

Archdeaonries Review Group Report

Contents

Introduction

Section A: Past Reviews

Section B: Role of Archdeacon

Section C: Key Learning from conversations

Section D: Finance

Section E: Insights from other dioceses

Section F: Strategic Development Officer Role

Section G: Archdeaconry reorganisation

Section H: Report Recommendations

Section I: Moving Forwards Options

Section J: Timetable

Please note that for any initial comments to be reflected at the Bishop's Council meeting on 7 November, they should be submitted to Cameron.butland@carlisle-diocese.org.uk by Monday 31 October. After 31st October further comments may be made prior to the Bishop's Council Residential in January. Following the January meeting the proposed way forward will be sent to Diocesan Synod members with the agenda and debated at the March Diocesan Synod.

Introduction

The Archdeaonries Review Group (ARG) was set up by the Bishop's Council at the January 2022 Residential. At this meeting Bishop's Council supported Bishop James in setting up a process to appoint a new Bishop of Penrith. As a result of this decision, it was felt that serious consideration should be given to the 2021 Task Force's recommendation to cut the senior staff to four posts. The implication of these two decisions would be that the diocese would have only two archdeacons going forward. ARG was given the authority to consider the three archdeaonries, the current role of the archdeacons, and to bring back a report to the September meeting.

This report sets out the information received as part of the consultation as well as general comments made during a series of conversations. In no way should any of the following be taken as criticism of those who are currently archdeacons. This paper is an honest and open assessment of the understanding of the role of archdeacon and offers a consideration of different future possibilities. The report has no preferred option, although some of the options suggested are more feasible than others. Rather this is a document which will inform discussion and debate of the way forward for the diocese.

The decision by the Archdeacon of Carlisle to step down from his role and to leave the Diocese, of course alters the context of this discussion and debate. Over the coming months his various roles and responsibilities will be covered by the other two Archdeacons and Assistant Archdeacon. As a result of this announcement on 31st August there is an opportunity to assess what the diocese is looking for in the archdeacons, to ask how their role most usefully supports the ecumenical county and, in this assessment, to ensure that they are not overwhelmed by the many demands being made upon them.

Given that the Archdeaconry of Carlisle is being covered in the interim by the other archdeacons for the rest of the year, this naturally gives space and time to consider this report and its various options. Of course, given the change in the context, it may be that now other ways forward will present themselves. Only by the widest consultation and discussion can the diocese come to a common mind on the best way forward.

In section J an outline timetable is given which will allow a time for debate. We would ask that everyone who reads this report will give serious consideration of the many complex issues involved.

Our grateful thanks go to those many people who have taken the time and trouble to contribute to the report and who have expressed their views so clearly. The role of this working group is now completed with the presentation of this report, but each of the members will continue to join in the ongoing discussions leading up to the Bishop's Council in January 2023 when proposals about the future role of the archdeacons will need to be agreed.

Cameron Butland, 18th October 2022

Section A: Past Reviews

Introduction: In the past 15 years the Archidiaconal role has been reviewed and developed on a number of occasions.

Reviews and Changes since 2007: Specific reviews or changes that we have identified include:

1. 2007-8: Foundation for Church Leadership and Clarity Development

In 2007-8 the Foundation for Church Leadership and Clarity Development Consultants undertook a consultation around the Diocese and made suggestions including:

‘Identifying things that Archdeacons should DO:

- equip clergy and laity for growth
- mentor and support clergy
- make connections across the Diocese, bringing people together for sharing of ideas, experience, skills

‘...and things they should BE:

- enablers for ministry and mission
- facilitators for vision, helping parishes work out what the Bishop’s vision means for them’

The role was also viewed as:

- Enabling experiment – eg advice and creation of liturgy, resources, new ways of engaging the local community
- Expert evangelist, event resource
- Finger on the church’s cultural pulse and the Cumbrian pulse
- The mechanism behind growth – vision, MAP, leading change, communication

In 2008, following that review, appointments were made in the West and North Archdeaconries with the following purpose/key responsibilities in the West role description being to:

- Promote and sustain a vision for church growth under the Diocesan Plan “Survival to Revival”. Use a wide range of opportunities to enable and support clergy and parishes in growing in all ways, including those that can be measured.
- Champion and sponsor social responsibility including community engagement and development, health care chaplaincy and industrial mission.
- Provide credible, inspirational leadership as part of the senior team in the diocese during a period of change. Work collaboratively with colleague Archdeacons and others. Show pastoral sensitivity while encouraging change and development.

Following the review and appointment of two new Archdeacons a further piece of work with Clarity Development was undertaken to identify and enable development in the role. Relevant extracts from that work include:

‘XX requested his own role description be brought in line with the more recent Archdeacon role descriptions, so as to include overtly the growth agenda as a priority within his role.

‘The team acknowledged that further work was needed to think the growth agenda through, including clarity about which parts they are to facilitate, and about how much does the growth agenda determine fresh work, to what extent it is about the slant of existing responsibilities and tasks, and what current portfolios can realistically be handed to others to enable this to happen. Within this, discussions at senior level about ‘mission units/zones/clusters’ [in many ways precursors to today’s Mission Communities] would be helpful, what they look like, how they perform and how to get from reality as it is today to the ‘mission zones’.

