversity. The solution constituted by the proposed canonical change modelled a hopeful possibility for the whole of the Communion, if not for the whole of the Church. The amendment to the Canon was intended to acknowledge the differences within the Church, to honour those who disagreed and to affirm in the generosity of God that it was possible to differ but remain God's beloved children, part of the family of God and of the body of Christ.

Following a moment of quiet, the Chair led the Synod in prayer.

The Motion was then put to the vote by ballot in houses and passed by the requisite majorities as follows:

House of Bishops: 4 in favour, one against, one abstention
House of Clergy: 42 in favour, 20 against, no abstentions
House of Laity: 50 in favour, 12 against, no abstentions.

The result was received in silence.

The chair invited the Most Rev David Chillingworth, Primus, to address Synod.

The Primus said that the decision represented the end of a long journey. There had been the Cascade Process which had involved people across the Church and the Doctrine Committee paper which had explored whether a Christian understanding of marriage could extend to same-sex couples. The Church had studied, thought and prayed.

In the life of the Church, endpoints were often also starting points. The step taken by the Synod had been momentous. By removing gender from the marriage Canon, the Scottish Episcopal Church now affirmed that a same-sex couple were not just married but were married in the sight of God. They could "leave and cleave" and express in marriage a commitment to lifelong faithfulness and to the belief that a calling to marriage was for them also a calling to love, forgiveness, sacrifice, truth. A new chapter had opened up and inclusion had taken a particular form. However, the decision was also difficult and hurtful for those whose integrity in faith told them that the decision was unscriptural and profoundly wrong. For them, the new chapter would feel like an exclusion, as if their church had moved away from them. Consequently, the journey now beginning also had to be a journey of reconciliation.

It was the case that every faith community had to face the issues bound up with human sexuality, in their own way and in their own time. Others would arrive at answers different from the Scottish Episcopal Church and the Anglican Communion, which was embedded in the history of the Scottish Episcopal Church and to which the Scottish Episcopal Church was passionately committed, would have to explore whether its historic commitment to unity in diversity could embrace the change.

The Primus referred to the fact that he had on many previous occasions indicated that a vote in General Synod changed the canonical position of the Church. However, it could not lay to rest the deep differences which the question exposed in the Scottish Episcopal Church, and every other faith community. The new Canon affirmed that there were differing views of marriage in the Church. No one would be compelled to do anything against their conscience. The Synod affirmed that the Scottish Episcopal Church was one of diversity and difference, bound together by oneness in Christ. The Church would carry forward in its life two honourable and historic understandings of marriage: one which saw marriage of same-sex couples as an expression of Christ-like acceptance and welcome; another which said that the traditional view of marriage was God-ordained and scripturally defined. That was the journey ahead and was now the calling of the Scottish Episcopal Church. Those in the Church had to, and would, address it with truth, graciousness and acceptance of one another.

3.2.3 Appendix 26 to the Code of Canons

The Rev Paul Romano (Convener, Committee on Canons) spoke to the text of the proposed amendments to Appendix 26 to the Code of Canons. He explained that when a cleric solemnised a marriage, they were acting as an arm of the State. One of the necessary preliminaries to any marriage was that the Registrar was satisfied that the parties to the marriage were not excluded by the terms of Schedule 1 of the Marriage and Civil Partnership (Scotland) Act 2014. It was, therefore, absolutely vital that Appendix 26 reflected the marriage legislation. There was no prohibition on adding to the list, as the Church saw fit, but it could not subtract any of the categories mentioned in the proposed Appendix. He commended the new Appendix 26 to Synod.

The Rt Rev Dr John Armes (Bishop of Edinburgh) then proposed, and Canon Helen Hood (Edinburgh), seconded the following Motion:

"That the amended text for Appendix 26 be adopted."

The Rev Canon Simon Mackenzie (Argyll and The Isles) said that there was a startling omission in the list of relationships, namely former spouse of child and former spouse of grandchild. Under the list as proposed, it was not possible to marry one's father's wife but one could marry one's son's former wife or daughter's former husband. In the letter to the Corinthians, St Paul had upbraided the Corinthians in relation to the man who had married, or was living with, his deceased father's wife. Paul had observed that such behaviour was not practised even amongst the pagans. The Scottish Government list did prevent such marriage but did not prevent marriage of one's daughter-in-law or son-in-law. Genetics were one matter to be taken into account. However, there was another issue to be considered which he believed was vital, namely the marriage bed of parent and child. It was a matter of pollution if one considered questions of sexuality and abuse. The bond between parent and child was surely sacred and, in that sense, sacrosanct. It was not a bond in which sexuality, in terms of genital expression was appropriate or legally allowed. To marry one's son's or daughter's former spouse would be to bring genital sexuality deeply into the relationship between parent and child where it did not belong and where it was surely very damaging. It would be a case of abuse. He could not believe that such relationships had been deliberately omitted. He wished to propose that additional categories of former spouse of child and grandchild be added to the list.

Mr Romano confirmed that those categories were not included in the marriage legislation, albeit he did not know why. It would be a matter for the Faith and Order Board to deliberate and to propose a further alteration to the Canon in due course if the Board were so minded.

The Motion was then put to the vote and passed by majority, one against, two abstentions.

3.2.4 Resolution Under Canon 31

The Rt Rev Dr John Armes (Bishop of Edinburgh) spoke to the text of the proposed Resolution 1 under Canon 31. He explained that the Motion was one with practical intent. The expectation of the legislation was that individuals would be nominated to the Registrar General to solemnise marriages of same-sex couples by the institution concerned. The Faith and Order Board believed that that was a pastoral, as well as an administrative, task and that it was best undertaken by the cleric's Diocesan Bishop.

Bishop Armes then proposed, and Canon Helen Hood (Edinburgh) seconded, the following Motion:

"That the following be adopted as Resolution 1 under Canon 31:-

Where a cleric is to be nominated on behalf of the Church to the Registrar General for Scotland for the purpose of solemnising marriages between persons of the same sex, the person to make such nomination shall be the cleric's diocesan bishop or, in the absence of a diocesan bishop, the dean of the diocese."

Mr Howard Thompson (Edinburgh) noted that, during the earlier debate, reference had been made to the fact that a Bishop who did not approve of same-sex marriage might turn down a request for nomination. He wondered whether that eventuality had been considered.

The Rt Rev Dr Nigel Peyton (Bishop of Brechin) explained that the College of Bishops had anticipated such circumstances and had reminded itself that the Diocesan Bishop would, in such circumstances, be acting administratively regardless of their personal view. He was sure that members of the College of Bishops would adhere to that. The Bishop would have to take into account all pastoral implications but he assured Synod that the Diocesan Bishop would be acting administratively.

Bishop Armes confirmed that it was possible that there would be Bishops who personally disagreed with same-sex marriage but they would also sign their consent to the Code of Canons and one of the principles articulated in the paper from the College of Bishops was that everyone acknowledged the Church's new canonical position. The Diocesan Bishop would not seek to veto a nomination but nevertheless needed to be in a position to take account of the pastoral context. He expected that the following week Bishops would be writing to their clergy indicating that the process would take some time and he encouraged members of Synod not to rush matters. The Canon would take effect 40 days from the end of the Synod meeting. Some consultations with vestries might take place during the 40 day period but there was no need to rush matters. Nominations did not have to be submitted to the Registrar General in a single batch and he advised clergy to be wary of making promises about dates for marriages which they could not keep.

The Motion was then put to the vote and passed by majority, two against, one abstention.

SESSION 4: THE REV CANON ANNE DYER IN THE CHAIR

4.1 Standing Committee: Committee for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults

Mr Chris Townsend (Convener, Committee for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults) reported that it had been a busy year for the Committee continuing in the work of advising the Church on safeguarding matters. However, any guidance given by the Committee was only as effective as its implementation at congregational level and that relied heavily on both communication and a proper understanding by vestries of their role in safeguarding. Protection of the most vulnerable people in church had to be seen as part of the Church's mission and the Committee felt strongly that there was a need for a greater awareness of safeguarding issues from the clergy, vestry members, volunteers and individual members of congregations who were often best placed to alert the PVG Co-ordinator to any concerns. There were potential serious financial and personal consequences of not giving safeguarding the priority it required.

Safeguarding was much more than PVG scheme membership and safeguarding was not the responsibility of the PVG Co-ordinator but of the vestry. There was scope for improvement in the level of familiarity on the part of vestry members and the level of knowledge would be enhanced by a greater level of attendance at training events run by the Provincial Officer and the Assistant Officer. Mr Townsend strongly encouraged attendance. The Committee was also reviewing its training resources and had begun work on putting together some additional web-based resources to keep those who had genuinely been unable to attend training events up-to-date with their knowledge. Some of those resources, it was hoped, might be used for a training session at a vestry meeting.

Mr Townsend said that it would never be possible to eliminate the risk of harm and abuse in the Church; one could only strive to minimise the risk and develop a safer church but for that to happen the whole Church needed to be vigilant and involved. The key message was that if anyone were in doubt about a safeguarding matter they should report it either to the PVG Co-ordinator or rector or to the Provincial or Assistant Provincial Officers immediately.

A second area of concern had been the level of response of annual congregational safeguarding returns submitted by congregations to dioceses. In some cases, the response level had been very good and was to be commended but there was scope for improvement and the Provincial Officers were working with Diocesan Protection Officers to support them in that exercise. Incomplete returns meant that it was extremely difficult for the Church to obtain a true sense of the extent of implementation of policies and procedures. The Committee intended to instigate a safeguarding audit and would thereafter issue recommendations for improvements.

Mr Townsend encouraged Synod and vestry members to commit to attending training if they had not done so in the previous two years and to work together to build a safe church. He thanked the previous Committee Convener, Mr Hugh Donald, for the leadership he had given to the Committee, and thanked Donald Urquhart and Daphne Audsley, the Provincial Officers, and the other members of the Committee for their work in the previous 12 months.

Comment was invited.

The Rev Peter Harris (Edinburgh) asked how many training sessions had taken place during the previous year.

Mr Townsend responded that five sessions had been delivered. Mr Harris suggested that the feeling locally was that there needed to be more training. Mr Townsend agreed to take that matter back to the Committee.

The Chair thanked Mr Townsend and the Committee for their work.

4.2 Greetings from Ecumenical Delegate

The Rev Dr David Easton (Methodist Church in Scotland) thanked the Synod on behalf of all of the ecumenical delegates for the Synod's welcome and hospitality. He commended the provision of "buddies" for the ecumenical delegates and thanked the Rev Sarah Shaw for acting as his buddy. He thanked the Synod for allowing the ecumenical delegates to be present for the debate the previous day regarding same-sex marriage. All churches were wrestling with similar questions and were at different stages on the journey and he welcomed the opportunity to have been part of the Scottish Episcopal Church's discussions. He referred to the Scottish Episcopal Church motto "Evangelical Truth and Apostolic Order". In his charge, the Primus had used the words "radical orthodoxy". Such statements encapsulated something which the Church felt was important and how the Church wanted to be part of the bigger picture. The previous day's debate had been part of that as the Synod had wrestled with the changing times and how people in the Church related to one another and how the Church related to the wider world – a world of which the Church was a part, not one from which the Church was set apart. Following the General Election results announced earlier in the morning, it was clear that within the UK there would be uncertain times ahead and in Scotland there was a changed, and changing, political landscape. How would the Church engage with that? What had taken place the previous day in the Synod had been a part of how the Church was working out its engagement with the world. On a personal note, he wished the Primus well for his approaching retirement and expressed appreciation for working with him in the Episcopal, Methodist, United Reformed Partnership. On behalf of all the ecumenical delegates, he wished the Synod the wisdom, graciousness and vision of the Holy Spirit.

The Chair thanked Dr Easton for his greetings.

4.3 Faith and Order Board: Inter-Church Relations Committee

The Rev Canon John McLuckie (Convener, Inter-Church Relations Committee) said that ecumenism was changing. Within months of the beginning of his papacy, Pope Francis had caught the mood of that change in *Evangelii Gaudium*. Ecumenism had been set in the wider context of the unity of the human family and was seen as a significant contribution to that unity. The Church, in its desire for unity, served the wider mission of God. In striking that tone, Pope Francis had been speaking in similar vein to the World Council of Churches' report *The Church: Towards a Common Vision*. The purpose of the Church was as part of Christ's work in reconciling all things to himself. As the focus of ecumenism changed, the churches and ecumenical bodies needed to find a new way of working. That new way of working was relational, was concerned with shared work for the common good, was committed to the proclamation of the Gospel and was rooted in a profound spirituality of unity and dialogue. Partnerships with sister churches were also undergoing major reviews. Relationships with the Methodist and United Reformed churches were strong enough for all three churches to review and reflect on their common working. The Scottish Episcopal Church's commitment to ACTS was strong enough for it to play a full part in a major review of its life and structures which would begin in the following months. Similarly, the new conversations being undertaken with the Church of Scotland sought to model that new ecumenism in practical and imaginative ways, building grassroots co-operation as well as reflecting theologically. Europe was also changing not least because of the UK's political place within it. The Scottish Episcopal Church had withdrawn from the Conference of European Churches eight years previously because there had been a concern that it had not been meeting needs effectively at that time. However, that organisation had now reset its

priorities and had sharpened its focus on the issues which faced the Continent. It was therefore being proposed that the Scottish Episcopal Church should recommit to that organisation.

Canon McLuckie then proposed, and the Rt Rev Mark Strange (Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness) seconded, the following Motion:

“That application be made on behalf of the Scottish Episcopal Church for membership of the Conference of European Churches.”

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) explained that he had been involved in the decision to withdraw from the Conference of European Churches and he felt that it had been the right decision at the time. He endorsed the Motion since it did now seem appropriate to re-join that body. However, he would not wish the fact that it had been the right decision at the time to be lost. He invited the Committee Convener to ponder whether there might be other ecumenical groupings for which a similar strategy might be effective.

Canon McLuckie responded that, because a period of review was about to commence, particularly in relation to ACTS, he did not consider that the current time was the point at which to make any change to other commitments.

The Motion was then put to the vote and passed unanimously.

Canon McLuckie then addressed the proposal contained in the Synod papers regarding the Episcopal, Methodist, United Reformed Partnership and explained that it was an opportunity to reform the focus of that Partnership. The Partnership had reached the stage where it was appropriate to take a couple of years to consider how to focus energy in the period which followed. He then proposed, and Bishop Strange seconded, the following Motion:

*“That this Synod approve the **Proposal for Synods of Spring 2017** regarding the Episcopal, Methodist, United Reformed (EMU) Partnership set out in the Synod Papers.”*

Mrs Margaret Hanley (Glasgow and Galloway) was delighted to see the Motion on the agenda. She was part of an EMU group in her local churches which had organised many events in the previous year.

The Rev Dr David Easton (Methodist Church) spoke in support of the Motion. He explained that the Motion had been approved at the United Reformed Synod in March 2017 and also by the Methodist Synod in April 2017. The conversations which had led to the proposal had not been easy. When he had returned to Scotland he had originally been somewhat sceptical about the value of EMU meetings but as time had passed he had increasingly valued the conversation since all of the churches were grappling with similar issues. However, his experience within the Methodist Church and also the Scottish Episcopal Church was that people did not know about EMU. He thought the United Reformed Church had been better at communicating the existence of the Partnership. There was a need to nurture the relationships better at local level and the Partnership needed to become more than just a paper declaration. He was happy to support the proposal but it needed to be more than just words. He encouraged Synod members to look for local opportunities to work together with the other churches.

The Rev Mitchell Bunting (United Reformed Church) explained that the Partnership had been a major part of his life during the 10 years he had been the Ecumenical Officer for the United Reformed Church. He was delighted, as he finished his role and moved into pastoral ministry, that the two congregations he would serve on the west coast were both linked in local partnerships with the Episcopal Church and in one case also with the Methodist Church. The recent assembly of the Congregational Federation in Scotland had agreed to look at ways in which it could engage with the Partnership. That meant that in future the Partnership might become EMUC or even ECUM.

The Motion was put to the vote and passed by majority, one against, no abstentions.

The Rev Markus Duenzkofer (Edinburgh) referred to the question which he had asked the previous year about the apparent discrepancy between the introduction to the Code of Canons and the schedule to Canon 15 regarding the Philippine Independent Church. He wondered whether there had been any progress on that matter.

Canon McLuckie confirmed that there had been no progress but thanked Mr Duenzkofer for the reminder.

The Chair thanked Canon McLuckie and his Committee for their work.

4.4 Committee on Canons: Second Reading of Canon 63 – Of the Office of Lay Representative

The Rt Rev Mark Strange (Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness) explained that the reason for the proposed change to Canon 63, section 3 was because, as the Canons stood at the present time, the alternate lay representative was in many churches not a member of the vestry. Since vestries were trustees, it seemed important that if the alternate lay representative was to step into the role of the lay representative then they also needed to be part of the vestry structure. Also, if the alternate lay representative became involved in episcopal election processes but had not been involved in attendance at any vestry meeting, it would be difficult for that person to have a proper sense of the opinions of the congregation.

Bishop Strange then proposed, and the Rev Canon Cedric Blakey seconded, the following Motion:

“That the amended text for Canon 63, Section 3 be read for the second time.”

Mr Howard Thompson (Edinburgh) explained that he was generally in favour of the proposal but considered that it needed to go considerably further. The Canon did not give an indication of the rights and responsibilities of the lay

representative. He himself had undertaken the role for six years but when he had started he had had little idea of what was expected at Area Council, Diocesan Synod or General Synod. At most Synods, there were no controversial issues but when a contentious issue arose lay representatives could find themselves on the spot. If the congregation or vestry attempted to influence the lay representative there was no explicit provision in the rules to make it clear that the lay representative had to make up their own minds. It could be difficult to resist pressure. He wished to suggest that the Canon be considered with a view to a clearer indication of the role of the lay representative. Also, the Canon was not clear on whether, if an individual ceased to be the lay representative, they continued for the full term of their General Synod membership.

Dr Anthony Birch (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) indicated that he had no objection to the proposal but noted that alternate lay representatives were simply one instance of a number of categories of alternate members. He suggested that any alternate ought to be involved similarly to the principal whom they might replace.

The Rev Peter Harris (Edinburgh) agreed with Mr Howard Thompson and asked for guidance about lay representatives and alternates. He was aware of a recent case where the individual in question had felt unable to report to their vestry because they had voted differently from the views held by the vestry.

Bishop Strange thanked those who had contributed for their comments. On the broader question of other categories of alternate he suggested that there was a distinction between those situations where trusteeship was involved and those where it was not. If better instruction was needed on the role of the lay representative, he suggested that people should send their comments to the Convener of the Faith and Order Board so that the matter could be considered and passed to the Committee on Canons.

Dr Beth Routledge (Glasgow and Galloway) asked for clarification as to whether the Canon related only to lay representatives and alternate lay representatives on Diocesan Synods, and not on General Synod. Bishop Strange confirmed that the Canon did not apply to General Synod membership.

Mr Alan Thornton (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) noted the reference in Canon 63.5 to linked charges. He could understand that if there was a single vestry for a number of charges the lay representatives would represent all of those charges but he could not understand how, if there were separate vestries, one person could function for all such charges.

The Rev Peter Harris (Edinburgh) said that there would be a single vestry in the case of a "joint charge" but "linked charges" implied there would be separate vestries.

The Rev Paul Romano responded that "linked" could mean one or more vestries. He suggested that the comments made be sent to the Convener of the Faith and Order Board and the Board could consider whether there were corrections which needed to be made.

The Motion was then put to the vote in houses and passed by the requisite majorities follows:

House of Clergy: passed *nem con*, one abstention
House of Laity: passed *nem con*, one abstention
College of Bishops: passed by majority, one against.

4.5 Information and Communication Board

The Rev Chris Mayo (Convener, Information and Communication Board) thanked all Synod members for their work the previous day when the Synod had been subject to intense media interest.

For the Board, it had been a year of endings and beginnings and the coming to fruition of the results of an approach which the Board believed would make the Church's communications missional in approach, more engaged with third sector partners and the Scottish people and would result in stronger ties with media channels throughout the UK. It was an approach which recognised the recent Government observation that communications now needed to be regarded as the fourth major utility. It also recognised that the current era was one of both highly professionalised communications and democratised access. It was necessary, therefore, to have the right skill sets and experienced communicators.

There had been a retargeting of what had been the role of the Communications Officer to one of Director of Communications. Previously, the Board had set strategy and the Communications Officer had put that strategy into action, along with the Board Convener. In a paradigm of 24/7 news, the time for interested amateurs to make strategic decisions in such areas had passed. The Board therefore turned to the person with the skills set and experience necessary to lead it in development. The Board retained a role for ideas generation and linkage with other boards and committees but now emphasised its oversight and auditing capacity.

The Board had been aware that a major gap in the Church's activity was in the area of digital and social media. That had not been through lack of intent but rather lack of capacity. Having only one person to keep up with social media, put together a printed magazine, liaise with media partners and deal with a wide range of other demands and requests, all urgent, was simply insufficient. Consequently, the previous month Aidan Strange had been appointed as the new Digital Communications Co-ordinator (part-time). Part of his remit was to encourage the Church community to tell its stories and he would be contacting people in the coming year.

It had been with regret that the Board had had to say goodbye to *inspires* as a printed magazine. Mr Mayo's predecessor as Convener had raised the question a number of years previously and the Board had decided two years earlier to relaunch and then review the magazine with a view to deciding its ultimate future in the spring of 2017. The

Board had, justly, been proud of each edition and had received wonderful feedback not just from within the SEC but from journalists, other churches and editors. It had been informative, challenging, inviting and consoling and Mr Mayo expressed thanks to the Rev Pip Blackledge for his Final Word. Despite the positive feedback, however, people had simply not subscribed and the magazine had continued to make a loss financially. The time taken to put the magazine together and consistently meet the print deadline had been key factors in bringing it to a close. The decision had been hard and painful and the Board had recognised that there were those who did not have access to fast broadband and those for whom that world was not where they wished to be. It was necessary, therefore, to create a vehicle by which articles could continue and comment be encouraged. The Board had, therefore, created *pisky.scot* which had been designed to be a forum for information, articles, the proactive curating of blog posts from across the SEC and beyond and the telling of stories through word, image, sound and video. It was separate from the main provincial website so that the latter could be the vehicle for the Scottish Episcopal Church's "official" presence. *pisky.scot* would allow for more latitude, comment and, hopefully, provide a challenging but safe space to encourage dialogue and debate. One of Aidan Strange's responsibilities would be to proactively curate content but it was open to all to offer articles and other material and shortly the Board would seek a more democratised method of posting content, moderating it with a light touch. Its success would rest upon contributors being ready and willing to use it. Items could be offered via the "submit a post" page where it would be held in draft form until the content had been checked to ensure that it met fair usage guidelines. This was not censorship but simply to ensure fair play. Much of the content might be an opportunity for clergy and others to disseminate electronically or in printed format

The Board had commissioned a "corporate video" for the Scottish Episcopal Church which would act as a new welcome mat on the provincial website, YouTube channel and Facebook page. It had been created and produced professionally by John Duncan, videographer, whom Mr Mayo recommended to any wishing to produce similar material. Mr Mayo's own appearance in the video was simply coincidence and he confirmed that he was not on commission.

At that point, the new corporate video was shown.

Mr Mayo closed his presentation with a period of silence.

The Rev Lesley-ann Craddock (Glasgow and Galloway) expressed sadness about the cessation of *inspires* magazine. Members of her congregation would miss the printed material. Some did not have the technology for online use or did not know how to access material online. She was considering installing a computer in her church to enable access. She wondered if there was another way of providing material, other than her having to print copious amounts of paper. It was important not to throw the baby out with the bathwater.

The Rev Dom Ind (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) appreciated the comments which had just been made but he recognised the need to be pragmatic (the magazine had not sold well in his own church, a location where it might have been expected to sell well). He thought the video was superb and caught well the essence of the Scottish Episcopal Church.

Dr Beth Routledge (Glasgow and Galloway) thanked Mr Mayo and wished the members of the Board success in taking matters forward. She wished to acknowledge that the future work would be built on a very strong foundation and wished to thank former conveners and members who had served on the Board who had worked to bring the Board to its current point.

Mrs Ruth Warmer (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) wished to support the comments made by the Rev Lesley-ann Craddock about the difficulty of disseminating the work of the Church to the disadvantaged. Much of her work had been with those who suffered from disorders such as dementia or those wrestling with poverty. *inspires* magazine had been able to reach them and she regretted its passing. She wished to find some other way to bring such people into the life of the Church which was not dependent on a knowledge and availability of technology.

Mr Grant Swain (Moray, Ross and Caithness) asked whether the principle of closing matters down where they were not economically viable would continue in other areas of the life of the Scottish Episcopal Church.

Mr Mayo responded that the closing of *inspires* had not just been a question of economics but the question of capacity in human resources had also been a factor. Each edition had largely been put together by a very small editorial team but the bulk of the work had fallen upon Lorna Finley and this had taken a disproportionately large amount of her time. Other urgent media demands meant that the publication was often being put together late at night or at weekends. He recognised the pastoral implications of the ending of *inspires*. Whether there was a future for a printed publication was for the Scottish Episcopal Church to determine but it would need to provide sufficient resources for that to happen.

Mr Colin Sibley (Argyll and The Isles) said that he had the technology and the ability to use it but did not have the inclination. He wanted to express thanks for *inspires online*.

In closing the session, the Chair thanked Mr Mayo and other members of the Board.

SESSION 5: THE RIGHT REV THE BISHOP OF MORAY, ROSS AND CAITHNESS IN THE CHAIR

5.1 Mission Board: Stories and Statistics

The Rev Jane Ross (Convener, Mission Board) indicated that intentional discipleship would be a focus area for the Mission Board in the following year. The Board endorsed the Anglican Communion's document *Intentional Discipleship and Disciple-Making - An Anglican Guide for Christian Life and Formation*, a summary of which appeared in the Synod papers. However, the publication of the initial findings of the Scottish Church Census had been felt to be

a more pressing matter to acknowledge at Synod in the current year, as well as sharing inspiring stories of mission. She explained that there was also a desire within the Mission Board to review the Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy and as a first step to that, a brief summary of the policy had been included in the Synod papers.

The Board had oversight of the Mission and Ministry Support Grant system and had appointed a Block Grants Review Panel to review the ways in which the seven dioceses had spent the Block Grants in the previous year. The Panel had noted that the accountability process was an evolving one, focused on sharing of experience (both good and bad) with a view to helping dioceses review and reflect on their mission. The Panel had had no concerns regarding the use of the funds and the Board wished to thank all dioceses for engaging with the process and compiling their submissions. It was hoped to circulate information in some form to the dioceses to assist them and their Bishops in developing further diocesan mission strategies. The Panel had noted that some decisions appeared to have been driven by lack of money rather than necessarily a clear sense of vision and that giving levels needed to be increased to sustain ministry and engage in mission. The Mission Board was seeking ways to address the issue of giving which it saw as a natural part of intentional discipleship. Also, the Board had noted that clergy provided strong leadership for effective mission and so the continued use of Block Grants to support the missional leadership of stipendiary clergy had been welcomed. The annual review process was an important means of sharing mission stories and the Board was already working with the Information and Communication Board to identify effective ways of doing that.

Mrs Ross then shared specific examples from each diocese arising from the Block Grant review information which she had found encouraging. These included: the Carpenters Arms Fellowship for Everyone (Caf4e) in Aberdeen; the embarking upon the "Living our Vision" five-year programme for which the funded congregational development officer/mission enabler post had been extremely effective in training and developing congregations (Argyll and The Isles); the weekly Soup and Soul in Dundee Cathedral, described as "loving care for the whole person" (Brechin); cookery classes for young adults and "pay as you can" meals on Saturday evening in Dunbar meeting a community need (Edinburgh); the Clydemen initiative of St Mary's, Port Glasgow providing a quality meal and stylish place to meet and talk now attended by up to 90 men (Glasgow and Galloway); the new church at the Crask Inn, Lairg (Moray, Ross and Caithness); child friendly church, the Filling Station project and the stall at Crieff market (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane).

A video about the Crask Inn was then shown to Synod.

Mrs Ross referred to the summary of the Scottish Church Census results which had been provided to Synod members. Detailed denomination-specific information was yet to be released but the Mission Board would consider those findings carefully. The Board hoped to encourage imaginative and creative ways of mission and hoped that the Church could dare to fund them. The report, entitled "Growth Amidst Decline" recognised that there was no place for complacency but growth which had been experienced in Scotland had nevertheless caused the previously expected decline to moderate.

Mrs Ross then spoke to a number of slides, produced by Mr Malcolm Bett, Provincial Treasurer, indicating the changing pattern of church attendance and membership in Scotland in general and in the Scottish Episcopal Church, in particular. She noted that total church attendance in Scotland had almost halved in the previous 35 years and the rise of independent churches was masking decline in many of the traditional denominations. In the Scottish Episcopal Church there had been a reduction of approximately 39% in communicant numbers between 1983 and 2015, an average annual reduction of approximately 450. In the period 2006-2015 communicant numbers had reduced by 18%, an annual total reduction of approximately 520, suggesting an increase in the rate of decline. The average size of Scottish Episcopal Church congregations had reduced by 17% from 96 communicants in 2006 to 80 in 2015 and the number of charges with 200 or more communicants had halved from 33 to 17 in the previous 10 years. There was an increasing number of smaller charges (approximately 28% of charges had 20-40 communicants).

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) expressed thanks for the statistics, a field in which he had previous experience. He had noted that, over the longer period, it seemed to be the case that the Scottish Episcopal Church had only experienced significant growth when it planted new congregations. He was aware that within Synod there were a number of people who had experience in doing that and he wondered how the Scottish Episcopal Church could own that truth and work with it creatively so as to encourage church planting across all the traditions. He encouraged the development of resources for that. The Canons allowed for the creation of new charges. Could there be some form of promotion of that online to support the creation of new Episcopal churches? He asked whether the Canon allowed people to start such a church beyond of Scotland. He had in fact received an enquiry about that recently. This was a missional, ecumenical, and faith and order question.

The Rev Canon Malcolm Round (Edinburgh) asked whether there was a particular reason for focusing on communicant numbers rather than the alternative attendance figures. He appreciated that a snapshot taken on a single date had its limitations but nevertheless it perhaps provided a more realistic picture of the state of the Church than communicant figures might suggest.

Dr Anthony Birch (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) noted that the statistics did not show the age profile of congregations. He suggested that perhaps congregations were not dying out as quickly as the age profile of church members might suggest. He wondered whether that was a hidden good news story.

The Rev Kirstin Freeman (Glasgow and Galloway) asked whether consideration had been given to the new housing being developed in Scotland much of which was geographically located far away from Scottish Episcopal, or other, churches. If the Church was serious about mission, it needed to look at where people were living.

Ms Victoria Stock (Edinburgh) asked how much collaboration there was between the Information and Communication Board and the Mission Board.

Mrs Ross responded to points raised. A member of the Mission Board attended meetings of the Information and Communication Board and Mrs Ross and the Rev Chris Mayo also talked together. The question of new housing was a good point. There was a tension between what the provincial Board and dioceses did. On the question of statistics, those taken on a particular day could be weather dependent. It had been recognised that the statistics currently collected did not measure the breadth of church life and the Board was endeavouring to develop a way of measuring such other aspects of the Church's life.

At this point, the Synod engaged in table group discussion on the following questions:

1. Share mission stories from your own experience. Do they resonate with any of the stories from the presentation?
2. How do you feel about the statistics?
3. How can the Mission Board help? What would you like to happen at diocesan level and as a province?

Responses from the table groups were recorded on flipcharts.

5.2 Church in Society Committee/Investment Committee

The Rev Professor David Atkinson (Convener, Church in Society Committee) referred to the report of the Church in Society Committee in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2016. He expressed thanks to the former Secretary of the Committee, Elspeth Davey, who had retired at the end of 2016. The Committee had agreed that it wished to focus on work to prevent and alleviate poverty. It interpreted that in a wide sense which was the reason why the Motion about to be considered by Synod focused on environmental issues. Those most affected internationally by climate change tended to be the poor. The Motion about to be considered dealt with how the Scottish Episcopal Church could respond to climate change. This had been joint work undertaken by the Church in Society and Investment Committees. It was important that individuals, congregations and dioceses thought about what each could do in relation to the problems associated with the man-made aspects of global climate change. Investment policy involved everyone in the Church because everyone was involved in making some contribution to climate change. Many churches had been debating what to do about their investments and the Synod had charged the Church in Society and Investment Committees to look at this. The report being presented, he believed, provided something which would be effective, made a clear statement, and was also practical.

Mr Adrian Tupper (Convener, Investment Committee) explained that the Investment Committee provided oversight to the management of the Unit Trust Pool. That was the part of the Church's balance sheet which was invested in financial markets. It provided a twice-yearly distribution and had contributed £1.4 million to the General Fund in 2016, approximately double the amount raised by quota. All dioceses and approximately 180 congregations were invested in the UTP which had a total value of approximately £66.5 million. He emphasised that the Pension Fund was not part of the UTP and was managed separately by the Pension Fund Trustees. The investments of the UTP were handled by professional investment managers, Baillie Gifford, whose appointment was reviewed periodically. Investing in financial markets carried risks but those could be managed and the objective was to achieve sustainable growth. Costs were kept down by a keenly negotiated agreement with Baillie Gifford who were set a benchmark for performance. At the end of May 2017, the value of the units had reached an all-time high. Part of the Unit Trust Pool was invested in pooled funds which meant that control of what was held within such funds was ceded. Approximately 35% of the Unit Trust Pool was managed directly on behalf of the Church and was the only part of the Fund where the Church's ethical policy could be directly applied. It would be possible for the entire Fund to be managed on a segregated basis but there would be additional cost amounting to multiples of £100,000. The Investment Committee met with the investment managers twice annually and held them to account. This included the question of how shares had been voted. The managers invested in a broad range of assets in order to keep down volatility. As things stood at the present time, businesses deriving revenues in excess of 15% in the sectors of weapons, gambling, pornography and tobacco were excluded in that part of the UTP which was managed directly. Baillie Gifford had its own ethical policy also, much of which related to the area of corporate governance. Mr Tupper emphasised that companies did not benefit when shares were bought, nor did they suffer when they were sold. The right of a shareholder to participate in annual meetings allowed the potential for engagement by way of shareholder activism.

