



United Reformed Church
General Assembly 2024

Order Paper

Friday 12 July 2024

Please retain each Order Paper as the material may be relevant for any day of the Assembly

Resolution 55

General Assembly appoints Morag M McLintock as convener of Tellers for General Assembly 2024.

Resolution 56

General Assembly appoints the following as members of a Facilitation Group:

Fiona Bennett
Nneoma Chima
Clare Downing
Muna Levan-Harris
Derek MacDonald
Craig Muir
Adam Scott
John McNeil Scott
Darnette Whitby-Reid

General Assembly also resolves that if there are not enough facilitators available at any point, the Moderator may appoint anyone they deem appropriate, on the advice of the Clerk or General Secretary, in an emergency.

Resolution 57

General Assembly appoints the Revd Margaret Ali, the Revd Dr Trevor Jamison, and Mx Sorrel Eyres as Tellers for the Election of the Moderator of General Assembly 2024-25, with the Revd Margaret Ali to act as Convener.

En bloc business

No items have been removed from en bloc.

Paper A2 – Assistant Clerk

Two discrepancies were missed in the proofreading of this paper:

1. All references to MIND should now be to CDAG.
2. All references to the assistant clerk role as a “job”, should all read “role”.

Paper A6 – PRWC terms of reference

The reference to paper K1 in the resolution should read A6. This was missed in proofreading, and will be corrected in the Minutes.

Paper A10 – new Nominations Committee

Further names are:

Deborah Brooks (EDI representative)

Laura Everard (URC Youth Assembly representative)

Andrew Mudharara (Racial Justice/GIM representative)

Paper H4 – amendments to the Plan for Partnership

Notice has been given of an amendment to the resolution, proposed by Steve Faber, and seconded by Steve Powell:

“September 2024” be changed to “January 2025”.

The Ministries Committee has indicated that they are content to accept the amendment.

Paper H1 - Ministries General Report:

Under 6 Roll of Assembly Accredited Lay Preachers, 06 Rachel Louise Morrall should read 05 Rachel Louise Morrall.

Paper H11 – Ministries

As stated in Paper H11, in Scotland, it is not possible for those who lead worship in our churches (who are not Ministers of the Word and Sacraments) to have membership of the PVG scheme (Protecting Vulnerable Groups Scheme) unless they are carrying out regulated work as defined by the Disclosure (Scotland) Act 2020. It is now the case within the Scottish legislation where membership of the PVG scheme is not possible as the applicant is not undertaking regulated work then what must be applied for is a Basic Disclosure (this is known as a Level 1 Disclosure in the new legislation). It is no longer possible to apply for a DBS for someone who is living in Scotland and carrying out the work requiring a criminal record check in Scotland.

Therefore, the following paragraphs to Paper H11 require amendment to reflect the new legislation not known before the paper went to print:

2.9

Should these no give cause for concern then the Ministries Office would organise the **appropriate criminal record checks. For applicants in England and Wales this will involve a DBS check and for applicants in Scotland this will require a Level 1 (Basic) Disclosure;** if there is a blemish this is followed up by the Secretary for Ministries and the URC Designated Safeguarding as per the usual process;

4.5

Should these no give cause for concern then the Synod Office would organise the **appropriate criminal record checks. For applicants in England and Wales this will involve a DBS check and for applicants in Scotland this will require a Level 1 (Basic) Disclosure;** if there is a blemish this is followed up by the Secretary for Ministries and the URC Designated Safeguarding as per the usual process.

5.3b

has a current **criminal record check. In England and Wales this will require a DBS. In Scotland this will require a Level 1 (Basic) Disclosure.** The lead denomination shall be asked to provide details of the certificate number and the level of DBS check.

6.2b

A criminal record check to be completed by the local church verifier before they preach. In England and Wales this will require a DBS. In Scotland this will require a Level 1 (Basic) Disclosure.

Last paragraph in Appendix 1

Please could you also supply the date, certificate number and level of their current criminal record check. In England and Wales this will be a DBS. In Scotland this will require a Level 1 (Basic) Disclosure. If there is any content on the DBS check would there be any transferable risks that we need to consider.

