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GENERAL SYNOD 2024 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 13 June for new members of Synod

Thursday 13 June 2024

10:30 Opening Eucharist at St Paul’s & St George’s Church
Offering for Friends of the Holy Land (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 and security announcements

Training session on how to vote

Preliminary Business (Page 13)

Motion 1: That, for the meeting of General Synod 2024 only, the Rules of Order of the General Synod be altered by the addition at the end of Rule 12 (d) of the following words:

“All notwithstanding the foregoing, the Chair may direct that votes be taken electronically, without the need in the first instance for a show of hands.”

Appointment of Tellers

Motion 2: That Malcolm Bett, Miriam Weibye and Mark Kisby be appointed as tellers for the meeting.

Appointment of Prolocutors

Motion 3: That the Very Rev Margaret Campbell be appointed as Clerical Prolocutor for the meeting.
Motion 4: That the Very Rev John Conway be appointed as Clerical Vice-Prolocutor for the meeting.

Motion 5: That Jeanette Whiteside be appointed as Lay Prolocutor for the meeting.

Motion 6: That Dr Martin Auld be appointed as Lay Vice-Prolocutor for the meeting.

Permission to speak

Motion 7: That Bishop Dorsey McConnell, Sarah Whitley, Phoebe Pryce, Jadon Rongong, Felina Hamilton other members of the Provincial Youth Committee, invited representatives from other churches and faiths and provincial staff members be given permission to speak to Synod.

Minutes of General Synod 2023 (Page 14)

Motion 8: That this Synod approve the minutes of the meeting of the General Synod held on 8-10 June 2023.

12:45 Lunch break

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

14:00 Standing Committee – Accounts, Budget and Quota Overview

Synod Voting Procedures (Page 78)

Session to seek Synod’s mind on voting

Motion 9: That this Synod express a preference that voting at Synod should in future be undertaken electronically rather than on a show of hands and invite the Standing Committee to bring forward to General Synod 2025 proposals to amend the Synod’s Rules of Order to reflect that preference.

Accounts

Motion 10: 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 2023.

Budget and Quota Overview (Page 81)

Board and Committee Work Plan (Page 103)

Board and Committee membership session (Page 130)
14:45  **Standing Committee and Pension Fund**

Pension Fund Triennial valuation, Pensionable Stipend and Pensionable Salary: a paper with motions 11-13 is enclosed separately

15:20  **Standing Committee - Provincial Environment Group**

Net Zero Update (Page 133)

15:45  Tea

**SESSION THREE: JEANETTE WHITESIDE IN THE CHAIR**

16:15  **Provincial Youth Committee**

16:35  **College of Bishops**

Presentation by the College on statistics

17:00  Evening Prayer

19:15  Synod Dinner at the Royal Scots Club 29-31 Abercromby Place, for 19:30 Edinburgh

**Friday 14 June 2024**

**SESSION FOUR: THE VERY REV ALISON SIMPSON IN THE CHAIR**

09:00  Morning Prayer

09:20  **Mission Board**

Introduction

Global Partnerships Committee

Local Mission

Short presentation from the Board followed by discussions in table groups

Church in Society Committee

Nuclear weapons (Page 139)

**Motion 14:** That this Synod agree the position that the use of nuclear weapons can never be theologically justified, and the church commits to a policy of advocating for arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.
SESSION FIVE: THE RT REV THE BISHOP OF ST ANDREWS, DUNKELD AND DUNBLANE IN THE CHAIR

11:15 Faith and Order Board

Inter-Church Relations Committee

Canons for second reading (Page 144)

Canon 15 (Of the Admission of Clergy of Other Churches, Provinces and Dioceses to Officiate) (Page 154)

Note on Safeguarding Implications of changes to Canons 15 and 16 (Page 160)

Opinions from Dioceses (Page 163)

**Motion 15:** That the amended text of Canon 15 be read for the second time.

If Canon 15 is approved at second reading the following two motions will be proposed:

**Motion 16:** That this Synod consent to the adoption by the Episcopal Synod of Schedule One to the Canon as set out in the Synod Papers.

**Motion 17:** That this Synod consent to the adoption by the Episcopal Synod of Schedule Two to the Canon as set out in the Synod Papers.

Canon 16 (Of Others who may be Permitted to Officiate in Churches) (Page 159)

**Motion 18:** That the amended text of Canon 16 be read for the second time.

Scottish Christian Forum (Page 170)

**Motion 19:** That this Synod note and acknowledge the emerging form of the Scottish Christian Forum since 2020 and affirm the continued participation of representatives of the Scottish Episcopal Church within the Scottish Christian Forum.
Motion 20: That this Synod recognise the Scottish Christian Forum (rather than ACTS) as the National Ecumenical Body within Scotland.

Motion 21: That this Synod thank the Trustees of Action of Churches Together in Scotland (ACTS) and offer them encouragement in developing the future role of ACTS.

Resolution under Canon 15 (Page 157)

Motion 22: That Resolution 1 under Canon 15 as set out in the Synod Papers be adopted to replace the existing Resolution 1 under the Canon.

12:15 Meet the Board Conveners

Opportunity in break out rooms to hear from the Board Conveners about their Board’s workplan and ask questions. Synod members are free to choose which session they wish to attend.

12:45 Lunch

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

14:00 Institute Council

Presentation

14:40 Administration Board

Introduction

Investment Committee

Buildings Committee

Net Zero changes - Canon 35 (Page 182)

Canon for second reading: Canon 35 (Of the Structure, Furniture and Monuments of Churches and the Due Care Thereof)

Motion 23: That the amended text of Canon 35 be read for the second time.

Amendment to be proposed to first reading text

Amendment: That the words “adheres to” be replaced by the words “must take account of”.

7
Faith and Order Board

Liturgy Committee

Paper from Committee Convener (Page 184)

Opinions from Dioceses (Page 186)

Liturgies for second reading (the text of the Lent, Holy Week and Easter liturgies is available online at: https://www.scotland.anglican.org/who-we-are/organisation/boards-and-committees/the-general-synod/)

**Motion 24:** That the proposal that the Liturgies for Lent, Holy Week and Easter for use with Scottish Liturgy 1982 (revised 2022) and A Service of the Word 2015 be added to the Schedule to Canon 22 be read for the second time.

**Amendment to be proposed to first reading text:**

**Amendment:** To add at the end of the above motion for second reading:

“subject to the replacement of the prayer in the “Distribution of the Palms” section of the Liturgy of the Procession:

“Almighty and everlasting God, may these palms [and branches] be for us a sign of Christ’s victory over sin and death; and may we who have been baptised in his name, worship him as king, obey him as Lord, and follow him in the way of the Cross, which leads to eternal life. We ask this through the same Jesus Christ our Lord."

by the prayer:

“Eternal God, may these palms [and branches] be for us a sign of Christ’s victory over sin and death; and may we worship him as king, obey him as Lord, and follow him in the way of the Cross, which leads to eternal life. We ask this through the same Jesus Christ our Lord."

Consideration of the liturgies for second reading will be continued after Tea if necessary

15:45 Tea
SESSION SEVEN: THE VERY REV SARAH MURRAY IN THE CHAIR

16:15 Faith and Order Board

Liturgy Committee (continued)

Removal of out of date liturgies from the Schedule to Canon 22

Motion 25: That the proposal that the following liturgies be deleted from the Schedule to Canons 22 with effect from the Sunday next before Advent in 2025 be read for the first time:

- Scottish Liturgy (Scottish Episcopal Church) (1982) listed as item 6 in the Schedule;
- Scottish Liturgy 1982 Eucharistic Prayers II-V (Scottish Episcopal Church) (1996) listed as item 11 in the Schedule.

16:45 Report from Primus on visit to Jamaica, April 2024

17:00 Evening Prayer

Saturday 15 June 2024

SESSION EIGHT: THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS IN THE CHAIR

09:15 Morning Prayer

09:35 Committee for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults (known as the Safeguarding Committee)

Canon for second reading: Canon 65 (Of Safeguarding in the Church)

Canon 65 Revision (Page 190)
Text of new Canon 65 (Page 194)

Motion 26: That the amended text of Canon 65 be read for the second time.

If Canon 65 is approved at second reading the following three motions will be proposed:

Motion 27: That, for the avoidance of doubt, the Schedule to the Canon be affirmed as unaltered.

Motion 28: That Resolution 1 under the Canon as set out in the Synod Papers be adopted to replace the existing Resolutions 1-3 under the Canon.
Motion 29: That the following be adopted as Resolution 3 under Canon 54:

“In interpreting Canon 54, the Provincial Committee for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults shall mean the Safeguarding Committee; and the Provincial Officer for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults shall mean the Provincial Safeguarding Officer.”

10:05 Standing Committee

Budgets and Quota (Page 81)

Motion 30: That this Synod, having examined the proposed budgets for the General Synod for the year 2025, agree to a quota figure of £750,000 for that year.

10:30 Coffee

SESSION NINE: THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS IN THE CHAIR

11:00 Elections (Page 71)

Standing Committee membership

Depending upon nominations being received motions may be included for elections to Standing Committee.

Motion 31: That the Rev Markus Dünzkofer be appointed as a member of the Standing Committee to serve a three-year term until General Synod 2027.

Institute Council membership

Motion 32: That Dr Ros Brett be appointed as a member of the Institute Council.

Administration Board Convenership

Motion 33: That Jeanette Whiteside be appointed as Convener of the Administration Board.

Administration Board membership

Motion 34: That Robert Dickson be appointed as a member of the Administration Board.
**Motion 35:** That the Rev Deborah Davison be re-appointed for an additional term as a member of the Administration Board.

Preliminary Proceedings Committee

**Motion 36:** That Yvonne Waugh be appointed as a practising lawyer member of the Preliminary Proceedings Committee until General Synod 2028.

**Motion 37:** That Professor Peter Sharp be appointed as the lay member of the Preliminary Proceedings Committee.

The following motion will be proposed if Jeanette Whiteside is appointed as Administration Board Convener:

**Motion 38:** That Morag Hendry be appointed as the alternate lay member of the Preliminary Proceedings Committee.

Clergy Discipline Tribunal membership

**Motion 39:** That Dr Jill Stoner be appointed as a lay member of the Clergy Discipline Tribunal until General Synod 2026.

**Motion 40:** That Robert Dickson be appointed as a lay member of the Clergy Discipline Tribunal until General Synod 2026.

**Motion 41:** That the Very Rev Kenneth Rathband be re-appointed for an additional term as a member of the Clergy Discipline Tribunal.

**Motion 42:** That the Rev Canon Marion Chatterley be re-appointed for an additional term as a member of the Clergy Discipline Tribunal.

Additional motions will be proposed to fill vacancies in the positions of practising lawyers on the Clergy Discipline Tribunal.

11:30 Closing act of worship and confirmation of Acts of Synod
1. Welcome to Delegates from Other Churches and Faiths
   Rev John Bremner: United Reformed Church
   Rev Ross Blackman: Church of Scotland
   Major David Cavanagh: Salvation Army
   Most Rev Leo Cushley, Archbishop of St Andrews & Edinburgh: Roman Catholic Church
   Paul Goldfinch: Action of Churches Together in Scotland
   Rev Martin Hodson: The Baptist Union of Scotland
   Rev Gareth Jones: Interfaith Scotland
   Rev Mark Slaney: The Methodist Church in Scotland
   Rev Martin Whitehead: United Free Church of Scotland
   Mary Woodward: Religious Society of Friends

   Guests from outwith Scotland
   Christopher Webb, Church of England

2. Tellers and Prolocutors
   The Standing Committee recommends the following appointments:

   Tellers:
   - Malcolm Bett
   - Miriam Weibye
   - Mark Kisby, AV Department

   Prolocutors:
   - Clerical Prolocutor: Very Rev Margaret Campbell
   - Clerical Vice-Prolocutor: Very Rev John Conway
   - Lay Prolocutor: Jeanette Whiteside
   - Lay Vice-Prolocutor: Dr Martin Auld

3. Assessor
   The Primus has appointed Gavin McEwan as Assessor

4. Permission to Speak

5. Minutes of General Synod 2023

6. Any Matters Arising from Minutes

7. Elections/Appointments
   The following will be dealt with in the final session of Synod:
   - Standing Committee membership
   - Institute Council membership
   - Administration Board Convenership
   - Administration Board membership
   - Preliminary Proceedings Committee membership
   - Clergy Discipline Tribunal membership

8. Roll Call
Freshers’ Meeting

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

Opening Eucharist

The Synod was constituted at a celebration of the Eucharist in St Paul’s & St George’s Church, Edinburgh at 10.30am on Thursday 8 June 2023.

The Most Rev Mark Strange, Primus, delivered his charge to the Synod during the Eucharist. Taking as his text “this is the way, walk in it” he reflected that when he asked people in the Province what they thought of the Church, he received many answers but invariably people commented that they loved their Church. In describing the Church, one could look to doctrine, liturgy, mission and ministry, canons and committees but all of those were simply a vehicle to allow the Spirit of God to be heard, followed and lived. Amidst all that could hinder, the Scottish Episcopal Church was a Church which was listening to the left and right and to St Paul’s words “who shall separate us from the love of Christ?”.

As the Primus reflected on all that had happened in the previous year he wished to recognise that people in the Church were in pain, one of his colleagues was not present at the Synod and there were those present in the Synod who were hurting but the Church was taking seriously the call to care and face difficulties both internally and in the world. Congregation after congregation had stepped up to support refugees and the Synod offering was for the Scottish Refugee Council. He called on the leaders of the nation to care for those arriving in the UK rather than declaring them to be illegal and moving them on.

Commenting on Synod business the Primus noted that for the previous three years the Church had started its work towards achieving net zero carbon emissions and had prayed its way towards a renewed understanding of the custodianship of creation. He expressed thanks to the Provincial Environment Group for the work they had undertaken.

The churches of Scotland had continued to work together to attempt to bring healing to many of those areas troubling society. The historic visit by the Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland to the current Synod meeting would mark a deepening of that working together. The Primus believed that something had changed and that denominations were now working more closely together evidenced by the St Andrew Declaration with the Church of Scotland, continuing conversations with the Roman Catholic Church and a growing fellowship within the Episcopal Methodist United Reformed partnership.

The Synod would have debates about internal matters, but the Church was concerned not only about itself but about the life of the communities and the world which the Church served. St Paul had noted that that would not always be easy but the Primus encouraged all to continue to pray that the Scottish Episcopal Church would continue to serve God and neighbour. He urged Synod members to reach out to one another, take up the banner of hope and walk together towards the light of Christ.

An online offering was taken to support the work of the Scottish Refugee Council. The offering amounted to £1,390.02 including Gift Aid.

SESSION 1: THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS IN THE CHAIR

1.1 Statement about Matters in the Diocese of Aberdeen and Orkney

The Primus made a short pastoral statement regarding the situation in the Diocese of Aberdeen and Orkney. During the course of the summer and autumn of 2022, formal “accusations” had been received under Canon 54 and Bishop Anne Dyer had been suspended. During the period of her suspension, Bishop John Armes had served as the Acting Diocesan Bishop and he
expressed the thanks of the College to him for undertaking that role. Accusations under Canon 54 were sent to the Preliminary Proceedings Committee which was independent of the College of Bishops. That Committee had been working hard to discharge its responsibilities in the context of a process which inevitably took time to complete and he expressed thanks to its members. Since a formal process was under way he was unable to provide any detailed comment or to respond to questions on the subject but asked members of Synod to continue to pray earnestly for all those involved and for a fair and just resolution. He confirmed that the offer of pastoral support had been made to those involved.

1.2 Preliminary Business

1.2.1 Welcome

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

The Rev Fiona Bennett (United Reformed Church)
The Rev Ross Blackman (Church of Scotland)
Major David Cavanagh (Salvation Army)
The Rev Andy Downie (United Free Church of Scotland)
Msgr Philip Kerr (Roman Catholic Church)
The Rev James Patron Bell (Methodist Church in Scotland)
Linsay Taylor (Interfaith Scotland)
Mary Woodward (Religious Society of Friends)
Bishop Adrian Wilkinson (Church of Ireland)

The Primus also welcomed the Rev Dr Michael Hull who would take up a new role as the Principal of the Scottish Episcopal Institute from the beginning of July, Mr Paul Williams who would take up the new role of Net Zero Delivery Director during the course of July and Mr John Wyllie who had started as Head of Safeguarding a number of weeks previously.

1.2.2 Appointment of Tellers

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

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

The Motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

1.2.3 Appointment of Prolocutors

The Rev Canon Dave Richards (Edinburgh) proposed, and the Very Rev Alison Simpson (Moray, Ross and Caithness) seconded, the following Motion:

“That the Very Rev Sarah Murray be appointed as Clerical Prolocutor for the meeting.”

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

The Rev Canon Dave Richards then proposed, and the Very Rev Alison Simpson seconded, the following Motion:

“That the Very Rev Margaret Campbell 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 as follows: 54 in favour, 1 abstention.
Ms Bridget Campbell (Convener, Standing Committee) proposed, and Mr Jim Gibson (Convener, Administration Board) seconded, the following Motion:

“That Dr Anthony Birch be appointed as Lay Prolocutor for the meeting.”

The Motion was put to the vote in the House of Laity and passed nem con as follows: 48 in favour, 2 abstentions.

Ms Campbell then proposed, and Mr Gibson seconded, the following Motion:

“That Jeanette Whiteside be appointed as Lay Vice-Prolocutor for the meeting.”

The Motion was put to the vote in the House of Laity and passed nem con as follows: 48 in favour, 1 abstention.

1.2.4 Permission to Speak

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

“That the Rev Jim Benton-Evans, the Rev Elizabeth Crumlish, Canon Alistair Dinnie, the Rt Rev Sally Foster-Fulton, Cathy Johnston, the Rev Kim Lafferty, Lexy Plumtree, Robert Woodford, the Rev Dr Michael Hull, Elizabeth Mills, Jadon Rongong, Olivia Smith, and other members of the Provincial Youth Committee, and invited representatives from other churches and faiths be given permission to speak to Synod.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously.

1.2.5 Minutes of General Synod 2022

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 9-11 June 2022.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed nem con as follows: 99 in favour, 10 abstentions.

1.2.6 Roll Call

The roll call of Synod members was taken by the completion of a registration sheet as members had arrived at the meeting of Synod. A total of 120 members attended.

1.3 Synod Rules of Order

Ms Bridget Campbell (Convener, Standing Committee) explained that she wished to propose certain changes to the Rules of Order on behalf of the Standing Committee. Because of the fact that recent meetings of Synod had been held online or in hybrid mode, an electronic voting system had been adopted. It had worked well in practical terms and she expressed thanks to Sanctus Media for their technical support. The main change to the Rules of Order which Standing Committee wished to propose was a change to reflect the use of electronic voting. That was in the form of an amendment to Section (d) of Rule 12, as set out in Motion 9 on the Synod agenda. However, since the papers for the Synod meeting had been circulated it had been pointed out that there remained certain questions about the implications of electronic voting which would benefit from further exploration in the year ahead before any permanent change to the Rules was proposed. That included consideration of how transparent electronic voting was compared with a show of hands. Standing Committee had therefore agreed to propose a slightly different version of Motion 9 as it appeared in the printed agenda, the effect of which would be to allow votes to be taken electronically at the current meeting.
If the Motion were passed the Primus intended to exercise the power given to the Chair to direct that votes be taken electronically for the current meeting.

The Committee also proposed a minor amendment to Section (c) in Rule 12 as set out in Motion 8. That was a "tidying up" amendment since the subject of elections was already dealt with fully in Rule 13.

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

“That Rule 12 (c) of the Rules of Order of the General Synod be altered by the deletion of the words “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.””

The Motion was put to the vote, it being noted that it required a two thirds majority, and was passed nem con as follows: 108 in favour, 2 abstentions.

Ms Campbell then proposed, and Mr Gibson, seconded the following Motion:

“That, for the meeting of General Synod 2023 only, the Rules of Order of the General Synod be altered by the addition at the end of Rule 12 (d) of the following words:

“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.””

Mrs Victoria Elliott (Edinburgh) indicated that she would vote in favour of the Motion but suggested that during the following year other means of voting which were not necessarily electronic should be considered – for example for those who did not possess an electronic device or have internet access. She was keen that the Synod should be as inclusive as possible.

Mrs Jan Whiteside (Glasgow and Galloway) suggested that one advantage of electronic voting was that it removed the possibility for potential bullying. For example, if she voted against a Motion, might she be subject to bullying by those who had proposed it? It was important not to leave people feeling vulnerable.

Dr Martin Auld (Aberdeen and Orkney) proposed that those who were voting online should have their screens turned on so that those present in person could see them.

Ms Campbell thanked those who had made comments which would be taken into account.

The Motion was put to the vote and passed as follows: 103 in favour, 1 against, 3 abstentions.

The Primus then directed that votes for the remainder of the meeting would be taken electronically.

SESSION 2: THE REV CANON DAVE RICHARDS IN THE CHAIR

2.1 Standing Committee – Accounts, Budget and Quota Overview

Ms Bridget Campbell (Convener, Standing Committee) reminded the Synod that the members of the Standing Committee were the charity trustees of the General Synod and acted as its executive committee between Synod meetings. She hoped that the focus of the current meeting
would be on renewing strength as a Church, learning from one another and committing to work together on ways in which the Church could grow. Growth was vitally important because of the challenge faced by the Church. The total number of members across Scotland was recorded in 2022 at just under 24,000 and the number of communicant members was under 17,000. Overall, numbers were smaller than a few years previously.

She expressed gratitude to the members of the Standing Committee and thanked Canon Dave Richards and the Dean Alison Simpson, the two members of Standing Committee who were standing down, and also to Jenny Whelan who had stood down the previous year. She also thanked the staff of the General Synod Office who worked in support of the Committee.

Ms Campbell presented the Report and Accounts for the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2022 and illustrated particular items by PowerPoint slides. The total annual income across the entire Church was in the region of £20 million, with the bulk of income and expenditure being at congregational level. The income of the General Synod represented only about 10% of the Church’s total income. In 2022, the boards and committees of the General Synod had spent nearly £3 million. The income arose from two main sources: investments (which accounted for 68% of income) and quota from dioceses (representing 22%). The investment income came mainly from the Synod’s holdings in the Unit Trust Pool, overseen by the Investment Committee. That Committee worked effectively, and she expressed gratitude to Mark Harris, its Convener and the other members. The Standing Committee had met representatives of the Investment Committee the previous year and had asked them to undertake a review of the potential for releasing more of the funds held in the Unit Trust Pool to support future actions. Later in the current meeting, Mr Harris would give a presentation about that. Throughout the previous year, the Standing Committee had been continually aware of the multiple challenges faced by congregations and the Church as a whole arising from the general state of the economy, rates of inflation and the cost of living crisis.

Ms Campbell noted that in 2021 the General Synod had agreed a policy for increases in clergy stipend, recognising that stipend had not kept pace with inflation. The Synod had agreed a period of catch up and the stipend increase for 2023 had been set at 1% above the rate of inflation. That policy had resulted in an increase in Standard Stipend for 2023 of 11.1%, with a consequent increase in pension contributions. Recognising that such an increase was likely to be challenging for many congregations, the Standing Committee had agreed to apply £365,000 of reserves over 2023 and 2024 to ease the transition to the new rate. That funding was known as Transitional Stipend Assistance and was available to dioceses to enable them to provide financial support to charges facing the greatest difficulty. However, that funding was intended to address only the challenges of transition and in future it was for charges and dioceses themselves to consider how to adjust to the increased levels.

Ms Campbell explained that the General Fund provided a good indication of the underlying financial position. In 2022, the final figures for both income and expenditure had turned out to be different from estimates drawn up before the year had started. There had been a surplus of approximately £79,000 on the General Fund (compared with a budgeted deficit of £113,000). That had been mainly because the income from the Unit Trust Pool had been larger than expected. Also, total expenditure had been less than budget for various reasons including fewer grant applications, staffing changes which had taken longer to implement than planned, and the fact that many meetings had continued to take place using videoconferencing facilities. Offsetting those underspends, there had been certain areas where the Standing Committee had had to spend more than had been budgeted – for example, the ongoing situation in the Diocese of Aberdeen and Orkney and action arising out of the tragic accident in Peterhead, which had sadly resulted in the deaths of two church volunteers, had meant that there had been greater expenditure on legal and advisory fees.

Following the Peterhead accident, the Health and Safety Executive had issued Statutory Notices on various bodies in the Church including the Province and these had been the subject of legal process which was still ongoing. Following the incident, the Buildings Committee had undertaken significant work in developing comprehensive new health and safety resources, in consultation with congregations, with an emphasis on risk assessment. The new materials to support congregations had been rolled out in February 2023 and Ms Campbell thanked the Convener of the Buildings Committee, Peter Sharp, and its other members for the work which they had undertaken to support dioceses and congregations to fulfil their health and safety responsibilities.
Overall, the Standing Committee, as it was required to do, had carried out an assessment of the General Synod’s ability to continue as a going concern financially and had concluded that it expected the Synod to have adequate resources to continue to operate for the foreseeable future.

In setting the budgets for 2023-2025, Standing Committee had agreed deficit budgets to ensure that the ongoing work of various boards was adequately funded. Deficits were projected on the General Fund for 2023 of £627,000, for 2024 of £370,000 and for 2025 of £298,000. The deficits in 2023 and 2024 were larger than they would otherwise have been due to the provision of Transitional Stipend Assistance. Whilst the actual financial outcome had in the past often been better than budget, the scale of the projected deficits meant that Standing Committee expected that deficits would actually be incurred in the following three years and that was likely to continue. These would be funded initially from surpluses generated in the recent past but would also require funding from the sale of investments. That meant that Standing Committee was planning to reduce the Synod's reserves.

Ms Campbell turned to consider matters which the Standing Committee would take into account in finalising budgets for the General Synod for 2024 and beyond. Everyone was going to have to make changes in response to the climate change emergency, particularly in reassessing how to heat and light church buildings and, indeed, whether the Church still needed and could afford all of its existing buildings. In 2020, the Synod had passed a Motion seeking the development of a programme to resource the Church in working towards achieving net zero carbon emissions by 2030. In 2021, the Standing Committee had established a Provincial Environment Group under the convenership of Bishop Ian Paton. The challenge faced by the Church was enormous and needed engagement at every level. The Provincial Environment Group had reported on progress to Synod 2022 and had since consulted widely including the publication in February 2023 of a draft Net Zero Action Plan. The Standing Committee was grateful to Bishop Paton and the Provincial Environment Group and to all who had participated in the consultation exercise. The challenge was not just about working out what needed to be done, and funding it, but also about devising the best model for supporting the activity and changes required. The responsibility for determining and carrying out action locally lay with congregations and dioceses and the Provincial Environment Group had demonstrated a way in which that work could be supported.

The financial projections provided to Synod included expenditure on the appointment of the provincial Net Zero Delivery Director but did not include the other costs envisaged for delivery of the Net Zero Action Plan. While the Provincial Environment Group continued to gather information there would inevitably remain considerable uncertainty about the precise costs of implementing many of the proposals in the Plan. However, considerable funds would need to be identified. Current projections suggested that additional provincial funding of several hundreds of thousands of pounds would be needed every year totalling several millions of pounds over the following seven years to 2030. Standing Committee wished to enable the Synod's commitment towards net zero by 2030 to be fulfilled and therefore intended to ensure that sufficient funding was available to implement the Action Plan. Standing Committee also remained committed to other priorities, in particular ensuring that sufficient funds were available to providing appropriate training for ministry and new mission initiatives.

Ms Campbell explained that an innovation at the current Synod meeting was a composite Workplan covering the work of many boards and committees. They had contributed to the first version of a composite forward-looking Workplan, as set out in the Synod papers. Standing Committee expected the Plan to develop over time but it had already proved useful in providing, in a single document, clarity on board and committee objectives and some insight into their future direction. For boards, the Workplan supported their management and oversight of the work of the committees which reported to them. The Workplan also encouraged focus and transparency in their work. The Workplan supported their management and oversight of the work of the committees which reported to them. The Workplan also encouraged focus and transparency in their work. The Workplan might in future be useful to Standing Committee if it became necessary to make decisions about budget allocation between potentially competing priorities. Standing Committee was grateful to the boards and committees, and particularly their Conveners, for their help in developing the Plan. Later in the Synod there would be the opportunity for Synod members to meet the Conveners to discuss the Workplan.

In closing, Ms Campbell expressed gratitude to all those who had served as Conveners or members on the Synod's boards and committees.
She 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 2022.”

Ms Lesley Whitwood (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) commented that the statistics in the Annual Report took no account of non-eucharistic services which were greatly valued in many congregations including Morning Prayer, Evensong, remembrance services and also online services. The Liturgy Committee had provided splendid resources and the fact that attendance figures were not recorded suggested to her that the Province was not interested in non-eucharistic services. If such services were not valued, it was unsurprising that only one person had entered training for lay readership. Such an approach diminished the value of all lay ministers and those who valued non-eucharistic services.

Ms Campbell responded that there was no intention to devalue such services or individuals. The statistics which were collected were very minimal. The question of how best to capture all the activity going on in the life of the Church was a matter which would need to be addressed in future years.

Mr Brian Harris (Aberdeen and Orkney) was delighted to see the innovation of the map of the Province in the Annual Report which showed Orkney and Shetland in their proper places. He suggested that a similar change should be made to the provincial website.

The Very Rev Elizabeth Thomson (Brechin) commented that, in ecumenical outreach, services were likely to be non-eucharistic. In mapping the way in which the Church responded to local communities it was important to capture that non-eucharistic activity.

The Motion was then put to the vote and passed as follows: 102 in favour, 1 against, 3 abstentions.

2.2 Investment Committee

Mr Mark Harris (Convener, Investment Committee) gave a presentation on the Unit Trust Pool (UTP). He explained that the UTP had been established in 1960 to enable professional management of the Province's investments and had subsequently been expanded to enable dioceses and individual charges to co-invest. Baillie Gifford had been appointed as the fund managers in 1995. The role of the Investment Committee was to determine strategic investment allocation, select and monitor performance of the fund manager, declare twice yearly distributions and ensure compliance with the Church's ethical investment policies. The fund manager selected the funds and investments within the strategic investment allocation, reported on performance and also ensured compliance with the ethical policies. The Committee could not provide advice on whether or not to hold units in the UTP. The overarching investment objective was to earn a return on the assets over the long-term which was sufficient at least to maintain the real value of the distribution. It was a long-term investment vehicle and not suitable for short-term investment. The key investment criteria were taking a long-term view (based on rolling periods of five years), the Fund being managed on a total return basis, and ensuring that the strategic investment allocation created appropriate balance between investment returns and investment risk. The total value of the UTP as at 30 April 2023 had been £116 million of which 63% was owned by the Province. 186 charges were invested in the UTP. The Fund pursued a diversified investment strategy with 35% applied to an income focus, 30% in a combined growth and income focus and 35% in a growth focus. Using PowerPoint slides, Mr Harris reported on the performance of the UTP which had been very good with average annual total return since 1995 of 9.6% and, in the previous three years, 14.2%. Those performance figures had been achieved notwithstanding three points of downturn resulting from the dot-com bubble burst, the global financial crisis in 2008 and the current geopolitical crisis concerning the war in Ukraine. Actual distributions until 2008 had more or less tracked the objective of maintaining the real value but the distribution had been cut at that point owing to the financial crisis. Since then, the distribution had been increased over time and, measured from 2001, there was a shortfall of 7p between the actual distribution and the objective. The Committee was determined to continue to endeavour to close that gap.
Mr Harris reported on the current outlook for the UTP which was generally positive but there remained at the present time certain headwinds particularly in relation to inflation and interest rates. Changes of holdings within the three strategies had been minor, reflecting Baillie Gifford’s confidence in the positions held for the long-term. The full year distribution for 2022 had been an increase of 15% on the 2021 figure and the interim distribution for 2023 represented an increase of 16% on the equivalent distribution in 2022. These reflected the Committee’s ongoing confidence in the UTP’s strategic positioning. The Committee was in full compliance with the ethical investment policy which excluded certain classes of investments, including for pooled funds. Ethical investment was given a high priority by Baillie Gifford and screening embedded into Baillie Gifford’s approach across all three strategies meant that attention was paid to impact on the environment not just because it was the right thing to do but also because it was good for business.

The Committee had been asked to consider possible realisation of some of the Province’s investment in the UTP. Mr Harris explained that the Committee had considered the possibility of releasing of £5 million or £10 million from the UTP. Releasing £5 million would involve the sale of 7% of the Province’s units and to realise £10 million would involve selling 14%. Mr Harris explained that if the Province had expected a total return of 7.5% from its holding in the UTP over the previous five years that would have produced £18.5 million. The actual total return over that period had in fact been £30.8 million and in that sense an “excess” total return of £12.3 million had been generated. That £30.8 million comprised £8.5 million of actual distributions and £22.3 million of actual gain in valuation. Consequently, the hypothetical realisation of £5 million or £10 million to which he had just referred were well within the “excess” total return achieved over that five years period. He likened any such realisation not to “raiding the cookie jar” but rather to picking up the cookies which had overflowed from the cookie jar. Selling units would of course mean that there would be a reduction in future income because there would be fewer units held in future. Based on a unit price of £26.63 and the level of the distribution in 2022, the reduction in income would be approximately £141,000 if £5 million were realised and £282,000 if £10 million were to be realised. That represented 6% or 12% respectively of the Province’s 2023 total budgeted income. It also took no account of future UTP performance and distribution increases. It was in any event unlikely that any such large realisation of units would be undertaken as one lump sum. If it were necessary to top up income by selling additional units, only 5,000 (or 10,000) units would need to be sold annually to replace the cash flow.

The Rev Canon Dr James Currall (Moray, Ross and Caithness) explained that in the area of work in which he was involved before ordination “UTP” stood for “unshielded twisted pair” which was a form of cabling. He thanked Mr Harris for a very clear presentation which enabled him to have a new understanding of the term “UTP”.

The Chair expressed thanks to Mr Harris.

2.3 College of Bishops

The Most Rev Mark Strange (Bishop of Moray, Ross and Caithness and Primus) explained that the College wished to open a dialogue about what a "call" by the Bishops to the Church for Scotland might comprise. The terminology of "call" came from the Lambeth Conference 2022. The process of "calls" at that Conference had enabled groups of Bishops to discuss the subject matter of those calls and for different opinions to be heard. It had allowed most Bishops to leave the Conference with a sense of continuing fellowship with those with whom they had met. The College considered that the concept of a call was something on which the Synod could work with the Bishops for the SEC. During the current session the members of the College would give glimpses of how the Five Marks of Mission could be lived out. After the presentations, the table groups at Synod would be asked to consider what questions Synod members believed it raised for the Bishops. The intention was that one question would come forward from each group. The Bishops were not looking for a new scheme or programme but rather to how the Synod and its boards and committees could frame a call to the Church in Scotland so that all were moving in the same direction.

The Rt Rev Kevin Pearson (Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway) spoke on the first Mark of Mission, namely "to proclaim the good news". Asking Synod members to remember their confirmation he reminded them that all the confirmation affirmations revolved around the question "do you turn to
Christ”. When an individual responded “I do” their life was turned around as Mary Magdalene’s had been in the garden of the Resurrection. At Confirmation the question led to a recognition of the gift and power of the Holy Spirit at work in the individual. He suggested that the way to proclaim the good news that God is love was to use the SEC motto “Evangelical Truth and Apostolic Order”. Truth was a journey not a destination which was why the truth of Scripture needed to be discovered and journeyed with day by day. It enabled the building of trust in God. As to apostolic order, the Church’s sacramental life made the presence of Jesus and God’s love real in the world. The Church had the power to share the good news and he urged Synod members to bring Scotland to God through trust, confidence and hope.

The Rt Rev Dr John Armes (Bishop of Edinburgh) spoke on the Mark of Mission “to teach, baptise and nurture new Christians”. It was more vital than ever to “continue in the apostles’ teaching” in an age where the Christian truths were understood only hazily. Christian nurture was not about transferring knowledge but rather about accompanying people as they grew into the stature of Christ. When he had ministered in an industrial part of Lancashire, the congregation had decided to run the Emmaus programme. He had been surprised that regular church attenders had turned up to undertake the course but newcomers had also come and by the end there had been more people in church than had been the case before. The best examples of nurture which he had learnt at that time were the ones which engaged the whole person and helped people develop a faith which touched their whole life, moving from being passive recipients to active agents. Such courses invited people into community and gave the opportunity to ask questions and offer honest answers. No church was required to do that alone. In his diocese, some congregations were joining together, or with other denominations, to offer nurture programmes. To see people being nurtured was one of the most rewarding aspects of ministry.

The Rt Rev Andrew Swift (Bishop of Brechin) spoke on the third Mark of Mission “responding to human need by loving service”. This mark manifested in every part of life. Already in Synod, the Primus had mentioned responding to the needs of refugees. Since the earliest days of the Church, it had responded in loving service to human need. Referring to the description of the early church in Acts 2, he noted that Christians had sold property in order to support those in need. There were plenty of current examples – projects in churches such as food banks, helping those on the margins, work with refugees. When congregational numbers were small, and the church roof needed fixed, the danger was always to become inward focused. What could the Church do to help its communities grow to respond again in loving service, even when circumstances felt overwhelming?

The Rt Rev Ian Paton (Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) spoke on the fourth Mark of Mission “to transform unjust structures in society, challenge violence of every kind and pursue peace and reconciliation”. There were remarkable people in the Province who were doing just that – the members of the Mothers’ Union. The injustice which the Mothers’ Union were working against was endemic in society – the evil of gender-based violence and domestic abuse. Gender-based violence did not just affect women but according to NHS Scotland four out of five incidents had a female victim and a male perpetrator. One in five women and one in 25 men experienced gender-based violence or abuse during their lives. Not all such violence was physical – some was verbal – but it was always dehumanising. The Mothers’ Union had been working hard and for many years had supported the Thursday in Black initiative. Its members were helping women’s aid centres to support survivors. In December each year they organised events around the country to support the United Nations’ 16 Days of Action against gender-based violence. In 2023, the theme would be “changing the story”. An empty red chair would symbolise those who had been killed or dehumanised by that kind of violence. The Mothers’ Union would be starting conversations on this topic in vestries, with Bishops and with SEI and would offer training and resources to raise understanding and change behaviour. Like racism, homophobia and transphobia, gender-based violence were evils that shamed society. Dame Helena Kennedy, when introducing the Government’s report on misogyny in Scotland, had said that the members of her committee had been shocked that over 50% of the population in Scotland were experiencing misogyny, all of the time. The Mothers’ Union was not taking up what some liked to dismiss as woke militancy but rather was helping to wake the Church up to challenge unjust structures of society and violence of every kind and pursue peace and reconciliation. He hoped the Church would listen.
The Rt Rev Dr Keith Riglin (Bishop of Argyll and The Isles) spoke on the fifth Mark of Mission "to strive to preserve the integrity of creation and sustain and renew the life of the earth". The challenge and delight of that Mark of Mission was that it did not address "something else" but rather something of which everyone was a part. When the psalmist proclaimed "the Earth is the Lord's and all that therein is, the compass of the world and all that dwell therein" the delight included humankind. Humankind was included in the affirmation of Genesis when God declared that creation was "very good". That reminded the Church that as it rose to the challenge of the Net Zero Action Plan it was engaged in a challenge but also in a delight. In Argyll and The Isles one charge was looking to replace its current rectory, recognising that it was no longer fit for purpose in the light of net zero. Another charge had recognised that because of the inefficiency of its heating it was no longer practical to pay £100 every time 15 people gathered together for public worship to heat the building. The Diocese was looking at how to use its resources to affirm the gift of God. In Skye, the congregation had turned an unused piece of land into a delightful quiet garden. On Mull, the church was looking at doing something similar. Such steps did not specifically reduce carbon footprint, but they expressed fine steps along the path. He hoped that as the Church responded to the challenge it could join with creation, with the valleys being "so thick with corn that they laughed and sang".

In closing the session, the Primus asked the table groups to engage in conversation and formulate questions for the College of Bishops which it hoped to answer in the second session the following day.

2.4 Anglican Consultative Council

Canon Alistair Dinnie spoke as one of the SEC representatives at the 18th Anglican Consultative Council (ACC) meeting which had taken place in Accra in February. It had met in the warm, hospitable, entrepreneurial energy of Ghana and also in the shadow of a controversial Communion development relating to differences on the issue of human sexuality, namely the recent Church of England response to same-sex issues. He had attended with the Rev Lee Johnston, the SEC's other representative, and also Amie Byers who had attended as a youth representative. The remit of the ACC was to facilitate the co-operative work of the Churches of the Anglican Communion, exchange information between the Provinces and to help co-ordinate common action. It advised on the organisation and structures of the Communion and sought to develop common policies with respect to the world mission of the Church, including ecumenical matters.

Over the course of five business days members had worked together around tables which had created space for deep and honest sharing. The work had been grounded in daily Bible study and worship, each day themed by one of the five Anglican Marks of Mission rendered in their short form: tell, teach, attend, transform, treasure.

"Tell" had set the scene with an opening address from the Archbishop of Canterbury. "Teach" had involved group discussion of intentional discipleship, theological education in the Communion and church planting, concluding with a fringe event on the outcome of the Church of England's Living in Love and Faith process.

"Tend" had scheduled conversation around the Health and Family Networks, the Unity Faith and Order Commission, the Liturgical Commission and the network for Colleges and Universities of the Anglican Communion with an evening fringe event about the Church of England's links with the transatlantic slave trade, which had resulted in a proposal to set up a £1 million impact fund to invest in a better and fairer future for all, particularly communities affected by historic slavery. The following day had comprised a visit to Cape Coast Castle where the links to historic slavery were laid horribly bare. The visit had been a powerful and dislocating experience with the officers’ quarters standing in utter contrast to the claustrophobic horror of the slave dungeons beneath where up to 1,500 enslaved people could be held in appalling conditions for up to three months before being shipped to the New World. There was one window into the series of interconnected dungeons from outside the castle's chapel, apparently designed to allow those in the dungeon to hear church services when they were being conducted. Astonishingly, that appeared to have been conceived as a compassionate gesture. Fittingly, the theme for the following day of business had been "transform" – "to transform the unjust structures of society, to challenge violence of every kind and pursue peace and reconciliation".
On the final working day the theme of "treasure" had allowed a focus on the Communion's Environment, Indigenous, Youth and language-specific networks.

Details of the meeting and its outputs were available on the website ACC18.org. Once again, Canon Dinnie said that he had returned from an ACC meeting barely able to comprehend the range, depth and vitality of the work in which the Communion was engaged. Since ACC18 had been his last meeting, he offered thanks to the Synod and the Province for the honour of being able to serve and for the opportunity of participating in the work of the Synod during that time. He asked for prayers for all who would take forward the work of the ACC and those who shouldered the work between meetings.

In a final reflection, he noted that over the previous seven years there had been occasions where conversations in which he had been involved had sought to identify why the Anglican Communion was a Communion. In all cases he had observed a similar dynamic, namely that instead of identifying unifying features the query tended to elicit analogies. He had heard the Communion compared to a flotilla of ships, all moving in much the same direction but under their own steam, or on another occasion prized recipes for a traditional dish all with their slight regional variations exciting fierce argument over which version was the most authentic. Often liturgy was named as a relevant factor but he had found himself wondering whether there were not issues of access to power, status and money that the Communion was too afraid to name. Being part of the Communion could be challenging in ways that were not always expected or constructive. For him, the most challenging point of the Ghana meeting had been the fringe event on Living in Love and Faith where the tectonic plates of the Communion differences on human sexuality had crashed into each other with some heat, but little light. Whatever the challenges, the Communion engaged in vital work and encompassed a diversity which gave opportunity for conversation across nation, culture and language at a time when structures which enabled that seemed to be increasingly under threat. In that context, his reflection was that perhaps the reason why the Anglican Communion was a Communion mattered less than the fact that its members made the active choice to be a Communion.

The Chair closed the session by thanking Canon Dinnie.

SESSION 3: THE RT REV THE BISHOP OF BRECHIN IN THE CHAIR

3.1 The Chair explained that an additional procedural motion was to be put to Synod to give permission to speak to all members of the Provincial Environment Group.

The following motion was then proposed to Synod:

"That members of the Provincial Environment Group be given permission to speak to Synod."

The Motion was put to the vote and passed as follows: 91 in favour, 1 against, no abstentions.

The Rt Rev Ian Paton (Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) spoke as the Convener of the Provincial Environment Group. Referring to the New Testament reading at the Synod Eucharist earlier in the day which had referred to the whole creation groaning in labour pains, and indeed, to those who had the first fruits of the Spirit similarly groaning while waiting for adoption, he explained that the current session would deal with the fruit of the labour pains with which the Provincial Environment Group (PEG) had laboured. The Net Zero Action Plan before Synod was a response to the decision of the General Synod in 2020 to achieve net zero carbon emissions by 2030. The revised version of the Action Plan contained in the Synod papers was one which had been revised following the consultation which had taken place earlier in the year. He thanked all those who had taken part in the consultation. He also thanked the members of PEG, the Vice Convener Cathy Johnston, the Rev Dr Valerie Cameron, the Rev Willie Shaw, the Rev Lewis Shand Smith and Robert Woodford. Mr Woodford had acted as a consultant and produced much of the material included in the Action Plan. He also thanked General Synod Office staff, particularly Miriam Weibye and Fiona Campbell, and, prospectively, Paul Williams the incoming Net Zero Delivery Director.
The Action Plan was being offered to give information and resources for local decisions to be made in moving towards 2030. It was a whole church challenge, not a green agenda on the part of enthusiasts. It was about mission, as the Church helped to lead society in its response to the climate emergency. It was not just about technology but about behaviour, for example, using less energy.

Cathy Johnston (Vice Convener of PEG) reminded Synod that at Synod 2022 she had talked of the Church as being an ecosystem. During the year PEG had been discovering the realities of the interconnections within that church ecosystem. The timeline for PEG’s work had been crammed into a relatively short timescale and the Group had been very busy. Robert Woodford had been appointed a consultant following Synod 2022 and an initial webinar had been presented. The consultation undertaken earlier in the year on the Action Plan had been done over a relatively short period but was part of the engagement strategy which PEG had set out from the beginning. She thanked all those who had participated. PEG had worked with various committees, in particular the Provincial Buildings Committee and others, including the College of Bishops. PEG had developed the consultation document into the Net Zero Action Plan presented to the current meeting.

