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GENERAL SYNOD 2022 AGENDA AND PROGRAMME

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

A “Freshers’ Meeting” will be held at 09:00 on Thursday 9 June for new members of Synod

Thursday 9 June 2022

10:30
Opening Eucharist at St Paul’s & St George’s Church
Offering for Disasters Emergency Committee Appeal for Ukraine (online offering only)
Constitution of General Synod

Coffee will be available following the Eucharist

SESSION ONE: THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS IN THE CHAIR

12:00
Primus: Welcome to delegates and guests

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

Housekeeping announcements and training session on how to vote

Preliminary Business (Page 9)

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 David Richards be appointed as Clerical Prolocutor for the meeting.

Motion 3: That the Very Rev Sarah Murray be appointed as Clerical Vice-Prolocutor for the meeting.

Motion 4: That James Gibson be appointed as Lay Prolocutor for the meeting.

Motion 5: That Maureen McKellar be appointed as Lay Vice-Prolocutor for the meeting.
Permission to speak

**Motion 6:** That invited representatives from other churches and faiths be given permission to speak to Synod.

**Motion 7:** That the Rev Dr Michael Hull, Patsy Thomson and the Rev William Shaw, be given permission to speak to Synod.

**Motion 8:** That the Rev Markus Dünzkofer be given permission to speak to Synod.

**Motion 9:** That Sabine Chalmers of Scottish Faiths Action for Refugees be given permission to speak to Synod.

**Motion 10:** That members of the Provincial Environment Group (Dr Val Cameron, Cathy Johnston, and Robert Woodford), be given permission to speak to Synod.

**Motion 11:** That Alan McLean QC be given permission to speak to Synod.

**Motion 12:** That Claire Benton-Evans and members of the provincial Youth Network be given permission to speak to Synod.

Minutes of General Synod 2021 (Page 10)

**Motion 13:** That this Synod approve the minutes of the meeting of the General Synod held on 10-11 June 2021.

12:45 Lunch break

**SESSION TWO:** THE RT REV THE BISHOP OF BRECHIN IN THE CHAIR

14:00 Standing Committee – Covid-19 Pandemic, Accounts, Budget and Quota Overview

Covid-19 Pandemic

Presentations on examples of congregational developments during the Pandemic

Small group discussions around the following questions:

- What has encouraged you in church life in the last two years?
• What have you found challenging in church life in the last two years?
• What have you learned and what will you take forward from the last two years?

Accounts

**Motion 14:** 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 2021.

Budget and Quota Overview (Page 55)

15:15 **Faith and Order Board**

Faith and Order Board Introduction

**Liturgy Committee**


Opinions from Dioceses (Page 120)

**Motion 15:** That the proposal that the Scottish Liturgy 1982 with Alternative Eucharistic Prayers (2021) be added to the Schedule to Canon 22 be read for the second time.

15:45 Tea

**SESSION THREE: THE RT REV BISHOP OF GLASGOW AND GALLOWAY IN THE CHAIR**

16:15 **Faith and Order Board**

**Liturgy Committee**

Liturgies for First Reading (the texts of the Pastoral Offices noted below are available online at: [https://www.scotland.anglican.org/who-we-are/organisation/boards-and-committees/the-general-synod/](https://www.scotland.anglican.org/who-we-are/organisation/boards-and-committees/the-general-synod/))

Pastoral Offices for Priests

**Motion 16:** That the proposal that the Pastoral Offices for Priests be added to the Schedule to Canon 22 be read for the first time.
Pastoral Offices for Deacons

**Motion 17:** That the proposal that the Pastoral Offices for Deacons be added to the Schedule to Canon 22 be read for the first time.

Pastoral Offices for Readers and Authorised Lay Ministers

**Motion 18:** That the proposal that the Pastoral Offices for Readers and Authorised Lay Ministers be added to the Schedule to Canon 22 be read for the first time.

Scottish Calendar

Commemoration of Figures of the Reformation Period until the Repeal of the Penal Laws (Page 125)

**Motion 19:** That, upon the recommendation of the Faith and Order Board, the Scottish Calendar (1991) be amended to include the Commemoration of Scottish Saints and Martyrs of the Reformation Period on 19 January.

**Motion 20:** That, upon the recommendation of the Faith and Order Board, the Scottish Calendar (1991) be amended to include the Commemoration of Members of the Church who suffered under the Penal Laws on 15 June.

17:00   Evening Prayer

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

Friday 10 June 2022

SESSION FOUR: THE VERY REV SARAH MURRAY IN THE CHAIR

09:00   Morning Prayer

09:20   **Faith and Order Board**

Committee on Canons

Canon 4 (Of the Calling and Election of Bishops to Vacant Sees) (Page 127)
Commentary and Guidelines on Canon 4 (Page 142)

**Motion 21:** That the amended text of Canon 4 be read for the first time.
SEVEN: SESSION FIVE: BISHOP OF ARGYLL AND THE ISLES IN THE CHAIR

10:45 Coffee

11:15 Institute Council

“How the SEI has been supporting the discipleship of the baptised”

12:05 Mission Board

Session to include an update on various areas of the Board’s work

Situation in Ukraine

Sabine Chalmers of Scottish Faiths Action for Refugees will address Synod

Motion 22: That this Synod deplore Russian aggression in Ukraine and endorse the statement by the Primus offered to this Synod.

12:45 Lunch

SESSION SIX: THE RT REV THE BISHOP OF EDINBURGH IN THE CHAIR

14:00 Administration Board

Introduction

Personnel Committee

Update (Page 144)

Guidance on handling complaints (Page 147)

Investment Committee

Buildings Committee

14:40 Standing Committee

Provincial Environment Group

15:20 Standing Committee

Ethical Investment

Report from Ethical Investment Advisory Group (Page 151)
Motion 23: That the Ethical Investment Policy Statement for the SEC Unit Trust Pool be adopted.

16:00 Tea

SESSION SEVEN: JENNY WHELAN IN THE CHAIR

16:30 College of Bishops

17:00 Evening Prayer

Saturday 11 June 2022

SESSION EIGHT: THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS IN THE CHAIR

09:15 Morning Prayer

09:35 Faith and Order Board

Inter-Church Relations Committee

09:55 Committee for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults (known as the Safeguarding Committee) (Page 162)

Motion 24: That section 2.2.7 (b) of the Digest of Resolutions be deleted and replaced with the following:

(b) the Committee for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults (known as the Safeguarding Committee), consisting of a Convener, up to six other members drawn from within the Church and up to two additional members drawn from outwith the Church and who have professional safeguarding management experience at a senior level.

10:10 Standing Committee

Budgets and Quota (Page 55)

Motion 25: That this Synod, having examined the proposed budgets for the General Synod for the year 2023, agree to a quota figure of £685,000 for that year.
Synod Rules of Order

Proposed changes to Rules of Order (Page 163)

**Motion 26:** That the revised Rules of Order, as set out in the Synod Papers, be adopted as new Rules of Order for the General Synod in place of the existing Rules.

10:45 Coffee

**SESSION NINE: THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS IN THE CHAIR**

11:15 **Elections** (Page 49)

Standing Committee membership

An appropriate motion will be included if a nomination is made

Institute Council membership

**Motion 27:** That the Rev Canon Elaine Garman be re-appointed for a second term on the Institute Council.

**Motion 28:** That the Rev David Paton-Williams be re-appointed for a second term on the Institute Council.

**Motion 29:** That Cathy Johnston be appointed as a member of the Institute Council.

Preliminary Proceedings Committee membership

**Motion 30:** That Jeanette Whiteside be appointed as alternate lay member of the Preliminary Proceedings Committee.

Clergy Discipline Tribunal membership

**Motion 31:** That the Hon Lady Wolffe be re-appointed for an additional term on the Clergy Discipline Tribunal.

**Motion 32:** That the Hon Lady Poole be re-appointed for an additional term on the Clergy Discipline Tribunal.

Administration Board membership

**Motion 33:** That the Rev Amanda Fairclough be re-appointed for an additional term on the Administration Board.
Motion 34: That the Rev Richard Kilgour be appointed as a member of the Administration Board.

Pension Fund Chair

Motion 35: That the appointment by Standing Committee of Sarah Whitley as Chair of the Pension Fund Trustees be ratified and that her term of office continue until the conclusion of General Synod 2027.

11:35 Mission Board

Provincial Youth Committee

11:55 Closing act of worship and confirmation of Acts of Synod
PRELIMINARY BUSINESS

1. **Welcome to Delegates from Other Churches and Faiths**
   - Rev Ross Blackman: Church of Scotland
   - Lieut-Colonel Carol Bailey and Major David Cavanagh: Salvation Army
   - Rev John Bremner: United Reformed Church
   - Mr Matt Driver: Focolare
   - Mr Stephen Hagan: Baptist Union of Scotland
   - Ms Carole Hope: Action of Churches Together in Scotland
   - Mgr Philip Kerr: Roman Catholic Church
   - Rev Mike Marsden: United Free Church of Scotland
   - Rev Mark Slaney: Methodist Church in Scotland
   - Mary Woodward: Religious Society of Friends
   - TBC: Interfaith Scotland

**Guests from outwith Scotland**

Dr Heather Payne, Church in Wales

2. ** Tellers and Prolocutors**

   The Standing Committee recommends the following appointments:

   **Tellers:**
   - Malcolm Bett
   - Miriam Weibye

   **Prolocutors:**
   - Clerical Prolocutor: Rev Canon David Richards
   - Clerical Vice-Prolocutor: Very Rev Sarah Murray
   - Lay Prolocutor: Mr James Gibson
   - Lay Vice-Prolocutor: Mrs Maureen McKellar

3. **Assessor**

   The Primus has appointed Mr Gavin McEwan as Assessor

4. **Permission to Speak**

5. **Minutes of General Synod 2021**

6. **Any Matters Arising from Minutes**

7. **Elections**

   The following will be dealt with in the final session of Synod:
   - Standing Committee membership
   - Institute Council membership
   - Preliminary Proceedings Committee membership
   - Clergy Discipline Tribunal membership
   - Administration Board membership
   - Pension Fund Chair

8. **Roll Call**

   Online registration
Welcome and Induction

A training video was shown before the beginning of the meeting.

Opening Eucharist

The Synod was constituted at a celebration of the Eucharist in St Paul's & St George's Church, Edinburgh via Zoom at 9.30am on Thursday 10 June 2021.

The Most Rev Mark Strange, Primus, delivered his charge to the Synod during the Eucharist, taking as his text “let your light shine before others so that they may see your good works and give glory to your Father in heaven. Do not place your light under a bushel basket. A city built on a hill cannot be hidden.” He reflected on the difficulties of the Covid 19 pandemic - people had been denied the things they were accustomed to do to make their light shine and, at times, the bushel basket had felt very close. However, he drew comfort from the words of the psalmist “Yea though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for thou art with me; thy rod and thy staff they comfort me.” There had been moments in the previous year and a half when he had been afraid – fear of losing the things that were precious. However, that was not a fear about evil. Evil was about assault on godliness, an assault on one's relationship with God and a desire to turn people from God. The Shepherd carried the rod of defence and the staff of guidance to protect the sheep. To reach the prepared table referred to in the psalm required a need to be anointed and to dwell in God's house. The evil that made him afraid and pushed him to take shelter with the Shepherd was the degradation of those who were different, the laying of blame at the feet of those who had no voice, child poverty, the plight of refugees and the level of public criticism of people. In the midst of all that, the green pastures of love and care could be glimpsed. He encouraged Synod members to uncover the place of quiet waters in the forthcoming meeting and discover those things which brought hope and joy, acknowledging that members might disagree on detail but needed always to agree the message the Church was asked to proclaim: the message of love.

During the Eucharist, an offering was taken to support the work of Stop Climate Chaos Scotland. The offering amounted to £848.62.

SESSION 1: THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS IN THE CHAIR

1.1 Preliminary Business

1.1.1 Welcome

The Primus welcomed all members and guests to Synod.

1.1.2 Appointment of Tellers

Ms Bridget Campbell (Convener, Standing Committee) proposed, and Mr Jim Gibson (Convener, Administration Board) seconded, the following Motion:

“That Malcolm Bett and Miriam Weibye be appointed as tellers for the meeting.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

1.1.3 Appointment of Prolocutors

The Very Rev Alison Simpson proposed, and the Very Rev Sarah Murray seconded, the following Motion:
“That the Rev Canon Simon Mackenzie be appointed as Clerical Prolocutor for the meeting.”

The Motion was put to the vote in the House of Clergy and passed nem con: 58 in favour, 2 abstentions.

The Very Rev Alison Simpson proposed, and the Very Rev Sarah Murray seconded, the following Motion:

“That the Rev Canon David Richards be appointed as Clerical Vice-Prolocutor for the meeting.”

The Motion was put to the vote in the House of Clergy and passed nem con: 57 in favour, 2 abstentions.

Ms Bridget Campbell (Convener, Standing Committee) proposed, and Ms Jenny Whelan seconded, the following Motion:

“That Hugh Morison be appointed as Lay Prolocutor for the meeting.”

The Motion was put to the vote in the House of Laity and passed nem con: 46 in favour, 1 abstention.

Ms Bridget Campbell (Convener, Standing Committee) proposed, and Ms Jenny Whelan seconded, the following Motion:

“That James Gibson be appointed as Lay Vice-Prolocutor for the meeting.”

The Motion was put to the vote in the House of Laity and passed unanimously.

1.1.4 Permission to Speak

Ms Bridget Campbell (Convener, Standing Committee) proposed, and Mr Jim Gibson (Convener, Administration Board) seconded, the following Motion:

“That the Rev Alexander Horsburgh be given permission to speak to Synod.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

Ms Bridget Campbell (Convener, Standing Committee) proposed, and Mr Jim Gibson (Convener, Administration Board) seconded, the following Motion:

“That Donald Bruce be given permission to speak to Synod.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed nem con: 107 in favour, 2 abstentions.

Ms Bridget Campbell (Convener, Standing Committee) proposed, and Mr Jim Gibson (Convener, Administration Board) seconded, the following Motion:

“That Alan McLean QC be given permission to speak to Synod.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

Ms Bridget Campbell (Convener, Standing Committee) proposed, and Mr Jim Gibson (Convener, Administration Board) seconded, the following Motion:

“That invited representatives from other churches and faiths be given permission to speak to Synod.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.
1.1.5 Minutes of General Synod 2020

Ms Bridget Campbell (Convener, Standing Committee) proposed, and Mr Jim Gibson (Convener, Administration Board) seconded, the following Motion:

“That this Synod approve the minutes of the meeting of the General Synod held on 5 December 2020”.

The Motion was put to the vote and passed ‘nem con:’ 91 in favour, 16 abstentions.

1.1.6 Roll Call

The roll call of Synod members was taken from the electronic records of the meeting. A total of 128 members attended.

1.2 Standing Committee – Accounts, Quota and Strategic Direction

1.2.1 Accounts

Ms Bridget Campbell (Convener, Standing Committee) introduced herself as the new Convener of the Standing Committee and thanked the Synod for the honour of having been elected. She expressed gratitude to those who had welcomed her and helped her to understand the role. She expressed thanks to her predecessor, Robert Gordon, and was glad that, whilst he had stood down from the role of Convener, he had become a Trustee of the General Synod. He had also kindly continued in the role of chairing the Advisory Group to help the Church through the pandemic. She expressed thanks to all members of the Advisory Group who had worked very hard throughout the pandemic to provide advice to dioceses and congregations on Government regulations and guidance on church gatherings. The Communications Team had also supported much additional digital communication and broadcasting and whilst nothing could wholly replace meeting in person, access to online worship had been a huge solace and support to many. She suggested that the way in which the Advisory Group had operated as a small, dedicated, mixed and flexible group had been a successful model which might be applied to other types of task in future.

Ms Campbell expressed thanks to the whole team at the General Synod Office which had continued to work since the previous meeting of Synod to support the usual work of the boards and committees as well as responding to the extra demands arising from the pandemic. As the Synod turned to consider finances, she paid particular thanks to the Treasurer for his work on accounts and budgets.

She referred Synod to the Annual Report and Accounts for the year ended 31 December 2020. The Standing Committee members were the charity Trustees of the General Synod and so were responsible for preparing the Report and Accounts. The Accounts were prepared on a going concern basis and the Committee had assessed the Synod’s ability to continue as a going concern. She confirmed that, in formal terms, the Committee had a reasonable expectation that the Synod had adequate resources to continue in operational existence for the foreseeable future.

In 2020, there had been many cost savings because many normal activities had had to be curtailed and so it was difficult to make comparisons with previous years. The main areas in which there had been less expenditure than budgeted were a direct consequence of the pandemic and the restrictions on travel and physical meetings imposed by lockdown. Total costs incurred by the General Fund had been approximately £235,000 less than budgeted. As well as savings on expenditure, there had been extra income and Ms Campbell drew attention to the continuing good performance of the Unit Trust Pool which had allowed the Investment Committee to agree a larger than anticipated increase in the rate of distribution, providing an additional £41,000 of income to the General Fund. There had also been a remarkable increase in the value of investments with a total gain on investments during the year of £20.7 million, a 36% increase. She expressed thanks to the Investment Committee and the Fund Managers for those positive results.
As had been explained at General Synod 2020, one of the Standing Committee’s decisions in response to the pandemic had been to agree to redistribute the financial benefits which had arisen by inviting applications to a Recovery and Renewal Fund. Guidance on applying to the Fund had been issued to dioceses earlier in the year and she drew to the attention of all Synod members the importance of encouraging congregations to take advantage of that opportunity.

She invited anyone with detailed questions about the Accounts to email the Treasurer.

Ms Campbell then proposed, and Mr Jim Gibson (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 2020.”

The Primus opened the motion for debate and questions.

Mr Euan Grant (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) explained he had been considering the membership and communicant statistics for the previous three years. He asked whether there had been a change in the methodology for the collection of such statistics and whether the statistics could be used for anything? To what extent did the statistics allow the Church to draw conclusions about the state and trajectory of church membership? He suggested that there were potentially different stories which could be drawn from the statistics. Ms Campbell responded by saying that she personally had been relying on the figures and drawing conclusions from them, but she invited the Secretary General to comment, She emphasised that the intention was for the figures to be capable of being relied upon. The Secretary General confirmed that there had not been any change to the methodology of statistical collection in recent years. However, the Mission Board was currently in the course of considering the collection of a broader range of statistics because some concern had been voiced that the current statistics did not adequately reflect the true life of the Church. A pilot project, using a new form, had been undertaken in the Diocese of Moray, Ross and Caithness but following discussion with the College of Bishops, any decision to take that forward more broadly had been postponed because it had been felt that to require the submission of a broader range of statistics at the current time would be to impose an unhelpful additional burden on congregations during the pandemic.

The Motion was then put to the vote and passed nem con: 112 in favour, 2 abstentions.

**1.2.2 Budgets**

Ms Campbell then turned to consider future Budgets to provide context for many of the debates which would arise during the meeting. In some sessions, members were likely to think about additional funding required for particular important issues. She emphasised that agreement for extra resources for any particular issue would entail an adjustment to expenditure elsewhere in the overall budget.

In recent years, the Standing Committee’s key financial objective had been to achieve a balanced budget and avoid deficits. However, the process of setting a balanced budget at the beginning of the year had regularly been followed by the generation of significant surpluses. That had generally happened because actual expenditure in particular areas or projects had been less than estimated, for example because of lower than expected uptake of grants. Because of the pandemic, there had been a very significant reduction in many areas of expenditure resulting in a surplus rather than the large deficit which had originally been budgeted. Accurate budgeting for future years was a particular challenge as the Standing Committee sought to establish how far patterns of working would change in the light of the experience of the previous 15 months. In agreeing budgets for future years, the Standing Committee intended to carry on with a prudent level of over commitment because it expected that underspends would occur and that, in the short-term, reserves would be sufficient to fund any likely deficit.
Ms Campbell outlined the process followed in the province for the agreement of budgets and those included in the Synod Papers reflected decisions made since the previous November, when the budgets had been considered originally. The numbers were dynamic and had changed even since the papers had been prepared for the current meeting. A recent decision by the Investment Committee had been to increase the Unit Trust Pool distribution, with the preliminary distribution for 2021 being set at 30p per unit and with an indication that, based on current performance, the total distribution for the year would be 65p per unit, an increase of 11% on the previous year's distribution. This was greater than the distribution assumed in the budgets. If the 65p distribution were achieved for 2021, the General Fund's income would be £113,000 greater than that detailed in the budget, reducing the budgeted deficit to £386,000. That would also mean that budgeted deficits would be smaller in 2023 and 2024 than had previously been expected.

She invited any high-level comment on the budgets.

Mr Hugh Morison (Moray, Ross and Caithness) wished to revert to a point which he had raised with Robert Gordon at the previous Synod, namely that he found the budget figures difficult to follow because they were expressed to the nearest pound. Mr Gordon had indicated that this matter would be looked at by the Standing Committee. He wondered whether it had been considered and, if not, whether it could be. He suggested that the figures could be rounded to the nearest hundred pounds.

Ms Campbell responded and said she was unaware of the previous history but would certainly arrange for the matter to be considered and whether the clarity of the figures could be improved.

1.2.3 Strategic Direction

Ms Campbell then turned to the question of strategic direction. She was aware of previous work undertaken on setting a strategic direction for the General Synod. She suggested that setting a strategic direction meant establishing an appropriate framework for determining how best to use the Church's resources at provincial level which would allow a sensible allocation of resource between competing demands.

As her predecessor, Robert Gordon, had described in 2020, work on defining a vision and strategy had had to be postponed because of the pandemic so that effort could be concentrated on tackling various urgent issues facing the province. That was what had led to the very successful work of the Advisory Group.

The baton had been passed to her and she was pleased to report that the College of Bishops and Standing Committee had decided to take forward previous discussions by preparing a vision, strategy and action plan for the province's work to meet the challenges of the second decade of the 21st century. That would obviously need to include how the Church would respond to the social, economic and environmental impacts of the global emergencies of the Covid 19 pandemic, and of climate change, and indeed the linked crisis of biodiversity loss.

The College of Bishops and the Standing Committee had agreed to produce a statement of vision, strategy objectives and action plan which would allow the province to maximise the effectiveness with which it met the challenges expected to be faced in the following 10 years. The statement needed to be capable of being used to inform the work of provincial boards and committees, including as a basis for prioritising and de-prioritising work, effective decision-making and efficient allocation of financial and human resources. It would also inform the work plans of General Synod Office staff. The statement would need to include:

- An expressive and inspiring vision – that might meet the need for an overarching narrative about what the Church stood for and which had been discussed at previous General Synod meetings.
The priorities for cross-Scottish Episcopal Church (SEC) action at provincial level in the following 10 years including measures which would lead to growth in membership.

The provincial structures of the SEC (boards and committees) which would be expected to align their work with the statement.

How far it was important or desirable for services and activity at provincial level to lead to consistent outcomes at diocesan level.

Ms Campbell explained that she had offered to facilitate a process, with the help of members of General Synod Office staff, to gather views on what ought to be covered and prepare initial drafts for comment which she hoped would be the subject of much discussion. The Standing Committee intended that a draft statement containing those elements would be available from December 2021 to inform practical decision-making and be ready for presentation to General Synod 2022. The College of Bishops and Standing Committee would be asked to agree the statement before it came to Synod.

The Standing Committee wished to invite the Synod to make an initial contribution to that process of discussion by asking members in the current meeting to take part in breakout groups and contribute to early thinking on the subject.

Synod members were then transferred into breakout groups on Zoom to discuss the following questions set by the Standing Committee Task Group:

1. What does a "vision" for the SEC need to say and what issues does a strategy to realise that vision need to cover?

2. What are the priorities for action at provincial level across SEC over the next ten years?

3. How would you ensure that provincial boards and committees focus on priorities once identified?

The collated responses from the breakout groups are appended to the minutes of the meeting.

SESSION TWO: THE RT REV THE BISHOP OF GLASGOW AND GALLOWAY IN THE CHAIR

2.1 Faith and Order Board

2.1.1 Liturgy Committee – Scottish Liturgy 1982 with Alternative Eucharistic Prayers (2021)

The Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway introduced the session. He explained that the Scottish Liturgy 1982 with Alternative Eucharistic Prayers (2021) came to Synod upon the recommendation of the Faith and Order Board. Members of Synod were encouraged to comment upon the liturgy but because liturgy could only be adopted upon the recommendation of the Board, it would not be possible to amend the liturgy on the floor of Synod. The liturgy was being presented for a first reading after which it would be sent to Diocesan Synods for consideration. The Board would then consider all comments received from dioceses and present the liturgy, with possible alterations, to General Synod 2022.

The Rev Canon Dr Nicholas Taylor (Convener, Liturgy Committee) referred Synod members to the report of the Committee in the Annual Report and Accounts for the year ended 31 December 2020.

He explained that a new impression of Daily Prayer would shortly be available which would correct a number of typographical errors and replace the blue paper on which the Psalter, canticles and prayers of the Evening Office had previously been printed with "desert yellow". Advice on the choice of colour had been received from the Scottish
Churches Disability Group and it was hoped that the new colour would prove more easily readable.

The Faith and Order Board had approved, and the College of Bishops had authorised for an experimental period, the introduction of a Season of Creation to the Liturgical Calendar with collects, a Eucharistic Prayer with post-Communion Prayer and Blessing, and Propers for Morning and Evening Prayer. These had been circulated to clergy and lay readers electronically in two booklets, one for the Eucharist and the other for Daily Prayer. A third booklet, containing intercessory material for use at any act of worship, had not been authorised but was provided as an additional resource. The material was also available on the provincial website. Starting in 2021, the Season of Creation would begin on the first Sunday of September and run for four weeks, culminating on the fifth Sunday. The readings from the Revised Common Lectionary for that period would be used to avoid disrupting the continuous reading of the Epistle and Gospel of the year. In order to encourage feedback on material which had been authorised for experimental use, an online platform was in the course of being designed and would be available shortly.

Two sessions on Zoom to introduce the Season of Creation and the new feedback process would be offered during August 2021. Clergy and lay people involved in conducting worship would be welcome to attend but it would be necessary to register in advance.

The disruption in established patterns of worship and the truncated nature of General Synod 2020 had delayed the process of authorising material which had been in experimental use for some years. The texts which were the subject of the motion on the Synod agenda reflected two discrete tasks in the continuing process of liturgical renewal, hence the two rationales set out on pages 43 and 44 of the Synod Papers.

The revisions to the Scottish Liturgy 1982 largely concerned the use of gendered language of God, the Church and human beings. It had been pointed out that an occurrence in the appended intercessions had not been rectified. That would be rectified by the Committee when other feedback was considered, and a revised text submitted to the Faith and Order Board ahead of General Synod 2022. A typographical error had entered the text of the Proper Preface for Christmas use with Eucharistic Prayer 1 and that would similarly be corrected prior to a second reading.

Eucharistic prayers for the seasons of Christmas and Epiphany, which had not previously been provided, were interpolated into the liturgy. Paragraph spacing in Eucharistic prayers 2a and 2b would be corrected prior to second reading.

The Chair invited comment.

The Rev Canon Peter Moger (Argyll and The Isles) thanked the Committee for its work and expressed support for the removal of masculine gender pronouns for God. However, he wished to take issue with a line in the Sursum Corda (line six of the Eucharistic Prayer). The issue was not a nit-picking exercise over wording but a broader theological one. “Our” thanks and praise were only part of a much bigger picture. The original version “it is right to give him thanks and praise” did not specify who or what might be giving the thanks. The publication the previous month of liturgical material for the Season of Creation was a reminder of the important emphasis in Christian scripture and theology that the whole contingent created order praised its Maker. To date, that had been implicit in the Sursum Corda and indeed in the wider Eucharistic Prayer, including, for example the Sanctus. He recognised that it was the case that some other Anglican provinces had opted for the wording “our” thanks and praise, but Canon Moger urged the Committee to consider the approach taken by yet other Anglican provinces of adopting the wording “it is right to give thanks and praise”.

Canon Taylor thanked Canon Moger for his comment. On instruction from the Faith and Order Board, the Liturgy Committee would give the matter serious consideration along with any other feedback received in the following months. He recognised that there had been various attempts to give an English rendition for that line across the Anglican
Communion and ecumenically and, ultimately, a decision would need to be taken on which wording to adopt.

Mr Euan Grant (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) recognised that the wording in question was derived from "dignum et justum est" and suggested that a doubling of the adjectives might be appropriate, such as the term "right and just".

The Rev Dr Stephen Holmes (Edinburgh) commended the new version of the 1982 Liturgy as skillful and sensitive. He also commended the new Eucharistic Prayers which compensated the, perhaps regrettable, loss of Proper Prefaces. He was glad, however, that the liturgy being presented had not incorporated all of the permitted changes included in the experimental version on the provincial website, some of which were not as elegant as those now being presented to Synod. The permitted changes document did have an excellent preface. His question related to section 25, "the Blessing", which he recognised was optional. There was a truncated, weak version of the Blessing in the permitted changes document to which he had referred. He considered the version being presented to Synod was a better version but nevertheless it omitted the words "his Son". He assumed that the deletion had been to remove masculine imagery but in the permitted changes document, the blessing was related to its source in Philippians 4:7 which referred specifically to Christ Jesus. Liturgical texts frequently used Scripture but did not slavishly follow it. He invited Canon Taylor to confirm that it was not the policy of the Liturgy Committee to conform liturgical texts to the Bible without reference to the liturgical tradition through which they had been received. People carried the liturgy within them, and he felt it was a pity that the phrase "his Son" or "God's Son" had been lost.

Canon Taylor expressed thanks for the comments which had been made. They were being noted. The Committee drafted texts on behalf of the Faith and Order Board which were finalised in conjunction with the College of Bishops. There was a dynamic relationship between Scripture and the liturgy which dated back to the earliest days of the Church. It was not a slavish relationship either way but a dynamic and creative one. There was a strong tradition in SEC liturgies to make allusions to Scripture but without a slavish following of particular texts.

The Primus proposed, and the Rt Rev Ian Paton (Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) seconded, the following Motion:

"That the proposal that the Scottish Liturgy 1982 with Alternative Eucharistic Prayers (2021) be added to the Schedule to Canon 22 be read for the first time."

The Motion was put to the vote in Houses and passed as follows:

- House of Laity: 48 in favour, 1 against, 2 abstentions
- House of Clergy: 49 in favour, 1 against, 3 abstentions
- House of Bishops: unanimously in favour.

2.1.2 Liturgy Committee – Addition to Calendar of Jane Haining

Canon Taylor reported that the Calendar had been cause for reflection, not only in Scotland but across the Anglican Communion. That was particularly true of the more minor commemorations, many of which elevated people whose witness had either been of very local significance, or had proved not to be of enduring value, or indeed had been compromised by information which had subsequently come to light, or which changing values in society and the Church had cast into rather different relief. Several provinces had also been vexed by proposals to include figures of quite recent history and were struggling to determine appropriate criteria to apply. In Scotland, the historical background included more than a century of being subject to penal laws, during which allegiance to the movement which had become the SEC had been costly, and for some their consciences had brought them into conflict with the State. The Committee was reflecting on how that period in the SEC's history ought most appropriately to be commemorated, when the names of those whose faith was heroic had been largely forgotten and those who were remembered might be controversial. A submission would be made to the Faith and Order Board in due course. In the meanwhile, the Committee
had no hesitation in recommending that Jane Haining, a Church of Scotland worker in Hungary who had perished at Auschwitz, should be added to the Calendar¹. She had been brought to the attention of the Faith and Order Board by the Rev Gerry Dillon of the Diocese of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane.

A video, compiled by Mr Dillon, was then shown to Synod recounting her life and witness.

The Rev Markus Dünzkofer (Edinburgh) strongly supported the inclusion of Jane Haining in the Calendar. He suggested that if the motion were approved the tradition of the Eastern Church should be adopted, namely that notification should be given not only to other churches in the Anglican Communion but also the Church of Scotland, the United Free Church and the Hungarian Reformed Church to the effect that Ms Haining would be part of the SEC’s ongoing worship.

Mr Hugh Morison (Moray, Ross and Caithness) also strongly supported the proposal. He had personal reasons for doing so. His wife was a Hungarian Jew born in Budapest in 1944, at the height of the deportations. Had it not been for the courage of people like Ms Haining, his wife might not be alive. Her mother would have known some if not many of the children cared for by Ms Haining.

The Rev Gary Clink (Brechin) commended the work which Ms Haining had done. However, those on the catholic wing of the Church asked the saints to pray for them. That was more difficult in the case of Ms Haining who was a Presbyterian. He wished to emphasise that Synod was being asked to make a decision about the inclusion in the Calendar of a Presbyterian missionary who, as a Presbyterian, would not have believed in praying to the saints.

Canon Taylor responded by confirming that discussion had taken place between the Convener of the Inter-Church Relations Committee and his counterpart in the Church of Scotland before the proposal had been formulated. It was understood that the proposal had the full support of the Church of Scotland. The question of how individual members of the Church prayed was up to their conscience. The kind of devotions mentioned by Mr Clink were above and beyond the discipline provided in the Authorised Liturgies of the SEC. Those members of the Church who did observe such a tradition would have to decide for themselves whether particular names in the Calendar ought to be invoked in that way. However, this would not be the first example of someone in the Calendar who, in their lifetime, would not have prayed to the saints. Consequently, the proposal was not a departure from existing practice.

The Primus then proposed, and the Rt Rev Ian Paton (Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) seconded, the following Motion:

"That, upon the recommendation of the Faith and Order Board, the Scottish Calendar (1991) be amended by the inclusion of Jane Haining."

The Motion was put to the vote and passed by majority: 106 in favour, 1 against, 6 abstentions.

The Chair expressed thanks to Canon Taylor and the Liturgy Committee.

2.2 Inter-Church Relations Committee – Our Common Calling: approval of the St Andrew Declaration

The Rev Canon John McLuckie (Convener, Inter-Church Relations Committee) reminded Synod that the church of Old St Paul's stood on the site where Bishop Alexander Rose had famously led members of his Cathedral congregation of St Giles in 1689 or 1690 to set up a new church following the establishment of Presbyterianism by King William. It was likely that he had not envisaged that separation from the presbyterian party of the Church of Scotland would be a permanent arrangement. If he had had the gift of seeing into the future, might he have been

¹ It was noted after the Synod meeting that the paper about Ms Haining included in the Synod Papers incorrectly stated that she was born in the Borders. She was in fact born in Dumfries and Galloway.
surprised at the continued separate identities of those two parts of the Church of Scotland 332 years later? Would he have recognised the nation of Scotland as it was now, where the deadly religious wars of the century of his birth had given way to one of the least religiously observant states in Europe? The religious landscape of Scotland still bore the scars of that bloody 17th-century but the battles that had caused them were far in the past. Since then, both episcopalian and presbyterian traditions had benefited from the Liturgical movement, evangelical revivals, the insights of biblical scholarship, the growing convergence in the practice of Christian spirituality, dialogue with Orthodox, Lutheran and Roman Catholic brothers and sisters, from the richness of interfaith encounter and, above all, from a growing sense that the Church was united in its mission to participate in God’s work of renewing creation and healing humanity in its brokenness. It was that call from God that was front and centre of the commitments of the St Andrew Declaration being presented to Synod. Two sister churches, forged in the same turbulent history, were invited to work together, united in a common purpose and delighting in an enriching diversity. That work was not an organisational merger, but an organic and creative co-operation in the work of God’s mission of love, healing and reconciliation.

The Our Common Calling Working Group, which had begun in 2016 and whose progress had been warmly endorsed by Synod in 2019, had kept that mission focus throughout its deliberations. The Group had visited rural and urban contexts across Scotland as well as exploring the work of mission communities of churches in Cumbria. The needs of each community were different and so the response of churches also had to be appropriate to context. The proposal was not any kind of one size fits all approach but rather one which gave permission and encouragement to each local partnership of churches to share human, spiritual and physical resources in the work of mission in the most appropriate way. For some that might mean the sharing of a building; for others sharing pastoral care or regular worship. For many it might be shared projects such as food banks, joint eco-congregation ventures, meditation groups, Messy Church, befriending schemes, Bible studies or courses for those new to faith. Such activity was already common across Scotland, but the intention was to encourage more of it and, as two of the Churches that sought to offer ministry to every community in Scotland, to recognise that there was a particular and distinctive commitment to work together to that end.

As well as energising such work in local communities, the St Andrew Declaration constituted a formal recognition of both churches as belonging to the One, Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of Jesus Christ. To many, that might feel like a statement of the obvious, but it was important to pause and note the significance of such a step between two churches which shared so much history, not all of it glorious. It represented a profound and joyful recognition, a moment of healing and hope.

The Declaration recognised that, because of the two churches’ distinctive identities, each had much to offer one another and much to receive. It recognised that each existed not for themselves but for the mission of God. It also recognised that, although there were unresolved matters, not least the nature of the Church’s ordained ministry, such matters need not hold the Churches back from doing all that could be done to share in a life of faith. The Declaration represented the start of a journey, not its end. It was a journey that two sister churches in Christ were being invited to undertake together in faith, unity and the strength of the Holy Spirit.

The Rev Sandy Horsburgh, Convener of the Church of Scotland’s Committee on Ecumenical Relations, expressed thanks for the invitation to address the Synod and noted that this was the second time he had had such an honour and hoped that this was the case. His reference to the Church of Scotland and the SEC being more than just friends, more even than best friends but truly sisters and brothers, was a sentiment which he wholly endorsed.

In the time taken by the Our Common Calling process to work together, both Churches had grown closer together. The fact that both Churches shared a virtually identical ecumenical policy was a sign of that. Most importantly, the fact that many congregations shared worship from time
to time and co-operated on local projects and that many clergy found genuine support and friendship with one another demonstrated that the Churches had moved from being neighbours living parallel lives, to friendship in responding to a mutual call into the mission of God in Scotland.

The times were tough for churches in Scotland and that also had drawn both Churches together. There was a need for mutual support and prayers. Out of that need the Churches could be more effective in working together in ministry and mission in different but complementary ways.

The St Andrew Declaration had been received by the General Assembly with some enthusiasm helped by the commendation received not only from the Primus but from the Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane who had been the SEC representative at the Assembly. It had clearly struck a chord with ministers and congregations of the Church of Scotland. The Declaration followed very closely the pattern adopted by other ecumenical agreements, notably the Reuilly Agreement and the Columba Declaration. In that sense the Declaration was in known and trusted territory, following a familiar pattern which recognised and celebrated the unique gifts and characteristics of each Church but pointed to the core of what was held in common. It also looked to the future, laying the ground for further co-operation in mission and service.

The decision on whether or not to adopt the Declaration was one for the General Synod but along with sisters and brothers in the Church of Scotland, he prayed that the Synod would adopt it and that, building on that foundation, together both Churches would find more and richer ways to glorify God together.

Finally, Mr Horsburgh expressed pleasure at being able to work with John McLuckie as Co-Convener of the Our Common Calling Group. As Canon McLuckie stepped down as Convener of the Inter-Church Relations Committee, he would look forward to working with the Rev Canon Professor Charlotte Methuen as she took on that role.

Synod members were then transferred into breakout groups on Zoom to discuss the following questions set by the Inter-Church Relations Committee:

1. The St Andrew Declaration invites SEC and Church of Scotland congregations to work together for the sake of the Church’s mission in Scotland. Can you share specific examples from your own experience of such collaboration between our two churches?

2. Looking to the future, what other examples of collaboration would you like to see in your own context?

3. Are there any barriers to co-operation that we need to overcome?

The collated responses from the breakout groups are appended to the minutes of the meeting.

The Rev Prof David Atkinson (Aberdeen and Orkney) spoke as someone who had been one of the SEC delegates more than 25 years previously to the Scottish Churches Initiative for Union and expressed thanks to Canon McLuckie and others for the work to achieve the St Andrew Declaration. The acknowledgements in the Declaration stressed that there was work to be done. Differences between denominations, which might seem important to those in churches, were not seen as important by people "out in the real world". There was a need to recognise that. Undertaking joint activity, without concentrating on the differences which divided the Churches, was a very real way ahead and also a way of attracting others into the Church.

