

# THE UNITED REFORMED CHURCH

## MINUTE OF ASSEMBLY EXECUTIVE MEETING

HELD AT THE HAYES CONFERENCE CENTRE, SWANWICK  
MONDAY 3<sup>rd</sup> - WEDNESDAY 5<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY 2025

Present

The Moderator, The Revd Tim Meadows  
The Moderator-Elect, Ms Catriona Wheeler  
The Clerk, The Revd Sarah Moore

The General Secretary, The Revd Dr John Bradbury  
The Deputy General Secretary (Discipleship), The Revd Jenny Mills  
The Deputy General Secretary (Mission), The Revd Philip Brooks  
The Chief Operating Officer, Mrs Victoria James  
The Treasurer, Mr Alan Yates  
The Deputy Treasurer, Mr Vaughan Griffiths

### *Assembly Standing Committee Convenors*

Business	The Revd Mark Robinson
Children's and Youth Work	The Revd Samantha Sheehan
Resources	The Revd Dr Michael Hopkins
Education and Learning	Ms Pippa Hodgson
Equalities	The Revd Jo Clare-Young
Worship, Faith and Order	The Revd Dr Robert Pope
Ministries	The Revd Mary Thomas
Mission	Ms Sarah Lane Cawte
Safeguarding	The Revd Roger Jones

### *URC Youth*

The Moderator, Miss Heather Moore | The Moderator-Elect, Miss Maya Withall | Miss Jay Tynan

### *Synod Representatives*

Northern,	The Revds Kim Plumpton , Sally Bateman , Dr Trevor Jamison , Mr Willie Duncan
North Western,	The Revds Clare Downing and Mike Walsh, Ms Elizabeth Hall , Mr Tim Hopley
Mersey,	The Revds Geoff Felton , Ruth Wilson , Nick Jones Ms Rita Griffiths
Yorkshire,	The Revds Jamie and Fran Kissack , Mr Tim Crossley , Mr Daniel Raddings
East Midlands,	The Revds Geoffrey Clark & Jane Wade, Mr David Greatorex , Dr Graham Jennings ,
West Midlands,	The Revd Steve Faber, Mr Steve Powell
Eastern,	The Revds Lythan Nevard, Dave Coaker & Anne Sardeson, Mr Richard Lewney
South Western,	The Revds David Downing, Richard Gray & Neil Thorogood, Mrs Rachel Leach
Wessex,	Miss Karen Bell, Mr Clive Snashall, The Revds Helen Everard & Dr Romilly Micklem
Thames North,	The Revds George Watt & Sally Thomas, Ms Nneoma Chima, Mr Peter Knowles,
Southern,	The Revds Bridget Banks, Martin Knight , & Russell Furley-Smith
Wales,	The Revd Dave Salsbury , Mr Chris Atherton , Ms Megan Price
Scotland,	The Revds Lindsey Sanderson, Jan Adamson, Susan Henderson, Mr Douglas

Maxwell

### Ecumenical Representatives

The Revd Sarah Gower, Church of England | The Revd Dr David Chapman, Methodist Church,

## In attendance

Minutes Secretaries, The Revd Andy Braunston | Ms Morag M McLintock  
Finance, Mr John Samson  
Secretary for Ministries, The Revd Nicola Furley-Smith  
Law and Polity, Ms Morag M McLintock,  
Minister for Digital Worship, The Revd Andy Braunston  
Education & Learning Transitional Lead, The Revd Dr Lesley Moseley  
Children & Youth Work, Dr Sam Richards  
Legal Adviser, Mr Andy Middleton  
Designated Safeguarding Lead, Mrs Sharon Barr  
Communications, Mr Andy Jackson  
Church Life Review, Mr Myles Dunnett  
Communications Officer, Mrs Ann-Marie Nye  
Community Engagement, Mr Steve Summers  
Reform, Dr Steve Tomkins, Mr Laurence Wareing  
Public Issues, Mr Roo Stewart  
Moderator's Chaplains: Ms Andrea Heron | The Revd Andrew Mann-Ray

## Observers

Admin Support, Ms Izumi Nishizono | The Revd Dr Alex Clare-Young

## Apologies

The Immediate Past Moderator, The Revd Dr Tessa Henry-Robinson, Martin Hayward, Observer  
The Revd Elaine Huthchinson, West Midlands Synod, The Revd Julie Kirkby, The National Synod of Wales,  
Miss Pam Tolhurst, Southern Synod, Rachel Wakeman, West Midlands Synod

## **Monday 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2025**

### **Session 1**

#### **1 Welcome and Introductions**

The Moderator's chaplains led the Executive in worship.

The Convenor of the Business Committee, the Revd Mark Robinson, introduced the platform party and provided some notices.

The Moderator, the Revd Tim Meadows, reminded the Executive of the process for this meeting and welcomed all to it.

#### **2 Minutes and matters arising**

The Clerk moved the adoption of the minutes of the Assembly Executive Meeting held at The Hayes, Swanwick on 9<sup>th</sup> to 11<sup>th</sup> February 2024 and the Assembly Executive Budget Meeting held via Zoom on 26<sup>th</sup> November 2024.

*Assembly executive agreed the aforementioned minutes*

The Revd Dr Romilly Micklem sought an update regarding the concern noted at Executive's meeting in November 2024 about the effectiveness (or lack thereof) of the Ministries and Mission system. The

General Secretary, the Treasurer Mr Alan Yates and the Convenor of the Resources Committee, the Revd Dr Michael Hopkins provided an assurance that the issue is being actively discussed in a number of committees and would consult appropriately. These discussions may lead to a paper for future discussion at General Assembly/Assembly Executive.

### **3 Facilitation Group**

The Clerk moved the resolution

**Assembly Executive appoints The Revd Jan Adamson, Chris Atherton, Sarah Lane Cawte, Nneoma Chima, The Revd Russell Furley-Smith, Richard Lewney, The Revd Kim Plumpton, and The Revd Mike Walsh to serve as a pool of members of any Facilitation Groups needed at this meeting.**

*Assembly executive agreed resolution unanimously*

### **4 Churches Mutual Credit Union**

The Treasurer gave a presentation and update on 10 years of the Credit Union.

### **5 Mission Team Presentation One**

#### **Ukraine Appeal-Commitment for Life**

The Deputy General Secretary for Mission, the Revd Philip Brookes, introduced a video from Ukraine about the work of the Transcarpathian Reformed Church. The Convenor of Commitment for Life Reference Group, Mr Richard Lewney, requested Executive encourage their Synods and Churches to support this one-off Ukraine Appeal to support the work of the Transcarpathian Reformed Church.