Ms Johnston reported on the responses to the consultation. The process had enabled PEG to learn about many things which were already under way within the Church as a whole. Part of the task had been to identify where PEG could be involved in the different structures of the Church as well as how local charges would be affected. The consultation could not have been undertaken without the assistance of GSO staff. Many people had responded positively to the questions in the consultation document. The issue of deliverability was the area in which the greatest degree of uncertainty had been demonstrated by respondents. There was a clear understanding of the urgency of the issue and also that the Plan was a credible way of proceeding. Narratives which people submitted as part of the consultation had been very varied and very valuable. Some had indicated that too much was being asked whereas others had said not enough was being proposed. Several areas of technical expertise had been revealed. There had been a significant reaction to the tone and language of the first draft and that had been changed in the final version of the Action Plan. Whilst not everyone would be able to undertake everything at once, everyone could at least be thinking about the values identified in the Action Plan such as discipleship, justice and hope. The final version retained the lens of discipleship, justice and hope but the suggested outcomes had been reformulated and were focused particularly on the issue of support. The objectives had been retained but were confined to emphases on energy consumption, moving to cleaner energy and issues of active travel. Importantly, there were also outcomes associated with shared governance. The concerns about deliverability highlighted the need for support. The Net Zero Delivery Director was one aspect of such support. Other areas of support needed were in relation to expertise and finance. The projection contained in the Synod papers was based on the best modelling available at the present time.

Robert Woodford then addressed Synod. He outlined three supporting resources which PEG was announcing at the current meeting, all of which aligned with the Net Zero Action Plan. These comprised an update to the Net Zero Toolkit, a new resource in the form of Net Zero cards, and a new Net Zero Workshop Programme.

The updated Toolkit would bring it into alignment with the 10 objectives of the Action Plan. The Toolkit would continue to be the first port of call and a central resource available to the Church. PEG intended to release the Toolkit as a living online document ensuring that it included the most up-to-date information. PEG would work with other provincial committees to ensure that the expertise of those other bodies was fully embodied in the Toolkit. He provided a visual outline of the new Toolkit. Lana Woolford had been commissioned to assist with that.

The Net Zero Cards comprised suggestions which churches could consider on their journey towards net zero. Some such actions might already have been completed but others would be new. The cards also aligned with the Net Zero Action Plan and were designed for use in small groups. PEG had worked with HeatHack to develop the cards. All of the content generated for the cards would be available under a creative Commons Licence so that any denomination or interfaith partner could make use of them. They would be made available as a set of 55 tactile printed cards as well as online to maximise access to them. A set of the cards was laid out for the Synod to see.
PEG intended to pilot a new programme of workshops in conjunction with its partner HeatHack. Those would help provide a facilitated forum in which groups of non-technical stakeholders could discuss and plan practical actions for net zero. A broad range of topics would be included. The existing HeatHack format was already being used by a number of Scottish Episcopal churches. St Mary’s, Dalkeith had undertaken such a workshop and was already achieving significant savings in their energy bills. PEG’s intention was to pilot a customised version of the workshop in 2023 and roll it out more broadly in 2024.

Mr Woodford also referred to a heating resilience plan template which was available to help congregations in the planning of any replacement of their heating system.

Mr Woodford recognised that there was much work to be undertaken and that there was limited resource available to many vestries. PEG therefore believed it was essential that dedicated qualified people were available to help drive the work forward. That was why PEG was proposing five local Net Zero Champions within the Plan. They would help in bringing understanding of the Toolkit, the cards and the workshop but would be able to meet face-to-face with charges to offer support, including assistance with grant funding applications, on completing the energy footprint tool and appraise and contextualise local action plans. The combination of the resources to which he had referred earlier and the availability of the local Net Zero Champions, PEG believed, would help all charges to accelerate their progress towards net zero by 2030. Finally, he unveiled to Synod a stained glass window illustration created by Lana Woolford based on the PEG logo and the 10 petals of the Net Zero Action Plan.

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

“That this Synod, having expressed in 2020 the need for urgent action in relation to the global climate emergency and having resolved to work towards achieving net zero carbon emissions by 2030, receive the Net Zero Action Plan (2023-2030) for the Scottish Episcopal Church and affirm the direction of the Plan as enabling fulfilment of that resolution.”

Synod then spent time in discussion in table groups, following which plenary debate resumed.

The Rev Dr James Currall (Moray, Ross and Caithness) said he found much that was encouraging in the report to Synod. However, the environmental crisis was much more than just global warming. The "elephant in the room" was the abuse of God’s creation in the overconsumption in the developed world and consequent broken relationship with neighbours worldwide especially the poor and those in less developed countries. These matters were not simply caused by using the wrong technology for energy generation. The issue was frequently ignored because it needed real change and not just a greening up of business as usual. The values and vision section in the Action Plan did not even hint at that. There was a radical inequality in the way the earth's resources were used and there was no solution other than one underpinned by a drastic reduction in consumption. The high rate of consumption produced consequences which were felt particularly in the Global South. Christians needed to treat the resources of the world as part of a relationship with God. Access to resources was not a right, and gratitude was essential. Social justice was key to tackling the issue. Patriarch Bartholomew and Pope Francis had pointed out the link between ecological justice and social justice. A church which failed to pray for the natural environment was one which denied food to a suffering humanity. The environmental crisis was a series of interrelated complex problems to which no one had the answer. Pope Francis had written that to seek only a technical remedy to an environmental problem was to mask the deepest problems of the global system. When faced with such problems, the people of God had historically turned to prayer and lament. In an age when much of the prevailing narrative was that humanity could overcome problems by scientific endeavour or technological advance, it was counter-cultural to suggest that perhaps part of the approach for the Church must be to turn to God rather than engage in ceaseless activity. The Church's approach had to start and end with God. Church and theology had to have something constructive to say since otherwise the Church risked being irrelevant. A truth that did not offer life was empty of meaning. What was the Church’s hope-filled vision for the rest of the world?
There was a responsibility not only to take action to contribute less to the problem but to be a prophetic voice in the world.

Bishop Paton commended Dr Currall for what he had said. None of what he had said was counter to what PEG was proposing, namely a whole Church and Gospel issue, not simply a technological one.

The Rev Willie Shaw (member of PEG) said that he was also a member of the Church in Society Committee which was taking on the responsibility for three of the ten petals of the Action Plan. He invited Dr Currall to bring his passion to building a wider movement and encouraging individual discipleship.

Dr Martin Auld (Aberdeen and Orkney) said that practical simplification of delivery was essential. Complex strategies were a barrier to people's engagement and he urged that the strategy be made simple and available. It was about changing people's lives. He reminded Synod of the five ‘Rs’ (refuse, reduce, reuse, repurpose, recycle). The provision of case studies would be very helpful. Climate change was leading to a biodiversity crisis and so there was a wider issue. Referring to Earth Overshoot Day, the date in the year when consumption of resources exceeded the resources produced by the Earth, he noted that the date had moved from 29 July in 2021 to 28 July in 2022. The period was therefore shortening. For the UK, the date had been 19 May which meant that the UK was a bigger user of resource than the Earth in general. He reminded Synod of the Brundtland Declaration in 1987 which had led to the understanding that the issues were social, environmental and economic. Sustainable development was development which met the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. There was a need for a strategy which helped people to understand that.

Cathy Johnston responded and appreciated the comments about the need to break down the strategy so that it could be understood. That was why PEG wished to develop the Toolkit so that it could be accessed easily. The proposed work with HeatHack would also assist in that. PEG was hoping to build case studies with assistance from diocesan groups. PEG recognised the importance of biodiversity and that was covered in the material.

Dr Stephen Goodyear (Aberdeen and Orkney) explained that prior to his retirement he had held a senior global role in Shell and had been heavily involved in energy transition projects. He was passionate about reducing emissions but the question was whether the Plan which had been presented to the Synod was credible. It asked for £35 million to be spent to reduce 6,000 tonnes per annum of CO2. The Plan assumed that £25 million of that funding requirement would come from public bodies. Most church buildings were not used very often and were difficult to insulate. It was therefore extremely expensive to achieve that level of abatement for every tonne of CO2. The figures were so high that they did not fit with any reasonable metric for a sensible project. The charity trustees might have a difficulty justifying the use of resources in that way. However, he did not think that funds would be available from public sources. Grants were only available for buildings with high utilisation. He had checked the position for his own church which had a utilisation of three hours per week and had received a response to the effect that it would be highly unlikely that funding would be available. He therefore found that element of the Plan profoundly disturbing. He believed that the Plan set the wrong balance between reducing CO2 and offsetting. If that were to be reconsidered, an offsetting strategy could address some of those deficiencies, including taking account of biodiversity. He would be happy to talk with anyone who was interested about such matters. He had shared more information with PEG.

The Rev Lewis Shand Smith (member, PEG) explained that for 10 years he had been the Energy Ombudsman for the United Kingdom. He sat on the Scottish Energy Advisory Board chaired by the First Minister, and was a member of the Green Heat Buildings Finance Task Force and chaired the Energy Consumers Commission. The question about funding was a good one. PEG was aware that church buildings were not used often and that there could be a difficulty in raising finance but that did not mean that congregations should not be doing their best to prepare their buildings to make them as energy efficient as possible. The Plan also encouraged charges to consider how church buildings were used. For example, could they be used more often and made more available to communities? He agreed with Dr Currall about the need to change behaviour. PEG was trying to help Christian people begin their journey towards net zero. The offsetting issue was an important one. There was a concern about how much more carbon the oceans could actually absorb. The first step had to be to reduce emissions. Offsetting would
help with the residual emissions but there was a need to start somewhere and that was what the Plan proposed.

The Rev Denise Herbert (Brechin) agreed with comments made by Dr Goodyear. When at St John’s, Jedburgh, she had been involved in fundraising and she appreciated how difficult it was to raise funds. Grant-making bodies were careful about how they allocated funds. She understood that the Green Energy Fund was no longer giving grants for homes and was only providing loans. Did the Church have the courage to consider selling Victorian rectories, which were difficult to heat, and to buy more appropriate properties, or even to stop providing rectories. Also, was there a need to dispose of some church buildings?

The Rev Bonnie Evans Hills (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) explained that she was the Convener of the Inter-Faith Relations Committee. She noted that many people carried a sense of burden about the issue. The cards would, no doubt, be useful but it would be helpful to have cards with prayers. The Church had decades of theological experience of engaging with climate change and she encouraged use of such resources. There was already liturgy for Creationtide but there were many other resources available such as Forest Church and Forest School which helped people connect with nature locally. She also wished to encourage working with ecumenical and interfaith partners. Each church also needed to connect with its own communities. Leven, where her church was, was an area of high deprivation but there were local eco-groups and there were local organic farmers. She was also aware of fisherfolk concerned about the preservation of the seabed. There was a wider ecology with which to engage.

Ms Susan Rowe (Brechin) explained that she had run one of the Millennium Commission projects. When she had applied for the job she had been informed that there was £12 million available to spend on churches who wished to convert their space to dual use. By the time she had been appointed, the amount had reduced to £2.5 million. People had been excited about the prospect of such financial resource. Her plea was that indications about how much money might be available should not be provided until there was certainty about how much would in fact be available. Also, she urged that the Church should not be carried away by one issue. There was a need to think holistically and bite the bullet as to whether church buildings were being used properly or should they be disposed of.

The Rev Amanda Fairclough (Argyll and The Isles) agreed with much of what had been said during the debate. It was very hard not to support doing good things. She recognised the efforts which PEG had made to engage the Church on climate change. PEG was, however, focused on a particular area in the life of the Church but she was not convinced that everyone had understood the holistic context of the charges. If she were to close mouldy buildings, she would probably need to close all six churches in her charge, as well as the rectory. Financially, the charge supported her and a full-time youth worker and there was more to being church than simply dealing with one particular issue. She intended to vote against Motion 12 on the agenda (regarding the provision of funding) since she was not comfortable writing a blank cheque. She was a member of the Investment Committee and she realised that it would be possible to release finance in a fiscally responsible way but there was a need to be holistic.

The Rev Dr Sophia Marriage (Edinburgh) indicated that she wholeheartedly supported the work that PEG had done. The project was a seven-year one. The Plan involved putting the money where one’s mouth was, and it was a critical issue for the world. It was one of many issues the Church needed to face but it was one of justice and of the future of the planet. She asked the Bishops to help clergy and others who were exhausted to know what other work could be dropped in order to take on the new priority. Permission from Bishops was needed for that.

Mrs Victoria Elliott (Edinburgh) thanked PEG for its work, but she had concerns about whether the Plan was too stringent. She considered it would be helpful to approach the subject in a doctrinal and theological way, leading to practical action. Her Diocesan Standing Committee had discussed matters earlier in the week and questions had been raised about the proposal for Net Zero Champions including their line management and funding. Also, there was a need to recognise work which had already been done by some charges, since there was a danger that the Plan might be perceived as a top-down requirement from the Province. She was undecided as to how to vote.
Mr Brian Harris (Aberdeen and Orkney) noted that Dr Auld had referred to the Brundtland definition of sustainable development. He believed that Brundtland needed to be redefined in terms of the biblical imperative of the second Great Commandment to love one’s neighbour. There were responsibilities to neighbours in time as well as in space.

Mr Hugh Morison (Moray, Ross and Caithness) agreed with much of what had been said. He believed the Plan was a good one. It was very useful to have the Toolkit. He welcomed the proposals for staff to be made available to give advice to congregations. Speaking as a member of a very small congregation in a rural area, he wondered whether the resource was available to implement matters locally. He asked PEG to bear that in mind. He also had concerns about Motion 12 and could not see how it fitted in with the overall responsibility for budgeting. His understanding was that the Synod was not being asked to approve the provision of funding set out in the document but rather to ask Standing Committee to propose such funding as was appropriate.

Mr Shand Smith responded to points made. One of the petals referred to in the Action Plan was the building of a movement and it was right to build such a movement in local communities. As to prayer and liturgy, the Liturgy Committee was involved and the cards would provide an opportunity to reflect. More material would come from the Liturgy Committee and would be added in due course. The Green Heat Scheme had not been successful and he understood it had been wound up but there were grants available from the Scottish Government through Business Energy Scotland and Homes Energy Scotland of up to £8,000 for retrofitting. Sadly, people did not appear to be applying for such grants and there was also an issue in Scotland that there were insufficient numbers of trained people to undertake the necessary work. He agreed that expectations about available finance should not result in overlooking the question as to whether buildings were in fact fit for purpose.

Mr Shaw reported that there were churches which had already applied, and received, funding, such as Wishaw and Motherwell. His own church was in the process of seeking finance. Business Energy Scotland would visit the building to help in the commencement of a plan. It was possible to separate halls and churches. A church hall was a public use space and could be developed to maximise such use. He agreed that there was a need for a holistic conversation about continuing to hold certain buildings.

Ms Bridget Campbell (Convener, Standing Committee) commented on the budgeting process. Each year at Synod, the Standing Committee provided to Synod an indicative budget for the subsequent three years. In November each year the Standing Committee agreed a firm budget for the following calendar year. Each year, the Committee explained to Synod how money had been spent in the previous year. The proposal was not about making an open-ended commitment. PEG had made some helpful projections based on the information it had been able to gather to-date. It had set a direction of travel and, year by year, the Standing Committee would be able to assess what it could afford to spend. Synod had heard earlier in the day from the Investment Committee about the potential availability of finance. Net zero was not the only issue on which finance could be spent but it encompassed a range of issues which the Church needed to address. She agreed that there was a need for a holistic approach. Synod was being asked to endorse not a blank cheque, but a direction of travel.

The Motion was then put to the vote and passed as follows: 79 in favour, 11 against, 9 abstentions.

Bishop Paton then proposed, and Ms Campbell seconded, the following motion:

“That this Synod request the Standing Committee to approve the provision of such funding as the Committee considers appropriate, in consultation with the Provincial Environment Group, to support implementation of the Net Zero Action Plan (2023-2030) for the Scottish Episcopal Church.”

The Chair clarified that Synod did not approve budgets as such. It was provided with the budgets but approved the quota figure, in the light of the budget presented.

The Motion was put to the vote and passed as follows: 74 in favour, 15 against, 12 abstentions.
In closing the session, the Chair thanked the members of PEG and all who had contributed to the debate.

**SESSION 4: THE RT REV THE BISHOP OF GLASGOW AND GALLOWAY IN THE CHAIR**

### 4.1 Mission Board

#### 4.1.1 Introduction

The Very Rev Sarah Murray (Convener, Mission Board) reported that there had been much discussion about the task and role of the Mission Board albeit not as much discussion as there had been about what was meant by “mission”. What was clear was that the Church had a mission in each place according to the local context and community and everyone had a part to play in that mission. The Board and its pendant committees, working with the College of Bishops and the Standing Committee, was looking at ways to support the Church in its mission. The Board had outlined some of the ways in which it sought to do that in its Workplan and there would be opportunity to explore that in more detail in the “Meet the Board Conveners” session later that day. It was essential for the Church and the sustainable future that ways be found to continue to be a national church with a vibrant and relevant presence in all communities. In the light of the Net Zero Action Plan from the Provincial Environment Group, and its emphasis on a holistic approach taking up the themes of discipleship, justice and hope, linked to the fifth Mark of Mission, the task of the Board was to encourage wider mission beyond climate sustainability recognising that Christ's saving power was to be found everywhere. That involved prophetic dialogue with the world and was a combination of the witness of individual churches and the institutional church.

The pilot phase of the Local Mission Development Committee had begun to ask questions and to seek to begin the process of looking at statistics, using data from a pilot project of an extended statistical return form undertaken in the Diocese of Moray, Ross and Caithness. That piece of work was in its early stages.

Other work of the Board included the Church in Society Committee which worked in partnership with other committees of the Church and a number of third sector agencies to promote justice for creation and justice for communities. Given the limited number of members on the Committee and constraints of available time, its work needed to be focused on particular themes or topics at any one time. In the previous 12 months the Committee had engaged with the Scottish Churches Parliamentary Office and a submission had been made supporting the appointment of a commissioner under the Well-being and Sustainable Development (Scotland) Bill and preparations were underway for a submission in relation to the Agriculture Bill. The Committee was also working with the Provincial Environment Group. A further development in the year had been the revision of criteria for, and the rebranding of, the former Child Poverty Grant scheme, to become the Enable Grant, details of which were available on the provincial website.

The Global Partnerships Committee continued to engage with churches around the world through supporting mission projects and capacity building identified by local dioceses overseas. The Committee was endeavouring to strengthen relationships with strategic partners for a more sustained and meaningful partnership. It also encouraged the strengthening of existing companion links and the forging of new ones.

The Board's third pendant committee, the Provincial Youth Committee would give a presentation later in Synod.

Provost Murray reported that the Board was pleased to receive feedback either during Synod or through the network of diocesan representatives on the Board and through the Local Mission Development Committee.
She expressed thanks to those who served on the Board and its Committees and to those who supported their work.

4.1.2 Season for Christian Life

The Rev Jim Benton Evans (member, Season for Christian Life Steering Group) explained that the Steering Group for the Season for Christian Life comprised him, the Rev Kim Lafferty, the Rev Dr Jenny Holden and the Rev Canon Peter Moger.

By way of introduction three short videos were shown of individuals responding to the question "what does it mean to you to turn to Christ?". That question was posed to candidates at baptism and it was in that context that the Season for Christian Life had been initiated by the College of Bishops in conjunction with the Mission Board, initially under the leadership of Bishop Anne Dyer. It comprised an invitation. It was not an initiative or a project being imposed upon people. It was an invitation to "live your best Christian life". The Season would comprise a series of opportunities for members of the Church to tell one another and the world about their Christian life. Above all, it would be a celebration of how the Christian life was expressed, which meant that it would be very different for different people in different places across the Province. The Season was also about recognising that what church members were already doing was Christian and about affirming that. It was set in the context of a common commitment to God and a common calling in Christ as created and beloved children.

The Rev Kim Lafferty (member, Season for Christian Life Steering Group) explained that she was a rector in East Perthshire. She was also interim pastor for Forfar and Kirriemuir. Having arrived in the SEC two years previously, it was a great joy to be involved in the season.

The Rev Dr Jenny Holden (member, Season for Christian Life Steering Group) explained that she was also the Adviser for Christian Life for the Diocese of Aberdeen and Orkney. Before that she had served as a priest in a growing congregation in city-centre Aberdeen. The members of the Steering Group were from diverse backgrounds and contexts, seeking to reflect the diversity of the Province. She explained that the Season had as its purpose the enlivening of Christian faith and life, with many different entry points. Everyone was different and connected with God in different ways. For some, that was expressed in acts of service; for others a commitment to treasuring the environment or telling others about Jesus or exploring different spiritual practices. It included activities which people undertook already such as serving on Synod, or in a church service, or campaigning on a local or global issue. The Season would not be defined by one Christian tradition and was not about telling people what to do but rather would offer resources to help church members look forward with hope and focus on the future in continuing to seek to know God more clearly, love God more dearly and follow God more nearly, day by day.

The report in the Synod papers mentioned a future provincial gathering. That would not be a very large meeting but a smaller scale gathering bringing people together to share stories and equip and enable those working in dioceses to facilitate the Season for Christian Life. The Steering Group was consciously engaging with the existing work of boards and committees of the Church including the Provincial Environment Group, where discipleship was one of the three themes of the vision.

The Group was keen to ensure that it was responding to the needs of individuals and congregations which was why the Synod would be invited to engage in table discussions on various questions suggested by the Group.

Synod then spent time addressing questions in table groups, it having been explained that the facilitators on each table would provide feedback from the discussions for passing to the Steering Group.
4.1.3 Local Mission Development Committee

The Very Rev Sarah Murray (Convener, Mission Board) spoke to the proposals set out in the Synod papers regarding the formalising of the Local Mission Development Committee as a pendant committee of the Mission Board. She offered her thanks to the Rev Diana Hall, the Convener of the Committee, who was unable to be present at Synod. She also thanked those who had worked with Ms Hall in the initial phase of the Committee’s life.

Provost Murray then proposed, and the Rev Dr Jenny Holden (Aberdeen and Orkney), seconded the following motion:

“That the Digest of Resolutions be amended:

- By the insertion after Section 2.4.3 (c) of the words:
  "(d) the Local Mission Development Committee."

- By the insertion of a new Section 2.4.6 as follows:
  “The Local Mission Development Committee shall have responsibility for offering support to those catalysing, developing and nurturing local mission and shall undertake particular projects relating to local mission development as requested by the Mission Board or College of Bishops.””

The Motion was put to the vote and passed as follows: 103 in favour, 1 against, 4 abstentions.

4.2 Address by the Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, the Rt Rev Sally Foster-Fulton

The Primus welcomed the Rt Rev Sally Foster-Fulton, the Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. Many in the SEC had worked with her in the past in connection with her role in Christian Aid. It was a historic day to be able to welcome her as leader of the national Church of Scotland.

The Moderator thanked Synod for its welcome and was honoured to join the meeting. One of her greatest joys over the years had come from intentional ecumenical partnerships. When Churches stood together adding their voices to a growing call for justice, that turned the volume from a whisper to a roar embodying the "body of Christ". When Christians chose to open their hearts and minds and step out in faith with those from other faiths who shared a vision for love, equity and peace, Christians were never diluted but rather enriched and enriching. She recalled the march at the COP26 Conference in Glasgow when a sodden and fully robed Primus had walked in rain-soaked solidarity with others - the SEC had made a statement that day and had continued to be a beacon for the Church in Scotland. She had been gladdened to hear of the Synod's decision about its Net Zero Action Plan the previous day.

The Moderator’s hopes for the Church in Scotland were to embrace every opportunity for love, to take hold and to shake off that which muted or slowed the Churches’ ability to make a difference. It had been an extraordinarily challenging time in the life of the planet, the life of the country and the Church and communities of faith had not been exempt. Green was the liturgical colour for "ordinary time" and was a reminder that it had been the determination and hopeful imagination of individuals and communities who had risen to the extraordinary challenges of the past.

Current times were challenging. Referring to the South African phrase "ubuntu", best translated as "I am because you are", she suggested that the work which the body of Christ had to do in sharing love and seeking justice would most authentically be done together.

The Moderator said that she had re-read the ecumenical policies of the SEC and the Church of Scotland. If the Churches truly embraced the vision which they offered, they would truly serve God and the communities of Scotland. The document celebrated the unique gifts and traditions of each Church. She urged working together to meet local needs, to address the challenges of climate change, injustice and violent conflict, to offer befriending to those who were isolated or
vulnerable and to provide worship that fed the souls of the Christian communities represented by
the Churches in imaginative ways.

She thanked the Synod for the St Andrew Declaration and rejoiced in the St Margaret Declaration
with the Roman Catholic Church. She committed her time as Moderator to supporting the ways
the Churches could put the spiritual, physical and emotional needs of the communities they
served first and foremost in decision-making. If one started with the theological questions, it
would take imagination and determination to a different level.

The Moderator said that her heart had been set on fire by the statement in the SEC ecumenical
policy document "God calls the Scottish Episcopal Church to share in the mission of God and, in
the light of this, to remove any obstacles that hinder our co-operation with our sisters and
brothers in Christ". The Church of Scotland would do the same. The theme of the Church of
Scotland's General Assembly in the current year had been "remember who you are". The
Church of Scotland and the Church in Scotland was going through a difficult-but-necessary
evolution and it was not without pain but if the vital work of the Churches was to continue it was
necessary to ensure that the Church was fit for purpose and to be clear about what that purpose
was. In the "remembering who we are" the Churches were part of the body of Christ with eyes
that saw the world as good and beautiful and one that needed all the love that could be
mustered. The body of Christ needed hands that were not afraid to get dirty, feet that walked the
extra mile and a heart hot with compassion. The body of Christ was so much bigger than any
individual or any one denomination.

The Moderator closed her address with a prayer.

The Primus thanked the Moderator for her address and the Chair opened the session to
comment and question.

Mr Bobby Dickson (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) thanked the Moderator on behalf of all
Synod members, for her outstanding address and for raising in the mind of the Synod the
necessity of working together. As he had done at General Synod 2022, he wished to cast his
mind back to an instance when things had gone wrong. In the 1950s there had been a genuine
attempt to link the SEC, the Church of Scotland and the Church of England but it had been
blocked through the regrettable ignorance of the SEC. The SEC ought to be ashamed that 70
years previously it had had missed the opportunity of closer working together. He welcomed the
St Andrew Declaration and was glad that the Churches were now working in a genuine
ecumenical partnership.

The Chair closed the session by thanking the Moderator most sincerely.

SESSION 5: THE VERY REV SARAH MURRAY IN THE CHAIR

5.1 Faith and Order Board - Introduction

The Primus explained that the work of the Faith and Order Board featured in various items across
the agenda for the current Synod. As Convener of the Board he expressed thanks to all
members of the Board and of the Board's pendant committees.

5.2 Inter-Church Relations Committee

The Rev Prof Charlotte Methuen (Convener, Inter-Church Relations Committee) reminded the
Synod that the previous year it had requested the Inter-Church Relations Committee to draw up
guidelines to explain the practical implications of the St Andrew Declaration. In undertaking that
task, it had become clear that Canon 15 did not make any provision for agreements such as the
St Andrew Declaration which was not an agreement of full Communion but which permitted
limited exchange. The SEC had entered into three such agreements, affirmed by the Synod:
Reuilly (2001) with the Protestant Churches in France and Alsace (Lutheran and Reformed), the
EMU partnership (2010) with the Methodist Church and the United Reformed Church in Scotland,
and the St Andrew Declaration (2021) with the Church of Scotland. The Board had asked the
Committee, in consultation with the Committee on Canons, to suggest a resolution for such
anomaly and the proposals brought to the current Synod did that.
Prof Methuen explained that the proposals would create a schedule of Churches with which the SEC had entered into agreements of limited exchange. The proposed amendments to Canon 15 would make it possible for an ordained minister of Word and Sacrament of one of those Churches to preside at a service of Holy Communion in an SEC church, using a rite of their own Church. Any such service would need to be advertised as such: a service of Holy Communion according to the rite of the Methodist Church or the Church of Scotland. She was aware that such services were already happening in some dioceses but in fact the Canons as they currently stood did not allow for that except in local ecumenical partnerships. The alterations also clarified procedures around visiting clergy, especially with regards to notifying the Bishop. As well as changes to Canon 15, the proposal included a substantive amendment to Canon 16, namely to add reference to Canon 15 in which the detailed provisions were set out. The opportunity was also being taken to make some minor changes to terminology in both Canons recognising shifts in practice. Since 2001, when the Reuilly Agreement had been approved, the Canons of the SEC had been out of step and the Committee and the Board hoped that Synod would wish to resolve that discrepancy.

Prof Methuen noted that, in a parallel development, the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland had the previous month clarified rules about who was able to celebrate the sacraments in the Church of Scotland, a move which she very much welcomed. The proposed changes to the SEC’s Canon were an expression of the SEC’s commitment to its partner Churches and to shared mission in Scotland.

The Primus then proposed the following motion:

“That the amended text of Canon 15 be read for the first time.”

The Primus explained that in his diocese, the SEC, the Church of Scotland and the Roman Catholic Church enjoyed hospitality in each other’s Churches. Asking people to travel 200 miles to a church of their own denomination simply did not work.

The Rt Rev Dr John Armes (Bishop of Edinburgh) seconded the Motion.

The Rev James Patron Bell (Methodist Church) spoke as the Ecumenical Officer for the Methodist Church in Scotland and declared a dual interest as a co-opted member of the Inter-Church Relations Committee. He welcomed the proposed amendments to Canon 15. They made tangible the developments possible by the agreements which the SEC had entered into. It was good to ensure that the Church was able to do what it said it would do. He also extended his thanks for the guidelines which had been produced on the topic since they would, together with the Canon, allow invitations to be made without any risk of non-compliance with the Canons, whilst also offering ecumenical hospitality and welcome.

The Rev Ross Blackman (Church of Scotland) explained he was the minister of Hamilton Old Parish Church of Scotland and the Convener of the Church of Scotland’s Committee on Ecumenical Relations. He thanked the Synod for its invitation to attend the meeting. He would have been present in 2022 in person but had unfortunately caught Covid at the General Assembly that year. He also expressed thanks for the Synod dinner. At the Eucharist at the beginning of Synod he had spent time contemplating the Rublev Icon of the Holy Trinity and the divine dance, as referred to by Richard Rohr, between the members of the Trinity. It led him to reflect on the relationships between the Churches and their members. Like the SEC, he held to the Word of God as exceptional as found in Scripture, to the early creeds and he used them regularly. He loved good liturgy and for the previous few years he had been preaching on the Five Marks of Mission in which the preface referred to the mission of the Church being the mission of Christ. He also adhered to the Lund principle that affirmed that Churches should act together in all matters except those in which deep differences of conviction compelled them to act differently. There were differences which needed to be acknowledged and applauded. Every Sunday he donned his cassock and Geneva gown but he worked locally with his Episcopal colleague in Hamilton and particularly enjoyed doing so in civic contexts. Three weeks earlier, the General Assembly had taken a further step by agreeing amendments to its Sacraments Act which finally made explicit the possibility of SEC clergy leading the Sacraments in a Church of Scotland building. He hoped the Synod would endorse the changes being proposed.
Dr Euan Grant (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) wished to comment on sections 2(c) and 5 of Canon 15. The changes were concerned with what it meant for the Church to be Episcopal, namely to be loyal to evangelical faith and apostolic order. He wished to plead with the Synod to vote against the proposals. The proposal related to the eucharistic life of charges and not about hospitality in church buildings. He had looked back over the records of Synod discussions over the previous nine years including the discussions about the St Columba Declaration, Our Common Calling, the St Andrew Declaration and the rationale set out in the Synod papers. He suggested that the St Andrew Declaration did not require the Church to adopt a proposal, but merely allowed it to do so. He had also looked back to the letters of St Ignatius, the Bishop of Antioch, who had stated that the Bishop “by his silence is able to accomplish more than those who vainly talk”. St Ignatius had much to say about episcopacy and the Eucharist. In St Ignatius’ letter to the Philadelphians, he had urged them to “take heed to have but one Eucharist… since there was but one altar and one Bishop”. The issue therefore, was unity in the Eucharist and unity in the Bishop and as he surveyed the Synod ecumenically he could see what called the Churches together and what divided them. For St Ignatius, who lived only one generation after the Apostles, the Eucharist and Bishop were inseparable. The Synod did not need to agree with St Ignatius. However, Synod members had a duty to take him seriously and the many others who had seen the historical unity in the episcopal succession in the Church and the eucharistic life entrusted to the Church. If that was discarded, what did it mean to be Episcopalian? He suggested that the proposal in the new Canon to some extent severed the unity of episcopacy and eucharist. There might be good answers to that question but it was a weighty question which he believed the Church had taken culpably lightly.

The Rev Dr Stephen Holmes (Edinburgh) also wished to invite the Synod to vote against the Motion. He thanked the Committee for its guidelines which were very useful and for much of the content of the Canons. His difficulty was with sections 2(c) and 5(a) and (c) of Canon 15 which allowed a non-episcopally ordained minister to preside at the Eucharist not as an act of hospitality but as part of a liturgical life of an SEC congregation. He believed that what the Primus had described was already allowed but that the proposal being out forward was different. He believed that in spirit the proposal contradicted Canon 1 under which any presbyter had to be ordained by a Bishop. He was not convinced by the proposal which envisaged the minister celebrating according to the rite of their own Church. He had experience of having served on the ministry team of St John’s, Princes Street, Edinburgh which was in a local ecumenical partnership. There had been a Church of Scotland minister on that team and at the outset notice had been given that services at which that person had presided were according to the Church of Scotland rite. However, members of the congregation felt that a warning in that form (perceived to be anti-Presbyterian) was not appropriate. Giving such a warning also did not appear kind and so the practice of giving notice was discontinued and the minister thereafter used the 1982 Liturgy, wearing a chasuble. Dr Holmes considered that that situation was somewhat dishonest and he believed that the Canon would institutionalise such dishonesty. He believed deeper consideration was needed and referred to the situation in Ireland where some means of enabling episcopal ordination of Methodist clergy had been achieved. He made clear that he did not wish to attribute the institutionalised dishonesty to which he had referred to any particular individual and he understood that the proposal was being brought forward for good reason.

Prof Methuen thanked those who had contributed. In relation to the relationship between Orders and the Eucharist, it was a relationship which everyone took very seriously where the Churches were seeking to find ways forward in ecumenical relations which ultimately would allow the Orders to be reconciled. With the Churches with whom the SEC had a relationship of full Communion, that had been achieved. Anglican polity meant that was possible only where agreement could be reached on episcopacy and that had not so far been reached with the Reformed Churches. It had been possible with some Lutheran Churches (such as those involved in the Porvoo Declaration). In the Reuilly Agreement, the EMU Partnership and the St Andrew Declaration the Churches had not reached a position of agreement on episcopacy. The ecumenical movement faced a question and Anglicans in the previous 40 years had made a decision with those Churches where agreement on full Communion could not be reached, to move forward with limited sharing. Roman Catholic policy indicated that it was not possible to discuss eucharistic hospitality until there had been agreement on Orders. With the limited exchange agreements, Anglicans had made a theological decision to permit sharing of the Eucharist even if Orders were still under discussion. Prof Methuen accepted that there were questions about that decision within the ecumenical movement but nevertheless that was what had happened. The proposed canonical amendment asked Synod to put into practice the
theology that underlay that decision. Synod had heard an eloquent explanation of the Catholic position which did not allow a split between eucharist and Orders. She did not consider that the proposals went beyond what the limited sharing agreements envisaged. The Meissen Agreement was the model for all subsequent ones and she believed that the proposed canonical changes were consistent with that. As to the question of dishonesty, she agreed that the proposal was not about permitting, say a Church of Scotland congregation, to worship in an SEC church. That was already legitimate. The proposal was about having the capability in a situation where a eucharist was expected and an SEC priest was not available, for a Church of Scotland minister to celebrate “our service” in an SEC Church. It was possible that not everyone might want to receive under such circumstances which was why making clear the nature of the service had been suggested as necessary. It was therefore not about institutionalising dishonesty but about recognising that different Churches had different polities and yet had reached sufficient agreement that the eucharist could be shared. The agreements did not allow concelebration but it was to enable a means for sharing eucharistic ministry and sharing mission and was therefore about being honest.

The Rev Canon Vittoria Hancock (Aberdeen and Orkney) thought she needed to start apologising to her Bishop for having breached the Canons. She had the fortune of working in two charges which had very good ecumenical relations. Holy Week and Easter were celebrated together. Earlier this year she had been ill and was off for Holy Week and Easter. In one of her congregations there was a retired Church of Scotland minister who, at the last minute had stepped in and led Holy Week and Easter. She did not have any lay readers or retired SEC clergy locally. That was the reality of rural ministry and there was a pastoral need which would be encountered regularly. An Easter Saturday vigil had been hosted at the local Church of Scotland but unfortunately, the Church of Scotland minister had also been off ill. One of her church members stood in for that minister. She recognised that there were theological and liturgical issues but, as a priest working on the ground in a rural area, she trusted her colleagues and there was no deception involved. The proposed changes were needed.

The Rt Rev Dr Keith Riglin (Bishop of Argyll and The Isles) said that with a heavy heart he supported those who had spoken against the Motion. He was also concerned by the answer given by Prof Methuen since not only did the proposal go beyond the wording of the existing agreements but he believed her answer went beyond the wording of the Motion in that a minister from a partner Church would be invited to take “our service”. He did not believe that the eucharist should be used as a means to unity when in fact it was an expression of unity.

Prof Methuen responded that her intention had been to say that the invitation was to take a service on a normal Sunday. The example given by Canon Hancock was exactly the kind of situation where the Canon could usefully apply. In other words, everyone should be clear about the tradition from which the celebrant was coming. It was not saying that a service could not take place because there was no one available to take it. That was what she meant by "our service". Such a service would not be billed as an SEC Eucharist.

The Rev Gary Clink (Brechin) also opposed the Motion, particularly in relation to Section 2(c). He believed there was a need to consider the effect the change would have on the wider Church beyond Scotland. The rest of the Anglican Communion was looking to see what the Synod decided. One needed to look no further than the subject of equal marriage where a decision had been taken in Scotland in the Scottish context but which caused division with provinces in Africa. If the Synod made a decision to open up the celebration of the eucharist to non-episcopally ordained clergy, it would be cause for further disunity. Good practice was already going on. In the Diocese of Brechin churches had been opened to Ukrainian Orthodox members to have services. It was important to show generosity of spirit. Ukrainian Orthodox Christians could celebrate on SEC altars because they shared a similar theology. Instead of rushing to find ways to be generous, there was a need to reflect on the Church’s theology.

Prof Methuen responded that it was important to realise that the proposals were not innovative. The Reuilly Agreement had been in place since 2001 and had built on the Meissen Agreement between the Church of England and certain Reformed Churches. The Canons of the Church of England, the Church of Ireland and the Church in Wales all made similar provision to what was being proposed. The proposal was, therefore, not an innovation, nor was it about hospitality but was about the possibilities available to the SEC in its own liturgical life.
The Motion was put to the vote but when the result was announced the Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) raised a point of order since in the House of Bishops seven votes had been recorded whereas only six were present to vote. He suggested that there was a need for a different voting procedure. The Chair announced that the vote would be audited and proceedings were paused for that purpose. One lay member indicated that she had not had an option to vote on her device.

Mr Neil MacLennan, (Sanctus Media and Teller) reported on the result of the audit and confirmed that one person who was not a Bishop had voted as a Bishop. He reminded Synod members that they had been invited to press the red button on their devices at the beginning of the debate and it appeared that one individual had not heard that instruction and, therefore, was not presented with the correct voting button. The Chair had suggested that the vote be re-run.

Dr Beth Routledge (Glasgow and Galloway) raised a point of order. She had concerns that if there were questions about the integrity of the voting system it would be more appropriate for the Chair to suspend electronic voting and revert to show of hands. Provost Holdsworth said that if the voting system had not correctly recorded the votes, simply to re-run the vote was not acceptable. Whilst previous votes in Synod had been passed by a significant majority, he was concerned that some of the Motions yet to come could be close. The Chair called a short adjournment.

On reconvening, the Chair explained that the reason for the irregularity had been established by the audit and invited Mr MacLennan to give a more technical explanation. Mr MacLennan then explained that in preparing for the complexities of the Motions on the agenda for the current day, he had set the full text of motions and amendments up on the Synod Hub at the beginning of the morning. At that point where appropriate to allow for voting in houses, houses had been allocated to each of the Motions. That required members to press the “current live debate” button on their screens to ensure that they had the latest code for voting purposes. It was apparent that at least one person had not done that with the result that their device did not have the updated voting code and so they had been able to vote in a different manner. There was no issue with the counting of the votes, it was just that an individual had been able to vote in the incorrect house. The auditing process involved drawing information from two different systems (they were separate for security reasons) and the information had to be manually combined to audit the vote. That had been done and that revealed the issue in question. The audit could be done in any house and provided information to the satisfaction of the Tellers. He hoped that the audit process was a reassurance to Synod.

Provost Holdsworth raised a further point of order. He asked whether the system was unable to identify people by name or by house. If that was the case, it would not be possible to ascertain who had been voting in which house. Mr MacLennan confirmed that the system was able to identify by both name and house. He confirmed that the other Tellers had access to that information. Mr Malcolm Bett (Teller) confirmed that the Tellers did have access to that information. It was confirmed that the identity of the individual who had voted in the House of Bishops had been ascertained.

The Chair asked the Synod whether it was content to return to electronic voting. On a show of hands Synod confirmed that it was.

Motion 14 and was then put to the vote again in houses with the following result:

- House of Clergy: 44 in favour, 11 against, 2 abstentions
- House of Laity: 44 in favour, 9 against, 1 abstention
- College of Bishops: 4 in favour, 2 against, no abstentions.

The Chair declared the Motion passed.

Prof Methuen then spoke to the proposal to amend Canon 16. The effect of the changes to Canon 16 were to reflect the changes which had just been accepted at first reading to Canon 15. The proposed changes were desirable, regardless of what members felt about the changes to Canon 15.
The Primus then proposed, and the Rt Rev Dr John Armes (Bishop of Edinburgh) seconded, the following motion:

“That the amended text of Canon 16 be read for the first time.”

The Chair opened the Motion to debate but there was no comment.

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

- House of Clergy: 46 in favour, 6 against, 6 abstentions
- House of Laity: 49 in favour, none against, 3 abstentions
- House of Bishops: 5 in favour, none against, 1 abstention

The Chair expressed thanks to Prof Methuen.

5.3 Committee on Canons – Canon 4

The Rt Rev Dr John Armes (Bishop of Edinburgh) presented, on behalf of the Faith and Order Board, the revised Canon 4 for its second reading. He hoped that it would gain sufficient votes in all houses to be passed as the new Canon for the calling and election of Bishops because he believed it improved the existing Canon in several ways. Those had been set out in the paper enclosed in the Synod papers.

Bishop Armes reminded the Synod that the process of revision had begun in 2018. The Canon 4 Review Group had invited comments from the whole Province, including Diocesan Synod and General Synod members, as well as those involved in previous elections, whether as Preparatory Committee members or as candidates. In 2021, the Synod had been invited to consider two options – either a more radical reinvention of the election process through an Electoral College or a revision which maintained the principle that, so far as possible, each diocese should elect its own Bishop. The Synod had clearly preferred the second of those options and the Canon presented to Synod in the current meeting was the outworking of that second option.

The new Canon followed the same principle as the existing Canon 4 in that it centred on an Electoral Synod drawn from clergy and laity from every charge in a diocese. However, in significant ways it differed from the existing Canon and the changes addressed the widespread frustrations and criticisms which had been offered by those who had responded to the Review Group’s consultation.

Bishop Armes explained that under the proposed Canon more agency would be given to the Electoral Synod to devise its own timetable for the process and the election was presented as a single process which might, or might not, pass through three stages. Under the existing Canon there had always been the possibility that the Bishops might have to make an election if two mandates failed to produce a favoured candidate. The new Canon would require the Bishops to be present at the first meeting of the Electoral Synod so that they could listen to the needs and aspirations of the Diocese. The new Canon also required the Bishops to consult with diocesan representatives on the Preparatory Committee in the event that the Episcopal Synod was required to elect. The new Canon also made it less likely that an election would end up with the Bishops. It offered the option at the second stage of reducing the minimum shortlist from three names to two.

One area of the existing Canon which had been the subject of significant criticism was the requirement to make public the names on the shortlist. Many candidates found that stressful and exposing and unhelpful also for their congregations. That was especially difficult for candidates who were not elected. Confidentiality had always been a vital part of the Canon 4 process and the deliberations of the Preparatory Committee and Electoral Synods had never been made public, nor had voting figures. The new Canon would extend confidentiality to the names on the shortlist.

The proposed revision also addressed a curious anomaly. Under the existing Canon only those clergy who were members of the final Diocesan Synod before the retirement of the Bishop could be electors. That meant that clergy appointed to posts after that point, perhaps many months
before the election itself, were disenfranchised. The proposed new cut-off date for clergy electors was when the mandate was issued.

Bishop Armes cautioned against unrealistic expectations of what a Canon could deliver. The election of Bishops was a matter of prayerful discernment by all concerned and the canonical process could provide a framework for such discernment but was not a substitute for it. Electing a Bishop was not the same as appointing a CEO. At every stage it was necessary to look to God and give primacy to God. The reference to “calling” in the new heading of the Canon was the call of God.

It was up to all those involved to inject humanity into the process. The Canon itself could not do that. Care needed to be taken to treat everyone with kindness and grace especially in the way that candidates in the process were treated. That was why the Canon would be accompanied by a Commentary and also Guidelines setting out best practice for the running of an election.

The Guidelines emphasised how vital it was that all those involved should be trained not only in best practice but in spiritual discernment. The matter of discernment was so important that Section 4(c) of the new Canon specified that training in discernment had to be given. If the new Canon received its second reading at the current meeting a new resolution to the Canon would be brought to General Synod 2024 to set out what that training should involve.

The Review Group had tried over the course of the previous five years to listen to God and to the members of the Church. It had sought to discern the will of God but the ultimate test was now for the Synod itself to discern, prayerfully and carefully, what was right for the Church.

Bishop Armes then proposed, and the Primus seconded, the following motion:

“That the amended text of Canon 4 be read for the second time.”

The Chair explained that certain amendments had been set out on the agenda for Synod.

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

Amendment 1:

To add at the end of the above motion for second reading:

“subject to the following alterations:

- That Section 10(d) be amended to read “Recipients of the Summons should also receive a copy of the Mandate, the Guidelines and the Commentary with a copy of this Canon attached.”
- That the reference in Section 28(a) to Appendix 3 be replaced by a reference to Appendix 3A
- That the reference in Section 30(a) to Appendix 3 be replaced by a reference to Appendix 3B.”

Mr Graham Robertson (Convener, Committee on Canons) explained that the amendment comprised a minor alteration and provided clarity on three matters. The first required a copy of the Canon to be provided to members of the Electoral Synod. The other two changes related to the formal declaration of the outcome of an episcopal election. Two different declarations were required depending on whether the election was by the Electoral Synod or the Episcopal Synod.

The Chair opened the amendment for debate but there was none. Bishop Armes confirmed that he had no objection to the amendment.

The amendment was then put to the vote in houses with the following result:

House of Clergy: 57 in favour, 1 against, 1 abstention
The Chair declared the amendment passed.