‘The team expressed enthusiasm for the Vision and Strategy work that is to be undertaken by the Bishop’s staff team at the forthcoming [in 2009/10] Residential Staff meetings. They see this as the essential foundation for developing strategy and are hopeful that clarity about the growth elements of their role will emerge from this process. The Archdeacons are keen that the work that has commenced concerning the respective roles of RDs, Archdeacons and the suffragan bishop be completed; as they seek to work together to enable growth in the Diocese. NB They counsel some realism about the [scope to extend the] role of Rural Deans.’

The review and subsequent work suggested that there was more of a different emphasis to the role than it of itself being a different role from previously.

2. Hours worked 2010

In 2010 the Archdeacons benchmarked their hours worked in different aspects of their roles. There were marked variations between the total numbers of hours worked and how these were broken down. Total weekly hours of work reported varied from 82 (including 10 hours of prayer, reading and retreat time) to 49. The main elements of work were:

- supporting growth (triennial visitations, appraisals, services/preaching, working with individual clergy and PCCs): 11 – 14 hours
- troubleshooting (local/clergy pastoral issues): 2 – 18 hours
- administration (DAC, pastoral schemes, admission of CWs, surrogate): 10 – 20 hours
- senior management (Bishop’s Staff, DBF, Bishop’s Council): 5 – 6 hours
- portfolios (eg Communications, Social Responsibility, DBE, Young Diocese, Rural Diocese, Ecumenical Officer): 10 – 14 hours
- prayer, reading and retreat: 0 - 10 hours
- travel: 4 – 15 hours

This suggests that the three Archdeacons took very different approaches to fulfilling the responsibilities of the role, including the extent to which they became involved in local 'issues'.

3. Growth Officers 2011

By 2011 Archdeacons were being explicitly referred to as Growth Officers. The advert for the Archdeacon of Westmorland and Furness at that time stated the following in describing the role:

'The successful candidate will work collaboratively as part of the Bishop's Leadership Team to realise the Diocesan Vision and Strategy "Growing Disciples":

- providing inspirational leadership during a period of major change
- promoting and enabling church growth
- leading and sponsoring specific projects under the Diocesan Vision
- clergy appraisals, mentoring and pastoral care
- statutory and customary responsibilities as Archdeacon'

The reference to leadership reflects the emphasis being given within the Diocese at that time to 'transformational leadership' as the single most important factor in enabling revival and growth.

The role as described is however not significantly different from that described in the 2007-8 review.

4. Strategy Development Officers (SDO) 2017

In the mid 2010s, the Ecumenical County was established, with three (and then four) partner denominations and an agreement to work towards a fully ecumenical strategy 'God for All' including the creation of ecumenical mission communities within which mission and ministry would be jointly resourced. Alongside this ecumenical collaboration the Archdeacons became 'Strategy Development Officers' (SDOs) whose role in terms of progressing God for All extended across the three denominations. This did not extend to any legal formal aspects such as MDR and appraisal which have remained the responsibility of individual denominations.

The role description used for the recruitment of new Archdeacons in 2017 gave some emphasis to the SDO role alongside specifically Anglican elements, as follows:

- Implement the strategy of developing ecumenical Mission Communities in the Archdeaconry of Carlisle
- Contribute to the leadership of the diocese as member of its senior leadership team
- Share closely with the Bishops in the pastoral care and administration of the four deaneries in the Carlisle Archdeaconry
- Have a dynamic passion to assist the churches of the Archdeaconry to be intentionally missional in engaging with the ecumenical God for All strategy

5. God for All implementation protocols 2018

In 2018 as part of codifying the governance of God for All a protocol for the SDO role was drafted. It was discussed at God for All meetings at the time but was not agreed by all the Archdeacons. As a result it was never formally approved or explicitly implemented although some of the elements have naturally happened in the course of the SDOs' work. The protocol described the roles of the SDOs as follows:

'The key role of the Strategy Development Officers (SDOs) is to support, promote and encourage the totality of God for All in the area that they cover.

'A key role of the Programme Office is to support them in this role.

'In terms of the God for All Programme the overall role of the SDOs is to:

- a. liaise with the appropriate structures (such as Area Steering Groups) in determining the shape of mission communities across their archdeaconries and obtaining local agreement;
- b. liaise with the proto-mission communities in developing their plans for mission, ministry and leadership, including staffing, administrative support, financial and governance arrangements, the filling of vacancies, the appointment of mission community leaders, etc.;
- c. determine when mission communities are in or are likely to be in a suitable state to be launched or commissioned;
- d. monitor the establishment and operation of mission communities;
- e. oversee the leadership of mission communities;
- f. promote and encourage missional imagination and pioneering;
- g. ensure the growth of discipleship, vocations and the growth of the role of the laity in mission, ministry and leadership;
- h. ensure that mission communities, as they develop and flourish, wholeheartedly engage with the variety of denominations and churches in their area;
- i. oversee and promote the opportunities for learning and development across their area;
- j. monitor the missional aspects of mission communities.

'Above all a key part of the role of the SDOs is to ensure the missional role of the mission communities.'

6. Archdeacon Portfolios 2018

In 2018, within the ambit of the Bishop's Staff Meeting, there was also a brief review of the Archdeacons' respective portfolios of wider responsibilities (eg themes such as social responsibility, membership of Diocesan Boards such as the Board of Education and engagement with partners) and their involvement in Diocesan meetings. This made some assessment of the scope to divide up Diocesan meetings between Archdeacons so that they did not all have to attend all meetings such as DAC, Bishop's Council, but any changes enacted were very limited in scope.

