REPORT OF THE CLERGY REMUNERATION PACKAGE REVIEW GROUP

Summary of Recommendations

The following is a summary of the recommendations made in this report:-

1. *That Standard Stipend continue to be set at same level as the National Stipend Benchmark of the Church of England.*

2. *That full time stipendiary clergy be paid no less than Standard Stipend (and part time stipendiary clergy no less than Standard Stipend pro rata).*

3. *That where more than Standard Stipend is paid to parochial stipendiary clergy, vestries consider carefully the wider implications of their so doing.*

4. *That the Administration Board review the current levels of Child Allowance and the manner of its payment, including the possible reduction in the age limit from 21 to 18 for children within the scope of the allowance, with a view to the allowance being a more effective supplement to clergy households in which there are dependents.*

5. *That stipend be paid on time and in full and that any vestries currently paying stipend by cheque be encouraged to move to a system of electronic payment, where appropriate, making use of any diocesan payroll facility.*

6. *That the current stipend differentials applicable to those in curacy and to bishops be continued.*

7. *That, in cases where this has not already been done, steps be taken by vestries to improve the energy efficiency of rectories as a means of reducing energy consumption and therefore cost to clergy.*

8. *That dioceses be reminded of the guidelines for minimum standards for clergy housing and where necessary survey their rectories with a view to ensuring compliance.*

9. *That, where this is not already being done, vestries be reminded of their obligations to maintain rectories under Canon 60.2 and to undertake a programme of regular maintenance of rectories to ensure their upkeep.*

10. *That dioceses should ensure the undertaking by vestries of quinquennial surveys (including rectories).*

11. *That the SEC continue its current provision of retirement housing provision.*

12. *That clergy be encouraged to take a regular day off and their annual holiday entitlement.*

13. *That vestries encourage their clergyperson in the taking of a regular day off and annual holiday entitlement and monitor that that is being done.*

14. *That vestries be encouraged to ensure full and prompt reimbursement of expenses.*

15. *That the provincial Personnel Committee be encouraged in its intention to produce clear guidance on the categories of reclaimable expenses.*

16. *That the Administration Board invite the Personnel Committee to consider and clarify the process for applying for the provincial resettlement grant and its scope and that the Board thereafter take steps to ensure that dioceses are aware of the availability of the grant and that they in turn encourage vestries to ensure that clergy moving into post are properly reimbursed for their removal expenses.*

17. *That a further review of the Clergy Remuneration Package be carried out in 10 years' time unless circumstances make it desirable that such a review should take place at an earlier date.*

1. Introduction

The last substantial review of clergy stipends was contained in the report of the Clergy Personnel Commission, *The Pastoral and Practical Care of Clergy* ("the Clergy Personnel Commission (CPC) Report") which was received by General Synod in June 2000. That report recommended that the then Scottish Episcopal Church ("SEC") minimum stipend should be brought into line with the Church of England National Stipend Benchmark over a period of five years and maintained at that level for the foreseeable future thereafter. That stipend was in future to be designated "Standard Stipend" within the SEC. The objective of parity was achieved by 2006 and Standard Stipend has maintained parity since then.

Following the substantial review of the benefit structure of the SEC Pension Fund, completed in 2013 and implemented with effect from the beginning of 2014, discussions within the provincial Administration Board, Finance Committee, Standing Committee and College of Bishops suggested that it would be appropriate to review the level of stipend and ancillary benefits which together comprise the "remuneration package" for stipendiary clergy.

In the light of that, the provincial Administration Board established a Review Group, the remit for which is set out in Appendix 1. The membership of the group comprised Canon David Palmer (Convener), the Right Rev Dr Nigel Peyton (Bishop of Brechin), Mr Nigel Cook (Treasurer for the Diocese of Edinburgh), Mrs Maureen McKellar and the Rev Canon Andrew Sheridan (respectively Convener and Member of the provincial Personnel Committee).

2. Methodology

Before commencing detailed discussion regarding the substantive issues contained in the Review Group's remit, the Group sought information from a number of sources.

Direct enquiries were made of the SEC's local Anglican partners, namely the Church of England, the Church in Wales and the Church of Ireland (with whom there is considerable cross-border clergy movement) and information was also obtained regarding stipend levels in the Church of Scotland and the Baptist Union of Scotland. A brief summary of current stipend rates is set out in Appendix 2. These need to be considered in the light of comments made elsewhere in this report.

In addition, two distinct questionnaires were developed and sent to stipendiary clergy (including bishops) and vestries respectively on a range of issues. Copies of the questionnaires are set out in Appendices 3 and 4.

70 stipendiary clergy responded, amounting to a response rate of 47%. 110 responses to the vestry questionnaire were received, a response rate of 38%. Summaries of the statistical responses to the clergy and vestries questionnaires are set out in the Appendices 5 and 6 (these do not include the specific comments made by respondents). Whilst non-stipendiary clergy were not invited to complete a questionnaire as such, they were given the opportunity to comment and a small number choose to do so.

The Review Group expresses its grateful thanks to all those who took the time to respond to the questionnaires and make comments. The Group found the responses most helpful to its deliberations.

3. Stipends

3.1 Concept of Stipend

The remit of the Review Group did not invite the Group to consider whether the very concept of stipend ought to be departed from. However, in its discussions, the Group endorsed the principle that payment of stipend, rather than salary, remained appropriate for clergy. It adhered to the view expressed in the CPC Report that stipend is not a financial reward but rather a means of releasing someone to give all of their time to ministry.

3.2 Historical Patterns of Stipend Increases

In considering future stipend levels, the Group had one eye on how levels of stipend increases had compared historically with increases in the general costs of living. Appendix 7 sets out specific comparisons against rates of increase in the Retail Prices and Consumer Prices indices and against average earnings.

Inevitably, any historic comparison depends in part on the period over which any such comparison is made. Generally, over the longer term (comparisons over 24, 20 and 15 years), growth in Standard Stipend compares favourably against the various inflationary measures. When measured for the period since 2006, the year in which parity with the Church of England National Stipend Benchmark was achieved, the comparison against inflation indices is somewhat less favourable. However, in a period where average earnings increases have been relatively modest, increases in Standard Stipend compare reasonably with earnings increases.

3.3 Level of Stipend – Adequacy and Reasonableness

The Review Group questionnaires invited comment on whether the current level of Standard Stipend was adequate and whether it was reasonable.