### **6 Review of post of Synod Moderator-East Midlands**

The General Secretary moved the following resolution

**Acting on behalf of the General Assembly, Assembly Executive reappoints the Revd Geoffrey Clarke to serve as Moderator of the East Midlands Synod from 1<sup>st</sup> May 2027 to 31<sup>st</sup> July 2029.**

*Assembly executive unanimously agreed the resolution*

### **7 Paper H2: Ministries-Special Category Pioneering Post**

The Convenor of the Ministries Committee, the Revd Mary Thomas, sought to withdraw paper **H2-Pioneering-Criteria.pdf** and advised that further work and consultation required to be undertaken. It is hoped that a further paper will be brought to General Assembly 2025.

*Assembly executive unanimously agreed the removal of the paper*

## **Session 2**

### **8 Paper A3: Business Committee - Ministerial Disciplinary Process Review**

The General Secretary and acting Convenor of CDAG, the Revd Dr John Bradbury, presented paper **A3-Ministerial-Disciplinary-Process.pdf** and moved the resolutions within.

After introducing the paper Dr Bradbury invited the Moderator to ask if there were questions for clarification.

The Revd Sally Thomas asked if there was a duty to disclose by the church to ministers being investigated who often must wait a long time for details. Dr Bradbury said that timing has improved with the move to using an external company to investigate. However, when a matter is referred to the police or the local authority this can lead to significant delays and that is not within the power of the Church to resolve.

Steve Powell asked where the authority would lie in the new process and why the renewal was urgent. He also mentioned he didn't understand what "enabling work" means in Resolution 8. Dr Bradbury clarified that the Business Committee would oversee the renewal process. Stating that the matter is urgent, if Assembly Executive agree, would enable the Business Committee to approve the process and then, later, invite Assembly or Assembly Executive to approve that action after the fact.

The Revd Dr Romilly Micklem asked for the definition of ASPD. Dr Bradbury clarified this was the Assembly Standing Panel for Discipline, the triage stage of the process which decides if a matter needs to be investigated, and after investigation whether allegations should be referred to the Hearing Stage or if a Caution would suffice for matters which are admitted.

The Moderator invited Assembly Executive to discuss the resolutions in small groups around tables.

The Revd Lythan Nevard commented that either one knows a lot about the process or nothing at all! She felt this had been the case for some time and more time needed to be given to explaining the process. She felt, too, that Assembly or Assembly Executive should be responsible for the process and not the Business Committee to do this. Dr Bradbury felt that Ms Nevard was entirely right about knowing the process. He would not resist the matter remaining with Assembly/Assembly Executive but did hold matters are urgent as some of the drafting and ways the process operates can be more complex than it needs to be.

Chris Atherton wondered if Resolution 7 should be expanded to include lay roles. Dr Bradbury noted that the Discipline of Officer Holders policy exists and needs to be reviewed.

The Revd Steve Faber supported the comments from Ms Nevard. He felt that this matter needs not to be remitted to the Business Committee but the revised Section O needs to be looked at by the full Assembly or Assembly Executive. Dr Bradbury noted the Business Committee made decisions in between General Assembly and Assembly Executive and have formal authority for this from Assembly. He noted that, in the past, such decisions were made by Assembly Officers but this authority had been merely custom and practice.

Catriona Wheeler wondered if the small group overseeing this work needs to be expanded. Dr Bradbury noted he is open to appointing a lay person to the small group overseeing the review.

The Revd Dr Romilly Micklem wondered how a duty to cooperate can be enforced on officer holders. Dr Bradbury noted that there are any number of things Ministers are required to do by General Assembly that aren't in their Terms of Settlement. He also noted that ministers are quite entitled not to comment until matters are at the Hearing Stage but there will be a need to have a careful definition of a duty to disclose.

Ms Morag McLintock wondered if Assembly Executive could be recalled via video conferencing to discuss a revised Section O process if matters were urgent. Dr Bradbury said this would be possible.

The Revd Dr Trevor Jamison asked if Assembly Executive could be reminded of the composition of the Business Committee. Dr Bradbury noted the Business Committee noted that the Officers of General Assembly: Moderator, Immediate Past Moderator, Moderator Elect, Clerk, Assistant Clerk, and Treasurer along with the four members of the General Secretariat and two members appointed by General Assembly to assure diversity; at the moment these are Reuben Watt and Darnette Whitby Reid.

The Revd Martin Knight wondered if there are general themes in cases which might indicate burnout, mental health issues, or other issues which might indicate issues around deployment. Dr Bradbury noted that there has been an informal evaluation of cases as they finish. Some of these emerge from the collective trauma of the pandemic where, because of that trauma, either the complainant has initiated a complaint that might not lead anywhere or where a minister has conducted themselves in ways that are influenced by that trauma. He further noted the presence of employed safeguarding staff in every Synod and the changing culture around safeguarding means the church is treating behaviour more robustly when people have been harmed. He also felt that the revised process made a significant change early on by sharing the responsibility for initiating a process to three people not just leaving that with the Synod Moderator.

The Moderator tested the mind of Assembly Executive about moving to the decision making stage. Assembly indicated its warmth.

The Revd Steve Faber felt it would be helpful to note that the Business Committee should act when there is an emergency but not when matters are simply urgent.

#### **Resolution 6**

**1. Assembly Executive accepts the recommendations of the Morgan Report as the basis for the preparation of an enhanced Ministerial Disciplinary process.**

**Agreed**

#### **Resolution 7**

**Assembly Executive instructs the working group (comprising Sharon Barr (Designated Safeguarding Lead), John Bradbury (General Secretary), Nicola Furley Smith (Secretary for Ministries) Andy Middleton (Head of Legal Services) and Sarah Moore (Clerk)) to continue to work with Dr Morgan on the preparation of new rules and accompanying processes for a revised process.**

**Agreed**

#### **Resolution 8**

Assembly Executive instructs the Business Committee, in consultation with the Complaints and Discipline Advisory Group, to enable work on the necessary structures and resources that will be necessary to implement a new process.

The Revd Dr Romilly Micklem moved to change the second “necessary” in Resolution 8 to “prerequisite”. Many members indicated they were in agreement. Dr Bradbury agreed to accept this amendment, members agreed, and the amended resolution read:

**Assembly Executive instructs the Business Committee, in consultation with the Complaints and Discipline Advisory Group, to enable work on the necessary structures and resources that will be a prerequisite to implement a new process.**

**Agreed**

## Resolution 9

Assembly Executive considers the introduction of a revised process to be an urgent matter which should be proceeded with as swiftly as possible.