Dr Donald Bruce explained that he had been the Director of the Church of Scotland's Science, Religion and Technology Project for many years and was now a member of the Church in Society Committee. He reiterated the seriousness of climate change which was altering the chemical and physical balance of the world and was having very far-reaching effects. Sea levels were rising and affecting South Sea Islands which were becoming uninhabitable. It also had immense effects on people, particularly the poorest, especially in the Global South. Everyone needed to make a significant change to their lives in order radically to reduce the burning of fossil fuels. The Paris Agreement of December 2015 had committed most countries to take action but it was the case that nothing much would happen unless everyone acted together. Therefore everyone should become eco-congregations, eco-dioceses, eco-families, eco-communities. Unless individuals took action, dealing with investment was meaningless. On the question of investment, when the initial discussions had started with the Investment Committee, the issue had been whether there should be disinvestment from fossil fuels. However, it had become apparent that that was not the best way to approach the issue. The picture was more complicated than a simple question of investment/disinvestment. Given the need to move to a low carbon economy, the question had become how the Scottish Episcopal Church could best act to encourage that. In relation to tobacco, an investor could easily divest from such a company because tobacco constituted the main business of the company. Fossil fuels, however, were integral to every level of lifestyle in industrialised countries. Fossil fuels were also the raw materials for many products, such as plastics. The issue was not the use of fossil fuels as raw materials but rather the burning of fossil fuels. A consensus had emerged amongst a number of other churches and there were two areas where a distinction could be made: the extraction of thermal coal and the tar sands oil production. Those were distinct areas from which disinvestment was possible. In other areas, however, the view which had been arrived at was one of shareholder engagement. In 2016, the Scottish Episcopal

Church had joined the Church Investors Group (CIG), the members of which had combined assets of approximately £17 billion. He had attended their annual conference in 2016. The Church Investors Group had been working on a carbon disclosure project to encourage companies to declare their greenhouse gas emissions and the resilience of their corporate plans, which were assessed on a scale from A (best) to E (worst). Approximately 50 UK companies had been identified as no better than rating C. CIG had engaged with them and 23 had improved their score and the CIG intervention had been a major cause for that change. This had led to the "Aiming for A" initiative which had targeted the 10 largest extraction and energy utility companies in the UK most of which were now at A or B level. A number of CIG members had been effective in using their shareholder power. Within the previous weeks, Exxon Mobil had been forced to consider a motion from the Church of England to compel them to make disclosures. The approach being suggested to Synod was one of engagement through CIG but also to encourage Baillie Gifford to produce data on companies in which the UTP invested. That was an area of ongoing development in conversations with Baillie Gifford. This approach also set a marker for a change in ethics in investment policy. The Church Investors Group had a number of other issues waiting to be raised such as labour conditions in clothing manufacturers in parts of Asia.

In presenting the paper, Professor Atkinson thanked Daphne Audsley for the significant help on her part in completing paper.

The Rt Rev Dr John Armes (Bishop of Edinburgh) then proposed the following Motion:

"That this Synod, conscious of its responsibilities as a Christian Church

- (a) Calls on all members, congregations and Dioceses to develop approaches consistent with a low carbon economy;*
- (b) Encourages the Church in Society and Investment Committees to work with and as part of the Church Investors Group as a means of informing and setting the Scottish Episcopal Church's policy on investment in an era of climate change and helping small investors to implement such policies;*
- (c) Seeks to follow the example of other churches by restricting its direct investments in companies deriving over 10% of their revenues from the extraction of thermal coal or tar sands;*
- (d) Asks for an annual meeting with the Scottish Episcopal Church's Investment Managers, currently Baillie Gifford, at which the means of agreeing any limits to investments in companies with a poor environmental profile and encouraging the use of targets and processes suggested by the Church Investors Group might be discussed;*
- (e) Seeks to put in place a mechanism, which would allow the policy of the Church Investors Group on voting at company meetings, to be put into effect;*
- (f) Encourages the Scottish Episcopal Church Pension Fund Trustees to follow similar approaches."*

Dr John Ferguson-Smith (Convener, Administration Board) seconded the Motion and emphasised that the work was a collaborative effort between the Church in Society and Investment Committees, having been commissioned by the General Synod.

Professor Alan Werritty (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) congratulated the Committees on their paper with its realistic proposals. Many would have liked the proposals to have applied to pooled funds but he had been persuaded by the strong case which had been made by the Committees. He also welcomed the Church's membership of the Church Investors Group. He wished to offer two suggestions for the future. Christian Aid was currently running a campaign entitled "The Big Shift" encouraging people to write to five of the UK major banks reminding them of commitments which they had entered into following the Paris Agreement. All had agreed to report on their patterns of investment in fossil fuel companies but none had in fact reported to date. He encouraged all members of Synod to check out the campaign and participate. Also, Professor Werritty noted that the final section of the proposed Motion referred to the Pension Fund Trustees. It was often said that fiduciary duties inhibited trustees in their scope for action. Christian Aid had also drawn attention to a Law Commission report published in 2014. That review had concluded that where trustees considered that ethical, environmental or similar issues were material, trustees ought to take such matters into account. He was not an expert in that field but he wondered whether some pressure could be brought to bear on the Pension Fund in terms of how it invested. He had discovered that the Trustees of his own Pension Fund, the Universities Superannuation Scheme, were members of the Institutional Investors Group on Climate Change. That Group included the Church Commissioners, Church in Wales, Church of Ireland and other churches. He invited the Administration Board to consider joining that Group.

The Rev William Shaw (Edinburgh) explained that he was the rector at Grangemouth and Bo'ness, where fossil fuels were very important. Another element of the fossil fuels debate which he would like to see addressed, particularly in the context of Bo'ness, was that of fracking. The charge at Bo'ness was invested in the Unit Trust Pool and would be horrified if their money was going into fracking. He considered it would be helpful if some of the information which had been provided to Synod could be provided in an abbreviated form for congregations. He also asked whether, in terms of the gradings which Dr Bruce had referred to, this led to a lowering of emissions by the companies in question. The report to Synod indicated that the UTP held very little investment in fossil fuels but he wished to emphasise that widows' mites were very important.

Mr Howard Thompson (Edinburgh) considered that the paper which had been presented was outstanding both in its analysis and its practical approach. He asked whether there were other issues for which a similar approach could be taken such as deforestation, desertification, damage to the oceans, dispersal of species of sea life, destruction of coral reefs. He noted too that Church roofs were very large and were an ideal place for solar panels but it could be difficult to obtain planning permission.

The Rev Kirstin Freeman (Glasgow and Galloway) emphasised the need to take fracking seriously. Some of her congregational members came from an area where land had subsided as a result of former mine workings. Fracking could have future implications as well as present ones. She also referred to the injunction in the report that everyone

should take action to achieve low carbon lifestyles across the entire reach of the Church's activities. That sounded wonderful but it was difficult for congregations because of the cost and congregations were unable to borrow from outside sources. She considered there was a need for structures to allow action to be taken. Perhaps a start would be for provincial offices to become carbon neutral.

Mr Jim Gibson (Glasgow and Galloway) found the report excellent. If the Motion were passed, whilst he did not wish to burden people with unnecessary statistics, he wondered whether there should be an annual report on progress made in the matters referred to in the report.

The Rt Rev Dr Nigel Peyton (Bishop of Brechin) asked whether it was the case that none of the pooled funds were already ethically screened. He spoke with personal experience of the Eden Tree suite of investment funds operated under the umbrella of Ecclesiastical Insurance. Such funds produced very good returns and gave the possibility of a virtuous circle comprising ethical investment, insurance cover and the possibility of a grant from Allchurches Trust Ltd.

Mr Adrian Tupper responded that, in theory, the pooled funds of the UTP could invest an unlimited amount in fossil fuels but in fact almost nothing was held.

Professor Atkinson indicated that he had taken note of points made in the debate. He suggested that those who had contributed and wanted action could contact him direct. He agreed that, in terms of follow-up, it would be good to keep a record of action that was being taken and report to Synod. The issue was one which was ongoing and the intention was to make things transparent and, to take the stance of working with people rather than antagonising them.

The Motion was then put to the vote and passed *nem con*, one abstention.

5.3 Church in Society Committee: Other Matters

The Rev Professor David Atkinson (Convener, Church in Society Committee) referred to the report contained in the Synod papers which referred to matters the Committee had been working on since the compilation of its report contained in the Annual Report for the General Synod of the year ended 31 December 2016. The purpose in bringing the paper was not to ask for Synod's approval but simply to make people aware of the issues. It was also an invitation to those interested to become involved and he invited contact accordingly.

Professor Atkinson said that the Church agreed that organ donation was a good thing. The Committee had been involved in Scottish Government consultations because the Government was considering moving to an "opt out" system rather than the current "opt in" one. The Committee had concerns about that both practically and theologically. If someone choose to opt in, they were making a gift. Gifting was an important part of the Church's theology and traditions. An opt out system, however, would move matters from gift to expectation. That was a major change. It would also involve moving to a system of presumed consent which did not exist in other areas of society. The Committee was concerned about that. A further issue was whether the Government and the NHS were capable of putting together the necessary IT system. A further concern was what moving to an opt out system said about people as individuals. It would be serious if people came to be valued, towards the end of their lives, for the transplant potential of their organs rather than as people. The Committee believed that this was an area in which the Church should provide guidance.

Dr Donald Bruce explained that in the 1990s he had chaired the first UK committee on the ethics of genetic modification. Such modification had only partially delivered what had been promised at that time. To an extent it had stagnated and led to global controversy. New technologies had emerged and the question was whether, and if so how, such technologies should be used. It was a particularly Scottish issue because it was easier to make such changes in animals than in plants and the Roslin Institute had perfected certain techniques. For example, a modification found in warthogs but not, generally speaking, in the UK pig population, could potentially be introduced to pigs to counter swine fever. It was an area where regulation could be hugely important. If there were overregulation, the field became restricted to multinational companies which had different motivations from simply addressing human need. An area which raised many issues was that of altering the human germline. This potentially raised serious issues such as producing experimental babies. Another area was that of mitochondrial DNA change. Faulty mitochondrial DNA was normally completely untreatable but authorisation had recently been given to permit such cell replacement. The Committee would continue to look at these issues and keep Synod apprised.

The Rev Canon Kathy Collins (Moray, Ross and Caithness) was disappointed to see a "take note" Motion from the Committee. She had been a senior hospital chaplaincy manager in North Wales when Wales had revised its organ donation laws. She had been a member of the Health Board's Organ Donation Committee. She was very disappointed to see the same old arguments being rehearsed again which had been gone through with the Church in Wales. Whether a system was opt in or opt out, everyone still had a choice. If the proposed change went through, as it had done in Wales, individuals still had the choice to opt out. The person receiving the donation of an organ would not mind whether it came to them via an opt in or opt out system. It took time to change people's hearts and minds about the value of organ donation. Her experience in Wales suggested that the conversation about the matter was far more important than the legislation and she believed the same lesson needed to be taken on board in Scotland. Conversations about organ donation should never start in intensive care waiting rooms or in accident and emergency departments. They should start in schools, churches and families. She had worked in situations where organ donation was only possible because such conversations had taken place beforehand. Synod could by all means support the Motion but she urged that the important thing was to start the conversations.

Dr Beth Routledge (Glasgow and Galloway) explained that her background was in biomedical sciences. It was important to carry out ethical research and to challenge unethical practices. However, if she had read the paper without any prior knowledge of the subject of genome editing, she might have wondered why the Church was addressing this in the first place. She illustrated some of the practical applications of that technique so that Synod

could understand why this matter was being discussed. The CRISPR-Cas9 technique enabled lots of genes to be looked at at once and that was important in a multiplicity of diseases which involved many genes at the same time such as heart disease, diabetes, schizophrenia, many of which placed a significant burden on individuals and society. There were also investigations as to how this might allow new treatment techniques so that treatments for certain kinds of cancer and cholesterol-related diseases and HIV could be addressed. She welcomed the fact that the Committee was continuing to engage with those issues. She invited the Committee to consider the advantages of such technologies as well as the disadvantages and risks.

The Rt Rev Dr John Armes (Bishop of Edinburgh) then proposed, and the Rev Jane Ross seconded, the following Motion:

“That this Synod take note of the paper from the Church in Society Committee contained in the Synod Papers.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

In closing the Mission Board session, the Rev Jane Ross thanked the Synod for its table discussions, the flipchart reports from which would be written up. The Board was grateful to the Church in Society Committee, its pendant Committee of the Committee for Relations with People of Other Faiths and the Youth Committee and Global Partnerships Committee. The Church did mission not to fill churches but because it was what God did in reaching out to reconcile the world to Godself. It was hard when the workers appeared to be few but the Church must hold to its conviction that God was faithful and embrace the new things which God was doing, grounding everything in prayer. The stories which she had told earlier in the session gave hope, showed that strategic approaches were evolving and that vision and direction could be developed if one was courageous and listened to God. The time was right to move towards intentional discipleship which fuelled the journey in mission. The Mission Board wanted to encourage and facilitate the Scottish Episcopal Church in that task.

SESSION 6: THE VERY REV ALISON SIMPSON IN THE CHAIR

6.1 Institute Council

The Rt Rev Kevin Pearson (Convener, Institute Council) referred to the Council's report contained in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2016. He suggested that the Scottish Episcopal Church motto was *“evangelical truth and apostolic zeal”*, that mission was the heartbeat of the Scottish Episcopal Church and the Scottish Episcopal Institute was the pacemaker.

The Rev Canon Dr Anne Tomlinson (Principal, Scottish Episcopal Institute) reported that the Institute had just come to the end of its first year of running the Common Awards curriculum. The Institute had moved to that way of validating and delivering courses for ordinands and lay reader candidates in order to be responsive to what the Church was asking of its training agency. The Church had asked for a training pathway focused upon formation – the shaping not only of knowledge but also of character, skills and virtues. The Durham course had offered such an integrated curricular pathway.

The Institute was trying to be responsive in many other ways. The previous year's intake had included by far the largest number of younger candidates for many years and at the start of the forthcoming academic year, there would be more candidates below the age of 45 than above. Both ends of the age spectrum were needed and valued but the increasing preponderance of younger candidates brought new challenges, excitements and demands to which the Institute was learning to adapt. Other demographic changes included the large number of candidates from the Diocese of Moray, Ross and Caithness probably in direct response to the ways in which that Diocese had been seeking to find new ways of being church in a changing context. In being responsive to that, the SEI summer school would take place in that Diocese learning from clergy and lay people in eight locations across the Diocese. A further demographic shift was the increasing number of candidates discerning a call to the vocational diaconate. Dr Tomlinson suggested that it would be good to see a corresponding increase in the number of people candidating for licensed lay ministry (as evangelists and catechetical workers). The lay reader pathway offered training for that.

Whilst many younger candidates arrived at SEI with existing theology degrees, several others were seeking to gain that through full-time study. In the autumn of 2017 four candidates would be studying full-time at New College, supported by SEI bursaries and the Vice Principal there had recently affirmed the value to the New College ministerial candidate body of the Scottish Episcopal Church ordinands. It had also been good to see links with the four ancient Scottish universities deepening over the previous two years.

The Durham University palette of courses, as well as laying down a foundation in Biblical and doctrinal modules, was also geared towards the Church of the present. The previous week, the Rev Annie Naish, the Bishop's Enabler of Mission in the Edinburgh Diocese, had begun to teach a course on “entrepreneurial mission”. Also, for the first time, students in the central belt had spent their first year's placement with chaplains from Workplace Chaplaincy Scotland in places such as shopping centres, ports, council offices, etc. In responding to the need for students to understand the wider Communion of which the Scottish Episcopal Church was a part, one student had spent time in Malawi learning about the provision of religious education in a mixed faith setting and later in the year another would spend time as a guest of the Anglican Communion Centre in Virginia Theological Seminary and a third would work in a church in Gothenburg which had a ministry to refugees.

The Rev Dr Michael Hull (Director of Studies, Scottish Episcopal Institute) spoke of how the Institute had sought to be responsive to the learning needs of the wider Church. These included a number of ongoing learning opportunities available to anyone who was interested. A module was being offered in New Testament Greek, taught by Professor John Starr. The group met at Emmaus House in Edinburgh to introduce people to the rigours of the study of Biblical

languages. Professor Starr was able to offer a grounding not only in the text but also in the principles of translation. A module in Christian ethics was being offered by the Rev David Robinson. This module was offered at the General Synod Office and provided an introduction to critical Christian moral thinking. These modules were not limited to Edinburgh and were available live on Skype.

A further development had been the launch of the new Scottish Episcopal Journal which was available online. It was an outreach to the whole of the Scottish Episcopal Church and beyond. It had been launched in March 2017. The Scottish Episcopal Church had a real depth of theological acumen, a great history of liturgy, a vibrant pastoral life and ministerial experience to share. The journal aimed to highlight the thinking of the clergy and laity, to encourage debate on current issues in the Anglican Communion and to engage in dialogue on what it meant to live a life of holiness and service as Episcopalians in Scotland. The journal was free to all and hopefully would serve as a catalyst for prayer and reflection. The second issue would be available by the end of the month. The SEI hoped to continue to be a resource to the wider Church.

Dr Tomlinson then spoke about the SEI's response to need in setting up a context-based training pathway from September 2018. SEI was keen to equip candidates with the skills for missional leadership and create new forms of church community and therefore placed great emphasis on field education modules. However, it was aware that increasingly many potential candidates desired to train with an even greater "on the job" emphasis. The new pathway would seek to enable candidates to spend part of each week working in churches or mission contexts with a local supervisor and spend the other working days on academic study. The placement would be financially supported.

Dr Tomlinson then engaged in conversation with the Rev Canon David Richards (Edinburgh) who had been closely involved in the discussions about the new pathway. Canon Richards referred to the change of context and the fact that training models which had been used in the past would not necessarily adequately equip people for the future. Whilst many might value a 17th-century liturgy, the fact was that the world had changed. Those being trained needed to be adapted, and adaptable, to the world around them. The concept of pulling people out of their local situation for training was a relatively recent one. Previously, people had been trained in their own locality. He referred to the conversations which had taken place with St Mellitus College in London which had over the previous 10 years developed into the largest training institution within the Church of England. It was aimed at part-time students in a church situation so that their theological, spiritual and ministerial formation took place hand-in-hand. It had proved particularly popular with those aged under 35. When it had become apparent that a partnership between the Scottish Episcopal Institute and St Mellitus would not be possible (because St Mellitus was concentrating on establishing a third centre in England), the Institute Council had decided that it would develop such a pathway itself. Canon Richards found that proposal appealing and confirmed that St Mellitus would be available for consultation. He pointed out that some congregations who might not be able to afford a curate might nevertheless be able to support an ordinand on such a pathway. It would be important, nevertheless, to ensure that such a person was not simply seen as a "cheap pair of hands" and it would be important to establish appropriate boundaries. It was hoped that advertisements for an individual to oversee the context-based training pathway would go out later in the year and it would also be important to identify charges potentially across all geographical contexts and church traditions. Canon Richards indicated that St Paul's & St George's hoped to be able to provide some finance to support the initiative.

The Rev Sarah Shaw (Edinburgh) asked whether ordinands on the context-based training pathway would still undertake a three-year curacy.

The Rev Canon Dom Ind (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane), speaking as a Diocesan Director of Ordinands, thanked all those involved in the SEI. He could see that the bar had been raised and that the quality of candidates was first rate. In his Diocese, which he suspected was not alone, there was a need for more priests, particularly self-supporting clergy to serve some of the smaller charges. In the light of the raising of the bar, there perhaps needed to be some degree of leniency. For those to become rectors, the training might be different from that appropriate for a person serving in an assistant priest capacity. Likewise, there might be scope for variation in relation to lay readers.

Mr Kennedy Fraser (Glasgow and Galloway) noted with some disappointment that there were no statistics for the numbers of lay readers coming through the discernment process. He asked why the SEI thought there had not been the same increase in the number of lay readers coming forward as it was experiencing in relation to ordinands. Was the bar being set at too high a level or was it that there were other routes available to people such as that of worship leader? In his own Diocese, it was sometimes difficult to see the difference between the roles of worship leader and lay reader.

Mr Colin Sibley (Argyll and The Isles) expressed disappointment at the text on the reverse of the SEI bookmarks which had been distributed which suggested means of raising funds for the Institute. He suggested funding was not being taken sufficiently seriously and that the "war chest" ought to be raided to fund the SEI.

The Rev Kenneth Webb (Edinburgh) was very encouraged by the proposed context-based training pathway. He emphasised that the key to its success would be in the quality of training incumbents and he wondered what was being done to address that.

The Rev Diana Hall (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) expressed thanks, as someone who was in her final year of curacy. Much hard work had been put in and she was excited to see how matters were developing. The future was bright.

Dr Tomlinson responded by explaining that the two types of formation were quite different. For someone undertaking the context-based pathway, there would still be the three-year IME (Initial Ministerial Education) 4-6 curacy, which would be a different kind of formation from IME 1-3. Experience from England, where some candidates had remained in the same context for six years, suggested that there were pros and cons about that.

Bishop Pearson responded to the issues of raising the bar in terms of training requirements. The thrust of the previous few years had been in response to experience that suggested that inadequate academic training in the context of formation meant that people were not sufficiently resilient. That question was, however, about to be looked at again as experience developed. The Council was aware of the need of the Church but it was also aware of the need of the individuals. Temporary expediences very rarely took things forward helpfully. On the question of lay readership, he suggested that lay readers themselves needed to be proactive in recruiting and letting people in congregations know that lay readership existed and that it was a very valuable ministry in the Church. Lay readers were a theological and catechetical resource within the Church and needed the training which was provided. In terms of statistics, only one lay reader had been recruited in the previous year. Historically, the Scottish Episcopal Church had ignored lay readership for a long time and it was only now being rediscovered. The Institute Council was looking at the issue. On the question of training incumbents, the Council was aware that curates had traditionally been placed in locations where finance and housing resources were available. Funds were needed to move to a position where training could be offered in locations where the local resources did not necessarily exist.

Bishop Pearson expressed thanks to Dr Tomlinson, Dr Hull and Canon Richards.

Bishop Pearson was heartened by the Synod's indication that funding for the Institute should be a priority but there was also a need to produce some new money. A theme of the current Synod had been moving from membership to discipleship and a characteristic of disciples was that their experience of the living God led them to make new disciples. That meant that the Institute needed friends who would pray and give money. He was not asking for money to prop up a failing institution or pay off its deficit but to help everyone move from membership to discipleship. A possible scheme for the Friends of the Scottish Episcopal Institute would be considered by the Institute Council in detail at its meeting at the end of June 2017. The provision of bookmarks was to flag up that the issue was money. The need was for an extra 50p per member per week. That would enable the funding of training programmes and future curacies and deal with the bulge of curates for the following years. People in each diocese would act as "ambassadors", not fundraisers, but would put church members in touch with relevant information. He commended the work to people's prayers and pockets.

The Chair thanked Bishop Pearson and all those who had contributed.

6.2 College of Bishops

The Primus paid tribute to the Rt Rev Dr Nigel Peyton, Bishop of Brechin, who was due to retire during the summer. He expressed thanks for Bishop Peyton's leadership of the Cascade process which had assisted the Church in being able to debate the marriage Canon the previous day. Bishop Peyton had also been instrumental in developing the Church Army Centre of Mission in Dundee. He wished him and Mrs Peyton a happy retirement.

The Rt Rev Mark Strange (Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness) then paid tribute to the Primus who was also due to retire during the summer. Bishop Strange reflected on the Primus' many achievements. He had from the start asked all of the right questions and had had a great ability to network across the Province, the nation and the Anglican Communion. At all times, the Primus had worked for his vision for the Scottish Episcopal Church. On behalf of the College of Bishops, Bishop Strange thanked him for his unstinting work and wished him and Mrs Chillingworth a happy retirement.

The Primus thanked Bishop Strange and reflected on his time in Scotland. The fact that there would shortly be a number of episcopal vacancies was a consequence of the fact that there had been a period of remarkable stability within the College of Bishops. That had enabled much to be achieved such as the Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy, the launch of the SEI and the process of discussion which had culminated the previous day in the alteration of the marriage Canon. He expressed thanks to General Synod Office staff and his wife and wished the Church every blessing for the future.

The Rev Markus Duenzkofer (Edinburgh) noted that the Synod had not had the opportunity the previous year to thank the Rt Rev Dr Bob Gillies who had retired later in the year as Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney. Thanks were expressed to him.

The Chair thanked all of the Bishops for their leadership and offered the Synod's prayers to the Primus and Bishop Peyton as they retired and to Bishop Duncan for his continuing recovery.

6.3 Faith and Order Board

6.3.1 Liturgy Committee

Dr John Davies (Convener, Liturgy Committee) reported that the new Pastoral Offices had been given approval by the College of Bishops for an experimental period of three years and all clergy and lay readers had been sent copies. Further copies were available from the General Synod Office. The cost of production had been borne from the Liturgy Committee budget hence the deficit in the figures shown in the Annual Report and Accounts for the year ended 31 December 2016. Members of the Committee had facilitated a workshop the previous month in the Diocese of Glasgow and Galloway to introduce those new Pastoral Offices. Committee members were happy to offer a similar workshop in other dioceses, if desired. During the course of the year, the main business of the Committee had been the drafting of new rites for Lent, Holy Week and Easter and this work was now ready to be presented to the Faith and Order Board in August 2017. Dr Davies indicated that feedback on any of the rites currently in experimental use would be welcomed, namely the new set of Collects, the Pastoral Offices and the new Eucharistic Prayers for Christmas and Epiphany. He reported that the Faith and Order Board had decided not to proceed with the

Eucharistic Prayer in contemporary language based on the 1929 Prayer Book which had previously been authorised for experimental use.

Comment was invited but there was none.

The Chair thanked Dr Davies and the Liturgy Committee.

6.3.2 Doctrine Committee

The Rev Professor David Jasper (Convener, Doctrine Committee) explained that he had been appointed Convener of the Committee following the resignation earlier in the year of the Rev Dr Harriet Harris. The Committee was in the course of being reformed since only two of the Committee's previous members remained at the current time. The Committee had had a provisional meeting a few weeks earlier and would have its first formal meeting over the summer.

Dr Jasper wished to introduce the Grosvenor Essay "*Clothe Yourselves with Compassion*" which had not thus far been completed but it was hoped that it would be available online before too long. Quoting Dr Harris, he indicated that there was a body of work on the science of compassion, and a growing awareness within and beyond Christianity (most strongly associated with Buddhist influences) of how prayer, worship, meditation, contemplation and the rhythm of life could help to cultivate compassion. It was hoped to develop that awareness for Christianity. Dr Harris had suggested that the context for such work was because compassion was much needed in a world in which there was a pandemic of loneliness in society, social resentment and distrust affecting attitudes such as immigration, a growth in fear-mongering, hate crime and violence and a climate in institutions which corroded compassion and a sense of community. The Essay would be both a theological and practical resource.

Looking to the future, the Doctrine Committee intended to prepare Grosvenor Essay number 14 on the role and theology of Bishops in the Scottish Episcopal Church. Looking more externally, it would also give consideration to the nature of truth, particularly relevant in the so-called post-truth world. The Committee also wished to work more closely with other pendant committees and initially intended to work jointly with the Liturgy Committee by providing a commentary on the Liturgy Committee's liturgies for Holy Week and Easter. Professor Jasper also hoped that the Committee could act as a faithful servant and commentator to the whole Church and the College of Bishops on matters of theological concern where a quick response was necessary. He hoped to be able to work more closely with other churches and other faiths in Scotland on matters of common interest.

Comment was invited but there was none.

The Chair thanked Professor Jasper and also expressed the thanks of Synod to the Rev Dr Harriet Harris, the former Convener.

SESSION 7: THE RIGHT REV THE BISHOP OF BRECHIN IN THE CHAIR

7.1 Pension Fund Trustees

Mr Richard McIndoe (Chair, Pension Fund Trustees) reported on the work of the Pension Fund Trustees. During the year, the Fund had received £1.5 million by way of employer contributions and had paid out £2.2 million in pensions and the difference had been made up by investment income. That was a normal dynamic for a mature pension fund. On the investment side, there had been a market value increase of approximately £6.8 million which had been quite extraordinary. The investment manager, Schroder, had achieved an investment return of 15% in the year and over five years had achieved an average annual return of 8.9%. The year had, therefore, been exceptionally good. Ironically, most of the return had been driven by Brexit. At the time of the Brexit referendum, the entire investment world had expected the vote to result in an investment disaster. It was possible that Brexit might yet prove to be such a disaster but the year-to-date had been good particularly for Sterling investors. That was because there had been a fall in Sterling and, therefore, any overseas investments were worth more in Sterling terms. UK equity investments had also done well because much of the UK equity market was relatively concentrated in a group of multinational companies. Returns had also been good for bond investors because of the uncertainty created by Brexit. As a result, the price of bonds had increased.

Mr McIndoe explained that the Pension Fund held growth investments, intended to provide the growth needed to fund pensions in the longer term, and also low risk investments (represented by bonds). The growth investments had generated a return of approximately 7.1% but the bonds had returned 15-20%. Unfortunately, the increase in price had reduced the yield and that resulted in an increase in the Fund's liabilities. That state of affairs was not evident from the Accounts. The liabilities were reported in the actuarial valuation which would happen at the end of the current year. The Trustees received regular updates from the Actuary and the estimate was that at the end of the year the liabilities were expected to have increased by approximately £6 million. The investment strategy was largely a matching one and, thus far, that investment strategy meant that the Fund was not exposed to the kind of deficit volatility to which it had been exposed in the past. The Trustees had in fact increased the bond part of the Fund and reduced the growth part by 10%. As he had stated in the Annual Report, expectations were that future growth might be more limited. The Fund was currently well invested but the problem arose in relation to future benefits earned by scheme members. If the return from investments reduced, such benefits then had to be paid from another source, namely employer contributions. He was, therefore, giving a word of warning about the valuation due at the end of the current year.

During the year, the Trustees had dealt with a number of technical matters. The scheme administration was carried out by Daphne Audsley but the Trustees had become involved in the case of a couple of death grants which had become payable during the year. Such lump sum benefits were payable "at the direction of the Trustees" according to the scheme rules. Generally, the Trustees would, in such circumstances, follow the wishes of the deceased person provided they had previously been notified. He wished to remind all scheme members to ensure that their expression of wishes was up-to-date and had been communicated to Daphne Audsley.

Finally, Mr McIndoe expressed thanks to Mr Bob Burgon who had stood down as a Trustee during the year and to Mr Andrew Hunter who had joined the Trustee Board.

The Rt Rev Dr John Armes (Bishop of Edinburgh) referred to the discussion which had taken place earlier in Synod regarding ethical investment. He asked whether the Trustees had had an opportunity to consider the paper debated by Synod.

Mr McIndoe responded that the broad position had been discussed at every meeting. The broad policy of the Trustees was to share the view of the Church but in fact it was unable to do so at the present time in any meaningful way because the entirety of Pension Fund investments was held in pooled funds. The Trustees were not in a position to impose stock constraints. The Trustees met the investment managers, Schroder, annually and responsible investment formed part of that discussion and would do again at a meeting later in the year. The Trustees would press them to engage with companies. The Pension Fund was somewhat different from other church investments and the question of funding the liabilities was a differentiator. The Fund existed only to pay those liabilities and the investment strategy had to be directed to that end.

Professor Alan Werritty (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) asked whether the Pension Fund Trustees could adopt a position similar to that discussed earlier in the day in terms of joining with others in a collective group. For example, could the Pension Fund Trustees join the Institutional Investors Group on Climate Change? Mr McIndoe responded that he was well aware of the Institutional Investors Group on Climate Change. He confirmed that the Pension Fund Trustees would consider the Motion which had been passed earlier in Synod and he did not wish to pre-empt that discussion. The Strathclyde Pension Fund, which he ran, was a big supporter of the Institutional Investors Group and the Church Investors Group was also a member of that Institutional Investors Group. The Pension Fund Trustees did not themselves have a separate membership of it. The main impact of separate membership would probably be a second membership fee but he would take the matter to the Trustees.

The Chair thanked Mr McIndoe and the other Pension Fund Trustees.

SESSION 8: THE RIGHT REV THE BISHOP OF ARGYLL AND THE ISLES IN THE CHAIR

8.1 Administration Board

Dr John Ferguson-Smith (Convener, Administration Board) referred to the reports of the Board and its pendant committees contained in the Annual Report and Accounts for the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2016. The Board was contributing to the review of impact of the Mission and Ministry Support Grants which had been referred to earlier in Synod by the Convener of the Mission Board. The Board had also received the recommendations of the Clergy Remuneration Package Review Group and had accepted all the recommendations. The new Buildings Grants system had also been introduced. The process for setting up the panel which would award the grants had taken longer than anticipated as a result of ensuring that the correct parameters were in place. The first round of grant applications had taken place earlier in the year amounting to a total of £45,100. There would be a series of publicised dates for future application rounds. The Buildings Committee had also developed a new church property inventory, based on a pilot project undertaken in the Diocese of Edinburgh. Maintaining an up-to-date inventory was increasingly important in relation to insurance. It was also intended that there would be a glossary of terms used in the pro forma. He expressed thanks to the Buildings Committee and its Convener, Rebecca Cadie.

Dr Ferguson-Smith reminded Synod that the Convener of the Investment Committee had contributed earlier in the meeting to the debate on climate change and fossil fuel investment. Much work had been involved on the part of the Committee as well as its continuing oversight of the management of the Unit Trust Pool.

The Retirement Housing Committee continued its work in providing suitable housing for retired clergy and Dr Ferguson-Smith expressed thanks to Mr Elliott Glen-esk who completed his term of office as Convener of that Committee at the current Synod.

8.2 Personnel Committee

Mrs Maureen McKellar (Convener, Personnel Committee) indicated that she had told General Synod 2016 about the new policies which the Personnel Committee had been working on and the revised Clergy Handbook it had planned to issue. Those had not yet been made available as the Committee had been discussing with the Administration Board how best the policies and procedures could be issued. The Committee was aware that clergy operated as office holders and not employees but in order to protect both clergy and the Church it was important that there were good and up-to-date procedures in place. In its discussions, the Committee had differentiated between those matters which were of a procedural or guideline nature and those which were fundamental terms and conditions and which might result in termination of office. Those latter processes were rightly covered by the Canons. The Committee had been aware that the Faith and Order Board had been discussing the disciplinary Canon, Canon 54, and she invited the Bishop of Brechin to comment since he served both on the Board and on the Committee.

The Rt Rev Dr Nigel Peyton (Bishop of Brechin) explained that at its most recent meeting the Faith and Order Board had received a Motion from the Brechin Diocesan Synod inviting the Board to carry out a comprehensive review of Canon 54. Experience in Brechin had raised four key concerns, namely that the canonical procedure needed to be just and timely for the accused, just and timely for the complainant, and that the process ought to demonstrate the highest standard of practice within the life of the Church as well as transparency and credibility in the public view. The Board had agreed in principle to establish a review group but it was also recognised, and this had been reinforced by subsequent discussions in the Personnel Committee, that Canon 54 ought not to be reviewed in isolation. It stood alongside Canons 53 and 64 and was also connected with Canon 65. In practice, issues surfacing under one or other of those Canons frequently tended to have aspects which bore on one or more of the other Canons. The critical point was that clergy might suffer loss of office as a result of proceedings under those Canons. The Board had considered a draft remit for such review but it was intended that, in the light of the further advice of the Personnel Committee, an expanded remit be drawn up for the Board's approval to include those other Canons in the review. The membership of the group would need to include those with experience as a Diocesan Bishop, those with experience in current HR practice, those with knowledge of the Church's Canons and, of course, the voice of stipendiary clergy. It was hoped that the review group would be able to report to the Faith and Order Board by the spring of 2018. Any changes which might be recommended would need to come to General Synod and follow the usual canonical procedure.