The questionnaires indicated that 64% of the clergy who responded to the questionnaire, considered it adequate and 73% considered it reasonable. 72% of vestries considered it adequate and 75% considered it reasonable.

Notwithstanding the fact that there were clear majorities among the respondents who considered Standard Stipend to be both adequate and reasonable, there were a number of points which emerged in the responses, including the following: –

- Some questioned the adequacy of stipend as sufficient to meet the living expenses of households in which there were dependants. In some cases, the availability of a second income appeared important in that regard.
- The fact that some rectories, particularly older ones, could entail significant heating bills.
- Whether having a Standard Stipend applicable across Scotland adequately catered for regional variations in living costs.
- That clergy were professionals, and that the Standard Stipend ought to be at a level commensurate with other professionals or at least take account of the degree of training and qualification undertaken by clergy.

- That a better comparator for stipends in Scotland than the Church of England would be the Church of Scotland, against which Standard Stipend appeared to compare unfavourably.
- That the level of stipend was not sufficiently high to allow clergy to invest in a property for their retirement.
- A query as to whether the level of stipend was a disincentive to "recruitment".
- A comment regarding comparability with the Living Wage.
- The fact some congregations pay in excess of Standard Stipend.

A number of the above factors are addressed in greater detail in other sections of this report below.

The Review Group recognises the difficulties that some clergy, particularly those with families, may encounter in meeting everyday living costs. It noted the fact that on a scale of 1 (very easy) to 5 (very difficult), 51% of clergy respondents placed themselves in either band 4 or 5.

The provincial system of child allowance (details of which are set out in Appendix 8) is intended to provide some support in such circumstances, but the Review Group considers that it would be appropriate for the Administration Board to reconsider whether the level of child allowance available is adequate and indeed it would be supportive of an increase beyond the levels of increase in recent years (which have in fact been in excess of inflation). It queries the fact that children up to age 21 come within the scope of the allowance since that age now appears somewhat arbitrary and it would suggest a reduction to age 18 in relation to new applicants entering the scheme

The Review Group recognises that some rectories are expensive to heat, particularly so in an age of rising energy costs. It would wish to encourage dioceses and charges to ensure that clergy housing meets the minimum standards recommended by the Province and also that careful consideration be given to making energy efficiency improvements to rectories. Dioceses may be able to offer advice on such matters but guidance is also available from bodies such as Eco-Congregation Scotland (http://www.ecocongregationscotland.org/) or the Energy Savings Trust (http://www.energysavingtrust.org.uk/).

On the question of comparison with the Living Wage (£8.25 per hour), if clergy were deemed to undertake a 48 hour week (the Review Group recognises that setting any specific number of hours worked in a week is a difficult exercise), that would produce a stipend of £20,592, which is less than current Standard Stipend. This takes no account of other benefits comprised in the "remuneration package".

As to whether the level of Standard Stipend adversely affects recruitment, there is no evidence that that is the case. Certainly, numbers of ordinands entering the new Scottish Episcopal Institute are higher than they have been for many years. Whilst it is the case that some charges can remain vacant for considerable periods of time, there is no specific evidence which points to the level of stipend as being the cause of such recruitment difficulties. A number of congregations, for example, have now moved to a part-time stipendiary arrangement which may limit the field of potential applicants.

On the question of whether stipend adequately recognises the professional training and standing of clergy, the Review Group would acknowledge that, in comparison to other professionals, clergy are on the whole less well paid. Clergy are to be applauded for the level of training and formation which they undertake prior, and subsequent, to ordination. They represent the public face of the church locally and have a standing in local communities and beyond. However, if the concept of stipend as a living allowance remains the underlying principle, then its adequacy to achieve that end, ultimately, depends on the costs of living, rather than the extent of qualifications undertaken.

3.4 Comparability with other Churches

Appendix 2 sets out details of stipends payable in some other churches. Like for like comparisons can be difficult to make on a consistent basis because the “remuneration package” varies from one church to another. For example, in the Church in Wales whilst its stipend is less than SEC Standard Stipend, parochial fees are retained by the clergy personally and therefore supplement stipend. In the Church of Scotland, the clergy pension scheme has a contributory element with the level of contribution by the church being related to the amount of contribution paid by the member.

In the Church of England, the National Stipend Benchmark is arrived at through consideration of economic factors – current year and projections – which are provided to dioceses who are then asked to indicate what they intend to pay to the greatest number of clergy (i.e. incumbents and those of incumbent status). The National Stipend Benchmark is therefore a result of a consultative process that draws in not just objective measures of what is ‘sufficient’ in the economic context and affordable to dioceses but also what is ‘right’ and what supports other aims: clergy wellbeing; flourishing ministry; growth in vocations etc. Data considered is drawn from a wide range of sources including the Minimum Income Standard (Joseph Rowntree Foundation); disposable income measures (Office of National Statistics); and net household equivalised income (Institute for Fiscal Studies).

The consultative exercise with dioceses in the Church of England, therefore, allows for significant input from across the regions of England and, to that extent, involves consideration of regional variances. The Central Stipends Authority of the Church of England in fact also sets Regional Stipend Benchmarks which adjust the National Stipend Benchmark for regional variations in the cost of living (excluding housing and travel) and provide general indications of the level of stipend required for each diocesan stipend to have the same purchasing power as the National Stipend Benchmark.

The Review Group considers that, generally speaking, comparison with Anglican stipends is a more appropriate comparison than one against other denominations. Clergy transfers from the Church of Scotland are not unknown but are very limited in number and involve additional levels of complexity, whereas it is the case that vacancies in the SEC are frequently filled by clergy from the Church of England and, to a lesser extent, the Church in Wales and Church of Ireland. If the SEC Standard Stipend were to be significantly out of kilter with Church of England stipends, in particular, the ability of clergy to transfer across the border might be impaired.

A further argument in favour of linkage with the Church of England is a practical one, namely that the resources of the Church of England allow for much greater degree of sophistication in the setting of stipend levels than the infrastructure of the SEC could straightforwardly provide. Whilst the Review Group does not regard that factor as in any sense decisive, it is nevertheless one to be borne in mind.

3.5 Stipend Differentials

As will be noted from the information in Appendix 2, most denominations include an element of differentials in their stipend payment structures. Frequently, these relate to some element of ecclesiastical seniority.