Dr Bradbury asked Assembly Executive about Resolution 9. Members indicated they were cool towards remitting the authority to the Business Committee. Members were very warm to recalling Assembly Executive to discuss a revised Section O process. Given this, Dr Bradbury sought Assembly Executive's permission to withdraw Resolution 9. Members agreed.

### **9 Paper A2: Business Committee-GA Committee Structures and General Secretariat**

The General Secretary presented paper [A2-GA-Committee-and-Staffing-Structures.pdf](#) and moved the resolutions within

The Revd Jo Clare Young questioned the position of the Equalities Committee (to be renamed Equalities, Inclusion, Diversity and Belonging Committee) in the proposed new structure whether the committee would have a budget and how it would bring resolutions to Assembly (would it require Mission and Discipleship Committee to agree to it and bring it to GA)

The General Secretary highlighted that discussions with the Resources Committee re a budget for EIDB would require to take place. It would be a matter for the two committees to discuss and establish.

Ms Megan Price questioned if the use of the name "Ministries Committee" would cause confusion with the old "Ministries Committee."

The General Secretary didn't believe it would cause confusion.

Ms Rita Griffiths questioned the place of lay discipleship in the new Committee structure.

The General Secretary highlighted the need to work together in local churches, synods and at Assembly level to help form lay discipleship.

The Revd Claire Downing questioned whether the DGS role would be open to lay and ordained persons? She also questioned what message the proposed structural make up the theological or governance split would send out. She further asked if the role of the General Secretariat is defined.

The General Secretary highlighted that the current rules would not change but that there is a need to review all posts in Church House. He argued that the message of the areas are intertwined and parity amongst them is required in today's society. Dr Bradbury noted that the terms of reference for both the Moderators' Meeting and the General Secretariat should be reviewed.

The Revd George Watt requested an undertaking that there would be clarification of the role of the General Secretariat. The General Secretary provided the assurance requested.

The Revd Fran Kissonock stated that she did not believe it was appropriate for the Head of Governance to be a member of the General Secretariat. She is of the view that all members of the General Secretariat should be members of the URC.

The General Secretary indicated he was not concerned, given the role of the General Secretariat, for the requirements of all to be members of the URC and that he believed that the Head of Governance required to be a member in order to ensure that all areas of the URC's work is

addressing and embodying Governance concerns and to ensure the URC's compliance at this time in the Church's work.

Further consideration of A2 and the resolutions contained therein within it were remaindered.

### **Session 3**

The Moderator invited the Chaplain, Ms Andrea Heron, to open the session in prayer.

### **10 Paper A4 : Business Committee-The Future of Governance**

The Moderator asked Dr Bradbury to introduce paper [A4-Future-of-Governance.pdf](#)

The Moderator invited Assembly Executive members to ask questions.

The Revd Lindsey Sanderson recognised that the URC raises funds and spends those funds over three nations and inquired whether it would be necessary to set up a Scottish Charitable Incorporated Organization (SCIO) as well as a Charitable Incorporated Organisation (CIO).

The Legal Advisor, Mr Andrew Middleton, advised that it was possible to register an England and Wales CIO with the Office of the Scottish Charity Regulator (OSCR).

The Revd Dr Romilly Micklem stated that irrespective of what mechanisms were utilised, the Trustees would be liable if they failed to discharge their responsibilities correctly. He also asked if a CIO needed to elect its trustees, how could it ensure that the Business Committee would be elected.

The Legal Advisor advised that the election of trustees would depend on the stipulation in the relevant provisions of the CIO constitution and that it was not unusual for e.g. a body of people to be appointed as trustees. He confirmed that trustees must discharge their duties without negligence.

The Revd Geoff Felton questioned whether a CIO had any implications for the Isle of Man and Dr Hopkins enquired if these would have implications for Jersey and Guernsey.

The Legal Advisor said there was no difficulty with the Isle of Man but was unaware of the implications re the Channel Islands and that this matter would require further research.

The Revd Lythan Nevard wondered if the changeover of Assembly Moderators would cause problems in being trustees of the CIO.

Dr Bradbury intimated the trusteeship would need to be different from the current membership of the Business Committee – not least because employees of a charity should not be trustees of a charity.

Mr Chris Atherton emphasised that it was important to establish the correct type of CIO to ensure that the members of the CIO are coterminous with General Assembly.

The Legal Advisor explained that there were two types of CIO-Foundation and Association. He advised that a Foundation Model has a body of trustees only who are responsible for the oversight and finances of an organization whereas an Association model has trustees and members with the members appointing the trustees. They differ in terms of input and inclusivity. He advised that the difficulty with the Association model meant that there is a requirement to organize

members meetings etc. Ultimately whichever model is chosen it is imperative that the funds are used for the charitable purposes of the CIO.

The Revd Russell Furley-Smith warned against using acronyms in papers as it is very confusing. He further asked about the implications for local churches.

Dr Bradbury noted that some local churches have registered their funds as Charitable Incorporated Organisation and it may be an avenue that larger churches, with employees and riskier projects would wish to explore.

The Revd Clare Downing asked if the Business Committee as Trustees of the CIO will become overstretched if it has to undertake the current workload.

Dr Bradbury responded that the current trends in charity governance is that Trustees are expected to set strategy and goals in much the same way that the Business Committee already works.

Further consideration of A4 and the resolutions contained therein within it were remaindered.

The Chaplains led Assembly Executive in a time of reflection and prayer. The meeting adjourned thereafter.



**Session 4**

The Revd Andrew Mann-Ray led the Executive in worship.

**11 Paper AD1: Business Committee, E&L-Resource Centres for Learning**

The Revd Dr Michael Hopkins, Convenor of the Resources Committee presented [AD1-Resource-Centres-for-Learning-FINAL-AE-Feb-2025.pdf](#) with Victoria James, Chief Operating Officer and Pippa Hodgson, Convenor of Education and Learning.

The Moderator invited members to ask questions for clarification.

The Revd Bridget Banks asked if any thought had been given to asking Synods to financially support their students.

Dr Hopkins welcomed any offers of extra money from Synods into the Assembly Budget! However, he noted that Synods are often asked to give to wider work but that Synod money is often endowment money and spending that capital reduces revenue.

The Revd Dr Romilly Micklem noted that budget overspent is a recurring theme and any solution will crash and burn unless the church gets a handle on its budget. He further commented if the church has a variable income and fixed costs this story will only end one way and we need to align our costs in line with that variable income.

Dr Hopkins noted that the Resources Committee last week had agreed a robust policy on budget overspend and agreed with Dr Micklem's comments about fixed costs and variable income.

