

Scottish Episcopal Church

GENERAL SYNOD 2020

Agenda and Papers

CONTENTS

1. Agenda and Programme for Synod	1
2. Preliminary Synod Business.	5
Minutes of General Synod Meeting 2019	6
Elections and Appointments to Provincial Bodies.....	42
3. Standing Committee	
Finance Report	49
4. Faith and Order Board	
Canon 4 Review Group, Consultation on the Election of Bishops	59
5. Safeguarding Committee (Committee for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults)	
Safeguarding Audit Implementation Progress Report	64
Safeguarding Policy and Principles	67
6. Standing Committee	
Report from Standing Committee on Ethical Investment	73
Interim Report from the Ethical Investment Advisory Group	75
7. Reports from Conveners	103

PINK PAGES

8. Rules of Order	119
9. List of Synod Members.	125
10. List of SEC Representatives on Other Bodies	129
11. Synod Feedback Form	133

THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK

GENERAL SYNOD 2020 AGENDA AND PROGRAMME

Saturday 5 December 2020

- 09:00 Welcome and induction
- 09:30 Opening Eucharist
Online offering for the Archbishop of Canterbury's Together in Unity
Appeal for the Anglican Communion Fund
Constitution of General Synod
- 10:15 Break

SESSION ONE: THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS IN THE CHAIR

10:30 **Primus: Welcome**

Preliminary Business (Page 5)

Appointment of Tellers

***Motion 1:** That Malcolm Bett and Miriam Weibye be appointed as tellers for the meeting.*

Appointment of Prolocutors

***Motion 2:** That the Rev Canon Simon Mackenzie be appointed as Clerical Prolocutor for the meeting.*

***Motion 3:** That the Rev Dr Sophia Marriage be appointed as Clerical Vice-Prolocutor for the meeting.*

***Motion 4:** That Dr Nicola Mills be appointed as Lay Prolocutor for the meeting.*

***Motion 5:** That Hugh Morison be appointed as Lay Vice-Prolocutor for the meeting.*

Permission to speak

***Motion 6:** That Alan McLean QC be given permission to speak to Synod.*

***Motion 7:** That David Strang be given permission to speak to Synod.*

If necessary Standing Committee will bring forward additional motions for any others for whom permission to speak to Synod is to be sought.

Minutes of General Synod 2019 (Page 6)

Motion 8: *That this Synod approve the minutes of the meeting of the General Synod held on 6-8 June 2019.*

Elections (Page 42)

Standing Committee Convenership

Motion 9: *That Bridget Campbell be appointed as Convener of the Standing Committee.*

Mission Board Convenership

Motion 10: *That the Very Rev Sarah Murray be appointed as Convener of the Mission Board.*

Institute Council Convenership

Motion 11: *That the Rt Rev Anne Dyer be appointed as Convener of the Institute Council.*

Institute Council Membership

Motion 12: *That the Rev Marjory McPherson be appointed for a second term on the Institute Council.*

Administration Board Membership

Motion 13: *That the Rev Deborah Davison be appointed as a member of the Administration Board*

Clergy Discipline Tribunal Membership

Motion 14: *That Fraser Falconer be re-appointed for an additional term on the Clergy Discipline Tribunal.*

Motion 15: *That Susan Horne be re-appointed for an additional term on the Clergy Discipline Tribunal.*

Motion 16: *That the Rev Canon Professor John Richardson be re-appointed for an additional term on the Clergy Discipline Tribunal.*

Motion 17: *That John Whittall be re-appointed for an additional term on the Clergy Discipline Tribunal.*

Preliminary Proceedings Committee

Motion 18: *That the appointment by the Standing Committee of Robert Phillips as a member of the Preliminary Proceedings Committee be ratified and that his current term of office continue until General Synod 2024.*

Pension Fund Chair

Motion 19: *That the term of office of Richard McIndoe as Chair of the Pension Fund Trustees be extended until General Synod 2021.*

General Synod Trusteeship

Motion 20: *That Robert Gordon be appointed as a General Synod Trustee.*

11:00 **Standing Committee – Accounts, Quota and Strategic Direction**

Accounts

Motion 21: *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 2019.*

Discussion in breakout groups

Budgets and Quota (Page 49)

Motion 22: *That this Synod, having examined the proposed budgets for the General Synod for the year 2021, agree to a quota figure of £600,000 for that year.*

12:00 **Lunch break**

SESSION TWO: THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS IN THE CHAIR

14:00 **Faith and Order Board**

Review of Canon 4 (Page 59)

14:15 **Safeguarding Committee (Committee for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults)**

Safeguarding Audit Implementation Progress Report (Page 64)

Safeguarding Policy and Principles (Page 67)

Motion 23: *That the Safeguarding Policy: Principles and Commitments set out in the Synod Papers for this Synod meeting be adopted and added at paragraph 1 of the Schedule to Canon 65 in substitution for the Policy Statements and Codes of Good Practice referred to in paragraphs 1 and 2 of that Schedule and that the remaining paragraphs of the Schedule be renumbered accordingly.*

14:40 **Administration Board**

Update on clergy stipends and personnel matters

14:55 **Standing Committee**

Report from Standing Committee on Ethical Investment (Page 73)
Interim Report of Ethical Investment Advisory Group (Page 75)

15:20 **Church in Society Committee**

Climate change

Motion to be advised

15:40 **Youth Presentation**

16:00 Report back from Breakout Groups

16:15 Evening Prayer and Confirmation of Acts of Synod

PRELIMINARY BUSINESS

1. Welcome to Members

2. Tellers and Prolocutors

The Standing Committee recommends the following appointments:

Tellers:

Malcolm Bett
Miriam Weibye

Prolocutors:

Clerical Prolocutor:	Rev Canon Simon Mackenzie
Clerical Vice-Prolocutor:	Rev Dr Sophia Marriage
Lay Prolocutor:	Dr Nicola Mills
Lay Vice-Prolocutor:	Mr Hugh Morison

3. Assessor

The Primus has appointed Professor Nicholas Grier as Assessor

4. Permission to Speak

5. Minutes of General Synod 2019

6. Any Matters Arising from Minutes

7. Elections

Standing Committee Convenership
Mission Board Convenership
Institute Council Convenership
Institute Council membership
Administration Board membership
Clergy Discipline Tribunal membership
Preliminary Proceedings Committee membership
Pension Fund Chair
General Synod Trusteeship

8. Roll Call

Online registration

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 6-8 JUNE 2019

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 a celebration of the Eucharist in St Paul's & St George's Church, Edinburgh at 10.30am on Thursday 6 June 2019.

The Most Rev Dr Mark Strange, Primus, delivered his charge to the Synod during the Eucharist. Referring to the reading from Isaiah 30, he noted how panic and fear caused those of faith to run away from Jerusalem and the house of God. The prophet urged the people to listen to the voice of the Lord – "this is the way, walk in it". As members engaged with the Synod agenda, the Primus encouraged them to remember that there was no point in asking questions if one was not prepared to seek the answers, to listen to one another and try to walk together on the way. The current time was one of unprecedented political upheaval with the reality of Brexit paralysing UK politics. People had been damaged by Universal Credit, were frightened by UK immigration policies, and young and old were living lonely lives because of social isolation, sexual exploitation and addiction. Increasingly, the Church was servicing food banks that ought not to be required and humankind, as steward of creation, continued to destroy it. The structures of the Church were to serve God, not themselves. As society cried out for reconciliation, fairness and hope, the Scottish Episcopal Church needed to be a church which could offer that but it could only do so if such values were mirrored in the way members treated one another. The Church had a mission to bring the love of God to the lives of others, to care for them, to share faith with them and uphold them because, as Jesus had said, "truly I tell you, just as you did it to one of the least of these who are members of my family, you did it to me".

During the Eucharist, an offering was taken to support the work of Aberlour Childcare Trust. The offering amounted to £1,117 (excluding Gift Aid).

SESSION 1: THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS IN THE CHAIR

1.1 Preliminary Business

1.1.1 Welcome

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

Lieut-Colonel Carol Bailey (Salvation Army), the Rev Dr Grant Barclay (Action of Churches Together in Scotland), the Rev John Bremner (United Reformed Church), the Rev David Broderick (Baptist Union of Scotland), the Rev Dr David Easton (Methodist Church in Scotland), the Rev John Fulton (United Free Church of Scotland), the Rev Alexander Horsburgh (Church of Scotland), the Very Rev Stephen Mulholland (Roman Catholic Church), Dr Maureen Sier (Interfaith Scotland), Mrs Jacqueline Thomson (Focolare Movement), Mary Woodward (Religious Society of Friends) and the Rt Rev John McDowell (Church of Ireland).

Synod members introduced themselves in table groups.

1.1.2 Election of Prolocutors

The Very Rev Fay Lamont and the Rev Canon Simon Mackenzie were elected as Clergy Prolocutor and Vice Prolocutor respectively.

Dr Anthony Birch and Dr Nicola Mills were elected as Lay Prolocutor and Vice Prolocutor respectively.

1.1.3 Tellers

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

1.1.4 Assessor

The Primus announced that Professor Nicholas Grier, Solicitor, had been appointed as his Assessor.

1.1.5 Voting

The Secretary General reminded Synod members as to who was entitled to vote on Motions and in elections. In cases where a count of votes was required, Synod agreed that the Facilitator at each table would complete a voting record slip to record the votes on their table. 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.

1.1.6 Permission to Speak

The Synod granted its permission for each of the following to speak during the course of the meeting: the Rev Philip Blackledge, the Rev Annie Naish, Ms Caroline Longley, Mrs Patsy Thomson, the Rev Dr Richard Tiplady, Dr Donald Bruce, Dr Lesley Penny, Ms Ley-Anne Forsyth, Mrs Claire Benton-Evans, Ms Amie Byers, Ms Rebecca Cromwell, Ms Becky Northover, Ms Phoebe Pryce, Ms Olivia Smith, Ms Eleanor Tofield, Sheikh Sayed Ali Abbas Razawi and all ecumenical and interfaith guests.

1.1.7 Minutes of General Synod 2018

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 7-9 June 2018".

The Motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con*.

1.1.8 Matters Arising

There were no matters arising from the minutes.

1.1.9 Elections

The Secretary General explained the procedure in relation to elections.

By general acclaim, the Synod appointed Mr James Gibson as the Convener of the Administration Board.

By general acclaim, the House of Clergy appointed the Rev Canon Dave Richards and the Very Rev Alison Simpson to serve a second term as clergy representatives on the Standing Committee.

By general acclaim, the House of Laity appointed Ms Jenny Whelan as a lay member of Standing Committee.

By general acclaim, the Synod appointed the Rev Professor Paul Foster, the Rev Professor David Jasper, Ms Nan Kennedy and the Rev Paul Watson to serve a second term as members of the Institute Council.

By general acclaim, the Synod appointed Professor Patricia Peattie to serve as lay member on the Preliminary Proceedings Committee and Mr Gary Burton to serve as its Secretary. The Synod authorised the Standing Committee to fill a remaining vacancy for the position of a practising lawyer on the Preliminary Proceedings Committee on the understanding that such appointment made by the Standing Committee would be brought to General Synod 2020 for appointment for the remainder of that person's term.

By general acclaim, the Synod appointed Lady Wolffe and Ms Anna Poole to serve as practising lawyers on the Clergy Discipline Tribunal.

It was noted that during the course of the meeting, the Synod would be invited to consider a second reading of an alteration to Canon 52 the effect of which would be to dissolve the Information and Communication Board. The Secretary General explained that owing to those unusual circumstances, Synod was invited to authorise the Standing Committee to appoint a new Convener to the Board if that second reading were not accepted, on the understanding that any such appointment would be limited to a period of one year and that a nomination would then be brought to Synod 2020 in the normal way. Synod accepted that proposal by majority.

1.1.10 Corrections to Synod Papers

The Secretary General drew the attention of Synod to errors in the Synod papers as follows.

On page 120 in the report of the Clergy Wellbeing Survey, the sentence "the majority of respondents feel happy with their life within ministry and the time split between working and home/leisure life" was to be regarded as deleted. Also, on page 121 the figure of 76.19% of respondents who felt that they did not have a balance between their ministry and home life ought to have read 70.48%. He explained that the reasons for these errors were that in its original form the Survey report had amalgamated figures for both stipendiary and self-supporting clergy and that when the statistics were separated into those two categories the narrative comment had not been fully updated.

1.1.11 Roll Call

The roll call of Synod members was taken by completion of attendance slips. A total of 121 members attended.

1.2 Faith and Order Board

1.2.1 Committee on Canons/Buildings Committee

Ms Rebecca Cadie (Convener, Buildings Committee) presented the second reading of changes to Sections 1 and 3 of Canon 35. She reminded Synod of the discussion which had taken place the previous year about how the Church looked after its buildings, given the context of ecclesiastical exemption from listed building control. That was delivered through the process set out in Canon 35. In 2018, the Synod had supported the proposed changes and in the main these had also been supported when the changes had been discussed in dioceses. The Buildings Committee had discussed comments made in some Diocesan Synods, details of which appeared in the Synod papers. Some comment had been made in relation to use of the terms "stained-glass" and "painted glass". Both fell within the craft of decorative glazing and the Committee was happy to include in the wording being proposed to the current Synod reference to both. There had also been discussion about "curtilage". The previous year she had confirmed that curtilage was a term understood within planning control. Guidance documents from the Scottish Government stated that "curtilage, although not specifically defined, is accepted to mean land which is used for the comfortable enjoyment of a building and which serves the purpose of the building in some necessary or reasonably useful way, normally the curtilage would relate to the property boundary...". She also referred to listed building guidance from Historic Environment Scotland which stated that under the terms of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act (Scotland) 1997, "every listed building has a curtilage (boundary). This means "any object or structure within the curtilage of the building though not fixed to it may be considered to be listed..."." The Buildings Committee was content that the term "curtilage" was, therefore, an appropriate term for inclusion within the Canon.

Ms Cadie reminded the Synod that Canon 35 made clear that it was still necessary to comply with other legislation affecting buildings, for example, the need for planning consents, building warrants, etc.

Dr John Ferguson-Smith (Convener, Administration Board) proposed and the Rt Rev Andrew Swift (Bishop of Brechin) seconded, the following Motion:

"That the amended text of Canon 35, sections 1 and 3 be read for the second time."

The Rev Peter Harris (Edinburgh) supported the proposal. His church had managed to install charging points for electric vehicles prior to the change of the Canon. Reading the Canon, however, he wished to confess that he had not always sought consent of the Bishop under Section 4 of the Canon which stated that churches ought not to be used for any purpose which was not religious or ecclesiastical without such consent. Events such as fayres, fêtes, etc had taken place. Did he require retrospective consent?

The Rt Rev Dr John Armes (Bishop of Edinburgh) responded that there had in fact been a general permission for Mr Harris' church for such events for some time.

The Rev Jonathan Livingstone (Glasgow and Galloway) queried whether "erection of fencing" ought to be included in the list of minor works to be exempted from Canon 35, as appeared on page 57 of the Synod papers. Ms Cadie responded that for fences in excess of 1,100 cm high it was necessary to apply for planning permission. She encouraged churches to consult their diocese even if a formal consent was not needed.

The Rev Canon John McLuckie (Edinburgh) indicated that the Cathedral in the Diocese of Edinburgh included within its curtilage a building which did not belong to the Cathedral. He sought clarification as to whether such an instance would fall within the scope of Canon 35. Ms Cadie responded that the Diocesan Property Committee would wish to know what was happening within the space comprising the curtilage – for example, whether there were implications for access, lighting, etc. It was a matter which she believed ought to be brought forward for consideration under Canon 35.

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

House of Bishops: passed unanimously
House of Clergy: passed by majority, 3 against, 1 abstention
House of Laity: passed unanimously.

Ms Cadie then turned to Resolution 3 under the Canon and explained that an approach had been received from the Scottish Civic Trust that the requirement in that resolution that proposals for alterations to church buildings be advertised to the Scottish Civic Trust, should be deleted. The Buildings Committee had considered this and proposed an amendment to Resolution 3 to delete reference to the Scottish Civic Trust and local civic amenity bodies. She noted that there would still be the opportunity for comment to be made through the planning process.

Dr John Ferguson-Smith then proposed, and the Rt Rev Andrew Swift seconded, the following Motion:

"That the first paragraph of Resolution 3 under Canon 35 be deleted and replaced by the following:-

"In the case of a building included in the statutory List of Buildings of Special Architectural and Historic Interest the Vestry shall, before making a formal application to the Bishop and the Diocesan Buildings Committee for any change under this Canon, advertise the proposals to the congregation and Historic Environment Scotland, and in the case of exterior works the local planning authority, allowing members of the congregation and these bodies four weeks in which

to make written representations on the proposals. Any representations received shall be considered by the Vestry before a formal application for consent is made.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

1.2.2 Review of Canon 4

The Rt Rev Dr John Armes (Bishop of Edinburgh) reminded Synod that in 2018 the Synod had instructed the Faith and Order Board to set up a process of review of Canon 4. He had been appointed as Chair of that review and the Review Group had met twice to date. It was seeking feedback from those who had had experience of the process whether as a member of an Electoral Synod or of a Preparatory Committee or as a candidate. Feedback was being sought by the end of June 2019. The Group had taken note of points raised at General Synod 2018 as well as drawing on the personal experience of Review Group members. Such issues included whether the timescales under the Canon were unhelpfully prescriptive, whether there should always be a requirement to deliver a shortlist of between three and five names and whether it was necessary for the shortlist to be public.

Whether the present Canon simply required tweaking or a significant rewrite would depend on the feedback received. However, Bishop Armes emphasised that if the Church wished to elect its Bishops then there would always be a need for a process to ensure that the election was run fairly, decently and in good order. Secondly, he cautioned against expecting too much of a Canon. There was more to finding the Bishops the Church needed than simply having a process. The business of discerning good candidates started long before the date the previous Bishop retired. Discernment meant seeking the will of God for a diocese, listening for and being open to the movement of the Holy Spirit.

Where the Canon had worked well in the past, interviewees and candidates had been treated with respect and human warmth and the host diocese had taken trouble not only to ensure the proper handling of paperwork but also to ensure that candidates felt appreciated, whether or not they were elected. Meticulous organisation was required for this as well as a quality of relationships which could not be legislated for. A diocese had to get its act together to deliver this. For that reason, the Review Group was considering whether it would be helpful to write a commentary to accompany the canonical process. He looked forward to receiving thoughts which members of Synod might have to offer.

SESSION 2: THE RT REV ANDREW SWIFT, BISHOP OF BRECHIN, IN THE CHAIR

2. Standing Committee: Accounts, Quota and Strategic Direction Overview

Mr Robert Gordon (Convener, Standing Committee) expressed thanks to the staff of the General Synod Office and to his fellow members of the Standing Committee. He was pleased to note that Synod had elected Mr Jim Gibson to the convenership of the Administration Board and to re-appoint the Rev Canon Dave Richards and the Very Rev Alison Simpson for further terms. He also welcomed Ms Jenny Whelan as a new member to the Committee and expressed thanks to the Rev Chris Mayo who had resigned earlier in the year and to Dr John Ferguson-Smith who was completing his convenership of the Administration Board at the current Synod. He expressed particular thanks to Mr Malcolm Bett, Treasurer, for his dedicated, thoughtful and imaginative work on financial matters.

Illustrating his presentation with PowerPoint slides, Mr Gordon turned to the financial outturn for 2018. 2017 was the most recent year for which full details of charge income was available to the General Synod Office. In that year, £23 million of income had been raised, approximately £1.7 million had been transferred to dioceses and Province by way of diocesan and provincial quota increasing their share of the overall resources from 3% to 8% and 7% to 10% respectively. In 2018, the income to the General Synod had comprised 65% from investments, rental and fee income and 31% from quota. The income had been spent as to 22% on support and training for ministry, 13% on mission development and support, 12% on communication, 7% on support for retired clergy, mainly through housing, and 5% on engaging with other denominations and faiths. 41% had comprised support and advice from the Province and GSO staff to dioceses and charges including £310,000 by way of Mission and Ministry Support Grants and £190,000 of Building Grants.

In 2018, the aim had been to achieve a budget surplus of £50,000 on the General Fund. The actual surplus had been £123,000 because investment and other income had been £37,000 over budget and expenditure by most boards had been slightly under budget. There had been some overspends by the Standing Committee such as legal and advisory fees, which had been necessary to deal with difficult personnel and associated issues, and support for the Primus reflecting geography (the difference between a Perth base and an Inverness one), additional travel associated with episcopal vacancies and a deliberate policy to accept opportunities to engage with other parts of the Anglican Communion following the change made by Synod in 2017 to Canon 31.

Mr Gordon also reported that fluctuations in the Stock Market in the latter part of 2018 had seen a fall in the value of investments by over £850,000. The position had subsequently recovered but he reminded Synod of the volatility of markets and the possible impact on the level of income available to draw down to fund revenue expenditure.

Mr Gordon then 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 2018.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

Mr Gordon then turned to the context for the rolling budget 2019-2021. The strategic priorities identified in the Standing Committee Report for 2018 were not set in stone and were discussed both within the Standing Committee and in joint meetings with the College of Bishops and were therefore subject to development as thinking evolved and new opportunities and challenges emerged. He made no apologies for borrowing from the Bishop of Argyll and The Isles by saying that the purpose of all of this was to provide opportunities for encounter with the living God. If one wanted the Kingdom to come, there was much to do.

The strategic aspirations of the Committee were as follows:

- **Formation:** preparing women and men to carry forward ministry in communities which no longer simply comprised traditional churchgoing people. Synod would hear later in the meeting more about the activity of the Scottish Episcopal Institute. This entailed financial consequences, particularly where there was a desire to place curates in locations which did not have the necessary financial resources available locally.
- **Mission:** the Mission and Ministry Support Grants scheme was currently under review and might be adjusted. It was necessary in some places to sustain existing ministry but the Mission Board was also looking at the possibility of developing financial support for new missional initiatives. The amount available for Buildings Grants was being increased by £55,000 in 2019 and subsequent years.
- **Governance:** whether the provincial governance arrangements in the widest sense were fit for contemporary purpose was kept under review. Reviews of a number of Canons (Canons 4, 53, 54 and others) were currently underway and a proposal in relation to communication would be considered later in the meeting, as well as alterations to the committee structure in relation to engagement with people of other faiths. Standing Committee encouraged all boards and committees routinely and systematically to consider the quality of their deliberations and decisions and the relevance of their agendas.
- **Relationships:** this covered relationships within the SEC, with other parts of the Anglican Communion, with other denominations and with other faiths. Later in the meeting, Synod would hear of a range of engagements.
- **Support:** over and above financial support was the help and guidance which the Province could provide to dioceses and charges. Later in the meeting, Synod would consider next steps necessary to be taken on safeguarding; last year there had been discussion of support given in relation to the General Data Protection Regulation. It might be possible for the Province to support collaboration between dioceses in relation to buildings and to strengthen links between Province and dioceses acknowledging that different dioceses had different strengths and requirements – the "variable geometry of relationships".
- **Communications:** the Standing Committee would support the actions outlined in the Synod papers to improve communications deploying the professional resources and technology available to the Church and linking virtually or physically provincial, diocesan and charge capacities to share information and promote the Church's story.

The Standing Committee and College of Bishops had met jointly in December 2018 and planned to meet again, probably early in 2020. The Committee had been encouraged to learn that the College of Bishops, acting in its metro-political role, would spend time later in the year taking stock in developing an overarching narrative for the SEC for the 2020s. Such a statement would help further sharpen priorities and provide a basis for further collaborative working between the two bodies.

Mr Gordon spoke to the budgets for the years 2019-2021. Beyond inflationary increases, there were significant uplifts in spending for the Administration Board by an increase in Building Grants of £55,000 in 2019 and subsequent years, for the Institute Council to take account of the appointment of a new full-time Provincial Director of Ordinands, the provincial contribution to the maintenance of mixed mode students, additional curate funding and expenditure on training for the new recruitment and selection procedures. The budget for the Institute Council was driven by assumptions about the number of curacies to be funded and variations in such numbers could impact significantly on budgets and outturns. The budgets contained best estimates but were subject to a health warning. The assumption for budgetary purposes was that the provincial contribution to curate funding would be at the historic level of 50% of stipend but there was a recognition that it might be necessary to offer a higher provincial contribution in some settings. Mission Board funding had been increased by an additional £50,000 allocated to the Church in Society Committee for Child Poverty Grants and a provision of £10,000 was included within GSO salaries to fund the new Provincial Youth Committee Enabler post.

The result of this was that in 2019-2021 deficits were now being budgeted for. In recent years Standing Committee had budgeted to break-even but for a variety of credible reasons surpluses had been generated. By budgeting for deficits, actual outturn might well be closer to break-even. There were worthwhile and impactful initiatives and priorities on which to spend resources and fortunately there were surpluses which could now be drawn down in order to fund them.

Mr Gordon then addressed the question of quota explaining that Standing Committee's proposal was for there to be no increase in provincial quota in 2020. In arriving at that decision, Standing Committee had noted the views expressed at General Synod 2018. He also explained that the budget papers referred to the impact of the departure from the denomination of two large congregations on quota and quota assessable income. Owing to uncertainty over the timing of such departures, Standing Committee had decided that for 2020 calculation of diocesan shares of provincial quota should proceed as if the departing charges had not departed. A recalculation of quota assessable income would have had the effect of requiring dioceses other than those losing congregations to contribute more to provincial quota in 2020. As a transitional measure, the Committee had decided that the Treasurer would have discussions with the dioceses in question with a view to agreeing a reduction in the quota which those dioceses would contribute to the Province reflecting their loss of income in the period to the end of 2020. The shortfall in income to the Province would be covered from provincial reserves. The Standing Committee would consider over the following year whether further mitigating action

might be necessary in 2021 and beyond. Leaving aside the position of departing congregations, the proposal for provincial quota for 2020 would amount to £741,527 – which represented no increase on 2019. Synod would be invited to agree that figure later in the meeting.

Mr Gordon then spoke to the proposed change to the Digest of Resolutions addressing the eventuality of Synod failing to agree proposals in relation to the level of future quota. Mr Gordon expressed gratitude to Dr Jaap Jacobs for comments received on the Motion and the Standing Committee had been happy to accept changes offered by Dr Jacobs. Revised wording for Motion 5 on the agenda had been provided to Synod members on their arrival at Synod. In essence, the Motion would allow the Standing Committee to determine the level of quota for the year in question at a level no greater than that applicable in the immediately preceding year.

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

“That paragraph 2.2.6 of the Digest of Resolutions be deleted in its entirety and replaced by the following: –

“The Standing Committee shall consider the annual budgets prepared by the Boards and Committees of the General Synod and recommend the figure of Provincial Quota annually, the portion of such Quota to be requested from each Diocese and the manner of division of unrestricted provincial income among such Boards and Committees.

In the event that the General Synod does not agree the amount of Provincial Quota to be requested from Dioceses for a particular year, the Standing Committee shall have power to set the quota for such year at a figure no greater than that of quota requested for the year immediately preceding that particular year.”

The Chair sought the consent of Synod to the withdrawal of Motion 5 as it appeared in the Synod agenda and its replacement with the alternative text which had been provided to Synod members on arrival at the meeting. Synod confirmed its consent.

The Motion was put to the vote and passed by majority, 1 against.

SESSION 3: THE VERY REV SARAH MURRAY IN THE CHAIR

3.1 Administration Board

3.1.1 Introduction

Dr John Ferguson-Smith (Convener, Administration Board) introduced the session, his final one as Convener of the Board. He added his thanks to those already expressed by the Convener of the Standing Committee, to General Synod Office staff. The Synod had already heard from the Buildings Committee and he had been pleased that the provision for Building Grants had been continued and increased. The Retirement Housing Committee did not have a slot on the agenda for the current Synod because there were no particular matters of report.

3.1.2 Rule 10 Motion – Ethical Investment

The Secretary General explained that just before the current meeting had been constituted during the Eucharist, he had received the text of a Motion submitted under Rule 10 of the Rules of Order. He explained that the Assessor had confirmed that it would not be competent for the Synod to pass both the Rule 10 Motion and the Motion which appeared as Motion 6 on the agenda for Synod. Synod would in effect have to make a choice as between the two Motions. Under Rule 10, the mover of the new Motion, the Rev Diana Hall, would be given two minutes to explain why she considered Synod ought to bring her Motion onto the Synod agenda. The text of the Motion was as follows:

“That:

- The Ethical Investment Policy be updated to reflect the moral imperative to divest fully from fossil fuels and to extend the list of restricted categories for direct investments and pooled funds;*
- Pending agreement of a revised Ethical Investment Policy, the current Ethical Investment Policy be retained; and*
- There be formed an Ethical Investment Advisory Group to develop a strategy to enable the SEC to completely disinvest from unethical sources of revenue.”*

The Rev Diana Hall (Edinburgh) then spoke to the Motion. She noted that Motion 6 on the agenda for Synod concerned financial stewardship and had a commendable aim to allow the Church to invest wisely and with due regard to moral and ethical responsibilities. It sought to allow investment in pooled funds which were good for financial risk profiles and financial returns. If passed, the Motion would make the Church's investments less, not more, ethical. That would be a dereliction of moral duty. Both the United Nations and the Scottish Parliament had confirmed that the world was in a climate emergency and the Church had a moral responsibility to respond. Synod had an opportunity to set the Church on a fresh path to support the environment as a prophetic voice. Her Motion sought to stop the Church investing in pooled investment funds and to initiate a review of the Ethical Investment Policy to follow the path of other denominations making positive steps including the United Reformed Church, the Church of Ireland and the Society of Friends by seeking to divest from fossil

fuels. The Motion recognised the complexity of the task by establishing a group specifically to work on such matters. She invited Synod to vote against Motion 6 so that her alternative Motion could be proposed and passed for the good of the world.

3.1.3 Investment Committee

Mr Adrian Tupper (Convener, Investment Committee) explained that the Committee oversaw the collective investment scheme known as the Unit Trust Pool. The General Synod was the largest investor in the fund and income from it accounted for approximately 65% of General Synod income. This allowed quota to be kept to current levels. Other investors included dioceses and congregations, united in the investment objective of growing the twice annual distribution. The Pension Fund was managed separately. The Committee comprised six investment professionals, all members of the Church, and was supported by General Synod Office staff and members of the Church in Society Committee were also invited to attend meetings. The Committee appointed investment managers, currently Baillie Gifford, to manage the Fund. The portfolio as a whole was split into three: Baillie Gifford's Long-Term Global Growth Fund (to provide capital growth), the Baillie Gifford Multi-Asset Income Fund (to produce income) and a third segment comprising direct investments managed on a "balanced" basis (Global Income Growth). As at 31 March 2019, the investments totalled £78.7 million and the return had been 11% up on the previous year (annualised return) after fees. In its oversight of the portfolio, the Committee considered a number of factors including quality of service, risk and cost. Over the years, Baillie Gifford had been reappointed on a number of occasions because they had always provided good service. They had been able to respond well to what the Church required. Given the intention to be able to distribute an ever-increasing distribution from the Fund, it was important that the investment return was not volatile. The Fund was a small one as far as institutional investments were concerned and it was not always easy to achieve diversification at reasonable cost or even to access diverse investments at all. Consequently, use was made of pooled funds. This allowed access to investment strategies which would otherwise be beyond the reach of the Church. As a consequence of the long relationship with Baillie Gifford, the fees charged were very low for a fund the size of the UTP. A pooled fund competitor (and the Committee had talked to others) would charge perhaps double what was charged by Baillie Gifford for pooled funds and perhaps three times for direct investments. Lower fees meant a greater distribution to General Synod and other investors in the UTP. Generally speaking, the more complicated the investment mandate, the higher the fees would be.

The Committee also participated in the Church Investors Group which brought together 67 churches and similar organisations with over £21 billion of investments. It worked to bring change to companies through applying investment policies based on Christian ethical principles. Issues such as executive pay, modern slavery and climate change had been on the agenda and global corporations had been forced to change their policies.

Mr Tupper addressed the Motion being brought from the Committee as appeared on the Synod agenda. In 2018, he had indicated to Synod that the Committee would consult within the Church on views about proposals to move further funds into the Multi-Asset Income Fund. He had stressed that if that decision had been an investment one only, the Committee would have had no hesitation in taking it. However, the Committee had been aware that the Ethical Investment Policy applied only to direct investments and by investing wholly in pooled funds the policy would cease to have practical application. He had not felt comfortable about that. The results of the consultation were included in the report in the Synod papers. He thanked Malcolm Bett and Daphne Audsley for undertaking the consultation and compiling the feedback. The outcome was a split of opinion between following a purely investment-led approach on the one hand and, on the other, a desire to keep at least some part of the portfolio subject to the Ethical Investment Policy. In the light of the consultation the Committee had decided not to pursue the switch of investments into wholly pooled funds.

Mr Tupper explained that the current Ethical Investment Policy had been written before any pooled funds had been held and therefore did not cease to address such a situation. The challenge was therefore to apply the thinking on ethical investment to the new set of circumstances. At present, the policy prohibited direct investment in companies which held more than 15% (or in some cases more than 10%) of their revenue in certain sectors. In the draft policy contained in the Synod papers, the Committee suggested that the total exposure to companies generating income in excess of 15% in prohibited sectors should be limited to 1% of the total value of investments across the whole UTP. The current exposure of the UTP was 0.3%. Such a policy was broadly similar to that adopted by the Church of England Ethical Investment Advisory Group in relation to its use of pooled funds. The draft policy obligated the Church to ask questions about holdings in pooled funds and thereby constituted a strengthening of the Ethical Investment Policy. The Motion allowed a degree of flexibility which might not in fact be needed but the Committee believed that investments could be structured to provide more stable returns, at lower risk and cost, if it was possible to find an acceptable way forward. The proposal was to seek approval from Standing Committee before committing to any particular switch of funds. Standing Committee would be able to consult whomever it considered appropriate, such as the Church in Society Committee and indeed the Investment Committee would wish them to do so.

Mr Tupper was aware of the Rule 10 Motion which had been brought. His concern with the proposal was that it left no flexibility whatsoever and it would mean continued exposure to an equity market with the risks associated with it, with no clear way out were market conditions to change. He was aware of only one pooled fund which adhered entirely to the restrictions contained in the existing Ethical Investment Policy. That fund would not provide the diversification which the Committee believed was necessary to meet the needs of General Synod and other investors. There were funds available which closely matched the Ethical Investment Policy and which could be considered. For the record, Mr Tupper confirmed that the Long-Term Global Growth Fund which represented approximately one third of the UTP was not ethically screened but did not hold any prohibited investments, nor was it likely to do so.

Dr John Ferguson-Smith then proposed, and the Rt Rev Andrew Swift (Bishop of Brechin) seconded, the following Motion:

"That

- *the Ethical Investment Policy be updated to reflect the use of pooled funds whilst respecting the need to subject investments to ethical screening and reporting;*
- *pending agreement of a revised Ethical Investment Policy the Investment Committee be permitted to transfer all or part of the current segregated ethically screened fund to appropriate pooled funds subject to Standing Committee's approval of the policies of any proposed pooled funds."*

In seconding the Motion, Bishop Swift suggested that the Motion represented a strengthening of the Ethical Investment Policy. However, if it were not to pass he believed that the Rule 10 Motion would provide a good opportunity for the Church to show leadership.

The Rev Professor David Atkinson (Aberdeen and Orkney) indicated that he agreed with much of what Mr Tupper had said and, as Convener of the Church in Society Committee, he commended the work done by the Investment Committee. It was important to recognise that the Church was a small investor which was why pooled funds needed to be used. The Church needed the income but there was also a need to be aware of the importance of expressing the Church's ethical principles and doing that through the Church's investments. Over the previous couple of years the Church in Society Committee had been working with the Investment Committee to look at matters such as climate change and two years previously a new red line had been set in relation to thermal coals and tar sands. It was always difficult to justify why the ethical policy was applied only to 30% of the overall portfolio. Whilst that might seem like a slippery slope, he believed it was important to maintain the mix and this allowed red lines to be applied to the bespoke element of the portfolio. That assisted in the Church's membership of the Church Investors Group which had significant influence with major businesses. It was important to be able to maintain that stance and he believed that the Motion on the Synod agenda risked losing that stance because it reduced the requirements in relation to the current bespoke funds. It put significant responsibility in the hands of the Standing Committee. That Committee was very competent but it was very busy attending to a large range of matters and his concern was that it would not have the time to act as the ethics committee for the Church. The Standing Committee Report contained a section on risk management but it did not address reputational risk. That was of concern to him in relation to ethics. The multi-asset investment fund to which Mr Tupper had referred included a very large number of investments and assessing whether any of those involved a risk was very complicated. He therefore wished to propose that most of the Motion on the agenda be accepted but that it be altered so that any movement out of the bespoke funds should be subject to being wholly consistent with the red lines already set in the Ethical Investment Policy. That would therefore give rise to a difficulty in relation to the multi-asset investment vehicle because of its holding in British American Tobacco.

Professor Atkinson then proposed, and the Rev Nick Bowry (Aberdeen and Orkney) seconded, an amendment to the Motion so that it would read:

"That

- *The Ethical Investment Policy be updated to reflect the use of pooled funds whilst respecting the need to subject investments to ethical screening and reporting;*
- *Pending agreement of a revised Ethical Investment Policy the Investment Committee be permitted to transfer all or part of the current segregated ethically screened fund to appropriate pooled funds subject to those funds being totally compliant with current ethical restrictions."*

Mr Hugh Morison (Moray, Ross and Caithness) suggested that there was a need for flexibility provided that that could be justified within agreed ethical principles. He believed that the original Motion provided that flexibility whereas the proposed amendment did not. He would vote against the amendment.

Dr Jaap Jacobs (Brechin) expressed concern at the use of the word "current" in the amendment and considered that its effect might be too restrictive.

The Rev Amanda Fairclough (Argyll and The Isles) asked whether the Investment Committee agreed with the proposed amendment.

Mr Tupper opposed the amendment because he believed it would reduce flexibility.

The amendment was put to the vote but not carried. Synod then proceeded to debate the Motion as set out in the Synod agenda.

The Rev Diana Hall (Edinburgh) spoke against the Motion. She wished to thank the Administration Board and Investment Committee for their hard work and stewardship. Good stewardship was imperative but also difficult. She did not wish to tear down but rather to find a way to help build up. The draft Ethical Investment Policy was framed in a way to make it seem reasonable. However, if it were to be reframed it was tantamount to indicating that it was acceptable to make money out of armaments, gambling, pornography, thermal coal and tar sands. She asked the Synod whether it was happy for the Church's income to be based on such things. This was the year in which a 16-year-old had acquired sufficient legitimacy to address Parliament and, indeed the Pope, on the reality that the world was facing a climate emergency. The policy left the Church in dereliction of its moral

duty and she was deeply grieved by it. The house was on fire and it was imperative to act now. Three things were needed: divestment, a more rigorous Ethical Investment Policy and the right help to achieve it. The Church needed to do its part to ensure that fossil fuels stayed in the ground. There was a need for rigor, courageous and prophetic policy-making because collective action was needed to address the current emergency. If the Church's current investment advisers could not provide the assistance which the Church needed then there was a need for new ones. Allowing pooled funds would fan the flames of the fire not douse them. There was an opportunity to do better and it was imperative that that happened. She urged Synod to vote against the Motion.

The Rev David Mackenzie Mills (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) also invited Synod to oppose the Motion. In Genesis, God said that creation was good and then stewardship was given to humankind which had not done a good job. He was in no way innocent of the part he played in using fossil fuels but he recognised a corporate responsibility on Synod to join its voice with others highlighting the catastrophic emergency currently faced. There was a need not just to reduce reliance on fossil fuels but to quench the world's thirst to have more. He hoped his children would inherit a world which was as good as the current generation could make it. In revising its Ethical Investment Policy, the SEC had a very public opportunity and duty to speak and act prophetically in caring for the beauty and health of the Earth including divesting completely from fossil fuels. If investment in pooled funds were to continue the list of exclusions needed to be expanded.

Dr Jenny Wright (Edinburgh) spoke against the Motion because it appeared to maintain the *status quo*. How the Church used its money and the documents comprising an ethical policy made a statement to the world about what the Church believed and the values it upheld. In encouraging discipleship she encouraged people to think about how faith affected the whole of life, including finances. As a priest, she preached about justice and walking humbly with God in all areas of life. Holding investments could not come at the cost of theology and ethics. Money was important but one could not think only about maximising profits. Two of the five marks of mission of the Anglican Communion were to transform unjust structures of society, to challenge violence of every kind and pursue peace and reconciliation and also to strive and safeguard the integrity of creation and sustain and renew the life of the Earth. She indicated she would like to see a more radical investment plan, guided by such marks of mission. There was a need to invest using negative criteria but also using positive criteria choosing good, ethical, change-making companies to invest in. There was a need to take seriously human rights abuses and invest in companies that were sensitive to the communities in which they operated, that had responsible employment practices and that treated suppliers and customers fairly. There was also a need to divest from fossil fuels. She asked for a longer list of investment exclusions, thinking particularly about challenging unjust structures in society. The investment plan should be consistent with good stewardship. Christians were called to be wise in dealing with what God had entrusted to them and she prayed that God could give the Church courage to put its money where its faith was.