In the SEC, there are two basic categories of differential. Firstly, those who receive less than Standard Stipend (essentially those in training) and, secondly, those who receive in excess of Standard Stipend, namely bishops who receive 1.5 times Standard Stipend.

The Review Group has given careful consideration to these categories and is of the view that it is appropriate to maintain such differentials. It recognises that such a view runs counter to the basic concept of stipend. However, it considers that most in the church would accept that those such as curates who are still in training, should not receive the full amount of stipend paid to those who have completed their initial ministerial training. Also, the Group takes the view that most in the church would recognise that the level of responsibility carried by bishops – a responsibility borne not only within their respective dioceses but provincially for the whole of the SEC - merits the higher level of stipend currently paid. It notes that pension for bishops is calculated on the basis of Standard Stipend only and sees no reason to alter that.

The Group also considered whether there were other categories of clergy, for whom differentials should apply. Deans, for example, carry a level of diocesan responsibility. It is the case that in fact many clergy within the church carry a degree of responsibility over and above that within their own immediate charge. In a small church such as the SEC, with limited numbers of stipendiary clergy, it can be expected that many clergy will have such additional duties. The Group considers that it would be invidious to introduce any greater degree of stipend differential than exists at present and therefore does not propose any change in that regard.

The Review Group would, however, wish to emphasise that Standard Stipend should be regarded as “standard”. Standard Stipend (or pro rata in cases of part-time appointments) should, therefore, be regarded certainly as a minimum and whilst the Group recognises that it cannot require congregations not to pay in excess of Standard Stipend, it urges congregations which do so to consider very carefully the consequences of their so doing.

3.6 Payment of Stipend

The Review Group was concerned to note from certain questionnaire responses that not all clergy are confident of receiving their stipend on time and that in a small number of cases it appears that stipend may still be paid by cheque.

It considers that there can be no justification for late payment of stipend. Late payment can put clergy in a position of severe embarrassment and is unacceptable. Similarly, in this day and age where electronic payment is now the norm, it considers that payment procedures should be updated to enable direct payments into the clergyperson's bank account. Most dioceses operate some form of payroll facility and congregations which are not currently paying stipend by BACS are urged to do so themselves or to contact their diocesan office with a view to participating in any centralised facility which may be available. Care should be taken, however, in structuring any such arrangements not to jeopardise availability of the Employment Allowance.

3.7 Recommendations regarding Stipend

1. *That Standard Stipend continue to be set at same level as the National Stipend Benchmark of the Church of England.*

2. *That full time stipendiary clergy be paid no less than Standard Stipend (and part time stipendiary clergy no less than Standard Stipend pro rata).*

3. *That where more than Standard Stipend is paid to parochial stipendiary clergy, vestries consider carefully the wider implications of their so doing.*

4. *That the Administration Board review the current levels of Child Allowance and the manner of its payment, including the possible reduction in the age limit from 21 to 18 for children within the scope of the allowance, with a view to the allowance being a more effective supplement to clergy households in which there are dependents.*

5. *That stipend be paid on time and in full and that any vestries currently paying stipend by cheque be encouraged to move to a system of electronic payment, where appropriate, making use of any diocesan payroll facility.*

6. *That the current stipend differentials applicable to those in curacy and to bishops be continued.*

4. Clergy Housing

4.1 The Tied House

In assessing the total value of the Remuneration Package, it needs to be borne in mind that stipend is only one component of that package. The provision of tied housing is a significant element. Whilst some may see tied housing as more of a burden than a benefit, it should be noted that the Church of England Central Stipends Authority undertakes a calculation to provide a general indication of the amount of additional gross income which clergy of incumbent status would require in order to provide basic domestic accommodation for themselves and their families. The most recently available such figure, for July 2014, is £9,910.

The concept of tied housing was beyond the remit of the Review Group. It was aware that there are pros and cons of the tied housing system. The perceived advantages include enabling the clergyperson to live within the local community (without tied housing, entry to certain areas could be inhibited where housing is expensive). Also, the provision of tied housing is tax efficient because it is not treated as a benefit in kind. The provision of housing in any other way (for example, by way of housing allowance) would be a more expensive way of providing housing for clergy. (It is noted in passing that the Review Group prepared a response for the Administration Board to submit to the consultation in late 2015 by the Treasury and HM Revenue and Customs regarding the taxation of employer-provided housing. It is not yet known whether that consultation is likely to lead to any alteration in policy.)

The disadvantages of the tied house system, however, include the fact that rectories are not always maintained by congregations as well as they might be, and this can prove a source of tension between the clergyperson, their family and the vestry. Also, upon retirement, the tied house system can mean that clergy find themselves without housing and, therefore, look to the church to provide.

Accepting the continuation of the tied housing policy, the Review Group offers a number of observations: –

- It is imperative that vestries ensure proper maintenance of rectories. Charges should be reminded that rectories should be included in quinquennial surveys (Digest of Resolutions, section 7.2.2). The onus should lie with the vestry to monitor the rectory regularly and attend to any necessary issues of maintenance. It should not be for the rector to have to ask.
- As mentioned above, steps should be taken to render rectories as energy efficient as possible.
- As mentioned above, rectories should comply with the minimum standards for clergy housing recommended by the province (see http://www.scotland.anglican.org/vestry-resources/buildings/), and dioceses should survey their rectories to ensure compliance.
- As a consequence of the tied housing system, the SEC should continue to make available housing for clergy in retirement, where they are unable to do so out of their own means. The Review Group had the benefit of a meeting with Dr Daphne Audsley who administers the provincial retirement housing stock and the Group is of the view that the system for provision of retirement housing works well, given the financial resources of the church.

4.2 Recommendations regarding Housing

7. *That, in cases where this has not already been done, steps be taken by vestries to improve the energy efficiency of rectories as a means of reducing energy consumption and therefore cost to clergy.*

8. *That dioceses be reminded of the guidelines for minimum standards for clergy housing and where necessary survey their rectories with a view to ensuring compliance.*

9. *That, where this is not already being done, vestries be reminded of their obligations to maintain rectories under Canon 60.2 and to undertake a programme of regular maintenance of rectories to ensure their upkeep.*

10. *That dioceses should ensure the undertaking by vestries of quinquennial surveys (including rectories).*

11. *That the SEC continue its current provision of retirement housing provision.*

5. Other Benefits

5.1 Range of Other Benefits

The provision of benefits to clergy beyond the normal remuneration package of stipend, housing (including Council Tax), pension and reimbursement of expenses does not appear to be significant.

