



## Kea Church PCC Standing Committee (SC)

### Minutes of Meeting held Monday 9<sup>th</sup> April 2018

**Present:** Marc Baker (MB) - Chair, Sian Goddard, Graham Loveland, Peter Short, Alan Stanhope, Jean Stanhope, John Taylor.

**1. Opening Prayer** – Jean Stanhope.

**2. Apologies for absence**

Jonathan Larkin.

**3. Approval of Minutes of meeting of 12<sup>th</sup> February**

Approved and signed.

**4. Matter Arising**

4.1 DBS forms. It was still proving difficult to obtain the necessary documentation from one person who teaches in Sunday Club.

**Action: Peter Short to follow up and report to Marc as necessary.**

4.2 Development Plan. An abridged version had been posted on the church website.

4.3 PCC Policies Review. Graham Loveland said owing to other commitments neither Kerstin Schuh nor Richard Card were likely to be able to perform the detailed reviews of policies on Complaints Handling and Risk respectively. Kerstin had indicated that the Complaints policy ideally required reworking but was usable. Regarding risk, Alan Stanhope argued that overseeing risk required the breadth of awareness of church activities that was realistically only available to a member of paid staff. Peter Short suggested that consultation with leaders in specific areas would indicate areas of potential risk.

**Action: Marc and Sian to discuss responsibility for risk**

**5. APCM**

5.1 Paper on “Becoming a member of the PCC 2018”. This had been withdrawn following a number of adverse comments from some PCC members. Criticisms had focused on whether it was discriminatory (a) to expect new members to be sympathetic to existing plans and (b) to expect members to use electronic media for PCC communications.

Alan Stanhope, as lead author of the paper, suggested that with regard to (b), PCC members who did not have access to electronic media would, unavoidably, be disadvantaged: it is not

practicable to conduct communications without it. Regarding (a) there were differences of emphasis within the Standing Committee as between:

- Those who argued that the potential turnover of one third of the PCC membership each year, avoiding “reinventing the wheel”, plus the need to plan for the long term required new members to be broadly sympathetic to the existing plans.
- Those who felt that it was inappropriate to expect everyone to agree with everything and that challenge was helpful, albeit broad agreement with plans was still necessary.

Differences on this specific issue seemed more of emphasis than real substance (how broad is broad agreement?) but raised wider issues of principle regarding the roles of the PCC as between their duty (as charged, with the Vicar) to provide leadership to the church versus their duty (as trustees) to challenge, to which no easy answer was seen as the PCC has to perform both roles.

It was proposed to revisit the issue later in the year with the new PCC with the paper to be tabled again for PCC discussion.

#### 5.2 Induction process for new members of the PCC.

The planned process of induction and training for new members of the PCC might need to revisit some of the discussions and decisions taken in 2017 in the “Fit for Purpose” process to ensure clear understanding.

**Action: Marc and Alan Stanhope to plan the induction process and set a date.**

5.3 Reducing the size of the PCC. Marc reviewed how the PCC had arrived at its decision to progressively reduce the number of elected members from 15 to 9 in the light of the creation of the Leadership Teams. He emphasized that this was a decision for the PCC not for the Vicar. It was agreed that a written proposal needed to be given to church members in advance of the APCM explaining the rationale. Peter Short agreed to write that and speak to the proposal at the APCM.

**Action: Graham Loveland to provide Peter with background and wording and to prepare voting slips.**

#### 5.4 Other APCM Matters

Sian Goddard explained that the Financial Statements had been produced and published as required. Other essential reports (Buildings, Vicar’s, Deanery Synod), as legally required, would be given but this year narrative reports would not be included in the written report but would be displayed on boards around All Hallows.

### **6. Development Plan/3 Next Steps**

John Taylor reported on amounts pledged to date. The level of response was less than had been hoped for (but developments subsequent to the meeting suggested that more responses were still being received). Peter Short suggested that actual giving would be likely to exceed advance promises.

Although the responses, in terms of amounts pledged, did not provide clarity or evidence of a clear mandate to proceed on any of the three proposed steps, Sian reported that feedback had mostly been positive, however there were a lot of misunderstandings and false rumours circulating. Nevertheless it was clear that both members and the PCC remained divided over the way ahead.

Sian suggested that the PCC now need to take action on the staff appointment and in time give consideration to steps 1 and 2.

**Action: Sian Goddard to collate responses from the Pledge process and circulate a note to members of the PCC as a matter of urgency in advance of reporting back to the church at the APCM.**

## **7. Finance**

7.1 Update. The statutory accounts had been returned from the Independent examiner with a “clean bill of health” and had been duly published. A “layman’s” summary would be produced together with the APCM presentation.

7.2 Summary of previous giving for CAP and Youth. Annual (2017) totals of giving specifically for CAP and Youth had amounted to £12312 and £14100 respectively. It was pointed out that numbers of people had been asked to move their giving to one church and so the income on these accounts did not reflect the actual picture of support for the work.

7.3 Expense claim forms. John Taylor said that there had been little feedback but the new formats seemed to be acceptable.

7.4 Monthly Church and Budget Holders’ Updates. John said these had been delayed owing to the process of producing the Financial Statements but that February and March Updates should be out soon. John said he would like to rationalize and reduce the number of separate budgets.

**Action: John Taylor to make some proposals regarding rationalization.**

7.5 Staff Pensions. Sian Goddard explained that, owing to a misunderstanding, employers’ contributions to staff pensions had not been increased as intended during 2017. In order to compensate for this error and to leave staff in the originally-intended position she suggested that contributions for this year could be raised.

At this point Sian left the meeting before any decisions on pensions were made.

Proposed by Alan Stanhope and agreed unanimously that 3% contribution should be made from this April. It was agreed that the level of employers’ contribution for 2019 should be revisited as part of the budget process in the latter part of 2018.

Sian then returned to the meeting.

## **8. Matters for the PCC Agenda**

8.1 Chairs of LTs. Marc reprised that it had been hoped that Chairs of Leadership Teams would be members of the PCC. However the AHLT was currently struggling to appoint a Chair whilst the TLT Chair was not currently on the PCC, whilst Hilary Rowe (Chair of the MWG) had resigned from the PCC. It was felt that it was still desirable in principle that the Chairs (especially of the congregational Leadership Teams) should be on the PCC so as to be able to apprise the PCC of the life of their congregations and to be the main point of contact. Had a role been created that it was not possible to recruit to? This would be brought to the May PCC meeting.

**Action: Graham Loveland for the May PCC agenda.**

## **9. AOB**

9.1 Approval of revisions to the Staff Handbook. Agreed.

## **10. Closing Prayer.** Marc