Paper 13 – Mission Committee

The committee wish to move resolution 40 in an amended form, as follows:

General Assembly calls on the UK Government to observe its obligations under the international Arms Trade Treaty, to cease arms sales to Israel, and to monitor existing embargoes on arms sales to nations that might be supporting Hamas militarily.

Papers J1 and J2: Nominations Committee updates:

Amendments to published list of Nominations to be noted

General Assembly is asked to note the following additions and amendments to the Nominations list in the Book of Reports for General Assembly 2024.

3.1 Mission Committee

The name of The Revd Katrina Hackett to be deleted from the list of members of the Mission Committee.

To be appointed:

Ref	Committee/Group	Name	Role	Years
3.1	Mission Committee	The Revd Sally Bateman	Member**	GA24- GA28

4.1.1 Accreditations (CRCW and SCM) sub-committee

Convenor: The Revd Dr Paul Dean [2025]

Joint Secretaries: Secretary for Ministries and Head of Community Engagement

4.1.3 Retired Ministers’ Housing sub-committee

The name of The Revd George Felton should read **The Revd Geoff Felton**

4.4 Safeguarding Committee

The name of Ms Ruth Goold to be deleted.

11.3 Congregational Fund Board: Amend the spelling of The Revd Bacheland Yemtsa to read **The Revd Bachelard Yemtsa.**

11.11 United Reformed Church History Society

The Revd Dr Michael Jagessar [2029] †

Mrs Jean Wyber [2027]

Dr Simone Maghenzani [2028]

Council Members serve five-year terms, which may be renewed.

Paper X2 – North Western Synod

There is a typographical error in the coversheet. Clare Downing's email address should read: moderator@nwsynod.org.uk

After discussion with the Clerk and the Mission Committee, the Synod wishes to propose their resolutions in a slightly amended form:

Resolution 52:

In response to General Assembly 2023 resolution 31 (c), General Assembly commends the North Western Synod's strategy document 'A Church with People at the Margins: A Strategy for Mission and Ministry' to the wider church. General Assembly encourages all parts of the United Reformed Church to reflect on its implications for their own areas of responsibility.

Resolution 53:

General Assembly requests that Synods, Assembly Committees and Task Groups consider the implications of the North Western Synod report, 'A Church with people at the margins' particularly in respect of the priority given to the allocation of resources (people, finance and other) for ministry and mission to churches working with those experiencing poverty and marginalisation, and instructs the Mission Committee to engage with Synods, Assembly Committees and Task Groups to explore the feasibility of establishing a Community Enabling Fund that any church within the United Reformed Church can apply to, in order to support and develop their presence and engagement with people experiencing poverty and marginalisation, with a view to bringing a proposal to General Assembly 2025.

Paper X3 – Thames North Synod

Thames North Synod have withdrawn their paper. The Ministries Committee has provided a response, which is published towards the end of this Order Paper.

Notice of a question

The Revd Dr Sarah Hall gave notice under Standing Order 14 of her wish to ask a question of the Retired Ministers Housing Subcommittee. Dr Hall has also declared that she has no personal interest in the matter, as she does not expect to require assistance from the Retired Ministers Housing Society. This will be taken when advised by the Convener of the Business Committee, and will be answered by the Secretary for Ministries:

While acknowledging with thanks the generosity of various terms of provision of housing for retired ministers, is the Committee aware of the depth of concern and ill feeling about the new rent policy adopted by RMHS, which is believed by many to be unjust? Please could the committee assure General Assembly that these concerns have been heard and will be considered?

Ministries Committee response to factual inaccuracies in Paper X3 and its appendix

Ministries Committee has requested the opportunity to correct the factual inaccuracies in Paper X3 and its appendix. Where relevant, content has been checked with the URC Legal Adviser and with ecumenical partners.

This response to the inaccuracies is not intended to rehearse the debate. The Ministries Committee will be reviewing the policy in 2025 as part of its normal review process. Despite this, it was felt it was important to correct the inaccuracies so that General Assembly is better informed.