Mrs McKellar continued by explaining that the Personnel Committee used ACAS procedures as the basis for new policies for the Church but altered them to suit the specific circumstances of the Church. They did not alter the employment status of clergy but were about spelling out good practice to assist clergy in their ministry and would cover subjects like shared parental leave, annual leave, time away from duties, a guideline for fees for weddings and funerals, abuse of drugs and alcohol and how to deal with bullying and harassment. The Committee considered that the best way of introducing such policies was for the Administration Board to consider the policies in detail and that was reflected in the Motion about to be proposed. That would enable a speedier response to external factors such as changes required by new legislation or HM Revenue and Customs. There would be consultation with clergy representatives on the Board and the Committee and any procedures that were to be considered contentious in any way would be consulted on more widely with clergy before being put to the Administration Board.

Mrs McKellar then proposed, and Dr Ferguson-Smith, seconded the following Motion:

"That paragraph 6.8 of the Digest of Resolutions be altered so that it read as follows:-

6.8 Clergy Personnel Provision

The Administration Board shall, on the recommendation of the Personnel Committee, have power to adopt policies, procedures, rules, and guidance in relation to personnel matters in respect of clergy, not otherwise covered by the Code of Canons."

The Rev Peter Harris (Edinburgh) warmly welcomed what the Committee was trying to do. He noted that the proposal was to broaden the scope of paragraph 6.8 of the Digest of Resolutions but further noted that reference to maternity pay, etc would no longer appear. Mrs McKellar responded that issues such as maternity would be covered by the generality of the new wording.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) proposed an amendment such that the words "provided that they shall be ratified by the General Synod before implementation" be added to the end of the proposed new paragraph 6.8.

Provost Holdsworth explained that he was trying to be helpful by proposing the amendment. The potential of the wording of the Motion was that it changed the relationship of stipendiary clergy to the Church. He accepted that the intention was entirely benign and he thanked those who worked on the Personnel Committee but he considered that matters could be fundamentally changed for clergy by the wording being originally proposed. He asked Synod to accept the amendment so that the wider church was automatically consulted.

The Rev Canon Cliff Piper (Moray, Ross and Caithness) seconded the amendment. He welcomed the amendment and appreciated what the Committee was trying to do. The amendment would enable him, as proposer, and other clergy to vote in favour of the Motion.

Discussion proceeded on the amendment.

The Rev Peter Mead (Brechin) suggested that even with the amendment as stated, he considered the issue to be one of tinkering around the edges. Earlier in the meeting, the Synod had demonstrated that it was not averse to changing its Canons in the light of present-day context. In the appeal judgement in the case of Sharp v Worcester the tribunal had stated that it had sympathy with the employment status of Mr Sharp but that it was bound by 800-year-old documents to determine his status as an office holder. It was surely necessary to look at such matters again and to consider changing the employment status of clergy (and not just full-time clergy) to that of employees. In his own Diocese, there would soon only be two full-time stipendiary clergy north of Dundee. Because there were only two full-time stipendiary clergy, that put considerable pressure on part-time clergy and they needed to be protected, in his view, by full employment contracts. He invited the Administration Board and Personnel Committee to look again at employment status. In the meantime, he invited Synod to vote against even an amended Motion.

Dr Jaap Jacobs (Brechin) said that the proposed amendment changed the meaning because it left the power of ratification in the power of the Synod. He suggested that the power to adopt ought therefore to be rephrased as a power to propose.

Mrs McKellar responded to the proposed amendment by indicating that it was not the Committee's intention to propose controversial material for adoption by the Administration Board. Her difficulty with the proposal was that if matters, such as shared parental leave, needed to be adopted to reflect legislation and the Synod then rejected the proposal, it would need a revised proposal to come to the following year's Synod before anything could be adopted. She had suggested previously to Provost Holdsworth that if the Administration Board were content with proposals being brought forward by the Personnel Committee then such material could be issued to clergy and only if there was an indication of unhappiness amongst clergy would it then come to Synod for a fuller discussion. She would be content if matters proceeded on such a basis.

Dr Ferguson-Smith appreciated the anxieties being expressed. On the Administration Board, there were diocesan representatives and there was therefore an opportunity for dioceses to have input to the discussions within the Board. As had been indicated earlier in Synod, there were vacancies on the Board for General Synod representatives, and a plea had been made, particularly, for clergy representatives. A number of expressions of interest had already been received during the course of the meeting in those vacancies. The current discussion was about keeping policies and processes up-to-date and relevant in order that matters could be addressed consistently across the Church by introducing guidance and pathways which had not previously existed. Their lack of existence was itself a threat in the longer term. Such matters could change quickly from year to year and there was a constant process of catch up. Aspects of tenure remained covered by Canons and matters affecting the position of individuals would remain covered by Canons. The Administration Board would take seriously the scrutinising of any material brought forward from the Personnel Committee.

The Rev Dr Sophia Marriage (Edinburgh) felt strongly that the Personnel Committee needed to be given space. In the previous 12 years she had had three children and had fortunately had a supportive rector, bishop, dean and vestry but she was aware that around the Province there were those who were not so accommodating. To wait two years for maternity benefits, or even to know what the benefits might be, was too long. She urged that the amendment not be accepted.

The Rev Markus Duenzkofer (Edinburgh) observed that the Personnel Committee was saying that it heard the concerns being voiced but was not reacting to those concerns. He heard the remarks of Dr Marriage but was concerned that power was being handed over to the Personnel Committee. He favoured ratification by the General Synod.

Mr Jim Gibson (Glasgow and Galloway) was unsure what the amendment intended by the use of the word "ratified". Did it mean a single vote by Synod or did it imply a two-year process? He hoped that Synod had sufficient trust in the Standing Committee to oversee what happened in the Administration Board and make sensible comment. He opposed the amendment.

Mr Robert Gordon (Standing Committee) said that, if it gave comfort, Standing Committee, which included four clergy and a number of Bishops, could be asked to sign off on any changes. Requiring matters to be ratified by Synod would hold things up. A subsequent Synod could then hold Standing Committee to account if necessary.

Dr Beth Routledge (Glasgow and Galloway) supported the amendment. She appreciated the work being done by the Personnel Committee but considered there was a need for checks and balances. This was not because she did not have trust in the people on the Committee and Administration Board, but there was a question of "legacy" in that different people would serve in decades to come.

Provost Holdsworth responded to points made. He suggested that for matters to be signed off by the Standing Committee would be worse because, having served on the Standing Committee previously, he was aware of how much work the Standing Committee already had to do. He was not proposing a two-year delay – his proposal was for the material to come for ratification to the very next Synod and therefore there would not be a two-year delay. On the question of consultation, he pointed out that matters had been discussed at a pre-Synod meeting in the diocese and had attracted very considerable discussion. The proposal was controversial and he noted that there had been no prior consultation about the proposal.

The amendment was put to the vote and carried 57 in favour, 41 against, 4 abstentions.

The Rev Sarah Shaw (Edinburgh) then proposed a further amendment to the Motion such that the words "and having regard to employment legislation and good practice" be inserted into paragraph 6.8 of the Digest of Resolutions after the words "the Administration Board shall, on the recommendation of the Personnel Committee,".

Mrs Shaw explained that she considered the original wording was too general in scope and made no reference to protections available to working people. Her amendment was therefore to introduce reference to employment legislation and good practice applicable to the world of work and also the practice in other churches.

The Rev James Currall (Moray, Ross and Caithness) seconded the amendment.

Mrs McKellar indicated that she was willing to accept the amendment.

Professor Alan Werritty (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) asked whether, if the Motion failed, what was the practice to which the situation would revert.

Dr Ferguson-Smith responded that the issue was not one of reversion but rather of progressing in order to put consistent practices in place across the Church which were not already there.

Mrs Shaw explained that she had not anticipated the amendment from Provost Holdsworth. The Chair clarified that Mrs McKellar had accepted Mrs Shaw's amendment. On a point of order, it was confirmed that the Committee Convener had power to accept an amendment in such circumstances and that the Synod's consent was not required.

On the question of the two-year period which had been mentioned in discussion, Mrs McKellar explained that if material came to Synod for ratification and was rejected it would then have to return to Synod the following year and in that sense Synods in two successive years would be involved.

The Rev Kirstin Freeman (Glasgow and Galloway) said her understanding was that ratification would require only a single majority vote at General Synod and not a two-year process.

Dr Ferguson-Smith clarified that the reference to two years had not been a reference to a two-year process. Mrs McKellar had simply been emphasising that if the Synod declined to ratify material at one Synod, it would then take a further year for material to be re-presented the following year.

The amended Motion was then put to the vote as follows:

"That paragraph 6.8 of the Digest of Resolutions be altered so that it read as follows:-

6.8 Clergy Personnel Provision

The Administration Board shall, on the recommendation of the Personnel Committee, and having regard to employment legislation and good practice, have power to adopt policies, procedures, rules, and guidance in relation to personnel matters in respect of clergy, not otherwise covered by the Code of Canons provided that they shall be ratified by the General Synod before implementation."

It was passed by majority, with four abstentions.

Dr Anthony Birch (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) spoke as a previous Convener of the Medical Review Panel under Canon 64. He explained that Canon 64 had been very difficult to operate and he urged that when any review of the Canons was carried out, there ought to be consultation with members of the Panel. He suggested that the current Canon had been drafted without input from the medical profession and that that was evident.

Dr Ferguson-Smith thanked members of the Administration Board and its Committees and also the General Synod Office staff.

The Chair expressed thanks to Dr Ferguson-Smith as the Board Convener.

SESSION 9: THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS IN THE CHAIR

9.1 Mission Board

9.1.1 Provincial Youth Committee

The Rev Tembu Rongong (Convener, Provincial Youth Committee) explained that the Provincial Youth Committee had run camps at Glenalmond and Strathallan for the previous two decades. At such camps, the seven diocesan crosses came together to form one single cross. In the current year, activities had been expanded beyond the single youth camp to events in each diocese. In April 2017, a celebration event had been held to mark the 20th anniversary of the annual camp. A video of that event was then shown.

Rebecca Cromwell was introduced as the new Chair of the Youth Committee. She spoke of her spiritual journey and how the Provincial Youth Committee and the Glenalmond camp had been part of that. In particular, the experience of Glenalmond had given her greater confidence to take a more active part in the local church. She now represented the Scottish Episcopal Church at the Church of Scotland National Youth Assembly and had attended the Heart and Soul event in Edinburgh at the time of the General Assembly. She referred to the fact that mental health was an increasing issue for young people. Young and old needed to work together to ensure the Church was a place where people could come together to talk and experience healing. Church needed to be a place where people were not judged or made to feel that they were not good enough. Young people in congregations needed not only the support of the Church but also had a job to explain to the Church the support which they needed. The Provincial Youth Committee helped to give young people a voice. The annual camp was an opportunity for young people to come together to develop their faith and develop lifelong friendships. Many previous delegates had subsequently become youth leaders in congregations. She thanked Tembu Rongong and the other Glen leaders for their unflinching support and also the Primus for all he had done to support youth work in his Diocese and the wider Scottish Episcopal Church.

Aidan Poon, another member of the Provincial Youth Committee, spoke of his faith journey and how Glenalmond had helped him in that. In particular, he had grown up in a church where the youth group numbered only two or three. Presence at Glenalmond where there were much larger numbers, had helped him to realise how much bigger the family of which he was a part was.

Rebecca Fleming, another member, similarly spoke about what Glenalmond meant for her. Initially her faith had been shaky but she had been encouraged by being able to explore her faith and beliefs. This had led to her becoming a member of the Provincial Youth Committee and she was also involved in youth activities in her local church.

Mr Rongong thanked the Synod for its attention and announced that the deadline for submission of applications for Glen 2017 had been extended. He encouraged applications.

From the Chair, the Primus thanked Mr Rongong and members of the Youth Committee who had participated. As he visited congregations, he was aware of more children and young people in church. On the growing number of Facebook pages for congregations in the dioceses, there was an awareness that there needed to be more images of young people. That changed the image which the Church projected. He invited Mr Rongong to comment on whether there was a growing understanding that Glenalmond needed to be able to change the face of the Church rather than simply being an event which young people attended – a move from being a parachurch group to one which changed the everyday life of the Church.

Mr Rongong said that only a small proportion of young people involved in everyday church life had come through Glenalmond. He suggested there was a need for people to listen to one another and that that was the best way to involve young people in every part of the Church's daily life, listening being more important than talking.

Mr Kennedy Fraser (Glasgow and Galloway) asked whether financial support was available to help young people attend Glenalmond. He was aware from discussions in his own Diocese that, when money was tight, vestries were tempted to think that the money which they might use to pay the one third share of the Glenalmond fees might better be spent elsewhere. He suggested that central funds might be used to assist.

Mrs Ruth Warmer (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) suggested that she was possibly the oldest member present at Synod and said how much she appreciated having young people present. They represented the future and the hope of the Church. She suggested the young people could bring the Church to a further hope that it could grow and have an influence in the community. She hoped the Church would offer its support and financial help.

The Rev Kirstin Freeman (Glasgow and Galloway) emphasised the importance of congregational support. Even if some financial assistance was available from elsewhere, it was important for the congregation to be involved in providing some finance.

Ms Victoria Stock (Edinburgh) said that she would not be at Synod if it were not for supportive youth work when she had been younger. She expressed gratitude for what the Provincial Youth Committee did.

Mr Rongong responded by saying that it was important to celebrate the young people for who they were now. It was indeed important to grow and develop but young people were present in the midst of the Church already.

9.1.2 Global Partnerships Committee

Mr David Kenvyn (Convener, Global Partnerships Committee) explained he had become the Convener of the Committee in July 2016. He expressed thanks to Elspeth Davey and the former Convener, the Rev Val Nellist, who had worked hard to ensure that the convenership transition was efficient and easy. He wished Elspeth Davey a happy retirement.

Mr Kenvyn explained that the Committee was responsible for the distribution of approximately £100,000 of grants per annum to projects run by sister churches in the Anglican Communion or, in co-operation with other denominations in Scotland, to suitable projects and organisations. In 2016, the Committee had funded projects in Gaza, Africa, South America and China and had been involved in projects supporting the empowerment of women in India, Brazil and various parts of Africa. One initiative had been the publication of a resource called *Loving One Another* which had been produced in co-operation with partners in India to assist them in their work on gender equality. With the papers for the current meeting, members had been provided with information about the Thursdays in Black campaign which sought to eliminate violence against women and it had been good to see many responding to that initiative on the first day of Synod. All projects were required to have the support of their Diocesan Bishop so as to ensure that the projects supported were ones which sister provinces wanted to deliver and also to ensure that any grants were properly spent and accounted for.

The Committee also ensured that the voice of the Scottish Episcopal Church was heard in relevant international organisations and, shortly, Synod would hear from Rachael Fraser who had been involved in UN activities regarding women's rights.

The previous year, the Committee had tried to organise a companion partnerships day but it had been cancelled because the only people registered to attend were Committee members. The vast majority of members of congregations did not know about the work of the Global Partnerships Committee. He encouraged Synod members that, if their church was supporting a project overseas, it would be worth remembering that the Committee had some money for small grants of up to £5,000 which could help to change lives.

Ms Rachael Fraser reported on her attendance at the 61st Session of the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women in March 2017. She reminded Synod that she had attended the 60th Session the previous year and had therefore been excited and honoured to return. The Commission was committed to the promotion of gender equality and the empowerment of women and met annually to consult with non-governmental organisations, UN entities and UN member states. Each year the Anglican Consultative Council sent a delegation of about 20 women from across the Communion. The delegation in the current year had come from different walks of life but shared a commitment to ensuring that the voices of the silenced could and would be heard.

She pointed out that every person was born into a particular set of circumstances, over which they had no control such as race, sex, nationality. Those attributes, however, often gave individuals advantages over others. Examples of privilege included white privilege, male privilege, straight privilege. It could mean having access to clean running water or where a man known to have sexually assaulted women was elected President of the United States. She encouraged Synod members to think about their own privileges. The problem was that for those accustomed to privileges, equality felt like oppression, as had been evident from some of the rhetoric in the recent general election.

The Commission had been one of the first wide-scale events in the US to have felt the effects of President Trump's travel ban and it had been a privilege to have a seat at the table at the Commission meeting. The financial support of the Scottish Episcopal Church had been crucial in enabling her to attend the meeting and she thanked the Global Partnerships Committee and hoped that funding to ensure future attendance would be protected.

The focus in 2017 of the Commission had been women's economic empowerment in the changing world of work. The Global Equal Pay Coalition had been launched during the meeting. In every country, women had fewer economic choices, less income and less control of assets than men did and were more likely to work in low paying, insecure jobs, often in the informal economy and without legal protection. Women also made a substantial, but invisible, contribution to the global economy through unpaid care work which in turn reduced their access to income. Economic empowerment of women and girls did not always look like an equal pay cheque. It could also be achieved by ensuring access to things like affordable health care and education.

She would shortly graduate from the University of St Andrews with a degree in international relations. Her tuition had been entirely paid for by the Scottish Government because of the privilege she enjoyed of being resident in Scotland. There were girls in many parts of the world with no access to education simply because men in positions of power did not think they were worthy of that education. When would such men understand that femaleness was not a design flaw?

The Commission had also discussed the UN's sustainable development goals, intended to be achieved by 2030. These were important in the Church context because the goals reflected deep Biblical themes of mutual responsibility for living well together, seeking the equality of all people created in the image of God and God's concern for the vulnerable and marginalised. She urged Synod members to familiarise themselves with those goals and consider how they could be discussed and worked towards locally. The Anglican delegation had again looked forward to the day when ACC resolution 13.31, which affirmed the goal of equal representation of women in decision-making at all levels of the Church, became a reality.

She reiterated the comments she had made to Synod the previous year that young people were not the future of the Church but were the present. She urged Synod members to talk to young people in congregations to find out what they cared about and to make hopes a reality.

It was not often acknowledged that the Church was a vital partner in civil society. The Church was often uniquely placed to reach the most vulnerable and had the networks, resources and capacity for social mobilisation. She could not emphasise enough the importance of working together. There was a need to be building bridges, not walls and it was especially important to engage men and boys in the fight for gender equality.

Attendance at the Commission had been an inspiring, faith affirming and transformational experience. She closed her presentation by referring to Galatians, chapter 3 "there is neither Jew nor Gentile, neither slave nor free, nor is there male and female for you are all one in Christ Jesus".

The Primus thanked Ms Fraser and congratulated her on the completion of her degree.

Mrs Ravinder Kaur Nijjar (Interfaith Scotland) said it was an honour and privilege to join the Synod meeting. She had noted the presentation earlier from young people and the importance of camps. In the Sikh community local Gurdwaras came together and held camps throughout the year and she suggested that might be a way forward for local churches. She had been interested in Rachael Fraser's presentation because she chaired the UK Women of Faith Network, Religions for Peace and she was also on the Global Women of Faith Network and violence against women was one of the issues handled there. 45% of women in the UK experienced violence at some point. The Religions for Peace Network had created a toolkit to help faith communities address the issue of violence against women which was available from the Religions for Peace website. The UK Women of Faith Network had also produced a document looking at what the nine world Scriptures said on the subject of the status of women. There was a need for male ambassadors to take that forward. There was both an exhibition and a booklet and she was happy to receive expressions of interest about that. She urged Synod to continue with its work. If all women downed tools for a week, the world would come to a standstill.

The Rev Liz Baker (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) said that she was aware of the work of the Global Partnerships Committee but only because she knew certain people who had served on it. She had heard nothing about the promotion of the Loving One Another resource nor the Thursdays in Black initiative. She made a plea for provision of more information. She had been inspired by Rachael Fraser.

The Rev James Currall (Moray, Ross and Caithness) said that one privilege which had not been mentioned by Ms Fraser was the fact that Synod members had been able to hear her presentation. He hoped her text could be made available to those who had not been present to hear it.

9.2 Standing Committee

9.2.1 Accounts

Mr Robert Gordon (Convener, Standing Committee) proposed, and Dr John Ferguson-Smith (Convener, Administration Board) seconded the following Motion:

“That this Synod accept the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church for the financial year ended 31 December 2016.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

9.2.2 Budget and Quota

Mr Gordon acknowledged that there had been underspends for many years but it was also the case that there were also predictions of overspends going forward. There was ongoing business to be dealt with for the future. Significant areas of expenditure for the future were grants to support mission and all of the work of the SEI. Indeed, the previous day Synod had actively encouraged additional spending in the area of training. He saw a great opportunity to do more and it was encouraging that more people were coming forward for ordination. He had been pleased to hear Provost Holdsworth talking of church planting and others raising the question of what could be done where churches were not located close to where people lived. Energy needed to be devoted to such areas and that was a joint enterprise between congregations and dioceses, with a provincial contribution. Provincial money was being provided via the Mission and Ministry Support Grants. There was a question as to whether there were some projects which would consume too large a share of such grants and need separate provision.

Illustrating his presentation with PowerPoint slides, Mr Gordon demonstrated how expenditure would exceed income depending on the assumptions adopted. It was possible that the need for expenditure might be even greater, for example, if additional funds were needed in relation to the Pension Fund or there were increases in relation to curate grants. At present, the pension contribution level was approximately 32% of stipend but the actuarial indications were that contributions might need to increase significantly, albeit that that was subject to the valuation due at the end of 2017. That would raise the issue as to whether there might be a provincial contribution so that the burden on congregations would not be so severe. In the short term, the expectation was for a small surplus in 2017 and a small surplus in 2018 but a deficit by 2019.

Standing Committee had considered whether to propose no increase in the level of quota for 2018 or to stick with the usual annual increase of 3%, given that inflation on stipends and salaries and general inflation levels were expected to be around 2%-3%. The Committee had decided to recommend to Synod an increase in 3%.

Mr Gordon then proposed, and Dr John Ferguson-Smith seconded, the following Motion:

“That this Synod, having examined the proposed budgets for the General Synod for the year 2018, agree to a quota figure of £741,527 for that year.”

Mr Jim Gibson (Glasgow and Galloway) noted that people had asked why much more could not be spent on mission. The underlying need, he emphasised, was for giving to be at a realistic level within congregations.

The Motion was then put to the vote and passed *nem con*, one abstention.

9.3 Vote of Thanks

The Primus expressed thanks to all members of Synod and guests for their attendance and engagement.

He expressed particular thanks to the following: Mr David Todd and the Rev Rosie Addis who had arranged the Eucharist and morning and evening prayer and all of the musicians; the retiring Conveners, namely the Rev Dr Harriet Harris and Mr Elliott Glen-esk; Hattie Williams of the Church Times; those with whom he had shared the Chair of Synod; those who had acted as facilitators and the Bishop of Argyll and The Isles and the Rev Dean Fostekew who had co-ordinated them; Dr Nicholas Grier as Assessor; Alison Dines and Paul Deponio for operating the IT and audio-visual facilities and the other staff of St Paul's & St George's; General Synod Office staff.

9.4 Confirmation of Acts of Synod

The Primus confirmed the Acts of Synod and closed the meeting with the blessing on Saturday 10 June 2017.

ELECTIONS TO PROVINCIAL BODIES

1. Standing Committee: Membership

Mr Jim Gibson completes his current term of office as a lay member of Standing Committee. As a result, one vacancy arises for a lay member of Standing Committee to be elected by the House of Laity. The term of office is four years.

Mr Gibson is eligible to serve a second term and the Standing Committee nominates him for such a second term.

His biographical details are as follows:-

Member of St Margaret's Newlands, lay rep and magazine editor. General Synod member since 2012 and a member of Standing Committee since 2014. Oxford Classics graduate and Chartered Accountant in general practice since 1980, with significant involvement in charities. Treasurer or Finance Committee member of a number of charities and member of the Charities Panel of the Institute of Chartered Accountants of Scotland (ICAS).

The following is a brief statement by Mr Gibson as to why he wishes to serve on the Committee:

If re-elected I would continue to draw on my practical experience of issues affecting charity governance, accounting, stewardship and strategic management. My approach is that of seeking to ensure that financial issues are clearly understood, interpreted and explained, and that decisions are soundly based and well communicated. I believe that these attributes add value to the work of the Standing Committee, especially at a time when strategic decisions are required about the use of resources.

Members of the Standing Committee constitute the Charity Trustees of the General Synod for the purposes of the Charities Act. The Committee has a number of functions. Under Canon 52, it is the body responsible for the issuing of the agenda for General Synod. Under the Digest of Resolutions, it has the general control and management of the administration of the General Synod and is empowered to exercise generally all financial powers vested in the General Synod. It is responsible for recommending to Synod the level of provincial quota and for presenting budgets to Synod.

Any additional nominations must be received not later than the commencement of the meeting of General Synod (they should be submitted to the Secretary General who has a style of nomination form available on request). In the event of an election, only members of the House of Laity are entitled to vote.

Details of any additional nominations received will be advised to Synod members at General Synod.

Any person elected will be expected to sign declarations confirming that they are eligible to serve as a Charity Trustee and that they are a 'fit and proper person' as required by HM Revenue and Customs. Copies of the declarations are available on request to the Secretary General.

2. Institute Council: Membership

There are two vacancies on the Council. Members are appointed by General Synod on the recommendation of the Standing Committee. The Standing Committee has nominated the Rev Elaine Garman and the Rev David Paton-Williams. Biographical details of each are as follows:-

Rev Elaine Garman

Rev Elaine Garman is the prospective Rector of St John the Evangelist, Forfar, concluding her curacy at the end of June 2018 with Holy Trinity, Dunoon & St Paul's, Rothesay and a period as Mission Enabler in the Diocese of Argyll and The Isles. Elaine has been a student who has come through the formation programme of the SEI and the former TISEC (Theological Institute of the Scottish Episcopal Church). She was already studying a theology degree with the University of Aberdeen and completed her academic preparation with them. Elaine has experience operating at Board level in her work previously as head of public health in Argyll & Bute and many years prior to that as a director of nursing. She also has worked in non-executive roles in a number of charities. Over the years she has helped train, teach and coach people for various roles and looks forward to supporting the future of the SEC through the SEI Council.

Rev David Paton-Williams

Rev David Paton-Williams has been the Rector of St Columba's by the Castle, Edinburgh since April 2016 when he moved north from the Diocese of Leeds. He has recently taken on responsibility for IME 4-6 for the central belt dioceses. Ordained in Durham in 1987, he has served in a variety of parish contexts in the north of England - a post-industrial town, a new town, a market town and surrounding villages, a city suburb - and as a university college chaplain in Ripon where he was also a minor canon at the cathedral. He has been involved in training three curates and has helped deliver modules for Lay Readers in training. In previous posts he served as chair of governors of two primary schools and of a charity mentoring ex-prisoners. Other past roles have included being the diocesan link officer with the church in Sri Lanka; a Rural Dean; and the chair of the House of Clergy. He is currently a member of Edinburgh Diocese's Mission and Ministry Committee with a particular focus on interfaith matters and is the convenor of the Edinburgh East Area Council.

3. Administration Board: General Synod Representatives

At present, the Digest of Resolutions provides that the membership of the Administration Board includes three members appointed by General Synod

from its own membership. As will be noted from a separate paper, the Board will propose to Synod an alteration to the Digest so that the requirement for persons elected to such posts to be Synod members would be removed and so that elections would be made by the Synod on the nomination of the Standing Committee.

Subject to that alteration being accepted by Synod, the Standing Committee nominates the Rev Christine Fraser and the Rev David Gifford (both of whom were appointed to the Board by Standing Committee when vacancies on the Board were not filled by General Synod 2017). If the alteration to the Digest is not accepted by Synod three vacancies will arise but these could be filled only by persons who are General Synod members, in which case any nominations must be received not later than the commencement of the meeting of General Synod (they should be submitted to the Secretary General who has a style of nomination form available on request). The term of office is four years.

Biographical details of each of the above are as follows:-

Rev Christine Fraser

The Rev Christine Fraser has been ordained for 16 years. For the past five years she has been in full time stipendiary ministry, serving as the Rector of St Peter's, Kirkcaldy. Prior to that she was on the clergy team at St Ninian's Cathedral in Perth as an NSM in full time employment. She had responsibility for St Columba's, Stanley under the direction of the Provost.

Her professional background is in accountancy and book-keeping and although she does not hold a professional qualification, she studied to HNC level at night school. She has had over 30 years' experience in two companies and held the position of Company Secretary in both of them with responsibility for budgets of several million pounds. She is also conversant with Company Law and was involved in Employment Law with her most recent company. She is presently Diocesan Treasurer for St Andrews Diocese Mothers' Union and is therefore familiar with Charities Law and OSCR in particular.

Rev David Gifford

The Rev David Gifford is Rector of the Renfrewshire Heartland Episcopal Churches - St Mary Port Glasgow; St Fillan Kilmacolm; St Mary Bridge of Weir.

For eight years he was Director of Europe & Canada, HFHI (USA) and oversaw the expansion and development of its not-for-profit House Building company across Central & Western Europe, UK, Kyrgyzstan and Canada. Areas of oversight of nine national offices included: Finance, Legal, HR, Strategic Alliances and General Operations. For eight years he was Marketing Director of CABI Bioscience UK, in charge of company branding, development of new markets; product development and external communications. For ten years he was Chief Executive Officer of the

Council of Christians & Jews (UK). This included strategic planning, re-direction & management as well as oversight of a team covering: general administration, finance & income generation, HR, operations, new project development and being Secretary to the Board. He worked closely with Lambeth Palace, Chief Rabbis Office, Moderator Church of Scotland, and Cardinals Archbishop of Westminster.

Details of any additional nominations received will be advised to Synod members at General Synod.

4. Clergy Discipline Tribunal: Membership

Two vacancies for clergy arise this year on the Clergy Discipline Tribunal, as a result of the Rev Maggie McTernan and the Very Rev Kenny Rathband completing their current terms of office. Members serve for three years and are eligible to be re-appointed.

Under Canon 54, the Standing Committee is required to make nominations for the vacancies on the Tribunal. The Standing Committee nominates both Ms McTernan and Dean Rathband for an additional term.

John F Stuart
Secretary General
May 2018

Budget Report

Format

The summary of all Funds (page 56) details the 2017 actual figures in the first column and the 2018-2020 budget figures in the final three columns. The individual Fund/Committee budgets (pages 57-70) detail the 2017 budget, actual and variance figures in the first three columns and the 2018-2020 budget figures in the final three columns.

Budget setting process

Boards agree budgets each autumn for the subsequent year and indicative budgets for the following two years. The budgets and associated requests for funding from the General Fund are submitted to the Standing Committee for consideration at its November meeting each year. Given that there were a number of decisions made subsequent to November with budgetary implications Standing Committee further reviewed budgets at its meeting in April.

In its oversight of the General Synod's finances the Standing Committee's focus is on the General Fund. The General Fund budget (which can be found at page 57) summarises all unrestricted income and its allocation to the Standing Committee and boards to fund their work. The budgeted allocations in effect represent the planned expenditure of each of the boards. Thus the General Fund statement provides a good overview of the overall financial position. In considering the budgets the Standing Committee is guided by two underlying principles:

- Budgets should be set with a view to achieving a broadly breakeven position in the General Fund.
- Large one-off receipts (such as legacies) should be capitalised to provide future income rather than being used to fund current operating costs.

Budget history

The General Synod's main source of funding is its investment income derived mainly from its investments held in the SEC Unit Trust Pool. This accounts for approximately 60% of income. Until 2008 investment income increased broadly in line with inflation each year enabling a steady growth in expenditure. The rate of distribution paid by the UTP however fell by 15% in 2009 and has not yet fully returned to its former level. The impact of the reduced rate of distribution has been partly mitigated by the investment of substantial legacies and part of the cash generated by recent General Fund surpluses. Market conditions continue to be volatile and it is difficult to predict what future rates of UTP distribution will be. The Investment Committee continues to work closely with the fund managers with a view to achieving modest growth in distribution rates where possible. It was possible to increase the distribution by 3% from 51p to 52.5p in 2017. For budgetary purposes no change in distribution rates is assumed over the period to 2020.

The initial response to the reduction in income was a two year moratorium on all building grants. Such grants have subsequently been reinstated. The combination of reductions in budgets to avoid deficits and further reductions in expenditure against those budgets (and some additional unbudgeted income) has resulted in substantial surpluses on the General Fund being generated in the period from 2010 to 2017. (The total surplus for the eight years is approximately £1.4million.) It is not Standing Committee's intention to generate such surpluses but they have helped fund the £2million lump sum payment to the Pension Fund agreed by General Synod in 2009 without the need to sell investments thus helping to safeguard future investment income. The level of surpluses generated in recent years has also allowed further funds to be added to the General Fund's investments. (£200,000 in 2014 and £500,000 in 2016.) The additional income generated by this investment (approximately £27,000 a year) helps avoid or reduce budget deficits. Standing Committee also regards these resources as a significant 'war chest' available to support the General Synod's ongoing activities or to meet some contingency. (The net impact of the increased rate of distribution and the income generated by the additional investments made in recent years is that investment income earned by the General Fund has almost returned to its 2008 level – investment income in 2017 being approximately £24,500 less than that of 2008.)

Why is outcome generally better than budget?

Standing Committee is aware of concerns regarding the continuing generation of surpluses and the extent to which in recent years actual financial outcome is generally better than budgeted. Standing Committee is keen to try to ensure that there is greater accuracy in the budgeting process and is working with the Boards to seek to ensure that the budget requests they submit are as realistic as possible and reflect their planned programmes. Whilst a surplus of some £77,000 was generated on the General Fund in 2017 this was only approximately £27,500 better than budget. The actual outcome for 2017 was therefore far closer to budget than has been the case for some years. Standing Committee will continue to work with boards and committees as part of the budgeting process to ensure that realistic budgets are set.

Total expenditure in 2017 was broadly in line with budget. The main reason that the surplus was greater than budget was the additional investment income of almost £31,000 arising from the increase in the UTP distribution rate.

Options considered by Standing Committee

Mindful of the surpluses generated in recent years and the surplus now budgeted for 2018, Standing Committee has considered the possibility of not increasing Quota for 2019.

The Committee is however of the view that, given the increasing deficits budgeted from 2019 arising from the planned investment in the training of future stipendiary clergy, it would not be appropriate to reduce future income by freezing the total

amount of Quota requested from dioceses. The Committee is therefore recommending that, in line with recent practice, total Quota is increased by 3% in 2019 and that future budgets continue to assume such an annual increase.

The Committee also remains firmly of the view that it should not seek to distribute ad hoc grants as a reaction to a possible surplus in a given year but that it should continue to focus on the medium to longer term pressures and demands in the use of financial resources.

Current budgetary pressures and uncertainties

There are a number of different areas of budgetary pressure and areas of uncertainty.

Curate funding

It is anticipated that the number of stipendiary curates in training will increase over the next few years. Whilst this is a welcome and important addition to the vitality and potential missional impact of the SEC and reflects the success of the renewed emphasis on formation and training, it has significant implications for provincial budgets (and those of the charges and dioceses involved in the training of curates). Expenditure on curate grants increased from £77,000 in 2013 to £132,000 in 2015 and remained at approximately that level in 2016. Whilst the level of funding required has eased slightly since then (2017 £110,000) and is budgeted to be only £107,000 in 2018 it is expected to increase from 2019. Currently it is anticipated that there will be seven new curates commencing in both 2018 and 2019 and that the level of curate grant funding required will be some £235,000 in 2020. (This assumes a continuation of the historic level of provincial support.)