Peter Knowles wondered if there had been any assessment of the wider impact of the wider work of the RCLs beyond Education for Ministry 1. He also asked about what feedback had been given from the RCLs on the proposed directions of travel.

Ms Hodgson commented that other forms of ministry outwith EM1 is flourishing often running alongside EM1 training. The reason for focusing on EM1 is historically this is the purpose of the block grants. Ms Hodgson referred Assembly Executive to the extra papers where the thoughts of the RCLs are noted.

Richard Lewney asked for details of how much more the English Colleges would need to raise in order to deal with the over capacity of spaces in the Colleges.

Ms Hodgson noted that the colleges have more spaces than are currently being used. She noted the fixed and variable costs of the RCLs differ. She wants to move to a fixed cost per student but noted the Business Committee felt the Assembly Executive needed to comment before moving in any particular direction.

The Revd Geoff Felton thanked those who had put the report together and asked if consultation beyond the URC around lay and ministerial training and asked if we have considered blending

learning approaches such as the St Mellitus College approach in the Church of England. He also asked about if it was possible to train overseas ministers in the UK given the number of overseas ministers who wish to work with us.

Ms Hodgson noted consultation has happened beyond the URC; Northern and Westminster have a number of international students. She felt there is a strong need to preserve a URC distinctive ethos and this might be lost if we trained ecumenically.

The Revd Nicola Furley-Smith noted some negotiations with partner international denominations who wished to partner via the General Assembly rather than directly with an RCL.

Dr Bradbury noted the centralising tendency within Methodism about training is being reviewed as they have found unintended consequences in their last reform. He noted the Anglican model of training, from his own observation, leads to instability for colleges as the money follows the students.

The Revd David Salsbury asked about seed funding / £14million in the New College Fund and what the impact on the RCLs would be if that capital was spent.

Dr Hopkins noted that the New College Fund is a restricted fund endowment from the proceeds of a college sold in 1977. It generates £400,000 per year to be used on education purposes only. He confirmed that if we spent the capital then income would reduce.

The Revd Sal Bateman sees our situation as one of opportunity not scarcity. She noted we are waiting for the results of the Church Life Review which may have implications for the ministry the church wishes to provide. She also feels we are ignoring in this discussion of whole of life training needs in the URC and that we should review this, externally, before we decide on future funding of the RCLs.

The Revd Neil Thorogood, noting he was, for 15 years, a tutor and then principal of Westminster. He felt that all three of the RCLs are a blessing not a burden and that we are dealing with a very complex situation. He is not sure that we will ever get to a point which is static. There is a dynamism in how we do education for learning and there needs to be a dynamism in financial provision as we are in partnership with a range of other providers which are also constantly changing. Any change we make must honour and hold the treasure within our tradition and within our RCLs. He noted the Anglican model that he watched unfold in Cambridge was the law of the jungle where every college was pitted against each other, and he warned against that model for us as it would undermine who we are as a denomination. He warned this might follow a model of pay per student. Of course, the RCLs follow the will of General Assembly but there needs to be a two way conversation so the RCLs influence the thinking of General Assembly.

Ms Hodgson noted that conversation thus far had been focused on finance and it would be good to be an expansionist frame of mind than we have been.

The Revd Dr Romilly Micklem felt the investment strategy for the New College fund needed to be examined as it wasn't generating enough. He felt we had been in a static position regarding Colleges and we had navigated College closure before.

Dr Hopkins has asked the same question about strategy and is awaiting an answer.

The Revd Steve Faber could not see a way around a dog eat dog world if we maintain three colleges with fewer numbers of students coming forward, even if that unhealthy internal market is moderated by the Assessment Board deciding which College ordinands attend. He noted that we had heard that each RCL offers a different experience but that General Assembly should determine what those experiences are. He further suggested cohorts needed to be large enough to give good experiences.

The Revd Geoff Felton wanted to assert there are good things to learn from the Anglican Church and reaffirmed the experience of St Mellitus and Hope University in Liverpool and sees the advantages in a blended online model.

Dr Bradbury reflected the discussion thus far. He concurred with the comments from Dr Hopkins about asking Synods to pay more. He noted that every Synod is engaged in education and learning through Training and Development Officers and wonders if we should have the type of external review that Ms Bateman mentioned. He wonders about time and the immediate pressure on the budget.

The Revd Nicola Furley-Smith highlighted that EM1 training is primarily about ministerial formation rather than simply following courses.

Dr Hopkins pointed out that the longer we take to decide the more money we spend.

Alan Yates commented that the two suggestions in the paper are mutually exclusive but doesn't wish to delay a financial change. He felt this whole area is not about cost reduction but about priorities. He noted that if Education and Learning reduce their expenditure it releases money for other areas of the church's life.

The Revd Anne Sardeson was struck by the issues caused by delaying a decision but is also concerned about not delaying and making the wrong decision. She'd prefer us to take longer to make a better decision.

Peter Knowles endorses the idea of spending a little more time to review.

*The Moderator remaindered this business until later in the meeting. Assembly Executive broke for coffee.*

## **Session 5**

### **11 Paper BDFH1: Children & Youth Work Committee | Education & Learning | Ministries | Worship, Faith & Order - Towards a Ministry of Children's and Youth Work**

The Revd Samantha Sheehan and Ms Pippa Hodgson introduced the paper [BDFH1-Towards-a-new-formal-ministry-for-childrens-and-youth-work.pdf](#) .

Executive broke into small discussion groups to discuss the following questions

- a) Having read the paper and appendices, is this the correct direction of travel for developing this new ministry of Church Commissioned Children's and Youth Worker for the URC?

b) What opportunities could this new ministry offer in your context?

c) How should this new ministry be financed and what would be the implications for the denomination

Groups emailed the content of their discussions into the group for consideration. Assurance was provided that the feedback will be carefully considered in moving this matter forward.

Executive then discussed Resolution 14.

The Revd Lytham Nevard asked if this post be open for non-stipendiary candidates.

The Revd Nicola Furley-Smith advised it would be open for non-stipendiary ministry.

The Revd Dr Trevor Jamieson asked if the ministry, would include the need to preside at Sacraments.

The Revd Nicola Furley-Smith advised this was not envisaged to be part of the role.

Karen Bell asked if the training should be focussed on those already in youth and children's work roles.

The Revd Samantha Sheehan reminded Executive that exploration into this matter was due to General Assembly 2023 resolutions and was envisaged to be a new form of Ministry.

The Revd Jane Wade questioned why, given this is envisaged to be an intergenerational role, the word "family" was not included in the title?

The Revd Sheenan advised that the role was very much to involve family work.

The Revd Steve Faber asked if this was a stipendiary ministry or a salaried /employed ministry.