General Assembly is reminded that Ministers of Word and Sacraments are not employees but office holders. By ordination their Call to serve is recognised by the URC and they are inducted to their role.

1. **Paper X3 point 2.** *“the URCcurrently rejects not only Government legislation.....”*

It is not correct to say that the URC rejects government legislation by having a ‘normal’ retirement age and that it fails to practice justice, inclusion and equality. The retirement policy of the URC includes such matters and applies a proportionate approach towards them in compliance with the legislative requirements of the Equality Act 2010 (EqA 2010).

The EqA 2010 provides that a person (A) discriminates against another (B) if, because of a protected characteristic, A treats B less favourably than A treats or would treat others. In respect of the protected characteristic of age A does not discriminate against B if A can show A's treatment of B to be a proportionate means of achieving a legitimate aim (EqA 2010 S.13 (1) &(2)).

The legitimate aims of the URC are objectives of public interest rather than purely individualistic and are set out within the URC Retirement Policy. The age of 68 is considered to be a proportionate means of achieving those legitimate aims in accordance with the legislative provisions of the EqA 2010.

The criteria for seeking an extension are considered against the legitimate strategic and social policy objectives and denominational reasons within the denominational retirement policy. See the commentary on the normal retirement age:

<https://urc.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/2023-GA-H4-Extension-beyond-the-Normal-Retirement-Age.pdf>

2. **Paper X point 3** *“.....there are limited exceptions where a compulsory retirement age is permitted. These being -*

- *the job requires certain physical abilities (eg in the construction industry)*
- *the job has an age limit set by law (eg the fire service)”*

This is only part of what the heading ‘When you can be forced to retire’ on the government website actually says “In some cases an employer can force you to retire at a certain age - known as ‘compulsory retirement age’. If they do this there must be a legitimate reason why, **for example but not limited to** :

- the job requires certain physical abilities (eg in the construction industry)

- the job has an age limit set by law (eg the fire service)

The approach in these and other specific cases take into account issues such as the health and safety of the individual employees and also the public interest.

3. **Paper X3 point 4.** *“Age UK states – Employers used to be able to force workers to retire at 65 (known as the Default Retirement Age), but this law was scrapped in April 2011, following a campaign by Age UK. This means that you can keep working beyond 65 if you want or need to.”*

Again, this is only part of what the Age UK article says. It goes onto say: “There are exceptions in some situations where an employer can force you to retire by law, but they must give a good reason why.”

Ministers are, of course, not employees but office holders.

4. **Paper X3 point 5** mentions previous iterations of extension to the normal retirement age policy but fails to mention the current policy: Paper H4 URC Procedure for the Extension to Stipendiary Ministerial Service beyond the Normal Retirement Age. This was passed at General Assembly 2023 which agreed the criteria for both full-time and part-time stipendiary service should be the same and that the decision for granting such an extension should come to the Accreditations (CRCW&SCM) sub-committee for approval upon receipt of both Church Meeting and Synod agreement. Discernment of Call is not just about the minister but is always determined through the Councils of the Church.
5. **Paper X3 point 6.** *“Wewould not rule out a time when stipendiary service is phased out.”* Ministries Committee wishes to make it clear that this is not a policy of General Assembly and has never been on Ministries agenda. We do not know where the author has come by this information. Ministries Committee values the place of stipendiary service.
6. **Paper X3 point 7.** *“Up to now the URC has defended a compulsory retirement age on the grounds that Terms of Settlement do not compare with a Contract of Employment.”*

The retirement policy of the URC demonstrates that the URC’s normal retirement age has nothing to do with Terms of Settlement or with Terms of Settlement not comparing with a Contract of Employment. As previously referred to the URC has legitimate strategic social policy objectives and denominational reasons for this **normal** retirement age and it is not considered that these aims be met by other means.

Normal and compulsory are not the same thing because there is always the possibility of extending beyond the normal retirement age.

7. **Paper X3 point 8** suggests that the URC is currently out of line with ecumenical partners. In consultation with ecumenical partners, Ministries has detailed current ecumenical practice in Appendix 1.