The Rev Markus Dünzkofer (Edinburgh) spoke in favour of the proposal. He was an SEC member of the Our Common Calling Working Group and had helped in the drafting of the Declaration. For the first time, the Declaration enabled the Churches to name their complex history, including the pain caused to one another. The statement also clarified what the Churches were allowed to do already. It was not a commitment to do anything which was not already in place. The world was yearning for healing and meaning, and the Gospel could be proclaimed more effectively when the Churches spoke with a united voice. Also, however, in
supporting the proposal, he did so with some heartache. How the statement was understood could cause confusion and even pain. As Episcopalians, it was necessary to recognise that the Declaration was not a "full communion" statement, nor, from his perspective, could it be at the present time. Also, his heartache related to the fact that further movement could mean a significant change in the SEC’s ecclesiology, identity and sacramental theology, specifically the theology of ordination. Much time had been spent on the marriage Canon in recent years, and it was important to reflect on the consequences when such a proposal was being made. Ecumenism was like apple pie – who would not vote in favour of it – but he wondered whether it was in fact faithful to the ecumenism of recent decades. The question was how to move forward without jeopardising the Church’s unique identity and how to involve those who had strong and divergent views about tradition and theology in these conversations.

The Rev Dr Stephen Holmes (Edinburgh) did not wish to speak against the Declaration but wished to express reservation. Ecumenical partnership involved working together and close friendships. He himself was involved in joint training. As an Episcopalian, it had been good to see the developments within the General Assembly especially the renewal plan announced in 2019 and, at the 2021 Assembly, the interim report of the Theological Forum which had recommended demoting the status of the Calvinist Westminster Confession, which would be appreciated by many Episcopalians. However, there were problems with the St Andrew Declaration. In the preamble, there were two inaccuracies which revealed deeper problems. Following the Reformation, Christians in some parts of Scotland had been happy to remain Roman Catholic rather than being Presbyterian or Episcopalian. That was an omission from the preamble. That was doubtless an innocent mistake but nevertheless had its roots in Scotland's shame, namely sectarianism. The Roman Catholic Church was one of the three main parts of Scottish Christianity in the current era. It was an unconscious slip, but the language revealed an attitude of who was “like us” and who were outsiders. A further criticism of the preamble was the phrase “English immigration” in the establishment of qualified chapels. That was not true. From the time of Queen Anne research showed that there had been mixed congregations which included Jacobites. English support was important but not the reason for the establishment of such chapels.

Mr Euan Grant (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) suggested that the reasons which Mr Dünzkofer had given for supporting the proposal with a heavy heart were in fact reasons to oppose it, with a heavy heart. Had the document been limited to the Commitments set out in the paper, he would have been able to support it but if the document was to be taken seriously, he had difficulty with Acknowledgements iv and v particularly. Such acknowledgements ran the risk that the episcopal ministry was seen as an adiaphoron, that the episcopal ministry of the Church was a secondary matter. Those were sufficient grounds for the SEC to reject the document.

The Rt Rev Ian Paton (Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) reported that it had been an immense privilege to represent the SEC at the General Assembly when the St Andrew Declaration had been affirmed so enthusiastically the previous month. He had explained to the Assembly that he had a personal interest in the Declaration in that his family had originally been staunch Presbyterians from Fife. His father had told the tale of an ancestor, Russell Paton, who was allegedly one of the Covenanters who had ambushed James Sharp, Archbishop of St Andrews in 1679. He personally might, therefore, be in the unusual position of one of his predecessors having been assassinated by one of his ancestors. The Declaration invited both Churches to acknowledge such pain of the past but also, and this was why he supported the Declaration, to turn to the needs of the present and the challenges of the future. The commitments made by both Churches were highly significant and would need to be worked at to be real and effective. There would be a need to go beyond the nice relationships and joint services to joint planning of how together the Churches would serve the nation. He was aware in his own diocese of many congregations where there was a real desire to do things together and structure their life more closely. Where the Declaration would lead the Churches, one could not say, but he believed both Churches were called to full communion not because all differences had been resolved but rather because they remained.

The Rev Amanda Fairclough (Argyll and The Isles) reported that she had been a member of the General Synod of the Church of England when the Columba Declaration had been voted upon a few years previously. There had been a level of discomfort in the meeting because the SEC was not a party to the arrangement. It had been voted through because the Archbishop of Canterbury had asked the Synod to vote in favour. She had not been able to bring herself to vote against it
but considered now that she ought to have done. The St Andrew Declaration included wording with which she could not agree – they were principally set out in the Acknowledgements section. It was a document which included statements of doctrine in the expectation that they would all be agreed. She was wholly in favour of ecumenism and there was no doubt that there was a need to try to work better together not just with the Church of Scotland but also with the Roman Catholic Church and others, but she could not vote in favour of the Declaration as a base from which to work. With a measure of regret she would vote against.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) agreed with the previous speaker and would also vote against the Declaration not because he did not believe in ecumenism (he did) but he struggled with the full visible unity model which appeared to be strongly inherent in the Declaration. His main reason for voting against was because the same words were used in the Declaration as were used in agreements of full communion. He struggled with using the same words to people with whom there was a different relationship. That could lead to friends thinking that the SEC meant something which in fact it did not. It might be thought that the SEC was willing to say anything to anyone – and that would not help. He also found the wording of the Acknowledgements section very difficult and did not agree with all of them. If the document were limited simply to the Commitments, he would find it easy to accept. He would vote against, with a heavy heart.

Canon McLuckie thanked members for their contributions. The language used in the Declaration was careful and allowed a breadth of interpretation, but he would not call it a fudge. The fact was that both Churches did differ in their emphases on theology (both between and within each Church). Within the SEC, for example, there were extraordinarily divergent views on the nature of the Eucharist, as was also the case in the Church of Scotland. The statements in the document were intended to show that there was a significant level of common ground while continuing to differ on emphases and significant areas of theology. However, both Churches shared the catholic Creeds and Scriptures and so there was a common apostolic faith which both churches were able to affirm, while recognising diversity. On the specific question of Episcopacy, he did not read the document, at all, as suggesting that episcopate was an adiaphoron. Canon 1 made very clear that threefold ministry of Bishops, priests and deacons was a gift of God to the Church and that was not about to be changed. It was indispensable. That was one reason why further work was needed in relation to ministry, albeit co-operation was already possible under the ecumenical Canon in certain circumstances. The document was not expressing a direction of travel in relation to SEC theology but rather expressing a diversity of theology within which both churches could work together. He deferred to Dr Holmes’ historical knowledge and apologised if there were inaccuracies in the document. Also, the Roman Catholic Church was indeed the third church which shared the commitment to cover the whole of Scotland in its ministry. In making the agreement with the Church of Scotland, other ecumenical partners were not being excluded. The Church of Scotland already had a very fruitful theological forum with the Roman Catholic Church and the Declaration would enable the SEC to benefit from that.

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

“That the St Andrew Declaration as set out in the Synod Papers be approved and adopted.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed by majority: 78 in favour, 21 against, 7 abstentions.

The Chair thanked Canon McLuckie for his work on the Committee and welcomed his successor the Rev Canon Professor Dr Charlotte Methuen.

SESSION THREE: THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS IN THE CHAIR

3.1 Institute Council

The Rt Rev Anne Dyer (Convener, Institute Council) reported on the work of the Institute Council and referred members to the written report contained in the Annual Report and Accounts for the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2020.
God continued to call people into worship and service and so, in every time, even in a pandemic, the emergence of vocations and the training and formation of ministry candidates continued. Vocational discernment and the central SEI provision had continued through the pandemic. It had been undertaken online and there had been great creativity and generosity in its provision and reception. Some candidates were just completing their first year of training and had never had the opportunity to meet another student face-to-face thus far. Friendships and spiritual relationships had been formed in other ways. They would meet in person in Kinnoull in the summer and being together might bring challenges and surprises.

The Periodic External Review which had taken place early in 2020 had been extensive and had considered all aspects of the SEI provision including the student experience and had included interviews with staff and incumbents, diocesan advisors, placement supervisors and so on. Bishop Dyer reminded Synod that training and formation of a candidate “takes a village”. The Review had been very good in its outcomes and the Council was grateful for the help the report gave to shape future training and formation. Following reception of the report, there had been further developments in relation to Common Awards. The validation contract had been confirmed until 2024. Postgraduate diplomas and MAs had been added to the suite of Common Awards programmes. Also, at present there was a review into the mixed mode pathway and all that that had brought to the richness of the training and formation provision. The Review would report to the Council in November and Synod would be updated in 2022.

Bishop Dyer closed by asking the Church's prayers for all those who were sensing the call of God to ministry of some kind, for all those involved in vocational discernment, for the student body, the SEI staff and the Council itself.

Comment was invited.

The Rev Amanda Fairclough (Argyll and The Isles) agreed that it “took a village” to train and form a candidate. The most important was the village which sent the candidate to training in the first place. The SEI did a wonderful job. The amount of time expected of candidates was incredible and it was clear that the SEI was very supportive of its students, but she made a plea not to forget the village from which the candidate came originally and to which they would return and where they could enable others to catch the vision of vocation.

The Chair thanked Bishop Dyer, members of the Council and the SEI for their work.

3.2 Standing Committee and Pension Fund – Triennial Valuation

Mr Richard McIndoe (Chair, Pension Fund Trustees) had been due to address the meeting but experienced technical difficulties and was unable to join.

In his absence Ms Daphne Audsley, Pension Fund Administrator, summarised the outcome of the preliminary results of the SEC Pension Fund Triennial Valuation as at 31 December 2020. She explained that the results contained both good and bad news. The good news was that the valuation indicated that the Fund was in surplus in relation to past service. The value of the assets had increased since 2017 but the liabilities had also increased. She outlined the principal reasons for the changes since 2017. Market conditions had not been favourable to pension funds because of the fall in gilts yields. However there had been positive investment returns. Also, a new method had been introduced for assessing mortality and had resulted in an improvement. The bad news was that the future service rate had increased again. In 2017, the future service rate had been 35.9% but it had been possible, because the Fund had been in surplus, to continue the actual contribution rate at 32.2%. In the 2020 valuation, the future service rate had increased to 41%. However, the surplus on the Fund was such as to enable the contribution rate to be maintained again at the same level of 32.2%. Another aspect of the valuation process was assessing the strength of the “employer covenant”, namely the relationship between the Church and the Trustees and the Church’s ability to continue to fund the scheme. The covenant remained strong.

Ms Bridget Campbell (Convener, Standing Committee) thanked the Chair of the Trustees, Richard McIndoe, and the other Pension Fund Trustees for their extremely hard work on managing the Fund over the previous year. The Church was also very grateful to Mr McIndoe for his willingness to stay on as Chair of the Trustees as a suitable successor was identified. She
also paid particular tribute to Daphne Audsley who had worked to support this vital element of the Church’s provision for more than 20 years and had even postponed her retirement. The Standing Committee had held a special meeting the previous month with the Chair, Ms Audsley, the Secretary General and Treasurer to discuss the preliminary results of the valuation. The Committee had confirmed the Trustees’ view that the contribution rate payable should be maintained at 32.2% from January 2021 and endorsed the proposal for the motion being presented to Synod.

Comment was invited but there was none.

Ms Campbell then proposed, and Mr Jim Gibson (Convener, Administration Board) seconded, the following Motion:

“That the contribution rate in relation to serving clerical and staff members of the Scottish Episcopal Church Pension Fund be maintained with effect from 1 January 2022 at 32.2% of standard stipend and salary respectively.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed nem con: 104 in favour, 2 abstentions.

The Primus also thanked Richard McIndoe for his willingness to stay on as Chair and Daphne Audsley for all her work and for stepping in at the last minute to present the report.

SESSION FOUR: THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS IN THE CHAIR

4.1 Mission Board

The Very Rev Sarah Murray (Convener, Mission Board) reported on the work of the Board. She expressed thanks to the Rev Canon Jane Ross, her predecessor as Convener, from whom she had taken on the role and offered thanks to General Synod Office staff and the pendant committee Conveners. The previous 15 months had been a period when the Church had looked at its mission and connections through a very different lens, quite literally in many places. Churches had connected with their people and places through creative and innovative ways and had been able to be alongside those who might not otherwise have had such connections to church communities. The Board would continue to discern the most appropriate time to gather such shared experiences and learning from lockdown. It was still too early to gather such data, but the Board did not wish to miss valuable stories and she encouraged everyone to keep notes and reflections on mission for the previous 15 month period so that, in due course, examples could be drawn on to shape the future mission of the Church.

Provost Murray expressed thanks to the Rev Dr Richard Tiplady for his development of a number of courses and seminars over the previous year which had been well received. They had enabled a learning community to gather to explore mission. He had also convened the Local Mission Resourcing Group until recently which had brought together those with a missional remit in their dioceses enabling them to share best practice and provide peer support. The Board was in the process of forming a new committee, the Local Mission Development Committee, which was to be convened by the Rev Diana Hall. The remit of that Committee was in the course of preparation with the hope that the Committee could be a resource to support vision cast by the College of Bishops and strengthen the work of dioceses.

In the year ahead, the Board would address various issues including the possible revision of the annual statistics collected within the Church and how that data could best be used to inform the work of the Church. The Board would also work with the Standing Committee and the College of Bishops to ensure that its remit reflected the vision and priorities of the Church and to ensure that the Board’s work reflected a joined-up approach with others. One of the current priorities, and one of the priorities of mission, was the response of the Church to the climate crisis to which the Synod would turn shortly.

4.2 Church in Society Committee – Climate Change

The Rev Dr Jenny Wright (Convener, Church in Society Committee) noted that barely six months had passed since the meeting of the General Synod in December 2020 when it had tasked the
Church in Society Committee with setting the province on a pathway to achieve the target of net zero carbon emissions by 2030. The bulk of the response to that motion would be contained in the action plan on which Dr Donald Bruce would separately address Synod.

A subgroup of the Church in Society Committee, the Climate Change Technical Group, had been hard at work to produce a programme of actions in response to the request of the 2020 motion. The programme now being presented to Synod represented a beginning only.

Through the work of the Technical Group, as well as a provincial group which had met at regular intervals with the Primus, it had been recognised that climate change generally, and achieving the net zero target specifically, would require whole Church involvement and action. It was not enough for one committee to undertake the work – all boards and committees would need to be involved at some point, the province and dioceses would need to make changes and dioceses would need to enable their charges to engage with necessary action. All charges themselves would need to take seriously their role in reducing emissions and forming whole life disciples to be responsible for and care for the Earth. To that end, a proposal had been brought to the provincial Standing Committee in preparation for General Synod that a provincial Environment Group be established not only to deal with the 2030 goal, but also wider matters associated with climate change, such as biodiversity. The aim of that Group would be to formulate a strategy to enable the realisation of the 2030 target, building upon the programme of actions being presented to the current meeting and to be responsible for the implementation of that strategy. Monitoring and assessment would be carried out by the Group which would report regularly to Standing Committee and General Synod.

There would be many questions ahead since achieving net zero by 2030 was no small feat. However, neither were the obstacles insurmountable. She hoped that the programme of actions, the current presentation to Synod and the group discussions which would follow shortly would be the first of many such conversations. It was recognised that support and resources at both provincial and diocesan level were necessary and the feedback from the breakout groups would help determine priorities for the future. She assured Synod that the Church would not be left alone in its efforts to reduce carbon footprint. The motions to be presented later in the session would determine how the Church moved forward, recognising that creation was good and that there was a need to do everything possible to preserve the world for the current and future generations.

Dr Donald Bruce (Convener, Climate Change Technical Group) reminded Synod that the Apostle Paul had written to the Christians in Rome “that the whole creation has been groaning as in the pains of childbirth up to the present time”. That had never been more true than in the present day. Human activity was changing the global climate catastrophically, with recent scientific measurements of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere being 50% more than before the Industrial Revolution. The greenhouse effect was inexorably warming the whole planet in ways which were harmful to lives, communities, health, food and God’s creation itself. Different parts of the world were affected in different ways, but the common feature was that the consequences fell disproportionately on the world’s poor and disadvantaged, who had the least means to adapt. Every person was part of the cause and the current and previous generations had been living off a legacy of cheap fossil fuels without taking heed of the waste that had been accumulating. Whilst the past could not be changed, the future could which was why the world’s governments had signed the historic 2015 UN Paris Agreement and would come to Glasgow in November to take forward the urgent process of reducing emissions. Scientists were warning that action in the following five to ten years would determine the state of the planet bequeathed to future generations – those generations were dependent on what happened now.

Simply put, there was a need to move away from burning fossil fuels for heating, transport and industrial processes. The changes needed encompassed most aspects of church life but also every area in which fossil fuels were burned. The need was to replace those with electricity or other renewable alternatives or, where that was not possible, to reduce, save and offset. Scotland had one of the lowest carbon footprints for its electricity in the world and so electricity, rather than gas, ought to be used as often as possible.

The challenge was not underestimated but the Technical Group was keen to encourage not just the need for action but also that action was possible. The SEC and the Church of England, Church in Wales and Church of Scotland were all making commitments towards reducing
emissions to net zero by 2030 – hence the set of resources and practical recommendations being presented to Synod. The intention was to "resize" what might otherwise seem like a daunting task into steps which could be undertaken and then be built upon progressively and realistically.

The SEC was not alone in the task. There was a movement across the churches in the whole of the UK and excellent experience to draw upon such as Eco-Congregation Scotland. Expert advice was also available within the Church of England and Church of Scotland on what to do in church buildings. There were also good secular sources such as Home Energy Scotland, Zero Waste Scotland, the Energy Saving Trust and Historic Environment Scotland where grants might be available.

The Group wished to encourage "champions" – a person or small group who could take matters forward and work and learn together. The paper presented to Synod was a summary and work was in hand to supplement it with a toolkit providing a more detailed set of resources which would be available later in the summer. The Group recognised the sheer diversity of situations across the province. The toolkit could not be a "one size fits all" document but would offer a set of actions and resources. He hoped, if feasible, that there might be an interactive website to enable people to find advice relevant to their situation.

In Morning Prayer at the beginning of the day's business, Synod had read "today, if you hear his voice, do not harden your hearts". There was now a race against time and transition to net zero emissions required action from everyone. Secular environmentalists could be gloomy, but the Church had a saviour. He urged Synod to join in the task of caring for Christ’s creation, as people who shared St Paul’s “hope that the creation itself will be liberated from its bondage to decay and brought into the glorious freedom of the children of God”.

Synod members were then transferred into breakout groups on Zoom to discuss the following questions set by the Church in Society Committee:

1. Have you had a watershed moment that changed the way you think about climate change? (A person or newspaper article that inspired you to do things differently, to engage more in a personal or corporate way?)
2. How is your church (or community) engaged with environmental issues and tackling climate change? (What are your good news stories?)
3. What do you understand by net zero carbon emissions? (Skip this question and move on to the last one if there is too little time.)
4. What do you find most daunting about the way forward to 2030 and how can the Church structures best support you and your congregation? (What do people think will be difficult for their church to achieve with regard to the 10 points of guidance and the action plan? What advice/guidance/support do they think they need going forward from the province and the dioceses?)

The collated responses from the breakout groups are appended to the minutes of the meeting.

The Synod then resumed in plenary session.

The Rev Dr Jenny Wright (Convener, Church in Society Committee) then proposed, and the Rt Rev Ian Paton (Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) seconded, the following Motion:

“That this Synod, recognising the urgency of the climate emergency, endorse and commend

- the Ten Points of Guidance set out in the paper from the Technical Group of the Church in Society Committee
- the programme of actions set out in the paper.”
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Professor Alan Werritty (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) commended the report as an excellent roadmap. He wished to comment on three of the practical suggestions identified in the report drawing on his own experience in his own charge of St Andrews, St Andrews. Having an energy audit to drive a carbon reduction plan was essential. It enabled actions to be prioritised and could also produce projects for submission for external funding. In the previous year, his charge had been awarded £14,000 by the Scottish Government's Community Challenge Asset Fund but there had been a window of only a few weeks in which to make the application and having a set of actions ready to be funded had been crucial to success. Secondly, it was important to make a distinction between making better use of the energy already being used and moving to low carbon energy sources. For better use of existing energy sources, he suggested checking out smart heating controls on boilers and radiators, improving insulation, reducing drafts and installing double glazing where possible. Those were lower cost actions which could be undertaken relatively quickly. Switching to an energy tariff from renewable sources would also generate carbon savings. In the longer term, replacing a gas or oil burner with heat pumps would also significantly reduce carbon footprint but typically those incurred much higher cost. The Eco-Congregation Scotland website had many very good suggestions. Solar panels on church roofs were also an obvious way to reduce carbon footprint, not least given the orientation of churches. Several years previously, his church (a B listed building in a conservation area) had applied for planning permission for solar panels on the roof. That had been rejected by Fife Council. However, the climate emergency had changed the context within which such planning applications were now decided. Local authorities now had to balance conservation heritage arguments against the carbon savings which would result. His charge had just submitted a revised application, prepared by a professional planning consultant, and awaited the result. If it proved successful, it might prove the first such application from a church which was both listed and in a conservation area, in which case it could be a valuable test case to cite in subsequent applications from other charges. He strongly endorsed the motion.

The Rev Canon Dr James Currall (Moray, Ross and Caithness) indicated that his first job had been as a lecturer in the Department of Environmental Science at the University of Bradford when such issues had been talked about many decades ago. He applauded the Church in Society Committee for bringing forward the material and for producing it so soon after the previous Synod. Whilst recognising that it was the start of a process, he considered the material was something of a curate’s egg. Aside from the quote from Romans 8:22 and the mention of God in one place, the paper could have been written by a secular organisation. People had created the climate emergency and, on their own, were not capable of averting it. Action by the Church needed to start by asking God for help, in prayer. The Church was part of the problem and there was a need to lament that fact and then repent and turn back to God. The elephant in the room, which was briefly alluded to in the report, was the fact that the climate emergency was caused by over-consumption. All elements of solution had to be underpinned by consuming less. There was a need to avoid simply moving the problem around by exporting emissions or dumping waste in other parts of the world. It was sobering that, at present, the world was capable of recycling only 2% of the lithium being used in batteries. It was not acceptable to achieve a “green glow” at the expense of others. The paper correctly emphasised that much of what could be done was dependent on local circumstances which was why a framework was needed to assist in making local decisions. That framework needed to be “reduce, reduce, reduce, reuse and only then recycle”.

The Rev Canon Liz Baker (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) suggested that a further elephant in the room was the need to challenge the whole political and economic system in which people lived. The Church needed to undermine the neoliberal economic model. There was a need to be evangelical about that and tell congregations what they needed to hear.

Dr Martin Auld (Aberdeen and Orkney) commended the report as excellent. However, he had a few concerns. An audit needed to be organisational so that there were standard measurements and numerical targets because otherwise it would not be possible to know what point had been reached by 2030. That, therefore, also implied a need for timescales. There was a need for an asset register which included land as well as buildings. There was a need for reduction in demand first followed by issues of recycling and reusing. Some buildings were multi-use and there was a need to take account of the carbon consumed in those different uses. It was also important not to ignore biodiversity targets. Nature could help the human population reduce its demand and sequester some of the emissions. There was also a need to reduce water demands.
Miss Morag O’Neill (Glasgow and Galloway) suggested there were some missing words in line 6 on page 89 of the Synod Papers.

The Rev Prof David Atkinson (Aberdeen and Orkney) indicated that he had been intending to speak on the motion on the Synod agenda inviting the Standing Committee to put new structures in place. The issue of climate change had been discussed frequently at Synods and his concern was that the Church risked becoming bored with it. Therefore, it was important for Standing Committee to set up a mechanism to continue to work on the issue because it would continue not just for the following 9 years but for much longer. Climate change needed to be seen as being at the heart of discipleship and mission. Putting it on future Synod agendas needed to be done in a way which attracted people to talk about the issue.

Dr Wright responded briefly to some of the comments and confirmed that the intention of the wording on page 89 of the Synod Papers was to encourage rescheduling of the times when church buildings were used so as to avoid having to reheat them from scratch every time. More generally, she thanked members for their comments. She emphasised that the Technical Group had produced the document within just four months. There had been a need to produce something for Synod, but the Group was also conscious that the work was ongoing, forever. Both science and the political agenda were changing and there was a need to be responsive to both. All of the comments would feed into the ongoing work.

The Motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con*: 106 in favour, 3 abstentions.

Dr Wright then proposed, and the Rt Rev Ian Paton (Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) seconded, the following Motion:

“That this Synod call on the Standing Committee of the General Synod to put in place appropriate structures to enable action at provincial level and report back to General Synod 2022.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con*: 110 in favour, 2 abstentions.

Dr Wright then proposed, and Bishop Paton seconded, the following Motion:

“That this Synod call on Dioceses to put in place appropriate structures to enable action at diocesan level and to support action at congregational level and report back to General Synod 2022.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed by majority: 108 in favour, 1 against, 2 abstentions.

Dr Wright then proposed, and Bishop Paton seconded, the following Motion:

“That the Synod call on the Scottish Episcopal Church to support through prayer, advocacy and practical action those people and nations suffering the most from the impacts of climate change.”

The Rev Markus Dünzkofer (Edinburgh) observed that the Synod had earlier approved the St Andrew Declaration. All of the motions regarding climate change addressed the SEC internally. He hoped that it would be possible to collaborate on such matters ecumenically.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) urged that in responding to the climate crisis it would be important for the Faith and Order Board to keep in focus appropriate liturgy to help the Church. The way the Church prayed was often liturgical, but he was not convinced that the liturgical resources available at present reflected the tone of the current debate with themes such as lament and repentance.

The Chair confirmed that note would be taken of such points.

The Motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con*: 114 in favour, 1 abstention.
SESSION FIVE: THE VERY REV FRANCES BURBERRY IN THE CHAIR

5.1 Faith and Order Board - Review of Canon 4

The Rt Rev John Armes (Bishop of Edinburgh) reported as the Convener of the Canon Four Review Group. Over the previous six months, the Group had consulted across the province about two options for revising Canon 4 (Of the Election of Bishops to Vacant Sees). The consultation had initially been rolled out to General Synod members in the autumn of 2020 and had been opened up for comment from Diocesan Synods, vestries and individuals. The basic question was whether to retain the present system whereby Bishops were ultimately chosen by the Electoral Synod of their diocese or for the election process to be owned instead by a smaller Electoral Council including representation from the wider province. The consultation had not been a scientific survey but sought to involve as many people as possible in the conversation and to allow an honest exchange of views. It was possible that some respondents had contributed in more than one forum and any votes taken had been purely indicative and non-binding.

A number of points had emerged in the responses from all parts of the province. There had been strong, albeit not unanimous, support for the option of retaining the Electoral Synod. That had been expressed in terms of a wish to retain diocesan power over the process and that at the point of the election there ought not to be any provincial input. The choice of Bishop was felt to be a matter for every charge in the diocese, not a select group of electors. There had been a clear desire to simplify the Canon and make it more easily understood with less rigid timescales. A commentary on the Canon and guidelines for its implementation was thought to be a helpful addition. Many had sought a Canon which was more obviously compassionate to those involved in the process. In particular, the publishing of names on the shortlist was considered by many to be unnecessary, and cruel to those not elected. Much had been said about the size of the shortlist. Some considered that the current minimum number of three was too large and that in some circumstances a shortlist of one should be permissible. More generally, a shortlist of two was felt to be the minimum. There had been overwhelming support for the proposal that more training should be offered to Synod/Council members, the Preparatory Committee and, indeed, to the Church at all levels. It had been clear from the consultation that some church members did not understand the process, nor what a Bishop did. Better use might be made of the initial meeting of the Electoral Synod or Council with input from those skilled in spiritual discernment and human resources, as well as an introduction to the Canon itself.

Following discussion in breakout groups, Synod members would be invited to indicate which option they wished to be developed into a draft Canon ready for first reading in 2022. Following Synod, the Review Group would present the preference articulated by Synod to the Faith and Order Board and, under that Board’s instruction, would work with the Committee on Canons to draft the new Canon. It would also seek the permission of the Board to develop a commentary to the Canon and a set of guidelines for its compassionate and effective working. These would all be ready in draft form for General Synod 2022.

Synod members were then transferred into breakout groups on Zoom to discuss the following questions set by the Canon 4 Review Group:

1. Discernment of vocation is at the heart of the election of a Bishop. What training or preparation for this would help you, if called on to serve on a Preparatory Committee or as an Elector?

2. As a member of the College of Bishops, a Bishop in the SEC has both a Provincial and a Diocesan role. What do you think the balance should be between province and diocese in the selection of candidates and the election itself?

3. Canon 4 has to be put into practice for each election. Do you think it would be helpful to have a Commentary on the text of the Canon, and practical Guidelines based on the experience of previous elections? What would help you as a member of a Preparatory Committee, a Candidate, or an Elector?

4. Having read the Report on the Consultation, which do you believe should be the best way forward for the revision of Canon 4: the Electoral Council, or the Electoral Synod?
The collated responses from the breakout groups are appended to the minutes of the meeting.

The Synod then resumed in plenary session.

The Rev Markus Dünzkofer (Edinburgh) had wished to raise a point of order before moving into breakout groups. His question had been whether there was scope for options other than those indicated in the Synod Papers to be discussed. The Chair confirmed that any other options raised could be passed to Bishop Armes.

The Rev Dr Stephen Holmes (Edinburgh) wished to make the general point that whilst discussion in breakout groups was good, he wondered whether that could inhibit discussion in plenary session within Synod and suggested adequate plenary discussion in future.

Ms Jan Whiteside (Glasgow and Galloway) suggested that one of the problems encountered in the most recent electoral process in the Diocese of Glasgow and Galloway had been about how individuals in the process were cared for. It was difficult for an individual to allow their name to go forward and explain that to their congregation without giving the impression that the individual wished to leave the congregation. She was keen for the Review Group to consider how such care and support could be offered. Her breakout group had all wished to stay with the Electoral Synod option.

The Rev Canon Dr James Currall (Moray, Ross and Caithness) emphasised that confidentiality was crucial. It became impossible to care for people if their details were made public.

Bishop Armes responded to comments made. His own breakout group had in fact spoken about other options. However, the discussion process had already been going on for some time and conversation could not continue forever. The Group had consulted with candidates who had been involved in previous processes, and with other provinces in the Anglican Communion and, in the end, it had come down to the two options of Electoral Synod or Electoral Council. He looked forward to receiving the written feedback from the breakout groups. When Synod debated a first reading of any new Canon, that would be discussed in plenary and, if passed, Diocesan Synods would similarly have the opportunity for full debate on the floor. The Group also noted the question of care for candidates. How candidates were cared for could be addressed perhaps in a protocol rather than in the Canon itself. Certainly, those who might not be elected could be disappointed, but it would be unfortunate if the process made that worse for them. Confidentiality was an aspect of that. The overwhelming view expressed in feedback thus far had been that shortlists ought not to be published and for members of Electoral Synods not to share such details. He closed by inviting any who wished to make further comments to write to him or the Review Group directly.

The Chair explained that the options about to be put to Synod were not to be regarded as a vote of Synod as such but rather an indicative vote of the members. The options were then put to the vote with the following result:

- Electoral Synod (Option 1) - 74 in favour
- Electoral Council (Option 2) - 39 in favour
- Neither of the above options (Option 3) - 5 in favour
- Abstain (Option 4) – 1 in favour

The Chair expressed thanks to members for their contributions both in breakout groups and plenary and also to Bishop Armes and members of the Review Group.

5.2 Administration Board

5.2.1 Clergy Stipends

Mr Jim Gibson (Convener, Administration Board) referred Synod members to the report of the Administration Board and its pendant committees in the Annual Report and Accounts of the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2020. The focus of the current session would be on clergy wellbeing but before proceeding he wished to report
that since the Synod Papers had gone to press, the Investment Committee had decided to increase the distribution from the Unit Trust Pool for the first six months of 2021 to 30p per unit, an increase of 13% on the corresponding distribution in 2020, with the hope of making a total distribution for the year of 65p per unit, thus increasing budgeted income for the province by £113,000. The Church was well served by the expertise of the Investment Committee and Baillie Gifford as Fund Managers.

The previous Synod had affirmed the Church’s value for its clergy and had noted that further work was being done on the topic of clergy stipends and clergy wellbeing. Behind the work detailed in the Synod Papers lay dedicated work of SEC staff and active and engaged participation of board and committee colleagues to whom he extended thanks.

The position regarding clergy stipends was summarised in the Synod Papers. Fourteen recommendations had been made and the full report of the Clergy Remuneration Package Interim Review Group was set out in the Synod Papers. In its deliberations, the Board had been conscious of a number of interrelated factors and in particular the work which clergy had been doing during the pandemic and the strain which that had involved, as well as of congregations’ ability to pay and the need to keep pace with inflation. Of the 14 recommendations, three related to stipend policy and needed the approval of Synod. The Board also recognised that the Church of England was undertaking a remuneration review. The Board would maintain a watching brief on that and consider whether it might have an impact on SEC policy but, for the moment, the position of the Board was that it wished to break the link with the Church of England National Stipend Benchmark and restore stipend to its 2006 level, adjusted for inflation, since there was a gap of approximately £1,440. To bridge that gap, the Board proposed a gradual approach which was set out in the three motions on the Synod agenda. The proposal comprised maintaining parity with the Church of England rate for 2020 (or Consumer Price Index, if greater). The Church of England had just announced that its rate for 2022 would comprise an increase of 1% but since the latest CPI figure for April 2021 showed an increase of 1.5% the Administration Board would confirm the position at its September meeting for 2022 in the light of CPI information available at that time. From 2023 onwards, the proposal was to increase stipends by 1% more than the Church of England, or 1% more than CPI, if the CPI increase was larger. He could not say how long it would take to bridge the gap but for the purposes of the current discussion he was assuming perhaps a catchup period of four years. Once the gap was finally bridged the intention was to use the same uplift as the Church of England but so as not to fall behind inflation, a triennial review would be undertaken to assess any changes in CPI and any other relevant factors.

Mr Jim Gibson (Convener, Administration Board) then proposed the following Motion:

“That Standard Stipend 2022 be increased in line with increases in Church of England National Stipend Benchmark or CPI if greater.”

The Rt Rev Andrew Swift (Bishop of Brechin) seconded the motion and explained to Synod that the purpose of the proposals was about valuing clergy. He recognised that the fact that there had been no increase in stipend in either the SEC or the Church of England for the current year had been difficult. The proposal was, therefore, about care for the Church’s clergy but also about increasing the level of stipend gently so that it did not create a financial crisis for charges which might have been weakened by the pandemic. He supported the proposals enthusiastically.

The Motion was put to the vote and passed by majority: 113 in favour, 1 against, 4 abstentions.

Mr Gibson then proposed, and Bishop Swift seconded, the following Motion:

“That from 2023, Standard Stipend should rise at rate one percentage point above the rate applied to the Church of England National Stipend Benchmark, or by one percentage point above CPI if greater, until such time as it reaches a level equal to 2006 Standard Stipend scaled up pro rata with CPI.”
The Motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con*: 109 in favour, 6 abstentions.

Mr Gibson then proposed, and Bishop Swift seconded, the following Motion:

“That in subsequent years, Standard Stipend maintain the same percentage uplift compared with Church of England National Stipend Benchmark, subject to a triennial review in the light of changes in CPI and other relevant factors.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed *nem con*: 113 in favour, 4 abstentions.

5.2.2 Personnel Committee

The Chair reported that a number of amendments had been received in relation to Motions 22 and 23 on the Synod agenda and an amendment to an amendment had also been received in relation to Motion 22. Each would be taken as a separate item of business once the Convener of the Personnel Committee had spoken.

Ms Jan Whiteside (Convener, Personnel Committee) explained that the Committee was bringing motions to General Synod this year in relation to a Complaints Procedure, a Policy on Bullying and Harassment and a paper proposing altered Guidelines for Clergy Holiday and Time Off. All three were offered as a direct response to the findings of the Clergy Wellbeing Survey of 2019. That survey had highlighted concerns around bullying and harassment and, because of that, the development of a bullying and harassment statement had been a priority. Neither the Complaints Procedure nor the Bullying and Harassment Policy were to be seen as set in tablets of stone. They were a first step which had been agreed at a series of meetings of the Personnel Committee, the College of Bishops and the Administration Board and could, and would, be expanded upon over the next year and beyond. They were, however, a vitally important first step.

Bullying and harassment was an unfortunate part of life of most organisations and, sadly, the SEC had not been exempt. Such behaviour could arise in almost any area of church life and experiences shared with her during her time as Convener had indicated that such behaviour could stem from both clergy and laity. The policy, she believed, would start the process whereby everyone could consider their behaviour and relationships with one another. Christ had called upon his followers to love one another.

The Committee had always believed that alongside a policy on bullying and harassment there would have to be a complaints procedure to enable complaints about bullying or harassment to be processed. The procedure being proposed to Synod was not at the current time a detailed, fully worked out process but reflected, to a very large extent, what happened in practice at present. The Committee had drawn together in the procedure a description of how complaints were likely to be dealt with at present and made the process easier and more accessible. It also gave accountability. It was possible that it might engender complaints, but that possibility ought not to make the Church shy away from having a robust procedure.

Since the procedure had been agreed for presentation to Synod, the Canonical Review Group had identified one small change which was needed to reflect a little-known provision in Canon 53, and she would shortly propose a minor amendment to reflect that.

Finally, the motion regarding guidance for clergy time off was offered as a result of the Wellbeing Survey but also reflected comments made at General Synod 2020. For a number of years there had been guidelines from the Administration Board about clergy time off which envisaged one day off per week (or the equivalent every two weeks). The Committee and listened carefully to comments made at Synod 2020 and wished to update the guidance, as set out in the Synod Papers. They would still retain the status of guidelines, but she hoped they would be of use to both clergy and vestries. She hoped it would encourage vestries in turn to encourage their clergy to see their “working week” as 5, not 6, days out of 7. Ensuring that clergy had their proper time off was a very tangible way of showing the Church’s appreciation of them and their families and of supporting their wellbeing. As the clergy cared for church members, church members had a mutual duty to care for them.
5.2.2.1 Complaints Procedure

Ms Whiteside then proposed, and the Rt Rev Andrew Swift (Bishop of Brechin) seconded, the following motion:

“That the Complaints Procedures for the Scottish Episcopal Church as set out in the Synod Papers be approved and adopted.”

The Chair then invited Ms Whiteside to propose her initial amendment to the motion, being brought under Rule 9(c) of the Rules of Order.

Ms Whiteside explained that she wished to propose a small amendment which recognised that the Complaints Procedure was a first step and which also addressed a point which had come to light since the Synod Papers had gone to print. She explained that Canon 53.12 provided an appeal mechanism to the Episcopal Synod in certain circumstances and that it was therefore appropriate that reference ought to be made in the Complaints Procedure to that.

Ms Jan Whiteside (Convener, Personnel Committee) then proposed, and the Rt Rev Andrew Swift (Bishop of Brechin) seconded, the following amendment to the motion so that it would read:

“That the Complaints Procedure for the Scottish Episcopal Church as set out in the Synod Papers be approved and adopted as an initial step to improving the Church’s process for handling complaints and that

1. the following words be added at the end of section 2 of the section entitled “Complaints against a member of a diocesan or provincial board or committee”:

   The Diocesan Secretary or the Secretary General, as appropriate, will endeavour to resolve the matter. If it cannot be resolved in that way disputes should be referred to the Episcopal Synod under Canon 53.12. Contact details for the Episcopal Synod are available from the Secretary General at the General Synod Office, 21 Grosvenor Crescent, Edinburgh EH12 5EE.”

The Chair opened the amendment to debate but there was none.

The amendment was put to the vote and passed by majority: 109 in favour, 1 against, 5 abstentions.

Before taking further amendments, the Chair invited any comment of a high-level nature which members of Synod wished to make.

Bishop Swift indicated as the seconder of the motions in question that the material being proposed to Synod should be viewed as a starting point. He recognised that there was work to be done over the coming year but it was a complicated business navigating territory intended to cover officeholders, employees, volunteers, etc. He encouraged Synod to see the proposals as an endeavour to ensure that everyone in the Church could feel safe.