The Rev David Paton-Williams (Edinburgh) also spoke against the Motion. Context was changing rapidly. Two years previously Synod had had a debate about divestments from fossil fuels. Two years was a long time in the current context and one now talked not of climate change but of climate emergency. Would someone reading the ethical policy in the future have any sense that now was a time of climate emergency? He questioned whether the policy was fit for purpose. He accepted that it was in line with the Synod's debate two years previously. Protection of the planet was perhaps the greatest call to mission in the current age. He did not wish to say to his grandchildren that his stipend and pension were paid for at the cost of the planet. He was disappointed that the policy did not go further than excluding thermal coals and tar sands. For example, it appeared from the policy that the Church was happy to invest in those who undertook fracking or drilled for oil under the Arctic. He asked whether any specific discussions had taken place in the light of the concerns previously expressed about fracking and, given the policy of shareholder engagement, had any consideration been given to such policy being conditional and time-limited? He had in mind the Church of England policy of signalling to oil and gas companies that if they did not bring their policies in line with the Paris Accord by 2023 they would then disinvest. He believed the SEC should do the same.

Mr Jim Gibson (Glasgow and Galloway) supported the Motion. "Ethics" essentially meant "sacrifice". He was reminded of the Christian Aid slogan "live simply that others may simply live". Whilst he would prefer that the Church held direct investments over which it could exercise control, he also wondered whether individuals gave the same degree of scrutiny to their personal investments or pensions. There could be a risk of hypocrisy. Ethical investment was a minefield – in addition to the restricted categories, he suggested there were other fields such as companies involved in the production of plastics, products which led to food obesity, companies which had exorbitant executive salaries, Wonga loans, Amazon etc. How wide ought the Ethical Investment Policy to be? He was concerned that there was as yet no track record of the existing ethical policy. The whole debate indicated that levels of giving in the Church needed to be reviewed. The distribution from the UTP already included an element of capital growth and in that sense the family silver was already being sold in order to prop up the work of the Synod.

Mr Robert MacDonald (Argyll and The Isles) said that the argument in favour of the Motion was based on investment criteria. He believed that it was mistaken to view asset classes such as property or infrastructure (as would be included in the Multi-Asset Income pooled fund) as less volatile classes. They were also significantly less marketable. He was surprised to hear that corporate bonds were being regarded as an inappropriate investment. He suggested that a fund such as the Unit Trust Pool would normally have an element of the fund in investment grade corporate bonds partly because if investing on an ethical basis Government stocks might not be appropriate, on the basis that governments funded armaments and wars. He reminded Synod that the Church of England Church Commissioners had encountered trouble in the 1990s when they had been unable to meet their pension fund liabilities because of direct property investment. He opposed the Motion on investment criteria grounds.

Mr Grant Swain (Moray, Ross and Caithness) considered that he had been hijacked. Prior to Synod, he had intended to vote in favour of the Motion but the debate at Synod suggested there was an underlying swell for a completely new policy. He would be happy to consider that the following year, once he had had a chance to read prior paperwork. In effect Synod was being faced with a choice of that which was no worse than currently ascertained and a radical Rule 10 Motion which had appeared at the last minute. He considered this grossly unfair. He would therefore support the Motion on the agenda and suggested that an investment policy be considered for discussion the following year.

Dr Julia House (Aberdeen and Orkney) suggested that change was always frightening. An ethical approach was what the Church did – there was no choice in the matter. However, she took issue with the comment that £74 million was a small amount of money. There were other churches in religious organisations which would have a similar approach to the SEC and it would be possible to work with them. She wondered if there was an attempt to avoid a full review because much had changed recently in terms of the availability of ethical funds. It was important not to be afraid of standing up for principles because that was what Church did.

The Rev Markus Duenzkofer (Edinburgh) had two points of order. He hoped the Secretary General would explain procedurally to the Synod how the choice between the two Motions was to be dealt with. Also, he suggested a short recess since he considered it would be helpful for Synod members to talk with one another rather than at one another.

The Secretary General explained that Synod would be asked to vote on the Motion contained on the Synod agenda. If that were passed, because the Rule 10 Motion contradicted it, the Rule 10 Motion would then not be put to the vote. If the Motion contained in the Synod agenda were to fall, then Synod could proceed to debate the Rule 10 Motion. Initially, however, Synod would need to agree under Rule 10 that it wished to bring that Motion onto the agenda.

Dr John Ferguson-Smith indicated that he would invite Mr Tupper to respond to points which had been made. As a general comment, he observed that the subject was one which raised real emotion. Everyone shared that. Those responsible for oversight of investments came from the same position. If Synod wished to do something different from what was proposed in the Motion on the Synod agenda, he suggested that that needed to be done in a measured way and not in a sudden way because a sudden movement might result in a significant financial penalty.

Mr Tupper responded to comments which had been made. On the subject of fracking, the Committee had not specifically discussed this. The main company involved in fracking was INEOS which was a private company in which it would not be possible to hold shares. He was not convinced that the portfolio as a whole in fact held any shares in fossil fuels anyway. As far as disinvesting was concerned, selling shares to another investor did not in fact stop extraction albeit it created headlines. It was correct that the Multi-Asset Income Fund did not have a track record but it comprised an encapsulation of a number of investment strategies which Baillie Gifford already had in place. In the absence of these being packaged into one fund, the UTP would not have had access to those separate strategies. He accepted that property and infrastructure had risks associated with them but the point of diversification was so that the investor was not dependent on one single class of asset at any one time. The Fund Managers would only choose assets which they would reasonably believe they could dispose of if necessary. On the question of income and capital, it was correct that part of the distribution came from capital. It did not amount to raiding the family silver but was part of a strategy adopted a number of years previously recognising that the investment return included both capital and income. If the Fund were invested in the Multi-Asset Income Fund the income would be sufficient to fund the distribution. If there were an ethical version of that Fund, the Investment Committee would have no hesitation in investing in it. The Committee was encouraging Baillie Gifford to bring such a fund to the market. The Committee had spent 12 months putting the paperwork together for the current Synod. He had not seen any analysis of the effects of the Rule 10 Motion such as how much it would cost or the risks associated with moving to a different manager. He would wish to see workings on that before making any informed comment. He suggested that the increase in fees which the approach might involve might result in a drop in the distribution of approximately 20%. The Committee spoke to other reputable investment houses frequently and "beauty parades" were conducted from time to time. He was in touch with one alternative investment house at the current time but in all cases management fees that would be charged would be higher and the Committee needed to satisfy itself that any alternative house would offer something over and above what was currently provided.

The Chair invited members of Synod to discuss matters in their table groups for five minutes.

The Rev Diana Hall (Edinburgh) asked what would happen to existing holdings in pooled funds if the Motion on the Synod agenda were to be rejected and her Rule 10 Motion accepted. Her understanding was that it would make no current difference, the Motion would not require disinvestment from pooled funds immediately but rather the door would be opened to indicate that such matters were to be looked at again.

The Chair then put the Motion to the vote which was not passed.

The Secretary General indicated that if Synod wished to debate the Rule 10 Motion, a two thirds majority was required to bring the Motion onto the agenda.

Synod then voted by the requisite majority to debate the Rule 10 Motion.

The Rev Diana Hall (Edinburgh) spoke to her Rule 10 Motion. Knowledge of the climate crisis was constantly increasing. Greta *Thunberg* had become the face of a new generation of activists. Young people, who were more or less absent from the current Synod meeting, were angry for other generations dragging their feet. She

felt embarrassed and apologetic. However, it was not only young people pressing the issue. David Attenborough's call had been heard far and wide to the effect that the scientific evidence suggested that if dramatic action were not taken within the following decade irreversible damage to the natural world could result. Other churches had already taken action: the United Reformed Church, the Church of Ireland and the Religious Society of Friends. She urged the Scottish Episcopal Church to join them. If there was to be any hope of reaching net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2045 there was a need to wean society off oil and gas rapidly. People outside the Church were asking where the Church's moral values were. In the meantime, oil and gas companies continued to grow their core business while saying they respected the Paris Accord. Continuing to invest in fossil fuels meant the Church was actively contributing to climate chaos. Members of the Church were taking personal action in relation to their own carbon footprint but it was clear that collective action was needed and quickly. The Motion allowed the Synod an opportunity to stand up and be counted. It was time for the Church to put its money where its mouth was. She recognised that it was a complex area which was why the Motion proposed specialist attention from those with investment and ethical expertise. She had received a comment that the Motion was unspecific in terms of timescales and mechanisms. That was acceptable because those who would take on the responsibility needed flexibility in undertaking the work.

Ms Hall then formally proposed the following Motion:

"That:

- *The Ethical Investment Policy be updated to reflect the moral imperative to divest fully from fossil fuels and to extend the list of restricted categories for direct investments and pooled funds;*
- *Pending agreement of a revised Ethical Investment Policy, the current Ethical Investment Policy be retained; and*
- *There be formed an Ethical Investment Advisory Group to develop a strategy to enable the SEC to completely disinvest from unethical sources of revenue."*

The Rev David Mackenzie Mills (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) seconded the Motion and thanked Ms Hall for bringing it.

Mr Grant Swain (Moray, Ross and Caithness) suggested that if the Motion were to go forward it ought also to include reference to palm oil as an excluded category.

Dr Jaap Jacobs (Brechtin) noted that the first and third parts of the Motion used different wording. In one place it referred to fossil fuels whereas in another it referred to unethical sources of revenue. Also, it did not include the list of excluded categories contained in the draft Ethical Investment Policy. He therefore wished to suggest that the Motion should make reference to the other excluded categories of armaments, gambling, pornography, tobacco, fossil fuels and palm oil. The Chair advised Dr Jacobs that if he was proposing a formal amendment it would need to be seconded. Mr Grant Swain (Moray, Ross and Caithness) seconded the amendment. The Chair requested a copy of the proposed amendment in writing.

Dr Beth Routledge (Glasgow and Galloway) urged the Synod to vote in favour of the Motion. She supported the idea of expanding the investment policy by disinvesting from other unethical practices, for example, companies practising tax avoidance or child exploitation. Mainly, however, she wished to reassure those members of Synod who were concerned about the level of financial returns. If a rigorous ethical approach were to be adopted the Church might lose money but the tide of the world was turning. Businesses were increasingly aware that they needed to conduct their businesses ethically. If the tide had not quite turned thus far and there was more work to do then it was for the Church to be a living, radical and prophetic voice for change. She wondered whether 200 years previously the Synod would have debated the ethics of investing in companies which made their money through the use of slaves. It was her hope that in a further 200 years investments in companies which mined fossil fuels, made their money from tobacco or which exploited children would be equally unthinkable.

Ms Victoria Stock (Edinburgh) said the matter was one of integrity. If people said they were Christians, they needed to act as Christians. Without justice there would be chaos. She urged Synod vote in favour of the Motion.

Mr Euan Grant (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) wished to draw a distinction between symbolic action and action likely to have an effect in terms of the climate emergency. This had been alluded to by Mr Tupper earlier. The value of the Motion in symbolic terms was self-evident but it was much less clear what effect it would have, on the basis that much greater leverage on the affairs of an oil company could be achieved by a consortium of shareholders.

The Rev Liz Baker (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) reflected on what the Synod would say to congregations. In her experience, congregations were reluctant to disinvest. There was a greater emphasis on cash than on the Kingdom. She urged Synod to support the Motion.

The Rev Markus Duenzkofer (Edinburgh) said he had spoken at Synod two years previously about active engagement with stock companies. He suggested that experience since then suggested that they would not listen and he believed the only way forward was to disinvest.

The Rev Dr Jenny Wright (Edinburgh) said she understood that the proposed amendment was to include a list of currently restricted investments. She suggested that the current Ethical Investment Policy already included such a list (with the exception of palm oil). She considered that the amendment was not necessary. Dr Jacobs withdrew his amendment.

The Chair put the Motion to the vote which was passed by majority.

3.1.4 Child Allowance

Dr John Ferguson-Smith (Convener, Administration Board) explained that the proposal in relation to child allowance emerged from the work of the Clergy Remuneration Package Review Group in 2016. At present, child allowance was potentially payable in relation to children under 16 or, if in full-time education, under 21. That upper limit was now regarded as somewhat arbitrary and it was proposed that it be reduced to 18. The number of cases to which the issue referred was in fact very small. A transitional period would allow those currently in expectation of receiving the allowance in respect of children under 21 to continue to receive it.

Dr Ferguson-Smith then proposed, and the Rt Rev Andrew Swift (Bishop of Brechin) seconded, the following Motion:

"That

- *paragraph 4.3.2 of the Digest of Resolutions be deleted in its entirety and the insertion in its place of the following:-*

"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 and qualifying stipendiary clergy shall be such children and stipendiary clergy respectively as meet criteria set from time to time by the Administration Board."

- *notwithstanding the foregoing, for the purposes of child allowances payable in 2020, 2021 and 2022, child allowances shall continue to be payable to qualifying stipendiary clergy who are currently in receipt of child allowance in respect of children under 21 in full-time education."*

The Rev Peter Harris (Edinburgh) declared an interest in the matter as his son was due to go to college later in the year and he had been supported year on year by grants from the Sons of the Clergy and the provincial child allowance. The child allowance had been useful as a contribution towards clothing for his children in the past and he wished to thank the Board for its availability. He queried the rationale for the proposed change. If children were under 21 and in education they were being asked to take on loans and enter into debt. £425 would not make a significant difference but, as a parent, made him feel supported.

The Rev Liz Baker (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) sought clarification. She recalled that her daughter had previously received child benefit until the age of 21 being in full-time education. She was not sure whether that still applied. A Synod member confirmed that that no longer applied.

Dr Ferguson-Smith noted the points which had been made.

The Motion was put to the vote and passed by majority, 4 abstentions.

3.2 Faith and Order Board

3.2.1 Canonical Review Group

The Most Rev Dr Mark Strange (Convener, Faith and Order Board) reported on the work of the Canonical Review Group. The Group was continuing its consideration of Canons 53, 54, 64 and 65. The Group had met four times since General Synod 2018 and further meetings were planned. The intention was to complete the work in time for the Committee on Canons to take forward recommendations from the Group to bring a first reading of canonical change to Synod 2020.

3.2.2 Doctrine Committee

The Rev Professor David Jasper (Convener, Doctrine Committee) reported that 18 months previously SCM Press had asked the Doctrine Committee if it would undertake work on the subject of truth and post-truth in the current age. A series of essays entitled "Truth and the Church in a Secular Age", written by some members of the Committee as well as other authors, had been compiled. It was to be published in July 2019. The essays had been edited by Dr Jenny Wright and himself. They were not intended to take a "position" but to engender discussion on truth and post-truth from a range of perspectives – theological, philosophical, pastoral, scientific, spiritual, liturgical and cultural. The writers were all worshipping members of the SEC and all believed absolutely in the necessity of truth however that was to be understood.

Following upon previous work on the authority of the episcopate, the Committee had embarked on a wider project on the theology and authority of ministry in the SEC. That included lay ministry and the Committee was working closely with the Diaconate Working Group. The work would emerge either as an issue of the SEI

Journal or possibly as a Grosvenor Essay. It would provide theological reflection on ministry, not doctrinal statements. It was not intended that the exercise would reinvent the wheel.

Along with Dr Wright, he had attended a meeting of the Church in Society Working Group on genome editing. The Committee was also working with the Liturgy Committee on the revision of the 1982 Liturgy. It was also involved in a proposed conference in 2020 on issues of gender and language as a preparation for that liturgical revision. This would include consideration of how much of the Church's liturgy which was deeply patriarchal and needed to be looked at. As an example, he indicated that theologically it was perfectly acceptable to say that God was "made man" but whether that was culturally so comfortable was another question. Such matters needed to be given proper attention in liturgical language.

Professor Jasper reminded Synod that the Doctrine Committee advised the Faith and Order Board. It was not a representative Committee but nevertheless strove to include a range of church personship, age and gender as far as possible. Members of the Committee did not always agree.

Questions were invited but there were none.

3.2.3 Liturgy Committee

Dr John Davies (Convener, Liturgy Committee) presented the work of his Committee. A new printing of the Scottish Liturgy 1982, incorporating the permitted changes relating to gendered language, was being prepared and would be presented to the Board in August 2019. In addition, the Board had commissioned the Liturgy Committee to produce a completely revised Eucharistic Liturgy by 2024. As part of that process, a scholarly conversation on the principles of liturgical reform would be aired in a special issue of the Scottish Episcopal Institute Journal. The Committee was additionally involved in the process of organising an academic conference to address the wider possibilities and implications of gender in relation to liturgical reform. Whilst it might be thought that gender differences in the liturgical life of the Christian churches had become significant only in recent years, scholarship demonstrated how such differences had always mattered profoundly. Work on this topic was being done in the Episcopal Church, the Church of England and in Sweden. All of this was important because the Church was first of all a worshipping community of all of the baptised with the Eucharist at its heart.

Growth and change were signs of life and renewal was the means by which such growth and change came about. In one sense, the Church could only be renewed through its liturgy since it was through the liturgy, and baptism and Eucharist most precisely, that the Church was made and existed. The liturgy led and impelled the Church in mission. Liturgical formation and renewal therefore had to be the foundations for mission and growth. Only with the Eucharist as the centre of the life of the Church could the love of God reach beyond the act of worship and into the everyday life of the world. Done right, the liturgy showed the Church how to see the world, how to live in it and was therefore for the transformation of the world.

Comment was invited but there was none.

SESSION 4: THE RT REV IAN PATON, BISHOP OF ST ANDREWS, DUNKELD AND DUNBLANE IN THE CHAIR

4.1 Administration Board – Personnel Committee

Dr John Ferguson-Smith (Convener, Administration Board) introduced Ms Jan Whiteside as the new Convener of the Personnel Committee. He expressed thanks to Ms Whiteside and her Committee for what had been achieved in the previous 12 months.

Ms Whiteside suggested that Synod 2018 had demonstrated that the Committee had not been listening carefully enough. In October 2018, she and other members of the Committee had met with a number of Synod members who had spoken during the Personnel Committee session at Synod 2018. There had been two particular outcomes from that meeting. The first had been an undertaking to go to the Administration Board and seek a review of clergy stipends, pension and housing. The second had been to identify what issues were of most concern to clergy. A Clergy Wellbeing Survey had been undertaken, the results of which were printed in the Synod papers. Anonymity had been guaranteed and the results had been analysed externally by the HR Department, an external consultancy firm that provided HR support to the Church. Specific comments which had been made by individuals in response to the Survey had not been included in the report to Synod in order to respect anonymity.

The results of the Survey had perhaps not been too surprising. It was encouraging that 82% of stipendiary clergy enjoyed their ministry as did 88% of the Church's self-supporting clergy.

Clergy had been concerned about stipend in a time of rising costs as well as pension provision and housing. The Administration Board had asked the Personnel Committee to suggest to the Board at its following meeting how a review of such matters might be undertaken. Any such review would take time and the outcome was unlikely to please everyone but she considered that it was nevertheless a significant step in the right direction.

Other responses to the Survey suggested that whilst most clergy considered they were given the resources needed to carry out their calling, some did not. Some felt they had not been adequately supported during a period of illness and many felt they did not have a work/life balance. Many did not claim all of their expenses and she encouraged clergy to recover such expenses so that the charge and diocese could be aware of overall costs. Clergy could always make donations back to the Church.

Sadly, whilst bullying and harassment might take place in any organisation, the statistics from the Survey were shocking particularly for a church which prided itself on being welcoming and inclusive. It questioned people's understanding of what constituted Christian behaviour. Ultimately, this was a problem of discipline and such issues fell under the pastoral authority of the Bishops. However, the problem was not just one for the College of Bishops nor just for the clergy nor just for the laity – it was a whole Church problem and would not be solved easily or quickly. Representatives of the Committee would meet with the College of Bishops to discuss matters later in the month. If the Church acknowledged that there was an issue needing to be addressed then it was essential that ways be found to address it. The Church could not and should not continue to ignore it and such practices had to be stopped.

Ms Whiteside suggested that as a matter of good governance there was a need for an anti-bullying strategy. The Personnel Committee was just at the start of a process and she was open to suggestions which Synod members might wish to make. It might be necessary to find out in greater detail what clergy meant when they said they felt bullied or harassed. Workshops, focus groups or a further survey might be appropriate. Every part of the Church needed to understand that such practices were not acceptable and would not be tolerated. Evidence in other churches suggested that the SEC was not alone and there might therefore be merit in exploring with Anglican and ecumenical partners how such matters were addressed in other churches. She encouraged members to talk with her, any such conversations being treated in the strictest confidence.

The Rev David Mackenzie Mills (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) noted the anniversary of the election of Bishop Paton as the new Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane and one element in his presentation during the election had been that of speaking truth to power. Mr Mackenzie Mills thanked the Committee for its report on clergy welfare which provided material for considered and sober thought. He wondered why others in ministry, particularly lay readers, had not been included in the Survey. Speaking truth to power meant speaking to the institution which all those at Synod had inherited. He referred to a friend who was involved in strike action in their workplace over a requirement to work six days per week. That was seen as a possible cause for industrial action. On page 121 of the Synod papers he noted that a significant percentage of clergy had indicated that they did not have a good work/life balance. He suggested that clergy were too polite, or perhaps too proud, to admit that the bar chart appearing in section 7.1 on page 124 was not in fact accurate and that far more clergy felt they spent "far too much time" rather than "a bit too much time" working and not enough at home/at leisure. He suspected clergy spouses and partners would agree. He was reminded of comments by a retired minister whose children indicated that where there was a struggle in relation to time allocation between work and home life, it was always the Church which won. Clergy could boast about how little time off they took and that could be a catalyst for breakdown.

Ms Victoria Stock (Edinburgh) said it was unacceptable that 39% of stipendiary clergy had felt harassed or bullied in the previous 12 months. This was a whole Church problem. If clergy were affected by bullying, she wondered to what extent lay workers in the Church also experienced bullying. She suspected that they did. There was a need to appreciate the significant contribution which the laity brought to the life of the Church and what policies and procedures were in place to protect lay people. She wished to make a plea that the position of lay people was considered even if it fell outwith the strict remit of the work of the Personnel Committee.

Dr Beth Routledge (Glasgow and Galloway) wished to comment on the question of clergy time off. She worked in a profession which had a high level of staff burnout and poor levels of staff wellbeing. There were similarities with the Church. The bar charts on page 122 of the report concerning the taking of time off, holiday entitlement and level of stress gave her cause for concern. She found it alarming that almost one quarter of stipendiary clergy did not generally take one day off per week. She was not sure how a person who was in effect the sole employee could continue functioning if they were not able to take adequate time for rest. Similarly, in relation to the statistics for time taken off for sickness or ill-health (in relation to both stipendiary and self-supporting clergy), she suggested the Personnel Committee should consider how many clergy needed to take time off for ill-health but felt unable to do so. Resilience was not about how long one could keep going but about having the necessary structures in place to support clergy. The figure suggested that such structures were not present in the Church.

The Rev Denise Herbert (Brechin) reported that she had experienced bullying both in South Africa and in Scotland. She wondered if the Survey had been sent to active retired clergy since she had not seen a copy but accepted that she may have missed it. [Post meeting note: retired clergy were included in the Survey.] She felt that retired clergy were not given sufficient acknowledgement. She wondered how many clergy were living on their own and how many were living in families or supported by spouses or partners. She lived on her own and her family did not live locally and therefore could not provide local support.

The Rev Canon Kathy Collins (Moray, Ross and Caithness) thanked the Committee for undertaking the Survey. If the question of bullying was to be addressed, she suggested that the Society of Mary and Martha (Sheldon) might be approached because they had experience in that area.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) also thanked the Committee for having undertaken the Survey. He agreed with the Convener that the Church had to say that the kind of behaviour which had been identified could not be tolerated. Unfortunately, it had been tolerated. He suggested that some of the problems might result from the structures of the Church. He believed that members of the episcopate might be able to help but the issue raised questions about episcopate itself and how it was exercised within the Church. Also, he noted that the figure concerning bullying and harassment referred to the preceding 12 months. He considered there was a need to take a longer view. Nearly 20 years previously he had spoken to the Synod about bullying which he had received within the Church's training structures and of abusive relationships that had existed then amongst staff. That speech had not been minuted. Was it the case that saying such things in Synod could now be recorded because he suggested that the fact that they had not been in the past might be part of the reason for the present situation?

The Rev Ruth Innes (Edinburgh) said that she would have appreciated seeing a statistical breakdown of the results on a gender basis to ascertain whether there was a difference between men and women. Also, if another survey were to be undertaken online, she wished to point out that the previous survey had not allowed respondents to see what the future questions were and nor was it possible to go back in the survey and change what had been said previously.

The Rev Dr David Easton (Methodist Church) congratulated the Church on being concerned about ministerial welfare. He believed there was a profound issue about boundaries for clergy between "work" and "play". For lay people involved in the Church, their involvement was not their "work". The boundary for clergy was very blurred. There was also much "loneliness" in ministry which could affect wellbeing partly because clergy worked on their own and from home. There also remained an expectation that clergy were omniscient. He suggested that the Church might wish to consider having a provincial wellbeing officer or a clear policy on sabbaticals. There was such an officer in the Methodist Church and there was a policy of a three-month sabbatical for every seven years served.

The Rev Peter Harris (Edinburgh) believed that the issues being discussed were related to the fact that clergy were called rather than employed. He also spoke about the lack of boundaries between work and leisure time – for example, if at the local swimming pool he became involved in a lengthy conversation with a parishioner. As a belittled, bullied, intimidated rector he felt that the Church's Canons offered him no protection. He had encouraged his church to prepare a code of conduct to set out how vestry members ought to behave. He found it unbelievable that such a course of action was needed. It was possible that such a code of conduct needed to be introduced across the board.

The Rev Rosie Addis (Edinburgh) noted that later in the meeting the Synod would consider a report on safeguarding. Safeguarding recognised that at some point any person could be vulnerable. There was a connection between that and the issues being discussed in the current debate.

The Rev Sophia Marriage (Edinburgh) congratulated the Committee on a good first step. She felt it was not just a case of saying "the Church needs to do X". She agreed with Provost Holdsworth that there was a need to consider structures. She had been particularly worried by the implication from the report that 75% of stipendiary clergy did not feel supported by their diocese/bishop and ministerial colleagues. That was a matter for urgent attention.

Mrs Ruth Warmer (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) said that there was an existing structure for support, namely that of rector's warden. That should be drawn to the attention of vestries.

Ms Whiteside responded to comments which had been made. At the outset the Committee had considered the scope of the Survey and had decided that the issue needed to be approached "bite by bite" which was why the exercise had commenced with a clergy survey. On the question of a six-day working week she had already recognised whether that was a matter which needed to be considered. On the subject of health, there was an issue as to how to enable clergy to indicate that they were not well enough to be "at work". The Survey did not address whether clergy were living on their own or the degree of family support available. There had been a need to keep the Survey relatively succinct. She recognised that the question of gender breakdown of the figures had not been undertaken. She recognised that joined up thinking with safeguarding was needed. She thanked the Synod generally for its comments.

Ms Whiteside then spoke to the two Motions from the Committee on the General Synod agenda. It had been clear from debate at General Synod 2018 that lengthy policies were not the best way to proceed. However, the Committee was keen that clergy ought to be entitled to benefits equivalent to some of the statutory benefits available to employees. The Synod papers explained the proposal in detail and the first Motion would incorporate the proposal into the Digest of Resolutions. The second Motion was to empower the Administration Board to make grants to assist congregations where they incurred additional costs associated with such benefits.

Dr John Ferguson-Smith (Convener, Administration Board) proposed, and the Rev Amanda Fairclough (Argyll and The Isles) seconded, the following Motion:

"That the Digest of Resolutions be altered by the addition of a paragraph 6.12 as follows:-

"Stipendiary office holders shall be entitled to maternity, paternity, parental and adoption leave for the same periods and subject to the same conditions as apply in the case of an employee under the Employment Rights Act 1996 or any regulations made under that Act. Where a stipendiary office holder is statutorily entitled to maternity or adoption pay, it shall be paid at the level of standard stipend for 22 weeks and, for the following 17 weeks, at the rate of 90% of standard stipend or the standard rate set by the Government (whichever is the lower)."

The Rev Jenny Wright (Edinburgh) expressed thanks for the Motions. She noted that maternity and adoption pay were specifically mentioned. She wondered whether consideration was given to the question of shared parental leave so that pay could be given in accordance with the statutory provision. Ms Whiteside responded that the intention was that clergy would have access to similar benefits to employees.

The Rev Canon Jane Ross (Glasgow and Galloway) welcomed the Motion but was concerned about the reference to the fact that for the final 17 weeks the rate of maternity/adoption pay was to be at 90% of stipend or the standard rate set by the Government or whichever was the lower. She thought it ought to be whichever was the higher.

The Rev John Bremner (United Reformed Church) suggested that the Motion should be changed so that it referred not simply to the Employment Rights Act 1996 but to future legislation also.

Dr Beth Routledge (Glasgow and Galloway) was concerned at the reference to Standard Stipend rather than to average earnings. She wondered how it would be applied if, for example, a Bishop wished to take maternity leave. Ms Whiteside confirmed that the intention was that clergy, including Bishops, would receive equivalent benefits to employees.

The Motion was then put to the vote and passed *nem con*, 4 abstentions.

Dr Ferguson-Smith then proposed, and the Rev Amanda Fairclough seconded, the following Motion:

"That the Digest of Resolutions be altered by the deletion of the existing paragraph 4.3.3 and the insertion in its place of the following:-

"The Administration Board shall make provision for grants to be payable to assist congregations towards additional costs incurred by congregations in situations where they make payment to clergy of maternity, paternity, adoption and shared parental pay."

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) noted that the proposal made reference to grants to assist congregations. Whilst he did not wish to complicate matters, he noted that if a Bishop were to go on maternity leave then assistance to a diocese might be necessary. Ms Whiteside confirmed that the intention would be to cover a situation of Bishops as well as other clergy.

The Motion was then put to the vote and passed *nem con*, 2 abstentions.

The Chair expressed thanks to Ms Whiteside.

The Chair also expressed the thanks of the Synod to Dr Ferguson-Smith for his term as Convener of the Administration Board.

4.2 Information and Communication Board

The Rev Philip Blackledge (Acting Convener, Information and Communication Board) indicated that he had shortened his speech because the Synod programme was running behind schedule. He referred to the paper contained in the Synod papers concerning the dissolution of the Information and Communication Board. In essence, the proposal was to dissolve the Board because it did not do anything. It was an editorial board for a magazine that no longer existed. There had been two main issues which had arisen when he had attended Diocesan Synods earlier in the year, namely what would replace the Board and how would the voices of the dioceses be heard in future. In one sense, an editorial board for a magazine which no longer existed did not in fact need replacing. However, there was a strong need for communications to work better along with the desire for stronger diocesan input. The proposal in the paper was that instead of having a provincial group of people, those diocesan individuals involved in communications would be brought together, diocese by diocese and, rather than imposing a provincial structure on them, the proposal would enable them to have input into provincial work. Encouraging diocesan workers to work together ought to prevent dioceses needing to reinvent the wheel, would enable bigger projects to be done on an inter-diocesan level, would save time and allow them to share expertise and work with provincial staff when they felt it useful to do so. In terms of dioceses improving their communications for mission, the proposal would make things better because there would be input into the paid provincial staff and there was a hope that in some way they would be connected into the Mission Board so that ideas emerging within that inter-diocesan group could be taken up through the Board to Standing Committee, in so far as matters affected provincial strategy. This would not make things perfect but it might make them better. Such matters could in fact be pursued already. This would not be a replacement of the Board, because the Board did not really do anything, but it would serve the mission of the Church. The Board currently served no purpose for the Church's mission which was why its dissolution was being proposed.

The Rt Rev Andrew Swift (Bishop of Brechin) proposed the following Motion:

"That the amended text for Canon 52, Section 23 be read for the second time."

Bishop Swift indicated that he proposed the Motion as a member of the Information and Communication Board. The effectiveness of the Board had not been a suitable return on the investment of time, people and money. Dissolution of the Board did not mean that communications did not matter, quite the opposite. The proposal was to try and make communication better. He urged Synod to support the Motion.

Mr Robert Gordon (Convener, Standing Committee) seconded the Motion.

The Chair indicated that owing to the late running of the agenda he intended to restrict those contributing to two minutes per person.

Mr Jim Gibson (Glasgow and Galloway) noted that in the past companies had had electronic data processing departments. They had worked in isolation and were called upon when specialist help was needed. Times had moved on and all employees now needed to be familiar with the basics of how computers worked but there was still a need for specialist assistance from time to time. He considered there was an analogy with the situation regarding the Information and Communication Board. The paradigm had shifted and the role for which the Board had previously been set up no longer existed. He urged Synod to support the Motion.

Ms Victoria Stock (Edinburgh) on a point of order asked that the matter be given longer consideration because it was an important one and if there was insufficient time at the current point in the meeting she suggested Synod might return to it later. The Chair responded that he wished to keep the debate going in the current session but would be generous in his time allocation.

Ms Stock said she considered the reasons for the proposed dissolution were valid but she was concerned that Synod appeared to be moving very quickly from identifying the problem to providing a solution in a single step. She considered there were other options. The Board could have a role in looking at different possibilities for the future. She accepted that communications had changed and was no longer publications-based. Everyone was now online and connected. This affected how people related to one another and impacted on people's identity. Being in the digital age was more than simply being able to use a website or run a social media account. The digital world was profoundly different from a book or the printed press. She therefore proposed that the future focus of the Board should take a more digital focus and that instead of drawing on geographical representation on the Board it should comprise those with experience in the digital area and who were theologically grounded. She considered that losing the Board would weaken communications and that neither the Mission Board nor the Standing Committee would have communications as their sole purpose (unlike a board). She encouraged Synod to think with creativity and oppose the Motion.

The Rev Professor David Atkinson (Aberdeen and Orkney) also wished to ask Synod to vote against the Motion. Canons were important in describing the shape of the Church. It was important that the structure of the Church was well managed and worked in a business-like way. The essence of the proposal was that information and communication was such a professional matter that it needed to be handled by professionals rather than by amateurs. He suggested that this was a move to a business culture, alien to the Church. He believed that information and communication needed to be linked solidly to dioceses because each diocese was different. It was important that the differences in culture between dioceses were reflected in how the Church dealt with communications. He accepted that perhaps the current remit of the Board needed to be changed for the future but he believed that the Board itself ought to remain, representing the dioceses. Professionalism, and the use of professionals, was indeed important but there was a diocesan role in indicating to the professionals what needed to be done. The proposal would mark a change in relation to the Standing Committee from being the executive committee of the Synod towards being the executive committee for the Church. He considered that to make such a move would be to the peril of the Church.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) also spoke against the Motion. He spoke as a former Convener of the Board. He did not wish to claim that the Board had always been functional but he believed it did much work, and much more than simply publishing a magazine. Some of the professionals and diocesan communications staff had very limited time and, within the dioceses, calls on their time were significant. There had been no negotiation with dioceses about releasing any of that time to the Province. He had heard that the Board was not working. If it was broken it needed to be fixed, not abolished. He wished to agree with comments made by Professor Atkinson about the governance of the Church. He believed it was a bad idea to put onto the officers of the Church greater policy decision-making. The decision-making and policy development of the Church should come from the Church itself, rather than officers and employees. He believed it was important to give the Board another go because such matters had never been more important.

The Rev Sophia Marriage (Edinburgh) noted that the Canon did not say that the Board was a defunct editorial committee. Referring to an earlier debate in the meeting in which Synod had discussed the question of ethics and professional investment, she noted that the current debate now appeared to be one between professionals in the communications realm and theology. The previous debate had expressed a desire to keep the two matters together and she believed the same needed to happen in the current debate. The Church's professionals could provide all the professional skills which were needed but the policy of the Church ought to come from within the synodical structures and not left to the Standing Committee.

Mr Hugh Morison (Moray, Ross and Caithness) reported that when the matter had been discussed at his Diocesan Synod the view had been taken that the Board ought not to be abolished because the Synod did not know what was to replace it. Having seen the Synod papers a different view had been taken by the diocesan representatives at their pre-General Synod meeting. If the Board was not doing a reasonable job, why ought it to be kept? He agreed there was a need to communicate with boldness and draw on the expertise of those experienced in digital communications but that was not to be found in a board which met three or four times per annum. Canons were inflexible and there was a need for flexibility in the Church's communications. He urged Synod to support the Motion to allow a flexible and effective communications strategy. One other matter which had arisen in his Diocesan Synod was whether the professional resources available to the Church were sufficient.

The Rev Philip Blackledge then responded to comments which had been made during the debate. He accepted that dioceses were different which was why more emphasis was being placed on the diocesan workers. If professionalism was not important then what was the purpose in employing such individuals? This was not a centralising issue. Dioceses would have just as much input as was currently the case but it would save time on the part of diocesan communications workers. On the question of moving to a solution quickly, he suggested that two years was not quick. He suggested that Ms Stock's comments were to the effect that the Board ought to be altered in terms of remit and composition. That was in fact what was being proposed. The idea was for a lighter touch so that it was less burdensome for diocesan workers. He agreed that communications were not the Mission Board's sole focus but without communication mission was impossible. Responding to Provost Holdsworth, Mr Blackledge indicated that he had encountered mixed comment in the dioceses as to whether in fact the Board had undertaken good work in the past. One member of the Board had said that they were ashamed to take expenses because the Board did so little. The point of involving diocesan workers was not to take more of their time but rather to facilitate them working together so they could take less time reinventing the wheel. He wished to have the future based on good relationships and positivity. In private conversations which he had had, it had been made clear to him that the structure of the Board was not the central issue but rather the poor personal relationships between people in the Synod meeting and people in the General Synod Office. Such matters were important. Matthew 18 set out how to deal with conflict and was in fact a good basis for a code of conduct against bullying. If one had an issue with someone else, one spoke to them privately one-on-one and if that was unsuccessful then two or three witnesses were to be called and if that did not work then the whole congregation were to be involved. Keeping a board which did not have any teeth was a way of embedding conflict into the structures not resolving it. He wanted communication to work because it was so vital to mission.

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

House of Bishops: unanimous
House of Laity: 38 in favour, 11 against, 7 abstentions
House of Clergy: 34 in favour, 12 against, 8 abstentions.

The Chair declared the Motion passed.

The Rt Rev Andrew Swift (Bishop of Brechin) then proposed, and Mr Robert Gordon (Convener, Standing Committee) seconded, the following Motion:

“That the Digest of Resolutions be altered by the deletion of paragraph 2.7 in its entirety and by the re-numbering of paragraphs 2.8-2.11 as paragraphs 2.7-2.10 respectively.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed by majority, 1 against, 6 abstentions.

The Chair thanked Mr Blackledge, as Acting Convener, and all other members of the Board for their work on its behalf and also the Rev Chris Mayo for his work as the previous Convener.

SESSION 5: THE RT REV ANNE DYER, BISHOP OF ABERDEEN AND ORKNEY, IN THE CHAIR

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

Mr Christopher Townsend (Convener, Committee for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults) indicated that the focus of his report to Synod would be the Safeguarding Audit carried out by the Committee with the full support of the College of Bishops and Standing Committee. The Provincial Officer had received 43 calls for safeguarding advice in the previous year but few had necessitated further enquiry and there had been nothing to suggest that significant issues had gone unreported. However, the Church could not afford to be complacent. Having received annual safeguarding returns from dioceses for a number of years, the Committee had wanted to conduct a more in-depth analysis of safeguarding to allow it to collate qualitative as well as quantitative data and to confirm areas of risk that necessitated further work. The Committee believed that the SEC had sound policies in place and had made progress over many years but was keen to identify where procedures could be improved and it had been important to establish how well policies were known, understood and implemented.

Mr Townsend explained that the audit had utilised a mixed method study to establish the degree to which churches were compliant with good safeguarding practice, factors affecting the likelihood of compliance with good practice, barriers to compliance and the support needed to increase engagement with safeguarding. A detailed questionnaire had been sent to all charges and a number of areas had been identified by the audit team as "red flag" issues which were the areas that would reflect concern in terms of a deficit in both knowledge and compliance. The Committee had set the bar high.

The overarching conclusion of the audit had been that whilst progress had been made by the Church in its approach to safeguarding there was a need for a broader and more consistent understanding of safeguarding in a faith context. It had been encouraging that the analysis demonstrated that most churches exhibited a low level of concern and many showed a significant level of understanding of their safeguarding responsibilities. However, the analysis had also shown a lack of complete understanding and this was reflected in the recommendation regarding training. It was important to re-emphasise that safeguarding was not just about child protection but also the support and protection of vulnerable adults. That message was consistently communicated through current training provision but the audit had also indicated a need to revisit the content of the training and the way it was delivered. Training had been provided at nine locations in the previous 12 months and over 150 people had attended. This had largely been at the request of Diocesan Protection Officers or individual congregations. There was a need to remind vestries of their responsibilities for safeguarding in a congregation and that the Provincial Officers ought to be contacted for advice.