8. **Paper X 3 point 9** “*Finally, and crucially, we bring this Resolution because the URC needs those who wish to continue working full time beyond the age of 68.....*”

Like most other denominations, there is already a process which allows ministers to extend beyond the normal retirement age: Paper H4 GA 2023 URC Procedure for the Extension to Stipendiary Ministerial Service beyond the Normal Retirement Age.

In this process, the local pastorate as well as the minister has a voice and their opinion must be taken into consideration as the discernment of Call is a two way process. Equally, as M&M decreases and the number of affordable full-time stipendiary equivalents reduces, it is important the Synod is able to plan strategically for deployment.

Having a normal retirement age allows the denomination to plan strategically by monitoring numbers of ministers and available finance.

9. **Previous relevant documents.** Please see the latest version Paper H4 URC Procedure for the Extension to Stipendiary Ministerial Service beyond the Normal Retirement Age.

<https://urc.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/H4-2023-Extension-beyond-the-normal-retirement-age.pdf>

10. **Financial** “*Minimal*”. This cannot be known. Legal costs in using Competency/Capability procedures may be high.

11. **Ecumenical.** *Passing this Resolution will establish parity with most ecumenical partners and be appreciated by them.* Only the Baptist Union of Great Britain has no normal retirement age. Others have a normal age at which ministers retire (normally around 67,68,70 or 75) which tends to link in with pension age.

12. **Appendix 1 Retirement Policies of mainstream denominations**

Direct quotes from each of the denominations are in quotation marks.

- a) **The Methodist Church.** Appendix 1 states the Methodist Church has no retirement age.

Methodist ministers do not retire, they ‘sit down’. Of course, it must be remembered that Methodist ministers are stationed for 5 years in the first instance with the possibility of **re-invitation**. Their Call to a pastorate is not ‘open-ended’ as it is in the URC.

“Our typical retirement age in terms of “usual pension rights” is 68 and whilst many retire sooner and at that point, some do stay longer in role particularly if appointments only have a year or similar to run”.

However, you can work in retirement as a supernumerary. All supernumeraries are expected to keep up to date with safeguarding training and DBS (or equivalent) checks.

<https://www.methodist.org.uk/for-churches/ministries/supernumerary-ministers>

- b) **The Church of England.** Appendix 1 quotes the Archdiocese of Perth which is not part of the Anglican Communion because it is Roman Catholic. There is no expectation by the Church of England to remove its retirement age.

“Your clergy pension comes with a normal retirement age. This age is 68. At this point, it is possible for you to retire on pension without any reduction in retirement benefits for early retirement. This should not be confused with the age when you are required by the Clergy Age Limit Measure to vacate your office at 70. You may retire before, provided that you give the bishop three months’ notice”.

https://www.churchofengland.org/sites/default/files/202204/ministry_after_retiring_final_final_april_22.pdf

- c) **The Baptist Union of Great Britain.** They do not have a normal retirement age.

“It is correct to say that we do not specify an age where a minister moves to the retired section of the accredited list. I have just looked and we have ten non-retired accredited ministers who are 75 years old or older. So we rely on a capability procedure to move people into retirement when they become no longer fit to serve. In theory, this would be instigated by a church seeking to remove the minister for being incapable, after which we would probably instigate our own capability hearing that would consider whether they may remain on the list of active accredited ministers.”

- d) **Eglwys Bresbyteraidd Cymru (Presbyterian Church of Wales).** They have a normal retirement age.

“The retirement age follows the pension age of 67. It is possible to extend beyond 67 according to the relevant process”.

- e) **The Moravian Church.** They have a normal retirement age.

“Retirement age is normal retirement age for pensions. You can retire before and beyond 68 using the correct process to extend”.

- f) **The Church of Scotland.** They have a retirement age.

The information given in the Appendix 1 does not apply to ministers but to lay employees.

However, the 2018-act-2-parish-ministry-act does apply to ministers and states:

“18. (1) subject to sub section (4), a Minister of Word and Sacrament inducted or introduced to a Charge shall be inducted or introduced until the date of his or her seventy-fifth birthday, on which date his or her ministry shall terminate as if he or she had resigned his or her Charge and such date been appointed by the Presbytery of the bounds for the demission by the Minister of Word and Sacrament of his or her Charge.

(4). On application by a Parish Minister, his or her tenure may be extended for an agreed period of time according to a process set out in Regulations made by the General Assembly, dealing with Continuing Ministry beyond the age of 75. Service of an application under the Regulations shall prevent the

termination of the tenure of the Parish Minister and the subsection (1) until the application is determined”.

- g) **Roman Catholic Church.** “Diocesan priests are generally expected to retire at the age of 75”.

Therefore, the removal of the normal retirement age would not put us in line with ecumenical colleagues apart from the Baptist Union of Great Britain.

Joint Paper G2

Linking Stipendiary Ministry Costs to M&M Receipts

Finance Committee and Ministries

Basic information

Contact name and email address	Alan Yates, Treasurer alan.yates@urc.org.uk Nicola Furley-Smith, Ministries Secretary nicola.furley-smith@urc.org.uk John Samson, Chief Finance Officer john.samson@urc.org.uk Vaughan Griffiths, Deputy Treasurer deputy.treas@urc.org.uk
Action required	Decision
Draft resolution(s)	Resolution 58 General Assembly adopts the process for linking stipendiary ministry costs to Ministry and Mission Fund receipts as defined in the main body of paper G2 of General Assembly 2024.

Summary of content

Subject and aim(s)	In response to the 2023 GA resolution 24, the Finance Committee has defined a process capable of linking stipendiary ministry costs to M&M receipts in a fair and transparent way.
Main points	To implement resolution 24 (GA 2023), the paper answers a number of questions: a) Who is included in the target? b) What is included in the 'direct cost of supporting the ministry from the Assembly budget'? c) How are these direct costs converted into a target number of ministers? d) What is the starting point for the linkage? The defined process uses total M&M receipts, including Synod support, and hence the M&M support provided by the Synods positively impacts stipendiary ministry targets.
Previous relevant documents	2023 General Assembly Paper G5 - Stipendiary Ministry target numbers
Consultation has taken place with...	Ministries Committee Education & Learning Secretary URC Trust

Summary of impact

Financial	Limited
External (eg ecumenical)	None

Introduction

1. 1 Corinthians 12: 12 and 14

‘For just as the body is one and has many members, and all the members of the body, though many, are one body, so it is with Christ... For the body does not consist of one member but of many.’

2. Covenantal relationships are modelled throughout the Bible, between God and humankind, and between human beings before God, as witness. A covenantal relationship brings with it responsibility and blessing. Stipendiary ministry in the URC is funded through a covenantal relationship between members and the Church. In the URC, church members pay into the M&M fund according to their ability to pay, and receive ministry according to their needs, moderated by the total ministry available to the Church.
3. In GA 2023 a resolution was passed to link the costs of stipendiary ministry to the M&M receipts¹. To implement this resolution there are a number of questions that need to be answered:
 - a. Who is included in the target?
 - b. What is included in the ‘direct cost of supporting the ministry from the Assembly budget’?
 - c. How are these direct costs converted into a target number of ministers?
 - d. What is the starting point for the linkage?

Who is included in the target?

4. It has been noted that a target for the number of ministers² is used by different departments for different purposes. In order to eliminate any confusion, it is suggested that this analysis includes all active³ ministers who are provided with a stipend, with the exception of the element of the stipends funded by the Synods for the two ministers deployed as National Ecumenical Officers in the National Synods of Scotland and Wales.
5. Users of this target can then make relevant deductions for their own purposes. For example, Ministries provide a deployment target for each Synod, and these targets do not include, for example, Synod Moderators, CRCWs, Special Category Ministers, Chaplains employed by other organisations and Ministers deployed in Church House. Please see the breakdown for the end of 2023 and for 2022 given in Appendix I below.
6. This analysis shows that M&M receipts funded 309.76 FTE (Full Time Equivalent) ministers at the end of 2022, and 289.2 at the end of 2023, giving an average for the year of 299.5.

