

Questions and Answers under business rule 6.3

1. Support for churches in the Middle East

Mr Peter M G Young asked the following question –

Has the Diocese given any support or offered any support to the following churches (or other similar organisations) in Sydney since 1 January 2014 in refugee matters and, if so, in what (general as opposed to specific) manner –

- (a) Holy Apostolic Catholic Assyrian Church of the East,
- (b) Syriac Orthodox Church,
- (c) Greek Orthodox Church,
- (d) Armenian Apostolic Church, or
- (e) Armenian Church?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

No, not in Sydney.

Anglican Aid has distributed funds for Iraq to the Diocese of Egypt, the Foundation for Relief and Reconciliation in the Middle East (FRRME) and St George's Anglican Church in Baghdad. These funds were then distributed through church networks. The Anglican Aid Annual Report will be provided to Synod members today. Page 10 of the Report states that FRRME distributed funds through the following churches in Iraq –

- The Syrian Orthodox Church
- MarShamot Church
- The Armenian Church
- The Carmelites
- Al-Bishara Church

2. Grants from the Diocesan Endowment to brownfield churches in 2007

Ms Lyn Bannerman asked the following question –

In respect of the \$9.32m brownfields grants (made from the one-off \$20m distribution in 2007 from the Diocesan Endowment) to the 9 parishes (excluding St Barnabas, Broadway) listed in the table at paragraph 10 of the paper "Ministry progress and brownfields' grants", page 166, Book 2 (Supplementary report of the Standing Committee) –

- (a) What criteria were used by the relevant Committee at the time, which made these grants in 2007?
- (b) Was there an open application process available to all parishes?
- (c) How much of each grant to each parish was spent on –
 - (i) repairs, maintenance and general upgrade of matters such as lighting and sound systems; and/or
 - (ii) extensions of existing buildings; and/or
 - (iii) new land; and/or
 - (iv) new buildings?
- (d) Was any consideration given by the granting committee, in respect of issues of repairs, maintenance and equipment upgrades referred to in point (c)(i) above, concerning the ongoing responsibility of church wardens relating to the care and maintenance of all church property and grounds?

Questions & Answers for the 2015 session of the 50th Synod

- (e) Was there a formal acquittal process required in respect of each of these grants and were these requirements met by each parish?
- (f) What was the remaining \$10.68m, from the total of the \$20m one-off distribution, spent on?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

The *Mission Property (Appropriation and Amendment) Ordinance 2007* (the “Ordinance”) established a mechanism by which the Mission Board, acting under delegated authority, was to determine the priorities for the application of the \$20 million appropriated from the Diocesan Endowment and added to the capital of the Mission Property Fund.

The Mission Property Committee (“MPC”) was required to report to the Mission Board about progress in implementing projects (both greenfield acquisition, the development of land and brownfield construction and renovation of ministry buildings) identified in accordance with those priorities.

- (a) Consistent with clause 5B of the Ordinance, the MPC considered the potential of a project to contribute to the objects of the Diocesan Mission was to be assessed primarily by its potential to contribute to an increase in the number of people attending church in the Diocese.

This was assessed by reference to a range of factors, some of which can be quantified and others of which are more subjective. Specific attention was given to –

- (i) evidence of growth (using the Church Life Cycle model) – does attendance and offertory data indicate potential for growth in the parish?
 - (ii) the status of the existing buildings – does the condition or capacity of existing buildings inhibit ministry?
 - (iii) projected demographic growth – is the parish located in an area where there is expected to be substantial population growth?
- (b) It was not an application process, the MPC drew on data from a number of sources including the New Capital Project (facility utilisation), project readiness (DA approval, regional Architectural Panel, etc), strategic demographic factors (Mission Property Strategy Report), and parish leadership (the Church Life Cycle model).
 - (c) The answer to this part of the question is shown in tabular form and will be available on the notice board in the foyer and on the SDS website.
 - (d) No grants were given for repairs, maintenance and equipment upgrades.
 - (e) Clause 5(4) of the Ordinance required the MPC to provide a detailed report to the Standing Committee about its progress in implementing projects. The MPC also appointed a project manager to oversee the completion of each project in accordance with the building contract.
 - (f) The answer to this part of the question is shown in tabular form and will be available on the notice board in the foyer and on the SDS website.