To ensure the availability of the required number of appropriate training opportunities for stipendiary curates it is possible that grant funding in excess of what has traditionally been provided might be required in some areas. To date enhanced funding has only been required in respect of one curate placement: Standing Committee agreed to the Institute Council's request that the grant funding of 75% of stipend and related costs (rather than the traditional 50%) be provided in respect of the one curate who commenced training in 2017. The Institute Council continues to work with dioceses and charges in identifying the training places for those commencing curacies in 2018 and 2019. This will involve an assessment of the availability of funding and housing and the extent to which additional grant funding might be required. For budgetary purposes funding for all new stipendiary curates is assumed to be at the traditional rate of 50% of stipend and related costs. By way of illustration of the impact of any enhanced level of funding – grant funding on the traditional basis costs approximately £60,000 over the duration of a curacy; a fully funded curacy (including housing costs and other expenses) could cost approximately £162,000.

As noted above the projected cost of curate grants in 2020 is £235,000. Even assuming no further enhanced curate grants are provided the cost of curate grants is budgeted to increase to in excess of £300,000 in 2021 and £400,000 in 2022 reflecting the anticipated number of new curacies. By way of illustration, if the

average curate grant were to increase to 60% additional cost in 2022 would be in the region of £80,000; an increase to an average 70% would result in additional costs of about £160,000.

The assumptions made in respect of curate numbers and the grants required to fund appropriate training places continues to be one of the key variables in preparing future budgets.

Funding of full-time ordinands

Standing Committee is pleased that it has been possible to reintroduce the option for a small number of ordinands to train on a full time basis combining their studies at the Scottish Episcopal Institute with a three year degree course at a Scottish University. The first will complete her degree this year and commence her curacy. There are three other full time ordinands currently in training. Whilst there are no new students anticipated in 2018 this option will remain available for future ordinands. Currently the costs of the grants provided to such students (each receiving a grant of approximately £12,700 year) is met from the SEI Training Fund and therefore has no impact on the General Fund. The SEI Training Fund was established in 2015 and benefitted from the generosity of individuals giving to the Lent Appeals of all the Bishops and to the General Synod offering that year. During 2016 further funds were transferred to it from two other miscellaneous funds administered by the General Synod. The Fund benefits from offerings uplifted at many ordination services and a small number of regular donors. Currently the resources of the SEI Training Fund are sufficient to fund the projected costs of grants to full time ordinands to 2019. It is however likely that from 2020 the continued provision of such grants will require some support from the General Fund. Assuming no new funds are identified the cost is likely to be in the region of £25,000 to £30,000 a year.

Mixed Mode training

Standing Committee welcomes the provision of a Mixed Mode training route for ordinands by SEI. A Director of Mixed Training is now in place and work is progressing with a view to a number of ordinands commencing their training later this year. Ordinands undertaking training through this route will combine their studies with a placement in a charge. Ordinands will receive a grant of approximately £12,700 a year – half of which will be funded from provincial resources. (The diocese / charge will fund the balance of the grant and provide housing.) This new initiative is to be partly funded by an anonymous donation of £50,000 to be paid over its first three years. Much of the detail of the costs of providing this new training route will evolve as the course itself develops and it becomes clearer how many ordinands are likely to wish to pursue this option and how many charges are likely to be willing and able to provide appropriate placements. For current budgetary purposes it is assumed that three ordinands will commence training in 2018 and every two years thereafter. The budgeted costs for Mixed Mode Training are £58,710 in 2018, £85,380 in 2019 and £94,640 in 2020. (Net costs of £42,040, £68,710 and £77,980 after allowing for the anonymous donation.)

Mission and Ministry Support Grants

In agreeing to the introduction of Mission and Ministry Support Grants in 2015 General Synod endorsed the suggestion that the grants scheme be reviewed in 2019 with a view to implementing any changes from 2020. The current annual cost of the MMSG is in the region of £315,000. Any significant change in this cost emerging from the review would have an impact on future budgets.

General Fund budgeted surpluses and deficits

The General Fund budgets agreed by Standing Committee result in the following budgeted surpluses and deficits:

2018	Surplus of £49,885
2019	Deficit of £21,989
2020	Deficit of £148,641

A surplus is budgeted for 2018. Although deficits are budgeted for 2019 and 2020 the surpluses generated in recent years are sufficient to fund them. As outlined above and further discussed below the decisions to be made in relation to the funding of curate training grants and the number of stipendiary curates in training will have a significant impact on future budgets with the potential for large deficits being incurred. Standing Committee is committed to ensuring that, as far as is possible, the availability of funding should not be a limiting factor on the number of appropriate candidates being trained for stipendiary ministry within the SEC and will work with all boards and committees in addressing the challenges created by the welcome demand for such training.

Why has there been an improvement in budgeted outcome?

The budgets presented to General Synod in 2017 indicated a surplus on the General Fund of £1,760 in 2018 and a deficit of £74,919 in 2019. The current budgets therefore indicate that the budgeted financial outcome has improved by approximately £48,000 in 2018 and £53,000 in 2019. There are a number of reasons why budgets change from year to year. The main factors that have resulted in an overall improvement in the budgeted outcome since the budgets presented last year are:

Increased income

- Increased investment income of approximately £31,000 a year is assumed (ie increased 2017 distribution rate assumed to continue throughout budget period.)

Reduced costs

- *Curate grant costs:* The number of anticipated new curates has been revised – a number of ordinands choosing to defer studies / commencement of curacy. Budgeted curate grant costs therefore reduced by £12,250 and £34,450 in 2018 and 2019 respectively.

Increased costs

- *Residential weekend costs:* Budget for 2019 increased by £9,200 to reflect anticipated need to provide an additional weekend in the annual training cycle of SEI students.
- *Mixed Mode Training costs:* Budget for 2019 increased by £8,400 to reflect revised costs of providing new training pathway.

Projections beyond 2020

Given the number of variables and uncertainties detailed above, producing accurate projections beyond the usual three year budget period is difficult. For example, as noted above, the assumptions made with regard to the number of stipendiary curates in training and the level of grant funding required will have a significant impact on such projections. Uncertainties in relation to levels of investment income complicate matters further. Standing Committee is however aware that for the reasons outlined above (increasing number of stipendiary curates, introduction of mixed mode training, full time ordinand grants being funded in part from the General Fund, the possibility of a new mission initiatives fund) the financial outlook from 2021 is likely to be quite different to that of recent years. Whilst the surpluses of recent years provide a relatively sound base, in the absence of any sources of additional income there is likely to be an increasing need to prioritise expenditure in the future.

Total budgeted surpluses and deficits

The budgets for all the Boards and Committees, including miscellaneous and restricted funds are summarised on page 56. These indicate the following budgeted total revenue surpluses and deficits:

2017	Surplus of £47,351
2018	Surplus of £9,471
2019	Deficit of £102,789

The total budgeted surpluses / deficits differ from those budgeted for the General Fund due to small surpluses / deficits budgeted for some of the miscellaneous and restricted funds. For example the Retirement Housing Fund is budgeted to produce a revenue surplus which is then used as required to fund the purchase of new retirement housing.

Robert Gordon
Convener, Standing Committee
April 2018

QUOTA 2019

All quota received will be credited to the General Fund.

It is recommended that total quota requested be increased by 3% to £763,773.

The allocation between dioceses is based on dioceses' quota assessable income. The amount of provincial quota requested from each diocese will therefore vary according to relative changes in its income. The allocation will be:

	2019	2018	Change from 2018	
	£	£	£	
Aberdeen and Orkney	86,841	83,941	2,900	3.45%
Argyll and The Isles	26,121	25,360	761	3.00%
Brechin	51,402	48,422	2,980	6.15%
Edinburgh	296,497	286,155	10,342	3.61%
Glasgow and Galloway	165,280	164,100	1,180	0.72%
Moray, Ross and Caithness	49,416	48,273	1,143	2.37%
St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane	88,216	85,276	2,940	3.49%
	763,773	741,527	22,246	3.00%

BUDGET SUMMARY – includes all revenue funds

Actual 2017 £		Revised Budget 2018 £	Budget 2019 £	Budget 2020 £	
1,898,097	General Fund	Income	1,915,040	1,937,866	1,961,369
(1,820,923)		** Allocated to Boards	(1,865,155)	(1,959,855)	(2,110,010)
77,174		Surplus/(deficit)	49,885	(21,989)	(148,641)
875,866		Balance brought forward	953,040	1,002,925	980,936
-		Transfer (to)/from capital	-	-	-
953,040		Balance carried forward	1,002,925	980,936	832,295
881,734	Standing Committee	** Income (From General Fund)	852,480	878,160	900,560
-		Income (other)	-	-	-
(881,734)		Expenditure	(852,480)	(878,160)	(900,560)
-		Surplus/(deficit)	-	-	-
-		Balance brought forward	-	-	-
-		Balance carried forward	-	-	-
195,957	Administration Board	** Income (From General Fund)	205,130	210,130	215,130
312,553		Income (other)	314,505	317,005	319,005
(490,005)		Expenditure	(480,345)	(466,076)	(466,861)
18,505		Surplus/(deficit)	39,290	61,059	67,274
22,011		Transfer (to)/from capital	(312,031)	(41,155)	(41,618)
-		Transfer to Inst Council misc	-	-	-
612,677		Balance brought forward	653,193	380,452	400,356
653,193		Balance carried forward	380,452	400,356	426,012
340,047	Institute Council	** Income (From General Fund)	390,765	447,470	564,495
78,522		Income (other)	109,495	109,285	95,597
(438,622)		Expenditure	(529,660)	(573,930)	(669,090)
(20,053)		Surplus/(deficit)	(29,400)	(17,175)	(8,998)
(624)		Transfer (to)/from capital	(520)	(536)	(552)
-		Transfer from Admin Brd misc	-	-	-
155,632		Balance brought forward	134,955	105,035	87,324
134,955		Balance carried forward	105,035	87,324	77,774
366,958	Mission Board	** Income (From General Fund)	373,930	382,090	388,645
146,453		Income (other)	125,826	125,826	125,826
(448,749)		Expenditure	(512,180)	(520,340)	(526,895)
64,662		Surplus/(deficit)	(12,424)	(12,424)	(12,424)
-		Transfer (to)/from capital	-	-	-
119,330		Balance brought forward	183,992	171,568	159,144
183,992		Balance carried forward	171,568	159,144	146,720
15,059	Faith & Order Board	** Income (From General Fund)	21,450	20,505	19,580
859		Income (other)	-	-	-
(17,808)		Expenditure	(21,450)	(20,505)	(19,580)
(1,890)		Surplus/(deficit)	-	-	-
1,422		Balance brought forward	(468)	(468)	(468)
(468)		Balance carried forward	(468)	(468)	(468)
21,168	Inform & Comm Board	** Income (From General Fund)	21,400	21,500	21,600
7,513		Income (other)	-	-	-
(25,807)		Expenditure	(21,400)	(21,500)	(21,600)
2,874		Surplus/(deficit)	-	-	-
8,899		Balance brought forward	11,773	11,773	11,773
11,773		Balance carried forward	11,773	11,773	11,773
1,898,097	GRAND TOTAL	<i>Income (From General Fund)</i>	1,915,040	1,937,866	1,961,369
545,900		<i>Income (other)</i>	549,826	552,116	540,428
(2,302,725)		<i>Expenditure</i>	(2,417,515)	(2,480,511)	(2,604,586)
141,272		Surplus/(deficit)	47,351	9,471	(102,789)
21,387		<i>Transfer (to)/from capital</i>	(312,551)	(41,691)	(42,170)
1,773,826		<i>Balance brought forward</i>	1,936,485	1,671,285	1,639,065
1,936,485		<i>Balance carried forward</i>	1,671,285	1,639,065	1,494,106

General Fund

Budget 2017 £	Actual 2017 £	Variance fav/ (adv) £		Revised Budget 2018 £	Budget 2019 £	Budget 2020 £
			INCOME			
			<i>Investment Income</i>			
1,048,990	1,079,845	30,855	UTP income	1,079,845	1,079,845	1,079,845
5,000	2,420	(2,580)	Interest	5,000	5,000	5,000
21,243	21,243	-	Net investment property income	21,243	21,243	21,243
1,075,233	1,103,508	28,275		1,106,088	1,106,088	1,106,088
			<i>Administration fees</i>			
2,000	5,835	3,835	UTP / investment administration	2,000	2,000	2,000
28,185	28,185	-	Pension Fund administration	29,030	29,610	30,200
18,395	18,395	-	Restricted Funds	18,395	18,395	18,395
48,580	52,415	3,835		49,425	50,005	50,595
719,929	719,929	-	Quota	741,527	763,773	786,686
18,000	21,695	3,695	Donations and legacies	18,000	18,000	18,000
-	550	550	Other	-	-	-
1,861,742	1,898,097	36,355	<i>Total Income</i>	1,915,040	1,937,866	1,961,369
			ALLOCATIONS			
826,210	881,734	(55,524)	Standing Committee	852,480	878,160	900,560
198,130	195,957	2,173	Administration Board	205,130	210,130	215,130
365,030	340,047	24,983	Institute Council	390,765	447,470	564,495
375,565	366,958	8,607	Mission Board	373,930	382,090	388,645
18,375	15,059	3,316	Faith and Order Board	21,450	20,505	19,580
28,800	21,168	7,632	Information and Communication Board	21,400	21,500	21,600
1,812,110	1,820,923	(8,813)	<i>Total allocations</i>	1,865,155	1,959,855	2,110,010
			BALANCES			
49,632	77,174	27,542	Surplus/(deficit) for year	49,885	(21,989)	(148,641)
875,866	875,866		Balance brought forward	953,040	1,002,925	980,936
925,498	953,040	27,542	<i>Balance carried forward</i>	1,002,925	980,936	832,295
			Note			
			In addition to allocations from the General Fund some Boards / Committees receive income from other sources			

Standing Committee

Budget 2017 £	Actual 2017 £	Variance fav/ (adv) £			Revised Budget 2018 £	Budget 2019 £	Budget 2020 £	
			INCOME					
826,210	881,734	55,524	Allocation from General Fund		852,480	878,160	900,560	
826,210	881,734	55,524			852,480	878,160	900,560	
			EXPENDITURE					
			A Costs of General Synod Office					
355,800	360,946	(5,146)	Employees	Salaries	372,000	384,500	394,200	
34,900	24,318	10,582		N.I.C	33,750	34,750	35,700	
113,900	113,256	644		Pension contributions	118,820	122,550	125,600	
1,700	1,741	(41)		Pensions ex-staff-old scheme	1,750	1,803	1,857	
4,250	4,347	(97)		Staff travel & subsistence	4,250	4,378	4,509	
1,910	842	1,068		Staff training	1,910	1,967	2,026	
3,500	6,971	(3,471)		Recruitment Costs	3,500	3,605	3,713	
515,960	512,421	3,539		Sub-total	535,980	553,553	567,605	
30,000	21,645	8,355	Premises	Building repairs & maint.	30,000	30,900	31,827	
2,400	1,932	468		Rates	2,400	2,472	2,546	
20,000	18,542	1,458		Light, heat & cleaning	20,000	20,602	21,219	
7,520	8,837	(1,317)		Insurance	9,000	9,270	9,548	
59,920	50,956	8,964		Sub-total	61,400	63,244	65,140	
4,500	4,807	(307)	Administration	Telephone	4,500	4,635	4,774	
6,500	6,766	(266)		Postage	6,500	6,695	6,896	
5,000	3,052	1,948		Printing & stationery	4,000	4,120	4,244	
12,000	12,122	(122)		Photocopier	12,000	12,360	12,731	
14,400	16,702	(2,302)		Computing - Maintenance	16,000	16,480	16,974	
2,000	1,882	118		- Equipment	2,000	2,000	2,000	
6,300	7,019	(719)		Payroll Bureau processing costs	6,800	7,004	7,214	
4,000	6,124	(2,124)		Miscellaneous	4,000	4,120	4,244	
1,000	618	382		Office equipment & furniture	1,000	1,000	1,000	
55,700	59,092	(3,392)		Sub-total	56,800	58,414	60,077	
631,580	622,469	9,111	<i>Total Costs of General Synod Office</i>		654,180	675,211	692,822	
			B Provincial Costs					
3,000	5,351	(2,351)	Office of Primus	Primus' expenses	4,000	4,120	4,244	
11,450	11,450	-		Assistance to Diocese	11,680	12,030	12,391	
6,500	13,764	(7,264)	College of Bishops		6,500	6,500	6,500	
10,000	10,000	-		Election of Bishop	10,000	10,000	10,000	
32,000	32,540	(540)	General Synod	Annual meeting	33,000	33,990	35,010	
1,000	875	125		Annual report	1,000	1,030	1,061	
3,200	3,950	(750)		Synod papers	3,200	3,296	3,395	
2,000	1,591	409	Office for Protec'n of Children & Vulnerable Adults		2,000	2,000	2,000	
350	1,672	(1,322)	New Clergy	Welcome Day	350	361	372	
3,000	2,698	302	Clergy Legal Expenses	Insurance	2,750	2,833	2,918	
3,000	1,895	1,105	Trustee Liability	Insurance	2,000	2,060	2,122	
13,150	12,900	250	Professional fee	Audit	13,550	13,957	14,376	
45,000	101,422	(56,422)		Legal / advisory	46,350	47,741	49,173	
2,800	2,761	39	Subscriptions	Churches Main Committee etc	2,800	2,884	2,971	
136,450	202,869	(66,419)	<i>Total Provincial Costs</i>		139,180	142,802	146,533	

Standing Committee

Budget 2017 £	Actual 2017 £	Variance fav/ (adv) £		Revised Budget 2018 £	Budget 2019 £	Budget 2020 £
			C Committee Meeting Expenses			
2,000	2,805	(805)	Standing Committee	2,000	2,060	2,122
400	93	307	Cttee for Protec'n of Children & Vulnerable Adults	400	400	400
2,400	2,898	(498)	<i>Total Committee Meeting Expenses</i>	2,400	2,460	2,522
			D Subscriptions to church bodies			
3,300	3,718	(418)	World Council of Churches	3,300	3,300	3,300
2,700	-	2,700	Conference of European Churches	2,700	2,700	2,700
5,000	5,000	-	Churches Together in Britain and Ireland	5,000	5,000	5,000
12,500	12,500	-	Action of Churches Together in Scotland	12,500	12,500	12,500
31,280	31,280	-	Anglican Consultative Council	32,220	33,187	34,183
54,780	52,498	2,282	<i>Total Subscriptions to church bodies</i>	55,720	56,687	57,683
			E Grants			
1,000	1,000	-	Primus discretionary	1,000	1,000	1,000
1,000	1,000	-	<i>Total Grants</i>	1,000	1,000	1,000
826,210	881,734	(55,524)	Total Expenditure	852,480	878,160	900,560
			BALANCES			
-	-		Surplus/(deficit) for year	-	-	-
-	-		Balance brought forward	-	-	-
-	-	-	<i>Balance carried forward</i>	-	-	-

Administration Board

Budget 2017 £	Actual 2017 £	Variance fav/ (adv) £		Revised Budget 2018 £	Budget 2019 £	Budget 2020 £
			INCOME			
198,130	195,957	(2,173)	Allocation from General Fund	205,130	210,130	215,130
198,130	195,957	(2,173)	<i>Total Income</i>	205,130	210,130	215,130
			EXPENDITURE			
			<i>Meeting Costs</i>			
1,000	881	119	Board	1,000	1,000	1,000
500	99	401	Building Grants Group	500	500	500
100	161	(61)	Investment Committee	100	100	100
400	263	137	Retirement Housing Committee	400	400	400
400	188	212	Buildings Committee	400	400	400
400	228	172	Personnel Committee	400	400	400
2,800	1,820	980	<i>Sub-total</i>	2,800	2,800	2,800
			<i>Grants</i>			
7,000	8,625	(1,625)	Child Allowance	9,000	9,000	9,000
3,330	1,200	2,130	Resettlement grants	3,330	3,330	3,330
10,330	9,825	505	<i>Sub-total</i>	12,330	12,330	12,330
			<i>Allocation to other funds</i>			
185,000	184,312	688	Building Grants Fund	190,000	195,000	200,000
185,000	184,312	688	<i>Sub-total</i>	190,000	195,000	200,000
198,130	195,957	2,173	<i>Total Expenditure</i>	205,130	210,130	215,130
			BALANCES			
			Revenue			
-	-	-	Surplus/(deficit) for year	-	-	-
-	-	-	Balance brought forward	-	-	-
-	-	-	<i>Balance carried forward</i>	-	-	-

Administration Board Building Grants Fund

Budget 2017 £	Actual 2017 £	Variance fav/ (adv) £		Revised Budget 2018 £	Budget 2019 £	Budget 2020 £
			INCOME			
185,000	184,312	(688)	Allocation from General Fund	190,000	195,000	200,000
185,000	184,312	(688)	<i>Total Net Income</i>	190,000	195,000	200,000
			EXPENDITURE			
	114,317		Grants - Issued			
	69,995		- Earmarked			
185,000	184,312	(688)	<i>Total Expenditure</i>	190,000	195,000	200,000
			BALANCES			
			Revenue			
-	-	-	Surplus/(deficit) for year	-	-	-
-	-	-	Balance brought forward	-	-	-
-	-	-	<i>Balance carried forward</i>	-	-	-

Administration Board Building Loans Fund

Budget 2017 £	Actual 2017 £	Variance fav/ (adv) £		Revised Budget 2018 £	Budget 2019 £	Budget 2020 £
			INCOME			
3,000	934	(2,066)	Interest on loans	1,000	1,500	1,500
3,000	934	(2,066)	<i>Total Net Income</i>	1,000	1,500	1,500
			BALANCES			
			Revenue (liquid funds for advancement of loans)			
3,000	934	(2,066)	Surplus/(deficit) for year	1,000	1,500	1,500
(255,559)	8,040	263,599	Transfer (to)/from capital	(262,533)	(1,500)	(1,500)
272,559	272,559	-	Balance brought forward	281,533	20,000	20,000
20,000	281,533	261,533	<i>Balance carried forward</i>	20,000	20,000	20,000

**Administration Board
Retirement Housing Committee
Supplementary Fund**

Budget 2017 £	Actual 2017 £	Variance fav/ (adv) £		Revised Budget 2018 £	Budget 2019 £	Budget 2020 £
			INCOME			
36,957	38,044	1,087	Investment income	38,044	38,044	38,044
50	23	(27)	Interest - Deposit account	50	50	50
2,000	2,000	-	Cargill Trust - Widows and Orphans	2,000	2,000	2,000
-	793	793	Legacies & Donations	-	-	-
39,007	40,860	1,853	<i>Total Net Income</i>	40,094	40,094	40,094
			EXPENDITURE			
4,000	-	4,000	Grants - Clergy	4,000	4,120	4,244
4,000	2,200	1,800	- Widows & Orphans	4,000	4,120	4,244
27,000	31,050	(4,050)	- Christmas payment	27,000	26,000	25,000
1,200	1,201	(1)	- Yearbooks (retired clergy)	1,200	1,200	1,200
1,500	-	1,500	Pension Fund (CRBF) top up	1,500	1,500	1,500
120	142	(22)	Miscellaneous	120	120	120
6,145	6,145	-	GSO Administration charge	6,145	6,145	6,145
43,965	40,738	3,227	<i>Total Expenditure</i>	43,965	43,205	42,453
			BALANCES			
			Revenue			
(4,958)	122	5,080	Surplus/(deficit) for year	(3,871)	(3,111)	(2,359)
31,025	31,025		Balance brought forward	31,147	27,276	24,165
26,067	31,147	5,080	<i>Balance carried forward</i>	27,276	24,165	21,806

**Administration Board
Retirement Housing Committee
Housing Fund**

Budget 2017 £	Actual 2017 £	Variance fav/ (adv) £		Revised Budget 2018 £	Budget 2019 £	Budget 2020 £
			INCOME			
3,000	2,366	(634)	Interest - Deposit	2,000	2,000	2,000
23,422	24,111	689	Investment income	24,111	24,111	24,111
79,000	76,245	(2,755)	Rents	77,000	79,000	81,000
105,422	102,722	(2,700)	<i>Total Net Income</i>	103,111	105,111	107,111
			EXPENDITURE			
6,285	6,323	(38)	Insurance	6,475	6,669	6,869
35,000	89,480	(54,480)	Repairs	35,000	36,050	37,132
8,240	7,955	285	Gas appliance / electrical testing	8,240	8,487	8,742
2,500	-	2,500	Property surveys etc	2,500	2,500	2,500
11,750	11,750	-	GSO Administration charge	11,750	11,750	11,750
63,775	115,508	(51,733)	<i>Total Expenditure</i>	63,965	65,456	66,993
			BALANCES			
			Revenue			
41,647	(12,786)	(54,433)	Surplus/(deficit) for year	39,146	39,655	40,118
(50,814)	13,971	64,785	Transfers (to)/from capital	(49,498)	(39,655)	(40,118)
9,167	9,167		Balance brought forward	10,352	-	-
-	10,352	10,352	<i>Balance carried forward</i>	-	-	-
			CAPITAL ACCOUNT			
			Additions to capital			
123,000	76,565	(46,435)	Profit on sale of property	251,000	-	-
476,000	-	(476,000)	Purchase of property	140,000	180,000	185,000
15,000	-	(15,000)	Capital repairs	15,000	15,000	15,000
-	42,378	42,378	Funds placed on deposit	51,898	-	-
614,000	118,943	(495,057)		457,898	195,000	200,000
			Disposals of capital			
125,000	56,349	68,651	Sale of property - book value	157,400	-	-
315,186	-	315,186	Funds from deposit account	-	155,345	159,882
440,186	56,349	383,837		157,400	155,345	159,882
173,814	62,594	(111,220)	<i>net additions (disposals) of capital</i>	300,498	39,655	40,118
4,331,211	4,331,211	-	Balance brought forward	4,393,805	4,694,303	4,733,958
4,505,025	4,393,805	(111,220)	<i>Balance carried forward</i>	4,694,303	4,733,958	4,774,076
			Funding of capital movement			
173,814	62,594	(111,220)	Funding required	300,498	39,655	40,118
123,000	76,565	(46,435)	Profit on sale of property	251,000	-	-
50,814	(13,971)	(64,785)	Transfer from/(to) revenue	49,498	39,655	40,118
-	-	-	<i>Funding shortfall</i>	-	-	-

Institute Council

Budget 2017 £	Actual 2017 £	Variance fav/ (adv) £		Revised Budget 2018 £	Budget 2019 £	Budget 2020 £
			INCOME			
365,030	340,047	(24,983)	Allocation from General Fund	390,765	447,470	564,495
42,000	42,022	22	Allocation from Training Fund	46,900	34,750	26,650
-	-	-	Allocation from Mixed Mode Training Fund	16,670	16,670	16,660
2,880	2,994	114	Investment income	2,995	2,995	2,995
5,675	6,275	600	Fees	5,760	17,625	11,980
415,585	391,338	(24,247)	Total Income	463,090	519,510	622,780
			EXPENDITURE			
			A Board			
3,250	2,162	1,088	Meeting costs	2,500	2,500	2,500
3,250	2,162	1,088	Total Board	2,500	2,500	2,500
			B Scottish Episcopal Institute			
			Staff Costs			
135,500	135,885	(385)	Salaries, pensions etc	140,640	145,450	148,360
2,000	1,848	152	Travel expenses	2,000	2,000	2,000
3,500	1,908	1,592	Staff training / development	3,500	3,500	3,500
-	3,229	(3,229)	Recruitment costs	-	-	-
141,000	142,870	(1,870)	Total staff costs	146,140	150,950	153,860
			Training costs			
42,580	36,356	6,224	Residential weekends	41,100	40,700	47,500
3,000	3,770	(770)	Field Education (placement) costs	3,000	3,000	3,000
12,200	12,195	5	Associate Tutors	14,560	14,850	15,150
1,000	28	972	Course materials / moodle costs	250	250	250
7,030	8,250	(1,220)	Common Awards (YSJ)	7,030	7,030	7,030
65,810	60,599	5,211	Total training costs	65,940	65,830	72,930
			Mixed Mode Training costs			
-	-	-	Director of MM Training salary, pension etc	42,850	55,600	57,900
-	-	-	Director of MM Training travel, expenses etc	3,900	3,900	3,900
-	-	-	Associate Tutors	5,000	5,000	5,000
-	-	-	Maintenance grants	6,360	19,080	25,440
-	-	-	Residential weekends	600	1,800	2,400
-	-	-	Total Mixed Mode Training costs	58,710	85,380	94,640

Institute Council

Budget 2017 £	Actual 2017 £	Variance fav/ (adv) £		Revised Budget 2018 £	Budget 2019 £	Budget 2020 £
			Other costs			
2,500	424	2,076	Library	2,500	2,500	2,500
700	1,797	(1,097)	Admin / publicity	700	700	700
3,200	2,221	979	Total other costs	3,200	3,200	3,200
210,010	205,690	4,320	Total SEI costs	273,990	305,360	324,630
			C Full Time ordinands			
42,000	42,022	(22)	Maintenance grants	46,900	34,750	26,650
42,000	42,022	(22)	Total full time ordinands	46,900	34,750	26,650
			D Curate funding			
125,275	109,888	15,387	Curate grants	107,300	143,900	235,500
125,275	109,888	15,387	Total curate funding	107,300	143,900	235,500
			E Recruitment and Selection			
27,550	27,270	280	PDO stipend / salary	25,900	26,500	27,000
2,000	1,408	592	PDO expenses (travel etc)	2,000	2,000	2,000
4,000	1,882	2,118	Provincial panels etc	3,000	3,000	3,000
1,000	1,016	(16)	Training	1,000	1,000	1,000
500	-	500	Materials etc	500	500	500
35,050	31,576	3,474	Total Recruitment and Selection	32,400	33,000	33,500
415,585	391,338	24,247	Total Expenditure	463,090	519,510	622,780
			BALANCES			
			Revenue			
-	-	-	Surplus/(deficit) for year	-	-	-
			Balance brought forward	-	-	-
-	-	-	<i>Balance carried forward</i>	-	-	-

Mission Board

Budget 2017 £	Actual 2017 £	Variance fav/ (adv) £		Revised Budget 2018 £	Budget 2019 £	Budget 2020 £
			INCOME			
375,565	366,958	(8,607)	Allocation from General Fund	373,930	382,090	388,645
10,400	10,759	359	Investment income	10,750	10,750	10,750
1,000	937	(63)	Legacies and donations	1,000	1,000	1,000
386,965	378,654	(8,311)	<i>Total Net Income</i>	385,680	393,840	400,395
			EXPENDITURE			
3,003	1,969	1,034	Board expenses	3,000	3,090	3,185
-	756	(756)	Miscellaneous	-	-	-
304,657	304,657	-	Mission and Ministry Support Grants	308,845	316,800	323,140
20,000	18,082	1,918	Provincial Youth Week	18,000	18,000	18,000
			Networks			
1,000	625	375	Children	500	500	500
2,400	-	2,400	Lay Learning	200	200	200
1,120	14	1,106	Mission Planning	560	560	560
1,150	143	1,007	Rural	575	575	575
500	40	460	Spirituality	250	250	250
1,000	-	1,000	Stewardship	500	500	500
2,000	3,680	(1,680)	Youth	4,000	4,000	4,000
336,830	329,966	6,864	<i>Sub-total</i>	336,430	344,475	350,910
			<i>Allocation to Committees</i>			
-	-	-	Global Partnerships Committee	-	-	-
50,135	48,688	1,447	Church in Society Committee	49,250	49,365	49,485
50,135	48,688	1,447	<i>Total allocated to committees</i>	49,250	49,365	49,485
386,965	378,654	8,311	<i>Total Expenditure</i>	385,680	393,840	400,395
			BALANCES			
			Revenue			
-	-	-	Surplus/(deficit) for year	-	-	-
-	-	-	Balance brought forward	-	-	-
-	-	-	<i>Balance carried forward</i>	-	-	-

**Mission Board
Global Partnerships Committee**

Budget 2016	Actual 2017	Variance fav/ (adv)			Revised Budget 2018	Budget 2019	Budget 2020	
£	£	£			£	£	£	
			INCOME					
-	-	-	Allocation from General Fund					-
98,426	101,321	2,895	Investment income	Unit Trust Pool	101,321	101,321	101,321	
-	12	12		Deposit account	-	-	-	
6,562	6,755	193		Noel Phillips Trust	6,755	6,755	6,755	
-	21,000	21,000	Grant awarded in previous year not required					-
104,988	129,088	24,100	<i>Total Net Income</i>					108,075
			EXPENDITURE					
45,000	32,641	12,359	Grants	Education	45,000	45,000	45,000	
15,000	8,390	6,610		Africa	15,000	15,000	15,000	
15,000	6,551	8,449		Asia (<i>inc Middle East</i>)	15,000	15,000	15,000	
5,000	144	4,856		Small grants	5,000	5,000	5,000	
10,000	-	10,000		Companion Relationships	10,000	10,000	10,000	
8,000	5,100	2,900		Agency Support	8,000	8,000	8,000	
12,000	10,649	1,351		Anglican Comm Network Support	12,000	12,000	12,000	
5,000	132	4,868		South America	5,000	5,000	5,000	
500	-	500	MidGies (formerly Justice, Peace and Creation Network)		500	500	500	
3,000	374	2,626	Committee expense	Travel / meetings	3,000	3,000	3,000	
1,000	632	368		Publicity / correspondence	1,000	1,000	1,000	
119,500	64,613	54,887	<i>Total Expenditure</i>					119,500
			BALANCES					
			Revenue					
(14,512)	64,475	78,987	Surplus/(deficit) for year					(11,425)
98,020	98,020		Balance brought forward					162,495
83,508	162,495	78,987	<i>Balance carried forward</i>					151,070
						139,646	128,221	

**Mission Board
Church in Society Committee**

Budget 2017 £	Actual 2017 £	Variance fav/ (adv) £		Revised Budget 2018 £	Budget 2019 £	Budget 2020 £
			INCOME			
50,135	48,688	(1,447)	Allocation from General Fund	49,250	49,365	49,485
-	937	937	Donations	1,000	1,000	1,000
<u>50,135</u>	<u>49,625</u>	<u>(510)</u>	<i>Total Net Income</i>	<u>50,250</u>	<u>50,365</u>	<u>50,485</u>
			EXPENDITURE			
38,500	37,970	530	Grants	36,500	38,500	38,500
7,635	8,000	(365)	HIV / Aids chaplaincy	7,750	7,865	7,985
1,500	1,082	418	CRPOF	1,500	1,500	1,500
2,500	2,573	(73)	Meeting costs / participating in consultations / conferences	4,500	2,500	2,500
<u>50,135</u>	<u>49,625</u>	<u>510</u>	<i>Total Expenditure</i>	<u>50,250</u>	<u>50,365</u>	<u>50,485</u>
			BALANCES			
			Revenue			
-	-	-	Surplus/(deficit) for year	-	-	-
-	-		Balance brought forward	-	-	-
<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<i>Balance carried forward</i>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>

Faith and Order Board

Budget 2017 £	Actual 2017 £	Variance fav/ (adv) £		Revised Budget 2018 £	Budget 2019 £	Budget 2020 £
			INCOME			
18,375	15,059	(3,316)	Allocation from General Fund	21,450	20,505	19,580
<u>18,375</u>	<u>15,059</u>	<u>(3,316)</u>	<i>Total Net Income</i>	<u>21,450</u>	<u>20,505</u>	<u>19,580</u>
			EXPENDITURE			
5,500	3,391	2,109	Board expenses	5,500	5,666	5,840
4,075	3,206	869	Work of Liturgy Committee	5,650	4,230	2,812
800	190	610	Work of Committee on Canons	800	824	849
800	615	185	Work of Doctrine Committee	800	824	849
5,000	6,343	(1,343)	Inter-Church Relations Committee	5,000	5,150	5,305
2,200	1,314	886	Europe Group	3,700	3,811	3,925
-	-	-				
-	-	-	Diaconate Working Group	-	-	-
<u>18,375</u>	<u>15,059</u>	<u>3,316</u>	<i>Total Expenditure</i>	<u>21,450</u>	<u>20,505</u>	<u>19,580</u>
			BALANCES			
			Revenue			
-	-	-	Surplus/(deficit) for year	-	-	-
-	-	-	Balance brought forward	-	-	-
<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<i>Balance carried forward</i>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
			PUBLICATIONS			
	859		Income	-	-	-
	(2,749)		Expenditure	-	-	-
	(1,890)		Surplus/(deficit) for year	-	-	-
	1,422		Balance brought forward	(468)	(468)	(468)
	<u>(468)</u>		<i>Balance carried forward</i>	<u>(468)</u>	<u>(468)</u>	<u>(468)</u>
Note	No specific budget is set for publications income and expenditure in either Faith and Order Board or Information and Communications Board. It is assumed that total income and expenditure is such that over time it will be broadly break-even.					