The Rev Diana Hall (Edinburgh) explained that she had practised prior to ordination as a litigation solicitor with experience in areas such as occupational bullying and harassment and alleged misconduct. A common feature of many cases and which had reached litigation had been the absence of good internal procedures to enable dispute resolution at an early stage. A good complaints procedure safeguarded procedural justice and gave details, time constraints, appropriate frameworks including relevant investigatory and appeal processes to give the complainers, and those complained about, confidence in the system. That was important for reasons of
wellbeing, reputation and the Gospel. The Complaints Procedure before Synod was welcome because it filled a gaping and unconscionable hole in procedures and she would vote in favour. However, she was concerned that, as they stood, they were not complete they did not offer assurances of procedural justice since there were no timescales, nor how details of how a complaint would be investigated or responded to, nor any clear means of appeal. She welcomed comments that had been made about such matters being work in progress. She also wished to know what support structures would be put in place – for example who would offer support for a cleric against whom a complaint was made, where their own Bishop, their ecclesiastically appointed pastor, was charged with investigating. Where was a Bishop to make a complaint to and who cared for members of the College when they were under attack. Also, how did the policy and procedures integrate with Canons 53 and 54?

The Rev Alastair MacDonald (Aberdeen and Orkney) explained that he was fully supportive of the motions before Synod and all of the work which had been done and he agreed with what the Rev Diana Hall had just said. His aim in bringing amendments was to strengthen the material and support the Committee as it undertook further work in development. He then proposed, and Dr Nicola Mills (Aberdeen and Orkney) seconded, the following amendment to the motion:

“22(ii). [Amendment] after "be approved and adopted", add: a final section be added to the Procedure as follows:-

“WRITTEN RECORDS
A written record must be kept of any complaint made. This written record should describe the nature of the complaint and the process to be followed for its resolution. This document must be approved and signed by all parties involved in the complaint. All other documentation involved in the process should also be kept on record, subject to appropriate confidentiality and data protection principles.”

Ms Whiteside confirmed that she considered the amendment should be considered by the Synod.

Dr Jaap Jacobs (Brechin) indicated that he wished to propose an amendment to Mr MacDonald's amendment. He was not sure that attempting to write procedures on the floor of Synod was the correct way to progress and he was glad that it had been indicated that the material represented a work in progress. His proposed amendment to the amendment was because he believed that any record drawn up ought to be made at the end of the procedure so that it could be a moment for reconciliation. He had conferred with Mr MacDonald in the chat facility but that was difficult in the context of a Zoom meeting. He therefore proposed, and the Rev Peter Mead (Brechin) seconded an amendment to Mr MacDonald's amendment to delete the words "to be" from the sentence "this written record should describe the nature of the complaint and the process to be followed for its resolution."

The Chair opened that amendment for debate.

Mr MacDonald noted that at the end of a complaints process, it was the case that parties were not always content with the resolution and, consequently, all parties might not be willing to sign off on such a record at the end of the resolution. The intention of his original amendment had been to sign off on the process. He would therefore be concerned with the proposed amendment.

Mr Jim Gibson (Convener, Administration Board) accepted that the matters dealt with in the motions in question were serious ones and it was important to put in place procedures soon. However, he wondered what was driving all of the amendments. He wondered whether those proposing the amendments believed the material was fundamentally flawed or whether there was a lack of trust in those who had been charged with the responsibility of implementing the task. Were they a vote of non-trust in the procedures?
The Rev Sophia Marriage (Edinburgh) queried whether all documentation needed to be signed and suggested that a summary would be sufficient to keep for the future.

Dr Jacobs amendment was put to the vote with the following result: 38 in favour, 51 against, 25 abstentions. The Chair declared Dr Jacobs’ amendment not passed.

The Chair invited the Synod to resume debate of Mr MacDonald's original amendment. In response to a point of order from Mr Euan Grant (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane), the Chair confirmed that the amendment from Dr Jacobs had not passed and that, consequently, Synod was now considering the original amendment proposed by Mr MacDonald.

In the absence of further comment, the Chair put Mr McDonald's amendment to the vote with the following result: 80 in favour, 17 against, 17 abstentions. The Chair declared the amendment passed.

Mr MacDonald then proposed, and Dr Mills seconded, the following amendment (iii) to Motion 22:

“22(iii). [Amendment] after "be approved and adopted", add: the section entitled “Complaints relating to training at the Scottish Episcopal Institute” be altered by the addition of a final sentence as follows: “Where a complaint is not addressed by these specific policies this Complaints Procedure may be used.”

Mr MacDonald explained that the procedures applicable to SEI at the present time did not cover all situations of possible complaints. His proposal was to protect ordinands.

Ms Whiteside opposed the amendment because there had been no opportunity to discuss it with representatives of the SEI or the Institute Council.

There being no further comment, the Chair put the amendment to the vote with the following result: 44 in favour, 51 against, 24 abstentions. The Chair declared the amendment not passed.

Mr MacDonald then proposed, and Dr Mills seconded, the following amendment:

“22(iv). [Amendment] after "be approved and adopted", add: the Administration Board working in conjunction with other provincial bodies as appropriate consider whether the procedure should be revised to provide for the appointment of an Independent Complaints Officer and to report to General Synod 2022 with proposals as appropriate.”

Mr MacDonald explained that complaints might be dealt with in a variety of locations but sometimes there was a need for someone outwith the situation to handle the matter. He recognised that the appointment of an independent complaints officer might have budgetary implications.

Ms Whiteside confirmed that she considered the amendment should be considered by Synod.

Dr Anne Martin (Edinburgh) supported the amendment. There was a need for someone to be specifically responsible for overseeing complaints to make sure they were fully dealt with. Such a person could also identify any areas not covered in the Complaints Procedure and how they were to be dealt with – one area not mentioned was that of complaints against vestries. Also, such a person could keep an overview of how complaints had been dealt with generally and could be consulted for advice.

The amendment was put to the vote and passed: 99 in favour, 11 against, 7 abstentions.

Mr MacDonald then proposed, and Dr Mills seconded, the following amendment:
“22(v). [Amendment] after "be approved and adopted", add: the Administration Board working in conjunction with other provincial bodies as appropriate consider revision of the procedure to incorporate a more detailed procedure specifying the precise process of how a complaint must be dealt and bring proposals to General Synod 2022.”

Mr MacDonald explained that the amendment reflected what had been said earlier in the meeting by the Rev Diana Hall, namely that there was a need for more detailed procedures to be drawn up.

Ms Whiteside confirmed that it had always been the intention as part of the process to draw up more detailed procedures. She agreed that the matter should be considered by Synod.

The amendment was put to the vote and passed: 110 in favour, 6 against, 4 abstentions.

Mr MacDonald then proposed, and Dr Mills seconded, the following amendment:

“22(vi). [Amendment] after "be approved and adopted", add: the Administration Board working in conjunction with other provincial bodies as appropriate consider revision of the procedure to incorporate an Appeal Process for any significant actions and decisions that are excluded from the Complaints Procedure and bring proposals to General Synod 2022.”

Mr MacDonald explained that his proposal stemmed from the reference in the Complaints Procedure to the fact that complaints could not be made about decisions or actions which had been taken as part of, or as a result of following legal or canonical processes or protocols, due process and any appeal processes. The question was how narrowly or broadly that sentence was to be understood. If it were to be understood broadly, then there were many things that could be excluded from the Complaints Procedure. If it were not to be included in the Complaints Process, he considered it appropriate to be dealt with in some other way. It was a question of natural justice and the fair treatment of individuals in the decision-making process.

Ms Whiteside confirmed that she was content for the matter to be considered by Synod.

The amendment was put to the vote and passed: 97 in favour, 6 against, 5 abstentions.

There being no further amendments, the motion incorporating amendments which had been agreed was put to the vote in the following form:

“That the Complaints Procedure for the Scottish Episcopal Church as set out in the Synod Papers be approved and adopted as an initial step to improving the Church’s process for handling complaints and that

1. the following words be added at the end of section 2 of the section entitled “Complaints against a member of a diocesan or provincial board or committee”:

“The Diocesan Secretary or the Secretary General, as appropriate, will endeavour to resolve the matter. If it cannot be resolved in that way disputes should be referred to the Episcopal Synod under Canon 53.12. Contact details for the Episcopal Synod are available from the Secretary General at the General Synod Office, 21 Grosvenor Crescent, Edinburgh EH12 5EE.”

2. a final section be added to the Procedure as follows:-

“WRITTEN RECORDS
A written record must be kept of any complaint made. This written record should describe the nature of the complaint and the process to be followed for its resolution. This document must be approved and signed by all parties involved in the complaint. All other documentation involved in the
process should also be kept on record, subject to appropriate confidentiality and data protection principles.”

3. the Administration Board working in conjunction with other provincial bodies as appropriate consider whether the procedure should be revised to provide for the appointment of an Independent Complaints Officer and to report to General Synod 2022 with proposals as appropriate;

4. the Administration Board working in conjunction with other provincial bodies as appropriate consider revision of the procedure to incorporate a more detailed procedure specifying the precise process of how a complaint must be dealt and bring proposals to General Synod 2022;

5. the Administration Board working in conjunction with other provincial bodies as appropriate consider revision of the procedure to incorporate an Appeal Process for any significant actions and decisions that are excluded from the Complaints Procedure and bring proposals to General Synod 2022.”

Ms Whiteside had no further comment to make and there was no other comment from members of Synod.

The amended motion was put to the vote and passed nem con: 117 in favour, 1 abstention.

5.2.2.2 Bullying and Harassment Policy

The Chair noted that Ms Whiteside had already addressed Synod in connection with the Bullying and Harassment Policy.

Ms Jan Whiteside proposed, and the Rt Rev Andrew Swift seconded, the following Motion:

“That the Bullying and Harassment Policy for the Scottish Episcopal Church as set out in the Synod Papers be approved and adopted.”

The Chair noted that a number of amendments had been raised.

The Chair invited any high-level comments.

Mrs Karen Ellis (Edinburgh) welcomed the Bullying and Harassment Policy and acknowledged that more work was to be done. She asked whether, in the light of recent comments by the Archbishop of Canterbury calling for a ban on the use of nondisclosure agreements in the Church of England after racial abuse had been exposed, confirmation could be given that nondisclosure agreements would not be used again in the SEC at any level.

Ms Whiteside responded that she had not considered the subject matter of the question. The Personnel Committee would need to consider that. She was unaware that nondisclosure agreements had been used in the Church.

The Rev Alastair MacDonald (Aberdeen and Orkney) indicated that he was fully supportive of the Bullying and Harassment Policy. His proposed amendments were to strengthen the Policy. His first amendment was to remove section 3.5 of the Policy, he believed that the section was too vague, and its meaning was unclear. His first two amendments sought to address those points by removing section 3.5 and adding a statement to the effect that if an individual believed that they were being bullied or harassed then they had a grievance, and it should be treated as a complaint until it was shown not to be. His third proposed amendment was to add a statement about false accusations. The Policy ought never to be used to harm others and making a false accusation was a very serious matter. His first three amendments went together.
Mr MacDonald then proposed, and the Rev Prof David Atkinson (Aberdeen and Orkney) seconded, the following amendment to the motion:

“23(i). [Amendment] after "be approved and adopted", add: subject to the following: That section 3.5 be removed and the remaining sections are renumbered.”

Ms Whiteside indicated she considered that the amendments should be considered by Synod.

Comment was invited but there was none.

The amendment was put to the vote and passed: 87 in favour, 14 against, 13 abstentions.

Mr MacDonald then proposed, and Professor Atkinson seconded, the following amendment to the Motion:

“23(ii). [Amendment] after "be approved and adopted", add: That the following statement be added to section 4: 4.1 “On the whole it is safest to take the view that if a person complains that they are being bullied or harassed, then they have a grievance, which should be dealt with regardless of whether or not their complaint accords with a standard definition.”

Ms Whiteside confirmed that she considered that Synod should debate the amendment.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) urged that Synod resist the amendment. He believed it would cause confusion because of the use of the word “grievance”. The term “grievance” was a technical one under the Canons and the Church’s Grievance Procedure in Appendix 29 to the Code of Canons was open only to some people. The purpose of the Complaints Policy was to deal with matters which did not fall under the Grievance Procedure. He urged Synod members to trust the Personnel Committee to take the comments made on the floor of Synod and work through them during the following year. The current discussion did not appear to be a good way of writing a policy. He invited Mr MacDonald to consider withdrawing all of the amendments.

Professor Atkinson noted what Provost Holdsworth had said but believed the issues of bullying and harassment could be hard to define. The key issue was that if an individual made a complaint it needed to be taken seriously and not become lost in a welter of definitions. That is what the intention of the amendment was. He urged support for the amendment.

Mr MacDonald agreed with the comments made by Professor Atkinson.

The amendment was put to the vote and passed: 52 in favour, 45 against, 18 abstentions.

Mr MacDonald then proposed, and Professor Atkinson seconded, the following amendment:

23(iii). [Amendment] after "be approved and adopted", add: That the following statement be added to section 4: 4.2 “False accusations are a serious matter. The behaviour of anyone who is found to have made an unfounded, malicious complaint or allegation will be regarded with the utmost seriousness and formal disciplinary action may be taken. A member of either the clergy or laity could be subject to an action for defamation if they have made false accusations against someone else.”

Ms Whiteside confirmed she believed the amendment should be considered by Synod.
The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) urged rejection of the amendment since it did not marry well with the Church's disciplinary Canons. It was not clear who would take disciplinary action, nor with what authority. He reasserted that the current process was not a good way to proceed within Synod.

The Rev Dr Jenny Wright (Edinburgh) considered that matters were becoming muddled with so many amendments. The issues at stake were very important and there was a need for procedures, but she suggested that Synod should trust the Personnel Committee and would like to see matters coming in due course to dioceses. The material being presented represented a good start and she expressed thanks to Ms Whiteside.

The Rev Dr Stephen Holmes (Edinburgh) wished to raise a point of order in relation to rule 11(b). In the light of what had recently been said by the previous two speakers, whether it was possible to move the motion "that the question now be put" to the original motion and disregard the amendments which had been proposed.

The Chair explained that some amendments had already been dealt with and she intended to proceed with the remaining amendments without further debate from the floor. Synod would be given the opportunity to express its mind by voting on the amendments.

The amendment was put to the vote with the following result: 34 in favour, 56 against, 25 abstentions. The Chair declared the amendment not passed.

Mr MacDonald then proposed, and Professor Atkinson seconded, the following amendment:

"23(iv). [Amendment] after "be approved and adopted", add: That the following statement be added to section 4: 4.3 "These matters are to be treated with appropriate confidentiality in order to protect all parties and no action will be taken without the willing consent of the person who feels he or she has been a target unless someone is at risk or has performed an action which is unlawful."

Mr MacDonald indicated that he had not had an opportunity to respond to Provost Holdsworth’s point in relation to the previous amendment. Professor Atkinson similarly indicated he had not had an opportunity to respond. The Chair explained that in the light of the proposal that the question be put the Chair had discretion to press ahead.

The amendment was put to the vote with the following results: 37 in favour, 45 against, 27 abstentions. The Chair declared the amendment not passed.

Mr MacDonald then proposed, and Professor Atkinson seconded, the following amendment:

"23(v). [Amendment] after "be approved and adopted", add: That a clear link to the Complaints Procedure be included in the Bullying and Harassment Policy."

The amendment was put to the vote and passed: 54 in favour, 38 against, 19 abstentions.

Mr MacDonald then proposed, and Professor Atkinson seconded, the following amendment:

"23(vi). [Amendment] after "be approved and adopted", add: That the Administration Board working in conjunction with other provincial bodies as appropriate consider whether the post of Independent Bullying and Harassment Adviser should be created and to report to General Synod 2022 with proposals as appropriate."

The amendment was put to the vote and passed: 57 in favour, 34 against, 17 abstentions.
Mr MacDonald proposed, and the Professor Atkinson seconded, the following amendment:

“23(vii). [Amendment] after "be approved and adopted", add: That the Administration Board working in conjunction with other provincial bodies consider revision of the policy to include the following sections and bring proposals to General Synod 2022

- I think I have been the target of bullying or harassment, what can I do?
- I have been accused of bullying or harassment, what can I do?
- Sources of advice"

The amendment was put to the vote and was passed: 50 in favour, 44 against, 18 abstentions.

The Rev Peter Mead (Brechin) wished to raise a point of order in relation to the motion that the question be put under Rule 11. He noted that under Rule 11 any such motion required to be seconded and he did not believe that it had been. The proposal then ought to have been voted upon. He was concerned that the rules had not been followed.

The Chair explained that the chat function on Zoom had indicated sufficient disquiet or concern and that it had been reasonable to conclude that the motion that “the question be put” would have been seconded and further that the Chair would have discretion to continue the debate without granting the right to respond. She thanked Mr Mead for his point of order. She was aware how difficult the debate was proving to conduct online and also that the session had already overrun considerably on time.

The text of the motion incorporating the agreed amendments, was displayed as follows:

“That the Bullying and Harassment Policy for the Scottish Episcopal Church as set out in the Synod Papers be approved and adopted subject to the following:

1. That section 3.5 be removed and the remaining sections are renumbered.

2. That the following statement be added to section 4:

   4.1 “On the whole it is safest to take the view that if a person complains that they are being bullied or harassed, then they have a grievance, which should be dealt with regardless of whether or not their complaint accords with a standard definition.”

3. That a clear link to the Complaints Procedure be included in the Bullying and Harassment Policy.

4. That the Administration Board working in conjunction with other provincial bodies as appropriate consider whether the post of Independent Bullying and Harassment Adviser should be created and to report to General Synod 2022 with proposals as appropriate.

5. That the Administration Board working in conjunction with other provincial bodies consider revision of the policy to include the following sections and bring proposals to General Synod 2022:

- I think I have been the target of bullying or harassment, what can I do?
- I have been accused of bullying or harassment, what can I do?
- Sources of advice”

The Chair opened the amended motion to debate.

Ms Whiteside reiterated that the matter was one of work in progress. It was a starting point and, on that basis, she was happy to consider all amendments, whether they had been agreed or not, back to the Personnel Committee for consideration in the coming
months. It had been a long debate and she had been grateful for all of the contributions.

The Rev Gary Clink (Brechin) noted that part of the Bullying and Harassment Policy referred to gender and gender reassignment. The policy adopted “he” and “she” terminology. He agreed with Provost Holdsworth about the difficulty of discussing the detail of policy in plenary debate. He was concerned that inadvertently the Synod could adopt terminology which encouraged discrimination.

Ms Whiteside noted the comments which had been made and would give them consideration.

The amended motion was put to the vote and passed: 92 in favour, 8 against, 14 abstentions.

The Chair thanked Ms Whiteside, Mr MacDonald, those who had seconded the motion and amendments and all who had contributed to the debate.

5.2.2.3 Clergy Time Off Guidelines

The Chair noted that Ms Whiteside had already addressed the substance of the guidelines for clergy holiday and time off.

Ms Jan Whiteside proposed the following Motion:

“That the Guidelines Concerning Holiday and “Time Off” Provision for Stipendiary Clergy as set out in the Synod Papers be approved and adopted.”

Bishop Swift seconded the motion and indicated that the recommendation was a significant one. Clergy did not have contracts and, as office holders, certain matters were less well defined than in an employment context. The key issue was about self-care, healthy patterns of life and space for recreation. These were essential for positive ministry, particularly coming out of the pandemic. There was a need for clergy to exercise self-care and be encouraged to do so. Would all clergy now take two days off each week? He thought probably not, but at present many clergy took little or no time off and sometimes congregations and others did not respect the boundaries about time off. The recommendation was therefore an encouragement and an authorisation to take time to re-equip themselves. He thoroughly commended it. In due course it would be worked out in dioceses and charges.

The Rev Roxanne Campbell (Brechin) spoke in favour of the motion and thanked the Committee for the proposal. She particularly welcomed the proposal in the preamble referring to support for clergy with young families and the fact that the Church wished to care not only for clergy but also for their families.

Ms Helen Vincent (Edinburgh) expressed concern to hear the seconder of the proposal indicate that the guidance might not be enacted in practice. She asked whether, in terms of transitioning to the new arrangements, there would be any guidance produced for vestries. She strongly supported clergy taking time off. Congregations might be concerned about the potential impact on their parish life. Her own trade union was currently lobbying for shorter working hours. For some people that was a cause of stress because if the work itself did not reduce it would have to be carried out in fewer hours. It would be helpful to have guidance in relation to the 48-hour time off provision about disconnecting from both email and social media. It was much harder to step away from the Internet for 48 hours than for 24.

Dr Vicki Clark (Edinburgh) said that life/work balance was a buzz phrase and relevant to the subject of clergy time off. Her issue with the motion was the specific reference to “days” in the documentation. Much clergy work took place in the evenings or weekends. Most church members defined their working week in terms of hours. She suggested it might be more appropriate to express clergy working time in terms of hours rather than days.
The Rev Carol Latimer (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) very much welcomed the concerns for the wellbeing of clergy as expressed in the guidelines. She agreed the matter was a hugely important one and timely. However, she wondered why the guidelines appeared to apply only to stipendiary clergy and did not address the wellbeing of non-stipendiary clergy or give an indication of their entitlement to time off. She thought non-stipendiary clergy would appreciate the clarity of a definitive guideline.

The Rev Peter Mead (Brechin) thanked Ms Whiteside and the Personnel Committee for the progress which had been made in the previous 12 months. He drew a connection between the current issue and that of the carbon emissions targets. There was a direct correlation between climate change issues and hours worked. Recent reports from the World Health Organisation, the Institute of National Health in France and the Institute of Personnel Management in the UK indicated that over-work could also store up health issues for the future. The Institute of Personnel Managers had discovered that those who were now working from home were working on average 10 hours more per week than others. Working from home was a norm for clergy. There were initiatives in parts of the world to reduce the working week to four days and so he urged that this matter to be seen as a work in progress and that the Church keep up to date with developments elsewhere. He was supportive of the motion.

Ms Whiteside thanked members for their comments. She was happy to look at the idea of guidance for vestries in putting the new provision into practice. She had assumed that the guidance would also apply to non-stipendiary clergy but that was an issue to be looked at. She was aware of the significant contribution to the life of the Church made by non-stipendiary clergy. She noted Mr Mead's comments about a four-day working week. One of the difficulties in relation to work life balance was that whilst the Church could offer guidelines, it could not actually change how people worked. Some clergy had indicated to her that they worked 80 hours per week to which her response had been that they needed help with their time management. The Personnel Committee could not help directly in such situations.

The motion was put to the vote and passed: 112 in favour, 1 against, 1 abstention.

The Chair again thanked Jan Whiteside and the Personnel Committee for their work and also all those who had participated in the debate.

SESSION SIX: THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS IN THE CHAIR

6.1 Standing Committee

6.1.1 Feedback from Session One (Strategic Direction)

Ms Bridget Campbell (Convener, Standing Committee) reported on the feedback which had been provided from the breakout group discussions during Session One of the Synod meeting the previous day. She expressed thanks to all of the facilitators and the Rev Canon Dean Fostekew for having collated the responses and provided a summary. The content of the discussions had been rich and diverse.

Ms Campbell then summarised the feedback which had been supplied. The collated responses from the breakout groups are appended to the minutes of the meeting. Ms Campbell confirmed that there was much to think about and there would be opportunity the following year for further discussion.

6.1.2 Ethical Investment

Ms Campbell reminded Synod that in response to a motion adopted at General Synod 2019, the Standing Committee had established an Ethical Investment Advisory Group. The Committee was grateful to the Group and in particular its Convener Alan McLean QC for work on what was a challenging subject. At General Synod 2020, an interim report from the Advisory Group had been given and, as that report had explained, the Group
was then about to consider the question of investment in pooled funds by the provincial Unit Trust Pool. Since December, the Group had worked on a proposed policy framework for investment in pooled funds which would now be presented to Synod by Mr McLean.

Mr McLean then presented the product of the work of the Ethical Investment Advisory Group, namely the proposed policy framework for investment of Unit Trust Pool monies in pooled funds.

The SEC was an unusual UK church body in that its central activities were funded to the extent of approximately 60% by the income received from its investments held in the Unit Trust Pool. To fund much of what the Church did, the money came not from its members' pockets but from money given over many years by people who had wanted to bless future generations and allow the mission of the Church to continue. This allowed much more to be done than if bills had to be met entirely from the contributions of current members.

Whilst the fund from which the income was derived might be thought to be very large – in excess of £120 million – in fact, in investment terms that was not a particularly large fund and was notably smaller than funds held by other UK church bodies and other denominations. However, for the SEC, it was conspicuously important. The UTP was managed by highly expert managers of investments, currently Baillie Gifford reporting to a small group of investment experts comprising the Investment Committee. In its turn, that Committee was responsible through the Administration Board to the Standing Committee as the Church’s charity trustees.

The investments had performed extremely well under that stewardship structure. However, the Church recognised that investment was often not value neutral. There were strongly held views as to what the Church should or should not be invested in. Over the years this had led to a number of "red lines" being put in place by Synod – areas in which the Church had agreed not to invest directly, including income earned from tobacco, armaments, gambling, pornography and the extraction of thermal coal or tar sands. Following the debate about wider investment in fossil fuels at Synod 2019, the last direct UTP holding in a company that obtained significant income from extracting fossil fuels, Total, had been disposed of and instruction had been given to Baillie Gifford that there should be no further direct investment in such companies.

The Ethical Investment Advisory Group had been set up to assist in shaping what ethical investment should mean for the Unit Trust Pool. Whilst the Church permitted no direct investments in various sorts of companies, the question arose as to indirect investments. Such holdings were themselves comprised fundamentally of collections of other investments selected and managed by a fund manager, and were known as "pooled funds". The benefits that pooled funds brought were set out in section 5 of the framework document. Further, there was a growing range of ethically screened pooled funds from which in due course the Investment Committee might be able to identify suitable funds matching the Church’s ethical criteria and investment requirements. That was a fast-developing trend in the investment industry. However, the risk in utilising pooled funds was that the possibility was entertained that there might be investments held within a particular fund which the Church would not wish to hold directly. To this, there was a spectrum of arguably ethical responses. At one end of the spectrum, it could be argued that the investment adviser should be given a relatively free hand to produce the best possible investment returns. One might accept that this was a situation of "wheat and tares", namely that there was a need to accept for now, in the current impure age, that the investment market contained companies which do wonderful things but also companies which did less wonderful things. That approach would suggest that one should not pull up the tares but, subject to giving such guidance to those managing the Church's funds as was possible, and relying on their environmental, social and governmental screening processes to avoid the ethically worst, the overall profits be taken and repurposed to the glory of God. At the other end of the spectrum, there could be an approach that the only ethical approach was one to avoid all ethically dubious investment. Therefore, the Church would either avoid indirect investment or withdraw from investment altogether and fund the Church’s activities first by spending the
accumulated capital in the UTP and then out of members pockets, cutting cloth accordingly. Whilst that might have an attractive purity of vision, it would be important not to be blind to the practical effect of such a decision, namely hazard the long-term future of approximately 60% of what the Church did.

The Group had wrestled with those and many other related issues in recent months. There were members of the Group who would probably place themselves at different points along the spectrum which he had just outlined. Struggling under God to reach consensus, the Group had sought to bring forward a proposed policy framework that would be both workable and practicable going forward and which gave ethics significant primacy but also acknowledged that absolute purity might be impracticable if the Church wished to go on relying on investment income.

Mr McLean then outlined the main aspects of the proposed framework. Firstly, the Investment Committee would be required to review every investment or proposed investment in a pooled fund from an ethical perspective with the aim of avoiding any investment which might lead to more than 1% of the total UTP being held ultimately in holdings which would not be invested in directly. The 1% limited had been chosen after considering policies adopted by other UK church bodies and discussing various alternative possible figures. The Group's collective judgement had been that 1% was an acceptable limit although higher figures had been discussed. Further, the Investment Committee would once a year examine closely the pooled funds held by the UTP. If the result was that no more than 1% of funds was invested in businesses in which the Church would not invest directly then that comprised compliance with the framework. In other words, 99% or more of the Funds held by the UTP would be invested in companies in which the Church would be content to invest directly. That was the current state of affairs. If the 1% limit had come to be jeopardised the Investment Committee would be obliged to report that to the Standing Committee with an explanation of the problem and proposals for addressing it. There might be many different permutations applicable to such situations and therefore it was impossible to lay down rigid rules for how each situation should be dealt with. The Group's view was that it was best to leave it to the good ethical sense of the Investment Committee and Standing Committee. Finally, if at any point between annual reviews the Investment Committee became aware of a threat to the 1% limit, it could bring that to the attention of the Standing Committee who would have the same powers as it would in relation to the annual review.

The policy framework represented a compromise and was a result of careful negotiation between people coming at the issue from very different perspectives. It was a way of balancing just some of the difficult issues raised by investment of the UTP. There would be people from both ends of the spectrum of views about investment who would be unhappy with the conclusion which the Group had reached but it nevertheless represented a solution which the Group viewed as holding in suitable tension the many considerations required. He commended it to Synod for approval.

Mr Euan Grant (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) wished to ask how far the proposed policy framework differed from the pooled fund policy which had been proposed to the Synod in 2019 and which had been voted down.

Dr Michael Green (Edinburgh) spoke as a member of the Investment Committee. He had no difficulty with the terms of the proposed policy but noted that it used the term "investments" throughout. At least one of the funds contained assets which were in fact loans, mainly to nations states. Those needed to be taken into account because some of the countries in question would not be considered to be ethical. He asked that that be borne in mind in the next iteration of the policy.

The Rt Rev Andrew Swift (Bishop of Brechin) spoke as proposer of the motion. The work of the Group under Mr McLean's careful and attentive chairing had drawn together both a prophetic voice, challenging injustice, and also prudence in relation to care for the investments of the Church. Two years ago, the work had not been sufficiently advanced to reach that point. It had been a complex and emotive task, but the policy was both prophetic and careful.
Mr McLean indicated that, since the point at which the Group had been formed, he had not looked at what had been said in 2019. The work of the Group had been one of going back to basics. The Group had looked at a raft of approaches by other churches which had similarly struggled with the issue. The proposed policy had been put together based on first principles. He would not wish Synod members to feel that an attempt was being made to enable the adoption of a policy which had not been successful in 2019. On the question of loans to unethical countries, Mr McLean noted that others had made the same point and that that was a matter which the Group needed to look at. The next piece of work which the Group had before it was to look at broader rules of approaching what was or was not ethical and to endeavour to formulate an overarching framework for that. It was possible that that might produce further red lines. A benefit of the policy being proposed was that new red lines could be introduced into it as matters developed in future.

Bishop Swift then proposed, and Ms Bridget Campbell (Convener, Standing Committee) seconded, the following Motion:

“That the proposed policy framework for investment of Scottish Episcopal Church Unit Trust Pool monies in pooled funds as set out in the Synod Papers be approved and adopted.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed: 107 in favour, 2 against, 4 abstentions.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) indicated that he wished to raise a point of order. He explained that his point of order in fact concerned earlier debate in Synod. He wished to suggest that the Standing Committee consider reviving the Organisation Review Committee to consider what could be learned from the discussions earlier in the meeting regarding the Complaints Procedure and Bullying and Harassment Policy. The Chair explained that that would need to be considered by the Standing Committee, but he took note of the point.

The Chair expressed thanks to Mr McLean and the Ethical Investment Advisory Group.

6.1.3 Budgets and Quota

Ms Bridget Campbell (Convener, Standing Committee) turned to the business of approving quota.

She illustrated quota figures on a PowerPoint slide and explained that those which she was illustrating were different to those shown in the table on page 27 of the Synod Papers and reflected the actual sums requested from dioceses for 2021. She apologised and explained that the anomaly arose owing to an error in the calculation of the quota allocation between dioceses for 2021 which had resulted in Glasgow and Galloway being asked to pay more than it should have been (and all other dioceses being asked to pay slightly less). The figure shown in the Synod Papers reflected the sums which ought to have been requested from each diocese whilst those on the slide were the actual figures used for quota 2021, as had been agreed at General Synod 2020. The calculation of 2022 quota included an adjustment for that error which the Treasurer had discussed and agreed with Diocesan Treasurers.

Ms Campbell reminded Synod that the total being requested for 2022 was £660,000 an increase which was in line with the general approach to quota for the period 2021-2024 which had been outlined by the Standing Committee in its finance report to General Synod 2020. The key points in that approach were:

- a large reduction in quota from 2020 to 2021 to provide assistance to dioceses and charges in meeting some of the financial challenges of Covid-19;
- a gradual increase over three years back to approximately the 2020 quota level (£750,000);
- a proposed quota for 2022 in line with that general approach, namely a 10% increase in total quota to £660,000; and
• an anticipation that in 2023 the quota would be £710,000 and in 2024, £750,000.

The amount payable by each diocese reflected the relative changes in its income assessable for quota which was why dioceses were facing different levels of increase above and below the 10% figure. The information submitted by each diocese was reviewed by the Treasurer and considered jointly every year by the Diocesan Treasurers and the allocation reflected a long-standing formula. Any detailed questions should be directed to the Treasurer.

Ms Campbell then proposed, and Mr Jim Gibson (Convener, Administration Board) seconded, the following Motion:

“That this Synod, having examined the proposed budgets for the General Synod for the year 2022, agree to a quota figure of £660,000 for that year.”

The Rev Prof David Atkinson (Aberdeen and Orkney) noted that whilst Covid had been mentioned in the context of the Recovery and Renewal Fund, it was not mentioned in the broader context of how the Church's finances were taken forward in the post Covid era. He was aware that a number of churches would have some difficulties in being able to fund activities as a consequence of the Covid lockdown on matters such as church attendance and giving. That in turn would make it difficult to respond to requests for diocesan and provincial quota. He asked what thought had been given to that. If churches were to face difficulties going forward, how would they be dealt with?

The Rev Markus Dünzkofer (Edinburgh) thanked those who had been involved in preparing the figures. He asked that quota deliberations be part of the future vision and strategic planning.

Ms Campbell thanked members for their contributions. In response to Professor Atkinson, she indicated that throughout the Covid period the Treasurer had been having regular discussions with the Diocesan Treasurers. Through that process he was obtaining regular feedback about what was happening locally. She would ask him to comment. She agreed with the comment made by Mr Dünzkofer.

Mr Malcolm Bett (Treasurer) confirmed that he had been in contact with Diocesan Treasurers and would continue to liaise with them in terms of the impact of post Covid on the finances of charges. One of the decisions which had been made by Standing Committee the previous year in terms of the quota being proposed was a significant reduction in provincial quota which was designed specifically to give flexibility to help dioceses and charges as they responded to the aftermath of Covid. Clearly that position would continue for longer and would affect churches and their incomes in different ways. That would in turn impact the calculation of quota. He would continue his discussions with Diocesan Treasurers.

The Motion was put to the vote and passed: 111 in favour, 3 against, 2 abstentions.

The Chair expressed thanks to Ms Campbell.

6.1.4 Elections

6.1.4.1 Institute Council Membership

The Rt Rev Anne Dyer (Bishop of Aberdeen and Orkney) proposed, and the Rt Rev Andrew Swift (Bishop of Brechin) seconded, the following Motion:

“That Patsy Thomson be appointed for a second term on the Institute Council.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed: 111 in favour, 3 against, 2 abstentions.

Bishop Dyer then proposed, and Bishop Swift seconded, the following Motion:
The Motion was put to the vote and passed nem con: 111 in favour, none against, 5 abstentions.

6.1.4.2 Clergy Discipline Tribunal Membership

The Rt Rev John Armes (Bishop of Edinburgh) proposed, and Ms Bridget Campbell (Convener, Standing Committee) seconded, the following Motion:

“That the Very Rev Kenneth Rathband be re-appointed for an additional term on the Clergy Discipline Tribunal.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed: 114 in favour, 1 against, 1 abstention.

Bishop Armes then proposed, and Ms Campbell seconded, the following Motion:

“That the Rev Canon Marion Chatterley be appointed as a member of the Clergy Discipline Tribunal.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed: 107 in favour, 4 against, 5 abstentions.

Bishop Armes then proposed, and Ms Campbell seconded, the following Motion:

“That the Hon Lord Arthurson be appointed as a member of the Clergy Discipline Tribunal.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed: 111 in favour, 1 against, 3 abstentions.

6.1.4.3 Preliminary Proceedings Committee

Bishop Armes proposed, and Ms Campbell seconded, the following Motion:

“That John Stirling be re-appointed for an additional term on the Preliminary Proceedings Committee.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed nem con: 112 in favour, 2 abstentions.

6.1.4.4 Pension Fund Chair

Ms Campbell proposed, and Mr Jim Gibson (Convener, Administration Board) seconded, the following Motion:

“That the term of office of Richard McIndoe as Chair of the Pension Fund Trustees be extended until 31 December 2021 and that the Standing Committee be authorised to make an appointment to fill the vacancy arising then, subject to ratification of any such appointment by General Synod 2022.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed nem con: 115 in favour, 1 abstention.

6.1.4.5 General Synod Trusteeship

Ms Campbell proposed, and Bishop Armes seconded, the following Motion:

“That Professor Patricia Peattie be appointed as a General Synod Trustee.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed nem con: 111 in favour, 2 abstentions.

6.2 Mission Board

6.2.1 Provincial Youth Committee

A video from the Youth Committee was shown in which young people spoke about the urgency of climate change. They called upon the Church to act since the time for words had passed.
The Rev Beki Cansdale (Argyll and The Isles) spoke of the steps which had been taken in her diocese and indicated how a community could be drawn together to take action.

The Chair commended the young people and their leaders and thanked them for their poignant call to action.

6.3 Thanks from the Primus

The Primus expressed thanks to all Synod members for their participation, to the Rt Rev Kevin Pearson and the Very Rev Frances Burberry for chairing the meeting, to those who had acted as Facilitators and to the Rev Canon Dean Fostekew who had co-ordinated the Facilitators and collated feedback from the breakout groups. The Primus thanked the Assessor and all those Conveners and members who were stepping down at the current Synod or had done so during the previous year including: the Rev Prof David Jasper (Doctrine Committee); Dr John Davies (Liturgy Committee), the Rev Canon John McLuckie (ICRC), the Rev Elaine Garman (Acting Convener, Church in Society), and Mr David Kenvyn (GPC).

The Primus also thanked Sanctus Media who had supported the technical aspects of the current virtual meeting, the staff of St Paul's & St George's, those who had arranged the Eucharist and led Morning and Evening Prayer and the staff of the General Synod Office.

Ms Bridget Campbell expressed gratitude to the Primus for his remarks and thanked him for having chaired sessions of the meeting.

6.4 Closing Worship and Acts of Synod

The Synod closed with an act of worship at the end of which the Primus confirmed the Acts of Synod and gave the Blessing.

6.5 Technical Matters

The Rev Simon Cake (Edinburgh) wished it to be noted that he had been unable to vote during the meeting.
ELECTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS TO PROVINCIAL BODIES

1. **Membership: Standing Committee**

A vacancy arises on the Standing Committee for a lay person to succeed Jenny Whelan.

The vacancy has been advertised in *inspires online* but no expressions of interest have been received to date. At the present time, the Standing Committee does not bring forward a nomination but intends to seek an appropriate individual and co-opt them during the course of the next year, with a view to their being nominated to General Synod 2023. However, nominations may be made by Synod members and must be received not later than the commencement of the meeting of General Synod (they should be submitted to the Secretary General who has a style of nomination form available on request). The appointment (or election in the event of more than one nomination) is made by the House of Laity of the General Synod.

Members of the Standing Committee are the charity trustees of the General Synod. The Committee has the general control and management of the administration of the charity comprising the General Synod, including responsibility for recommending to the annual meeting of Synod the level of provincial quota and for presenting budgets to Synod.

The Committee comprises a lay convener, the conveners of the provincial boards, a representative of the College of Bishops, two members elected by the House of Clergy and one other member elected by the House of Laity. The Committee coordinates the work of the respective boards, gives strategic direction and agrees the agenda for General Synod. The Committee normally meets five times each year.

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

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

Details of any nominations received will be advised to Synod members at General Synod.
2. **Institute Council**

Members of the Institute Council are appointed by General Synod on the recommendation of the Standing Committee following consultation with the College of Bishops. In 2022, two members, the Rev Canon Elaine Garman and the Rev David Paton-Williams complete their current terms of office, and the Standing Committee recommends their re-appointment for a second term.