The Revd Samantha Sheehan explained this would be a stipendiary ministry.

The Revd David Salisbury if there was a way into this ministry through a Certificate of Eligibility and, if so, what gifts and graces would be looked for.

The Revd Nicola Furley-Smith remarked that Eligibility Certificates for ministries other than Word and Sacrament can be very difficult to map onto our requirements. She felt this would be a piece of work that could be done but would be complex.

The Revd Dr Romilly Micklem asked about funding for this new ministry in relation to the Church Life Fund review and that we are running down parallel tracks and not demonstrating joined up thinking.

The General Secretary advised that this was not linked to The Church Life Review and was a separate track about recognising a formally recognised Commissioned Ministries rather than employed lay people to run in parallel with other Ministries.

The Revd Sally Bateman moved that Resolution 14 be not put. The Revd Dr Micklem seconded this idea. At Dr Bradbury's suggestion Ms Bateman withdrew her resolution meantime to allow for further discussion and to facilitate Executive providing a required steer re what next.

The Revd Mike Walsh wondered if a salaried post was better to allow more people to be appointed and paid for by local churches.

The Revd Sheehan undertook to reflect further on what the pattern of ministry might look like. The Revd Nicola Furley-Smith pointed out that salaried posts are employees not office holders.

Daniel Raddings sought clarification that Resolution 14 was to facilitate moving this matter forward and discouraged further delays.

The Revd Geoff Felton believed this matter was highly inspirational and that General Assembly needed a concrete proposal to discuss. He requested partnership working moving this forward especially in relation to enable suitable numbers of applicants to any post created.

Steve Powell noted the resolution was in two parts and the task group can't have met the brief until it brings proposals to Assembly. He felt that the issues of deployment which remain to be addressed need to be addressed and feels that the feedback from earlier discussions needs to be reflected upon. He moved to delete the wording from "confirms" to instructs."

Dr Hopkins was concerned that feedback sent in by email undermines our discernment task as it is not possible to know the groups said so it's not possible to engage fully in discernment. He further noted as Convenor of Resources that this new ministry will need to be paid for and there is no proposal for to fund this.

The Revd David Salsbury fed back that his group were unsure how this ministry sat alongside the other ministries already established within the URC along with lay employed roles within churches and synods.

The Revd Nicola Furley-Smith referred Mr Salsbury to the papers which highlighted the connection with other ministries.

The Revd Samantha Sheehan indicated the Task Group wished to withdraw the Resolution, in order to allow them to reflect on the conversations and feedback from this Executive and consider what could and should be presented to General Assembly.

Executive consented to the Resolution 14 being withdrawn by majority. Concern was expressed that there did not appear to be general warmth to the proposal of this new form of stipendiary Ministry amongst Executive at this time. The Revd Samantha Sheehan assured Executive that the matter, with all feedback and comments etc, would be carefully considered before the matter is brought to General Assembly.

#### *Resolution 14*

*Assembly Executive confirms that the task group has met the brief of GA2023 resolution and instructs the task group to bring proposals for a new formal ministry of Church Commissioned Children's and Youth Workers to GA2025.*

*withdrawn*

The Executive broke for lunch.

## **Session 6**

12 The Moderator took the chair and Executive returned to **Paper A2: Business Committee-GA Committee Structures and General Secretariat**

**Resolution 1 Assembly Executive approves the formation of a Mission and Discipleship Committee in line with the content of Report A2 and instructs the Business Committee, after due consultation, to bring finalised Composition and terms of reference to the General Assembly in 2025.**

*Agreed*

**Resolution 2. Assembly Executive adopts the formation of a Children’s and Youth Work Programme sub-committee of the new Mission and Discipleship Committee, the terms of reference and makeup of which are to be agreed by the existing Mission and Discipleship Department Committees and the Youth Executive. The makeup and Terms of reference are to be formally adopted by the New Mission and Discipleship Committee at its first meeting.**

Dr Bradbury proposed an amended resolution (as above) which was accepted by Executive.

Dr Hopkins highlighted that an associated piece of work to reformulate Standing Orders to ensure enough time is allowed for this new Committees to report and bring business to Assembly.

Dr Bradbury assured Executive this work would happen.

The Revd David Salsbury noted other Committees are changing their remit and have not been included in resolutions and asked if there was a reason for this.

Dr Bradbury noted this was a mistake!

*The Resolution was agreed unanimously*

**Resolution 3 Assembly Executive adopts the formation of a new Ministries Committee in line with the content of Report A2 and instructs the Business Committee, after due consultation, to bring finalised Composition and Terms of Reference for adoption by General Assembly July 2025**

*The Resolution was agreed unanimously*

**Resolution 4 Assembly Executive instructs the Nominations Committee and the Youth Executive to bring names for the population of the new Ministries and Mission and Discipleship Committees to General Assembly July 2025.**

Heather Moore sought clarification re whether the “bringing of names” would be in addition to the defined roles already on those committees. Dr Bradbury confirmed that this would be covered by the Terms of Reference.

*The Resolution was agreed unanimously*

**Resolution 5 Assembly Executive determines that the General Secretariat shall consist of the General Secretary, the Chief Operating Officer, the Deputy General Secretary and the Head of Governance as of the close of General Assembly July 2025.**

The Revd Russell Furley-Smith questioned whether there should be a review/end date for this proposed composition.

Dr Bradbury urged caution re this and indicated that flexibility was desired at this juncture but confirmed that this would be a matter that would be kept under review.

Vaughan Griffiths questioned the inclusion of the role of Head of Governance whereas we don't currently have one and if there should be a substitute offered.

Dr Bradbury undertook to come back to Assembly in July should recruitment for this role fail.

The Revd Martin Knight highlighted that he was not entirely convinced that the title General Secretariat is appropriate as it sounds a little like a Soviet institution and seems more distant than is intended.

Dr Bradbury indicated his agreement but wondered what the alternative should be.

The Revd Sally Bateman wondered if the Head of Governance should be a role in attendance at the General Secretariat rather than a member.

Dr Bradbury indicated this idea had been considered but wanted to have an equality of membership within this group.

The Revd Steve Faber wondered if there should be a power of co-option in the case of vacancies. Dr Bradbury noted this could be dealt with in the Terms of Reference which are being developed.

The Revd Dr Romilly Micklem doesn't accept there is an employment law issue as this is simply a Committee not a post.

Victoria James noted that her role description includes being a member of the General Secretariat which gives her the required authority in Church House. She felt the same authority needed to be with the Head of Governance post.