Information and Communication Board

Budget 2017 £	Actual 2017 £	Variance fav/ (adv) £		Revised Budget 2018 £	Budget 2019 £	Budget 2020 £
INCOME						
28,800	21,168	(7,632)	Allocation from General Fund	21,400	21,500	21,600
<u>28,800</u>	<u>21,168</u>	<u>(7,632)</u>	<i>Total Net Income</i>	<u>21,400</u>	<u>21,500</u>	<u>21,600</u>
EXPENDITURE						
2,991	1,405	1,586	Board expenses	3,067	3,142	3,216
12,000	11,277	723	Online Communications	12,000	12,000	12,000
809	529	280	anglican.org domain	833	858	884
5,500	350	5,150	Training, Promotion and Publicity	5,500	5,500	5,500
7,500	7,607	(107)	inspires publication / distribution costs	-	-	-
		-	Miscellaneous projects	-	-	-
<u>28,800</u>	<u>21,168</u>	<u>7,632</u>	<i>Total Expenditure</i>	<u>21,400</u>	<u>21,500</u>	<u>21,600</u>
BALANCES						
Revenue						
-	-	-	Surplus/(deficit) for year	-	-	-
-	-	-	Balance brought forward	-	-	-
<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<i>Balance carried forward</i>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>
<hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/>						
PUBLICATIONS						
	7,513		Income	-	-	-
	(4,639)		Expenditure	-	-	-
	2,874		Surplus/(deficit) for year	-	-	-
	8,899		Balance brought forward	11,773	11,773	11,773
	<u>11,773</u>		<i>Balance carried forward</i>	<u>11,773</u>	<u>11,773</u>	<u>11,773</u>
Note	No specific budget is set for publications income and expenditure in either Faith and Order Board or Information and Communications Board. It is assumed that total income and expenditure is such that over time it will be broadly break-even.					

EXHIBITING OF COMMUNICANTS' ROLLS

(RESOLUTION 1 UNDER CANON 41)

The agenda for General Synod contains a motion to alter Resolution 1 under Canon 41.

As Resolution 1 stands at present, there is an obligation to exhibit the Communicants' Roll for the two Sundays prior to the annual general meeting of the congregation.

Advice has been received by the Province that entry of an individual on the Communicants' Roll should be treated as "sensitive personal data" under the General Data Protection Regulation. One result of that is that such information cannot be publicly exhibited without the consent of the individuals concerned.

The Faith and Order Board has therefore agreed to present an alteration to the resolution so that the obligation to exhibit the Roll applies only where the cleric is satisfied that applicable laws relating to data protection would not be infringed (in other words, provided the consent of the individuals on the Roll has been obtained). In circumstances where such consent has not been obtained the obligation to exhibit the Roll would not apply.

The proposed change to the wording of Resolution 1 under Canon 41 is set out below (*the text to be added is shown in italics and the text to be deleted is scored through*).

Resolution 1

The cleric shall normally keep privately the Communicants' Roll ~~but has discretion to~~ *and may* exhibit it to the members of the congregation at large or to individual members thereof, ~~or otherwise in such manner as the Bishop may direct or shall be prescribed by resolution~~ *only after the cleric is satisfied that to do so would not infringe any applicable laws relating to data protection. Subject to compliance with such laws, the Roll* ~~Nevertheless it shall be made available to the members of the congregation for inspection at the close of divine worship upon the two Sundays immediately preceding the Annual Meeting of the congregation and shall be exhibited to the Bishop upon request or to the Dean as provided by Resolution under Canon 42.~~

The Most Rev Mark Strange
Primus, Convener, Faith and Order Board

REVIEW OF CANON FOUR

(Of the Election of Bishops to the Vacant Sees)

The agenda for General Synod contains a short motion as follows: –

That Canon 4 “Of the Election of Bishops to Vacant Sees” be revised and amended as necessary.

In March 2018, the Diocesan Synod in Aberdeen and Orkney agreed that a motion in that form should be passed to the provincial Standing Committee for consideration for inclusion on the agenda for General Synod. The Faith and Order Board, which met a few days after that Diocesan Synod meeting, was advised of the passing of the motion and resolved that it would adopt the motion as its own for presentation to General Synod. The provincial Standing Committee has agreed that the motion be brought to Synod in that way.

The Faith and Order Board is supportive of the idea of undertaking a review of the Canon. Pending discussion at General Synod, the Board has not made any decisions on exactly how it would undertake such a review.

Any alterations to the Canon would require the usual two-year canonical process which would involve consultation with the wider church at Diocesan Synods. Depending on the extent of any changes which might be proposed, it is possible that the Board might wish to bring forward a preliminary discussion paper for consultation prior to embarking upon the formal process for canonical alteration. In any event, the Board would welcome comments from across the church regarding any perceived areas of difficulty with the Canon and suggestions for improvement.

The Board is due to meet next towards the end of August 2018 and will consider any comments made during discussion at General Synod.

The Most Rev Mark Strange
Primus, Convener, Faith and Order Board

CLERGY PERSONNEL MATTERS

During the last year the Personnel Committee has continued to work on a range of policies in relation to clergy HR issues.

The following policies have been produced by the Committee and discussed within the Administration Board. They were amended in the light of those discussions and, having subsequently been approved by the Board, are brought to General Synod for the Synod's ratification (as General Synod 2017 requested):-

- Leave Policy
- Maternity, Paternity, Adoption, Parental & Shared Parental Leave Policy
- Clergy Housing Policy
- Retirement Policy
- Clergy Expenses

A further matter relates to Resettlement Grants.

Following the report of the Clergy Remuneration Package Review Group, the Administration Board invited the Personnel Committee to consider the question of provincial resettlement grants.

The few resettlement grants which have been applied for in recent years have, in fact, amounted to applications for relocation expenses. The Committee considered that the availability of grant in such circumstances could act as a disincentive to vestries from reimbursing relocation expenses in full. It, therefore, wished to emphasise the importance of vestries reimbursing such relocation expenses and recommended to the Board that any provincial resettlement grants be discontinued. The recommendation to the Board from the Personnel Committee is set out below and the Board has accepted that recommendation.

The Board intends that in order to cater for any applications in the system at the present time, a period of six months' grace be allowed. Any grant applications submitted by 31 December will therefore be honoured.

Alterations to a couple of parts of the Digest of Resolutions are necessary to reflect this change and the alterations are shown below. A motion is included in the Synod agenda to effect those changes.

John Ferguson-Smith
Convener, Administration Board
April 2018

Changes required to the Digest of Resolutions:-

4.1 General

Provincial grants and loans shall be available, subject to funding, in accordance with rules or policies adopted from time to time by the Board or Committee (or a Committee's parent Board) having charge of the fund in question to the extent that such rules or policies are not inconsistent with the other provisions hereof. For the avoidance of doubt a parent Board having charge of a fund may delegate its powers in relation to such fund to any of its pendant Committees or sub-Committees.

Listed below are the main Provincial grants and loans which are available:

4.1.1 Personnel Grants	Sources of Funding
Curate Grants	Institute Council
Child Allowance	Administration Board
Resettlement Grants	Administration Board
Maternity or similar parental Grants	Administration Board

4.3.2 ~~Grants shall be paid to individual clergy for the undernoted purposes:~~

- (a) Child Allowances shall be paid annually at a rate set by the Administration Board. They shall be paid on behalf of all qualifying children of all qualifying stipendiary clergy of the Scottish Episcopal Church who apply for such allowances. The allowances shall be paid in February (or when claimed, if later) in the year following that to which they relate. Payment shall be made to the Paying Officer of the parent concerned. Qualifying children shall be those who are under 16, or, if in full-time education, under 21. Qualifying stipendiary clergy shall be such stipendiary clergy as meet criteria set from time to time by the Administration Board.
- ~~(b) Resettlement Grants shall be paid to qualifying stipendiary clergy who apply by way of reimbursement of qualifying expenditure incurred in moving to a new charge in the Province. Such grants shall be payable at a rate and on such terms as are set by the Administration Board.~~

Recommendation to the Administration Board from the Personnel Committee

Introduction

The work on the Personnel policies and the guidance for clergy expenses led to investigation on relocation expenses and resettlement grants.

Generally, vestries have been responsible for relocation expenses. Grants were available from Sons and Friends of the Clergy, but a change in policy has led to

them only awarding in cases of severe hardship. Resettlement grants were available from the Province but have been used only as reimbursement of relocation expenses. Attached are the numbers and amounts claimed. In 15 years, 17 have been awarded amounting to around £15,000.

Recommendation

We felt there should be clear guidelines on relocation expenses. Vestries should be responsible for relocation costs. If a vestry anticipated any difficulty in meeting such expenses, this should be raised with the diocese prior to commencing any appointment process since it might be symptomatic of deeper financial issues.

HMRC allow relocation expenses to be paid tax free subject to the sum being less than £8500 and fulfilling certain conditions set out in HMRC Guide 480 (2017) Expenses & Benefits Chapter 5 and Appendix 7. It is important that all claims meet these guidelines, are incurred as a direct consequence of the move, and have invoices for every item.

A resettlement grant would likely be taxable by HMRC. If all reasonable expenses are reimbursed there is less need for a resettlement allowance. The Church of England pay one of the order of £2000. However, our recommendation is that no resettlement grant is paid, and all reasonable relocation expenses are reimbursed.

Maureen McKellar
March 2018

LEAVE POLICY

This policy affects you if you are a full time or part time stipendiary Office Holder.

While it is necessary to set down a leave policy to ensure consistency between dioceses, it is recognised that most clergy do not adhere to standard hours and work whatever is necessary to fulfil their duties. An example of this is the lead up to Christmas and Easter when there are very full days and no days off. So, it is hoped that Vestries will treat this policy in a spirit of generosity. It is important to remember that good communication between all parties applying the policy will go a long way to preventing issues.

1. OVERVIEW

1.1 This policy covers absence from your duties due to Annual leave, Special leave or Time Off for Dependants.

1.2 This policy does not cover the arrangements for sickness, nor for Maternity/Paternity/Adoption/Parental & Shared Parental Leave which are covered in a separate policy.

2. PROCEDURES

2.1 To maintain the spirit of good practice, this policy will be applied transparently and consistently.

This means that:

- you should notify the Diocese and where stipulated the Bishop of any intended time away from duties so that all periods of leave can be co-ordinated and recorded;
- you should give as much notice as possible for any intended time away from duties;
- in the case of compassionate/bereavement leave, you should inform your Bishop of your absence or intended absence as soon possible by phone or email;
- any related documentation will be stored in your Individual Personnel File;
- you should inform your Treasurer and/or Paying Officer of the dates of your absence;
- you should keep a record of all time away from duties for any reason;
- communication and contact during extended periods of Maternity/Paternity/ Adoption Leave will be handled by your Bishop/Dean;
- should you wish support can be offered by the Bishop.

3. ROLE OF VESTRIES

3.1 Vestries will:

- ensure that they, and their congregations, are aware of and abide by the arrangements made with you in relation to annual leave and time away from duties.
- encourage you to take annual leave and time away from duties in accordance with such arrangements.
- discuss to assess the impact your absence will have on the charge and ensure your duties are covered (where appropriate) during your time off.

4. ANNUAL LEAVE

4.1 Finding a work life balance can be difficult and you are encouraged to take all your entitlement to annual leave. You and your Vestry(ies) should observe the following as a minimum provision for your Annual Leave and other time away from duties.

4.2 On the basis of a six day 'working week', the intention of your Annual Leave provision is that you should have annual leave of 36 days (including public and bank holidays) of which no more than 5 should be Sundays. Therefore, you are entitled to:

- a) Four weeks basic annual leave per annum (24 days).
- b) Up to six days following both Christmas and Easter (12 days) but with flexibility so that you may take such days at other more convenient times, as agreed in consultation between you and your vestry.

4.3 The Digest of Resolutions - Paragraph 6.5.2 - requires congregations to be responsible for ensuring payment of the expenses of a *locum tenens* for not more than five Sundays each year to enable you to take time away from your duties for a holiday.

5. REGULAR TIME AWAY FROM DUTIES

5.1 On the basis that the 'working' day can be divided into 3 sectors, (morning, afternoon and evening) it is expected that you will only work for 2 of these sectors each day.

5.2 You are expected to take at least one day away from duties in every seven (or at least two days being taken every fortnight).

6. SPECIAL LEAVE

There may be circumstances where leave (paid or unpaid), in addition to your normal entitlement, may be appropriate.

6.1 Medical, Dental and Optical Appointments

Where possible appointments should be made outwith your "working" day/sector as defined in section 6.

6.2 Jury Service & Court Attendance as a Witness

Should you receive notification to attend court for Jury Service you can exercise your right to be excused. Should you not wish to do this then you must inform your Vestry(ries) and Bishop.

You must inform your Vestry(ies) and Bishop immediately upon receiving notification to attend court as a witness. The duration of your attendance at court will be difficult to estimate initially but you must inform your Vestry and Bishop as soon as the court proceedings provide an indication of likely duration of time away from duties.

You are expected to take steps to recover your earnings by utilising the Court's procedure for reimbursement of wages which, on receipt, must be paid to the Charge.

6.3 Military Reserve/Territorial Army Reserve

In the event you are required to do compulsory military service, you must inform your Bishop as soon as practical and provide the appropriate documents. A copy of these documents will be filed in your Individual Personnel file. You will be granted unpaid leave of absence for the duration of the compulsory service as the Ministry of Defence normally pay you during military service.

You must obtain agreement from your Bishop prior to volunteering for military service.

6.4 Bereavement

Bereavement can lead to practical difficulties as well as emotional trauma. The Church aims to support you during this difficult time by granting up to six days paid Bereavement Leave to allow you to deal with matters arising from your loss.

Your Bishop will consider each case individually and the length of leave given will take into consideration your relationship to the deceased and any domestic or travel arrangements that must be made.

Longer periods of absence will only be considered on a case by case basis at your Bishop's discretion.

6.5 Compassionate Leave

Up to 6 days of paid Compassionate Leave may be granted at your Bishop's discretion. Longer periods of compassionate leave may be considered, on a case by case basis, at the discretion of your Bishop.

6.6 Personal Leave

All requests for leave of absence, not covered by this policy will be considered on a case by case basis. The granting of such requests will depend on the reason for the leave, the estimated duration of time away from duties and the needs of the Charge at that time or during the period of requested absence. Your Bishop will only grant such additional leave if it does not adversely affect the needs of the Charge and this leave may be granted on a paid or unpaid basis.

7. TIME OFF FOR DEPENDANTS

7.1 Sudden or unexpected problems may arise in relation to the care and welfare of your dependants. It is important that you and your Vestry(ies) are clear about the conditions for taking time away from your duties to care for dependants so that there are no misunderstandings on whether leave is paid or unpaid and also how much leave you can take.

7.2 Definitions are laid out below;

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| Dependant | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• your partner• your child or parent• someone who lives with you as part of your family e.g. elderly aunt or grandparent |
| Reasonable time off | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• less than one day• one or two days at the most |

7.3 It is expected that time off would normally be paid, but if dependants lived far away and extra time was necessary or the situation was recurring there should be discussion between you and your Bishop on the ratio of paid/unpaid leave and the Vestry should be informed.

8. Resolutions of Disputes

Any disputes in this policy should be referred to the Bishop for resolution.

1. MATERNITY, PATERNITY, ADOPTION, PARENTAL & SHARED PARENTAL LEAVE POLICY

This policy affects you if you are considering Maternity/Paternity/Adoption/Parental and Shared Parental Leave and you are a stipendiary Office Holder.

1.1 OVERVIEW

Maternity/Paternity/Adoption Leave enables eligible parents to take time off work to care for their child during the first year of birth or adoption. Its purpose is to give parents time to care for and bond with their child. All eligible Office Bearers are entitled to take Maternity/Paternity/Adoption Leave and there may also be an entitlement to Maternity/Paternity/Adoption Pay.

It is recognised that, from time to time, you may have questions or concerns relating to your Maternity/Paternity/Adoption rights and open discussion is encouraged to ensure that questions and problems can be resolved as quickly as possible. You should clarify the relevant procedures with your Bishop to ensure that they are followed.

You must give notice to the Diocese, within the required timescales, of:

- a) your intended period of leave
- b) your request for Pay
- c) any changes to your dates for leave and/or pay

1.2 DEFINITIONS

EWC	Estimated week of childbirth
Notification Week	The 15 th week before the EWC
Stipend	Depending on your hours this may be pro rata

1.3 NOTIFICATION

Where this policy calls for notification to be given, you must submit, all notifications in writing and on time to the Diocesan Office, Vestry Secretary and Treasurer and/or the Paying Officer.

1.4 MATERNITY LEAVE ELIGIBILITY

The following criteria must be satisfied if you wish to take Maternity Leave.

- a) Be in receipt of stipend at the time Maternity Leave begins.
- b) Give an undertaking of your intention to return to duties after the birth.
- c) Give written notice of your intention to take Maternity Leave before the end of the Notification Week. The Treasurer and/or Paying Officer will confirm the date in writing, including the date when you are expected to return to work.
- d) Be pregnant at the 11th week before the EWC, or have had your baby.

You can alter your dates but should give 28 days' notice of any changes, which will be confirmed by the Treasurer and/or Paying Officer in writing.

1.5 MATERNITY LEAVE ENTITLEMENT

You are entitled, if eligible, to 52 weeks of Maternity Leave comprising of Ordinary leave for the first 26 weeks and Additional leave for the last 26 weeks.

Maternity Leave can start:

- a) Any time from the 11th week before EWC.

- b) The day after the birth if the baby is early.
- c) Automatically if you're on a period of sickness absence for a pregnancy-related illness in the 4 weeks before the week (Sunday to Saturday) that your baby is due.

You are entitled to Maternity Leave as outlined above even if your baby is stillborn or you miscarry after the start of your 24th week of pregnancy or the baby dies after birth within the period of Maternity Leave.

1.6 MATERNITY PAY

To qualify for Maternity Pay, you must meet the following criteria:

- a) Have at least 26 weeks' continuous service by the end of the 15th week before the EWC.
- b) You must give at least 28 days' notice of the date of starting Maternity Pay and provide medical evidence of your pregnancy by submitting a form MAT B1 to your Paying Officer which can be obtained from your GP or Antenatal clinic.
- c) Maternity Pay usually starts when you begin your Maternity Leave and, if eligible, you will receive Maternity Pay during your Maternity Leave follows:

First 22 weeks of Maternity Leave	Full stipend
Next 17 weeks of Maternity Leave	90% of stipend or Statutory Maternity Pay (as set by the Government ¹), whichever is lower.

Maternity Pay:

- a) Can start any time from the 11th week before the baby is due or;
- b) must start from the date the baby is born or if it has not already done so.

Maternity pay is taxable and attracts National Insurance deductions.

1.7 PATERNITY LEAVE AND PATERNITY PAY

To qualify for Paternity Leave and Pay, you must meet the following criteria:

- a) Have at least 26 weeks' service by the end of the Notification Week.
- b) Be in paid service when the baby is born.
- c) Be the biological father of the child, or the mother's spouse, or the mother's partner.

You must, if eligible, give notice by the end of the Notification Week, of the intended Paternity Leave dates and the date of the EWC.

You will, if eligible, be entitled to 2 weeks' leave on full stipend which can be taken as either one period of two full weeks or two blocks of one week. Leave can start at the time of birth or taken in the subsequent 56 days, whichever is more helpful to your family.

Should the baby be born early, the leave must still be taken within the period from birth until 56 days from the first day of EWC.

You can alter the start date of your Paternity Pay and Leave but you should give at least 28 days' notice.

¹ SMP Standard Rate is updated each year in April. See www.gov.uk/maternity-pay-leave/ for the up to date rate.

1.8 ADOPTION LEAVE AND PAY

Adoption Leave and Pay are only available for adopter(s) when the adoption is an agency one. This means an adoption where the child is placed by an adoption agency with adopter(s) who have been assessed and approved as adopters by the same or a different adoption agency. It is also available, if you are eligible, where you have used a surrogate to have your baby. A step-parent adopting their partner's child would not qualify for Adoption Pay or leave because such an adoption is not an agency one. Either the adopting mother or the adopting father (but not both) may claim Adoption Leave and Pay. However, one parent can claim Adoption Leave and Pay while the other claims Paternity Pay or Parental Leave. You must give the Paying Officer a completed self-certificate as evidence of entitlement to Statutory Paternity Pay.

You can alter the date of starting Adoption Leave and Pay, but you should give at least 28 days' notice of when you want paid Adoption Leave to start.

Where you do not want to take your full leave entitlement, you must give 28 days' notice of when you intend to start working again. The Treasurer and/or Paying Officer will confirm, in writing, the date you are expected to resume duties within 28 days of receiving your notification.

1.9 ADOPTION LEAVE ELIGIBILITY

If you wish to take Adoption Leave you must satisfy the following criteria.

- a) Be in receipt of stipend at the time Adoption Leave begins.
- b) Have at least 26 weeks continuous service by the time you have been 'matched' with a child or get your 'official notification' (overseas adoptions only).
- c) Give at least 28 days written notice of your intention to adopt a child.
- d) Give notice of:
 - i) Your intention to take Adoption Leave within 7 days of being notified by the adoption agency that you have been 'matched' (i.e. an adoption agency has decided that you are suitable to adopt a particular child) or get your 'official notification' (overseas adoption only).
 - ii) When the child is expected to be placed, and when Adoption Leave is expected to start.
Where possible, give 28 days' notice.
 - iii) Where you use a surrogate to have your baby, give written notice of your intention to take Adoption Leave, the baby's due date and when you want to start your leave before the end of the Notification Week.
- e) Give an undertaking of your intention to return to duties after the period of leave.

1.10 ADOPTION LEAVE ENTITLEMENT

Adoption Leave, if you are eligible, is up to 52 weeks and comprises of Ordinary Leave for the first 26 weeks and Additional Leave for the last 26 weeks.

Adoption Leave can start:

- a) up to 14 days before the date the child starts living with you (UK adoptions)
- b) when the child arrives in the UK or within 28 days of this date (overseas adoptions)
- c) the day the child is born or the day after (if you have used a surrogate to have a child)

Only one period of leave is available irrespective of whether there is more than one child placed for adoption as part of the same arrangement. If the child's placement ends during Adoption Leave you can continue Adoption Leave for up to 8 weeks after the end of placement.

Adoption Leave is not available where you are not newly matched with a child for adoption. In other words, if Adoption Leave is not taken at the time of matching and placement, it is not available at a later time.

1.11 ADOPTION PAY

To qualify for Adoption Pay, you must meet the following criteria:

- a) Have at least 26 weeks' continuous service by the week you were matched with a child or get your 'official notification' (overseas adoptions only).
- b) Give notice of:
 - i) Your intention to take Adoption Leave within 7 days of being notified by the adoption agency that you have been 'matched' (i.e. an adoption agency has decided that you are suitable to adopt a particular child).
 - ii) When the child is expected to be placed, and when Adoption Leave is to start. If possible, this should be at least 28 days before you want to start receiving Adoption Pay (when the child is 'placed') and
 - iii) Provide a letter from the adoption agency confirming the proposed placement or, in the case of surrogacy, a written statement to confirm you have applied or will apply for a parental order in the first 6 months after the child's birth.

You will, if eligible, receive Adoption Pay for the period you are on Adoption Leave up to a maximum of 39 weeks as follows:

First 22 weeks	Full stipend (from the commencement of Adoption Leave)
Next 17 weeks	Statutory Adoption Pay (90% of stipend or the standard rate set by the Government ² , whichever is lower)

Adoption Pay starts when you take your Adoption Leave. It is taxable and attracts National Insurance deductions.

Either parent within the Church may receive Adoption Pay, but not both. The other parent (mother or father) may receive Paternity Pay subject to the conditions set out above.

1.12 DISCUSSIONS REGARDING MATERNITY/ADOPTION LEAVE

Contact your Bishop to arrange an informal discussion as early as possible regarding your proposed Maternity/Paternity/Adoption Leave, to talk about your plans and discuss what will happen while you are away from duty.

Once you confirm that you are pregnant it will be the responsibility of the Vestry to ensure that a Risk Assessment is completed. (Add link)

1.13 TERMS and CONDITIONS DURING MATERNITY/PATERNITY/ADOPTION LEAVE

During the period of Maternity/Paternity/Adoption Leave, the terms of your service continue in force and you are entitled to receive all your benefit entitlement including Church housing, except for stipend. In particular, forms of authorisation will continue.

- **Pension**

Pension contributions will continue to be made during any period when you are receiving Maternity/Paternity/Adoption Pay.

² SMP Standard Rate is updated each year in April. See www.gov.uk/maternity-pay-leave/ for the up to date rate.

All unpaid Maternity/Paternity/Adoption Leave will be pensionable, and pension contributions will continue to be paid during this period, as, under the present rules of the Pension Scheme, death in service payments can only be made during pensionable leave.

- **Continuous Service**

When in the above provisions, a period of continuous service is required as a condition of eligibility to any of the benefits, service as a cleric within the Scottish Episcopal Church shall be counted for this purpose.

- **Annual Leave**

Maternity/Paternity/Adoption Leave is granted in addition to your normal annual holiday entitlement. Holidays should, wherever possible, be taken in the year that they are earned. Where a period of Maternity/Paternity/Adoption Leave overlaps two leave years you should consider how your annual leave entitlement can be used to ensure that it is taken by the end of your holiday year.

1.14 CONTACT DURING MATERNITY/ADOPTION LEAVE

Before your Maternity/Adoption Leave begins, your Bishop will discuss the arrangements for keeping in touch during your leave. The Church reserves the right in any event to maintain reasonable contact with you from time to time during your Leave period. This may be to discuss your plans to return to duties, to discuss any special arrangements to be made or training to be given to ease your return to duties or simply to update you on developments during your period of leave.

1.15 MATERNITY/ADOPTION LEAVE KEEPING IN TOUCH (KIT) DAYS

You may agree to return to duty (or attend training) for up to 10 separate days during your Maternity/Adoption Leave without bringing it an end or impacting on your right to claim Maternity/Adoption Pay for that week. These are known as "Keeping in Touch" or "KIT" days. There is no obligation for you to do this, so making use of KIT days is entirely voluntary and we have no right to require you to carry out any duties, and are under no obligation to offer you any duties, during your Maternity/Adoption Leave.

KIT days should be agreed with you and your Bishop well in advance and may only be used after the first 2 weeks following the birth or placement of your baby. KIT days should be used for one or a combination of the following purposes:

- a) Training or development activities related to your duties
- b) Update meetings to keep in touch with events and developments
- c) Carry out some agreed tasks.

Where you take a KIT day, you will receive full payment. Where a KIT day occurs during a week when you are receiving Maternity/Adoption Pay, this will be effectively 'topped up' (where appropriate) so that you receive full payment for the day in question. Any KIT days worked do not extend the period of Maternity/Adoption Leave.

You may use, with the Bishop's agreement, KIT days to carry out duties part of a week during your Maternity/Adoption Leave. You and your Bishop may agree to use KIT days to affect a gradual return to duties by you towards the end of a long period of Maternity/Adoption Leave or to trial a possible flexible working pattern.

1.16 RETURNING TO DUTIES AFTER MATERNITY/ADOPTION LEAVE

As stated in the Eligibility section, you must give an undertaking of your intention to return to duties after the birth or placement of your child to be eligible for Maternity/Adoption Leave in the first instance.

Following Maternity/Adoption Leave, you are entitled to return to the same post/duties you held before commencing your leave.

The right to return to work also includes the right to make a request for flexible working, i.e. to return to duties on a different basis from your existing terms of office, for example to part-time duties. Your Vestry in consultation with your Bishop will consider any such request on its own merits and explain the reason for any decision reached in relation to the context and demands of the role and office.

It is expected that you will return to your duties on the day after the last day of your Maternity/ Adoption Leave unless you notify the Bishop otherwise. Where you are unable to attend to your duties due to sickness or injury, the normal arrangements for sickness absence will apply. In any other case, late return, without prior, written consent will be treated as unauthorised absence.

1.17 RECORD KEEPING

Records must be kept for HM Revenue and Customs (HMRC), including:

- proof of pregnancy - usually a doctor's note or a MATB1 certificate (a photocopy is fine)
- the date SMP began
- SMP payments (including dates)
- the SMP reclaimed
- any weeks that were not paid and why

These records will be kept by the Treasurer and/or Paying Officer.

2. PARENTAL LEAVE

2.1 OVERVIEW

It is appreciated that you may need or want time away from your duties to look after the health and welfare of your child. Likewise, it is understood that you may need time away from your duties to deal with unexpected or sudden problems affecting your dependants and to make any necessary longer term arrangements for their care.

2.2 ELIGIBILITY

You are eligible to take **unpaid** parental leave if you have 12 months continuous service and

- a) Are named on the child's birth certificate;
- b) Are named on the child's birth certificate after adoption (i.e. the child's birth certificate which is from the Adopted Children's Register – this is the official birth certificate for an adopted child, not his or her original certificate);
- c) Have legal parental responsibilities and/or rights for the child;

2.3 ENTITLEMENT

You are entitled, if eligible, to take a maximum of 18 weeks of **unpaid** parental leave for each of your children.

2.4 PERIOD OF LEAVE

Parental leave is subject to a maximum of 4 weeks in any one calendar year, and should be taken in blocks of one week or more. Parental leave of less than a week block will be counted as a week for calculating the remaining leave. The exception to this rule is where

parental leave is for the care of a disabled child as parental leave can be taken in units of single days and is counted as the actual days taken.

2.5 TAKING PARENTAL LEAVE

Birth or Adoption

Parental leave can start once your child is born or adopted. Each parent may take a total of 18 weeks' parental leave and it may be taken at any time up to your child's fifth birthday, or until five years after the adoption. In the case of a disabled child, parental leave can be taken up to your child's 18th birthday.

2.6 NOTICE PERIODS

You must give 21 days' notice of a request for Parental Leave, in writing, to your Vestry Secretary and Diocesan Office. Where Parental Leave is to be taken immediately after the birth or adoption of your child, you must give:

- in the case of childbirth, 21 days' notice before the beginning of the Expected Week of Childbirth
- 21 days' notice should be given of the expected week of adoption or placement.

2.7 POSTPONING PARENTAL LEAVE

Under exceptional circumstances the Vestry in consultation with the Bishop may make a decision to postpone your Parental Leave. Parental Leave may only be postponed for up to six months from the date requested where it would be considered that your absence would be unduly disruptive to your Charge. Where, because of postponement, the period of Parental Leave falls after your child's 5th birthday, you will be entitled to take leave after that date.

Your Parental Leave will not be postponed where you have given notice to take Parental Leave immediately after the time a child is placed with your family for adoption or has come to live with you.

2.8 TERMS and CONDITIONS DURING PARENTAL LEAVE

During the period of parental leave, the terms of your service continue in force and you are entitled to receive all your benefit entitlement, including pension contributions except for stipend and your annual leave entitlement will continue to accrue.

2.9 ANNUAL LEAVE

Parental Leave is granted in addition to your normal annual holiday entitlement. You are reminded that annual leave should, wherever possible, be taken in the year that it is earned.

3. SHARED PARENTAL LEAVE POLICY

This policy affects you if you are a full time or part time stipendiary Office Holder. It will affect you in the event you are considering Shared Parental Leave (SPL) and Shared Parental Pay (ShPP).

3.1 OVERVIEW

Shared Parental Leave enables eligible parents to choose how to share the care of their child during the first year of birth or adoption. All eligible Office Bearers are entitled to take Shared Parental Leave and there may also be an entitlement to some Shared Parental Pay.

3.2 ELIGIBILITY

SPL can only be used by two people:

- The mother/adopter **and**
- One of the following:
 - the father of the child (in the case of birth) or
 - the spouse, civil partner or partner of the child's mother/adopter.

Both parents must be sharing the main responsibility for the care of the child at the time of the birth/placement for adoption.

Additionally, each of the following criteria must be satisfied if you wish to take SPL:

- the mother/adopter of the child must be/have been entitled to statutory Maternity/Adoption Leave or, if not, must be/have been entitled to statutory Maternity/Adoption Pay or Maternity Allowance and must have ended or given notice to reduce any maternity/adoption entitlements
- You must still be ministering in the Church at the start of each period of SPL;
- You must have a minimum of 26 weeks' continuous service in the Church at the end of the 15th week before the child's expected due date/matching date and still be in service in the first week that Shared Parental Leave is to be taken.
- Your partner must meet the 'employment and earnings test' requiring him/her to have worked for at least 26 weeks in the 66 weeks leading up to the due date/matching date and have earned above the maternity allowance threshold in 13 of the 66 weeks.
- You must correctly notify us of your entitlement and provide evidence as required.

Where both parents satisfy these tests, they will both be able to share the leave. However, a family can still use Shared Parental Leave even when only one parent actually meets the eligibility criteria.

3.3 SHARED PARENTAL LEAVE ENTITLEMENT

Eligible employees may be entitled to take up to 50 weeks SPL during the child's first year in their family. The number of weeks available is calculated using the mother's/adopter's entitlement to maternity/adoption leave. By reducing their maternity/adoption leave entitlement they and or their partner may opt-in to the SPL system.

A mother/adopter may reduce their entitlement to maternity/adoption leave by returning to work before the full entitlement of 52 weeks has been taken, or they may give notice to reduce their leave at a specified future date.

If the mother/adopter is not entitled to maternity/adoption leave but is entitled to Statutory Maternity Pay (SMP), Statutory Adoption Pay (SAP) or Maternity Allowance (MA), they must reduce their entitlement to less than the 39 weeks. If they do this, their partner may be entitled to up to 50 weeks of SPL.