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

Amendment 2:

To add at the end of the above motion for second reading:

“subject to adding at the end of Section 29(b) the following sentence: “The purpose of this meeting shall be to consider the reasons why the Electoral Synod was unable to complete the electoral process and also to discuss the particular needs of the diocese, including mission and ministry and spiritual oversight.””

Mr Robertson explained the purpose of the second amendment. It proposed the introduction of additional wording into Section 29(b) of the Canon to explain that the purpose of the meeting of members of the Episcopal Synod with the diocesan members of the Preparatory Committee was to consider the reasons why the Electoral Synod had been unable to complete the electoral process and also to discuss the particular needs of the Diocese, including mission and ministry and spiritual oversight.

The Chair opened the amendment for comment but there was none.

Bishop Armes confirmed that he was content with the proposed amendment.

The amendment was then put to the vote in houses with the following result:

House of Clergy: 54 in favour, 2 against, 1 abstention
House of Laity: 50 in favour, none against, 4 abstentions
House of Bishops: 5 in favour, none against, 1 abstention

The Chair declared the amendment passed.

The Chair then opened the original motion, as amended, for debate.

Prof Alan Werritty (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) explained that he was a member of the Canon 4 Review Group. It had become clear to him in the responses to the consultation which the Group had undertaken that the current Canon was not fit for purpose. Many of the concerns which had been raised related not to the text of the Canon but rather to the way the Canon had been implemented. Two findings in particular had stood out to him: a lack of consistency in how individual candidates had been treated and an imperfect understanding on the part of the electorate as to how the process worked. Some candidates had found the process brutal and lacking in humanity. Some electors had viewed the process as a "beauty competition" in which performance at the initial electoral meeting had been given undue emphasis. Others appeared to have made up their mind even before the preliminary meeting. The inflexibility of the timetable prescribed by the Canon was another area of concern as was the role of the Bishops. Significant changes had been made. Unusually, the Canon was to be accompanied by a Commentary and Guidelines. The Commentary was intended as a user guide and checklist for clarifying a text which could appear opaque to the non-specialist reader. The Guidelines would provide a checklist with clear instructions for those charged with specific tasks as part of the process, including, specifically, the care of candidates. The Guidelines and Commentary could be amended in future by a single vote in Synod. The most fundamental change was contained in Section 4(c) in that the calling of a Bishop was seen as a process of discernment. The Rev Canon Ian Barcroft, Provincial Director of Ordinands, had helped the Review Group understand how the calling to the episcopate was not inherently different to that applicable to a deacon or presbyter. If the Canon were passed, the Faith and Order Board would develop training on discernment, tailored to the needs of the specific groups involved in the electoral process. This would include surrounding the process with prayer to ensure an openness to the Holy Spirit. No revised Canon would be perfect but he urged Synod not to let the perfect be the enemy of the good.
Dr Stephen Goodyear (Aberdeen and Orkney) had a question for clarification. The Charities and Trustee Investment (Scotland) Act 2005 had made significant changes to charity law when it was introduced. His observation was that the Code of Canons had not been updated to reflect that. Where there was a major canonical revision, it seemed an appropriate opportunity to check that any new Canon was consistent with the provisions of charity law. He asked whether the Committee on Canons was certain that the new Canon 4 was fully compatible with charity law. As an illustration of where he believed it might not be, he noted that if the election went to stage three it allowed a third party to impose the elected candidate on the charity trustees of a diocese, which was an independent charity. Even if that was in compliance with charity law, he queried whether it sent the right message as to the responsibilities of the charity trustees of a diocese, given that the elected Bishop would become a charity trustee and would be paid by the charity.

Mr Gavin McEwan, the Synod Assessor, was invited to respond to the question, the Synod having confirmed it was content for the Assessor to address Synod. He confirmed that the Canon would be compatible with charity law. It was common for people to be appointed to offices and for those offices sometimes to carry with them charity trusteeship. The Office of the Scottish Charity Regulator accepted that that was consistent with charity law. Charity law in Scotland also allowed charities to determine their own processes for the appointment of trustees. That could sometimes involve third parties. That was within the gift of the charity itself.

The Rt Rev Kevin Pearson (Glasgow and Galloway) said that it grieved him to speak against the proposed new Canon. However, he was not about to say anything which he had not already said to the Review Group when first interviewed. He had believed for a long time that the Canon needed radical reform and that to elect a Bishop an Electoral College was needed rather than an Electoral Synod. He believed that the reason an Electoral College had not been favoured was because of a lack of trust. He believed that that was endemic in society at the present time but was particularly difficult in a church setting. He believed that needed to be addressed. The Canon needed to be more radical. That had been emphasised at his Diocesan Synod earlier in the year. It had been the first Diocesan Synod to meet in person for three years and the pain, anger and distress concerning the previous election suggested to him that a radical new Canon was needed.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) said that Synod members who had been present the previous year would remember what he had said of his experience of having been a candidate. He had been deeply critical about how some candidates had been treated by the Church. He wished today to be more positive. It was the case that there had been people who had cared for him and had been deeply kind but they had not been part of the process, rather they were his friends around the Church and in his congregation who had been very supportive. He urged Synod members to be similarly supportive and kind when they had the opportunity. He believed that the new Canon would remove that choice since, by cloaking everything in a veil of confidentiality (which he did not believe could be enforced), the candidates themselves would not be able to talk to anyone and would be cut off from their friends and their congregations would be cut off from knowing what was happening. He thanked those who had tried to produce the Canon. Most of the good things were in the guidance and he hoped it would be possible to find a way to incorporate what was in the Guidelines into the Church’s practice, even if, as he hoped, the Synod would not adopt the Canon. Prof Werritty had spoken of the perfect being the enemy of the good. The question was whether the new Canon was a step in the right direction. From his point of view, he believed that the new Canon would make the situation worse, notwithstanding that everyone who had been involved in developing the new Canon was trying to make it better. The Canon would stop people caring for candidates, unless they were members of the Electoral Synod, in which case a different relationship with the candidates would exist. Whilst it was said that the election of a Bishop was an election to the wider Church, electors would not be able to talk to others in the wider Church about the candidates. He asked Synod to vote against the adoption of the Canon.

Dr Beth Routledge (Glasgow and Galloway) commended the Faith and Order Board for the work which had gone into revising Canon 4 and especially to Mrs Jan Whiteside and the Personnel Committee for their input into the Guidelines, which had been asked for the previous year and which were excellent. However, she felt unable to vote in favour of the new Canon. She agreed that the current Canon was dysfunctional pastorally and functionally. In her conversations with electors and candidates and those who had been elected she was aware that the electoral
process had generally speaking worked reasonably well. For those who had been involved in such processes, the changes might seem sufficient to address the problems which had been encountered. She could see that most dioceses appeared to be of that view. However, her own diocese did not view matters in that fashion. She echoed the words of Bishop Pearson in that the experience in the Diocese of Glasgow and Galloway was not one of technical difficulty but rather that the process had gone so badly and been managed so badly that the resulting trauma was still tangible in the Diocese five years later. She did not use the word trauma lightly. In her diocese over 80% of the Synod did not believe that the proposed new Canon would provide the necessary solution. Even in the dioceses where it had been accepted some substantial issues had been raised requiring more work which could not be undertaken at a second reading. The resolution from the Diocese of Glasgow and Galloway asked that the Canon be sent back to the Faith and Order Board for further work. She did not think that the revised Canon would address the issues which caused the trauma in her diocese. She also believed it would not protect other dioceses from a process going badly wrong in future. The work undertaken had been well-intentioned, but she urged the Synod to vote against.

The Very Rev Dr Emsley Nimmo (Aberdeen and Orkney) acknowledged that being a member of the Committee on Canons was a thankless task (he had been a member of the Committee in the past) and he thanked the members for their work. He was glad to see that the overriding principle was that the Diocese elected its own Bishop. That process had been followed since 1721. Against the will of the College of Bishops, the Diocese had elected Archibald Campbell who became a prominent Bishop in the life of the SEC. For about 200 years, no change had been made to the Canon except that in the previous 20 years there had been nothing but tinkering and alterations since the Glasgow election in 1974. The old system had given good Bishops. He was concerned about the members of the College of Bishops attending the Preliminary Meeting. There was no precedence for that in the history of the Church catholic. The assent of the College was rightly required after the diocesan election, as an act of ratification. However in keeping with the ancient principle that it was for the Diocese, autonomously, to elect its Bishop, the influence of the College of Bishops he believed ought to be kept at arm’s length until the appropriate time for ratification. The presence of the entire College could inherently introduce an element of intimidation to the vacant diocese. It would almost certainly stifle free and open conversation within the Electoral Synod at a time at which frank and serious discussion about the life of the Diocese had to be undertaken and it was important that that was done without external influence. The presence of the College would jeopardise the independence and autonomous nature of the local diocese. He also believed that Section 17 of the proposed new Canon directly contravened the policy of the Church, as practised by the Church catholic since the second century. That section allowed the College unlimited right to reject any names brought to them by the Preparatory Committee before interviews had been undertaken. Names could be rejected without reasons being given to the Preparatory Committee. That granted an unlimited power to the College of Bishops in determining candidates for a vacant see without the voice of the diocese being heard. There was no precedence in the history of the Church for the assent of the provincial College being required before the decision of the diocese. He also believed that the Canon significantly diminished the role of Deans during the period of episcopal vacancy. He hoped that the Synod would not support the adoption of the Canon.

Ms Helen Vincent (Edinburgh) considered it was profoundly troubling for the whole Church that six dioceses had accepted the new Canon, but one had wholeheartedly rejected it. She disagreed with Bishop Pearson that the preference for a synodical, rather than Electoral College, approach was because of a lack of trust. The discussions which she had been part of in the course of the previous few years had been about valuing the role of charges in the process and also whether the approach of an Electoral College would privilege certain individuals who already had a position of privilege within the diocese. If there was a desire for an Electoral College, perhaps a solution to that could be worked out but she believed that all charges should be represented in the process on an equal basis. She urged acceptance of the new Canon.

Dr Michael Wood (Edinburgh) suggested that what was before Synod was the outcome of a process which had been instigated at the request of the General Synod. The Church had been consulted about it over a period of several years. The Synod had asked for a new Canon because of dissatisfaction with the existing one. The selection of a Bishop was rightly a complex process requiring training, discipleship and love. It also raised big questions about the direction of the Church and those needed to be part of a discussion about the culture of the Church. He believed that some of those questions were addressed in the Guidelines and Commentary, at
least to some extent. The Canon did not do that because that was not what a Canon was for. The Canon outlined a bottom-up, deliberative process and it had taken time to come up with the new proposal. He expected that there would be a number of Bishops to elect in the following years. The proposed new Canon gave the Church a fighting chance to do that well. He urged the Synod to walk the path of the new Canon.

The Rev Canon Lynsay Braybrooke (Aberdeen and Orkney) wished to comment on the concerns which had been raised about the presence of Bishops at the Preliminary Meeting of the Electoral Synod. She had been in a diocese where people could disagree but still behave charitably and in love with one another. She also had experience of being in a diocese where groups met together and organised themselves, and intimidation within the Diocesan Synod was a real issue. When a diocese was trying to consider what it needed sometimes those who did not wish the College of Bishops to be present might also themselves fear a lack of power in controlling the debate. There were checks and balances within the proposed new Canon which she believed could be very healthy.

The Rev Canon Dr Sophia Marriage (Edinburgh) noted that everyone had mentioned the dysfunctionality of the existing Canon and the pain and trauma of previous experience. She agreed with Dr Wood that there would be episcopal elections in the foreseeable future. For some people, having their names in public gave them the opportunity to receive support. For others who were going through trauma having one’s name in public would put them off from putting their names forward. Speaking as someone who had themselves experienced trauma (not in the context of the Canon 4 election) she indicated that it had been for her to seek the support she needed from those she loved and trusted. There were two options. Either names were public and love and support could come from everyone or the shortlist could remain confidential, which would avoid the possibility of individuals being put off from being involved in the process. Synod had previously agreed to try to make the Canon more humane. She agreed that the best should not get in the way of the good. The Canon was not the end of the process and discussion could continue in future but in the meantime she urged Synod to accept the Canon.

Bishop Armes responded to comments which had been made. Dean Emeritus Nimmo had mentioned Section 17. Bishop Armes drew attention to Section 17(a) which dealt with the question of assent by the College of Bishops before any shortlist had been agreed. That was part of the existing Canon as well and was not a new invention. On the question of the presence of Bishops at the Preliminary Meeting, he noted that there were different views. One criticism had been that if the Bishops were required to make an election, how were they to do that without having knowledge of the diocese and its needs and so the idea of the Bishops being present at the outset had been introduced to make them better informed. The role of the Bishops would be specifically to listen. However, the Synod was now being told that that was intimidating. On the question of Provost Holdsworth’s point about the list not being made public, Section 16(i) indicated that the shortlist was to be treated as confidential by those who received it. It was not saying that someone who was on the list could not seek support. The subject of training and discernment had been the subject of considerable discussion at the Faith and Order Board and he had explained to the Board that he wished to approach Standing Committee to ask for funding in principle to establish a good training course in discernment, not just for episcopal election processes but one which would assist the whole Church in discerning the Holy Spirit (for example, in the case of a vestry seeking to make an appointment). He hoped it might also be available for clergy who at some point in the future might contemplate offering themselves for episcopal ministry. The proposed new Canon did not propose an Electoral College. The Synod had decided that it did not want an Electoral College two years previously. If people favoured an Electoral College, they could still advocate for that in future but in the following five years there would be a succession of elections of Bishops. However, that next generation of Bishops would either be elected under the existing Canon 4 which was regarded as dysfunctional and unhelpful, or they would be elected under the proposed new Canon. The question was simple: which was the better of the two Canons, the existing one or the proposed new one.

The following amended Motion was then put to the vote in houses:

“That the amended text of Canon 4 be read for the second time subject to the following alterations:

43
That Section 10(d) be amended to read “Recipients of the Summons should also receive a copy of the Mandate, the Guidelines and the Commentary with a copy of this Canon attached.”

That the reference in Section 28(a) to Appendix 3 be replaced by a reference to Appendix 3A

That the reference in Section 30(a) to Appendix 3 be replaced by a reference to Appendix 3B

and subject to adding at the end of Section 29(b) the following sentence: “The purpose of this meeting shall be to consider the reasons why the Electoral Synod was unable to complete the electoral process and also to discuss the particular needs of the diocese, including mission and ministry and spiritual oversight.”

Voting was as follows:

House of Clergy: 49 in favour, 8 against, 1 abstention
House of Laity: 43 in favour, 12 against, no abstentions
House of Bishops: 4 in favour, 1 against, 1 abstention.

The Chair declared the Motion carried.

Bishop Armes explained that the remaining motions to be considered during the current session were all consequent upon the passing of the new Canon.

He then proposed, and the Primus seconded, the following Motion:

“That Resolutions 1-3 under the former Canon 4 be deleted.”

The Chair gave the opportunity for comment but there was none.

The Motion was put to the vote and passed nem con as follows: 107 in favour, none against, 3 abstentions.

Bishop Armes then proposed, and the Primus seconded, the following Motion:

“That the following be adopted as a new Resolution 1 under Canon 4:

“The General Synod shall adopt Guidelines which are to be followed by Electoral Synods 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.”

The Chair provided the opportunity for comment but there was none.

The Motion was put to the vote and passed nem con as follows: 112 in favour, 1 against, 3 abstentions.

Bishop Armes then proposed, and the Primus seconded, the following Motion:

“That the following be adopted as a new Resolution 2 under Canon 4:


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.”

The Chair gave the opportunity for comment but there was none.

The Motion was put to the vote and passed as follows: 110 in favour, 1 against, 3 abstentions.
Bishop Armes then proposed, and the Primus seconded, the following Motion:

“That Appendices 1, 2, 3A and 3B, as set out in the Synod Papers, be adopted as new Appendices to the Code of Canons, in substitution for the existing Appendices 1, 2 and 3.”

The Chair gave the opportunity for comment.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) said that a number of years previously the Synod had taken the view that it would list all of the authorised services in the Canon on liturgy without specifying the book of Common Prayer separately. He was interested to know why it continued to be mentioned specifically in the appendices to Canon 4. He had no objection to any of the text but was curious.

Bishop Armes said that the form was similar to those used when clergy were granted authorisation by their Bishop. He suggested it was a topic that could be considered further in future.

The Motion was put to the vote and passed nem con as follows: 111 in favour, none against, 2 abstentions.

Bishop Armes thanked Mrs Jan Whiteside for her assistance in preparing the proposed Guidelines to be adopted under the Canon. He then proposed, and the Primus seconded, the following Motion:

“That the Guidelines set out in the Synod Papers be adopted as the Guidelines referred to in Resolution 1 under Canon 4.”

The Chair gave the opportunity for comment but there was none.

The Motion was put to the vote and passed as follows: 115 in favour, 1 against, 1 abstention.

Bishop Armes thanked all those who had been involved in the development of the Commentary to be adopted under the Canon. He then proposed, and the Primus seconded, the following Motion:

“That the Commentary set out in the Synod Papers be adopted as the Commentary referred to in Resolution 2 under Canon 4.”

The Chair gave the opportunity for comment.

Mr Brian Harris (Aberdeen and Orkney) noted the need for a minor typographical error in the spelling of “discreetly” on page 198 Synod papers under the heading “Assent of the College of Bishops”. Bishop Armes confirmed he was content to accept that correction.

The Motion was then put to the vote and passed as follows: 113 in favour, 2 against, 1 abstention.

The Chair thanked everyone who had contributed to the session.

After the lunch break Synod members were given the opportunity to attend separate “Meet the Board Conveners” sessions run separately by the Conveners of the Administration Board, Faith and Order Board, Mission Board, Institute Council and Standing Committee respectively.
SESSION 6: THE RT REV THE BISHOP OF ARGYLL AND THE ISLES IN THE CHAIR

6.1 Institute Council

6.1.1 Introduction

The Rt Rev Andrew Swift (Bishop of Brechin and Acting Convener of the Institute Council) introduced the session. The Council provided oversight, support and guidance for the excellent work undertaken by the core and wider staff of the Scottish Episcopal Institute and for those in the process of formation for ministry. He thanked all those who were involved in the work of the Institute. The Synod would shortly be addressed by the Rev Dr Mike Hull who was the Director of Studies for the Institute but would shortly become its new Principal. Bishop Swift expressed thanks to the Rev Canon Dr Anne Tomlinson, the outgoing Principal, for all of her years of work from the inception of the Institute.

6.1.2 Update from the Rev Dr Michael Hull

Dr Hull started by thanking Canon Tomlinson for her leadership and care for both students and staff. He was honoured, and slightly timid, to take on the responsibility of becoming Principal and asked for the Synod's prayers. In the current session, he would speak about the efforts which SEI had made and was continuing to make in terms of learning for the wider Church and also about the SEI postgraduate programmes of study.

Referring to the Apostle Paul's statement to the Corinthians that “what he had received, he had passed on”, Dr Hull suggested that the role of SEI was to pass on that which had been received. He had reported to General Synod 2022 on the rolling out of 10 sessions of lay learning under the title “Christian Doctrine: an Anglican Perspective”. That had led to further developments: in Lent 2021 a six-session series “Acting like a Christian”; in Advent 2021, four sessions on “Reading the Bible Like an Episcopalian”; and in Lent 2022 a series on “Episcopali ans and their Ethics”. There had been incremental growth in attendance over that period. Synod 2022 had been asked for feedback and that feedback had been partially addressed in Advent 2022 with a series “What does it mean to be an Anglican Christian?” and then in Lent 2023 SEI had offered “Lord Teach us to Pray: a Close Reading of the Lord’s Prayer”. The Synod had also asked that these be a resource available for the wider Church and all of those series were now available on YouTube via the SEI website.

Dr Hull outlined plans for the future, all of which built on the suggestions made by Synod 2022. SEI intended to increase the range of topics and delve into greater depth. Series were in the course of preparation on the Ten Commandments, the Four Marks of the Church and the Three Creeds of the Church. Also, series were planned on ongoing questions in society such as that of human identity and how human dignity impacted upon ethical choices. The SEI also intended better technological delivery and was intending to use professional expertise to improve both the quality of the audio and video. Also, a wider range of presenters had been approached. Dr Euan Grant would offer a series on natural theology and St Thomas Aquinas and the Rev Dr Jane Edwards would address bereavement and liturgy. Different modes of presentation were also being considered, such as conversation, rather than lecture, on topics such as original sin. Whereas previously only two series had been offered each liturgical year, SEI hoped to deliver four series in the following year.

In addition to the development in lay learning, SEI had also been developing its postgraduate programmes of study. SEI currently offered two Masters programmes through Common Awards: a Masters in Theology, Ministry and Mission and a Masters in Contemporary Christian Leadership. The Scottish Episcopal Church had a history of which to be proud and the Church cherished in particular its liturgy. He was therefore pleased to announce that a third Masters degree would be available from September 2023 in Worship and Liturgical Studies, with a special emphasis on Episcopalianism in Scotland.
The SEI punched above its weight, like the SEC. The SEI was the only theological education institution in the UK which ran three MA programmes from Durham University and was the only one in the UK, and to his knowledge in the Anglican Communion, which produced a quarterly peer-reviewed journal. It was also the only institution which received such close and personal attention from its Church and he thanked Bridget Campbell the Convener of the Standing Committee, Bishop Swift as Acting Convener of the Institute Council and all members of Synod for their support of the SEI.

6.1.3 Initial Ministerial Education Two Programme

The Rev Liz Crumlish (IME2 Officer) said that since she had taken up her role the previous October she had been increasingly grateful to those who had undertaken the delivery of IME2 training in dioceses in previous years particularly the Rev David Paton-Williams and the Very Rev Sarah Murray. She thanked them for their vision, in which she continued, as well as exploring how to work ecumenically in the training of those in their first three years of ministry. She was grateful to have been entrusted with the role and brought experience from other denominations’ processes of formation for ministry as well as her experience of having offered and taught pastoral supervision and reflective practice.

In bringing that vision to fruition, she referred to an image by Bryn Gillette of the Woman at the Well. The woman was unnamed in the Gospels but in the Eastern Church was known as “bearer of light”. That was a fitting image for the whole Church. The training of those as priests, distinctive deacons and lay readers called for frequent encounters around the well. In IME1 students were being formed as missional leaders, people of prayer, collaborative workers, reflective practitioners, pastors, disciples of characters, Episcopalians and lifelong reflective learners. IME2 sought to build on each of those characteristics. It supported people from knowing the role to inhabiting the role. There was an integration of learning and a forging of identity. It also created opportunity to share their learning and experience with one another. Discerning the will of God would always be part of that agenda. The programme included a pattern of regular online gatherings each month, a day conference in November and a residential gathering in May. Topics included the context of current day mission, pastoral care and what contributed to healthy ministry. It included contemporary theology about the environment, work with children and young people and faith in older people. There was a wealth of resource available in the SEC and ecumenically, as well as from IME2 participants who brought their own lived experience. Working across the Province brought a wider sense of collegiality among those in their first three years of ministry as they worked things out together. The story of Jesus and the Samaritan woman at the well was one of mutual learning. Both had been changed by the encounter but the transformation had also led to transformation of the community. Those being formed for ministry were being formed in community.

At the most recent residential gathering, the well had become a campfire around which participants had gathered forging connection and being ignited to return to the mission of God in their localities. At the current time, there were 15 people serving in the first three years of ministry and in 2023/24 there would be at least 18. She hoped that IME2 would be foundational in setting a pattern for future ministry of meeting around the well in which to encounter transformation. Her vision was for those involved to continue to be bearers of light and involved in the transformation of communities.

The Chair gave the opportunity for comment.

The Rev Mary Jepp (Brechin) explained that her journey to Scotland had been academic. Originally, she had been a lay reader and had finally ended with an MA in Pastoral Theology from Cambridge. She was aware from her experience of working in small charges, that there were people who sensed a calling to minister locally. What was on offer through the Institute was hugely academic and time-consuming. Many of those who wanted to respond to their calling had life commitments and were unable to give what was required by SEI courses. She asked that the Church give consideration to how to support those who sensed a calling and recognise that sometimes it was not about academic qualification.
Dr Hull thanked Ms Jepp for her comment. It was good to hear from the Synod floor but it was not a new question. Rome had not been built in a day and much of what had been going on within SEI was to respond to the needs of the Church in so far as those needs were presented to SEI. When he had started at the Institute a few years previously, it offered only a diploma. Over the years courses had been expanded to include a degree and subsequently a number of masters degrees. That academic tangent had been good for the Church. Another development was that of lay learning which had led to the series to which he had referred earlier. An issue which the Institute was still working on was those ministries which might occur within dioceses and charges beyond the specific authorised ministries for which SEI currently provided training and formation. There was a need to explore with Bishops what other roles needed to be addressed. He had already had some discussions with Bishop Swift as the acting Convener of the Institute Council about that.

The Rev David Paton-Williams (Edinburgh) noted that the "bar had been raised" in many ways such as training under the leadership of Canon Tomlinson, discernment under the Provincial Director of Ordinands, the Rev Canon Ian Barcroft and in lay learning in the initiatives mentioned by Dr Hull. The bar had also been raised in relation to IME2 (formerly IME 4-6). IME2 had tended, particularly in the Church of England, to be the poor relation of IME1. The development in IME2 in the SEC was commendable. A province-wide system had now been created with a curriculum for IME2 in order to ensure that whether an individual was in a rural setting in the Highlands or in the heart of Edinburgh they received the same training. He was delighted that the Rev Liz Crumlish had joined the SEI. The vision was worth celebrating.

The Rev Amanda Fairclough (Argyll and The Isles) had been reminded of the Bishop's charge to her in the Ordinal to her "to discern and foster the gifts of all God's people". There was no question that what was happening in the SEI was very good. That did not mean that what had already been happening outwith the auspices of the SEI was not also good in developing and fostering vocations. When clergy preached, they were teaching. Clergy were not necessarily academics, but they understood that vocation was about "doing". She had been particularly struck when she had moved from the Church of England to Scotland that when she had a potential ordinand who started ordination training she had received a letter from the SEI thanking her for having encouraged the vocation but which implied that her role in that had now been completed. She asked that the SEI not forget that those not directly involved in its work still had a part to play in the growth and fostering of vocations and the education of laity and other clergy. She thanked all those who fostered the vocations of other Christians around them.

The Rev Canon Elizabeth Baker (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) echoed what Ms Fairclough had just said. She also wished to mention mixed mode training which had not been mentioned during the session. She had had a mixed mode trainee for three years. The training had been practical. She wondered why no mention had been made of it in the presentation to Synod.

The Rev Canon Dr Sophia Marriage (Edinburgh) was hesitant to add further suggestions because she recognised that the SEI was already dealing with much. She declared that she had previously been a historian and her PhD had been in liturgy. She believed the history of liturgy was exceptionally important but she also thought that the future of liturgy was very important. Hearing about the Masters in liturgy which had been mentioned during the presentation, she wanted the future of liturgy to be addressed also. She hoped that creative and forward-looking liturgy would be part of that Masters course.

Dr Hull responded to comments made. He noted that the Church's liturgies had come through the "wee bookie" stage and were now online and the Church was not static on this topic. Moving forward would be a feature of the Masters.

The Rev Canon Vittoria Hancock (Aberdeen and Orkney) applauded the work of the SEI. She had a slight reservation in that she believed that the training provided was very academic. She had people in her charges who would be good lay readers but were put off by the requirement of a three-year course involving 20 hours of work per week. Such
people were already perfect, just as they were, for ministering in her context. She was concerned that in focusing on the academic aspects, there was a risk of losing the skills of those who were not academic.

Dr Hull explained that the reason that mixed mode training had not been mentioned earlier was because his remit for the current Synod had been to focus on lay learning and the new degree programmes. It had not been left out because it was unimportant. The question about the balance of academic content in training was an issue which was constantly before the SEI. The qualifications which SEI put forward were not meant principally to be academic so, for example, SEI addressed "theology for ministry", "theology, mission and ministry". The Church had asked for a diploma level of study prior to licensing as a lay reader or deaconing. The difficulty was to inculcate in students both the knowledge which they needed to go forward, the personal sense of theological reflection and the experience of ministry. To do all of that in three years and part-time would always be a difficult balance. It would never be possible to get it absolutely right but SEI would continue to the best of its ability to balance all aspects. He was happy to take advice from those who were already in ministry about what needed to be emphasised in training.

The Chair thanked Dr Hull, Ms Crumlish and Bishop Swift for their presentations.

6.2 Administration Board

6.2.1 Introduction

Mr Jim Gibson (Convener, Administration Board) referred to the reports in the Annual Report and Accounts for the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2022 on the work of the Administration Board and its pendant committees. As he had done in previous years, he likened the SEC to a vehicle needing a competent driver, fuel which would not clog the engine (ideally an electric vehicle) and bodywork which was fit for purpose. All were interrelated, the driver being the clergy, the fuel the Church's investment income and the bodywork being the buildings of the Church. Synod had already taken note of the presentation from the Investment Committee and the focus of the current presentation would be from the Buildings Committee but that was not to undervalue the work undertaken by the Board's other two committees, Personnel and Retirement Housing.

The Buildings Committee would bring forward motions designed to encourage good practice in risk assessment and to indicate steps which could be taken to ensure that church buildings moved towards meeting the challenges of net zero carbon emissions.

Mr Gibson reminded Synod that the stipend policy agreed at General Synod 2021 had had the unexpected consequence that stipends for 2023 had risen by 11.1%, driven by the high level of inflation following Russia's invasion of Ukraine. Provincial reserves had been made available to provide a measure of transitional relief to assist congregations in the current year and a reduced level of assistance would also be available in 2024. The policy of increasing stipend above the rate of inflation had been agreed, with the goal of restoring stipends to their 2006 level, adjusted for inflation. At the Board's request, the Clergy Remuneration Review Group had considered how best to achieve that goal in the light of what might be high levels of inflation in the following years. The Group had decided not to recommend any changes but had restated the importance of restoring the real level of stipend. The policy of increases above the rate of inflation would therefore continue and Mr Gibson urged charges to take steps to ensure that they were able to fund stipends once the transitional stipend assistance grants had ceased.

Mr Gibson had been pleased to note that the interim Unit Trust Pool distribution payable in August 2023 had been agreed at 39p per unit, an increase of 16% on the equivalent payment the previous year, and a target of 82pence per unit was in mind for the full year distribution.
Mr Gibson suggested that the SEC was not exempt from increasing levels of bureaucracy and regulation stemming from Government. The committees took account of changes in regulations, best practice and public mood. In the previous two years, the Synod had engaged firmly with issues concerning clergy well-being, climate change and cost of living increases. All such factors resulted in an increase in workload placed on office staff and committee members and he thanked them for their dedication.

He also expressed thanks to Mark Harris and Peter Sharp, the Conveners of the Investment and Buildings Committees, and to Peter Marsh who had taken on the mantle left by the Rev Lorna Mortis as Convener of the Retirement Housing Committee. He also expressed thanks to the Rev Richard Kilgour and the Rev Les Ireland who had completed their terms of service on the Board.

### 6.2.2 Buildings Committee

Prof Peter Sharp (Convener, Buildings Committee) referred to the report contained in the Synod papers setting out the proposals being brought to Synod in relation to matters of health and safety, environment and administration.

He reminded the Synod that at Synod 2022, he had made reference to the tragic accident which had taken place at St Peter's, Peterhead. The Committee had worked with an external health and safety consultant to produce guidance for charges and all charges had now been sent a risk assessment booklet and a link to provincial webpages where a training video could be accessed on how to carry out risk assessments and an online health and safety toolkit was available. He appreciated that there might be questions on the implementation of health and safety procedures which were not answered by reference to the toolkit and so consideration was being given to providing a professional health and safety support network. The proposals to change Resolution 1 under Canon 42 and Section 7.2.1 of the Digest of Resolutions were being introduced to monitor the use of risk assessments. The Deans would be subject to a duty to inspect the risk register and risk assessment records when they inspected other charge registers and arrangements for risk assessment and management would be included as a duty of enquiry for Diocesan Synods and congregations.

Mr Gibson then proposed, and the Rt Rev Andrew Swift (Bishop of Brechin) seconded, the following Motion:

> “That Resolution 1 under Canon 42 be amended to read:

> “It shall be the duty of the Dean of the Diocese to inspect the registers, inventories and records (including the risk register and risk assessment records) of the congregation, including the Communicants’ Roll and the Roll of members as defined by Canon 41, at least once in every four years and to report the result of the inspection to the Bishop in Synod unless the Bishop shall have stated publicly in Diocesan Synod that this duty, or a specified portion thereof, will be undertaken by the Bishop. Without prejudice to the foregoing requirement, the Dean shall inspect the registers, records, reports and inventories together with the Communicants’ Roll and Roll of Members, as soon as possible after the intimation of the resignation, or the death of a cleric in charge, so as to have them in order for the person succeeding to that charge.””

The Chair invited comment but there was none.

The Motion was then put to the vote and passed *nem con* as follows: 106 in favour, none against, 3 abstentions.

Mr Gibson then proposed, and Bishop Swift seconded, the following Motion:
“That the Section 7.2.1 of the Digest of Resolutions be amended by the inclusion of a new paragraph (d) to read:

“(d) arrangements for risk assessment and management;”

and by the re-lettering of the existing paragraph (d) as paragraph (e).”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed unanimously, 109 in favour.

Prof Sharp explained that the challenges posed by many church buildings featured highly in the Church’s efforts to move towards net zero. In 2022, the Committee had issued advice on the heating of buildings. It intended to revise the list of minor works so that changes to heating systems would, in future, require Canon 35 consent. To complement the heating advice, the Committee had drafted guidance on the insulation of buildings and once feedback had been received from the Provincial Environment Group, it would be placed on the provincial website. Also, to ensure that consent to any changes in buildings granted by a Diocesan Buildings Committee and Bishop was aligned with net zero guidance, the Committee wished to put forward a small change to Canon 35 to ensure that any approvals given under the Canon adhered to any such guidance endorsed by the Buildings Committee.

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

“That the amended text of Canon 35 be read for the first time.”

Dr Stephen Goodyear (Aberdeen and Orkney) noted that the proposed change would give the ability to the Buildings Committee, without any review, to be constantly updating its guidance without oversight by Synod. He believed that the change was ultra vires since it gave a group of people the ability to constantly change the Canons without review. He also had a concern that if the net zero plan was something which could not be delivered or was inappropriate in some parts of the dioceses because of other things which were happening, then it was inappropriate to be telling charges that they had to adhere to guidelines. It was not possible to tell people to make two plus two equal five in their context. He asked that Synod consider that and that the comments be taken forward for discussion at Diocesan Synods.

The Chair noted that Dr Goodyear had suggested that the Motion was ultra vires. After taking advice from the Assessor, the Chair confirmed that the Motion was not ultra vires. He suggested that the proposed reference in the Canon was to guidance. Dr Goodyear responded that “guidance” did not normally have to be “adhered to”.

Prof Sharp responded that he did not see a need for a change.

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

House of Clergy: 46 in favour, 2 against, 4 abstentions
House of Laity: 39 in favour, 6 against, 3 abstentions
House of Bishops: 6 in favour, none against, no abstentions.

Prof Sharp then addressed the question of energy performance certificates (“EPCs”). In the Committee's guidance on Minimum Standards for Clergy Housing, the Committee advised that rectories ought to have an EPC rating of no lower than C. In order to ensure that all church buildings had an EPC, the Committee wished to introduce a change to Section 7.2.2 of the Digest of Resolutions to ensure that the quinquennial inspection included examination of the EPC.

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

“That Section 7.2.2 of the Digest of Resolutions be amended to read:

“Each Vestry, which failing the diocese on behalf of the Vestry, shall appoint an architect, chartered surveyor or other suitably qualified person to
supervise the buildings under the Vestry’s charge and notify the Diocese of any change in such appointment from time to time and the Vestry shall obtain a written report, including an energy performance certificate, in respect of these buildings, at least every five years. The report shall also confirm that the building’s energy performance certificate is up-to-date.”

Dr Beth Routledge (Glasgow and Galloway) intended to vote in favour of the Motion. It represented good practice irrespective of the net zero strategy. She wished to take the opportunity to ask the Committee to consider whether there was a need to reconsider the Minimum Standards on Clergy Housing both in the light of the 2030 target and also the cost of living crisis. Prof Sharp responded that the Minimum Standards had been revised the previous year and the Committee would keep them under review.

The Rev Gary Clink (Brechin) asked that funding be found to help charges meet EPC standards. He applauded the intent but there was a need for funding. Prof Sharp responded that he thought Mr Clink’s Bishop would be happy to discuss that.

The Motion was put to the vote and passed as follows: 97 in favour, 7 against, six abstentions.

Prof Sharp turned to the question of the Building Committee’s role in hearing appeals against decisions of Diocesan Buildings Committees. Following a recent appeal, the Committee had considered an alteration to its guidance on appeal processes and would issue that in due course. The resolutions under Canon 35 currently required any appeal to be lodged within four weeks and the Committee considered that that was too short. It was therefore suggesting that Resolution 7 under Canon 35 should be changed to extend the period from four to six weeks.

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

“That Resolution 7 under Canon 35 be amended to read:

“Within six weeks of a decision having been made by the Bishop and Diocesan Buildings Committee, an appeal, lodged in writing with the Secretary General of the General Synod, may be made to the Provincial Buildings Committee either by the Vestry against one or more conditions attached to a consent or against a refusal of consent, or by not less than twenty per cent of communicant members of the congregation against a granting of consent. Such an appeal shall be decided within twelve weeks by the Provincial Buildings Committee whose decision shall be final.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed as follows: 106 in favour, 3 against, 1 abstention.

6.3 Faith and Order Board: Liturgy Committee

6.3.1 Introduction

The Rev Canon Nicholas Taylor (Convener, Liturgy Committee) referred to the report of the Committee contained in the Annual Report and Accounts for the General Synod for the year ended 31 December 2022. The new draft Rite for the ordination of deacons which was mentioned in that report and also the Committee’s Workplan had been referred by the Faith and Order Board to the College of Bishops.

Canon Taylor drew attention to the International Anglican Liturgical Consultation document "Liturgy of the Baptised" which had been commended to member churches by the Anglican Consultative Council at its recent meeting. The working party which had produced that document had been convened by his predecessor as Convener, Dr John Davies.

A video in which Dr Davies presented that document was then shown to Synod. Dr Davies explained that a meeting had taken place in Hong Kong in 2019 after concerns
had been expressed to the International Anglican Liturgical Consultation about the lack of liturgical formation on the part of those training for ordination. The process had resulted in suggestions for the formation in liturgy of all Anglican Christians, not just clergy. A meeting of the working group in 2021 had also considered the liturgical formation of Bishops. After an online meeting of the International Anglican Liturgical Consultation in 2021 he had had the privilege of chairing a working group tasked with creating a final report. That had been sent to the Inter-Anglican Standing Commission on Unity, Faith and Order in September 2021 and had subsequently been presented to the Lambeth Conference in 2022 and the Anglican Consultative Council in 2023. The final document was entitled "The Liturgical Formation of all the Baptised". Formation was understood as the process of growing spiritually, becoming more like Christ, and liturgical formation was an essential part of Christian formation in the Anglican Communion, shaped by Scripture, worship, communion and God's mission. The liturgy was a privileged place for encounter with Christ. Formation was a spiral process which led to growth. He encouraged Synod members to read the paper which he believed was a profitable and useful resource for the Anglican Communion as a whole.

6.3.2 Liturgies for Second Reading

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 Pastoral Offices for Priests be added to the Schedule to Canon 22 be read for the second time."

The Primus explained that that Motion, and the following two motions which would be proposed to Synod, were all subject to amendments as set out on the Synod agenda. As mover of the Motions, he was content with the amendments, which had arisen from discussions within the Faith and Order Board, but the Synod would still need to vote on them.

Canon Taylor then proposed, and the Rev Canon Dr James Currall (Moray, Ross and Caithness) seconded, the following amendment:

Amendment 1:

To add at the end of the above motion for second reading:

"subject to the inclusion of an introductory sentence in the order for Holy Communion from the Reserved Sacrament outside Public Worship as follows:

'Ve are the body of Christ, who has promised to be with us when we gather in his name. As we seek forgiveness of our sins, hear the Word of God in Scripture, pray for those in need, and receive the Body and Blood of Christ in the sacrament, we are united in the communion of saints and in the eucharistic life of the local church (the local congregation may be named).’"

Comment was invited but there was none.

The amendment was then put to the vote in houses and passed as follows:

House of Clergy: 52 in favour, none against, no abstentions
House of Laity: 47 in favour, 1 against, 1 abstention
House of Bishops: 6 in favour, none against, no abstentions.

The Motion as amended was then put to the vote:

"That the proposal that the Pastoral Offices for Priests be added to the Schedule to Canon 22 be read for the second time subject to the inclusion of an introductory
sentence in the order for Holy Communion from the Reserved Sacrament outside Public Worship as follows:

'We are the body of Christ, who has promised to be with us when we gather in his name. As we seek forgiveness of our sins, hear the Word of God in Scripture, pray for those in need, and receive the Body and Blood of Christ in the sacrament, we are united in the communion of saints and in the eucharistic life of the local church (the local congregation may be named).’"

Voting on the amended Motion was as follows:

House of Clergy: 53 in favour, none against, no abstentions
House of Laity: 47 in favour, one against, one abstention
House of Bishops: 6 in favour, none against, no abstentions.

The Chair declared the motion carried.

The Primus then proposed, and Bishop Paton seconded, the following Motion:

“That the proposal that the Pastoral Offices for Deacons be added to the Schedule to Canon 22 be read for the second time.”

Canon Taylor proposed, and Canon Currall seconded, the following amendment:

**Amendment 1:**

To add at the end of the above motion for second reading:

"subject to the inclusion of an introductory sentence in the order for Holy Communion from the Reserved Sacrament outside Public Worship as follows:

'We are the body of Christ, who has promised to be with us when we gather in his name. As we seek forgiveness of our sins, hear the Word of God in Scripture, pray for those in need, and receive the Body and Blood of Christ in the sacrament, we are united in the communion of saints and in the eucharistic life of the local church (the local congregation may be named).’"

The amendment was put to the vote and passed in houses as follows:

House of Clergy: 54 in favour, none against, no abstentions
House of Laity: 47 in favour, 1 against, 1 abstention
House of Bishops: 6 in favour, none against, no abstentions.

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

“That the proposal that the Pastoral Offices for Deacons be added to the Schedule to Canon 22 be read for the second time subject to the inclusion of an introductory sentence in the order for Holy Communion from the Reserved Sacrament outside Public Worship as follows:

'We are the body of Christ, who has promised to be with us when we gather in his name. As we seek forgiveness of our sins, hear the Word of God in Scripture, pray for those in need, and receive the Body and Blood of Christ in the sacrament, we are united in the communion of saints and in the eucharistic life of the local church (the local congregation may be named).’"
Voting was as follows:

- House of Clergy: 53 in favour, none against, no abstentions
- House of Laity: 46 in favour, none against, 1 abstention
- House of Bishops: 6 in favour, none against, no abstentions.

The Chair declared the Motion carried.

The Primus then proposed, and Bishop Paton seconded, the following Motion:

> “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 second time.”

Canon Taylor then proposed, and Canon Currall seconded, the following amendment:

**Amendment 1:**

*To add at the end of the above motion for second reading:*

> “subject to the inclusion of an introductory sentence in the order for Holy Communion from the Reserved Sacrament outside Public Worship as follows:

> ‘We are the body of Christ, who has promised to be with us when we gather in his name. As we seek forgiveness of our sins, hear the Word of God in Scripture, pray for those in need, and receive the Body and Blood of Christ in the sacrament, we are united in the communion of saints and in the eucharistic life of the local church (the local congregation may be named).’”

The amendment was put to the vote in houses and passed as follows:

- House of Clergy: 53 in favour, 1 against, no abstentions
- House of Laity: 46 in favour, 1 against, 1 abstention
- House of Bishops: 6 in favour, none against, no abstentions.

Canon Taylor then proposed, and Canon Currall seconded, the following further amendment:

**Amendment 2:**

*To add at the end of the above motion for second reading:*

> “subject to the inclusion of an additional sentence, after the second sentence of the prefatory section entitled “Laying-On of Hands of the Sick” in the liturgy for Holy Communion from the Reserved Sacrament outside Public Worship, as follows:

> ‘If a priest is available, it may be appropriate to request that s/he attend, perhaps accompanied by the lay person who normally visits the person receiving this ministry.’”

The Rev Gary Clink (Brechin) reported that at his Diocesan Synod a question had arisen about the use of language. It had been decided that the use of “they” instead of “he/she” was more appropriate.

Canon Taylor commented that the Faith and Order Board had discussed that matter in principle and had agreed to use the word "they". He would revise the wording to reflect that intent. Synod accepted that the amendment should be further amended to reflect that.
With that amendment, the amendment was put to the vote in houses and passed as follows:

- **House of Clergy**: 52 in favour, 1 against, 1 abstention
- **House of Laity**: 48 in favour, none against, 1 abstention
- **House of Bishops**: 6 in favour, none against, no abstentions.

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

> “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 second time subject to the inclusion of an introductory sentence in the order for Holy Communion from the Reserved Sacrament outside Public Worship as follows:

> ‘We are the body of Christ, who has promised to be with us when we gather in his name. As we seek forgiveness of our sins, hear the Word of God in Scripture, pray for those in need, and receive the Body and Blood of Christ in the sacrament, we are united in the communion of saints and in the eucharistic life of the local church (the local congregation may be named).’

and subject to the inclusion of an additional sentence, after the second sentence of the prefatory section entitled “Laying-On of Hands of the Sick” in the liturgy for Holy Communion from the Reserved Sacrament outside Public Worship, as follows:

> ‘It may be appropriate to request that a priest, if available, attend, perhaps accompanied by the lay person who normally visits the person receiving this ministry.’

Voting was as follows:

- **House of Clergy**: 50 in favour, 2 against, no abstentions
- **House of Laity**: 49 in favour, none against, 1 abstention
- **House of Bishops**: 6 in favour, none against, no abstentions.

The Chair declared the Motion carried.

Mrs Victoria Elliott (Edinburgh) wished to pick up on themes of language and pastoral offices for the sick. She asked the Synod to imagine her being in France at a mass in circumstances where she did not speak French. She illustrated how inadequate Google translate would be to help her with the liturgy. She would encounter difficulty not only in translation but also in distraction. She was not the only person who would have such difficulties, even when the service was in English. For some, this arose from a disability of some kind. Not all disabilities were immediately obvious, such as visual or hearing impairments. For her, it had taken a diagnosis of ADHD, autistic traits and dyspraxia to be able to appreciate what she already knew at a fundamental level. Everyone was “a bit odd” and this reflected the glorious diversity of God. Neurodivergent people were often highly creative and had unique thinking styles. How to approach God in worship was affected by such challenges. Knowing when to stand or sit could provoke anxiety if the rules had not been explained. Inconuous phrases such as “we have disfigured your image” might create additional hurdles. Her immediate personal response to such a phrase was that Jesus was being punched and needed to go to accident and emergency. The absurdity of that necessitated that she had to concentrate and ask whether that was actually what was meant. She worked as a senior content designer for a public body producing accessible content on websites and in printed material. The use of everyday language and plain English benefited everyone, whether they had a disability or not. Perhaps that was an approach which could be drawn upon in the Church’s liturgy. That was important both for people inside and outside the Church. She thanked the Liturgy Committee for all the work they had done and, looking to the future, she wanted to ask everyone to consider how the Church could develop its liturgy to communicate the message of God’s love for all.
SESSION 7: THE VERY REV ALISON SIMPSON IN THE CHAIR

7.1 Faith and Order Board: Liturgy Committee (continued)

7.1.2 Liturgies for First Reading

The Primus proposed, and Bishop Paton seconded, the following Motion:

“That the proposal that the Liturgies for Lent, Holy Week and Easter for use with Scottish Liturgy 1982 (revised 2022) and A Service of the Word 2015 be added to the Schedule to Canon 22 be read for the first time.”

Canon Taylor informed Synod that the Joint Liturgical Group for Great Britain (an inter-denominational body on which most denominations were represented) would be holding conferences in Scotland in 2024 on some of the issues mentioned at the end of the previous session and would be open to any who wished to attend.

Canon Taylor explained that the collection of Rites for Lent, Holy Week, and Easter had been authorised for experimental use in 2017 and the Committee had appreciated the comments made by members of the Church since then. The texts authorised for experimental use had been expanded to include Ascension and Pentecost as integral to the Season of Easter. Also, the revised Psalter from the Anglican Church of Canada, incorporating inclusive language, was being used where applicable.

Canon Taylor explained that, as with all liturgical provision, the task of the Committee was to draft texts which would give contemporary expression to the Christian faith, drawing upon and at the same time contributing to the liturgical tradition of the Church catholic. The text being proposed to Synod had not been drafted in isolation from the work of Anglican and ecumenical neighbours but with an independence that sought to be true to the distinctive liturgical heritage of the SEC. Each liturgy was preceded by a theological introduction with some practical guidance and a commentary on the collection, produced in collaboration with the Doctrine Committee and published at the time of authorisation for experimental use, remained available on the provincial website.

The Very Rev Elizabeth Thomson (Brechin) commented that the shortened versions of the dramatised readings for the Passion in the Gospels of both Matthew and Mark terminated just before the verses about the women standing at the foot of the cross. The transition from that point to the evening came after that verse. The women were not just part of the aftermath, they were part of the core story and it was regrettable that the readings stopped where they did. She would continue to include that verse when she used the liturgy. She also asked how the liturgies had been changed as a result of feedback during the experimental period.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) commented on the Passion narrative in the Gospel of John in the context of current sensitivities about anti-Semitism. He asked what consideration had been given to the way in which Christians celebrated Good Friday. When he met with Jewish friends at that time of year either formally or informally, he was aware of huge concerns about how Christians spoke about the Jews. He sought a reassurance that the Synod was not about to take a step which it could do better. He wondered whether there had been a conversation with Jewish people about that subject.

Canon Taylor agreed that the question of anti-Semitism was a very sensitive one and concerned both the Gospel of John and the Gospel of Matthew. As they were texts of Scripture, they were an issue which the Church had to work with. The text of the Good Friday liturgy had been worked through carefully with the question of anti-Semitism in mind. Traditional texts associated with anti-Semitism had been removed. As far as the dramatic readings were concerned, the text followed those stipulated in the revised Common Lectionary. He accepted that the cut-off points of the readings were unfortunate, and it was possible that the Faith and Order Board might wish to bring forward an amendment at second reading.
The vote was then put to the vote in houses and passed as follows:

House of Clergy: 50 in favour, 1 against, 3 abstentions
House of Laity: 46 in favour, 2 against, 2 abstentions
House of Bishops: 6 in favour, none against, no abstentions.

The Primus thanked the members of the Liturgy Committee for their work including its Convener, Canon Taylor.

7.2 College of Bishops

The Rt Rev Andrew Swift (Bishop of Brechin) explained that following the table group sessions which had taken place the previous day the College had received 44 questions and he thanked the Synod for them. The College would in due course answer the questions but for the purposes of the current session, six themes had been identified. Each Bishop would respond to one theme. They comprised the culture in the Church; the culture and make up of the College of Bishops; being leaders of mission; being leaders of ministry; ecumenical relationships and justice and social action.

The Primus said there had been a number of questions on the issues of power and authority, the mission of the Church and matters of gender, race and class. The question of how people were treated had been mentioned including questions of unconscious bias. It was difficult to answer some of the questions because he recognised there were steps which he now needed to take. He recognised that as a white man in leadership he did not have all the necessary tools to deal with the questions which had been asked. He needed someone to teach him and help him understand when he was about to say something which was hurtful (which he had not recognised would be hurtful). He could not answer the questions on those topics at the present time but needed to ask for permission to have someone else work with him. He would respond after having listened to professional help.

The Rt Rev Bishop Ian Paton (Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) said that there had been many questions about the culture of the College of Bishops including the gender balance and other balances in the College. He agreed that the image of six male people was not an image of the inclusivity of the Church. The Bishops recognised that and needed to listen to those in the Church who were different from them. The gender balance of the College of Bishops was, of course, in the hands of the electors. Beyond that, however, how could the Church encourage people who were not middle-class, middle-aged-to-elderly white males to come forward as candidates? How were women to feel confident and safe in the Church to take the risk of being candidates in elections in a Church in which women did not always feel safe? One question had asked how the Church could help the College of Bishops address the question of misogyny. It would be easy to think that because the Church ordained women to all orders of ministry that inequality had been solved. Similarly, because the Church had accepted equal marriage and included inclusive language in its liturgies, there was an assumption the issue of inequality had been solved, but that was not the case. Most prejudice was hidden, and the Bishops recognised that they too were subject to prejudice and it was possible to make decisions based on invisible and unheard prejudice, which the College needed to reflect upon. There was a need to listen much more both within the College and within the Church at large. He recounted a story of a female curate at Old St Paul's who had discovered that all copes had been designed to be worn by men. As a result, the cope frequently slipped off her shoulders. She had written a sermon based on her experience of having to wear men's clothes as a woman priest. It stood as a parable. Women in the priesthood and in the episcopate were changing the Church's ministry and more women in the episcopate would change it further. He prayed that the Church would have a whole ministry and episcopate and a more whole church as a result but it was for the electors in elections to be mindful of that.

The Rt Rev Dr Keith Riglin (Bishop of Argyll and The Isles) spoke to the subject of ecumenism. There had been three questions: the sharing of the Gospel in partnership with other churches; courses to enable charges to engage in the teaching of and nurturing of disciples; co-operation with others on shared goals to reach net zero. In other words, the questions were about evangelism, education and the environment. Bishop Riglin responded with two principles namely the Lund Principle that Churches should only do separately what they could not do together and also the principle that the wheel ought not to be reinvented. On evangelism, Bishops could and
would encourage efforts to share the Gospel in partnership with others. It might be through street pastors schemes or in joint work, as was the case in his diocese, with the Church of Scotland and Church Army to establish a pioneering initiative. Matters of “hard ecumenism” would arise and would be addressed when they were encountered. On education, the Bishops appreciated the charge given to them to be the pastors and teachers of the Church. The Bishops commended those resources which the Church already had. The Synod had already heard about resources available from the SEI and there were various online courses available as well. He encouraged people to contact their Diocesan Bishop or the College and they would endeavour to help. On the environment, the Lund Principle might suggest that the common use of buildings should be addressed, especially during the winter months. For example, on alternate months two churches close to one another could agree to provide hospitality for the other so that only one building was heated, rather than two. If a vestry was struggling to work out what to do in relation to net zero, there might be advantage in meeting with the local Kirk Session to share resources. In the three areas of evangelism, education and environment there was much common ground. The College would give active encouragement to all charges in the Province.

The Rt Rev Dr John Armes (Bishop of Edinburgh) addressed the theme of ministry including questions such as how, having heard all that was said about the Five Marks of Ministry, were the Bishops going to resource it; how were the Bishops going to maintain hope and realism, and give permission to people to give up long established activities; how were they to open channels of co-operation with ecumenical neighbours; and what were the key features of the Bishops’ three-five year strategy to reverse numerical decline in the SEC. It was inevitable that when the College invited questions the response would be to ask the College what it was going to do in response. However, it was important to remember that Bishops were “Bishops in Synod”, they were not working on their own. In response to the question of resources, the Synod hall was full of resources and they were evident from what had been said earlier in Synod in relation to the Season for Christian Life and what was going on in the SEI. Both of those were initiatives which had come originally from the College of Bishops. The College had done much in helping to establish the new Institute under the leadership of Bishop Pearson, Bishop Dyer and Bishop Swift. Similarly, the Season for Christian Life had come from the College of Bishops but it was only an idea which could have any traction if everyone was involved. The Bishops were members of many of the key committees in the Province and were working with others in that. As Bishop of Edinburgh, he found many good things were going on, some of which he could give active permission for and affirm but in fact they were happening because they were led by wonderful lay people and highly trained and capable clergy. Those were patterns of church life in which Bishops were involved, but not on their own. Recently the Diocese had gathered for a day event at the Cathedral entitled “the Big Story” at which charges from the Diocese had been present to show what they were doing in their communities to demonstrate the light of Christ. The day had given the lie to some of the more negative narratives which one encountered. Bishop Armes could not give a plan for reversing numerical decline but it could be reversed by the work of the Holy Spirit if the Church co-operated but he was not convinced that that was God’s primary thrust. Creating healthy communities was more important than numbers. Every church he had visited since lockdown had had new people attending. Sometimes their coming had been in response to work undertaken by charges online or in their communities and sometimes it had simply been because God was at work in their lives and they had chosen to come to church. Increasingly, as Bishop, he was undertaking confirmations of both young and old. Numerical growth was happening. Rather than creating a negative narrative, the Church could choose to look at the positive developments. He encouraged the doors to be opened so that when the Spirit moved, the Church could move too.

The Rt Rev Kevin Pearson (Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway) addressed the theme of mission. It was important to remember that the Church, in the power of the Spirit, joined in with God’s mission. Decline was not inevitable. In every charge in which he had served he had always said that at the heart of one’s faith was a desire to be with God. His ambition in every diocese was to be able to respond to the question “why do you go to church” by saying “I have an experience of the living God”. Unpacking that statement meant being nourished by God in worship, where one found an experience of God which one wanted to share and which motivated one’s life. There had been many examples during the current meeting of how that experience could be shared. The Synod had also heard that there was a need to look forward and that former models were no longer relevant. He had suggested to his own diocese that in the future there would be a need for bigger regions with one worship centre in each. All the clergy who were currently seeking to maintain ageing buildings would be based in that single worship centre and able to minister in the
region. Such a model would be sustainable and was aligned with net zero principles and patterns of ministry. An essential for all that was a need for trust in one another, in God and in the Bishop. Bishops could not impose mission plans but they could work together with others to enable people to have an experience of the living God.

Bishop Pearson had also been asked to speak to the theme of children and young people. He believed the secret was to take children seriously in response to their spiritual needs. He had done that with young people by asking them specifically “what would keep you in church?”. In closing, he asked the Synod to ponder the question “how would you preach the Gospel on Love Island?”.

The Rt Rev Andrew Swift (Bishop of Brechin) addressed the theme of poverty, cost of living and unjust structures. How could power in the Church be used to create a prophetic voice? One of the comments had suggested that Bishops were often silent. However, it had often been said that the SEC punched above its weight. The Bishops did use their voices. The Primus often made public statements on behalf of the College on many issues including refugees, poverty, fuel prices, etc. The College would continue to do that. Bishop Swift said that the College would lead, encourage and support and he recognised that, occasionally, it was necessary to take the Bishop out of the picture to enable things to happen. In addressing such needs, it could be difficult to tune out the anxieties which arose about other matters and Bishops experienced that as well as congregations. Having read the questions, he expressed a commitment to listen more. One question had been “how can the College of Bishops liberate us from talk, talk, talk to action, action, action and liberate us from institutional constraints to relate to the realities of our charges for God?”. He endorsed that question wholeheartedly. In closing, he encouraged the members of Synod to continue to provide feedback to the College of Bishops and expressed thanks to the Synod for their questions.

The Chair thanked the Synod for having provided the questions and the College for its responses.

SESSION 8: THE RT REV THE BISHOP OF EDINBURGH IN THE CHAIR

8.1 Committee for the Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults (known as the Safeguarding Committee)

8.1.1 Introduction

Mr Richard Baker (Convener, Safeguarding Committee) introduced the session, the main substantive item for which, he explained, would be the first reading of a proposed revision to Canon 65. Before addressing that, he wished to record thanks to Donald Urquhart who had retired after many years of service and wise counsel as the Provincial Officer for safeguarding. He also expressed thanks to Daphne Audsley for acting as interim Provincial Officer while the Committee had recruited for the new role of Head of Safeguarding. He welcomed John Wyllie who had taken up that role and the Committee was delighted to have secured an individual with Mr Wyllie’s experience and expertise - he had held a number of senior roles within Police Scotland. Mr Wyllie was already putting in place plans for safeguarding training across the Province and was helping the Church to prepare for the new Protection of Vulnerable Groups Scheme when that was introduced by Government. Mr Wyllie’s appointment was an important step forward in implementing the recommendations of the short-life Working Group which had been led by David Strang on improving the Church’s safeguarding structures. Along with the new safeguarding policy which Synod had approved in 2020, the Committee believed that the reform of Canon 65 would contribute to ensuring that the Church had effective and up-to-date policies in place. He expressed gratitude to the Committee on Canons for taking that work forward and was pleased that Lexy Plumtree would set out the reforms for Synod.

8.1.2 First Reading of Canon 65

Ms Lexy Plumtree presented the first reading of proposed changes to Canon 65 (Of Safeguarding in the Church). She explained that she was a member of the Committee...
Ms Plumtree commented on various specific sections in the new Canon. Whilst Section 8 on risk assessments was new, the Safeguarding Team in fact undertook risk assessment already. The intention was to evaluate the level of safeguarding risk.

Bridget Campbell (Convener, Standing Committee) proposed, and the Primus seconded, the following Motion:

“That the amended text of Canon 65 be read for the first time.”

Dr Stephen Goodyear (Aberdeen and Orkney) thanked the Committee for its work which he commended. It was helpful to have clarified the understanding of the responsibilities of the different bodies within the Church in relation to safeguarding. He wished to propose a small, but significant, amendment. Many members of Synod would be trustees of a charity, perhaps in their role as a vestry member. Trustees had legal duties which potentially exposed them to personal liabilities. The issue of safeguarding was therefore very important for all trustees to take seriously. He asked Synod members to imagine a charge where they were one of the charity trustees and where the charge had a full-time clergy person and full-time lay worker. His concern related to Sections 6(a) and 8(f) of the proposed new Canon. If there was a safeguarding issue which arose in relation to a lay person, the local trustees would be informed. However, if an issue arose in relation to the clergy person the Canon did not allow the trustees to be told because the matter would be dealt with elsewhere. As a trustee, he had been disturbed about that when he first read the Canon because it would enable him to take action in relation to a lay person, but not a clergy person. He believed that that was an asymmetry which was not right. He believed everyone should be treated equally. He also suggested that if a risk assessment raised issues which were not necessarily disciplinary issues it would be for the trustees to ensure in their local context that they were aware of such matters and able to protect both the person who had been subject to a risk assessment and those who could be affected by them if the individual posed a threat. The purpose of his amendment, therefore, was to place both clergy and lay people on the same footing. He believed that that was an asymmetry which was not right. He believed everyone should be treated equally. He also suggested that if a risk assessment raised issues which were not necessarily disciplinary issues it would be for the trustees to ensure in their local context that they were aware of such matters and able to protect both the person who had been subject to a risk assessment and those who could be affected by them if the individual posed a threat. The purpose of his amendment, therefore, was to place both clergy and lay people on the same footing. He had had the opportunity for discussion the previous day and thanked Daphne Audsley in particular for that. He recognised that there was a complication in that Canon 54 dealt with matters of clergy discipline. A revision to Canon 54 had, however, been delayed for obvious reasons and might yet take a number of years. He believed the current Canon 54 was unfit as a safeguarding tool because, if there were concerns about an individual, Canon 54 only worked if someone took the matter forward and the position of the Church to date had been that it would only act if a victim brought forward safeguarding concerns. In other areas of society when people suffered abuse they were often unable to come forward, for a variety of reasons. That did not absolve trustees from their responsibility of making sure that others should be protected.
Dr Goodyear then proposed, and Dr Martin Auld (Aberdeen and Orkney) seconded, the following amendment to the Motion so that it would read:

"That the amended text of Canon 65 be read for the first time subject to: (i) replacing the words "other than" with "including" in Section 6(a) and (ii) replacing the words "other than" with "including" in Section 8(f)."

Ms Plumtree indicated that the proposed amendment was not acceptable to the Committee on Canons. She explained that the situation was complex and that there was an interface between employment law, charity law and the "unusual" position of clergy who were not employees. The proposed new Canon was exactly the same in this matter as the existing Canon. The existing one allowed the Safeguarding Officer to propose that an individual should be suspended and was repeated in the proposed new Canon. The existing Canon had never been intended to cover the situation of suspension of clergy. Canon 54 was the disciplinary Canon, Canon 65 was not. Canon 54 would be revised. The Canonical Review Group had already undertaken significant work on it and the Committee on Canons had too. It was not possible to bring forward the new Canon 54 at the moment but that would be the place in which to deal with such matters. The interface between charity law, Canon law and employment law was very complicated. Charity trustees could remove a trustee who was in persistent breach but that related to removal rather than suspension. Removal would be under the Canons as the internal rules applicable for the Church. A vestry would not necessarily be notified in the case of a recommended suspension. Safeguarding cases involved a high degree of confidentiality both in relation to victims and alleged perpetrators.

The Rev Canon Lynsay Braybrooke (Aberdeen and Orkney) was glad to hear the explanation which had been given. She considered she needed to draw to the attention of the Synod a pattern which those outside her Diocese might not be aware of, namely that Canon law was being undermined by reference to charity law. She believed that that approach was undermining of the Bishop and reduced all matters to charity trustee level.

The Rev Dr Stephen Holmes (Edinburgh) considered that it was important that clergy ought to be held to high standards in safeguarding but he opposed the amendment because they confused the nature of the structure of the Church. The Church was a collection of charities and there was a hierarchy of charities. The Church was not just a collection of independent charges. There was an appropriate level for dealing with such matters within the Church and in some cases that might be the Diocese or the Province. That was the case both within the Canons but also, he believed, in relation to charity law and he wondered whether the Assessor might wish to comment.

The Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth (Glasgow and Galloway) indicated that he had also sat on the Canonical Review Group which had considered the disciplinary Canon. It was important that General Synod understood that, as Provost Holdsworth saw it, what Dr Goodyear was proposing would not achieve what he hoped it would achieve. Vestries did not issue licences for clergy. It was the Bishop who issued clergy licences and that was why the matter had to be dealt with under Canon 54. It was clear under that Canon that if the Provincial Officer lodged an accusation then the individual had to be suspended. He also considered that the amendment should be resisted because it would be confusing to have two different provisions in two different Canons dealing with the same subject area. That would make it less likely that the Church would be able to act if necessary because there would be legal argument over which Canon applied. He considered that the amendment was well-intentioned but would not work.

Dr Martin Auld (Aberdeen and Orkney) indicated that he had spent many years managing large teams of people both remotely and face-to-face. In such management, he had discovered that it was very important that everyone was treated honourably, fairly and in the same way. He believed the issue was about natural justice and if there were a system which appeared to treat different people in different ways there was a danger of unhelpful separation.

Dr Goodyear noted that an accusation had been made about him. He was happy to discuss that with anyone. The Code of Canons were not the law; they were the rules of
the internal "club" constituting the Church. The situation was different in England where the Canons were part of the law. The hierarchy was, therefore, the law of the land and the Code of Canons were the rules of the club (but the SEC was more than a club, it was God's church). He noted that Archbishop Sentamu had recently been suspended for suggesting that Canon Law was more important than the law of the land. It was important to ensure that the hierarchy was correct. The responsibilities of charity trustees trumped the Code of Canons. He accepted that there was a process for serious cases but a risk assessment did not automatically trigger action under Canon 54. However, such an assessment would highlight areas of concern. Trustees of charities, including churches, had to be able to act on such concerns. Such concerns were not dealt with under Canon 54 and he believed that those who suggested otherwise were not being straight with the Synod. It was therefore essential that if there was such a risk assessment, vestries were aware of it. The question was not about vestries suspending people – that was dealt with elsewhere – but it was about vestries protecting other people. By having the information, vestries would be able to take steps to ensure that everybody was protected. He accepted that the Canon would be discussed at Diocesan Synods and come for a second reading but he considered that there was an opportunity at the current Synod to send a message that the Synod took safeguarding seriously and wanted vestries to have the information where it was important and affected vestries' ability to safeguard other people. He urged the Synod to accept the amendment.

Dr Euan Grant (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) raised a point of order and asked whether there was anyone within the structures of the Synod who was independent who could offer comment.

Mr Gavin McEwan (Assessor) said that the particular clauses in Canon 65 being referred to applied to employees and volunteers, not clergy. Clergy were dealt with under Canon 54. The intention of the Committee on Canons was to keep the two Canons separate since otherwise they would conflict with each other and make the process unworkable.

Dr Goodyear raised a point of order and indicated that Section 8(f) applied to risk assessments which were not covered by Canon 54. He accepted that the Assessor's point was relevant in relation to Section 6 but there was no provision in Canon 54 for risk assessment. He believed the advice given was incomplete.

The Chair indicated that the Synod would have to decide on the amendment.

The proposed amendment was then put to the vote with the following results: 21 in favour, 74 against, 7 abstentions.

The Chair declared that the amendment had not been passed.

Debate then continued on the original Motion.

The Rev Denise Herbert (Brechin) explained that she was the Safeguarding Officer for the Diocese of Brechin. She noted that Section 10 of the proposed Canon enabled the Standing Committee to appoint an Appeals Committee and asked how the Standing Committee would make such appointments. The Province was a small one and people tended to know one another. She wondered how the membership of the Appeals Committee would be drawn. She was concerned that there should be fair treatment.

Dr Anthony Birch (St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane) congratulated those who had drafted the Canon. He wondered whether the process of simplifying canonical language had gone too far and whether there was a need for greater clarity. The distinction between what was dealt with in Canon 65 and Canon 54 respectively, he suggested, needed a parenthesis to make clear that where the Canon indicated it did not apply to Bishops, Priests and Deacons, it should explain that such matters were dealt with under Canon 54. Similarly, he believed there should be clear pointers to direct those in the life of the Church to where they could find the information which they needed to comply with safeguarding procedures.
The Rev James Patron Bell (Methodist Church) while welcoming the proposed new Canon, asked whether consideration could be given to safeguarding in the context of local ecumenical partnerships and clarity over which Churches’ policies were to be applied in any particular context.

Ms Plumtree responded to comments made. The Appeals Committee had met twice over a period of 25 years. In both cases, the Chair of the Appeals Committee was a Sheriff of considerable experience. The members of the Appeals Committee were appointed by the Standing Committee. Natural justice would dictate that no individual on the group would have any connection with the person making the appeal. Such appeals related to a decision by the Provincial Officer on the suitability of an individual to hold an appointment because of a blemished disclosure. No one on the Safeguarding Committee or the provincial Safeguarding Team would be a member of the Appeals Committee. As to including a cross-reference in the Canon to Canon 54, she would take that matter away for further consideration. However, too much cross-reference could be confusing. Further consideration could also be given to the possibility of making explicit reference in Section 1(a) to policy documents but that was not the normal way in which the Canons were drafted. She understood the importance of the issue raised in relation to local ecumenical partnerships. It was probably not possible to cover such matters in the Canons which related only to the SEC. The matter was covered in existing guidance but could be looked at again.

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

- House of Clergy: 51 in favour, none against, no abstentions
- House of Laity: 47 in favour, 1 against, no abstentions
- House of Bishops: 5 in favour, none against, no abstentions.

The Chair expressed thanks to Ms Plumtree, the Safeguarding Committee and Safeguarding Team.

8.2 Standing Committee

8.2.1 Ethical Investment Advisory Group

The Rt Rev Andrew Swift (Bishop of Brechin) suggested that ethical investment was an important issue because Jesus had indicated that where one’s treasure was, one’s heart would be also. He reminded Synod that in 2022 it had approved the ethical investment policy for the Unit Trust Pool proposed by the Ethical Investment Advisory Group. That policy was in operation and was being complied with. The Synod had also asked the Standing Committee to create a body to continue to provide advice on ethical matters and to make connections between the Church in Society Committee and the Investment Committee. Bishop Swift paid tribute to Alan McLean KC who had chaired the first Ethical Investment Advisory Group. Bishop Swift had been appointed to chair the new Group which had now been constituted. The members were drawn partly from the Investment Committee (Gordon Arthur and Andrew Hunter) and from the Church in Society Committee (the Rev Simon Scott and Jan Benvie) as well as Dr Eve Poole and Dr Donald Bruce. The Group had only met once to date but each year it would consider matters referred to it by the Standing Committee and explore any other ethical matter which the Advisory Group itself might raise or which was referred to it by others in the Church. The Group would also undertake some future “horizon scanning” to identify what new issues might emerge.

The Chair invited comment but there was none, and he expressed thanks to Bishop Swift.

8.2.2 Budgets and Quota

Ms Bridget Campbell (Convener, Standing Committee) addressed Synod on the Standing Committee’s plans for spending in the period 2023-2025. She explained that the process for developing budgets mostly involved considering what had been spent in the previous
year and rolling that over or adjusting it for the following year. However, by setting out forward plans for each board and committee, the Standing Committee was moving in a direction where it might in future be able to match resources to priorities in a more deliberate and considered way.

In the previous year, budget out-turns had been more positive than had been forecast but the Committee expected that in the following year it would start to incur deficits. To meet those deficits, the Committee would start by using up unused funds available at the end of a year because of underspends. It was also undertaking a specific review to ensure that there were no designated or restricted funds lying unused which could be repurposed. However, the projections for future spending had reached a point where the Committee expected to consider releasing some investment reserves, which stood at around £50 million. She referred to the presentation which had been given by Mark Harris earlier in the meeting in which he had demonstrated how it would be possible to release funds from the Unit Trust Pool. The Committee would be considering whether to do that in the following months.

In November 2023, the Committee would agree a firm budget for 2024 and update its budgetary expectations for 2025 and 2026. Earlier in the meeting, the Synod had voted in favour of the direction of travel set out in the Net Zero Action Plan. The financial estimates in that plan were, of necessity, based on incomplete information. The Committee would work with dioceses, the Provincial Environment Group and other relevant provincial committees to agree a budget for 2024 which would look to provide funding to help the Church take the next steps towards net zero. It would also consider what additional funds needed to be released in the current year to assist in that journey. The Committee intended also to ensure that sufficient funding would be available to implement the Net Zero Action Plan. What needed to be worked out year by year was exactly what was to happen in charges and dioceses and those were matters for local decision. Each diocese needed to work out what would be the best way to implement reductions in carbon emissions, taking account of wider local factors beyond net zero.

It would be the job of the Net Zero Delivery Director working with the Provincial Environment Group to support the work in dioceses. It would not be appropriate for Standing Committee to make what were essentially local decisions. However, what the Standing Committee could, and needed to, do was to establish criteria to assess how future funding might be allocated. The pattern which had been developed in previous years was to gather information from dioceses, use that information to allocate overall levels of funding and then to ask each diocese to make decisions about local allocation. Whatever approach might be adopted, the Committee would seek to ensure that appropriate value for money was achieved and that funds were used effectively.

The Committee recognised the challenge of finding sufficient financial resources at both provincial and diocesan level to implement the Net Zero Action Plan and acknowledged that it would not be sensible to raise the necessary finance simply by increasing provincial quota requested from dioceses. It therefore anticipated using the Province's substantial investment reserves as the primary source of provincial funding support and had no plans, at the present time, to increase quota to fund implementation. The use of investments in that way would have an impact on future investment income available to the Province to fund other activities and the Committee would be mindful of that in its future budgeting.

Ms Campbell then turned to the question of the amount of provincial quota to be requested from dioceses in 2024. The Committee proposed that the 2024 quota figure should be £715,000, an increase of 4.4% from 2023. She reminded the Synod that after a freeze in quota for 2019 and 2020 and a substantial reduction in 2021, the Committee was gradually working its way back to earlier levels in a relatively slow and phased manner. In 2022, the Synod had agreed Standing Committee's proposal to extend the phasing over a longer period up to 2025. The allocation of quota between dioceses was based on how much income was assessable for quota in each diocese and the actual amount of quota requested from each diocese therefore varied according to the relative changes in the income of each diocese. She illustrated the allocation in a PowerPoint
presentation. The formula for allocation had been discussed in detail, and agreed, with all Diocesan Treasurers.

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 2024, agree to a quota figure of £715,000 for that year.”

The Chair provided the opportunity for comment but there was none.

The Motion was then put to the vote and passed as follows: 98 in favour, 1 against, 1 abstention.

8.2.3 Size of General Synod: Review of Formula under Canon 52, Resolution 8

Ms Campbell referred to the paper included in the Synod papers and explained that the number of members which each diocese was entitled to appoint to the General Synod depended on the overall number of communicant members in the diocese. That was determined by a formula set out in Resolution 8 under Canon 52. Every diocese was entitled to a minimum of 12 members (six clerical and six lay) and any diocese which had a communicant membership in excess of 2,000 was entitled to two additional members for every 600 members above 2,000. The membership numbers were fixed for a 10 year period and the formula was then reapplied using updated communicant statistics. The formula was next due to be applied in 2024 in time for General Synod 2024. The 2023 communicant statistics would not be available until 2024 but the paper demonstrated the application of the formula using the statistics received from dioceses for 2022. The result of that would be a reduction in membership of the Synod from 124 to 102.

Earlier in 2023 the Standing Committee had consulted dioceses. Not all dioceses had responded and whilst the Diocese of Moray, Ross and Caithness had indicated no objection to its representation reducing to the minimum level, the Dioceses of Edinburgh and Glasgow and Galloway had been of the view that it would be premature to reduce the size of Synod. They had expressed concern because the distortion of church attendance caused by the Covid-19 pandemic meant that it was too early to form a clear picture of church attendance and that it would therefore be preferable to delay any change for at least two years. That would also give the opportunity for a broader review to be undertaken on the collection of statistics. The Standing Committee agreed that it would be premature to apply the formula for 2024 and proposed that the application of the formula be deferred until the 2025 statistics were available and which would also allow time for a broader review to be undertaken.

Ms Campbell then proposed, and the Primus seconded, the following Motion:

“That the next decennial review of the formula for diocesan representation and the number of members on the General Synod to be undertaken in accordance with Resolution 4 under Canon 52 be deferred until the communicant membership statistics for the Church for 2025 are available.”

Mr Hugh Morison (Moray, Ross and Caithness) suggested that when the Standing Committee looked at the question of statistics it should also consider the overall size of Synod. If the formula were applied in its existing form, the size of Synod would reduce. He thought that such reduction might be beneficial but he considered that thought should be given to the optimum size of Synod.

Ms Campbell thanked Mr Morison for his comment. She agreed with his comment and that was why the Standing Committee had suggested that a broader review was needed.

The Motion was then put to the vote and passed nem con as follows: 100 in favour, none against, 1 abstention.
SESSION 9: THE MOST REV THE PRIMUS IN THE CHAIR

In opening the session, the Primus reminded the Synod of Rule 7 of the Rules of Order and the need for Synod members to speak to the meeting respectfully.

9.1 Contribution from Ecumenical Delegate

Mary Woodward brought greetings from the Religious Society of Friends. She always found it a joy to be present at General Synod. The Religious Society of Friends was meeting that day to talk about the future of Quakers in Scotland. She had been pleased to note the increasing use of silence, both at General Synod and at the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, and she commended it to the Synod. She offered a reading about silence from a Swiss Quaker.

9.2 Elections

9.2.1 Standing Committee Membership

It was reported to the meeting that nominations of the Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth and the Rev Canon Peter Moger had been received in relation to the two clergy vacancies on the Standing Committee. Nominations had been received from Dr Anne Martin and Dr Beth Routledge in relation to the one lay vacancy on the Committee.

The following Motion was proposed:

“That the Very Rev Kelvin Holdsworth be appointed as a member of the Standing Committee.”

The Motion was put to the vote in the House of Clergy and passed as follows: 36 in favour, 7 against, 5 abstentions.

The following Motion was proposed:

“That the Rev Canon Peter Moger be appointed as a member of the Standing Committee.”

The Motion was put to the vote in the House of Clergy and passed as follows: 43 in favour, 2 against, 4 abstentions.

The Rev Amanda Fairclough (Argyll and The Isles) suggested that in the spirit of Rule 7 of the Rules of Order and the encouragement to speak kindly to one another, if people did not wish to vote in favour of a candidate, it would be preferable to abstain rather than vote against them.

An election was then conducted in the House of Laity with the following result:

Dr Anne Martin: 25
Dr Beth Routledge: 13

The Chair declared Dr Martin duly elected. The Primus thanked both for standing.

9.2.2 Institute Council Membership

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

“That the Rev Susan Henderson be appointed as a member of the Institute Council.”
The Motion was put to the vote and passed nem con as follows: 93 in favour, none against, 6 abstentions.

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

“That the Rev Dr John Carswell be appointed as a member of the Institute Council.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed as follows: 94 in favour, 1 against, 4 abstentions.

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

“That the Very Rev Margaret Campbell be appointed as a member of the Institute Council.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed as follows: 94 in favour, 1 against, 5 abstentions.

9.2.3 Personnel Committee Convenership

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

“That the term of Jeanette Whiteside as the Convener of the Personnel Committee be extended until General Synod 2024.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed nem con: 97 in favour, none against, 3 abstentions.

9.2.4 Committee on Canons Convenership

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

“That the term of Graham Robertson as the Convener of the Committee on Canons be extended until General Synod 2024.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed nem con as follows: 95 in favour, none against, 5 abstentions.

9.2.5 Preliminary Proceedings Committee

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

“That the appointment by Standing Committee in 2022 of Callum Kennedy as a member of the Preliminary Proceedings Committee until General Synod 2027 be ratified.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed nem con as follows: 91 in favour, none against, 5 abstentions.

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

“That the appointment by Standing Committee in 2022 of Niall McLean as the secretary of the Preliminary Proceedings Committee until General Synod 2027 be ratified.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed nem con as follows: 94 in favour, none against, 3 abstentions.

9.2.6 Clergy Discipline Tribunal Membership

Ms Campbell proposed, and Bishop Armes seconded, the following Motion:
“That Gill Scott be appointed as a member of the Clergy Discipline Tribunal.”

The Motion was put to the vote and passed nem con as follows: 91 in favour, none against, 6 abstentions.

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

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

The Motion was put to the vote and passed nem con as follows: 91 in favour, none against, 7 abstentions.

The Primus thanked all those who had been willing to put their names forward.

9.3 Provincial Youth Network

The Rev Tembu Rongong (Moray, Ross and Caithness) said it continued to be his absolute pleasure to convene the Provincial Youth Committee (PYC), bringing together youth representatives and officers from across the Province. It was exciting, rewarding and necessary work. The pandemic continued to have an effect on the Church's young people, as did the crazy world of the "new normal". Young people needed to find time away from those pressures and to be with people of their own age in a supportive environment and be who they were without judgement. The Provincial Youth Week "Yeek" was such a time and the theme for 2023 was "the Quest". A quest took the whole person on a journey and the PYC would accompany young people on such a journey. The numbers of bookings had been good but there remained places available, and he encouraged Synod members to encourage people to apply. A further opportunity would arise in October 2023 when a youth pilgrimage to Iona, which had originally been planned for 2021, would take place. Places had been reserved for two pilgrims from each diocese with extra spaces being available to all dioceses. Applications would go live the following week and the pilgrims would need to raise finance. He encouraged Synod members to look kindly on requests for support in their local charges.

Claire Benton-Evans (Provincial Youth Co-ordinator) wished to celebrate the workers and volunteers in SEC congregations who were dedicated to ministry with children and young people. She encouraged Synod members to think of those in their own churches who ran toddlers' groups, creche, Sunday School, after-school clubs, family services, holiday or youth clubs. Such people went the extra mile as did the adult helpers at the Provincial Youth Week. All such individuals were involved in the vital work of discipling churches’ young people. She invited Synod to show its appreciation.

Ms Benton-Evans also wanted to celebrate the global reach of the SEC's young people. Since General Synod 2022, young adults had represented the SEC in Germany, France and Ghana. A steward had been sent to the Lambeth Conference, a delegate to the World Council of Churches, an intern to the Ecumenical Forum for European Christian Women and a youth representative to the Anglican Consultative Council. SEC youth had been punching above its weight in the international arena. That was also evident in the Anglican Communions’s Youth Network which aimed to connect young people across the Communion. The SEC was the most active Anglican province in the Europe region. Ley-Anne Forsyth and Rachel Walker had just been elected to sit on the Network’s Global Council representing the Europe region as well as the SEC.

Youth representatives then addressed the Synod.

Jadon Rongong reported that as of March 2023, the number of asylum applicants in the UK had increased by 33% over the previous 12 months. In November 2022, there had been over 200,000 refugees in the UK with a further 127,000 still awaiting approval. Such people had fled their own countries as a result of fear of being persecuted or because of war or conflict but they did not receive a warm welcome upon arrival in Britain. Most did not have the right to work in the UK and relied on support from the Government. They were provided with lodging and were given £40.85 per week to pay for food, sanitation, travel, clothing and all other expenses. Refugees often found difficulty in finding accommodation in the UK. A hotel in Elgin had closed in order to
provide accommodation for 50 men who were provided with meals and the equivalent of £1.30 per day. There were some groups helping to support refugees and asylum seekers. Two people had visited his own church in Elgin to talk about the supported lodging scheme in Moray. The scheme was looking for young people in Moray to provide lodgings for unaccompanied young people. Such young people needed safe and supportive environments. The scheme had successfully integrated a number of young people into schools, including his own. He believed that it was groups such as the supported lodging scheme which needed the support of the Church. Church members could sign up to work with the scheme or to donate funds. He urged Church members to support such work.

Elizabeth Mills spoke about the challenges faced by young people, especially students during the cost of living crisis. Providing support could play a crucial part for young people and could build a positive connection between young people and the Church. Students had little opportunity to take part time work and faced the prospect of student loan repayments in future. Most students had no choice but to enter the cheapest available accommodation. Almost 50% of students had missed classes in order to undertake paid work and over 25% had missed deadlines for the same reason. 25% also had indicated they would be unlikely to finish their degree because of the cost of living crisis. Support could be provided by churches informally such as the provision of financial advice, food planning, cooking classes or field trips.

Olivia Smith also spoke about the impact of the cost of living crisis on young people and students. The crisis had had a profound impact on young people, particularly university students. Students were constantly encouraged to think about their futures but rises in the cost of food and heating made people wonder if they had a future at all. The issue was even more pressing in the summer months when SAAS funding was no longer available. Many students tried to find paid work but there could be difficulties in finding work if they could not demonstrate prior work experience. Many were also affected by disabilities and were unable to work or were subject to discriminatory practices. People could be unsympathetic to their situation. Young people sought a life of friendship and joy without having to worry that today's indulgences would mean tomorrow's starvation. What relief could the Church offer? Young people were looking for a place to exist in comfort without being asked to spend money. Churches could provide such spaces, particularly those close to university campuses. Churches could reach out to university societies and find out what support was needed. It would also be an opportunity for young people to find solidarity. For LGBTQ plus students she was aware that name tags which contained pronouns were a signal of support. Another area of support was the stocking of free sanitary and menstrual products. There was an opportunity to provide a unique vessel for God’s love in higher education settings. The approach of some Christian groups did not resonate with the student body. The Church could provide a space to meet people's needs in a less confrontational form of evangelism. Jesus had not just taught his followers but he had sat down with them and fed them.

The Primus thanked those who had contributed.

9.4 Thanks from the Primus

The Primus expressed thanks to Synod members, ecumenical and interfaith guests whether present in person or online, to those who had acted as Chairs or Facilitators and to the Rev Canon Dean Fostekew who had co-ordinated the Facilitators. He also thanked the Assessor, those who had arranged the Eucharist and had led Morning and Evening Prayer and those stepping down from the Standing Committee, the Rev Canon Dave Richards and the Very Rev Alison Simpson.

The Primus also thanked the Rev Canon Dr Anne Tomlinson, Sanctus Media, the staff at St Paul's and St George's and General Synod Office staff.

9.5 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.
1. **Membership: Standing Committee**

General Synod 2023 elected the Rev Canon Peter Moger to fill a clergy vacancy on the Standing Committee. Canon Moger resigned shortly afterwards having accepted a new position in the Diocese of Oxford.

Following an invitation to members of the House of Clergy to suggest a successor, the Standing Committee appointed the Rev Markus Dünzkofer to fill the position until Synod 2024.

Mr Dünzkofer is now nominated for appointment for a further three years. His nomination is proposed by the Rev Canon Oliver Brewer-Lennon and seconded by the Rev Canon Dean Fostekew. His biographical details are as follows:

**Ministerial positions:**
Since 2013, rector of Church of St John the Evangelist, Edinburgh; previously Associate Rector 1999-2004 St. Matthew’s Episcopal Church, Evanston, IL, U.S.A; Assistant Chaplain & locum tenens during chaplain’s sabbatical 2003-2004 Canterbury Northwestern: The Episcopal Campus; Adjunct Faculty 2004 Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, Evanston, IL, U.S.A; Incumbent, 2004-2012 St. Paul’s Anglican Church, Vancouver, BC, Canada; Dean 2010-2012 Deaneries of Burrard and East Vancouver

**Accomplishments & Recognitions:**

**Memberships:**
Fellowship of St John (Society of St John the Evangelist); Friends of the Iona Community; Gathering the Next Generation – GenX clergy in The Episcopal Church; Honorary Fellow, Sion College London; Trained mentor, Exploring Faith Matters/Education for Ministry (University of the South, Sewanee); Chair, Edinburgh City Centre Churches Together (ECCCT); Sole member and member of the Board, Just-Festival Edinburgh; Sole member and member of the Board, Cornerstone Bookshop; Honorary Secretary, Society of St Willibrord in Britain and Ireland

Other nominations may be made 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 vacancy is filled by election by the House of Clergy 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 additional 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.

Following consultation with the College, the Standing Committee nominates Dr Ros Brett. Her biographical details are as follows:

*Experience and expertise to contribute to the Institute Council:* Former TISEC/SEI student; currently practising Lay Reader; experience of theological study in institutions other than TISEC/SEI, and in different modes; involved in piece of work reviewing SEI Mixed Mode training in 2021-22; experience of offering lay training (principally in current diocese, but also other contexts); considerable experience in University teaching and administration

*Qualifications:* MTh Biblical Studies, Edinburgh, 2017; CertHE Theology for Ministry, Scottish Episcopal Institute, 2016; PG Cert in Scripture and Theology, International Christian College, 2014; Certificate in Christian Studies, St John’s College Nottingham, 2010; PhD in neuropharmacology, Strathclyde, 1992; BA (Biological Sciences), Open University, 1985; MA Librarianship, Sheffield, 1976; BA (Modern Languages), Cambridge, 1974

3. **Convenership: Administration Board**

Mr Jim Gibson retires this year as Convener of the Administration Board and General Synod is required to elect a successor.

Ms Jan Whiteside is nominated as the new Convener by Mr Gibson and seconded by the Rt Rev Andrew Swift, Bishop of Brechin and a member of the Board.

Ms Whiteside’s biographical details are as follows:

> Her professional background is in Human Resources within a large local authority Housing and Social Work Department. She has been a member of the congregation of St Margaret’s, Newlands for almost 30 years. During that time, she has been a member of the vestry both as Lay Representative and People’s Warden. She is currently the Alternate Lay Representative and serves as part of the Pastoral team and the Flower team. She serves as a Eucharistic assistant, is on the readers’ rota and responsible for the altar linen.

> She is a member of Diocesan Council and has recently been elected to serve a further 4 years as a Diocesan representative to General Synod.

> At General Synod 2024, she will complete 8 years as a member of the Provincial Retirement Housing Committee and 6 years as Convener of the Provincial Personnel Committee. As the Convener of the Provincial Personnel Committee for the previous six years she has served on the Administration Board. She has also served on the Canon 4 Working Group.

The Convener of the Administration Board is *ex officio* a member of the Standing Committee.

Other nominations may be made 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).

4. **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 there are two vacancies.

The Standing Committee nominates the Rev Deborah Davidson who completes her first term of four years on the Board and is willing to serve for a second four-year term. Her biographical details are as follows:

> Theology BA (Hon) University of Exeter 1979

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

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

PGDip - Public Health - London South Bank Univ 2006

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Standing Committee also nominates Robert Dickson. His biographical details are as follows:

Robert Dickson is a retired Sheriff having worked for 35 years and was previously a Solicitor.

He has been a member of the Vestry at St Michael and Angels Elie for more than 20 years and been Warden to the Priest in Charge for 15 years. He was legal advisor to Bishop John Armes at the time of the last Episcopal vacancy in St Andrews Diocese and acted in this capacity for four synods after the death of the Chancellor.

He has been his Church’s representative on Diocesan Synod for 10 years and a member of the General Synod for 3 years.
5. **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.

The Preliminary Proceedings Committee comprises a number of standing members and, where an accusation is lodged under Canon 54, additional members are then appointed for the purposes of the accusation in question.

The standing members comprise two practising lawyers and a lay person. An alternate lay member is also appointed who must be resident in a diocese other than that in which lay member resides.

A vacancy in one of the practising lawyer positions arose in late 2023 and Standing Committee appointed Yvonne Waugh, advocate, to fill the position pending General Synod. The Standing Committee now nominates her for appointment for the remainder of a five-year term until 2028. Her biographical details as follows:

Yvonne Waugh, advocate, specialises in reparation and represents both defenders and pursuers in the Court of Session and Sheriff Courts.

She has significant experience in all areas of personal injury litigation including industrial disease, employers’ liability, road traffic accidents, catastrophic injury and fatal cases. She is experienced in dealing with cases arising from the oil and gas, construction and insurance sectors. She has particular experience of clinical negligence cases where she is regularly instructed in cases relating to birth injuries, delayed diagnosis and many others.

She is Co-Director and Head of her Chambers and is an Ad-Hoc Advocate Depute and is a Standing Junior Counsel to the Advocate General. She is a member of St Paul’s and St George’s, Edinburgh.

Professor Patricia Peattie completes her term of office as the lay member on the Committee at General Synod 2024. The Standing Committee nominates Prof Peter Sharp to succeed her. Professor Sharp’s biographical details are as follows:

Professor Sharp retired as Professor of Medical Physics at Aberdeen University in August 2012 having worked jointly for the university and the NHS. As well as his personal responsibilities for research and teaching, he managed department of about 100 full-time staff and around 40 postgraduate students and so had to deal with numerous problems of both personal and professional nature that arose among them.

He has been president of both national and international professional societies and chaired a committees for the Scottish government. He is a trustee for a number of charities.

He was an honorary sheriff at the Stonehaven court for several years.
He is a Fellow of the Royal Society of Edinburgh. In 2012 he was made an Officer of the Order of the British Empire for his services to healthcare science. He is convener of the Provincial Buildings Committee and so sits on the SEC Administration Board. He is a member of the Brechin Diocesan Council and treasurer and lay representative for St James’s Church, Stonehaven.

The current alternate lay member on the Committee is Jan Whiteside. If she is appointed by Synod as the new Administration Board convener she will also become a member of the Standing Committee and is therefore precluded from serving on Preliminary Proceedings Committee. If Synod appoints her as Administration Board convener, the Standing Committee will nominate Morag Hendry, the new Personnel Committee convener as the new alternate lay member of the Preliminary Proceedings Committee. Morag Hendry’s biographical details are as follows:

Morag Hendry is a graduate of St Andrew’s University and Cardiff University and holds Associate Membership of the CIPD. Her early career commenced in Corporate HR roles with The Royal Bank of Scotland and then Scottish Power, specialising in compensation and benefits. While raising a young family, she changed career direction and in 2007 became the Youth & Children’s Officer for the Diocese of Edinburgh. From 2013 she has worked for various Third Sector organisations in people-focussed roles and more recently has consolidated her Third Sector and HR experience working alongside charities as a freelance HR Consultant. This has involved recruitment, investigations, grievances & disciplinaries, managing performance and absence and offering general employment advice.

Morag has been an active member of the SEC since childhood; is a past Diocesan representative at General Synod and is currently a member of St Mary’s Episcopal Church, Dunblane.

6. 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.

Since General Synod 2023 Standing Committee has filled vacancies for two lay members of the Clergy Discipline Tribunal, by appointing Robert Dickson and Jill Stoner until General Synod 2024. It now nominates both of them for appointment as lay members of the Tribunal for the remainder of a three-year term. Robert Dickson’s biographical details are reproduced above in connection with his nomination as a member of the Administration Board. Jill Stoner’s biographical details are as follows:

Jill Stoner is a General Practitioner by profession but retired from clinical practice, in June 2022. She continues to be a GP Appraiser, working the equivalent of a day a week. She teaches English to refugees based in the Highlands and has attended St Regulus Church, Cromarty 22 years where she is a Lay Eucharistic Minister. She is a member of the Iona Community.

Her qualifications include: 1985 MBBS; 1989 Membership of the Royal College of General Practitioners; 2001 Certificate in Theology, University of Exeter;
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2018 Cambridge English Level 5 Certificate in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (CELTA)

She has been involved in a range of charitable work over the years and was awarded the BEM in the New Year’s Honours list for her work for Cromarty Care Project and refugees. She is currently a trustee of Positive Action in Housing based in Glasgow.

In addition, the Very Rev Kenneth Rathband (retired Dean of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane and latterly rector of Holy Trinity, Dunfermline) and the Rev Canon Marion Chatterley (Vice Provost, St Mary’s Cathedral Edinburgh) complete their terms of office as clerical members of the Tribunal. Both are willing to be reappointed for a further term and Standing Committee nominates them for reappointment. The Standing Committee will also bring forward nominations to fill vacancies on the Tribunal in relation to the positions of “practising lawyer” and further information about nominees will be provided when available.

The Synod agenda includes motions to fill the appointments outlined above. Where more than one nomination is received for a vacancy, an election will be held.

John F Stuart
Secretary General
May 2024
GENERAL SYNOD – VOTING PROCEDURES

The Standing Committee wishes to seek the views of General Synod on how voting at Synod should be undertaken in future.

For the last few years, Synod has operated in "hybrid" mode. In order to ensure a voting facility in which those present in person and those present remotely could participate, the voting has been electronic, via the Synod Hub. In general, Synod members appear to have appreciated electronic voting.

Electronic voting, however, represents a move away from the underlying principles contained in the Synod’s Rules of Order. The Rules envisage that, normally, voting at Synod will be on a show of hands. One third of any house is entitled to require voting to be by (secret) ballot - see rule 12 (d) of the Rules, set out below. In 2023, the Synod passed a specific motion to permit an electronic voting for that meeting. A similar motion will be presented to General Synod 2024 to alter Rule 12(d) for that meeting.

At Synod 2024, we will make use of a new system with electronic voting devices being provided to all voting members. Each member will be allocated a specific device which means that for the purpose of undertaking a voting audit, should that be needed for any reason, it will be possible for the Tellers appointed by the meeting to check whether a vote cast has been registered on the system and by whom such a vote has been cast. Access to such voting records will be restricted to the Tellers.

It makes sense to establish a policy for the longer term, rather than requiring a decision on voting policy to be made annually at each Synod. To resolve the issue for the longer term would also assist in the planning of Synod meetings.

Standing Committee hopes that by engendering discussion on a motion which expresses a preference that future voting should be electronic, it will be possible to gauge the mind of the Synod. If such a preference is expressed, it would be Standing Committee’s intention to propose formal changes to the Rules of Order at General Synod 2025.

Bridget Campbell
Convener, Standing Committee
April 2024

Rules of Order

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.

(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.
Budget Report

Format

1. The summary of all Funds (page 89) details the 2023 actual figures in the first column and the 2024-2026 budget figures in the final three columns. The individual Fund/Committee budgets (pages 90-102) detail the 2023 budget, actual and variance figures in the first three columns and the 2024-2026 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. Further revisions for known changes are considered by the Standing Committee at its April meeting.

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 90) 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 the following principles:

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

   • In the medium term the ‘excess return’ earned on the General Fund’s investments is available, if required, to fund operational deficits.

   • 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 72% 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 returned to its former level only 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. Increases in distribution have been possible each year for the last eight years. In the last three years the performance of the UTP has been sufficiently strong to allow the Investment Committee to commit to a strategy of restoring the real level of distribution to its 2008 level. There have therefore been above inflation increases in the distribution rate since 2021. An
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An increase of 10p per unit (13.3%) was paid in 2023. The Investment Committee has indicated that it anticipates that it will achieve its aim of restoring the distribution rate to its real 2008 level in 2024 and that future increase will be more modest than those of the last three years. For budgetary purposes an annual increase of about 6% is assumed for 2024 with increases of about 3% thereafter.

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 2023 it accounted for 21% 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. In light of the continuing financial pressures experienced by charges, including the impact of higher than expected rates of inflation, General Synod 2022 agreed that the period over which the increase in quota to £750,000 was to be phased should be extended by a year. In accordance with that revised timetable a quota figure of £750,000 is proposed for 2025. (For budgetary purposes it is assumed that, in the short term at least, quota increase will continue at a rate similar to recent years to compensate, at least partially, for previous reductions in quota. An increase of £35,000 (4.7%) in 2026 is assumed.

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, 2021 and 2023. 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 fifteen years to 2023 is approximately £694,000.) It is not Standing Committee’s intention to generate such surpluses. In addition to allowing the investment of £700,000 in 2014 and 2016 (resulting in additional annual income of about £40,000) the surpluses have also provided the opportunity for a number of actions that have directly benefited dioceses and charges:

- In light of a deficit on the Pension Fund a lump sum of £2 million was paid in 2009 reducing the need for increases in pension contribution rates.
- Quota was frozen in 2019 and 2020 and substantially reduced in 2021 as part of the financial response to Covid-19.
- £300,000 was distributed to dioceses and charges in 2021 through the Recovery and Renewal Fund.
- Transitional Stipend Assistance Grants of £265,000 were distributed to charges via dioceses in 2023. A further £100,000 is being distributed in 2024.
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. It recognises that reserves will need to be used to fund the costs of implementing the Net Zero Action Plan.

Why is outcome generally better than budget?

8. Standing Committee is keen to try to achieve greater accuracy in the budgeting process and encourages the Boards to submit realistic budget requests. Although there was a deficit of £585,300 on the General Fund in 2023, this was about £42,000 better than budget. A number of factors contributed to the better than anticipated outcome – including better than budgeted investment income and the lack of applications for some grants programmes. Although there has been an increase in in-person meetings the continuing use of online meeting facilities has also resulted in some cost savings.

Action agreed by Standing Committee

9. As noted above quota has been reduced and will not be restored to its 2020 level until 2025. Funding the reduction will use approximately £335,000 of accumulated reserves.

10. A total of £300,000 was allocated by Standing Committee to the Recovery and Renewal Fund used to assist dioceses and charges meet the challenges and opportunities encountered as they emerged from lockdown restrictions.

11. Recognising that many charges would find it difficult to fund the increases in Standard Stipend in 2023 in light of the stipend policy agreed by General Synod in 2021 and unusually high rates of inflation, Standing Committee agreed to provide Transitional Stipend Assistance Grants to dioceses to enable them to provide financial support to charges finding most difficulty in funding the increased costs. A total of £365,000 has been made available in 2023 and 2024.

12. In setting the budgets for 2023 – 2025 Standing Committee agreed to deficit budgets to ensure that the ongoing work of the various boards was adequately funded. The budgets for 2024-2026 reflect Standing Committee’s continuing commitment to use reserves to fund work of the church. A significant element of this relates to the costs involved in implementing General Synod’s Net Zero aspirations. Other areas where additional resources have been committed include Safeguarding (increased staff resource to expand training capability and implementation of new Protection of Vulnerable Groups regulations), curate training and support (increased curate grants, provision of more structured support for newly ordained clergy, deacons and licensed lay readers in the second phase of their Initial Ministerial Education) and expansion of training options provided by the Scottish Episcopal Institute (increased number of courses provided).
13. It is anticipated that the current revenue reserves of £302,000 will be used within the next year and that it will become necessary to sell investments to fund ongoing deficits.

**Current budgetary pressures and uncertainties**

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

**Quota income**
15. As outlined above it is planned to restore quota to previous levels by 2025. It is assumed that thereafter annual increases will again be possible.

**Investment income**
16. Whilst the SEC Unit Trust Pool is currently performing well there can be no guarantee that investment income will continue to increase. Investment income will be reduced when investments are sold to fund deficits. (At current unit values and distribution rates each £100,000 of investments sold reduces annual investment income by about £3,000.)

**Implementation of Net Zero Action Plan**
17. The costs of realising Synod’s commitment to working toward net zero carbon emissions by 2030 are not yet known. The Net Zero Action Plan (NZAP) presented to General Synod in 2023 estimated a provincial funding requirement of £4.7 million over the period 2023-2030. Since then it has been agreed that the five ‘Net Zero Champion’ posts envisaged in the plan would be provincially funded for the initial three year period rather than an equal sharing of costs with dioceses as suggested in the NZAP. The demand for the various grants envisaged by the NZAP and the capacity to undertake the necessary works to some church buildings and rectories is not yet known. The revised building grants programmes have recently been launched and it is anticipated that initial grant applications will be submitted in the coming months. Future budgets will be adjusted in the light of experience and actual costs incurred. The current budgeted costs are broadly based on the NZAP estimated costs adjusted to reflect the agreed funding arrangements for the ‘Net Zero Champions’ over the next three years. Budgeted costs increase from £441,400 in 2024 to £816,600 in 2026 – a total of £1.9m over the three year period.

**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 £23,000 a year over a three year training period. The numbers of individuals expected to commence curacies, even in the relatively short term, can change from year to year as personal circumstances change. Currently there are seven stipendiary curates in training. It is anticipated that the number will remain constant during 2024.

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. Before 2022 enhanced funding had only been required in respect of one curate placement. Standing Committee however agreed that funding of 75% of stipend and related costs would be provided in respect of the three stipendiary curate placements that started in 2022. It has also agreed that 75% funding will be provided in respect of two of the three curates due to commence training in 2024. Should funding at that level become the norm there will be a general increase in budgeted costs. For budgetary purposes, funding at the traditional 50% level is assumed for all new stipendiary curates (other than those where 75% funding has been agreed.)

**Funding of full time ordinands (including Mixed Mode students)**

20. The Scottish Episcopal Institute (SEI) 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 £15,300). Currently SEI’s share of grant costs is funded by the SEI Training Fund and therefore has no impact on the General Fund deficit.

21. 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 2025. It is however likely that from 2026 the continued provision of such grants will require some support from the General Fund. The budgets currently reflect a funding requirement of £23,000 in £66,000 in 2025 – increasing to about £80,000 - £100,000 a year thereafter. The number of full time ordinands in training will therefore have a significant impact on the General Fund from 2025.

**Pension contribution costs**

22. The Actuarial Valuation of the SEC Pension Fund as at 31 December 2023 is currently underway. The results of the valuation, together with relevant recommendations regarding the future pension contribution rate, will be reported to General Synod. It is currently anticipated that a reduction in the contribution rate will be possible. The budgets currently assume that the current rate of 32.2% will apply in 2025 and 2026. Each 1% reduction in the contribution rate results in a cost saving of £3,600 in the provincial budgets.
Legal costs
23. Significant costs have been incurred to date in relation to the ongoing Canonical process relating to the Diocese of Aberdeen & Orkney. It is not known what further costs will be incurred.

Staff costs
24. In considering the recruitment of a new Secretary General Standing Committee reviewed the post’s workload and has agreed in principle that an additional member of staff should be recruited to undertake certain aspects of the role. It is anticipated that once in post the new Secretary General will work with Standing Committee in developing a proposal for a new post. Standing Committee is aware that a number of Boards are also developing proposals for the recruitment of additional staff and will consider such proposals if submitted. The budgets are based on agreed current staffing arrangements and make no provision for any possible additional staff costs.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Deficit</th>
<th>(£775,740 excluding TSAGs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>Deficit of £875,740</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>Deficit of £824,294</td>
<td>(£775,740 excluding TSAGs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>Deficit of £971,079</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The deficit in 2024 is larger due to the payment of Transitional Stipend Support Grants (TSAGs).

26. 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 initially be funded from the surpluses generated in recent years but will also require funding from the sale of investments. Standing Committee remains committed to ensuring that sufficient funds are available to provide appropriate training for authorised ministries within the SEC and to seek ways of developing new mission initiatives whilst providing appropriate support for existing ministries. It is also committed to fulfilling General Synod’s commitment to work towards net zero by 2030 and will therefore seek to ensure sufficient funding is available to implement the Net Zero Action Plan. It will work with all Boards and Committees in addressing the financial challenges arising from the prospect of incurring deficits.

Projections beyond 2026
27. 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. The uncertainty and likely scale of the costs associated with achieving General Synod’s Net Zero aspirations further complicates projecting beyond 2026. 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 2026. Whilst the surpluses of recent years provided a relatively sound base for a period of deficits the 2023 deficit of £585,000 has significantly reduced the capacity to absorb future deficits. Investments will therefore need to be sold to fund deficits. Standing Committee will continue to review planned expenditure and prioritise where necessary.

**Total budgeted deficits**

28. The budgets for all the Boards and Committees, including miscellaneous and restricted funds are summarised on page 89. These indicate the following budgeted total revenue deficits:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Deficit</th>
<th>(£593,180 excluding TSAGs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>Deficit of £693,180</td>
<td>(£593,180 excluding TSAGs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>Deficit of £640,080</td>
<td>(£593,180 excluding TSAGs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>Deficit of £754,840</td>
<td>(£593,180 excluding TSAGs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. 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  
May 2024
QUOTA 2025

All quota received will be credited to the General Fund.

It is recommended that, total quota requested be increased by £35,000 (4.9%) to £750,000. (This is in line with the extended transition period back to 2020 Quota levels proposed to General Synod 2022.)

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>2025</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>Change from 2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen and Orkney</td>
<td>73,125</td>
<td>73,574</td>
<td>(449) (0.61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyll and The Isles</td>
<td>27,375</td>
<td>25,097</td>
<td>2,278 (9.08%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brechin</td>
<td>47,925</td>
<td>46,761</td>
<td>1,164 (2.49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>319,800</td>
<td>297,224</td>
<td>22,576 (7.60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow and Galloway</td>
<td>141,225</td>
<td>138,281</td>
<td>2,944 (2.13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moray, Ross and Caithness</td>
<td>49,275</td>
<td>48,048</td>
<td>1,227 (2.55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane</td>
<td>91,275</td>
<td>86,015</td>
<td>5,260 (6.12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>715,000</td>
<td>35,000 (4.90%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BUDGET SUMMARY – includes all revenue funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual 2023</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2024</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2025</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Fund</strong></td>
<td>Income</td>
<td>2,668,455</td>
<td>2,767,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(265,000)</td>
<td>(100,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Allocated to Boards</strong></td>
<td>(3,444,195)</td>
<td>(3,592,030)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surplus/(deficit)</td>
<td>(875,740)</td>
<td>(624,294)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>302,046</td>
<td>(673,694)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer (to)/from capital</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>(573,694)</td>
<td>(1,397,988)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Standing Committee</strong></td>
<td><strong>Income (From General Fund)</strong></td>
<td>1,926,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>(1,926,375)</td>
<td>(2,011,940)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surplus/(deficit)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Administration Board</strong></td>
<td><strong>Income (From General Fund)</strong></td>
<td>287,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>(692,037)</td>
<td>(711,949)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surplus/(deficit)</td>
<td>125,442</td>
<td>127,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>817,087</td>
<td>539,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Institute Council</strong></td>
<td><strong>Income (From General Fund)</strong></td>
<td>645,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>(754,975)</td>
<td>(800,200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surplus/(deficit)</td>
<td>(7,654)</td>
<td>(14,613)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mission Board</strong></td>
<td><strong>Income (From General Fund)</strong></td>
<td>556,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>(697,145)</td>
<td>(718,835)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surplus/(deficit)</td>
<td>64,772</td>
<td>70,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer (to)/from capital</td>
<td>(403,067)</td>
<td>(114,857)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>346,473</td>
<td>411,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>411,245</td>
<td>482,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Faith &amp; Order Board</strong></td>
<td><strong>Income (From General Fund)</strong></td>
<td>27,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>(27,375)</td>
<td>(23,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surplus/(deficit)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Publications</strong></td>
<td><strong>Income (From General Fund)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surplus/(deficit)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>Income (From General Fund)</td>
<td>2,668,455</td>
<td>2,767,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>836,272</td>
<td>858,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surplus/(deficit)</td>
<td>(693,180)</td>
<td>(640,080)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer (to)/from capital</td>
<td>(403,067)</td>
<td>(114,857)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>1,567,745</td>
<td>471,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>471,498</td>
<td>(283,439)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## General Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>2023 fav/</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>(adv)</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTP income</td>
<td>£1,645,517</td>
<td></td>
<td>£1,851,217</td>
<td>£1,912,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>£4,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>£15,000</td>
<td>£15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net investment property income</td>
<td>£21,243</td>
<td></td>
<td>£21,243</td>
<td>£21,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>£1,670,760</td>
<td></td>
<td>£1,887,460</td>
<td>£1,949,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocation fees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTP / investment administration</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>£5,000</td>
<td>£5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension Fund administration</td>
<td>£35,215</td>
<td></td>
<td>£36,625</td>
<td>£38,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Funds</td>
<td>£20,210</td>
<td></td>
<td>£21,370</td>
<td>£22,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Allocations</strong></td>
<td>£685,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>£715,000</td>
<td>£750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus/(deficit)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing Committee</td>
<td>£1,333,710</td>
<td></td>
<td>£1,926,375</td>
<td>£2,011,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Board</td>
<td>£278,070</td>
<td></td>
<td>£287,770</td>
<td>£296,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute Council</td>
<td>£607,940</td>
<td></td>
<td>£645,690</td>
<td>£682,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Board</td>
<td>£28,105</td>
<td></td>
<td>£27,375</td>
<td>£23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith and Order Board</td>
<td>£607,940</td>
<td></td>
<td>£556,985</td>
<td>£577,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Stipend Assistance Grants</td>
<td>£265,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>£100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Allocations</strong></td>
<td>£3,043,630</td>
<td></td>
<td>£3,544,195</td>
<td>£3,592,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus/(deficit)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance brought forward</strong></td>
<td>£887,359</td>
<td></td>
<td>£302,046</td>
<td>£573,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance carried forward</strong></td>
<td>£259,914</td>
<td></td>
<td>£573,694</td>
<td>£1,397,988</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### Revised Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Revised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>2026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2023</th>
<th>1,333,710</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### EXPENDITURE

#### A Costs of General Synod Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Budget 2023</th>
<th>Actual Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>508,697</td>
<td>67,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>597,100</td>
<td>630,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.I.C</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>64,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension contributions</td>
<td>192,000</td>
<td>203,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff travel &amp; subsistence</td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td>4,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff training</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>1,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment Costs</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>3,605</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B Provincial Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Budget 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office of Primus</td>
<td>10,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primus’ expenses</td>
<td>15,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance to Diocese</td>
<td>14,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Bishops</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Synod</td>
<td>65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual report</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synod papers</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safeguarding Office</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication costs</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Safety advice</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Clergy Welcome Day</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training (Clergy / discernment/ race)</td>
<td>19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy Legal Expenses Insurance</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee Liability Insurance</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional fees</td>
<td>16,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal / advisory</td>
<td>175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions</td>
<td>3,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Costs of General Synod Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2023</th>
<th>917,760</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Total Provincial Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2023</th>
<th>344,165</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocation from General Fund</th>
<th>Budget 2023</th>
<th>Actual Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>1,926,375</td>
<td>2,011,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>2,214,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOME</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investment in General Synod Office</td>
<td>£1,333,710</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation from General Fund</td>
<td>£1,926,375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPENDITURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURE</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>6,282</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>6,180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>6,189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing &amp; stationery</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopy</td>
<td>8,240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing - Maintenance</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Bureau processing costs</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office equipment &amp; furniture</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>876,010</td>
<td>909,268</td>
<td>935,336</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premises</td>
<td>32,462</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building repairs &amp; maint.</td>
<td>30,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light, heat &amp; cleaning</td>
<td>45,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>13,390</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>92,100</td>
<td>94,866</td>
<td>97,712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>6,282</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>6,180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>6,189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing &amp; stationery</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopy</td>
<td>8,240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing - Maintenance</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Bureau processing costs</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office equipment &amp; furniture</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>876,010</td>
<td>909,268</td>
<td>935,336</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premises</td>
<td>32,462</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building repairs &amp; maint.</td>
<td>30,900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light, heat &amp; cleaning</td>
<td>45,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>13,390</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>92,100</td>
<td>94,866</td>
<td>97,712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>6,282</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>6,180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>6,189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing &amp; stationery</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopy</td>
<td>8,240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing - Maintenance</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Bureau processing costs</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office equipment &amp; furniture</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>876,010</td>
<td>909,268</td>
<td>935,336</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>6,282</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>6,180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>6,189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing &amp; stationery</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopy</td>
<td>8,240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing - Maintenance</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Bureau processing costs</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office equipment &amp; furniture</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>876,010</td>
<td>909,268</td>
<td>935,336</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Costs of General Synod Office

| Total Costs of General Synod Office | £1,048,110 | £1,078,204 | £1,109,250 |

### Total Provincial Costs

| Total Provincial Costs | £344,165 | £225,261 | £231,398 |
## Standing Committee

### Revised Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C Net Zero Delivery Costs
- NZ Team - salaries, expenses etc: £208,900
- NZ Team - other costs (inc equipment): £7,500
- Building Grants: £125,000
- Rectory Green Fund grants: £40,000
- Active Travel grants: £30,000
- Training, workshops, EFT licensing: £30,000

### D Committee Meeting Expenses
- Standing Committee: £2,500
- Safeguarding Committee: £400
- Ethical Investment Advisory Group: £100
- Provincial Environment Group: £2,000
- Preliminary Proceedings Committee: £269

### E Subscriptions to church bodies
- World Council of Churches: £4,500
- Conference of European Churches: £1,400
- Churches Together in Britain and Ireland: £5,000
- Anglican Consultative Council: £37,800

### F Grants
- Primus discretionary: £1,000
- Other: £38,000

### BALANCES
- Surplus/(deficit) for year: £-199,676
- Balance brought forward: £-39,000
- Balance carried forward: £-38,000

---

**Total Expenditure** = £1,926,375

**Surplus/(deficit) for year** = £-199,676

---
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## Revised Budget

### INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget 2023</th>
<th>Actual 2023</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation from General Fund</td>
<td>287,770</td>
<td>296,960</td>
<td>305,940</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Income</td>
<td>278,070</td>
<td>265,596</td>
<td>12,474</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>278,070</td>
<td>265,596</td>
<td>12,474</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPENDITURE

**Meeting Costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget 2024</th>
<th>Budget 2025</th>
<th>Budget 2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Grants Group</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Committee</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Housing Committee</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings Committee</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Committee</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,803</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget 2023</th>
<th>Budget 2025</th>
<th>Budget 2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Allowance</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Allocation to other funds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget 2023</th>
<th>Budget 2025</th>
<th>Budget 2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Grants Fund</td>
<td>273,970</td>
<td>283,160</td>
<td>292,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>264,267</td>
<td>254,269</td>
<td>9,998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget 2023</th>
<th>Budget 2025</th>
<th>Budget 2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>278,070</td>
<td>265,596</td>
<td>12,474</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BALANCES

**Revenue**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(deficit) for year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Administration Board
**Building Grants Fund**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget 2023</th>
<th>Actual 2023</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2024</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2025</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264,267</td>
<td>254,269</td>
<td>(9,998)</td>
<td></td>
<td>273,970</td>
<td>283,160</td>
<td>292,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,733</td>
<td>15,733</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,530</td>
<td>11,840</td>
<td>10,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>19,145</td>
<td>19,145</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>289,147</td>
<td>9,147</td>
<td></td>
<td>287,500</td>
<td>295,000</td>
<td>302,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91,505</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197,642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>289,147</td>
<td>9,147</td>
<td></td>
<td>287,500</td>
<td>295,000</td>
<td>302,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALANCES</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>-</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>Note</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addiional funds being made available for Net Zero related works are included within the Standing Committee budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Building Loans Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget 2023</th>
<th>Actual 2023</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2024</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2025</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>2,707</td>
<td>(793)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>2,707</td>
<td>(793)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BALANCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>2,707</td>
<td>(793)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(296,200)</td>
<td>(14,572)</td>
<td>281,628</td>
<td></td>
<td>(282,963)</td>
<td>(3,500)</td>
<td>(3,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311,328</td>
<td>311,328</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>299,463</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18,628</td>
<td>299,463</td>
<td>280,835</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Revenue (liquid funds for advancement of loans)**
- Surplus/(deficit) for year: £3,500
- Transfer (to)/from capital: £282,963
- Balance brought forward: £299,463

**Balance carried forward**: £20,000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Revised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>fav/ (adv)</td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>Incl.</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCOME</td>
<td>57,971</td>
<td>61,594</td>
<td>3,623</td>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>65,218</td>
<td>67,392</td>
<td>69,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>Interest - Deposit account</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(2,000)</td>
<td>Cargill Trust - Widows and Orphans</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Net Income</td>
<td>60,071</td>
<td>61,937</td>
<td>1,866</td>
<td>65,418</td>
<td>67,592</td>
<td>69,765</td>
<td>72,664</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPENDITURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPENDITURE</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>Grants - Clergy</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,120</td>
<td>4,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>- Widows &amp; Orphans</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,120</td>
<td>4,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>43,740</td>
<td>(3,740)</td>
<td>- Christmas payment</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>47,000</td>
<td>49,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>- Yearbooks (retired clergy)</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>GSO Administration charge</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>7,440</td>
<td>7,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>57,850</td>
<td>54,237</td>
<td>3,613</td>
<td>63,350</td>
<td>65,830</td>
<td>68,318</td>
<td>70,892</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BALANCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>Surplus/(deficit) for year</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,221</td>
<td>7,700</td>
<td>5,479</td>
<td>Surplus/(deficit) for year</td>
<td>2,068</td>
<td>1,762</td>
<td>1,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55,183</td>
<td>55,183</td>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>62,883</td>
<td>64,951</td>
<td>66,713</td>
<td>68,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>57,404</td>
<td>62,883</td>
<td>5,479</td>
<td>64,951</td>
<td>66,713</td>
<td>68,160</td>
<td>69,932</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Administration Board
### Retirement Housing Committee
#### Housing Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget 2023 £</th>
<th>Actual 2023 £</th>
<th>Variance 2023 fav/(adv) £</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2024 £</th>
<th>Budget 2025 £</th>
<th>Budget 2026 £</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: Deposit</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>23,116</td>
<td>16,116</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>36,741</td>
<td>59,548</td>
<td>22,807</td>
<td>81,463</td>
<td>84,178</td>
<td>86,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rents</td>
<td>88,000</td>
<td>89,558</td>
<td>1,558</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>92,000</td>
<td>94,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>131,741</td>
<td>172,222</td>
<td>40,481</td>
<td>186,463</td>
<td>191,178</td>
<td>195,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>8,149</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>8,755</td>
<td>9,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>33,327</td>
<td>1,673</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>36,050</td>
<td>37,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas appliance / electrical testing etc</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>10,059</td>
<td>2,941</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>13,390</td>
<td>13,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property surveys / Management etc</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>2,790</td>
<td>8,210</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSO Administration charge</td>
<td>12,910</td>
<td>12,910</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,670</td>
<td>14,126</td>
<td>14,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80,910</td>
<td>67,235</td>
<td>13,675</td>
<td>77,670</td>
<td>79,821</td>
<td>82,024</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>50,831</td>
<td>104,987</td>
<td>54,156</td>
<td>108,793</td>
<td>111,357</td>
<td>113,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(deficit) for year</td>
<td>(56,709)</td>
<td>(84,554)</td>
<td>(27,845)</td>
<td>(120,104)</td>
<td>(111,357)</td>
<td>(113,869)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers (to)/from capital</td>
<td>5,878</td>
<td>5,878</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26,311</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26,311</td>
<td>26,311</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPITAL ACCOUNT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions to capital</td>
<td>684,000</td>
<td>1,183,091</td>
<td>499,091</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Profit on sale of property</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>64,787</td>
<td>64,787</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other income</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>217,941</td>
<td>(7,059)</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>245,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Purchase of property</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(15,000)</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Capital repairs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Funds placed on deposit</td>
<td>924,000</td>
<td>2,665,819</td>
<td>1,741,819</td>
<td>410,000</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>265,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds invested in Unit Trust Pool</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposals of capital</td>
<td>143,775</td>
<td>207,517</td>
<td>(63,742)</td>
<td>70,800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sale of property - book value</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>(16,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Repayment of loan</td>
<td>36,741</td>
<td>1,109,870</td>
<td>(1,070,354)</td>
<td>64,096</td>
<td>148,643</td>
<td>151,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Funds from deposit account</td>
<td>183,291</td>
<td>1,333,387</td>
<td>(1,150,090)</td>
<td>134,896</td>
<td>148,643</td>
<td>151,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>net additions (disposals) of capital</td>
<td>740,709</td>
<td>1,332,432</td>
<td>591,723</td>
<td>275,104</td>
<td>111,357</td>
<td>113,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>5,626,988</td>
<td>5,626,988</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,959,420</td>
<td>7,234,524</td>
<td>7,345,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>6,367,697</td>
<td>6,959,420</td>
<td>591,723</td>
<td>7,234,524</td>
<td>7,345,881</td>
<td>7,459,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding of capital movement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding required</td>
<td>740,709</td>
<td>1,332,432</td>
<td>591,723</td>
<td>275,104</td>
<td>111,357</td>
<td>113,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Profit on sale of property</td>
<td>684,000</td>
<td>1,183,091</td>
<td>499,091</td>
<td>155,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>64,787</td>
<td>64,787</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Transfer from/(to) revenue</td>
<td>56,709</td>
<td>84,554</td>
<td>27,845</td>
<td>120,104</td>
<td>111,357</td>
<td>113,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Funding shortfall</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Institute Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revised Budget 2024</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2025</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocation from General Fund</td>
<td>645,690</td>
<td>682,295</td>
<td>697,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation from Training Fund</td>
<td>43,875</td>
<td>45,050</td>
<td>15,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees</td>
<td>5,135</td>
<td>5,290</td>
<td>5,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>11,400</td>
<td>17,515</td>
<td>17,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Income</td>
<td>706,100</td>
<td>750,150</td>
<td>735,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPENDITURE

#### A Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting costs</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Board</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B Scottish Episcopal Institute

**Staff Costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries, pensions etc</td>
<td>175,700</td>
<td>186,400</td>
<td>194,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel expenses</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff training / development</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment costs</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Staff Costs</td>
<td>181,700</td>
<td>191,900</td>
<td>200,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Training costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Education (placement) costs</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Tutors</td>
<td>34,500</td>
<td>35,500</td>
<td>36,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Awards</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Training Costs</td>
<td>96,000</td>
<td>97,000</td>
<td>98,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mixed Mode Training costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director of MM Training salary, pension etc</td>
<td>69,700</td>
<td>73,100</td>
<td>75,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of MM Training travel, expenses etc</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>3,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Grants</td>
<td>16,700</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>40,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mixed Mode Training Costs</td>
<td>90,300</td>
<td>99,500</td>
<td>120,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEI Journal</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administraion and other costs</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Other Costs</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total SEI Costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>372,500</td>
<td>392,900</td>
<td>422,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget 2023</td>
<td>Actual 2023</td>
<td>Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time ordinands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19,740</td>
<td>19,740</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19,740</td>
<td>19,740</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IME 2 Training costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>176,000</td>
<td>163,956</td>
<td>12,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20,400</td>
<td>14,176</td>
<td>6,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>196,400</td>
<td>178,132</td>
<td>18,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment and Selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64,500</td>
<td>64,910</td>
<td>(410)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>9,417</td>
<td>4,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81,000</td>
<td>75,423</td>
<td>5,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BALANCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Surplus/(deficit) for year</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Mission Board

### Revised Budget and Quota

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance (adv)</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Budget 2024</th>
<th>Budget 2025</th>
<th>Budget 2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530,805</td>
<td>512,175</td>
<td>(18,630)</td>
<td>Allocation from General Fund</td>
<td>556,985</td>
<td>577,835</td>
<td>592,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,040</td>
<td>17,654</td>
<td>2,614</td>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>15,660</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>17,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
<td>Legacies and donations</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Income</strong></td>
<td>546,845</td>
<td>529,829</td>
<td>(17,016)</td>
<td><strong>573,645</strong></td>
<td><strong>595,335</strong></td>
<td><strong>611,030</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPENDITURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,146</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>Board expenses</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401,000</td>
<td>401,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Mission and Ministry Support Grants</td>
<td>432,300</td>
<td>453,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>29,491</td>
<td>(491)</td>
<td>Provincial Youth Week (and pilgrimage)</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Children's work</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>1,356</td>
<td>Local Mission Development Committee</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>1,410</td>
<td>2,590</td>
<td>Youth Committee</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>Other activities</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>(1,250)</td>
<td>Training courses and events</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440,500</td>
<td>436,001</td>
<td>4,499</td>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>467,300</td>
<td>488,990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Allocation to Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Partnerships Committee</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church in Society Committee</td>
<td>106,345</td>
<td>106,345</td>
<td>106,345</td>
<td>106,345</td>
<td>106,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total allocated to committees</strong></td>
<td><strong>106,345</strong></td>
<td><strong>106,345</strong></td>
<td>106,345</td>
<td><strong>108,345</strong></td>
<td><strong>108,345</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 546,845 | 529,829 | 17,016 | **Total Expenditure** | **573,645** | **595,335** | **611,030** |

### BALANCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Balance carried forward
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Surplus/(deficit) for year</th>
<th>Balance brought forward</th>
<th>Balance carried forward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>£154,394</td>
<td>£130,420</td>
<td>£23,974</td>
<td>£252,078</td>
<td>£297,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>£164,043</td>
<td>£143,722</td>
<td>£19,321</td>
<td>£325,820</td>
<td>£391,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>£9,649</td>
<td>£3,802</td>
<td>£5,847</td>
<td>£463,540</td>
<td>£541,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>£173,693</td>
<td>£169,500</td>
<td>£2,893</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INCOME**

- **Allocation from General Fund**: Not applicable
- **Investment income**: Unit Trust Pool: £173,693
- **Deposit account**: Noel Phillips Trust: £11,579
- **Grant awarded in previous year not required**: £1,800

**Total Net Income**: £185,272

**Expenditure**

- **Grants Education**: £28,000
- **Africa**: £33,000
- **Middle East and Pacific**: £6,000
- **Asia**: £12,000
- **Small grants**: £3,000
- **Companion Relationships**: £8,000
- **Agency Support**: £6,000
- **Anglican Comm Network Support**: £8,000
- **South America**: £6,000
- **Bank and currency transfer fees**: £5,500
- **Committee expenses**: £3,000
- **Publicity / correspondence**: £1,000

**Total Expenditure**: £119,500

**Revenue**

- **Surplus/(deficit) for year**: £65,772
- **Balance brought forward**: £325,820
- **Balance carried forward**: £391,592

**BALANCES**

- **Revenue**: £297,265
- **Expenditure**: £285,554

**Surplus/(deficit) for year**: £31,711

**Balance brought forward**: £463,540

**Balance carried forward**: £541,663
<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>2023</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>fav/(adv)</td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106,345</td>
<td>93,828</td>
<td>(12,517)</td>
<td>Allocation from General Fund</td>
<td>106,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Income</strong></td>
<td>107,345</td>
<td>107,345</td>
<td>109,345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54,845</td>
<td>47,320</td>
<td>7,525</td>
<td>General Grants</td>
<td>54,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child poverty projects grants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40,831</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>37,270</td>
<td>(37,270)</td>
<td>Enable Grants</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting costs etc</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2,431</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td>107,345</td>
<td>107,345</td>
<td>109,345</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>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Surplus/(deficit) for year</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Balance brought forward</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Faith and Order Board

<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>2023</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>2026</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>27,375</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>27,645</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Net Income</td>
<td>28,105</td>
<td>14,226</td>
<td>(13,879)</td>
<td>27,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board expenses</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>6,076</td>
<td>6,258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work of Liturgy Committee</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td>6,122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work of Committee on Canons</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>849</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work of Doctrine Committee</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td>2,122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Church Relations Committee</td>
<td>10,705</td>
<td>7,905</td>
<td>8,142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfaith Relations Committee</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,575</td>
<td>2,652</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diaconate Working Group / Chapter of Deacons</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>28,105</td>
<td>14,226</td>
<td>13,879</td>
<td>27,375</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>-</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>Balance carried forward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WORK PLAN

Provincial Boards and Committees

THE GENERAL SYNOD
(Bishops, Clergy & Laity)

College of Bishops
Standing Committee
General Synod Office

Mission Board
- Pension Fund Trustees
  - Youth
  - Church in Society
  - Global Partnerships
  - Local Mission Development Committee
  - Provincial Environment Group
  - Protection of Children & Vulnerable Adults
  - Ethical Investment Advisory Group

Institute Council
- Recruitment & Selection
- Management Committee

Faith and Order Board
- Interfaith Relations
  - Liturgy
  - Canons
  - Inter Church Relations
  - Doctrine

Administration Board
- Buildings
- Investment
- Personnel
- Retirement Housing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provincial Board, Committee or other body &amp; Meeting Frequency</th>
<th>Convener</th>
<th>Officer/Secretary</th>
<th>Priorities for period to General Synod 2024</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standing Committee</td>
<td>Bridget Campbell</td>
<td>John Stuart</td>
<td>1. Clarify and strengthen the overall direction of the SEC.</td>
<td>Ongoing 2024 – for 1-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five meetings per annum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Encourage and support initiatives of the College of Bishops and the Mission Board with the potential to lead to growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Work with the Investment Committee to release funds to support the SEC where lack of funding is a barrier to positive action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Support the Church in working towards the net zero target of 2030, including financial support to enable the delivery of steps outlined in the Net Zero Action Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Help the Church respond to the cost of living crisis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Continue to oversee and develop the composite SEC workplan to improve coherence and shape overall future priorities from the General Synod</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Use the revised Risk Register as an active tool of governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Support, as necessary, the canonical processes concerning Aberdeen and Orkney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Oversee design of staffing structures in the General Synod Office to meet future needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### WORK PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provincial Board, Committee or other body &amp; Meeting Frequency</th>
<th>Convener</th>
<th>Officer/Secretary</th>
<th>Priorities for period to General Synod 2024</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faith and Order Board</td>
<td>Primus</td>
<td>Miriam Weibye</td>
<td>1. To support further work of the Canonical Review Group and prepare with the Canons Committee Canons to present to General Synod 2024 or 2025 for 1st Reading.</td>
<td>General Synod 2024/2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One residential meeting a year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. To consider the work of the Review Group looking at Episcopal Decision Making and agree any actions as appropriate.</td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and two online meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. To continue discussion around what the Board can and should be bringing to the wider church and society as a whole.</td>
<td>Late 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From 2024, the residential will be three days.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. To co-ordinate the work of the Board’s committees and encourage joint working across the committees of the Board.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. To facilitate connection between the Primus’s ecumenical work and community work and the work of the Board.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Integrating net zero issues into the work of the Board.</td>
<td>Mid-2024 onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. To engage with wider church in discussion about what it thinks F&amp;O should be offering to the Church.</td>
<td>During 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. To support the Diaconate Working Group as it supports the emerging Chapter of Deacons, including providing minimal budget for membership of ecumenical organisations.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### WORK PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provincial Board, Committee or other body &amp; Meeting Frequency</th>
<th>Convener</th>
<th>Officer/Secretary</th>
<th>Priorities for period to General Synod 2024</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interfaith Relations Committee</td>
<td>Bonnie Evans-Hills</td>
<td>Miriam Weibye</td>
<td>1. The IFRC is preparing a course on interfaith issues in Israel-Palestine that can be shared across the SEC.</td>
<td>Target date completion of drafting the course is now Autumn 2024, depending on funding for publication &amp; provision of in-person sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four meetings per annum, meeting in person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. The Jewish-Christian Glossary, published by the Church of Scotland at their 2023 General Assembly is now being shared and explored ecumenically. The IFRC is taking part in those discussions.</td>
<td>No time scale for the glossary has yet been ascertained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. There is a possibility of the Special Adviser from the UN Office for Genocide Prevention making a visit to Scotland, at the invitation of the IFRC. This will involve collaboration with Interfaith Scotland and the Scottish Religious Leaders Forum</td>
<td>The second half of 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Collaboration with the SEI with regard to training</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Refugee work is an ongoing issue for the foreseeable future, seeking to establish achievable targets as the situation becomes clearer, including exploring the possibility of provision of faith chaplains.</td>
<td>During 2024/2025, including looking ahead to General Election</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. To this end the IFRC is also exploring the possibility of multifaith chaplains in schools and academies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Following COP26, we also seek to develop further collaboration with groups such as Ecosynagogue and Faith for the Climate – both UK-wide organisations – as well as others Scotland-based. On-going work with the Scottish Religious Leaders Forum will continue.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Board, Committee or other body &amp; Meeting Frequency</td>
<td>Convener</td>
<td>Officer/Secretary</td>
<td>Priorities for period to General Synod 2024</td>
<td>Timescale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfaith Relations Committee (continued)</td>
<td>Bonnie Evans-Hills</td>
<td>Miriam Weibye</td>
<td>8. <strong>On-Going collaboration</strong>: on-going work with Interfaith Scotland, Interfaith Glasgow, Interfaith Edinburgh, Scottish Faiths Action for Refugee, Churches’ Together in Britain &amp; Ireland and the Inter Faith Theological Advisory Group as well as the Churches Forum for Inter Religious Relations, the World Council of Churches, the Anglican Communion Inter Faith Commission, and on-going work with colleagues within Scotland, across the UK and internationally. The Convener has done some work with the UN Office for Genocide Prevention. This entails connections with Holocaust Memorial Day Trust, Remembering Srebrenica, survivors of the Rwanda Genocide, as well as other on-going tensions.</td>
<td>On-going collaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Liturgy Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Convener</th>
<th>Officer/Secretary</th>
<th>Priorities for period to General Synod 2024</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Taylor</td>
<td>Miriam Weibye</td>
<td>1. To prepare for second reading at General Synod 2024 Lent, Holy Week, Easter rites.</td>
<td>General Synod 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. To continue work on revising experimental Collects.</td>
<td>2024-2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. To revise Daily Prayer for experimental use from Advent 2024.</td>
<td>Late 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. To consider rites for Christian Funerals, with piloted areas of experimental use.</td>
<td>2024 onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. To release guidance on Memorial Services.</td>
<td>Spring 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. To host Four Nations Liturgical Group residential.</td>
<td>September 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Attendance at Joint Liturgical Group in London.</td>
<td>Annually (September)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Three/four meetings a year, mostly online but with one three-day residential meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Convener</th>
<th>Officer/Secretary</th>
<th>Priorities for period to General Synod 2024</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Taylor</td>
<td>Miriam Weibye</td>
<td>1. To prepare for second reading at General Synod 2024 Lent, Holy Week, Easter rites.</td>
<td>General Synod 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. To continue work on revising experimental Collects.</td>
<td>2024-2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. To revise Daily Prayer for experimental use from Advent 2024.</td>
<td>Late 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. To consider rites for Christian Funerals, with piloted areas of experimental use.</td>
<td>2024 onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. To release guidance on Memorial Services.</td>
<td>Spring 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. To host Four Nations Liturgical Group residential.</td>
<td>September 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Attendance at Joint Liturgical Group in London.</td>
<td>Annually (September)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## WORK PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provincial Board, Committee or other body &amp; Meeting Frequency</th>
<th>Convener</th>
<th>Officer/Secretary</th>
<th>Priorities for period to General Synod 2024</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee on Canons</td>
<td>Graham Robertson</td>
<td>Miriam Weibye</td>
<td>1. General objectives: to continue to draft new or revised Canons as instructed by the Faith and Order Board.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four/five meetings a year, with a mix of online and in person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Work in progress to prepare for First Readings. Canon 64 Incapacity; (b) Canon 53 Sections 1-9 Pastoral Breakdown; (c) Canon 53 Section 10 Grievance Procedure; (d) Canon 53 Sections 11-15 Resolution of Other Disputes and Differences - consultation required with Personnel Committee and other relevant bodies and thereafter road-testing.</td>
<td>General Synod 2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Work will continue on the remaining disciplinary canon, Canon 54. It is hoped that this can be submitted for first reading in the next year or so but further consultation is necessary before drafting can be completed.</td>
<td>General Synod 2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Produce note on compliance with Scots Charity Law.</td>
<td>Summer 2024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## WORK PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Board, Committee or other body</th>
<th>Convener</th>
<th>Officer/Secretary</th>
<th>Priorities for period to General Synod 2024</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Inter-Church Relations Committee       | Charlotte Methuen | Miriam Weibye     | 1. Work with the St Andrew Declaration Contact Group to oversee the implementation of the St Andrew Declaration and its further development: a) Ecumenical Audit 2024 b) Scotland: Making Space for God’s Mission 2025 c) Ongoing theological work. Contact Group meetings alternating in person and on Zoom. Travel for four people for in person, and minimal hosting costs. Four in person meetings a year.  
   a) Intend to apply to ACTS for grant for staff time for audit and 2025 project  
   b) Will be likely costs for publicity, meeting hosting, general admin.  
   c) Meeting and hosting costs. Possible conference at some stage down the line, c. 2026. 2024 costs minimal, will do alongside contact group. | Work ongoing  
   a) 2024  
   b) 2024-2025 Approval at GS2024  
   c) Ongoing |
|                                        |                   |                   | 2. Prepare information about revisions to Canons 15 and 16 for Diocesan Synods. Attend Diocesan Synods by ICRC members. | Spring 2024  
   Second reading GS2024 |
<p>|                                        |                   |                   | 3. Continued SEC involvement in the drafting of a constitution for the Scottish Christian Forum. [Attendance at roundtable; Possible Ecumenical Officers meetings] | Bring proposal to GS2024 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provincial Board, Committee or other body &amp; Meeting Frequency</th>
<th>Convener</th>
<th>Officer/Secretary</th>
<th>Priorities for period to General Synod 2024</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Church Relations Committee (continued)</td>
<td>Charlotte Methuen</td>
<td>Miriam Weibye</td>
<td>4. Work with the ecumenical bodies of other Scottish Churches and the Scottish Christian Forum to establish a new way of monitoring and reporting on Local Ecumenical Partnerships in Scotland. [Attendance at Local Ecumenical Partnership reviews.]</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | | | 5. Continue to monitor and participate in the Porvoo, Meissen and Reuilly steering groups, reporting as appropriate.  
- Porvoo: Attendance of CRO and one other at Porvoo each year  
- Reuilly: Attendance at Contact Group meeting for one person  
- Meissen: In rotation with Wales and Ireland. SEC turn not expected until 2030ish. | Ongoing |
| | | | 6. World Council of Churches. Involvement in WCC meetings and commissions. | 2022 – 2030 |
| | | | 7. Four Nations (British and Irish Anglicans) meetings. Alternating Consultations and EOs meeting each year. Hosting in rotation. In 2024, Consultation in England with four SEC attendees and, in 2025, SEC hosting EOs meeting. | Ongoing |
| | | | 8. Ecumenical Attendances. One person at Four Nations Synods in rotation, plus Scottish ecumenical synods and assemblies. Membership at CofS Ecumenical Relations Committee, currently on Zoom but might start being in person. Residential possible. | Ongoing |
| | | | 9. Charlotte Methuen currently member of ALICUM (Anglican/Lutheran) and AOCCIC (Anglican/Old Catholic). Annual meetings paid for by Anglican Communion Office. | ALICUM 2020-2025 AOCCIC 2023-2028 |
## WORK PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provincial Board, Committee or other body &amp; Meeting Frequency</th>
<th>Convener</th>
<th>Officer/Secretary</th>
<th>Priorities for period to General Synod 2024</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctrine Committee</td>
<td>Harriet Harris</td>
<td>Miriam Weibye</td>
<td>1. Overarching priority – working out best way to communicate work of the Committee. Specific areas of work:</td>
<td>Mid-2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly online with one overnight residential.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Pilot in person conversation on contemporary topic, such as trauma, anxiety, and radical hope.</td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Work on theology of trauma, anxiety, radical hope.</td>
<td>Ongoing 2024/25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Response to Jewish-Christian Glossary (Church of Scotland).</td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## WORK PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provincial Board, Committee or other body &amp; Meeting Frequency</th>
<th>Convener</th>
<th>Officer/Secretary</th>
<th>Priorities for period to General Synod 2024</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mission Board | Sarah Murray | John Stuart | Mission of the Board is to work across the Church to find ways in which the SEC, responding to both statistical and anecdotal evidence that suggests a decline in church membership and attendance, can be sustainable and continue to provide national availability of mission and ministry in Scotland. This area of work will explore needs and resources and identify areas of good practice and examples. Drawing on statistical research available. Continue to work on relationships with College of Bishops and other Boards and Committees to establish where and how priorities for Mission originate and are held accountable and for the Board to be able to respond to any Mission Calls from the College of Bishops. To include the mission of the Church in an online world and context. Main Areas of work identified: | |}

1. Exploring how and where mission happens for example in ‘neglected’ areas such as urban, rural and new areas of housing/housing estates, church planting etc., de-churched and unchurched.  
1a. Communities of Practice to be set up with LMDC - see LMDC workplan for more information  
2. Identifying resources encouraging and enabling work in the SEC with Children and Families to look at how this group of people, who may have little, or no experience of church can be welcomed and able to grow in faith in preparation for youth work and beyond. Currently exploring the options for this potential post. Paper received and under the Board’s consideration.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timescale</th>
<th>Across the Board with LMDC work on specific project areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Board, Committee or other body &amp; Meeting Frequency</td>
<td>Convener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Board (continued)</td>
<td>Sarah Murray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## WORK PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provincial Board, Committee or other body &amp; Meeting Frequency</th>
<th>Convener</th>
<th>Officer/Secretary</th>
<th>Priorities for period to General Synod 2024</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth Committee</td>
<td>Tembu Rongong</td>
<td>Claire Benton-Evans</td>
<td>1. To plan a programme of Diocesan-hosted Provincial meetups for Provincial youth.</td>
<td>Ongoing 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets three times per annum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. To book and plan the Youth Week 2024.</td>
<td>Ongoing till August 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Board, Committee or other body &amp; Meeting Frequency</td>
<td>Convener</td>
<td>Officer/Secretary</td>
<td>Priorities for period to General Synod 2024</td>
<td>Timescale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church in Society Committee</td>
<td>Rev Simon Scott</td>
<td>Miriam Weibye</td>
<td>1. Work of the Church in Society Committee continues along two key strands: <em>Justice for Communities</em> and <em>Justice for Creation</em>.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. To promote Enable Grants (formerly Child Poverty) around Province and review strategic grant partners.</td>
<td>Spring 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Work with PEG on relevant petals in NZAP such as <em>Build a Movement</em> and <em>Biodiversity</em>.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three/four meetings a year, a mix of in person and online.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Work with College of Bishops and Mission Board on possible statement on nuclear weapons.</td>
<td>General Synod 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 2024, a residential meeting is planned.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Willing to be involved in work on racial justice and legacies of historic slavery.</td>
<td>2024 onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Work on gender justice and equalities, including supporting ecumenical 16 Days project, and speaking to Church of Scotland about their work on equalities.</td>
<td>2024 onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Board, Committee or other body &amp; Meeting Frequency</td>
<td>Convener</td>
<td>Officer/Secretary</td>
<td>Priorities for period to General Synod 2024</td>
<td>Timescale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Partnerships Committee</td>
<td>Hamilton Inbadas</td>
<td>Miriam Weibye</td>
<td>1. To identify and consolidate links with strategic global partners (such as the Church of South India, Chandrapur, St John’s College, Brazil, EAPPI).</td>
<td>Early 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. To agree on a list of International Christian/church-based agencies for supporting future links and projects (such as Christian Aid, USPG, Anglican Alliance).</td>
<td>Spring 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four meetings a year, two online and two in person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Move GPC’s way of working from individual grant funding towards more strategic projects with identified global partners and agencies and adjust budget accordingly. Priorities remain the UN Sustainable Development Goals.</td>
<td>2024-2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Whilst working on numbers 1-2, to continue the Committee’s grant-making programme and respond to incoming applications.</td>
<td>2024-2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. To standardise Education grants (under Noel Phillips Trust) as a standard scholarship programme.</td>
<td>2024-2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Plan a one-off overnight residential meeting to fully discuss points 1-5.</td>
<td>April 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Seek additional committee members.</td>
<td>Summer-Autumn 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. To encourage and support charges and dioceses in SEC to initiate new companion links or to revive pre-existing links that may have not been very active in the past few years.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## WORK PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provincial Board, Committee or other body &amp; Meeting Frequency</th>
<th>Convener</th>
<th>Officer/Secretary</th>
<th>Priorities for period to General Synod 2024</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Mission Development Committee</td>
<td>Diana Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td>Based on General Synod feedback and Mission Board work in recent months: 1. Establish an online Community of Practice for Lay pioneering</td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or three meetings per annum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Establish an online Community of Practice for Clergy pioneering</td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Run a day event with guest speaker on mission in New Housing hubs</td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Building on work with Diocesan Reps, run a series of online seminars on Healthy Worshipping Communities</td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## WORK PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provincial Board, Committee or other body &amp; Meeting Frequency</th>
<th>Convener</th>
<th>Officer/Secretary</th>
<th>Priorities for period to General Synod 2024</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Environment Group</td>
<td>Rt Rev Ian Paton</td>
<td>Miriam Weibye</td>
<td>1. To assist Standing Committee to support Net Zero Delivery Director and the team in the implementation of the Net Zero Action Plan 2023-2030.</td>
<td>Ongoing – report on progress at General Synod 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of meetings is workload dependent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. To support the establishment of network of Diocesan Environment Groups, resource them for Diocesan Synods 2023/4 and establish close working with other churches and faith communities, and with Eco-Congregation Scotland.</td>
<td>Ongoing from General Synod 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. To promote an ‘eco-system’ understanding of the SEC and enable different parts to prioritise Net Zero agenda.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. To work with SEI Council and staff to support ‘Greening the Curriculum’ and raise awareness of Net Zero Action Plan 2023-2030 and associated Toolkit.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. To encourage participation in the use and curation of the Net Zero ‘Toolkit’ and promote the use of ‘Heat hack workshops’.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. To widen membership of PEG to reflect priority areas and develop wider expertise.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. To ensure that the SEC agenda on the Environment reflects the Lambeth Calls on the Environment and Sustainable Development.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Board, Committee or other body &amp; Meeting Frequency</td>
<td>Convener</td>
<td>Officer/Secretary</td>
<td>Priorities for period to General Synod 2024</td>
<td>Timescale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute Council</td>
<td>Rt Rev Andrew Swift, Acting Convener</td>
<td>Michael Hull, Principal</td>
<td>1. Recruitment of new Provincial Director of Ordinands</td>
<td>May 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three meetings per annum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Expand Lay Learning Initiatives with diverse array of presenters, topics and styles</td>
<td>Ongoing in 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Scottish Episcopal Institute ‘on the road’ across the Province to raise its profile</td>
<td>Ongoing in 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Initial Ministerial Education 2 programme review</td>
<td>June 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Investigate ways and means for Transitional Ministry training to be integrated into Scottish Episcopal Institute’s offerings for Continuing Ministerial Development</td>
<td>Ongoing in 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Update the Handbook and website to incorporate information and policies across Initial Ministerial Education 1, Initial Ministerial Education 2 and Continuing Ministerial Development</td>
<td>September 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Build relationships with Reformed ministerial training programmes in Scotland (e.g. Church of Scotland Faith Nurture Forum, Edinburgh Theological Seminary, Highland Theological College)</td>
<td>Ongoing 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Review student financial support across all formational pathways</td>
<td>December 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Board, Committee or other body &amp; Meeting Frequency</td>
<td>Convener</td>
<td>Officer/Secretary</td>
<td>Priorities for period to General Synod 2024</td>
<td>Timescale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Board</td>
<td>Jim Gibson</td>
<td>Malcolm Bett</td>
<td>1. To review progress on committee objectives.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two meetings per annum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. To set Standard Stipend for 2024 and consider impact of current inflation rate.</td>
<td>Completed September 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. In relation to clergy wellbeing to review issues arising as policies on bullying and safeguarding etc are implemented.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Monitor progress of Charities Bill through parliament and ensure charges advised of any implications.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. To consider revision of Building Grant Fund rules (particularly in light of NZAP implications).</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Liaise as required with pendant committees and Provincial Environment Group re issues arising from implementation of Net Zero Action Plan.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Board, Committee or other body &amp; Meeting Frequency</td>
<td>Convener</td>
<td>Officer/Secretary</td>
<td>Priorities for period to General Synod 2024</td>
<td>Timescale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Buildings Committee                                           | Peter Sharp    | John Stuart       | 1. **Health & Safety**  
  - To develop Health and Safety support network  
  - To implement New Protect Duty (Martyn’s Law)                                                                 | March 2024  
  Dependent on implementation/form of the legislation                      |
| Two meetings per annum                                        |                |                   | 2. **Administration**  
  - To monitor the activity of Built Environment Scotland                                                                 | Ongoing                                                  |
|                                                               |                |                   | 3. **Environment**  
  - Advice on church building insulation completed but subject to ongoing review  
  - Plan webinar on Net Zero Action Plan for Property Conveners  
  - Add further case studies to guidance documents on heating and insulation  
  - Solar Panels – to consider the implications of installing solar panels on church buildings  
  - Good practice guidance for secondary double glazing | Ongoing                                                  |

Standing Committee  
Board and Committee Work Plan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provincial Board, Committee or other body &amp; Meeting Frequency</th>
<th>Convener</th>
<th>Officer/Secretary</th>
<th>Priorities for period to General Synod 2024</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Investment Committee                                           | Mark Harris | Neil Wright      | 1. **Review of Investments**  
|                                                               |           |                  |   - Ongoing monitoring of overall investment performance of Unit Trust Pool and of Baillie Gifford  
|                                                               |           |                  |   - Ongoing assessment of suitability of the strategies adopted  
| Four meetings per annum                                       |           |                  |   - Annual compliance report on pooled funds  
|                                                               |           |                  |   - Response to any new guidance or instructions provided by the successor body to the Ethical Investment Advisory Group | Quarterly  
|                                                               |           |                  | 2. **Distributions**  
|                                                               |           |                  |   - Decisions on level of interim and final distributions to be declared | May and November each year |
|                                                               |           |                  | 3. **Investor Communications**  
|                                                               |           |                  |   - Discussions with Standing Committee on overarching investment and distribution policies and objectives | Ongoing  
|                                                               |           |                  |   - Educational meeting for investors on the roles of the Investment Committee and Baillie Gifford and of the constituent parts and performance of the Unit Trust Pool | By General Synod 2024  
|                                                               |           |                  |   - Annual meeting of Unit Holders | Annually (post GS each year starting 2025) |
## WORK PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provincial Board, Committee or other body &amp; Meeting Frequency</th>
<th>Convener</th>
<th>Officer/Secretary</th>
<th>Priorities for period to General Synod 2024</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel Committee</strong></td>
<td>Jan Whiteside</td>
<td>John Stuart</td>
<td>1. Continue to update the online Clergy Personnel Handbook.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. To continue the revision of the Vacancies Handbook.</td>
<td>General Synod 2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Four meetings per annum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. To consider and finalise good practice note on clergy retiral, both pre and post retiral.</td>
<td>End of 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. To continue to support Bishops and Dioceses as required.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. To continue to support Place for Hope training on Living Well with Differences.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. To continue to work with the Canons Committee on the Clergy Grievance Procedure.</td>
<td>Timescale subject to Canons Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. To continue Committee succession planning (members)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Induction processes for clergy and Bishops</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Board, Committee or other body &amp; Meeting Frequency</td>
<td>Convener</td>
<td>Officer/Secretary</td>
<td>Priorities for period to General Synod 2024</td>
<td>Timescale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement Housing Committee</td>
<td>Peter Marsh</td>
<td>Neil Wright</td>
<td>1. Survey of stipendiary clergy to establish future need for Retirement Housing.</td>
<td>Autumn 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four meetings per annum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Update future funding requirements arising from the survey.</td>
<td>Autumn 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Recommendations on possible changes to the guidelines on matters such as standard property price and the 10-year eligibility criterion.</td>
<td>Spring 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. To review the performance and costs of Aberdein Considine and determine future contract.</td>
<td>Spring 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. To consider to what purposes the Retirement Supplementary Fund should be used and eligibility for access to the Fund.</td>
<td>Autumn 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. To review tenancy agreements to ensure compliance with updated legislation and best practice</td>
<td>Spring 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. To review EPC ratings across the Retirement Housing stock as part of the Net Zero work plan</td>
<td>Winter 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. To oversee the day-to-day work of approving house purchases and sales, ensuring property needs are effectively managed, monitoring the financial position on the Retirement Housing Fund and the Retirement Supplementary Fund, recommend changes to the standard housing price.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## WORK PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provincial Board, Committee or other body &amp; Meeting Frequency</th>
<th>Convener</th>
<th>Officer/Secretary</th>
<th>Priorities for period to General Synod 2024</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safeguarding Committee</td>
<td>Richard Baker</td>
<td>John Wyllie</td>
<td>1. Recruitment of the Head of Safeguarding;</td>
<td>In post April 2023 Progress: Commenced in role 17th April 2023 -COMPLETE-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or three meetings per annum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Recruitment of safeguarding training officer and delivery of safeguarding training;</td>
<td>Develop new training programme for delivery during 2023/2024 Progress: Training being designed and delivered by Head of Safeguarding who has training design, delivery, monitoring and evaluation experience. Three phase training programme underway. All PVG Coordinators and Clergy to be offered training by end of Dec 2024.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Introduction of new PVG Scheme arrangements and relevant compliance with same;</td>
<td>Government legislation changes anticipated 2025 into 2026 Progress: Ongoing - Monitoring and engagement via Scottish Churches Committee and Disclosure Scotland. Safeguarding Support Officer recruitment to manage increased workload being progressed with interview early May 2024. Audit activity underway to ensure PVG compliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Board, Committee or other body &amp; Meeting Frequency</td>
<td>Convener</td>
<td>Officer/Secretary</td>
<td>Priorities for period to General Synod 2024</td>
<td>Timescale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safeguarding Committee (continued)</td>
<td>Richard Baker</td>
<td>John Wyllie</td>
<td>4. Consideration of clergy wellbeing and clergy abuse of power</td>
<td>During 2023 NOW PENDED This matter is partially being dealt with through training and Canonical revision. It is pended at the moment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Recruitment of independent members to Safeguarding Committee</td>
<td>Ongoing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Progress: One independent member appointed. Head of Safeguarding actively in discussions with another individual.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## WORK PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provincial Board, Committee or other body &amp; Meeting Frequency</th>
<th>Convener</th>
<th>Officer/Secretary</th>
<th>Priorities for period to General Synod 2024</th>
<th>Timescale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pension Fund Trustees</td>
<td>Sarah Whitley</td>
<td>Neil Wright</td>
<td>The work of the Pension Fund Trustees is based on yearly and three-yearly cycles:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Yearly cycle</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Trustee training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Annual report and accounts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Risk Register</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Scheme Annual Return to The Pensions Regulator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Providing SEC accounts to Dun &amp; Bradstreet for the purposes of calculating the Pension Protection Fund levy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Employer Covenant Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Monitor investment performance and funding levels (six-monthly)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Monitor cash flow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Annual benefit statements to members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Summary funding statement to members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Review investment adviser objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Legal reporting matters (if required)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Increases to pensions in payment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Pensioner proof of life survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Actuarial update</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Board, Committee or other body &amp; Meeting Frequency</td>
<td>Convener</td>
<td>Officer/Secretary</td>
<td>Priorities for period to General Synod 2024</td>
<td>Timescale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension Fund Trustees (Continued)</td>
<td>Sarah Whitley</td>
<td>Neil Wright</td>
<td><strong>Three-yearly Actuarial Valuation cycle</strong>&lt;br&gt;The last actuarial valuation report was as at 31 December 2020 when the Fund was in surplus. The next report is due as at 31 December 2023. 2023 is therefore year 3.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Year 1:</strong> setting actuarial assumptions; preliminary results; consultation with Standing Committee on preliminary results and preparation of joint report to General Synod; approval of contribution rate for 3 years from 1 January year 2. Agree recovery plan if Fund is in deficit.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Year 2:</strong> review actuarial factors and Cash Equivalent Transfer Value basis; review of investment strategy; review of Statement of Investment Principles and Statement of Funding Principles&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Year 3:</strong> completion of year 2 review; training for next valuation&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Occasional</strong>&lt;br&gt;Member nominated trustee elections (due August 2023)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOARD AND COMMITTEE VACANCIES

The following is the text of an article posted to the Provincial Website in March 2024: https://www.scotland.anglican.org/vacancies-on-provincial-boards-and-committees/

Since its publication the vacancy on the Buildings Committee has been filled but there will be a vacancy arising in 2025.

The Provincial boards and committees structure provides the framework through which the work of the General Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church is carried out, supported by staff of the General Synod Office and the Scottish Episcopal Institute.

Each board or committee oversees a specific area of the Church’s work. Conveners are elected by the General Synod while committee members are appointed by their parent board, and board members are generally appointed by dioceses.

The work of committee members is vital to the Church’s ability to achieve its objectives, as they pursue and put into action the broad policy guidelines laid out by the General Synod. Without this indispensable support, the Church would struggle to function properly.

Participation on boards and committees is undoubtedly a commitment on the part of volunteers, but members often report a sense of achievement and satisfaction in their roles, as they play their part in helping the Church to flourish. Recent editions of Inspires Online have highlighted the work of the Administration Board and the Standing Committee and given examples of the roles fulfilled.

Members often have previous experience or expertise in a particular field – from information technology to overseas mission and youth work, and more – and there are committees which would benefit from such input.

Meetings tend to be no more than quarterly and can be held in-person, but post-Covid many of the boards and committees have conducted a significant number of meetings online, thus cutting down on travelling.

“The Scottish Episcopal Church is blessed with members who have skills, wisdom and experience in a wide range of areas but the province is not always aware of who and where such people are,” says John Stuart, Secretary General. “We would benefit greatly from members making themselves available to serve on provincial committees. And the benefit is not just one way – members themselves benefit from the opportunity to share in the life of the wider church and network with others. Now more than ever we need new members – so let me encourage us all to ensure that our lights are not hidden under bushels!”

At present, 12 of the Provincial boards and committees have vacancies and would be pleased to hear from anyone who could contribute to their work.

If you think you could help any of these boards or committees, and would like to learn more about how they operate, please get in touch with the listed GSO contact, by email.
Board and Committee Vacancies

Administration Board
Responsible for overseeing the work of its pendant committees, developing policies relating to a range of issues including clergy stipends and building grants and the provision of information to charges on a variety of charity regulatory and compliance matters. More info here.
GSO contact: Malcolm Bett – treasurer@scotland.anglican.org

Buildings Committee
Responsible for providing guidance on matters concerning the maintenance and upkeep of church buildings and also considering appeals lodged under Canon 35 against the decision of a Diocesan Buildings Committee or Diocesan Bishop. More info here.
GSO contact: John Stuart – secgen@scotland.anglican.org

Canons Committee
Responsible for drafting changes to the Code of Canons. More info here.
GSO contact: Miriam Weibye – churchrelations@scotland.anglican.org

Church in Society Committee
Addresses major issues facing Scottish society and encourages positive change in government policy and within the global community, and can provide some small grant provision for local projects. More info here.
GSO contact: Miriam Weibye – churchrelations@scotland.anglican.org

Global Partnerships Committee
Responsible for supporting church projects and people all over the world. It enables the Scottish Episcopal Church to reach out in prayer and commit to the needs of the wider church community. More info here.
GSO contact: Miriam Weibye – churchrelations@scotland.anglican.org

Institute Council
Has strategic oversight of the Scottish Episcopal Institute and of the delivery of formation and training for authorised ministry in the Scottish Episcopal Church. More info here.
GSO contact: Prof Michael Hull – principal@scotland.anglican.org

Inter-Church Relations Committee
Responsible for promoting inter-church working locally and nationally. More info here.
GSO contact: Miriam Weibye – churchrelations@scotland.anglican.org

Investment Committee
Responsible for investment strategy and monitoring the performance of the Scottish Episcopal Church’s Unit Trust Pool. More info here.
GSO contact: Neil Wright – neilw@scotland.anglican.org

Local Mission Development Committee
Responsible for encouraging and enabling local and Diocesan work, and to helping share the good news of this work across the Province. More info here.
GSO contact: John Stuart – secgen@scotland.anglican.org

Personnel Committee
Responsible for matters relating to the terms and conditions of clergy service and for promoting clergy wellbeing. More info here.
GSO contact: John Stuart – secgen@scotland.anglican.org
Retirement Housing Committee
Responsible for assisting with the provision of retirement housing and related assistance to retired clergy. More info [here](#).
GSO contact: Neil Wright – [neilw@scotland.anglican.org](mailto:neilw@scotland.anglican.org)

Safeguarding Committee
Responsible for the General Synod policy in relation to work and ministry with children and vulnerable adults. More info [here](#).
GSO contact: John Wyllie – [safeguarding@scotland.anglican.org](mailto:safeguarding@scotland.anglican.org)
NET ZERO UPDATE

Context

The Net Zero Action Plan (2023-2030) provides a pathway for the whole church to move towards the General Synod’s 2020 motion of achieving Net Zero by 2030. The Provincial Environment Group (PEG) was set up in response to this motion and went on to develop a plan.

The General Synod 2023 “received and affirmed the direction” of the Net Zero Action Plan (2023-2030) which sets the SEC on the path to reducing its contribution to climate change by actively reducing the emissions footprint of its operations and adopting a restorative approach to caring for creation.

In July 2023, I was appointed as Net Zero Delivery Director to develop and implement the plan at Provincial level. I am line managed by Secretary General, John Stuart, and the direction of my work, ideas and strategies is overseen by PEG which is convened by Bishop Ian Paton.

As various aspects of the Net Zero Action Plan are developed and delivered, PEG will bring relevant elements to Standing Committee for approval. The purpose of this report is to provide an update on progress made by PEG and me on five elements of the plan:

- Recruiting the Net Zero Team
- HeatHack workshops
- Carbon literacy training
- Licensing the energy footprint tool
- Grants

We have made significant progress in all five of these areas since the last meeting of Standing Committee on February 2nd 2024 and we are now on the road to collaborating with Dioceses and charges across the Province.

I have continued to develop the strategic approach to delivering the Net Zero Action Plan which focuses on a practical and cultural approach driven by peer-to-peer leadership. In practical terms, the provincial team will be working with Dioceses and charges at whatever stage they are at so that the best approaches can be taken locally. Now that the New Zero Team is in post, I will begin the process of identifying a number of “early adopter” charges within the Province, which are those who have made early progress in tackling their carbon emissions and can provide shared learning opportunities to others.

1. Recruiting the Net Zero Team

Recruitment for the Net Zero Team commenced in November 2023 and concluded in March 2024 and involved John Stuart and me from General Synod Office and Val Cameron and Cathy Johnston from PEG. As of April 17th 2024, all members of the Provincial Team will have started in post. The Team is as follows:
Net Zero Sustainability Officer: Iain Johnstone (full time). He joins from Voluntary Action North Lanarkshire

Iain’s role is to support charges and Dioceses with Net Zero planning by designing and conducting whole-property surveys of SEC buildings and land. His role encompasses sustainability appraisals, environmental audits and Diocesan level planning. He will help charges develop sustainable net zero projects through management support, knowledge, research, procurement, funding and contracts.

Carbon Projects and Data Officer: Neil Rawlins part-time (28 hours), who joins from Research Data Scotland

Neil’s role is to provide carbon emissions tracking at Provincial, Diocesan, and Charge level, providing support and guidance on carbon reduction projects and how to establish baseline data. Neil will help Charges and Dioceses gather information and make informed plans. This role will also play an integral part in work on the grants both for measuring the success of the grants and ensuring that funds are allocated to projects with potential to reduce emissions significantly.

Net Zero Clean Energy Advisor: Daniel Prince, part-time (30 hours) who joins from Sustrans Scotland

Daniel’s role is to help charges and Dioceses install low/zero emission heating and energy systems and be a key contact for matters relating to heat, efficiency, and insulation. Daniel will also develop and share regular guidance on green energy tariffs and work on behalf of charges and Dioceses to secure reliable information and contracts from energy providers and installers of renewable technologies.

Net Zero Innovation Coordinator: Jack Nevin, (full time), who joined us from the Energy Saving Trust

Jack’s role is to connect people with the Net Zero skills, knowledge and experience with the Charges and Dioceses that need them. He is to identify the demand for knowledge across the Province and provide training and learning opportunities to upskill the Church in exploring innovative ideas and technologies. These will take the form of workshops, webinars and in-person training sessions.

Net Zero Empowerment Coordinator: Bethany Nelson, part-time (28 hours) who joined us from the Edinburgh Diocesan Environment Group

Bethany’s role is primarily to consolidate how we communicate on Net Zero by exploring, capturing and sharing the case studies and knowledge that already exist throughout the Province. In her role, she will work on behalf of charges and Dioceses to tell their story, share their successes, and inspire others through peer-to-peer learning. She will establish a knowledge management framework to store all the key information on Net Zero as it grows with each emerging project and turn this information into easy-to-use resources and online stories. She has already begun work developing a new SEC Net Zero Portal (see www.netzerochurch.scot) and is aiming for a full launch of this new website before General Synod in June 2024.
Diocesan Contacts:

During consultation with PEG, the Cross-Diocesan Environment Group, and the College of Bishops, it became clear that Dioceses still want a dedicated key contact person within the Team. To respond to this, we intend while all Dioceses will have access to any member of the Team, they will also have a key contact person who will be the primary liaison person for their Standing Committees, Diocesan Environment Groups, and charges. This means that all the Team have a Diocesan support element written into their job description. In practical terms, this means that each Diocese and its charges has a specific Team member to help them with planning, grant funding, and fielding general enquiries.

Diocesan Contacts in the Net Zero Team:

**Moray, Ross and Caithness – Daniel Prince** DanielP@scotland.anglican.org

**Aberdeen & Orkney / Brechin – Jack Nevin** jackn@scotland.anglican.org

**Argyll & The Isles / Glasgow & Galloway – Iain Johnstone** IainJ@scotland.anglican.org

**Edinburgh – Neil Rawlins** NeilR@scotland.anglican.org

**St. Andrews, Dunkeld & Dunblane – Bethany Nelson** bethanyn@scotland.anglican.org

Net Zero Team – Next Steps

The Net Zero team is approaching Dioceses and will begin supporting them where they need it most. This will be on a case-by-case basis to meet Dioceses where they are and support them moving forward. It is anticipated that a starting point will be to build capacity within the Dioceses to develop Net Zero Action Plans which are sensitive to their local contexts. We understand that all Dioceses have some form of approach to mission, their charges, and the management of their buildings. Any Net Zero Plans will take these factors into account. The Team contact details will be distributed via our usual comms channels and will be on the Net Zero Portal. The Team will also be the first point of contact for the new Rectory Green Fund and Building Grants Fund.

Bethany Nelson has already conducted desktop project of identifying 135 ‘potential Early Adopter’ charges in each Diocese by means of identifying charges which are Eco-Congregation Scotland Members or Award Winners, have submitted emissions returns data, have taken part or shown interest in a Net Zero HeatHack Workshop, or have otherwise got in touch about Net Zero works. From April 2024, the Net Zero Team will begin regional fieldwork with the Dioceses to short list and identify ‘Early Adopter’ charges with the highest potential for trail-blazing new Net Zero Projects. We hope that these charges will lead the way in their Dioceses and help to encourage measurable progress across the Province. With a Provincial Net Zero Team in post provisionally for three years, we hope that by 2027 there will be at least 50 ‘early adopter’ charges leading the way to Net Zero.
The Net Zero Team Key contacts will now be able to fully support Dioceses on an individual basis whilst the Dioceses and charges will also have access to the various skills across the whole Team. The appointment of the Net Zero Team also enables the SEC to move multiple projects forward simultaneously.

2. HeatHack Workshops

HeatHack is a voluntary organisation with two goals: helping property managers and building users understand how heating and heat loss work now and could work in the future and collecting the data that people (including energy efficiency consultants) need to be confident about how to retrofit them. HeatHack were instrumental in helping PEG develop the Net Zero Toolkit, Net Zero Cards, and Net Zero Workshops that are now freely available to charges.

The HeatHack funding period for the workshops ended in February 2024. In the period between October 2023 and March 2024, 20 charges registered interest in the programme with 7 having completed some or all the process.

I met HeatHack Director, Jean Carletta in March 2024 to review the process and decide next steps. With HeatHack financially unsupported while they seek new funders, it was agreed that it was within the remit of Bethany Nelson (Net Zero Empowerment Coordinator) and Jack Nevin (Net Zero Innovation Coordinator) to bring elements of the workshop programme in-house. The aim is to continue to offer the workshops and integrate them into the wider programme of offerings being developed by the Net Zero Team. It is anticipated that the workshop programme will be in a transition stage between March and June 2024 while the Net Zero Team takes this on.

Jean Carletta has agreed to support the Net Zero Team during this period on a consultancy basis.

3. Carbon Literacy Training

Enhancing Carbon Literacy within the SEC was identified by PEG as an important step towards having the knowledge and capacity required to create a positive shift in how we live, work, and behave in response to climate change.

At PEG’s request, I commissioned the Carbon Literacy Project to develop SEC specific Carbon Literacy Training (CLT) for senior leadership. The course material was developed by Caroline Harmon (who worked on CLT for the Church of England) in consultation with Rev Willie Shaw (Member of PEG). The SEC courses ran from February to April 2024 and were offered to all members of the College of Bishops, Standing Committee, PEG, the Faith and Order Board, Mission Board, Admin Board, and all GSO Staff and Officials. Of the total membership, 43% enrolled in the training over four cohorts.

The next step for the CLT is for the Net Zero Team to complete a ‘Train the Trainer’ course to equip members to run CLT for Dioceses and Charges. We hope that CLT can be offered at Diocesan level later in 2024.
The Senior Management Staff at GSO is also exploring how to acquire Bronze Level CLT Accreditation to be formally recognised as Carbon Literate.

4. Licensing the Energy Footprint Tool

The Energy Footprint Tool is a piece of software developed for the Church of England to enable Dioceses and charges to submit energy data and measure their carbon footprint easily. Since September 2023, I, with support from PEG and Secretary General, John Stuart, have been negotiating an agreement to license the tool for SEC use.

This requires the development of a partition within the software that is exclusive to the SEC and signing a Service Level Agreement (SLA) for the ongoing use of the tool.

As of April 2024, the SEC partition has been built and is ready for use with all the relevant SEC charge and Diocesan data. The SLA is currently undergoing legal review with our SEC lawyers at Shepherd and Wedderburn.

While the timeframe for legal review is based on reaching an agreement and thus not quantifiable, once the SLA has been agreed by both parties, it is expected that the tool can be rolled out across the Province in a matter of days. Neil Rawlins (Carbon Data and Projects Officer) will take the work forward to roll out the tool for use in Dioceses and Charges. He will provide all the primary administration and conduct any necessary set-up and training for Dioceses as needed.

5. Grants Update

Grant funding was the focus of the last Net Zero Update paper for the Standing Committee meeting on February 2nd 2024. There have been no changes to the process or financial implications since that paper and thus this section is an updated timeframe.

Revised changes to the grant application forms were approved by the Buildings Grants Group (BGG) on February 28th and adopted by the Administration Board on March 26th 2024.

Malcolm Bett (Treasurer) is working to make the forms available by the end of April 2024.

Bethany Nelson (Net Zero Empowerment Coordinator) is linking the Net Zero Portal to the SEC website to coordinate communications on when the forms will be available to applicants.

Jack Nevin (Net Zero Innovation Coordinator) is developing ideas such as webinars and visual roadmaps to provide guidance and training on submitting applications.

The grants process is on track for any new applications to be considered by the BGG at meetings in June, September and December 2024.
6. Report Summary

The Net Zero Team with a broad range of skills has been recruited and is now setting to work supporting Dioceses and charges. We plan that a new ‘one-stop-shop’ communication online platform for all things SEC Net Zero will be ready by General Synod 2024.

HeatHack workshops have been delivered and will continue to be offered to SEC charges as the Net Zero Team evolves and takes the programme forward.

Many senior members of SEC have received carbon literacy training and the Net Zero Team will be trained to offer this training at Diocesan level.

The energy footprint tool has been developed for SEC use and needs only to pass the final hurdle of securing legal agreement with a dedicated member of the Net Zero Team ready to take forward Provincial roll out (allowing charges and Diocese to track their emissions)

Work on the Rectory Green Fund and Provincial Buildings Grants Fund will be completed and will be open for applications by the end of April 2024 with the Net Zero Team helping charges and Dioceses through the process.

Paul Williams
Net Zero Delivery Director
April 2024
A SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL POSITION ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS
BACKGROUND PAPER

This paper is a modified version of a paper presented to the Church in Society Committee by Bishop Andrew Swift, in November 2023. The original paper has been modified, based on the subsequent discussions of the committee, to present a background to the proposed motion for General Synod to consider.

Background to the proposed motion

In the contemporary global context, the potential for nuclear conflict looms, posing an existential threat to the whole of God’s creation.

The Scottish Episcopal Church (SEC) does not yet hold an agreed view on nuclear armaments. It is hoped that such an agreed position can now be achieved. By articulating a firm position against the use of nuclear weapons, the Church not only upholds its moral responsibility to safeguard human life and the whole of God’s creation, but also contributes to broader dialogue on peace, security, and the common good.

Other Christian denominations in Scotland have stated views on nuclear armaments. The Joint Public Issues Team, representing the Baptist Union, the Methodist Church, the United Reformed Church and the Church of Scotland has written in opposition of nuclear weapons.¹ The Church of Scotland has, for 30 years, “consistently condemned the existence and threat of nuclear weapons…”² Within the Anglican communion, in 2018 the Church of England Synod voted to support the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, in a motion that stated that nuclear weapons were both “dangerous and unnecessary”.³

As a modern Christian denomination, the SEC is committed to theologically coherent positions that are consistent with our understandings of salvation and the teachings of Jesus Christ as revealed in scripture; informed by centuries of contextual church thought and teaching; and supported by rational and scientific developments in the modern work (Scripture – Tradition - Reason). Any position on nuclear armaments requires such a theological approach. As a denomination, the SEC approaches ethical matters by seeking the consent of the General Synod on particular positions or statements. The purpose of this paper is to provide a background to and a proposed motion to agree a coherent SEC position on Nuclear Weapons.

In 2016 a motion was put to General Synod (Motion 18) that:

“This Synod, affirming that as Christians we are called to be peacemakers and stewards of creation, call on HM Government to cancel the renewal programme for Trident.”⁴

¹ https://jpit.uk/issues/peacemaking/nuclear-weapons
Debate around the motion was indicative of several views held by Synod, specifically in relation to the renewal of Trident, and the 2016 motion did not carry.

That the 2016 motion did not carry is understandable. In relation to nuclear armaments, Christian understandings vary from a view that nuclear weapons can never be justified, to views that although the existence of nuclear weapons is regrettable, programmes such as Trident have been and are a necessary ‘deterrent’ to maintain global security. Both views are valid approaches to a Christian understanding of peacemaking.

The debate at the 2016 Synod clearly expressed that any SEC statement or position on nuclear weapons should encompass the range of Christian understandings expressed above.

In the wording of the motion that is presented to Synod this year (2024) the Church in Society Committee has considered the breadth of views to form a statement that we hope will be congruent with the range of views that Synod will hold.

We have also considered theological approaches to the ethics of warfare, statements made by other Scottish churches on the matter and secular perspectives from NATO and the UN.

This paper will now briefly outline these below.

**The Ethics of Warfare - a Biblical and Theological Approach.**

Scripture, in the ten commandments, prohibits the taking of human life [Exodus 20:13]. This position is not absolute in the Hebrew scriptures as war and killing (primarily of non-Hebrews) is not only permitted but appears required by Yahweh in certain contexts, on threat of divine retribution for non-compliance [e.g. 1 Samuel 15]. Yahweh is described as punishing disobedience of the Israelites by the lethal violence of e.g. invading foreign powers [e.g. Isaiah 10:5], although these foreign powers are also seen as punished by Yahweh by their eventual violent conquest. Execution for certain type of misconduct was a norm in ancient Hebrew society [e.g. various elements of Exodus 21] (as it was in most Ancient Near Eastern cultures). In the New Testament, the teachings of Jesus are implicitly against taking human life: turning the other cheek [Matthew 5:39]; telling Peter to sheaf his sword after attacking an assailant in Gethsemane [e.g. John 18:10], as examples, can be seen as setting Christians against any violence. The only New Testament reference to ethical conduct for armed conflict is John the Baptist’s direction to some soldiers to be content with their pay and not to extort money (implicitly by threat of violence) [Luke 3:10]. The early Christian church tended to be on the receiving end of lethal violence from those in power and authority rather than choosing to engage in armed resistance.

Tradition developed in the early centuries of the church’s development as Christianity changed from a sometimes oppressed minority to, eventually, the principal religion of the Roman Empire. Towards the end of the Roman empire, early 5th century work by St Augustine in his “City of God”, in particular, develops a Christian tradition of ‘Just War’; circumstance where a Christian (or Christian society) would be justified in engaging in armed conflict. This work developed over the
(warlike) centuries that followed into a codified tradition of Christian warfare via e.g. Aquinas and De Vitoria with two broad categories to judge whether armed conflict was ‘just’. These are *jus ad bellum*, the criteria by which waging war can be justified, and *jus in bello*, the ‘rules’ by which such a war should be conducted. The *jus ad bellum* basis for starting a war was, broadly, as a last resort to maintain good order. The *jus in bello* ‘rules of war’ included factors such as only taking proportionate action and avoiding indiscriminate harm to civilians and non-combatants. This remains broadly the state of ‘Just War Theory’.

A ‘reasoned’ perspective to the ethics of warfare could be suggested as the United Nations basis that should be used to oversee such matters. In the modern world the basis for judging wars to be ‘legal’ or otherwise remains broadly the same as the developed Christian model, with the key *jus ad bellum* justification for war being a last resort for the defence of a country’s sovereignty, the ultimate ‘good’ in the United Nations charter. The *jus in bello* rules by which a war should be conducted remain broadly unchanged but are codified in e.g. the Geneva convention. The actual effectiveness of the UN in such matters given the present state of the world could be debated.

**Nuclear Weapons and a Just War?**

*Christian perspective*

Nuclear warfare, conceived and executed on two cities in Japan at the end of the second world war, challenges any concept of a Just War. The nuclear arms race that followed that war and the Cold War that claimed to balance nuclear powers in position of ‘Mutually Assured Destruction’ has not yet, maybe by the grace of God, resulted in a nuclear war. From a Christian ‘Just War’ perspective any last resort warfare to preserve order and stability in the world is not compatible with a model of war that would, essentially, destroy human life on earth. The *jus in bello* standard of avoiding indiscriminate violence and harm to civilians and non-combatants can never be met by the use of any form of nuclear weapon, whether on a battlefield or on a city. Nuclear weapons can never be used in a discriminating way.

*Secular perspectives*

Two sample international bodies of significance in respect of nuclear powers are NATO and the UN. Both of these bodies publicly support control, disarmament and non-proliferation (noting that the nuclear powers individually appear unwilling to unilaterally disarm).

**NATO:** “… is fully committed to arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation. Since the height of the Cold War, it has reduced the size of its land-based nuclear weapons stockpile by over 90 per cent, reducing the number of nuclear weapons stationed in Europe and its reliance on nuclear weapons in strategy…”⁵

The **United Nations:** “Nuclear weapons are the most dangerous weapons on earth. One can destroy a whole city, potentially killing millions, and jeopardizing the natural environment and lives of future generations through its long-term catastrophic effects. The dangers from such weapons arise from their very existence.

⁵ [https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_50068.htm](https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_50068.htm)
“Although nuclear weapons have only been used twice in warfare—in the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945—about 13,400 reportedly remain in our world today and there have been over 2,000 nuclear tests conducted to date. Disarmament is the best protection against such dangers, but achieving this goal has been a tremendously difficult challenge.

“The United Nations has sought to eliminate [nuclear] weapons ever since its establishment. The first resolution adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1946 established a Commission to deal with problems related to the discovery of atomic energy among others. The Commission was to make proposals for, *inter alia*, the control of atomic energy to the extent necessary to ensure its use only for peaceful purposes. The resolution also decided that the Commission should make proposals for “the elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons and of all other major weapons adaptable to mass destruction.”’”

These secular views are consistent with Christian Just War theory: the practise that the powers in the UN and, to an extent NATO, follow in maintaining their nuclear interests, waging war for geopolitical advantage (Ukraine, Afghanistan) and the inability of the UN to ‘police’ international conflict all challenge this ideal. But the ideal is still stated, in the modern international world.

**Conclusion**

There is, one can suggest, no way in which the use of nuclear weapons in warfare can be justified by any Christian theologically based view from scripture, tradition or reason. The position that any church with a theologically coherent approach to ethics must take towards nuclear weapons is to oppose their potential use, and to, as a minimum, align themselves with positions such as those stated by e.g. NATO and the UN: that arms control, disarmament (with debates about uni- or multi-lateral processes) and non-proliferation are objectives that should be pursued for the sake of humanity and the world.

Church debates could and should be encouraged about specific national and international policies, the merits or otherwise of particular weapon systems, the industrial-economic base that nuclear weapons form part of and so forth: there are nuanced places that such discussions and debates can take us. But the overall position that the use of nuclear weapons in warfare can never be theologically or ethically justified should be stated and stand regardless of these lower-level debates.

**Proposed Motion for General Synod 2024**

“This Synod agree the position that the use of nuclear weapons can never be theologically justified, and the church commits to a policy of advocating for arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.”

---

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

Canons for First Reading

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

Canons for Second Reading

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

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

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

John F Stuart
Secretary General
Preamble
Since the signing of the St Andrew Declaration on 30 November 2021, it has become clear that there is some confusion around the implications, particularly in relation to the exchange of ministries. The ICRC was asked by the College of Bishops and the Faith and Order Board to draw up Guidelines to make clear what is and is not possible under the St Andrew Declaration. These Guidelines can be found here: https://www.scotland.anglican.org/wp-content/uploads/SEC-guidelines-on-ecumenical-relations-final-01.2023.pdf.

The process of drafting these Guidelines revealed a number of anomalies between the SEC Canons and current practice in the SEC. In particular, the St Andrew Declaration is rooted in a long history of close relationship between the SEC and the Church of Scotland, including in many parts of the province provision for shared services. However, some forms of these shared services are not technically permitted under the present Canon 15.

At its meeting in August 2022, the Faith and Order Board requested the ICRC to draft amendments to Canon 15 to resolve these anomalies. The proposed changes received their first reading at the 2023 General Synod and are now being referred to dioceses for discussion before returning to the 2024 General Synod for the second reading.

Summary of proposed changes to the Canons
The proposed changes to Canon 15 create a schedule 2 listing churches with which the SEC has entered into agreements of limited exchange. They make explicit the possibility of eucharistic sharing with the churches contained in that schedule, and the mode of such sharing. They also clarify the process for welcoming visiting clergy.

The proposed change to Canon 16 makes explicit that where appropriate the provisions of Canon 15 should be taken into account when inviting clergy from other Churches to be involved in SEC worship.

The issues
(1) Acknowledging the existence of agreements permitting limited exchange
Since 2001, the Scottish Episcopal Church has entered into three ecumenical agreements which currently do not (yet) achieve full communion but permit limited exchange:

- the EMU Partnership (2010) between the Methodist Church in Scotland, the Scottish Episcopal Church, and the United Reformed Church National Synod of Scotland.
- the St Andrew Declaration (2021) between the Scottish Episcopal Church and the Church of Scotland.
The SEC Canons currently make no provision for such agreements, naming only churches with which the SEC is in a relationship of full communion. Particularly since the signing of the St Andrew Declaration, confusion has arisen as to whether or not the St Andrew Declaration leads to a relationship of full communion. Although it is in fact an agreement permitting limited exchange, some have assumed that it does lead to a relationship of full communion and that the ministers of the two churches are fully interchangeable. In this connection, questions have arisen about what is permitted through these three agreements for the clergy and authorised lay people of the partner churches. These often centre on the question of who can participate in or lead SEC worship.

The Guidelines clarify the distinction between the churches with which the SEC is in full communion and the churches with which the SEC has entered into agreements permitting limited exchange. The proposed changes to the Canons make this distinction explicit.

For the sake of clarity and to avoid confusion, it is proposed that a second schedule be introduced in Canon 15 listing the churches with which the SEC has entered into agreements permitting limited exchange. (Section 2 of the revised Canon 15.)

The aim will always be to work with those churches with which the SEC has entered into agreements permitting limited exchange (i.e. the churches listed in the new Schedule 2) to reach full communion. Thus the Reuilly Agreement commits the signatory churches “to continue theological discussions between our churches to work on the outstanding issues hindering fuller communion” (paragraph b.vi.) and the St Andrews Declaration includes the commitment “To stimulate theological discussions between our churches, including on the outstanding issues hindering fuller communion” (paragraph B.iv.). When full communion with a Schedule 2 church is achieved, General Synod will be able to remove that church from Schedule 2 and add it to Schedule 1 without needing any change to the revised Canon 15.

(2) Worship
Over the years the relationship with the SEC’s partner churches within Scotland has deepened such that ministers of these partner churches are on occasion asked to preside at services in an SEC charge when the SEC rector or priest-in-charge is not available. The need is often particularly acute at major festivals. For instance, General Synod heard of a case when a retired Church of Scotland minister who is a regular communicant in an SEC parish was asked to take Easter services when the rector became ill during Holy Week. There is also a need, particularly in rural or isolated areas, for it to be possible for (for instance) a Church of Scotland minister to be able to celebrate a Maundy Thursday service in an SEC church building to which all local Christians are invited. However, the currentCanon 15 makes provision for such services only within officially recognised LEPs, or in the case of a “wedding, funeral or memorial service or at a service or occasion of an ecumenical character”.

In addition, the Reuilly Agreement includes the following commitment:

“to encourage shared worship. When eucharistic worship is judged to be appropriate, it may move beyond eucharistic hospitality for individuals. The
participation of ordained ministers would reflect the presence of two or more churches expressing their closer unity in faith and baptism and demonstrate that we are still striving towards making more visible the unity of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church. Nevertheless, such participation still falls short of the full interchangeability of ministers. The rite should be that of the church to which the presiding minister belongs, and that minister should say the eucharistic prayer.” (paragraph b.iv.)

Reuilly thus provides for clergy of the French Reformed and Lutheran church to be able to celebrate the Eucharist in an SEC charge provided they use the rite of their own Church. This provision is however not reflected in the SEC Canons.

The EMU partnership commits the three churches to “sharing in the provision and deployment of both lay and ordained ministries of all the people of God.” On a very similar theological basis to Reuilly, the St Andrew Declaration affirms that “in our churches the Word of God is authentically preached, and the sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion are faithfully administered” (paragraph A.iii.) and commits the two churches “to welcome one another’s members to worship and participate in the congregational life of each other’s churches” (paragraph B.iii.). The St Andrew Declaration achieves the same level of interchangeability of ministries as Reuilly had done, recognising that in many parts of the SEC, the SEC and the Church of Scotland are already working together in this way.

The revisions to Canon 15 provide for ministers in Schedule 2 churches to be invited to take services, including eucharistic services, in SEC charges. They make clear that any such eucharistic services must be advertised as a service of the tradition from which the presiding minister comes. (revised paragraph 5; new paragraph 6; see also revisions to Canon 16)

(3) Provisions for welcoming visiting clergy
In discussion of the revisions it became clear that the present Canon 15 does not reflect current practice and procedures in welcoming visiting clergy. Current practice is that visiting clergy and/or the Rector who invited them are expected to notify the diocesan bishop and to demonstrate that the visiting clergyperson is good standing with their church.

A change to Canon 15 has been made to reflect current practice. (revised paragraph 8)

(4) Visiting clergy and safeguarding
In addition, the provision of current Canon 15.7 allowing visiting clergy to serve for “five consecutive Sundays” without written permission or safeguarding checks is seriously out of step with current practice on safeguarding. The revised Canon (now 15.8) provides that clergy may not officiate in any diocese “for more than five Sundays in any one year” without the bishop’s permission. When a visiting clergyperson is invited to take an SEC service, it is standard practice for the bishop to check with the authorities of that clergyperson’s church that they are in good standing (including safeguarding checks) and authorised to undertake this ministry. (This is different from an ecumenical service which two or more denominations hold jointly: all those involved in leading such ecumenical services are under the jurisdiction of their own
denomination.) The revised canon significantly strengthens the safeguarding provision for visiting clergy. The revised provisions have been approved by the SEC safeguarding team (see attached note).

A consequent change to Canon 15 has been made. (revised paragraph 8)

(5) Minor revisions

(a) The use of the term “Church”
During discussion of the revisions, it became clear that there was some confusion about the use of the word “church” in the current Canon 15, which has been taken by some to mean that Canon 15 also seeks to provide guidance for the offering of hospitality to congregations of other denominations to hold services in SEC church buildings. This is, however, not the case. In the proposed changes “church” has been replaced by the term “charge” to indicate that Canon 15 concerns the liturgical life of SEC congregations rather than any situation of ecumenical hospitality.

(b) Removal of duplicated provisions
The Faith and Order Board determined that paragraph 15.4 of the current Canon essentially duplicated the current paragraph 15.3. The revised Canon therefore deletes the current paragraph 15.4.

A note on similar provisions in other Anglican provinces within the British Isles
Recognising Reuilly and other similar relationships, similar provisions regarding worship and presiding at Holy Communion have been made by the Church of England (Canon B 43, together with the list of designated churches [https://www.churchofengland.org/sites/default/files/2019-04/list_of_designated_churches_3_oct_18.pdf]) and the Church in Wales (Canons “To Implement the Reuilly Agreement” [27 April 2000] and “To Support Relations with Other Churches” [7 April 2005]).

The Rev’d Prof Charlotte Methuen
Convener, Inter-Church Relations Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Canon (2020)</th>
<th>Proposed amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>15: OF THE ADMISSION OF CLERGY OF OTHER CHURCHES, PROVINCES AND DIOCESES TO OFFICIATE</strong></td>
<td><strong>15: OF THE ADMISSION OF CLERGY OF OTHER CHURCHES, PROVINCES AND DIOCESES TO OFFICIATE</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1. The Scottish Episcopal Church recognises as in full communion with itself the Churches of the Anglican Communion, the other Churches which are listed in the Schedule to this Canon, and such other Churches as shall be added from time to time to this Schedule by the Episcopal Synod with the prior consent of the General Synod. No person other than the clergy of these Churches shall be permitted to minister in any congregation of this Church except as hereinafter provided. The Episcopal Synod shall have the power, | 1. **CHURCHES OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION AND CHURCHES LISTED IN SCHEDULE ONE**

(a) The Scottish Episcopal Church recognises as in full communion with itself the Churches of the Anglican Communion, the other Churches which are listed in the Schedule One to this Canon, and such other Churches as shall be added from time to time to this Schedule One by the Episcopal Synod with the prior consent of the General Synod.

(b) No person other than the clergy of these |
subject to the consent of the General Synod, should any Church listed in the Schedule to this Canon take such action as shall have rendered itself, in the opinion of the Episcopal Synod, in a state of impaired communion with this Church, to determine its removal from the said Schedule.

| Churches shall be permitted to minister in any congregation of this Church except as hereinafter provided. |
| (c) The Episcopal Synod shall have the power, subject to the consent of the General Synod, should any Church listed in the Schedule One to this Canon take such action as shall have rendered itself, in the opinion of the Episcopal Synod, in a state of impaired communion with the Scottish Episcopal Church, the Episcopal Synod shall have the power, subject to the consent of the General Synod, to determine its removal from the said Schedule. |
| 2. CHURCHES LISTED IN SCHEDULE TWO |
| (a) The Scottish Episcopal Church has in addition entered into Agreements, endorsed by General Synod, which permit limited exchange of ministries with a number of Churches which are listed in Schedule Two to this Canon. |
| (b) Clergy or authorised lay people of these Churches may give addresses, lead prayers and worship, and assist in the distribution of Holy Communion in services in the Scottish Episcopal Church, as authorised by their own Church. |
| (c) Clergy may preside at a service of Holy Communion in a charge in the Scottish Episcopal Church subject to the provisions of section 5 of this Canon and as authorised by their own Church. |
| (d) Other Churches may be added from time to time to Schedule Two by the Episcopal Synod subject to the signing of similar Agreements and with the prior consent of the General Synod. |
| (e) Should any Church listed in Schedule Two to this Canon take such action as shall have rendered itself, in the opinion of the Episcopal Synod, no longer to be in relationship with the Scottish Episcopal Church, the Episcopal Synod shall have power, subject to the consent of the General Synod, to determine its removal from the said Schedule. |

| 3. A Bishop may grant permission for an ordained minister or a member of a Trinitarian Church, not included in Section 1, |
| 3. MINISTERS/MEMBERS OF TRINITARIAN CHURCHES NOT INCLUDED IN SCHEDULES ONE AND TWO |
## Inter-Church Relations Committee

### Rationale for the Proposed Changes to Canons 15 and 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>to give addresses, lead prayers, and assist in the distribution of Holy Communion in any Church within the Diocese, if the College of Bishops has previously determined that the relation of this Church to the Church in question makes such action desirable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>A Bishop may grant permission for an ordained minister or a member of a Trinitarian Church, not included in Section 1 Schedules One or Two, to give addresses, lead prayers and worship, and assist in the distribution of Holy Communion in any Church within the Diocese, if the College of Bishops has previously determined that the relation of the Scottish Episcopal Church to the Church in question makes such action desirable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Notwithstanding the further provisions of this Canon, where one or more congregations of other Trinitarian Churches are closely associated in mission with a congregation of the Scottish Episcopal Church, the General Synod may, at the request of the Synod of the Diocese of which the said Episcopalian congregation is part, approve the creation of a Local Ecumenical Partnership or Ecumenical Parish, within which members of participating congregations will be welcome to share in the Eucharist in each other’s congregations, under the presidency of any of the duly ordained clergy of those congregations who have received the requisite authority of their own denomination to preside at the Eucharist, subject always to the pastoral oversight and canonical authority of the Bishop of the Diocese.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>A Bishop may grant permission to an episcopally ordained cleric of a Church not included in Section 1 hereof to give addresses in any church within the diocese if the College of Bishops has previously determined that the relation of this Church to the Church in question makes such action desirable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Subject to the provisions of Canon 16, Section 1 hereof, no Rector shall permit any cleric to officiate in any church of which that Rector has charge without ascertainning that the said cleric has been episcopally ordained to the Order to which the said cleric professes to belong, and while so officiating will not act or speak in a manner contrary to the doctrine and discipline of this Church. A Bishop may, however, at the request of the Rector give permission for clergy of other churches to officiate at a service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>A Bishop may grant permission to an episcopally ordained cleric of a Church not included in Section 1 hereof to give addresses in any church within the diocese if the College of Bishops has previously determined that the relation of this Church to the Church in question makes such action desirable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>PERMISSION FOR CLERGY OF OTHER CHURCHES TO OFFICIATE AT A SERVICE (a) Subject to the provisions of Canon 16, Section 1 hereof, no Rector or Priest-in-Charge shall permit any cleric to officiate in any church of which that Rector or Priest-in-Charge has charge without ascertainning that the said cleric has been episcopally ordained to the Order to which the said cleric professes to belong, or that the said cleric is ordained.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
permission for a minister (whether episcopally ordained or not) of a Trinitarian Church outside the Anglican Communion to assist at a wedding, funeral or memorial service or at a service or occasion of an ecumenical character in a church within the diocese in such manner as the College of Bishops shall direct.

and licensed or authorised to minister in one of the Churches listed in either Schedule One or Schedule Two to this canon.

(b) And when so officiating the cleric shall not act or speak in a manner contrary to the doctrine and discipline of the Scottish Episcopal Church.

(c) An ordained minister from one of the Churches listed in Schedule Two of this canon may be invited to preside at a Eucharist in a charge of the Scottish Episcopal Church according to a rite normally used in and within the tradition of their own Church. The service should be advertised as a service of Holy Communion in the tradition of the Church to which they are licensed.

6. PERMISSION TO ASSIST AT A PASTORAL OFFICE FOR A MINISTER OUTWITH THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION

A Bishop may, however, at the request of the Rector or Priest-in-Charge give permission for a minister (whether episcopally ordained or not) of a Trinitarian Church outside the Anglican Communion to assist at a wedding, funeral or memorial service or at a service or occasion of an ecumenical character in a church charge within the diocese in such manner as the College of Bishops shall direct.

6. No cleric of any other Church or Province shall be given any appointment in this Church unless that cleric is able to produce to the Bishop of the diocese concerned a recommendation from the Bishop of the diocese in which that cleric last served.

67. RECOMMENDATION PRIOR TO APPOINTMENT

No cleric of any other Church or Province shall be given any appointment in this Church the Scottish Episcopal Church unless that cleric is able to produce to the Bishop of the diocese concerned a recommendation from the Bishop of the diocese in which that cleric last served.

7. No Rector shall allow any cleric not already instituted or licensed or holding written permission to officiate in this Church to conduct services within the charge committed to that Rector for more than two Sundays in any one year without previously informing the Bishop of the diocese; and no cleric from another diocese shall officiate for more than five consecutive Sundays in any one year without permission in writing under the hand of the Bishop of the diocese, in terms of Appendix No.17.

78. INVITATION TO CLERIC OR AUTHORISED LAY PERSON FROM ANOTHER CHURCH

(a) Any invitation to a cleric or authorised lay person not already instituted or licensed or holding written permission to officiate in this the Scottish Episcopal Church to lead worship or to give an address in a charge of the Scottish Episcopal Church should normally be notified to and approved by the Bishop of the diocese prior to the service.

(b) Such a person must be in good standing with their own Church and authorised in their
**Rationale for the Proposed Changes to Canons 15 and 16**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resolution</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resolution 1</strong></td>
<td>The Inter-Church Relations Committee shall, in terms of this Canon, act on behalf of General Synod to issue approval of Local Ecumenical Partnerships undertaken with members of the Scottish Churches’ National Sponsoring Body for Ecumenical Partnerships (NSB). These partnerships will be reviewed ecumenically following NSB guidelines every</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resolution 2</strong></td>
<td>own church to undertake the responsibilities which they are being asked to exercise within the Scottish Episcopal Church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resolution 3</strong></td>
<td>(c) No Rector or Priest-in-Charge shall invite or allow any cleric or authorised lay person not already instituted or licensed or holding written permission to officiate in this the Scottish Episcopal Church to conduct services within the charge committed to that Rector or Priest-in-Charge for more than two Sundays in any one year without previously informing the Bishop of the diocese; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resolution 4</strong></td>
<td>(d) No cleric from another diocese or another Church shall officiate in any diocese of the Scottish Episcopal Church for more than five consecutive Sundays in any one year without permission in writing under the hand of the Bishop of the diocese, in terms of Appendix No.17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resolution 5</strong></td>
<td>8. The Bishop of any diocese shall have power to inhibit, in terms of Appendix No.18, any Bishop or any Priest or Deacon from outwith the diocese, from preaching or performing any ecclesiastical function within the diocese, and if the person so inhibited should disregard the inhibition, the Bishop inhibiting shall report the action to that cleric’s ecclesiastical superior; and shall also report the inhibition, with the grounds of the same, to the next Episcopal Synod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resolution 6</strong></td>
<td>89. <strong>POWER TO INHIBIT</strong> (a) The Bishop of any diocese shall have power to inhibit, in terms of Appendix No.18, any Bishop or any Priest or Deacon from outwith the diocese, from preaching or performing any ecclesiastical function within the diocese; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resolution 7</strong></td>
<td>(b) if the person so inhibited should disregard the inhibition, the Bishop inhibiting shall report the action to that cleric’s ecclesiastical superior; and shall also report the inhibition, with the grounds of the same, to the next Episcopal Synod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resolution 8</strong></td>
<td>9. Any cleric of the diocese, knowingly disregarding such inhibition by allowing the inhibited person to officiate, shall be liable to admonition; and if the admonition be disregarded, the Bishop may take proceedings against that cleric in Synod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resolution 9</strong></td>
<td>910. <strong>DISREGARDING OF INHIBITION</strong> Any cleric of the diocese, knowingly disregarding such inhibition by allowing the inhibited person to officiate, shall be liable to admonition; and if the admonition be disregarded, the Bishop may take proceedings against that cleric in Synod.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
five years from date of signing. When a request for approval of a Local Ecumenical Partnership comes from Scottish Episcopal and Methodist Congregations, any such partnership so approved shall be subject to the provisions of Canon 15 and of the Declaration of Intent between the Scottish Episcopal Church and the Methodist Church in Scotland agreed by General Synod in June 1996.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule to Canon Fifteen</th>
<th>Schedule One to Canon Fifteen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In addition to The Church of England, The Church of Ireland, The Church in Wales, The Episcopal Church in the United States of America, and all other Churches of the Anglican Communion, the Scottish Episcopal Church recognises as in full communion with itself The Old Catholic Churches in communion with the Metropolitan See of Utrecht; The Church of North India, The Church of Pakistan, The Mar Thoma Church of Malabar, The Church of Bangladesh, The Church of South India; The Church of Norway, The Church of Sweden, The Evangelical Lutheran Church of Estonia, The Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland, The Evangelical Lutheran Church of Iceland, The Evangelical Lutheran Church of Lithuania, The Evangelical Lutheran Church in Denmark, The Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church Abroad and The Lutheran Church in Great Britain.</td>
<td>In addition to The Church of England, The Church of Ireland, The Church in Wales, The Episcopal Church in the United States of America, and all other Churches of the Anglican Communion as defined by the Anglican Communion Office (which include The Church of North India, The Church of Pakistan, The Church of Bangladesh, The Church of South India, The Spanish Reformed Episcopal Church, and the Lusitanian Catholic Apostolic Evangelical Church), the Scottish Episcopal Church recognises as in full communion with itself The Old Catholic Churches in communion with the Metropolitan See of Utrecht (through the Bonn Agreement), The Church of North India, The Church of Pakistan, The Mar Thoma Church of Malabar, The Philippine Independent Church, The Church of Bangladesh, The Church of South India; and with The Church of Norway, The Church of Sweden, The Evangelical Lutheran Church of Estonia, The Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland, The Evangelical Lutheran Church of Iceland, The Evangelical Lutheran Church of Lithuania, The Evangelical Lutheran Church in Denmark, The Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church Abroad and The Lutheran Church in Great Britain (through the Porvoo Common Statement).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule Two to Canon Fifteen</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Scottish Episcopal Church has entered into agreements of limited exchange with the following churches: the Church of the Augsburg Confession of Alsace and Lorraine, the Reformed Church of Alsace and Lorraine, the United Protestant Church of France (formerly the Evangelical-Lutheran Church of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
France and the Reformed Church of France) (through the Reuilly Agreement); the Methodist Church of Great Britain and the United Reformed Church (through the EMU Partnership), the Church of Scotland (through the St Andrew Declaration).

16: OF OTHERS WHO MAY BE PERMITTED TO OFFICIATE IN CHURCHES

1. The Rector of a church may invite representatives of other Communions to give an address or assist at a service, provided that the Bishop of the Diocese consents to the invitation being given.

2. A Bishop, on the application of a Rector of any church within the diocese, may grant permission to any lay person in communion with the Scottish Episcopal Church to address the congregation in that church or to conduct any service which does not require the ministrations of a Priest. Nothing in this Section shall be held to limit the functions of Lay Readers and Deaconesses as defined in the Code of Canons.

3. A Bishop may, in view of a large number of communicants or for any other good or sufficient reason, at the request of a Rector give permission to a lay person in communion with the Scottish Episcopal Church to assist at the administration of Communion.

4. This Canon is subject to such Regulations as the College of Bishops may from time to time enact and publish.
CANON FIFTEEN
OF THE ADMISSION OF CLERGY OF OTHER CHURCHES,
PROVINCES AND OTHER DIOCESES TO OFFICIATE

1. CHURCHES OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION AND CHURCHES LISTED IN SCHEDULE ONE

(a) The Scottish Episcopal Church recognises as in full communion with itself the Churches of the Anglican Communion, the other Churches which are listed in Schedule One to this Canon and such other Churches as shall be added from time to time to Schedule One by the Episcopal Synod with the prior consent of the General Synod.

(b) No person other than the clergy of these Churches shall be permitted to minister in any congregation of this Church except as hereinafter provided.

(c) Should any Church listed in Schedule One to this Canon take such action as shall have rendered itself, in the opinion of the Episcopal Synod, in a state of impaired communion with the Scottish Episcopal Church, the Episcopal Synod shall have the power, subject to the consent of the General Synod, to determine its removal from said Schedule.

2. CHURCHES LISTED IN SCHEDULE TWO

(a) The Scottish Episcopal Church has in addition entered into Agreements, endorsed by General Synod, which permit limited exchange of ministries with a number of Churches which are listed in Schedule Two to this Canon.

(b) Clergy or authorised lay people of these Churches may give addresses, lead prayers and worship and assist in the distribution of Holy Communion in services in the Scottish Episcopal Church, as authorised by their own Church.

(c) Clergy may preside at a service of Holy Communion in a charge in the Scottish Episcopal Church subject to the provisions of Section 5 of this Canon and as authorised by their own Church.

(d) Other Churches may be added from time to time to Schedule Two by the Episcopal Synod subject to the signing of similar Agreements and with the prior consent of the General Synod.
(e) Should any Church listed in Schedule Two to this Canon take such action as shall have rendered itself, in the opinion of the Episcopal Synod, no longer to be in a relationship with the Scottish Episcopal Church, the Episcopal Synod shall have the power, subject to the consent of the General Synod, to determine its removal from said Schedule.

3. MINISTERS/MEMBERS OF TRINITARIAN CHURCHES NOT INCLUDED IN SCHEDULES ONE AND TWO

A Bishop may grant permission for an ordained minister or a member of a Trinitarian Church, not included in Schedules One or Two, to give addresses, lead prayers and worship and assist in the distribution of Holy Communion in any charge within the Diocese, if the College of Bishops has previously determined that the relation of the Scottish Episcopal Church to the Church in question makes such action desirable.

4. LOCAL ECUMENICAL PARTNERSHIP OR ECUMENICAL PARISH

Notwithstanding the further provisions of this Canon, where one or more Congregations of other Trinitarian Churches are closely associated in mission with a congregation of the Scottish Episcopal Church, the General Synod may, at the request of the Synod of the Diocese of which the said Episcopalian congregation is part, approve the creation of a Local Ecumenical Partnership or Ecumenical Parish, within which members of participating congregations will be welcome to share in the Eucharist in each other’s congregations under the presidency of any of the duly ordained clergy of those congregations who have received the requisite authority of their own denomination to preside at the Eucharist, subject always to the pastoral oversight and canonical authority of the Bishop of the Diocese.

5. PERMISSION FOR CLERGY OF OTHER CHURCHES TO OFFICIATE AT A SERVICE

(a) Subject to the provisions of Canon 16 Section 1, no Rector or Priest-in-Charge shall permit any cleric to officiate in any church of which that Rector or Priest-in-Charge has charge without ascertaining that the said cleric has been episcopally ordained to the Order to which the said cleric professes to belong, or that said cleric is ordained and licensed or authorised to minister in one of the Churches listed in either Schedule One or Schedule Two to this Canon.

(b) When so officiating, the cleric shall not act or speak in a manner contrary to the doctrine and discipline of the Scottish Episcopal Church.
(c) An ordained minister from one of the Churches listed in Schedule Two of this Canon may be invited to preside at a Eucharist in a charge of the Scottish Episcopal Church according to a rite normally used in and within the tradition of their own Church. The service should be advertised as a service of Holy Communion in the tradition of the Church to which they are licensed.

6. PERMISSION TO ASSIST AT A PASTORAL OFFICE FOR CLERGY OF CHURCHES OUTWITH THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION

A Bishop may, at the request of the Rector or Priest-in-Charge give permission for a minister of a Trinitarian Church outside the Anglican Communion to assist at a wedding, funeral or memorial service or at a service or occasion of an ecumenical character in a charge within the diocese.

7. RECOMMENDATION PRIOR TO APPOINTMENT

No cleric of any other Church or Province shall be given any appointment in the Scottish Episcopal Church unless that cleric is able to produce to the Bishop of the diocese concerned a recommendation from the Bishop of the diocese in which that cleric last served.

8. INVITATION TO CLERIC OR AUTHORISED LAY PERSON FROM ANOTHER CHURCH

(a) Any invitation to a cleric or authorised lay person not already instituted or licensed or holding written permission to officiate in the Scottish Episcopal Church to lead worship or to give an address in a charge of the Scottish Episcopal Church should normally be notified to and approved by the Bishop of the diocese prior to the service.

(b) Such a person must be in good standing with their own Church and authorised in their own Church to undertake the responsibilities which they are being asked to exercise within the Scottish Episcopal Church.

(c) No Rector or Priest-in-Charge shall invite or allow any cleric or authorised lay person not already instituted or licensed or holding written permission to officiate in the Scottish Episcopal Church to conduct services within the charge committed to that Rector or Priest-in-Charge for more than two Sundays in any one year without previously informing the Bishop of the diocese.

(d) No Cleric from another diocese or another Church shall officiate in any diocese of the Scottish Episcopal Church for more than five Sundays in any one year without permission in writing under the hand of the Bishop of the diocese in terms of Appendix No.17.
9. **POWER TO INHIBIT**

(a) The Bishop of any diocese shall have power to inhibit, in terms of Appendix No.18, any Bishop or any Priest or any Deacon from outwith the diocese from preaching or performing any ecclesiastical function within the diocese.

(b) If the person so inhibited should disregard the inhibition, the Bishop inhibiting shall report the action to that cleric’s ecclesiastical superior, and shall also report the inhibition, with the grounds of the same, to the next Episcopal Synod.

10. **DISREGARDING OF INHIBITION**

Any cleric of the diocese, knowingly disregarding such inhibition by allowing the inhibited person to officiate, shall be liable to admonition, and if the admonition be disregarded, the Bishop may take proceedings against that cleric in Synod.

**RESOLUTION UNDER CANON FIFTEEN**

*Resolution 1*

The Inter-Church Relations Committee shall, in terms of this Canon, act of behalf of General Synod to issue approval of Local Ecumenical Partnerships. These partnerships will be reviewed ecumenically every five years from date of signing.

**SCHEDULE ONE**

In addition to The Church of England, The Church of Ireland, The Church in Wales, The Episcopal Church in the United States of America, and all other Churches of the Anglican Communion as defined by the Anglican Communion Office (which include The Church of North India, The Church of Pakistan, The Church of Bangladesh, The Church of South India, The Spanish Reformed Episcopal Church and the Lusitanian Catholic Apostolic Evangelical Church), the Scottish Episcopal Church recognises as in full communion with itself The Old Catholic Churches in communion with the Metropolitan See of Utrecht (through the Bonn Agreement), The Mar Thoma Church of Malabar, the Philippine Independent Church; and with The Church of Norway, The Church of Sweden, The Evangelical Lutheran Church of Estonia, The Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland, The Evangelical Lutheran Church of Iceland, The Evangelical Lutheran Church of Lithuania, The Evangelical Lutheran Church in
Denmark, The Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church Abroad and The Lutheran Church in Great Britain (through the Porvoo Common Statement).

**SCHEDULE TWO**

The Scottish Episcopal Church has entered into agreements of limited exchange with the following Churches: the Church of the Augsburg Confession of Alsace and Lorraine, the Reformed Church of Alsace and Lorraine, the United Protestant Church of France (formerly the Evangelical-Lutheran Church of France and the Reformed Church of France)(through the Reuilly Agreement), the Methodist Church of Great Britain, United Reformed Church (through the EMU Partnership) and the Church of Scotland (through the St Andrew Declaration).
CANON SIXTEEN
OF OTHERS WHO MAY BE PERMITTED TO OFFICIATE IN CHURCHES

1. INVITATION TO REPRESENTATIVES OF OTHER CHURCHES TO PARTICIPATE AT A SERVICE

The Rector or Priest-in-Charge of a charge of the Scottish Episcopal Church may invite representatives of other Communions and Churches to give an address or assist at a service, subject to the provisions of Canon Fifteen, and provided that the Bishop of the Diocese consents to the invitation being given.

2. PERMISSION TO A LAY PERSON TO PARTICIPATE AT A SERVICE

(a) A Bishop, on the application of a Rector or Priest-in-Charge of any charge within the diocese, may grant permission to any lay person in communion with the Scottish Episcopal Church to address the congregation in that church or to conduct any service which does not require the ministrations of a Priest.

(b) Nothing in this Section shall be held to limit the functions of Lay Readers and Deaconesses as defined in the Code of Canons.

3. PERMISSION TO A LAY PERSON TO ASSIST AT ADMINISTRATION OF COMMUNION

A Bishop may, in view of a large number of communicants or for any other good or sufficient reason, at the request of a Rector or Priest-in-Charge, give permission to a lay person in communion with the Scottish Episcopal Church to assist at the administration of Communion.

4. REGULATIONS

This Canon is subject to such Regulations as the College of Bishops may from time to time enact and publish.
NOTE ON THE SAFEGUARDING IMPLICATIONS OF REVISIONS TO CANONS 15 AND 16

This note has been prepared in the light of discussions at the Glasgow and Galloway Diocesan Synod on 2 March 2024. The following is an extract from the notes provided by the Diocesan Secretary:

**Canons 15 and 16:** upon seeking comments regarding both Canons, the view was that although the Canons had many positive attributes, they were ‘not ready yet’. There were concerns that we were inviting people from other denominations to take services when we are not in full communion with them. Frequent reference was also made to safeguarding issues which allowed clergy from other denominations to be admitted to our system without having gone through our own safeguarding protocols, and it was felt that Synod should say no to the Canons in their current form. Much debate ensued, with strong support of these views expressed, most especially with regard to the fact that the safeguarding issues did not seem to have gone before the Provincial Safeguarding Committee. So although there were suggestions from some that General Synod should take the Canons forward to a Second Reading with the request ‘that they be updated’, it was pointed out that Synod was being asked to approve them for a Second Reading or not, and that we needed to say ‘no’ out of love and encouragement to get the Canons right.

Accordingly, a vote was taken to establish whether Synod Members were willing to have these Canons considered for a Second Reading by General Synod.

**The result of this vote was strongly against taking Canons 15 and 16 to a Second Reading (For: 5; Against: 67; Abstentions: 7)**

Frequent reference was also made to safeguarding issues which allowed clergy from other denominations to be admitted to our system without having gone through our own safeguarding protocols, and it was felt that Synod should say no to the Canons in their current form.

**Safeguarding implications**

One of the concerns raised at Diocesan Synod was the lack of consultation with the Safeguarding Committee. The Canons Committee sought advice on the proposals from Daphne Audsley prior to General Synod 2023. Advice was provided by email on 29 March and there was discussion at the Canons Committee on 30 March. The proposed ‘five Sunday’ limit was not at variance with current safe recruitment practice, so there was no requirement to consult the Safeguarding Committee.

This paper sets out the current practice in relation to visiting clergy. Practices will be reviewed when the Scottish Government finalises changes to the PVG Scheme.

Canon 65 (On Safeguarding) is also under review and will be presented for the second reading at General Synod 2024 and revised guidance on safe recruitment will be issued thereafter.
Inter-Church Relations Committee
Note on Safeguarding Implications to Canons 15 and 16

The SEC’s policy on safe recruitment applies to all positions but the requirement for criminal record disclosures applies to relevant positions. The revised Canon 65 states:

2 (c) Each body must implement guidance issued from time to time by or on behalf of the Safeguarding Committee on safe recruitment including submitting applications to the Provincial Safeguarding Officer for criminal record disclosures for all relevant positions.

The SEC’s long-established safe recruitment practice is that no cleric is allowed to officiate in the SEC either on a temporary or a permanent basis without the relevant Bishop first checking that the individual is authorised for ministry and in good standing with their own Church. This was made clear in the paper covering revisions to the Canons which was provided to dioceses with the revised wording for Canons 15 and 16.

The SEC Safeguarding Team carries out PVG criminal record checks for all relevant positions. The PVG legislation and Scottish Government guidelines are something of a labyrinth for the voluntary sector. The PVG Scheme is intended to be proportionate, so there are restrictions on the types of roles that come under the legislation. In general terms PVG disclosures are available to faith groups in respect of individuals who are appointed to do regulated work which very broadly means either/or (1) teaching or supervising children and (2) providing pastoral care to protected adults. In addition, eligibility for a PVG disclosure depends on the work meeting criteria relating to ‘normal duties’ and being undertaken with ‘frequency and formality’. PVG guidance also covers how a non-regulated work role may change over time and become regulated work, but the guidance is clear that the PVG application should be submitted only when the role changes and not as a precaution at the outset.

Anyone who is appointed to a formal role in the SEC working with children and/or protected adults is required to complete a PVG Scheme disclosure in addition to the other requirements of the safe recruitment process before taking up their role.

The requirement for a PVG scheme disclosure only applies to clerics who are formally appointed to ministry in the SEC. A visiting cleric from another church who is invited to preach on an occasional basis, or conduct a wedding or funeral does not require to have a PVG criminal record disclosure as any contact with vulnerable groups is defined in the legislation as ‘incidental’ to the main activity of conducting a service which is open to the general public and does not meet the criteria for regulated work. Any concerns (Safeguarding or otherwise) arising in relation to visiting clergy would be referred to statutory services (where appropriate) and to the relevant senior leader and/or safeguarding service in their own church.

Permanent appointments of clergy are treated differently. For example, clergy retiring to Scotland are not permitted to conduct worship or engage in pastoral work until both stages of the safe recruitment process have been completed and they have been issued with a warrant or PTO by their diocesan Bishop. The same conditions apply to student placements and visiting clergy who have pastoral responsibilities in a congregation or diocese throughout the period of their placement or visit.

161
The proposed five-week limit at which the involvement with the SEC reaches the level of ‘frequency and formality’ to trigger PTO and associated PVG disclosure is considered proportionate for visiting clergy covered by Canons 15 and 16 and consistent with the SEC’s policy on safe recruitment and PVG legislation. The Safeguarding Team guidelines will be updated to cover the practicalities if the proposed changes to Canons 15 and 16 are passed by General Synod at the second reading this year.

Daphne Audsley  
Assistant Safeguarding Officer  
8 March 2024
CANON FOR SECOND READING

OPINIONS FROM DIOCESES

Canon 15

Aberdeen and Orkney:
The Canon was approved without objection.

Argyll and The Isles:
The Canon was approved unanimously.

Brechin:
The Canon was approved.

Voting was as follows:
  Bishop: in favour
  House of Clergy: 12 in favour, 0 against, 0 abstentions
  House of Laity: 12 in favour, 0 against, 2 abstentions

Edinburgh:
The Canon was approved.

Voting was as follows:
  Bishop: in favour
  House of Clergy: 43 in favour, 2 against, 1 abstentions
  House of Laity: 42 in favour, 2 against, 0 abstentions

Glasgow and Galloway:

Canons 15 and 16: upon seeking comments regarding both Canons, the view was that although the Canons had many positive attributes, they were ‘not ready yet’. There were concerns that we were inviting people from other denominations to take services when we are not in full communion with them. Frequent reference was also made to safeguarding issues which allowed clergy from other denominations to be admitted to our system without having gone through our own safeguarding protocols, and it was felt that Synod should say no to the Canons in their current form. Much debate ensued, with strong support of these views expressed, most especially with regard to the fact that the safeguarding issues did not seem to have gone before the
Provinceal Safeguarding Committee. So although there were suggestions from some that General Synod should take the Canons forward to a Second Reading with the request ‘that they be updated’, it was pointed out that Synod was being asked to approve them for a Second Reading or not, and that we needed to say ‘no’ out of love and encouragement to get the Canons right.

Accordingly, a vote was taken to establish whether Synod Members were willing to have these Canons considered for a Second Reading by General Synod.

The result of this vote was strongly against taking Canons 15 and 16 to a Second Reading (5 in favour; 67 against; 7 Abstentions)

**Moray, Ross and Caithness:**

The Canon was approved.

**St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane:**

Voting was as follows: 38 in favour, 5 against, 3 abstentions.
Canon 16

Aberdeen and Orkney:
The Canon was approved without objection.

Argyll and The Isles:
The Canon was approved unanimously.

Brechin:
The Canon was approved.

Voting was as follows:
  Bishop: in favour
  House of Clergy: 12 in favour, 0 against, 0 abstentions
  House of Laity: 12 in favour, 0 against, 2 abstentions

Edinburgh:
The Canon was approved.

Voting was as follows:
  Bishop: in favour
  House of Clergy: 43 in favour, 2 against, 1 abstentions
  House of Laity: 42 in favour, 2 against, 0 abstentions

Glasgow and Galloway:
See comments above in relation to Canon 15

Moray, Ross and Caithness:
The Canon was approved.

St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane:
Voting was as follows: 47 in favour, 0 against, 1 abstention.
Canon 35

Aberdeen and Orkney:

Comments expressed during the discussions were as follows:-

An amendment was passed deleting the words "adheres to" and substituting the word "considers". The point made was that it would be very difficult for a small congregation with limited funds in a remote location to adhere to Net Zero Guidance.

The voting on the amendment was as follows: -

House of Clergy: 6 in favour, 5 against, 4 abstentions.

House of Laity: 13 in favour, 11 against, 5 abstentions.

There was an objection to the grammar used in the amendment, and indeed in the existing first sentence of Section 1 of Canon 35.

The lengthy sentence, which extends to ten lines initially makes a change in the structure etc the subject of the sentence, but at the end of the sentence, the subject has become the approval. It is surely the change in the structure etc that must adhere to the SEC Net Zero Guidance, rather than the approval of the Bishop and the DBC.

Synod took the view that the wording of Section 1 be looked at again before the Canon is submitted for Second Reading.

Argyll and The Isles:

The Canon was approved unanimously.

Voting was as follows: 14 in favour, 1 against, 0 abstentions

Brechin:

The Canon was approved.

Voting was as follows:

Bishop: in favour

House of Clergy: 12 in favour, 0 against, 0 abstentions

House of Laity: 15 in favour, 1 against, 0 abstentions
Edinburgh:

The Canon was approved.

Voting was as follows:

  Bishop: in favour

  House of Clergy: 22 in favour, 12 against, 10 abstentions

  House of Laity: 29 in favour, 4 against, 3 abstentions

Glasgow and Galloway:

Although there was extremely strong support for the philosophy behind the amendment to Canon 35, there was significant apprehension about the practicality of ‘adhering’ to the Net Zero Guidance endorsed by the Provincial Buildings Committee, which many charges felt was too prescriptive and, if fully enacted, would simply not allow their charges to survive as it would be impossible to completely adhere to these requirements due to the various constructions and limitations of their buildings. In short, some slight room for leeway was felt to be essential.

A motion was raised, “That this synod votes to replace the words 'adheres to' in the proposed Canon 35.1 with the words “bears in mind or must take account of” so that the new sentence would read

provided always that such approval bears in mind or must take account of the Scottish Episcopal Church Net Zero Guidance endorsed by the Provincial Buildings Committee

Two votes were taken on this matter, the first to confirm that Synod agreed to this amendment:

  House of Clergy: 34 in favour, 1 against, 0 abstentions

  House of Laity: 41 in favour, 3 against, 2 abstentions

The second vote was to confirm that Synod was only in favour of passing the second reading with the amendment in place:

  House of Clergy: 33 in favour, 0 against, 1 abstention

  House of Laity: 43 in favour, 1 against, 1 abstention

Moray, Ross and Caithness:

The Canon was approved.

St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane:

Voting was as follows: 31 in favour, 1 against, 9 abstentions.
Aberdeen and Orkney:
The Canon was approved.
Three amendments were proposed but two were defeated and the third was withdrawn.
Voting on the Canon was as follows:
   House of Clergy: 14 in favour, 0 against, 1 abstention
   House of Laity: 29 in favour, 0 against, 0 abstentions

Argyll and The Isles:
The Canon was approved unanimously.

Brechin:
The Canon was approved.
Voting was as follows:
   Bishop: in favour
   House of Clergy: 12 in favour, 0 against, 0 abstentions
   House of Laity: 15 in favour, 0 against, 0 abstentions

Edinburgh:
The Canon was approved.
Voting was as follows:
   Bishop: in favour
   House of Clergy: 43 in favour, 0 against, 1 abstention
   House of Laity: 36 in favour, 0 against, 3 abstentions

Glasgow and Galloway:
The Canon was approved.
Voting was as follows:
   House of Clergy: 32 in favour, 0 against, 0 abstentions
   House of Laity: 46 in favour, 0 against, 0 abstentions
Moray, Ross and Caithness:

The Canon was approved.

St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane:

Voting was as follows: passed unanimously (52 in favour).
1. The General Synod of the SEC is asked to approve the proposals for the Scottish Christian Forum, constituted through the Scottish Church Leaders Forum and the Ecumenical Officers Forum as presented in the document, “Proposal for the Scottish Christian Forum”. The background to this proposal is given in the document, “Scottish Christian Forum – Nature, Purpose and Aims”.

2. In making these proposals, it is recognised that this is a work in progress. The plans for a Scottish Christian Forum (SCF) grew from a review of the activities of ACTS, which is a legally recognised corporate body which currently acts as the Scottish National Ecumenical Instrument. The original intention was to transform ACTS into a looser organisation, but that proposal failed on legal grounds. The ACTS trustees agreed to reduce both staff and ecumenical activities while plans for the SCF were developed. That done, ACTS continues to hold significant funds, which it will now gradually disburse through grants for approved ecumenical purposes. Recognising that a corporate structure (or similar) is required under Scots law to allow the holding of such charitable assets, the ACTS’ trustees prepared a draft for ACTS’ future which is currently under discussion with the ACTS member churches.

3. The looser structures of the SCF, and perhaps particularly the Scottish Leaders Forum, has enabled the involvement of churches which were not involved in ACTS. There are now fifteen churches participating in either the Church Leaders Forum, the Ecumenical Officers Forum, or both, compared with the nine member churches of ACTS. This represents a significant increase in participation.

4. The SCF has led to a closer working relationship between the Scottish Ecumenical Officers which is a real benefit, although it must also be recognised that the long process of forming the SCF has placed a significant burden on them.

5. The Ecumenical Officers Forum is already acting as the sponsoring body which supports Local Ecumenical Partnerships (currently on delegated authority from ACTS and subject to annual report to ACTS); this will continue in the new structure.

6. Going forward, the SCF will also develop strategies and structures aimed at supporting and invigorating local ecumenical activity and local ecumenical relationships.

Churches involved in the Scottish Christian Forum:

Member Churches of ACTS:


The Rev’d Prof Charlotte Methuen
Convener, Inter-Church Relations Committee
April 2024
PROPOSAL FOR THE SCOTTISH CHRISTIAN FORUM
(Paper prepared by the Scottish Ecumenical Officers Forum)

Background

There has been work for a number of years around the future shape of the ecumenical landscape in Scotland and, within this, the place of Action of Churches Together in Scotland (ACTS) and the Scottish Christian Forum (SCF). This proposal relates directly to the Scottish Christian Forum but will include appropriate references to other groups and bodies.

The Ecumenical Officers Forum (EOF) was charged to undertake this work following the gathering of ecumenical stakeholders on 16th of January 2023, and to report back in the autumn of 2023. At the further meeting on 28th November 2023, stakeholders agreed to proceed with ‘option two’ in the paper Proposal for the Scottish Christian Forum v0-5, which tasked the EOF to prepare more detailed plans for setting up the Scottish Christian Forum under a lead church model. The EOF agreed to report back to the wider group in early February 2024.

Both option one and option two as presented in November are described in the appended paper.

Current Situation

After the meeting in November, the EOF began work on preparing detailed plans for the SCF, beginning with a meeting in December to explore some broad questions with the assistance of Robert Marshall (Senior Public Sector Policy Adviser) and the Rev Dr Liam Fraser (Church of Scotland). The EOF intended to meet in January to discuss governance of the SCF, with the assistance of Pauline Weibye (Church of Scotland), and Martin Burnell (Religious Society of Friends (Quakers)).

During the intervening weeks, however, one of the participating denominations held discussions with its senior leadership and ecumenical advisors about its future relationship with ACTS and the Scottish Christian Forum. The results of these discussions made it clear that the proposed ‘option two’ agreed at the roundtable in November would not be compatible with the way that this denomination wants to engage ecumenically in Scotland.

The EOF met in January to discuss the situation, and agreed that it would not be advisable to proceed with establishing the SCF under a lead church model without the full support of the churches involved on the journey so far. In order to avoid defaulting to ‘option one’ (ceasing all work on the matter), the EOF agreed to recommend an alternative proposal which effectively tightens up the current system without any significant changes.

New Proposal

- That the existing bodies of the Scottish Church Leaders Forum and the Ecumenical Officers Forum form the Scottish Christian Forum, by slightly
amending their current terms of reference but without significantly altering their objectives. Both bodies would continue to carry out the work they do currently.

- That the Scottish Christian Forum exist only in the two bodies working together, and as an umbrella term encompassing both and their shared work.

- That the Ecumenical Officers Forum undertake secretarial responsibility for the Church Leaders Forum by nominating two of its members to serve as co-secretaries, and that the EOF as a whole would function, effectively, as the executive arm of the Church Leaders Forum.

- That the ‘ecumenical instrument' sit with both bodies collegially. The EOF would act as first point of contact.

- That participating in one of the bodies would not automatically mean participation and association with the other. Each church and tradition would participate in each body as it desires to.

There is still some work to be done before the proposal, if agreed at the roundtable, can be shared with the churches for approval within their respective processes. The EOF would like to discuss how the two bodies of the Forum communicate with each other and coordinate their work, and how communication is managed externally, e.g. a potential website. It is hoped that this will take no more than two weeks.

If this model, or some amended form of it, is not adopted then, given the amount of work done previously, and the lack of support for a model, the EOF feels that we have reached an impasse and cannot foresee undertaking further work on this matter.

**Timeline**

Assuming that the new proposal is agreed, the EOF propose the following draft timeline for the work to be implemented:

- Early Spring 2024: write up proposal in form to take to churches and governing bodies.

- Late Spring/Summer 2024: approved document then to be taken through formal approval process of respective church traditions, including approval at relevant governing bodies.

- End of process: date of last church meeting, or 31st December 2024.
Vision:

1. The vision for the Scottish Christian Forum is rooted in the belief that the Holy Spirit is calling the churches, inter-church and Christian organisations in Scotland to a pilgrimage of greater unity, cooperation and common witness. The Forum will create an open space where respectful conversation between leaders and representatives from these bodies can take place.

2. The vision is inspired by a renewal of the call to prayer and our common witness to the Gospel. Embracing this vision will lead to the deepening of a shared spirituality; support for ecumenical initiatives at all levels; and the exploration of common challenges. It will foster ecumenical relationships which respect the variety of Christian life and witness in Scotland and encourage participation in the shared life of the Church.

3. The foundation of the Forum is mutual respect, acceptance and attentive listening, allied to the recognition of diversity among the participants. The Forum will seek to discern the work of the Holy Spirit and to respond in an ecumenism of action. Implicit in this is the recognition that participation will not require any church or organisation to abandon particular theological perspectives or traditional religious identities. Participation is to be understood theologically, whereby it is acknowledged that all participants are members of the Body of Christ (1 Corinthians 12:12-31).

Constituent Elements:

The constituent elements of the Scottish Christian Forum, in the first instance, are the Scottish Church Leaders’ Forum and the Scottish Ecumenical Officers’ Forum. As the Forum evolves it is anticipated that other forums will develop and become an integral part of the body.

National Ecumenical Body:

The Scottish Christian Forum will be designated the National Ecumenical Body, and will relate as such to the other ecumenical instruments within Britain and Ireland through the Scottish Ecumenical Officers’ Forum.
**Scottish Church Leaders’ Forum**

**Nature and Purpose:**

The Scottish Church Leaders’ Forum is a forum in which designated senior leaders within particular churches in Scotland gather together for the purpose of sharing fellowship, information and insight. At present, the Forum offers a meeting place to the following churches and communities:

1. Church of Scotland
2. Catholic Church in Scotland
3. Scottish Episcopal Church
4. United Free Church of Scotland
5. United Reformed Church
6. Methodist Church
7. Religious Society of Friends
8. Salvation Army
9. Congregational Federation
10. Baptist Union of Scotland
11. Free Church of Scotland
12. Redeemed Christian Church of God
13. Greek Orthodox Church
14. Ukrainian Catholic Church

The Scottish Church Leaders’ Forum is a participatory body and is, in nature, a voluntary association and its purpose, as stated, provides the basis on which the Forum is established. The Forum welcomes the participation of other churches within its life on the basis of agreement with the stated Nature, Purpose & Aims, and on the basis of the consensus of the Forum.

The Forum was initiated in March 2020 and the catalyst for its initiation and subsequent development was the onset of the Covid-19 pandemic and the need for a shared response to the challenges of the pandemic. Subsequent to this, the aims of the Forum have evolved in relation to the present context of the church in Scotland.

**Aims:**

The Forum seeks to:

1. Encourage the mission of the Church of the Lord Jesus Christ in Scotland;
2. Encourage the living out of our shared response to the prayer of Jesus that we may ‘all be one’ (John 17: 21);
3. Encourage the Church to share in the call to prayer;
4. Encourage a broad spectrum of churches to participate in its life;
5. Encourage the commissioning of research into areas of mutual interest;
6. Provide a platform for working cooperatively with other churches and ecumenical bodies within Scotland, and within Britain and Ireland.

Cooperation:

The Scottish Church Leaders’ Forum will work cooperatively with other church and ecumenical bodies, as appropriate, including:

1. Ecumenical Officers’ Forum  
2. Scottish Churches Parliamentary Office  
3. Scottish Churches Committee  
4. Scottish Church Planters' Network  
5. Evangelical Alliance (Scotland)  
6. Churches Together in Britain & Ireland  
7. Churches Together in England  
8. Irish Council of Churches and the Irish Inter-Church Meeting  
9. Churches Together in Wales (Cytûn)

Convener:

The Convener of the Scottish Church Leaders’ Forum shall be appointed from amongst the members of the Forum and shall serve at the pleasure of the Forum.

Secretary:

The Secretariat of the Scottish Church Leaders’ Forum shall be provided by the Scottish Ecumenical Officers’ Forum.

Annual Review:

The Scottish Church Leaders’ Forum shall conduct an annual review towards the end of each calendar year and set goals for the calendar year following.
Scottish Ecumenical Officers’ Forum

Nature and Purpose:
The Scottish Ecumenical Officers’ Forum is a forum in which designated Ecumenical Officers, and those with ecumenical responsibility within their church, gather together for the purpose of sharing fellowship, information and insight.

Further, the Scottish Ecumenical Officers’ Forum serves as the Secretariat of the Scottish Church Leaders’ Forum and in that capacity shall record the Minute of meetings of the Scottish Church Leaders’ Forum and, where appropriate, to forward initiatives agreed by the latter Forum.

The Forum offers a meeting place to the following churches and communities, and includes, where appropriate, representatives from the respective Committees of those churches and communities:

1. Church of Scotland (Ecumenical Relations Committee)
2. Catholic Church in Scotland (Bishops’ Ecumenical Reference Group of the Scottish Catholic Bishops’ Conference)
3. Scottish Episcopal Church (Inter-Church Relations Committee)
4. United Free Church of Scotland (Ecumenical Relations Working Group)
5. United Reformed Church (Ecumenical Relations Task Group of the National Synod of Scotland)
6. Salvation Army
7. The Redeemed Christian Church of God
8. Religious Society of Friends
9. Methodist Church in Scotland
10. Churches in Communities

The Scottish Ecumenical Officers’ Forum is a participatory body and is, in nature, a voluntary association and its purpose, as stated, provides the basis on which the Forum is established. It was initiated in November 2019.

Aims:
The Forum seeks to:

1. Encourage the living out of our shared response to the prayer of Jesus that we may ‘all be one’ (John 17: 21);
2. Encourage the Church to share in the call to prayer;
3. Encourage a broad spectrum of churches to participate in its life;
4. Provide a platform for working cooperatively with other churches and ecumenical bodies within Scotland, and within Britain and Ireland.
5. Encourage the witness of the Church to the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, by encouraging, enabling and supporting the formation, development and ongoing life of ecumenical partnerships at a local and national level.

Local Ecumenical Partnerships:

The Scottish Ecumenical Officers’ Forum will seek to encourage and support new and innovative forms of local ecumenical partnership. Further, it will seek to fulfil the responsibilities of Oversight and Review which are written into the constitutions of established Local Ecumenical Partnerships, and will liaise with the parent bodies of the churches which are members of such Partnerships.

Cooperation:

The Scottish Ecumenical Officers’ Forum will seek to work cooperatively with other church and ecumenical bodies, as appropriate, including:

1. Scottish Church Leaders’ Forum
2. Ecumenical Committees of the Scottish churches
3. Local Ecumenical Partnerships and the governing bodies of the churches party to them
4. Churches Together in Britain & Ireland

Convener:

The Convener of the Scottish Ecumenical Officers’ Forum shall be appointed from amongst the members of the Forum and shall serve at the pleasure of the Forum.

Secretary:

The Secretary of the Scottish Ecumenical Officers’ Forum shall be appointed from amongst the members of the Forum and shall serve at the pleasure of the Forum.

Annual Review:

The Scottish Ecumenical Officers’ Forum shall conduct an annual review towards the end of each calendar year and set goals for the calendar year following.

January 2024
INVESTMENT COMMITTEE

Report to Standing Committee on Pooled Funds held in the UTP as at 30 September 2023 and 31 December 2023

In June 2021 General Synod approved the policy on the use of pooled funds in the UTP which requires the Investment Committee to report to Standing Committee:

Policy on the use of Pooled Funds in the UTP (extract)

The Investment Committee should review pooled funds held by the UTP on an annual basis so as to consider the continued appropriateness of the UTP investing in each pooled fund, and whether this policy framework is being complied with overall.

If the Investment Committee is of the view, on such a review, that the holding of a particular pooled fund within the UTP has come to jeopardise compliance with the 1% limit set out above [holdings of the restricted categories to be less than 1% of the total UTP funds], it should so report forthwith to Standing Committee along with their explanation as to how that situation has arisen and their recommendation as to the appropriate way to proceed, bearing in mind Standing Committee’s fiduciary duties in relation to the UTP and the need for efficiency and economy in management thereof. Standing Committee may then approve that recommendation or require its amendment. The Investment Committee will then forthwith implement the recommendation as approved (with or without amendment) by Standing Committee.

Restricted categories

In June 2022 General Synod approved the revised ethical investment policy statement presented by EIAG. The SEC restricted categories are companies deriving >10% of their revenue from oil & gas extraction, armaments, gambling, pornography, tobacco. The full policy is publicly available at:

https://www.scotland.anglican.org/vestry-resources/general-information/ethical-investment-policy/

Timing of reports

Previous reports have detailed compliance as at 30 September in both 2021 and 2022. Future reports will consider compliance as at 31 December each year in line with other reporting timetables. To ensure that the Investment Committee complies with the requirement to undertake an annual review this report considers compliance as at 30 September 2023 and 31 December 2023.

Statement of Compliance as at 30 September 2023 and 31 December 2023

As at both 30 September 2023 and 31 December 2023 the UTP held no investments in the restricted categories, either directly or in pooled funds.

The Investment Committee has considered the ‘continued appropriateness of the UTP investing in each pooled fund’ and reports as follows.
UTP Holdings

The UTP holds 30% in direct investments in Baillie Gifford’s Global Income Growth strategy. The investments are screened by Baillie Gifford in accordance with the revised restrictions listed above. There are no direct holdings in the restricted categories.

The UTP has holdings in two pooled funds:

Long Term Global Growth Fund (35%)

Baillie Gifford’s Long Term Global Growth Fund (LTGG) is not a screened fund, but it has not held any companies in the restricted categories (including fossil fuel extractors) since around 2012. The Fund’s focus on companies that have potential to grow their business in the long term and other factors make it unlikely that Baillie Gifford would reintroduce holdings in any of the excluded categories. LTGG is a concentrated fund holding a relatively small number of stocks (30-60), so a single holding in the excluded category could breach the 1% limit, however the Investment Committee considers there is a low risk of this happening and will continue to monitor the direction in which the fund is evolving.

The Committee notes that LTGG continues to hold stocks that make a positive contribution to combatting climate change including Tesla and NIO (electric vehicles) and CATL (batteries).

Sustainable Income Fund (35%)

The SEC was a seed investor in Baillie Gifford’s Multi Asset Income Fund (MAI) when it was launched in 2018. MAI addressed the Investment Committee’s objective of increasing diversification of asset classes and reducing the risk of volatility in the UTP.

Baillie Gifford changed the name of MAI to Sustainable Income Fund (SIF) on 31 March 2023 to better reflect the main aim of the fund which is to deliver a sustainable income stream that is protected against inflation over time. At the same time as the name change a number of responsible investment restrictions also came into effect. All asset types in SIF, with the exception of cash and cash-like instruments, are now subject to an assessment of their sustainability and a consistent scoring framework is applied across the asset classes. In addition, new revenue-based exclusions have been introduced: fossil fuel extraction and production, thermal coal distribution, tobacco production, and armaments norms-based exclusions (UN Global Compact non-compliant).

Baillie Gifford had been evolving their approach to responsible investment over time and much of the assessment process was already in place before the name change. Consequently, it was not necessary for Baillie Gifford to make any changes to the holdings in SIF when the new restrictions and methodology were formally implemented at the end of March. The new restrictions and methodology bring SIF into closer alignment with the SEC’s ethical investment policy for the UTP. Whilst MAI/SIF has complied with the pooled funds policy since it was introduced in 2021, the introduction of formal exclusions gives additional comfort that it will continue to comply in the future.
Next steps
As the UTP complies with the policy on pooled funds no action is required.

The Investment Committee is of the view that the current investment strategy for the UTP is appropriate, and it recognises the importance of backing this up with analysis on a periodic basis and considering alternatives as appropriate. The Investment Committee anticipates that EIAG will continue to develop the SEC’s thinking on impact investment and other ethical questions and that this will inform future investment strategy.

Investment Committee
February 2024
BUILDINGS COMMITTEE

Since the establishment of the Provincial Environment Group (PEG), the Buildings Committee has had regular engagement with PEG. In conjunction with PEG, it has developed guidance for congregations on various matters including information about insulating churches. All of its guidance is available on the Vestry Resources section of the website.

In support of the move towards Net Zero, in 2023 the Committee brought a first reading of a small change to Canon 35.1 to Synod to ensure that consent to a change to a church building under that Canon granted by the Diocesan Bishop and Diocesan Buildings Committee are consistent with SEC guidance on Net Zero.

The opinions received from Diocesan Synods on the proposed change proposed in 2023 are set out in the separate paper listing those opinions.

The Committee has considered the opinions received from Dioceses and, in the light of that, intends to bring forward a further amendment. The text of the proposed amendment is set out in the Synod agenda which, if adopted by Synod 2024, would alter the proposed new wording in the Canon by replacing the words “adheres to” with the words “must take account of”.

Prof Peter Sharp
Convener, Buildings Committee
April 2024
CANON 35

The following is the text of the amendment to the Canon presented for first reading to General Synod 2023:

1. With the exception of minor works identified by the Provincial Buildings Committee, no change (whether by introduction, alteration or removal) shall be made in the structure, ecclesiastical furniture or ornaments, monuments, mural tablets or painted or stained windows of any Church used for public worship or within the curtilage thereof, nor shall any scheme of redecoration or any alteration of lighting or heating system be undertaken unless the Vestry of the same with the consent of the Rector shall have obtained the approval in writing of the Bishop and of the Diocesan Buildings Committee; provided always that such approval adheres to the Scottish Episcopal Church Net Zero Guidance endorsed by the Provincial Buildings Committee and does not violate any restrictions contained in the Constitution or titles of the Church. Subject to the Constitution or titles of the Church, a Vestry or twenty per cent of the members of the Communicants’ Roll, as defined in Canon 41, Section 2, of the charge concerned shall have a right of appeal against the decision of the Diocesan Buildings Committee or of the Bishop to the Provincial Buildings Committee. Notwithstanding the above, the Vestry with the consent of the Rector, may undertake re-ordering of the ecclesiastical furniture or ornaments of the Church for an experimental period.

The following is the text of the amendment to the Canon incorporating the text of the amendment to be proposed in the light of some Diocesan opinions:

2. With the exception of minor works identified by the Provincial Buildings Committee, no change (whether by introduction, alteration or removal) shall be made in the structure, ecclesiastical furniture or ornaments, monuments, mural tablets or painted or stained windows of any Church used for public worship or within the curtilage thereof, nor shall any scheme of redecoration or any alteration of lighting or heating system be undertaken unless the Vestry of the same with the consent of the Rector shall have obtained the approval in writing of the Bishop and of the Diocesan Buildings Committee; provided always that such approval must take account of the Scottish Episcopal Church Net Zero Guidance endorsed by the Provincial Buildings Committee and does not violate any restrictions contained in the Constitution or titles of the Church. Subject to the Constitution or titles of the Church, a Vestry or twenty per cent of the members of the Communicants’ Roll, as defined in Canon 41, Section 2, of the charge concerned shall have a right of appeal against the decision of the Diocesan Buildings Committee or of the Bishop to the Provincial Buildings Committee. Notwithstanding the above, the Vestry with the consent of the Rector, may undertake re-ordering of the ecclesiastical furniture or ornaments of the Church for an experimental period.
LITURGY COMMITTEE

The Report of the Committee for the year ending 31 December 2023 can be found in the 41st Annual Report.

Since the submission of that Report, the Faith and Order Board has referred, and the College of Bishops has authorised for an experimental period:

- seasonal material for use with Scottish Liturgy 1982 (rev. 2022),
- a revised order of Daily Prayer, and
- revised and expanded provision of Funeral Rites.

The revised order of Daily Prayer will be available in print as well as on-line, and will come into use on Advent Sunday, 1 December 2024. As intimated at previous sessions of Synod, the Revised (Inclusive Language) Liturgical Psalter of the Anglican Church of Canada has been adopted with permission. A significant development is recitation of the Psalter on a sixty day cycle, with propers appointed only for a small number of Category 1 commemorations. This and other changes will be fully explained in the 2024-2025 Calendar and Lectionary Guide. Webinars will be arranged, and publicised in *Inspires online* and elsewhere, to explain the changes and to answer any questions.

In view of pastoral sensitivities, the new Funeral Rites are being used in selected congregations across all seven dioceses, and participating clergy have been briefed.

As with all liturgies in experimental use, feedback from members of the Church is invaluable. The invitation does not apply only to officiating clergy, but includes all who participate in the worship of our Church.

The collection of rites for Lent, Holy Week, and Easter was authorised for experimental use in 2017, and revised and expanded before being submitted to General Synod 2023 for a first reading. As always, the Committee appreciates very much the comments and suggestions received from members of the Church during the period of experimental use.

The text which received a first reading at General Synod 2023 was referred to Diocesan Synods for comment. In six dioceses the liturgies were approved overwhelmingly, while a number of amendments were suggested by that of the Diocese of Glasgow and Galloway. These were considered by the Faith and Order Board, which decided to adopt one of these in part, and to introduce an amendment accordingly. This is included in the Synod agenda.

As with all liturgical provision, the task of the Committee is to draft texts which give faithful but contemporary expression to the Christian faith and the doctrine of this Church, drawing upon and at the same time contributing to the liturgical tradition of the Church catholic. The texts now submitted to Synod have not been drafted in isolation from the work of Anglican and ecumenical neighbours, but with an independence that seeks to be true to the distinctive liturgical heritage of our Church. Each liturgy is preceded by a theological introduction with some practical guidance, mindful of the considerable diversity of pastoral contexts in which congregations
gather for worship. A commentary on the rites, produced in collaboration with the Doctrine Committee and published at the time of authorisation for experimental use, remains available on the SEC website, and is currently being revised at https://www.scotland.anglican.org/who-we-are/publications/liturgies/experimental-liturgies-and-resources/new-experimental-rite-lent-4/

Successive revisions and additions to Scottish Liturgy 1982 over the past forty years have left a legacy of earlier versions which are still listed on the Schedule to Canon 22. While it is not the wish of the Faith and Order Board or of the College of Bishops to cause hardship or inconvenience in any congregation, it is nonetheless believed that the current version, with its full range of Eucharistic Prayers and moves towards inclusive language, should be used. A motion has therefore been tabled to remove from the Schedule to Canon 22 the previous editions of this rite, with effect from the Sunday next before Advent 2025.

The Rev Canon Nicholas Taylor
Convener, Liturgy Committee
April 2024
LITURGY FOR SECOND READING

OPINIONS FROM DIOCESES

Liturgies for Lent, Holy Week and Easter for use with the Scottish Liturgy 1982 and A Service of the Word 2015

Aberdeen and Orkney:
The liturgies were approved unanimously in the Houses of Clergy and Laity.

Argyll and The Isles:
The liturgies were approved unanimously.

Brechin:
The liturgies were approved without comment.

Voting was as follows:

Bishop: in favour

House of Clergy: 12 in favour, 0 against, 0 abstentions

House of Laity: 14 in favour, 0 against, 2 abstentions

Edinburgh:
The liturgies were approved.

Glasgow and Galloway:
There was a very lengthy discussion on these second readings for the Liturgies, and strong feelings were expressed that, although Synod applauded and appreciated the valuable work that had gone into them by the Faith and Order Board, there were certain areas that could be made better to ensure that our Liturgies are fully inclusive and accessible. Although opportunities had already been offered for feedback, it was strongly felt that the opportunity to make further improvements should be taken before the second readings were passed, hence the Four Liturgical Resolutions/Motions below, on which votes were taken, with the desire to have these Resolutions submitted on behalf of Glasgow and Galloway Diocese demonstrated by significant majorities in each case.

LITURGICAL MOTION 1 (In favour 50, Against 7, Abstentions 20)

That this synod welcomes the intention to introduce services for Lent and Holy Week which reflect the language of the 1982 Liturgy (Revised). Given this declared intent, it is the mind of this synod to request that the Lenten themes of the 1982 Liturgy and
Daily Prayer are incorporated into the introduction to the season by making a change to the proposed address at the start of Lent as follows:

Replace the following:

*Dear friends in Christ, as we begin the season of Lent we are reminded that, in our Christian lives, we seek to realise the death of Jesus so that God may be glorified in our worship and through our witness in the world. Saint Paul writes of ‘carrying around the death of Jesus in our bodies, so that the life of Jesus may be clearly shown in our bodies’ (2 Cor 4. 10). It is through baptism that we die into Christ’s death (Rom 6. 3–4) so that we may share in his resurrection. In beginning our Lenten observance, we are therefore reminded of our baptism, and how Christ’s death on the cross may clearly be shown in our lives. We now come before God in penitence, reflecting on our life in Christ. We pledge ourselves to observe this season of self-examination, discipline, and self-denial with sincerity, prayer, and reverent reflection on holy Scripture, seeking God’s purpose for us, and modelling our lives on the example of Christ Jesus.*

with a text such as this:

*Dear Friends in Christ, it is the custom of Christian people to prepare to mark the time of Christ’s passion and resurrection by a season of penitence and fasting. The church calls each of us during these forty days to repent of all that causes harm to ourselves, harm to our earthly dwelling place and harm to our relationship with God. By carefully keeping these days, Christians take to heart the call to repentance and the assurance of forgiveness proclaimed in the gospel, and so grow in faith and devotion. In turning our hearts towards God, we discover anew the boundless grace of God. For God will help us to create beauty even within the turmoil of this chaotic world and will help us to gather a harvest of joy and gladness from lives of sorrow and care. Today and every day, God calls the wandering exile home. We are invited therefore, in the name of the Church, to the observance of a holy Lent, by self-examination and repentance; by prayer, fasting, and self-denial; and by reading and meditating on God’s holy word.*

**LITURGICAL MOTION 2 (In favour 52, Against 9, Abstentions 16)**

That this synod recognises that the call to repentance is to the whole world and not simply to those who are baptised. In recognition of this, and aware that the church often includes those who are seeking baptism as well as those who have already been baptised, this synod requests the use of more inclusive language at the imposition of Ashes as follows:

Replace:

*I invite you to receive the mark of Christ’s cross, with which we are signed at Baptism, and by which we are forgiven our sins and live to the glory of God.*
with a text such as this:

*I invite you to receive the mark of Christ’s cross, our symbol of salvation, and live to the glory of God.*

**LITURGICAL MOTION 3 (In favour 31, Against 19, Abstentions 29)**

That this synod requests language that is inclusive of those who are yet to be baptised be used at all points during Lent and Holy Week and specifically at the distribution of Palms and that the language of the Palm Sunday liturgy does not confuse the Palm Sunday procession with walking the way of the Cross.

Thus, replacing:

*Almighty and everlasting God, may these palms [and branches] be for us a sign of Christ’s victory over sin and death; and may we who have been baptised in his name, worship him as king, obey him as Lord, and follow him in the way of the Cross, which leads to eternal life. We ask this through the same Jesus Christ our Lord.*

with a text such as this:

*Eternal God, may these palms [and branches] be for us a sign of Christ’s victory over sin and death; and may we worship him as king, obey him as Lord, and follow him with joy. We ask this through the same Jesus Christ our Lord.*

**LITURGICAL MOTION 4 (In favour 53, Against 5, Abstentions 23)**

That this synod

- welcomes the recognition in the Maundy Thursday liturgy that we are all made in the image of God and
- acknowledges that the recognition that every person is made in the image and likeness of God has given dignity to the human condition and has directly led to many different aspects of the modern human rights movement including recognising the full and equal humanity of men and women, LGBT people and people of colour.
- For this reason, the synod requests that the new liturgy does not also use language that could seem to suggest that the image of God that every person bears, might be marred, spoiled or removed.

Thus, replace:

*Do you repent of the sin which has separated you from God, and marred God’s image in you?*

with a text such as this:
Do you repent of the sin which has separated you from God?

Moray, Ross and Caithness:

The liturgies were approved.

St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane:

The liturgies were approved. Voting was as follows: 49 in favour, 0 against, 1 abstention.
COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION OF CHILDREN AND VULNERABLE ADULTS (SAFEGUARDING COMMITTEE)

CANON 65 REVISION

General

This explanatory note sets out the background to the proposed changes to Canon 65.

In 2020 General Synod approved a new safeguarding policy based on the Anglican Communion’s Safe Church Charter. Safe Church refers to the commitment of churches and other institutions of the Anglican Communion to work towards making churches safer places for everyone. Safeguarding refers to the measures that are implemented to enable Churches to put their Safe Church commitments into practice. Canon 65 relates to the Scottish Episcopal Church’s Safeguarding measures. It is a business rather than a policy document.

The purpose of Canon 65 is to assign safeguarding authorities and duties at a high level. Operational practice is covered in the various policy and practice guidance documents published on the SEC website. These will require to be updated and expanded in the light of changes to the Canon.

As far as is possible for a legal document such as a canon, the proposed revision uses simpler wording than the current canon. Each section has been broken down into sub-sections for ease of reference. To avoid the requirement for future amendments, references to legislation that may change are avoided.

There will be consequential changes elsewhere in the Code of Canons wherever there are references to ‘Protection of Children and Vulnerable Adults’ which will be updated to ‘Safeguarding’ at the second reading.

The proposed new Canon 65 represents a significant step forward in defining key areas of responsibility more clearly than under the current Canon. Amending the Canons is a two-year process, but if the proposed version passes the first stage this year, the Safeguarding Committee and Officers will be in a better position to continue the work of building a robust framework for safeguarding in the SEC.

The proposed revision is presented as a ‘clean’ copy. It represents a substantial redraft with new Sections and the Sections in the current Canon are written in a different order. This does not lend itself to presentation as a document with tracked changes but the current Canon is available to view at:


The proposed new Canon 65 should be read in conjunction with the notes below. The numbered headings relate to the Sections and letters to the subsections in the draft Canon. The 2020 Policy Principles and Commitments is published on the SEC website:

1. **Duty to Safeguard**

This new Section sets out in broad terms where responsibility for Safeguarding lies.

(a) This reflects the wording in the 2020 policy: *We will promote a culture of safety in our congregations and church organisations and communities by education and training to help clergy, other church workers and participants prevent the occurrence of harm and abuse.* The same wording is used in Section 3(b). Abuse is defined in the glossary to the 2020 Policy.

(b) This covers the duty of all members of the Church to uphold the principles of safeguarding and comply with the Church’s policies and procedures.

(c) This has been added to cover employees and volunteers who may not be members of the Church. Examples include administrative staff, caretakers, cleaners and church musicians. This is perhaps more a statement of aspiration than legal duty as such since such people are unlikely to be subject to the Code of Canons directly.

2. **Specific duties and responsibilities of Church Bodies**

This new Section defines where responsibility for implementing the Church’s policies lies. This was less clear in the original.

(a) A Church Body is defined as having charitable status in its own right. This includes, but is not restricted to, vestries, dioceses and the province. Each Church Body has safeguarding responsibilities in relation to the appointment of its personnel, whether clergy or lay, stipendiary, salaried or voluntary.

(b) This restates subsection 1(b) but it is helpful to reinforce this point in the context of subsections 2(c) and 2(d) below.

(c) This is an essential element of the working relationship between the Safeguarding Team and Church Bodies in relation to safe recruitment and PVG. The duty of the Safeguarding Committee is to promote safe recruitment practices and these practices are facilitated by the Safeguarding Team, but it is the responsibility of each Church Body to implement and act on the guidance.

(d) The requirement on Church Bodies to prepare an annual return, originally covered in the resolutions under the Canon, is now included here.

3. **Provincial Safeguarding Committee**

This Section expands on Section 1 of the current Canon.

(f) This clarifies the relationship between the Committee and the Provincial Safeguarding Officers in relation to safeguarding advice. Section 5 of the draft canon covers the Provincial Safeguarding Officer’s duty to seek advice and Section 7 covers sources of advice.

4. **Provincial Safeguarding Officer**

This ensures that there is always a Provincial Safeguarding Officer or Acting Provincial Safeguarding Officer in post.
(d) In this context ‘terms and conditions’ refers to the terms and conditions of employment determined by the Provincial Standing Committee.

5. Authority of the Provincial Safeguarding Officer

This covers the duties and authorities of the Provincial Safeguarding Officer in relation to safe recruitment.

(a) All criminal record disclosure applications are submitted to Disclosure Scotland by the Safeguarding Team. Section 2(c) places on each Church Body responsibility for identifying relevant appointments and submitting disclosure applications to the Team for processing.

(d) The requirement to seek advice is contained in the current Canon and is retained. The term ‘complex and difficult questions’ is not defined here but is covered by practice agreed between the Provincial Officer and the Committee.

(e) This has been added for practical reasons as consultation with the full Committee may not always be possible.

6. Authority to recommend suspension

This is a clarification of the process set out in the current Canon 65. It refers only to the suspension of volunteers and lay employees, with clergy suspension being dealt with under Canon 54.

(c) The notification is given to the Church body as defined in Section 2(a). The requirement to advise the Bishop in the original Canon 65 has been removed as Bishops have no authority to suspend a volunteer appointed by a vestry. The advice to suspend a person from their duties must be delivered to the person or persons with the authority to implement the suspension. It is not helpful to try to define this in greater detail as the relevant person will differ between charges. This will be covered by a practice note.

A recommendation to suspend reflects the reality that only the appointing body has the authority to suspend or dismiss, so stronger wording would not be appropriate. That said, the Canon places the duty to comply and uphold the Church’s Policies and procedures on each Church Body with separate charitable status, and as such charity trustees should always take into account safeguarding advice.

7. Authority in relation to safeguarding concerns

This section covers the powers of the Provincial Officer in relation to safeguarding concerns.

(a) The authority to provide advice is understood but not stated in the current Canon.

(b) Standing Committee has authorised funding to enable the use of external consultants.

(c) The authority to investigate a concern is fundamental to Safeguarding but is not set out explicitly in the current Canon.
(d) This may require to be amended in the light of revisions to Canon 54.

8. Risk Assessment

This is an addition to the current Canon 65 to formalise practice. Risk assessment is the term used to quantify and reduce potential risk of harm in a wide variety of situations. Risk assessments have always formed part of the work of the Provincial Officer in relation to appointments and safeguarding concerns.

(c) If a potential risk is identified, it is the duty of the Provincial Officer to carry out a risk assessment with or without the co-operation of the individual concerned.

9. Decisions

This is updated from the current Canon 65 to include an Acting Provincial Officer.

10. Appeals Committee and
11. Appeals

Minor changes only.

Schedule

No changes at this time.

Resolutions

There are currently three resolutions under the Canon. Resolutions 1 and 2 cover duties that are now set out in Sections 1 and 2 of the proposed new Canon. Resolution 3 is retained with revised wording.

Richard Baker
Convener, Safeguarding Committee
1. **DUTY TO SAFEGUARD**

(a) The Scottish Episcopal Church must promote at all times a safe and protective environment for all people who participate in the activities of the Church, with a particular focus on preventing harm and abuse.

(b) Those in authorised ministry and all dioceses, vestries, and congregations of the Scottish Episcopal Church must uphold and comply with the Church’s safeguarding Policies set out in the Schedule and the procedures adopted by the Safeguarding Committee from time to time.

(c) Any person working in the Scottish Episcopal Church, whether on a paid or on a voluntary basis, must uphold and comply with the Church’s safeguarding Policies set out in the Schedule and the procedures adopted by the Safeguarding Committee from time to time.

2. **SPECIFIC DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF CHURCH BODIES**

(a) This Section applies to each body within the Scottish Episcopal Church which has charitable status in its own right and which has the power to make appointments.

(b) Each body must uphold and comply with the Church’s safeguarding Policies set out in the Schedule and the procedures adopted by the Safeguarding Committee from time to time.

(c) Each body must implement guidance issued from time to time by or on behalf of the Safeguarding Committee on safe recruitment including submitting applications to the Provincial Safeguarding Officer for criminal record disclosures for all relevant positions.

(d) Each body must prepare and submit an annual safeguarding return in accordance with guidance issued from time to time by or on behalf of the Safeguarding Committee and participate in any safeguarding audit as and when required.

3. **PROVINCIAL SAFEGUARDING COMMITTEE**

(a) There shall be a Safeguarding Committee, whose members shall be appointed by the Standing Committee of the General Synod.

(b) The Safeguarding Committee is responsible for promoting a safe and protective environment for all people who participate in the activities of the Church, with a particular focus on preventing harm and abuse.

(c) The Safeguarding Committee is responsible for promoting safe recruitment practices within the Church.
(d) The Safeguarding Committee is responsible for monitoring the Church’s compliance with all relevant safeguarding legislation.

(e) The Safeguarding Committee is to perform the functions and duties allocated to it under this Canon or by the Policies set out in the Schedule.

(f) The Safeguarding Committee is to tender such advice to the Provincial Officer as it sees fit when the Provincial Officer seeks its advice or consults it.

(g) The Safeguarding Committee has the power to monitor the operation of this Canon and to propose amendments to the Canon and to any or all of the Policies set out in the Schedule and to Resolutions under the Canon.

4. PROVINCIAL SAFEGUARDING OFFICER

(a) The Standing Committee of the General Synod is to appoint a Provincial Safeguarding Officer who shall carry out the functions and duties set out in this Canon.

(b) The Standing Committee also has the power to appoint one or more Assistant Provincial Safeguarding Officers to assist the Provincial Safeguarding Officer.

(c) The Standing Committee of the General Synod has the power to appoint an Acting Provincial Safeguarding Officer, who shall have all the duties, powers and authority of the Provincial Safeguarding Officer when that Officer is absent or unavailable or when that post is vacant.

(d) All appointments made under this Section shall be on such terms and conditions as the Standing Committee determines.

5. AUTHORITY OF THE PROVINCIAL SAFEGUARDING OFFICER IN RELATION TO SAFE RECRUITMENT

(a) The Provincial Safeguarding Officer has authority to apply for a criminal record disclosure, in so far as permitted or required by any relevant legislation, in respect of any person holding, applying for or proposed for appointment to a position in the Church, being a position to which the relevant legislation applies.

(b) The Provincial Safeguarding Officer shall make decisions about the suitability of a person holding, applying for or proposed for appointment to a position in the Church in respect of which a check of criminal conviction, vetting or listing information is available.

(c) The Provincial Safeguarding Officer has authority to provide advice about the suitability of any person holding, applying for or proposed for appointment to a position of trust and responsibility in the Church.

(d) The Provincial Safeguarding Officer must seek the advice of the Safeguarding Committee on complex and difficult questions regarding the suitability of any person.

(e) When providing advice under subsection (d) in a particular case the Safeguarding Committee may delegate the matter within the Committee as it sees fit.
6. **AUTHORITY OF THE PROVINCIAL SAFEGUARDING OFFICER TO RECOMMEND SUSPENSION**

(a) This Section applies to any person holding a position in the Scottish Episcopal Church other than a Bishop, Priest or Deacon holding any form of authorisation to minister in the Scottish Episcopal Church.

(b) In the event that a decision is made by the Provincial Safeguarding Officer under Section 5(b) of this Canon that a person is not suitable to continue to hold a position within the Church, the Officer may recommend that the person be suspended from their position.

(c) When the Provincial Safeguarding Officer recommends suspension of such a person, the Officer must give notification of the recommendation to the body responsible for the person's appointment.

7. **AUTHORITY OF THE PROVINCIAL SAFEGUARDING OFFICER IN RELATION TO SAFEGUARDING CONCERNS**

(a) The Provincial Safeguarding Officer has the authority to provide advice on all matters relating to safeguarding.

(b) The Provincial Safeguarding Officer has the authority to consult generally on any safeguarding matter with whomever the Officer considers appropriate, including but not restricted to Assistant Provincial Safeguarding Officers and members of the Safeguarding Committee.

(c) The Provincial Safeguarding Officer has the authority to carry out investigations into safeguarding allegations, including those in respect of any Bishop, Priest or Deacon holding any form of authorisation to minister in the Scottish Episcopal Church, as the Officer considers appropriate; and the Officer may delegate parts of such investigatory work to suitably qualified persons.

(d) The Provincial Safeguarding Officer has the authority to assist with any investigatory work commissioned by or under the procedures set out in Canon 54 in matters relating to safeguarding issues.

8. **RISK ASSESSMENT**

(a) A risk assessment to evaluate the level of safeguarding risk, if any, that a person may pose to other people may be undertaken by the Provincial Safeguarding Officer or by an Assistant Provincial Safeguarding Officer.

(b) A risk assessment may also be undertaken by a suitably qualified person chosen by the Officer or Assistant Officer, where it is considered that the person has expertise appropriate to a particular assessment.

(c) The Provincial Safeguarding Officer has the authority to require that a person seeking or holding a position in the Scottish Episcopal Church, including a Bishop, Priest or Deacon holding any form of authorisation to minister in the Church, undergoes a risk assessment in relation to safeguarding matters.

(d) The Provincial Safeguarding Officer may seek the advice of the Safeguarding Committee about whether a risk assessment is required in a particular case, and if so, who should carry it out.
(e) When a risk assessment under this Canon has been carried out in relation to a person seeking a position in the Church, the Provincial Safeguarding Officer may use the assessment to inform a decision under Section 5(b).

(f) When a risk assessment under this Canon has been carried out in relation to a person holding a position in the Church (other than a Bishop, Priest or Deacon holding any form of authorisation to minister in the Church), the Provincial Safeguarding Officer may recommend suspension of that person under Section 6.

(g) When a risk assessment under this Canon has been carried out in relation to a Bishop, Priest or Deacon holding a position in the Church, the Provincial Safeguarding Officer may use the assessment to inform proceedings under Canon 54.

9. **PROVINCIAL SAFEGUARDING OFFICER’S DECISIONS BINDING**

(a) All decisions taken by the Provincial Safeguarding Officer or the Acting Provincial Safeguarding Officer under this Canon shall be binding upon all persons or bodies to whom they relate, subject only to the Appeal provisions set out below.

10. **PROVINCIAL SAFEGUARDING APPEALS COMMITTEE**

(a) The members of the Provincial Safeguarding Appeals Committee shall be appointed by the Standing Committee of the General Synod.

(b) The Provincial Safeguarding Appeals Committee shall determine its own procedures and rules for the disposal of appeals.

11. **APPEALS AGAINST SECTION 5(b) DECISIONS**

(a) Any person who is dissatisfied with a decision under Section 5(b) of this Canon regarding their fitness to hold or continue to hold a position in the Church may appeal against that decision to the Provincial Safeguarding Appeals Committee.

(b) An appeal must be lodged in writing with the Secretary General of the General Synod within 21 days of the date of the intimation of the decision.

(c) Where an appeal is lodged after 21 days, it may be accepted late if there is a good reason for doing so.

(d) The decision about whether to accept a late appeal shall be made by the Chair of the Provincial Safeguarding Appeals Committee.

(e) The decision of the Provincial Safeguarding Appeals Committee on the appeal shall be final.
SCHEDULE

The Policies adopted by the General Synod in relation to Safeguarding matters comprise the following:-


3. The policy on the Secure Handling, Use, Storage and Retention of Disclosure Information adopted by the General Synod in June 2012.


RESOLUTIONS UNDER CANON SIXTY-FIVE

Resolution 1

The Safeguarding Committee has the power to adopt detailed safeguarding procedures and to amend them to ensure compliance with legislation and good safeguarding practice.
RULES OF ORDER OF THE GENERAL SYNOD

(Amended 12 June 1997, 7 June 2012, 12 June 2014, 11 June 2022, 8 June 2023)

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 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 should normally 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 should normally 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 theSynod) 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.

(f) 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.

   (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.

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.
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)
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 2024
## SCOTTISH EPISCOPAL CHURCH
### REPRESENTATION ON OTHER BODIES/ORGANISATIONS – May 2024

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Body/Organisation</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Appointing Body</th>
<th>Start Date*</th>
<th>Fixed Term Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANGLICAN COMMUNION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican Consultative Council</td>
<td>Dr Beth Routledge Second post vacant</td>
<td>Standing Committee</td>
<td>2023-32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican Communion Standing Committee</td>
<td>Primus (alternate member)</td>
<td>Primates Meeting</td>
<td>2022*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglican Communion Networks and Commissions: -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Network</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Mission Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Network</td>
<td>Alan Werritty</td>
<td>Mission Board</td>
<td>2003*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Network</td>
<td>Ley-Anne Forsyth</td>
<td>Mission Board</td>
<td>2020*</td>
<td></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>
<td></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>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTS (Action of Churches Together in Scotland)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee Board</td>
<td>Paul Goldfinch</td>
<td>Faith and Order Board</td>
<td>2015</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHURCH OF SCOTLAND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecumenical Relations Committee</td>
<td>Rev Prof Charlotte Methuen</td>
<td>Inter-Church Relations Committee</td>
<td>2021-2026</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COUNCIL OF THE CHURCH SERVICE SOCIETY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CTBI (Churches Together in Britain and Ireland)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Representatives Forum</td>
<td>John Stuart²</td>
<td>ex officio Secretary General</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIACONAL ASSOCIATION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND</td>
<td>Rev Norma Higgott</td>
<td>Faith and Order Board</td>
<td>2016*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAITH IN COMMUNITY SCOTLAND ACTION FUND</td>
<td>Rev Canon Fay Lamont</td>
<td>Church in Society (annual reappointment)</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></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>GLENALMOND COUNCIL</td>
<td>Primus</td>
<td><em>ex officio College of Bishops</em></td>
<td>2014*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERFAITH GROUP ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE</td>
<td>Hilary Moran</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERFAITH SCOTLAND</td>
<td>Rev Bonnie Evans-Hills</td>
<td>Interfaith Relations Committee</td>
<td>2020*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEISSEN COMMISSION (Celtic Churches Observer)</td>
<td>Rev Dr Maurice Elliot</td>
<td>Church of Ireland</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSION TO SEAFARERS</td>
<td>Bishop of St Andrews, Dunkeld and Dunblane</td>
<td>College of Bishops</td>
<td>2019*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORVOO CONTACT GROUP</td>
<td>Miriam Weibye3</td>
<td>Inter-Church Relations Committee</td>
<td>2016*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REUILLY CONTACT GROUP</td>
<td>Rev Canon John McLuckie</td>
<td>Inter-Church Relations Committee</td>
<td>2016*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTLAND4PEACE STEERING GROUP</td>
<td>Rev David Mumford</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>2008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTTISH CHURCHES COMMITTEE</td>
<td>Peter Sharp</td>
<td>Admin Board</td>
<td>2024*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Stuart4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1996*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTTISH CHURCHES COMMITTEE SAFEGUARDING GROUP</td>
<td>John Wyllie/ Daphne Audsley</td>
<td>Ex officio</td>
<td>2007*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTTISH CHURCHES PARLIAMENTARY OFFICE</td>
<td>Coordination Group</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holyrood Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>2023*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTTISH FAITHS ACTION FOR REFUGEES</td>
<td>Rev Nick Bowry</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>2019*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTTISH PILGRIM ROUTES FORUM</td>
<td>Rev Dr Paul Singh</td>
<td>Mission Board</td>
<td>2023*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITY ENTERPRISE</td>
<td>Rev Les Ireland</td>
<td>Church in Society</td>
<td>2013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES ASSEMBLY</td>
<td>Miriam Weibye</td>
<td>Faith and Order Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORLD DAY OF PRAYER (Scottish Committee)</td>
<td>Rev A Thomasson-Rosingh</td>
<td>College of Bishops</td>
<td>2022</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.
## Expenses Claim

### General Synod 2024 Expenses Claim

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel</strong></td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mileage</strong></td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accommodation Allowance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you submitted an advance claim for accommodation expenses?</td>
<td>Yes ☐ No ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hotel: Dinner, B&amp;B</strong></td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(up to a max of £175 per night)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friends &amp; Family allowance</strong></td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(up to a max of £50 per night)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please attach all receipts (see notes below)**

**TOTAL** £

### Name and Address

(please print)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attending as:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Synod Member</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate GS Member</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Convener</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresher</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please state)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date:** _______________ 2024

### Bank account details for payment of expenses

Either: Use my bank details previously provided to General Synod Office ☐

Or: use the following bank details: ☐

- **Account in the name of:** _____________________________
- **Bank sort code:** _____________________________
- **Bank account number:** _____________________________
- **Email address:** _____________________________

### Notes:

1. Please ensure that this form is returned by not later than **30 June 2024** to the General Synod Office, 21 Grosvenor Crescent, Edinburgh, EH12 5EE or emailed to GSexpenses@scotland.anglican.org.
2. Public transport should be used wherever possible.
3. Central Edinburgh parking costs will only be reimbursed in exceptional circumstances.
4. Maximum overnight rate (including dinner and breakfast) is £175.
5. For members staying with friends and family during Synod an allowance of £50 a night is available to support a contribution by members to the costs incurred by their hosts.
6. Notification of payment of expenses 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/yLkQdBt1rMuM6SSX6. 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 24 June 2024.

1. I appreciated the worship at General Synod
   - AGREE
   - NEUTRAL
   - DISAGREE

2. Sessions were generally chaired competently and clearly
   - AGREE
   - NEUTRAL
   - DISAGREE

3. I consider that the agenda for Synod was appropriate
   - AGREE
   - NEUTRAL
   - DISAGREE

4. I would have liked to have seen the following on the agenda:

5. I felt adequately prepared to participate in the Synod
   - AGREE
   - NEUTRAL
   - DISAGREE

6. I understood how to vote on motions and in elections
   - YES
   - NO

7. My Diocese arranged a pre-Synod meeting of its General Synod members
   - YES
   - NO

8. I think consideration should be given to holding at least some future meetings of Synod online only
   - YES
   - NO

9. I would welcome a return to General Synod operating in hybrid mode
   - YES
   - NO

10. I am a new member of General Synod
    - YES
    - NO

I am from the Diocese of

- Aberdeen & Orkney
- Argyll & The Isles
- Brechin
- Edinburgh
- Glasgow & Galloway
- Moray, Ross & Caithness
- St Andrews, Dunkeld & Dunblane
I am a member of the House of

- LAITY
- CLERGY
- BISHOPS
- I WOULD RATHER NOT SAY

If you would like to include your contact details: name, address, e-mail then please use the space below:

If you have any further comments you wish to make please do so in the space below:

Name (optional):

Thank you for completing the Feedback Form