Only three respondents to the vestry questionnaire indicated that a car or car allowance was provided. Some respondents also mentioned assistance with further training or professional development.

However, the Review Group was concerned to note that 30% of clergy respondents indicated that they did not take a regular day off and 26% indicated they did not take their full annual holiday entitlement. Occasionally, lack of clergy cover was cited as a reason for this. The Group wishes to emphasise the importance of a regular day off in order to maintain appropriate work/life balance and, similarly, the need for holiday provision to be taken. (The Administration Board has previously adopted guidelines in relation to holidays and time off and this will feature in revised Clergy Personnel guidance to be available soon.) It may be that there needs to be greater advance planning on the part of some clergy to ensure that cover is available but the Group also believes that there is an onus on vestries to check with their clergyperson that time off and holiday entitlement is properly taken and that the necessary arrangements are put in place to enable this to happen.

5.2 Recommendations regarding Other Benefits

12. *That clergy be encouraged to take a regular weekly day off and their annual holiday entitlement.*

13. *That vestries encourage their clergyperson in the taking of a regular weekly day off and annual holiday entitlement and monitor that that is being done.*

6. Expenses

6.1 Reimbursement of Expenses

The Review Group was concerned to note that 26% of respondents to the clergy questionnaire indicated that they were not reimbursed for all out-of-pocket expenses. It is difficult to draw too definitive a conclusion from that because some clergy indicated specifically that they did not reclaim expenses because they regarded the bearing of such expenses as a form of giving to their charge. Such an intention is laudable, but it does mean that the costs associated with “running the congregation” are, in fact, understated. Also, not to seek reimbursement of expenses is much less tax efficient than claiming the expense and then making a donation back to the charge by way of Gift Aid.

The Review Group wishes to emphasise the importance of full and prompt reimbursement of expenses to clergy. It is aware that the provincial Personnel Committee is considering the production of a specific document giving guidance on clergy expenses and would wish to encourage the Personnel Committee in that endeavour. Clergy may also wish to avail themselves of the services of specialist clergy tax advisers.

Of particular concern from some of the questionnaire responses was the fact that certain members of clergy had struggled significantly in connection with relocation expenses. It is the duty of the receiving charge to be responsible for reasonable relocation expenses and, in principle, there seems no good reason why such expenses are not promptly reimbursed. The Group highlights the availability of the provincial Resettlement Grant (the current guidance notes for which are set out in Appendix 9) but has noted that there seems to be some lack of clarity about its availability and scope and recommends that the provincial Administration Board take steps to address this.

6.2 Recommendations regarding Expenses

14. *That vestries be encouraged to ensure full and prompt reimbursement of expenses.*

15. *That the provincial Personnel Committee be encouraged in its intention to produce clear guidance on the categories of reclaimable expenses.*

16. *That the Administration Board invite the Personnel Committee to consider and clarify the process for applying for the provincial resettlement grant and its scope and that the Board thereafter take steps to ensure that dioceses are aware of the availability of the grant and that they in turn encourage vestries to ensure that clergy moving into post are properly reimbursed for their removal expenses.*

7. Pensions

Whilst recognising that the clergy pension forms a significant part of the remuneration package, the Review Group considered that since a far-reaching review of the SEC Pension Fund benefits had been undertaken as recently as 2012/2013, it was not necessary to revisit that review.

It noted that that review had resulted in some reduction in the level of benefits available from the Scheme but also that the consultation leading to those benefit changes had explored in some detail the extent of affordability on the part of congregations. It is pleased that the results of the review were to maintain the scheme as a non-contributory final salary arrangement. Were the non-contributory aspect of the scheme to be altered in the future, the Review Group wishes simply to note, for present purposes, that the introduction of any form of compulsory member contribution would, in effect, have a negative effect on the overall value of stipend. At the present time, however, no such intention is in prospect.

8. Future Process

8.1 Future Considerations

Noting that this is the first provincial review on the subject matter for 16 years, the Review Group recommends that a further review be undertaken in 10 years' time, unless circumstances make it desirable that such a review should take place at an earlier date.

This report is provided to the provincial Administration Board, as the body which established the review. It will wish to consider the recommendations made in this report and, if it accepts them, decide how to take them forward. It may also wish to make this report more widely available or at least to provide to the wider church an indication of decisions which the Board chooses to take in the light of the recommendations presented.

8.2 Recommendation regarding Future Review

17. *That a further review of the Clergy Remuneration Package be carried out in 10 years' time unless circumstances make it desirable that such a review should take place at an earlier date.*

David Palmer
Convener, Clergy Remuneration Package Review Group
September 2016

APPENDIX 1

Review Group Remit

To review current policy and provision in relation to the remuneration and other benefits provided to stipendiary clergy and make recommendations to the Administration Board for any changes thought to be necessary or desirable.

This should include consideration of: -

(a) Clergy Stipends:-
- (i) the factors to be taken into account in assessing the appropriate level of stipend for clergy (including bishops)
- (ii) whether current policy of setting Standard Stipend with reference to the Church of England National Stipend benchmark should continue

(b) Clergy Housing:-
- (i) the complex of issues concerning the relationship between tied and retirement housing.

(c) Clergy Expenses:-
- (i) whether current provision of reimbursement of expenses is adequate
- (ii) whether the current system of question of relocation expenses is adequate

(d) Pensions: -
- (i) whether the Church's current provision is appropriate.

(e) Other Benefits:-
- (i) The identification of any other benefits routinely provided to stipendiary clergy and the extent to which there may be any disparity in policy as between dioceses in relation to such benefits (including for example in relation to car loans) and if so whether steps should be taken to standardise provision.

Composition of Review Body
The group should comprise a lay convener, a Bishop, a member of stipendiary clergy, and a person with HR experience (drawn from the provincial Personnel Committee if any of the former are not also Personnel Committee members)

Timescale
The Review Body is asked to report to the Administration Board in time for the latter's meeting in September

November 2015

APPENDIX 2

Comparative Stipend Rates

A. Scottish Episcopal Church

Standard Stipend 2016:	£25,061
Grade A Priest in 3rd and subsequent years, Deacon in 4th and subsequent years: 95% of Standard Stipend:	£23,808
Grade B Priest in 1st and 2nd years, Deacon in 2nd and 3rd years: 92.5% Standard Stipend:	£23,181
Grade C Deacon in 1st year: 90% of Standard Stipend:	£22,555
Bishop's Stipend (1.5 x Standard Stipend)	£37,591

B. Church of England

The National Minimum Stipend from 1 April 2016: £23,440 Under common tenure all full-time office-holders must receive stipend, or stipend together with other income related to their office, of at least this amount.