It had become apparent that some questions in the questionnaire had not been as clear as had been thought – for example, most congregations did in fact assess risk regarding their most vulnerable members but did not necessarily identify it as risk assessment as such. The recommendations in the main could be implemented without the need for canonical change but they had also reinforced the need for the ongoing current review of both Canons 54 and 65. A working group to assist with the implementation of the recommendations was currently being established and Mr Townsend would inform Synod of progress the following year. He invited Synod to comment on matters arising from the report included in the Synod papers in particular on the recommendation that clergy should be subject to compulsory safeguarding training.

Dr Anthony Birch (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) wished to commend the Committee for the work which they had undertaken but he suggested that there appeared to be certain statistical oddities in the Executive Summary contained in the Synod papers. He asked whether the full report would be available because that might provide information on definitions which were lacking in the summary. He also asked how individual charges were to receive feedback on their red flag, or possibly blue flag, status. There had been 30 questions in the questionnaire but he wondered whether the red flags had been identified before the questionnaire had been written. If the red flags had been identified in advance then questions could be framed to achieve a balanced response. Also, on page 149, there was a failure of definition between the thinking of churches in the low and high risk categories. The summary did not contain any definition of low or high risk. He asked, therefore, whether any particular expertise in the devising of questionnaires had been accessed by the Committee before the questionnaire had been sent out.

Mr Townsend reported that the College of Bishops, the Standing Committee and Diocesan Protection Officers had or would receive the report. The Committee would consider the question of broader release. On the subject of feedback to individual charges, that matter would be considered by the Working Group. No decision had been made. The red flag issues had been identified in advance. He accepted the point regarding definitions but explained that the view had been taken that it would be better to ask open questions to ascertain local perception of safeguarding and risk. This could be revisited by the Committee in the formulation of future guidance. On the subject of expertise, Mr Townsend explained that Dr Jenny Parkinson, a member of the Committee, had played a key role in the devising and undertaking of the audit and had experience in research and analysis.

Mr Chris Brown (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) expressed thanks for the allocation of time on the Synod agenda for safeguarding and also for the report itself. He spoke as someone who had personally experienced abuse and worked with victims of abuse. He had been involved with actors in the film "Spotlight" one of whom had commented on the experience of victims by indicating "who can say no to God" – when abusing clergy appeared to act in the name of God. David Horsburgh had written about pastoral care in a Mennonite context and commented that churches suffered from congenital niceness which could lead to chronic niceness and ultimately terminal niceness. Churches across the Province needed to grasp the issue not just as a procedural one but as a profoundly theological and pastoral one. It was his experience that people might not report abuse until decades after it had originally taken place. Churches could also put pressure on the victim to forgive. He urged the theologians in the Church to think further about the question of forgiveness.

The Rev Denise Herbert (Breachin) spoke as the Diocesan Protection Officer in her Diocese. She thanked the previous speaker for his powerful statement. Training was vital and clergy ought to undertake it. Online training was available in the Church of England and dioceses could check to see whether their clergy had in fact undertaken it. She believed there was a case for considering online training in the SEC. She was a member of the NHS Ethics Committee in which there was a very high expectation that people would undertake training and the Church needed to do likewise. She underlined the need for congregational co-ordinators to report directly to the vestry on a regular basis. The vestry was responsible for safeguarding. She agreed there was a need to consider the question of forgiveness and support for the victim. There was also a need to remember the perpetrator's family.

The Rev Rosie Addis (Edinburgh) considered that safeguarding sometimes appeared as something of a Cinderella issue and she was pleased that time was being taken in the current Synod to address that. Every person had the possibility of becoming a vulnerable adult at some point in their lives. The issue ought not to be regarded as one "for the other" – there was a need for a change of culture so the Church saw it as "us". She suggested greater working together between safeguarding and personnel. She considered the Faith and Order Board could also be involved because she felt there was a need for a value statement before policies were developed. The thinking had to be grounded in theological understanding. This would apply both to safeguarding but other areas as well such as disability.

Professor Alan Werritty (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) asked if an action for historic abuse were to be raised would it be raised at charge, diocesan or provincial level and was there adequate public liability insurance cover in place?

Mr Alistair Dinnie (ACC representative) commended the guidelines which had been produced by the Anglican Communion Safe Church Commission.

Rev Alexander Guinness (Argyll and The Isles) wished to raise the question of producing identity cards for clergy. He observed that anyone could pose as a cleric by wearing a clerical collar. He believed it would be helpful if those in positions of authority in the Church could be provided with identity cards. He believed this had been raised with the College of Bishops and wondered what their view on that was. Driving licences were not a sufficient alternative.

Mr Townsend then responded to comments made. He agreed that the Church could be seen as too nice. The biggest risk to any congregation was to think that because everyone in the congregation was nice, there could be no risk. He agreed that it was a question of developing a culture of safeguarding which was much more than a tick box exercise. He agreed that there were underlying theological issues and the Committee had discussed some of those in the past, particularly in relation to the subject of forgiveness. The idea of compulsory training for clergy had come not from the Committee but from members of the clergy. As to the potential risk of damage to the Church, that could be both financial or reputational and was in part why the audit had been conducted. He invited any further comments to be sent to Donald Urquhart, the Provincial Officer.

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

5.2 Faith and Order Board: Inter-Church Relations Committee

The Rev Canon John McLuckie (Convener, Inter-Church Relations Committee) reminded Synod that every time the Eucharist was celebrated the Church prayed "may we grow together in unity and love". The Scottish Episcopal Church had a calling, as part of the worldwide Anglican Communion, to be a church which worked, hoped and prayed for the visible unity of the Church Catholic. The call to unity was not for the sake of organisational efficiency but was a fundamental and spiritual expression of the unity sought for the whole of God's creation. The proposed ecumenical policy being brought to Synod stated the calling clearly and recognised that the journey of unity took its first steps with the relationships which the SEC formed with sisters and brothers in Scotland to participate together in God's mission. The work already begun with the Church of Scotland in *Our Common Calling*, was a prime expression of that policy in action and he would invite his friend and Co-Chair in that work, the Rev Sandy Horsburgh, to speak shortly.

The Committee also expressed local commitments in partnerships with other churches and in the papers provided to Synod there was a fresh commitment to the SEC's partnership with the United Reformed and Methodist Churches in a joint letter signed by church leaders. The Committee was also committed to working with Action of Churches Together in Scotland as it made a transition to a new expression of ecumenism for Scotland in the form of the new Scottish Christian

Forum. Above all, at local level, the proposed policy was a simple invitation to everyone to keep on working with fellow Christians in as many and creative ways as were possible. The policy also reiterated the SEC's commitment to express unity in European and global relationships. The global character of the true Oikumene had never been more urgent than at the current time when the fragility of the planet was recognised. Something of that outward-looking dimension of ecumenism was contained in the report from Churches Together in Britain and Ireland a copy of which had been provided to Synod members on arrival. Finally, the proposed policy also helped to prioritise the Church's ecumenical work so that most effective use could be made of resources.

The Rev Sandy Horsburgh (Church of Scotland), speaking as Convener of the Church of Scotland Ecumenical Relations Committee, brought greetings from the Church of Scotland and also thanked the Synod on behalf of all ecumenical guests, for the Synod's hospitality and friendship. He reported that the Church of Scotland was delighted that the SEC was on the verge of adopting substantially the same ecumenical policy as the Church of Scotland had adopted in 2018. Ecumenism was not a discrete area of church activity separate from ministry, mission, worship and witness. The Church was most truly the Church when different denominations recognised that they were all part of the whole Church of Christ. All forms of church had their strengths and failings and there was a need humbly to acknowledge that the Church on earth was an imperfect reflection of the Church in heaven.

Through the *Our Common Calling* process, the two churches were growing together and the adoption of what would become a shared ecumenical policy was an important sign of that. That was not to say that the Church of Scotland was about to adopt Bishops, though increasingly it was recognising the value of personal leadership, nor was it praying for the Scottish Episcopal Church to set up presbyteries. Growth together was built upon and nourished by renewed appreciation for the gifts, insights, traditions and practices of each church and especially on the recognition that both churches shared a calling to minister to the whole people of Scotland. Some theological work had been undertaken on how to identify and respond to areas of theological convergence and divergence and the following principles had been discerned to guide the process:

- That if differences between the two denominations were those which would be tolerated within them, then such differences posed no theological obstacle to co-operation;
- That the churches ought not to judge each other's theology and practice by reference to their own respective traditions but by their fidelity to Scripture; and
- That both churches ought to presume that each other's traditions were faithful to Scripture and the call of Christ unless evidence to the contrary were encountered.

The churches had also reaffirmed their commitment to the Lund principle that churches should act together in all matters except those in which deep difference of conviction compelled them to act separately.

The motivation behind *Our Common Calling* was not to fix a perceived problem, nor was it a church union scheme, but was an expression of joint commitment to the mission of God. The focus had been on learning from and seeking to encourage shared ministry in local contexts. They had been learning from places where there were already good examples of congregations working together both in cities and in rural areas. They had learned of new worshipping communities developing, such as the Crask Inn in Sutherland, drawing together Christians from both traditions and even appealing to those with no previous background in faith. They were also looking forward to learning about the sharing of ministry in the centre of Edinburgh through the work of St John's, St Cuthbert's and St Andrews and St George's West. Answers were being sought to questions about how ordained ministries could be shared so that congregations could be served better and best use could be made of tangible resources such as buildings.

Mission was at the heart of *Our Common Calling* and both churches had been inspired by what had been learned in Cumbria about working ecumenically in the cause of mission. That had raised more strategic questions and as the Church of Scotland looked to reconfigure its regional structure there was a commitment to do that work in consideration for the regional structures of the Scottish Episcopal Church. Whilst mission was rightly the focus, *Our Common Calling* was also a spiritual process. Speaking personally, Mr Horsburgh said that one of his most profound privileges as Convener of the Ecumenical Relations Committee had been to lead the working group in a service of Holy Communion in Inverness Cathedral. Breaking bread and drinking wine together was a simple thing but its effect was profound. He commended the *Our Common Calling* process to Synod as he had done a couple of weeks previously at the General Assembly.

Canon McLuckie then proposed, and the Most Rev Dr Mark Strange (Primus) seconded, the following Motion:

"That this Synod approve and adopt the statement of Scottish Episcopal Church Ecumenical Policy."

The Rev John Bremner (United Reformed Church) affirmed Mr Horsburgh's thanks to Synod. It was undoubtedly the case that in Scotland there was a sense of the churches working more closely together and there were positive signs in the midst of what were deeply difficult times in relation to the Church's relationship to society. A colleague from the Church of Scotland had used the word "catastrophic" in relation to the situation and this had brought home to Mr Bremner the seriousness of the situation faced by all churches in relation to matters such as the number of ministers, how church buildings were to be maintained, etc. How often such issues dwarfed the real issue which was that of mission to the people of Scotland. He supported the three Motions being brought to Synod by the Committee. However, he wondered how the relationship between the SEC and the Church of Scotland fitted in with the relationship between the SEC, the Methodist and United Reformed Churches. He emphasised the need to work together. On behalf of the United Reformed Church he welcomed the three Motions and would take the policy back to his own Committee and perhaps his own Synod.

Mr Euan Grant (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) wished to thank Mr Horsburgh for his remarks. He sought reassurance on one aspect of the ecumenical policy in relation to Trinitarian theology. He detected the shadow of modalism in the language of manifestation applied to the Trinity. He sought reassurance that such language was not intended to draw any distinction between the revelation of the Trinity through the incarnate Son and the Source of Being, Eternal Word and Holy Spirit.

The Rev Peter Harris (Edinburgh) spoke as an ecumenical partner of Mr Horsburgh. He noted that the ecumenical policy referred to the life of God as being "essentially relational". He believed that it was relational, not just essentially relational.

Canon McLuckie responded to comments made. He confirmed that there was no intention to introduce elements of monarchianism. Both churches were thoroughly chalcedonian. To say that the life of God was "essentially" relational meant that it was "of the essence" of God. Also, he recognised the compulsion of circumstances leading to the sharing of resources and working together but at the same time, he felt optimistic about the opportunities. He was attentive to the question about how the *Our Common Calling* process related to other processes and confirmed that it was not intended to be an exclusive process.

The Motion was then put to the vote and passed *nem con*, 4 abstentions.

Canon McLuckie then proposed, and the Primus seconded, the following Motion:

"That this Synod affirm the Common Calling process as described in the update report."

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) wished to affirm the *Our Common Calling* paper but struggled to do so in the form presented. He also wished to bring his personal greetings to Mr Horsburgh with whom he had worked as an ecumenical partner in Bridge of Allan. As with all ecumenical statements, it was a question of good manners and courtesy and for the view of one church not to trump the view of another. The Church of Scotland had a different theological tradition from the SEC. Normally in Synod, one did not speak about "fidelity to Scripture" only. The SEC had an extremely high regard for Scripture but it also took into account reflections on tradition and reason. He wished to propose that the third bullet point in the *Our Common Calling* paper be altered to read "that we should use our reflections on scripture, reason and tradition to discover the work of God in other Christian traditions". He suggested that the SEC could offer this as a gift to the conversation in the way that the Church of Scotland brought its gifts also.

Canon McLuckie explained that the document in question was not a policy statement but was simply an update on discussions. However, he welcomed the point being made by Provost Holdsworth and agreed that Scripture needed to be read alongside tradition and reason. He was content to accept the proposed change on the basis that this was not a corrective to the Church of Scotland but rather the offer of something.

The Chair explained that the Motion in question would remain unaltered but it was being presented to Synod on the understanding that the update on the *Our Common Calling* process be altered as Provost Holdsworth had suggested. On that understanding, the Chair then put the Motion to the vote which was passed by majority, 1 against, 5 abstentions.

Canon McLuckie then proposed, and the Primus seconded the following Motion:

"That this Synod welcome the personal statement signed by the Primus, Chair of the Synod, Methodist Church in Scotland and Moderator, United Reformed Church National Synod of Scotland."

Canon McLuckie explained that there had been a period of reflection on the future of the EMU partnership. The church leaders of the three denominations had met and affirmed their support as set out in the personal statement being presented to Synod.

The Rev Dr David Easton (Methodist Church) explained he was coming to the end of his term as the head of the Methodist Church in Scotland. He was delighted that the EMU partnership was undergoing a period of renewal. Apart from the letter, he believed that there might be ways in which the churches could work together more closely both locally and nationally, for example, on the induction of clergy coming to Scotland from south of the border. Also, there could be some overlapping locally. He encouraged the Synod, especially the clergy, to be committed as the EMU partnership was rolled out locally. In closing, he paid tribute to the Primus who had been very committed and proactive ecumenically and he was delighted to have worked with him.

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

5.3 Committee for Relations with People of Other Faiths

5.3.1 Address by Imam Sayed Ali Abbas Razawi

The Most Rev Dr Mark Strange (Primus) welcomed to Synod Sheikh Sayed Ali Abbas Razawi, the Director-General and Chief Imam of the Scottish Ahlul Bayt Society.

Sheikh Razawi said he was humbled to be present at the Synod. Being present, he felt part of a wider family and, having watched the Synod in debate, that too had felt like family. He felt the fraternity and diversity within Scotland was something unique. In his travels, he had never seen greater acceptance of diversity than was the case in Scotland. Despite being of different faiths, in Scotland there was a sense of being one family. Jesus was regarded as a prophet by Muslims in the same way as Muhammad. Jesus' teachings were taken as being infallible and from God. Part of that teaching was to love one's neighbour and one could see that being lived out by the Synod. He considered that today marked the beginning of a new chapter in coming together as family. He had been in Babylon the previous week and had felt the tension and confusion. In such

times there was a need for leadership and for people of faith to come together. He believed there was much miscommunication. A Google search on Islam would reveal an initial 10 pages of misinformation and if one Googled Christianity in the Middle East the same would be true. Dialogue was therefore particularly important in the age of social media. He believed that both Jesus and Muhammad had taught this. For him, the Sermon on the Mount demonstrated the importance of the human touch. Social media was no substitute for human dialogue. Distances between people were increasing and there was a lack of understanding for one another. If people were not talking to one another, in times of difficulty or crisis communities became insular and then aggressive towards other communities. In Scotland, people opened their doors to one another. The Primus had extended his arms to him when they had met at Westminster Abbey to discuss Christian minorities in the Middle East. They had walked together from Westminster Abbey to Lambeth Palace in full religious robes. Dialogue allowed people to become friends which in turn led to trust and hope.

Sheikh Razawi explained that he was from a migrant community with 1,400 years of migrant experience. Abraham, Moses and Jesus had all been migrants which meant that those of the Abrahamic faiths understood the value of neighbours. The Prophet Muhammad had said that if one went to sleep when one's neighbour was hungry then one was not a Muslim. One's neighbour was anyone of the Adamic community. Humankind was the image of God in all its diversity. It was not just about "tolerating" the other but accepting the other. Shia Muslims had a legacy which went back to *Imam Hussain*. He and 72 of his colleagues had stood up for humanity and had been slaughtered as a result. Both Christians and Jews visited his shrine because he represented a sign of humanity. Christians, Muslims and Jews had been living side-by-side in the Middle East for 1,400 years and Sheikh Razawi believed that would continue to happen. He urged caution about statistics in relation to Christians in the Middle East.

Sheikh Razawi emphasised the importance of a theology of compassion. Both faiths taught compassion. In current times, it appeared that people were not willing to be compassionate to their friends let alone others. There was a need to be compassionate to one another whether friend or foe. The Abrahamic tree could heal people in times of division. The faiths could show that people were accepted in their diversity and for their differences. The faiths could work together in selfless service and be seen together shoulder to shoulder. He feared that words could be superficial. It was important that the love of sisterhood and brotherhood could be felt. The Ummah in Medina had brought together different faiths as one community. He had made a pledge to advocate for minority Christian communities and had done so in the Middle East and Pakistan. He hoped that the two faiths could advocate for one another wherever respective communities were being oppressed. They should stand together to truly show the image of God.

The Chair thanked Sheikh Razawi for his address and his companions Mr Shabir Beg and Mrs Ishrat Hussain for their presence.

5.3.2 Interfaith Relations Developments

The Rev Cedric Blakey (Convener, Committee for Relations with People of Other Faiths) thanked the Standing Committee for allotting space on the agenda of the current Synod. He explained that Synod in the current meeting was being asked to signal support for the ongoing task of promoting good relations between members of different faith communities in Scotland, to assist this within the SEC by making the Committee a full Committee under the Faith and Order Board and by giving it a simpler name, the Interfaith Relations Committee.

The SEC had a long and distinguished record in interfaith relations and part of the story was told in the booklet CAIRing for Scotland which had been circulated to Synod members. That booklet had been compiled a couple of years previously to tell the history of interfaith activity in the Scottish churches at a time when the Churches Agency for Interfaith Relations (CAIRS) was being wound up. He paid tribute to the significant work of his predecessors, the Very Rev John Conway, the Rev Dominic Ind, the Rev Donald Reid and others. The SEC had good reason to be proud of its heritage but the task was no less critical at the current time. Indeed it was perhaps more critical. The German theologian Hans Kung had famously written "there will be no peace in the world if there is not peace between the religions. And there will be no peace among the religions unless there is dialogue between them."

Others shared the same goals as the SEC. The Scottish Methodist Church and the Scottish Synod of the United Reformed Church were part of the Committee and together with the Scottish Catholic Bishops' Conference Committee for Interreligious Dialogue, the Church of Scotland, Quakers and others it related to the Scottish Government funded Interfaith Scotland. Synod was privileged to have its Director Maureen Sier as a guest at the current Synod. Significantly, other faith communities were also reaching out in dialogue enterprise. The Jewish communities had welcomed visitors to their synagogues on Shabbat and the Scottish Ahlul Bayt Society included Christians in their dialogue projects, social enterprises and youth exchanges. There were 22 local interfaith groups throughout Scotland and there was the opportunity for all to be involved locally in the annual Scottish Interfaith Week in November. The main outcome was good community cohesion. It was not necessary for all to have the same beliefs in order to live alongside one another, protect each other and serve together for the common good. In reaching out in friendship, respect and love one found that one examined one's own faith and practice more deeply. In a world experiencing the rise of populism and a lurch to blame minorities in any culture for the ills of the day and in a year where violence and religious hatred had been experienced in the USA, Sri Lanka and elsewhere and where innocent Muslims, Jews, Christians and others had been attacked in their homes and places of worship, people of integrity and belief were called to understand others, befriend their neighbour and work alongside them. This was a task to be done in Scotland, in local communities.

Mr Blakey suggested that now was the moment to make good interfaith relations increasingly mainstream in the Church's common life and to signal that this was an endeavour which could be engaged with not just in cities but in remote rural communities also.

The Primus then proposed, and the Rev Professor David Atkinson seconded, the following Motion:

"That this Synod, recognising the multi-faith nature of contemporary Scottish society, emphasises the urgency of the task of enabling all congregations to understand and engage with other faith communities in their neighbourhood."

Dr Maureen Seer (Interfaith Scotland) said it was an honour to be present at Synod and she had found the experience uplifting and thought-provoking. She thanked Sheikh Razawi for his words which had resonated deeply. She believed the Motion stated the urgency of the situation clearly. She commended the Motion and offered the resources of Interfaith Scotland to help. She wished to thank the churches, the SEC, Mr Blakey and his predecessors and the Primus and his predecessors for their support. Interfaith Scotland was a tiny organisation and needed the support of the churches. The task was urgent. She was a member of the Baha'i faith which asked its followers to consort with the followers of all religions in amity and concord so that there could be inhaled the sweet fragrance of God. She believed that sweet fragrance was indeed being inhaled on the basis of her experience of the Synod meeting. She also thought that the proposed new name for the Committee was sensible and she looked forward to engaging with it.

She looked forward to returning to Synod next year and to hearing how the Motion had been put into practice.

The Rev John Bremner (United Reformed Church) wished to remind the Synod of the distinction between agreement and disagreement at a doctrinal level between faiths, on the one hand, and, on the other, the necessity that society allow space for everyone to say their piece. The SEC and his own church had suffered in the past from a state which had not allowed space for diversity. There was a need for a constant call to Government to ensure that space for diversity. That was not to be confused with the suggestion that all faiths were saying the same thing. He could not rejoice, for example, that there were people in Scotland who did not know Jesus Christ as their Saviour and Lord. He wished to commend the Committee for the wording of the Motion which called on congregations "to understand and engage with" (not to agree with) other faith communities in their neighbourhood. He welcomed both of the Motions being brought forward by the Committee.

The Rev Canon John McLuckie (Edinburgh) strongly supported the Motion and wished to commend the work of the Focolare Movement which was accompanying the Inter-Church Relations Committee and brought a deep charism of unity and prayer in relation to both ecumenical and interfaith relations. He was delighted that their representative Jacqueline Thomson was present at Synod.

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

The Primus then proposed and Professor Atkinson seconded, the following Motion:

"That the Digest of Resolutions be altered as follows:-

- *by the insertion in paragraph 2.4.3 after the words "Except that the" of the words "the Interfaith Relations Committee shall have the right to appoint one additional member to the Church in Society Committee and also that the";*
- *by the deletion in paragraph 2.4.3 of the words "The Convener of the Committee for Relations of People of Other Faiths shall, ex officio, be a member of the Church in Society Committee.";*
- *by the deletion of paragraphs 2.4.4 and 2.4.7 in their entirety and by the renumbering of the remaining paragraphs 2.4.5 and 2.4.6 as 2.4.4 and 2.4.5 respectively;*
- *by the insertion of the words "the Interfaith Relations Committee" as a new paragraph 2.5.3 (e);*
- *by the insertion of a new paragraph 2.5.8 to read as follows:*

"The Interfaith Relations Committee shall have responsibility for oversight at provincial level of matters appertaining to relations with people of other faiths."

The Motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

SESSION 6: MS JENNY WHELAN IN THE CHAIR

6.1 Mission Board

The Rev Canon Jane Ross (Convener, Mission Board) indicated that the year had been a busy one for the Board. Her own personal circumstances had limited her scope for involvement recently which was why the Rev Annie Naish would report on behalf of the Board.

The Rev Annie Naish (member, Mission Board) challenged Synod members to consider how passionate they were about mission and discipleship. God called people into relationship and the presentation of the Board would be all about relationship. In the light of the statistics which had been referred to at General Synod 2018, when it had been noted that since 2002 the SEC had declined in size by 29%, the Board had been looking at the opportunities. The Board had

created the Local Mission Resourcing Group which drew together people from dioceses in order to share stories, information about events and what was going on so that there was the opportunity to learn from one another. All dioceses were in different places and the hope was to be able to offer to the wider Church thinking about mission. The Group had been considering the organising of a conference on mission strategy for Bishops and other senior diocesan leaders to inspire the whole Church to share God's saving love. The Group had also been reflecting on pioneering, church planting and Fresh Expressions. It was clear that there was a need to begin to explore new ways of reaching people. The traditional model for mission had tended to be "you come to us". Whilst that was still important, more needed to be done. There was a need to reach people with the good news in the communities in which churches were situated. There was a need for a strategic approach to such matters. There had also been discussion about the creation of a new initiatives fund in order to support new ideas and innovation. The Local Mission Resourcing Group had been tasked to put together a robust application process. That would sit alongside the Block Grants available from the Mission and Ministry Support Group and the new Child Poverty Grants. Also, there were many opportunities to work with others. Mission was at the heart of the new ecumenical policy. The General Assembly had made some radical decisions including the adoption of a proposal to undertake 100 church plants in the following 10 years. Could the SEC work together with the Church of Scotland in church planting and pioneer initiatives? Already, the SEC was working with the Church Army.

There was also the question as to how the Church should gather better data on what was going on within the Church. A new statistical form was being trialled in Moray, Ross and Caithness. If any members of Synod wished to engage in that they should contact her or the Rev James Currall. The idea was that the new form would be better at capturing information, such as midweek activities, than the current form allowed.

The Very Rev Sarah Murray (Moray, Ross and Caithness) reported on the discussions within the Board concerning Christian values in education. The Rev Nerys Brown had reported to the Board about the Christian values in education training programme. The Board had considered it would be helpful to find out more about the value of school chaplaincy and the role and mission of the Church in schools with young people. The Board had tasked a small group to explore the breadth of school chaplaincy in the SEC and all dioceses had been contacted in order to distribute the survey to both clergy and lay people. As well as providing a clearer picture of what currently happened, it had also sought to find out whether there was a need for resources and training to enable more of such work to be undertaken. The results of the survey would be analysed and brought to the Board meeting in September 2019. The Board would then be in a position to make recommendations on what was required of the wider church and how the Board could support this. She invited any Synod members who had not participated in the survey to contact her. Similarly, if there were those with skills in school chaplaincy, the Board would be delighted to hear from them.

Provost Murray then reported on behalf of the Board in relation to the review which had been undertaken of the Mission and Ministry Support Grant Scheme. The Board's panel, which was responsible for undertaking an annual review, had also undertaken the first triennial review of the scheme. The panel reviewed the annual reports and financial accountability statements from each diocese and collated information submitted by dioceses reporting on it to the Board. The purposes for which grants were provided included stipend support, travel grants and related ministry costs, the funding of mission development officers or equivalent, mission development such as Fresh Expressions, youth work and retreats. Amongst its recommendations, the panel had recommended to the Board that it should encourage dioceses to further develop their annual reporting and maximise the opportunity to reflect on their mission and ministry activities for the benefit of mutual learning throughout the Province, and to continue to work with the communications team to identify the most effective way of sharing news of mission throughout the Province. It had also encouraged the Local Mission Resourcing Group similarly to work with the communications team. The panel had also reported to the Board that there was a general sense that the quality of reporting from dioceses was of a high quality and provided expert examples of the life and mission of the Church. It had the potential to be a good tool for sharing good news stories and be a resource on good practice.

Provost Murray then reported on the triennial review. The review had considered the extent to which the objectives detailed in the original proposal had been achieved; the extent to which greater flexibility in the use of provincial funds had enabled new forms of mission or new initiatives; the extent to which the funds appeared to have been used to continue to support otherwise unsustainable posts or initiatives; the impact of funding in supporting ministry and enabling mission throughout the Province; the adequacy of the funding provided; the appropriateness of the formula used to allocate the funds; diocesan views on the annual review process. For most dioceses the fund appeared to be working reasonably well and was viewed as an improvement on the previous funding arrangements. The review considered that there was potential for further development of the annual review process as a means of assisting dioceses in reviewing and planning their own mission and ministry activities as well as sharing experiences with one another. It had also welcomed the opportunity of further enhancing the process by the involvement of the Local Mission Resourcing Group. The review panel had recommended to the Mission Board that consideration be given to revising the formula to more accurately reflect the funding requirements of dioceses and that the Local Mission Review Group should be invited to submit its collective comments on the annual diocesan returns.

Ms Naish then referred to the report in the Synod papers from the Mission Board on the comments which had been recorded on flipcharts at General Synod 2018. In response to the question "what does following Jesus mean to you?" she noted that "Jesus" had been mentioned 22 times. There was an acknowledgement by Synod members that they were followers of Jesus and had a relationship with Him. Other themes in relation to that question had been change, transformation and challenge. In relation to the question "how has being part of the SEC helped you to flourish?" she noted that the responses had suggested that the Church was good at welcome and inclusivity, at worship through liturgy and prayer and that the Church gave space to explore. In relation to the question "what opportunities have you had to be involved in growing other disciples and how did that feel?", themes which had emerged had been the making of connections and being alongside people, creating opportunities for people to explore faith and the fact that all of that required commitment and time. The feedback in 2018 had asked whether such matters were just for clergy. Ms Naish emphasised that they were for everyone – disciples made disciples. God called disciples to grow new disciples. How could the Mission Board help in that?

Short videos of two individuals who had come to faith and become new disciples were then shown. Synod members, in table groups, then considered the following questions:

- What inspired you or challenged you about what those involved in the presentations were saying?
- How are our churches currently being effective in growing new disciples?
- What are the new opportunities for growing new disciples which we need to explore and how might the Mission Board help us all do that?

Ms Naish confirmed that the comments made on flipcharts at the current Synod would be typed up and considered by the Mission Board. A summary could then be sent to dioceses.

The Rev Canon John Walker (Aberdeen and Orkney) had been encouraged to hear what Ms Naish had said. During the process which had led to the change of the Canon on marriage a couple of years previously, it had been said that once that matter had been settled, full attention could be given to mission. Scotland was one of the most secular countries in Europe. A recent article in the Guardian, based on the number of non-religious marriages taking place in Scotland, had suggested that the nation was the most non-religious country in the world. Communicant numbers had now dropped beneath 20,000. This represented a drop of almost 10% in a single year. In his own Diocese, a congregation would leave the denomination resulting in a further 10% reduction in diocesan figures. In the past, the SEC had benefited from provincial initiatives such as Mission 21, Make Your Church More Inviting and Local Collaborative Ministry all of which had helped people to grow. He recognised that mission was not generated from the top down but nevertheless provincial initiatives helped. The Church was dependent on the Holy Spirit in its work of mission. The founder the Iona community, George MacLeod, had said that nothing built community like a demanding shared task. He asked whether the Mission Board had plans for a provincial initiative in congregational development and growth?

Ms Victoria Stock (Edinburgh) suggested there was a need to think carefully about what was meant by growing disciples. Was it something that was "done" to people or was it more relational? She described herself as having been a "God freak" when she had been a child but that had turned out not to be very effective. Discipleship was more about who one was so that others could see something of God in one.

The Rev Dr Jenny Wright (Edinburgh), speaking as the other SEC representative on the Anglican Consultative Council, wished to commend the work of the Anglican Communion on intentional discipleship. There were fantastic resources available to enable people to live as disciples and which emphasised the making of disciples as well as simply being disciples. The Mission Board ought to take note of such materials.

The Rev Paul Watson (Glasgow and Galloway) said that mission was in his DNA but he had recently reached a watershed. He spoke of the American explorers Lewis and Clark who had sought to find a passageway to the Pacific. They had trekked to the source of the Mississippi River and had found not a channel to the Pacific but the Rocky Mountains. Page 166 of the Synod papers set out a core definition of what the SEC was good at. Lewis and Clark had had their old map but it had not been adequate to the geography of what lay before them. Lewis and Clark's mission had changed from that of finding a river to the Pacific to exploring what they found in front of them. The Church needed to do the same. There was a need to find new partners in mission. He suggested it would be helpful to set a day aside to look at what the new map might entail.

The Rev Mary Jepp (Glasgow and Galloway) said that she had only recently come to Scotland and lived in Kilmarnock, an area of great need. Her church was a minority church in the community but was nevertheless at its heart. The poor came to its doors. It worried her when the Church seemed to approach matters as if the numbers of people in church were the priority. Part of mission was about how to reach people in communities in real ways and come alongside them. That was the way in which hearts and minds would be won and communities changed. That might not fill pews but it would represent the Kingdom of God.

The Rev Canon Simon Mackenzie (Argyll and The Isles) suggested that the way in which language was used was important. He suggested that it was vegetables which were "grown". Jesus had "called" disciples and called them to love one another.

Mr Euan Grant (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) wished to draw attention to the need for concrete practices. Talking about relationships was all very well but people had plenty of relationships outwith the Church which were as nourishing as those within the Church, except that they did not make reference to God revealed in Jesus Christ. Friendliness from Christians was not guaranteed to outdo such friendliness outside the Church. Growth and formation were aided by concrete practices such as daily prayer, devotional practices, saying grace before meals, etc which gave a distinctiveness to the Christian life. Such practices had been an engine of growth amongst young people.

The Rev Rosemary Bungard (Argyll and The Isles) suggested that one of the essential things was for young people to know something about Christianity. In a post-Christian world, one of the ways in which people heard about Christianity was through Christian school assemblies. She asked that a closed Facebook page or website be established so that resources could be shared which were culturally relevant to Scotland.

The Rev Dr James Currall (Moray, Ross and Caithness) reported that when in training, he had undertaken a placement in Prestwick with Canon Ross' predecessor. He had said to Dr Currall that when people talked of "bringing people to Jesus", it was a case of recognising that "Jesus was already there". There was a need to recognise what Jesus was already doing and join in.

Canon Ross responded to some of the points which had been made. She agreed that a provincial emphasis on mission would be wonderful but there was a need to live with the intention that the Whole Church Mission and Ministry Policy located mission in the diocese. There had been some talk about resurrecting the idea of a provincial conference but that

was at a very early stage and there was a lack of personnel resource to take that forward. She agreed with Ms Stock on the importance of the relational aspects of discipleship and thanked Dr Wright for the comment regarding ACC material. The Board had already pointed to that material a couple of years previously at General Synod. She agreed with other comments which had been made including the sharing of concrete practices. The Board's agenda at each meeting included communication specifically and there was more work to be done in sharing good news stories. She agreed with the comment regarding school assemblies.

In closing the Mission Board session, Canon Ross expressed thanks to the Rev Professor David Atkinson who was completing his term of office as Convener of the Church in Society Committee, for all his work in relation to both the Committee and for serving on the Scottish Churches Rural Group.

6.2 Institute Council

The Rt Rev Kevin Pearson (Convener, Institute Council) introduced the report of the Council. As referred to in the Council's annual report, wisdom was the unique blend of vision and common sense. A vision was realisable, unlike a fantasy. He suggested that Synod members could identify in what was to come during the session those elements of vision and common sense. He was about to introduce people who made the vision real – people who recognised what Jesus was doing and encouraged those around them to join in. That was what leadership was about. The presentation would comprise contributions from lay theologians, namely lay readers, from those engaged in mixed mode training and, finally, a description of a pilot project to enable the Institute to provide training for authorised ministries. In his presentations to Synod in successive years, he had demonstrated how the vision for the Institute was being realised in common sense matters such as the provision of a pilot scheme. Capacity had also been built by the appointment of a new Administrator to the Institute staff and of a new Provincial Director of Ordinands. The Church was training a new generation of leadership to lead it into intentional discipleship, an essential part of which was lay readers.

Ms Patsy Thomson (member, Institute Council) spoke as a lay reader. She referred to a meeting of lay readers in spring 2019 at which her Diocesan Bishop, Bishop Mark Strange, had said that the connection with lay readers had with the area in which they lived was the heart of their ministry. Her location was Cromarty, it was a place with large numbers of artists and crafts people. People cared passionately about the environment, peace and justice and about spiritual matters. The town contained a lively Buddhist sangha with a membership almost as large as the local Church of Scotland congregation. St Regulus, Episcopal Church, was recognised as the spiritual hub of the town and was open daily and people came in. The congregation was growing and visitors commented on the atmosphere of peace. Two Episcopalians had started the Cromarty Peace Group when the Iraq war was looming. Its first event had been a joint one with the Inverness mosque. Many members of the Peace Group had no religious affiliation. The Rector made the Church open for such gatherings. He had led a march of schoolchildren with a peace pole for incorporation in a new peace garden. In May 2019 there had been a service in Westminster Abbey celebrating 50 years of seaborne nuclear weaponry. The local Peace Group had held an alternative vigil for peace. The Primus had spoken powerfully disassociating the Scottish Episcopal Church from any support for nuclear weapons. She was hugely grateful to the Scottish Episcopal Church for making tolerant space available to her to take on lay reader ministry and for allowing her to promote interfaith links. She joined the sangha weekly and she endeavoured to dismantle prejudices about the Church. She tried to be a cross-cultural disciple. She regularly shared Richard Rohr's daily meditations with people of any or no faith. She closed with a reference quoted by Richard Rohr in his meditation of the day: "we are here to awaken from the illusion of separation".

Ms Caroline Longley (Edinburgh) explained that she had been licensed as a lay reader in September 2018 and was based at the Church of the Good Shepherd in Edinburgh where she was supervised by the Rev Canon Dean Fostekew. Her time in training at the Scottish Episcopal Institute had been very significant for her. It had been not only about gaining the theological knowledge necessary for preaching but also experiencing life in community, developing pastoral skills and growing in her spiritual disciplines. Following her licensing, one of her first tasks had been to find out what her contribution would be to the life of the Church in her new community. She had become a reader because she had felt a call to preach. She had enjoyed developing her preaching ministry and was beginning to find out what it meant to be a theological resource. The Church of England's Central Readers Council had developed three themes for lay readers one of which was "teaching the faith" and to which she felt particularly drawn. Two examples of her ministry related to that theme. Firstly, she had taken on the leadership of a monthly service in a local care home which included a dementia friendly talk. She had drawn on her training. Secondly, she had stewarded Edinburgh pupils as they staged a school strike to raise awareness of the climate crisis. This had raised hope in her that the necessary paradigm shift might be achieved in the coming years. The co-chair of a recent intergovernmental report on biodiversity had written of how society needed to develop a new narrative about "success" built not purely on economic factors but also on community, the arts and spirituality. The Church knew something about those things already. In her professional job, she was a civil servant and she detected much more openness to talk about spiritual, albeit not necessarily religious, topics. She wanted to be able to speak positively about what society could be aiming for. She wished to nurture whatever spiritual awareness might be growing in people. Both examples which she had quoted required ongoing commitment on her part and she felt her training had only just begun. She shared theological knowledge but her ministry also had spiritual and pastoral elements.

Bishop Pearson said that mission was about communicating the excitement of living with God. Lay readers demonstrated that. Mission was the heartbeat of the Church and the Institute was the pacemaker. There were three new candidates for lay readership training commencing in the current year bringing the total in training to four. In addition, a conference on lay readership was to be offered at Dunkeld House Hotel in November 2020. Specific dates would be communicated in due course.

The Rev Dr Richard Tiplady (Director of Mixed Mode Training) reported that in the year to date there had been two mixed mode students, one at St John's, Princes Street and the other at St Andrews Cathedral, Inverness. The initial plan had been for alternate year entry but there had been considerable interest from ordinands and placements and it was hoped that two more students would commence in September 2019, one in Edinburgh and the other in the Diocese of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane. Two other students who had been due to start in 2019 had for personal reasons deferred but would start in 2020 in the Dioceses of Edinburgh and Glasgow and Galloway. The first two students had

been in city centre churches; those starting in the autumn would include a rural placement in a linked charge setting. The students had been involved in leading worship, preaching and pastoral care, one had started a youth group and the other a young adults group. There was an emphasis on mission and evangelism in the programme and a module on evangelism had been run not just for the mixed mode students but for other SEI students focused primarily on the integration of evangelism into the life of the local church. There had been a practical element for the mixed mode students. One had run an evangelistic Advent study group and the other was developing a project called "messy cafe". A module had been run on developing mission and ministry in context for all SEI students. Topics included were as diverse as mission as peacemaking, turning a small church towards mission, how to engage with those who defined themselves as "spiritual not religious" and the reasons why people left church. Reports suggested that approximately 750,000 people in Scotland were not part of church but regarded themselves as followers of Jesus. Initial planning was being undertaken for the pioneer project which the mixed mode students would undertake in their second year. Dr Tiplady was working with the Bishops on longer-term planning. He hoped the planning of mixed mode placements could be developed in the longer term alongside the planning of curacy placements and to enable both to serve diocesan strategies for mission. If those at Synod were interested in exploring the possibility of becoming a placement, he urged them to contact their Bishop initially and then approach him. He expressed thanks to both the Rev Markus Duenzkofer and the Very Rev Sarah Murray for the work which they had done together with him in the shaping of the programme to ensure that it served the SEC and the students.