The Revd Clare Downing pointed out that the only person in the General Secretariat who had to be a Minister of Word and Sacrament is the General Secretary. Dr Hopkins understands the employment point raised by the General Secretary but holds this is a conflict with the idea that this structure is flexible. He, therefore, asks for clarity if this measure is meant to be permanent or not.

Dr Bradbury noted that in existing job descriptions and contracts this is permanent but that to effect change would require HR processes. The job advert for Head of Governance has included the likelihood of the post holder being a member of the General Secretariat. By "flexible", Dr Bradbury has meant a 4-5 year timescale.

Chris Atherton noted a danger in the discussion of not trusting our secular employees.

The Revd Fran Kissack feels profoundly uncomfortable about the creation of a wider General Secretariat when the Terms of Reference for the body are not clear if the body is charged, primarily with giving theological leadership to the URC.

Executive indicated to the Moderator that they were not ready to move to a decision and wished discussion to continue.

The Revd Dr Romilly Micklem agreed with Ms Kissack in that Executive was being asked to put the cart before the horse and that Terms of Reference needed to be developed first.

Dr Bradbury agreed that Dr Micklem was correct but that the Councils of the Church had set this cart before horse situation up in the first place noting it illustrates the need for the Head of Governance to be part of the General Secretariat.

The Revd Lythan Nevard wanted more work to be done to consider why the Head of Governance needed to be within the General Secretariat.

Dr Bradbury agreed there needed to be more clarity but that it's not easy to start from where we are given the previous decisions of the Councils of the Church in the past.

The Revd Sally Thomas indicated her agreement with Dr Micklem.

Dr Bradbury wished to firmly resist a strict division between the theological and spiritual from the governance and operational parts of church life. He felt all four of these are key parts of our life together and should be held in a type of incarnational tension.

Willie Duncan noted the need to do the right thing and that, in our current climate, doing the right thing involves ensuring the Head of Governance is within the senior leadership of the church.

Karen Bell encouraged Executive to trust the recruitment process to appoint the right person of faith for this essential role. She questioned how "seasonable" the need for good governance would actually be given many of their areas of work are long term/permanent matters. Karen indicated her support for the Head of Governance to be part of the General Secretariat.

The Revd Clare Downing felt that Executive might be more comfortable the July Assembly was presented with both the Terms of Reference for the General Secretariat alongside the posts that should serve within it.

Dr Bradbury understood the logic of this comment he would prefer it if Executive would agree both the composition of the General Secretariat now but approve Terms of Reference at the July Assembly.

The Revd George Watt wondered about co-opting the Head of Governance until the Terms of Reference were agreed.

Dr Bradbury asked the Moderator to send the Resolution to a facilitation group. The Moderator agreed to ask Jan Adamson and Sarah Lane Cawte to convene a Facilitation Group.

### **13 Paper A5: Business Committee - the Future of the General Assembly**

The General Secretary presented the paper [A5-Future-of-General-Assembly.pdf](#)

Executive broke into discussion groups to explore papers A4 and A5 and the questions contained therein.

### **Session 7**



#### **14 Paper [R1-CDAG-Section-O-Changes.pdf](#) Amendments to Section O**

The Revd Andy Braunston introduced the paper and explained. There were no questions or points for discussion (not even from The Revd Dr Romilly Micklem)

The General Secretary moved the Resolution

**Assembly Executive amends the Manual's Section O framework and appendices as outlined in this paper**

*The Resolution was agreed unanimously*

#### **15 En Bloc Business**

The General Secretary moved the following papers and the resolutions contained within

**Paper A1 Reporting BC decisions since GA** [A1-Business-Committee-Report.pdf](#)

**Paper G1 Pensions Committee Terms of Reference** [G1-Pensions-Committee-Terms-of-Reference.pdf](#)

**Paper G2 Pensions Update** [G2-Pension-Update.pdf](#)

**Paper G3:Pensions Process and Delegated Authority** [G3-Pensions-Process-and-Delegated-Authority.pdf](#)

**Paper H1: NSM Expenses Policy** [H1-NSM-Expenses-Policy.pdf](#)

**Paper H3: Revision of Section O Appendix D** [H3-Revision-of-Section-O-Appendix-D-Moderators-Mandated-Warning.pdf](#)

**Paper I1 Mission Report** [I1-Mission-Report.pdf](#)

**Paper J1 Nominations:** [J1-Nominations-Report.pdf](#)

**Paper Q1 LBAC report** [Q1-LBAG-Report.pdf](#)

**Paper S1 PVG Matrix** [S1-PVG-Matrix.pdf](#)

**Paper S2 Safeguarding Committee Terms of Reference** [S2-Safeguarding-Committee-Terms-of-Reference.pdf](#)

Assembly Executive accepted the papers and resolutions unanimously and therefore agreed the following resolutions:

#### **Resolution 15**

**Assembly Executive approves the revised Terms of Reference of the Pensions Committee**

## **Resolution 16**

**On matters relating to the closed Ministers' Pension Fund, Assembly Executive notes that if the process for 'buy in and buy out' of the Pension Fund requires decisions from the Church which cannot be taken to either Assembly Executive or General Assembly for reasons of timing, then the Business Committee will exercise the authority delegated to it in its Terms of Reference to make urgent decisions on behalf of the Church. Such decisions would be taken on the recommendation of the Pensions Committee (through the Resources Committee)**

## **Resolution 17**

**Assembly Executive adopts the NSM Expenses Policy**

## **Resolution 19**

**Assembly Executive receives Journeying Together, the Roman Catholic/United Reformed Church Dialogue Group resource, give thanks to those who have produced this practical document and commends it for use by Synods, local churches and ecumenical partners.**

## **Resolution 20**

**Assembly Executive appoints committee members and representatives as set out in paragraph 4.1 of this Report ([J1-Nominations-Report.pdf](#))**

## **Resolution 21**

**General Assembly approves the amendments to the membership of the Safeguarding Committee from: Up to two representatives nominated by the URC advocated survivors group to Up to two representatives nominated either because they have lived experience as a survivor, or because they are a youth member (18-25)**

16 Paper A4

Executive returned to **Paper A4: Business Committee-GA Committee Structures and General Secretariat**

The General Secretary moved Resolution 10

The Revd Lythan Nevard asked to discuss the resolutions together as they are interlinked.

Dr Bradbury welcomed more general discussion and was open to both being discussed together.

Ms Nevard felt that the current Business Committee was quite small and was mixed of employees and URC office holders and wondered if that meant they could be trustees.

The Rev Dr David Chapman (Methodist Church) shared the experience of the Methodist Church re this form of governance and encouraged the URC to adopt it. He wondered if it is possible to separate the spiritual leadership of the church from the secular.