The National Stipend Benchmark from 1 April 2016: £25,060.

	Senior Clergy starting on or after 1 April 2004	Senior Clergy in equivalent or higher paid post before April '04
Residentiary Canons	£27,060 Regionally adjusted	£28,900
Assistant Bishops (full-time)	£33,850	£34,060
Deans	£34,980	£35,480
Suffragan Bishops	£34,980	£35,480
Diocesan Bishops	£42,870	£43,220
Bishop of London	£62,040	£65,070
Archbishop of York	£67,680	-
Archbishop of Canterbury	£78,980	-

C. Church in Wales

	2016 (£ p.a.)
Assistant Curate, Cathedral Chaplain	19,919
Incumbent, Vicar in Rectorial Benefice, Cleric in Charge and cleric appointed to an extra-parochial office	23,434
Incumbent of a Rectorial Benefice	24,606
Residentiary Canon	26,949
Archdeacon	35,854
Dean	36,323
Assistant Bishop	39,838
Diocesan Bishop	43,353
Archbishop	46,868

D. Church of Ireland

The 2016 sterling ‘minimum approved stipend’ (MAS)	£27,870
Clergy also receive a ‘locomotory’ allowance which is set on a diocesan basis and calculated with reference to the parish location and size. This is generally worth between:	£6,500 and £8,000
They also are entitled to a personal allowance which is in relation to office expenses of about:	£1,200 to £1,500 – this is for office expenses
Bishops	1.75 times MAS
Archbishops receive	2.25-2.45 times the MAS respectively
Curates	a proportion of MAS dependent on years into their curacy

E. Church of Scotland

	Stipend Scale 2016
Point 1	£26,380
Point 2	£28,106
Point 3	£29,831
Point 4	£31,557
Point 5	£32,419

The scale points relate to experience, normally with annual progression up the scale.

F. Baptist Union of Scotland

Reference Stipend 2016/17: £23,440

APPENDIX 3

Questionnaire to Stipendiary Clergy

The provincial Administration Board has established a Group to review current policy and provision in relation to the remuneration and other benefits provided to stipendiary clergy. The review will cover stipend, housing, expenses and any other benefits provided. The Scottish Episcopal Church Standard Stipend is currently set at a level equivalent to the Church of England National Stipend Benchmark.

The Review Group is keen to consult stipendiary clergy on a number of matters and would be most grateful for your response to the questions set out below. (The Review Group is also sending a questionnaire to vestries.)

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. The information you supply will be treated in the strictest confidence and will be used only in the context of the work of the Review Group.

1. Standard Stipend for 2016 is £25,061 (Standard Stipend for curates is a percentage of this). Please indicate whether you receive:-
    - Standard Stipend (or, if a curate, the curate equivalent or, if part-time, Standard Stipend pro rata)? Yes/No
    - More than Standard Stipend Yes/No
    - Less than Standard Stipend Yes/No

2. Do you consider that the current level of Standard Stipend is adequate?
Yes/No

3. If your answer to question 2 is “no”, please give reasons

4. Do you consider that the current level of Standard Stipend is reasonable?
Yes/No

5. If your answer to question is 4 “no”, please give reasons

6. Please indicate how you receive your monthly stipend
BACS (electronic bank transfer)
Cheque

7. Do you receive your stipend on time each month? Yes/No

8. How easy do you (or would you) find it to live on Standard Stipend as your sole source of income?

1 Very easy - 5 Very difficult

1 2 3 4 5

9. If you have a partner, does s/he have paid employment? Yes/No

10. Is your partner's income crucial to your financial stability?
Yes/No

11. Do you live in a tied house? Yes/No

12. If you do not live in a tied house, what kind of housing provision is made for you?

    a) No provision
    b) Housing allowance
    c) Other

13. If your answer to question 12 is "other", please provide brief details

14. If you live in a tied house, is it well maintained?

1 Well Maintained – 5 Badly Maintained

1 2 3 4 5

15. Apart from reimbursement of expenses, payment of pension contributions, provision of tied housing (or a housing allowance), do you receive any other financial benefit from your congregation as part of your "remuneration package"?
Yes/No

16. If your answer to the preceding question is "yes", please indicate what kind of benefit

17. Are you reimbursed for all out of pocket expenses incurred by you in relation to your ministry?
Yes/No

18. Does the congregation/diocese provide you with a car or car loan?
Yes/No

19. Are you making any specific provision for retirement income (other than the SEC pension)?
Yes/No

20. Do you take a regular day off? Yes/No

21. Do you take your annual holiday entitlement? Yes/No

22. Are you making any specific provision for your retirement by way of housing?
Yes/No

23. Do you consider that the church has an obligation to assist with housing for retired clergy?
Yes/No

If there are any aspects of the clergy remuneration package not covered by the above questions on which you wish to comment, please indicate what they are.

24. It would be helpful to have the following brief details (please circle as appropriate)

Age range under 30

30-50

51-67

67+

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire

Respondent details (optional)

Name:

Email or Postal Address:

Position:

Address:

Please return this form by not later than 28 March 2016. The preferred manner of response is by use of the online response form available at:

Alternatively, the form can be submitted by email to DonnaG@scotland.anglican.org or by post to:-

The Secretary General
General Synod Office
21 Grosvenor Crescent
Edinburgh
EH12 5EE

APPENDIX 4

Questionnaire to Vestries

The provincial Administration Board has established a Group to review current policy and provision in relation to the remuneration and other benefits provided to stipendiary clergy. The review will cover stipend, housing, expenses and any other benefits provided. The Scottish Episcopal Church Standard Stipend is currently set at a level equivalent to the Church of England National Stipend Benchmark.

The Review Group is keen to consult vestries on a number of matters and would be most grateful for your response to the questions set out below. A response should be made on behalf of the vestry after it has had the opportunity to discuss the questionnaire. (The Review Group is also sending a separate questionnaire to stipendiary clergy.)