Attachment: (parts (c) and (f))

	Project total	Funding	Type
Annandale	2,400,000	1,000,000	Extension
Auburn St Thomas	500,000	450,000	Extension
Berowra	3,000,000	900,000	Extension
Broadway	18,500,000	1,750,000	New building
Dapto	3,300,000	1,100,000	New building

Questions & Answers for the 2015 session of the 50th Synod

	Project total	Funding	Type
Glenmore Park	2,400,000	900,000	Extension
Hoxton Park	5,280,000	1,400,000	New building
Marrickville	280,000	170,000	Extension
Naremburn/Cammeray	3,900,000	500,000	Extension
Rooty Hill	3,500,000	1,150,000	New building
Total	43,060,000	9,320,000	
Contingency		680,000	
Oran Park (land)		2,200,000	
Austral (land)		1,750,000	
Stanhope Gardens (land)		3,630,000	
Other		2,400,000	

3. Secure online access to Synod documents

Ms Lyn Bannerman asked the following question –

Noting the expressed desire from some members at previous Synods for easier access to Synod documents, including confidential ones, which are too voluminous to make freely available in printed form –

- (a) Is there any consideration being given currently to the development of a secure area of the SDS website for Synod members?
- (b) Have any major barriers been identified to such a development, and if so, what are they; and
- (c) If so, what proposals are there, or might there be, to address these barriers?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

- (a) SDS is currently considering how it can best provide secure information on its website to the members of the various boards and committees it serves. This includes Synod members.
- (b) In relation to Synod, a major barrier is the projected level of administration required to facilitate individual logon credentials on the current website for about 770 Synod members.
- (c) The most promising avenue to address this is as part of a possible new website, which is being actively considered.

4. Access to Audited Accounts and Annual Reports of Diocesan organisations

Ms Lyn Bannerman asked the following question –

As a number of the Audited Accounts and Annual Reports of the 41 diocesan organisations, tabled in Synod are publicly available on the Australian Charities and Not-for-profits Commission (ACNC) website –

- (a) could Synod please be provided with a list of those diocesan organisations and the website link to their reports; and

Questions & Answers for the 2015 session of the 50th Synod

- (b) noting this Diocese's Governance Policy for Diocesan Organisations, Appendix 1, section D, part (d) which states –

“Members of the Synod must have reasonable access to the annual reports of diocesan organisations tabled at the Synod and must have an adequate opportunity to ask and have answered questions about the governance of diocesan organisations”,

could Synod in future receive this information, requested in part (a) of this question, prior to each Synod; and

- (c) if not, why not?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

- (a) The answer to this part of the question is shown in tabular form and will be available on the notice board in the foyer and on the SDS website. So far as we can ascertain it is not possible to provide a direct web link to the audited accounts on the ACNC Register because of the way the ACNC uploads this information to the Register. The table provides the ABN's for the organisations. These ABNs can easily be used to search the ACNC Register for the information at www.acnc.gov.au.
- (b) Yes (though not direct web links to audited accounts for the reason stated). One possibility is that we indicate which organisations in the list have their audited accounts and reports available from the ACNC Register.
- (c) Not applicable.

Attachment:

School / Organisation	ABN
Abbotsleigh School Council	18 199 714 462
ACPT – Community Building Partnership Fund	19 344 575 886
Anglican Retirement Villages #	39 922 848 563
Anglican Youthworks	96 398 231 605
Anglican Aid (incorporating Archbishop's Community Care and Development Program) #	28 525 237 517
Anglican Aid – Overseas Ministry Fund #	94 609 182 072
Anglican Aid – Overseas Relief and Aid Fund #	59 792 865 372
Anglicare #	88 851 368 006
Arden Anglican School	22 851 187 489
Barker College Council	18 620 620 356
Campbelltown Anglican Schools Council	65 653 218 326
Illawarra Grammar School Council	88 023 426 543
Kings School Council	24 481 364 152
Macarthur Anglican School Council	58 390 019 481
Moore Theological College Council	47 746 452 183
St Catherine's School Council	98 012 260 068
Sydney Anglican Schools Corporation	63 544 529 806
Sydney C of E Grammar School Council (Shore)	60 352 822 184
Tara Anglican Girls School Council	88 512 104 678

School / Organisation	ABN
Trinity Grammar School Council	79 245 605 610
William Branwhite Clarke College Council	83 169 319 110

Note: # – 30 June year end.