The Rev Markus Duenzkofer (Edinburgh) reported on his experience of St John's, Princes Street acting as a mixed mode placement. "Mission" was a buzzword which provoked strong reactions. Mission was a wide field and done by all parts of the Church. It included outreach, speaking up for the voiceless and evangelism. He did not wish to pigeonhole evangelicals but wondered why mission was often left to that particular constituency. He referred to a friend who responded to approaches on the streets from fundraisers who asked "have you got five minutes" by saying "yes, but only if you have five minutes to talk about Jesus". Mr Duenzkofer realised that he himself might not be able to do that for five minutes in a relevant way that witnessed to the goodness of God. Mixed mode training had challenged him to talk about Jesus in a relevant and life-giving way. His mixed mode student, Beki Cansdale, had said how important it was to her to see the outworking of mission in the local church setting. Her experience would enable her to link learning and ministry. She had brought wonderful energy and new ideas to create programmes which St John's would not otherwise have been able to undertake. Whilst the congregation was devoting financial resources sacrificially to support the placement, she was not simply an "extra pair of hands". There remained challenges because St John's was still a guinea pig, as mixed mode training continued to be developed. Inverness Cathedral, the other mixed mode placement, was in a similar position. He thanked Provost Sarah Murray for her collegiality in such matters. They were both feeding back to the SEI the challenges and the joys of acting as placements. He emphasised that Beki Cansdale incarnated the push and pull towards God's mission. Every time he interacted with her he was reminded that church was more than vestry meetings, worship planning or finance meetings. Church was also about those who had left the Church or not yet engaged with faith in meaningful ways. She reminded him that the Church was about mission and the whole congregation of St John's of the need to be able to talk about Jesus for more than five minutes – so that one could honestly pray "Lord, here I am, send me".

Bishop Pearson thanked Mr Duenzkofer and Dr Tiplady. He reminded the Synod that as SEI applied its vision and common sense, it was working across the Province and genuine learning was taking place from the experience, as Mr Duenzkofer had indicated.

Bishop Pearson reported that a pilot scheme was about to be initiated for those who wished to explore theology in its widest sense without taking a full-time course in theological study. This might be a means of providing training for other authorised ministries in the Church. In September 2019, a group of around five people in mid-Argyll would begin studying by Skype two modules offered by the SEI. This would include a module "Introduction to Doctrine". The teaching by Skype from Edinburgh would be backed up by local enablers in the Diocese.

The Rev Canon Dean Fostekew (Edinburgh) indicated that Caroline Longley had been too modest to admit that one benefit of having a lay theologian in the congregation was that it caused other ministries to rise up.

Bishop Pearson explained that the College of Bishops was responsible for appointing the Provincial Director of Ordinands who acted as the Executive Officer of the College when it functioned as the Provincial Recruitment and Selection Committee. He wished to record his thanks to the Rev Canon Dr Alison Peden who was retiring from the role of PDO. She was a person of outstanding integrity, holiness and intellect. He was delighted that the Rev Ian Barcroft was being appointed as her successor. Finally, Bishop Pearson recorded his thanks to all members of the SEI staff.

The Chair thanked Bishop Pearson and the Institute Council for its work.

SESSION 7: THE REV CANON DAVE RICHARDS IN THE CHAIR

7.1 Church in Society Committee

The Rev Professor David Atkinson (Convener, Church in Society Committee) explained that Synod members had received a report on the ways in which the Church in Society Committee allocated its grant budget for the development of mission. Following the discussion which had taken place at General Synod 2018, a fund was now in the course of being set up to provide grants to congregations for work in the field of child poverty. In September 2018, the Committee had run a one-day conference on pilgrimage, a report of which would be published in a future edition of the SEI Journal.

Professor Atkinson explained that the focus of the Church in Society session at the current Synod was to address the question: what it means to be human – the challenge of genome editing. It would be introduced to Synod by way of a conversation among Dr Donald Bruce, Dr Lesley Penny and the Rev Dr Jenny Wright. What it meant to be human was a subject which had been considered through the ages and in different ways. It was a major theme in literature and

Scripture. How human beings might change was at the heart of science fiction. To an extent, such matters had now come together because genome editing had become a reality. In November 2018, a Chinese scientist had announced that he had genetically modified two human embryos and brought them to term. That underlined the urgency of the situation. Discussion on such subjects could be visceral and, therefore, the intention behind the conversation at the current Synod was to model dialogue.

Dr Donald Bruce explained that genome editing was the term given to a variety of scientific techniques and which had created a revolution in medicine, agriculture, food and other areas. It was a technology which was easy-to-use. It was likely that some applications would be regarded as acceptable but others raised profound ethical questions. The Committee had therefore set up a Working Group to bring together input from a variety of disciplines to look at the issue. Dr Wright spoke on theological perspectives. Why was it important that the Church should consider the subject of genome editing? In debates in the past, which had sometimes turned nasty, theologians had sometimes started by questioning why scientists wished to play God. Theologians were not there to tell scientists how to do their jobs better. Instead, theologians could assist in how to think better about life as it changed. Theologians could ask how the gifts of science and medicine could be used for the benefit of all people. Science and medicine could not answer the question of the human condition. Christians needed to work out how to live well in the frailty of humanness. That included how to live well in knowing God's healing and, ultimately, God's saving power. Part of the task of the theologian was to build a bridge between the rich narratives of Scripture and what it meant to be human and how that was held against the realities of current science. She raised the question of a theology of disability. How could one value all people if certain people considered they were being characterised as in some way less than human. There was a need to address ideas of perfection and recognise that it was all right to be imperfect.

Dr Lesley Penny spoke as a veterinary surgeon by training, working in biomedical research. The genie was already out of the bottle. Cloning had been a much less efficient procedure and had a success rate of approximately 1%. With CRISPR editing there was a much higher success rate. CRISPR editing was now being used as standard practice in biomedical research with plants and animals. Somatic cell work fixed a problem in the genetic code but did not pass matters down generations. Certain forms of disease, such as Huntington's, were genetic conditions. Clinical trials were already happening using such technologies. The issues arising from somatic cell work, given that it did not pass down the generations, were different from those that would affect future generations. In relation to somatic cell work, the issues might relate to basic justice and financial considerations such as who would be able to afford such treatment – which would be very expensive once available.

Dr Bruce indicated that the Chinese baby question had raised the issue of the editing of embryos. Such work might be undertaken for research or for treating disease. The Human Fertilisation and Embryology Authority had given a licence to the Francis Crick Institute for research on the effect of knocking out aspects of the genetic code to see what effect that would have on development. The embryos would otherwise have been destroyed. Such research raised questions as to the status of an embryo. There were two particular Christian views, one of which asserted that life started at the point of fertilisation, the other that life started at some later point. The latter view allowed scope for research during the period prior to commencement of life. Another application was in relation to implanting. Ethical questions arose as to whether it was acceptable to change the genetics of people who were not yet born. Conversely, for those who might otherwise inherit an adverse genetic condition, was it ethical not to alter their genetics in advance? A further factor was that of risk since genes could have more than one function. To test that over generations would mean experimental babies which would clearly be unacceptable – unless it could be shown that the risk of the disease which might otherwise ensue would outweigh the risks of the treatment.

Dr Penny spoke about aspects relating to farm animals. For example, it would be possible to create animals which would be fully resistant to certain kinds of disease such as African swine fever. A range of ethical questions arose. Another example was in relation to the kind of dairy cows prevalent in the UK. They would be unable to survive in Africa partly because of climate and partly because of exposure to certain diseases. However, if such cows could be genetically modified that would allow greater milk production and other opportunities to the benefit of populations in Africa. It was also possible to gene edit to remove horns from cattle. At present, horns were frequently removed from calves in a somewhat unpleasant procedure. It was predominantly done in order to stop cattle hurting each other. That allowed the keeping of more cattle in smaller spaces which in turn raised issues of animal welfare. There were difficulties in supplying sufficient protein from non-animal sources for humans. Consequently, being able to introduce meat producing animals into areas of the world which could not currently support them could become a significant issue. She asked Synod members whether if low fat gene edited meat was available, in order to reduce the risk of heart attacks, would people buy it? Trials suggested that people would buy it only if it was considerably cheaper than normal meat. The result would be that those who would buy would be those who could not afford anything else.

Dr Bruce explained that he hoped the Working Group would be able to present the results of its discussion to bodies such as the Nuffield Council on Bioethics and also the European group on ethics. There might also be the possibility to engage with the idea of a future moratorium on germline questions. The Church had a very important role to play. Dr Wright said that grappling with such questions in a congregation meant addressing the fundamental question of what it meant to be human including dependency on one another, as members of the body of Christ, and also of the community outside the Church. There was a need to acknowledge that suffering was not meaningless, difficult as it might be. Congregations could address those issues through Bible study, having expert speakers, etc.

Professor Atkinson then proposed, and the Rt Rev Dr John Armes seconded, the following Motion:

“That this Synod

- *welcome the report on genome editing in animals and humans;*
- *recognise that some applications may be beneficial such as inherited cell gene therapy in humans and disease resistance in pigs but that some applications raise major ethical concerns, such as editing the human germline to produce modified babies;*

- *instruct the Church in Society Committee to continue to examine these issues and to engage with appropriate national and international fora where these ethical issues are under discussion."*

The Rev Rosemary Bungard (Argyll and The Isles) thanked the working party for its paper. She wondered how long ethicists might envisage a moratorium lasting and whether it would comprise a blanket ban on all laboratory research including that which had no intention to alter embryos from plantation. It was not known what the consequences of the Chinese intervention might be. Exposing human beings to such unknown risks was highly unethical. It was one thing to offer treatment in a situation where there was no other possibility but the creation of designer babies was altogether different. She knew a family where three out of four sons had been diagnosed with muscular dystrophy. That had been unknown in their parents but had been inherited from previous generations. Allowing licensed laboratory research in such a field would allow hope to such families. In the pharmaceutical industry, it took at least 10 years to be sure about the effects of certain kinds of treatment. She wished to call for licensed laboratory research such as was taking place at the Crick Institute.

Mr Euan Grant (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) suggested that the theological responses had asked questions but had not provided answers. One theological element which had been adduced was that of the image of God. Asking questions was only worth doing if one was prepared to attempt to give answers. He would welcome the report more if it had been bolder in offering answers. Answering questions necessitated a positive theology. Unless specifically Christian answers could be provided, he believed it was an open question as to whether the Church really did have a role in such matters. He posed the question why there ought not to be designer babies. In a liberal society, it did not seem implicitly wrong that someone might say they wished their baby to be tall, good-looking, intelligent and humble. To say that such an approach was wrong would require one to give an account of the nature or the relevance of the normative human being or that "being as we are" retained a moral and normative force. There was therefore a need for a theology of human nature as well as simply asking the question what it meant to be human. Nature was a deeply contested theological category. Unless the Synod was prepared to say that those speaking on the subject had a particular authority, he believed there was limited value in simply asking questions. Unless a particular theology could be articulated, a Christian response did not add much to the debate.

The Rev Dr John Cuthbert (Moray, Ross and Caithness) contrasted the role of physicists and biologists. Fundamentally, physicists were observers and were not in a position to change things. Biologists were tamperers. In his experience as a biologist, the language of "normal" and "abnormal" was used. Often there was research into the abnormal to find out what was normal. That kind of terminology was no longer used. Defining what was accommodated or accepted in one's humanity included a large range of conditions. He believed that one of the challenges in a society which had less and less concept of the soul was that life simply became that which was between birth and death, with nothing beyond it. There was a need for a theology that spoke of the infinite rather than the finite.

Dr David Simmons (Glasgow and Galloway) wondered whether the debate could learn from the biodiversity movement. He spoke as a psychologist and was interested in neurodiversity. An expert had suggested that if autism could be eradicated there might no longer be any mathematicians, engineers, or scientists. There was a need to be careful. There were some single gene conditions where there was a good argument for alteration but where the boundary was to be drawn was indeed an interesting debate. It might require to be done on a case-by-case basis. He suggested that use of the word "defect" in the report was perhaps inappropriate. In his workplace, there was a team looking at social robotics. Artificial intelligence was growing in complexity and sophistication and there might be a point at which it would be necessary to decide whether an artificially made creation could be regarded as human.

The Rev Terry Taggart (Aberdeen and Orkney) suggested that when one was uninformed, one meddled at one's peril. In a previous occupation he had been a detective in Special Branch and, during the 1990s, had been involved in gathering intelligence on activists causing disorder at experimental crop sites. The Government at the time had been intent on stamping out opposition. He was not suggesting that the Scottish Episcopal Church would be infiltrated by undercover officers, but it was nevertheless worth bearing in mind. He was grateful to the Working Group for the report's openness and comprehensiveness and he fully supported the Motion. Science would do whatever it did, but the Church also must do what it needed to do.

Mrs Ruth Warmer (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) spoke of her personal experience in the loss of a beloved daughter owing to a genetically inherited disease, hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. It had been totally unexpected and undiagnosed. She had died at the age of 26. The origins of the genetic condition had been researched and it had then been discovered that it had been present in previous generations but at no stage had there been any realisation that the condition was in fact a genetic one. If there was research and medical knowledge that could be continued to edit genes to make sure ethically that further generations did not need to suffer loss she would support it wholeheartedly. This was an area on which Christians ought to take a stand.

Dr Bruce responded to comments. He explained that the idea of a moratorium would relate to germline changes to embryos not to genome research in general. There was no reason, for example, why research into Huntington's should be subject to moratorium. On the question of human enhancement, the Council of European Churches had looked extensively at the question of ethics and theology and there was a great deal of theology available on that topic. It was too large a topic for the Church in Society Working Group to address. The purpose of the Working Group's work had been to introduce the Church to the dilemmas. He could not give a single answer to the status of the human embryo because there were different Christians views on the subject. The churches could make a very significant contribution in such areas partly by explaining that there was diversity of views within the Christian community.

Dr Wright responded to theological comments. She explained that as a Christian ethicist she believed that asking questions was the place to start. Life moved rapidly and answers arrived at quickly became out of date. It was difficult to keep up but it was imperative for the Church to bring doctrine to bear on such matters in the service of public theology. The report raised many questions and further work would be undertaken on the theological aspects. All members of the Church should be asking such questions, particularly in difficult pastoral circumstances.

Professor Atkinson suggested that as new areas arose the first stage was always to ask questions. Answers were not always immediately available.

The Motion was then put to the vote and passed *nem con*, 1 abstention.

The Chair expressed thanks to the panel who had represented the issue and to Professor Atkinson as he completed his term of office as the Convener of the Church in Society Committee.

7.2 College of Bishops – the Role of the Churches in Reconciliation Following Social Change

The Rt Rev Ian Paton (Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) indicated that Brother Roger, the founder of the Taizé Community, had been one of the profoundest influences on his journey of faith. One of Brother Roger's guiding principles had been that of reconciliation and he had named the church at Taizé as "The Church of Reconciliation". Above the entrances to the church were notices indicating "be reconciled all who enter here" – both believers and those who could not believe. He had seen reconciliation as a basic demand of the Gospel without which Christians spoke without integrity and without which human beings were held back and could not move forward. For Brother Roger, reconciliation had meant the restoration of relationships. The imperative of reconciliation rested on the life, death and resurrection of Jesus. The witness to that was Scripture, interpreted by tradition and reason. The Church was a divided Church in a divided world but was still called to reconciliation. As the Bishops had reflected on this, the starting point had been Scripture.

Synod members then engaged in Bible study, based on the tradition of *Lectio Divina*, in table groups.

Bishop Paton suggested that it felt to him as if the good ship UK had become stranded on the issue of Brexit. Whilst in Scotland the statistics were different, the division between opinion was nevertheless the same – in the nation as a whole, in families and indeed within the current Synod meeting. The question of independence was similarly divisive. In politics, whilst one was used to differences, one tended to be able to agree to disagree. Both Brexit and independence felt different in kind, not just degree. The issues invited polarisation rather than shared space. They were emotive, not just practical and political ones. Scotland was not the only country facing such difficulty and he invited the Bishop of Clogher to speak to Synod.

The Rt Rev John McDowell, Bishop of Clogher, brought greetings in Gaelic. He was the lead Bishop on the subject of Brexit in the Irish House of Bishops and advised the Archbishop of Armagh. On questions of social cohesion, in Ireland, they had settled for tolerance. Reconciliation was entirely different. Part of the reason for that had been that the churches had not played a particularly significant role, with the exception of a small number of individuals. It had been assumed that all was well in Ireland because of the Good Friday agreement but in fact he suggested that Ireland was now more divided than it had been when he had been a youngster. There was now less social integration than there had been. Reconciliation was not the same as forgiveness because it brought in a matrix of theological ideas which were much more complex. The drag on politics in Ireland had been the legacy of the past. On the subject of Brexit, the question of the Irish border had loomed large. His diocese straddled the border. It was in fact not "the Irish border" but rather the "UK/Irish" border. However Brexit worked out, there would have to be a resetting of relationships between the islands of Ireland and the UK.

The Church of Ireland was one of the few provinces of the Anglican Communion which stretched across two political jurisdictions. The Church was therefore the embodiment of a kind of non-political unity. Despite what might be thought, the demographics would not result in a nationalist majority which would allow for a shared Ireland (which, if it happened, would simply create another alienated group of people). The demographic suggested that the split would be 40% nationalists, 40% unionists and 20% who did not wish to be defined by either. All groups would therefore be minorities. As far as the border was concerned, the debates had included elements of complacency and exaggeration, both based on ignorance. A further myth in Westminster was that "the Irish are being difficult". That was the tail wagging the dog. In fact, for the first time in Anglo-Irish relations, the Republic had been in a position of relative strength. In his view, the Republic had acted morally, respectfully and responsibly. By pooling its sovereignty, the Republic had in fact been able to deepen and increase its sovereignty as a small nation.

Bishop McDowell suggested that some adjustment had been needed to the Good Friday Agreement. However, the advent of Brexit had prevented that. The Church of Ireland was celebrating its 150th anniversary. In his researches on the subject, he had come across reports of debates at the time in the House of Lords on the Irish Church Act. The Archbishop of Armagh had been in the chamber and had spoken against the bill which had nevertheless passed. The Archbishop had recorded his thoughts at the time including the fact that a Catholic bishop who had watched the debate from the gallery had said to him "see what these English will do to you".

Bishop Paton said that in Scotland both Brexit and independence were emotive issues. Polarisation had led to populist approaches and some politicians to their shame had poured oil on the fires while others had become targets of hatred. It had encouraged racism and xenophobia and aggression towards immigrants and minority communities. Whatever happened practically, such feelings were likely to persist and even deepen. What would reconciliation look like? It would not be a superficial papering over of cracks or an avoidance of issues. Conflict which was faced and lived through in dialogue could be the engine of positive change. The reconciliation needed would be a long period of healing and listening and the rebuilding of social respect and political confidence. Gordon Brown had said recently that reconciliation would take a generation. What could the churches offer their communities? Earlier in the meeting, Sheikh Razawi had urged the Synod to consider how the faith of the Abrahamic tree could offer the healing of the nations by example. In England, the Archbishops had encouraged churches to invite people to come for a chat and a cup of tea. Starting the process of healing deep divisions might need something stronger than a cup of tea but such opportunities to be real would need to recognise that the questions had raised deep emotional impact on the everyday feelings of many people. The Church would need to offer safe spaces for people to express feelings of hurt, anger and disappointment. The

Church of Scotland had proposed opening churches as places of prayer and reflection over the long-term. In February 2019, the College of Bishops had stated that it had become increasingly concerned at the level of aggression heard in the media and at times in parliamentary behaviour and that Scotland was rooted in values which made it an inclusive place. He suggested that the SEC had collective insights, skills and resources to offer from its own recent experience such as the principles of indaba in the Anglican Communion, principles of creativity and community and conversation which the SEC tried to apply in its own Cascade Conversations on issues of human sexuality. In such conversations, everyone was regarded as equal because there could be no victims in reconciliation. The Church could provide safe space for remainers and leavers to share their stories. The questions which the Archbishops in England had offered for use might be useful and were set out in the sheet provided to Synod members. Table groups were asked to engage in the questions and to concentrate particularly on how people felt about the issues. There was a need to move into the geography of hope.

The Synod engaged in table group discussion.

SESSION 8: THE REV SOPHIA MARRIAGE IN THE CHAIR

8.1 College of Bishops

8.1.1 Vocation and Discernment Processes

The Rt Rev Anne Dyer (Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney) gave a presentation on the changes in vocation and discernment procedures which would take place in the Scottish Episcopal Church from summer 2019. Candidates for the ordained ministry would no longer go to England for their final selection panel. Instead, the vocation and selection process would be undertaken entirely within the Province, overseen and resourced by the Province. The College and others working with it had been encouraged to review the entirety of the processes for discerning and authorising a rich diversity of ministries both lay and ordained. The Ordinal stated that it was the Bishops' responsibility to send out ministers and to nurture the community of the baptised. That was why the College was presenting these matters to Synod. The College had been considering how to ensure that those called to ministry were deployable in many settings and how the training offered through SEI would work for all.

Bishop Dyer wished to remind Synod that all members of the body of Christ were called, by virtue of their baptism, to participate in the mission of God. All were called to grow in Christ (as disciples) and were sent out (as apostles) in the power of the Holy Spirit. Every member of the body of Christ was a minister and ministry, in the world and in the Church, took many forms. The primary place where people were encouraged as disciples and where each person could discern their call to ministry, was the local church. There was work to do to encourage the ministries of everyone.

Some would find the primary location of their vocation in the workplace, through volunteer work or in family life. Many offered time and energy to activities within church life which did not require discernment or significant training. Good churches would actively support such vocations. Some vocations outside the Church required discernment, selection and training, such as workplace chaplaincy. In such instances, training might be provided from outwith the Church. Some Church ministries required vestry and Bishop approval such as eucharistic ministers or those taking services with the reserved sacrament. There would be authorisation and training, normally provided in the local context. Some church ministries were by invitation or election, for example election to vestry or Synod. Such ministries ought to be supported through training and in prayer. For such ministries of disciple and apostle, active and ongoing support was needed. The College intended to pay renewed attention to such matters.

In addition to the ministries to which she had referred, were being added authorised lay ministries. Such ministries would be at the discretion of the Diocesan Bishop according to diocesan need. They would require diocesan selection, authorisation and training and, for example, might include worship leaders, pastoral assistants, evangelists or spirituality leaders. These would be "train as you go" ministries and for which vocation would be discerned in the diocese for ministry in a particular charge. They would be authorised by the Bishop with ongoing training. There would be strong encouragement, for those who were able, to take one SEI module per year. Such ministries might be particularly appropriate for those serving in a particular charge or who would not have the time to undertake the three year training required for lay reader ministry. The College's hope was that such lay ministries might be the kind of ministries to which some people were sensing a call at the present time. For others, they might be a stepping stone to further ministry in the future.

The Rt Rev Kevin Pearson (Bishop of Argyll and The Isles) did not intend to provide a detailed summary of the new discernment processes. However, he reminded Synod that wisdom had the two facets of wisdom and common sense, both of which were present in the new system. The detail of the new processes would be available on the provincial website in the near future. In short, the essence of the new system would be that the entirety of the selection process would be embraced with confidence in the SEC, rather than sending some candidates to the Church of England. The College had confidence that those selected through the new system would be deployable throughout the Anglican Communion.

Bishop Pearson reminded the Synod that in all things ordination was the prerogative of the Diocesan Bishop. The new system would emphasise that. The processes would draw on expertise from across the Province. The budget had been developed to ensure that the new system would work in practice. The Provincial Director of Ordinands would remain responsible for recruitment and selection of candidates for the ordained ministry throughout the Province. However, the way of referring candidates to the PDO would change. The local rector would write a letter of referral to the PDO so that the PDO was aware of who was in the process at any given

time. The Bishop would similarly be informed. Locally there would be Assistant Directors of Ordinands who would work with the people in the process. This would not necessarily operate on a strict diocesan basis and the system would operate across diocesan borders. The PDO had now been revised as a full-time job. As well as the Assistant Director of Ordinands there would be Vocations Advisers who would be able to open up a gateway to a range of ministries. The College was endeavouring to bring together the nomenclature for different kinds of ministries. It could not all be done at once but the intention was to move towards a more unified pattern of ministry throughout the Province. Lay readership at present had a separate selection process but would in due course be brought into the new arrangements. The basic criteria for any ministry was that it had to be realistic, informed and obedient.

Bishop Pearson reported that individuals had already been approached to take on the new roles envisaged by the new processes and one training event had already taken place and had been an enormous success. That event had articulated the values and skills needed for the future. In future, the advisory panels would be in-house within the Province and the process leading to such panels would involve local discernment meetings which would help people to articulate their faith. He suggested that the new processes were a sign of the Holy Spirit moving within the Church. If Synod members had questions they should direct them to those individuals.

The Chair indicated that questions would not be taken.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) asked as a point of order why new ministries were being declared without having been intimated in the Synod papers and why there had been no opportunity to discuss matters or ask questions. Reference had been made to wisdom and common sense and it seemed strange that the Synod was not being given an opportunity to discuss. Bishop Pearson responded by saying that what had been presented was representative of what was in fact already happening in the Dioceses. The Bishops were beginning to offer a way forward, none of which was "in tablets of stone". Provost Holdsworth questioned the wisdom of speaking of a form of lay ministry about which the Church was not united. Bishop Dyer had recognised that the same language was not used across the Province and many churches did not speak of every person being a minister. He asked why that system was being imposed on the whole Province when there was an acknowledgement already that it was not agreed by all. Bishop Pearson said that matters were not being imposed. What was being said was that by baptism one entered the ministry of the Church and everyone was a full disciple. That was what baptism was about. Provost Holdsworth disagreed.

8.1.1 Primus' Activities

The Most Rev Dr Mark Strange (Primus) reported on his activities on behalf of the Province in the Anglican Communion. In July 2018, he had attended the General Convention of The Episcopal Church and had also visited the Archbishop of the Canadian Anglican Church. One third of Anglican Primates had been present at the General Convention and there had been opportunity for significant conversation. In September 2018, he had addressed the Church in Wales' equivalent of the General Synod regarding the process followed within the SEC on matters of sexuality. Later that month he had also met with the Bishop of Bujumbura in Edinburgh. In October 2018, he had had the privilege of receiving, on behalf of the SEC, an Honorary Doctorate at Sewanee University in Tennessee and had taken the opportunity then to travel to New York where he had addressed staff and congregations at Trinity Wall Street. In November with the Focolare Movement, he had met Bishops from across Europe, mainly Orthodox, Anglican, Lutheran and Roman Catholic. In December, he had paid an official visit to the Anglican Communion office and also had a meeting at Lambeth Palace. In February 2019, he had met the Archbishop of Brazil in London, with USPG and Churches Together in Britain and Ireland. He had been invited to a retreat in Kenya for African Anglican Primates and spouses. He had been somewhat surprised to receive such an invitation. It had been a wonderful experience and his wife had been able to address the group on education in Scotland. A regional Primates' meeting had taken place in Armagh and, in April, he had visited the Holy Land and preached at St George's, Jerusalem and had been able to engage with local people. He expressed thanks to Trinity Wall Street who had been very supportive financially. In November 2019, he was due to attend a meeting in Zambia and the next Anglican Primates' Meeting would take place in January 2020, leading into the Lambeth Conference later that year. On occasion, he had found himself being excluded from certain meetings as a result of the Synod's decision in relation to marriage in 2017. He expressed his thanks to the Very Rev Alison Simpson as Dean of his Diocese who handled matters when he was away from the Diocese. He similarly thanked Synod members for their support.

The Chair thanked the Primus for all he did on behalf of the Church and assured him of the Church's prayers.

8.2 Report on ACC-17

Mr Alistair Dinnie (ACC representative) indicated that it had been a great privilege for him and the Rev Dr Jenny Wright to represent the Scottish Episcopal Church at the meeting of the Anglican Consultative Council in Hong Kong, ACC-17. It had taken place in late April and early May 2019. He reminded Synod that the ACC was one of the four instruments of Communion within the Anglican Communion. Dependent on size, every Province sent either two or three delegates. In addition, there were eight regional youth representatives who had been added to the meeting for the first time. Amie Byers from the SEC had been one of those regional youth representatives. A number of other individuals with past or present connections to the Scottish Episcopal Church had also been present: Ms Rachael Fraser, Ms Lucy Copeland, the Rev Rachel Mash and Mr John Rea. Membership of the ACC included the Archbishop of Canterbury, as *ex officio* President and the Chair and Vice-Chair who were elected by the ACC, currently the Most Rev Paul Kwong and Ms Maggie Swinson. Five members of the Primates' Standing Committee were also members. Approximately 120 individuals had attended and 38 out of the 40 Provinces in the Communion had been represented. Mr Dinnie indicated the range of business which had been on the agenda and explained that, whilst not part of the formal business, there had also been a session on the Church of England's sexuality listening process *Living in Love and Faith*.

The Rev Dr Jenny Wright (Edinburgh) described the ACC meeting at which there had been many presentations but not enough time for discussion. The meeting had opened with a memorable striking of a gong at a service in the Cathedral. The Archbishop of Canterbury had said that the Church needed to seek "to be visibly the body of Christ, visibly serving, visibly disagreeing well, visible witnesses to the hope that drives us today". The Archbishop of Hong Kong had called for the Church to be relevant to the world. Particular aspects on the agenda which had stood out to her had been: woman on the frontline; *Thy Kingdom Come*; women in church and society; theological education; and the Anglican Safe Church Commission. The reports were available on the Anglican Communion website. She also referred to the networks of the Anglican Communion: Peace and Justice; Colleges and Universities; Environmental Network; Women's Network and Family Network. Resolutions had been passed including ones on equipping God's people for gender justice, the dignity of human beings, sustainable development goals and the development, use and impact of nuclear weapons. One of the more emotional sessions had concerned a resolution initially on the subject of human sexuality but following revision referred instead to human dignity. A half hour slot had become 2½ hours in length. The original resolution, proposed by the Bishop of Oklahoma, had asked the Anglican Communion to institute a listening process, which had been promised earlier, and to take seriously the exclusion of people. Some voices at the meeting had expressed concern at being able to take such a motion back to their churches. After much discussion, three Bishops who had been involved in the discussion had re-drafted the resolution which was passed after the Archbishop of Canterbury had offered an apology regarding the way in which invitations to the Lambeth Conference 2020 had been handled. The debate had been reported differently in various ways around the Communion and she suggested that delegates may have been left wondering whether it had been a good or bad handling of the topic. For her, however, despite major differences, it had highlighted the availability of a platform to talk and a willingness to listen.

The meeting had also adopted various public statements on the situations in Sri Lanka, South Sudan, Sudan, Pakistan and India and on cyclones Idai and Kenneth. The meeting also received a report on the planning towards the Lambeth Conference 2020 and on the season of intentional discipleship. A publication "Jesus Shaped Life" was an additional resource in relation to intentional discipleship which had been produced. She encouraged Synod members to look at the resources available on the Anglican Communion website.

Mr Dinnie then offered his personal reflections on the meeting. Hong Kong itself had been the most unabashedly aspirational place he had ever visited. The flipside to the economic activity in Hong Kong were matters such as the euphemistically described "helpers" who slept in kitchen cupboards and could be sacked from employment when it emerged that they had a long term health issue. The Province of Hong Kong brokered the wealth of congregations such as St John's Cathedral into a very impressive social programme. The Anglican Consultative Council exemplified the diversity across the Communion and yet gathered united around the Eucharist. Aspects of the meeting had been very testing, as alluded to already by Dr Wright. In the final business session, the meeting had considered resolutions which had laid all too bare divisions around human sexuality but also differences about how people related to one another and where power and influence lay within the Communion. He had expected the difficulties but had been challenged where certain behaviours had fallen short of what he had hoped. By the end of the meeting he had felt somewhat disillusioned, tired and emotional and yet God had broken through for him at St John the Baptist, East Kowloon.

The Chair thanked Mr Dinnie and Dr Wright for representing the SEC in the worldwide church.

SESSION 9: THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS IN THE CHAIR

9.1 Religious Society of Friends

Mary Woodward (Religious Society of Friends) thanked Synod for its hospitality and welcome. Of the discussions encountered thus far in Synod, she enthusiastically agreed with some of what had been said and had found some parts marginally, and other parts very, challenging. Earlier in the year she had represented British Quakers at the Finnish yearly meeting, at which 12 people had been present and more recently she had been at the British yearly meeting at which there had been some 1,200. She had recently been appointed to a group which was rewriting the "Book of Discipline" which included an anthology of Quaker writings. She offered to the Synod the gift of silence and also her favourite quote from the "Book of Discipline" written in 1661 by Isaac Pemberton which spoke of self-giving to God and the growth of God's seed in oneself.

9.2 Standing Committee: Budget and Quota

Mr Robert Gordon (Convener, Standing Committee) suggested that the Synod had come a long way in the previous two days of meeting. He hoped that members felt that good business had been done and that Boards and Committees had been mandated to undertake work in the year ahead.

Mr Gordon then proposed the following Motion:

"That this Synod, having examined the proposed budgets for the General Synod for the year 2020, agree to a quota figure of £741,527 for that year."

He reported that he had been asked whether the passing of the Rule 10 Motion earlier in Synod would require an adjustment to the budgets for 2020/21. He considered that they did not require adjustment but Synod would be invited to consider budgets for 2021/22 in 2020. He had spoken to the Rev Diana Hall and believed that the Rule 10 Motion which had been passed asked the Church to develop a strategy to work towards disinvestment. In the year ahead, the Church would work with her, the Investment Committee and the Church in Society Committee to develop a proposal for consideration at Synod 2020. Mr Gordon paid tribute to Mr Adrian Tupper, the Convener of the Investment Committee, who had done a huge amount of work in the previous 12 months with the Investment Managers and Church in Society Committee seeking to find appropriate investment vehicles to meet ethical standards and achieve the kind of investment returns needed to fund the Church's work. The medium to longer term issue which might need consideration would be the extent to which the Church's income was drawn respectively from the UTP and quota.

Dr John Ferguson-Smith (Convener, Administration Board) seconded the Motion.

Dr Jaap Jacobs (Breachin) expressed thanks to the Convener of the Standing Committee for the replies which had been provided to the questions which had been raised at General Synod 2018 in relation to quota. He also wished to thank the Convener for the proposal being brought forward for a freeze on provincial quota. He felt that that showed that Standing Committee was both listening and acting and hopefully this would provide some relief. However, he believed that there was still a need to address certain underlying issues. It was still the case that congregations faced a decline in membership and levels of giving. The question of whether the current system of financial relationship was fair arose – in particular the question of how provincial quota was shared. The Church might wish to consider whether changes to the system were required. He wondered whether the Standing Committee would consider setting up a group to review the structural arrangements.

Mr Jim Gibson (Glasgow and Galloway) noted that the effect of the Motion was that quota would be frozen for the third year in a row. Given the possible variation in investment income there had remained an underlying issue of congregational liberality and stewardship.

Mr Hugh Morison (Moray, Ross and Caithness) referred to the fact that he had previously worked with Mr Gordon in the civil service. He noted that the budget had been examined by Synod before having its very lively discussion about communications. He wondered whether there was a need for consideration or whether resources put into communications were sufficient. He also suggested that budgets, rather than being calculated to the nearest pound, might be calculated to the nearest ten pounds.

Mr Gordon responded indicating he had been delighted to catch up with Mr Morison during the course of Synod after many years. He owed a debt of gratitude to him for having been tutored by him in the past. Mr Gordon agreed that budgets could be rounded to the nearest ten pounds. Standing Committee would be reviewing with the Director of Communications how to take forward the proposals contained in the paper which had been considered by Synod. He agreed with comments made by Mr Gibson, who would also be involved in the future discussions regarding ethical investment in his new position as Administration Board Convener. As to Dr Jacobs' suggestion, Mr Gordon explained that significant work was done year by year by the Treasurer in conjunction with Diocesan Treasurers to agree the amount of quota assessable income. He would be delighted to engage in further discussion with Dr Jacobs to see whether wider consideration was needed in relation to the assessment of quota. Mr Gordon believed it to be reasonably fair given its relation to the state of individual congregations but there was also the question of how diocesan quota was set.

The Motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

The Chair expressed thanks to Mr Gordon for all that he did for the Church as Standing Committee Convener.

9.3 Mission Board

9.3.1 Global Partnerships Committee

Mr David Kenvyn (Convener, Global Partnerships Committee) reported on the work of the Committee. The Committee had approximately £110,000 available each year to spend on grants for work overseas in other Anglican provinces. The use of the funds was restricted and could not be spent on any other purpose. It enabled the Committee to make considerable differences to the lives of ordinary people. In 2018, it had continued to work closely with the Side-by-Side campaign and Thursdays in Black to make sure that gender justice issues remained at the centre of its work. Two major initiatives had developed the work in that area. The Committee was funding a project run by Charities Education International in Bangladesh to improve the lives of young women by increasing the educational opportunities open to them and improve their skills once they had left education. In Yida refugee camp in South Sudan, the Committee had assisted with the provision of sanitary products and in menstrual education. The Committee had supported a hospital project in Uganda, worked with the Green Anglicans project in southern Africa and in Amazonia had funded a women's refuge safe house as well as beginning to develop a partnership with a new youth project.

In Scotland, the Committee had worked with the Just Festival providing funding to enable a production from the Market Theatre in Johannesburg to be arranged. Unfortunately, that had fallen foul of Home Office delays in issuing visas and as a direct result of the Government's "hostile environment". The Secretary General had sent a letter of complaint to the Home Secretary but the latter's response had been inadequate.

The Committee had provided a travel grant for a member of the Diocese of Edinburgh to attend the Soul Edge Christian Leadership Training Programme among the First Nations of Canada and similar grants could be available to other dioceses. The highlight of the year had been the funding of a Christmas party for children from marginalised communities in Palestine organised by Wi'am, a Christian charity based in Bethlehem. The Primus had been able to visit Wi'am during his trip to the Holy Land earlier in the year. In the year ahead, the Committee hoped to hold a companion partnerships day in preparation for Lambeth 2020. He encouraged dioceses and churches which had a link with an organisation abroad to consider applying to the Committee for support.

Finally, Mr Kenvyn thanked Miriam Weibye and Marion Watson for their support for the Committee.

The Rev Denise Herbert (Breachin) thanked the Committee for their work which had included provision of grant finance to a charity in South Africa which was close to her heart. She expressed concern about the Home Office delay in providing visas. She wondered whether Synod itself could send a note of complaint to the Home Office. The Secretary General explained that the original letter of complaint had been sent on behalf of the Church.

The Primus thanked Mr Kenvyn and the Committee for their work.

9.3.2 UN Commission on the Status of Women

Ms Ley-Anne Forsyth, Youth Officer for the Diocese of Moray, Ross and Caithness, explained that she had represented the Church at the 63rd Session of the UN Commission on the Status of Women. The theme for that meeting had been "social protection systems, access to public services and sustainable infrastructure for gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls". Owing to her professional and church experience, she considered that she had a clear idea of the issues to which she felt the West, and in particular the UK, had to give an answer. The issues which she had identified and wished to take to the meeting had included equal opportunities for education regardless of gender (research suggested that by the age of six, children had future identified careers and learning on the basis of gender); the fact that more than four million children lived in poverty in the UK; the fact that one in five women and girls in Scotland had experienced serious sexual assault; the disproportionate amount of unpaid domestic work carried out by women; austerity; gender-based violence in all its forms; slowing the pace of progress in relation to women's rights; and the Church's own inequalities.

The Anglican delegation to CSW had comprised eight delegates. She had felt that the mandate for her work in New York had been the large number of women who had reached out to tell her of their concerns. In addressing Synod, she did so with the mandate of such people in the SEC who cared fiercely about the issues in question.

Anglican Communion staff had secured a private meeting with Lord Ahmed of Wimbledon, the head of the UK Government delegation. She had raised with him the concern that in the UK there appeared to be a regression in rights for women, referencing the UN report on austerity as well as her own experience of the disproportionate numbers of women who relied on supplemented income, in particular Universal Credit. Issues such as the "rape clause" and the failure to protect domestic abuse victims from economic abuse had been raised directly with him. Her comments had been "noted".

A delegate from the Solomon Islands had raised with Lord Ahmed the importance of faith-based organisations in delivering front-line refugees in her country. In response he had explained that the UK had set up a new fund which could provide support. Other opportunities to influence the UK delegation had come in the form of a nightly debrief with Charles Ramsden, Head of EU and International Policy.

After a week of presentations, meetings and discussions, negotiations had begun on the conclusion document. The agreed conclusions ran to some 22 pages. They included the noting by the Commission that universal access to social protection played a central role in reducing inequality, eradicating poverty and promoting inclusive growth. The Commission had also reiterated that everyone had the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of them and their families but had expressed concern that there were gaps in coverage, especially for women and girls.

Ms Forsyth commented that there had been a sense of regression at the meeting being pushed in particular by the USA. In fact, the USA had not achieved the backward steps which it had requested. Nevertheless a number of weeks after the meeting the USA had been successful at the Security Council in having reference to sexual and reproductive rights removed from the document. It was imperative that the Church as a whole and members of the Church as individuals did all that could be done to defend the rights of women and girls.

The theme of CSW 64 would be "Beijing 25" since it would be 25 years since the Beijing Declaration had been adopted by the UN. In 2020, 10 years would be left before the 2030 deadline for implementing sustainable development goal number five, to achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls. She suggested that the Synod needed to ensure that its own house was in order and that the opportunity ought to be taken to reflect on the past 25 years within the SEC to see how far it had come since the Beijing Declaration. There was a need to consider sustainable development goal five and come up with a plan to ensure that true gender equality was met by the target date of 2030.

The Primus expressed thanks to Ms Forsyth and acknowledged how privileged the Synod was year after year to hear from young women in the Church who had come through the Provincial Youth Committee and gone on to represent the Church at the UN CSW. The Church needed to take heed of what they said.

Dr Julia House (Aberdeen and Orkney) thanked Ms Forsyth for her presentation. She had noted the comment that by the age of six girls and boys knew which career they should pursue. In the Church there was an internal bias of which one was not conscious. The Church did indeed suffer from terminal niceness and she had frequently encountered the expression "I am not sexist but...". The use of language was very important. She was delighted that changes to liturgy were being considered but less happy about how long it might take. That was one reason why young women left the Church.

The Rev Peter Harris (Edinburgh) commented on how quickly the gender movement had moved on. He wondered whether there had been any discussions regarding the fluidity of gender at the meeting since that was a subject which the Church would need to start considering seriously for the future.

Ms Forsyth explained that any document to be adopted by the UN had to have support across the Board. While she agreed that there should be a discussion about gender fluidity, the meeting which she had attended had not been the place to do that. The Provincial Youth Committee handled matters well.

9.3.3 Provincial Youth Committee

The Rev Tembu Rongong (Convener, Provincial Youth Committee) said that longer serving members of Synod would note the development over the years in the PYC presentation at Synod from one or two members to the large group of individuals present at the current Synod. The work of the PYC had developed to the point that additional help had been needed to support the volunteers. He introduced Mrs Claire Benton-Evans who had been appointed as the PYC Enabler. Mrs Benton-Evans then spoke briefly about her role in championing the young people, being their advocate and defender, assisting them in finding their place in the Church and enabling them to speak for themselves.

Ms Phoebe Pryce talked about the things which she enjoyed doing in church and how opportunities could be created for young people. Young people were not the Church of the future but the Church of today. Young people could serve on a welcome team, lead the intercessions or even sit on vestry. The previous year a Glen-style service had been run by the PYC in a congregation which had involved interaction with the congregation. Ms Olivia Smith spoke of her experience in serving on a vestry. For her, the issue was whether the Church was doing enough to help those who were in need. There was a greater need to look outward beyond internal Church concerns. Ms Amie Byers reported on her attendance at ACC-17 in Hong Kong as one of the eight regional youth representatives. She had been blessed to be there with Mr Alistair Dinnie and the Rev Dr Jenny Wright as well as Rachael Fraser on the Anglican Communion Office staff. Her daily updates on the meeting were available on Facebook.

Ms Rebecca Cromwell spoke as the retiring Youth Chair of the Committee and the opportunities which that had given to her including serving as a lay person on the Preparatory Committee for the election of the Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane. Her time as Chair was finishing but further opportunities would arise. She would attend the forthcoming Kirchentag and also Glen as a leader. She expressed thanks to all those who had supported her during her period as Chair.

Ms Becky Northover spoke as the retiring Youth Secretary of the Committee. The Committee provided a safe space for young people to voice their own opinions. Initially, she had been unsure as to whether she had many opinions but over time the Committee had enabled her to put her ideas forward which had then become a reality.

Ms Eleanor Tofield spoke as the incoming Youth Chair of the Committee. She had come onto the Committee a few years previously and her main aim as Chair would be to seek the complete acceptance of young people in church. She hoped to be able to create closer relations with other churches in Scotland and thanked Rebecca Cromwell for being an inspiration.

The Rev John Bremner (United Reformed Church) responded to the invitation which he had heard to other denominations to become more closely involved. The more the Churches could work together, particularly in relation to young people, the better. The EMU arrangement might enable that to happen.

The Primus expressed thanks to all those who had contributed and to the Provincial Youth Committee as a whole.

9.4 Scottish Episcopal Institute Valedictory Service and Close of Synod

The Synod closed with the Scottish Episcopal Institute Valedictory Service at the end of which the Primus expressed thanks to David Todd and those who had arranged the Eucharist and led worship throughout Synod, the representatives of other denominations and faiths, those who had acted as Chairpersons or Facilitators, the Assessor, the staff of St Paul's & St George's and of the General Synod Office.

At the end of the Service, the Primus confirmed the Acts of Synod and gave the blessing on Saturday 8 June 2019.

ELECTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS TO PROVINCIAL BODIES

1. Standing Committee Convenership

Robert Gordon retires this year as Convener of the Standing Committee and General Synod is required to elect a successor.

Bridget Campbell is nominated by Standing Committee as the prospective new Convener.

Brief biographical details:

Key strengths

- *Organisational leadership with skills in building and managing effective senior teams who devise policies and deliver major projects for Government Ministers*
- *Leading through others: helping organisations become more effective through strengthening their leadership and use of good governance*
- *Delivering major projects and engendering change across systems*
- *Substantial experience of public policy development in Scottish and UK Governments with an emphasis on strategy and strengthening the use of evidence in policy-making*

Church membership

Brought up and confirmed in Scottish Episcopal Church

Member of St Vincent's Chapel, Edinburgh since 2006

*Secretary to the Vestry 2006-16 – in 2015 supported recruitment of new Rector
Vestry member 2019 – present*

Work

2015 to present: Director, Environment & Forestry:

Environmental protection, circular economy, natural resources and biodiversity, 125 staff, budget £230 million. Legislated for UK's first Deposit Return Scheme. Co-chaired programme to boost work to tackle decline in Scotland's biodiversity. Increased tenfold annual budget for peatland restoration. Set up Scottish Land Commission to pursue land reform. Prepared for Brexit. Sponsor of public bodies including Scottish Environment Protection Agency, Scottish Natural Heritage, 2 national parks, Zero Waste Scotland and Royal Botanic Garden Edinburgh. Set up collaborative Environment & Economy Leaders' Group of all sponsored bodies' CEOs. Oversaw collaborative process leading to publication of Environment Strategy for Scotland. Oversaw response to Covid-19 with programme to keep waste collected and disposed of throughout lockdown. Completed devolution of forestry: line manager for CEOs of Forestry and Land Scotland (turnover £120 million, 900 staff); and Scottish Forestry (£65 million; 180 staff) and in 2018 new agencies met tree planting targets for first time in decades.

2014 Director, Readiness:

Prepared Scottish Government for outcome of independence referendum.

2010-14 Director, Justice:

Legislation on criminal and civil justice including minimum price for alcohol. Oversaw development of Justice Strategy – evidence-based whole system strategy produced in collaboration with CEOs and leaders of all organisations in system. Set up Justice Board which brought together CEOs of Crown Office, Scottish Courts and Tribunals Service, Scottish Legal Aid Board, Scottish Prison Service, Scottish Fire and Rescue Service, Chief Constable of Police Scotland. This led to programmes to improve efficiency of criminal justice system, tribunals service and reduce reoffending working across agencies. Oversaw review of organisation of criminal justice social work. Led major cross-agency project to establish Scottish Crime Centre at Gartcosh.

2005-2009: Director, Police & Community Safety:

Policy and funding of police, fire and rescue and emergency planning; justice analytical services. 215 staff; programme expenditure £1.3 billion. Challenged services to improve their performance. Legislated for and established single common police services body for ICT, forensic science, training, criminal records and serious and organised crime for all Scotland's eight police forces. Set up new police complaints commissioner. Put in place framework to measure police performance accepted by all 8 police forces. Oversaw development of new services to improve Scotland's resilience to deal with emergencies. Oversaw development of new strategy which improved the way that public services supported recovery of drug addicts and supported innovative approach to tackling violent behaviour. Developed approach to devolution of policy on defence and security.

2003-2004: Projects including review of senior management structure in Scottish Executive Health Department; and confidence in Scotland.

2002-2003: Director, Public Service Delivery Group, Scottish Executive. Devised major change programme for Scottish Executive, public service reform and e-government.

2000-2001: Deputy Director, Head of Cabinet Secretariat, Scottish Executive.

1998-2000: Deputy Director, Environment Protection, Scottish Office/Executive policy on sewage, rubbish and radioactive waste.

1996-1998: Deputy Director, Housing Policy and Home Ownership, Department for Environment, Transport & Regions Comprehensive Spending Review of Housing which secured increased resources of £3.6 billion.

1987-1996: Principal posts dealing with regeneration of severely deprived inner city housing estates; legislation on restructuring local government in England; sustainable development; UK sponsor of the UN Environment Programme and follow up to the Earth Summit of 1992; organised major international sustainable development conference in Manchester; policy on trade and the environment with international organisations including World Trade Organization, European Commission and OECD.

1982-1986: Training posts including privatisation of British Transport Hotels and Sealink ferries, public expenditure coordination, legislation to abolish Greater London Council and Private Secretary to Permanent Secretary.

Education & continuing professional development

BA Literae Humaniores, St Anne's College, Oxford University 1981

Cycle Internationale, Ecole Nationale D'Administration, Paris 1990

Top Management Programme, National School of Government

*Senior Leaders Programme, Windsor Leadership
High Potential Development Scheme, National School of Government
Major Projects Leadership Academy, Saïd Business School, Oxford University*

Nominations were invited in the letter of 22 September 2020 from the Convener of the Standing Committee to General Synod members. No other nomination has been received.

2. Mission Board Convenership

The Rev Canon Jane Ross resigned as Convener of the Mission Board earlier this year. Pending a meeting of General Synod, the Very Rev Sarah Murray has served as Acting Convener. Following consultation between the Board and the Standing Committee, the Standing Committee nominates Provost Murray as the new Convener of the Board.

Brief biographical details:

Born and brought up on the Isle of Wight, educated on the Island and Brighton. Further Education at Brighton University in Hospitality Management. Moved to the Highlands of Scotland in 1992 to manage local Hotel in Golspie and subsequently worked for VisitScotland for ten years as one of the Quality Advisors (better known as Hotel Inspectors!).

I became involved in the local church and took on roles within the lay ministry team and on Vestry. I engaged in the discernment process and was ordained Deacon in 2013 and served my curacy in Keith, Huntly and Aberchirder. On completion of my curacy I took up the post of Vice Provost at Inverness Cathedral in 2016, this followed by taking up the post of Provost in October 2017. The Cathedral celebrated 150 years of worship in 2019 and this marked daily worship in the building for the duration. The worshipping life of the cathedral is integral to the mission in the community, the faith in the City and offers diverse worship for all.

I have served on the Diocesan Mission and Ministry Board for 5 years and sit on the Diocesan Standing Committee. I was the Diocese of Moray, Ross & Caithness representative on the Information and Communication Board until its dissolution. I am also the Diocesan representative on the Provincial Mission Board.

I am a Board Member of the Street Pastors in Inverness and have recently remitted the role of Chairperson, having carried out this role for three years.

I am a Godly Play trained facilitator and embarked on Value Based Reflective Practice Facilitator (VBRP)¹ in March.

I am interested in how the church engages with the local community and reaches those on the edges. Inverness Cathedral is one of the Founding Members of HeartEdge. The inSpire project at the Cathedral offers a Winter Jacket Bank, a School Uniform Bank, a Holiday Lunch facility with activities and an Open Table Christmas Day Lunch. The Cathedral Café & Shop has been

¹ <http://www.knowledge.scot.nhs.uk/vbrp.aspx>

developed over the last few years, offering a place of hospitality for visitors to the cathedral and city, locals and offers 'pay it forward' coffees and meals. The Café has several paid employees and offers a volunteering program to many, including those living with mental health, those preparing to become workplace ready and others.

In my spare time I enjoy cooking, baking, walking, gardening, reading and ballet (watching from the audience!).

Nominations were invited in the letter of 22 September 2020 from the Convener of the Standing Committee to General Synod members. No other nomination has been received.

3. Institute Council Convenship

The Rt Rev Kevin Pearson completes his term of office as Convener of the Council and General Synod is required to elect a successor. The Convener must be a bishop, nominated to Synod by the Standing Committee, following consultation with the College of Bishops.

Following consultation with the College of Bishops, the Rt Rev Anne Dyer, Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney, who has previously served as the additional bishop on the Council is nominated by Standing Committee as the prospective new Convener. (The College of Bishops has appointed the Rt Rev Andrew Swift, to serve as the additional Bishop on the Council in future.)

4. Institute Council Membership

Members of the Institute Council are appointed by General Synod on the recommendation of the Standing Committee. For the last few years, the Rev Marjory McPherson has served as ecumenical member of the Council. Ms McPherson, having previously served as the Education and Support Secretary of the Church of Scotland's Ministries Council, is now the Presbytery Clerk for the Edinburgh Presbytery. Her current term of office comes to an end at General Synod and the Standing Committee, following consultation with the College of Bishops, nominates Ms McPherson to serve for a second term.

5. Administration Board: General Synod Representatives

One vacancy arises for membership of the Administration Board. It is for the General Synod to fill the vacancy upon a nomination by the Standing Committee. The term of office is four years. The Rev Deborah Davison is nominated by Standing Committee as the prospective new member. No other nominations have been received.

Brief biographical details:

Theology BA (Hon) University of Exeter 1979

Initial work experience includes: Nursing Auxiliary (nights) 1974-1976; Housing Visitor, Southwark Council (1979-80); Warehouse assistant SPCK, Marylebone.

State Registered Nurse - St Thomas' Hospital, London 1983 Staff Nurse – renal ward; & ITU. Registered Health Visitor – North London Polytechnic 1984 Obstetrics – Doncaster Royal Infirmary

Worked in Paddington, Earls Court, Lewisham – particular field of work with homeless families; housing/homelessness & health – founder member of national group (involved 1976-1996). Member of Editorial Board of HV Journal. Worked in community (North Surrey) 1996-2011.

PGDip - Public Health - London South Bank Univ 2006

PDip – Ministry whilst training for ordained Ministry – Cuddesdon Theological College, Oxford

Volunteering roles include: Nightline (as an undergraduate: 1975-1979); Shelter, Slough (c 1994-95); foodbank (2013-2015); LooseEnds Newbury, Berks (2015-2019); Red Cross Emergency Relief (during ongoing pandemic)

Deaconed – 2/7/11 Priested – 23/6/12 (Diocese of Oxford)

Title served at: All Saints, Maidenhead; & St Paul's Wokingham. Particular focus included establishing 'Mission & Outreach Group; served on Diocesan – Health & Social Action Committee (it underwent a few name changes.!); Chaplain to local Community Hospital; volunteer at foodbank; Chaplaincies to Nursing Homes, & to Loose Ends Group (local project supporting people who are rough sleeping; served local school – church & community links, School Governor (2015-2019).

Chief concerns: health & social inequality - & where the church locates in light of these. DEEPLY concerned too about homelessness in all its forms – the gross injustice that impacts people (of all ages – babies to seniors) without a safe, secure decent, genuinely affordable home.

I have been in the Scottish Episcopal Church since August 2019, as Rector of Holy Trinity & St Barnabas & The Good Shepherd Hillington. I still have a great deal to learn – about everything.

If there was time – I love to swim; & also walk (or bike) & explore – city & mountains – both of which Scotland does very generously! I love languages, but don't really speak any.

I have three adult children; & greatly value & enjoy any time at all with them. Last Summer, we went to Mablethorpe, played bingo, & swam in the sea. This Summer we did have a day in Skye & swam in the sea there too!

6. Membership: Clergy Discipline Tribunal (Canon 54)

Five vacancies arise this year on the Clergy Discipline Tribunal. Fraser Falconer, Susan Horne and John Whittall each complete terms of office as lay members of the Tribunal, the Rev Canon Professor John Richardson completes his term of office as a clerical member and Lord McEwan completes his term as a practising lawyer. The first four are willing to serve a further term on the Tribunal in the same capacities and the Standing Committee nominates each of them to Synod for re-appointment. Lord McEwan, having retired professionally, is no longer eligible to be reappointed. At the point of going to print, a name to succeed Lord McEwan has not been identified.

7. Membership: Preliminary Proceedings Committee (Canon 54)

Appointments to the Preliminary Proceedings Committee under Canon 54 are made by General Synod on the recommendation of the Standing Committee.

As explained to General Synod 2019, steps were in hand at that time for the appointment of a practising lawyer to the Committee. The Synod authorised the Standing Committee to fill that vacancy on the understanding that such appointment made by the Standing Committee would be brought to General Synod 2020 for appointment for the remainder of that person's term. Standing Committee filled the vacancy by appointing solicitor Robert Phillips and that appointment is brought to Synod 2020 for ratification.

Brief biographical details:

Robert is a Legal Director with Addleshaw Goddard. He advises on all employment law matters from responding to complaints and grievances, allegations of discrimination and discipline issues, reorganisations, restructuring and redundancies, TUPE, threats of industrial action and large-scale changes to terms and conditions. He has a depth of expertise in complex, contentious employment litigation defending complaints in tribunal by alleged whistle-blowers. Having appeared in employment tribunals throughout the UK, Robert has extensive experience of tribunal advocacy and resolution of workplace disputes by negotiation or mediation. He has appeared in the Employment Appeal Tribunal, the Sheriff Court and the Central Arbitration Committee. He is accredited as a specialist in Employment Law by the Law Society of Scotland

8. Pension Fund Chair

Richard McIndoe completes his term of office as Chair of the Pension Fund Trustees at this General Synod. A triennial valuation of the Fund is due at the end of this year and in order to give continuity during this period when the Fund is also in the course of arranging the outsourcing of certain aspects of the Fund's administration, he has kindly agreed to remain in position until Synod 2021. Standing Committee has included a motion in the Synod agenda to extend his convenership.

9. General Synod Trusteeship

Since the General Synod is an unincorporated association, it does not enjoy legal personality and cannot hold property in its own name. Accordingly, the Digest of Resolutions provides for the appointment of Trustees as a means of enabling this. (The Digest also allows for the mechanism of a nominee company and Scottish Episcopal Church Nominees exists for this purpose and is now the usual means for the Synod to hold property (eg retirement housing)). Some property acquired at an earlier stage remains in the name of the Trustees.

The current Trustees are Mr Martin Haldane, the Rt Rev Edward Luscombe, the Hon Lord McEwan and Sheriff Alexander Wilkinson. During the year David Palmer and Lady Caroline Douglas Home have resigned as Trustees. Two vacancies

therefore arise. At this point, Standing Committee brings one nomination to Synod, that of Robert Gordon, who retires at Synod as Convener of the Standing Committee. His biographical details are as follows:

Robert Gordon CB was born in Aberdeen and after graduating in 1973 from the University of Aberdeen joined the civil service in the Scottish Office in Edinburgh. He undertook a range of roles in various departments including education, economy, development and agriculture, was Principal Private Secretary to the Secretary of State for Scotland and led projects to transform support services and develop and implement new accommodation and ICT strategies.

In 1997, he became Head of Constitution Group responsible for setting up the Scottish Parliament and Executive. In 2002, he was appointed as the first Chief Executive of the Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service to implement a programme of modernisation and transformational change in the prosecution service. In 2005 he was appointed Head of the Justice Department (later DG Justice and Communities) and again oversaw a programme of change and modernisation. After leaving the Scottish Government in 2010 he undertook a range of coaching and change consultancy work for a variety of clients in the public and voluntary sectors.

He has acted in the past as Vestry Chair and Chair of the Resources and Staffing Groups, at St Paul's and St George's Church in Edinburgh, where he has been a member since 1985. He was Chair of Bethany Christian Trust from 2009 to 2020. He has also served as a member of the board of Inspiring Scotland, as a Warden of the Incorporation of Goldsmiths of the City of Edinburgh and as Chair of the Audit and Accountability Committee of the Police Investigations and Review Commissioner. He has been convener of the Standing Committee since 2015.

The Synod agenda includes motions to fill those vacancies for which only Standing Committee may make a nomination. Any additional nominations for any of the other positions (the convenerships of the Standing Committee or Mission Board) must be received not later than the commencement of the meeting of General Synod but if at all possible, in current circumstances, at least seven days prior to the meeting. They should be submitted to the Secretary General who has a style of nomination form available on request. Any person elected to a position which includes membership of Standing Committee (such as convenership of the Standing Committee and of the Mission Board) 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.

John F Stuart
Secretary General
October 2020

Finance Report

Introduction

General Synod is normally provided with copies of budgets for all boards and committees detailing the actual results of the previous year and the budget for the current and two successive years. Given the timing of this year's Synod and the stage of the budgetary cycle Standing Committee has agreed to adopt a different approach. What follows is a brief commentary on the currently projected financial outcome for 2020 and an indication of the likely budgets for 2021 – 2023. The information focusses on the General Fund which provides a good overview of the financial position. Details regarding Standing Committee's approach to Quota, including its specific proposals for Quota 2021 are also provided.

General Fund – budgeted and projected outcome 2020

In its oversight of the General Synod's finances the Standing Committee's focus is on the General Fund. The General Fund budget 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. That is why the General Fund statement provides a good overview of the overall financial position.

The first three columns of the statement on page 57 show the budgeted and projected outcome for 2020. The budget reflects that agreed by Standing Committee at its November 2019 meeting. The projected outcome is based on actual income and expenditure to 30 September and estimates for the rest of the year. The projections are therefore based on a number of assumptions and actual results will be different.

A deficit of almost £231,500 was budgeted for 2020. (An increase of about £32,000 on that previously budgeted.) The projected outcome is however for a broadly break-even position (surplus of about £7,200). The projected outcome is therefore considerably better than budgeted. A small element (£10,285) of this improvement relates to the expectation that investment income will be slightly greater than budgeted (subject to agreement of final Unit Trust Pool distribution for the year) the majority however is as a result of costs savings – many of which are directly related to the impact of Covid-19, the restrictions it has imposed and the consequent changes in practice.

Projected underspends

Covid-19 restrictions have resulted in all board and committee meetings being held online since March and limitations on travel by staff, Bishops and others representing the SEC both within the UK and overseas. It is projected that savings of about £40,000 will be made in general meeting and travel costs. In addition, the following savings are projected:

General Synod meeting costs – Holding the meeting online will result in estimated cost savings of £28,500.

SEI residential weekends and orientation week – to date two residential weekends and the annual Orientation Week have been held virtually rather than at St Mary's Kinnoull. It is likely that the December weekend will also be held online. Estimated cost savings - £26,300.

Annual Glenalmond Youth week and other youth activities. Very few actual meetings of the Provincial Youth Committee have been held this year. The annual youth week at Glenalmond was also cancelled with some of the delegates meeting online throughout the week. Estimated cost savings - £18,900.

Discernment process. The planned Advisory Selection Panels and training events are being held online rather than residentially. Estimated cost savings - £16,000.

Lay Readers' Conference. The conference planned for November 2020 has been postponed. Estimated cost savings - £10,000.

General Synod Office costs. It is anticipated that the General Synod Office will have been closed for the majority of the year resulting in savings in a range of property and other costs. Estimated cost savings - £10,000.

Salary costs. The restrictions imposed by lockdown resulted in a delay in implementing some of the changes in General Synod Office staffing arrangements assumed in the budgets. A number of staff were furloughed. Recognising the need to ensure that there was adequate technical capacity to produce online services Standing Committee agreed to increase the Digital Communications Coordinator's hours from part time to full time throughout much of the year. Estimated net cost savings - £37,000.

Child poverty project grants. The Church in Society Committee launched its Child Poverty Projects grants earlier this year. To date it has awarded six grants totalling £19,500. The Committee is due to meet again later this year and may well have further grant applications to consider. It is currently projected that only £25,000 of the annual budget of £50,000 will be required. Covid-19 and its related restrictions is likely to be one of the factors that has resulted in the demand for grants being less than anticipated. Estimated cost savings - £25,000.

Additional expenditure incurred

Other than the additional costs associated with increasing the Digital Communications Coordinator's hours to full time referred to above the only other significant additional costs incurred in the year are the Covid support grants provided to three charities. Standing Committee requested that the Church in Society Committee allocate a total of £50,000 to charities that were facing additional demands on their services as a result of the Covid-19 lockdown. The following grants were awarded:

	£
Aberlour Childcare Trust	20,000
Scottish Women's Aid	15,000
Scottish Association for Mental Health	15,000
	50,000

Financial response to Covid-19

Standing Committee has discussed the financial impact on dioceses and charges of Covid-19 at all of its meetings since the lockdown restrictions were imposed. It is aware of the concerns regarding the ongoing loss of income from a variety of sources such as giving at Sunday services, hall lets, fundraising activities and investment income, arising from current restrictions on normal activities and wider implications for the general economy. Standing Committee understands that whilst most charges appear to be coping financially many are likely to be utilising their reserves to do so. It recognises that such a situation cannot continue indefinitely. It is also aware of a number of charges facing particular financial difficulties at this this time. Standing Committee is proposing two responses:

Creation of a Recovery and Renewal Fund

Standing Committee has considered the principle of establishing a grants fund focussing specifically on helping dioceses finance the costs of adapting and changing to meet the challenges and opportunities created by Covid-19 and its aftermath. It is anticipated that cost savings of about £230,000 accruing in 2020 will be allocated to the Fund. The detail of the operation of the Fund is being developed but it is planned that it will be administered by Standing Committee in accordance with criteria to be proposed by a Task Group the Committee has established to consider the issues facing the SEC throughout the ever lengthening period of pandemic and in the years beyond. It is anticipated at this stage that the grants will be available for one year with applications being considered by Standing Committee in the context of Diocesan Forward Plans in the latter half of 2021. The aim is to provide an update on progress at General Synod.

Quota reductions

Total Quota requested has remained unchanged since 2018. Earlier this year Standing Committee agreed that, given the restrictions being imposed and their likely impact, at the very least there would be no increase in Quota requested in 2021. Standing Committee has further reflected on how best to provide assistance to dioceses and charges coping with and recovering from the pandemic and is therefore proposing a substantial reduction in Quota for 2021. It will be for dioceses to determine the extent to which quota reductions are reflected in reduced diocesan quota requests. Standing Committee's intention is that reducing the amount of quota requested from dioceses will give dioceses some flexibility to best determine how to provide assistance taking account of local circumstances and recognising that some charges will be affected more than others by current restrictions. Quota is a significant element of provincial income and Standing Committee's proposal is to plan a phased increase back to current levels by 2024. The proposed reductions will require the use of reserves – a total of about £250,000 being used over the three year period to 2024 (ie

Quota income will by then be about £250,000 less than it would have been if quota had continued to be frozen at its current level.) The proposed quota requested for 2021 – 2024 is:

	Quota £'000s	Change from previous year	
		£'000s	%age
2020	742	-	-
2021	600	(142)	(19.1%)
2022	660	60	10.0%
2023	710	50	7.6%
2024	750	40	5.6%

The specific recommendation for Quota 2021 can be found on page 56.

Budgets

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. That process is currently underway and no budgets have yet been agreed by Standing Committee for 2021. The budgets referred to below reflect those currently under discussion.

Budget assumptions

The budgets broadly reflect those previously agreed with a small number of changes to reflect anticipated changes in income and expenditure. Given the continuing uncertainty regarding ongoing pandemic related restrictions no changes have been made to budgets to reflect their implications on costs associated with travel, meetings etc or the extent to which practices adopted in recent months will continue into the future. (For example, it is thought likely that many Boards and Committees will continue to hold some of their meetings online resulting in cost reductions.) It is recognised that, at least in the short term, costs may therefore be less than budgeted. There are only two significant changes to the budget: the reduction in quota and the proposed Recovery and Renewal Fund.

In preparing the budgets it has been assumed that the investment income from the SEC Unit Trust Pool will continue to increase each year broadly in line with recent annual increases. Whilst the UTP continues to perform well despite general economic concerns there can, of course, be no guarantee that income will be maintained or continue to increase.

General Fund Budgeted deficits

The budgets suggest the following deficits on the General Fund

2021	£635,187	(£405,187 excluding the Recovery and Renewal Fund)
2022	£314,031	
2023	£288,639	

Excluding the Recovery and Renewal Fund the 2021 deficit is about £195,000 greater than previously budgeted mostly due to the proposed reductions in quota. (The 2022 deficit is about £147,000 greater than previously budgeted – mainly for the same reason.)

Funding the deficits

The General Fund has sufficient reserves to fund the budgeted deficits in the short term. In the last ten years (2010-2019) there have been surpluses of £1.4million on the General Fund. These have augmented the General Fund's reserves (including a total of £700k invested in the UTP in 2014 and 2016). Whilst in recent years efforts have been redoubled to avoid generating surpluses (as it has always been the intention to budget to break even) these historic surpluses have resulted in resources in the General Fund that can be used to cover a range of eventualities and in the current circumstance to provide support to charges and dioceses by way of reduced quota. It is expected that it will be necessary to sell investments of about £230,000 to fund the budgeted deficit in 2023. Further sales of investments will be required should it be necessary to continue to fund deficits beyond 2023.

Current budgetary pressures and uncertainties

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

Quota income

As outlined above it is hoped to restore quota to current levels by 2024. It is assumed that modest annual increases thereafter will again be possible. Any inability to increase quota will result in further pressure on the General Fund.

Investment income

As noted above, whilst the SEC Unit Trust Pool is currently performing well there can be no guarantee that investment income will not fall during a period of such economic uncertainty. Investment income will be reduced if it becomes necessary to sell some of the General Fund's investments to fund ongoing deficits.

Curate funding

The number of stipendiary curates in training and the grant funding provided to the training charges has a significant impact on budgets. Currently annual funding of 50% of stipend and related costs is provided in respect of each curate in training –

equivalent to about £18,000 a year over a three year training period. The numbers of individuals expected to commence curacies, even in the relatively short term, can change from year to year as personal circumstances change. Currently there are seven stipendiary curates in training. It is anticipated that this will reduce to five during 2021.

To ensure the availability of the required number of appropriate training opportunities for stipendiary curates it is possible that grant funding in excess of the traditional 50% might be required in some areas. To date enhanced funding has only been required in respect of one curate placement. In working with dioceses and charges in identifying the training places for stipendiary curacies the Institute Council will continue to assess 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.

Funding of full time ordinands (including Mixed Mode students)

The Scottish Episcopal Institute currently offers two options for full time ordinands; the traditional route of combining studies at SEI with a three year degree course at a Scottish University and the Mixed Mode route in which ordinands combine their SEI studies with a placement in a charge. In both cases Ordinands are provided with an annual grant (currently £13,500). (For Mixed Mode students a third of the grant is funded by the charge / diocese in which the student is placed.) Currently SEI's share of grant costs is funded by the SEI Training Fund and therefore has no impact on the General Fund deficit.

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 2022. It is however likely that from 2023 the continued provision of such grants will require some support from the General Fund. The budgets currently reflect a funding requirement of £12,000 in 2023 – increasing to about £75,000 - £90,000 a year thereafter. The number of full time ordinands in training will therefore have a significant impact on the General Fund from 2024.

New mission initiatives fund

Standing Committee has encouraged the Mission Board to develop its thinking in relation to the suggestion emerging from its recent discussions that a new fund should be established specifically to finance new mission initiatives. Should such a Fund be established it is likely to have a significant impact on future budgets.

Pension Fund – actuarial valuation

A triennial actuarial valuation of the SEC Pension Fund as at 31 December 2020 is due to be undertaken next year. Standing Committee is mindful that one possible outcome of the valuation will be the need to increase pension contributions from 2022. Any such increase would result in increased provincial staff costs and may also result in the need to consider the provision of financial support to enable charges to pay the increased contributions.

Robert Gordon
Convener, Standing Committee
October 2020

QUOTA 2021

All quota received will be credited to the General Fund.

It is recommended that total quota requested be reduced to £600,000.

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:

	2021 £	2020 £	Change from 2020 £	
Aberdeen and Orkney	62,880	85,127	(22,247)	(26.1%)
Argyll and The Isles	22,860	26,398	(3,538)	(13.4%)
Brechin	40,380	49,386	(9,006)	(18.2%)
Edinburgh	237,360	289,788	(52,428)	(18.1%)
Glasgow and Galloway	124,740	157,649	(32,909)	(20.9%)
Moray, Ross and Caithness	40,440	47,384	(6,944)	(14.7%)
St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane	71,340	85,795	(14,455)	(16.8%)
	600,000	741,527	141,527	(19.1%)

(Note – Edinburgh 2020 shown prior to agreed reduction of £9,509 in respect of departure of St Thomas)

General Fund

Draft budget

Budget 2020 £	Projected 2020 £	Variance fav/ (adv) £		Revised Budget 2021 £	Budget 2022 £	Budget 2023 £
			INCOME			
			<i>Investment Income</i>			
1,151,840	1,162,125	10,285	UTP income	1,162,125	1,182,694	1,203,264
4,000	4,000	-	Interest	4,000	4,000	4,000
21,243	21,243	-	Net investment property income	21,243	21,243	21,243
1,177,083	1,187,368	10,285		1,187,368	1,207,937	1,228,507
			<i>Administration fees</i>			
2,000	3,000	1,000	UTP / investment administration	2,000	2,000	2,000
30,055	30,055	-	Pension Fund administration	30,500	30,800	31,200
18,395	18,395	-	Restricted Funds	18,395	18,712	19,029
50,450	51,450	1,000		50,895	51,512	52,229
732,018	732,018	-	Quota	600,000	660,000	710,000
3,000	3,000	-	Donations and legacies	3,000	3,000	3,000
1,962,551	1,973,836	11,285	<i>Total Income</i>	1,841,263	1,922,449	1,993,736
			ALLOCATIONS			
969,280	825,250	144,030	Standing Committee	977,870	1,003,910	1,016,900
251,320	251,972	(652)	Administration Board	259,820	267,320	274,820
489,290	424,566	64,724	Institute Council	505,120	456,720	471,830
459,910	459,080	830	Mission Board	477,365	482,040	491,100
24,250	5,760	18,490	Faith and Order Board	26,275	26,490	27,725
-	-	-	Recovery and Renewal Fund	230,000	-	-
2,194,050	1,966,628	227,422	<i>Total allocations</i>	2,476,450	2,236,480	2,282,375
			BALANCES			
(231,499)	7,208	238,707	Surplus/(deficit) for year	(635,187)	(314,031)	(288,639)
1,000,975	1,000,975		Balance brought forward	1,008,183	372,996	58,965
769,476	1,008,183	238,707	<i>Balance carried forward</i>	372,996	58,965	(229,674)
Note						
In addition to allocations from the General Fund some Boards / Committees receive income from other sources						

THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK

CANON 4 REVIEW GROUP

A Consultation on the Election of Bishops

1. Introduction

In the Scottish Episcopal Church, as our name suggests, we look to our bishops for leadership and pastoral care. We seek to appoint to the office those with appropriate gifts and in whom we can affirm their sense of God's call. This means that whilst canonical provision may facilitate this search it is in the end only the framework within which the church enters into prayerful discernment and careful listening for the guiding voice of the Holy Spirit. For this process to work well it requires two vital ingredients that cannot be legislated for in a Canon.

- A cohort of clergy in whom the church has discerned and nourished the potential for senior leadership – people who are themselves exploring the possibility that God may be calling them to one of the senior roles in our Province. This unfolding of vocation should not be dependent upon episcopal or other vacancies; it should be a part of our continuing life as a church.
- Appropriate training for all involved. Training is offered to those who assist in the discernment and selection of our junior clergy, surely it is equally important in the context of choosing our senior clergy.

2. Any process of discernment, especially one concerning senior leadership, should be robust and demanding. It is inevitable that some who generously offer themselves, believing that they may be called to episcopal office, will be disappointed. This means there is all the more reason to conduct the process with kindness and courtesy. As we have consulted we have discovered that, as it stands, Canon 4 has bewildered many and hurt others. Without exception those who have offered feedback have suggested revisions that range from a reworking of the present Canon to a complete reinvention of it. Indeed, our consultation has led us to propose that the Canon must be significantly revised.

3. In this document we outline two options on which we seek the opinions of church members. We shall roll out this consultation firstly to General Synod members then to Diocesan Synods and finally to the wider church membership. Drawing on results of this consultation we shall offer feedback to General Synod in 2021 and, with the approval of the Faith & Order Board, present a new Canon 4 for a first reading at General Synod in 2022.

4. The Present Canon

The principle underlying the present Canon 4 is that a Diocese should choose its own bishop. The Canon is devised to make this possible whilst ensuring involvement from the wider Province and providing a means to bring about a resolution if the Diocese proves unable to elect. A brief summary of the canonical process is offered in the paragraphs that follow – for further details we would refer you to the Canon itself.

5. When a diocese falls vacant the Primus is required to issue a mandate which begins the electoral process. There are precise time-scales laid down in the Canon. A Preparatory Committee consisting of representatives of the diocese, the Province and the College of Bishops (Convened by the Primus or another bishop) considers nominations and aims to provide a short-list of between three and five names for the consideration of the Electoral Synod. The Synod meets the candidates and at a separate meeting seeks to elect a new bishop by a clear majority in both houses (of clergy and laity).

6. Should this first mandate not deliver either a short-list of candidates or a result from the Electoral Synod, the Primus will issue a second mandate which sets in motion a similar process (with a more limited time-scale). If this second stage also does not deliver a result the matter falls to the College of Bishops to elect, according to a process and a time-scale of their own devising.

7. Various objections have been raised about the Canon as it stands – some are listed here:

- It is confusing and unclear.
- Its timescales are too prescriptive and may not be altered at the discretion of either the College of Bishops or the Electoral Synod. There is little flexibility to take account of church seasons, for example, or to delay the start of the process should the previous bishop die suddenly in office.
- The Electoral Synod, which in effect draws its membership from the final Diocesan Synod under the previous bishop, may thus disenfranchise a significant number of clergy who arrive in post after that Diocesan Synod.
- The minimum size of shortlist (three) is considered by some to be too large. Why not allow the Electoral Synod to vote on two or even one candidate should the Preparatory Committee consider them to be suitable? Might discretion be allowed at a later stage in the process to reduce the size of shortlist?
- When a shortlist is produced the candidates' names are made public. Why is this, when in any other clergy appointments confidentiality is considered paramount?
- Once the shortlist is decided and shared with the Electoral Synod, why is it necessary then to wait for a month before the Synod may meet the candidates?
- The Preparatory Committee does its work very thoroughly and produces paperwork to inform the Electoral Synod in its deliberations. Experience suggests that electors sometimes arrive at the Synod having failed to read this paperwork.
- This last point increases the likelihood that the subsequent election will be a 'beauty contest' decided on the basis of how well an individual 'performs' on the day rather than on a whole range of other factors which placed them on the short-list in the first place. (Equally, there is evidence to suggest that some voters have already decided who to vote for before they even hear what the candidates have to say.)
- The voting procedures laid down in the Canon itself seem to press too quickly for a decision. Might it be possible, in the event of stalemate, to allow a vote of both houses together?
- Is a process which depends on a large group of people, many of whom have no experience of the discernment of vocation in others or, for that matter, of

making significant appointments in their secular lives really the best way of choosing our bishops in this day and age?

- If the election falls ultimately to the College of Bishops, do members of that College know enough about the context and aspirations of the vacant diocese to make an informed decision?
- Would it not be helpful for all concerned, that once the College has reached a mind, their nominee be presented to the Electoral Synod for a confirmatory vote?

8. Two Options

The Review Group offers two options which we believe address these objections – but in quite different ways. The options are offered in outline only. Following this consultation, a detailed proposal will be offered for full and formal scrutiny by General Synod.

9. Option One – Electoral Synod

The first would offer a significant revision of the present Canon but would retain the Electoral Synod as the key decision-making body.

10. The revised Canon would take account of the objections noted above. In particular, we would want to see the election as one process, activated by one mandate and followed to a conclusion over three possible stages. There would be few timetabling specifics and discretion allowed at each point. At the initial meeting of the Electoral Synod all members of the Preparatory Committee should be expected to be present as well as, ideally, the whole College of Bishops. Training in spiritual discernment and employment good practice should be provided for all involved.

11. As at present, the process would require a Preparatory Committee to produce short-lists, it will provide for up to two full meetings of the Electoral Synod and an election by the College of Bishops as a final resort. The timetable, which could be approved by the Electoral Synod at its preliminary meeting, might set out dates for meetings of the Preparatory Committee, Electoral Synod and College of Bishops (should the latter be required to convene as an electoral body).

12. The deadline for membership of the Electoral Synod should depend on the date of the mandate rather than the previous Diocesan Synod. We would also propose to offer greater flexibility in the voting procedures. We shall seek General Synod's guidance on the size of the shortlist to be presented to the electors and on the question of whether this shortlist should be made public.

13. In favour of this option: This option retains the longstanding tradition in our church that in the first instance the diocese itself elects its bishop. This has long been a central part of our polity and is respected in other Provinces. It is deeply empowering to those bishops elected in this way to know that they have the support of the majority of the clergy and laity of their diocese.

14. Against this option: This option depends on every member of the Electoral Synod understanding the process they are part of and being willing to prepare themselves properly for the decisions they will be called to make. Experience suggests that the

present process may sometimes fall down on this point. With a larger number of electors, confidentiality around names and process may be more difficult to maintain.

15. Option Two – Electoral Council

The second option would be to replace the Electoral Synod with an Electoral Council.

16. The Council would be a much smaller body than the Electoral Synod but somewhat larger than the present Preparatory Committee. (We shall seek your views on the appropriate size of the Council.) The Province would be represented through members elected by each diocese and through two representatives from the College of Bishops (one of whom would usually be the Primus). Diocesan representatives would be elected by the Diocesan Synod at a specially convened meeting soon after the mandate for the election is issued. We would suggest that membership should be split 60%-40% in favour of the Diocese and, as far as possible, be divided equally between clergy and laity. This electoral process and the subsequent work of the Council would normally be overseen by the Primus. Training in spiritual discernment and employment good practice should be undertaken by all members of the Council.

17. As with the Preparatory Committee in the present Canon, we would expect Council members to familiarise themselves thoroughly with the life and mission of the diocese not least through a Diocesan Profile provided by the diocese. The Council should be free to determine the details of its appointment process but it would be required to seek nominations and applications and, through a prayerful process of interviews and consultation, to elect the new bishop. This whole process would remain confidential and only the elected candidate's name would be announced.

18. In favour of this option: Whilst retaining direct diocesan involvement in the process, the task will be undertaken by a group of people chosen on the basis of their gifts and experience and who are willing to offer considerable time to the responsibilities entrusted to them. The smaller number involved means that confidentiality should be more easily maintained. The resulting process, though robust, would be far kinder to the candidates.

19. Against this option: This option departs from the long-established practice that each diocese, every charge represented, elects its bishop. There may be a feeling of disenfranchisement and therefore a lack of 'buy in' amongst those not elected to the Council who may fear that their tradition or point of view will not be given proper weight.

20. Consultation with General Synod and the Wider Church

The Review Group believes that both the above options have merits and before offering a draft Canon for first reading we seek to assess the mind of our church. The importance of this question should not be underestimated. The Episcopal Church that emerged from the eighteenth century was a church in which the clergy and people of each diocese elected their own bishop. The first option more clearly reflects this position; the second would introduce a significantly new approach for the SEC – although variants on this model already exist in other parts of the Anglican Communion. Do either of these options command wide support?

21. We offer this consultation to encourage a full and wide debate on this question in Synods and Vestries as well as amongst individuals. Once a Canon is offered for first

reading it will be subjected to a formal round of scrutiny at Provincial and Diocesan level. As you will see, the feedback paper seeks your input both about your preferred option and on one or two consequent matters.

22. Once we have this feedback we can move to the detailed working-out of whichever option finds favour and, with the help of the Canons Committee and the consent of the Faith & Order Board, bring a Canon for first reading in 2022.

23. One Final Point

We propose that whatever the preferred option the Canon should be accompanied by a commentary and guidelines (authorised under a resolution of the Canon) which establish principles for good process and care of all involved. Having listened carefully to those who have experienced the present Canon we have done some preliminary work on these guidelines. We offer a brief example of commentary and guidelines as an appendix to this paper. The final and full draft of this document will, of course, depend on the preferred option for revision of Canon 4.

05/10/20

Canon 4 Review Group

Rt Rev Dr John Armes

Dr Martin Auld

Very Rev Fay Lamont

Rt Rev Ian Paton

Mr Graham Robertson

Prof Alan Werritty

SAFEGUARDING AUDIT IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS REPORT FOR GENERAL SYNOD 2020

1. Introduction

1.1 At its meeting in June 2019, the General Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church received the Provincial Safeguarding Committee's Report on the Safeguarding Audit which had been conducted over the latter part of 2018 and the early months of 2019. Synod was advised that, following the acceptance of the Report's conclusions and recommendations by the Church's College of Bishops and the Provincial Standing Committee, an Implementation Group would be set up to implement the Report's recommendations.

1.2 Under the auspices of the Provincial Standing Committee and the Provincial Safeguarding Committee, an Implementation Group was established under the chairpersonship of David Strang, retired chief constable and HM Inspector of Prisons in Scotland. Comprising representation from bishops, clergy and laity and supported by the Provincial Safeguarding Team, the Safeguarding Audit Implementation Group, SAIG, first met on 28th August 2019 at the General Synod Office.

1.3 Since its first meeting, the SAIG has held five meetings in Edinburgh and Dundee and its meetings in April, May and August 2020, were held utilising the Zoom electronic meeting facility. Notwithstanding the restrictions caused by the Coronavirus pandemic, the Group has continued to work on the recommendations from the Audit and this Report is intended to advise Synod on how this work is progressing.

2. Recommendations

2.1 Synod will recall that the recommendations from the Audit focused on six specific areas of safeguarding:

- Leadership and governance of safeguarding in the SEC;
- Safeguarding policy, procedures and guidance in the SEC;
- Safeguarding training;
- The role and functions of diocesan and church safeguarding officers in the SEC;
- A system for advising individual churches across the Province on specific areas of risk and the provision of appropriate and relevant support from diocesan and provincial safeguarding officers;
- The level and accessibility of support in safeguarding for rural dioceses and churches.

3. Progress

3.1 To date, the most significant progress has been the development of a new safeguarding policy to replace the Child Protection Policy Statement and Guidelines (1998) and the Vulnerable Adults Policy Statement and Guidelines (2006). Based on the five commitments of the Anglican Communion's Safe Church Charter, which Synod adopted in 2016, the Scottish Episcopal Church Safeguarding Policy Principles and Commitments has been approved by Standing Committee following a process of consultation with Provincial Boards and Committees. SAIG is grateful for feedback received from the Provincial Safeguarding Committee, Mission Board, Administration Board and the Committee on Canons. The updated policy will be presented to Synod at its virtual meeting in December for approval and adoption under the Schedule to Canon 65. As with the previous policies, there will be a motion requiring vestries to adopt the new policy.

3.2 The Safeguarding Policy Principles and Commitments comprises the five commitments of the Safe Church Charter:

- Safeguarding culture;
- Suitability for ministry and positions of trust;
- The practice of ministry;
- Effective responses to abuse; and
- Support where there has been abuse.

3.3 Subject to the approval of General Synod, the new policy will lead to the progressing of a range of work directly associated with and implementing a number of the Audit's recommendations. The updated policy moves away from the existing policies specifically focusing on protecting children and vulnerable adults towards a broader policy encompassing safeguarding more generally, which is in keeping with the general development of safeguarding in society more widely and in all churches and faith groups more specifically. This leads to the review and updating of the range of procedures and guidance required to develop and support these particular strands and work has already started on this.

3.4 In October 2019 the Assistant Provincial Safeguarding Officer became a member of the Anglican Communion Safe Church Commission which issued *Guidelines to enhance the safety of all persons especially children, young people and vulnerable adults within the provinces of the Anglican Communion* in May 2019. In due course, General Synod will also be asked to adopt the Safe Church Commission's Guidelines (ACC resolution C17:01).

3.5 The Safe Church Commission is developing generic safeguarding training for use across the Anglican Communion and this will inform the development of training programmes in the SEC. In the meantime, safeguarding training delivered across the Province will focus on the updated safeguarding policy and safeguarding advice and guidance to support this.

3.6 Work on the other recommendations from the Audit is progressing but, with the Provincial Officers having only limited capacity, both are part-time in their roles, the updating of existing safeguarding procedures and guidance and the development of new procedures where required is slow. This has not been helped by the restrictions because of the Coronavirus pandemic.

3.7 During the discussions of the Implementation Group, it was clear that progress on the remaining recommendations required a more detailed discussion on issues impacting on effective safeguarding in the SEC. This is particularly relevant given the potential overlap of the current work of the PSC, the SAIG and the Canonical Review Group and to ensure a more joined-up approach to safeguarding. It has thus been agreed jointly by the Provincial Safeguarding Committee and the Safeguarding Audit Implementation Group to establish a short life working group (SLWG) to consider the wider cultural and structural issues associated with safeguarding in the SEC.

3.8 This will include systemic and organisational issues, safeguarding roles at church, diocese and provincial level and the barriers to effective safeguarding in the Church. It is anticipated that the SLWG will be able to suggest potential solutions to improve and raise awareness of safeguarding across the SEC and bring forward a proposal for the Provincial Safeguarding Committee on the relevant issues and recommended solutions. This will be presented to the College of Bishops and the Provincial Standing Committee once this work has been completed.

3.9 Once the SLWG has concluded its work, it is anticipated that the remaining recommendations can be addressed and implemented successfully.

4. Conclusion

4.1 General Synod is asked to note the progress being made in implementing the Safeguarding Audit's recommendations.

**David Strang,
Chair, Safeguarding Audit Implementation Group**

22nd October 2020

SAFEGUARDING POLICY AND PRINCIPLES

Safeguarding Principles and Commitments replaces the existing two policy statements on child protection (1998) and vulnerable adults (2006). It has formed a major part of the first stage of the work of the Safeguarding Audit Implementation Group (SAIG). In drafting the policy, the SAIG acknowledges significant input from the Provincial Safeguarding Committee, and feedback from consultation with relevant Boards and Committees.

Safeguarding Principles and Commitments is based on the five commitments of the Anglican Communion Safe Church Charter which was adopted by General Synod in 2016. The Charter commitments were the benchmark against which the Provincial Safeguarding Committee assessed the implementation of safeguarding practice in the SEC and reported to the Safe Church Commission in 2018. A report on safeguarding in the provinces of the Anglican Communion was presented at ACC17 in 2019 by the Safe Church Commission. The Safe Church Commission's *Guidelines to enhance the safety of all persons especially children, young people and vulnerable adults within the provinces of the Anglican Communion* was the subject of a resolution at ACC17. Resolution C17:01 included a request to all provinces to report to ACC18 on the steps taken to implement the Guidelines. The Provincial Safeguarding Committee will commence work on this in 2021. The Guidelines may be downloaded at:

<https://www.anglicancommunion.org/media/349360/ACSCC-Guidelines-2019-English.pdf>

Resolution C17:01 also requested that each province appoint *a representative with the responsibility of liaising with the Commission regarding the adoption of the Charter, implementation of the Protocol and the Guidelines, and the development of recommendations for the enhancement of the safety of children, young people and vulnerable adults in the Anglican Communion.* The Revd Canon Marion Chatterley has been appointed as the SEC's provincial representative, and Daphne Audsley is a member of the Safe Church Commission.

Richard Baker
Convener Provincial Safeguarding Committee

David Strang
Chair Safeguarding Audit Implementation Group

SAFEGUARDING POLICY AND PRINCIPLES

SEC Safeguarding Policy

Principles and Commitments

The witness of Scripture recognises and affirms God's love for all members of the human family and the priority given in Jesus' ministry to children and the vulnerable of society. His ministry was one of welcome for all. To be free to worship and participate in the life of the Church, people need to feel safe and included. Good safeguarding practice helps to ensure that everyone is welcome in a church community. Good safeguarding practice is part of how we value people, and treat them with respect.

Clergy and church workers, both paid and volunteers, undertake ministry in the church in a variety of forms including the provision of spiritual advice and support, counselling, assistance in times of need, education and activities for children and young people, and these take place in a variety of situations within a church community. In their ministry relationships clergy and church workers must act in the best interests of those to whom they minister, always recognising that anyone may be vulnerable.

The five commitments in this policy are based on the Anglican Communion Safe Church Charter which was adopted by General Synod in 2016. Each is followed by a statement of the safeguarding principles that underly the commitment.

Full details of safeguarding governance structures, practice and procedure are contained in Canons 65 and 54 and in a range of guidance and practice notes available from the General Synod Office and the SEC website. The Provincial Officers and Provincial Safeguarding Committee are responsible for overseeing and updating guidance and practice notes in line with current best practice. A schedule of safeguarding terminology and definitions is appended to this policy.

In seeking to make the Scottish Episcopal Church a safer place for all people, we make the following commitments:

Culture of safety

- 1. We will promote a culture of safety in our congregations and church organisations and communities by education and training to help clergy, other church workers and participants prevent the occurrence of harm and abuse.**

The church bears witness to the gospel message of salvation by its teaching and its life as a community. Church communities seek to be like the kingdom of God, but humanity is imperfect, and people harm one another, both intentionally and unintentionally. Only in heaven will God's people be completely free and safe from harm. On Earth we need safeguards to enable the church to become more like the kingdom of God.

There are many forms of abuse, but abuse is always wrong. The harm caused by abuse can be deeply destructive and have lifelong effects. People in the church must work together to prevent abuse, seek justice when it has occurred, and care for those affected by abuse.

It is the responsibility of all who are called to positions of authority and leadership in the church to promote and exercise good safeguarding practice. In Acts 20: 28-30 Paul speaks to the elders of the church at Ephesus of their responsibilities, recognising the difficulties that lay ahead for them:

Keep watch over yourselves and over all the flock, of which the Holy Spirit has made you overseers, to shepherd the church of God that he obtained with the blood of his own Son. I know that after I have gone, savage wolves will come in among you, not sparing the flock. Some even from your own group will come distorting the truth in order to entice the disciples to follow them.

This passage speaks to the church today of the need always to be alert, and of the harm and distress caused by those who have perpetrated abuse in the church, and of those who have concealed abuse or minimised the effects of abuse.

People who are known or suspected abusers may seek to participate in the life of a church community. They include those charged with or convicted of criminal offences involving sexual abuse. While ministry to them is encouraged, this should not compromise the safety of others, especially children, young people and vulnerable adults. Those who pose a risk to vulnerable people should not be permitted to participate in a leadership role.

Creating and maintaining a culture of safety in the church requires the involvement of all who participate in the life of church communities, not just clergy and church workers. Training to understand and prevent the occurrence of abuse should be part of the formation and ongoing development of clergy. Church workers should receive safeguarding training relevant to their area of responsibility in the church's ministry. Those charged with church governance should receive training in their responsibilities for implementing safeguarding policy. All participants in church communities should receive teaching to help them understand the principles of safeguarding and its importance to a Christian way of life.

Creating and maintaining a culture of safety in the church requires more than the adoption of rules and policies. These need to be effectively implemented, and their implementation monitored. The Anglican Communion's Safe Church Commission *Guidelines to enhance the safety of all persons especially children, young people and vulnerable adults within the provinces of the Anglican Communion* is based on the Safe Church Charter, and the guidelines are adopted as benchmark against which to assess implementation of the Scottish Episcopal Church's safeguarding policy on an ongoing basis.

Suitability for ministry and positions of trust

- 2. We will have and implement policies and procedures to assess the suitability of persons for ordination and clergy appointments, and lay appointments to positions of responsibility and trust in the church including checking their background.**

Safer recruitment practice is an important means to prevent abuse in the church, as past conduct is an indicator of behaviour in both the present and the future. Assessment of clergy and church workers' suitability for ministry should include background checking. The purpose of background checking is to identify any information which indicates that the person may pose a risk to the safety of others.

Background checking involves a criminal record check where permitted or required by Government legislation. Clergy background checks require bishops to disclose ministry suitability information.

In assessing suitability for training for ministry and ordination, discernment processes should include background checking.

Safer recruitment practice for lay appointments, both paid and voluntary, should include publicising the paid position or voluntary role, interviewing candidates and taking up references.

Information from background checking is taken into account in assessing whether the person is suitable to undertake a ministry role in the church.

Practice of ministry

- 3. We will adopt and promote by education and training standards for the practice of ministry by clergy and other church workers, whether employees or volunteers, who share in specific areas of the church's ministry.**

There is an intrinsic imbalance of power in a ministry relationship between clergy and other church workers and those to whom they minister. This arises because they have spiritual authority over others, specialised knowledge and expertise, or access to the leaders and resources of the church. It is always the responsibility of the clergy and church workers to maintain appropriate boundaries in their ministry relationships.

Clear standards for the practice of ministry should be understood and adopted by all clergy. Other church workers should be provided with a job description that sets out the responsibilities for their particular role in the church's ministry. Training on standards of behaviour helps clergy and church workers to maintain appropriate boundaries in their ministry relationships. Mentoring, supervision, peer support and ministry review are effective ways of promoting good safeguarding practice.

Effective responses to abuse

- 4. We will have and implement policies and procedures to respond properly to allegations of abuse against clergy and other church workers that include:**
 - 1. making known the procedure for making complaints;**
 - 2. arranging care and advice for any person making a complaint of abuse;**
 - 3. the impartial determination of allegations of abuse against clergy and other church workers, and assessment of their suitability for future ministry;**
 - 4. providing support for affected congregations and church organisations.**

Transparency and openness, accountability and justice are guiding principles in responding to abuse.

Clergy and church workers have power and authority by virtue of their role in ministry and are therefore in a position of trust. Some may be unaware of their power and unconsciously exercise it in abusive ways to achieve their own desires. Others intentionally use their power to overcome the resistance of their victims. Clergy and church workers who misuse their power and authority by abusing others have betrayed the trust conferred on them and should be held accountable for their conduct.

The church has a duty to take allegations of abuse seriously, and not to minimise or cover up allegations to protect the church's reputation. Concealment of abuse is an abuse of power and is a failure to act with justice and integrity. Survivors of abuse are further harmed when the church fails to act upon their complaints.

Support where there is abuse

5. We will provide support for the abused, their families, and affected congregations and church organisations and communities by:

- 1. listening with patience and compassion to their experiences and concerns;**
- 2. offering spiritual assistance and other forms of care.**

Abuse is behaviour which causes harm to another person or is undertaken with the intention of causing harm to another person, or which may place another person at the risk of harm. Types of abuse include, but are not limited to, bullying, concealment of abuse, cyber abuse, emotional abuse, financial abuse, gender-based violence, harassment, neglect, physical abuse, racial abuse, sexual abuse and spiritual abuse.

When abuse occurs more than one form of abuse can be involved. In the church, other forms of abuse can be accompanied by spiritual abuse. Perpetrators of abuse sometimes silence their victims by misusing their spiritual authority, such as by saying that compliance with the abuse is God's will or threatening exclusion from the church if the abuse is disclosed.

Abuse often occurs and continues unimpeded because of the unequal power relationship between the abuser and their victim. People will be afraid to disclose abuse where there is a culture of silence in the community and the church. When people disclose alleged abuse, the Church should listen without judgement, respond with compassion and maintain confidentiality, therefore church leaders and members should not make comments or express opinions on such allegations.

A variety of social and cultural factors can contribute to a person's vulnerability to abuse, such as the poverty, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender, and physical or intellectual disability of the victim. Other circumstances in which a person may be vulnerable include bereavement, relationship breakdown, loss of employment and other life changing events.

People who have suffered abuse must never be pressured to forgive their abuser. Further harm can be caused through pressure to forgive. They may condemn themselves and believe they are condemned by others if they are not willing or able to forgive. They may see themselves as 'not being Christian', and beyond the forgiveness of God.

Abuse does not only affect the person who has suffered abuse. Secondary victims include families both of the victim and the alleged abuser, friends and church communities. The way in which the church cares for victims must be centred on the individual's needs. Some situations will require specialist support from outside the church.

Those who provide care to primary and secondary victims of abuse should receive relevant training. They also require support in their ministry. It is often not realised that caring for victims can be emotionally and spiritually draining, especially where care is provided for a long period of time. Support of those providing care helps to sustain them in this ministry.

If the principles outlined in these policy commitments are followed, the Scottish Episcopal Church will be a place of enhanced safety for everyone, where:

- **clergy and church workers act with integrity**
- **victims of abuse receive justice**
- **clergy and church workers who commit abuse are held accountable**
- **church leaders do not conceal abuse**

STANDING COMMITTEE

Ethical Investment

At General Synod 2019, the provincial Investment Committee brought forward a motion to update the Ethical Investment Policy applicable to the Unit Trust Pool to reflect the use of pooled funds. The motion proposed to Synod read as follows:

“That

- *the Ethical Investment Policy be updated to reflect the use of pooled funds whilst respecting the need to subject investments to ethical screening and reporting;*
- *pending agreement of a revised Ethical Investment Policy the Investment Committee be permitted to transfer all or part of the current segregated ethically screened fund to appropriate pooled funds subject to Standing Committee’s approval of the policies of any proposed pooled funds.”*

Immediately prior to the commencement of Synod, an alternative motion was received under Rule 10 of the Synod’s Rules of Order. That alternative motion read as follows:

“That:

- *The Ethical Investment Policy be updated to reflect the moral imperative to divest fully from fossil fuels and to extend the list of restricted categories for direct investments and pooled funds;*
- *Pending agreement of a revised Ethical Investment Policy, the current Ethical Investment Policy be retained; and*
- *There be formed an Ethical Investment Advisory Group to develop a strategy to enable the SEC to completely disinvest from unethical sources of revenue.”*

After debate, Synod opted not to adopt the Investment Committee motion and instead approved the motion brought under Rule 10.

Following the meeting of Synod, the Standing Committee gave significant time to considering the implications of the motion which had been passed. Discussions took place with the proposer of the motion and with members of the Investment Committee. Standing Committee arranged for investment consultants from Mercer (who also advise the Pension Fund Trustees) to lead an informative and thought provoking seminar at General Synod Office in December 2019 to which a wide range of individuals were invited, and which looked at various approaches to the subject of ethical investment. Standing Committee also proceeded to create the Ethical Investment Advisory Group (EIAG) requested by the motion. There follows in the Synod Papers the Interim Report produced by the EIAG which details both the remit and membership of the Group.

The Interim Report was discussed by Standing Committee at a meeting in September 2020. The Committee expresses its grateful thanks to Alan McLean QC, the Chair of the EIAG, and its members, for producing such a thorough and thoughtful report and

which recognises the complexities of the issues which arise when considering questions of divestment and ethical investment.

Amongst other things, the report outlines the EIAG's discussion of the issue of divestment from fossil fuels. Without repeating at length in this paper the details of that discussion, the Standing Committee noted the clarification sought from Baillie Gifford, the Unit Trust Pool Fund Manager, on the extent of direct, individual investment held in the UTP in companies that generate more than 10% of their turnover from extracting fossil fuels from the ground. They reported that as at 31 December 2019 the value in the UTP so directly invested was £92,715.72, being a holding in Total, a fossil fuel extraction company. That represented 0.35% of the directly-invested funds in the UTP, under the relevant Baillie Gifford strategy. Standing Committee was pleased to note that the investment in Total is no longer held and that the UTP therefore has no direct investments in companies engaged in fossil fuel extraction. Baillie Gifford have been instructed that no further direct investment by the UTP should be made in such companies in future.

Standing Committee commends the report to Synod for the latter's consideration. As will be apparent from the report, the work of the EIAG is as yet far from completed. To help it shape its ongoing work the EIAG would welcome comment from Synod members on the report and its work to date.

Robert Gordon
Convener, Standing Committee
October 2020

INTERIM REPORT OF THE ETHICAL INVESTMENT ADVISORY GROUP

Executive Summary

The interim report summarises the work undertaken by the Ethical Investment Advisory Group (EIAG) in its first year. It sets out progress to date and identifies where further work is needed.

Since its first meeting in February 2020, EIAG has progressed work in all four areas of its initial remit:

- **Review the current range of thinking on the ethics of investment (section 3).** EIAG identifies both basic principles and the complexity of ethical investment. EIAG suggests the need to develop for the SEC a wider ethical policy than ethical exclusions alone, which involves seeking ethically positive investments, engaging with companies and fund managers where possible, and divestment where deemed necessary.

- **Define ‘divestment from fossil fuels’ for the purposes of the UTP (section 7).**

The SEC Unit Trust Pool is a fund in which investments (whether direct or pooled) for many parts of the SEC are managed so as to generate a reliable return to fund various aspects of the SEC’s regular work. EIAG recommends that the immediate focus should be on the exclusion from the UTP of companies involved in the extraction of fossil fuels, but that industries that are users of fossil fuels, particularly in relation to burning of fuels, should form part of the ongoing discussion.

- **Make recommendations on the use of pooled funds for the UTP (section 8).** EIAG concludes that the use of pooled funds for a relatively small fund such as the UTP is a pragmatic solution that addresses a number of investment criteria and administrative issues. EIAG identifies the need for a practical framework for making decisions about which pooled funds to invest in. These include how to determine whether a specific pooled fund is a suitable investment, and how ethical concerns about individual holdings in pooled funds will be addressed in future.

- **Propose a timescale for implementation of changes to the UTP (section 9).** During the course of the year the direct holding in the oil and gas company Total was sold, and direct investment in all fossil fuel extractive companies added to the list of exclusions. However, this exclusion does not apply to pooled funds. Having agreed to recommend the use of pooled funds in the UTP, EIAG accepts that it would not be possible to set a timescale for changes to pooled funds held in the UTP until the proposed framework on the use of pooled funds is in place.

In considering options that could be appropriate for the UTP, EIAG reviewed how other UK churches and charities have approached fossil fuel divestment, and how they have achieved or are working towards their goals (Appendix). It notes the SEC’s high level of dependence on the UTP as a source of income, and the relatively small size of the UTP compared with funds held by other organisations (section 5 and

Appendix). These factors may limit SEC's investment options. EIAG has also reviewed the current range of ethical pooled funds that might be suitable investment vehicles for the UTP (section 8(d)). EIAG acknowledges that the ethical investment environment is evolving rapidly, and that there have been new developments since the research for this report was carried out in the Spring of 2020.

This report aims to demonstrate EIAG's commitment to achieving fossil fuel divestment in the UTP. It is seeking a practical solution that takes into account ethical imperatives and investment criteria.

1. The Ethical Investment Advisory Group

Following a debate at General Synod in June 2019 and the passing of the rule 10 motion requiring this to be done, Standing Committee of the Scottish Episcopal Church (“SEC”) has established an Ethical Investment Advisory Group (“the EIAG”). The EIAG has the following membership:

Alan McLean QC, Chair

Gordon Arthur, Member, Investment Committee

Dr Donald Bruce, Member, the Church in Society Committee

The Revd Amanda Fairclough, Priest in Charge, West Highland Region; Member, Investment Committee, Personnel Committee and Administration Board

The Revd Diana Hall, Rector of St Anne’s, Dunbar

Andrew Hunter, Member, Investment Committee

The Rt Revd Andrew Swift, Bishop of Brechin

Simeon Wilton, formerly Intern, St Paul’s & St George’s Church, Edinburgh

The Revd Jenny Wright, Associate Priest, Christ Church Morningside; Convener of the Church in Society Committee

Administrative support has been provided by the SEC General Synod Office, particularly in creating the Appendix to this report, and is gratefully acknowledged by the EIAG.

2. Remit of the EIAG

The initial remit of the EIAG, set by Standing Committee, is as follows:

To make proposals for the revision of the ethical investment policy for the SEC’s Unit Trust Pool (“the UTP”) and to produce an interim report in time for General Synod 2020 (“GS 2020”), to include:

- a stand-alone paper setting out the current range of thinking on the ethics of investment for inclusion in the papers for GS 2020;
- proposals for a definition of ‘divestment from fossil fuels’ for the purposes of the UTP;
- recommendations on the use of pooled funds in the UTP; and
- a proposed timescale for the implementation of changes to the UTP.

This paper, with its Appendix (which is the “stand-alone paper” mentioned at the first bullet point above), constitutes the EIAG’s interim report to GS 2020.

Following GS 2020, the EIAG is to proceed to provide:

- proposals for a definition of ‘unethical sources of revenue’ for the purposes of the UTP; and
- recommendations on a framework for considering and implementing other investment criteria to include any proposals for future investment restrictions and impact investment.

The remit of the EIAG notes the complex issues involved in these matters and obliges the EIAG to take account of the following:

- the wide range of views held by those having an interest in the UTP, including boards, committees and individual members of the SEC on how to respond to climate change;
- the implications for the SEC of increasing the current investment restrictions, including costs, investment risk, volatility of income and their potential impact on the work of the SEC; and
- the ongoing work of shareholder engagement by the Church Investors Group (CIG), the Institutional Investors Group on Climate Change (IIGCC) and other denominations.

The EIAG remit does not cover:

- The SEC Pension Fund. This is the responsibility of the Pension Fund Trustees.
- Investments managed by other fund managers on behalf of congregations and dioceses.
- The selection of fund manager or funds for the UTP. UTP investment strategy remains the responsibility of the Investment Committee.

3. Context – What does Ethical Investment mean?

The investment world is seeing an ever-increasing emphasis on the need to make financial investments not simply to maximise returns, but also with a strong commitment to ethical values. A 2020 Morningstar survey found that sustainable funds were performing at least as well and often better than traditional funds.^{1 2} The awareness of the responsibility on investors to ‘do good’ and not harm with the monies they invest has become mainstream, and the churches have been playing a significant role. Increasing scrutiny is being given to companies over their ESG performance (Environmental, Social and Governance). ESG encompasses a wide range of ethical social and environmental issues including human rights, labour conditions, modern slavery and gambling.

But the most prominent catalyst in this sea change is climate change. There is a belated recognition that the urgent global need to reduce radically the extraction and use of fossil fuels has immense implications. Many investors and investment fund managers are asking searching questions about companies’ performance against indices which measure responsiveness (or otherwise) to the climate crisis. It has also led to calls on major investors and organisations to withdraw investments altogether in companies engaged in fossil fuel extraction. In 2019, Synod passed a motion that the SEC should “update its ethical investment policy to reflect the moral imperative to divest from fossil fuels ...” and “to form an Ethical Investment Advisory Group to develop a strategy to enable divestment.”

¹ <https://www.theguardian.com/money/2020/jun/13/ethical-investments-are-outperforming-traditional-funds>

² <https://www.morningstar.co.uk/uk/news/202274/investors-back-esg-in-the-crisis.aspx>

Ethical Basis for Investment

Before one considers the practicalities of the SEC's investments, one needs to establish what is the basis of *ethical* investment and what are its implications in practice? Over the years, people have donated money to the SEC in the service of God, and the church carries the responsibility for the good stewardship of the money entrusted to it. This involves three foundational ethical principles of investment, which can be expressed as:

- a) The responsibility of prudent use of the money entrusted to the church, in wise and effective investments, in the context of the economic situation prevailing at the time.³
- b) The responsibility to make investments directly or indirectly in companies whose activities are not inconsistent with the church's spiritual and moral values under God, reflecting the most pressing needs of the times, and not to invest in those whose activities are contrary to those values.
- c) The responsibility arising from the dependence of the missional work of the SEC upon the annual returns made from the investments for the work of the church, the staff it employs and the voluntary efforts of time, energy and talents of the wider church membership.

Taken together these three ethical principles form a basis for an ethical investment policy. It is clear that the second principle is meaningless unless it takes priority over the other two, in the event of a dilemma over a financially prudent and remunerative investment which does not line up with the church's ethical values. But this also raises a question of what then *are* the church's values, and how are these to be expressed in the context of investment choices.

Ethical Exclusions are not the full answer

The main response of churches has been that of making 'ethical exclusions' (see the Appendix). These are a list of specific activities, where a church has decided not to invest in a company whose main business is in these activities. In the case of SEC, these have been in armaments, gambling, pornography and tobacco, to which the 2017 Synod added the extraction of thermal coal or tar sands (see, in more detail, para 4(d) below). The advantage of this approach is that it should give those responsible for making the investments a wide degree of freedom to look for the best sustainable returns in the market place, provided care is taken to exclude investing in the specified activities. In practice, however, this approach to ethical investment runs into several significant problems:

1. In relation to a few activities like producing tobacco, it is fairly clear which companies should be avoided, but in many cases it is more complicated. A company may have some activities which the church would object to and also ones it would not wish to exclude as such. For example, should SEC's exclusions apply to all entertainment companies with *any* involvement in

³ [This refers to the *ethical* principle behind the *legal* responsibility of 'fiduciary duty'.]

gambling? The current approach applies a numerical limit relative to a company's business, typically if 15% of its turnover is in excluded activities. In ethical terms, is this a reasonable response to the complexities of the real world, or is it an unethical compromise on what is a point of principle? Again, should we invest in a company which has now become a major promoter of renewable energies, while its core business remains in oil and gas extraction?

2. The notion of excluding certain activities from its investments assumes that the church is in a position to select directly the companies it invests in, and to monitor their activities as time goes by. If a small church like SEC considers that it cannot afford to do this (as more fully explored below), it must delegate the task to a third party fund manager, in which circumstances it may be much more difficult to insist on ethical exclusions.
3. Roughly two-thirds of SEC's investments are in pooled funds (see further section 4 below). Within a given pooled fund, SEC is one partner amongst many and cannot make exclusive demands that the fund avoid certain categories of investment. Thus, to the extent that the church uses pooled funds, the ethical exclusions become correspondingly inoperable, unless pooled funds can be found with filters that match the church's ethical exclusions. This is limited to the funds available in the market place at the time or to those offered by the current fund manager.
4. Ethical exclusion is a negative screen, not a positive filter. It does nothing to guide investors in doing good with the money, only not to do harm. *De facto* a negative screen makes the assumption that all other activities than the listed ones are equally good from an ethical standpoint and that their financial opportunity is the overriding value. This is ethically questionable.

Towards a wider Ethical Investment Strategy

This is not to say that ethical exclusions are a wrong approach, but to point out their limitations and that an ethical investment policy ideally needs to encompass much more than merely determining what to exclude. This is not a new question. The joint report to the 2013 Synod declared that “ ‘ethical considerations’ must encompass much wider considerations [than exclusions]. Even a cursory reading of the Old Testament prophets show God's concern for the poor and his condemnation of dishonest and exploitative business practices. An investment policy reflecting a determination to live out a Christian ethic requires a broader application of ‘ethical’ considerations than a mere repudiation of certain investee companies.”⁴ We suggest an ethical investment strategy should ideally encompass also the following factors:

The first consideration is **positive investment**. The second of the basic ethical principles requires that an ethical investment policy should be a positive reflection of the values of the church, rather than a ‘free-for-all with exclusions’. However, a wish list of ‘good things we would like to do with our money’ may not be realised in companies and funds with reliable and good returns. But SEC can draw upon the

⁴ Church in Society Committee and Investment Committee report to General Synod 2013 “Ethical Investment and Ethical Banking”

experience and expertise of other churches and charities who have asked similar questions, through its membership of the CIG. It is suggested that SEC enters into ongoing discussion with relevant churches and religious charities on what they have been able to do in positive investment.

The second factor is to use our **influence by engagement**. The report to Synod of 2017 pointed out the potential of using our power as an investor to influence positively the activities of an organisation which we invest in. In ethical terms, this is to declare our ethical credentials not in standing morally apart, but in seeking to make improvements in a very imperfect real world, recognising that one is likely to 'get one's hands dirty' in the process.

SEC should ideally be in a position to scrutinise the performance of companies we invest in, and if we have avenues and people able to do so, engage with them. The services of SEC's fund manager include scrutiny and insight of companies' performances. In engagement, SEC is in a position to draw on its membership of the CIG, which brings together the investors of all main UK churches and many Christian charities. The combined influence of many churches can be very effective. Methods include writing letters to companies, having meetings with senior executives, and filing shareholder resolutions, in all of which SEC can be a signatory, if it holds (preferably direct) investments in the company concerned.

For a relatively small church like SEC, it is arguably more important to seek to **influence the investment managers** to offer funds and to operate policies within them that meet our ethical values, and more broadly to promote and improve their ethical strategies. SEC should make a priority of taking advantage of the new opportunities in the investment market arising in response to the increasing demand for ethical investment and ESG factors.

Notwithstanding positive investment and engagement, **divestment** can also have a role in an ethical policy, in two ways. Divestment may be done as a matter of effectiveness. The argument for retaining an investment primarily in order to engage holds good only in so far as the church has a reasonable prospect of effective engagement. If its realistic ability to influence were small, and there were no prospects of collaborative initiatives, and there was no prospect that a company would change an objectionable policy, divestment would be the more ethical response. The Church of England indicated to certain companies with whom it had engaged that if there were not a marked improvement in their carbon reduction performance, they would divest.

Divestment may, alternatively, be done on a matter of principle. Even if it excludes the possibility of engagement with the companies concerned, the church may consider that a point of principle takes priority. The question is not effectiveness for change but being true to our values as a church. Which values are key and how these are expressed will vary with the situation. For example, this might be on a particular principle, or a matter of virtue ethics - what a wise and compassionate church would do in the relevant situation. For example, to hold investments in a company promoting tobacco would be to be complicit in the production and sale of an addictive and poisonous substance causing death and widespread damage to people's health and their families. The exclusion by the 2017 Synod of extraction of

thermal coal and tar sands applies the analogous principle towards companies actively promoting the extraction and use of primary causes of damaging climate change.

Fossil fuel company investments

The 2017 and earlier reports to Synod have laid down the moral imperative on all people and organisations to change their ways in order to limit the effects of climate change, which we and previous generations have set in train, and to limit future global warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius. This is the ethical foundation of the 2019 Synod resolution on the “moral imperative to divest from fossil fuels”. But we need to clarify what is meant by the resolution. Put simply, one cannot divest from the raw chemicals, but from companies - but what sort of companies, engaged in what sort of activities?

In 2020, the SEC’s last direct investment in a fossil fuel extraction company has been disposed of (see section 7 below), but this does not mean that SEC has now dealt with the fossil fuel investment issue. Divestment discussions have often lost sight of the fact that it is not the extraction of fossil fuel raw materials that is the primary cause of human-induced climate change, but burning them for heat, propulsion, or in chemical processes involving fossil fuel combustion. Investments in companies engaged in large scale *burning* of fossil fuels may now be more important than extraction companies. To exclude only fossil extraction while investing in such companies would be both scientifically and ethically inconsistent. The Synod motion has opened up a much more demanding exercise.

This, however, brings home that the use of our investments in addressing climate change is especially difficult and sensitive. This is because the burning of fossil fuels is utterly embedded in the both the lifestyle and the economy of our nation and all nations like us. Our very expectations have been framed around what we have been able to do with the apparently limitless availability of cheap fossil fuels. Until recently we have given little or no heed to the fact that the primary waste product released into the atmosphere by our actions was on such a scale that it would change the planet’s chemical balance and physical systems. How to address this crisis with urgent speed, but without widespread disruption, is as difficult and urgent as limiting the spread of the Covid-19 virus. One unintended outcome of a near global lock-down has been to reduce emissions from transport. What should be the ‘new normal’ in respect of climate change, in our lives and activities as individuals, families, in our organisations and as a church, as much as in our investments, is a matter of the utmost seriousness and urgency.

Conclusions on an Ethical Investment Strategy

An ethical investment strategy for the SEC should ideally be multi-dimensional. It should involve positive investment, ethical exclusions, ethical engagement with companies and with fund managers, collaboration with the experience and initiatives of other churches, divestment in principle, and divestment because of failed conditions. All these dimensions of an ethical investment strategy may have their roles to play. Depending on each circumstance, one or another factor may take

precedence. It should seek consistency, compassion and generosity and be prepared to go an extra mile for the kingdom of God.

Some have voiced concern that to move to a more ethically responsive approach to SEC's investments, rather than simply maximising our returns, would run the risk of reducing the amount of returns on investments and thus the amount of money available for the church's missional and central activities. This is an important concern and needs to be borne in mind, especially given the terms of the EIAG's remit noted at section 2 above.

Is it indeed the case that returns would necessarily be reduced? The Morningstar report on the good performance in 2020 of ESG-oriented funds compared with traditional funds may challenge that assertion. However, whilst it is acknowledged that there are ethical pooled funds that provide good returns, some do not, and not all would be suitable for the UTP as there are other investment criteria to be considered. EIAG's initial review of ethical pooled funds (see para 8(d) below) identified a relatively small number of funds that might meet the UTP's investment criteria from the much wider choice of funds currently available. Therefore, although one still has to be careful in choosing an appropriate ESG fund, it is not axiomatic today that ethical investment means lower returns. Secondly, what would be the ethical basis for contending that for SEC to do its investments ethically is not important if the result would mean, for example, losing our local priest, or the closing of a department at the church offices? Such real world questions as these prompt us to ask, as followers of Jesus Christ, what ethical values matter most? These are not easy questions to answer.

At the time of Wilberforce, the abolition campaign alerted many people to the fact that a significant part of Britain's prosperity at the end of the 18th century was derived directly or indirectly from the slave trade. The economic disruption that abolition would cause was a major argument used to defeat successive abolition bills in Parliament and prolonged the slave trade for many years. If people have belatedly awoken to the fact that our present lifestyles are won and enjoyed at the cost of climate change, the church cannot say 'business as usual'.

4. Context – the UTP and its place in the funding arrangements of the SEC and in the investment marketplace

- (a)** The UTP is a pooled fund in which investments for many parts of the SEC are managed so as to generate a reliable return to fund various aspects of the SEC's regular work. Those investments are held in trust and must be managed in accordance with the relevant fiduciary duties. The investors in the fund include the General Synod (approximately two thirds) and various dioceses and also about 190 individual congregations (the remainder). The objective of the fund is to generate a stream of income (distributed six monthly) increasing in line with inflation without eroding the value of the underlying fund, while avoiding excess volatility. The UTP is worth approximately £99.5m and over the last year produced a net income for its investors of £2.3m. This income is of critical importance to the SEC's mission in, for example, paying for the central administrative machinery of the SEC and various centrally-orchestrated SEC programmes, such as

training candidates for ministry, the annual youth camp, safeguarding, supporting retired clergy and providing grants to dioceses and charges to assist in meeting a range of costs including those related to mission, ministry and maintaining and developing buildings. The UTP typically provides around 60% of the income required for such things. In the absence of that income, it is likely that reserves would quickly be depleted and other sources of income would have to be found, for example by increasing congregational contributions significantly by way of quota or securing additional donations from individual church members, failing which cuts would have to be made to the work of the church in various respects.

- (b)** The management of the UTP is in the hands of professional managers appointed by the SEC Investment Committee, who report via the Administration Board to the Standing Committee. The managers are tasked to invest so as to preserve the value of the UTP while maintaining the real value of the income received from it, for the benefit of SEC investors, in accordance with the above objective. Optimising returns usually involves taking a degree of investment risk which must be balanced against the need not to hazard the funds in the UTP. Thus the investment decisions which have to be taken involve delicate questions of balancing perceived risk and reward.
- (c)** In recent times, the professional managers appointed by the Investment Committee have been Baillie Gifford. The Investment Committee consider that they have provided a good service for a competitive fee.
- (d)** The UTP is currently divided into three very roughly equal sub-funds. One of these sub-funds (the Global Income Growth Portfolio) is directly invested into specific, individual holdings, in accordance with a set investment strategy implemented by Baillie Gifford for a number of their clients. There are existing SEC exclusionary rules applied in relation to this fund (companies with in excess of 15% of their revenue derived from tobacco, armaments and gambling have been excluded since 1998; companies with in excess of 15% of their revenue derived from pornography have been excluded since 2013; and companies deriving over 10% of their revenue from the extraction of thermal coal or tar sands have been excluded since 2017). Baillie Gifford have been advised in 2020 that no further investment of SEC monies in this fund should be made into companies involved in the extraction of fossil fuels. The other two sub-funds are invested in funds run for more general investment purposes by Baillie Gifford (the Multi-Asset Income Fund and the Long Term Global Growth Fund). Investing in such pre-existing funds reduces the level of charges that Baillie Gifford would otherwise have to levy for the management of the UTP, as well as increasing diversification and therefore reducing volatility. No SEC ethical filters are currently applied to either of these pooled funds, although Baillie Gifford apply their own filters and protocols to such funds.

- (e) Despite what may seem at first sight to be the significant overall value of the UTP, in investment terms the UTP is a small fund. If bespoke investment arrangements are made for funds, particularly small funds, there is a high risk that the management charges will rise as a proportion of the income generated by the fund, thus reducing the sums available to the investors as income.

5. Context – the high level of dependence of the centralised work of the SEC on the UTP

- (a) In comparison with other UK church bodies, the SEC is unusually reliant for funding of its day-to-day operations on the income generated from the UTP. As mentioned above, about 60% of the income of the SEC is derived from its investments as against an average of around 10% in Anglican dioceses in England and Wales (ignoring such income as these dioceses may receive from the central funds held by the Church Commissioners). A study of annual accounts of 44 English and Welsh Dioceses (using Charities Commission data) indicates that on average investment income from their own investments is less than 10% of their total income, as indicated in the following table, and even the most dependent upon investment income obtains only 27.5% from that source:

	Total income (m)	Income own investments (m)	Income own investments (%)
Total dioceses	541.2	49.76	
Average	12.1	1.13	9.19%
Diocese with lowest absolute income	3.5	0.09	2.60%
Highest absolute income	27.1	2.37	8.70%
Least dependent on own investments (% relative terms)	10.6	0.12	1.10%
Most dependent on own investments (% relative terms)	10.6	2.92	27.50%

- (b) Of the national church organisations, only the Representative Body of the Church in Wales has a higher level of dependence on income from investments (around 95%) with USPG and the Jesuits around 40%. An investment strategy has to be appropriate to the income requirements of the organisation, and managing volatility and risk becomes increasingly important with an organisation's dependence on investment income. These factors will have to be borne in mind in establishing ethical investment policies for the SEC.

6. Context – the current investment environment

- (a)** The EIAG duly notes the exceptionally challenging environment for investment and for the economy generally at the time of writing, following the development of the crisis revolving around the Covid-19 coronavirus. The EIAG nonetheless looks to present this paper looking at the issues as ones of principle, with suggested solutions that should be applicable in most market conditions.
- (b)** What the present crisis does illustrate very clearly is the way in which sudden and unexpected changes of market conditions can make the task of maintaining the value of the UTP and producing the income that various parts of the SEC rely upon from the UTP very challenging. This emphasises the importance of applying competent investment strategies for the UTP, and particularly of adequate diversification across many spheres of commerce, in the hope that, even if one or more sectors of the economy are struggling at a particular time, others will outperform so as to even out overall returns – the importance of “spreading one’s eggs between many baskets”.
- (c)** The EIAG also acknowledges that the relevant investment environment is in any event a rapidly-changing one, with a greater emphasis on environmental and social issues. Human-induced climate change and the imperative to reduce fossil fuel extraction and consumption have become mainstream issues across all sectors of the economy since the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change was agreed by the world’s governments in Paris in 2015. This has led those involved in the investment industry to recalibrate their expectations and advice in relation to companies involved in fossil fuel extraction, with a new-found concern that such companies may, at some stage, be barred from further extraction (at least in some locations, or by using some technologies), or be otherwise penalised by governments. Therefore holdings in such companies tend to take a much lower profile in standard portfolios than they once did. There is also an increasing appreciation in the investment industry that investors, both private and institutional, may wish to avoid investment in companies that are involved in fossil fuel extraction for ethical reasons, and therefore an increasing range of funds are being established which avoid such companies, to meet this demand (as touched upon above in section 3). Further, indices of companies have begun to be published ranking them in terms of the carbon neutrality of their business, or according to other ethically-focussed criteria (e.g. the Responsibility 100 Index and the TPI Climate Transition Index).
- (d)** The investment environment, both generally and specifically, is therefore very dynamic and the guidance which the group will propose needs to be sufficiently flexible to allow sensible investment decisions to be taken by the Investment Committee in a fast-changing environment, with the advice of their professional investment managers.

7. Proposals for a definition of ‘full divestment from fossil fuels’ for the purposes of the UTP.

In line with the growing understanding of the climate crisis and the need for restriction of fossil fuel extraction mentioned above, the motion passed by GS 2019 stipulated that the UTP should “divest fully from fossil fuels”. A difficulty arises of knowing what precisely that is to mean for the instruction of the managers of the UTP. It seems that there is no generally-accepted definition of this term, even amongst those who favour ethical investment.

- (a)** The EIAG proceeds on the basis that “fossil fuels” means oil, coal and gas and related carbon-based materials in the ground which are commonly extracted and used as fuel. However, fossil fuels are also extracted for a wide variety of other uses, such as raw materials for plastics, clothing, household products, etc. EIAG understands the motion is directed to extraction for burning as fuels, in the first instance.
- (b)** As pointed out in section 3 above, this opens up a wider discussion of investment in companies involved in the large-scale burning of fossil fuels, and the EIAG would propose to look at other aspects of fossil fuel divestment at a later stage.
- (c)** In addition to companies whose core business is the extraction of fossil fuels, some companies may have interests in fossil fuel extraction that form a small, part of their business. For that reason, it is conventional to set a percentage of turnover which is to be taken as being a less than peripheral involvement in the industry. The figure we propose is 10% of turnover, as applied already in relation to thermal coal and tar sands.
- (d)** One possible approach thereafter is to require that all direct, individual investments currently held in the UTP in companies that generate more than 10% of their turnover from extracting fossil fuels from the ground should be sold, and that no further direct, individual investments should be made in such companies. We asked for clarification from the managers of the UTP as to what this would involve, practically. They reported that as at 31st December 2019 the value in the UTP so directly invested was £92,715.72, being a holding in Total, a fossil fuel extraction company. That represented 0.35% of the directly-invested funds in the UTP, under the relevant Baillie Gifford strategy. Baillie Gifford have since sold the holding of Total in this fund and SEC accordingly is understood currently to have no direct investments in companies engaged in fossil fuel extraction. As mentioned above, Baillie Gifford have been advised that no further direct investment of SEC monies should be made into such companies.
- (e)** Another possible approach is to require that all such investments, whether held directly or indirectly (i.e. as part of a pooled fund) should be sold, and no further investments should be made in such companies or into funds that hold investments in such companies. We asked for clarification from the fund managers as to what proportion of the entire UTP is so held. Of the whole of the UTP as at 31st December 2019, including the pooled funds mentioned

above, a total of about £311,846.49, being 0.36% of the funds, was held in such companies. Within that amount, the companies in question were for the most part involved in fossil fuels, with smaller contributions from tobacco and gambling. While the directly-invested holding in Total just mentioned was disposed of relatively easily, Baillie Gifford could not be compelled by SEC to divest the relative investments in the two pooled funds.

- (f)** The EIAG notes that in divesting from all companies in the fossil fuel sector wholesale, one would also be divesting from some of the leading investors in renewable (“green”) energy generation. For example, Shell is engaged in very significant extraction of fossil fuels, but is also currently one of the world’s largest investors in the development of renewable sources of energy. Nonetheless, as the GS motion focused on divestment rather than positive (or “impact”) investment, we have not considered that issue further at this stage.
- (g)** It would be possible to take the understanding of “divestment from fossil fuels” to an extreme which would be likely to make stockmarket investment unfeasible, because such a broad range of companies would be excluded from consideration that the necessary diversity could not be achieved in the UTP portfolio (leading to unacceptable levels of investment risk). For example, it could be understood also to require divestment from all sectors that made major use of fossil fuels – such as road transport, aviation, construction, shipping and conventional energy generation. Even more extremely, it could be taken to exclude any company which made any use of fossil fuels whatsoever, thus cutting out any company which used fossil fuel-powered transport to any extent at all, or used any plastics derived from fossil fuels, or played any part whatsoever in the industries that extract fossil fuels (for example, by manufacturing parts or providing outsourced recruitment services). This would involve unfeasible levels of due diligence to analyse and monitor the detailed business of each potential investment and in any event would leave very little of the market available for investment. It is the view of the EIAG that such extreme understandings of “divestment from fossil fuels” cannot have been what the General Synod had in mind in 2019. However, as noted above, the EIAG will proceed in due course to examine the broader questions in relation to fossil fuel use discussed in section 3.
- (h)** The EIAG therefore proposes a definition of “divestment from fossil fuels” for present purposes as follows: “Divestment from fossil fuels means the avoidance of any investment which results in the UTP holding, directly or as part of a pooled fund, any interest in any business which generates more than 10% of its turnover directly from extracting fossil fuels.” This would therefore be proposed as an additional “red line” which would apply to investment on the part of the UTP in any individual holding or pooled fund for the future.

8. Recommendations on the use of pooled funds in the UTP

- (a)** The EIAG appreciates the benefits which investment in pooled funds brings to the UTP. By investing in such pooled funds, one obtains (i) significant diversification (and therefore, in principle, increased resilience against economic shocks) and (ii) reduced management charges compared to what one would have to pay to achieve a similar level of management attention and diversification of investments by making direct investments. Therefore the group does not, as a matter of principle, rule out the use of pooled funds for the UTP, and indeed accepts their positive contribution to sound investment management.
- (b)** However, given the passing of the GS resolution in June 2019 and the suggested definition set out above, it will now be necessary for any pooled fund selected to adhere to the above definition of “divestment from fossil fuels”. Following the motion, any such pooled fund should also in principle adhere to the other “red lines” already fixed in relation to direct investment for the UTP – namely, to avoid investment in companies with in excess of 15% or their revenue derived from tobacco, armaments, gambling and pornography and companies deriving 10% of their revenue from thermal coal or tar sands. See section 9 below in relation to the practicalities of this proposed divestment in relation to pooled funds.
- (c)** As suggested above, whereas in the past it might have been very difficult to find existing pooled funds which would match these red lines, that situation is rapidly changing. There is a broad interest in the concept of ethical investment, driven not only by charities and religious bodies but also by mainstream investors (such as pension schemes, councils or universities) wishing to impose ethical limitations on what their funds are invested in. The varied approaches taken to ethical investment by some other bodies, including in particular churches, are highlighted in the Appendix.
- (d)** It is now possible to identify a growing number of pooled funds where ethical screens are applied as a matter of course. The screens applied tend to overlap with, but occasionally include and go further than, the screens so far chosen by SEC. Such funds include:
- Epworth (funds managed for the Central Finance Board of the Methodist Church) – would apply ethical screens that include, and go further than, the proposed SEC exclusionary categories.
 - CCLA Investment Management COIF Charities Ethical Investment Fund – a multi-asset fund that would apply ethical screens that include, and go further than, the proposed SEC exclusionary categories.
 - BMO Global Asset Management responsible funds – BMO offers a range of funds with exclusions that would match the proposed criteria
 - Northern Trust Green Transition Index Fund – a passive fund that fully divests from companies with fossil fuel reserves, excludes the

top 10% of carbon-intensive companies and screens out businesses involved in weapons and tobacco, amongst other things.

- Mercer/LGIM Passive Sustainable Global Equities – a passive fund that excludes companies with significant income from pornography, alcohol, gambling, tobacco, “controversial” armaments and fossil fuels.
- RBC Vision Global Horizon Fund – an active fund that excludes, amongst others, alcohol, tobacco, adult entertainment, gambling, weapons or extracting, processing or transporting coal, oil or natural gas.

In addition, certain fund managers would be prepared to screen a portfolio of direct investments for a client:

- Rathbone Greenbank – can offer a screening service for charity clients.
- Ruffer – can provide screening to a client’s specification in a segregated portfolio.

As with all other matters reviewed in this paper, this is a fast-evolving situation and it seems highly likely that further ethical funds which will meet the proposed SEC exclusionary criteria will become available, including (potentially) funds managed by BlackRock, Baillie Gifford and others. Baillie Gifford are understood to be working on devising an ethical multi-asset fund that would exclude tobacco, alcohol, armaments, pornography and fossil fuels. They also have a Responsible Global Equity Income Fund and a Global Alpha Choice Fund that may meet the SEC’s proposed ethical criteria.

Selection of funds would remain a matter for the Investment Committee, against the background of the SEC’s ethical and investment criteria.

9. A proposed timescale for the implementation of changes to the UTP

The EIAG accepts that to make changes of this nature to the management of a fund such as the UTP must be carefully managed and will take time. There will be costs involved in any sales and purchases of holdings required. There may conceivably be a necessity to find an alternative investment manager for the portfolio, depending upon the charges that various managers might propose for managing the portfolio with these additional red lines in place for pooled funds as well as direct holdings. In the meantime, there is currently a very small portion of the overall portfolio of the UTP (about one third of one percent) invested in excluded businesses. The group suggests that the Standing Committee should be instructed to communicate the newly-updated ethical guidelines to the Investment Committee. Thereafter, the EIAG is to consider what other guidance should be given in relation to other “unethical sources of revenue”, including other fossil fuel-related activities. The EIAG proposes that rather than start to impose the red lines on all pooled investments when those red

lines may change in relatively early course, the appropriate way to proceed would be to hold over the application of the red lines to pooled funds until after GS 2021, by which time it is hoped that the EIAG's additional guidance should be available.

10. Footnotes

- (a)** The EIAG appreciates the strength of feeling in relation to fossil fuel divestment which led to the passing of the motion at GS 2019. The vote at GS 2019 will require the introduction of the new “red line” and its eventual application to not only direct investments but also pooled investments. This will have, to an extent, an impact on the ability of the Investment Committee and their professional managers to manage the UTP so as to achieve its objective, outlined above.
- (b)** The EIAG would caution that GS should not rush to introduce other red lines into the picture without very careful consideration. It is possible to think of various other red lines which could be introduced, which might prove more or less controversial amongst the broader membership of the SEC. The more such red lines are introduced, the harder it will be, even in the modern environment, to keep within them whilst also not adversely impacting on income levels, diversification and the level of charges which the UTP will have to pay to secure professional management of its investments.
- (c)** Nonetheless, the EIAG will proceed to examine the remaining aspects of its remit, including that of seeking to reach a general definition of “unethical sources of revenue” which may be applied for the future when assessing whether or not other red lines might be desirable. It will also, in a more positive approach, consider whether and, if so, how the UTP might consider impact investment – the selection of investments on the basis of a positive bias in favour of businesses and funds seeking to demonstrate particularly good and responsible management and/or to make the world a better place.

Alan McLean QC
Chair
On behalf of the Ethical Investment Advisory Group
3 September 2020

APPENDIX

A review of the current range of thinking on the ethics of investment

Purpose and Scope

To provide an overview of the ethical investment policies of UK churches and charities to inform the work of EIAG.

Religious organisations, charities and universities have been the focus of fossil fuel divestment campaigns, and several organisations have published reports on progress towards divestment. Around 70% of universities have committed to divestment (most full divestment, but some coal and tar sands only). Four UK churches, including the SEC, have committed to full divestment, two have committed to divesting from companies that do not align with Paris targets, and two others to coal and tar sands. Three churches do not exclude fossil fuels in their policies at national level.

Methods

Students Organising for Sustainability (SOS) is an educational charity created by students and staff at NUS in response to the climate emergency and ecological crisis.

SOS publish a table (up to date as at February 2020) of universities that have made commitments to fossil fuel divestment with embedded links to the relevant ethical/socially responsible investment policies that are publicly available. The SOS list was used as the starting point for this strand of the research, with additional material from People and Planet and university websites.

The Church Investors Group (CIG), of which SEC is a member, was the starting point for information on religious organisations and charities – CIG's website provides a link to the members' own websites and policies. Information on some additional UK charities was included for comparison. The Charities Commission website provides financial information and access to the latest annual report and accounts in England and Wales.

Students Organising for Sustainability: <https://sustainability.nus.org.uk/divest-invest/our-asks/divest-and-invest/divest-invest-commitments>

People and Planet Scorecards for UK universities:

<https://peopleandplanet.org/fossil-free>

Church Investors Group (CIG): <https://churchinvestorsgroup.org.uk/about/cig-membership/>

Charities Commission: <https://beta.charitycommission.gov.uk/>

1. UK Universities

SOS Research: 42 of the 79 universities listed by SOS as having made a commitment to partial or full fossil fuel divestment have publicly available policy statements on their websites. Of these 42, SOS states that 36 are committed to full divestment and 6 to divesting from coal and tar sands. However examination of the associated policy documents shows that 19 match with the commitment recorded by SOS (1 is stronger – full as opposed to partial divestment), but 23 policy documents

state a lower level of divestment than recorded by SOS. It is possible that SOS has access to other sources of information, or that these institutions are still in the process of changing and/or implementing their policies. However, most policies are dated within the last 5 years and it is reasonable to assume that given the sensitivity to student and public opinion universities will be keen to keep their published documentation up to date.

What types of investment do these 42 policies apply to?: Cash (6); Cash & endowments (5); Endowments (15); No investments or very small (6); Not specified (10). 18 policies relate to direct investments and 11 of these also make reference to pooled funds.

Other ethical red line exclusions include: Tobacco (23); Arms (22); Pornography (4); Gambling (6); Alcohol (4); High interest lending (1); Animal testing (1).

Most of the 42 documents are described as investment policies but vary considerably in their content and purpose. Many of the policies focus on liquidity and cash management rather than equities, whereas fossil fuel investments tend to be equities, either as direct holdings or in pooled funds. Several policies state that the university currently holds no long term investments, but that fossil fuels would be excluded if funds were to be invested in the future, indicating that “divestment” has not involved any immediate changes for such bodies.

People and Planet publish divestment scorecards for UK universities. These provide information on size of investment fund and an estimate of the amount invested in fossil fuels. 109 scorecards were examined. Some of the scorecard data were ambiguous, but it appears that at least half the UK universities do not have significant levels of long term investments (defining “significant” as at least £10m).

Some of the older universities have very large endowments (Oxford and Cambridge have in excess of £3bn each), but many smaller and more recent establishments have modest levels of endowments and long term investments, but are dealing with high levels of cash.

Example 1

The **University of Bath** is reported by SOS to have committed to full divestment in May 2018 with the date for implementation unspecified. People and Planet scorecard estimates that Bath holds £9.7m in fossil fuel investments, i.e. 4.7% of their portfolio based on investments of £204.9m.

Bath’s Investment Policy 2014 (19pp) is more detailed than many of the policies on the SOS list. It covers general SRI (socially responsible investment) principles but contains no specific exclusions (not unexpected as it predates the University’s 2018 divestment commitment). The annual Treasury Management Strategy Statement which would provide further details including fund managers does not appear to be publicly available. The University’s code of ethics (revised 2016) is published on the website, but does not provide any additional detail.

<https://www.bath.ac.uk/publications/investment-policy/attachments/investment-policy.pdf>

<https://www.bath.ac.uk/corporate-information/code-of-ethics/>

Bath's 2018-2019 annual report states: "Our investments and cash increased by £5.3m to £218.5m. Our investments are segmented based on our predicted cash flows with approximately 50% held for use within one year (short-term), 25% held for investment of between one and three years (medium-term) and the remaining held for in excess of three years (long term). These durations reflect our intention to hold these investments however they all have liquidity of considerably shorter duration."
<https://www.bath.ac.uk/publications/financial-statements-and-annual-reports/attachments/annual-report-and-accounts-2018-19.pdf>

Example 2

The **University of Edinburgh** is reported by SOS to have committed to full divestment in February 2018 with immediate implementation. People and Planet scorecard estimates that Edinburgh holds £2.3m in fossil fuel investments, i.e. 0.7% of their portfolio based on endowment funds of £356m.

Edinburgh's responsible investment policy sets out how the University is working to achieve divestment from its endowments. This includes arrangements with Baillie Gifford who manage direct equity holdings.
https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/responsible_investment_policy_statement.pdf

The annual report (p54) indicates total reserves of £2bn. This includes substantial sums in cash.
https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/201908_uoe_annual_accounts_2019_29_online.pdf

2. Churches and Charities

Church of England

The Church of England Commissioners have investments of £7.7bn and £183.6m income from investments (Charities Commission).

The Church of England devotes significant resources to ethical investment research through its own EIAG: <https://www.churchofengland.org/eiag>

The Church of England excluded thermal coal and tar sands in 2015, and in July 2018 committed to divestment in 2020 from oil and gas companies that are 'not taking seriously their responsibilities to assist with the transition to a low carbon economy' and to complete divestment from companies not aligned with the Paris Agreement targets by 2023. It is assumed that all Church of England dioceses and other associated organisations adopt EIAG guidelines.

EIAG lists 22 policies including pooled funds:

<https://www.churchofengland.org/sites/default/files/2017-11/Pooled%20Funds%20Policy.pdf>

Church in Wales

The Representative Body of the Church in Wales has income of £20.6m of which £19.2m comes from investments. It has long term investments of £631.7m (Charities Commission). The annual report and accounts divides this between income generating assets of £450m and funds committed to clergy pensions of £181m.

There is also a Common Investment Fund with assets of £52.5m which is similar in purpose to the UTP but separately managed from central funds:

“The Fund is suitable for investment by parishes where long term capital growth and a reasonable level of income and income growth are desired, and is not suitable for money that is liable to be needed in the near future. Parish funds and trusts from bequests and legacies can be invested in the Fund.”

The ethical investment policy applies to central funds and the Common Investment Fund: It is the policy of the Church in Wales not normally or knowingly to invest in any company which derives more than 20% of turnover from a primary focus on gambling, or the production or sale of alcoholic beverages or tobacco products; which derives more than 5% of turnover from pornography, predatory lending activities or the proliferation of armaments beyond areas of legitimate defence and international peacekeeping; or which derives more than 10% of turnover from the extraction of thermal coal or the production of oil from tar sands.

The documentation does not include any reference to pooled funds.

http://apps.charitycommission.gov.uk/Accounts/Ends13/0001142813_AC_20181231_EC.PDF

<https://www.churchinwales.org.uk/en/about-us/representative-body/common-investment-fund/>

Methodist Church

The Methodist Church manages assets of around £1bn through the Central Board of Finance and Epworth (commercial sector).

<https://www.cfbmethodistchurch.org.uk/about/>

Like the Church of England, the Methodist Church has made a significant contribution to ethical investment research through the Joint Advisory Committee on the Ethics of Investment (JACEI):

Joint Advisory Committee on the Ethics of Investment (JACEI):
<https://www.methodist.org.uk/our-work/our-work-in-britain/public-issues/ethical-investment/>

In 2015 coal and tar sands were excluded. In 2017 the Methodist Conference recommended that any fossil fuel company that had not aligned their business investment plans with the Paris Agreement target should be excluded by 2020.

Roman Catholic Church

The Catholic Trust for England and Wales and several dioceses and religious orders are represented on CIG. Many dioceses hold assets on behalf of their

congregations as well as their own endowments, and whilst some have limited resources others some have responsibility for managing investment portfolios of £60-70m. Most dioceses have adopted general SRI principles and include a statement about not holding investments that are incompatible with Roman Catholic teaching on the sanctity of human life and the importance of society.

In January 2020 the Dioceses of Middlesbrough and Lancaster announced their commitment to divest from fossil fuels, becoming the first Roman Catholic dioceses in England and Wales to do so (see the Epiphany Divestment Declaration, below). Middlesbrough and Lancaster Diocesan Trusts have long term investments of £33.7m and £26.7m respectively (Charities Commission). (Lancaster was one of the first Roman Catholic dioceses to introduce an ethical and SRI policy. Its investments are managed by Quilter Cheviot).

Salvation Army

At national level the Salvation Army has income of £237.7m, including £4.59m from investments, £182.7m held in long term investments (Charities Commission). The Salvation Army also manages investments on behalf of other Salvation Army trusts. The Annual Report p 19-21 states: “The Salvation Army Common Investment Fund (No 1) consists of permanent endowments which are restricted by the wishes of the donor. The Salvation Army Common Investment Fund (No 2) is operated for those Salvation Army Trusts without permanent endowments.” Cazenove Capital Management manages CIF1 and 50 per cent of CIF2, whilst Sarasin & Partners LLP manage 50 per cent of CIF2. The investment objectives for CIF1 and CIF2 are also set out in the annual report.

The ethical investment policy states: “There will be no investment in companies which derive a material amount of their revenues (% indicated) from the following activities:

- the production of alcohol (5%)
- the sale, together with any production, of alcohol (10%)
- the production of tobacco (5%)
- the sale, together with any production, of tobacco (10%)
- the manufacture of whole weapons, weapon platforms and weapon systems (no minimum limit)
- the manufacture or sale of strategic parts for weapons systems (10%)
- the business of gambling or providing access to such businesses (5%)
- the production of adult entertainment services or providing access to such services (1%)
- the publication or wholesale of pornographic magazines or newspapers (1%)”

Note: The use of pooled funds is permitted, but there is no published guidance on how the above ethical exclusions are applied to pooled funds.

<https://www.salvationarmy.org.uk/files/satrustcentralfundsreportyearend31mar18pdf-0/download?token=72z56uLT>
<https://www.salvationarmy.org.uk/files/environmentpdf/download?token=msJlwgr0>

Religious Society of Friends

The Quakers have a long tradition of ethical investment and were the first UK religious organisations to commit to full divestment from fossil fuels (2013). At national level the Quakers have income of £12.2m of which £1.42m is from investments, and long term investments of £41.5m (Charities Commission).

The following is taken from their investment policy: “Britain Yearly Meeting (BYM) is a faith-based charity. It supports and sustains the Religious Society of Friends in England, Wales and Scotland.... BYM has average annual income of £8–8.5m from contributions, grants, legacies, dividends, property income and profit from the Hospitality Company. Annual expenditure averages £9m. Investments such as equities and bonds form 32% of our total assets. Investment and functional property form 63% of our total assets. For this reason, we hold a low level of property-related investments in our investment portfolio. Dividend income provides 5–6% of our annual operating expenditure requirements. ... We do not invest directly in companies that are primary producers of the following:

- pornography
- prostitution
- munitions and related products
- fossil fuel extraction

We do not invest directly in companies that are profiting from the occupation of Palestine.

We may invest where an enterprise’s main business purpose is held to be generally in the public interest, and less than 5% of the company’s annual turnover is generated in one or more of the following:

- tobacco
- alcohol
- gambling

When investing in pooled funds it is appreciated that BYM's strict ethical criteria may not be entirely matched by those of the fund. We currently only invest in pooled funds which focus on areas we are keen to support such as renewable energy, education, clean water, healthcare, social housing and sustainable development. As such the funds are very unlikely to hold any companies from restricted industries in our list. Our fund manager regularly checks and reports to us on this matter.”

<https://quaker-prod.s3.eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/store/3fd6a1c5dc1f6b9431ae18c7927d2be92c10b7a27782b8734488ce8f4f2c>

Church of Scotland

The Church of Scotland Investors Trust has three investment funds:

Growth Fund £276.9m (Newton)

Income Fund £71.8m (Royal London)

Deposit Fund £86.4m (Thomas Miller Isle of Man)

The ethical exclusions are to: Avoid investment in any company whose management practices are judged by the Trustees of the Unincorporated Councils and Committees/Unincorporated Entities to be unacceptable. In particular, investment will be avoided in any company substantially involved in gambling, tobacco products, alcohol, armaments and other activities which are felt to harm society more than they

benefit it. “Substantially” is interpreted as 15% or more of total turnover being derived from these sectors. In addition to the foregoing exclusions, investment will be avoided in companies who derive more than 15% of their turnover from extraction and/or sale of thermal coal and/or oil extracted from tar sands.

Divestment was the subject of a debate in 2019 when the General Assembly voted against full divestment from fossil fuels.

https://www.churchofscotland.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0006/48885/Statement_of_Investment_Principles.pdf

Church of Ireland

The Church of Ireland operates a Unit Trust Pool with fund values as at 31 December 2019 split between Northern Ireland (£60.06m) and the Republic of Ireland (€243.67m).

In 2018 the Representative Church Body voted to fully divest from fossil fuels by 2022, having previously excluded coal and tar sands.

The Investment Committee of The Representative Church Body, and its investment team, ‘formulate investment policy and manage the Trust on behalf of the Trustee’. The reports note the members of the Investment Committee and two advisers who appear to be individual appointments rather than from a company providing investment advice. There is nothing to indicate if there is a fund manager.

<https://www.ireland.anglican.org/cmsfiles/pdf/Resources/ParishResources/Investments/RBGUTReports/NI-2019-Dec2019.pdf>

<https://www.ireland.anglican.org/cmsfiles/pdf/Resources/ParishResources/Investments/RBGUTReports/RI2019-6mDec2019.pdf>

<https://www.ireland.anglican.org/news/8172/chief-officer-and-campaigner-highlight>

United Reformed Church

The URC Trust has income of £26.5m of which £1.84m is from investments, and long term investments of £44.6m (Charities Commission).

In May 2019 the URC Mission Council passed a resolution stating: “The URC now urges its trust bodies to:

- a) not invest in fossil fuel companies whose total turnover is more than 10% derived from the extraction and/or supply of fossil fuels, including thermal coal, natural gas and oil
- b) complete the divestment required to fulfil this decision by the time the URC General Assembly meets in 2020
- c) widen their proactive role as investors, by engaging further with companies whose activities foster significant carbon emissions, for example the electricity and automotive industries, and producers of energy intensive products (e.g. cement)
- d) refocus the Church’s investment portfolio by scaling up investment in renewable energy and clean technologies.”

As at 31 December 2018, the URC Trust was invested in CCLA COIF Ethical Fund and COIF Property Fund. In 2019 COIF Ethical Fund divested from fossil fuels. Property funds are presumed to be fossil fuel free.

http://apps.charitycommission.gov.uk/Accounts/Ends73/0001133373_AC_20181231_EC.PDF

The URC has 13 regional synods with lower levels of income (up to £2.7m). Some synods provide details of investments in their annual accounts – several have holdings in COIF and property funds, but some also have holdings in pooled funds that have not divested from fossil fuels (M&G Charifund is mentioned).

Neither the URC Trust nor any of the regional synods appear to hold any direct investments. It appears no changes were required to implement divestment at national level, but that some changes would need to be implemented at synod level to fully divest from fossil fuels. Some regional synods have committed to divestment as part of the Epiphany Declaration for Fossil Free Churches (January 2020 – see below)

Baptist Church

The Baptist Union of Great Britain has income of £9.5m, £890k of which derives from investments. £10m is held in long term investments (Charities Commission), but the accounts list substantial endowment and restricted funds. The ethical guidelines which include the use of pooled funds are set out in the annual report and accounts:

“The investments are managed within ethical guidelines set down by the Council of the Baptist Union of Great Britain. In summary, these specify that we do not take direct investment in companies involved in tobacco production, distilling of alcoholic beverages, gambling, pornography, armaments and high-interest lending. Companies are screened to ensure that no more than 10% of revenue comes from these sources and pooled funds are screened prior to acquisition and half yearly to ensure that no more than 5% of the assets in the fund are investments in companies that would fail to meet the direct investment criteria. The policy also has a positive screening policy which means investing in companies or sectors which reflect Christian values in areas like environmental protection, supporting sustainable development, health, education, employment, human rights, good corporate social responsibility, good governance, financial transparency, anti-corruption controls, safe working practices, natural justice and sensitivity towards the communities in which their business operates.”

http://apps.charitycommission.gov.uk/Accounts/Ends12/0001125912_AC_20181231_EC.PDF

Other charities

Many large charities have relatively low investment income. Christian Aid (a CIG member) has income of £120.4m, including £100k from investments, and £15.5m in long term investments (Charities Commission) held mainly in gilts, fixed interest, cash and property (annual report and accounts). Tear Fund (not a CIG member) has no long term investments. It has income of £76.3m (£120k from investments,

presumably cash deposits) (Charities Commission). Neither charity appears to have a policy on ethical investment.

There are various trusts whose purpose is to administer funds for special purposes which depend almost entirely on income from investments:

Royal Society for the Support of Women of Scotland (no ethical restrictions, but commitment not to increase tobacco holdings) has £44m in long term investments, with income of £2.4m (£2.0m from investments). The Society provides annuities to women over the age of 50 who are suffering financial hardship. After the 2008 crash the Society adopted a policy that reduced dependence on income by committing to lower levels of guaranteed annual payments, with annuitants receiving additional grants as and when funds permitted.

Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust is a Quaker charity which has divested from fossil fuels. It has a strong SRI policy.

<https://www.jrct.org.uk/userfiles/documents/Investment%20Strategy%202019.pdf>

It has investments of £231m held almost entirely in equities with a focus on positive investment. Income from investments is £330k, and total expenditure £11.21m. There is a recognition in the investment report in the annual accounts (p21-24) of the effect of volatility on the charity's activities resulting from investing in equities.

http://apps.charitycommission.gov.uk/Accounts/Ends37/0000210037_AC_20181231_EC.PDF

The investments are listed on their website:

<https://www.jrct.org.uk/userfiles/documents/JRCT%20holdings%20as%20at%2031%20July%202017.pdf>

Clergy Support Trust (aligned with Church of England EIAG policies) has investments of £100.8m and income of £4.7m (£4.1m from investments). The Trust arose from the merger and restructuring of the Corporation of the Sons of the Clergy and the Friends of the Clergy Corporation. Following the 2008 financial crash, both funds suffered significant losses of capital and income and grant-making had to be curtailed.

3. Other information

Fund Managers

The following is a list of the main fund managers publicised as being used by church organisations in the UK (in alphabetical order):

CCLA
BlackRock
Brewin Dolphin
Cazenove (Schroders)
Charles Stanley
Killik & Co
Newton
Quilter Cheviot
Rathbone Greenbank
Ruffer
Sarasin

Epiphany Declaration for Fossil Free Churches

In January 2020 the following made a commitment to divest from fossil fuels:

Diocese of Middlesbrough (Catholic)
Diocese of Lancaster (Catholic)
Congregation of Jesus, English Province (Catholic)
Presentation Sisters, English Province (Catholic)
United Reformed Church Synod of Wales
United Reformed Church South Western Synod
Lavington URC, Bideford
Redland Park URC, Bristol
Northern College, Manchester (URC/Congregational)
Ivybridge Methodist Church, Devon
Stirling Methodist Church, Stirling (Methodist Church in Scotland)
Devonport Baptist Church, Plymouth
St Luke's Holloway, London (Church of England)
Pudsey Parish Church, Leeds (Church of England)
The churches of the Parish of Alston Moor (Church of England).

Conclusions

Commitments to fossil fuel divestment by UK churches at national level are unchanged from the state of affairs as at August 2019. The 20 new commitments made under the Epiphany Declaration in January 2020 are by regional bodies, congregations and religious orders.

For around half of UK universities who have divestment policies, divestment appears not to have involved major changes as investments are held mainly for the purposes of cash flow management. Managing cash flow may involve some indirect exposure to fossil fuels in holding cash and cash equivalents, but this is not an area that is of relevance to the SEC as it does not hold significant cash reserves. Fossil fuel divestment is mainly about equities, held directly or indirectly in pooled funds.

The ethical policies of the universities studied for this report indicate the adoption of fewer red lines than most UK churches. Tobacco and armaments are excluded categories in around half the 42 policies examined, but gambling is excluded in only 6 policies, with pornography and alcohol in 4 policies. This may be related to the emphasis of policies on cash rather than long term investments.

The ethical investment policies of the Church of England EIAG and JACEI are highly developed and although red lines are included, the primary focus is on positive engagement. Their research is publicly available and widely used. The Church of England's Transition Pathway Initiative is designed to help organisations decarbonise their investments. However, the value of assets under management in the Church of England and Methodist Church places them in a league of their own in terms of developing their investment strategies. Entirely direct investment, and/or splitting funds between different managers, are strategies that are open to organisations with funds measured in hundreds rather than tens of millions.

Two other UK churches have made recent commitments to full divestment (the Quakers having been committed to divestment since 2013). These are the United Reformed Church and the Church of Ireland. At national level the URC was already invested almost entirely in a pooled fund that excluded fossil fuels in 2019, and it is not significantly dependent on income from investments. It is not clear from publicly available information how the Church of Ireland is implementing its divestment policy. Given the combined size of the Northern Ireland and Republic of Ireland funds it is likely to be invested directly rather than in pooled funds.

Some useful insights into practical application may be gained from further study focusing on the investment strategies of universities and churches with modest endowments funds in the region of £50-£150m, and the distribution policy of churches with common investment funds. How decisions are made to allocate assets between different fund managers and funds, and how asset allocation and rebalancing is managed on an ongoing basis are also of relevance to the SEC, as the SEC currently benefits from advice in these areas from its fund manager. Information about how such organisations make their investment decisions would be helpful when the SEC begins to consider how to manage the UTP in future.

In summary, whilst organisations' 'red lines' reveal the growing trend towards divestment from fossil fuels, lists of excluded categories do not address the practicalities of divestment. Other factors need to be considered in order to put into practice a pledge to exclude investments from a specific industry. These include the size of the assets as this can limit the types of investment vehicles and fund managers that are available. As one of the smaller investors, the use of pooled funds and pooled fund policies is of particular relevance to the SEC. All investment decisions have consequences and every organisation has responsibility to seek the best possible outcome within the specified parameters.

REPORTS FROM CONVENERERS

STANDING COMMITTEE

Standing Committee has met five times so far in 2020.

The first meeting in January was the last in Forbes House. Discussion focused on the financial position at the end of 2019 – a deficit of just under £75,000 almost £61,000 better than budget – and on planning for the June 2020 General Synod when a major debate on climate change under the auspices of the Church in Society Committee was planned. Additionally, the Committee was briefed on progress with the Safeguarding Audit, reviewed the Risk Register, took stock of developments on communications and considered a range of appointment and administrative matters including adding to the resilience of pensions administration by outsourcing.

Just as we were planning to issue the letter confirming General Synod in June, it became clear that Covid-19 would peak then. SC concluded that the appropriate course was to postpone Synod, continue to monitor developments and impacts on the SEC and to engage closely (in company with other denominations and faiths) with Scottish Government as restrictions on activity were imposed in most areas of life. There followed decisions to suspend physical meetings of all provincial bodies and to introduce homeworking for GSO staff.

Standing Committee met by Zoom at the beginning of April to take stock of developments (including financial implications to the extent then known) across the Province during a period of uncertainty and rapid change. Options for providing financial support to dioceses were discussed and the Treasurer was tasked with liaising with dioceses to ensure any required support was provided to them. Areas of GSO business (beyond responding to the pandemic) which should be accorded priority were agreed. The scheduled late April meeting invited the Church in Society Committee to bring forward proposals to disburse up to £50,000 to organisations providing support to those in greatest need during the pandemic. Grants were subsequently made to Aberlour, Scottish Women's Aid and Scottish Association for Mental Health. The meeting also reviewed the financial position and took forward planning for a shortened and digital General Synod later in the year, noted progress with a number of initiatives including the work of the Ethical Investment Advisory Group (EIAG) and congratulated the communications team on the level of productive delivery being achieved.

The Committee next met in June to take stock of Covid-19 developments, continue planning for General Synod towards end of year, consider financial issues including options for provincial quota 2021 and a range of other matters. At its September meeting, the Committee firmed up plans for Digital Synod including agreement on a proposal for 2021 quota and the possibility of release later in 2021 of funds to dioceses in response to their plans for new initiatives as part of the recovery from Covid-19. The Committee also welcomed an initial report from EIAG for submission to Synod and agreed to establish a task group to scope the issues to be addressed at provincial level to assist the Province emerge from lockdown and pursue its mission and ministry in a changed context. The Committee expects to meet again in November just ahead of Synod.

Looking ahead to 2021, the Committee will continue to monitor the impact of Covid-19, will take forward work in the areas identified by the recently established Task Group and will plan for a Synod in summer 2021.