7. Lynas Report

The report by Stephen Lynas in November 2022 considered the role of the Archdeacons as well as arguments in favour and against appointing a new Bishop of Penrith. Stephen commented:

“POSSIBILITY B: If you decide to reduce the Archdeacons’ posts...

Amongst the people I spoke to, opinions differed as to whether the diocese could function effectively with two, rather than three Archdeaconries. Traditional loyalties are strong for many, and the geographical differences between West and East, and between the towns and the deep rural areas were stated as reasons why the three present Archdeaconries make sense. On the other hand, the potential for Cumbria becoming two Unitary authorities, for some, gave a basis for re-working the map into two Archdeaconries that would match the new secular authorities.

The real issue is surely workload. I encountered some dissatisfaction with the joint responsibilities in the present system of Archdeacon and Strategic Development Officer. It was said that there are conflicts between the need to be the ‘bulldog’ archdeacon and the more nurturing aspects of encouraging of Mission Community development. Others I spoke to stress the Archdeacon’s knowledge of activity at ground level and the welcome broadening it gives to their jobs.

There are items in their portfolios which are not well understood, and some have parish responsibilities. A number of people (including Archdeacons) felt that if the diocese were to reduce to two Archdeaconries, then some work would have to stop, and other tasks changed. It was said that ‘leaner’ archdeacons would be needed, and various suggestions were made:

- Not all Archdeacons need to be at DAC.
- If we are serious about Mission Communities, then clergy Ministerial Development Reviews could be devolved to the Mission Community leadership, rather than remaining with Archdeacons.
- Visitations could be devolved to Rural Deans
- You would need both Bishops to be present for significant amounts of time in the diocese to make senior leadership more present.
- The two archdeacons should not remain as Strategic Development Officers for their ‘patch’: a revised diocesan strategy should place this role elsewhere. (Views differ as to whether the Mission Communities are sufficiently embedded for this.)

The process of moving from three archdeaconries to two requires pastoral re-organisation. There are statutory procedures for this (which are in the process of being eased by General Synod), but they require time and consultation. Even if and when the Diocesan Synod agrees to a change, other steps are required, and it is possible that it could not all be achieved within the months that remain of Bishops James’s tenure.

Individual’s ministries and homes are also involved. There is a mechanism for compensation in circumstances when a priest is dispossessed of their office, but it

would inevitably be painful and disruptive, and would go against any statements that reductions can be achieved by natural wastage. The recent ‘job share’ within the West Cumberland Archdeaconry means that potentially there are four people whose jobs would be at risk, to be replaced by two. A decision would have to be made as to whether there was open advertising for the two ‘new’ posts, or the present incumbents were put in a pool to fill the two vacancies from the (four) current post holders. In any event, it is possible that existing post holders might choose to leave and ease the process, but there can be no expectations or guarantees of that. To go down this route would require firm leadership and wise pastoral care, but it would establish a firm base for the next diocesan bishop to work with, rather than inheriting the current problem.”

8. Direction of Travel: The consistent direction throughout the reviews in was to shape the role around enabling and equipping clergy and churches for mission and growth while fulfilling the statutory and customary Archidiaconal duties. Some of the changes and developments have been to use the statutory and customary duties as levers for mission and growth (eg proposals for the re-ordering of church buildings, appointments, MDR and appraisal) while others have introduced more strategic tasks (promoting the establishment of ecumenical mission communities, planning, commissioning and supporting the delivery of Mission Community Leadership Development Programme).

Section B: Role of Archdeacon

The role of an Archdeacon varies in the Church of England. Most of those who offer a view in conversations with the members of the working party recognised the heavy workload of the existing archdeacons. However, there were many comments suggesting that the archidiaconal role should be the primary focus and that some of the roles currently taken on could be done by other people. Section F will look at this issue in more detail. However, it is the view of the working party that archdeacons should prioritize the following roles when managing their workload.

Diocesan governance – *ex officio* memberships exercised by an archdeacon

1. Diocesan Synod – Church Representation Rules 2020 (CRR), Rule 31(1)(b); meets 3 times per annum.
2. Carlisle Diocesan Board of Finance (CDBF) – CDBF Articles of Association, para 3(c); meetings of the CDBF form part of the proceedings of Diocesan Synod.
3. Bishop’s Council – Diocesan Synod standing orders Rule 72.1, as required by CRR Rule 44(2)(h); 4 evening meetings per annum and one residential.
4. Diocesan Advisory Committee (DAC) – Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction and Care of Churches Measure 2018, para 2(1)(b) of Schedule 2; 8 meetings per year, 7 sets of site meetings per year per archdeaconry.

5. Diocesan Parsonages Board – Repair of Benefice Buildings Measure 1972, para 1(4); meetings combined with the Mission and Pastoral Committee as MAPP.
6. Mission and Pastoral Committee (MAPP) – Mission and Pastoral Measure 2011 (MPM), para 4 of Schedule 1; the Diocesan Mission and Pastoral Committee rarely operates, there is an Archdeaconry Mission, Pastoral and Parsonages Committee for each archdeaconry, each of which normally meets 4 times per annum.
7. DBF Finance Committee (as Trustees & Directors)– CDBF Articles of Association, para 32(b); 6 meetings per annum.
8. Vacancy in See Committee (by election from within the group)
9. Bishop’s Leadership Team – not a statutory duty.