5. Licences for Assistant Ministers and Stipendiary Lay Workers

The Rev Simon Roberts asked the following question –

- (a) How many new licences were issued to Assistant Ministers and Stipendiary Lay Workers in 2014-15 (ie, not renewals of existing licences)?
- (b) How many of these licences were issued before a Rector made a letter of offer to the applicant and before they commenced parish ministry?
- (c) How many of the licence applications covered by (a) were refused?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

- (a) Between 1 October 2014 and 30 September 2015 new licences (not renewals of existing licences) were issued to –

60 ordained Assistant Ministers; and

23 Stipendiary Lay Workers

A further 27 new licences were issued to Assistant Ministers as a consequence of them being ordained as a presbyter.

- (b) Licences are only issued to Assistant Ministers and Stipendiary Lay Workers in parishes in accordance with a request by the Rector of the relevant parish. The Diocesan Registry has no way of knowing the date of a letter of offer to an applicant and relies upon the Rector to notify the date of commencement in the parish. Presumably a Rector would not sign a licence application for an Assistant Minister until he was satisfied that an appropriate offer and acceptance of a position was in place.

Rectors should ensure that any offers made to prospective Assistant Ministers and Stipendiary Lay Workers are subject to clearance by the Professional Standards Unit and the approval of the Archbishop.

- (c) The Registry is not aware of any completed application which has been refused during the year.

6. Minimum price for the sale of Bishopscourt

Mr Bruce York asked the following question –

My question concerns what is the process for the evaluation of the minimum acceptable selling price of Bishopscourt.

I understand the Standing Committee Subcommittee was not satisfied by the private auction best offer and therefore the sale process was not concluded. However for understandable commercial reasons the best price offer was never stated and therefore my question concerns what the process was in determining minimum acceptable price. I would take this to mean that someone did the sums on the current costs of running Bishopscourt compared to the estimate of costs in running another Archbishop's residence. The difference would be capitalised at current Glebe Board earnings rate (say about 4%) and this plus the funds required to purchase a new residence would determine the minimum acceptable price. Has something like this been undertaken by the

Subcommittee please? Hopefully the final sale would be substantially greater than this minimum to provide for funds to be invested for the benefit of the Endowment of the See.

The Synod will also need to be reasonably satisfied that the sale has been properly evaluated not only on financial grounds but also on non-financial grounds.

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

This question is out of order under business rule 6.3(4) in that it contains assertions, expresses opinions and offers an argument.

Nonetheless I can make the following general comments.

The minimum price for the sale of Bishops Court is determined by Standing Committee after a recommendation on an offer to purchase has been made to it by the Property Trust.

The Property Trust has not made any recommendation on a sale price to the subcommittee of the Standing Committee.

Synod may be aware that while media speculation has suggested a sale price in the order of \$25m, for commercial in confidence reasons the Property Trust does not comment on such speculation.

The Property Trust also notes Synod's requirement that up to \$7m from the sale proceeds is required to be applied towards the purchase of a new residence for the Archbishop and his family, so determination of a minimum sale price necessarily needs to balance the ongoing cost of operating Bishops Court, including the maintenance of a routine capital expenditure program and achieving a sale at a level that will ensure that the sale proceeds over and above \$7m is of sufficient size to generate an appropriate investment return over the longer term.

7. Review of Ethical Investment Policy

The Rev Katrina Haggart asked the following question –

In their review of the Ethical Investment Policy has the Glebe Administration Board considered extending negative screens to cover businesses that use sexualised or porn-inspired advertising? If so, why is this not included in the report? If not, why not?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

No. In reviewing the scope of the negative screens in the existing policy, Glebe Administration Board is only considering those activities which have been the subject of a specific Synod or Standing Committee resolution or direction (for example, businesses which earn revenue from pornography and gambling).

Glebe Administration Board is not aware of any specific Synod or Standing Committee resolution or direction about the matter referred to in the question.

8. Resources for outreach to Muslims

The Rev Dr Margaret Powell asked the following question –

What is the Diocese currently doing to equip our churches to reach Muslims for Christ in our city in the face of their increased presence among us?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

There are people working in our Diocese who are experienced in connecting with Muslim people and who are available to visit churches and train church members - at least 19 as well as 1 working in the academic sphere and 2 currently training in Middle East in order to return and minister in Sydney. In the past year some churches (at least 5) and 3 university campuses have taken up this opportunity.