SPL can commence as follows:

- The mother can take SPL after she has taken the legally required two weeks of maternity leave immediately following the birth of the child.
- The adopter can take SPL after taking at least two weeks of adoption leave.
- The father/partner/spouse can take SPL immediately following the birth/placement of the child, but may first choose to exhaust any paternity leave entitlements (as the father/partner cannot take paternity leave or pay once they have taken any SPL or ShPP).

Where a mother/adopter gives notice to reduce their maternity/adoption entitlement then the mother/adopter's partner can take leave while the mother/adopter is still using their maternity/adoption entitlements.

SPL will generally commence on your chosen start date.

If you are eligible to receive it, Shared Parental Pay (ShPP) may be paid for some, or all, of the SPL period. (see "Shared Parental Pay" below).

SPL must end no later than one year after the birth/placement of the child. Any SPL not taken by the first birthday or first anniversary of placement for adoption is lost.

3.4 NOTIFYING OF AN INTENTION TO TAKE SHARED PARENTAL LEAVE

Where you are eligible and intending to take SPL, you must give your Bishop notification of your eligibility and intention to take to SPL, at least eight weeks before you can take any period of SPL.

Part of the eligibility criteria requires you to provide the correct notification. Notification must be in writing and requires each of the following:

- your name.
- the name of the other parent.
- the start and end dates of any maternity/adoption leave or pay, or maternity allowance, taken in respect of the child and the total amount of SPL available.
- the date on which the child is expected to be born and the actual date of birth or, in the case of an adopted child, the date on which the employee was notified of having been matched with the child and the date of placement for adoption.
- the amount of SPL you and your partner each intend to take.
- a non-binding indication of when you expect to take the leave.

You must provide a signed declaration stating:

- that you meet, or will meet, the eligibility conditions and are entitled to take SPL.
- that the information you have given is accurate.
- if you are not the mother/adopter you must confirm that you are either the father of the child or the spouse, civil partner or partner of the mother/adopter.
- that should you cease to be eligible you will immediately inform us.

You must provide a signed declaration from your partner confirming:

- their name, address and national insurance number (or a declaration that they do not have a national insurance number)
- they are the mother/adopter of the child or they are the father of the child or the spouse, civil partner or partner of the mother/adopter.
- they satisfy the 'employment and earnings test' (see 'Eligibility' above), and had, at the date of the child's birth or placement for adoption, the main responsibility for the child, along with you.
- they consent to the amount of SPL that you intend to take.
- they consent to us processing the information contained in the declaration form and, in the case where the partner is the mother/adopter, that they will immediately inform their partner should they cease to satisfy the eligibility conditions.

3.5 REQUESTING FURTHER EVIDENCE OF ELIGIBILITY

Your Bishop may request, within 14 days of the SPL entitlement notification being given, that you provide:

- the name and business address of your partner's employer (where your partner is no longer employed or is self-employed their contact details must be given instead)
- in the case of biological parents, a copy of the child's birth certificate (or, where one has not been issued, a declaration as to the time and place of the birth).
- in the case of an adopted child, documentary evidence of the name and address of the adoption agency, the date on which they were notified of having been matched with the child and the date on which the agency expects to place the child for adoption.

In order to be entitled to SPL, you must submit this information within 14 days of your Bishop's request.

3.6 DISCUSSIONS REGARDING SHARED PARENTAL LEAVE

You are encouraged to contact your Bishop to arrange an informal discussion as early as possible regarding your potential eligibility, to talk about your plans and to enable you to be supported if you are considering/taking SPL.

Your Bishop may, upon receiving a notification of entitlement to take SPL, seek to arrange an informal discussion with you to talk about your intentions and how you currently expect to use your SPL entitlement.

Upon receiving a 'Leave Booking Notice', your Bishop will usually arrange a meeting to discuss it. Where a notice is for a single period of continuous leave, or where a request for discontinuous leave can, without further discussion, be approved in the terms stated in your notice booking leave, a meeting may not be necessary.

3.7 BOOKING SHARED PARENTAL LEAVE

In addition to notifying your Bishop of your eligibility to SPL/ShPP, you must also give notice to take the leave. In many cases, notice to take leave will be given at the same time as the notice of entitlement to SPL.

You can submit three notifications specifying leave periods you are intending to take. Each notification may contain either:

- a) a single period of weeks of leave.
- b) two or more weeks of discontinuous leave, where you intend to return to work between periods of leave.

SPL can only be taken in complete weeks but may begin on any day of the week. For example, if a week of SPL began on a Tuesday it would finish on a Monday. Where you return to duties between periods of SPL, the next period of SPL can start on any day of the week.

You must book SPL by giving the correct notification at least eight weeks before the date on which you wish to start the leave and (if applicable) receive ShPP.

- **Continuous Leave Notifications**

A notification can be for a period of **continuous leave**, which means a notification of a number of weeks taken in a single unbroken period of leave (for example, six weeks in a row).

You have the right to take a continuous block of leave notified in a single notification, so long as it does not exceed the total number of weeks of SPL available to you (specified in the notice of entitlement) and you have given at least eight weeks' notice.

You may submit up to three separate notifications for continuous periods of leave.

- **Discontinuous Leave Notifications**

A single notification may also contain a request for two or more periods of **discontinuous leave**, which means asking for a set number of weeks of leave over a period of time, with breaks between the leave where you return to duties (for example, an arrangement where you will take six weeks of SPL and return to duty every other week for a period of three months).

Where there is concern over accommodating the notification, either party may seek to arrange a meeting to discuss the notification with a view to agreeing an arrangement that meets both our needs (see “Discussions regarding Shared Parental Leave” above).

Your Bishop will consider a discontinuous leave notification but has the right to refuse it. If the leave pattern is refused, you can either withdraw it within 15 days of giving it, or can take the leave in a single continuous block.

3.8 RESPONDING TO A SHARED PARENTAL LEAVE NOTIFICATION

- **Continuous Leave Notification**

Your notice for continuous leave will be confirmed, in writing, by your Bishop, no later than the 14th day after the leave request was made.

- **Discontinuous Leave Notification**

All requests for discontinuous leave will be carefully considered, on a case-by-case basis, weighing up the potential benefits to both parties against any adverse impact to the Charge. Your Bishop will inform you, in writing of the decision, no later than the 14th day after the leave notification was made. The request may be granted in full or in part: for example, your Bishop may propose a modified version of the request. Agreeing to one request will not set a precedent or create the right for another Office Holder to be granted a similar pattern of SPL.

Where a discontinuous leave pattern is refused, you may withdraw the request without detriment on or before the 15th day after the notification was given; or may take the total number of weeks in the notice in a single continuous block. Should you choose to take the leave in a single continuous block, you have until the 19th day from the date the original notification was given to choose when you want the leave period to begin. The leave cannot start sooner than eight weeks from the date the original notification was submitted. Where you don't choose a start date, the leave will begin on the first leave date requested in the original notification.

3.9 VARIATIONS TO ARRANGED SHARED PARENTAL LEAVE

You are permitted to amend or cancel an agreed and booked period of SPL, provided you inform your Bishop, in writing, at least eight weeks before the date of any variation. A new start date cannot be sooner than eight weeks from the date of the variation request.

Any variation or cancellation notification you make, including notice to return to duty early, will usually count as a new notification reducing your right to book/vary leave by one. However, a change as a result of a child being born early or, as a result of your Bishop requesting the change and you being agreeable to the change, will not count as further notification. You will receive written confirmation of any variation from your Bishop.

3.10 STATUTORY SHARED PARENTAL PAY (ShPP)

You may (if you are eligible) be able to take up to 37 weeks ShPP while taking SPL. The amount of weeks available will depend on the amount by which the mother/adopter reduces their maternity/adoption pay period or maternity allowance period.

ShPP may be payable during some or all of SPL, depending on the length and timing of the leave.

In addition to meeting the eligibility requirements for SPL, you (if you are seeking to claim ShPP) must further satisfy each of the following criteria:

- the mother/adopter must be/have been entitled to statutory maternity/adoption pay or maternity allowance and must have reduced their maternity/adoption pay period or maternity allowance period;
- you must intend to care for the child during the week in which ShPP is payable;
- you must have average weekly earnings (for the period of eight weeks leading up to and including the 15th week before the child's expected due date/matching date) that are not less than the lower earnings limit in force for national insurance contributions;
- you must have continuous service until the first week of ShPP has begun;
- you must give proper notification in accordance with the rules set out below.

Where you are entitled to receive ShPP you must, at least eight weeks before receiving any ShPP, give your Bishop written notice advising of your entitlement to ShPP. To avoid duplication, if possible, this should be included as part of the 'Notice of Entitlement/Intention' to take SPL.

In addition to what must be included in the notice of 'Notice of Entitlement/Intention' to take SPL, any notice that advises of an entitlement for ShPP must include:

- the start and end dates of any maternity/adoption pay or maternity allowance.
- the total amount of ShPP available, the amount of ShPP you and your partner each intend to claim, and a non-binding indication of when you expect to claim ShPP.
- a signed declaration from you confirming that the information you have given is correct, that you meet, or will meet, the criteria for ShPP and that you will immediately inform us should you cease to be eligible.

It must be accompanied by a signed declaration from your partner confirming:

- their agreement to you claiming ShPP and for us to process any ShPP payments to you and, where the partner is the mother/adopter:
 - a) that they have reduced their maternity/adoption pay or maternity allowance.
 - b) that they will immediately inform you should they cease to satisfy the eligibility conditions.

Any ShPP due will be paid at a rate set by the Government for the relevant tax year.

3.11 TERMS and CONDITIONS DURING SHARED PARENTAL LEAVE

During the period of SPL, the terms of your service continue in force and you are entitled to receive all your benefit entitlement, except for stipend and your annual leave entitlement will continue to accrue.

The Church will continue to make your normal pension contributions during any period when you are receiving ShPP and during any period of SPL.

3.12 ANNUAL LEAVE

SPL is granted in addition to your normal annual holiday entitlement. You are reminded that annual leave should, wherever possible, be taken in the year that it is earned. Where an SPL period overlaps two leave years you should consider how your annual leave entitlement can be used to ensure that it is not untaken at the end of your holiday year.

3.13 CONTACT DURING SHARED PARENTAL LEAVE

Before your SPL begins your Vestry(ies) in consultation with the Bishop will discuss the arrangements for keeping in touch during your leave. The Church reserves the right, in any event, to maintain reasonable contact with you from time to time during your SPL. This may be to discuss your plans to return to duties, to discuss any special arrangements to be made or training to be given to ease your return to duties or simply to update you on developments during your period of leave.

3.14 SHARED PARENTAL LEAVE IN TOUCH DAYS

During SPL you and your Bishop will be able to agree up to 20 Shared Parental Leave In Touch (SPLIT) days. There is no obligation on the Church to offer these days or for you to agree to them. SPLIT days can be used in situations where both parties feel it would be beneficial for you to attend a ministry related activity, for example a training session or a meeting, or to attend to duties part of a week to affect a gradual return to duties by you towards the end of a long period of SPL or to trial a possible flexible working pattern without bringing your period of SPL to an end or impacting on your right to claim ShPP for that week.

You will receive full payment when you take an agreed SPLIT day or part of a day and, if the SPLIT day occurs during a week when you are receiving ShPP, this will be effectively 'topped up' so that you receive full stipend for the day in question. SPLIT days worked do not extend the period of SPL.

The 20 SPLIT days can be shared between the two parties sharing parental leave.

3.15 RETURNING to DUTIES AFTER SHARED PARENTAL LEAVE

Your Bishop will advise you, in writing, of the end date of any period of SPL. You are expected to return to duties on the day after this date, unless you notify him/her otherwise. Where you are unable to attend to your duties due to sickness or injury, the normal arrangements for sickness absence will apply. In any other case, late return, without prior, written consent will be treated as unauthorised absence.

Should you wish to return to duty earlier than the expected return date, you must provide your Bishop with a written notice to vary the leave, giving at least eight weeks' notice of your date of early return. This will count as one of your notifications. If you have already used your three notifications to book and/or vary leave, the notice to return early does not have to be accepted but may be if it is considered to be reasonably practicable to do so.

On returning to duty after SPL, you will return to the same post, if your aggregate total maternity/paternity/adoption leave and SPL amounts to 26 weeks or less, on the same terms of service as if you had not been absent. The same post is the one you occupied immediately before commencing maternity/paternity/adoption leave and the most recent period of SPL.

Where the maternity/paternity/adoption leave and SPL amounts to 26 weeks or more in aggregate, you are entitled to return to the same post you held before commencing the last period of leave.

Where you also take a period of unpaid parental leave of 4 weeks or less this will have no effect on your right to return and you will still return to the same post as you occupied before taking the last period of leave if the aggregate weeks of maternity/ paternity/adoption and SPL do not exceed 26 weeks.

Where you take a period of 5 weeks of unpaid parental leave, even if the total aggregate weeks of maternity/paternity/adoption and SPL do not exceed 26 weeks, you will be entitled to return to the same post you held before commencing the last period of leave.

3.16 SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES

In certain situations, your eligibility and requirements regarding SPL and ShPP may change. The Church will consider any statutory obligations in place at that time should this situation arise.

CLERGY HOUSING

This policy affects you if you are a full time stipendiary Office Holder moving to a new charge.

1. OVERVIEW

1.1 It is the general intention to provide housing for all stipendiary, parochial clergy. Indeed, Canon 17 requires every Rector or Priest-in-charge to reside in the house provided unless exempted from doing so for sufficient reason approved by the Bishop.

1.2 Only under exceptional circumstances where there is either no accommodation available, or where your Bishop has given prior written consent for you to make your own arrangements, will the charge provide you with an allowance to cover the cost of housing incurred. Separate guidance is available with regards to Housing Allowance.

1.3 There is no provincially prescribed housing allowance but the General Synod in 2001 endorsed the principles set out in this policy. These are provided by way of assistance to you and your Vestry(ies) in situations where a housing allowance is to be agreed.

2. THE ROLE OF VESTRIES

2.1 Vestries will be fully involved in discussions with you in connection with all aspects of your move e.g. décor, family requirements, etc.

3. STANDARDS OF HOUSING

3.1 Where housing is provided, Vestries are expected to maintain buildings properly. Canon 60.2 states that, with the Rector or Priest-in-Charge, unless the charge constitution provides otherwise, the Vestry(ies) has care of the Rectory and must see to its safe maintenance and insurance.

3.2 The Provincial Administration Board has, under paragraph 6.4 of the Digest of Resolutions, adopted guidelines for minimum standards for clergy housing, upon the recommendation of the Buildings Committee. These can be found in the Vestry Resources section of the Church's website at Minimum Standards for Clergy Housing.

3.3 The Rector or Priest-in-Charge is responsible for ensuring that an acceptable standard of cleanliness is maintained while living there and the property is cleared of all possessions and inspected by the Vestry on the day of vacating.

3.4 It is good practice for the Vestry to inspect the property annually.

4. RELOCATION EXPENSES

4.1 Where clergy move from one charge to another, removal expenses are the responsibility of the Vestry(ies) of the charge to which clergy are moving. Vestries should ensure that the individual is not left out of pocket.

4.2 It is recommended that it be made clear, in situations where a prospective appointee may come from abroad, that the vestry could not be expected to be responsible for overseas removal costs.

5. COUNCIL TAX

5.1 The Vestry(ies) are responsible for the payment of Council Tax for its cleric's official residence (paragraph 6.5.1, Digest of Resolutions).

- A charge should not be financially disadvantaged by the Bishop's agreement to allow you to provide your own accommodation.

RETIREMENT POLICY

1. OVERVIEW

1.1 The policy referred to below affects you if you are a full time or part time stipendiary Office Holder retiring from your stipendiary appointment.

1.2 The Church recognises the importance of supporting you to achieve a balance between your duties and home life, not just during your appointment but also in planning the transition to your retirement at a time and pace which suits you.

1.3 This section aims to provide guidance for you and your Vestry(ries)/Bishop so that you are aware of the relevant provisions and help you make choices about the way in which you wish to retire and your eventual retirement.

2. PROCEDURE

2.1 To maintain the spirit of good practice, this policy will be applied transparently and consistently.

2.2 The procedure for Retirement by Stipendiary office holders is set out in (Canon 62). In general clergy cannot hold stipendiary office beyond the age of 70 but Canon 62 provides for some possibility for extension and also makes provision for those who remain in a post which they held on 15th July 1991.

3. THE ROLE OF VESTRIES

3.1 The Vestry(ries) will be involved in discussions prior to your retirement to ensure a smooth transition from your appointment, in order to maintain ministerial duties during and after your transition to retirement.

4. RETIREMENT AGE

4.1 At present, the retirement age from stipendiary appointments is 70 years of age (Canon 62.1).

5. PENSION FUND

5.1 The Pension Fund is administered from the General Synod Office.

5.2 A booklet is published by the Pension Fund and is made available to you on taking up your first appointment in the Province and joining the scheme.

6. RETIREMENT HOUSING

6.1 In limited circumstances the Retirement Housing Fund administered from the General Synod Office is able to provide assistance with the provision of retirement housing for clergy with at least 10 years' stipendiary service in the Scottish Episcopal Church.

7. DISCUSSIONS REGARDING YOUR RETIREMENT

7.1 Planning for retirement can take some time and you are encouraged to contact your Bishop to arrange an informal discussion as early as possible regarding your retirement. This discussion will allow you to talk about your plans, including plans to continue involvement in vocational work (if relevant) and enable you to be supported if you are considering/taking retirement.

7.2 You should contact the Pensions and Retirement Housing Officer in the General Synod Office at least 3-6 months prior to your planned retirement to discuss the pensions options available to you. If you think that you may require assistance with housing such contact should be made at least a year in advance of your anticipated retirement.

8. EARLY RETIREMENT

8.1 Full pensions are available from age 67. Early retirement, with the Church's consent, may be possible in certain circumstances from age 55 but will involve a reduction in pension entitlement. You should contact the Pensions Officer should you wish to consider early retirement options.

8.2 Early retirement on ill-health grounds is available at any age without any reduction in pension entitlement. You should contact the Pensions Officer if you think you might be eligible to retire early due to ill-health.

9. VOCATIONAL INVOLVEMENT BEYOND RETIREMENT

9.1 Your continued involvement in vocational work within the Church after retirement is a matter for the Bishop in the diocese where the proposed work is to take place. However, it would not be considered appropriate for you to continue an involvement with a congregation in which you ministered at the time of retirement. Further details relating to this can be found within the produced Guidance and Procedures for Bishops and Retired Clergy. (Link to be added). The rules relating to early retirement on ill-health grounds may limit your ability to be involved in vocational work after retirement.

Scottish Episcopal Church

Clergy Expenses

April 2018

Contents

Introduction	98
General notes	98
Definition of expenses	99
Claims for reimbursement	104
Vestry accounts	105
Expenses incurred in secondary appointments	105
Capital items	105
Non-stipendiary ministers and retired clergy	106
Personal expenditure	106
Relocation Expenses	106
Taxation	107
Conclusion	108
Index	108

Introduction

1. These are guidelines to clergy and Vestry Treasurers about the reimbursement of expenses. It is written primarily with stipendiary clergy in mind but most of it is equally applicable to other clergy, deacons, lay readers, leaders and workers. These notes, suitably amended, may also be of use to Dioceses, Cathedral Chapters and other bodies.
2. The Administration Board sets the Standard Stipend each year. Expenses also form part of a cleric's remuneration and it is expected that expenses are reimbursed in full. Vestries should be committed to reimbursing clergy expenses in full.
3. It is hoped that this booklet/online guide will help clergy and Vestries to make further improvements in this area. Although we have tried to provide for most situations, it is impossible to produce a standard formula applicable to all clergy in ministry; many different factors help determine each expense claim and the level of reimbursement achieved, but, if these are examined carefully, it should be possible, with mutual understanding between priest and congregation, to ensure full reimbursement.
4. When clergy serve more than one congregation or are in a dual role post with other responsibility, it is vital that all the Vestries and other bodies involved come to a mutually agreed method of meeting expenses.

General notes

5. Vestries should ensure prompt reimbursement of actual expenses incurred which should be accompanied by evidence.
6. It is essential that clergy regularly discuss with their Vestries or charge Treasurers the true costs of all expenses as they occur and come to an agreement on how to meet them in the particular circumstances of the congregation. It may be helpful to consult the Diocesan Treasurer where there are questions or concerns.
7. When purchasing goods or services for which reimbursement is to be sought from the Vestry, clergy should check that the proposed purchase meets with the Vestry's approval before proceeding with the purchase.
8. Clergy should avoid paying for items that are truly the charge's liability and then seeking reimbursement, as this can cause complications to their personal taxation affairs. Items that would come under this heading might be: printing the parish magazine, repairs to or cleaning of church buildings, altar requisites, payments to organists and vergers. Vestries should make their own arrangements to meet such bills direct.

9. If all properly chargeable expenses are fully reimbursed, there will be no grounds on which to make a valid claim for a tax allowance. The taxation implications of expenses are considered later in this guideline.
10. As a matter of good practice, clergy should retain all invoices and receipts relating to their expenses. Where this is not possible, they should retain a written record of the cost they have incurred and the basis on which it is calculated. These records should be made available to the Vestry Treasurer as required. The records will also prove invaluable if either the Vestry or cleric becomes the subject of an HM Revenue & Customs or OSCR (Scottish Charities Regulator) investigation.

Definition of expenses

11. Charge expenses may be defined as all those running costs which clergy and Vestries agree are necessary for clergy to fulfil the duties of their post.
12. The costs of heating, lighting, cleaning and garden upkeep at the official house (Rectory) – including payments under this heading to a spouse or member of the family – are running costs and are not normally to be treated as charge expenses chargeable to the Vestry, as other rules apply to them (referred to below). A proportion (usually not more than 25%) of the heating, lighting, cleaning and garden upkeep expenses, if borne by the cleric, can be offset against his/her tax in the cleric's tax return. See a clergy tax advisor for more guidance.
13. Details of how to account for these costs can be obtained from the Diocesan Treasurer.

If a Vestry makes a contribution to the cost of heating, lighting, cleaning and garden upkeep at the Rectory, the Vestry must consider the reporting requirements set out in paragraph 62. Council Tax and water charges are also handled separately.

14. The properly reimbursable charge expenses of clergy that are wholly, exclusively and necessarily incurred in the performance of duties, include the following:
 - postage; stationery; telephone (including answering machine), broadband
 - administrative or secretarial assistance
 - repair and maintenance of vestments worn in conduct of church services
 - provision of locum
 - travelling expenses, including related subsistence expenses.
 - books purchased for use in the conduct of services or preparation of services

- provision of reasonable entertainment on official occasions to visiting ministers, officers of the church or members of church organisations.
 - Communion expenses, for example supply of wine.
15. Other items that might, under certain conditions, be included are, repair/replacement of carpets, chairs and other furnishings in the official part of the house, and in-service training. The paragraphs that follow give some guidance on how items in each of these categories might best be treated.

Postage and Stationery

16. Expenditure on these items is relatively easy to assess in full by use of a post book or by keeping empty stamp books as receipts, and by retaining receipts (or invoices) for any stationery. In some larger charges, the expenses can be charged direct to the Vestry.

Telephone and Internet Access

16. This is adapted from Churches' Legal Advisory Service Guide, 2009, http://www.churcheslegislation.org.uk/files/publications/CLAS_TAXATION_OF_MINISTERS_OF_RELIGION.doc
17. The cost of telephone calls and in addition, the provision of a telephone and the payment by the church of any related rentals, will not give rise to a taxable benefit, provided the church is the registered subscriber and the minister bears or reimburses the cost of personal calls.
18. The current HMRC Guidance makes it clear that there is no charge to tax on a single mobile phone provided to a minister or on any line rentals paid in respect of that phone which is paid by the church. Whether or not the phone is provided by the employer (or church in our case), accounting for use is extremely complicated. The only sure course is to retain all itemised bills.

Equipment such as a smartphone, which combines a mobile phone with access to email and the Internet, is not a mobile phone for the purposes of the mobile phone exemption. But if a smartphone is provided to an employee (cleric in our case) solely for business use and any private use is insignificant, it will be exempt in the same way as a mobile phone provided in the same circumstances.

19. If the church pays for an Internet connection to the rectory under a package where there is no separate billing or record of access calls, and no breakdown is possible between work and private usage, it is accepted that where private use is not significant and does not affect the cost of the package, the costs of connection are exempt from tax. However, where the minister pays for an inclusive Internet package with unlimited access and no separate billing procedures s/he will not be able to identify any specific part of the cost as

relating to business use and, as a result, no deduction will be due because there can be no identifiable cost that is wholly and exclusively to business use.

See Paragraphs 48 and 49 for advice about the purchase of computer equipment.

Administrative assistance

20. Where someone has been appointed to give administrative and/or secretarial assistance to the clergy, the Vestry should determine his/her terms of service (including the number of hours to be worked) and be the 'employer'. The Vestry should pay the employee direct.

Maintenance of Vestments

21. Clergy will generally have their own cassocks, surplices, albs etc. These together with suits and shoes are tax allowable as they are necessary for duties.
22. The charge is responsible for the provision of vestments which the clergy should be encouraged to make use of. Any costs of cleaning and repairing vestments should be the responsibility of the Vestry.

Hospitality

23. Clergy and Vestries need to come to their own arrangements about hospitality expenses. Reasonable costs should be reimbursed when clergy have to entertain visiting clergy, officers of the church, or members of the church on official occasions. HM Revenue & Customs advise that hospitality for official - but not social - functions qualifies for tax relief.

Locum

24. Fees for a locum should be the responsibility of the Vestry. Diocesan Office should be contacted for details.

Travelling

General

25. Before the true cost of travel can be assessed, it is necessary to be clear which journeys are 'official' and thus chargeable to expenses. A general starting point is to say that they include all journeys to and from:
 - parishioners and churches in the care of the cleric;
 - church meetings within the parish, diocese and Province where such expenses are not the responsibility of the diocese or the Province;

- public cemeteries and crematoria (unless separate provision is made for these journeys by the funeral director);
 - hospitals for the purpose of visiting sick parishioners;
 - suppliers of robes, communion bread and wine, ecclesiastical books etc;
 - approved training courses, Continuing Ministerial Development courses, visits to Spiritual Director. If the Spiritual Director is some distance from the charge, the cleric and Vestry should discuss this at outset. The Vestry should where possible take a generous view.
26. A number of official journeys undertaken will include an element of private and family use. In most cases, it should only be necessary to define the principal purpose of the journey and include it or exclude it from expenses as appropriate. This should ensure an equitable charge on the pockets of both charge and clergy. Charges should be encouraged to take a reasonably generous view if there is any doubt or difficulty over deciding between private and official journeys.
27. Where clergy live outside their parish, with the permission of the diocesan bishop, it would be fair to expect the Vestry to pay reasonable travelling expenses to and from the charge. This is a matter where there needs to be agreement between the cleric and the Vestry. The diocesan treasurer's advice should be sought, as there may be an agreement at the time of the appointment and the diocese may accept responsibility for such payment. However, the expenses of travelling between the charge and home would not generally be allowable for tax relief.
28. Travel between charges in a multiple charge setting – the cleric's 'normal place of work' is the rectory – so all journeys should be calculated from there. So, e.g. travelling to another town in a linked charge is an official journey,

Public Transport

29. Where public transport is used for any official journey, reimbursement should be made in full for the fares paid. For long distance journeys, agreement should be reached beforehand on which body is the appropriate one from which to seek reimbursement. Agreement should also be obtained on the appropriate method of transport to be used.

Car

29. Where clergy use their own cars for official purposes, it is a legal requirement for them to keep a log of journeys undertaken so that they can correctly apportion the costs between private use and official use. Where they 'wear several hats', it is essential for all journeys to be logged, so that the expense incurred can be properly claimed from the appropriate body. However, in many cases, this log can be fairly simple – a note of mileage at the beginning of each week and a separate note of all official journeys. (sample mileage log attached)

Responsibility for the reimbursement of the costs of charge use falls to the Vestry. Reimbursement of Diocesan and Provincial business falls to the respective body.

30. The simplest way to reimburse motoring costs is to use a mileage rate.
31. Each year, HM Revenue & Customs publish Approved Mileage Allowance Payments (AMAP). Any reimbursement which is in accordance with these rates may be paid tax-free. Where a rate lower than AMAP is paid, tax relief is available up to the level of the AMAP.

Where a rate higher than the AMAP is paid, the excess will be taxable. For this reason, the Scottish Episcopal Church uses the HMRC rate for reimbursement.

32. Mileage rates and AMAPs cover all running costs (e.g. depreciation, maintenance, road tax, loan interest, insurance etc) but do not cover external costs such as parking, congestion charges and road tolls. The actual cost of these should be reimbursed separately. However, any fines arising from road traffic offences or parking fines incurred whilst using the car on official business will be the personal responsibility of the individual member of the clergy and should not be included in any expenses claim.
33. A very few Vestries will be able to provide an official car, and no problems need arise, provided that there is an absolute ban on use for private purposes. If, however, the car thus provided is available for private purposes, clergy will incur a tax liability on the benefit of the car. They should also make arrangements to pay the Vestry an appropriate rate for such use. Vestries should also be aware that they will be liable for Class 1A National Insurance in respect of providing a car.
34. In most cases, the car will be provided by the clergy themselves, with or without the help of a loan. (Churches Mutual Credit Union may provide loans to clergy for this purpose.)
35. Where a journey involves being away from home for a significant time, the additional cost of meals and accommodation thereby incurred should be claimed from the body/organisation that required the journey to be made.

Books

36. A Vestry might reasonably expect to pay for one of the Church weekly newspapers and, possibly, a regular order for one of the theological journals. Over and above this, clergy should be reimbursed for the cost of books considered necessary to assist them in their pastoral and teaching ministries. Tax relief will only be allowed on the cost of books actually used in the conduct of services or the preparation of sermons, as well as books given out to engaged couples, confirmation candidates and bible classes, etc. where clergy have paid for them themselves. Clergy may be able to claim capital tax

allowances in respect of substantial reference books that are likely to have a long useful life.

37. The purchase of the Scottish Episcopal Directory (Red Book) is a legitimate working expense and should be reimbursed.

Upkeep of the rectory

38. Maintenance of the Rectory building is the responsibility of the Vestry and a quinquennial report is mandatory. Repairs to fixtures and fittings, for example bathroom or kitchen fittings or repainting a room, are also the responsibility of the Vestry and should normally be agreed by and paid by the Vestry.
39. If a church bears the cost of any internal decoration or repairs, other than ingoing redecoration and ongoing repairs and maintenance of landlord's fixtures and fittings (such as electric, gas, water and central heating installations, fitted kitchens and bathrooms etc.), a benefit will arise which will be both taxable and chargeable to Class 1A Employer NIC's. The cost (less any amount made good by the cleric) must be shown on a P11D form.

Payments to spouse or relative

40. To justify payment of a spouse or member of the family to HM Revenue & Customs, the amount must be reasonable for the duties performed (i.e. it should be related to, though not necessarily equal to, rates that would be payable to an employee), and the duties performed should clearly be beyond the usual call of a relative. Evidence should also be available, if requested by HMRC, that the spouse or relative has received payment (for example on their tax return).

In-service training, retreats and Continuing Ministerial Development

41. Dioceses generally make central provision for the cost of attending approved training courses. Nonetheless, individual clergy may well feel the need, after discussion with an adviser or the bishop, to attend a particular course, training seminar, or retreat. Vestries should be prepared to meet the cost of any bona fide fee and expenses

Claims for reimbursement

42. Experience shows that full reimbursement of expenses is less common when a claim form is not used. This implies that charges are more willing to reimburse expenses if clergy use a form. (sample claim form attached)
43. Where clergy serve two or more charges, it is essential that agreement be reached as to the proportion of expenses to be borne by each charge. Advice can be sought from the Diocesan Treasurer.

44. Some clergy feel that the Vestry should not be asked to reimburse the full cost of all their expenses, making the balance their own personal contribution to Vestry funds. If clergy wish to make a contribution to charge funds in this way, it is usually best for clergy to claim and be reimbursed for the full cost and then to make a payment to the Vestry via Gift Aid. It is far better for the Vestry to know the full cost of expenses its clergy are incurring, even if it cannot meet the total bill. Unless expenses are claimed from the Vestry (even if the Vestry is not in a position to reimburse them), the expenditure does not qualify for tax relief. At least in this way the situation is open for all to see, including any potential successor. Full declaration also avoids misunderstandings arising from the use of different figures on returns to the diocese and HMRC. Donating money back via Gift Aid or Payroll Giving is also more tax efficient than simply not claiming for expenses.
45. If clergy find for any reason that the Vestry is unable or unwilling to reimburse their legitimate expenses, they should consult their Diocesan Treasurer or their Bishop at the earliest opportunity.

Vestry accounts

46. Charge accounts are required by law to disclose expenses paid to all trustees. The Rector/Priest in Charge is a trustee of the charge, so all reimbursed expenses must be disclosed. All payments made directly to clergy in reimbursement of expenses incurred, together with all payments made on their behalf, should be shown in the charge accounts as 'clergy expenses'.

Expenses incurred in secondary appointments

47. Certain clergy hold chaplaincies (or similar posts, e.g. teaching) in addition to their charge appointments, and it is sometimes felt by them and their Vestries that expenses incurred on such duties are not a proper charge on the Vestry. This may indeed be the case, and clergy should consider this at outset. Vestries could be encouraged to take a more generous view and perhaps see it as part of their total ministry to the area. If the hospital, school or other institution or organisation will not meet the expenses, Vestries and clergy should bear in mind two things before agreeing that such costs should not fall on the Vestry. First, in cases where clergy receive an honorarium, this may be inadequate to cover all the expenses incurred. Secondly, it is possible that the clergy will not be able successfully to claim all such expenses for tax purposes.

Capital items

48. Anyone providing administrative assistance should be able to make recommendations direct to the Vestry about the purchase of equipment which should remain the property of the Vestry. The Vestry is then directly responsible for the equipment's maintenance.
49. Where clergy receive no direct administrative assistance, different considerations should apply. Where appropriate, the Vestry should provide and

retain ownership of suitable office equipment, such as a filing cabinet, computer and photocopier, etc. Where the clergy have purchased such equipment for themselves which they use for charge work, it is necessary to come to an agreement as to the proportion of its use applicable to the charge (in most cases this will be nearly 100%) and the equipment's likely life span (no more than 5 years for computer equipment; up to 10 years for other equipment) over which its value can be written off. The annual value written off then becomes a Vestry charge for expenses in addition to reimbursement for service and repair charges.

Non-stipendiary ministers and retired clergy

50. It is important that charges take positive steps to ensure that all those giving assistance on whatever basis are fully reimbursed for all the expenses they have incurred. These include non-stipendiary ministers, retired clergy and readers. If non-stipendiary ministers, retired clergy, or readers are reimbursed by the Vestry, the reimbursement will be not taxable. However, if the expense is not reimbursed, a tax deduction cannot be claimed against pension or other income as tax relief is only allowed against earnings as a minister of religion.