Parochial governance

10. Annual visitation – Canon C22, para 5; under para 2 can be delegated to an official or commissary.
11. Convening extraordinary meetings of a PCC – CRR, Rule M14.
12. Guiding benefices in the appointment process during a vacancy and inducting the priest – Canon C22, para 5 (but can be delegated).

Buildings and Property

13. Processing applications under List B of the Faculty Jurisdiction Rules 2015 (FJR) – FJR, Rule 3.3. The archdeacon is the only person (other than the chancellor) who can authorise an application, however there is scope for someone to undertake the preliminary work and make a recommendation to the archdeacon.
14. Dealing with the removal of articles to a place of safety – FJR, Rule 8.1.
15. Granting licenses for temporary re-ordering – FJR Rules 8.2/8.3.
16. Other involvement in faculty proceedings – e.g. FJR, Rule 10.1(d) as an ‘interested person’.
17. Responsibilities in person or by deputy to survey all churches and churchyards (triennial visitations) – Canon C22, para 5.
18. Enforcing the requirement for a quinquennial inspection – Inspection of Churches Measure 1955 Section 2 and Schedule 45 of Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction and Care of Churches Measure 2018.

Pastoral re-organisation

19. The archdeacon is an ‘interested party’ in relation to pastoral proposals affecting in their archdeaconry. In practice they play a key role in identifying the need and consulting with interested parties – MPM, Section 6.
20. Similarly involved in pastoral church buildings schemes (church closures) – MPM, Section 21.

Pastoral care of clergy and clergy discipline

21. ‘He shall see that all such as hold any ecclesiastical office within the same perform their duties with diligence, and shall bring to the bishop’s attention

- what calls for correction or merits praise’ – Canon C22 para 4, again under para 2 can be delegated to an official or commissary.
22. Assisting the bishop in the examination of candidates for ordination – Canon C7.
 23. Following a request for an enquiry on the grounds of serious pastoral breakdown the bishop will refer it to the archdeacon to report on whether, in their opinion, such an enquiry should be instituted – Incumbents (Vacation of Benefices) Measure 1977.
 24. Under paras 15-17 of the Code of Practice the archdeacon may act as a complainant under CDM – Clergy Discipline Measure 2003 and Code of Practice 2021.
 25. The archdeacon is normally the person appointed by the bishop to oversee an enquiry into the capability of an office holder under Common tenure – Ecclesiastical Offices Regulations 2009, Capability Procedure para 4.1.
 26. The archdeacon is normally responsible for overseeing the formal stages of the grievance procedure – grievance procedure under Regulation 32 of the Ecclesiastical Offices (Terms of Service) Regulations 2009.
 27. The archdeacon generally is the first point of contact for low level complaints and has a significant pastoral role in defusing problems before they develop into major issues.

Section C: Conversations and Key Issues

Members of the review group interviewed thirty-three people in leadership roles in the diocese, in Mission Communities and among ecumenical partners. There was a very broad cross-section of lay and clergy consulted. In addition, there were a similar number of conversations about the role of an archdeacon with those in other dioceses and with some of those who had previously worked in the diocese. This section highlights some of the key learning points and issues raised from these conversations. All comments are anonymised.

- a) The starting point should be the work that is required. Once that’s defined, we can work out which roles are required.
- b) Customary and statutory duties – given the size of the Diocese these aspects of the role are unlikely to require more than 1/3 of each Archdeacon’s time
- c) Supporting Diocesan Governance through committee structure (some but not all aspects of which are customary/statutory eg DBF, DAC, AMAP, Rydal Hall, DBE, MAT, adhoc working groups etc) – traditionally Archdeacons have been expected to provide Diocesan/leadership input to, or lead/chair many elements of the structure
- d) Aspects of pastoral care of the clergy – in Carlisle the two Bishops take on a significant responsibility in this area and the new Bishop of Penrith’s role is explicitly focused on support to clergy, lay leaders and parishes. Given that there are only around 120 local clergy roles (stipendiary, house for duty and self-supporting) in the Diocese, the two Bishops have capacity to provide the bulk of routine pastoral care. With the creation of Mission Communities there is also an expectation that Mission Community Leaders will increasingly support a local ministry team.