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. The information you supply will be treated in the strictest confidence and will be used only in the context of the work of the Review Group.

1. Does your congregation pay or contribute to paying stipend to a member of the stipendiary clergy? (If in a clergy vacancy, answer this question as if the vacancy has been filled)

   Yes/No

   If no, go to question 4.

2. Standard Stipend for 2016 is £25,061 (Standard Stipend for curates is a percentage of this). Please indicate whether your clergyperson receives:-

   - Standard Stipend (or, if a curate, the curate equivalent or, if part-time, Standard Stipend pro rata)? Yes/No
   - More than Standard Stipend Yes/No
   - Less than Standard Stipend Yes/No

3. If your congregation pays more or less than Standard Stipend please explain why you do so.

4. Do you consider that the current level of Standard Stipend is adequate?

   Yes/No

   If your answer to question 4 is “no”, please give reasons

5. Do you consider that the current level of Standard Stipend is reasonable?

   Yes/No

6. If your answer to question 6 is “no”, please give reasons

7. Apart from reimbursement of expenses, payment of pension contributions, provision of tied housing (or a housing allowance), does your congregation provide any other financial benefit to your clergyperson?

   Yes/No

8. If your answer to question 8 is “yes”, please indicate what kind of benefit

9. Does the congregation/diocese provide your clergyperson with a car or car loan?

   Yes/No

10. Do you provide a tied house to your clergyperson?

    Yes/No

11. If the answer to question 11 is yes, is there a regular system in place to ensure adequate maintenance of the tied house?

    Yes/No

12. Do you consider that the church has an obligation to assist with housing for retired clergy?

    Yes/No

13. If there are any aspects of the clergy remuneration package not covered by the above questions on which you wish to comment, please do so.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire

Respondent details (optional)

Name:

Email or Postal Address:

Position:

Name of Congregation:

Please return this form by not later than 28 March 2016. The preferred manner of response is by use of the online response form available at:

Alternatively, the form can be submitted by email to DonnaG@scotland.anglican.org or by post to:-

The Secretary General
General Synod Office
21 Grosvenor Crescent
Edinburgh
EH12 5EE

APPENDIX 5

Response to Statistical Questions in Stipendiary Clergy Questionnaire
(This summary does not include specific comments made in response to the questions which invited comment since these are referred to in the body of the report.)

Number of responses received

Named	49
Anonymous	21
	71 (a response rate of 47%)

1. Standard Stipend for 2016 is £25,061 (Standard Stipend for curates is a percentage of this). Please indicate whether you receive:-

• Standard Stipend (or, if a curate, the curate equivalent or, if part-time, Standard Stipend pro rata)?	**55**
• More than Standard Stipend	**10**
• Less than Standard Stipend	**5**

(**note** – at least two of those receiving more than Standard Stipend are bishops.).

2. Do you consider that the current level of Standard Stipend is adequate?

Yes	**45**
No	**25**

~~3. If your answer to question 2 is "no", please give reasons~~

4. Do you consider that the current level of Standard Stipend is reasonable?

Yes	**51**
No	**19**

~~5. If your answer to question is 4 "no", please give reasons~~

6. Please indicate how you receive your monthly stipend

BACS (electronic bank transfer)	**64**
Cheque	**6**

7. Do you receive your stipend on time each month?

Yes	**67**
No	**3**

8. How easy do you (or would you) find it to live on Standard Stipend as your sole source of income?

1 Very easy	**2**
2	**9**
3	**23**
4	**26**
5 Very difficult	**10**

9. If you have a partner, does s/he have paid employment?

Yes	**39**
No	**31**

10. Is your partner's income crucial to your financial stability?

Yes	**31**
No	**8**

11. Do you live in a tied house?

Yes	**60**
No	**10**

12. If you do not live in a tied house, what kind of housing provision is made for you?

d) No provision	**6**
e) Housing allowance	**2**
f) Other	**2**

~~13. If your answer to question 12 is "other", please provide brief details~~

14. If you live in a tied house, is it well maintained?

1 Well Maintained	**14**
2	**21**
3	**18**
4	**7**
5 Badly Maintained	**nil**

15. Apart from reimbursement of expenses, payment of pension contributions, provision of tied housing (or a housing allowance), do you receive any other

financial benefit from your congregation as part of your “remuneration package”?

Yes **11**
No **59**

~~16. If your answer to the preceding question is “yes”, please indicate what kind of benefit~~

17. Are you reimbursed for all out of pocket expenses incurred by you in relation to your ministry?

Yes **52**
No **18**

18. Does the congregation/diocese provide you with a car or car loan?

Yes **2**
No **68**

19. Are you making any specific provision for retirement income (other than the SEC pension)?

Yes **39**
No **31**

20. Do you take a regular day off?

Yes **49**
No **21**

21. Do you take your annual holiday entitlement?

Yes **52**
No **18**

22. Are you making any specific provision for your retirement by way of housing?

Yes **47**
No **23**

23. Do you consider that the church has an obligation to assist with housing for retired clergy?

Yes **59**
No **11**

~~24. If there are any aspects of the clergy remuneration package not covered by the above questions on which you wish to comment, please indicate what they are.~~

25. It would be helpful to have the following brief details (please circle as appropriate)

Age range	under 30	**nil**
	30-50	**15**
	51-67	**50**
	67+	**4**
	(one not specified)	

APPENDIX 6

Response to Statistical Questions in Vestry Questionnaire
(This summary does not include specific comments made in response to the questions which invited comment since these are referred to in the body of the report.)

Number of responses received

Named	99
Anonymous	11
	110 (a response rate of 38%)

1. Does your congregation pay or contribute to paying stipend to a member of the stipendiary clergy? (If in a clergy vacancy, answer this question as if the vacancy has been filled)

   Yes **100**
   No **10**

   If no, go to question 4.

2. Standard Stipend for 2016 is £25,061 (Standard Stipend for curates is a percentage of this). Please indicate whether your clergyperson receives:-

   - Standard Stipend (or, if a curate, the curate equivalent or, if part-time, Standard Stipend pro rata)? **84**
   - More than Standard Stipend **10**
   - Less than Standard Stipend **6**

3. ~~If your congregation pays more or less than Standard Stipend please explain why you do so.~~

4. Do you consider that the current level of Standard Stipend is adequate?

   Yes **79**
   No **31**

5. ~~If your answer to question 4 is "no", please give reasons~~

6. Do you consider that the current level of Standard Stipend is reasonable?

   Yes **82**
   No **28**

7. ~~If your answer to question 6 is "no", please give reasons~~

8. Apart from reimbursement of expenses, payment of pension contributions, provision of tied housing (or a housing allowance), does your congregation provide any other financial benefit to your clergyperson?