Dr Bradbury noted that the URC has been looking at how the Methodist Church has done this and noted that we are looking at a charitable law process which does not easily map onto our spiritual understanding of Church. He agreed with Dr Chapman in that governance is also about culture; he saw the need to adopt a governance model which is congruent with our ecclesiastical culture yet, at the same time, our culture has not dealt strongly enough with governance. Dr Bradbury highlighted the journey to this point highlighting that the URC Trust in the past (partly due to how it was set up) has been too detached from General Assembly which raised concern and that the Business Committee was an amalgam of the Assembly Arrangements Committee and the Mission Council Advisory Group (MCAG). He emphasised that we require to form a body with oversight of all matters and a solid wide working understanding of the work of GA.

Steve Powell recognised that the objectives could be met through either a CIO or a Company and asked for more information regarding the pros and cons (cost wise) of the current regime and that of a CIO.

Dr Bradbury felt that it would be possible to go with either route but that it would be better to go via the CIO route so we were only accountable to the Charity Commission and not Companies House too. The Legal Advisor further advised that benefits of creating a CIO as a legal entity include that it can hold land/funds/property, register the funds of GA and act as an employer which is contrary to the abilities of the current URC Trus. A CIO would enable neater, active and more meaningful governance, better utilising the active GA experiences, skillset and knowledge of its Trustees in a more positive way than the status quo.

Graham Jennings asked for more details of the roles of the people who would make up the Business Committee to ensure skill set me role requirements.

## **Resolution 10**

**Assembly Executive welcomes the ongoing exploration of the United Reformed Church Trust Company being replaced with a Charitable Incorporated Organisation and invites the Business Committee and the United Reformed Church Trust Company to continue further work leading in this direction.**

*This was agreed.*

## **Resolution 11**

Assembly Executive welcomes the exploration of a re-formed Business Committee, whose members would be members of the General Assembly, becoming the Trustee body of a new CIO and invites the Business Committee and United Reformed Church Trust Company to continue exploring this option.

Steve Powell queried what the overlap would be between the trustee and Assembly function.

Dr Bradbury noted that this paper has been evolving and explained how the two members of the current Business Committee who are not members of Assembly ex officio are very helpful. Dr Bradbury asked Executive's permission to withdraw Resolution 11 given that the authority to do the work is in Resolution 10.

The Moderator asked if Executive agreed with the withdrawal of Resolution 11; Executive agreed.

## 17 Paper A5 continued [A5-Future-of-General-Assembly.pdf](#)

Executive returned to Paper A5

Karen Bell reported that her discussion group preferred option A to B with some tweaks

The Revd Clare Downing noted her group had wondered how changes to General Assembly would fit in with other aspects of the church particularly with regard to how matters might be brought to Assembly.

Dr Bradbury didn't think there would be a change in how business gets to Assembly – though its committees or through Synods.

The Revd Geoff Felton noted his group battled with the decision making and pastoral and relational aspects of Assembly. They wondered about the feasibility of a 5 year term for GA Moderator. Dr Bradbury noted the unified way in which we attend to pastoral and relationship aspects alongside the governance of the church; he asked what we are willing to sacrifice that we can't do well.

Dr Bradbury asked to test Executive's mind about an Assembly every five years. Executive was icily cold to the idea. He noted that we need to be more proactive in looking at embodying diversity in our Assembly composition and noted ways in which other bodies do this.

The Revd Lindsey Sanderson noted that her group was warmer to the idea of a 5 year Assembly schedule. Her group saw it as an opportunity to use the consensus decision making process properly through discussion, discernment, Bible Study and worship the agenda of the Church emerges from General Assembly.

Dr Bradbury found the steers from Mrs Sanderson about the way we do business very helpful indeed. He wondered if we could find different modes of working for different types of business where consensus decision making could come into its own.

The Revd Sally Thomas reported in her group that a new model was needed but it wasn't sure what. She commented that the resolution only offered two possibilities and that we needed more creative options.

Dr Bradbury felt the resolutions were as broad as possible. The ideas in the paper were discussion starters not either/or options.

The Revd Dr Michael Hopkins noted the status quo is financially unsustainable. He noted the Assembly size in the 1970s compared to URC membership the size of Assembly should be about the current size of Executive. He suggested that having an Assembly and Executive is not necessary and we could, like the Church of England General Synod, meet more than once a year. Dr Bradbury noted that meeting around tables is a much better way of working but that this would require a smaller body. He was very warm to the idea of a smaller body of people meeting more frequently.

The Revd David Salsbury affirmed Dr Hopkins' remarks. He noted that preparation helps participation and that a longer preparation time is needed and giving better summaries at the start of papers.

Dr Bradbury thanked Mr Salsbury for his helpful comments on participation.

Catriona Wheeler asked which General Assembly in 2025 was referred to in the resolutions.

Dr Bradbury noted he meant July 2025.

The Revd Samantha Sheehan reminded Executive that the URC has actively committed to hearing the voices of children and young people at all levels of governance and is mindful how this will play into our discussions about governance. She also encouraged Executive to safeguard the minimum of two young people per synod.

Dr Bradbury noted that if we were reducing the number of Synod representatives this would mean there would not be 2 youth representatives per Synod but noted there are other ways of increasing the number of young people sent from Youth Assembly or Executive.

The Revd Sally Bateman wondered if there should be different reps for Assembly if it met twice a year. She also wondered about changing the times of meetings to enhance the participation of young people and to consider the ease of reporting and work.

Dr Bradbury noted her points needed to be given active consideration.

Jay Tynan craved more detail (and assurance) re how the representation of young people and children could be preserved and enshrined into future Assembly level gatherings.

The Revd Lythan Nevard noted that in her group indicated that Assembly needed to be an occasion of celebration and appreciation for the ecumenical partners present at Assembly. She commended the way of working at this Executive where discussion has led to matters being withdrawn and we should not see that as failure but as an example of greater discernment.

Dr Bradbury supported these comments.

Megan Price noted the difficulties and variances in being able to identify youth representatives for Youth Executive and General Assembly.

Dr Bradbury noted that we need to become more creative in how we recruit people to come to Youth Executive and General Assembly.

Victoria James hoped it would be possible to get to a point where General Assembly is able to set strategic priorities for any given period and this should feed into discernment about timing and frequency. The Revd Jenny Mills affirmed this.

Dr Bradbury noted that we are not always very good at using Assembly as a place to focus on priorities and strategy.

The Revd Fran Kissack urged us not to lose sight of our conciliar nature as we think about relative size of Assembly and Executive.