MentAC (Mentoring Across Cultures) is an apprenticeship training program based in Greenacre and has been operational for 4 years. In this 2 year program full or part time apprenticeship trainees are given theoretical input as well as practical experience in talking with Muslim men and women about Christ. There are currently 18 coming to the formal training and this includes 5 official trainees and 3 from other denominations.

There are several courses available which can be run in small or large groups with local or specialist leaders e.g. Cross and Crescent; Friendship First (Interserve); Bridges Course (Crescent Project, AIM).

Each year Moore College teaches a number of classes on Islam and all Moore College students are given the opportunity to be part of a focussed mission.

While there is much happening in a few areas of Sydney and amongst a small number of Sydney Anglicans, there is much work to be done to equip our churches to reach our Muslim neighbours for Christ.

9. Financial operation of the Glebe Admin Board and the Finance and Loans Board

Mr Mark Boyd asked the following question –

- (a) Can churches apply for loans from the Glebe Board?
 - (i) if not, when did this process cease?
 - (ii) if not, what arrangements were made for existing Glebe Board loans at that time?
- (b) Were any loans refinanced to the Finance & Loans Board? If so, how many and what was the total value?
- (c) How much capital does the Finance & Loans Board have?
- (d) How much is available to loan?
- (e) Does the Finance & Loans Board have any lending limits?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

The Glebe Administration Board determined in November 2013 to cease its lending business and thereby ceased making new loans to parishes. Existing GAB borrowers were notified that loan terms would continue to be honoured but they would need to seek an alternative lender at the expiry of the loan with GAB. A number of borrowers have refinanced loans with other financiers or repaid loans.

The Finance and Loans Board has refinanced some, but not all, of the former GAB loans.

The Finance and Loans Board has net assets of about \$15.6m of which about \$2.8m is currently available for lending to parishes and other Diocesan organisations under its Ordinance.

The Finance and Loans Board is limited by the amount of capital it has available to lend but generally lends amounts up to \$750,000 for capital works on church buildings and rectories.

10. Workers compensation for ordained clergy

Mr Paul Fitzpatrick asked the following question –

- (a) What arrangements are in place for Workers Compensation (or equivalent) for ordained clergy injured in the course of their ministry in this Diocese?
- (b) Do these arrangements differ from those in place for lay people on staff at a church?
- (c) If so, how and why do they differ?
- (d) Would the President please advise the Synod of any recommended options for parishes to pursue in this area, especially in light of individual differences in private health cover and the potential severity of workplace injury?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

- (a) Parish clergy of the Diocese of Sydney are not, generally speaking, covered by the NSW Workers Compensation system. Alternative arrangements are in place for parish clergy.

There is a Stipend Continuance Insurance plan which provides a monthly income benefit if parish clergy are totally disabled due to injury or sickness, or having been totally disabled, remain partially disabled. It is paid after 90 days have elapsed after the injury or sickness and continues until retirement or the disability ceases. Parish clergy who have completed 6 or more year's service receive a benefit of up to 75% of the notional value of the remuneration package of a minister. Parish clergy with less than 6 years service receive a benefit of up to 75% of the notional remuneration package of a 3rd and 4th year assistant minister. The benefits are lower in the case of a partial disability. Further information is contained in the SDS facts sheet about the Stipend Continuance Insurance Plan, which will be posted with this answer in the foyer and on the SDS website [*not reproduced here*].

The Diocesan Sickness and Accident Fund also provides for payments to wardens to meet any short-term additional costs incurred when parish clergy are unable to perform normal ministry duties due to sickness or accident. It also provides assistance, up to certain limits, when parish clergy incur medical, hospital, rehabilitation or related expenses following an accident which occurred in the course of performing normal ministry duties, and these costs are not covered by insurance or Medicare.

- (b) Yes.
- (c) At a broad level the main differences are as follows –
 - Workers compensation applies in relation to workplace injuries, while Stipend Continuance Insurance coverage applies whether the injury or sickness is work related or not. Given the nature of ministry it would not always be clear whether or not a minister is injured in the course of work.
 - Workers compensation would provide a refund for medical and other expenses, while the Sickness and Accident fund provides assistance up to certain limits. However many expenses would also be covered by Medicare or Private Health Insurance.
 - There is also the possibility of lump sum payments under workers compensation.
- (d) No. Part (d) of the question is out of order under rule 6.3(4)(f) of the Synod business rules as it seeks a legal opinion.