Yes	**34**
No	**76**

~~9. If your answer to question 8 is "yes", please indicate what kind of benefit~~

10. Does the congregation/diocese provide your clergyperson with a car or car loan?

Yes	**3**
No	**107**

11. Do you provide a tied house to your clergyperson?

Yes	**95**
No	**15**

Of those with stipendiary clergy:

Yes	**91**
No	**9**

12. If the answer to question 11 is yes, is there a regular system in place to ensure adequate maintenance of the tied house?

Yes	**89**
No	**6**

13. Do you consider that the church has an obligation to assist with housing for retired clergy?

Yes	**62**
No	**48**

~~14. If there are any aspects of the clergy remuneration package not covered by the above questions on which you wish to comment, please do so.~~

APPENDIX 7

Standard Stipend – has it kept pace with inflation and growth in average earnings?

One potential concern regarding the level of stipend paid is the extent to which increases in stipend rates have reflected levels of inflation and growth in earnings. This paper seeks to answer that question.

The attached schedule details Standard Stipend, RPI, CPI and changes in Average Earnings for 1993 – 2016 and provides comparisons between the various indices and the rate of increase in Standard Stipend.

There are a number of inflationary measures that could be used none of which are likely to be a perfect comparison. RPI and CPI are however the most commonly used and generally accepted measures of inflation and appear to be a reasonable benchmarks against which to measure the extent to which Standard Stipend has retained its real value. CPI is likely to be more appropriate than RPI given that it does not account for many costs of home ownership which would not be incurred by most stipendiary clergy. (see extract of the ONS brief guide to Consumer Price Indices below). A variety of earnings statistics are produced for different industry sectors and regions – the one used reflects all full-time workers across the UK.

A number of averages have also been calculated to provide comparisons over a period of years rather than focussing on year on year comparisons.

In considering the question, it is worth noting that, following the decision in 2000 to increase Standard Stipend to achieve parity with the Church of England National Stipend Benchmark, there was a period of 5 years (2002 – 2006) in which there were "inflation plus" increases in Standard Stipend. Analysis of stipend trends will therefore be influenced by the inclusion or exclusion of that catch-up period.

The averages and the extent to which growth in Standard Stipend compares with changes in the three inflationary measures are summarised in the following table:

Averages	**Stipend increase**	**RPI**	**Stipend less RPI**	**CPI**	**Stipend less CPI**	**Earnings**	**Stipend less earnings**
Over last 24 years	3.61%	2.80%	0.81%	2.16%	1.45%	3.26%	0.35%
Over last 20 years	3.41%	2.80%	0.61%	2.02%	1.39%	3.20%	0.21%
Over last 15 years	2.95%	2.84%	0.11%	2.16%	0.79%	2.65%	0.30%
Over last 10 years	2.05%	3.04%	(0.99%)	2.51%	(0.46%)	2.11%	(0.06%)
Over last 5 years	1.90%	2.96%	(1.06%)	2.28%	(0.38%)	1.70%	0.20%

An alternative way of addressing the same question is to consider what Standard Stipend would be in 2016 if it had changed in line with specific inflationary measures over a period of time. The table below provides comparisons using two different base years – 1993 (the earliest year for which data has been collected) and 2006 (the year in which parity with Church of England National Stipend Benchmark was achieved).

	Base year - 1993	**difference**	**Base year - 2006**	**difference**
Standard Stipend - 2016	25,061		25,061	
RPI linked	20,845	4,216	27,568	(2,507)
CPI Linked	17,841	7,220	26,199	(1,138)
Average Earnings Linked	22,945	2,116	25,205	(144)

Observations:

Over the longer term growth in Standard Stipend compares favourably with the three selected inflationary measures – with averages for all three over 24, 20 and 15 years indicating greater than inflationary growth in Standard Stipend. This is also illustrated by the extent to which Standard stipend exceeds "inflation linked" stipends from using 1993 as the base year.

Over the longer term annual Standard Stipend increases have tended to be greater than annual rates of inflation. In the last 24 years Standard Stipend increases have exceeded RPI increases in 15 years, CPI increases in 16 years and average earnings increases in 13 years.

Standard Stipend compares less favourably with inflation measures since 2006 – the year in which parity with the Church of England National Stipend Benchmark was achieved. Both ten year and five year averages comparisons with RPI and CPI indicate stipend increase lagging behind inflation. The position in relation to average earnings is more favourable with stipend increases only slightly less than average earnings increase over the ten year period and slightly greater than average earning over the five year period.

Conclusion

Any claim that Standard Stipend is / is not keeping pace with inflation will be heavily dependent on the inflationary measure used and the time period being considered. Using the commonly used RPI and CPI measures there appears to be some justification to the claims that in recent years (and importantly, since achieving parity with Church of England National Stipend Benchmark) Standard Stipend has failed to keep pace with inflation. This however also coincided with a period of recession and modest increases in average earnings – against which increases in Standard Stipend compare more favourably.

Extract from *Consumer Price Indices – A brief guide*

Currently the coverage of CPI and CPIH is identical, except for the inclusion of a measure of owner occupiers' housing costs in the latter. The RPI and RPIJ include a number of items relating to housing costs (such as mortgage interest payments and council tax) that are not included in the CPI. Conversely there are also some services covered by the CPI and CPIH - such as charges for financial services - which are not in the RPI or RPIJ