Robert Gordon
Convener

SAFEGUARDING COMMITTEE (COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION OF CHILDREN AND VULNERABLE ADULTS)

The Provincial Safeguarding Committee has met on six occasions this year although three of these meetings were arranged to allow the Committee to discuss a specific area of concern – how the SEC supports victims of abuse within the Church. As with the other Boards and Committees, the February meeting was the only meeting at which the Committee met face to face with the others being conducted by video conferencing.

The Committee has considered the ongoing work of the Safeguarding Audit Implementation Group under its Chair, David Strang and the principal outcome from the Group to date has been an updated Safeguarding Policy and Principles which will be presented to General Synod at its virtual meeting in December. The implementation of the remaining recommendations has been paused for a period to enable some joint work between the Implementation Group and the Safeguarding Committee and a short life working group has just been established for that purpose.

The Committee considered the Draft Report of the Canonical Review Group which has been considering possible changes to Canons 54 and 65, both relating to safeguarding. The Committee sought to highlight the concerns that the Safeguarding Committee members have of the omissions and oversights of the Review Group's thinking in this respect.

The main work of the Committee has been to focus on how the SEC supports victims of abuse in the Church. The Church has not had to consider the number of serious reports of abuse which other churches have faced but it is evident the Church has no room for complacency on these matters. Previous cases which have been considered have highlighted deficiencies in both Canon 65 and Canon 54 which the Committee believes emphasises the need for reform of the Canons. With significant media scrutiny and the recommendations from the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse (IICSA) in England and Wales likely to focus on the need for changes in the way that faith groups deal with this, the Safeguarding Committee considers that it is important that the SEC stays ahead of the curve and implements necessary changes voluntarily before such change is forced on the Church.

Looking ahead, the Committee will be presenting its proposals for better dealing with victims/survivors of abuse within the Church and supporting and facilitating the work of the joint short life working group with a view to developing a more effective approach to safeguarding in the SEC. It is also anticipated that the awareness of the importance of safeguarding can be raised which, the Committee is confident, will enable a safer culture to be developed in the Church.

Richard Baker
Convener

FAITH AND ORDER BOARD

In 2020 the Faith and Order Board met two times to oversee important areas of our church's life and work, including a residential meeting not long before lockdown was announced. The Board considered the work and interplay of its five pendent committees – Canons, Doctrine, Inter-Church Relations, Interfaith Relations, and Liturgy – and also discussed a number of other matters affecting the life of the Church.

The Board considered the impact of Covid-19 as it affects the different areas of faith and order in the Church, for example the theological nature for online worship, new and revised liturgical material for lockdown, and the impact on ecumenical and interfaith relations. Each pendent committee will continue to reflect and feed back to the Board on these matters.

Recognising the urgency of the climate crisis, the Board also discussed the particular need for faith and order consideration as part of wider provincial discussions. Each committee was asked to consider how it can best contribute to a whole-church approach to the climate crisis.

The Diaconate Working Group (DWG), an ad-hoc group reporting to Faith and Order, met to consider plans to support a provincial network of vocational deacons, and to look at changes to the Ordinal for Ordinations to the Diaconate.

In addition to looking at the continuing work of the Canonical Review Group on a range of clergy HR and safeguarding matters, the Board also noted the work of the Canon 4 Review Group, which has begun detailed consultation across the Province on options for a revised canon for the election of bishops. The Review Group aims to bring any such revised canon for first reading to General Synod 2022.

The detailed work of the five pendent committees of Faith and Order is set out in the reports which follow.

I wish to thank all the members of the Board for giving serious consideration to all that comes before them and equally to thank the Conveners and members of the pendent committees. I am also grateful to all the GSO staff for their support throughout this unusual year.

Bishop Mark
Convener

COMMITTEE ON CANONS

The Committee on Canons has met twice so far in 2020. Further meetings by Zoom are planned for November and December.

The Canonical Review Group has issued its Interim Report, which has been considered by the Faith and Order Board. The Committee awaits further instructions to proceed with Canonical changes.

Mr Robert Phillips resigned at the beginning of the year and I would record my thanks to him for his contribution during his period of membership. Two new members, Rev Chris Lowdon and Mr Gavin McEwan were appointed in September.

Graham Robertson
Convener

LITURGY COMMITTEE

Until the coronavirus pandemic led to “lockdown”, with its particular challenges for the Church and its worship, the main item of business this year would have been a minor revision of Scottish Liturgy 1982, incorporating new seasonal Eucharistic prayers suitable for Christmas and Epiphany and the permitted changes currently authorised by the College of Bishops.

During the period of lockdown, material was produced to address real and anticipated contingencies, such as time constraints on funerals and the inability of families to gather for such occasions. This material was largely authorised by individual Bishops for use in their dioceses, and the Committee is now considering which may have longer-term usefulness, and be submitted to normal processes of authorisation.

A consultation on the Collects for Experimental Use was carried out, and revisions have been made in the light of comments received. This work continues.

Work on liturgical material for times of lament has been undertaken and drafts will be forthcoming in due course.

A special issue of the *Scottish Episcopal Institute Journal* was curated by John Davies and Nicholas Taylor on the theme of Liturgical Revision in the Scottish Episcopal Church and was published in December 2019. This collaborative publication offered a collection of studies mainly by members of the Liturgy Committee. We also invited several contributions from specialists outside the Committee. The articles do not represent any settled opinion of the Liturgy Committee but rather the considered thoughts of the individual contributors at the outset of a journey towards revision and renewal of the Eucharistic liturgy of the SEC.

The Liturgy Committee was represented by Nicholas Taylor at a meeting in Exeter of the Anglican Four Nations Liturgy Group (hosted by the Church of England), and at meetings of the Joint Liturgical Group of Great Britain in London. In January 2019 John Davies represented the SEC at a meeting of the International Anglican Liturgical Consultation in Hong Kong, where he contributed to documents on liturgical formation in Anglican theological education.

Dr John Davies completed his term as Convener in June, and was succeeded by the Rev Canon Dr Nicholas Taylor. Dr Davies returned to this role while Dr Taylor recuperated from eye surgery. We are grateful for the contribution Dr Davies has made to the work of the Committee over many years, including his five very productive years as Convener.

Nicholas Taylor
Convener

INTER-CHURCH RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Local Ecumenism

Much of the focus of the Inter-Church Relations Committee's work this year has been focused on how the churches in Scotland can find ways of working together in a new and uncertain context. Leaders of various Scottish churches have been meeting regularly throughout the pandemic to work and pray together; this new forum has been a welcome addition to the usual ecumenical scene, and represents a positive sign of the emerging Scottish Christian Forum.

The member churches of Action of Churches Together in Scotland (ACTS) continue the difficult and oft-times frustrating task of completing a transition to new patterns of working together in the Scottish Christian Forum, a task made more difficult by the inability to meet together in person. Nevertheless, ICRC is hopeful of seeing significant progress within the next few months.

At a bilateral level, Our Common Calling - The Scottish Episcopal Church's dialogue with the Church of Scotland - continues fruitfully even though Covid-19 delayed a proposed partnership declaration. This delay has given time to discuss sharing mission and practical outworkings of being church - it is hoped that the fruits of the last few years of journeying together will be presented in 2021.

An Ecumenical Policy for the Scottish Episcopal Church having been agreed in 2019, this year the ICRC has focused on how to highlight the Policy at local and diocesan levels.

International Matters

Although many international ecumenical events have been cancelled or postponed, the Porvoo Communion (Nordic and Baltic Lutherans) was able to hold a fruitful theological conference in October on 'Communion', which looked back on the last 25 years of communion, and encouraged members to consider how we continue to journey together for the next 25 years.

Thanks to all committee members for their efforts over the year. Particular thanks to Miriam Weibye, our Church Relations Officer, for all of her support.

John McLuckie
Convener

INTERFAITH RELATIONS COMMITTEE

1. Visit to Dundee 12/13 February 2020

In what could be a pattern for future visits to different localities in Scotland to encounter, learn from and support local interfaith groups and communities, the Committee spent 24 hours in Dundee. Members prayed at St Paul's Cathedral with Bishop Andrew, learned of the Dundee Interfaith Association, visited the Al Maktoum Mosque, toured the city with Bishop Andrew to learn of its religious communities and to hear about his role as a faith leader and as member of the Al Maktoum College Council.

2. Meeting on 9 June 2020

The Committee has been joined by three new members, Rev David Paton-Williams (Edinburgh), Rev Dom Ind (Glasgow and Galloway) and Rev Bonnie Evans-Hills (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane). It discussed the conference held in Glasgow arranged by Churches Together in Britain and Ireland on “Inter-Riting” or the experience of worshipping alongside peoples and communities of different faiths. The Convener has been invited to curate an edition of the SEI Journal on this subject. This meeting also heard about local interfaith group activities during and in response to the Covid-19 pandemic lockdown. The Scottish Government has been in regular contact with the leaders of the SEC together with other Scottish faith communities concerning related public policy, with InterFaith Scotland playing a central role in keeping channels of communication open. The relationship between Government and faith communities has also been helped by the fact that Prof Jason Leitch, National Clinical Director, is an active Baptist Church member.

3. Anglican Network for Interfaith European and North America Concerns (NIFECAC) 7 September 2020

A major 24 hour gathering was due to take place in Edinburgh hosted by the IFRC. Because of pandemic limitations a much reduced Zoom conversation took place and the hope is for a full consultation in Edinburgh in 2021.

4. Succession

The Faith and Order Board has approved the nomination of the Rev Bonnie Evans-Hills to replace Rev Cedric Blakey whose extended term as Convener expires at GS20 in December. This will herald a significantly new era in the SEC’s historic interfaith journey.

Cedric L Blakey
Convener

DOCTRINE COMMITTEE

During the past year the Doctrine Committee has been working on Grosvenor Essay No. 13, *Theology of Authority in the Ministry of the Church*. This is now available online on the SEC website, and it is hoped that a hard copy will be printed in due course. Thanks are especially due to Dr Nicholas Taylor who edited the Essay which, we hope, will stimulate discussion within both ordained and lay ministries. Work has begun on a new volume of essays by members of the Committee, to be edited by Dr Michael Fuller and Dr Nicholas Taylor and provisionally entitled *In the Image of God: What Does it Mean to be Human?* A contract has been secured with Sacristy Press and costs will be covered by a grant from the Drummond Trust. This will be an interdisciplinary book dealing with questions of religious anthropology.

A brief paper describing the nature and work of the Doctrine Committee has been put on the SEC website.

The Committee continues to co-operate with the Liturgy Committee as it continues to undertake revision of the 1982 Liturgy at the request of the College of Bishops. Advice

was offered on the wording of proposed new Eucharistic prayers. Issues concerning liturgy and gender have also been discussed with the Liturgy Committee.

The Convener offered a short paper on the subject of theological issues after Covid-19 to a meeting of NIFENAC (Network for Interfaith in North American and European Concerns) chaired by the Archbishop of Dublin on 7 September 2020, and this has been the basis for further discussion in the Committee with a view to expansion in the coming year.

The Committee received the document *What Do Anglicans Believe?* (Theological Education in the Anglican Communion [TEAC]) and began to consider a response.

The Committee welcomed Dr Harriet Harris as a new member in the past year.

In the coming year, the Committee propose to complete the book of essays *Made in the Image of God*, and hope to present the published form at General Synod, 2021.

We plan to complete Grosvenor Essay No. 14 on issues in theology and church after lock-down and Covid-19, and to present this to General Synod, 2021. This is in the context of wider discussions within the SEC on this subject as proposed by the Primus. Discussions for further Grosvenor Essays will take place.

We will continue to work with the Liturgy Committee as it continues with its work of liturgical revision.

We will prepare a response to the document *What Anglicans Believe*.

It is hoped that Professor Oliver O'Donovan will join us as a new member in the coming year.

David Jasper
Convener

MISSION BOARD

The Mission Board will have met for the usual meetings by the end of this year, four times, which included a meeting specifically to review mission in light of Covid-19. The February meeting was able to take place in person; however, the remainder of the meetings have been held via Zoom.

The Board has a number of pendant committees reporting to the Board: Church in Society, Global Partnerships and Youth. Each of these committees presents their minutes and business to the Board for consideration along with any relevant actions as appropriate.

The Board also received reports from the Local Mission Resourcing Group, which is currently convened by the Rev Dr Richard Tiplady and comprises members in mission resourcing roles within Dioceses.

A number of standing items are on the agenda each meeting. The Board has as its main focus future mission policy priorities. Within this the Board has continued to explore Intentional Discipleship, Fresh Expressions and, in this year, the impact of Covid-19 and mission in light of Covid-19. The Board endorsed and welcomed the courses offered by Richard Tiplady on Developing a Pioneer Culture in the Local Church. Five iterations of this course will have taken place with people from across the Province and beyond coming together to learn and discuss.

Members of the Board have met with other representatives from the Province including the College of Bishops to bring a number of discussions together, including one on Intentional Discipleship with a view to offering a conference on this topic in 2022.

The work of the Board is wide and varied all with the focus of mission. In recognising the executive function of the pendant committees and groups and the governance role of the Board, an important piece of work this year has been to look at the role of the Board. In this process there is a pilot piece of work to set up a new pendant committee to look at the work of 'Home Mission', this being a working title. The Rev Diana Hall has agreed to take up the convenership of this new committee.

Many thanks go to all those serving on the Board and the various pendant committees, who all bring their gifts and enthusiasm to the Church through this Board.

Sarah Murray
Acting Convener

CHURCH IN SOCIETY COMMITTEE

The Church in Society (CiS) Committee has continued to work on its overarching objectives of 1) exploring the interface between church and society 2) assessing the impact of secular issues on our church and 3) developing appropriate strategic partnerships. Three priority topics were agreed during this past year: climate change, child poverty and genome editing. General Synod 2019 considered the issues in the paper *What it Means to be Human: The Challenge of Genome Editing* and this document remains the work in progress. Dr Donald Bruce attends relevant events and liaises with other similar experts.

Following discussion at General Synod 2018, Standing Committee in 2019 agreed to allocate £50,000 for child poverty projects. This year monies have been disbursed from this fund. The CiS Committee will evaluate the effectiveness and impact of the grants, with Child Poverty Fund grant holders being invited to an event in 2021 where learning can be shared and then disseminated with the help of the SEC Communications team. As reported in the Standing Committee Report the CiS Committee also made recommendations for the disbursement of £50,000 to organisations providing support to those in greatest need during the Covid-19 pandemic.

Regrettably, whilst Covid-19 reduced our impact on the environment, our progress on climate change actions has been adversely affected. The 26th Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (COP26), due to be held in November 2020 was cancelled because of the pandemic and the establishment of an SEC Climate Change Group was slowed as we all sought to adapt

our church locally and at Diocesan and Provincial level. Membership from CiS Committee is represented on the Ethical Investment Advisory Group which forms part of the SEC's overall response to climate change.

Our work with strategic partners is encompassed in the networking, grant funding and liaison that goes on with different members of the Committee throughout the year. The annual Grant Recipients' Lunch provides a focal point and celebration of that work and includes not only strategic partners but also national and local charities, and local SEC churches, all of whom have received monies from the SEC. This was held in person in November 2019 and will be by video conference in November 2020. Our challenge is to improve the dissemination of such work in 2021.

Priorities for 2021 remain climate change, child poverty and genome editing.

Elaine C Garman
Acting Convener

GLOBAL PARTNERSHIPS COMMITTEE

The Global Partnerships Committee has the responsibility for making grants to partner organisations within the Anglican Communion, and for some liaison with the other provinces of that Communion. We have approximately £110,000 a year available to spend on grants for work overseas in other Anglican provinces. This money is from legacies and cannot be spent on any other purpose. While this is not a great deal of money, it enables us to make considerable differences in the lives of ordinary people worldwide through carefully targeted spending.

In 2020, the GPC is on track to spend all but a few pounds of the money that was available for us to allocate to projects abroad. Our original plans for 2020 included grants to each of the seven SEC dioceses to support programmes around the Lambeth Conference. With the onset of Covid-19, and the cancellation of Lambeth 2020, these grants were reallocated to a specific Covid-19 fund, and dioceses were invited to apply in support of their own companion dioceses. Grants made from this fund so far have aided in: the provision of PPE in Zambia; running a counselling service for women at increased risk of domestic abuse in Palestine; and provided a grant to the Diocese of Brechin to help support their partnership with the Diocese of Swaziland. With the effects of Covid-19 continuing to be felt around the world, the GPC will continue to offer the Covid-19 fund in 2021.

A snapshot of some of the other new projects funded in 2020 include:

- the provision of latrines and boreholes in Yida Refugee Camp in South Sudan
- contributing to the costs of a cathedral roof in Biharamulo, Tanzania, and of desks for a primary school in Kenya
- assisting with higher theological education costs for students in India, China, and South Sudan
- providing workshops for healing of memories from conflict in South Africa

Finally, I would like to thank Miriam Weibye, Marion Watson and Malcolm Bett for their work in keeping the GPC on track this year.

David Kenvyn
Convener

YOUTH COMMITTEE

The PYC's February meeting progressed as normal, with plans, thoughts and ideas for the year ahead. Once lockdown began, it seemed increasingly unlikely the Glen 20 camp would go ahead at Glenalmond College. What to do instead? The camp has been a mainstay and spiritual boost for delegates and leaders for many years.

We started a series of regular online worship, meetups and games. Different youth groups round the Province led worship in varying styles. We (well, us older leaders!) all had to get to grips with new technology and ways of working. What a difference, though, to see peoples' faces and hear their news from round the country. The way in which young people continued to link up with us, showed how necessary these meetups were.

When it came time for the Glen week in August we planned an online week. Care packages with mugs, hot chocolate, sweets and stickers came through the post. Activities were planned each day – not too many as online meetings are tiring, but enough to get the favourites from the week. This way we had a quiz, breakfast, morning prayer, house-groups, murder mystery, film night, afternoon activities and night eucharist - complete with (battery operated) tea light. We had 36 delegates signed up – down from normal, but still way more than some had predicted. With leaders too, that's a lot over zoom but definitely worthwhile, enjoyable, and important for faith and friendship.

Looking ahead we have an online event planned for the end of November and a (post) Christmas dinner (again online).

Next year we are hoping for Glen 2021 as normal, but have all we have learned about Glen online up our sleeves. We are due to have our Youth Pilgrimage to Iona in October 2021.

Tembu Rongong
Convener

SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL INSTITUTE COUNCIL

Core Values: Detail and Strategy

The core values of the SEI can be summarised as: - (a) Christ Centred, (b) Community Based, (c) Compassion Shown and (d) Creation Honoured.

a) Christ Centred

We have continued to divide Council meetings into a morning session when we consider the detail of SEI life, governance, and delivery. Afternoons are for consideration of strategic direction.

Detail: All aspects of SEI life were subject to a Periodic External Review in January. This was carried out by the Ministry Team of the Church of England and Durham University. The Reviewers attended a Council meeting and a residential weekend, as well as meeting with numerous stakeholders.

The Report said:

‘Our overall conclusion is that the Scottish Episcopal Institute continues to provide an appropriate environment for ministerial formation and is fit for purpose for preparing candidates for ordained and licensed ministry with the Scottish Episcopal Church.’

Strategy: Recommendations were made in the Report and plans are in place to implement those recommendations.

b) Community

Detail: Obviously during the lock down the community moved online and staff embraced the new mode of being. Residentials also moved online.

The October weekend student feedback noted:

‘The online session worked really well and whilst it is not the same as physically meeting the sense of being together in spirit was not lost.’

Strategy: Staff are working to ensure that any future virtual weekends are shaped around the feedback received. The next year is ‘virtually’ planned residentials etc should that be necessary.

c) Compassion

Detail: Building on the experience of staff and students who were part of the ‘Argyll Pilot’, further theological courses have been offered and more are planned.

Strategy: To offer online courses to lay and ordained throughout the Province.

d) Creation

We are all made in God’s image and part of God’s creation.

SEI is working hard to ensure equality of ‘access to learning.’ A Special Learning Disabilities Ombudsperson has been appointed.

Bishop Kevin
Convener

ADMINISTRATION BOARD

The Board’s meetings during 2020 have continued to deal principally with the interlinked issues of clergy wellbeing, stipends and investments.

The Personnel Committee has continued its work assessing the responses to the Clergy Wellbeing Survey of 2019, and the Committee’s Convener has discussed

particular issues and concerns with a significant number of respondents. The Committee is undertaking further work in relation to bullying and harassment and it is intended to provide a general update at the forthcoming General Synod.

The Clergy Stipend Review Group presented a full report to the Board's September meeting; this noted the extent to which Standard Stipend had fallen behind the cost of living in real terms, raised the question of whether Standard Stipend should remain aligned to that of the Church of England, and stressed the responsibility of all parties to ensure that clergy housing is kept in good repair. The Board will reflect further on the issues raised, with a view to bringing proposals to General Synod 2021.

Diocesan Treasurers are in touch with congregations concerning the financial effects of the Covid-19 pandemic and the Board has been kept abreast of any issues arising.

The Board was pleased to learn that, at a time of financial uncertainty for many congregations, the SEC Unit Trust Pool performance since March had been more than sufficient to make good the initial downturn in value experienced at the outset of the Covid-19 pandemic. The Investment Committee's decision to maintain the level of interim distribution at 26.5p was particularly welcomed by the Board.

Applications for Building Grants continue to be oversubscribed and as at September £230,000 of the £257,500 budget for 2020 had been allocated. A budget of £265,000 has been set for 2021.

Regarding Retirement Housing, a number of purchases and sales of property were made in 2020 and the stock of retirement housing is of good quality. Regular visits are made to the properties for which the Retirement Housing Committee is responsible.

Prospects for 2021

While some vacancies on the Board's pendant committees remain unfilled (particularly on the Investment Committee), the Board is pleased to have filled others. In the year ahead the Board will continue to work on the key issues noted above, in the firm belief that those who labour in the vineyard should be backed by the resources needed to ensure that they can carry out their calling effectively.

James N Gibson
Convener

INVESTMENT COMMITTEE

As reported in the Blue Book, the value of the UTP at 31 December 2019 was £86.6m. By 31 March 2020 it had fallen sharply to £78.9m, but markets swiftly rebounded and it had risen to £87.2m in May. Since then it has continued to rise steadily, reaching £107m at 30 September.

The Committee met in May by Zoom. Members were interested to hear that Zoom had been recent acquisition in the Long Term Global Growth Fund which is one of the pooled funds held in the UTP. At the meeting the fund managers Baillie Gifford gave a report on the UTP's performance and provided a detailed analysis of income forecast for the year. The diversification of assets and having a total return policy (investing for capital growth and income) had benefited the fund.

In setting the distribution for the first six months of 2020 at 26.5p per unit, the Committee recognised that the impact of loss of income from hall lets and reduction in giving from congregations whilst churches were closed was likely to be severe, and that an increase in line with inflation, if possible, would be welcomed by unit holders. The fund's performance to date and income forecast for the year ahead had given rise to cautious optimism and although the times ahead were uncertain, the Committee concluded there was no need to cut the distribution. Whilst there would be a reduction in income, the capital value of the fund had so far held up, and it was agreed that it would be appropriate to make up the shortfall in income from capital in order to maintain the real value of the distribution.

Following the sale of the direct holding in the oil and gas company Total, the Committee put in place an agreement with Baillie Gifford that excludes future direct investment in companies involved in the extraction of fossil fuels.

Since meeting in May, the Committee has received further positive updates from Baillie Gifford. The Committee is due to meet again in November when it will set the distribution for the second half of 2020. It remains cautiously optimistic but does not underestimate the challenges in the months and years ahead.

The Committee continues its work without a Convener, and Paul Sweetnam retired this year after serving two terms as a member. The Committee would therefore be interested to hear from anyone with an involvement in the investment management industry who would be willing to offer their expertise to serve the SEC in this important work.

Investment Committee (convenership vacant)

BUILDINGS COMMITTEE

At the time of going to print, the Committee had not met during 2020. The Committee is due to meet on 28 October 2020 and a report of its work will appear in the General Synod's Annual Report and Accounts for 2020.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

The Personnel Committee is concerned with the wellbeing and support of the clergy of the Scottish Episcopal Church. The Committee is at full strength and the Convener is indebted to the members who offer their time and support.

Since General Synod in June 2019, and the results of the Clergy Wellbeing Survey the Committee has been seeking ways in which support could be offered to clergy at all levels of the Church. Many members of clergy, at all levels, both stipendiary and non-stipendiary, retired and in post were prepared to offer the Convener their time and their views. Through these conversations it is clear that bullying is present at all levels of the Church. A clear and concise anti-bullying statement is required to which all members of the SEC can agree. This statement must be backed up by a variety of support. For some clergy a supportive conversation would be enough; others may need more professional advice and support. The College of Bishops has asked the Committee to prepare a strategy document as to how this can be moved forward.

Other issues that had been raised by the well-being survey were that of clergy stipends, pensions and housing and the Administration Board established a specific working group, which included some representation from the Personnel Committee, to carry out a review of these. This resulted in a further survey being sent to the clergy. The results of the review will be reported on separately once the Administration Board has completed its consideration of the group's report.

The Convener has been keen to consider clergy 'time off'. Current guidance envisages the equivalent of a six day working week with one day off. Consideration is being given to whether proviso should be made for an additional day off in every four weeks, in effect giving five days off in a month, instead of four. This would be a positive step and the practicalities will be addressed over the coming months.

The work of the Committee over the next year will be largely around the anti-bullying and harassment strategy, and the provision of support. There are a number of organisations which can offer ad hoc advice and support to the clergy and the Committee is in the process of pulling that information together and which will serve to support the anti-bullying strategy.

Sadly, much of the clergy's experience of bullying appears to come from lay members of the Church and the Committee is looking at ways in which congregations might be made more aware of their responsibilities to offer care and support to their cleric and to work together.

The Convener would want to record her gratitude to John Stuart and Ian Pilbeam for their unswerving support and advice.

Jan Whiteside
Convener

RETIREMENT HOUSING COMMITTEE

The Retirement Housing Committee met at the General Synod Office in February in order to consider applications for funding, review the current situation regarding house sales and purchases and to receive updates regarding current property repairs. As reported in the Blue Book, 2019 had been an exceptionally busy year, but no new applications for assistance had been intimated for the rest of 2020.

The Standard Property Price was reviewed and it was agreed to retain it at £180K.

One property became vacant and was allocated to another tenant. The sale of one property was completed at the end of February, but the purchase of another agreed for April was delayed until mid-June. During lockdown emergency repairs were carried out when necessary, but planned refurbishments were delayed until after restrictions had eased and businesses re-opened.

The Committee met via Zoom in August and received updates on work in progress and gave advice on cases.

The housing market continued to be volatile. No change was made to the Standard Property Price, but this would be reviewed if a new application for assistance was made before the year end.

It was agreed to pay a Christmas Gift of £90 to all SEC pensioners.

Mrs Judy Robinson retired from the Committee in June after serving for two terms of office and the Rev Paul Fletcher was appointed in September.

Looking to 2021, the Committee will continue to monitor the situation regarding the properties it is responsible for and will ensure repairs are carried out with the safety of tenants in mind and in compliance with any ongoing restrictions.

Lorna A Mortis
Convener

PENSION FUND

The Pension Fund Trustees have met twice during 2020: on 16 March and 8 October.

The March meeting was one of the last to be held at the General Synod Office before lockdown. At that time it was just becoming apparent how quickly Covid-19 could escalate and how much of an effect it might have on normal lives and routines. Investment markets had already reacted, falling sharply since the end of January. The UK market had been hit harder than the rest of the world. The MSCI world index was down by 15%, but the FTSE All Share index was down by 30%. The SEC Pension Fund was not unaffected by this volatility, but the investment strategy had so far meant that the Fund had been reasonably isolated from it.

The October meeting was held by Zoom. Markets had experienced a significant recovery in the second quarter and the Fund's total return for the first half of the year was +7.4%. The total value of investments was £61 million, up from £58 million at 31 December 2019. The Fund's actuaries, Mercer reported that the value of liabilities had also increased. Overall, the funding level had reduced since the last formal valuation in 2017 and was now around 104%. This represented a current funding surplus of around £2.4 million. The cost of providing future benefits had also increased as a result of a further reduction in expected investment returns.

The Trustees' main focus during 2021 will be completion of the next formal Actuarial Valuation of the Fund as at 31 December 2020. The figures reviewed at the October meeting would suggest that there may be some pressure to increase the employer contribution rate. The continuing surplus should offset this to some extent, but perhaps not entirely, and these figures can only be indicative with ongoing market volatility and some time still to go until the valuation date. Preliminary results of the valuation should be available for General Synod 2021.

Richard McIndoe
Chairman

THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK

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 MEMBERS 2020

House of Bishops

Most Rev Mark J Strange
Rt Rev Dr John A Armes
Rt Rev Anne Dyer
Rt Rev Kevin Pearson
Rt Rev Ian Paton
Rt Rev Andrew Swift

Standing Committee Members not Otherwise Diocesan Representatives

Mr Robert Gordon
Mr James Gibson
Very Rev Alison Simpson

ACC Representatives

Mr Alistair Dinnie
Dr Jenny Wright (also a Diocesan Representative for the Edinburgh Diocese)

Aberdeen & Orkney Clergy

Rev Prof David Atkinson
Rev Captain Gerry Bowyer
Rev Neil Brice
Rev Dr Ruth Green
Very Rev Dr Emsley Nimmo
Rev Canon Terry Taggart
Rev Canon John Walker

Aberdeen & Orkney Laity

Dr Martin Auld
Dr Julia House
Mrs Virginia Irvine-Fortescue
Miss Mary McKinnell
Dr Nicola Mills
Ms Cassandra Smith

Argyll & The Isles Clergy

Rev Rosemary Bungard
Very Rev Margi Campbell
Rev Amanda Fairclough
Rev Alexander Guinness
Rev Canon Simon Mackenzie
Rev David Railton

Argyll & The Isles Clergy Alternates

Rev Canon Sister Clare Lockhart
Rev Canon Peter Moger

Argyll & The Isles Laity

Ms Sally McKim
Mr Stephen Plant
Mr Colin Sibley
Mr Michael Smith-Tennent
Two Members, names not disclosed

Argyll & The Isles Laity Alternates

Mr Robert MacDonald

Brechin Clergy

Rev Dr Francis Bridger
Rev Canon Fay Lamont
Rev Peter Mead
Rev John Skinner

Brechin Clergy Alternate

Rev Canon Kerry Dixon
Rev Canon Michael Turner
One Member, name not disclosed

Attending 2020

Attending 2020

Brechin Laity

Ms Jean Fenwick
Mr Harold Jack
Dr Jaap Jacobs
Mrs Judy Robinson
Mr Graeme Stirling
Mrs Vina Strachan

Brechin Laity Alternates

Dr Aileen Black
Mr Graeme Smillie
One Member, name not disclosed

Edinburgh Clergy

Very Rev Frances Burberry
Very Rev John Conway
Rev Markus Dünzkofer
Rev Canon Dean Fostekew
Rev Diana Hall
Rev Dr Stephen Holmes
Rev Canon Ruth Innes
Rev Dr Sophia Marriage
Rev Canon John McLuckie
Rev Nicola McNelly
Rev David Paton-Williams
Rev Canon David Richards
Rev William Shaw
Rev Dr Jenny Wright

One Member, name not disclosed

Edinburgh Laity

Mrs Victoria Elliott

Mrs Karen Ellis

Dr Michael Green

Miss Sheila Kidney

Mr Barnaby Miln

Ms Cathy Outram

Mrs Wendy Pemble

Mr Alex Stewart

One Member, name not disclosed

Glasgow & Galloway Clergy

Rev Janice Aiton

Rev David Gifford

Not Attending 2020

Rev Andrea Hagenbuch

Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth

Rev Mary Jepp

Not Attending 2020

Rev Reuben Preston

Rev Paul Singh

Rev Canon Jane Ross

Rev Canon Drew Sheridan

Rev Canon Dr Nicholas Taylor

Rev Paul Watson

Glasgow & Galloway Clergy Alternates

Rev Canon Oliver Brewer-Lennon

Attending 2020

Rev Matthew Little

Attending 2020

Rev Jonathan Livingstone

Rev The Hon Sydney Maitland

Glasgow & Galloway Laity

Mr Kevin Boak

Mrs Margaret Hanley

Miss Trudy Hill

Mrs Anne Jones

Mrs Carol Lovett

Mr Alan Rumble

Dr David Simmons

Ms Jenny Whelan

Mrs Linda Whitby

Mrs Jan Whiteside

One Member, name not disclosed

Glasgow & Galloway Laity Alternates

Mr Ray Gascoigne

Mr Richard Horrell

Mr Petko Marinov

Miss Morag O'Neill

Moray, Ross & Caithness Clergy

Rev Julia Boothby
Rev Dr James Currall
Rev Canon Dr John Cuthbert
Rev Canon Michael Last
Very Rev Sarah Murray
Rev Katrina O'Neill
Rev Tembu Rongong

Moray, Ross & Caithness Laity

Mr Michael Campbell
Mr Iain Foyers
Ms Alison Garraway
Mr Hugh Morison
Mrs Deborah Munday
Mr Grant Swain
One Member, name not disclosed

Not Attending 2020

St Andrews, Dunkeld & Dunblane Clergy

Rev Liz Baker
Rev Tracy Dowling
Rev Samantha Ferguson
Rev Prof Trevor Hart
Rev Carol Latimer
Rev Dean Norby
Very Rev Kenneth Rathband
Rev Canon Graham Taylor
Rev Christoph Wutscher

St Andrews, Dunkeld & Dunblane Clergy Alternates

Rev Canon Dr Carrie Applegath
Rev Genevieve Evans
Rev Jo Mulliner

Attending 2020

St Andrews, Dunkeld & Dunblane Laity

Mrs Emma Barrie
Dr Anthony Birch
Mr Chris Brown
Mrs Linda Brownlie
Mr James Gardner
Mr Euan Grant
Mr Ross Stirling-Young
One Member, name not disclosed

Not Attending 2020

St Andrews, Dunkeld & Dunblane Laity Alternates

Mrs Shirley Mann

Attending 2020

SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CHURCH

REPRESENTATION ON OTHER BODIES/ORGANISATIONS

There follows a list of current representatives appointed to represent the Scottish Episcopal Church on a variety of other bodies and organisations.

Most positions are held by volunteers but in a few cases the SEC is represented by staff members and the list is annotated to show this.

Vacancies arise from time to time in the positions in question and if you have an interest in serving in any of the areas in question, please make your interest known to the General Synod Office.

John F Stuart
Secretary General
October 2020

SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CHURCH

REPRESENTATION ON OTHER BODIES/ORGANISATIONS – October 2020

Body/Organisation	Representative	Appointing Body	Start Date* *No Fixed Term Date
ANGLICAN COMMUNION			
Anglican Consultative Council	Alistair Dinnie Jenny Wright	Standing Committee	2016-25 2019-28
Anglican Communion Networks and Commissions: -			
Family Network	John Rea	Mission Board	2007*
Environmental Network	Alan Werritty	Mission Board	2003*
Women's Network	Ley-Anne Forsyth	Mission Board	2020*
ACTS (Action of Churches Together in Scotland)			
Trustee Board	Paul Goldfinch	Faith and Order Board	2015
Members' Meeting	Bishop of Edinburgh Rev Canon John McLuckie (Alternate) Miriam Weibye ¹	College of Bishops Faith and Order Board	2017 2016
Ecumenical Development Group	Rev Canon John McLuckie Miriam Weibye ²	Faith and Order Board	2016
Finance Committee	Mr Nick Cooke	ACTS	2014*
CEAS (formerly Scottish Sunday School Union)	Lorraine Darlow	Mission Board	2015*
CHURCH OF SCOTLAND			
Church Art and Architecture	Rebecca Cadie Alex Stewart (Alternate)	Buildings Committee	2008* 2005*
CTBI (Churches Together in Britain and Ireland)			
CRJN (Churches Racial Justice Network)	Rev Timothy Njuguna	Church in Society	2008*
Consultative Group on Ministry Among Children	Lorraine Darlow	Mission Board	2013*
Senior Representatives Forum	John Stuart ³	<i>ex officio</i> Secretary General	2007
Global Mission Network	Rev Eileen Thompson	Global Partnerships Committee	2008

¹ Church Relations Officer appointed as third SEC Representative. The position is non-voting. Officer presence helpful because of general overview of ecumenical relations.

² Since this is the successor to the body which previously oversaw Local Ecumenical Partnerships throughout Scotland, it is appropriate that the Church Relations Officer, as the ecumenical officer for the SEC, should also participate in this. This is mirrored in appointments from other denominations.

³ The Forum comprises senior denominational officers *ex officio*.

Body/Organisation	Representative	Appointing Body	Start Date* *No Fixed Term Date
DIACONAL ASSOCIATION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND	Rev Norma Higgott	Faith and Order Board	2016*
FAITH IN COMMUNITY SCOTLAND	Appointment in hand	Mission Board	2019*
FAITH IN COMMUNITY SCOTLAND ACTION FUND	Rev Canon Fay Lamont	Church in Society (annual reappointment)	2001
GLENALMOND COUNCIL	Primus	<i>ex officio</i> College of Bishops	2014*
INTERFAITH GROUP ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	Hilary Moran	Church in Society	
INTERFAITH SCOTLAND	Rev Cedric Blakey	Interfaith Relations Committee	2015*
MEISSEN COMMISSION (Celtic Churches Observer)	Rev Markus Dünzkofer	Inter-Church Relations Committee	2018*
MISSION TO SEAFARERS	Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane	College of Bishops	2019*
NHS SPIRITUAL CARE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE	Rev Carrie Applegath Sister Clare Lockhart (Alternate)	College of Bishops	2004* 2006
PORVOO CONTACT GROUP	Miriam Weibye ⁴	Inter-Church Relations Committee	2016*
REUILLY CONTACT GROUP	Rev Canon J McLuckie	Inter-Church Relations Committee	2005*
SCOTLAND4PEACE STEERING GROUP	Very Rev David Mumford	Church in Society	2008*
SCOTTISH CHURCHES COMMITTEE	John Whittall John Stuart ⁵	Admin Board	2013* 1996*
SCOTTISH CHURCHES COMMITTEE SAFEGUARDING GROUP	Donald Urquhart/ Daphne Audsley	<i>Ex officio</i>	2007*
SCOTTISH CHURCHES HOUSING ACTION	Vacant	Church in Society	
SCHA Affordable Housing Group	Elliot Glen-esk	Buildings Committee	2012
SCOTTISH CHURCHES PARLIAMENTARY OFFICE			
Advisory Group	Miriam Weibye	Church in Society	2006*
SCOTTISH FAITHS ACTION FOR REFUGEES	Rev Nick Bowry	Church in Society	2019*
SCOTTISH JOINT COMMITTEE FOR RELIGIOUS AND MORAL EDUCATION	Patricia Boyd Rev Alastair Macdonald	Church in Society Mission Board	2003* 2016*

⁴ Officer well placed within the denomination to act as liaison point with the Porvoo Communion.

⁵ Much of the agenda of the Committee deals with issues of a legal/regulatory nature. The two SEC representatives have traditionally comprised one officer and one other.

Body/Organisation	Representative	Appointing Body	Start Date* *No Fixed Term Date
SCOTTISH PILGRIM ROUTES FORUM	Margaret Pedersen	Mission Board	2013*
UNITY ENTERPRISE	Rev Les Ireland	Church in Society	2013*
WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES ASSEMBLY	Miriam Weibye One other	Faith and Order Board	
WORLD DAY OF PRAYER (Scottish Committee)	Rev A Wren	College of Bishops	2018

GENERAL SYNOD 2020 FEEDBACK FORM

The Standing Committee values the comments of General Synod Members on the operation of the General Synod. In 2020, because the Synod takes place virtually, different questions are being asked. Members are invited to complete the form electronically at the following link: <https://bit.ly/33FCdxz> The questions in the online form are set out below so that members can see at a glance the entirety of the Feedback Form. It can be submitted anonymously. The electronic version of the form will close on 14 December 2020.

- | | | | | |
|-----|--|--------------|----------------|-----------------|
| 1. | I found the experience of General Synod online to be generally positive | AGREE | NEUTRAL | DISAGREE |
| 2. | I appreciated the worship at General Synod | AGREE | NEUTRAL | DISAGREE |
| 3. | Sessions were generally chaired competently and clearly | AGREE | NEUTRAL | DISAGREE |
| 4. | Given the constraints of operating online, I consider that the agenda for Synod was appropriate | AGREE | NEUTRAL | DISAGREE |
| 5. | I would have liked to have seen the following on the agenda: | | | |
| 6. | I felt adequately prepared to participate in the Synod online | AGREE | NEUTRAL | DISAGREE |
| 7. | I understood how to vote on motions and in elections | | YES | NO |
| 8. | I attended one of the training sessions organised before Synod (if YES, answer question 9; if NO, skip to question 10) | | YES | NO |
| 9. | I found the training session helpful | | YES | NO |
| 10. | I think consideration should be given to holding at least some future meetings of Synod online | | YES | NO |
| 11. | I am a new member of General Synod | | 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
- I WOULD RATHER NOT SAY

If you would like to include your contact details: name, address, e-mail then please use the space below:

If you have any further comments you wish to make please do so in the space below:

Name (optional):

Thank you for completing the Feedback Form