Also, a vacancy arises for a new member to succeed Nan Kennedy. The Standing Committee recommends the appointment of Cathy Johnston. Her brief CV is as follows:

*A committed public servant who wishes to offer knowledge and experience in a new setting to continue connecting people, planet and place and develop spiritual growth in myself and others.*

*Worked for Glasgow City Council, Development and Regeneration Services 2004-2020, latterly worked as Group Manager: Development Plan*

*I held a senior management position where I championed the regeneration of the city through the City Development Plan and Open Space Strategy. I am passionate about creative and collaborative working to bring about change, tackle inequalities and to ‘think global and act local’.*

*My role required me to work with internal and external partners and communities to develop policy and create the framework for action at the City, as well as at the City Region, level. The approach developed has been used as an exemplar at the UNECE Committee for Urban Development, Housing and Land Management and World Health Organisation.*

*Existing church roles are:*

- **Lay Representative for Holy Trinity Episcopal Church, Stirling, in the Diocese of St Andrews Dunkeld and Dunblane and member of Vestry – taking lead on Climate and Eco-Congregation work at Holy Trinity.**
- **Member of Scottish Episcopal Church Discernment Team – Vocation Adviser; Discernment Meeting member and Advisory Selection Panel participant.**
- **Member of Scottish Episcopal Church Provincial Environment Group.**
- **Member of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane Diocesan Climate Change Group.**
- **Member of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane Diocesan Ministry Board**

*Professional Qualifications*

- **Fellow of the Landscape Institute, 2015**
- **Member of Royal Town Planning Institute, 2001**
- **Academician at Academy of Urbanism and member of Scottish Advisory Group, 2011**
Standing Committee
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Academic Qualifications

- BA (Hons) Landscape Architecture, Heriot-Watt University, 1980
- Master of Environmental Studies, Strathclyde University, 1996

3. 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.

A vacancy arises in the position of Alternate Lay Member on the Committee, to succeed Geoff Sage. The Alternate Lay Member serves in the event that the principal Lay Member (currently Professor Patricia Peattie) is unable to.

The Standing Committee nominates Jeanette Whiteside for appointment. Her brief CV is as follows:

My professional background is in HR within a Social Work setting until my retirement some eleven years ago. During that period, I dealt with a very broad range of personnel issues including disciplinary ones. I am currently the convener of the provincial Personnel Committee and before that served two terms on the Committee as a member.

I have been a member of St Margaret’s Newlands for about 30 years. During that time, I have served as Lay Representative, People’s Warden and as a member of the Vestry. I was also a Eucharistic Assistant and served on the Provincial Personnel Committee. On my return to Scotland after spending 4 years in Sri Lanka, I again was asked to join the Vestry of St Margaret’s. I continue to be a Eucharistic Assistant and am very involved in the life of both my church and church community.

I am also currently a member of the Provincial Retirement Committee and as convener of the Personnel Committee serve on the provincial Administration Board.

4. Membership: Clergy Discipline Tribunal (Canon 54)

Appointments to the Clergy Discipline Tribunal are made by the General Synod and the Standing Committee is required to make nominations. This year two members of the Tribunal, serving in the role of “practising lawyer”, the Hon Lady Wolffe and the Hon Lady Poole, complete their current terms of office. The Standing Committee nominates both to serve a further three-year term.

5. Membership: Administration Board

The Administration Board includes up to three members appointed by the General Synod on the nomination of the Standing Committee. This year the Rev Amanda Fairclough completes her current term of office and is eligible to serve another term. In addition, one vacancy arises and, following advertisement of the vacancy, the Standing Committee nominates the Rev Richard Kilgour. His brief CV is as follows:


6. Pension Fund Chair

General Synod 2021 authorised the Standing Committee to appoint a new Chair of the Pension Fund Trustees from 31 December 2021 when Richard McIndoe completed an extended term of office. The Standing Committee appointed Sarah Whitley as the new Chair with effect from 1 January 2022 and her appointment is brought to General Synod for ratification. Her brief CV is as follows:


2019- Present: Rakuten, Japan - External Director, supervisory role on main board of large Japanese company involved in e-commerce, telecoms and finance.

2019 – Present: Chair Edinburgh International Festival, Endowment Fund (EIFEF is the permanent endowment supporting the EIF)

2019 – Present: President, St Andrew Boat Club, Chairing Trustee meetings and leading organisation.
2021 - Trustee of the Abbotsford Trust

Member Investment Committee of the Carnegie Trust for the Universities of Scotland

Member St Columba’s-by-the-Castle, serving on its Finance Committee.

The Synod agenda includes motions to fill the appointments outlined above.

John F Stuart
Secretary General
May 2022
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Budget Report

Format

1. The summary of all Funds (page 64) details the 2021 actual figures in the first column and the 2022-2024 budget figures in the final three columns. The individual Fund/Committee budgets (pages 65-77) detail the 2021 budget, actual and variance figures in the first three columns and the 2022-2024 budget figures in the final three columns.

Budget setting process

2. 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 meeting each year in November. In this instance a number of decisions with budgetary implications were made after November and Standing Committee further reviewed budgets at its meeting in April 2022.

3. In its oversight of the General Synod’s finances the Standing Committee’s focus is on the General Fund. The General Fund budget (which can be found at page 65) summarises all unrestricted income and its allocation to the Standing Committee and boards to fund their work. The budgeted allocations represent the planned expenditure of each of the boards. Thus the General Fund statement provides a good overview of the overall financial position. In considering the budgets the Standing Committee is guided by two underlying principles:

   • In the longer term budgets should be set with a view to achieving a broadly breakeven position in the General Fund.

   • Large one-off receipts (such as legacies) should be capitalised to provide future income rather than being used to fund current operating costs.

Budget history

Investment income

4. The General Synod’s main source of funding is its investment income derived mainly from its investments held in the SEC Unit Trust Pool. This accounts for approximately 60% of income. Until 2008 investment income increased broadly in line with inflation each year enabling a steady growth in expenditure. The rate of distribution paid by the UTP fell by 15% in 2009 and only returned to its former level in 2020. Over that period, the impact of the reduced rate of distribution has been partly mitigated by the investment of substantial legacies and part of the cash generated by recent General Fund surpluses. Market conditions continue to be volatile and it is difficult to predict what future rates of UTP distribution will be. The Investment Committee continues to work closely with the fund managers with a view to achieving modest growth in distribution rates where possible. Increases in
distribution have been possible each year for the last six years. An above inflation increase of 7p per unit (a 12% increase) was paid in 2021. The distribution has therefore more than kept pace with inflation in recent years. It is not yet known if it will be possible for future distribution rates to match currently rapidly increasing rates of inflation. For budgetary purposes an increase of about 7% is assumed for 2022 and 4% for 2023 and 2024.

**Quota income**

5. The second largest source of income is the quota received from dioceses. This source of income became more important following the significant reduction in investment income in 2009. In 2008 quota income accounted for approximately 24% of total income. In the period 2016 – 18 it accounted for about 31% of income. It has however reduced in importance in recent years as a consequence of successive quota freezes, the significant reduction in quota agreed for 2021 and increasing investment income. In 2021 it accounted for 23% of total income.

6. In its Finance Report to General Synod 2020 Standing Committee outlined its financial response to Covid-19. One of the responses was to reduce quota for 2021 by about 19% to £600,000 with a gradual phased increase to £750,000 in 2024. Under that plan quota was due to increase by £50,000 to £710,000 in 2023. In light of current financial pressures being experienced by charges, including the impact of higher than expected rates of inflation, Standing Committee is however proposing that the quota increase be limited to £25,000 and that quota for 2023 be set at £685,000. It is further proposing that the period over which the increase to £750,000 is to be phased should be extended by a year to 2025. This is to allow dioceses and charges time to come to terms with the changing economic situation as they plan for the future.

**Surpluses**

7. Despite a significant reduction in investment income in 2009 there have been surpluses on the General Fund every year since 2010 other than 2019. This is partly due to the steps taken to reduce expenditure following the reduction in income but also reflects further reductions in expenditure against that budgeted and some additional unbudgeted income. (The total surplus for the eleven years to 2020 is approximately £1.5million.) It is not Standing Committee’s intention to generate such surpluses. The surpluses have however helped fund a £2million lump sum payment to the Pension Fund agreed by General Synod in 2009 (reducing the need for increases in pension contribution rates) and allowed the addition of £700,000 to the General Fund’s investments leading to additional annual income of about £30,000. The surpluses have augmented the General Fund’s reserves and enabled Standing Committee to freeze quota for a number of years and to suggest its significant reduction in 2021 as part of its financial response to Covid-19. These reserves also allowed Standing Committee to distribute £300,000 to dioceses and charges through the Recovery and Renewal Fund in 2021. Standing Committee is committed to using the reserves to support the work of the SEC and will therefore continue to budget for deficits in the short term if it considers it appropriate to do so.
Why is outcome generally better than budget?

8. Standing Committee is aware of concerns about the continuing generation of surpluses and how often in recent years actual financial outcomes have generally been better than budgeted. Standing Committee is keen to try to ensure that there is greater accuracy in the budgeting process and will work with the Boards to seek to ensure that the budget requests they submit are as realistic as possible and reflect their planned programmes. A General Fund deficit of £242,000 was incurred in 2021. This was largely due to the one-off Recovery and Renewal Fund grants of £300,000 awarded during the year. The underlying position on the General Fund, ignoring the impact of the Recovery and Renewal Fund, was a surplus of £58,000 – some £307,000 more than budgeted. A number of factors contributed to the better than anticipated outcome – including better than budgeted investment income and the costs savings arising from continuing restrictions on in-person meetings and travel. The current circumstances also add to the difficulties in setting budgets given the uncertainties about resumption of some activities and the extent to which meetings will continue to be held online.

Action agreed by Standing Committee

9. As reported to General Synod 2020 Standing Committee agreed to use some of the accumulated General Fund reserves to finance a reduction in quota over the period 2021 – 2024. The proposed reductions in quota will use approximately £250,000 of the accumulated reserves. The further extension of reduced levels of quota detailed at paragraph 6 above will use a further £85,000 of accumulated reserves.

10. Initially a further £250,000 was allocated by Standing Committee to provide a Recovery and Renewal Fund. Having seen the quality of the applications submitted it decided to allocate an increased total of £300,000 of reserves to assist dioceses and charges meet the challenges and opportunities encountered as they emerged from lockdown restrictions.

11. Standing Committee recognises that many charges will be faced with a significant increase in stipend costs from 2023 following General Synod’s decision to implement a new striped policy. For the next few years stipend increases will be in excess of inflation. At the time the policy was agreed it was not anticipated that inflation would be at such high levels. Standard Stipend for 2023 has yet to be agreed but it is currently anticipated that the increase is likely to be at least 7% resulting in additional costs of about £2,500 to £3,000 for charges with stipendiary clergy. Standing Committee has agreed to use a further £300,000 of reserves to help ease the transition to increased stipend rates. Transitional Stipend Assistance Grants will be provided to dioceses to enable them to provide financial support to...
charges finding most difficulty in funding the increased costs. Grants totalling £200,000 will be provided in 2023 with a further £100,000 in 2024.

12. In setting the budgets for 2022 – 2024 Standing Committee has agreed to deficit budgets to ensure that the ongoing work of the various boards is adequately funded. In particular it has responded to requests submitted by boards and committees for additional expenditure in the following areas:

**Safeguarding Training**
Standing Committee recognises the importance of ensuring adequate safeguarding training is provided throughout the SEC and welcomes the proposal by the Provincial Safeguarding Committee to appoint a full time Safeguarding Training Officer. It is hoped that an appointment will be made later in 2022. (Additional annual budget cost about £37,000.)

**Development of a provincial programme for IME 4-6 training**
Currently the Scottish Episcopal Institute provides training for ordinands in their first three years of training (Initial Ministerial Training 1-3) but has no specific remit for training and formation once ordinands have progressed to curacies. For some time it has been an aspiration of the Institute Council to provide a more co-ordinated approach to training for individuals in Initial Ministerial Education 4-6 to ensure greater consistency throughout the province. A specific IME 4-6 curriculum is therefore to be developed and delivered by the Institute. The Standing Committee endorses this development of the role of the Institute. (Additional annual budget cost about £17,000.)

**Further provincial funding for Mixed Mode ordinands**
The Mixed Mode training pathway for full time ordinands was introduced in 2018. One of the recommendations arising from a review of the first three years of the programme was that the province should fund a greater share of the costs associated with such placements. This recommendation arose from a recognition that charges and dioceses often encountered difficulties in identifying adequate funding for what were likely to be good training placements. Having considered a number of options the Institute Council has recommended that dioceses / charges are no longer required to fund a share of the grant paid to Mixed Mode ordinands. Grant costs will therefore be fully funded by the province. (Additional annual budget cost about £15,000 to £30,000 depending on number of ordinands in training.)

13. It is anticipated that almost all of the current revenue reserves of £809,000 will be used over the next two to three years and that it is likely to be necessary to sell investments to fund deficits from 2024.
Current budgetary pressures and uncertainties

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

**Quota income**

15. As outlined above it is hoped to restore quota to previous levels by 2025. 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**

16. 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.

**Commitment to net zero carbon emission**

17. General Synod 2020 passed a resolution committing the SEC to working toward net zero carbon emissions by 2020. The Provincial Environment Group has now been established and work is underway to establish ‘base-line’ position and what will be required to make our buildings more energy efficient. The financial implications of working towards this goal are not yet known.

**Curate funding**

18. The number of stipendiary curates in training and the grant funding provided to the training charges has a significant impact on budgets. Traditionally 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 four stipendiary curates in training. It is anticipated that this will increase to five during 2022.

19. It has been recognised for some time that to ensure the availability of the required number of appropriate training opportunities for stipendiary curates 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. Standing Committee has however agreed that funding of 75% of stipend and related costs will be provided in respect of the three stipendiary curate placements due to start in 2022. Should funding at that level become the norm there will be a general increase in budgeted costs.

20. 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 (other than the three commencing in 2022) is assumed to be at the traditional rate of 50% of stipend and related costs.
Funding of full time ordinands (including Mixed Mode students)

21. 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). (Currently SEI’s share of grant costs is funded by the SEI Training Fund and therefore has no impact on the General Fund deficit.

22. 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 2023. It is however likely that from 2024 the continued provision of such grants will require some support from the General Fund. The budgets currently reflect a funding requirement of £79,000 in 2024 – increasing to about £105,000 - £130,000 a year thereafter. The number of full time ordinands in training will therefore have a significant impact on the General Fund from 2024.

General Fund budgeted deficits

23. The General Fund budgets agreed by Standing Committee result in the following budgeted deficits:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Deficit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Deficit of £112,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>Deficit of £443,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>Deficit of £465,564</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. Whilst recent experience suggests that actual financial outcome may be better than budgeted the scale of the budgeted deficits is such that it is considered likely that deficits will be incurred in the next three years. These will be funded from the surpluses generated in recent years. Standing Committee remains committed to ensuring that sufficient funds are available to provide appropriate training for authorised ministries within SEC and to seek ways of developing new mission initiatives whilst providing appropriate support for existing ministries. It will work with all boards and committees in addressing the financial challenges arising from the prospect of incurring deficits.

Projections beyond 2024

25. Given the number of variables and uncertainties detailed above, producing accurate projections beyond the usual three year budget period is difficult. For example, as noted above, the assumptions made about the number of stipendiary curates in training and the level of grant funding required have a significant impact
on such projections. Standing Committee is however of the view that, given the scale of the deficits budgeted for the next three years and the absence of any apparent source of additional income, deficits are likely to continue beyond 2024. Whilst the surpluses of recent years provide a relatively sound base and will fund the deficits in the short term there is likely to be an increasing need to prioritise expenditure in the future. It is also increasingly likely that investments will need to be sold to finance deficits.

**Total budgeted deficits**

26. The budgets for all the Boards and Committees, including miscellaneous and restricted funds are summarised on page 64. These indicate the following budgeted total revenue deficits:

- **2022** Deficit of £73,674
- **2023** Deficit of £390,010
- **2024** Deficit of £371,566

27. The total budgeted surpluses / deficits differ from those budgeted for the General Fund due to small surpluses / deficits budgeted for some of the miscellaneous and restricted funds.

Bridget Campbell  
Convener, Standing Committee  
April 2022
Graph 1: Total income and expenditure 2002-2021

Graph 2: Quota and investment income as a percentage of total income 2002-2021
QUOTA 2023

All quota received will be credited to the General Fund.

It is recommended that total quota requested be increased by £25,000 to £685,000. (This represents a reduction of £25,000 on the phased increases in quota for the period 2021 – 2024 outlined by Standing Committee in its Finance Report to General Synod 2020.)

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diocese</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>Change from 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen and Orkney</td>
<td>74,229</td>
<td>71,262</td>
<td>2,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyll and The Isles</td>
<td>24,515</td>
<td>25,008</td>
<td>(493)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brechin</td>
<td>44,577</td>
<td>44,340</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>280,322</td>
<td>264,438</td>
<td>15,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow and Galloway</td>
<td>132,786</td>
<td>131,064</td>
<td>1,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moray, Ross and Caithness</td>
<td>47,218</td>
<td>45,234</td>
<td>1,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane</td>
<td>81,353</td>
<td>78,654</td>
<td>2,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>685,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>660,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>25,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BUDGET SUMMARY – includes all revenue funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2021 £</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2022 £</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2023 £</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2024 £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Fund</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>2,026,380</td>
<td>2,181,332</td>
<td>2,269,651</td>
<td>2,363,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transitional Stipend Assistance Grants</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(200,000)</td>
<td>(100,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recovery and Renewal Fund</strong></td>
<td>(300,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocated to Boards</strong></td>
<td>(1,968,355)</td>
<td>(2,293,920)</td>
<td>(2,512,710)</td>
<td>(2,728,565)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus/(deficit)</strong></td>
<td>(241,975)</td>
<td>(112,588)</td>
<td>(443,059)</td>
<td>(465,564)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>1,050,831</td>
<td>808,856</td>
<td>696,268</td>
<td>253,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standing Committee</strong></td>
<td>(202x759)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (From General Fund)</td>
<td>857,426</td>
<td>1,021,205</td>
<td>1,141,190</td>
<td>1,203,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus/(deficit)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1,021,205)</td>
<td>(1,141,190)</td>
<td>(1,203,955)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration Board</strong></td>
<td>253,670</td>
<td>267,320</td>
<td>274,820</td>
<td>282,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (From General Fund)</td>
<td>394,946</td>
<td>397,155</td>
<td>412,667</td>
<td>428,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>(538,491)</td>
<td>(633,031)</td>
<td>(622,015)</td>
<td>(639,557)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus/(deficit)</strong></td>
<td>110,125</td>
<td>31,444</td>
<td>65,472</td>
<td>70,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>479,018</td>
<td>454,033</td>
<td>463,560</td>
<td>475,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institute Council</strong></td>
<td>118,482</td>
<td>494,600</td>
<td>565,415</td>
<td>683,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (From General Fund)</td>
<td>79,493</td>
<td>95,890</td>
<td>116,506</td>
<td>87,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>(523,735)</td>
<td>(606,620)</td>
<td>(724,120)</td>
<td>(783,840)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus/(deficit)</strong></td>
<td>118,837</td>
<td>(16,130)</td>
<td>(42,199)</td>
<td>(12,896)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>116,837</td>
<td>100,707</td>
<td>58,508</td>
<td>45,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mission Board</strong></td>
<td>236,137</td>
<td>259,737</td>
<td>289,513</td>
<td>325,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (From General Fund)</td>
<td>411,049</td>
<td>481,920</td>
<td>504,195</td>
<td>522,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>149,144</td>
<td>162,525</td>
<td>169,367</td>
<td>176,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus/(deficit)</strong></td>
<td>36,571</td>
<td>23,600</td>
<td>29,776</td>
<td>35,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>236,137</td>
<td>259,737</td>
<td>289,513</td>
<td>325,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faith &amp; Order Board</strong></td>
<td>2,781</td>
<td>28,875</td>
<td>27,090</td>
<td>26,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (From General Fund)</td>
<td>199,566</td>
<td>95,890</td>
<td>116,506</td>
<td>87,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>(2,781)</td>
<td>(28,875)</td>
<td>(27,090)</td>
<td>(26,330)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus/(deficit)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publications</strong></td>
<td>12,807</td>
<td>4,418</td>
<td>5,006</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (From General Fund)</td>
<td>(588)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>12,219</td>
<td>12,219</td>
<td>12,219</td>
<td>12,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus/(deficit)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>12,219</td>
<td>12,219</td>
<td>12,219</td>
<td>12,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>2,026,380</td>
<td>2,181,332</td>
<td>2,269,651</td>
<td>2,363,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (From General Fund)</td>
<td>628,001</td>
<td>655,570</td>
<td>698,489</td>
<td>692,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>(2,751,061)</td>
<td>(2,910,576)</td>
<td>(3,358,150)</td>
<td>(3,426,612)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus/(deficit)</strong></td>
<td>(96,680)</td>
<td>(73,674)</td>
<td>(390,010)</td>
<td>(371,566)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>1,921,004</td>
<td>1,522,964</td>
<td>1,077,009</td>
<td>646,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>1,921,004</td>
<td>1,522,964</td>
<td>1,077,009</td>
<td>646,351</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## General Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>fav/ (adv)</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>£</strong></td>
<td><strong>£</strong></td>
<td><strong>£</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INCOME

#### Investment Income

- **UTP income**
  - 2021: 1,439,819
  - 2022: 1,501,528
  - 2023: 1,563,238

- **Interest**
  - 2021: 4,000
  - 2022: 4,000
  - 2023: 4,000

- **Net investment property income**
  - 2021: 1,465,062
  - 2022: 1,526,771
  - 2023: 1,588,481

#### Administration fees

- **UTP / investment administration**
  - 2021: 2,000
  - 2022: 2,000
  - 2023: 2,000

- **Pension Fund administration**
  - 2021: 31,870
  - 2022: 32,670
  - 2023: 33,500

#### Donations and legacies

- 2021: 3,000
- 2022: 3,000
- 2023: 3,000

### ALLOCATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>fav/ (adv)</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>£</strong></td>
<td><strong>£</strong></td>
<td><strong>£</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Standing Committee

- 2021: 857,426
- 2022: 1,141,190
- 2023: 1,203,955

#### Administration Board

- 2021: 433,429
- 2022: 565,415
- 2023: 683,190

#### Institute Council

- 2021: 411,049
- 2022: 504,195
- 2023: 532,770

#### Mission Board

- 2021: 2,781
- 2022: 23,494
- 2023: 26,330

#### Faith and Order Board

- 2021: 28,875
- 2022: 27,090
- 2023: 26,330

#### Transitional Stipend Assistance Grants

- 2021: -
- 2022: -
- 2023: 100,000

#### Recovery and Renewal Fund

- 2021: 300,000
- 2022: 50,000
- 2023: 253,209

### BALANCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>fav/ (adv)</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>£</strong></td>
<td><strong>£</strong></td>
<td><strong>£</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>£</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Surplus/(deficit) for year

- 2021: (112,588)
- 2022: (443,059)
- 2023: (465,564)

#### Balance brought forward

- 2021: 808,856
- 2022: 696,268
- 2023: 253,209

#### Balance carried forward

- 2021: 696,268
- 2022: 253,209
- 2023: (212,355)

### Note

In addition to allocations from the General Fund, some Boards / Committees receive income from other sources.
## Standing Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance (adv/fac)</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Budget 2023</th>
<th>Budget 2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>912,170</td>
<td>857,426</td>
<td>(54,744)</td>
<td>1,021,205</td>
<td>1,141,190</td>
<td>1,203,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>912,170</td>
<td>857,426</td>
<td>(54,744)</td>
<td>1,021,205</td>
<td>1,141,190</td>
<td>1,203,955</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPENDITURE**

### A Costs of General Synod Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employees</th>
<th>Salaries</th>
<th>N.L.C</th>
<th>Pension contributions</th>
<th>Staff &amp; subsistence</th>
<th>Staff training</th>
<th>Recruitment Costs</th>
<th>Sub-total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>409,800</td>
<td>38,100</td>
<td>133,700</td>
<td>1,910 (50)</td>
<td>4,250 741 3,536</td>
<td>3,500 230 3,270</td>
<td>593,170 571,099 22,071</td>
<td>665,360 780,410 833,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,940</td>
<td>3,167</td>
<td>147,900</td>
<td>2,000 2,060 2,122</td>
<td>4,250 4,378 4,509</td>
<td>1,910 1,967 2,026</td>
<td>3,500 3,605 3,713</td>
<td>88,500 70,556 72,671</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B Provincial Costs

| Office of Primus | Primus' expenses | Assistance to Diocese | College of Bishops | Election of Bishop | General Synod | Annual meeting | Annual report | Synod papers | Office for Protec'n of Children & Vulnerable Adults | New Clergy Welcome Day | Clergy Training | Clergy Legal Expenses Insurance | Trustee Liability Insurance | Professional fees | Audit | Legal/Advisory | Churches Main Committee etc | Sub-total |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|-------|---------------|----------------------|----------|
| 7,500           | 3,958           | 3,542                 | 12,150             | 12,150            | 8,000         | 8,992         | 992           | 3,814 (514)  | 3,000           | 3,750                   | 2,157                  | 746 254        | 3,713                      | 16,391                    | 15,120         | 173,126 | 3,979         | 3,713                  | 4,774   |

### Total Costs of General Synod Office

723,170 686,107 37,063

### Total Provincial Costs

130,400 124,082 6,318

166,845 168,957 173,126
### Standing Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2021 fav/ (adv)</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong> Committee Meeting Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>Standing Committee</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td>2,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>Cttee for Protec’n of Children &amp; Vulnerable Adults</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Ethical Investment Advisory Group</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>(261)</td>
<td>Provincial Environment Group</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>Total Committee Meeting Expenses</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>2,460</td>
<td>2,522</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **D** Subscriptions to church bodies | | | | | |
| 4,000 | 4,107 | (107) | World Council of Churches | 4,000 | 4,000 | 4,000 |
| 1,400 | 1,225 | 175 | Conference of European Churches | 1,400 | 1,400 | 1,400 |
| 5,000 | 5,000 | - | Churches Together in Britain and Ireland | 5,000 | 5,000 | 5,000 |
| 8,000 | - | 8,000 | ACTS / Scottish Churches Forum | 8,000 | 8,000 | 8,000 |
| 36,700 | 35,644 | 1,056 | Anglican Consultative Council | 36,700 | 37,800 | 38,900 |
| 55,100 | 45,976 | 9,124 | Total Subscriptions to church bodies | 55,100 | 56,200 | 57,300 |

| **E** Grants | | | | | |
| 1,000 | 1,000 | - | Primus discretionary | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| 1,000 | 1,000 | - | Total Grants | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 |

| **Total Expenditure** | 912,170 | 857,426 | 55,005 | 1,021,205 | 1,141,190 | 1,203,955 |

| **BALANCES** | | | | | |
| - | - | Surplus/(deficit) for year | - | - | - |
| - | - | Balance brought forward | - | - | - |
| - | - | Balance carried forward | - | - | - |

912,170 857,426 55,005 1,021,205 1,141,190 1,203,955
## Administration Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Revised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INCOME
- Allocation from General Fund: £267,320, £274,820, £282,320
- Total Income: £267,320, £274,820, £282,320

### EXPENDITURE

#### Meeting Costs
- Board: £1,000, £1,000, £1,000
- Building Grants Group: £500, £500, £500
- Investment Committee: £100, £100, £100
- Retirement Housing Committee: £400, £400, £400
- Buildings Committee: £400, £400, £400
- Personnel Committee: £400, £400, £400

#### Sub-total: £2,800, £2,800, £2,800

#### Grants
- Child Allowance: £10,000, £10,000, £10,000

#### Sub-total: £10,000, £10,000, £10,000

#### Allocation to other funds
- Building Grants Fund: £254,520, £262,020, £269,520

#### Sub-total: £254,520, £262,020, £269,520

### Total Expenditure: £267,320, £274,820, £282,320

### BALANCES

#### Revenue
- Surplus/(deficit) for year: - £ - £ - £
- Balance brought forward: - £ - £ - £

- Balance carried forward: - £ - £ - £
## Administration Board
### Building Grants Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget 2021</th>
<th>Actual 2021</th>
<th>Variance fav/ (adv)</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2022</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2023</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation from General Fund</td>
<td>247,020</td>
<td>247,020</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>254,520</td>
<td>262,020</td>
<td>269,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations (Allchurches Trust /Benefact Trust)</td>
<td>17,980</td>
<td>17,980</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17,980</td>
<td>17,980</td>
<td>17,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclaimed earmarking from previous year</td>
<td>- 1,590</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Income</strong></td>
<td>265,000</td>
<td>266,590</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>272,500</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>287,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                | £           | £           | £                   | £                    | £                    | £                    |
| **EXPENDITURE**|             |             |                     |                      |                      |                      |
| Grants - Issued | 92,305      | 174,285     |                     |                      |                      |                      |
| **Total Expenditure** | 265,000     | 266,590     | 1,590               | 272,500              | 280,000              | 287,500              |

|                | £           | £           | £                   | £                    | £                    | £                    |
| **BALANCES**   |             |             |                     |                      |                      |                      |
| Revenue        |             |             |                     |                      |                      |                      |
| Surplus/(deficit) for year | -           | -           | -                   | -                    | -                    | -                    |
| Balance brought forward | -           | -           | -                   | -                    | -                    | -                    |
| **Balance carried forward** | -           | -           | -                   | -                    | -                    | -                    |

## Building Loans Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget 2021</th>
<th>Actual 2021</th>
<th>Variance fav/ (adv)</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2022</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2023</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on loans</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>3,092</td>
<td>1,592</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Income</strong></td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>3,092</td>
<td>1,592</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                | £           | £           | £                   | £                    | £                    | £                    |
| **BALANCES**   |             |             |                     |                      |                      |                      |
| Revenue (liquid funds for advancement of loans) | 1,500       | 3,092       | 1,592               | 3,500                | 3,500                | 3,500                |
| Surplus/(deficit) for year | -           | -           | -                   | 3,500                | 3,500                | 3,500                |
| Transfer (to)/from capital | (277,835)  | 13,273      | 291,108             | (296,200)            | (3,500)              | (3,500)              |
| Balance brought forward | 296,335     | 296,335     | -                   | 312,700              | 20,000               | 20,000               |
| **Balance carried forward** | 20,000      | 312,700     | 292,700             | 20,000               | 20,000               | 20,000               |
## Administration Board
### Retirement Housing Committee
#### Supplementary Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Budget 2022</th>
<th>Budget 2023</th>
<th>Budget 2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021 Actual</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£43,116</td>
<td>£47,102</td>
<td>£3,986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td></td>
<td>£50,725</td>
<td>£52,899</td>
<td>£55,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest - Deposit account</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cargill Trust - Widows and Orphans</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacies &amp; Donations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Income</strong></td>
<td><strong>£52,775</strong></td>
<td><strong>£54,949</strong></td>
<td><strong>£57,123</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021 Actual</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£4,000</td>
<td>£200</td>
<td>£3,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants - Clergy</td>
<td>£4,000</td>
<td>£4,120</td>
<td>£4,244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants - Widows &amp; Orphans</td>
<td>£4,000</td>
<td>£4,120</td>
<td>£4,244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas payment</td>
<td>£35,000</td>
<td>£35,000</td>
<td>£35,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearbooks (retired clergy)</td>
<td>£1,400</td>
<td>£1,400</td>
<td>£1,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension Fund (CRBF) top up</td>
<td>£1,500</td>
<td>£1,500</td>
<td>£1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSO Administration charge</td>
<td>£6,145</td>
<td>£6,145</td>
<td>£6,779</td>
<td>£7,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td><strong>£52,550</strong></td>
<td><strong>£53,069</strong></td>
<td><strong>£53,596</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balances</strong></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(deficit) for year</td>
<td>£225</td>
<td>£1,880</td>
<td>£3,527</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>£48,563</td>
<td>£48,788</td>
<td>£50,668</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance carried forward</strong></td>
<td><strong>£48,788</strong></td>
<td><strong>£50,668</strong></td>
<td><strong>£54,195</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Budget 2022</th>
<th>Budget 2023</th>
<th>Budget 2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021 Actual</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£43,116</td>
<td>£47,102</td>
<td>£3,986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td></td>
<td>£50,725</td>
<td>£52,899</td>
<td>£55,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest - Deposit account</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cargill Trust - Widows and Orphans</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacies &amp; Donations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Income</strong></td>
<td><strong>£52,775</strong></td>
<td><strong>£54,949</strong></td>
<td><strong>£57,123</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021 Actual</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£4,000</td>
<td>£200</td>
<td>£3,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants - Clergy</td>
<td>£4,000</td>
<td>£4,120</td>
<td>£4,244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants - Widows &amp; Orphans</td>
<td>£4,000</td>
<td>£4,120</td>
<td>£4,244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas payment</td>
<td>£35,000</td>
<td>£35,000</td>
<td>£35,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearbooks (retired clergy)</td>
<td>£1,400</td>
<td>£1,400</td>
<td>£1,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension Fund (CRBF) top up</td>
<td>£1,500</td>
<td>£1,500</td>
<td>£1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSO Administration charge</td>
<td>£6,145</td>
<td>£6,145</td>
<td>£6,779</td>
<td>£7,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td><strong>£52,550</strong></td>
<td><strong>£53,069</strong></td>
<td><strong>£53,596</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balances</strong></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(deficit) for year</td>
<td>£225</td>
<td>£1,880</td>
<td>£3,527</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>£48,563</td>
<td>£48,788</td>
<td>£50,668</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance carried forward</strong></td>
<td><strong>£48,788</strong></td>
<td><strong>£50,668</strong></td>
<td><strong>£54,195</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Administration Board Retirement Housing Committee Housing Fund

### Revised Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2021 Variance</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest - Deposit</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>(816)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>27,326</td>
<td></td>
<td>32,148</td>
<td>33,526</td>
<td>34,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rents</td>
<td>86,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>91,000</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>99,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Income</strong></td>
<td>114,826</td>
<td></td>
<td>124,148</td>
<td>129,526</td>
<td>134,904</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPENDITURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2021 Variance</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>8,600</td>
<td>8,858</td>
<td>9,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>(5,280)</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>36,050</td>
<td>37,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas appliance / electrical testing etc</td>
<td>9,100</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>27,400</td>
<td>11,742</td>
<td>12,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property surveys / Management etc</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSO Administration charge</td>
<td>11,750</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,400</td>
<td>12,931</td>
<td>13,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>65,850</td>
<td>(2,239)</td>
<td>106,400</td>
<td>77,081</td>
<td>79,312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BALANCES

**Revenue**

- Surplus/(deficit) for year: £17,748
- Transfers (to)/from capital: £(28,166)
- Balance carried forward: £-10,418

**Capital Account**

- Profit on sale of property: £286,000
- Purchase of property: £200,000
- Capital repairs: £15,000
- Funds placed on deposit: £-61,578

**Disposals of capital**

- Sale of property - book value: £126,400
- Funds from deposit account: £60,434

**Funding of capital movement**

- Funding required: £342,940
- Profit on sale of property: £286,000
- Transfer from/to revenue: £28,166

**Balance carried forward**

- £5,621,179
- £5,673,624
- £5,729,216

---
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## Institute Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Budget 2022</th>
<th>Budget 2023</th>
<th>Budget 2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from General Fund</td>
<td>494,600</td>
<td>565,415</td>
<td>683,190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from Training Fund</td>
<td>45,150</td>
<td>71,310</td>
<td>42,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>3,990</td>
<td>4,160</td>
<td>4,330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees</td>
<td>14,730</td>
<td>8,925</td>
<td>9,120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>558,470</td>
<td>649,810</td>
<td>738,740</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Budget 2022</th>
<th>Budget 2023</th>
<th>Budget 2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Board</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting costs</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Board</strong></td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Scottish Episcopal Institute</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Costs</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries, pensions etc</td>
<td>166,400</td>
<td>177,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel expenses</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff training / development</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total staff costs</strong></td>
<td>161,000</td>
<td>171,900</td>
<td>183,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training costs</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential weekends</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Education (placement) costs</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Tutors</td>
<td>22,800</td>
<td>23,300</td>
<td>23,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Awards</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total training costs</strong></td>
<td>84,300</td>
<td>84,800</td>
<td>85,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mixed Mode Training costs | £             | £           | £           | £           |
| Director of MM Training salary, pension etc | 58,600       | 62,850      | 67,120      |             |
| Director of MM Training travel, expenses etc | 3,900        | 3,900       | 3,900       |             |
| Maintenance grants | 31,380        | 51,660      | 89,100      |             |
| **Total Mixed Mode Training costs** | 93,880       | 118,410     | 160,120     |             |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other costs</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin / publicity</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Reader conference</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total other costs</strong></td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total SEI costs</strong></td>
<td>351,180</td>
<td>377,110</td>
<td>430,420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Institute Council

### Revised Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget 2021</th>
<th>Actual 2021</th>
<th>Variance fav/ (adv)</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2022</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2023</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C Full Time ordinands</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University fees</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance grants</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,770</td>
<td>19,650</td>
<td>32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total full time ordinands</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,770</td>
<td>19,650</td>
<td>32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D IME 4-6 Training costs</strong></td>
<td>148,800</td>
<td>133,552</td>
<td>15,248</td>
<td>110,650</td>
<td>150,300</td>
<td>160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stipendiary Curate grants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,770</td>
<td>20,400</td>
<td>29,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IME 4-6 training programme</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>115,420</td>
<td>170,700</td>
<td>189,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E Recruitment and Selection</strong></td>
<td>56,500</td>
<td>56,611</td>
<td>(111)</td>
<td>58,600</td>
<td>62,850</td>
<td>67,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDO stipend / salary</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDO expenses (travel etc)</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discernment Meetings</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Selection Panel</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>3,980</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>69,000</td>
<td>57,091</td>
<td>11,909</td>
<td>75,600</td>
<td>79,850</td>
<td>84,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Recruitment and Selection</strong></td>
<td>526,950</td>
<td>491,735</td>
<td>35,215</td>
<td>558,470</td>
<td>649,810</td>
<td>738,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALANCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(deficit) for year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mission Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget 2021</th>
<th>Actual 2021</th>
<th>Variance fav/ (adv)</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2022</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2023</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget 2021</th>
<th>Actual 2021</th>
<th>Variance fav/ (adv)</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2022</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2023</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocation from General Fund</td>
<td>476,820</td>
<td>411,049</td>
<td>(65,771)</td>
<td>481,920</td>
<td>504,195</td>
<td>532,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>12,225</td>
<td>13,396</td>
<td>1,171</td>
<td>14,425</td>
<td>15,040</td>
<td>15,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacies and donations</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>(287)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Income</strong></td>
<td>490,045</td>
<td>425,158</td>
<td>(64,887)</td>
<td>497,345</td>
<td>520,235</td>
<td>549,430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EXPENDITURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget 2021</th>
<th>Actual 2021</th>
<th>Variance fav/ (adv)</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2022</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2023</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board expenses</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,090</td>
<td>3,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission and Ministry Support Grants</td>
<td>353,900</td>
<td>353,900</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>361,000</td>
<td>386,300</td>
<td>413,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Youth Week</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>2,795</td>
<td>15,205</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's work</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Mission Development Committee</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Committee</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>3,606</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other activities</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training courses and events</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>383,900</td>
<td>357,869</td>
<td>26,031</td>
<td>391,000</td>
<td>413,890</td>
<td>441,085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Allocation to Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Budget 2021</th>
<th>Actual 2021</th>
<th>Variance fav/ (adv)</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2022</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2023</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Partnerships Committee</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total allocated to committees</strong></td>
<td>106,145</td>
<td>67,289</td>
<td>38,856</td>
<td>106,345</td>
<td>106,345</td>
<td>108,345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Expenditure**                     | 490,045     | 425,158     | 64,887              | 497,345             | 520,235             | 549,430             |

#### BALANCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budget 2021</th>
<th>Actual 2021</th>
<th>Variance fav/ (adv)</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2022</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2023</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(deficit) for year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mission Board
Global Partnerships Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>fav/(adv)</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>£</strong></td>
<td><strong>£</strong></td>
<td><strong>£</strong></td>
<td><strong>£</strong></td>
<td><strong>£</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation from General Fund</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114,830</td>
<td>125,445</td>
<td>10,615</td>
<td></td>
<td>135,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>Unit Trust Pool</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit account</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noel Phillips Trust</td>
<td>7,655</td>
<td>8,363</td>
<td>708</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Income</strong></td>
<td>122,485</td>
<td>133,812</td>
<td>11,327</td>
<td>144,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants Education</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East and Pacific</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small grants</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Companion Relationships</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covid-19 Support</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Support</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican Comm Network Support</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank and currency transfer fees</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee expenses Travel / meetings</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity / correspondence</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>119,500</td>
<td>97,751</td>
<td>21,749</td>
<td>119,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balances</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>2,985</td>
<td>36,061</td>
<td>33,076</td>
<td>24,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>180,591</td>
<td>180,591</td>
<td>216,652</td>
<td>241,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance carried forward</strong></td>
<td>183,576</td>
<td>216,652</td>
<td>33,076</td>
<td>241,252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mission Board

**Church in Society Committee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Revised</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>fav/ (adv)</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### INCOME

|          |        |          |        |        |        |        |        |
|----------|--------|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Allocation from General Fund | 106,345 | 106,345 | 108,345 |
| Donations | 1,000 | 1,000 | 1,000 |

**Total Net Income**

|        |        |          |        |        |        |        |
|--------|--------|----------|--------|--------|--------|
| 107,145 | 68,002 | (39,143) | 107,345 | 107,345 | 109,345 |

#### EXPENDITURE

|          |        |          |        |        |        |        |
|----------|--------|----------|--------|--------|--------|
| Grants | 54,645 | 54,645 | -  | 54,845 | 54,845 | 56,845 |
| Child poverty projects grants | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 |
| Meeting costs / participating in consultations / conferences | 2,500 | 2,500 | 2,500 |

**Total Expenditure**

|        |        |          |        |        |        |        |
|--------|--------|----------|--------|--------|--------|
| 107,145 | 68,002 | 39,143 | 107,345 | 107,345 | 109,345 |

#### BALANCES

|          |        |          |        |        |        |
|----------|--------|----------|--------|--------|
| Surplus/(deficit) for year | - | - | - |
| Balance brought forward | - | - | - |

**Balance carried forward**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Faith and Order Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget 2021</th>
<th>Actual 2021</th>
<th>Variance fav/ (adv)</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2022</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2023</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INCOME

26,275 2,781 (23,494) Allocation from General Fund 28,875 27,090 26,330

26,275 2,781 (23,494) Total Net Income 28,875 27,090 26,330

### EXPENDITURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board expenses</td>
<td>5,770</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,770</td>
<td>5,942</td>
<td>6,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work of Liturgy Committee</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>2,225</td>
<td>2,875</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>5,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work of Committee on Canons</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work of Doctrine Committee</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Church Relations Committee</td>
<td>5,305</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>5,113</td>
<td>5,305</td>
<td>5,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe Group</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>3,725</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>3,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfaith Relations Committee</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2,425</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diaconate Working Group</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCC Assembly</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26,275 2,781 23,494 Total Expenditure 28,875 27,090 26,330

### BALANCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(deficit) for year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK
Response to Opinions of Diocesan Synods in relation to the Scottish Liturgy 1982 (revised 2021)

Following the first reading of Scottish Liturgy 1982 (Revised 2021) at General Synod 2021, the draft text was referred to Diocesan Synods, all of which met late February or early March 2022. The opinions of these Synods are set out separately (pp. 120-124). Amendments proposed, and supported by resolutions of, Diocesan Synods were considered by the Faith and Order Board at its March meeting. Some amendments proposed by the Synods of Argyll & The Isles, Moray, Ross & Caithness, and St Andrews, Dunkeld & Dunblane, were adopted by the Faith and Order Board, and incorporated into the text submitted to General Synod 2022. These concern (1) indication of the parts appropriate to the Deacon, (2) integration of alternative forms for the Offertory into the main text, and (3) variation in the opening addresses to God in the post-Communion prayers so that not all begin with “Father”. These amendments were quite straightforward, and consistent with thinking and developments in the wider Church on, e.g. restoration of the Diaconate and gendered language of God.