Standard Stipend

Year	Stipend	Percentage increase		RPI (note 1 & 2)	Stipend less RPI	CPI (note 1 & 3)	Stipend less CPI	(note 1 & 4)	Stipend less earnings
	£	%		%		%		%	
1993	11,160	3.9%		3.7	0.21%	4.3	(0.39%)	4.8	(0.88%)
1994	11,304	1.3%		1.6	(0.31%)	2.5	(1.21%)	2.8	(1.54%)
1995	12,000	6.2%		2.4	3.76%	2.0	4.16%	3.7	2.49%
1996	12,852	7.1%		3.5	3.60%	2.6	4.50%	2.9	4.20%
1997	13,764	7.1%		2.4	4.70%	2.5	4.60%	4.2	2.92%
1998	14,340	4.2%		3.1	1.08%	1.8	2.38%	4.9	(0.76%)
1999	14,940	4.2%		3.4	0.78%	1.6	2.58%	4.2	0.03%
2000	15,570	4.2%		1.5	2.72%	1.3	2.92%	6.3	(2.03%)
2001	16,236	4.3%		3.0	1.28%	0.8	3.48%	4.8	(0.49%)
2002	16,920	4.2%	(note 5)	1.8	2.41%	1.2	3.01%	2.5	1.70%
2003	17,628	4.2%	(note 5)	1.7	2.48%	1.3	2.88%	3.5	0.69%
2004	18,360	4.2%	(note 5)	2.9	1.25%	1.4	2.75%	4.0	0.14%
2005	19,420	5.8%	(note 5)	3.0	2.77%	1.3	4.47%	4.3	1.48%
2006	20,460	5.4%	(note 5)	2.8	2.56%	2.1	3.26%	4.3	1.07%
2007	20,980	2.5%		3.2	(0.66%)	2.3	0.24%	3.6	(1.09%)
2008	21,600	3.0%		4.3	(1.34%)	2.3	0.66%	3.4	(0.47%)
2009	22,250	3.0%		4.0	(0.99%)	3.6	(0.59%)	3.2	(0.23%)
2010	22,470	1.0%		(0.5)	1.49%	2.2	(1.21%)	1.2	(0.25%)
2011	22,810	1.5%		4.6	(3.09%)	3.3	(1.79%)	1.1	0.40%
2012	23,270	2.0%		5.2	(3.18%)	4.5	(2.48%)	2.0	0.04%
2013	23,740	2.0%		3.2	(1.18%)	2.8	(0.78%)	1.1	0.94%
2014	24,210	2.0%		3.0	(1.02%)	2.6	(0.62%)	1.5	0.49%
2015	24,690	2.0%		2.4	(0.42%)	1.5	0.48%	2.3	(0.32%)
2016	25,061	1.5%		1.0	0.50%	0.0	1.50%	1.6	(0.14%)

Averages	Stipend increase	RPI	Stipend less RPI	CPI	Stipend less CPI	Earnings	Stipend less earnings
Over last 24 years	3.61%	2.80%	0.81%	2.16%	1.45%	3.26%	0.35%
Over last 20 years	3.41%	2.80%	0.61%	2.02%	1.39%	3.20%	0.21%
Over last 15 years	2.95%	2.84%	0.11%	2.16%	0.79%	2.65%	0.30%
Over last 10 years	2.05%	3.04%	(0.99%)	2.51%	(0.46%)	2.11%	(0.06%)
Over last 5 years	1.90%	2.96%	(1.06%)	2.28%	(0.38%)	1.70%	0.20%

Notes

1 Annual inflation rates shown are for preceding year (ie RPI figure shown for 2016 is that for 2015)
2 Source: ONS RPI all items: percentage change over 12 months (Table CZBH)
3 Source: ONS CPI all items: percentage change over 12 months (Table D7G7)
4 Derived from National Average Earning Index (to 2009) and Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (2009 onwards)
5 Stipend increases 2002 - 2006 reflect implementation of policy of parity with with CoE National Stipend Benchmark

APPENDIX 8

Child Allowance 2015 – Guidance Notes

There are two forms of Child Allowance – Standard Child Allowance and Discretionary Child Allowance. Standard Child Allowance is payable to clergy with lower household incomes. Clergy with household incomes in excess of the agreed level are able to apply for a Discretionary Child Allowance if their Bishop supports the application.

1. Standard Child Allowances are payable to Qualifying Clergy with Household Income below the Qualifying Income Level.

2. Discretionary Child Allowances are payable in exceptional circumstances to Qualifying Clergy with Household Income in excess of the Qualifying Income Level. Payment is made on the Bishop's recommendation.

3. Household Income is the taxable income of both the clergy and his/her spouse in the tax year ended 5 April 2015.

4. Qualifying Children are those who are less than 16 years of age at the beginning of the year for which application is made (or 21 years of age if in full time education) and those born during the year.

5. Qualifying Clergy are those stipendiary Clergy "employed" by the Scottish Episcopal Church at the end of the year for which application is made. Clergy (and widowed clergy spouses) in receipt of pension from the SEC Pension Fund are deemed to be Qualifying Clergy.

6. Applications for Standard Child Allowance should be submitted to the General Synod Office. Applications which include an application for Discretionary Child Allowance should be submitted to the Diocesan Bishop, together with an explanatory letter, for counter signature and recommendation. Such applications will be forwarded to the General Synod Office by the Bishop.

7. Child Allowances are paid in arrears – payment in respect of Qualifying Children in 2015 will be made in 2016.

8. Child Allowances are subject to deduction of Income Tax and National Insurance and are therefore remitted to Paying Officers to be paid to clergy with stipend. To ensure that payment is included with February stipend the completed application forms should be submitted to the General Synod Office by the middle of January.

9. Clergy may choose to have Child Allowance paid direct to their spouses. Such clergy should notify their Paying Officer that they wish the Child Allowance to be paid in this way.

10. The rate of allowance and qualifying levels of income for 2015 are:-

Qualifying income level	£30,460
Standard Child Allowance	£350
Discretionary Child Allowance	£350

APPENDIX 9

Clergy Resettlement Grants – Guidance Notes

1. Grants are payable to all clergy moving to a new charge in the Province.

2. The maximum grant payable is 5% of Standard Stipend.

3. Any expenditure incurred as a direct consequence of the move to the new charge is eligible.

4. Invoices for all claims must be attached.

5. Applicants should seek appropriate grants from the Corporation of the Sons of the Clergy and the Friends of the Clergy Corporation towards removal expenses. Contribution towards other settlement costs should be sought from the Vestry before any claim is made to the Province.

6. Application forms should be provided by the Diocesan Office to clergy at the time of moving to a new charge.

7. A maximum of three applications can be submitted (totalling the maximum grant payable).

8. All applications must be submitted within six months of moving to the new charge.

9. Initial applications (form RG/2) to be submitted to Diocese for approval. Subsequent applications (form RG/3) to be submitted to General Synod Office for payment.