11. The role of the Commissary

Mr Paul Fitzpatrick asked the following question –

What exactly is a Commissary and why does the business of Synod require that he be tabled?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

Section 11 of the Constitution in the Schedule to the Anglican Church of Australia Constitution Act 1902 provides for the bishop of a diocese to appoint another bishop as a commissary who may exercise the powers vested in the diocesan bishop if the diocesan bishop is absent from the Province of NSW.

The word “commissary” is derived from the word “commission”. The Commissary acts in commission with the Archbishop in fulfilling his diocesan duties when he is unavailable to do so.

Rule 1.2 of the Synod Business Rules provides that the Commissary will preside at Synod in the absence of the Archbishop.

Rule 3.2(d) of the Synod Business Rules requires that the appointment of the commissary be tabled. The rule provides for the transparent and efficient running of the Synod in the event that the Archbishop is unavailable to preside.

12. Special Religious Education in public schools

Mrs Alison Woof asked the following question –

Concerning Special Religious Education (SRE) in public schools in New South Wales.

- (a) How many students are taught Primary SRE by people overseen by the Diocese? How many teachers and helpers do we deploy in this ministry?
- (b) How many students are taught High School SRE by people overseen by the Diocese? How many teachers and helpers do we deploy in this ministry?
- (c) Regarding the banning of High School SRE resources earlier this year –
 - (i) was the Diocese aware of the ban before it was in place?
 - (ii) if the answer to (c)(i) is “yes”, what advocacy did the Diocese perform at that time to attempt to stop the ban before it was in place?
 - (iii) what advocacy did the Diocese perform after the ban was put in place?
- (d) Regarding the changes to the Enrolment form for SRE –
 - (i) was the Diocese aware of the changes to the Enrolment form before they were in place?
 - (ii) if the answer to (d)(i) is “yes”, what advocacy did the Diocese undertake at that time to attempt to stop the changes to the Enrolment form before they were in place?
 - (iii) what advocacy did the Diocese perform after the changes to the Enrolment form were put in place?
 - (iv) does the Diocese have an estimate of the contraction in the number of students enrolled for SRE due to those changes? If so, what is that estimate?
- (e) Regarding the banning of Special Religious Instruction (SRI) in Victoria, what liaison has been performed by the Diocese with the providers of SRI in Victoria and the Dioceses in Victoria to learn from that experience to ensure such a ban does not occur in New South Wales?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

- (a) 2,300 SRE teachers and helpers and an estimated 80 000 students.
- (b) Approximately 200 SRE Teachers and an estimated 30 000 students.

Questions & Answers for the 2015 session of the 50th Synod

- (c) There was a Ministerial directive to immediately disallow the use of three high school resources in public and secondary schools, though the Department claims it was not a ban.
- (i) No.
 - (ii) Not applicable.
 - (iii) As the directive came from the Minister, the Archbishop immediately sought an appointment with the Minister for Education, which was granted the following week. The outcome of this meeting was to reinstate the two books in the high school curriculum. One of the books, *Teen Sex by the Book*, was not part of the SRE curriculum despite the Minister's directive including this publication.

Senior Youthworks staff also met with representatives of the Department a week after the directive and requested an explanation for the directive and the process by which it was implemented.

The Diocesan Secretary and the SDS Legal Counsel also met with the Department's Legal Counsel in an effort to understand the legal basis, if any, for the Department's action.

- (d) (i) Yes. The Director of EdComm was aware of the proposed changes as a member of the Department's SRE Consultative Committee.
- (ii) Advocacy was made by both the Executive Director of EdComm, Dr Bryan Cowling and by the Archbishop who supplied and advocated alternative forms in writing.
- (iii) Dr Cowling is in ongoing conversations with the Department as the new enrolment form for 2016 was released last week. The Archbishop continues to have an active interest in this area.

A representative from Anglican Youthworks liaised with representatives from the other SRE providers to advocate for the 2014 changes to be overturned and for a new form be developed that better reflected the legislation regarding SRE in the school program.

- (iv) Youthworks has received significant anecdotal evidence that the changes did have a material and negative impact on some schools. Sales of Youthworks' SRE resources were down approximately 10% within one year. Several factors have contributed to the contraction in the number of students enrolled in SRE. At least some of that decline may be attributed to the 2014 changes to the Enrolment form that was put in place.

- (e) The SRE Office Director has been contacted by Victorian ACCESS ministries to discuss how we respond to the changing environment around SRE.