Personal expenditure

51. It is not always easy to separate official from private expenses and clergy will need to exercise an element of judgement in assessing what is reasonable. There will always be some personal items of expenditure which include an element that is related in some way either to the job or the rectory; the two most obvious examples are 'hospitality' and 'car running'.
52. Another item which is not a 'Vestry expense' but may also give cause for concern is insurance of home contents. Items owned by the Vestry but situated in the home are the responsibility of the Vestry to maintain and insure. Beyond that, it is generally reasonable to regard 25% of the cost of contents insurance as an expense.
53. Where clergy reside in a 'high risk' area, they may find that annual premiums are higher than they feel that they should reasonably be expected to bear personally. Under such circumstances, they should first discuss with professional insurers an adequate, but realistic, level of cover; for example, it is not usually essential to have all household items included in an 'all-risks' clause. Once the correct level of cover has been ascertained, further discussions might usefully take place with the diocesan authorities. Details of the Ecclesiastical Insurance Group's insurance schemes are available direct from the EIG, Beaufort House, Brunswick Road, Gloucester GL1 1JZ (www.ecclesiastical.com tel. 0845 777 3322).

Relocation Expenses

54. Normally when a priest moves to a new charge, the Vestry is responsible for the costs of relocation.

55. The Vestry should discuss the costs of relocation and how it will be funded with the Diocesan Treasurer before appointment.
56. Subject to certain conditions laid down by HMRC (link to HMRC publications) some relocation costs up to £8,000 are exempt from reporting and paying tax and National Insurance. These are qualifying costs and include moving costs and buying certain things for a new home.
57. For the costs to be qualifying costs the priest must be moving area and beginning a new ministry and the costs need to be paid before the end of the tax year after the one in which the move took place.
58. Receipts should be kept for all expenses and submitted to the Vestry. It is expected that three quotations will be sought for the removal.
59. Qualifying costs over £8,000 and non-qualifying benefits must be reported to HMRC on a P11D form and Class 1A National Insurance paid.
60. Any queries should be raised with HMRC directly.

Taxation

Class 1a National Insurance

61. The reimbursement of charge expenses does not normally attract any liability for national insurance. However, where a Vestry provides a taxable benefit in kind (e.g. a car, car fuel, or other asset available for personal use), it is liable for class 1A National Insurance. This is an annual charge on the provider of the benefit. The Vestry should notify HM Revenue & Customs. (Link to HMRC publications)

62. Self-Assessment: Vestries' responsibilities

Vestries are under the following legal obligations:

- i) When expenses (other than those wholly, exclusively and necessarily incurred in the performance of duties) are paid to clergy written confirmation of the amount(s) paid must be provided to them. 'Expenses' includes both reimbursements directly to clergy, and the payment of bills on their behalf.
- ii) If benefits are provided to clergy, written confirmation of the 'cash equivalent' of these benefits must be given. 'Benefits' includes providing a car and/or petrol, payments towards heating, lighting, cleaning and gardening at an official house, and any loans (for work purposes) at a concessionary rate of interest.
- iii) For both expenses and benefits, the choice of when and how to provide this information (for example each time they are paid, or as a grand total at the end of the year) belongs to the Vestry but it must be in writing and it must not be later than 6 July each year.

63. The Vestry does not need to make any Returns to HMRC.
64. HM Revenue & Customs' publication *Expenses and Benefits – A Tax Guide* (Booklet 480 2017) ([link](#)) explains in more detail what constitutes an expense or benefit and how to calculate cash equivalents. It is available in booklet form from any HM Revenue & Customs office.

Self-Assessment: clergy responsibilities

65. The SEC's system of paying stipends and expenses is structured to make full use of the concessions available in tax law. Consequently, it is usually necessary for clergy to complete a tax return each year. Clergy must therefore keep adequate records of all income and expenses relating to their work. Anyone who makes payments to the clergy in connection with their work is under an obligation to give written confirmation of the amounts involved. Clergy generally find it helpful to have an Adviser.
66. The substantive document on this subject is the Churches' Legislation Advisory Service circular entitled *The Taxation of Ministers of Religion: a rough guide* produced in 2009. This can be found at www.churcheslegislation.org.uk/publications

Conclusion

67. It is the responsibility of clergy to submit regular claims, the joint responsibility of clergy and their Vestries to discuss regularly the level and method of reimbursement and the responsibility of Vestries to meet the agreed cost.
68. It is hoped that this booklet/online guide has given a degree of constructive and practical advice which will enable everyone involved to look more realistically at the level of expenses claimed and the manner in which full reimbursement can be made. The essential objective is to ensure that no one who ministers on behalf of the Church should be left to find any part of his/her proper expenses out of his/her own pocket.

Index

The numbers refer to paragraphs

Attachments include sample mileage log and sample expense claim form (to follow)

ALTERATIONS TO THE CODE OF CANONS

VOTING PROCEDURES – AN EXPLANATORY NOTE

The alteration of a Canon contained in the Code of Canons requires two “readings” in successive years at the General Synod. The voting procedure on each reading is different. An alteration, for these purposes, includes any modification or abrogation of any Canon, any addition to a Canon and the enacting of any new Canon. The process is set out in Canon 52, Section 17.

Canons for First Reading

A first reading requires a simple majority of the members of each house of Synod, present and voting. Voting is, therefore, in houses.

Canons for Second Reading

A second reading requires a two-thirds majority of the members of each house of Synod, present and voting. (Again, therefore, voting is in houses.) Before confirming any alterations at a second reading, the Synod must consider any opinions received from Diocesan Synods.

On a second reading, amendments may be incorporated provided they are not, in the judgement of the chair, irrelevant to, beyond the scope of or inconsistent with the general subject-matter and purport of the Canon as put to Diocesan Synods after the first reading. Such amendments must themselves receive a two-thirds majority.

Also, no amendment may be moved on a second reading which, in the judgement of the chair, does not substantially reflect an opinion communicated by a Diocesan Synod or is not merely a verbal or drafting amendment unless due notice has been given or the Chair grants leave to dispense with notice. Due notice, for this purpose, means that notice must have been received by the time limit stipulated for the receipt of resolutions when the notice convening the Synod is despatched (Canon 52, Resolution 10).

John F Stuart
Secretary General

CANON 35

PROPOSED ALTERATION

Canon 35 applies to any changes to structure, furniture or ornaments etc, as well as redecoration or alteration to heating and lighting etc. in 'Any Church used for Public Worship'. It thus has a wider scope than just the buildings that fall within the remit of the 'ecclesiastical exemption', which only refers to the interiors of Listed Buildings.

Most Scottish Episcopal Churches have some sort of curtilage round them, and in many rural parishes this probably includes a graveyard, defined by a surrounding wall and fence, too. Often the setting of a church building, or its relation to other buildings, is part of its architectural importance, and the listing of a church building sometimes specifically includes its curtilage, or churchyard, but there are non-listed buildings/churchyards where the setting is important and enhances the environment.

At present there is some confusion as to what is included under the terms of Canon 35. The Canon does not currently make any reference to church curtilages. Consequently, for example, whereas the addition of an external ramp abutting the church building would be regarded as falling within the current Canon 35 (because it forms part of the church structure), the tarmacking of part of the church grounds to create a car park might not (there is some ambiguity in cases where the listing of the church includes the curtilage). The Buildings Committee is of the view that the inclusion of church curtilages within the scope of Canon 35 would help to bring clarity.

The Committee accepts, however, that some changes to the surroundings of a church ought not to require Canon 35 approval. The Canon already provides for an exemption from the Canon for "minor works", as defined in a list determined by the Buildings Committee. The Committee would intend to expand that list if the Canon is changed to include curtilages. Set out in the appendix below is a revised "Minor Works" list showing the additions which the Buildings Committee would propose to include within the scope of the exemption.

The proposed alteration to Canon 35 is set out in a separate paper and a motion for a first reading of that canonical change is included in the Synod agenda.

Rebecca Cadie
Convener, Buildings Committee
March 2018

Appendix

Draft list of minor works under Canon 35 which the Buildings Committee would intend to adopt to replace the existing list if the alteration to Canon 35 to include curtilages is accepted

The text to be deleted is scored through and the text to be inserted is shown in italics.

The following is a list of minor works identified by the Provincial Buildings Committee as referred to in Canon 35, Section 1. *Items are included on the list only in the event that they do not require planning permission. Where any matter does require planning permission it is not to be regarded as a minor work exempted from the scope of Canon 35.*

A. Furniture and Fixtures

1. Decorative banners (*in the church or curtilage*) used for displays not lasting more than three months.
2. Fire Extinguishers (subject to the recommendation of the local Fire Officer as to location).
3. Introduction of movable bookcases or display stands.

B. Items of Work/Maintenance

1. Works of routine maintenance on the fabric of the church *or in the curtilage of the church* not involving demolition or additions of any sort, except where in the opinion of the Diocesan Buildings Committee they will result in a material alteration either externally or internally to the appearance of the church or affect its setting. This permitted work includes, for example, the replacement like-for-like of broken roof tiles or slates, clear, stained, painted or coloured window glass, the re-surfacing like-for-like of an existing path, the cleaning of gutters and down pipes.
2. Works of maintenance, repair and minor alterations to existing heating systems and electrical equipment and fittings which do not alter the appearance of the exterior or interior of the building (and for the avoidance of doubt this permission does not include alterations to light fittings).
3. Modification to an existing, or installation of a new, heating system for the church building which does not involve disruption to the fabric or any alterations to the appearance of the exterior or interior of the building (the introduction of new radiators are regarded as alterations to the appearance of the interior for this purpose).
4. Installation of a certified loop system for the hard of hearing (but if the system requires placement of loudspeakers approval must be sought).

5. External or internal decoration or redecoration (but only in the same colour scheme as the existing decoration) and replacement of carpets and curtains in the same colour as existing.

C. *Items in the Curtilage of a Church*

1. *The erection of fencing.*
2. *The erection of signage.*
3. *The installation of portable garden items such as benches, planters, solar lights.*
4. *General gardening but not the planting of new trees nor the creation of a new memorial garden.*
5. *The creation of new drainage or service trenches.*
6. *The erection of gravestones.*
7. *The erection of a storage shed.*
8. *The interiors of detached halls or detached rectories within the curtilage of the church.*

CANON THIRTY-FIVE

OF THE STRUCTURE, FURNITURE AND MONUMENTS OF CHURCHES, AND THE DUE CARE THEREOF

The current text of Canon 35 is set out below for information. The text to be deleted is scored through and the text to be inserted is shown in italics.

1. With the exception of minor works identified by the Provincial Buildings Committee, no change (whether by introduction, alteration or removal) shall be made in the structure, ecclesiastical furniture or ornaments, monuments, mural tablets or ~~painte~~ *stained* windows of any Church used for public worship *or within the curtilage thereof*, nor shall any scheme of redecoration or any alteration of lighting or heating system be undertaken unless the Vestry of the same with the consent of the Rector shall have obtained the approval in writing of the Bishop and of the Diocesan Buildings Committee; provided always that such approval does not violate any restrictions contained in the Constitution or titles of the Church. Subject to the Constitution or titles of the Church, a Vestry or twenty per cent of the members of the Communicants' Roll, as defined in Canon 41, Section 2, of the charge concerned shall have a right of appeal against the decision of the Diocesan Buildings Committee or of the Bishop to the Provincial Buildings Committee. Notwithstanding the above, the Vestry with the consent of the Rector, may undertake re-ordering of the ecclesiastical furniture or ornaments of the Church for an experimental period.
2. None of the holy vessels or ecclesiastical furniture or ornaments of any church shall be sold, exchanged, or otherwise disposed of without the written consent of the Bishop, Dean, and Registrar of the Diocese.
3. The Vestry with the Rector shall cause all proper and reasonable care to be taken of the places of worship within its charge, *including the curtilage thereof*, and of the furniture and ornaments thereof, and shall use every endeavour to keep them decent, clean, and in good repair. The Vestry shall make provision for the adequate protection and insurance of all Church fabric and property.
4. No church that is consecrated or set apart for public worship shall be used for any purpose not religious or ecclesiastical without the consent of the Bishop.

Information and Communications – Governance and Structure

This paper proposes a new arrangement in the governance and implementation of communications at Provincial level of the Church.

The ways in which people communicate have developed significantly, not least in the use of social media and the demand for 24 hour communications and sharing of information. This, aligned with the international stage that the Scottish Episcopal Church (SEC) has been placed on over recent years, requires the Church to ensure it is fully equipped to respond to new and increasing demands in communication. The change in the Communications Officer's role to that of Director of Communications was the first stage in recognising a need to create a more professionalised approach in the way the Church manages its communications. It also altered the role of the Information & Communication (I&C) Board in relationship to the Director who now takes the lead in identifying and implementing the Church's communications priorities, rather than the reverse role of Officer supporting the Board. The appointment of a part-time Digital Communications Co-ordinator, reporting to and working with the Director of Communications, provides the basis for the SEC to increase its digital and social media presence and the development of a growing online community.

The current climate in which we operate demands that communications be supported by appropriately qualified and experienced people. A Board appointed to meet a requirement for diocesan representation cannot be guaranteed to provide an adequate mechanism of support or skills to meet this demand.

In recognising that in its current format it is not best placed to adequately support the increasing priorities and pressures of internal and external communications, the I&C Board carried out a review and resolved that:

- A Communications Strategy be presented to General Synod 2018, in consultation with the College of Bishops and Standing Committee.
- The two-year process to dissolve the I&C Board commence at General Synod 2018.
- Prior to its dissolution, the I&C Board continue to work with the Director of Communications in identifying potential projects and specific tasks and appoint appropriate people to work on various short-term projects when required (eg production of marketing material and website review); this could be carried out either by some current Board members or other people across the Province with relevant and required skills, expertise and experience.
- The Director of Communications attend meetings of the College of Bishops and Standing Committee to report on communications and to discuss any amendments in implementing the Communications Strategy and addressing changing priorities and demands.

Dissolution of the I&C Board would mean that governance in relation to communication matters would fall under the oversight of the Standing Committee. The Director of Communications would be accountable to the Standing Committee, under the direct line management of the Secretary General. This new structure of governance would have a number of benefits. In particular it would allow:

1. Decisions relating to communications to be more streamlined and taken more quickly - by people with particular awareness of what impact such decisions might have on the SEC more widely (ie the Standing Committee) and who have the

experience and authority to deliver governance as a whole. To an extent part of this already happens as strategic I&C decisions require to be made by the Standing Committee; therefore the Director of Communications working directly with the Standing Committee, rather than I&C Board, would remove an unnecessary level or layer of duplication.

2. A more direct and efficient delivery of internal communications and sharing of information and discussion of priorities, given membership of the Standing Committee is representative of all boards and committees of the General Synod of the SEC.
3. The appointment by Standing Committee of relevant people to work on various short-term projects and specific operations, alongside the Director of Communications, when required.
4. Auditing of the communications budget (possibly carried out by a nominated individual on Standing Committee, liaising with the Director of Communications) and addressing and scrutinising specific matters relating to budget.
5. Enhanced ability to manage the risk of reputational damage to the SEC, which requires great skill and clear accountability. Standing Committee is well placed to provide oversight in this area to the Director of Communications, as it is Standing Committee that has the overall responsibility for provincial risk assessment and good governance.

At each meeting of the Standing Committee, the Director of Communications would present a forward month by month plan of communications activity and a review of its delivery and measurement thereafter, and be held to account in how this reflects the Communications Strategy and the SEC's priorities, as identified by the Boards and Committees of the General Synod of the SEC.

The change in structure of communications within the SEC would mean that opportunities and issues relating to a range of matters could be considered, managed, and implemented more swiftly in consultation with those appointed to represent the wider church, and its governance, rather than those appointed only on a diocesan representation basis. However, dissolving the I&C Board and the consequent loss of diocesan representation would not mean that there would be no contact between province and dioceses in the area of communications. The Director of Communications would continue to have regular contact with each of the diocesan bishops and diocesan offices who would be able to feed directly into the relevant diocesan structures issues for consideration, consultation or action as appropriate. It is the intention of the Communications team to host occasional workshops on aspects of communications which relevant people from across dioceses could attend.

Following dissolution of the I&C Board (in June 2019, after a canonical second reading) for the purposes of governance, an annual report of what the Communications team achieves throughout the year would be produced by the Director of Communications and this would form part of the Standing Committee's report to General Synod each year.

***The Rev Philip Blackledge
Vice-Convener, Information and Communication Board
April 2018***

Communications Strategy

The purpose of this strategy is to provide a framework to plan, monitor and measure the work of the Communications Team at provincial level in the Scottish Episcopal Church.

Aim

To raise the profile of the Scottish Episcopal Church (SEC) and promote its role in Scotland and the Anglican Communion

To engage and encourage dioceses, congregations and individuals in sharing stories of mission and ministry and to promote a sense of belonging to the SEC as a whole

To ensure an effective flow of information within the Church

To minimise the risk of reputational damage and protect the SEC in situations that require crisis management

Methods and implementation

The strategy can be delivered, at various levels, through the following methods:

Media and Press relations

The Director of Communications works closely with individual Bishops in building relationships with a number of key newspapers and media outlets, seeking opportunity where possible to provide a platform for comment and opinion on a range of topics and issues.

Digital and Social Media

The SEC has a presence on Facebook and Twitter and communicates through its own website which also links to all seven diocesan websites. Inspires online and *Pisky.Scot* are platforms for communication and dissemination of information. Whilst social media is without doubt the fastest growing and most popular medium for communications; it does have to be approached with care and caution. There is a range of social media channels and these have to be chosen depending on the content and nature of the information or comment being communicated.

The Director of Communications continually develops a network of media and press contacts, which results in the ability to identify the best channels of offering comment and in responding to media/press requests efficiently and effectively.

Use and promotion of Video

The use of Video to promote a message or initiative is an increasingly popular method of communications and the SEC has produced a number of short videos for placing on its website over the past year. There are plans to further develop this throughout 2018.

Evaluation

Key performance indicators can be obtained from:

- Digital and social media statistics and analysis
- The range and trend of comment and opinion expressed through social media and online feedback
- Press and Media coverage – the balance of positive and negative coverage and range of topics covered; both proactively and reactively.

CANON FIFTY-TWO

OF THE GENERAL SYNOD

The current text of Canon 52, Section 23 is set out below for information. The text to be deleted is scored through.

23. **BOARDS AND COMMITTEES**

Without prejudice to its right of appointment of Special Committees, the General Synod shall appoint with such duties as it sees fit, a Standing Committee, a Faith and Order Board, a Mission Board, an Administration Board, ~~an Information and Communication Board~~, a Board of the Scottish Episcopal Institute (to be known as the Institute Council), and the Provincial Buildings Committee as provided for under Canon 35, Section 1 and which shall include persons with expert knowledge of architecture, ecclesiastical artefacts and liturgy.

Role of Mission Board in Resourcing, Supporting and Encouraging Mission

In the course of the last year, the Mission Board has been taking stock of the Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy and considering its own role in how best to undertake its role in relation to the strategic oversight of mission.

The process that has been followed so far has included several steps

- Discussion at Mission Board meetings about the role of the Board and strategy (with input from Network Coordinators)
- Summarising the position paper entitled Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy (WCMMP)
- Circulating the summary of the policy at General Synod 2017 and asking members what they wanted from the Mission Board
- Involving dioceses by asking dioceses to respond to 6 questions

All of these measures have been used in formulating this paper.

Firstly the responses from the latest consultation with dioceses indicated

1. *Does the WCMMP continue to provide an effective framework for your Diocese to undertake mission?*

Other than highlighting collaboration and primacy of mission, the WCMMP was not something seen as particularly relevant to churches in dioceses. This is perhaps not surprising since the WCMMP essentially relates to the provincial/diocesan axis.

2. *The WCMMP Networks (Mission Planning, Lay Learning, Children, Rural, Youth and Retreats/Spirituality) are designed to enable the sharing of good practice among Dioceses and to support diocesan mission within the Dioceses. Does your Diocese derive value from the Networks and, if so, how?*

Generally the answer was no.

3. *Does your Diocese consider that the Province has a continuing role in relation to mission?*

Yes, was the unanimous answer.

4. *If your answer to 3 above is “yes”, what would you like the Mission Board to do to support mission in your Diocese?*

Sharing of resources, good practice and good news stories.

Enabling communication and dissemination of such information across the Province.

Representing the SEC on national mission bodies and initiatives.

5. *If you would like the Board to help provide resources, please indicate which resources you would find most helpful:-*

Listing of resources, review of resources, organising provincial conferences, information sharing, publicising good news stories, sharing expertise, arranging opportunities for mutual support, provision of statistics. More or less all were selected.

6. *Does your diocese already collaborate with another Diocese in relation to mission – if so, how? Would you like the Board to encourage such collaboration, if so in what way and in what fields?*

Generally smaller dioceses welcomed opportunities to access events in larger dioceses.

With better communication, better collaboration might naturally emerge.

In summary the following themes emerge:

- In agreement with the WCMMP, the dioceses are seen as the locus of mission and the purpose of the Mission Board is to support this.
- There is a desire to improve communication and sharing.
- The Networks are not functioning as intended when the WCMMP was brought in for various reasons.

Discipleship and mission are closely related rather like two sides of the same coin; if we are not followers of Jesus in every area of our lives then mission does not happen and though making disciples is not the one goal of mission, it is a natural outcome. Moving us from members to disciples is important for the SEC and so, in consultation with the College of Bishops and Standing Committee, promoting discipleship has been added to mission as the Mission Board's focus.

Discipleship and mission primarily take place in people's individual lives and the local church context. In the structures of the SEC it is the diocese, as the locus of mission, which has responsibility to encourage and support this. The provincial role, and the role of the Mission Board, is therefore primarily to support, stimulate and seek to resource this diocesan role in enabling mission and discipleship in the local church context. The way forward therefore would seem to be:

1. To change culture in the wider church to have a clearer focus on mission and discipleship, encouraging investment in continuing ministerial development so that not only those new to licensed ministries are trained in new areas such as Pioneer Ministry, Entrepreneurship, Fresh Expressions, Church Planting and working alongside experienced mission movements such as Church Army.
2. To stand down the existing Networks and instead establish 'go to' people for some areas of work. Such individuals could connect with their own informal network if they so desired and keep Mission Board updated by report. Communicate the names of such people to all dioceses and have this information on the diocesan and provincial websites.

3. To set up a Local Mission Resourcing Group for 3 years initially and which would comprise the SEI's Director of Mixed Mode Training and the person in each diocese who is most involved at diocesan level in mission (diocesan missionaries/enablers or, in the absence of these posts, chairs of diocesan mission boards). The group will improve communication by identifying and sharing information, resources, good practice and good news stories, just as they currently share amongst their own dioceses what is happening within. Ideally this information should be communicated by as many media channels as possible. This group would also be tasked with beginning work on items 4 and 5 below. The Local Mission Resourcing Group would report to the Mission Board and it might be helpful if there was some overlap between members of the Local Mission Resourcing Group and the diocesan representatives on Mission Board.
4. To help each individual diocese in the development of its own unique strategy, a Mission Strategies Day will be organised to which the bishops and senior staff involved in diocesan strategy are invited. There could be opportunity for each diocese to share their historical approach and learn from each other's current strategy. An inspiring and qualified speaker could be invited (e.g. Bob Jackson who has expertise in enabling the development of diocesan strategies). Dioceses could then use the day to help inform and shape the development of their own strategies in light of their own resources for implementation.
5. To set up funding for bids for imaginative missional projects approved by the appropriate diocesan bishop. The successful bids would be expected to share experiences, generate increased interest in such mission activity and contribute to the change in culture referred to in point 1. If such a fund can be established (and that will in part depend on budgetary implications), it would be important to distinguish to role of such a fund from that of the Mission and Ministry Support Grants scheme and the respective roles played by province and diocese respectively in relation to each.
6. To undertake work on discipleship.

In conclusion, taking the steps above should help us move as a church towards a greater focus on mission and discipleship and help the Mission Board achieve its purpose more easily. Changes to culture and ways of working are needed. Increased funding will be required.

The Mission Board is very grateful to everyone who has helped in the evaluation process.

Rev Jane Ross
Convener, Mission Board
April 2018

CHILD POVERTY

Child poverty remains as a significant issue in Scotland today. A Family is identified as being in poverty when their income is <60% of average after adjustment for household size. Figures from the Rowntree Foundation show that prior to 1999 31% of children in Scotland were classed as being in poverty. By 2010 this had fallen to 20%. By 2017 it had risen again to 25%.

Child Poverty in Scotland is less prevalent than in England and Wales. Recently Scottish Government released additional funding of around £0.5M to boost the income of pregnant women and families at risk of poverty. The Scottish Government also announced the roll out of the Healthier, Wealthier, Children's Scheme, which had been pioneered in Glasgow.

Poverty is not uniformly spread across Scotland. Child poverty in W Aberdeenshire and Kincardine and in Gordon was among the lowest at 9.3%. In Glasgow SW it was 33.5% and in Dundee, Glenrothes and North Ayrshire over 28%. Projections for 2030 suggest that by that date 16% of children will be in persistent poverty and 1 in 3 children in absolute poverty if nothing is done to change the current situation.

Child poverty has long lasting consequences both for individual children and for their families and for society as a whole. Children in poverty can be malnourished during vital developmental periods leading to restricted growth and lifelong health issues. They do less well in early education leading to poorer career options and the likelihood of their children suffering from the same impacts of child poverty.

This is unacceptable in a rich society. It matters to question what we as a church can do. We can individually and in partnership with other churches and organisations lobby both the Scottish and Westminster Governments to institute initiatives such as the "give me 5" campaign which, would result in 33,000 children being lifted out of poverty.

However, there are a range of things, which we can do as churches within our communities. The provision of meals during summer Holidays or weekends, food and clothing banks, assistance in tackling the rules surrounding the benefit system so as to access finance which could be available are just some examples of what is currently being done.

A Round Table discussion at Synod aims to explore this further by focussing discussion on the questions:

What is your experience of child poverty?

What would you like to do about Child poverty?

How can I engage?

Answers will be recorded by each table on “post it notes” and collated by the Church in Society Committee as part of their programme of work for 2018/19. It will also be suggested that all members of Synod should write on a “post it” one thing that they intend to do when they return home.

David Atkinson
Convener, Church in Society Committee

Motion for General Synod 2018

That this Synod, remembering Jesus’ saying that he came that we may have life in all its fullness and remembering his concern for children, support the ‘Give me 5’ campaign and call on the Scottish Government to pay a £5 a week top up on child benefit.

THE WORK OF THE CHURCH IN SOCIETY COMMITTEE DURING 2017/18

The role of the Church in Society Committee (CinS) is to respond to developing issues in Society for our Church. The range of issues, which we cover, is too many to be covered in formal presentations to General Synod. This report aims to update members of General Synod about current areas of work so as to present an opportunity for Synod members to engage with the Committee on particular issues or to actively join the conversations as the work develops. Communication and discussion have always been difficult within our Church and so we would appreciate any comments on how we might be more effective in engendering discussion of difficult issues and representing the views of the Church.

Climate Change Action and Fossil Fuel Investments

At General Synod 2017 the Committee and the Investment Committee submitted a joint paper and a motion, which was endorsed by Synod. The motion called on the two committees to work as part of the Church Investors Group (CIG), to restrict our investments, where practical, in companies whose primary business was the extraction of thermal coal or tar sands, continue liaison with the Church's investment managers, Baillie Gifford, and to encourage the SEC Pension Fund Trustees to follow a similar approach.

Since that time joint work by the two Committees has continued. Representatives of CinS have met with Baillie Gifford both separately and together with the Investment Committee. Issues related to both the extent of our relevant holdings, which are currently small, and developments within the sector, which are being kept under review. The CIG continues to be active in this area but has now begun to focus on the extent of human trafficking and its links both to major businesses, especially in the food sector, and to charities. A recent meeting of the SEC Pension Trustees decided that at this time it was not possible at this time to follow the lead of the Investment Committee.

At General Synod 2017 a number of suggestions were made as to actions which synod members thought might be helpful. The Committees have endeavoured to follow through on some of the suggested actions:-

- 1) Follow ups to the Paris Agreement. Christian Aid were encouraging people to write to the major UK Banks and to remind them of their responsibilities in relation to The Paris Agreement. We have encouraged individuals to follow this guidance.
- 2) Fracking. Currently there is no significant action in Scotland although we keep this under review with our colleagues in the Church and Society Council of The Church of Scotland.
- 3) Wider application of the approach. Our membership of the CIG allows us to follow their work on subjects beyond Climate Change such as Human Trafficking. Within the Committee where time resources are limited we are currently focused on issues related to biotechnology which we think may well be the next major challenge to us as churches and which is likely to be the subject of the Committee's major focus for General Synod 2019.

- 4) Engagement on environmental, social and corporate governance issues. Ethical screening of the pooled funds that the UTP invests in is not currently possible. The wider area represents an on-going area of discussion with Baillie Gifford. The Committee aims to keep this area under review especially through SEC's membership of CIG.

The Dilemmas Posed by Scientific and Technical Breakthroughs in Genome Editing

New genome editing techniques have opened a revolution in genetics with potentially far-reaching consequences in food, agriculture, medicine and perhaps beyond. A small ecumenical working group set up to discuss these issues have now met on three occasions. The current focus of the group is two-fold. One is on genetic editing being made to food animals, several examples of which are at an advanced stage, and in which the Roslin Institute is a leading player. The other is into research with the potential to modify humans.

We are developing a series of case studies of increasing ethical complexity, selected to indicate both what might be feasible, and ethical and theological questions with which we will need to engage. These cover the following applications of genome editing techniques:

- 1) To improve the resistance of pigs to African swine fever and to porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome;
- 2) To grow human transplant tissues inside pigs;
- 3) To edit 'spare' human embryos for research into early embryo development;
- 4) Somatic cell gene therapy achieved by editing defective genes taken from the body and replaced once corrected;
- 5) Germline gene therapy using genome editing to correct a specific heritable medical condition in an embryo and its future offspring;
- 6) Genetic enhancement, attempting by genome editing to enhance human characteristics such as strength, beyond any normal medical needs.

The animal modifications highlight the ability to address serious diseases, which afflict food animals such as pigs and poultry, for which no vaccines exist, and also cost the industry much money. Are such interventions in our fellow creatures ethically acceptable? Would people eat the pork, what risks are involved, and how should these interventions be regulated?

In humans, genome editing is being done in London and elsewhere on spare embryos to research the processes and problems in early development, which raise once more the ethical and theological questions as to whether or under what circumstances human embryos should be research subjects. Genome editing also offers significant advances in the difficult therapeutic techniques to repair faulty genes in somatic (non-reproductive) tissues in adults and children. Early clinical trials are underway to correct genes and replace them in the body, which it is hoped

may result in improved treatments for some intractable genetic diseases. This could potentially be extended to correct a faulty gene in an early stage embryo so that that embryo and all of his or her descendants would be free from the genetic defect. The ethical implications and risks of changing the genome of as yet unborn people are much in debate. Some would take the editing techniques further into attempting to enhance genetic characteristics beyond medical need. While medical progress in general is to be welcomed it does raise issues related to ethics, prudence, efficacy and safety, and how such research and its possible applications should be regulated. We will continue to take further evidence and discuss these issues and present a full report to the Synod of 2019.

In addition, the Committee represented the SEC at a Conference organised by the Conference of European Churches (CEC) in February 2018. The conference dealt explicitly with human genome editing and the far-reaching ethical and theological challenges in relation to how far we should intervene in our human genetic make-up, now that techniques are emerging, which may enable us to do so.

At the CEC meeting one of the lead speakers from CEC described the issues as being among the most difficult that the churches had had to contend with during the past 100 years because of their relationship to issues of life, health and death. While the progress made is to be welcomed it does raise issues related to safety, efficacy, ethics and prudence. This is especially the case, as the cost of commercially focused work in this area seems likely not to be high, so raising the possibility of unregulated commercial activity.

We are not accidents of our births, with none of us having any choice as to whom we are born nor the genetic package assigned to us. If we accept that we are made in the image of God and that all are equal in God's sight then we need to accept all people regardless of any perceived disabilities, health compromising conditions or mental handicaps. This asks questions about the extent to which we should aim to "improve" the genome or is action of this type "playing God"? This essentially asks the question: because we can, should we?

While these are issues currently being considered by European Christian Churches they also raise issues for people of other faiths. Related issues in the past have shown that people tend to have strong views about new technologies of this type. However, we are aware that individuals can find themselves in a dilemma when offered a treatment which on the one hand could benefit a family member but which on the other might involve a choice which conflicts with long held beliefs. The area also has the potential to see a significant clash between faith organisations and our secular society.

The involvement of secular society raises the risk of future debate becoming focussed on technical aspects and of losing sight of the ethical dimension to human actions. For many years we have accepted the importance of corrective surgery such as hip replacements, heart and kidney transplants and corneal implants. The development of somatic genome therapy, changes to the tissues of current individuals, could be seen as merely an advance in these procedures. Modification of the genome of the as yet unborn tends to be seen differently.

Joint work with RSPB on Creation and the natural world

The SEC has joined with the Church of Scotland, Eco-Congregation Scotland, A Rocha UK and RSPB Scotland in a unique agreement to work collaboratively in a one-year pilot project called 'Faith Action for Nature'.

This has grown from a shared view that churches need to raise their profile when taking action, or speaking about, care for God's creation. The aim of the agreement between RSPB Scotland and churches is to encourage greater engagement of their congregations in the natural world, equip them with ideas about how church grounds can be managed better for wildlife, and offer opportunities for congregation members to visit local RSPB reserves to experience the wonder and awe of the created world.

RSPB Scotland staff (public affairs, site managers/wardens and volunteers) will try to assist participating churches in the development of their projects and provide expert advice as necessary. Eco-Congregation Scotland has created a dedicated web page for the project, hosting seasonal advice, for example, quizzes, suggestions for talks, activities, worship resources and advice on the wildlife on church sites and in congregational members' gardens.

The steering group hopes that churches will see the missional opportunities of communicating their concern for the protection of God's creation to their local communities, by providing practical demonstrations of stewardship in action. In addition, by encouraging a greater appreciation of nature in church, through green theologies and spirituality, church leadership and other key individuals will be in a more informed position to explain that our way of life as a species is damaging our planet, to the point where both other species and our own are suffering, especially in vulnerable communities in the less developed world.

The cumulative effects of degrading natural environments, loss of biodiversity, pollution of water, and emission of climate changing gases that have been an accelerating concern for the last twenty years or so, are now joined by shortages and increased costs of key resources. The steering group believes that this is a *kairos* moment for the Church to demonstrate that a radically simpler lifestyle can no longer be seen as a calling for a certain few, but that we need to pull together as a community, and try to understand the complex set of challenges being presented to us. But the call is also a humble one, not so much a summons, but an invitation to carry out active and ritual care for our local ecosystems.

Brexit

This remit of the Committee inevitably results in our having to deal with issues, which have a significant political content. We also interact with other churches that wish to establish joint church positions. Many of the issues with which we deal are areas where there are a number of views within the Church and where it is unlikely that there will ever be a single definitive position. In such areas there is need to promote dialogue and so in such areas we see our primary role being to facilitate discussion.

How this is best done is now being reconsidered. The advent of *Pisky.Scot* provides an alternative means of helping our Church to discuss the issues of the day and to

allow the Committee to gain a sense of the mood and mind of those members of the Church who respond.