The Moderator asked Executive to vote on Resolution 12

**Resolution 12 Assembly Executive agrees that General Assembly 2025 should be invited to consider the size and pattern of meetings of the General Assembly.**

*This was agreed unanimously.*

Dr Bradbury asked Executive's permission to withdraw Resolution 13 confirming that discussions held at Executive have been heard and will assist with the framing of future work.

Executive unanimously agreed to Resolution 13 being withdrawn.

Resolution 13

2. Assembly Executive invites the Business Committee to bring more detailed proposals to the General Assembly for consideration based on the following options: ... [to be developed from the context of our conversations within Assembly Executive]

After prayer the Executive adjourned for dinner.

## **Session 8**

### **18 Mission Team presentation two**

#### **URC Apology to Jamaica**

Executive watched a short film about the ecumenical pilgrimage to Jamaica about the legacies of slavery (available on the URC YouTube channel)

Dr Stephen Tomkins conducted a conversation with The Revd Geoff Felton and The Revd Dr Tessa Henry Robinson in writing about their experience of the pilgrimage, the apology given, the need for it and what next.

The Chaplains led Assembly Executive in a time of reflection and prayer. The meeting adjourned thereafter.

**Wednesday 5<sup>th</sup> February 2025**

## **Session 9**

The Moderator invited his chaplains to lead the Executive in worship.

The Moderator invited the Revd Philip Brooks, Deputy General Secretary (Mission) to address the Assembly about the new Roman Catholic / URC Dialogue resource which had recently been published. Mr Brooks commended the resource to Assembly. (**Paper I1 Mission Report** [I1-Mission-Report.pdf](#))

### **19 Paper A2**

Executive returned to discuss Paper A2. The Facilitation Group introduced an amended Resolution 5 with two new clauses:

## **Resolution 5**

**Assembly Executive determines that the General Secretariat shall consist of the General Secretary, the Chief Operating Officer, the Deputy General Secretary and the Head of Governance as of the close of General Assembly 2025.**

**Assembly Executive requests the Business Committee to bring terms of reference the General Secretariat to General Assembly July 2025**

**Assembly Executive requests the Resources and Ministries Committees to determine, by July 2025, whether for future appointments the post of Deputy General Secretary for Mission and Discipleship should be restricted to members of the URC or ministers of the URC.**

After questions for clarification had been answered, concern expressed about the process, timeline of actions and the role of Head of Governance in the grouping and following some discussion, this resolution was agreed. Assurances were given that the name “General Secretariat” will also be thought about and reviewed and that if agreed, the Terms of Reference will be implemented immediately.

## **20 AD1 Resource Centres for Learning**

Executive returned to discussing paper AD1. [AD1-Resource-Centres-for-Learning-FINAL-AE-Feb-2025.pdf](#)

The Moderator invited The Revd Dr Hopkins, Convenor of the Resources Committee and the Revd Jenny Mills, Deputy General Secretary (Discipleship) to introduce Resolutions X and Y.

Dr Hopkins apologised for not including, in his previous remarks, further funding to the Resource Centres for Learning (RCLs) which include further capital funding from the New College Fund and resources given in kind.

Ms Mills noted that these resolutions were offered with the caveat that the conversations around the issues of governance and capital funding will continue, being facilitated by the Resources and the Education and Learning Committees. Ms Mills noted that the two resolutions were ambitious but the urgency of the situation, which has already taken a long time to resolve, coupled with the fact that the church cannot continue to spend money in the way we have done mean that action is needed. She noted, however, that whilst Executive understood the urgency a preferred option for moving forward was not offered. She noted there was a warmth towards understanding the contemporary learning needs of the URC including both lay learning and ministerial formation. She also thought that there was also a desire to be brave and consider some of the issues around smaller cohorts, excess capacity, and the current RCL provision.

The Moderator invited questions.

The Revd Neil Thorogood noted that this was a lot of work to do in a short period of time.

Ms Mills noted this was a challenging timespan. It was felt that Resolution X could be worked on

fairly quickly as the RCLs will need to know by September 2025 what their funding will be for the year ahead, whilst Resolution Y would need a 48-hour residential conference.

The Revd Sally Bateman was warm to the resolutions but noted they don't take into account the working of the Church Life Review process and asked why the deadline could not be for Executive 2026.

Ms Mills noted the Church Life Review is not charged with reviewing ministry and the outcome of these Resolutions would feed into the Church Life Review process.

The Revd Dr Romilly Micklem affirmed that this is an urgent task.

Ms Mills thanked Dr Micklem for his comments.

Elizabeth Hall urged Executive to carry these resolutions so that the RCLs can plan with knowledge of their funding especially around the care of staff if they had to enter into a redundancy situation.

Ms Mills thanked Ms Hall for her comments.

The Revd Samantha Sheehan asked that Children and Youth are involved in discussions around Resolution Y.

Ms Mills assured Ms Sheehan that Children and Youth will be involved.

The Revd Russell Furley-Smith asked that those charged with this work will be allowed to manage their workload well.

Ms Mills and Dr Bradbury assured Mr Furley-Smith that this would happen and the work is to be done in a challenging timeframe. Dr Bradbury clarified that Executive needs to manage its expectation of what other work will be possible given this piece of work will be pressing and that the pressure on the budget, and on the RCLs is unmanageable and so clarity is needed but there will be consequences as some other areas of work may well slip.

Resolution X was agreed unanimously.

**Resolution X Assembly Executive instructs the Education and Learning and Business Committee Working Group to bring back to July General Assembly 2025 proposals for addressing the excess capacity and associated costs in our formation of accredited and recognised ministries.**

Discussion continued about Resolution Y.

The Revd Steve Faber urged consideration around the importance of a training cohort and wished to give a steer to the working group to reduce the number of RCLs so that cohorts are larger.

Dr Hopkins noted that Mr Faber's comments were an obvious implication of the resolution and that this will be considered in the discussion. Ms Hodgon affirmed that the point had been heard.

**Resolution Y**



**Assembly Executive instructs the Education and Learning and Business Committee Working Group to design and implement a review of the learning needs of the denomination, with facilitation and external support, and to bring back a needs analysis to July General Assembly 2025.**

*Resolution Y was agreed unanimously*

**21 Paper A6 Assistant Clerk [Mission Council 2021](#)**

The Revd Philip Brooks moved the resolution:

**Resolution Z**

**Acting on behalf of the General Assembly, Assembly Executive appoints the Revd Dr Alex Clare-Young to serve as Assistant Clerk of the General Assembly from the close of this meeting to the close of the meeting of the General Assembly in 2029.**

Executive unanimously passed the resolution with thanks.

Executive concluded with Worship and Communion