The Standing Committee has also requested a report from EdComm concerning SRI in Victoria and its implications for NSW. It is anticipated that this report will be provided to the November 2015 meeting of the Standing Committee.

13. Current Commissary

Mr Daniel Armishaw asked the following question –

Who is the current Commissary?

To which the President replied –

From time to time I sign a document appointing a Commissary. The appointment only comes into effect when I am absent from the Province of New South Wales.

On some occasions the person who usually acts as the Commissary may be absent or unable to act and therefore it is usual practice for the appointment document to list a number of bishops to act as may be needed.

By a document signed by me on 25 September 2015, the following were appointed as Commissary in the order shown –

Bishop Robert Forsyth
Bishop Ivan Lee
Bishop Peter Hayward
Bishop Chris Edwards
Bishop Peter Lin

14. Average weekly service attendance in the Diocese related to Connect09

Mrs Pamela Shaw asked the following question –

I recall that at the Synod in 2014 someone on the floor stated that the number of parishioners in the Diocese went down after the commencement of the first Connect mission.

Can we please have the relevant numbers of parishioners in the Diocese –

- (a) before Connect 1,
- (b) after introduction of Connect 1.

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

There is no way of knowing the number of parishioners in the Diocese however each year the Diocesan Registry receives returns from parishes about average weekly service attendance. The attendance numbers for 2013 are shown on page 128 of the 2015 Year Book.

Assuming the reference to “Connect 1” in the question means what was known as Connect 09, I can advise that the total average weekly service attendance for the whole diocese in the relevant years were –

2008	50,634
2009	51,951
2010	53,216

15. Itinerant preachers employed by Evangelism and New Churches

The Rev Matthew Lemsing asked the following question –

How many itinerant preachers and how many student ministers has Evangelism Ministries employed each year from 2005 to the present?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

The number of itinerant preachers employed by Evangelism and New Churches ranged from 2 to 6 over the period.

ENC engaged either 5 or 6 student ministers from 2005 to 2009, none from 2010 to 2014 and 4 in 2015.

Further details will be provided in tabular form on the notice board in the foyer and on the SDS website.

Attachment:

Year	Itinerant preachers	Student ministers
2005	6	5
2006	4	5
2007	3	6
2008	5	5
2009	5	6
2010	3	0
2011	3	0
2012	2	0
2013	3	0
2014	3	0
2015	4	4

16. Simplified form of the Doctrine Commission's report into Human Sexuality and the Same Sex Marriage Debate

The Rev Jeremy Tonks asked the following question –

Is the Archbishop aware of any plans to provide a simplified and more accessible summary of the Doctrine Commission's "Human Sexuality ... (and the same sex marriage debate)"?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

At its December 2014 meeting, the Standing Committee requested Anglican Media (in consultation with the Chair of the Doctrine Commission) to communicate the report through "the publication of a condensed version...in Southern Cross" and "the preparation and dissemination...of material conveying the key elements of the report to broader audiences".

In March this year, Anglican Media published a feature article in Southern Cross titled "Beneath the Surface" which contained a summary of the key elements on the report. A PDF copy of the March Edition of Southern Cross can be accessed at sydneyanglicans.net.

17. Parishes that contribute to the central Diocesan funds and organisations

Ms Lyn Bannerman asked the following question –

Are there any other parishes that contribute by ordinance to central Diocesan funds and organisations other than those listed at page 140 of Book 1 (red book)? If so, can a list be provided to Synod of the churches, the receiving funds/organisations and the annual amounts?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

The answer is shown in tabular form and will be available on the notice board in the foyer and on the SDS website.

Attachment:

Organisation/fund and Parish	Amount distributed in 2014
Diocesan Endowment	
St Laurence	\$14,303
Miranda*	\$3,134
*From September 2015 distributions are instead made to the Synod Fund.	
Endowment of the See Expenditure Fund	
Ryde	\$81,727
Northern Regional Council	
Hunters Hill	\$2,689
South Sydney Regional Council	
York Street	\$354
Surry Hills	\$3,469
Leichhardt	\$39,782**
Darling Street	\$1,253
Randwick	\$18,118
** This figure is larger than usual given late distribution of some 2013 funds.	
Georges River Regional Council	
Liverpool	\$17,961
Other	Unknown
The Parish of Campbelltown makes contributions to the Sydney Anglican Indigenous People's Ministry Committee.	
The parish of Leichhardt makes contributions to CMS.	
The parish of Liverpool makes contributions to the parish of Fairfield with Bossley Park.	
The parish of Malabar makes contributions to Unichurch (UNSW).	