What is included in the ‘direct cost of supporting the ministry from the Assembly budget’?

7. The following cost categories constitute the direct cost of supporting ministry, together with the actual costs for 2023. Please note that these categories appear under several lines of the accounts. For example, in addition to the main expenditure line in the high-level reported accounts (Stipends and associated costs) other stipend costs, principally for central and Assembly posts) appear in other lines.

Stipends and allowances	£9,096k
Pension costs	£2,268k
National insurance costs	£909k
Allowances	£148k
Housing costs (for centrally deployed ministers)	£56k
Other (including Pastoral supervision)	£48k
TOTAL	£12,525k

How are these direct costs converted into a target number of ministers?

8. To make the process as clear as possible, in this description we are assuming we have reached 2024 and have a final set of accounts for 2023.

Step 1

9. To derive a target number of ministers we need to calculate the average, direct cost of a minister. This will be done using the total 2023 costs in the defined categories as given above. As it is expected that the number of ministers who received stipends from the M&M fund will vary over the year, the average cost will be calculated by dividing the total cost by the average of the number of full time equivalent (FTE) ministers at the beginning of 2023 and at the end of 2023.
10. For the purposes of this paper, to calculate the average cost of a minister we have used the numbers given in Appendix 1. This gives the average cost of a full-time minister in 2023 as (12,525/299.5) £41,819.70

Step 2

11. Once we have an average cost per minister for 2023, the average cost for 2024 will be estimated by applying expected stipend rises (typically agreed at Assembly Executive in November) and the forecast of other cost increases.
12. For the purposes of this paper, we assume the costs for 2024 will be inflated by 5% (the stipend increase agreed for 2024), giving a predicted cost per minister of £43,910.68.

Step 3

13. The amount of money to be spent on ministry in 2024 needs to be calculated. This is done by calculating the percentage fall (or rise) in M&M receipts expected in 2024. The actual spend on ministry in 2023 is then multiplied by this factor to calculate the target spend for 2024.
14. For 2024 we assume that the M&M receipts will remain the same as for 2023. This gives us the Ministries' budget for stipendiary ministry to be as per the expenditure in 2023, which is £12,525K.

Step 4

15. The target spend for 2024 is then divided by the forecast average cost for a minister in 2024. This provides us with the target for the number of stipendiary ministers in 2024. Longer term targets can be calculated by estimating cost inflation and the reduction in M&M receipts (and hence ministerial spend) for further years.
16. Please note that M&M receipts, used in these calculations, will include any sums given by Synods to bolster the receipts.
17. For 2024 the target number of ministers becomes (12,525/43,910.68) 285.2.
18. The spreadsheet given in Table 1 summarises this approach for 2024 and provides further estimates for 2025 and 2026.

CATEGORY	2023 act	2024 f/c	2025 f/c	2026 f/c
Costs of Ministry, £k	12,525			
Expected fall in M&M receipts, %		0%	0%	0%
Target cost of ministry, £m		12.525	12,525	12,525
No. of ministers at end of 2023	299.5			
Ave cost of ministry for 2023, £k	41.820			
Expected increase in ministry costs, %		5.0%	3.0%	2.5%
Ave cost of ministry in future, £k		43.911	45.228	46.359
Target number of ministers	299.5	285.2	276.9	270.2

Table 1 - Example calculations for 2023 to 2026

19. Consequently, the target for the end of 2024 would be 285.5 FTE ministers, which represents a reduction of 4 on the December 2023 actual.

How and when will the target be applied?

20. Should this paper be approved by General Assembly in 2024 it is assumed that the linkage would start from 2025. This means that the 2024 costs will be used to define the stipendiary minister target for the end of 2025 (note that a single target is given for the whole year).
21. To use the process as described above, in its basic form could be problematic because it assumes that the forecast movements and timings will prove accurate. This is not a practical assumption. Therefore, in applying the proposed process, some form of 'room for manoeuvre' will be needed. Consequently, if the actual number of ministers overshoots the target by 1% or less this will be deemed to be satisfactory. Should an overshoot of more than 1% be predicted, Ministries are requested to consult with the Treasurer and CFO to establish if there is room in the budget for any additional overshoot.

Conclusion

22. We believe that this process will fairly and accurately fulfil the 2023 GA resolution for the cost of ministry to track M&M receipts. It is not anticipated that this policy and process will curtail URC-ordained stipendiary ministry; the main impact will be to 'regulate' the number of certificates of eligibility issued each year. Neither is it intended to restrict those offering themselves for ministerial training. Should the glorious circumstances occur when we have 'too many' offering themselves for ministerial training I'm sure the denomination would find money to support all of them through training and beyond.
23. Finally, It must be recognised that this paper does not address the strategic question of what is the minimum level of ministry needed to viably build God's Kingdom on earth.

24. APPENDIX I – Ministerial Deployment and Funding

MINISTERIAL FUNDING Dec 2023				
	CATEGORY	NUMBER	FTE	BUDGET HOLDER
A	December 23 payroll	307		Various
B	Retired	2		?
C	Part time ministers	32	17.2	Various
D	Full time ministers	273		Various
E	FTE ministers		290.2	Various
F	National Ecumenical Officers	2	1	50% Synod, 50% M&M
	Ministers funded by M&M		289.2	M&M

MINISTERIAL DEPLOYMENT Dec 2023				
	CATEGORY	NUMBER	FTE	BUDGET HOLDER
	Full time MWS pastorially deployed	209.8	209.8	M&M
	Part time MWS pastorially deployed	31	16.7	M&M
	Full time CRCWs	13	13	M&M
	Part time CRCW	1	0.5	M&M
	Full time MWS in Synod posts		14.2	M&M
	SCM	12	12	M&M
	Mission partners	2	2	M&M
	National Ecumenical Officers	2	1	50% Synod, 50% M&M
	RCLs	3	3	Westminster College
	Ministers deployed in Church House	7	7	
	Synod Moderators	11	11	
	TOTAL		290.2	

MINISTERIAL FUNDING Dec 2022			
	CATEGORY	NUMBER	FTE
A	December 22 payroll	328	
B			
C	Part time ministers	36	18.76
D	Full time ministers	292	
E	FTE ministers		310.76
F	National Ecumenical Officers	2	1
	Ministers funded by M&M		309.76

MINISTERIAL DEPLOYMENT Dec 2022			
	CATEGORY	NUMBER	FTE
	Full time MWS pastorially deployed	226.8	226.8
	Part time MWS pastorially deployed	35	18.26
	Full time CRCWs	13	13
	Part time CRCW	1	0.5
	Full time MWS in Synod posts		14.2
	SCM	12	12
	Mission partners	2	2
	RCLs	3	3
	Ministers deployed in Church House	7	7
	Synod Moderators	13	13
	TOTAL		309.76

An explanation regarding the 'Address to the Throne'

The 'Address to the Throne' is a regular feature of General Assembly business. It might feel like an anachronism, especially with some of the formal language that is used. It might be difficult for some to stomach, as we continue to wrestle with deconstructing empirical tyranny. For some of us who are ardent republicans, it might seem like anathema!

Yet, for the URC, the Address to the Throne has become an opportunity to present an alternate view of society, to set before the country's monarch what the URC cares about, and what we are aiming to do as a people seeking God together. It points the way, we hope, to Christ and a coming kin-dom of justice and joy.

Each year, the Address is sent to the King's Private Secretary, and we request that it is 'laid before the King'. Shortly afterwards, we receive a response from the Private Secretary, thanking us for our communication on behalf of the King. We have no way of knowing if it ever reaches the eyes or ears of the King, or if the Address has any real impact, but we have hope that the heartbeat of the URC and the call of God on us will be evident in its words for any and all who read it.

After hearing the Address read aloud, General Assembly will be invited to vote to receive it. If accepted, the current Moderator and Clerk will sign it on behalf of us all, and it will be sent to the King.