A number of possible alterations itemised in the above-mentioned document, proposed by the Synods of the Dioceses of Argyll & The Isles and Moray, Ross & Caithness, were of a more complex nature, and some would have potential doctrinal and ecumenical implications. While at least some of those proposed alterations may have considerable merit, it was believed that they needed longer and more careful consideration than would be possible within the timeframe of current Synodical process. The Faith and Order Board, in consultation with the Liturgy Committee, therefore advises that these not be passed at this time.

The reasons for the recommendations are provided below. The proposed amendments are presented in the order in which the relevant texts appear in Scottish Liturgy 1982. Firstly, some more general points are explained.

Some of the texts at issue are of great antiquity, and have been formulated to resolve doctrinal issues of their day. In the case of the Nicene Creed, the Greek text remains a doctrinal standard for most Christian denominations, including our major ecumenical partners. Translation into modern languages, for both liturgical and pedagogical use, is a matter for ecumenical consultation. In the case of English, the relevant body from 1969-1983 was the International Consultation on English Texts (ICET), and from 1983 the English Language Liturgical Consultation (ELLC), on which the SEC is represented through the Joint Liturgical Group of Great Britain (JLG). The agreed texts are published on the ELLC website with accompanying explanation (and the line numbering used there will be followed below). While these are not binding on the churches on whose behalf the translations were produced, deviations are not to be undertaken lightly where there are potential doctrinal implications.

Notwithstanding this point, the English language is used, and has evolved, in some diversity of cultural contexts, and is used in worship in numerous countries today, whether as the vernacular or as a lingua franca. The ELLC explanations often express a concern to avoid colloquial usage and its connotations, which perhaps suggests a preoccupation with North American argot which may not be relevant elsewhere. Colloquial usages may, furthermore, prove very transient. There may therefore be instances where the reasoning behind ELLC translations is not relevant to the situation of the SEC today and in the foreseeable future, and that more appropriate translations are to be found than those provided.
Reference was made in some submissions to the Faith and Order Board from Diocesan Synods to an authorised Orthodox translation of liturgical texts. This is the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom, issued by the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople in 1995, for use by Byzantine rite churches in anglophone countries. As such it is used by the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of Thyatira and Great Britain. While the Holy Synod of Constantinople and the Ecumenical Patriarchate were invited to delegate representatives to ELLC, the latter body represents predominantly Western churches and ecumenical bodies in anglophone countries.

Where reference is made below to earlier liturgies, in all cases the Scottish and English (1662) Communion Offices in the Scottish Book of Common Prayer are in full verbal agreement at the relevant lines, and the Scottish Prayer Book therefore cited only once.

13. Nicene Creed

This is the translation of a Greek text, formulated at the first Ecumenical Council, convened at Nicaea by the emperor Constantine in 325. This was revised at the Council of Constantinople in 381, but with the exception of the *filioque* clause which entered the Western tradition at a much later date, has remained unaltered since the fourth century. While not strictly universal, as not all churches known to exist at the time were represented at either Nicaea or Constantinople, this Creed did gain assent from churches beyond the Roman empire, and is of enduring ecumenical authority. Any proposed amendment therefore needs to be considered with immense care. Where there is any ambiguity or uncertainty in the English translation, reference can be made to the Greek texts of Nicaea (325) and Constantinople (381) for clarification. While precise verbal equivalence might be difficult to attain, it would not be legitimate to render any line of the Creed in a way incompatible with the Greek text.

Line 13: Nicaea (325): τὸν δὲ ἡμῖν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν

For us human beings and for our salvation

This line remained unaltered at the Council of Constantinople (381), but further material was interpolated into the following lines.

Scottish Prayer Book: For us men and for our salvation

Scottish Liturgy 1982: For us men and for our salvation

ELLC (1990): For us and for our salvation

Authorised Orthodox tr (1995) For our sake and for our salvation

Scottish Liturgy rev 2021: For us and for our salvation

Proposed alteration (A&I): For us human beings / humankind, “or some such” ...

That translation of this line is problematic has long been recognised. A variety of options were considered by ELLC, but the priority at that stage was to remove “men”, rather than to substitute a gender-neutral term for people. The vagueness of “us” is recognised, but the wording of the proposed alteration is not explicit. “For us human (beings) and for our salvation” would undoubtedly be the most accurate and least ambiguous rendition of the Greek, but needs to be weighed against deviating from the agreed ecumenical translation.
Line 16: Nicaea (325): καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα
and was made human/became human (middle/passive)

This line remained unaltered at Constantinople (381), while line 15 and part of line 14 were interpolated.

Scottish Prayer Book: and was made man
Scottish Liturgy 1982: and was made man
ELLC (1990): and became truly human
Authorised Orthodox tr (1995) and became man
Scottish Liturgy rev 2021: and was made human
Proposed alteration (MR&C): and took our form

This proposed alteration is not a translation of an ancient and ecumenically agreed text, but at best a paraphrase. The word “human” is theologically significant, and should not be removed. The concept of “form” (μορφή), used by St Paul in the christological hymn in Philippians 2, had a definite if contested meaning in hellenistic philosophy, which is not replicated in contemporary English usage. The ELLC explanation for inserting “truly”, on the basis of colloquial usage of “human”, is unconvincing. The case could be argued for preferring “became” (middle voice) to “was made” (passive); either would be possible translations of the original Greek.

Line 27: Constantinople (381): τὸ σῶν Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον
who with the Father and Son is worshiped (together) and glorified (together)

Scottish Prayer Book: who together with the Father and the Son is worshiped and glorified
Scottish Liturgy 1982: With the Father and the Son, he is worshiped and glorified
ELLC (1990): who with the Father and the Son is worshiped and glorified
Authorised Orthodox tr (1995) who together with the Father and the Son is worshipped and together glorified
Scottish Liturgy rev 2021: who with the Father and the Son is worshiped and glorified
Proposed alteration (A&I): who, together with the Father and the Son, is worshiped and glorified

The introduction of “together” reflects the alliterative emphasis of the Greek text introduced to the Creed at the Council of Constantinople (381). This emphasis is clearly not considered necessary by ELLC, but the proposed alteration is clearly a sound translation of the Greek original, and is close to the authorised Orthodox text. It is arguably a better translation, but the meaning may be sufficiently clear in the text as read at General Synod 2021. The merits of the alteration would need to be weighed against the implications of deviating from an ecumenically agreed text, at the final stage in the Synodical process.
18. **Sursum Corda**

This is an ancient formulary, first attested in the *Apostolic Tradition* (Latin recension), and quite possibly reflecting custom in parts of the Church of the first three centuries. Notwithstanding its greater antiquity, this formulary does not bear the same doctrinal weight as the Nicene Creed. Furthermore, the tradition is quite varied, as is clear from the following.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line 6:</th>
<th><strong>Apostolic Tradition</strong> 4:3</th>
<th><strong>Dignum et iustum est</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Prayer Book:</td>
<td>It is meet and right so to do</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Liturgy 1982:</td>
<td>It is right to give him thanks and praise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLC (1990):</td>
<td>It is right to give our thanks and praise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Liturgy rev 2021:</td>
<td>It is right to give our thanks and praise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed alteration (MR&amp;C):</td>
<td>It is right to give God thanks and praise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While contemporary Roman Catholic usage follows the *Apostolic Tradition*, “It is right and just”, Anglican usage has tended to be more expansive. Line 5, “Let us give thanks to the Lord our God”, is reflected in line 6, in keeping with ancient Hebrew tradition. The proposed amendment is one that ELLC considered, but decided that it is sufficiently clear to whom thanks and praise are offered.

18. **Sanctus**

Deriving from the account of Isaiah’s vocational theophany (Isaiah 6:1-8), the Sanctus is attested in Christian worship from the late first or early second century (*1 Clement* 34:6-7), and evidence survives of its use in a variety of contexts from an early date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line 1:</th>
<th>Chrysostom; Basil; James</th>
<th>Ἅγιος, ἅγιος, ἅγιος Κύριος Σαβαώθ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roman, Mozarabic</td>
<td><em>Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus, Dominus Deus Sabaoth:</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Prayer Book:</td>
<td>Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Hosts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICET (1971):</td>
<td>Holy, holy, holy Lord, God of power and might</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Liturgy 1982:</td>
<td>Holy, holy, holy Lord, God of power and might</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLC (1990):</td>
<td>Holy, holy, holy Lord, God of power and might</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Liturgy rev 2021:</td>
<td>Holy, holy, holy Lord, God of power and might</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed alteration (A&amp;I):</td>
<td>Holy, holy, holy Lord, God of angel hosts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The issue in the proposed alteration is how the Hebrew נִצָּבָה, transliterated rather than translated in the Septuagint (Greek) and (Latin) Vulgate transmissions of Isaiah 6 as well as in the ancient Greek and Latin liturgies, should be rendered in English. Deriving from Ancient Near Eastern polytheism, the connotations mutated as the Hebrew religion developed, from a pantheon of deities to the
gathering of created celestial beings around the one God. This is often conceived in military formation or in courtly terms, with God seated in a chariot (Ezekiel 1) or on a throne (Isaiah 6). By the time Christianity emerged, צבּות had evolved into a divine attribute, or even a name of God. It is not alone among Hebrew and Aramaic words passing into Christian liturgical usage in Greek and even Latin environments – and is not the only example in the Sanctus, Hosanna being the other. Finding an English rendition has been a quite recent trend, which is perhaps precisely what has created the problem. The modern tendency to prefer abstractions of power to the military imagery implicit in notions of angelic armies, is not without ancient Oriental precedent, even if in those contexts equivocation or doubt as to the existence of angels was not a consideration. The choice would seem to be between accepting the power language, notwithstanding some reservations, or making explicit and potentially militaristic reference to angels. A third possibility would be to revert to transliteration of the Hebrew, the most ancient attested usage, but this is not an option currently proposed. The proposed alteration has drawn attention to an issue which requires more careful consideration, which would most appropriately be undertaken during the next phase of liturgical renewal.

23. Post-Communion Sentence

While giving thanks to God is not in itself a novel concept, the post-Communion sentence is a relatively recent innovation. The Sarum Missal includes a Dominus vobiscum (The Lord be with you), without even the Deacon responding, before the post-Communion prayer and dismissal. The Church of England “Deposited Book” of 1928 includes an address before the post-Communion prayer: “Having now received the precious Body and Blood of Christ, let us give thanks unto our Lord God.” The Scottish Prayer Books of 1912 and 1929 provide a rather longer such address:

HAVING now received the precious body and blood of Christ, let us give thanks to our Lord God, who hath graciously vouchsafed to admit us to the participation of his holy mysteries; and let us beg of him grace to perform our vows, and to persevere in our good resolutions; and that being made holy, we may obtain everlasting life, through the merits of the all-sufficient sacrifice of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Its successors have been less verbose:

Scottish Liturgy 1970: O give thanks unto the Lord, for he is gracious. And his mercy endureth for ever.

Experimental Liturgy 1977: Give thanks to the Lord, for he is gracious. For his mercy endures for ever.

Scottish Liturgy 1982: Give thanks to the Lord, for he is gracious. And his mercy endures for ever.

Scottish Liturgy rev 2021: Give thanks to our gracious God: whose mercy endures for ever.

Proposed alteration (MR&C): Give thanks to our gracious God: for God’s mercy endures for ever.

The argument seems to be that it is unclear from the revised text that it is God’s mercy which endures. Given that the response is a continuation of the same sentence as the versicle, it would seem to be abundantly clear, and difficult to understand how it could be interpreted otherwise. The
revised versicle is less expansive than the biblical texts from which previous versions derive (Ps 107:1; 118:1; 136:1; Prayer of Azariah 1:67). The curtness of the versicle seems to be the problem, rather than the response. While not for present consideration, at a future phase of liturgical renewal consideration might be given to reverting to the wording of the psalms. If “Lord” is to be avoided, “Give thanks to God, who is always gracious” would be an option, emphasising as it does the enduring grace of God.

The Most Rev Mark Strange
Convener, Faith and Order Board
April 2022
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[date]
Scottish Liturgy 1982

PREPARATION

1 Welcome

Grace and peace to you from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.
Amen.

2 Peace
or at 16

We meet in Christ's name.
Let us share his peace.

3 Collect for Purity †

Almighty God, to whom all hearts are open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hidden: cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of your Holy Spirit, that we may perfectly love you, and worthily magnify your holy name; through Christ our Lord.
Amen.

4 Summary of the Law †

* Our Lord Jesus Christ said:
The first commandment is this: “Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is the only Lord. You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul, with all your mind and with all Your strength.”
The second is this: “Love your neighbour as yourself.”
There is no other commandment greater than these.
Amen. Lord, have mercy.
5 Confession and Absolution

or at 15

* God is love and we are God’s children.
There is no room for fear in love.
We love because God loved us first.

Let us confess our sins in penitence and faith.

Silence

God our Father, we confess to you
and to our fellow members in the Body of Christ
that we have sinned in thought, word and deed,
and in what we have failed to do.
We are truly sorry.
Forgive us our sins,
and deliver us from the power of evil,
for the sake of your Son who died for us,
Jesus Christ, our Lord.

God, who is both power and love,
forgive us and free us from our sins,
heal and strengthen us by the Holy Spirit,
and raise us to new life in Christ our Lord.

Amen.

6 Kyrie †

Kyrie eleison. or Lord, have mercy.
Kyrie eleison.

Christe eleison.

Christ, have mercy.

Christe eleison.

Christ, have mercy.

Kyrie eleison.

Lord, have mercy.

Kyrie eleison.
7  Gloria †

Glory to God in the highest, and peace to God's people on earth.

Lord God, heavenly King, almighty God and Father, (with God the Son, Jesus Christ, and God the Holy Spirit,) we worship you, we give you thanks, we praise you for your glory.

Lord Jesus Christ, only Son of the Father, Lord God, Lamb of God, you take away the sin of the world: have mercy on us; you are seated at the right hand of the Father: receive our prayer.

For you alone are the Holy One, you alone are the Lord, you alone are the Most High, Jesus Christ, with the Holy Spirit, in the glory of God the Father. Amen.

3, 4, 6 and 7 are selected according to the season or the occasion

8  Collect of the day
THE LITURGY OF THE WORD

9a  First Reading

9b  Psalm †

10  Second Reading †

11*  Gospel

*When it is announced:
Glory to Christ our Saviour.

At end:
Give thanks to the Lord for his glorious Gospel.
Praise to Christ our Lord.

12  Sermon †
or other exposition of the Word

13  Nicene Creed †

We believe in one God,
the Father, the almighty,
maker of heaven and earth,
of all that is, seen and unseen.

We believe in one Lord, Jesus Christ,
the only Son of God,
eternally begotten of the Father,
God from God, Light from Light,
true God from true God,
begotten, not made,
of one substance with the Father;
through him all things were made.
For us and for our salvation
he came down from heaven,
was incarnate of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary
and was made human.
For our sake he was crucified under Pontius Pilate;
he suffered death and was buried.
On the third day he rose again
in accordance with the Scriptures;
he ascended into heaven
and is seated at the right hand of the Father.
He will come again in glory to judge the living and the dead,
and his kingdom will have no end.

We believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, the giver of life,
who proceeds from the Father,
who with the Father and the Son is worshipped and glorified,
who has spoken through the prophets.
We believe in one holy catholic and apostolic Church.
We acknowledge one baptism for the forgiveness of sins.
We look for the resurrection of the dead,
and the life of the world to come.  Amen.
14 **Intercessions**

* Prayer is offered
  for the world and its people,
  for those who suffer and those in need,
  for the Church and its members.

15 **Confession and Absolution**

* If not used at 5

God is love and we are God’s children,
There is no room for fear in love.
We love because God loved us first.

Let us confess our sins in penitence and faith.

_Silence_

**God our Father, we confess to you**
and to our fellow members in the Body of Christ
that we have sinned in thought, word and deed,
and in what we have failed to do.
We are truly sorry.
_Forgive us our sins,_
_and deliver us from the power of evil._
_For the sake of your Son who died for us,_
_Jesus Christ, our Lord._

God, who is both power and love,
forgive _us_ and free _us_ from our sins,
heal and strengthen _us_ by the Holy Spirit
and raise us to new life in Christ our Lord.

_Amen._

16 **Peace**

* If not used at 2

We meet in Christ's name.
_Let us share his peace._
THE LITURGY OF THE SACRAMENT

The Taking of the Bread and the Wine

17 Offering

Silence

or

Let us present our offerings to the Lord.

Yours, Lord, is the greatness, the power, the glory, the splendour, and the majesty; for everything in heaven and on earth is yours. All things come from you, and of your own we give you.

or

Blessed are you, Lord God of all creation; through your goodness we have this bread to offer, which earth has given and human hands have made; it will become for us the bread of life.

Blessed be God for ever.

Blessed are you, Lord God of all creation; through your goodness we have this wine to offer, fruit of the vine and work of human hands; it will become the cup of our salvation.

Blessed be God for ever.
The Great Thanksgiving

18 Eucharistic Prayer I

The Lord be with you.

And also with you.

Lift up your hearts.

We lift them to the Lord.

Let us give thanks to the Lord our God.

It is right to give our thanks and praise.

Worship and praise belong to you, Father,
in every place and at all times.
All power is yours.
You created the heavens and established the earth;
you sustain in being all that is.

In Christ your Son our life and yours
are brought together in a wonderful exchange.
He made his home among us
that we might for ever dwell in you.

Through your Holy Spirit
you call us to new birth
in a creation restored by love.

As children of your redeeming purpose
we offer you our praise,
with angels and archangels
and the whole company of heaven,
singing the hymn of your unending glory:

Holy, Holy, Holy Lord, God of power and might,
heaven and earth are full of your glory.

Hosanna in the highest.

Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord.
Hosanna in the highest.

Glory and thanksgiving be to you,
most loving Father,
for the gift of your Son born in human flesh
He is the Word existing beyond time,
both source and final purpose,
bringing to wholeness all that is made.
Obedient to your will he died upon the Cross.
By your power you raised him from the dead.
He broke the bonds of evil
and set your people free
to be his Body in the world.
On the night when he was given up to death,
knowing that his hour had come,
having loved his own,
he loved them to the end.
At supper with his disciples
he took bread and offered you thanks.
He broke the bread,
and gave it to them, saying:
“Take, eat. This is my Body: it is broken for you.”
After supper, he took the cup,
he offered you thanks,
and gave it to them saying:
“Drink this, all of you.
This is my Blood of the new covenant;
it is poured out for you, and for all,
that sins may be forgiven.
Do this in remembrance of me.”

We now obey your Son’s command.
We recall his blessed passion and death,
his glorious resurrection and ascension;
and we look for the coming of his Kingdom.
Made one with him, we offer you these gifts
and with them ourselves,
a single, holy, living sacrifice.

Hear us, most merciful Father,
and send your Holy Spirit upon us
and upon this bread and this wine,
that, overshadowed by your Spirit’s life-giving power,
they may be the Body and Blood of your Son,
and we may be kindled with the fire of your love
and renewed for the service of your Kingdom.

Help us, who are baptised into the fellowship of Christ’s Body
to live and work to your praise and glory;
may we grow together in unity and love
until at last, in your new creation,
we enter into our heritage
in the company of the Virgin Mary,
the apostles and prophets,
and of all our brothers and sisters living and departed.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord,
with whom, and in whom,
in the unity of the Holy Spirit,
all honour and glory be to you,
Lord of all ages,
world without end. Amen.

Next Section: 19. The Sharing of Bread and Wine.
SEASONAL MATERIAL FOR INSERTION IN THE EUCHARISTIC PRAYER
Each clause is inserted at the same place in the paragraph which precedes the Sanctus.

Advent
As children of your redeeming purpose ...
who await with eager longing
the fulfilment of all things
in the coming of your Son,
we offer you our praise, ...

Christmas
As children of your redeeming purpose ...
for whom Christ Jesus humbled himself
and became poor to make us rich,
we offer you our praise, ...

Epiphany
As children of your redeeming purpose ...
who have seen the radiance of your glory
revealed to all the nations in your Son,
we offer you our praise, ...

Lent
As children of your redeeming purpose ...
who are called to share Christ's suffering
and be made like him in his death,
we offer you our praise, ...

Passiontide
As children of your redeeming purpose ...
for whom Christ endured the cross of shame
to rise triumphant over sin and death,
we offer you our praise, ...

Easter
As children of your redeeming purpose ...
freed by him who burst from the tomb
and opened the gate of life,
we offer you our praise, ...

Ascension
As children of your redeeming purpose ...
who rejoice that in Jesus our human nature
is carried for ever into the glory of heaven,
we offer you our praise, ...

Pentecost
As children of your redeeming purpose ...
who are marked with the seal of your Spirit
for the day of our final liberation,
we offer you our praise, ...
Trinity
As children of your redeeming purpose ...
who worship the mystery of your Godhead,
Father, Son and Holy Spirit,
we offer you our praise, ...

All Saints
As children of your redeeming purpose ...
called to attain with all your saints
to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ,
we offer you our praise, ...

Mary
As children of your redeeming purpose ...
who honour Mary, chosen mother of your Son,
and with all generations call her blessed,
we offer you our praise, ...

Any Saint
As children of your redeeming purpose ...
rejoicing in communion
with N. and all your saints,
we offer you our praise, ...

Dedication
As children of your redeeming purpose ...
your household, founded upon apostles and prophets
with Christ Jesus himself the chief cornerstone,
we offer you our praise, ...

Unity
As children of your redeeming purpose ...
called to bring all things in heaven and on earth
into a perfect unity in Christ,
we offer you our praise, ...

Harvest
As children of your redeeming purpose ...
and stewards of Your creation
who give thanks for the fruits of the earth in their season,
we offer you our praise, ...

Baptism / Confirmation / Ordination
As children of your redeeming purpose ...
who are marked with the seal of your Spirit
for the day of our final liberation,
we offer you our praise, ...

Funeral
As children of your redeeming purpose ...
who as pilgrims on this earth
are kept safe in your tender and steadfast love,
we offer you our praise, ...
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Eucharistic Prayer II
Anticipation (Suitable for Advent)

The Lord be with you.
And also with you.
Lift up your hearts.
We lift them to the Lord.
Let us give thanks to the Lord our God.
It is right to give our thanks and praise.

Worship and praise belong to you, God our maker.
Out of nothing, you called all worlds to be,
and still you draw the universe to its fulfilment.
Dawn and evening celebrate your glory
till time shall be no more.

In Christ your Son
the life of heaven and earth were joined,
sealing the promise of a new creation,
given, yet still to come.

Taught by your Spirit,
we who bear your threefold likeness
look for the City of Peace
in whose light we are transfigured
and the earth transformed.

As children of your redeeming purpose
who await the coming of your Son,
we offer you our praise,
with angels and archangels
and the whole company of heaven
singing the hymn of your unending glory:

Holy, holy, holy Lord, God of power and might,
heaven and earth are full of your glory.
Hosanna in the highest.

Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord.
Hosanna in the highest.

Glory and thanksgiving be to you,
most loving Father.
In Jesus you showed us yourself.
Our hope is built on him,
the first, the last, the living one.
Obedient, even to accepting death,
He opened the gate of glory
and calls us now to share the life of heaven.
Before he was given up to suffering and death,
alight with the vision of a feast
that heralded a kingdom yet to come,
at supper with his disciples
he took bread and offered you thanks.
He broke the bread,
and gave it to them, saying:
“Take, eat.
This is my Body: it is broken for you.”
After supper, he took the cup,
he offered you thanks,
and gave it to them saying:
“Drink this, all of you.
This is my Blood of the new covenant;
it is poured out for you, and for all,
that sins may be forgiven.
Do this in remembrance of me.”

We now obey your Son's command.
We recall his blessed passion and death,
his glorious resurrection and ascension;
and we look for the coming of his Kingdom.
Made one with him, we offer you these gifts
with them ourselves,
a single, holy, living sacrifice.

Hear us, most merciful Father,
and send your Holy Spirit upon us
and upon this bread and this wine,
that, overshadowed by your Spirit's life-giving power,
they may be the Body and Blood of your Son,
and we may be kindled with the fire of your love
and renewed for the service of your Kingdom.

Help us, who are baptised into the fellowship of Christ's Body
to live and work to your praise and glory;
may we grow together in unity and love
until at last, in your new creation,
we enter into our heritage
in the company of the Virgin Mary,
the apostles, and prophets,
and of all our brothers and sisters living and departed.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord,
with whom, and in whom,
in the unity of the Holy Spirit,
all honour and glory be to you,
Lord of all ages, world without end. Amen.

Next Section: 19. The Sharing of Bread and Wine.
Eucharistic Prayer III
Incarnation (suitable for Christmas)

The Lord be with you.
And also with you.
Lift up your hearts.
We lift them to the Lord.
Let us give thanks to the Lord our God.
It is right to give our thanks and praise.

Worship and praise belong to you, God our maker. Out of nothing, you called all worlds into being, and still you draw the universe to its fulfilment. Day and night celebrate your glory till time shall be no more.

In Jesus Christ, your Word became flesh, and (on this night/day)\(^1\) was born of the Virgin Mary. He emptied himself, taking our human form, that through his incarnation and passion we might come to share in his divine nature.

Filled with the Spirit, who at the first Creation moved over the face of the waters, and who overshadowed the blessed Virgin at Nazareth, we await with joy the fulfilment of your new Creation.

As children of your redeeming purpose who celebrate the birth of your Son, we offer you our praise, with angels and archangels and the whole company of heaven singing the hymn of your unending glory:

Holy, holy, holy Lord, God of power and might, heaven and earth are full of your glory.

Hosanna in the highest.
Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord.

Hosanna in the highest.

Glory and thanksgiving be to you, most loving Father. In Jesus the Messiah you have come to us, and lived among us, that we might forever live with you. In the manger at Bethlehem, in his flight to Egypt, and as the carpenter’s son, the Only Begotten humbled himself to meet us.

\(^1\) Words in brackets should only be used at midnight or during the day on Christmas Day.
Obedient to your calling,
he accepted death on the cross.
When you exalted him on the third day,
and bestowed on him the name above all names,
he opened the gate of glory
that we might be your children,
and share in his kingdom of Peace.

Before he was given up to suffering and death,
desiring to complete the work
for which he came into the world,
at supper with his disciples
he took bread and offered you thanks.
He broke the bread,
and gave it to them, saying:
“Take, eat.
This is my Body: it is broken for you.”
After supper, he took the cup,
he offered you thanks,
and gave it to them saying:
“Drink this, all of you.
This is my Blood of the new covenant;
it is poured out for you, and for all,
that sins may be forgiven.
Do this in remembrance of me.”

We now obey your Son’s command.
We recall his blessed passion and death,
his glorious resurrection and ascension;
and we look for the coming of his Kingdom.
Made one with him, we offer you these gifts
and with them ourselves,
a single, holy, living sacrifice.

Hear us, most merciful Father,
and send your Holy Spirit upon us
and upon this bread and this wine,
that, overshadowed by your Spirit’s life-giving power,
they may be the Body and Blood of your Son,
and we may be kindled with the fire of your love
and renewed for the service of your Kingdom.

Help us, who are baptised into the fellowship of Christ's Body
to live and work to your praise and glory;
may we grow together in unity and love
until at last, in your new creation,
we enter into our heritage
in the company of the Virgin Mary,
the apostles, and prophets,
and of all our brothers and sisters living and departed.

**NARRATIVE OF THE INSTITUTION:** An account of the Last Supper.

**ANAMNESIS AND OBLATION:** The work of Christ is recalled and linked with our offering.

**EPICLESIS:** We ask for the descent of the Holy Spirit as the divine response to our obedience.

**PRAYER OF PETITION:**
As members of the Church we pray for its whole life and mission.
Through Jesus Christ our Lord, with whom, and in whom, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, all honour and glory be to you, Lord of all ages, world without end.  

Amen.

Next Section: 19. The Sharing of Bread and Wine.
Eucharistic Prayer IV
Incarnation (suitable from Epiphany to the Presentation of Christ)

The Lord be with you.
And also with you.
Lift up your hearts.
We lift them to the Lord.
Let us give thanks to the Lord our God.
It is right to give our thanks and praise.

Worship and praise belong to you, God our maker.
Out of nothing, you called all worlds into being,
and still you draw the universe to its fulfilment.
Day and night celebrate your glory
till time shall be no more.

In Christ, your only begotten Son,
you have revealed yourself to the world.
By the leading of a star,
you made him known to the nations
as the son of David and king of Israel;
that in following him,
we might be led from darkness
into his marvellous light.

Filled with the Spirit,
who descended upon your Son at his Baptism in the Jordan,
we who are baptised in his name
strive for his heavenly kingdom
in whose radiance we are transfigured
and the earth transformed.

As children of your redeeming purpose
[who celebrate the epiphany of your Son]²,
we offer you our praise,
with angels and archangels
and the whole company of heaven
singing the hymn of your unending glory:

Holy, holy, holy Lord, God of power and might,
heaven and earth are full of your glory.
Hosanna in the highest.
Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord.
Hosanna in the highest.

Glory and thanksgiving be to you,
most loving Father.
In Jesus the Messiah you have come to us.
Our hope is built on him
in whom you are well pleased.

² Words in brackets are suitable for use on the feast of the Epiphany.
Having been shown to the world as your beloved Son, he proclaimed the good news of your kingdom. The blind received their sight, the lame walked, the lepers were cleansed, and the captives set free. At his word, water became wine, the hungry were filled with bread, and the dead were raised.

Before he was given up to suffering and death, desiring to complete the work for which he came into the world, at supper with his disciples he took bread and offered you thanks. He broke the bread, and gave it to them, saying: “Take, eat. This is my Body: it is broken for you.” After supper, he took the cup, he offered you thanks, and gave it to them saying: “Drink this, all of you. This is my Blood of the new covenant; it is poured out for you, and for all, that sins may be forgiven. Do this in remembrance of me.”

We now obey your Son’s command. We recall his blessed passion and death, his glorious resurrection and ascension; and we look for the coming of his Kingdom. Made one with him, we offer you these gifts and with them ourselves, a single, holy, living sacrifice.

Hear us, most merciful Father, and send your Holy Spirit upon us and upon this bread and this wine, that, overshadowed by your Spirit’s life-giving power, they may be the Body and Blood of your Son, and we may be kindled with the fire of your love and renewed for the service of your Kingdom.

**NARRATIVE OF THE INSTITUTION:** An account of the Last Supper.

**ANAMNESIS AND OBLATION:** The work of Christ is recalled and linked with our offering.

**EPICLESIS:** We ask for the descent of the Holy Spirit as the divine response to our obedience.
Help us, who are baptised into the fellowship of Christ's Body to live and work to your praise and glory; may we grow together in unity and love until at last, in your new creation, we enter into our heritage in the company of the Virgin Mary, the apostles, and prophets, and of all our brothers and sisters living and departed.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord, with whom, and in whom, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, all honour and glory be to you, Lord of all ages, world without end. Amen.

Next Section: 19. The Sharing of Bread and Wine.

**PRAYER OF PETITION:**
As members of the Church we pray for its whole life and mission.

**DOXOLOGY:**
A concluding act of praise.
Eucharistic Prayer V
Returning to God (Suitable for Lent and Passiontide)

The Lord be with you.
And also with you.
Lift up your hearts.
We lift them to the Lord.
Let us give thanks to the Lord our God.
It is right to give our thanks and praise.

Worship and praise belong to you,
maker of light and darkness.
Your wisdom draws beauty from chaos,
brings a harvest out of sorrow
and leads the exiles home.

In Christ your Son enemies are reconciled,
debts forgiven
and strangers made welcome

Your Spirit frees us
to live as sons and daughters
in our Father's house.

We who by Christ's power
follow the way of the Cross,
sharing the joy of his obedience,
now offer you our praise,
with angels and archangels
and the whole company of heaven
singing the hymn of your unending glory:

Holy, Holy, Holy Lord, God of power and might,
heaven and earth are full of your glory.
Hosanna in the highest.

Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord.
Hosanna in the highest.

Glory and thanksgiving be to you,
most loving Father,
for Christ in whom the world is reconciled.
Lifted on the Cross,
his suffering and forgiveness
spanned the gulf our sins had made.
Through that dark struggle
death was swallowed up in victory,
that life and light might reign.

OPENING PRAYER:
Celebrating the work of Father,
Son and Spirit, in creating,
restoring and bringing to completion, all that belongs to God.

SANCTUS:
An anthem to God's glory

BENEDICTUS: The greeting to the one who came in the flesh, comes in the sacrament and is still to come.

CHRISTOLOGICAL PRAYER: Thanksgiving to God for all that was accomplished in the life, death and resurrection of Jesus.
Before he was given up to suffering and death, recalling the night of Israel's release, the night in which the sons of Egypt died, your Chosen One, himself the First-Born, freely offered his life. At supper with his disciples he took bread and offered you thanks. He broke the bread, and gave it to them, saying: “Take, eat. This is my Body: it is broken for you.” After supper, he took the cup, he offered you thanks, and gave it to them saying: “Drink this, all of you. This is my Blood of the new covenant; it is poured out for you, and for all, that sins may be forgiven. Do this in remembrance of me.”

We now obey your Son's command. We recall his blessed passion and death, his glorious resurrection and ascension; and we look for the coming of his Kingdom. Made one with him, we offer you these gifts and with them ourselves, a single, holy, living sacrifice.

Hear us, most merciful Father, and send your Holy Spirit upon us and upon this bread and this wine, that, overshadowed by your Spirit's life-giving power, they may be the Body and Blood of your Son, and we may be kindled with the fire of your love and renewed for the service of your Kingdom.

Help us, who are baptised into the fellowship of Christ's Body to live and work to your praise and glory; may we grow together in unity and love until at last, in your new creation, we enter into our heritage in the company of the Virgin Mary, the apostles, and prophets, and of all our brothers and sisters living and departed.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord, with whom, and in whom, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, all honour and glory be to you, Lord of all ages, world without end. Amen.

Next Section: 19. The Sharing of Bread and Wine.
Eucharistic Prayer VI  
New Life, The Lord, The Spirit (Suitable from Easter day to Pentecost)

The Lord be with you.  
And also with you.  
Lift up your hearts.  
We lift them to the Lord.  
Let us give thanks to the Lord our God,  
It is right to give our thanks and praise.

Worship and praise belong to you, Author of all being.  
Your power sustains, your love restores, our broken world.  
You are unceasingly at work,  
from chaos bringing order  
and filling emptiness with life.

Christ, raised from the dead,  
proclaims the dawn of hope.  
He lives in us that we may walk in light.

Your Spirit is fire in us,  
your breath is power  
to purge our sin  
and warm our hearts to love.

As children of your redeeming purpose,  
freed by him who burst from the tomb  
and opened the gate of life,  
we offer you our praise,  
with angels and archangels  
and the whole company of heaven,  
singing the hymn of your unending glory:

Holy, holy, holy Lord, God of power and might,  
heaven and earth are full of your glory.  
Hosanna in the highest.

Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord.  
Hosanna in the highest.

Praise and thanksgiving be to you, Lord of all,  
for by the Cross eternal life is ours  
and death is swallowed up in victory.  
In the first light of Easter  
glory broke from the tomb  
and changed the women’s sorrow into joy.  
From the Garden the mystery shone clear  
that he whom they had loved and lost  
is with us now  
in every place for ever.
Making himself known in the breaking of the bread, speaking peace to the fearful disciples, greeting fishermen on the shore, he renewed the promise of his presence and of new birth in the Spirit who sets the seal of freedom on your sons and daughters.

Before he was given up to suffering and death, recalling the night of Israel’s release, the night in which slaves walked free, at supper with his disciples he took bread and offered you thanks. He broke the bread, and gave it to them, saying: “Take, eat. This is my Body: it is broken for you.” After supper, he took the cup, he offered you thanks, and gave it to them saying: “Drink this, all of you. This is my Blood of the new covenant; it is poured out for you, and for all, that sins may be forgiven. Do this in remembrance of me.”

We now obey your Son’s command. We recall his blessed passion and death, his glorious resurrection and ascension; and we look for the coming of his Kingdom. Made one with him, we offer you these gifts and with them ourselves a single, holy living sacrifice.

Hear us, most merciful Father, and send your Holy Spirit upon us and upon this bread and this wine, that, overshadowed by your Spirit’s life-giving power, they may be the Body and Blood of your Son, and we may be kindled with the fire of your love and renewed for the service of your Kingdom.

Help us, who are baptised into the fellowship of Christ’s Body to live and work to your praise and glory; may we grow together in unity and love until at last, in your new creation, we enter into our heritage in the company of the Virgin Mary, the apostles, and prophets, and of all our brothers and sisters living and departed.
Through Jesus Christ our Lord, with whom, and in whom, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, all honour and glory be to you, Lord of all ages, world without end. Amen.

DOXOLOGY: A concluding act of praise.

Next Section: 19. The Sharing of Bread and Wine.
Eucharistic Prayer VII

The Lord be with you.
And also with you.
Lift up your hearts.
We lift them to the Lord.
Let us give thanks to the Lord our God.
It is right to give our thanks and praise.