The exit of the UK from the EU is an issue, which continues to divide society across the country. So is it an issue for us to encourage discussion? A number of bodies to which we are linked are currently dealing with various aspects. The ACTS Rural Committee, on which the Committee is represented, is currently assessing the potential impact of Brexit on rural communities, churches and changes to agricultural funding, food businesses and the environment resulting from a movement of powers currently shared between the EU and the Scottish Government to the UK Government. In addition many of the organisations, which we support and which deal with issues linked to refugees and trafficking, are concerned about the potential impact on immigration and the treatment of immigrants. This resulted in the Committee passing a resolution as follows:-

This meeting of the Church in Society Committee of the SEC expresses its deep concern at the present state of negotiations between the UK Government and the European Union about Brexit.

It considers that the British people should be enabled to revisit the decision to leave the European Union once the final terms are known. This could be by means of a further referendum, a general election or otherwise.

It considers that any agreement should ensure that the Scottish economy is supported, that employment rights in Scotland are protected and that the environment is safeguarded.

In particular it considers that it is essential to secure the following issues:

- 1. There should be full recognition of the rights of UK citizens in Europe and EU citizens in the UK as at March 2019. This should include safeguarding the rights of the child and ensuring that families including all dependent relatives can stay together.*
- 2. EU powers in areas that are already devolved (e.g. fishing, agriculture) should be devolved to Holyrood.*
- 3. The border in Ireland must remain an open one.*
- 4. If necessary, Scotland should be allowed to adopt a more flexible policy on immigration, which takes account of the needs of the Scottish economy and institutions of higher education.*
- 5. The UK should take in its fair share of refugees.*
- 6. If the UK is not to remain a member of Euratom, then adequate regulatory bodies and procedures need to be in place as at March 2019.*

This resolution arose from meetings held with Churches Together in Britain and Ireland before the referendum and with ACTS in April 2017. It outlines the basic concerns arising from these meetings and which the respective churches agreed to raise with their members. Discussion is requested on what should be the role of the Church in this debate.

United Nations Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons

Since the first use of Nuclear weapons in 1945 this has been a contentious area of debate. It continues to be so. Over the intervening period issues related to this have been discussed by committees within our Church and by General Synod. At General Synod 2016 the Synod decided not to support a motion, which called for the Trident Missile system not to be renewed. Discussion at Synod ranged over a number of more general areas within the overall topic of nuclear weapons. New issues however continue to arise many linked to developing emergencies such as current tensions in the Korean peninsula.

It has been suggested by some that nuclear weapons pose the most immediate and catastrophic threat to the future of humanity. They suggest that even a 'small' nuclear exchange (India/Pakistan, USA/North Korea) would put so much material into the atmosphere that a nuclear winter could lead to massive starvation. As long as countries possess nuclear weapons, there is a risk of accidental or deliberate nuclear war. As a result the use of such weapons of mass destruction is unacceptable to Christians who believe in comprehensive nonviolence. There are however other views within our and other churches. Some would argue that the absence of world wars of the type, which dominated the last century, is as a result of nuclear weapons and a balance of power between those who hold them and that as such they help maintain peace. This is not a simple issue but one which has many ramifications.

Many Christians who endorse a just war approach question whether any use of nuclear weapons can be justified because the killing is likely to be indiscriminate rather than proportionate. Ever since the signing of the non-proliferation treaty in 1968 the nuclear weapons states have committed themselves to working for nuclear disarmament in 'all good faith'. Fifty years on, and with new weapons systems being continually developed and with more countries having nuclear weapons (India, Pakistan, Israel, North Korea), the United Nations has acted to try and outlaw nuclear weapons in the same way that biological and chemical weapons of mass destruction have been outlawed.

In July 2017 the UN adopted the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons. 122 governments (including the Vatican) supported this and the treaty has now been ratified. None of the countries, which currently have nuclear weapons, are signatories at this time. Those countries signing the treaty agree not to develop, test, produce, manufacture, acquire, possess, stockpile, transfer or receive nuclear weapons. Whether the UK should sign up to this treaty continues to be a matter of debate. Were the UK to become a signatory it would not need to leave NATO but it would need to develop a clear timetable for removing nuclear weapons from the UK. If the SEC were to support the UK adopting the treaty it would be joining the other churches in Scotland (Roman Catholic, Church of Scotland, Methodist, URC, Baptist as well as the Quakers) in urging the Westminster government to sign up to the Treaty. Discussion of this issue will continue and so we would welcome both contributions to the discussion and suggestions as to how our Church should best develop its thinking in this area.

Pilgrimage

The Scottish Pilgrim Routes Forum (SPRF) is an ecumenical body, which brings together people interested in the development of new pilgrim routes and in the promotion of Pilgrimage. SEC is a corporate member of SPRF and the Church in Society Committee has the role of managing our membership. Pilgrimage is seen as a means of both creating a dialogue with those who would not easily relate to current church and as an approach to understanding Episcopalianism. To further these aims the Committee is sponsoring a conference on Pilgrimage, which will be held at St Margaret Aberdeen on 21st September.

The aim of the conference as set out in the Conference leaflet is seen as being the following:

Pilgrimage has been a significant part of practice for most of the life of most faiths. The Pilgrimages of James IV were an example of its role in the expression of faith in Scotland. It has for at least the last 500 years been important to the development of our approach to faith in the Episcopal Church. The routes travelled by past religious figures such as Columba have been followed and sites associated with saints and others visited.

Currently organisations, such as the Scottish Pilgrim Routes Forum an ecumenical organisation, are attempting to recreate and to provide interpretive material for routes of this type. Chaucer's Pilgrims followed journeys, which took several days. Multi-day journeys are however not the only approach. Shorter journeys can be a means of reconnecting life and its issues with the world in which we find ourselves.

The Conference aims to look at some of the history of Pilgrimage in Scotland and to its role in linking to our heritage, at pilgrim trails, which are in the process of being recreated, at the potential role of Pilgrimage in the development of religious thought and spirituality and its role in linking us to the issues of our time.

Scottish Faiths Action for Refugees

Scottish Faiths Action for Refugees (SFAR) is a project which seeks to co-ordinate and promote action by faith communities in Scotland to support asylum seekers and refugees. David Bradwell (Church of Scotland) is funded by the members of this ecumenical and interfaith SFAR Coordinating Group (largely from CofS and SEC) and is very effective networking/sharing ideas/representing the Scottish view at UK/European conferences. Joan Lyon, a co-opted member of Church in Society, attends the quarterly meetings of SFAR and is supported by named key people in six out of seven SEC dioceses. The aim of the Coordinating Group is to disseminate information and encourage local activity.

Communication is via an excellent website – www.sfar.org.uk Please have a look at the regular newsletters.

Aims of SFAR are to promote clearer understanding of issues facing refugees coming to Scotland and to assist those who welcome

- a) by offering appropriate training (by other agencies at the request of SFAR);

- b) by keeping up to date with government policy and world-wide reaction to increasing migration;
- c) seeking ways locally of helping “resettlement“ move towards “integration” – i.e. intensive language learning, befriending, education for refugees about our legal partnerships, health and social care strategy, safeguarding policy and, most importantly, opportunities for continuing education, readiness for work and employment opportunities. The refugees want to say thank you and be able to give something back to their welcoming communities;
- d) gaining a richer understanding of the greater possibilities of interfaith partnership.

One example of training organised by SFAR is Amina Muslim Women’s Resource Centre running a training session to enhance understanding of Muslim women, their needs and the issues they face.

The work being done in Aberdeen provides an example of some of the activities being undertaken. To date almost 100 Syrians and Kurds have been welcomed into Aberdeen city with two recent family reunions. This is good news for this particular family but not at all easy for many others whose applications for family reunion have been refused. Families are expanding – many new babies arriving – a sign of peace and hope but incurring additional pressures on housing. After 6 July 2017 those who have come through the Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Scheme (VPRS) can now change their status to that of “refugee”. They are therefore no longer classed technically as needing “humanitarian protection”. This means that they have indefinite leave to remain, the right to work and the right to travel abroad e.g. to visit family members. There are major questions about how to access appropriate help as the VPRS hands over.

When the New Syrian Scots arrived, a Syrian Project Partners Group was set up to welcome, organise donations (including setting up a financial fund), volunteer and support the City Council initiatives – a wonderful example of church, council and voluntary organisations coming together.

A key question is what should our focus be? Local council funding is being cut across Scotland; the wider community needs to step forward to help future integration. Please think about...

- Further practical donations to turn a house into a home
- Local churches/faith groups together fund e.g. bus hire for outings
- Befriending and integration/what the refugees would like to contribute
- Support of initiatives like City of Sanctuary (see www.cityofsanctuary.org)
- Continuing Education on the issues and changes of policy within our congregations
- Active Lobbying of Scottish and UK governments as appropriate

There need not be refugees in your own particular area. You may never meet one. However the list above gives opportunities for anyone anywhere to become involved, particularly with lobbying. Without government legislation (e.g. reunification of families), the possibility of welcoming the stranger with appropriate support faces greater challenges.

#LockedinLimbo UK faith leaders urge action to end statelessness

SFAR is involved in supporting this UK specific campaign statement, which has been backed by 110 religious, and faith leaders. (Full list available on the #Lockedinlimbo website; only Prof Revd. David Atkinson and Revd. Joan Lyon from SEC – it would be good to see more SEC signatories.)

The #LockedinLimbo statement urges the UK Government to do more to welcome those who no longer have a country to call their home.

The move came during Interfaith Week (12-19 November 2017), which seeks to build on the good relationships and partnerships between people of very diverse faiths and beliefs.

All have a shared commitment to protecting human rights and promoting human dignity.

The statement is calling for action on part of the UK Government to review its policies towards stateless people as many end up in prolonged and pointless detention while the Home Office tries to remove them from the UK.

‘Stateless’ people without legal status cannot leave the UK because no country will accept them. But without status, they don’t have permission to work in the UK and remain vulnerable to destitution, exploitation and detention.

Signatories are calling for alternatives to detention and better support for access to rights and advice and help with integration.

The move is part of the #LockedInLimbo campaign which is led by the European Network on Statelessness and seeks to end the detention of people who end up locked in limbo simply because they have no country that they can return to.

“The role of the World Council of Churches in advocating for the rights of stateless people has been particularly important in helping to focus attention on this issue.”

The video on www.sfar.org.uk website by Katalina Tahaafe-Williams shows why we must help stateless people.

David Atkinson
Convener, Church in Society Committee

Preliminary Results of the Actuarial Valuation of the SEC Pension Fund as at 31 December 2017

A valuation of the Pension Fund is undertaken every three years. This paper sets out the preliminary results of the valuation as at 31 December 2017 and makes a recommendation regarding future contribution rate.

At the time of the previous valuation, as at 31 December 2014, there was a surplus of £1.3m, and a future contribution rate of 30.3% of standard stipend or salary. The total contribution rate had been 34.9% for the previous six years, which following the 2011 valuation had comprised a deficit reduction contribution of 2.7% and a future service contribution rate of 32.2%. At the 2014 valuation the Pension Fund was in surplus, so deficit contributions ceased. Following discussion between the Trustees and Standing Committee a joint proposal to retain the contribution rate at 32.2% from 1 January 2016 was approved by General Synod.

The Trustees receive regular funding updates from the Scheme Actuary. During 2017 the past service funding level fluctuated at around 100%, but the continuation of all-time low gilt yields indicated that the future service contribution rate could rise to around 40%. These estimates were on the basis of the 2014 valuation data and assumptions.

The Trustees met in March 2018 to set the assumptions for the 2017 valuation. These include investment returns, inflation, future stipend and salary increases, mortality improvements, retirement age, pension increases, and the proportion of members married or in civil partnerships. Pensions legislation requires that the assumptions adopted by the Trustees are based on prudent principles.

The assumptions are used to calculate the technical provisions. These cover two areas.

1. Past Service funding level

This is an estimate of whether the Fund holds sufficient assets to cover the costs of providing benefits that have already been accrued by members. If there is a deficit the Trustees are required to submit a recovery plan. The key changes that have affected the 2017 results are:

- Investment returns have been higher than assumed (positive impact)
- Change to demographic assumptions (positive)
- Change in market conditions (negative)

2. Future service contribution rate

This is the estimated cost of accruing future benefits for serving members of the Fund. The key changes that have affected the 2017 rate are:

- Changes in market conditions (negative impact)
- Change to demographic assumption (positive)

Employer Covenant

Assessment of the strength of the Employer Covenant is fundamental to the valuation process. The Trustees considered Standing Committee's Employer Covenant Report and reviewed their assessment of the Covenant. The Trustees are satisfied that there have been no material changes since the 2014 valuation that would affect their assessment of the Covenant as positive.

Preliminary results

The results on a technical provisions basis indicated a future service contribution rate of 35.9% and a surplus of £3.7m. Mindful of the general understanding that the ceiling of affordability is 35%, the Trustees considered that they would be willing to use some of the surplus to reduce the contributions payable to a rate below the future service rate. The Trustees met with Standing Committee in April and proposed that the contribution rate payable be maintained at 32.2% from 1 January 2019. Standing Committee endorsed the proposal for submission to General Synod. A motion to continue the contribution rate at its current level is included in the agenda for Synod.

Richard McIndoe, Chairman, Pension Fund Trustees
Robert Gordon, Convener, Standing Committee

Climate Change Action and Fossil Fuel Investments Response from the Pension Fund Trustees

The Pension Fund Trustees have considered the paper *Climate Change Action and Fossil Fuel Investments* from the Church in Society and Investment Committees, and the General Synod motion from June 2017, specifically section f: 'encourage the Pension Fund Trustees to follow similar approaches' in relation to restricting investment in thermal coal and tar sands, adopting a policy on voting shares and engaging with the Pension Fund's investment managers on Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) matters.

The Pension Fund Trustees adopted the SEC's ethical investment policy in 2007, but in practice the Fund has held no relevant investments that it can be applied to since 2010 when Schroders were appointed to manage the Fund and the Trustees began the process of reducing risk in the portfolio.

The Scottish Episcopal Church Pension Fund is currently invested entirely in pooled funds. This means there is no scope at present for ethical screening of the portfolio, nor can the Trustees vote shares.

The current investment strategy was implemented in March 2017 after a period of consultation with our investment advisers Mercer, and Schroder who manage the Fund. 30% of the Pension Fund's assets target capital growth and comprise a holding in Schroders Diversified Growth Fund. The investment objective of the Diversified Growth Fund is to invest in a broad range of asset classes to aim to generate a return of UK inflation (as measured by the UK Consumer Price Index) +5% per annum over an economic cycle, typically a five year period, with a volatility less than two thirds of global equities.

Other options to the Diversified Growth Fund were considered, but at that point there were no ethically screened funds that provided an equivalent investment objective. Managing volatility is a significant element of the investment objective which is to achieve and maintain a fully funded scheme, on a low risk basis with reduced reliance on equity markets and funding from congregations and General Synod. The Trustees will seek to move towards implementing the SEC's ethical criteria as and when suitable investment vehicles become available.

The Trustees meet with Schroder each year, and take an active interest in their record of engagement on ESG matters. The Trustees have given Schroder discretion in exercising voting rights for the Fund's investments.

The Trustees are kept informed of the work of the Church Investors Group (CIG) of which the SEC is a member, but are not in a position to make a commitment to membership.

*Scottish Episcopal Church Pension Fund Trustees
15 March 2018*

ADMINISTRATION BOARD

Composition of the Board

The Administration Board wishes to propose that the current requirement that members appointed to the Board by General Synod must be General Synod members be removed so that in future appointments by Synod to the Board could be of individuals whether or not they are Synod members.

In recent years, despite there having been vacancies for the positions of General Synod members on the Board, difficulty has been encountered in filling those positions and on a number of occasions nominations for vacancies have simply not come forward.

At present there are three positions for General Synod representatives on the Board. In 2017, all three positions were vacant and specific attention was drawn to them in advance of Synod. However, no nominations were received by the deadline and so no elections were held at General Synod with the result that the right to appoint fell to the Standing Committee. A number of individuals had in fact expressed an interest in serving on the Board but many of them were ineligible because they were alternate members of Synod or were about to end their term as full members. Standing Committee was able to appoint one General Synod Member to the Board and it also co-opted two individuals to the Board for the period to General Synod 2018.

In its discussions, the Standing Committee noted that the requirement for General Synod representatives on boards now only applied in relation to the Administration Board. (When the Mission and Ministry Board was dissolved and the Mission Board and Institute Council created the opportunity was taken to move away from the concept of General Synod representatives: the Mission Board has the power to co-opt up to three additional members should it wish to do so and, whilst the majority of the members of the Institute Council are appointed by General Synod, there is no requirement for them to be Synod members. Neither the Faith and Order Board nor Information and Communication Board have had General Synod representatives in the past.)

Standing Committee invited the Board to consider bringing forward to General Synod 2018 a proposal that the three General Synod representative posts on the Board be replaced by three general posts for which General Synod membership would not be an eligibility criterion.

In theory, the position of General Synod representatives on the Board provides some provincial “balance” to the remaining members, most of whom are representatives appointed by the dioceses. In practice, however, there seems no reason why input to the Board of a “non-diocesan” nature need be restricted to General Synod members. Indeed, it would be helpful for the Board to be able to draw on a wider pool of individuals with relevant expertise or experience. The Board recognises that the right of appointment ought nevertheless to remain which the General Synod.

It is suggested that, in common with nominations made to the Institute Council, nominations for appointment to the three positions in question should be brought to the Synod by Standing Committee. This will require a change to the Digest of Resolutions.

The relevant provision of the Digest of Resolutions currently reads as follows:–

The **Administration Board** shall consist of a Convener appointed by the General Synod, a Bishop (appointed by the College of Bishops), a representative appointed by the Mission Board, three members appointed by the General Synod from its own membership, a representative of each Diocese as appointed by each Diocesan Synod and the Conveners of the pendant committees of the Board.

The proposed new section of the Digest (changes highlighted) would read as follows:–

The **Administration Board** shall consist of a Convener appointed by the General Synod, a Bishop (appointed by the College of Bishops), a representative appointed by the Mission Board, three members appointed by the General Synod ~~from its own membership~~ on the nomination of the Standing Committee, a representative of each Diocese as appointed by each Diocesan Synod and the Conveners of the pendant committees of the Board.

A motion is included in the Synod agenda to alter the Digest of Resolutions accordingly.

Dr John Ferguson-Smith
Convener
Administration Board

RULES OF ORDER OF THE GENERAL SYNOD

(Amended 12 June 1997, 7 June 2012, 12 June 2014)

1. Application

These rules of order shall apply to the proceedings of the General Synod whether sitting as one body or in separate Houses of Bishops, other Clergy and Laity.

2. The Chair – Powers and Duties

Deference shall at all times be paid to the authority of the Chair. All points of order shall be addressed to the person occupying the Chair, stated briefly and audibly, and raised immediately the perceived irregularity occurs, otherwise the person occupying the Chair shall disallow them. Points of order shall not introduce new subject matter. Speeches shall not be allowed on points of order. Where, in the view of the person occupying the Chair, the matter raised does not constitute a point of order, the person occupying the Chair shall rule accordingly. On all points of order the ruling from the Chair shall be final and not open to discussion. When the person occupying the Chair rises to speak, any member of the Synod who is addressing the meeting shall sit down.

It shall be the responsibility of the person occupying the Chair to preserve order and secure that members obtain a fair hearing, to decide all matters of order arising at meetings of the Synod and to decide, if two or more members rise in their places, which to call to speak. In the event of disorder arising at any meeting of the Synod, the meeting may be adjourned by the person occupying the chair who shall also, then or subsequently, fix a time for its reconvening. Quitting the Chair in such circumstances shall, without further procedure, have the effect of a formal adjournment of the meeting.

3. Order of Debate

Members desiring to speak shall indicate their desire to do so in the manner directed by the person occupying the Chair, or in the absence of any other direction, by raising their hand. Those called upon to speak shall address the Chair. Speeches shall be directed to the motion or amendment being proposed, seconded or otherwise under discussion or to a question of order. No member shall be allowed to speak more often than once on any subject under discussion, save on a point of order or, with consent of the Chair, to make an explanation, but the mover of a motion shall have a right of reply. A member who is speaking when a question of order is raised shall stop speaking until the question of order has been decided by the person occupying the Chair.

4. Matters Taken in Private

The Synod may decide by a majority of those present and voting that:-

- (a) any business shall be taken in private;
- (b) the Synod shall go into Committee for the informal discussion of any subject;
- (c) the Synod shall go into groups for the informal discussion of any subject (in which case minutes of such informal discussion need not be taken).

Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Chair shall have power to direct that the Synod shall break into small groups, for a period not exceeding 10 minutes, for the informal discussion of any subject (in which case minutes of such informal discussion need not be taken).

5. Adjournment

- (a) Any meeting of the Synod may be adjourned to such other place, time or day and hour as may be set by the person occupying the Chair.
- (b) Any meeting of the Synod may be adjourned to a later time on the same day and such an adjournment may be made on the direction from the Chair, or failing such direction, on the motion of any member, the vote on which motion, on being seconded, shall without amendment or discussion be taken by a show of hands as one House.

6. Quorum

The Quorum of the Synod shall be one half of the eligible membership of the House of Clergy and of the House of Laity and not less than three members of the House of Bishops, but no business shall be invalid because transacted without a quorum being present, unless the attention of the Chair has been called to the absence of a quorum. The person occupying the chair shall then ascertain, in such a way as seems fit, that no quorum is present, and declare the fact. This shall be a responsibility of the person occupying the chair, whose declaration, whether or not a quorum is present, shall be final. If it has been declared from the Chair that no quorum is present, no business shall be transacted until a quorum is declared from the Chair to be present except: (a) the consideration of a motion to adjourn; (b) such non-contentious business as the meeting, with consent of the person occupying the chair, sees fit to transact. If, however, a division is challenged on any subject other than on a motion for adjournment, the same shall not be dealt with by the meeting. No motion for adjournment shall be submitted until at least fifteen minutes after the declaration from the Chair that a quorum is not present, except with the consent of the person occupying the Chair.

7. Obstructive or Offensive Conduct

- (a) In the event of any member at any Synod meeting disregarding the authority of the Chair, or being guilty of obstructive or offensive conduct, a motion may thereupon be moved and seconded to suspend

such member for the remainder of the sitting. The motion shall be put without discussion.

- (b) The person occupying the Chair shall warn any member of the public who interrupts the proceedings at any meeting. If that member of the public continues the interruption the person occupying the Chair shall order the person concerned to leave the meeting, and not return.

8. Duration of Speeches

The mover of a motion shall not speak for more than ten minutes except with the consent of Synod. All other speakers taking part in the discussion on the motion or amendment shall not normally speak for more than five minutes, subject to the discretion of the person occupying the Chair. The mover of the original motion shall have the right to speak for five minutes in reply, but shall not introduce any new matter into the debate. Thereafter the discussion shall be held closed and the question shall thereupon be put from the Chair.

9. Motions

- (a) The Synod shall consider only the following motions:-
 - (i) motions which have been included in the agenda and papers for that meeting;
 - (ii) motions which the Synod has agreed to consider in terms of Rule 10;
 - (iii) formal or procedural motions.
- (b) All motions and amendments shall be stated, immediately on their being proposed to the meeting, by the mover, before being spoken to. All motions under Rule 9 (a) (ii) and all amendments shall be submitted in writing, signed by the mover and seconder and delivered to the Secretary General immediately on being moved.
- (c) Every amendment shall be relevant to the motion on which it is moved. A motion may be amended by the mover with the consent of the meeting, which consent shall be by the majority of those present and voting. In the case of a motion emanating from a Diocesan Synod or from a Board or Committee of the General Synod, the mover of that motion shall have the power, unless specifically denied it by the body from which the motion has emanated, to accept the amendment to that motion, thus altering the text of the motion on which the Synod is asked to vote.
- (d) A motion or amendment may be withdrawn by the mover with the consent of the seconder of the motion or amendment, but the Synod shall have power by simple majority of those present and voting to refuse to allow such withdrawal, in which case the motion shall stand.

- (e) Motions or amendments which are not seconded shall not be discussed or inserted in the minutes.
- (f) If, in the opinion of the person occupying the chair, more than one motion deals with the same subject matter, only the motion first lodged with the Secretary General (whether by hand delivery or by post) shall be considered and if, in the opinion of the person occupying the chair, any motion deals with a matter already under consideration by a Board or Committee, that motion shall not be considered.
- (g) If a member who has submitted a notice of motion is not present to move the motion, the motion shall fall, unless Synod agrees that another member may move the motion.
- (h) No motion of any kind which involves a grant of money shall be competent unless it is printed in the programme of business with the observations of the Board or Committee within whose budget the grant would fall, with power to the Chair on special occasions to take the sense of the meeting with reference to matters appearing in the programme of business and, if satisfied, to dispense with the necessity of observations by the appropriate Board or Committee. Except as above provided, no motion (other than votes of thanks) shall be entertained unless notice has been given to the Secretary General in reasonable time to enable it to be entered in the programme of business, unless the person occupying the Chair sees fit to put the question to the meeting that want of notice shall be dispensed with and interprets it as the evident sense of the meeting that this be allowed. There shall be no poll on the question, but a show of hands may be taken to assist in coming to a decision.

10. Rule 10 Motions

- (a) Notice of Rule 10 motions should normally be given in writing (to the Secretary General) before Synod starts.
- (b) The motion shall be in writing, and signed by the mover and seconder, and supported by the signatures of twelve members (excluding the mover and seconder of the motion) of Synod who are present at the meeting.
- (c) The mover of a motion under this Rule shall be given the opportunity to address Synod briefly (maximum of two minutes) as to why the Synod should consider the motion at that time before a vote is taken on whether the Motion should be considered.
- (d) Subject to any contrary provision in the Code of Canons, in order for a Rule 10 motion to be considered by Synod, a two thirds majority of those present and voting shall vote in favour of its being considered.

11. Motion: “That the Question be now put”.

- (a) The amendment called “The previous question” shall not be allowed.
- (b) It shall be competent for any member who has not spoken on the question before the meeting to move “that the question be now put”. On this being seconded, if it seems to the person occupying the chair that the question before the meeting has been sufficiently discussed, a vote shall be taken, without amendment or discussion. If the motion is carried, the mover of the original motion shall have a right to reply, and the question under discussion shall then be put to the meeting. If the motion “that the question be now put” is not carried, a similar motion may be made after every three additional members have spoken.

12. Voting

- (a) After the question on which the vote is to be taken has been announced, and voting has commenced, no member shall be permitted to offer an opinion, or ask a question, except on a point of order, or otherwise interrupt the proceedings until the result of the vote has been intimated.
- (b) Save as otherwise provided, all motions and amendments shall be passed by a majority of the members of the Synod present and voting.
- (c) The person occupying the chair shall have a deliberative but not a casting vote. Where the matter which is the subject of the vote relates to the appointment of a member of the Synod to any particular office or committee, voting shall be by ballot.
- (d) When the question is put to the vote, tellers shall be named from the Chair and shall give in their report of each division taken. Except where otherwise stated in these Rules of Order, the vote may be taken in the first instance on a show of hands, the result, in the opinion of the person occupying the chair, being declared therefrom. In all cases of doubt the vote shall be taken by counting the hands held up. On any question, if one third of the present and voting members of any House so wish, voting shall be by ballot.
- (e) When voting by Houses, the Houses must meet separately if one third of the present and voting members of any House so wishes. When the Synod votes by Houses, the numbers of the vote in each House shall be recorded, and a majority of those present and voting shall be required in each House for the passing of the motion.
- (f) A challenge to the accuracy of the minutes shall be made by way of amendment to the motion that the minutes be approved. Only those members who were present at the previous meeting to which the minutes relate shall be entitled to vote on the said amendment.

13. Election, Selection or Appointment of Members to Office

In the case of election, selection or appointment by Synod of a member of the Synod or of any other person to any office where the number of candidates nominated exceeds the number of vacancies, the member or person to be elected, selected or appointed as the case may be shall be determined by a vote (or votes) by ballot in (each of) which members will be entitled to vote for as many candidates as there are vacancies. No member may record in the ballot more than one vote for any candidate. The candidate or candidates having the highest number of votes shall be declared duly elected. If there is equality of votes for the last vacancy, this shall be resolved by ballot or by a show of hands.

14. Assessor

The Standing Committee of the General Synod shall nominate an assessor, who may be a member of the Synod, but the assessor shall intervene as assessor only on the call of the Chair, without prejudice to the right of the assessor when a member of the Synod to speak and vote as such.

15. Suspension of Rules

The application of any or all of these Rules of Order may be temporarily suspended or amended by a majority amounting to two-thirds of those present and voting. Voting shall be as one House.

.....
RULE 10 MOTIONS: PRACTICE NOTE

Before considering presenting a motion Synod members are encouraged to liaise with the Secretary General in order to consult with the Board to whom the matter will be delegated if the motion is passed. It is expected that in a majority of cases this will result in a co-operative response where the matter is taken on to the Board's agenda, and the need for a Rule 10 Motion will pass. Most matters can be dealt with using this process during the year through consultation with the relevant diocesan representative.

GENERAL SYNOD: A REFLECTION ON MORNING AND EVENING PRAYER

You make the dawn and the dusk to sing for joy (Psalm 65.8)

Within the daily rhythm of life, we become aware, when day breaks and when night falls, of moments of significance. A day begins and a day ends, never to return. Time has moved on during that day, and we have drawn a little nearer to whatever our end will be. Tomorrow will be another day, with a significance of its own. It will not be merely a repeat of today, no matter how many similarities there may be. Each day thus comes to us as a distinctive gift. We do not make it. We can only receive it. We may learn to receive it with gratitude and to return thanks for it to the God of creation, the giver of life.

*Every day will I bless you
and praise your name for ever and ever. (Psalm 145.2)*

Thus it is that human beings, whatever their religious persuasion, have instinctively offered prayer at each day's beginning and ending. At daybreak, prayer expresses gratitude for the passing of the night and for the gift of the new day. It offers to God all that is to be done and experienced as the day runs its course. At nightfall, prayer again expresses gratitude for what the day has brought and invites reflection on our use or perhaps misuse of it, entrusting our lives once again to God's care during the hours of darkness.

Father, hallowed be your name, your kingdom come. (Luke 11.2)

Prayer becomes part of the rhythm of life, of waking and sleeping, of working and resting. The sun and the moon, as time's markers, bring the further seasonal rhythms of winter and spring, summer and autumn. All these rhythms lead us to celebrate and reflect on the mystery of life itself, of our waking to life and of the coming sleep of death. Faith leads us further, to see in the passage from light to darkness and from night to morning an image of Christ's surrender to death and, with his being raised from death, the promise of a new creation, the goal towards which all our labours, as people of faith, are directed.

*Rejoice always, pray without ceasing, give thanks in all circumstances,
for this is the will of God in Christ Jesus. (1 Thessalonians 5.16f)*

Morning and Evening prayer thus form the frame within which the activities of each day take place. They are the beginning and the ending of each day's work. When, for example, the General Synod of our Church meets, Morning Prayer begins the day's business and Evening Prayer brings it to a conclusion. Both express the context of faith which informs the entire work of Synod. Both offer us the opportunity to draw deeply on the words of the sacred writings (psalms, canticles, readings and prayers) and allow them to become the voice of our own prayer.

"[The Psalms] are the bright mirror in which we become more deeply conscious of what is happening to us". (Cassian, conferences X,11)

Both Morning and Evening Prayer are there, not as optional extras for the piously inclined, but as the means by which we are reminded, as we begin and as we end the business of Synod, of the heart of the matter: the God through whom, in whom and for whom we exist.

"He prays unceasingly who combines prayer with necessary duties and duties with prayer. Only in this way can we find it practicable to fulfil the commandment to pray always. It consists in regarding the whole of Christian existence as a single great prayer. What we are accustomed to call prayer is only a part of it." (Origen, On Prayer)

Note: Copies of the most recent edition of *Daily Prayer* (which includes Morning and Evening Prayer, Night Prayer (Compline) and the Psalter) are available from the General Synod Office, Price £9.00.

ATTENDANCE SLIP
GENERAL SYNOD 2018

Name: _____

Diocese: _____

PLEASE PUT THIS IN THE BOX PROVIDED AT THE SYNOD

This page is intentionally blank

GENERAL SYNOD 2018
TRAVEL AND MEALS CLAIM FORM

Travel: _____ £
_____ miles at 45p/mile
Public Transport (receipts must be attached) _____

Overnight Accommodation Allowance (dinner, bed and breakfast):
_____ nights at £_____ (up to max of £80 per night)
(receipts must be attached) _____

TOTAL COSTS
Balance due from Scottish Episcopal Church _____

Name (please print): _____

Address: _____

Payment will be by cheque or electronic bank transfer. If you wish payment to be made by bank transfer, please indicate as follows:

Either: Use my bank details already provided to General Synod Office*

Or: Use the following bank details*:

* Delete as appropriate

Account in the name of: _____

Bank sort code: _____

Bank account number: _____

Email address: _____

Signed: _____

Date: _____

(see notes overleaf)

NOTES:

- 1 Please ensure that this form is returned by not later than 29 June 2018 to the General Synod Office, 21 Grosvenor Crescent, Edinburgh, EH12 5EE.
- 2 If you have decided not to claim expenses, please return the form marked accordingly.
- 3 Please state if attending as an alternate.
- 4 Notification of payment of expenses made by electronic transfer will be sent be email.

GENERAL SYNOD 2018 FEEDBACK FORM

The Standing Committee values the comments of General Synod Members on the operation of the General Synod. If you have any comments, which you would like to have considered by the Standing Committee, you are invited to complete this Feedback Form and place it in the box at the exit when you leave after the final session of this General Synod. If you wish to make additional comments there is space at the end of the Feedback Form for that purpose. The Feedback Form can be submitted anonymously.

Please **CIRCLE** your multiple choice response and **PRINT** any other information

- | | | | | |
|-----|--|--------------|----------------|-----------------|
| 1. | Sessions were generally chaired competently and clearly | AGREE | NEUTRAL | DISAGREE |
| 2. | I would prefer more time in Synod to be given over to decision making rather than presentations of information | AGREE | NEUTRAL | DISAGREE |
| 3. | I appreciated the worship at General Synod | AGREE | NEUTRAL | DISAGREE |
| 4. | I liked the layout used for the Opening Eucharist | AGREE | NEUTRAL | DISAGREE |
| 5. | I would have liked to have seen the following on the agenda: | | | |
| 6. | If I could make <i>one change</i> to the <u>way</u> General Synod meets it would be: | | | |
| 7. | I enjoyed the General Synod Dinner | YES | NO | |
| 8. | My Diocese held a pre-Synod meeting | YES | NO | |
| 9. | I attended my Diocese's pre-Synod meeting | YES | NO | |
| 10. | I am a new member of General Synod | YES | NO | |
| 11. | My Diocese allocated me a "Buddy" | YES | NO | |

I am from the Diocese of

- Aberdeen & Orkney
- Argyll & The Isles
- Brechin
- Edinburgh
- Glasgow & Galloway
- Moray, Ross & Caithness
- St Andrews, Dunkeld & Dunblane

I am a member of the House of

- LAITY
- CLERGY
- BISHOPS

If you would like to include your contact details: name, address, e-mail then please use the space below:

Thank you for completing the Feedback Form.

Please remember to put it in the box at the exit before you leave for home on Saturday.

If you have any further comments you wish to make please do so in the space below:

