

*These minutes do not include any wording the Board has agreed be kept confidential in the online publication.*

## Diocese of Leeds Leeds Board (“the Board”)

Minutes of the Board held on 23 September 2019 at Church House, 17/19 York Place, Leeds LS1 2EX.

### Present:

The Rt Revd Nick Baines (Chair), Mr Matthew Ambler, The Ven Paul Ayers, Mr Simon Baldwin, Mrs Marilyn Banister, Ms Kay Brown, The Revd Canon Sam Corley, The Ven Dr Anne Dawtry, The Very Revd John Dobson, The Revd Canon Kathryn Fitzsimons, The Rt Revd Jonathan Gibbs, The Ven Jonathan Gough, The Rt Revd Dr Helen-Ann Hartley, The Ven Andy Jolley, Mr Andrew Maude, Canon Mrs Ann Nicholl, The Rt Revd Tony Robinson, The Ven Peter Townley, Canon Mr Irving Warnett and The Revd Nigel Wright.

### In Attendance:

Ms Alison Bogle, Mrs Mary Chapman, Mrs Debbie Child, The Revd Canon Andrew Norman, Mr Geoff Park and Mr Chris Tate. Mrs Judith Calvert, Mrs Charlotte Lilley, Ms Janet Edmond and Ms Becky Nicholson attended for part of the meeting.

Item Number	Minute	Action point	Return to Leeds Board?
1	Opening Prayers.  The Revd Nigel Wright led the opening prayers.		
2	Welcome and Apologies.		

	<p>The Bishop of Leeds welcomed Mrs Mary Chapman, Audit Committee Chair of the Archbishops' Council of the Church of England, who had carried out the review of the Diocesan Governance Structures.</p> <p>Mrs Charlotte Lilley, Diocesan Mission &amp; Pastoral Secretary (a secondment post after Judith Calvert leaves).</p> <p>Apologies had been received from The Rt Revd Toby Howarth, The Rt Revd Paul Slater, Canon Mrs Jane Evans, Mr Peter Foskett and Mrs Jane Wardman.</p>		
3	<p>Declarations of conflicts interest.</p> <p>Members were reminded to declare any conflicts of interest concerning any items on the Agenda.</p> <p>No conflicts of interest were disclosed.</p>		
4	<p>Diocesan Governance Review presentation from Mary Chapman LB19 09 02.</p> <p>The Board members had been circulated with a copy of Mary Chapman's review of the diocesan Governance (LB19 09 02). The review document was taken as read. Mary Chapman (MC) gave an overview of the recommendations with an opportunity for Board members to ask general questions. MC had been asked to look at the Parsonages Board, Scrutiny, Mission, and Pastoral. MC outlined that a theme throughout the report was an issue not unique to Leeds Diocese of communication, clarity and simplicity in describing diocesan governance. There were key strands within this: early consultation in discussions on issues, basic information being available and the development of training. MC and the Board members discussed Recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4 and 9-11. Key themes from each these Recommendations were:</p> <p>Recommendation 1 Clarity of identity of the Leeds Board was important. This could be achieved by referring only to the Board rather than the Leeds Board/DBF.</p> <p>Recommendation 2 The Questionnaire data disclosed some confusion about where decisions were made which had a</p>		

	<p>large impact on finances (eg clergy numbers and property assets decisions). Clarity of the role of the Board would need to be regularly enforced and Board members were reminded they had a responsibility as trustees to ensure they asked for information if they did not understand. Clarity was needed about the roles of committees: when they can make decisions, when their role is to advise the Board and accountability on reporting. MC acknowledged that the nature of the church structures meant there was a particular challenge in understanding where decisions are made. In the secular world, it would not be usual to have three or four of the senior executives (ie paid senior leadership positions) on a unitary board where there is a mix of senior executives and non-executive people.</p> <p>Recommendation 3 MC reported that the larger the group the less opportunity there was to have a discussion rather than receive a report and ask a few questions. It was important that the Board exercised effective scrutiny. However, there was the Mission and Pastoral requirement to have all the archdeacons on the DMPC and in the DBF measure to have a roughly 50:50 representation of clergy/laity. It was noted that MC had made some practical suggestions for the management of the current structure.</p> <p>Recommendation 3 and 4 Area Mission and Pastoral Committees What had been delegated to the AMPCs and the counter balancing reporting and accountability needed to be clear, along with the clarity around the strategic role of the DMPC and AMPCs.</p> <p>Parsonages It was noted that the diocese was aware that it needed a property sub-committee and this was why MC had been asked to review this. The current approval process had been implemented to enable decision making on a temporary basis until the property sub-committee was in place. It was noted that reporting back from the current approvals process to the Board direct (rather than as part of the finance report) was missing. MC emphasised that the creation of a property sub-committee was also an opportunity to be more strategic about property and to create policies about buying, selling and maintenance.</p> <p>Recommendations 9 – 11 MC reported that engagement in synodical activity was not what it might be. The Diocesan Synod filled elected places are below the potential places fixed by the Synod. It may be better to have a</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<p>smaller Synod whose members really engage. A working group could be created to look in to the potential of different sized synods. It was pointed out that Synod had disagreed with this when the Board presented it.</p> <p>Training and Induction The induction and training of Synod members could be used to make the synodical role including that of scrutiny (though not on a separate panel but as part of their synodical role) clear to members.</p> <p>Conclusion The diocese needs to decide a plan for the implementation of the recommendations.</p> <p>It was agreed that a small group (The Bishop of Leeds, Debbie Child, Geoff Park, the Chair of the House of Clergy and Chair of the House of Laity of the Diocesan Synod) would draft an action plan for the recommendations.</p> <p>The Bishop of Leeds thanked MC for her review and her commitment to the Diocese of Leeds.</p>	DC to convene Governance Review action plan group.	
	<p><i>Mr Geoff Park, Chief Finance officer joined the meeting.</i></p> <p><i>Ms Becky Nicholson and Ms Janet Edmond, Stewardship Officers joined the meeting.</i></p> <p><i>The Area Bishops were not members of the Diocesan Mission and Pastoral Committee for items 5 and 6 on the Leeds Board agenda.</i></p>		
5	<p>Minutes of the meeting of the Episcopal Areas Mission and Pastoral Committees for noting. LB19 09 03, LB 19 09 03 01, LB19 09 03 02, LB19 09 03 03 and LB19 09 03 04 had been circulated to the Board members via the Leeds Board members' diocesan website page: <a href="http://www.leeds.anglican.org">www.leeds.anglican.org</a>.</p> <p>Judith Calvert confirmed that the minutes were for noting only. There were no questions on the circulated AMPC minutes.</p>		
6	<p>Diocesan Mission and Pastoral report LB19 09 04. A report from the Secretary to the Diocesan Mission and Pastoral Committee had been circulated</p>		

	<p>to the Board members.</p> <p>Judith Calvert highlighted from her report that there was one case in the Wakefield EA where adverse replies had been received to a proposed scheme. From the AMPC minutes, Ripon EAMPC had been looking at team ministries and rural church. Leeds EAMPC was carrying out a review of West Leeds and of Pudsey and Outer West Leeds and Huddersfield EAMPC were looking at proposals for deaneries. There would be thirteen closed churches at the end of 2019.</p> <p>There were no questions.</p> <p>The Bishop of Leeds thanked Judith, who was leaving her role at the end of September 2019, and wished her well for the future.</p>		
	<p><i>The DMPC business ended and the Area Bishops re-joined the meeting again as Members of the Leeds Board. Judith Calvert and Charlotte Lilley left the meeting.</i></p>		
7	<p>Presentation - Parish Giving Scheme.</p> <p>Janet Edmond gave a presentation on the Parish Giving Scheme (PGS). The PGS is a professional donation management system designed for parishes and included Gift Aid support. The PGS was being used by 27 dioceses. The stewardship team was running a pilot of the PGS currently with 88 parishes until December 2019 and would launch the PGS diocesan wide in January 2020 with five launch events in all the episcopal areas.</p> <p>Janet confirmed that increasing the giving annually by the donor to take account of inflation was optional. There was no upper or lower limit on the number of people who could join the PGS from each church and donations could be made anonymously.</p> <p>Janet was thanked for her presentation.</p>		
	<p><i>Becky Nicholson and Janet Edmond left the meeting.</i></p>		

8	<p>Minutes of the Leeds Board held on 11 July 2019 LB19 09 05.</p> <p>The draft Minutes of the Leeds Board held on 11 July 2019 had been circulated. No amendments had been received. The draft Minutes were for approval.</p> <p>The Minutes were approved.</p>	DC to add to minutes book.	
9	<p>Matters arising from the Minutes of the meeting on 11 July 2019.</p> <p>There were no matters arising from the Minutes.</p> <p>There were no matters to be kept confidential/redacted from publication.</p>		
10	<p>Finance Report and Parish Share report 2019 LB19 09 06, LB19 09 06 01, LB19 09 06 02 and LB19 09 06 03.</p> <p>Board members had been circulated with a copy of a Finance Report from Geoff Park (GP) and Irving Warnett (IW), a copy of the Parish Share payments to the 31.7.19, FAIC Minutes of 27 June 2019 and 24 July 2019.</p> <p>GP reported that due to lower expenditure than expected, the finances were ahead of Budget. Parish Share receipts were below Budget but this was offset by property income.</p> <p>There were no questions.</p> <p>Glydegate Building purchase</p> <p>Archdeacon Andy Jolley outlined that negotiation with Bradford Council was making uneven progress. Due to the long delays, the condition of the property was deteriorating and so the SDF budget for renovation may not be sufficient. The architect's estimate for the extra refurbishment work needed to remedy the damage caused by squatters was £100k. GP had now been appointed a director of the Fountains board. A launch event attended by 173 people had been held on 22 September 2019.</p>		

	<p>There were no questions.</p> <p>Parish Share Scheme</p> <p>GP reported that a working group had been formed to review the current parish share scheme with a view to introducing a revised scheme in 2021. The group would identify the issues with the current scheme and work to resolve these and improve the current scheme. The option of a wholesale review had been left open if it was not possible to improve the current scheme. There would also need to be a review of other aspects of the parish share scheme in particular communication, incentives and “consequences” of non-payment.</p> <p>FAIC minutes 24 July 2019 Item 8 – MACE tenancy</p> <p>GP confirmed that two possible tenants were in discussion with the agents. The Budget had included an assumption that there may not be a new tenant immediately.</p>		
11	<p>Safeguarding update LB19 07 07.</p> <p>Members had been circulated with a Safeguarding report. DC reported that as required by PCR 2, the Bishop of Leeds had written to every parish. There was concern that some parishes had replied immediately and DC would be following this up. As well as the review of potential past cases outlined in PCR 2, parishes will also need to set up Subject Referral Groups following a designated process. Few returns have been received so far for the SRGs.</p> <p>Due to the retirement of the present Chair, a new Chairperson was being sought for the diocesan Strategic Safeguarding Committee. There were very specific guidelines (circulated) about what experience the candidate needed to have. Board members were asked to let DC know of any possible candidates.</p> <p>The Bishop of Leeds highlighted that retired clergy must have formal Permission to Officiate, Safeguarding training and be DBS checked before they may perform official duties in the diocese. This must be checked before they did so.</p> <p>There were no questions.</p>	Board members – to let DC know any potential candidates for Chair of the Strategic Safeguarding Committee.	

12	<p>Appointment of member of the Auditors for the Leeds Diocesan Board of Finance LB19 09 08, LB19 09 08 01.</p> <p>Two documents had been circulated to members concerning the appointment of external auditors for the DBF. Geoff Park outlined that the Board was asked to approve the appointment of Saffrey Champness LLP as provider of external audit services to the LDBF. An appointment process had been followed and Saffrey Champness LLP had demonstrated strategic understanding, a forward-looking approach and an understanding of the need for relationship management with finance team and Board. It was recommended that the firm be appointed for three years with an option to extend.</p> <p>The proposal as approved unanimously.</p>		To review in 2022
13	<p>Budget 2020 LB19 09 09.</p> <p>A draft Budget for 2020 and sustainability plan to 2024 had been circulated to the Leeds Board members. The Board was asked to review the proposed budget and approve the following motion:</p> <p><i>“That the Leeds Board approves and recommends to the Diocesan Synod the draft Diocesan Budget 2020 (LB19 09 09) and approves The Revd Nigel Wright to move a money resolution at the Diocesan Synod ‘that the Diocesan Synod authorise (or direct) the diocesan board of finance to raise and expend a sum not exceeding £22,023,181 for the calendar year 2020’”.</i></p> <p>Irving Warnett (IW) gave an overview of the proposed 2020 Budget and sustainability plan. The proposed Budget would result in a small surplus of £53k after transfers from reserves. The key difference from the 2019 budget was the reduction in national church funding. FAIC had rigorously reviewed the proposed budget for vulnerabilities and he felt that £53k surplus was a robust figure. The proposed sustainability plan has the same period as the diocesan Strategy. Various work streams were planned, particularly to review ministry costs, new income streams and building a diocesan mission and strategic investment fund. There remained questions around the pension deficit.</p> <p>Geoff Park (GP) gave a PowerPoint presentation on the detail of the proposed 2020 Budget. The Budget assumptions were a 2% increase in the base share request, a 1% increase in stipends and</p>		



staff salaries, and a continued freeze in the overall Ministry in Parish's budget. Changes to budgeting were driven by lower grants from the national church, higher cost of ministry in parishes, property and support for parishes when compared with 2019 when there has been an underspend and higher expenditure on SDF projects. This was offset by higher parish share income. The operating surplus after reserves transfer was forecast to be £53k. The unrestricted cash deficit after payment of pension deficits is forecast at £1,163k. GP highlighted that casual duty fees had not been reviewed for some time and so an increase was being proposed. Support for parishes was significantly under budget currently and a challenge to keep costs to a similar level has been built in to the proposed budget.

There were no questions.

The Chair proposed the motion set out above:

*“That the Leeds Board approves and recommends to the Diocesan Synod the draft Diocesan Budget 2020 (LB19 09 09) and approves The Revd Nigel Wright to move a money resolution at the Diocesan Synod ‘that the Diocesan Synod authorise (or direct) the diocesan board of finance to raise and expend a sum not exceeding £22,023,181 for the calendar year 2020’”.*

Agreed unanimously.

#### Sustainability Plan 2020-2024

GP gave a PowerPoint presentation of the proposed Sustainability Plan 2020-2024. He highlighted:

- The need to focus on parish share receipts
- Creating new income generation – a new working group was needed for this
- New savings in support costs would be considered
- It was important to recognise that the sustainability plan was dependent on the accuracy of the forecast; it was difficult to plan for the “unknowns”.
- Pensions deficit – it would not be known until the end of 2019 how much the diocese had paid towards the deficit. The calculation of the deficit had been changed and it seems that the deficit will now be paid off by 2023. However, the diocesan contribution is unlikely to reduce.
- Cash flow will be in a healthy position at the start of 2020, mainly due to property sales. It

	<p>was proposed by FAIC that any surplus would be used to i) make the diocesan properties environmentally aligned, ii) create a mission fund and iii) make grants to parishes.</p> <p>The Board members discussed the Sustainability plan. Comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An environmental focus was to be encouraged</li> <li>• Would the parish mission grants be sufficient?</li> <li>• Seed corn funding can assist parishes approach other funding bodies who require matched funding</li> <li>• The mission grants may be welcome for work done at deanery rather than just parish level</li> <li>• There should not be a distinction between paying stipends and mission as the clergy were at the heart of mission.</li> </ul> <p>GP and IW were thanked for their work on the Budget and Sustainability Plan.</p>		
<p>14</p>	<p>2020 Deanery Synods Elections – formula for determination of parish lay membership allocations LB19 09 10.</p> <p>A revised paper “LS19 09 10 revised” had been circulated to the Board members. The Ven Andy Jolley outlined that elections for the deanery synod lay members were due to be held in 2020. The Diocesan Synod had to approve a formula for determining the allocation for lay deanery synod membership for the parishes. The revised formula included an adjustment to the formula used in the 2017 elections. This added an allocation of two for parishes between 26-50 and an increase of the allocation for all the other bands of one members. This revised formula sought to take in to account that in determining the allocations, the size of the deanery synod should not be more than 150 and, so far as practicable, be not less than 50 members.</p> <p>The proposal:</p> <p><i>“That the proposals for determining the number of lay members to be elected to Deanery Synods from the parishes in the 2020 deanery synod elections as set out in paper LB19 09 10 revised be recommended for approval to Diocesan Synod.”</i></p> <p>was approved.</p>	<p>DC to circulate with DS agenda.</p>	
<p>15</p>	<p>Reader Review update.</p>		

Members had considered the Reader Review at the last meeting and had been circulated with a document “Reader Review Way Forward”. The Revd Canon Andrew Norman, Director of Ministry and Mission and Kay Brown led a plenary discussion.

AN outlined that there were 380 active licensed Readers in the diocese. The age profiles for these are 51% are 60 and 69 years, 30% are 50 and 59 years, 11% are 40 to 49 years and the remaining 7% are over 69 years. A review of Reader ministry was included in the diocesan Strategy goal of re-imagining ministry and this was in line with a national trend for dioceses to review Reader ministry for their contexts. A steering group had been set up to carry out the review for the diocese. A questionnaire had been circulated to licensed Readers, clergy and focus groups in the episcopal areas. Kay Brown gave an overview of the analysis of the feedback, looking at age profile, distribution, context, PCC membership, core calling (actual and perceived) and training. Andrew Norman highlighted the threefold vision of the Church Readers Council.

Board members were asked to feedback. This included:

- Reader ministry was set up to be outward looking to the wider world
- Unfortunately, the question about being a leader referred to both church and society
- What is the objective of the review? Is it trying to refine Reader ministry for a new generation or creating a new form of ministry in an old container? Do we have a “both and” approach? Do we need Readers, but could some of what is being proposed be done in another way?
- Could there be a skew to the responses from existing Readers because of their age profile? Ministry is viewed differently by each age group.
- There are missing voices in the responses from those who did not train as Readers when the current Readers trained.
- Joint clergy and laity CME should be encouraged and would be beneficial.
- Training structures can prevent younger people from training as Readers. Younger people need more flexibility.
- Reader ministry experience will differ depending on when Readers were trained and this will be reflected in their responses.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ministry is not about fulfilling the needs of the minister but about the needs of church and mission.</li> </ul>		
16	<p>Any other business.</p> <p>The Rhythm of Life A paper from the Revd Canon Andrew Norman, Diocesan Director of Ministry and Mission had been tabled. The Bishop of Ripon outlined to the Board that the paper had been tabled as a progress report for the Board members' information and for prayers. There was a correction to the named steering group members, The Revd Paul Maybury was a member of the group. The item would be discussed at the forthcoming Bishops Staff meeting and would be an agenda item at the November Board meeting.</p> <p>Diocesan Teams update The Board members had been circulated with a report from the Director of Communications, Director of Ministry and Mission and the Director of Education. The Bishop of Leeds outlined that this was a new report for the Board members. A similar report is made at the Bishop's Staff meetings. It was felt that it would be beneficial for the Board members to receive a similar overview from the diocesan teams. Board members were asked to send any questions direct to Chris Tate, Richard Noake or Andrew Norman, as appropriate.</p>	DC - Rhythm of Life: add to November 2019 Board agenda.	
17	<p>Close.</p> <p>The Bishop of Leeds closed the meeting with the Grace.</p>		

Signed:.....

Date: .....