Worship and praise belong to you, Father,
in every place and at all times.
You made us,
all the people of the world,
and everything that is.

You give us the daylight.
Your Word lights up our minds.
Jesus was born among us
to be light in our darkness.

Your Spirit lives in us
so that we can look at the world with your eyes.

One day we will be with you in heaven,
but already we laugh with the saints and angels,
and sing their joyful song:

Holy, holy, holy Lord, God of power and might,
heaven and earth are full of your glory.
Hosanna in the highest.
Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord.
Hosanna in the highest.

Father, you never forget us or turn away from us,
even when we fail you.
You sent your Son Jesus
who gave his life for us.
He healed those who were sick,
cared for those who were poor,
and cried with those who were sad.
He forgave sinners
and taught us to forgive.

For all your love we give you thanks
in the way that Jesus showed us.

On the night before he died,
while he was having supper with his friends,
he took bread and offered you thanks.
He broke the bread,
and gave it to them, saying:

OPENING PRAYER:
Celebrating the work of Father,
Son and Spirit, in creating,
restoring and bringing to
completion, all that belongs to
God.

SANCTUS: An anthem to
God’s glory

BENEDICTUS: The greeting
to the one who came in the
flesh, comes in the sacrament
and is still to come.

CHRISTOLOGICAL
PRAYER: Thanksgiving to
God for all that was accom-
plished in the life, death and
resurrection of Jesus.
“Take, eat. This is my Body: it is broken for you.”
After supper, he took the cup, he offered you thanks, and gave it to them saying:
“Drink this, all of you. This is my Blood of the new covenant; it is poured out for you, and for all, that sins may be forgiven. Do this in remembrance of me.”

So, as we do what he told us, we open our hearts to him; we remember how he died and rose again to live now in us.

Together with him we offer you these gifts: in them we give you ourselves.

Send your Holy Spirit on us and on this bread and this wine, that they may be the Body and Blood of Christ, and that, sharing your life, we may travel in your company to our journey’s end.

With all your people we give you thanks and praise through the Son and in the Spirit, now and for ever.

Amen.
The Sharing of the Bread and the Wine

19 Breaking of the Bread

Silence

or

The living bread is broken for the life of the world.
Lord, unite us in this sign.

20 Lord’s Prayer

As our Saviour has taught us, so we pray:

Our Father in heaven,
    hallowed be your name,
    your kingdom come,
    your will be done,
    on earth as in heaven.
Give us today our daily bread.
Forgive us our sins
    as we forgive those who sin against us.
Do not bring us to the time of trial
    but deliver us from evil.
For the kingdom, the power and the glory are yours,
    now and forever. Amen.

or

As our Saviour Christ has commanded and taught us, we are bold to say:

Our Father, who art in heaven,
    hallowed be thy name;
    thy kingdom come;
    thy will be done;
    on earth as it is in heaven.
Give us this day our daily bread;
and forgive us our trespasses,
    as we forgive those who trespass against us.
And lead us not into temptation,
    but deliver us from evil.
For thine is the kingdom, the power and the glory,
    for ever and ever. Amen.
21 Communion

At the giving of the bread:
The Body of Christ given for you.

At the giving of the cup:
The Blood of Christ shed for you.

The Communicant replies Amen.

22 Communion Song †

Lamb of God, you take away the sins of the world:
have mercy on us.
Lamb of God, you take away the sins of the world:
have mercy on us.
Lamb of God, you take away the sins of the world:
grant us peace.

or

Jesus, Lamb of God: have mercy on us.
Jesus, bearer of our sins: have mercy on us.
Jesus, redeemer of the world: Give us your peace.
THANKSGIVING AND SENDING OUT

23 Sentence

An appropriate seasonal sentence may be used

Give thanks to our gracious God:
whose mercy endures forever.

24 Prayers

One of the following is said

(a) Holy and life-giving God, we have broken the bread which is Christ's body, we have tasted the wine of his new life. We thank you for these gifts by which we are made one in him and drawn into that new creation which is your will for all the world; through him who died for us and rose again, your Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen.

(b) Father of all, we give you thanks and praise that when we were still far off you met us in your Son and brought us home. Dying and living, he declared your love, gave us grace, and opened the gate of glory. May we who share Christ's body live his risen life; we who drink his cup bring life to others; we whom the Spirit lights, give light to the world. Keep us firm in the hope you have set before us, so we and all your children shall be free, and the whole earth live to praise your name; through Christ our Lord. Amen.

(c) Loving God, your steadfast purpose is the completion of all things in your Son. May we who have received the pledges of the kingdom, live by faith, walk in hope and be renewed in love, until the world reflects your glory and you are all in all; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

25 Blessing †

A seasonal variant may be used

The peace of God which passes all understanding,
keep your hearts and minds in the knowledge and love of God
and of Jesus Christ our Lord:
And the blessing of God almighty,
the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit,
be among you and remain with you always. Amen.

26 Dismissal

Go in peace to love and serve the Lord.
In the name of Christ. Amen.
APPENDIX
FORMS OF INTERCESSION
Form 1

Through Jesus, whom we confess as Lord, we give thanks and praise to the Father, calling on the one who is judge of all: Father, your kingdom come.

**Father, your kingdom come.**

For all the peoples of the world; that they may know you as the God of peace, we pray to you, O Lord:

**Father, your kingdom come.**

For nations, for leaders and governments; that integrity may mark all their dealings, we pray to you O Lord:

**Father, your kingdom come.**

For all who labour for righteousness; that your presence and help may give them courage, we pray to you, O Lord:

**Father, your kingdom come.**

For communities torn by dissension and strife; that your forgiveness may bring them healing, we pray to you, O Lord:

**Father, your kingdom come.**

For the anxious, the lonely, the bereaved; that consolation and peace may be theirs, we pray to you, O Lord:

**Father, your kingdom come.**

For the Church, your household and family; that we may be firm in the confession of our hope, we pray to you, O Lord:

**Father, your kingdom come.**

For ... our Bishop, and for all who bear Christ's name; that their lives may proclaim your glory, we pray to you, O Lord:
Father, your kingdom come.

For those who are separated from us by death; that theirs may be the kingdom which is unshakeable, we pray to you, O Lord:

Father, your kingdom come.

O God of peace, who brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep: make us perfect in all goodness to do your will and to be what you would have us be; through him to whom be glory for ever, Jesus Christ our Lord.

Amen.

Form 2

O God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, in whom you chose us, before the foundation of the world, and destined us in love to be your own: help us to pray for all your children.

For the life of the world; that your peace may be known and may prevail:

For ...

Lord, hear us.

Lord, graciously hear us.

For all who suffer injury, death or loss; that they may know the hope to which you call us:

For ...

Lord, hear us.

Lord, graciously hear us.

For all who exercise rule and authority; that they may acknowledge your power:

For ...

Lord, hear us.

Lord, graciously hear us.

For the Church which is Christ's body; that it may live for the praise of your glory:
For ...

Lord, hear us.  
**Lord, graciously hear us.**

O God, you exerted your strength and power when you raised Christ from the dead, putting everything in subjection beneath his feet: accept the prayers which we offer in his name for the world you have created and redeemed; through him in whom you have set forth the mystery of your will, to unite all things in heaven and on earth, your Son, our Lord Jesus Christ.

**Amen.**

**Form 3**  
To the one God let us make our requests with thanksgiving, to the one mediator between God and humankind, Christ Jesus, himself human.

I ask your prayers for peace in the life of the world ... Pray for God's peace.

**Silence**

I ask your prayers for all who suffer injury, sickness and loss ... Pray for all who are afflicted.

**Silence**

I ask your prayers for all who wield authority and influence ... Pray for all who exercise power.

**Silence**

I ask your prayers for all whom we have wronged ... Pray for all who hate us.

**Silence**

I ask your prayers for our bishop(s) ... and for all whom Christ has appointed to his service ... Pray for God's people.

**Silence**
I ask your prayers for ...

_Silence_

Give thanks to God for all in whom Christ has been honoured, (especially ...)  

_Silence_

O God, whose will it is that all should find salvation and come to know the truth: receive the prayers and petitions which we offer in faith and love; through him who gave proof of your purpose, and who sacrificed himself to win freedom for all the world, Jesus Christ our Lord.

_Amen._
ALTERNATIVE BLESSINGS

Advent
Christ the Sun of Righteousness shine upon you
and scatter the darkness from before your path;
and the blessing ...

Christmas
Christ, who by his incarnation gathered into one
all things earthly and heavenly,
fill you with his joy and peace; and the blessing ...

Epiphany
Christ the Son of God gladden your hearts
with the good news of God’s kingdom;
and the blessing ...

Ash Wednesday to Lent 4
God give you grace to grow in holiness,
to deny yourselves, take up your cross, and follow Christ;
and the blessing ...

Lent 5 and Holy Week
Christ crucified draw you to himself,
to find in him a sure ground for faith,
a firm support for hope, and the assurance of sins forgiven;
and the blessing ...

Easter
The God of peace,
who brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus,
that great shepherd of the sheep,
make you perfect in every good work to do God’s will;
and the blessing ...

Ascension
Christ our king make you faithful and strong to do his will,
that you may reign with him in glory;
and the blessing ...

Pentecost
The Spirit of truth lead you into all truth,
give you grace to confess that Jesus Christ is Lord,
and to proclaim the word and works of God;
and the blessing ...
Trinity Sunday
God the Holy Trinity make you strong in faith and love, defend you on every side, and guide you in truth and peace; and the blessing ...

Saints’ Days
God give you grace to follow the saints in faith and hope and love; and the blessing ...

Unity
Christ the Good Shepherd, who laid down his life for the sheep, draw you and all who hear his voice to be one within one fold; and the blessing ...
LITURGY FOR SECOND READING

OPINIONS FROM DIOCESES

Scottish Liturgy 1982 with Alternative Eucharistic Prayers

Aberdeen and Orkney:

An indicative vote approving the liturgy was approved.

Argyll and The Isles:

The Creed

Synod noted that we do not have authority to alter the text of the Creed. It was presumably with this intention that the filioque was removed from the text of the Nicene Creed during the preparation for 1982. The objectionable character of the now to be removed statement by the power of the Holy Spirit comes precisely from mistranslation.

for us ... and for our salvation
The Creed begins ‘we believe’ (the Greek saying pisteuo, I believe). By omitting the words human beings di’ hemas tous anthropous, the text now reads as if the Incarnation happened on behalf of believers, and not on account of the salvation of the whole world. The inclusion of the words human beings or humankind, or some such, is thus doctrinally essential.

with the Father and the Son is worshipped and glorified
In SPB this read with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified.

The Greek text reads ‘together with the Father and Son is worshipped and together glorified’ : (English translation authorized by the Ecumenical Patriarch 1995) – in Greek sumproskunoumenon kai sundoxazomenon. The emphasis on together is striking. It should therefore be rendered in the English translation.

enantropesanta: was made human.

The Post-Communion Prayers

All three post-Communion prayers begin ‘Father’, though the second is ‘Father of all’. This means that the celebrant cannot lead into the prayer by using the first phrase but is necessitated to say ‘Prayer a’ etc, which is liturgically very undesirable. Request that each prayer should have a distinct lead in.

The Sanctus

Holy, Holy, Holy Lord, God of power and might.
This was the ECCL version of the Sanctus, a mistranslation of Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus, Domine Deus Sabaoth, or of the Greek Hagios, hagios, Hagios, Kurios Sabaoth. The Roman Catholic Church unilaterally abandoned the agreed ECCL text in its revised liturgy of 2000. Its text now reads Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of hosts. The authorized English patriarchal Orthodox text(1994) reads Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord of hosts. SPB reads Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of hosts.

**Power and might** is not an acceptable version. Since the two major liturgical traditions in English now translate correctly, there is little benefit in the SEC holding to the past usage, which has damaging implications.

**Objections to the existing version:**

1 The translation is inaccurate.

2 Although God is often addressed as ‘Almighty’, nevertheless, the word ‘might’ in English conveys notions of brute force which are not reconcilable with the account of the Lord’s Supper, in which Our Lord Jesus Christ demonstrated the totality of his kenosis. Current events in Ukraine demonstrate precisely what ‘might’ means.

3 God is actually being described as the God of Angels, as the basic text in Isaiah 6 expounds. The angelic beings understood as surrounding the divine Throne are the energetic sources of divine potential (v. Margaret Barker’s works, passim), and the manifestations of God’s creative energies. These have nothing to do with any normal understanding of ‘might’. As part of the Angelic Song, the words involve the participants in the divine beauty and truth (cf. H.U. von Balthasar, The Glory of the Lord etc).

4 It is interesting that in the Creed, the Incarnation was mistranslated at the same epoch as ‘by the power of the Holy Spirit’ - power not being in the original text. This is also an angelic moment. It seems probable that at the times of the early liturgical revisions, a kind of time of maximum Cartesian dualism and technological self-satisfaction, discomfort with the notion of angels led to the substitution of the word might. One effect of this is to isolate God over against an isolated humanity, solipsistic in its self-perceived rationality - an attitude which ultimately makes humanity more interesting than the Godhead.

5 It also leads to a profoundly unecological vision of creation: a monarchic God vis-a-vis an isolated humanity, unaccompanied by the formerly full ecology of the heavenly host, and the teeming fecundity of the earthly cosmos. This is not a vision reflected in early Eucharistic prayers, e.g. of the Mozarabic rite, which abound, not only with Cherubim, Seraphim, Archangels, Angels and the heavenly hosts, but with fur, feather and fish. The liturgy is cosmic, not domestic. It is vital that the western Church rediscover this
neglected dimension which its primitive wisdom shared with the spirituality of indigenous peoples.

6 A further consequence is that the very many people who today seek to reverence the angelic powers and the orders of nature look to the Church in vain for guidance to lead them upward to ‘God, ineffable, incomprehensible, invisible, inconceivable, ever existing eternally the same’.

7 Attention may perhaps be given to the metre of musical settings of the Sanctus.

Brechin:

We discussed the principles of liturgical reform and inclusion, then voted on a motion to accept what has been approved at GS 2021. We did this in houses, for a canonical matter. The ‘against’ votes were concerned with a departure from ecumenically agreed forms of liturgy and the gap this might introduce into e.g. Anglican-Roman Catholic debates. John Davies spoke to this and said that ecumenical dialogue had informed the work.

Voting was as follows:

Bishop
  In favour -1
Clergy
  In favour - 12
  Against - 1
  Abstentions- none
Laity
  In favour - 18
  Against - 1
  Abstentions - 2

Edinburgh:

- General welcome and support for the changes, but
- A feeling that inclusive wording (i.e. avoiding male v female) had missed some important cases and would benefit from a further sweep
- A view that focus on eliding male/female references was passe, and that the agenda had moved on to “non-binary”
- A recognition that the proposed changes are interim and that a fuller review is needed and
- A plea (but not shared by one speaker) for considered language, observing that earlier formulations had captured well a mystical and transcendent message which we need not to lose.

Glasgow and Galloway:

From the discussion, it might be reasonably inferred that there was support for the changes, including the extension of gender-neutral references to all
people as well as to the Deity, but some concern was expressed about a perceived departure from the authority of Scripture in making such changes, as well as a concern about the ‘over-wordy’ nature of our liturgy in a society where visual expression is becoming the norm. However, other than certain individual opinions, there was no particular Synodical feeling expressed regarding the proposed liturgical changes, and certainly no direct opposition to them, so a general tenor of support would best summarise the response of our Synod.

Moray, Ross and Caithness:

A report on the discussion at MRC Synod has been supplied as follows:

During the debate on the revisions to the Scottish Liturgy 1982 a number of matters were discussed. Four of those were formed into a more formal vote. One of those was a question of the changes to the Blessing; this amendment was not passed by the synod.

The first alteration was from the Sursum Corda and the Post Communion Sentence. It relates to who or what is being addressed in the response. Some felt that the response in the revised wording

\[
\text{Let us give thanks to the Lord our God} \\
\text{It is right to give our thanks and praise.}
\]

would make more sense when God who is being addressed is mentioned i.e.

\[
\text{Let us give thanks to the Lord our God} \\
\text{It is right to give God thanks and Praise}
\]

And again in the Post Communion Sentence revised wording is;

\[
\text{Give thanks to our gracious God:} \\
\text{whose mercy endures forever.}
\]

The proposers preferred:

\[
\text{Give thanks to our gracious God:} \\
\text{For God’s mercy endures for ever}
\]

This was voted on, 22 in favour of the amended words, 11 to keep the words as presented to synod.

The second alteration discussed and voted on was the phrase: \textit{and was made human}

The word human seems to instinctively cause hesitation, a suggested alternative was: \textit{and took our form}
This was voted on, 24 in favour of the amended words, 6 to keep the words as presented to synod.

The third alteration concerned the rubric of the liturgy.

Rev Norma Higgott proposed the following motion:

“.... that this Synod requests that rubrics be inserted in the text of the 1982 Liturgy indicating which parts are proper to the Deacon when present.”

She pointed out that the process had already begun when the Liturgy Committee presented the material on Lament. In the margin of that material the words or actions considered to be diaconal are marked with a line. She also explained that this motion was not intending that such a rubric should reserve any of the liturgy for a deacon, rather simply pointing out that if a deacon was present then this would be the appropriate liturgical place for them. A short debate followed, and the synod then voted with 28 in favour, none against and 5 abstentions.

Synod wished to thank the Liturgy Committee and the Faith and Order Board for the work involved and for providing the joy of debate.

St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane:

Approval was given to the liturgy on a show of hands. Voting was as follows:

In favour: 43
Against: 1
Abstentions: 3

Members of Synod considered an additional motion regarding the liturgy as follows:

“That the section “ALTERNATIVE USE AT OFFERTORY be incorporated into section 17 of the Eucharist.”

Voting was as follows:

In favour: 51
Against: 0
Abstentions: 2
LITURGY COMMITTEE - CALENDAR

Commemoration of Figures of the Reformation Period until the Repeal of the Penal Laws

The SEC today is in many respects the outcome of social, political, cultural, intellectual, and religious developments which began with the sixteenth century Renaissance and Reformation and continued in the political and religious conflicts of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. While these movements affected Scotland in distinct ways, the events took place in a wider European context, and their interpretation remains contentious in church, society, and academia today. In other countries, seminal theological thinkers and leaders of reform movements, and others who suffered and died for professing insights and convictions contrary to those upheld by religious and political rulers, are remembered by name, and commemorated according to the traditions which have evolved in their particular contexts. For the SEC, identifying such figures is a more complex, and potentially divisive process, not least as the church which emerged from the shadow of the Penal Laws to prominence in Scottish society during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries embraced both communities which had remained faithful to the reformed episcopal polity through the vicissitudes of the preceding centuries, and congregations of generally more recent immigrants to Scotland, whose heritage derived from the established churches of England and Ireland.

A further difficulty is that this period coincided with the invention of the printing press, and the extension of literacy and proliferation of writing which this enabled, which, together with the vernacularisation of religious observance and expression in Scotland, and the deep divisions which have mutated rather than dissipated during ensuing centuries. Unlike the era of the ancient Scottish churches and their saints, and the undisputed hagiography which has preserved their fame, figures from the Reformation period onwards are invariably controversial, and their memory contested, and subjected to critical scrutiny. There is truth in the saying that a saint is someone who has never properly been investigated. In this modern era, the potential for critical investigation is greater, and that of hagiography correspondingly diminished.

The Faith and Order Board has resolved, after careful consideration of these issues over a prolonged period, not to propose the inclusion of named individuals in the Calendar at this stage, but rather that two group commemorations be created, one to remember Scottish Saints and Martyrs of the Reformation Period, and the other Members of the Church who suffered under the Penal Laws. The character and emphasis of these proposed commemorations is somewhat different: the former acknowledges the suffering inflicted by whoever was in power at any time, including at times senior clerics and lay aristocracy of what became the SEC, upon the less powerful with contrary theological convictions, and therefore embraces Scottish Christians of all persuasions; the latter is quite specific to what became the SEC, and recognises that men, women, and children, the majority of whose names are not known, remained faithful to the church at considerable cost, in the face of constant discrimination and intermittent violence. The two proposed commemorations are accordingly the subject of separate motions to this Synod.
The Collects and lectionary for the proposed commemorations are provided here, but will be subject to separate Synodical measures in due course, and do not form part of the motions before Synod.

**Commemoration of Scottish Saints and Martyrs of the Reformation Period**

It is proposed that this commemoration be kept on 19 January, a day early in the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity on which no existing commemoration falls. This recognises the lasting divisions in the Church which resulted from the Reformation, and that, whatever role those who suffered may have played in these, the SEC and other Christian denominations in Scotland today are committed to overcoming these, working together for the Gospel, and seeking collective healing and mutual forgiveness. This is emphasised in the Collect drafted by the Liturgy Committee, and reflected in the lectionary identified for the proposed commemoration.

**Collect:** Most Merciful God,
give us such grace that we may revere your holy Word and celebrate your Sacraments with order and with joy; grant to your Church that peace and unity which is your will, that those who have been divided on earth may be reconciled in your eternal presence; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

**Lectionary:** 1 Kings 11:26-40; Ps. 133; Galatians 2:1-10 (11-14); Mark 9:33-41

**Commemoration of Members of the Church who suffered under the Penal Laws**

It is proposed that this commemoration be kept on 15 June, the date in 1792 on which the repeal of the Penal Laws took effect. This acknowledges the legacy of discrimination and repression, and also the beginning made possible, through which congregations of diverse history, membership, and political sympathies were united in what became the SEC. This is reflected in the Collect and readings.

**Collect:** Merciful God,
when this Church suffered under human laws, you inspired the courage and constancy of those who sustained your faith and worship through times of adversity and persecution: may we, who worship you in peace, show courage and conviction in our lives, and glorify you before those in power; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

**Lectionary:** Jeremiah 38:1-13; Ps. 101; Hebrews 11:23-28; Mark 13:9-13 (14-23)
1. **DEFINITIONS**

In this Canon

“Bishop-Elect” means the person stated in the Declarations referred to in Sections 28 and 30 of this Canon as the person elected as the Bishop of the Diocese in question;

“Candidate” means any person whose name shall have been included by the Preparatory Committee in the list of candidates for the vacant bishopric at the conclusion of its work in terms of Section 16 of this Canon, and "Candidates" shall be construed accordingly;

"Commentary" means the Commentary adopted by the General Synod under Resolution 2 of this Canon, which Commentary is at all times subordinate to this Canon;

“Convener of the Preparatory Committee” means the person so specified to act as the Convener of the Preparatory Committee in terms of Section 15 of this Canon;

“Convener of the Electoral Synod” or "Convener" means the person so specified to act as the Convener of the Electoral Synod in terms of Section 6 of this Canon;

“Description of the Diocese” means the document or other method of presentation describing the diocese in question referred to in Section 4 of this Canon;

"Electoral Process" means the process for the election of a Bishop-Elect contained in this Canon;

“Electoral Synod” means the body constituted in Section 8 of this Canon;

“Electoral Meeting” means the electoral meeting of the Electoral Synod;

“Electors” means the members of the Electoral Synod present at any meeting;

"Electronic Means" means any method of transmission of information, sound or images between computers or other machines, other than facsimile machines, designed for the purpose of sending and receiving such transmissions and which allows the recipient to reproduce the information, sound or images transmitted in a tangible medium of expression;

"Guidelines" means the Guidelines adopted by the General Synod under Resolution 1 of this Canon, which Guidelines are at all times subordinate to this Canon;

“the List” means the list of names of candidates prepared by the Preparatory Committee in terms of Section 16 of this Canon;}
“Mandate” means the document in terms of Appendix 1 to the Code of Canons;

“Preliminary Meeting” means the Preliminary Meeting of the Electoral Synod being the meeting referred to in Section 10 of this Canon;

“Preparatory Committee” means the body constituted in Section 15 of this Canon;

“Provincial Panel for Episcopal Elections” means the standing body constituted under Section 3 of this Canon;

“Stage” means the First Stage, Second Stage and Third Stage of the electoral process specified in Section 12 of this Canon and "Stages" shall be construed accordingly.

PRELIMINARIES

2. CONFIDENTIALITY AND DISPOSAL OF DOCUMENTATION

(a) All documents and proceedings arising under this Canon shall be subject to a duty of confidentiality such that they shall be treated as strictly confidential by all persons involved in all or any of the proceedings arising under the Canon and who are subject to the Canons of the Church.

(b) At the conclusion of the Electoral Process all documentation issued to the Electoral Synod and the Preparatory Committee shall be disposed of in such a way as the Convener shall direct.

3. PROVINCIAL PANEL FOR EPISCOPAL ELECTIONS

(a) There shall be a Provincial Panel for Episcopal Elections.

(b) The Diocesan Synod of each diocese shall elect from among its own number two persons, one lay and one clerical, to serve on the Provincial Panel for Episcopal Elections.

(c) The period of office of such persons shall be not more than four years in the first instance, but they may be re-elected for a second term of office.

(d) The Standing Committee of the Diocese shall have the power to fill any casual vacancies arising in the membership including a clerical member disqualified in terms of Section 16, on the condition that such person appointed will hold office until the next Diocesan Synod.

(e) If, before the next Diocesan Synod, an Electoral Process under this Canon has commenced, the person shall continue in office until the Diocesan Synod following the completion of the Electoral Process.

(f) The person shall be entitled to stand thereafter for such office for the full period of four years.

(g) Any member of the Panel who has been appointed to a Preparatory Committee shall continue to serve on that Committee notwithstanding an expiry of period of office.
4. **OVERSIGHT DURING VACANCY AND DESCRIPTION OF THE DIOCESE**

(a) During the vacancy of the see, until the newly elected Bishop is installed, a Bishop nominated by the College of Bishops shall act as Bishop of the Diocese, with full powers.

(b) As soon as the intention of the Bishop to resign has been intimated in terms of Canon 7, or after the death of the Bishop, or the removal of the Bishop due to incapacity in terms of Canon 64, or the removal of the Bishop in terms of Canon 54, the Standing Committee of the Diocese shall complete and circulate a Description of the Diocese, together with such future plans and intentions for the work of the Diocese as seem relevant to said Standing Committee.

(c) It shall also promote training on the Electoral Process and discernment for the calling of a Bishop.

(d) The Description of the Diocese shall be circulated to all members of the Electoral Synod, the College of Bishops, the Preparatory Committee and the Candidates.

5. **ISSUE OF THE MANDATE**

(a) Within twenty-one days of a Diocese becoming vacant, the Primus shall issue the Mandate to the Dean of that Diocese with a copy to each of the Chancellor of the Diocese, the Clerk to the Episcopal Synod and the Convener of the Standing Committee of the General Synod.

(b) The date of issuing the Mandate may be extended by the College of Bishops.

(c) In the event of there being a vacancy in the office of Dean, the Mandate shall be issued to the Synod Clerk of that Diocese.

(d) The issue of the Mandate shall inaugurate the Electoral Process.

---

**THE ELECTORAL SYNOD**

6. **CONVENERSHIP OF ELECTORAL SYNOD**

(a) The meetings of the Electoral Synod shall be convened by the Primus.

(b) The Convener shall have no vote in the deliberations of the Electoral Synod.

(c) The organisation of the meetings of the Electoral Synod shall be the responsibility of the Convener with the assistance of the Standing Committee of the Diocese.

(d) Notwithstanding Section 5 of Canon 3, if the Primus is unable or unwilling to act for any part of the procedures set out in this Canon, another Diocesan Bishop at the request of the Primus or on the instruction of the College of Bishops shall act in place of the Primus.
(e) If a Bishop is appointed to replace the Primus in the conduct of the Electoral Process, that Bishop shall act in place of the Primus in all subsequent matters concerning that Electoral Process.

(f) Should the Bishop so appointed become unable or unwilling to act, the College of Bishops shall appoint another of their members to act.

7. ASSSESSOR

(a) The Convener of the Electoral Synod shall appoint the Chancellor of the Diocese, whom failing the Registrar of the Diocese or a legally qualified person to act as Assessor to the Electoral Synod and Assessor to the Preparatory Committee.

(b) The Assessor shall attend all meetings of Electoral Synod and the Preparatory Committee.

(c) If the Assessor is not able to attend any meeting, the Convener shall be entitled to excuse such non-attendance, and at the Convener’s sole discretion appoint a legally qualified person to act as Assessor.

8. MEMBERSHIP OF THE ELECTORAL SYNOD

(a) The membership of the Electoral Synod shall comprise the members, as defined in Sections 3 and 4 of Canon 50, of the Diocesan Synod who as at the date of the Mandate are qualified to vote at that Synod.

(b) Any cleric who has allowed their name to appear on the List at any Stage may not participate in the Electoral Process at that Stage.

(c) Such cleric shall not be excluded from participation at a Stage when their name does not appear on the List.

(d) Any Lay Representative who ceases to be a communicant member of the congregation by which that Lay Representative was elected shall be ineligible to serve, in which case that person’s place at the Electoral Synod shall be taken by the Alternate Lay Representative of that congregation in office at the date of the Mandate.

(e) In the event of any Lay Representative being unable to attend any Meeting of the Electoral Synod, the Alternate Lay Representative may attend any such Meetings as a voting member of the Electoral Synod and shall continue as a voting member of the Electoral Synod in place of the Lay Representative until the election has taken place.

(f) Written confirmation of such substitution should if possible be made by the Lay Representative or the Vestry Secretary of the congregation to the Convener of the Electoral Synod within 10 days of the date of the next Meeting, to ensure inclusion in the roll of Electors for such meeting.
(g) In unforeseen circumstances where any Lay Representative or the Alternate Lay Representative has suddenly become indisposed, the Convener has a discretion to allow the Lay Representative or the Alternate Lay Representative to attend later meetings of the Electoral Synod.

(h) The roll of Electors shall be amended accordingly.

9. DIVISION INTO HOUSES

(a) It shall be competent for the Electoral Meeting held under this Canon to divide into a house of Clergy and a house of Laity for discussion, should that be the wish of a majority of the members of either house present and voting, for such time as the Convener shall decide.

(b) If before the two houses reassemble together, a majority of either house considers it advisable that the trend of their discussions should be transmitted to the other, the Convener shall arrange for this.

(c) During such separate meetings, each house shall elect one of their number to take the chair for that meeting.

10. PRELIMINARY MEETING OF THE ELECTORAL SYNOD

(a) The Convener shall summon a Preliminary Meeting of the Electoral Synod.

(b) The Summons can be by Electronic Means or by letter.

(c) The Preliminary Meeting shall take place within 21 days of the issuing of the Summons.

(d) Recipients of the Summons should also receive a copy of the Mandate, the Guidelines and the Commentary.

(e) All members of the College of Bishops shall normally attend the Preliminary Meeting.

(f) They may contribute to the discussion but shall have no vote in the deliberations.

(g) All members of the Preparatory Committee already appointed shall normally attend the Preliminary Meeting.

(h) They may contribute to the discussion but shall have no vote in the deliberations unless they are members of the Electoral Synod in their own right.

11. PROCEDURES OF THE PRELIMINARY MEETING

(a) The Preliminary Meeting shall start with a celebration of the Eucharist at which the Convener of the Electoral Synod shall preside, following which the Convener shall constitute the Preliminary Meeting.

(b) Following the reading of the Mandate, the roll of clerical and lay members of the Electoral Synod shall be called.
Immediately thereafter, objection may be stated to the inclusion of any name on that roll, and any person claiming to be a member may ask to be included on that roll.

Such objection or claim shall be disposed of forthwith and shall not be competent at a later stage of the proceedings.

The Convener, acting on the advice of the Assessor, shall decide on any such objection or claim, and the Convener’s decision shall be final and not subject to appeal.

At the Preliminary Meeting the Convener shall explain to the members of the Synod the working of the process under this Canon.

The Preliminary Meeting may discuss, in whatever manner may be directed by the Convener or chosen by the Meeting, all procedures to be followed in the implementation of this Canon, the Description of the Diocese or the subjects which it might have been expected to cover and all matters relating to the election of a Bishop under this Canon.

If not already elected at the last Diocesan Synod prior to the issue of the Mandate, the Preliminary Meeting shall, from its own membership, elect two additional clerical members and two additional lay members to join the Preparatory Committee.

No congregation shall be represented by more than one member on the Preparatory Committee.

12. TIMETABLING BY PRELIMINARY MEETING AND STAGES

(a) The Preliminary Meeting shall approve a provisional timetable for all possible meetings of the Electoral Synod under a single Mandate including all of the Stages.

(b) The Electoral Process shall be completed within one year of the date of the Vacancy even if it is necessary to engage in all three Stages.

(c) The provisional timetable may be extended at the discretion of the Convener with the support of a majority of the Electoral Synod.

(d) Consultation may be carried out by Electronic Means or letter and notice of a decision shall be transmitted by the same method to all members of the Electoral Synod.

(e) The three Stages of the Electoral Process are as follows:-

FIRST STAGE

ELECTION BY ELECTORAL SYNOD AT FIRST ATTEMPT

• The Preparatory Committee sends the List to the Electoral Synod.
• The Meeting of the Electoral Synod with the Candidates.
• The Electoral Meeting at which the Bishop-Elect is elected.
SECOND STAGE (Should there be no List or no successful election)

ELECTION BY ELECTORAL SYNOD AT SECOND ATTEMPT

- Further Meeting of Electoral Synod.
- The Preparatory Committee sends the List to the Electoral Synod.
- The Meeting of the Electoral Synod with the Candidates.
- The Electoral Meeting at which the Bishop-Elect is elected.

THIRD STAGE (Should there be no List or no successful election at the second Stage)

ELECTION BY EPISCOPAL SYNOD

- A meeting between members of the Episcopal Synod and the Diocesan Members of the Preparatory Committee.
- The Meeting of the Episcopal Synod at which the Bishop-Elect is elected.

13. QUORUM

(a) The quorum for all meetings of the Electoral Synod shall be as defined in the Diocesan Constitution or, should no quorum be specified, it shall be one half of those entitled to vote.

(b) Should circumstances make it difficult to ensure a quorum, the Convener shall have the discretion to extend the periods within which such meetings may be held.

14. VALIDITY OF PROCEEDINGS

(a) The validity of the proceedings at any meeting under this Canon shall not be affected by the failure of any of the members of the Electoral Synod, Preparatory Committee or Episcopal Synod to attend.

PREPARATORY COMMITTEE FOR A DIOCESAN EPISCOPAL ELECTION

15. MEMBERSHIP

(a) The preparation of all documentation for meetings of the Electoral Synod, other than the Preliminary Meeting, shall be the responsibility of a Preparatory Committee.

(b) The Preparatory Committee shall comprise

(i) the Convener of the Electoral Synod who shall act as Convener of the Preparatory Committee,

(ii) one other bishop, nominated by the College of Bishops,
(iii) five members of the Provincial Panel for Episcopal Elections chosen by the Standing Committee of the General Synod (of whom at least two shall be laity and at least two shall be clerics, including both members from the diocese concerned), and

(iv) two further lay and two further clerical members chosen by the last Diocesan Synod prior to the issuing of the Mandate, which failing the Electoral Synod from among its own members at the Preliminary Meeting.

16. WORK OF THE PREPARATORY COMMITTEE

(a) All meetings of the Preparatory Committee shall take place within the Diocese concerned.

(b) Where it is not possible or permissible to meet in person, or it is easier for members to participate, meetings can be held using Electronic Means.

(c) The Convener and six members shall constitute a quorum of the Preparatory Committee provided that this includes at least two diocesan members and one provincial member.

(d) The Preparatory Committee shall prepare a List consisting of not less than three and not more than five names.

(e) In determining the content of this List, the Preparatory Committee shall consult interested parties, including the Diocesan Standing Committee and the College of Bishops.

(f) In determining the content of this List, the Preparatory Committee may receive suggestions from whomsoever wishes to make them; may interview prospective Candidates; and may use such other means as it sees fit to employ.

(g) Any suggestions submitted shall include an indication of the willingness of the person suggested to be considered for candidacy by the Preparatory Committee.

(h) In addition to the List, the Preparatory Committee shall provide

(i) a *curriculum vitae*, prepared by each Candidate,

(ii) a statement from each, in the form of responses to a questionnaire prepared by the Preparatory Committee and completed by each Candidate, and

(iii) a form of assent to nomination as Candidate (in terms of Appendix No.2) from each Candidate.

(i) The List shall not be made public and shall be treated as confidential by all those who receive it.

(j) If a clerical member of the Preparatory Committee declares a willingness to be considered for inclusion on the List, that member shall immediately cease to be a member of the Preparatory Committee.
(k) If the member concerned is a member of the Provincial Panel for Episcopal Elections but not the member for the Diocese in question, the Standing Committee of the General Synod shall select a replacement from the Provincial Panel for Episcopal Elections.

(l) If the member concerned is one of the additional clerical members chosen by either the Diocesan Synod or the Electoral Synod, the Standing Committee of the Diocese shall nominate a replacement cleric from among those who were members of the Diocesan Synod at the date of the issue of the Mandate.

(m) In the event of the clerical member of the Provincial Panel for Episcopal Elections being the Diocesan member thus disqualified, a replacement shall be appointed in terms of Section 3.

(n) The Preparatory Committee shall endeavour to produce the List within the provisional timetable at both the first and second Stages agreed by the Electoral Synod in terms of Section 12, but if this cannot be done it may seek an extension.

(o) In the second Stage the List shall contain not less than two and not more than five names.

(p) If the Preparatory Committee is unable to produce a List at the Second Stage, or if no Candidate is elected at the Second Stage, the third Stage shall commence and the right of Election shall pass to the Episcopal Synod.

17. ASSENT OF THE COLLEGE OF BISHOPS

(a) Once nominations have been received, but before any interviews take place, the Preparatory Committee shall send details of those nominated to the College of Bishops, who must assent to any names going forward for further consideration.

(b) The name of any person who is not agreed as acceptable by the College of Bishops may not be included in the List.

(c) The reasons for such decisions shall be recorded in the minutes of the College of Bishops, which minutes shall be confidential.

(d) Such members of the Preparatory Committee as are bishops shall be charged by the College of Bishops with informing the Preparatory Committee of the unacceptability of any proposed candidate.

(e) The appearance of any name on the List shall be regarded as evidence that that name is acceptable to the College of Bishops.

18. PROMISES TO AND STATEMENTS BY CANDIDATES

(a) No promises, either written or spoken, other than the subscriptions prescribed in Canon 12 shall be required from or given by any person as a condition of proposal as a Candidate.

(b) No person who has been proposed as Candidate shall make any public statement, spoken or written, relating to that candidacy or the Electoral Process, other than as provided in these Canons.
(c) Any infringement of this provision by a Candidate shall be notified to the Convener and then considered by the Electoral Synod prior to the Electoral Meeting with Candidates and the Electoral Synod may decide that the candidacy shall be treated as having been withdrawn.

THE MEETING OF THE ELECTORAL SYNOD WITH THE CANDIDATES

19. CONVENING

(a) The Convener of the Electoral Synod shall summon the Meeting of the Electoral Synod with the Candidates by Electronic Means or letter.

(b) Recipients of the Summons should also receive confirmation of the date of the Electoral Meeting and receive the List and those other papers prepared by the Preparatory Committee for the use of the Electoral Synod.

20. MEETING OF THE ELECTORAL SYNOD WITH CANDIDATES

(a) The Electoral Synod’s meeting with the Candidates shall start with a celebration of the Eucharist at which the Convener shall preside, following which the Convener shall constitute the meeting.

(b) The roll of Electors as constituted under Section 11 shall be checked.

(c) Any amendments to the roll of Electors under Section 8 shall be intimated, and if any objection is raised to the inclusion or omission of a name on the electoral roll, the Convener, on the advice of the Assessor, shall decide on such objection.

(d) The Convener’s decision shall be final and not subject to an appeal.

(e) The Candidates shall be introduced to the meeting by the Convener, and the meeting will proceed as the Convener may direct.

THE ELECTORAL MEETING

21. CONSTITUTION AT CELEBRATION OF THE EUCHARIST

(a) The Electoral Meeting shall start with a celebration of the Eucharist, at which the Convener shall preside, following which the Convener shall constitute the Electoral Meeting.

22. READING OF MANDATE AND CHECKING OF ROLL OF ELECTORS

(a) Following the reading of the Mandate, the roll of Electors as constituted under Sections 11 and 20 shall be checked.

(b) The Convener shall have discretion to admit latecomers to the Electoral Meeting on good cause being shown, although no person will be admitted once these initial proceedings have come to an end.
(c) The initial proceedings, consisting of the Eucharist, the reading of the Mandate and the checking of the roll of Electors, shall take place in public.

(d) All subsequent proceedings shall be in private and shall be and shall remain confidential.

(e) Confidentiality as to the result of the election shall be maintained by all members until the Convener formally intimates that the Bishop-Elect has accepted the appointment.

23. VOTE OF “NONE”

(a) Abstentions shall not be counted as votes.

(b) However, any member of the Electoral Synod may vote ‘None’ as a vote or, in the transferable ballot, as an expressed preference, if that member wishes to express the view that none of the Candidates, or none of the remaining Candidates, should be elected.

(c) If at any stage in the voting process in terms of Section 25, Section 26 or Section 27 of this Canon, the number of votes of "None" exceeds one half of the total number of votes cast in either house, the Convener shall declare the Electoral Process unsuccessful.

24. ADJOURNMENTS

(a) On the motion of any member of the Electoral Synod the Electoral Meeting may, before proceeding to any vote, resolve to adjourn to a specified later period of the same day.

25. PROCEDURE FOR INITIAL VOTES

(a) After checking the roll, the Convener of the Electoral Synod shall place before the Electoral Synod the List and may invite discussion.

(b) In due course, the Convener shall call upon the Electoral Synod to vote upon the List.

(c) The vote shall be by ballot by houses, one vote being cast by each member of the Electoral Synod.

(d) No votes may be cast by proxy.

(e) At the end of the vote, the result shall be declared by the Convener.

(f) In the event of a Candidate receiving a majority of the votes of each house of members of Electoral Synod recorded as present and admitted, in terms of Section 22 of this Canon, and voting, that Candidate shall be declared by the Convener to have been elected.

(g) In the event of no Candidate receiving a majority in both houses, the Convener shall call upon the meeting, following any further discussion which the Convener may decide to allow, to vote for a second time upon the List.
(h) This second vote shall also be by ballot by houses, one vote being cast by each member of Electoral Synod.

(i) At the end of the second vote, the result shall be declared by the Convener in the same manner as for the first vote.

(j) In the event of the second vote being inconclusive, where there are more than two Candidates, the Convener shall move to the voting procedure specified in Section 26 of this Canon.

(k) Where there are only two Candidates, the Convener shall move to the voting procedure specified in Section 27 of this Canon.

26. PROCEDURE FOR A TRANSFERABLE VOTE WHERE THERE ARE MORE THAN TWO CANDIDATES

(a) Where there are more than two Candidates and no Candidate has received the majority of votes in both houses, the Convener of the Electoral Synod shall call upon the Electoral Synod to proceed without further discussion to a transferable vote in which the members of Electoral Synod shall vote by placing each of the Candidates in order of preference.

(b) An option for ‘None’ shall be included on the ballot paper and may be listed as a preference.

(c) The vote shall be by ballot in each of the houses, with a transferrable vote being cast by each member of the Electoral Synod.

(d) The count of first preference votes against each Candidate will be tallied.

(e) The Candidate who receives the lowest number of first preference votes in each house shall be eliminated.

(f) The ballot papers which listed the eliminated Candidate as the first preference shall then be recounted and the second preference votes on those ballot papers shall be counted and added to the tally of the remaining Candidates.

(g) This process will continue until two Candidates remain.

(h) If at any point where a second preference vote on a ballot paper is being counted and that vote is in favour of a Candidate who has been eliminated, the third preference vote shall be counted instead and so forth until a preference is reached in respect of a Candidate who has not been eliminated. That preference vote shall be counted as though it were the second preference.

(i) At any stage in the process, if a Candidate receives a majority of the votes of each house of members of Electoral Synod recorded as present and admitted, in terms of Section 22 of this Canon, and voting, that Candidate shall be declared by the Convener to have been elected.

(j) When only two Candidates remain, a final round of voting under this Section shall take place using a first past the post system.

(k) The vote shall be by ballot by houses, one vote being cast by each member of the Electoral Synod.

(l) No votes may be cast by proxy.
(m) At the end of the vote, the result shall be declared by the Convener.

(n) In the event of a Candidate receiving a majority of the votes of each house of members of Electoral Synod recorded as present and admitted, in terms of Section 22 of this Canon, and voting, that Candidate shall be declared by the Convener to have been elected.

27. FINAL VOTE

(a) If voting has taken place under Section 25 and, where appropriate, under Section 26, and neither Candidate has obtained a majority in both houses in the first past the post vote, the Convener may call upon the Electoral Synod to adjourn.

(b) This adjournment will last for a period of not less than thirty and not more than ninety minutes.

(c) Following the adjournment, the Convener shall ask the Electoral Synod to vote again on the two Candidates.

(d) This final vote shall be by ballot by houses, one vote being cast by each member of the Electoral Synod.

(e) No votes may be cast by proxy.

(f) In the event of a Candidate receiving a majority of the votes of each house of members of Electoral Synod, recorded as present and admitted, in terms of Section 22 of this Canon and voting, that Candidate shall be declared by the Convener to have been elected.

(g) If at the end of this process no Candidate has a majority in both houses the Convener shall declare the Electoral Process unsuccessful.

28. DECLARATION OF ELECTION BY ELECTORAL SYNOD

(a) When a Candidate has been elected after Stage 1 or Stage 2, a Declaration in triplicate stating the result in terms of Appendix No.3 shall be signed by the Convener of the Electoral Synod in the presence of the Electoral Synod.

(b) One copy of the Declaration shall be transmitted to the Registrar of the Episcopal Synod, one to the Bishop Elect, and one to the Diocesan Registrar for preservation and registration.

29. EPISCOPAL SYNOD RIGHT OF ELECTION

(a) Where the Convener of the Electoral Synod has declared the Electoral Process to be unsuccessful at Stage 2, the right of election shall pass to the Episcopal Synod.

(b) Prior to the Election Meeting of the Episcopal Synod, the members of the Episcopal Synod shall meet with the Diocesan Members of the Preparatory Committee.
30. DECLARATION OF ELECTION BY EPISCOPAL SYNOD

(a) When a Candidate has been elected by the Episcopal Synod, a Declaration in triplicate stating the result in terms of Appendix No.3 shall be signed by the Convener of the Episcopal Synod.

(b) One copy of the Declaration shall be transmitted to the Registrar of the Episcopal Synod, one to the Bishop Elect, and one to the Diocesan Registrar for preservation and registration.

31. ACCEPTANCE BY BISHOP–ELECT

(a) The Bishop-Elect shall give written acceptance of election to the Primus within seven days of the date of the election.

(b) The period of seven days may be extended at the discretion of the College of Bishops.

(c) A verbal acceptance on the day of the Electoral Meeting or of the meeting of the Episcopal Synod is sufficient for the Convener of the Electoral Synod or the Primus to make a public announcement of the election result.

(d) If the Bishop-Elect declines to accept election, or does not accept election within the seven day period or any other period extended at the discretion of the College of Bishops, the election shall proceed to the next Stage.

(e) If all Stages have been exhausted, a Mandate shall be issued for a fresh Election.

EPISCOPAL ORDINATION AND INSTALLATION

32. ORDINATION AND INSTALLATION OF THE BISHOP–ELECT

(a) The College of Bishops shall make provision for the ordination to the episcopate of the person elected, unless already a Bishop, and installation into the vacant see.

(b) The ordination, if required, and the installation shall take place at the latest within one hundred days after the date of acceptance of election, unless the College of Bishops deem it necessary to postpone it beyond that period.

33. JURISDICTION

(a) The newly elected Bishop shall take jurisdiction within the Diocese from the time of the installation.

OBJECTIONS TO PROCEEDINGS OF ELECTORAL SYNOD

34. APPEALS

(a) The Convener of the Electoral Synod shall decide all questions of order or of any issues arising in the course of the proceedings.
(b) There shall be no appeal in relation to decisions about the inclusion or omission of a name on the Electoral Roll.

(c) An appeal against any other decision of the Electoral Synod or the conduct of proceedings in the Electoral Synod shall be competent to the Episcopal Synod.

(d) Any such objections, with reasons, must have been made at the relevant meeting of the Electoral Synod and be supported by not less than one-third of the Electoral Synod members who were present at said meeting.

(e) A written statement of the objections, with the names of the objectors, must be lodged with the Registrar of the Episcopal Synod within four days of the meeting to which they refer.

(f) The decision of the Episcopal Synod shall be final.

35. POWERS OF EPISCOPAL SYNOD

(a) The Episcopal Synod shall hear any appeal under this Canon

(b) Following such hearing, the Episcopal Synod shall declare: EITHER

   **A:** that the objection does not affect the validity of the result of the election and that the election stands; OR

   **B:** that the objection has affected the validity of the result and that the election is void.

(c) If the election is set aside, the Primus shall forthwith issue a Mandate for a fresh election.

(d) No Bishop who has acted as the Convener in the Electoral Process shall be a member of the Episcopal Synod in any appeal.

RESOLUTIONS UNDER CANON 4

Resolution 1

   Guidelines
   The General Synod shall adopt Guidelines for implementation of the Electoral Process.
   The Guidelines may be adopted or amended from time to time by resolution of General Synod on the recommendation of the Faith and Order Board.

Resolution 2

   Commentary
   The General Synod shall adopt a Commentary for all parties involved in the Electoral Process.
   The Commentary may be adopted or amended from time to time by resolution of General Synod on the recommendation of the Faith and Order Board.
COMMENTS AND GUIDELINES ON CANON 4

The Canon 4 Working Group’s earlier consultation identified several concerns in terms of the clarity of the existing Canon 4 and the way in which it has been implemented in recent Episcopal Elections. In response to these concerns the Group has drafted a ‘Commentary’ and a set of ‘Guidelines’ linked to the Canonical text which, it hopes members of the Electoral Synod would find helpful during an Episcopal Election. These, if accepted, would be adopted by Resolution of General Synod. They would not have any ‘legal’ status, rather they are intended to assist electors in the task of calling and electing a Bishop.

The text below provides an outline of what might be included in a Commentary and a set of Guidelines. Fully worked out final versions of both documents will be presented to Diocesan Synods and the General Synod in 2023, should the revised Canon 4 be passed at first reading by the 2022 General Synod.

A key change in focus in the revised Canon is placing ‘discernment’ at the heart of the electoral process. Given this, a brief note on the importance of discernment throughout the calling and election of a Bishop is appended to the outlines of the Commentary and set of Guidelines. It will also be suggested that all electors and members of the Preparatory Committee receive diocesan training on discernment before the Mandate is issued.

**Commentary – outline**

This commentary is designed to provide a “User’s Guide” to Canon 4 and clarify what can often appear as very dense legal text. Precisely drafted text is necessary for a clear set of rules and procedures governing an Episcopal Election, but the intent of the resulting Canon is not always self-evident to non-specialists. Hence the need for a commentary. The rational for each section, or grouped sections, will be explored in turn in the fully worked out version and aligned with each of the major headings listed in the Canon:

- Preliminaries
- The Electoral Synod
- Preparatory Committee for a Diocesan Episcopal Election
- The meeting of the Electoral Synod with the Candidates
- The Electoral Meeting
- Episcopal Ordination and Installation
- Objections to proceedings of the Electoral Synod

The Commentary should be read alongside the Guidelines. Whereas the Commentary explains the rationale for each section; the Guidelines provide information on how an Episcopal Election should be undertaken.

**Guidelines – outline**

The Guidelines will assist in the process of calling and electing a Bishop. They are designed to provide a ‘check list’ of tasks to be completed from the announcement of a vacancy in the see to the consecration and installation of a new Bishop. They should read alongside the Commentary on Canon 4. Whereas the Guidelines will provide information on how an Episcopal Election should be conducted: the Commentary will explain the rationale for the revised Canon.
The rational for each section, or grouped sections, will be explored in turn in the fully worked out version and aligned with each of the major headings listed in the Canon:

- Preliminaries
- The Electoral Synod
- Preparatory Committee for a Diocesan Episcopal Election
- The meeting of the Electoral Synod with the Candidates
- The Electoral Meeting
- Episcopal Ordination and Installation
- Objections to proceedings of the Electoral Synod

The Guidelines will be drafted to promote a more uniform and consistent operation of Canon 4 across all dioceses. It is hoped that dioceses will follow them and thereby undertake an Episcopal Election in which the work of the Holy Spirit is evident through the process of ‘discernment’ and candidates are treated with appropriate dignity and respect. The whole province is invited to underpin each election of a new Bishop in prayer.

E lecting a Bishop is one of the most important moments in the life of a Diocese and a key responsibility of the Electoral Synod. It requires time and commitment from every elector and candidate.

**Discernment of Vocation**

The Election is a process governed by the Canons of the SEC; however, it is also a process of choosing someone whom God is calling to serve, a process of vocational discernment by the Preparatory Committee, the Electoral Synod, and the candidates. Offering oneself as a candidate is itself a vocation, as is serving as an elector. It requires faithful prayer even more than it requires correct procedure.

The entire process, not just the final election, is about discernment. Attentiveness to the leading of the Holy Spirit by everyone involved needs prayerful reflection and silence as well as listening and speaking. The meetings of the Electoral Synod begin with the Eucharist, during which the Synod should pray for the guidance of the Spirit, and the candidates should be prayed for by name. But prayer should be allowed for at other times. These might include the beginning and ending of meetings, before and after meeting a candidate in interview, and before any ballot.
PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

Update for General Synod 2022

The Committee has reported in the annual Blue Book on the progress it had made by the end of 2021 on a number of issues discussed at General Synod 2021. This note is to provide an update on major developments since the end of 2021.

In 2022, the SEC has promoted and rolled out a Zoom-based course called ‘Living Well with Differences’. This course, delivered by charity ‘Place for Hope’, explores good handling of conflict and bullying/harassment in church communities. After a pilot course in late 2021, this is now being rolled out for all stipendiary clergy in the SEC through 2022 and 2023.

At General Synod 2021, various motions were proposed by the Personnel Committee. Those relating to a draft Complaints Procedure and draft Bullying and Harassment Policy were agreed subject to a number of amendments including some detailed matters for consideration by the Personnel Committee.

These included, relating to the Complaints Procedure:

- Consideration of the appointment of an Independent Complaints Officer. The Committee believes it would be premature to bring forward any proposals on this to Synod 2022. Most complaints can be handled locally using existing structures. The Committee is also aware that initial discussions have taken place within the Faith and Order Board to look at governance and accountability and external scrutiny of decisions by a body such as the College of Bishops or an Episcopal Synod.

- Possible revision to the Complaints Procedure to provide more detail on how a complaint would be dealt with. The Committee has drawn up detailed guidance for Bishops on the handling of complaints received in a Diocese. This guidance will sit alongside the Complaints Procedure and gives more detailed information to amplify how a complaint will be dealt with in a timely, fair and reasonable manner. The guidance indicates possible routes from complaint into other canonical processes. This guidance is not a matter for formal Synod approval, but the Personnel Committee will listen carefully to any comments made by Synod members on its content.

- Amending the Procedure to incorporate an appeal process for any significant matters that might otherwise be excluded from the Procedure. The Committee is also aware that Canon 53, which in its various forms of action already contains certain appeal processes that might be used in this situation, is under review. It considers that it would be appropriate to await the outcome of those other work streams.

These also included, in relation to the Bullying and Harassment Policy:
• Creation of guidance for assistance to any individual who believes they have been bullied or harassed. The ‘Living Well with Difference’ Course has explicit, simple guidance on following the Complaints Procedure in such cases. This is initially being rolled out to clergy, but the information can be easily shared in graphical form with all in the church.

• Consideration of creating a post of Independent Bullying and Harassment Adviser. Again, the Committee believes it would be premature to bring forward any proposals on this to Synod 2022, as we believe the existing structures, with the Complaints Procedure and Bishops’ Guidance should safely and fairly address most instances, and the Faith and Order Board work should explore issues of governance and accountability for more extreme or difficult cases.

Work also progresses on the wide range of policies and procedures governing areas such as clergy wellbeing, effective ‘terms of service’, handling of vacancies and many other areas. The Committee is working to produce a web-based collection of these policies, procedure and guidance for Synod approval/reception in future years.

Jan Whiteside
Convener, Personnel Committee
Scottish Episcopal Church

I think I’ve been bullied or harassed? What do I do?

https://www.scotland.anglican.org/who-we-are/complaints-procedure/

Problem with a Lay person?
- Raise the issue with them
  - if that fails
    - Escalate to Rector who will raise the issue with them
      - if you are the Rector or if that fails
        - Escalate to the Bishop who may: Set up mediation Issue a warning/reprimand

Problem with a Cleric?
- Raise the issue with them
  - if that fails
    - Escalate to Bishop who will raise the issue with them. This might be informal or a Canon 53 dispute resolution.
      - if that fails and it could be misconduct?
        - You initiate a Canon 54 disciplinary process against the Cleric

Problem with a Bishop?
- Raise the issue with them
  - if that fails
    - Escalate to the Primus who will raise the issue with them. This might be informal or a Canon 53 dispute resolution.
      - if that fails and it could be misconduct?
        - Enter Grievance Procedure from Canon 53
      - A priest has a grievance?
        - You initiate a Canon 54 disciplinary process against the Bishop

Safeguarding issue?
Dial 999 for immediate danger to a child or adult.
Contact Provincial Safeguarding Officer on protection@scotland.anglican.org (tel 0131-225-6357 or 07702-793553)
GUIDANCE FOR DIOCESAN BISHOPS ON HANDLING COMPLAINTS RECEIVED AT DIOCESAN LEVEL USING THE SEC COMPLAINTS PROCEDURE

Any complaint made within SEC structures should be handled according to the SEC Complaints Procedure (approved by General Synod 2021) and, where appropriate, within the constraints of the Canons of the SEC.

There are eight categories of complaint that may be addressed using the SEC Complaints Procedure, noting that the Procedure states that this is not an exhaustive list.

The eight categories (with ones that this advice applies to in bold) are:

1. Complaint regarding a safeguarding issue which must be referred to the Provincial Safeguarding Officer. This advice note does not apply in this category.
2. Complaints against clergy (other than a diocesan bishop). This advice applies when the complaint is ‘escalated’ to the Diocesan Bishop.
3. Complaints against a Diocesan Bishop. This present advice/timescales applies to the Primus/Senior Bishop.
4. Complaints against a lay person in the context of a congregation. This advice applies when the complaint is ‘escalated’ to the Diocesan Bishop.
5. Complaints against a member of a diocesan or provincial board or committee. This advice does not apply in this category.
6. Complaints against a member of diocesan or provincial staff. This advice does not apply in this category.
7. Complaints by a member of diocesan or provincial staff. This advice does not apply in this category.
8. Complaints relating to training at the Scottish Episcopal Institute. This advice does not apply in this category.

In categories 1 and 5 to 8 there are other complaints procedures in place which will not involve a Bishop in handling matters.

In the following two categories:
“2. Complaints against clergy (other than a diocesan bishop)” and
“4. Complaints against a lay person in the context of a congregation.”
where a complaint has been escalated to the Diocesan Bishop, the following advice supports the Bishop in following the Complaints Procedure.

In the category “3. Complaints against a Diocesan Bishop” where a complaint has escalated to either Primus or the Senior Bishop, the following advice supports the Primus or Senior Bishop in following the Complaints Procedure.

Receipt of a Complaint

From the Complaints Procedure: “Any notification of a complaint must be made in writing and include the complainant’s name and contact details, clear details of the complaint, together with any supporting evidence, and a description of steps taken, if any, to resolve the issue before raising it with the Bishop.”
Upon receipt of such a complaint, the initial stages are:

- Acknowledge
- Review
- Respond

**Acknowledge:** On receipt of a complaint, the Bishop must acknowledge this within a week.

**Review:** The Bishop should review the complaint and judge if it is a minor complaint that can be addressed pastorally. If this is not judged possible, the Bishop may conclude that an investigation of the complaint is required. The Bishop must then consider the complaint with a view to determining who would be the most appropriate individual or agency to investigate the complaint. Options might be HR or legal specialists, as well as internal church options (e.g. a Dean, retired Bishop etc.).

**Respond:** If the complaint can be resolved pastorally, that should be communicated to the complainant and, if necessary, to the accused. If an investigation is to be carried out, the fact and the name of the investigator involved parties must be informed. Arrangements for pastoral support of the complainant and accused should also be considered. The letter giving this information should be issued to the involved parties no later than 3 weeks from receipt of the complaint.

**The Investigation**

Communication: it is vital that clear communication from the Bishop to the parties involved regarding the investigation is planned and managed. The parties involved include:

- The complainant
- The accused
- The investigator

The Bishop will also have to consider communication to:

- Witnesses who might be interviewed in the investigation
- The church community that is the context of the complaint

The purpose of conducting an investigation is to establish as best as possible all of the facts relevant to the points made in the complaint and to help the Bishop determine the correct course of action. There is always an element of subjectivity in any investigation.

It is important to be clear from the start of the investigation stage exactly what is being investigated and to ensure that the complainant, the accused and the investigator understand the scope of the investigation. In discussion with the complainant, three key questions should be considered:

1. What specifically is the complaint (or complaints)?
2. What does the complainant hope to achieve by complaining?
3. Do the complainant’s expectations appear to be reasonable and achievable within the pastoral and Canonical framework of the SEC?

If the complainant’s expectations appear to exceed what can reasonably be provided or are not within the Canonical power of the SEC to provide, this should be reported back to the Bishop as soon as possible. The Bishop should inform the complainant of this as soon as possible in order to manage expectations about possible outcomes.

The investigating officer is, as part of the investigation, very likely to have to interview both the complainant and the individual against whom the complaint has been made. Potential witnesses may also have to be interviewed. This process will take time and it is essential that sufficient time is allowed by the investigation officer to undertake this important piece of work. Communication with the church communities should also be considered to avoid rumour or misinformation.

**Outcome of the complaint and investigation**

The investigating officer will report their findings back to the Bishop. The Bishop will use this report to judge the correct course of action within the Complaints Procedure. The options include:

For clergy:

a) No action  
b) Pastoral conversation with the clergyperson  
c) Identify training or support for the clergyperson  
d) Mediation between the parties  
e) Escalating the matter to Canon 53 (The Resolution of Other Disputes and Differences paragraphs 11 to 13) – noting that options a) to d) could all take place under this Canonical provision.  
f) Initiate disciplinary action under Canon 54

For a lay person in the context of a congregation:

a) No action  
b) Pastoral conversation with the lay person (not in the Complaints Procedure)  
c) Mediation  
d) Letter of warning or reprimand  
e) Inviting the vestry to consider the matter  
f) Escalating the matter to Canon 53 (The Resolution of Other Disputes and Differences paragraphs 11 to 13) – options a) to e) could all take place under this Canonical provision

The Bishop will communicate the outcome of the complaint and investigation to the involved parties (including consideration of whether communication is needed with witnesses and the church communities involved).

Rights of Appeal against a decision are allowed within the framework of Canon 53 or Canon 54.
Written Records

A written record must be kept of any complaint made. This written record should describe the nature of the complaint and the process to be followed for its resolution. This document must be approved and signed by all parties involved in the complaint. All other documentation involved in the process should also be kept on record, subject to appropriate confidentiality and data protection principles, for 6 years (unless there were circumstances which require a longer period, such as a safeguarding complaint).
1. Background

1.1 Following the establishment of the SEC’s Ethical Investment Advisory Group (“EIAG”) after General Synod 2019, its Interim Report to General Synod in 2020 and the approval of the Policy Framework for Investment of SEC Unit Trust Pool (“UTP”) Monies in Pooled Funds by General Synod 2021, the EIAG has continued its work to fulfil the initial remit given to it by Standing Committee. The remaining matters requiring to be addressed are:

“a) proposals for a definition of ‘unethical sources of revenue’ for the purposes of the UTP; and

“b) recommendations on a framework for considering and implementing other investment criteria to include any proposals for future investment restrictions and impact investment.”

1.2 The background to ethical investment of the UTP remains highly complex. Several factors need to be borne in mind together.

Compared with many denominations, the SEC is unusual in its high level of dependence on the return it derives from the UTP in fulfilling its on-going missional activities. This results in an acute need to preserve the capital and to maintain a high level of return to support the work of the Church. For a church seeking to manage its affairs consistently with Christian ethical values, however, it is not acceptable simply to maximise the financial return, without regard for the activities of organisations in which its moneys are invested. There are the many potential ethical issues that are faced today by any investor seeking to do good with their money and to avoid doing ill with it. As well as sectors over which there are long established ethical objections, new areas of concern are regularly raised, which may be thought to require varying types of response. The interim report to the 2020 Synod laid out a range of responses, of which, for example, divestment is only one.

Further, there is the very fast-changing picture as regards environmental, social and governance (“ESG”), sustainable and other ethical investment criteria. In the investment marketplace, concerns about such matters are no longer the minority interest that they perhaps once were, but are now mainstream factors for investors to take into account. There are now multi-billion pound industries involved, with more and more providers offering ethical screens for investment and/or ethical funds in which to invest, with multiple sources of rankings of investments on varying bases widely available. Notwithstanding this expansion in interest in ethical investment, it is not at all straightforward to find funds, investment strategies and fund managers which will be an exact match for what SEC requires both ethically and in terms of other investment requirements.

Lastly, it also has to be borne in mind that the UTP funds are relatively small, both in terms of the general investment industry and also compared with funds invested by various other Christian denominations. The SEC does not have the resources to devote time and expenditure to, for example, engaging with companies in order to
influence corporate behaviour, as some larger churches can. To have such influence, SEC must rely on its membership of larger bodies of church investors.

1.3 This background was explored in some detail in the EIAG’s Interim Report of 2020, to which readers are referred. The picture has continued to evolve at a rapid pace since that report was written. Notwithstanding these and other difficult and constantly changing issues, the SEC needs a sound framework to permit it to address the issue of ethical investment in the longer term.

1.4 The challenge for the EIAG to fulfil its initial remit has been summarised as one to propose a robust, and yet sufficiently flexible, set of (a) principles and (b) procedures by which the UTP, under the expert care of the SEC’s Investment Committee and its appointed professional investment managers, might navigate these difficult waters for the foreseeable future.

2. Principles - 'unethical sources of revenue'

2.1 EIAG’s Interim Report, para 3, sets out some broad principles that the EIAG found important to bear in mind when examining what is meant by “ethical investment” for the SEC. Readers are referred to that material for significant background considerations that have influenced our discussions throughout.

2.2 SEC (through General Synod) has taken decisions that certain sources of income are unethical for the UTP, and has put in place exclusionary “restricted categories” that reflect those decisions. Those restricted categories have then been applied by the Investment Committee to investments held directly (i.e. as individual holdings) within the UTP. The restricted categories are as follows:

- Companies deriving more than 15% of their revenue from tobacco, armaments and gambling (excluded by decision of General Synod 1998);
- Companies deriving more than 15% of their revenue from pornography (2013); and
- Companies deriving more than 10% of their revenue from extraction of thermal tar and coal sands (2017).

Since General Synod 2019, although this has not been formally adopted by Synod, the Investment Committee and the managers of the UTP have also applied a rule against investing in companies deriving more than 10% of their revenue from extracting fossil fuels by any means. This subsumes the rule against investing in companies deriving income from extraction of thermal tar and coal sands. There is an argument that in each of the above cases, it might be more straightforward if the percentage figure were set at 10% for the future. We are advised by SEC’s current investment managers that this would cause them no difficulty and we accordingly recommend that that change is made, and that the rule in relation to extraction of fossil fuels is formally adopted.

2.3 However, these restrictions do not easily apply to the parts of the UTP which are in pooled funds, over which SEC, as one investor in the pool amongst many, does not have exclusive power to stipulate exclusions. After General Synod 2021 adopted the EIAG’s proposed Policy Framework, these restricted categories have also been applied to pooled funds within the UTP, by way of the procedures established under
that Framework. At the time of the Investment Committee’s first annual report under the Policy Framework, focussing on the position as at 30 September 2021, the UTP was fully compliant with the Policy Framework.

2.4 EIAG is now tasked with proposing a general definition of “unethical sources of revenue” for the UTP. The challenge in this regard is that, in order to stand the test of time, such a definition needs to be framed broadly, and needs also to take into account the fact that on many issues related to ethical investment, different members and groups of members within the SEC might quite legitimately disagree, notwithstanding their shared theological starting points. Simply by way of example, in a number of other denominational settings, to derive any income at all from the production or sale of alcoholic drinks would be unconscionable. It is understood that in the SEC there would not be unanimity on that issue.

2.5 We have considered a number of different approaches to defining ethical investment utilised not only by other Christian bodies that have significant investments, but also within the wider investment industry, where, as mentioned above, there is currently considerable activity in the constructing and marketing of “ethical” investment funds. Every major investment manager claims to give a role to ethical and/or ESG and/or sustainable investment principles. What has become clear to us is that there is absolutely no standard definition of “ethical” or “unethical” sources of revenue. Indeed, the many league tables that are published ranking companies according to ethical criteria are capable of disagreeing profoundly as to whether investing in any particular company is or is not “ethical”, depending largely on the criteria that the authors take into account when compiling their tables and also the weighting given to those criteria. A company like Tesla, for example, can feature above or below Exxon Mobil in such tables depending on the approach of those compiling the table. Funds marketed as “ethical” can be found to have large holdings that some people, now or in the past, might have considered to be potentially ethically questionable, in (e.g.) oil companies, “big pharma”, brewers/distillers, large banks, mining companies, and/or companies sometimes suggested to underpay or otherwise mistreat their employees.

One broad approach to such matters might be to ask whether, if the company in question doubled in size over the next five years, that would be good or bad for the planet. The answer to such a broad question would nonetheless be open to different answers depending on what one meant by “good” and “bad”, and how one balanced outcomes that might in part be bad and in part good. In the setting of a Christian body, one would want to factor in to such an approach also whether such an expansion would be good or bad for humanity and indeed for the gospel. Further complexities arise when one considers how to apply such criteria to investment not in companies but in government debt, whether of the UK or other countries, another highly topical issue in the ethical investment sphere. There are complexities too in assessing the trajectory of entities, in terms of whether they are at any given time moving towards or further away from the ESG approach that is felt to be most desirable.

2.6 Following lengthy discussion and consideration, our proposal for broad criteria to guide the assessment of what may or may not be an ethical source of revenue for the UTP is as follows:

Does the entity in question tend to promote (or, conversely, to harm):
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a) the health and dignity of human beings, particularly the most disadvantaged in society;
b) the long-term stewardship of the planet; and
c) the mission of the worldwide church?

It is hoped that the theological underpinning of the three aspects of this approach is uncontroversial ((a) love and respect for all our neighbours, made in God’s image, particularly the poor; (b) love and respect for God’s creation, entrusted to us; and (c) the Great Commission and the call to serve others).

2.7 The aim is not that the SEC should use these broad criteria or any one of them to impose more de facto restricted categories – but rather to influence discussions within the SEC with a view to maximising these things, not only by avoiding harmful investment but also seeking out investments that will positively promote desirable outcomes – i.e. “impact investment”.

3. Procedure - a framework for considering and implementing investment criteria, to include restrictions and impact investment.

3.1 By the time of the Interim Report in 2020, EIAG had reached the view that “ethical exclusions”, were not the full answer to ethical investing. We cautioned in that report against rushing to delineate new areas from which simply to divest. Following further consideration, EIAG has reached the general view that simple ethical exclusions are seldom the answer in the complexity of the issues and the organisations, in relation to modern slavery, for example. We have to consider each area on its merits. The full practical (as well as ethical) consequences need to be carefully considered and weighed before any proposal is put before General Synod.

3.2 Nonetheless, there will undoubtedly continue to be issues that arise that require SEC to consider the ethics of how the UTP is invested. As a Christian body, SEC cannot abdicate its responsibility to think about these things, as matters of integrity and faithfulness to the churches’ prophetic role.

3.3 It is simply not possible to predict what all these issues might be. The whole area of fossil fuel extraction gives a very good and clear example of how something can change from being an accepted part of everyday life, and indeed a core element of any responsibly-invested fund, to being something that is known to be the major cause of the climate crisis, and thus ripe for exclusion. Fossil fuels also provide a good example of the complexities that are faced as soon as one begins to reflect on all aspects of such an issue – in the age of the Covid-19 pandemic, we cannot manage at this point in time without significant amounts of single-use plastics, derived from oil, for example for PPE and lateral flow tests; and, further, it perhaps turns out that the primary targets of concern should not be those who extract fossil fuels so much as those who burn them – which in the modern economy means many, many different entities, including the SEC and most of its members. We also acknowledge the ethical dilemma that some of the largest fossil fuel extractors are now attempting to become major players in the transition to green energy. It is difficult, for example, to decide whether one insists that none of a company’s income should come from extracting fossil fuels before one invests, or alternatively permits some small percentage of such income. It is also complex to know how one addresses the issue of trends in a company’s performance in that regard. These
issues must nonetheless be carefully considered, and the product of that consideration fed into the decision-making processes for the UTP investments.

3.4 We have therefore reached the view that, for the future, SEC needs a mechanism whereby both ethical concerns about investments and ideas for investments which aim to make a positive ethical impact can be addressed and evaluated. This should provide input for the Investment Committee to bear in mind, in conjunction with its professional investment managers, on an on-going basis. This will require a standing group within the SEC with the personnel having the appropriate experience and skills, and (if necessary) the budget, to be able to deal effectively with such matters. We are conscious that the initial remit of the EIAG will shortly be completed. We would suggest that either the EIAG should be re-tasked by Standing Committee to undertake this role, or alternatively the EIAG should be disbanded and Standing Committee should be required to set up a replacement group, under whatever title is thought appropriate, to deal with such matters.

3.5 It is vitally important that such a group is properly equipped in all respects to deal with the issues that it has to address. The EIAG has benefitted enormously from having members, all drawn from within the SEC, who bring advanced expertise from the world of finance and investment (including some members of the Investment Committee) and from the world of ethics and theology (including some members of the Church in Society Committee and members of the Clergy) – and indeed some who are equally expert in both worlds. It may be thought to be helpful to have a chair who comes from none of these worlds, but rather plays the role of making sure that all voice are fully heard and properly taken into account.

3.6 As for the mechanism, we feel that an appropriate way forward should be as follows. Such a group should have an on-going remit to be looking out for, investigating and reporting to Standing Committee on such ethical issues. Further, should a member of the church have any concern about the ethical quality of one or more of the holdings in the UTP, or a concern about whether the UTP should or should not be focussed on any particular area of investment, then that concern should be directed to the proposed group. That group would then be responsible for liaising with the Investment Committee and, where relevant, the Church in Society Committee on the issue and investigating and assessing that concern as against the ethical principles outlined above and in the wider setting of ethical investment approaches then current and the practical realities and consequences of various possible courses of action, and to report on that to Standing Committee.

It is possible that such investigation may require the obtaining of external research input, and for that purpose it may be necessary for the group to have a budget allocated to it – the SEC does not have enough resources (in contrast, for example, to the Church of England, with its vastly larger endowments) to generate such research in-house.

The group’s report to Standing Committee could suggest one or more of a range of responses – for example,

- it could suggest that the concern should be noted and highlighted to the Investment Committee, to be given particular weight in its deliberations and discussions with its investment managers;

- it could suggest that nothing more need be done about a particular issue;
• it could suggest that it was desirable for impact investment to be focussed in a particular area;

• or, it could recommend that the Investment Committee engage with its investment managers to seek to influence the composition of funds invested in, to change those funds, or to seek to influence corporate behaviour by a particular company.

It would then be for Standing Committee, as the charity trustees responsible for the UTP, to consider what action to take in light of that report – which may or may not include an instruction to the Investment Committee or a motion being put forward to General Synod to give effect to the group’s recommendation.

3.7 The EIAG accordingly recommends the above framework for considering and implementing ethical investment criteria, in light of the proposed principles.

3.8 Purely as an aid to further discussion, we have appended to this report a draft for the possible remit of such a group. Such a remit would need to be agreed and issued by Standing Committee. We also append a proposed Ethical Investment Policy Statement for the SEC Unit Trust Pool for consideration at General Synod 2022, which, among other things, updates the exclusionary policies as suggested at para 2.2 above.

Alan McLean QC
Chair
Ethical Investment Advisory Group
June 2022

Appendix:

Draft terms of reference/

The Scottish Episcopal Church
[insert name of group]
Terms of Reference

**Name:** [insert name of group], hereinafter referred to as the Group.

**Type:** The Group is an advisory group convened by the Standing Committee of the SEC to support the work of the Investment Committee (IC) in managing the SEC’s Unit Trust Pool (UTP). The Group has no remit in respect of the SEC Pension Fund.

**Purpose:** The Group’s purpose is to support the IC to invest in an ethical manner that aligns with SEC’s Christian beliefs and investment objectives. This will be achieved by offering timely and practical advice on issues such as public policy
issues and ethical screening criteria. Such advice shall be grounded in Christian theology. The advice will be offered by the Group to Standing Committee, as the charity trustees of the General Synod, for consideration and passing on (as appropriate) to the IC.

**Authority:** The Group shall have no investment powers and may act only in an advisory capacity in accordance with its purpose as described above. Advice given by the Group shall not be binding on Standing Committee or the IC.

Nothing herein shall oblige the Group to give advice the nature and circumstances of which would require the Group or any member to obtain a Part 4A permission under the Financial Services and Markets Act 2000. The advice and other activities of the Group are not, and are not to be construed as, financial or investment advice.

With prior approval of Standing Committee, particularly in relation to any expenditure involved, the Group may make arrangements with third parties for such matters as the Group thinks necessary or desirable in connection with the fulfilment of its purpose, for example by engaging independent, technical or professional expert advisors, or commissioning research or theological analysis.

**Accountability:** The Group shall be accountable to Standing Committee. It shall have regard to (but shall not be bound by) opinion expressed in General Synod and shall publish an Annual Report of its activities and lay it before the General Synod.

**Feedback:** In relation to each report by the Group to Standing Committee, Standing Committee will provide a written response to the Group explaining the action that has been taken in light of that report, or, if no such action has been taken, explaining why that is so.

**Membership:** The Group shall have a total membership of at least seven and no more than ten persons, appointed by Standing Committee. At least two members shall be drawn from the members of the IC and at least two members shall be drawn from the members of the Church in Society Committee (CISC). At least two members of the Group shall be members of the clergy, of whom ideally one will be a Bishop.

Standing Committee shall select a Convener who is neither a member of the IC nor of the CISC.

Overall in selecting the members, Standing Committee will ensure that there is an appropriate balance of expertise, independence of thought and diversity among members. Relevant skills and experience might include, but are not limited to, the fields of investment, finance, business, theology, ethics, missional activity and public policy.

The Convener shall seek the advice and support of the SEC Secretariat for any communications relating to the Group, having also consulted with the Standing Committee in relation to any such communication.

The SEC Secretariat will provide general administrative support to the Group.

**Terms of Office:** Members shall be appointed for a term of four years, and may be re-appointed for a further term of four years.
Meetings of the Group: The Group will decide on the frequency of its meetings, and will meet at least once per annum. Such meetings may be held in person or remotely by electronic communication. The group will work collaboratively in consultation with IC, CISC and other groups within the SEC having an interest in the field of ethical investment.

The Group's agenda:

- will include matters recommended and requested by Standing Committee for discussion.
- will include additional items determined by the Convener on behalf of the members of the Group, IC, CISC, or in response to events/current affairs or concerns highlighted by one or more members of the SEC.
- will, on an on-going basis, include an element of 'horizon scanning'.

Minutes: Meetings will be minuted. A draft copy of the minutes will be circulated to all Group members as soon as practicable after the meeting. At the next meeting of the Group the minutes of the previous meeting will be considered and, once agreed to be accurate, will be adopted as a record of the previous meeting.

Quorum: The quorum for meetings of the Group shall be one third (rounded to the nearest whole number) of the members of the Group, provided that the Convener and at least one member drawn from each of the IC and the CISC are present.
Ethical Investment Policy Statement for the SEC Unit Trust Pool (UTP)

The Scottish Episcopal Church (SEC) recognises its members’ duty as Christians to live in society in a manner which represents an effective witness to our Christian faith. In a complex world this is not an easy task and the difficulties are particularly challenging in the context of investing funds in the UTP.

Amongst other matters, we need to consider:

- our duties as responsible stewards of the funds entrusted to the SEC;
- what determines our values and our understanding of ethical investment, recognising that these will develop over time;
- in practical terms, how these may be applied to the UTP on an on-going basis.

1. **Principles of responsible stewardship**

The SEC Ethical Investment Advisory Group’s 2020 report identified three foundational principles:

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

2. **Principles of ethical investment**

Certain categories of investments are deemed to be inconsistent with SEC’s values. The Investment Committee should therefore avoid direct investment in companies deriving more than 10% of their revenues in the following restricted categories:

- Armaments
- Fossil Fuel extraction
- Gambling
- Pornography
- Tobacco
The Investment Committee relies on the use of pooled funds to achieve the investment objectives for the UTP. Pooled funds are the subject of a separate policy which was approved by General Synod 2021 and can be found here. The policy states that the total value of investments in the restricted categories held in pooled funds should be less than 1% of the total value of the UTP.

Ethical investment includes far more than simply avoiding areas that are incompatible with the SEC’s values. It can involve making a commitment to investing in areas that actively produce social and environmental benefits.

Useful broad criteria to guide the assessment of what may or may not be an ethical source of revenue for the UTP are the positive or negative impacts of the entity in question on:

a) the health and dignity of human beings, particularly the most disadvantaged in society;

b) the long-term stewardship of the planet; and

c) the mission of the worldwide church.

Assessment of ESG criteria (Environmental, Social and Governance) can be a useful tool for understanding how seriously a company takes such questions and integrates them into its business practices. However, as yet there is no universally accepted standard for assessing relative ESG performance. The Investment Committee therefore depends on its investment and fund managers for analysis of ESG performance of the companies it selects for investment. The Church Investors Group (CIG), of which the SEC is a member, conducts valuable research in this area.

When considering the appointment of an investment manager for the UTP, the Investment Committee will seek to appoint a firm that can demonstrate a responsible and progressive ESG policy.

In addition, SEC should have regard, where possible, to the desirability of investing the UTP in funds with a focus on making a positive contribution in one or more of the following areas:

- Developments in human health, wellbeing, education and communications.
- Sustainable development of just and peaceful societies.
- Businesses that minimise and mitigate the harmful effects of industry, recognising that all human activity has an impact on the planet.

3. Practical considerations

In selecting appropriate funds to invest in, the practical considerations include balancing ethical criteria with the need to meet the investment objectives and the resources required to administer the UTP.

This raises questions of how appropriate funds should be selected for the UTP, the triggers that will result in an immediate review of on-going suitability, the frequency of routine reviews and reporting requirements, and the process for considering future ethical investment concerns and opportunities as and when they arise.
(a) Selection and monitoring of funds

- A pooled fund under consideration for the UTP must comply with the SEC’s Policy Framework on Investment of SEC Unit Trust Pool Monies in Pooled Funds at the outset.
- Investment Committee will engage with the UTP’s investment manager on ESG issues at least annually.
- Investment Committee will have regard to the level of impact investment in any fund under consideration for investment and in the UTP as a whole.
- Investment Committee will include an impact investment statement in its annual compliance report to Standing Committee.
- Investment Committee will include ethical investment criteria in its formal review of the UTP’s investments which takes place every three years.

(b) Triggers to change fund or investment manager

- Investment Committee is required to report to Standing Committee on options for action in the event of non-compliance in terms of the SEC’s Policy Framework for investment in pooled funds.
- Timing of any divestment will be dependent on the identification of an appropriate alternative fund that meets ethical and investment criteria and/or an appropriate alternative investment manager.

(c) Framework for investigating ethical concerns

It is recognised that issues will arise that require SEC to consider the ethics of how the UTP is invested. The SEC recognises its responsibility to give careful consideration to such areas of concern.

Standing Committee will appoint and oversee an advisory group to be tasked with looking out for such issues and assessing ethical investment concerns raised by SEC groups or individual members and providing advice to Standing Committee in that regard. In carrying out its work, the group will act collaboratively in consultation with IC, CISC and other groups within SEC having an interest in the field of ethical investment.

The Terms of Reference for that group will be as set by Standing Committee from time to time.

---

Synod will recall that the Provincial Committee for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults (known as the Safeguarding Committee) conducted a Safeguarding Audit in 2018/2019 and, since then, the Safeguarding Committee has been working on implementing the Audit’s recommendations and developing relevant changes to safeguarding structures across the Province.

In doing so, the Committee has been monitoring developments across safeguarding generally and, more particularly, within other faith organisations and an area of criticism and concern that is raised regularly in the review of safeguarding cases is the absence of appropriate external review and scrutiny.

This is an aspect of safeguarding in faith organisations that is also most likely to draw criticism from the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse (IICSA) when it delivers its final report later this summer and, whilst any recommendations in this respect will apply to England and Wales, it is reasonable to assume that, in due course, similar developments will be expected of faith organisations in Scotland.

In anticipation of this, the Safeguarding Committee, with the support of the Standing Committee, is proposing that safeguarding within the SEC should be strengthened with changes to the membership of the Safeguarding Committee. It is proposing to include within the membership of the Safeguarding Committee up to two additional individuals from outwith the Scottish Episcopal Church with safeguarding management experience at a senior level in a relevant profession to provide an appropriate independent perspective.

The Committee recognises that this proposal requires a change to the Digest of Resolutions and a motion is included on the Synod agenda to effect this change.

Richard Baker
Convener
Committee for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults
THE GENERAL SYNOD – RULES OF ORDER

Experience of debate at General Synod in recent years has given rise to a need to revisit the Rules of Order of the Synod and Standing Committee proposes some improvements.

The meeting of General Synod should be a place where issues can be debated openly in a framework which respects the democratic principles underlying synodical government and which, at the same time, ensures good governance so that those participating in debate and voting can do so on an informed basis. Whilst there may be occasions where, because of particular circumstances, an "emergency" motion is appropriate, in normal circumstances, Synod members should have adequate prior notice of issues to be discussed and access to appropriate information on which to make a judgement.

Provincial boards and committees devote considerable time to preparing material or developing proposals for Synod and have the opportunity to explore and discuss issues in that preparatory process. Ultimately, of course, Synod accepts, amends or rejects such proposals. Where Synod decides to reject proposals in favour of a different approach, Synod members should have adequate opportunity to consider any proposed alternative, and the board or committee in question should have adequate opportunity to consider and respond.

There are currently a number of routes through which material may come to General Synod. Most material appears because it is specifically included on the agenda. Under Canon 52.2, Standing Committee has the responsibility of agreeing the agenda for General Synod. Boards and committees and Diocesan Synods have the opportunity to invite Standing Committee to include material on the agenda. Synod members are also given the opportunity to propose motions for Synod. In the letter sent out in March each year convening the Synod, a deadline is given for members to suggest any motions they wish, so that Standing Committee can consider whether to include such motions on the agenda. Where Standing Committee decides not to include such a motion it must notify Synod members of that and give reasons for non-inclusion. A further route for Synod members to bring motions to Synod is the “private motion” procedure under Rule 10 of the Rules of Order.

Notice of Rule 10 Motions

As the Rules stand at present, notice of a Rule 10 motion “should normally” be given to the Secretary General before Synod begins. Any such motion needs to be signed by the mover and seconder and supported by 12 members present at the meeting. Standing Committee considers that, generally, it would be helpful for there to be longer notice of Rule 10 motions because notice given immediately before the Synod begins can deny the opportunity for meaningful response from the convener of the board or committee whose original proposals may be countered. Notice given immediately before the beginning of a Synod meeting also means that Synod members themselves have inadequate time to consider such matters, thus hindering informed debate.

Standing Committee therefore proposes that in future notice of a Rule 10 motion should be given at least 7 days before the Synod meeting is due to start. This
proposed change would require notification to be given in writing. Those supporting the motion would similarly be required to confirm their support in writing.

There may be some circumstances where it is impractical to give 7 days’ notice – for example a motion relating to an event which arises just before, or during, General Synod. Rule 15 already allows temporary suspension of the Rules of Order by a two thirds vote. Thus there is a mechanism to waive the requirement for 7 days’ notice if the Synod considers that appropriate.

**Countermotions**

The Rules of Order already include a process for making amendments to motions. Notice of amendments is not required in advance of the meeting and Standing Committee does not propose any change to that process. However, it expresses the hope that where members know in advance that they wish to propose an amendment they will give notice in advance.

The question of what constitutes a competent amendment is ultimately a decision for the Chair, as advised by the Assessor. An amendment which, for example, alters the terms of a motion to say the opposite of the original motion would not be competent. In such circumstances, if Synod is unhappy with the terms of the original motion, it is open to it to vote the motion down. There may, however, be circumstances in which it would be appropriate for Synod to consider alternative motions. The Rules do not currently envisage the possibility of “countermotions”. Standing Committee considers it would be helpful to provide an explicit process for countermotions and is, therefore, bringing forward an expansion of the Rules to enable such a possibility.

The countermotion procedure would apply if, for example, a Rule 10 motion in effect represents an alternative to an existing motion on the Synod agenda. The proposed changes to the Rules also allow the Standing Committee to use the countermotion procedure if it feels it would be helpful to place other options on the agenda for Synod’s consideration.

Under the proposed new procedure where a motion is received which is a countermotion to a motion already included on the agenda (the original motion) the process can be represented as follows:
The original motion is considered and any amendments are voted on so that the form of the motion is finalised.

The countermotion is considered and any amendments are voted on so that the form of the motion is finalised.

Synod votes on which of the two motions it wishes to debate substantively. The motion receiving the fewer votes is rejected.

Synod proceeds to debate the remaining motion and votes on it substantively.

**Amendment of the Rules**

Standing Committee proposes that the General Synod agree a new Rule 16. As mentioned above, the Rules of Order can be temporarily suspended or amended by a two thirds vote of the Synod. In the past, where amendments to the Rules have been made, they have required only a simple majority (ie more than 50% of those present and voting). If the Rules can be suspended or amended temporarily on the basis of a two thirds vote, it seems consistent that any long-term amendment of the Rules should similarly be subject to a two thirds majority requirement.

**Other Alterations**

Since it is proposing revisions to the Rules, Standing Committee is also taking the opportunity to propose a few other minor clarificatory changes:
• Rule 8: clarification that the Chair has discretion to allow speeches for
speakers other than the mover of the motion to be either longer or shorter
than the stated 5 minute limit.

• Rule 12: it is proposed to delete the second sentence of paragraph (c) since
voting on elections, appointments etc is dealt with by Rule 13 and the wording
in paragraph (c) is inconsistent with that.

• Rule 12 (d): wording is introduced to allow flexibility in relation to voting in the
event that the meeting is being conducted, wholly or partly, on a virtual basis.

• Rule 14: the wording is being changed to align it with the wording of Canon
52.15.

Bridget Campbell
Convener, Standing Committee
April 2022
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 to permit either a longer or shorter duration. 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 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.

(g) 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.

(h) In circumstances where the Standing Committee wishes to place a different option or options on the agenda for the Synod’s consideration, it shall have power to include on the agenda two or more motions which are alternative or contradictory to one another and in such cases shall state that the counter-motion procedure set out in Rule 10(e) below shall apply. In any such case, the counter-motion procedure shall apply, so that the motion appearing first on the agenda shall be considered the original motion and any further motion or motions shall be regarded as if they were Rule 10 motions for the purposes of applying the counter-motion procedure and as if they had been received in the order in which they are placed on the agenda.

10. Rule 10 Motions

(a) Notice of Rule 10 motions shall be given in writing (to the Secretary General) at least seven days before Synod starts.

(b) The motion shall be in writing, and signed by the mover and seconder, and supported by no fewer than twelve members (excluding the mover and seconder of the motion) of Synod who must be present at the meeting at which it is intended to move the motion. The support of each of such twelve (or more) members shall be evidenced either:-
by their confirming such support, at least seven days before Synod starts, by providing to the Secretary General a copy of the motion bearing their signature; or

by their confirming such support, at least seven days before Synod starts, in writing to the Secretary General, and by thereafter providing to the Secretary General, no later than the start of Synod, a copy of the motion bearing their signature.

(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.

(e) If, in the opinion of the Convener of the Standing Committee, a Rule 10 motion comprises a counter-motion (as defined in paragraph (f) below) to a motion which has been included in the agenda for the meeting in question, and if a two thirds majority as required by the immediately preceding paragraph (d) has been achieved, the following procedure shall apply:

- the Synod shall first consider and vote on any amendments to the original motion;
- the Synod shall then consider and vote on any amendments to the Rule 10 motion or motions;
- once all such amendments have been dealt with, a vote shall be taken between the motions (that is the original motion included in the agenda (as amended by any amendments accepted by the Synod)) and the Rule 10 motion(s) (as amended by any amendments accepted by the Synod) in the order in which the motions were made, beginning with the first. Synod members may vote for one motion only. If, on the results being announced, one motion has obtained a clear majority of votes, the other motion (or all other motions, as the case may be) shall fall; but if no motion has obtained a clear majority, the motion having the smallest number of votes shall be struck off and votes shall be taken between the remaining motions until all remaining motions have been disposed of;
- once the number of motions under the procedure set out above has been reduced to one, the Synod shall consider that remaining motion and vote on it.
A counter-motion is a motion which is contradictory or negative of a motion which has been included in the agenda for the meeting or of a substantial part of such a motion. A counter-motion therefore differs from an amendment to a motion because an amendment is not substantially contradictory of the original motion but makes deletions, alterations or additions without defeating the main object of the original motion).

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.

   (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. The Chair may direct that votes be taken electronically. Where the meeting is being conducted by members being present by an audio or audio-visual link, votes may be cast by some form of visual indication, or by use of a voting button or similar, or by way of a message sent electronically - and providing the Chair has no reasonable grounds for suspicion as regards authenticity, any such action shall be deemed to be a vote cast personally.
(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 Primus shall appoint an assessor, who may be a member of the Synod, on the nomination of the Standing Committee of the General Synod with the approval of the College of Bishops, 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.
16. Amendment of Rules

Any or all of these Rules of Order may be 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.
RULES OF ORDER OF THE GENERAL SYNOD  
(Amended 12 June 1997, 7 June 2012, 12 June 2014)

1. Application

These rules of order shall apply to the proceedings of the General Synod whether sitting as one body or in separate Houses of Bishops, other Clergy and Laity.

2. The Chair – Powers and Duties

Deference shall at all times be paid to the authority of the Chair. All points of order shall be addressed to the person occupying the Chair, stated briefly and audibly, and raised immediately the perceived irregularity occurs, otherwise the person occupying the Chair shall disallow them. Points of order shall not introduce new subject matter. Speeches shall not be allowed on points of order. Where, in the view of the person occupying the Chair, the matter raised does not constitute a point of order, the person occupying the Chair shall rule accordingly. On all points of order the ruling from the Chair shall be final and not open to discussion. When the person occupying the Chair rises to speak, any member of the Synod who is addressing the meeting shall sit down.

It shall be the responsibility of the person occupying the Chair to preserve order and secure that members obtain a fair hearing, to decide all matters of order arising at meetings of the Synod and to decide, if two or more members rise in their places, which to call to speak. In the event of disorder arising at any meeting of the Synod, the meeting may be adjourned by the person occupying the chair who shall also, then or subsequently, fix a time for its reconvening. Quitting the Chair in such circumstances shall, without further procedure, have the effect of a formal adjournment of the meeting.

3. Order of Debate

Members desiring to speak shall indicate their desire to do so in the manner directed by the person occupying the Chair, or in the absence of any other direction, by raising their hand. Those called upon to speak shall address the Chair. Speeches shall be directed to the motion or amendment being proposed, seconded or otherwise under discussion or to a question of order. No member shall be allowed to speak more often than once on any subject under discussion, save on a point of order or, with consent of the Chair, to make an explanation, but the mover of a motion shall have a right of reply. A member who is speaking when a question of order is raised shall stop speaking until the question of order has been decided by the person occupying the Chair.

4. Matters Taken in Private

The Synod may decide by a majority of those present and voting that:-

(a) any business shall be taken in private;
(b) the Synod shall go into Committee for the informal discussion of any subject;
(c) the Synod shall go into groups for the informal discussion of any subject (in which case minutes of such informal discussion need not be taken).

Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Chair shall have power to direct that the Synod shall break into small groups, for a period not exceeding 10 minutes, for the informal discussion of any subject (in which case minutes of such informal discussion need not be taken).

5. Adjournment

(a) Any meeting of the Synod may be adjourned to such other place, time or day and hour as may be set by the person occupying the Chair.
(b) Any meeting of the Synod may be adjourned to a later time on the same day and such an adjournment may be made on the direction from the Chair, or failing such direction, on the motion of any member, the vote on which motion, on being seconded, shall without amendment or discussion be taken by a show of hands as one House.

6. Quorum

The Quorum of the Synod shall be one half of the eligible membership of the House of Clergy and of the House of Laity and not less than three members of the House of Bishops, but no business shall be invalid because transacted without a quorum being present, unless the attention of the Chair has been called to the absence of a quorum. The person occupying the chair shall then ascertain, in such a way as seems fit, that no quorum is present, and declare the fact. This shall be a responsibility of the person occupying the chair, whose declaration, whether or not a quorum is present, shall be final. If it has been declared from the Chair that no quorum is present, no business shall be transacted until a quorum is declared from the Chair to be present except: (a) the consideration of a motion to adjourn; (b) such non-contentious business as the meeting, with consent of the person occupying the chair, sees fit to transact. If, however, a division is challenged on any subject other than on a motion for adjournment, the same shall not be dealt with by the meeting. No motion for adjournment shall be submitted until at least fifteen minutes after the declaration from the Chair that a quorum is not present, except with the consent of the person occupying the Chair.

7. Obstructive or Offensive Conduct

(a) In the event of any member at any Synod meeting disregarding the authority of the Chair, or being guilty of obstructive or offensive conduct, a motion may thereupon be moved and seconded to suspend
such member for the remainder of the sitting. The motion shall be put without discussion.

(b) The person occupying the Chair shall warn any member of the public who interrupts the proceedings at any meeting. If that member of the public continues the interruption the person occupying the Chair shall order the person concerned to leave the meeting, and not return.

8. Duration of Speeches

The mover of a motion shall not speak for more than ten minutes except with the consent of Synod. All other speakers taking part in the discussion on the motion or amendment shall not normally speak for more than five minutes, subject to the discretion of the person occupying the Chair. The mover of the original motion shall have the right to speak for five minutes in reply, but shall not introduce any new matter into the debate. Thereafter the discussion shall be held closed and the question shall thereupon be put from the Chair.

9. Motions

(a) The Synod shall consider only the following motions:

(i) motions which have been included in the agenda and papers for that meeting;

(ii) motions which the Synod has agreed to consider in terms of Rule 10;

(iii) formal or procedural motions.

(b) All motions and amendments shall be stated, immediately on their being proposed to the meeting, by the mover, before being spoken to. All motions under Rule 9 (a) (ii) and all amendments shall be submitted in writing, signed by the mover and seconder and delivered to the Secretary General immediately on being moved.

(c) Every amendment shall be relevant to the motion on which it is moved. A motion may be amended by the mover with the consent of the meeting, which consent shall be by the majority of those present and voting. In the case of a motion emanating from a Diocesan Synod or from a Board or Committee of the General Synod, the mover of that motion shall have the power, unless specifically denied it by the body from which the motion has emanated, to accept the amendment to that motion, thus altering the text of the motion on which the Synod is asked to vote.

(d) A motion or amendment may be withdrawn by the mover with the consent of the seconder of the motion or amendment, but the Synod shall have power by simple majority of those present and voting to refuse to allow such withdrawal, in which case the motion shall stand.
(e) Motions or amendments which are not seconded shall not be discussed or inserted in the minutes.

(f) If, in the opinion of the person occupying the chair, more than one motion deals with the same subject matter, only the motion first lodged with the Secretary General (whether by hand delivery or by post) shall be considered and if, in the opinion of the person occupying the chair, any motion deals with a matter already under consideration by a Board or Committee, that motion shall not be considered.

(g) If a member who has submitted a notice of motion is not present to move the motion, the motion shall fall, unless Synod agrees that another member may move the motion.

(h) No motion of any kind which involves a grant of money shall be competent unless it is printed in the programme of business with the observations of the Board or Committee within whose budget the grant would fall, with power to the Chair on special occasions to take the sense of the meeting with reference to matters appearing in the programme of business and, if satisfied, to dispense with the necessity of observations by the appropriate Board or Committee. Except as above provided, no motion (other than votes of thanks) shall be entertained unless notice has been given to the Secretary General in reasonable time to enable it to be entered in the programme of business, unless the person occupying the Chair sees fit to put the question to the meeting that want of notice shall be dispensed with and interprets it as the evident sense of the meeting that this be allowed. There shall be no poll on the question, but a show of hands may be taken to assist in coming to a decision.

10. Rule 10 Motions

(a) Notice of Rule 10 motions should normally be given in writing (to the Secretary General) before Synod starts.

(b) The motion shall be in writing, and signed by the mover and seconder, and supported by the signatures of twelve members (excluding the mover and seconder of the motion) of Synod who are present at the meeting.

(c) The mover of a motion under this Rule shall be given the opportunity to address Synod briefly (maximum of two minutes) as to why the Synod should consider the motion at that time before a vote is taken on whether the Motion should be considered.

(d) Subject to any contrary provision in the Code of Canons, in order for a Rule 10 motion to be considered by Synod, a two thirds majority of those present and voting shall vote in favour of its being considered.
11. **Motion: “That the Question be now put”**.

   (a) The amendment called “The previous question” shall not be allowed.

   (b) It shall be competent for any member who has not spoken on the question before the meeting to move “that the question be now put”. On this being seconded, if it seems to the person occupying the chair that the question before the meeting has been sufficiently discussed, a vote shall be taken, without amendment or discussion. If the motion is carried, the mover of the original motion shall have a right to reply, and the question under discussion shall then be put to the meeting. If the motion “that the question be now put” is not carried, a similar motion may be made after every three additional members have spoken.

12. **Voting**

   (a) After the question on which the vote is to be taken has been announced, and voting has commenced, no member shall be permitted to offer an opinion, or ask a question, except on a point of order, or otherwise interrupt the proceedings until the result of the vote has been intimated.

   (b) Save as otherwise provided, all motions and amendments shall be passed by a majority of the members of the Synod present and voting.

   (c) The person occupying the chair shall have a deliberative but not a casting vote. Where the matter which is the subject of the vote relates to the appointment of a member of the Synod to any particular office or committee, voting shall be by ballot.

   (d) When the question is put to the vote, tellers shall be named from the Chair and shall give in their report of each division taken. Except where otherwise stated in these Rules of Order, the vote may be taken in the first instance on a show of hands, the result, in the opinion of the person occupying the chair, being declared therefrom. In all cases of doubt the vote shall be taken by counting the hands held up. On any question, if one third of the present and voting members of any House so wish, voting shall be by ballot.

   (e) When voting by Houses, the Houses must meet separately if one third of the present and voting members of any House so wishes. When the Synod votes by Houses, the numbers of the vote in each House shall be recorded, and a majority of those present and voting shall be required in each House for the passing of the motion.

   (f) A challenge to the accuracy of the minutes shall be made by way of amendment to the motion that the minutes be approved. Only those members who were present at the previous meeting to which the minutes relate shall be entitled to vote on the said amendment.
13. **Election, Selection or Appointment of Members to Office**

In the case of election, selection or appointment by Synod of a member of the Synod or of any other person to any office where the number of candidates nominated exceeds the number of vacancies, the member or person to be elected, selected or appointed as the case may be shall be determined by a vote (or votes) by ballot in (each of) which members will be entitled to vote for as many candidates as there are vacancies. No member may record in the ballot more than one vote for any candidate. The candidate or candidates having the highest number of votes shall be declared duly elected. If there is equality of votes for the last vacancy, this shall be resolved by ballot or by a show of hands.

14. **Assessor**

The Standing Committee of the General Synod shall nominate an assessor, who may be a member of the Synod, but the assessor shall intervene as assessor only on the call of the Chair, without prejudice to the right of the assessor when a member of the Synod to speak and vote as such.

15. **Suspension of Rules**

The application of any or all of these Rules of Order may be temporarily suspended or amended by a majority amounting to two-thirds of those present and voting. Voting shall be as one House.

RULE 10 MOTIONS: PRACTICE NOTE

Before considering presenting a motion Synod members are encouraged to liaise with the Secretary General in order to consult with the Board to whom the matter will be delegated if the motion is passed. It is expected that in a majority of cases this will result in a co-operative response where the matter is taken on to the Board’s agenda, and the need for a Rule 10 Motion will pass. Most matters can be dealt with using this process during the year through consultation with the relevant diocesan representative.
GENERAL SYNOD: A REFLECTION ON MORNING AND EVENING PRAYER

You make the dawn and the dusk to sing for joy (Psalm 65.8)

Within the daily rhythm of life, we become aware, when day breaks and when night falls, of moments of significance. A day begins and a day ends, never to return. Time has moved on during that day, and we have drawn a little nearer to whatever our end will be. Tomorrow will be another day, with a significance of its own. It will not be merely a repeat of today, no matter how many similarities there may be. Each day thus comes to us as a distinctive gift. We do not make it. We can only receive it. We may learn to receive it with gratitude and to return thanks for it to the God of creation, the giver of life.

Every day will I bless you
and praise your name for ever and ever. (Psalm 145.2)

Thus it is that human beings, whatever their religious persuasion, have instinctively offered prayer at each day’s beginning and ending. At daybreak, prayer expresses gratitude for the passing of the night and for the gift of the new day. It offers to God all that is to be done and experienced as the day runs its course. At nightfall, prayer again expresses gratitude for what the day has brought and invites reflection on our use or perhaps misuse of it, entrusting our lives once again to God’s care during the hours of darkness.

Father, hallowed be your name, your kingdom come. (Luke 11.2)

Prayer becomes part of the rhythm of life, of waking and sleeping, of working and resting. The sun and the moon, as time’s markers, bring the further seasonal rhythms of winter and spring, summer and autumn. All these rhythms lead us to celebrate and reflect on the mystery of life itself, of our waking to life and of the coming sleep of death. Faith leads us further, to see in the passage from light to darkness and from night to morning an image of Christ’s surrender to death and, with his being raised from death, the promise of a new creation, the goal towards which all our labours, as people of faith, are directed.

Rejoice always, pray without ceasing, give thanks in all circumstances, for this is the will of God in Christ Jesus. (1 Thessalonians 5.16f)

Morning and Evening prayer thus form the frame within which the activities of each day take place. They are the beginning and the ending of each day’s work. When, for example, the General Synod of our Church meets, Morning Prayer begins the day’s business and Evening Prayer brings it to a conclusion. Both express the context of faith which informs the entire work of Synod. Both offer us the opportunity to draw deeply on the words of the sacred writings (psalms, canticles, readings and prayers) and allow them to become the voice of our own prayer.

“[The Psalms] are the bright mirror in which we become more deeply conscious of what is happening to us”. (Cassian, conferences X.11)

Both Morning and Evening Prayer are there, not as optional extras for the piously inclined, but as the means by which we are reminded, as we begin and as we end the business of Synod, of the heart of the matter: the God through whom, in whom and for whom we exist.

“He prays unceasingly who combines prayer with necessary duties and duties with prayer. Only in this way can we find it practicable to fulfil the commandment to pray always. It consists in regarding the whole of Christian existence as a single great prayer. What we are accustomed to call prayer is only a part of it.” (Origen, On Prayer)

Note: Copies of the most recent edition of Daily Prayer (which includes Morning and Evening Prayer, Night Prayer (Compline) and the Psalter) are available from the General Synod Office, Price £9.00.
GENERAL SYNOD MEMBERS 2022

House of Bishops
Most Rev Mark Strange
Rt Rev Kevin Pearson
Rt Rev Dr John Armes
Rt Rev Anne Dyer
Rt Rev Andrew Swift
Rt Rev Ian Paton
Rt Rev Dr Keith Riglin

Standing Committee Members not Otherwise Diocesan Representatives
Ms Bridget Campbell
Mr James Gibson
Ms Jenny Whelan
Very Rev Sarah Murray

ACC Representative
Canon Alistair Dinnie (not attending)

Aberdeen & Orkney Clergy
Rev Canon Neil Brice
Rev Dr Ruth Green
Rev Canon Vittoria Hancock
Rev Dr Jennifer Holden
Very Rev Dr Emsley Nimmo
Rev Canon Terry Taggart

Aberdeen & Orkney Laity
Dr Martin Auld (not attending 2022)
Mr Brian Harris
Dr Julia House
Mrs Virginia Irvine-Fortescue (not attending 2022)
Dr Nicola Mills

Argyll & The Isles Clergy
Very Rev Margaret Campbell
Rev Rebekah Cansdale
Rev Amanda Fairclough
Rev Alexander Guinness
Rev Canon Peter Moger
Rev David Railton

Argyll & The Isles Clergy Alternates
Rev Rosemary Bungard

Argyll & The Isles Laity
Mr Robert MacDonald
Ms Marion MacKay
Ms Sally McKim
Mr Michael Smith-Tennent
Two Members, names not disclosed
Argyll & The Isles Laity Alternates
One Member, name not disclosed

Brechin Clergy
Rev Roxanne Campbell  
Rev Denise Herbert
Rev Mary Jepp
Rev Peter Mead
Very Rev Dr Elizabeth Thomson
One Member, name not disclosed

Brechin Clergy Alternate
Rev Canon Kerry Dixon  (not attending 2022)
Rev Canon Michael Turner
Ven Canon Dr Ian Young

Brechin Laity
Mrs Valerie Beveridge
Mr Peter Chaffer
Mr Steven Coull
Ms Jean Fenwick
Ms Susan Rowe

Brechin Laity Alternates
Mrs Judith Chaffer
Mrs Harold Jack
Dr Jaap Jacobs

Edinburgh Clergy
Very Rev Frances Burberry
Very Rev John Conway
Rev Canon Dean Fostekew
Rev Diana Hall
Rev Dr Stephen Holmes
Rev Canon Dr Sophia Marriage
Rev Nicola McNelly
Rev David Paton-Williams
Rev Canon David Richards
Rev Elizabeth Talbot
Rev Susan Ward
One Member, name not disclosed

Edinburgh Laity
Dr Vicki Clark
Mrs Victoria Elliott
Mrs Karen Ellis  (not attending 2022)
Ms Emma Forrest
Ms Liza Garcia
Mr Ian Kerry
Dr Anne Martin
Mr Barnaby Miln
Ms Helen Mitchell
Mrs Wendy Pemble  
Ms Helen Vincent  
Dr Helen Wright  
One Member, name not disclosed

**Glasgow & Galloway Clergy**  
Rev Janice Aiton  
Rev Canon Oliver Brewer-Lennon  
Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth  
Rev Harriet Johnston  
Rev Matthew Little  
Rev Wilhelmina Nesbitt  
Very Rev Reuben Preston  
Rev Canon Jane Ross  
Rev Paul Singh Job Retnaselvam  
Rev Canon Dr Nicholas Taylor  
Rev Martyn Trembath

**Glasgow & Galloway Clergy Alternates**  
Rev Deborah Davison  
Rev Canon Gordon Fyfe  
Rev Heller Gonzalez Pena  
Rev Dominic Ind

**Glasgow & Galloway Laity**  
Mr Ray Gascoigne  
Miss Trudy Hill  
Mrs Anne Jones  
Mrs Carol Lovett  
Mr Petko Marinov  
Miss Morag O'Neill  
Mr Nigel Rayner  
Dr David Simmons  
Mrs Jan Whiteside  
Two Members, names not disclosed

**Glasgow & Galloway Laity Alternates**  
Mr Paul Hindle  
Mr Richard Horrell  
Mr Richard Smith  
One Member, name not disclosed

**Moray, Ross & Caithness Clergy**  
Rev Julia Boothby  
Rev Canon Dr James Currall  
Rev Dr Hamilton Inbadas  
Rev Katrina O'Neil  
Rev Tembu Rongong  
Rev Simon Scott  
Very Rev Alison Simpson  
*(not attending 2022)*
Moray, Ross & Caithness Clergy Alternates
Rev Eleanor Charman (attending 2022)

Moray, Ross & Caithness Laity
Mr Michael Campbell
Mr Iain Foyers
Ms Alison Garraway
Mr Hugh Morison
Mrs Deborah Munday
One Member, name not disclosed

Moray, Ross & Caithness Laity Alternates
One Member, name not disclosed

St Andrews, Dunkeld & Dunblane Clergy
Rev Canon Liz Baker
Rev Canon Dr Alasdair Coles (not attending 2022)
Rev Bonnie Evans-Hills
Rev Samantha Ferguson
Rev Canon Prof Trevor Hart
Rev Carol Latimer
Rev Dean Norby (not attending 2022)
Very Rev Graham Taylor
Rev Christoph Wutscher

St Andrews, Dunkeld & Dunblane Clergy Alternates
Rev Genevieve Evans (attending 2022)

St Andrews, Dunkeld & Dunblane Laity
Dr Anthony Birch
Mrs Linda Brownlie
Mr Robert Dickson
Mr Euan Grant
Mrs Sue Hoare (not attending 2022)
Mrs Shirley Mann
Mrs Jean Richardson
Mrs Elizabeth Roads
Prof Alan Werritty

St Andrews, Dunkeld & Dunblane Laity Alternates
Mrs Isabelle Pottinger
Ms Lesley Whitwood (attending 2022)
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
May 2022
# SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CHURCH

## REPRESENTATION ON OTHER BODIES/ORGANISATIONS – May 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Body/Organisation</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Appointing Body</th>
<th>Start Date*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANGLICAN COMMUNION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican Consultative Council</td>
<td>Alistair Dinnie</td>
<td>Standing Committee</td>
<td>2016-25 2022-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican Communion Standing Committee</td>
<td>Primus (alternate member)</td>
<td>Primates Meeting</td>
<td>2022*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anglican Communion Networks and Commissions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Network</td>
<td>John Rea</td>
<td>Mission Board</td>
<td>2007*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Network</td>
<td>Alan Werritty</td>
<td>Mission Board</td>
<td>2003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Network</td>
<td>Ley-Anne Forsyth</td>
<td>Mission Board</td>
<td>2020*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Anglican Liturgical Commission Working Partly on Church Calendars</td>
<td>Rev Canon Dr Nicholas Taylor</td>
<td>Liturgy Committee</td>
<td>2021*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter Anglican Liturgical Commission Working Group on Formation</td>
<td>Dr John Davies</td>
<td>Liturgy Committee</td>
<td>2021*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican Communion Science Commission</td>
<td>Bishop of Brechin as Episcopal Link</td>
<td>College of Bishops</td>
<td>2022*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTS (Action of Churches Together in Scotland)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee Board</td>
<td>Paul Goldfinch</td>
<td>Faith and Order Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members’ Meeting</td>
<td>Bishop of Edinburgh Rev Canon Professor Charlotte Methuen (Alternate) Miriam Weibye¹</td>
<td>College of Bishops Faith and Order Board</td>
<td>2017 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CEAS (formerly Scottish Sunday School Union)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lorraine Darlow</td>
<td>Mission Board</td>
<td>2015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHURCH OF SCOTLAND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Art and Architecture</td>
<td>Rebecca Cadie Alex Stewart (Alternate)</td>
<td>Buildings Committee</td>
<td>2008* 2005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COUNCIL OF THE CHURCH SERVICE SOCIETY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rev Christoph Wutscher</td>
<td>Liturgy Committee</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CTBI (Churches Together in Britain and Ireland)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRJN (Churches Racial Justice Network)</td>
<td>Rev Timothy Njuguna</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>2008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s Ministry Network</td>
<td>Lorraine Darlow</td>
<td>Mission Board</td>
<td>2013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Representatives Forum</td>
<td>John Stuart²</td>
<td>ex officio Secretary General</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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 The Forum comprises senior denominational officers ex officio.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Body/Organisation</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Appointing Body</th>
<th>Start Date*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIACONAL ASSOCIATION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND</strong></td>
<td>Rev Norma Higgott</td>
<td>Faith and Order Board</td>
<td>2016*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FAITH IN COMMUNITY SCOTLAND ACTION FUND</strong></td>
<td>Rev Canon Fay Lamont</td>
<td>Church in Society (annual reappointment)</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GLENALMOND COUNCIL</strong></td>
<td>Primus</td>
<td><em>ex officio</em> College of Bishops</td>
<td>2014*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERFAITH GROUP ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE</strong></td>
<td>Hilary Moran</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERFAITH SCOTLAND</strong></td>
<td>Rev Bonnie Evans-Hills</td>
<td>Interfaith Relations Committee</td>
<td>2020*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEISSEN COMMISSION (Celtic Churches Observer)</strong></td>
<td>Rev Dr Maurice Elliot</td>
<td>Church of Ireland</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MISSION TO SEAFARERS</strong></td>
<td>Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane</td>
<td>College of Bishops</td>
<td>2019*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PORVOO CONTACT GROUP</strong></td>
<td>Miriam Weibye³</td>
<td>Inter-Church Relations Committee</td>
<td>2016*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REUILLY CONTACT GROUP</strong></td>
<td>Miriam Weibye</td>
<td>Inter-Church Relations Committee</td>
<td>2005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROYAL SCHOOL OF CHURCH MUSIC</strong></td>
<td>Rev Christoph Wutscher</td>
<td>Primus</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCOTLAND4PEACE STEERING GROUP</strong></td>
<td>Rev David Mumford</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>2008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCOTTISH CHURCHES COMMITTEE</strong></td>
<td>Mike Duncan/John Stuart⁴</td>
<td>Admin Board</td>
<td>2021* 1996*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCOTTISH CHURCHES COMMITTEE SAFEGUARDING GROUP</strong></td>
<td>Donald Urquhart/Daphne Audsley</td>
<td>Ex officio</td>
<td>2007*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCOTTISH CHURCHES PARLIAMENTARY OFFICE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination Group</td>
<td>Miriam Weibye</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holyrood Group</td>
<td>Miriam Weibye</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCOTTISH FAITHS ACTION FOR REFUGEES</strong></td>
<td>Rev Nick Bowry</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>2019*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCOTTISH PILGRIM ROUTES FORUM</strong></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Mission Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNITY ENTERPRISE</strong></td>
<td>Rev Les Ireland</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>2013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES ASSEMBLY</strong></td>
<td>Miriam Weibye/One other</td>
<td>Faith and Order Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WORLD DAY OF PRAYER (Scottish Committee)</strong></td>
<td>Rev A Wren</td>
<td>College of Bishops</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ Officer well placed within the denomination to act as liaison point with the Porvoo Communion.

⁴ 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.
GENERAL SYNOD 2022
TRAVEL AND MEALS CLAIM FORM

Travel:

£

__________ miles at 45p/mile
Public Transport (receipts must be attached) _______

Overnight Accommodation Allowance (dinner, bed and breakfast):

__________ nights at £______ (up to max of £90 per night)
(receipts must be attached) _______

TOTAL COSTS

Balance due from Scottish Episcopal Church _______

Name (please print):

______________________________

Address:

______________________________

______________________________

Payment will be by cheque or electronic bank transfer. If you wish payment to be made by bank transfer, please indicate as follows:

Either: Use my bank details already provided to General Synod Office*
Or: Use the following bank details*:
* Delete as appropriate

Account in the name of: __________________________
Bank sort code: __________________________
Bank account number: __________________________
Email address: __________________________

Signed: __________________________

Date: __________________________

(see notes overleaf)
NOTES:

1  Please ensure that this form is returned by not later than 30 June 2022 to the General Synod Office, 21 Grosvenor Crescent, Edinburgh, EH12 5EE.

2  If you have decided not to claim expenses, please return the form marked accordingly.

3  Please state if attending as an alternate.

4  Notification of payment of expenses made by electronic transfer will be sent by email.
The Standing Committee values the comments of General Synod Members on the operation of the General Synod. Members are invited to complete the form electronically at the following link: https://forms.gle/e9VFtxdfA8nYX8i78 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 20 June 2022.

1. I found the experience of a hybrid General Synod 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. 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
   AGREE  NEUTRAL  DISAGREE

7. I understood how to vote on motions and in elections
   YES  NO

8. I attended a training session 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. My Diocese arranged a pre-Synod meeting of its General Synod members
    YES  NO

11. I think consideration should be given to holding at least some future meetings of Synod online only
    YES  NO

12. I think the hybrid format for General Synod should become the norm in future
    YES  NO

13. I am a new member of General Synod
    YES  NO

I am from the Diocese of

- Aberdeen & Orkney
- Argyll & The Isles
- Brechin
- Edinburgh
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