- e) SDO implementing strategy – the experience of the last 8 years is that Archdeacons working as SDOs across the ecumenical county has had mixed success. Reasons for this are not entirely in the hands of the archdeacons.
- f) unless the Archdeacons' role involves substantial pastoral support for local clergy (which would duplicate what could be expected from Bishops), and assuming that some aspects of strategy implementation – particularly the hands-on support for Mission Communities – will be better undertaken in other ways, at most two Archdeacons are required.
- g) Personal relationships, an Archdeacon must know their parishes and mission communities both in terms of people but also their buildings, financial resources and local specifics. They must have an independent knowledge when problems arise and make sure that Churchwardens are abiding by legislation. Diplomacy and direction are key qualities in these relationships.
- h) DAC: If the number of Archdeacons reduced, key role within DAC mustn't be reduced. Need the Archdeacons to be involved in the DAC meetings and tackle issues e.g. quinquennials falling behind.
- i) Implementation of mission communities needs to be seen through. Accountability is required at all levels.
- j) Archdeacons need to be able to answer more queries instead of just forwarding them on. They should be a point of contact who have a broader view and greater knowledge.
- k) Concern about the geographical impact of moving to two. Geographical determination – need to be able to visit the people and the places.
- l) Need for Archdeacons to work together. The Archdeacons should model best behaviour and show care in all circumstances.
- m) Take SDO role out but add assistant Archdeacons in – normal clergy with a bit added on (not increasing numbers). This has been done elsewhere.
- n) Appointments process needs to be followed consistently and in order, the Archdeacons need to work with the team of people in Bishop's House and Church House to provide a simple and easy procedure for everyone involved.
- o) Archdeacons' role is to provide oversight and not to spend time covering vacancies e.g Sunday services / exhumations – covering for a lack of functioning PCCS. Rural Dean role needs to be developed.
- p) Visitations need to be held every three years, there has been slippage and the triannual process is important to hold clergy and parishes to account, but also to allow parishes to raise issues directly with Archdeacons.
- q) Some concerned that if the two archdeacons cover a vacant archdeaconry, they would be pressurised for two that are left. Rather at the next vacancy there is a need to have a really good system of delegation and feedback. Ultimately with delegation you have to have accountability to Archdeacons
- r) Building issues: Is there capacity to deal with these time-consuming issues.

Recommendation 1: that the effectiveness of the Archdeacons' role in relation to the DAC be reviewed

Recommendation 2: If one of Options A-D (below) is pursued then the number of Deaneries should be reviewed. If Options B or C are pursued the role of the Rural Dean should also be reviewed.

Section D: Finance

The Diocesan Board of Finance funds the costs of Archdeacons, including their housing, expenses and administrative support.

Costs: Approximate annual average unit costs (2022/3) are:

| Item | | |
|--|--------|--------|
| Stipend | 38,123 | |
| National Insurance | 4,422 | |
| Pension | 13,724 | |
| Total Payroll | | 56,269 |
| | | |
| Housing (maintenance, repairs, council tax, water, insurance) | | 7,261 |
| Expenses (assuming 10% carbon neutral reductions are applied to historic baseline) | | 8,528 |
| Removals, resettlement (assuming an appointment every 8 years) | | 600 |
| Training (CME) | | 300 |
| Administrative Support | | 11,209 |
| | | |
| Total Average Annual Running Costs | | 84,167 |

Each Archdeacon is housed in a DBF property. The average capital value of the properties is £450,000. The annual opportunity cost of capital (ie the return if the capital was invested in CBF Investment Fund or Property Fund units) is £18,000.

Total Costs:

| | |
|---|---------|
| Direct (payroll, housing, expenses etc) | 72,658 |
| Support (admin, training) | 11,509 |
| Housing Capital | 18,000 |
| | |
| Total | 102,167 |

The full average annual cost of an Archdeacon post is therefore: £102,167.

Section E: Insights from other dioceses

In March 2022 an exercise was undertaken to benchmark the number of Archdeacons and Suffragan Bishops in dioceses across the CofE against number of local clergy, church buildings and benefices.

33 out of 42 Dioceses responded in full, providing a robust data set for comparison between Dioceses. The data of itself does not relate to different models of leadership and pastoral support between Diocese (eg the respective roles of Bishops, Archdeacons and Rural Deans), nor does it account for the special character of the ecumenical relationships in Cumbria. Care should therefore be taken not to draw simplistic comparisons without understanding other contextual factors. However, the data at the very least raises questions which are worthy of further investigation.

Headline Analysis

Various approaches could be taken to analysing the data. The approach taken to date has simply been to produce consistent set of ratios between numbers of archdeacons and numbers of stipendiary clergy, church buildings and benefices.

On those measures, the data shows:

- Carlisle has the lowest ratio of stipendiary clergy to archdeacons of any mainland diocese in the CofE. The ratio of Carlisle (1:25) is less than half of the national average (1:53).
- If we were to have two archdeacons our ratio for stipendiary clergy to archdeacons (1:37.5) would rank us 7 out of 32 mainland dioceses.
- Carlisle has the 5th lowest ratio of benefices to archdeacons of any mainland diocese. The ratio in Carlisle (1:40) is approximately 2/3s of the national average (1:58)
- If were to have two archdeacons our ratio of benefices to archdeacons (1:60) would rank us 13 out of 32 mainland dioceses.
- Carlisle has a slightly lower ratio of church buildings to archdeacons (1:110) than the average of mainland dioceses (1:146).
- If we were to have two archdeacons our ratio for church buildings to archdeacons (1:165) would be slightly above the national average.

| diocese | number of archdeacons (posts) | number of suffragan or area bishops (posts) | number of stipendiary clergy (posts) | stipendiary clergy per archdeacon | number of church buildings | church buildings per archdeacon | number of benefices | parishes | benefices per archdeacon |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|----------|--------------------------|
| Lincoln | 2 | 2 | | | 629 | 315 | 175 | | 88 |
| Sodor and Man | 1 | 0 | 14.5 | 14.5 | 40 | 40 | 14 | | 14 |
| Carlisle | 3 | 1 | 75 | 25.0 | 330 | 110 | 120 | 244 | 40 |
| St Eds & Ips | 4 (2 SDF funded) | 1 | 103 | 25.8 | 478 | 120 | 109 | 445 | 27 |
| Truro | 2 | 1 | 65 | 32.5 | 305 | 153 | 94 | | 47 |
| Hereford | 2 | 0 | 67 FTE | 33.5 | 408 | 204 | 80 | 365 | 40 |
| Liverpool | 4 1 vacant | 1 | 145 | 36.3 | 255 | 64 | 170 | | 43 |
| Durham | 3 (one also dir) | 1 | 110 | 36.7 | 257 | 86 | 150 | 209 | 50 |
| Chelmsford | 7 | 3 | 263 FTE incl Hfc | 37.6 | 578 | 83 | 382 | 475 | 55 |
| Salisbury | 4 | 2 | 157 157 paid (57) | 39.3 | 573 | 143 | 138 | 434 | 35 |
| Worcester | 2 | 1 | 85 | 42.5 | 279 | 140 | 73 | | 37 |
| Leeds | 5 | 4 plus one vac | 281 | 56.2 | 598 | 120 | | | 0 |
| Norwich | 3 | 2 | 141 | 47.0 | 640 | 213 | 154 | 560 | 51 |
| Chichester | 4 2 shared w/it | 2 | 194 plus 19 part | 48.5 | 474 | 119 | 272 | | 68 |
| Newcastle | 2 | 1 | 97 exc chaplain | 48.5 | 237 | 119 | 122 | 169 | 61 |
| Bristol | 2 plus 1 associ | 1 | 98 | 49.0 | 203 | 102 | 100 | | 50 |
| Leicester | 2 | 1 | 100 | 50.0 | 313 | 157 | 160 | | 80 |
| Gloucester | 2 | 1 | 100 | 50.0 | 400 | 200 | 100 | 300 | 50 |
| Exeter | 4 | 2 | 210 | 52.5 | 595 | 149 | 147 | 489 | 37 |
| Darby | 2 3 from June | 1 | 110 | 55.0 | 319 | 160 | 140 | | 70 |
| York | 3 | 3 (excl. PEV) | 165 FTE | 55.0 | 577 | 192 | 229 | 442 | 76 |
| Birmingham | 2 | 1 | 110 | 55.0 | 187 | 94 | 137 | 150 | 69 |
| Peterborough | 2 | 1 | 113 | 56.5 | 383 | 192 | 133 | | 67 |
| Southwell & Nottingham | 2 | 1 | 119 | 59.5 | 320 | 160 | 154 | | 77 |
| Lichfield | 4 (= 2 associat | 3 | 247 | 61.8 | 567 | 142 | 269 | 425 | 67 |
| Manchester | 3 | 2 | 190 | 63.3 | 320 | 107 | 173 | 257 | 58 |
| Gulldford | 2 | 1 | 135 FTE | 67.5 | 212 | 106 | 142 | 159 | 71 |
| Blackburn | 2 | 2 | 137 | 68.5 | 285 | 143 | 178 | | 89 |
| St Albans | 3 | 2 | 207 | 69.0 | 400 | 133 | 214 | | 71 |
| London | 6 | 6 | 450 paid for carr | 75.0 | 470 | 78 | 402 | | 67 |
| Oxford | 4 plus 3 associ | 3 | 310 also lots of t | 77.5 | 812 | 203 | 290 | | 73 |
| Rochester | 3 | 1 | 240 | 80.0 | 231 | 77 | | 214 | 0 |
| Chester | 2 | 2 | 182 FTE includes | 91.0 | 324 | 162 | 220 | 269 | 110 |
| Winchester | 1 | 2 | 116.5 | 116.5 | 374 | 374 | 145 | | 145 |
| Bath and Wells | | 1 | 178 | | 560 | | 179 | 461 | |
| Average | | | | 53.0 | | 146 | | | 58 |
| Carlisle | | | | 25.0 | | 110 | | | 40 |
| Carlisle if 2 Archdeacons | | | | 37.5 | | 165 | | | 60 |

The pattern of archidiaconal roles across dioceses shows three key developments:

1. Using archdeacon's posts in complimentary ways, rather than requiring split roles. For example, in Worcester the two archdeacons cover the whole diocese, one in a traditional statutory and legal role and the other purely as parish development,
2. In some dioceses assistant archdeacons have been appointed as freeing up the archdeacon to be more creative, whilst the day-to-day tasks are given to the assistant,
3. One archdeacon's post has been removed leading to either the appointment of a specialist development post or giving Area/Rural Deans more responsibility.

Section F: Review of SDO role and workload

The Archdeacons' role as SDO has been to focus on the setting up of Mission Communities. This work is now largely completed. The question facing the diocese and ecumenical county is whether the development of mission communities requires different skills? The review group having listened to many different views came to a clear conclusion that the Archdeacons should no longer be SDOs. There is a significant problem for the archdeacons around workload but is this specifically related to the core archidiaconal role, or the additional tasks taken on.

Workload assessment

The following provides an assessment of the workload associated with the archidiaconal role following discussions with three of the four archdeacons in post.

For convenience estimates of time equivalence are given in terms of a number of sessions per week, where a day may be split into 3 sessions (morning, afternoon and evening) based on an availability of 46 weeks in a year. In the case of archdeacons with a split role, the figures are normalised to reflect what they would be if covering the entire archdeaconry.

Statutory duties

At the core of the archidiaconal role are a set of statutory duties prescribed by law (measures, instruments and canons) These may be divided into those associated with diocesan governance and those of a more parochial and pastoral nature. The distinction is important because the time spent on the former is essentially independent of the size of the archdeaconry whilst the time spent on the latter is substantially dependent on the size of the archdeaconry. The former typically occupy ~2 sessions per week and the latter ~5, giving a total of ~7. A move to 2 archdeaconries would change the latter to ~7.5, or a total of ~9.5 sessions per week.

There was considerable variation in the time spent on some duties:

- List B applications – from 3 to 50 sessions per year dependent upon the approach; from reasonably light touch, through a site visit for almost every application, to fuller checking with the DAC and with the architect.
- Triennial visitations – from less than 8 to 45 sessions per year.
- Proposals for pastoral schemes – from 15 to 40 sessions per year and church buildings schemes from 3 to over 11 sessions per year.
- Handling complaints under CDM – from 0 to 18 sessions per year.

In addition to the statutory duties, the archdeacons are also responsible for conducting ministerial development reviews on their clergy on a triennial basis, estimated from 10 to 60 sessions per year or 1.5 to 2.3 sessions per week..

Other duties

Non-statutory pastoral duties (meetings with rural deans and lay chairs, dealing with complaints and grievances, and other pastoral care for their clergy account for between 68 and 107 sessions per year.

Archdeacons have also been operating as strategy development officers (SDOs), spending from ~50 to ~80 sessions per year, or 1.1 to 1.7 sessions per week.

In addition, some time is spent on covering vacancies, including services, baptisms, etc.

| | min | max | avg |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----|-----|
| | <i>sessions per week</i> | | |
| Diocesan governance | 1.5 | 1.9 | 1.9 |
| Parochial governance | 1.0 | 1.2 | 1.1 |
| Buildings and property | 1.1 | 1.5 | 1.3 |
| Pastoral re-organisation | 0.4 | 1.1 | 0.9 |

| | | | |
|---|------------------|-----|------|
| Pastoral care of clergy and clergy discipline | 1.2 | 2 | 1.7 |
| MDR | 0.2 | 1.3 | 0.8 |
| Pastoral (other) | 1.5 | 2.3 | 1.8 |
| Strategy Development Officers | 1.1 | 1.7 | 1.5 |
| Covering vacancies | 1.7 | 4.1 | 1.9 |
| Total sessions per week per archdeaconry | 3 archdeaconries | | 12.9 |
| | 2 archdeaconries | | 18.4 |

Additional Roles

The list below is of the other roles taken on by the current archdeacons and as such represents a significant amount of work, which would need to be undertaken by other if it was not covered by the archdeacons:

Safeguarding

Education

Rydal Hall

Buildings strategy

GSMAT

Cathedral Honorary Canons

Churches Trust for Cumbria trustee

President, Diocesan Guild of Bellringers

Healthwatch / NHS CoProduction

St John's in the Vale Youth Centre trustee

Assistant Communications Officer

NMS

Christians in politics

Chaplaincy lead

Environmental / Carbon Neutral lead

Clergy wellbeing (Archdeacon lead)

New Start team

General Synod

Comments from other diocesan leaders

There have been a number of issues with the Archdeacons acting as SDO for the following reasons:

- s) there is a fundamental conflict of interest between the role of an archdeacon and being able to support MC development with the ethos mentioned above. With the very best of intentions the current archdeacons might not agree with this, but the ministers and church members at a local level *do* see it this way. Being an archdeacon is still a role that is associated with checking up that everything is in order, with legal processes, at times with cutting clergy posts and closing churches. That is probably inevitable as an archdeacon is the local ‘face’ of the diocese.
- t) in an ecumenical county with an ecumenical strategy using Anglican archdeacons reinforces the ecumenical weighting and suggests that although all ecumenical partners are equal, ‘Anglicans are more equal than others’. Having a person whose role is dedicated to MC development would cut through this, regardless of the individual’s denominational home.
- u) It has undoubtedly created a greater workload. There has been a significant difference in how Archdeacons have taken things on
- v) If the SDO role was separated out there would need to be a key stakeholder with strong working relationship with the Archdeacons
- w) In terms of Mission Communities, Archdeacon’s should have more of a traditional role – pastoral and holding clergy to account.

Recommendation 3: Significant elements of the current ‘Strategy Development Officer’ role currently undertaken by Archdeacons should transfer to a new role (a minimum of 2 posts) created to work closely with Mission Communities on the next steps of their development, with funding from external sources such as the Church Commissioners. This Recommendation is particularly relevant if Option A below is pursued, but is also relevant to the other Options.

Section G: Implications of reorganisation of archdeaconries

In some circumstances Archdeaconries can be reorganised without the requirement for a Pastoral Scheme with associated formal consultation with every parish in the diocese. Rather a Bishop’s Pastoral Order (BPO) can be used to dissolve a vacant archdeaconry, move deaneries into different archdeaconries and rename archdeaconries. The Bishop proposes a new structure and the Pastoral Officer drafts proposals for the Bishop to approve/amend. The Pastoral Officer then consults on the Bishop’s behalf. The consultation must include the DMPC- it is recommended that when archdeaconry changes are proposed, the consultees also include the Archdeaconry Mission and Pastoral Committees, Deanery Chapters & Synods, Archdeacons, Rural Deans and Lay Chairs. There is no statutory period for consultation but it’s recommended it should be at least four weeks. Once the consultation ends, the Bishop considers all comments, before deciding whether to make the BPO or not. There are no consents required for a BPO, nor rights to represent. If the Bishop decides to proceed, the BPO is signed, witnessed and sealed, bringing it into effect.

Section H: Recommendations

Recommendation 1: that the effectiveness of the Archdeacons' role in relation to the DAC be reviewed

Recommendation 2: If one of Options A-D (below) is pursued then the number of Deaneries should be reviewed. If Options B or C are pursued the role of the Rural Dean should also be reviewed.

Recommendation 3: Significant elements of the current 'Strategy Development Officer' role currently undertaken by Archdeacons should transfer to a new role (a minimum of 2 posts) created to work closely with Mission Communities on the next steps of their development, with funding from external sources such as the Church Commissioners. This Recommendation is particularly relevant if Option A below is pursued, but is also relevant to the other Options.

Section I: Proposed options

The review group considered a number of possible ways forward in the light of the recommendation of the Task Group to reduce the number of four senior clergy. The review group were also mindful of the general changes in the Church of England and the way in which the diocese can appear to those outside to be over resourced in the number of archdeacons. The review group are not presenting a preferred option, the following have been suggested and, in the view of the group, some are more workable than others. However, it may be that none are suitable and that from a time of mutual reflection and discernment the way forward may emerge. The status quo option has not been included on the assumption that 2020's in principle decision to reduce the number of senior clergy roles in the Diocese will be respected.

The following options have been considered:

- A. Two Archdeacons and Two Archdeaconries** – this option would merge the next vacant archdeaconry with the two remaining archdeaconries. This reorganisation would come about as a result of a Bishop's Pastoral Order. At the same time the diocese would seek external funding for specialist posts, (candidates could be lay or ordained) to work closely with Mission Communities on the next stages of their development. The Archdeacons would make the statutory, pastoral and strategic leadership roles their priority recognising that the new Bishop of Penrith's role also has a substantial pastoral aspect facing outwards to the clergy.
- B. One Archdeacon for the statutory role and one Archdeacon for the pastoral role** – this would create two specialist roles and each Archdeacon would cover the whole diocese, this option would also enhance the role of Rural Deans and require the slimming down of the whole diocesan structure. This would require Rural Deans to take on some

aspects of work currently undertaken by Archdeacons (for example visitations and MDR of clergy). It would probably be accompanied by a reduction in the number of deaneries and for Rural deans to be selected to work half time in this role. It would create additional costs.

- C. **One Archdeacon** – this option would not replace the next two archidiaconal vacancies. Rather the one Archdeacon would address the legal and statutory necessities. There would only be one archdeaconry which would be the same as the diocese. The pastoral care of the clergy would be in the hands of the two bishops and locally with the Rural deans with an enhanced job description, and a full-time role. It implies a significant reduction in the number of deaneries. The archidiaconal role would be similar to other archdeacons across the Church of England in terms of number of clergy and parishes, however the geography and complex regional variations across Cumbria might make this option impractical. This option would also create additional costs.
- D. **Three Archdeacons and three archdeaconries** – keep the status quo with three archdeacons and three archdeaconries, but effectively cut the number of posts to two but linking each archdeacon with a significant parish responsibility. The role of the Archdeacon to statutory and pastoral, covering two-thirds of their workload. The review group wouldn't be in favour of this option. The experience across the Church of England is that these split roles don't work and can cause serious conflicts of interest. [nb: this differs from the current New Start approach which involves time-limited archidiaconal support for particular Mission Communities where substantial change is required and does not involve permanently adding a parish responsibility to an Archdeacon role.]
- E. **Two Archdeacons and three archdeaconries on an interim basis** – that everything should remain as it is at the next vacancy, that the two remaining archdeacons to cover the vacant archdeaconry until the appointment of a new diocesan bishop, who will authorise a new strategy. The risk with this approach is that it creates a sense of drift during the vacancy and puts a new bishop in a position of wanting to make a decision without having the local experience required to inform it. This is an option which the review group are not favour of supporting, as it 'kicks the can down the road'. The review group believe that the issue of the number of archdeacons and archdeaconries should be resolved by the time of the next archidiaconal vacancy.

Section J: Timetable

The following is a suggested timetable for the Bishop's Council, together with the Bishops Leadership Team) to consider the report and to come to a common view.

7th September - Presentation of the report at the Bishop's Council

15th October - Presentation to Diocesan Synod

18th October – Consideration of this report with BLT

Wider consultation and receiving feedback

7th November – Bishop’s Council discusses the report

21st November – BLT gives further consideration

Comments and feedback received are summarised for the Bishop’s Council

January 2023 Bishop’s Council residential major discussion about the way forward

March 2023 Proposal about the way forward is put to Diocesan Synod for debate and agreement

Post implementation of Synod decision or if not decision reached continuation of interim arrangements.

Members of the Working Party

Ali Ng – HR Manager and Head of Governance

Chris Angus – Synod Chair of the House of Laity

Derek Hurton – Diocesan Secretary

Shanthi Thompson – Synod Chair of the House of Clergy

and **Cameron Butland** – Bishop of Carlisle’s Chaplain (Chair of ARG)