Notes:

1. The question uses the present tense. The answer therefore includes parish contributions from investment and lease income but not one-off past contributions made from sale proceeds.
2. The list only includes contributions made under an ordinance. It should be noted that other parishes may also make direct contributions to organisations from their own funds.
3. The list does not include the payments from parishes already listed on page 140 of the Synod Book.

18. Use of Greenfield Grant money

Ms Lyn Bannerman asked the following question –

In answer to my question dated 12 October 2015, on Brownfield Grants (made from a one-off distribution in 2007 from the Diocesan Endowment for various building projects) it was advised that \$2.4 million was spent on “other”.

- (a) Could a breakdown of this \$2.4 million be provided to Synod?
- (b) And if not, can an indication be given of the general purposes to which the expenditure was put?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

All of the \$2.4m was applied to supplement the Land Acquisition Levy funds used to purchase the Mission Property Committee's most recent sites at Leppington (\$1.5m) and Marsden Park (\$0.9m).

19. Development of Safe Ministry Training resources

The Rev Craig Schafer asked the following question –

In relation to paragraph 48 of the Safe Ministry Board (SMB) and PSU report –

- (a) Will the SMB consult with rectors as part of its considerations of online delivery of safe ministry content?
- (b) Is the SMB aware if other churches in Australia are successfully using online safe ministry training?
- (c) When does the SMB anticipate that its considerations will reach a conclusion?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

- (a) Yes. There are also 2 Rectors who are currently members of the Safe Ministry Board (the "Board") who bring a parish perspective to the delivery of training.

The Board would encourage any Rectors who wish to be consulted in relation to the online delivery of safe ministry training content to email the Professional Standards Unit.

The Board has also already surveyed Safe Ministry Representatives in relation to safe ministry training earlier this year. The Board has noted that there is strong support among survey respondents for an online component of the training. The Board has resolved to investigate this matter further.

- (b) Yes. Hunter Bible Church on the Central Coast is one example of a church that has developed, and is using, online safe ministry training.

The Board has recently learned that another denomination is currently developing online safe ministry training for the use of its member churches. The Board will be liaising with those involved in the development of this training as part of its investigations as to what form of training may be suitable and appropriate for the Sydney Diocese.

- (c) It is likely that the SMB will have completed its investigations into this matter by the next session of Synod, and will have made recommendations about this matter by that time.

20. Consultation with Syrian speaking churches regarding the intake of refugees

The Rev Craig Schafer asked the following question –

In planning how best to respond to the Australian Government's decision to accept a special intake of Syrian refugees, what consultations has Anglicare, the Archbishop or other diocesan representatives had with representatives of Syrian speaking churches in Sydney?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

I have not as yet undertaken any direct consultations with representatives of Syrian Churches in Sydney. To my knowledge, nor has Anglicare, or any other diocesan representatives.

Undertaking such consultations with representatives of Syrian churches and congregations in Sydney will of course be a consideration as the diocesan response to the special intake of refugees gains momentum in the coming months once refugees begin arriving in numbers.

21. Greenfields funding and the Land Acquisition Levy

The Rev James Warren asked the following question –

- (a) Is 2% “greenfields” Land Acquisition Levy enough?
- (b) If there was more money available to MPC what more could be done?
- (c) What opportunities/greenfield are we missing out on that is a great shame given the development of Sydney?
- (d) What amount (percentage-wise) would MPC find useful if they could request?
- (e) What is holding us back in increasing this figure or asking parishes with larger incomes to contribute more?
- (f) Who is best placed to reconsider whether the Land Acquisition Levy is set high enough?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

The Diocesan Resources Committee is responsible for providing recommendations to Standing Committee and Synod regarding the land acquisition levy and future funding of MPC.

Approximately \$2 million per annum is to be raised by the land acquisition levy from 2016-2018. Synod has set the levy at 2% of parish receipts based on a number of considerations including the demand for land acquisitions and what is a feasible amount for local parishes to afford.

The MPC estimates that \$17.5 million in greenfield land acquisitions and \$42 million for construction of new churches is required over the next 5 years. This answer excludes the needs for new churches in brownfield areas of the Diocese.

The most recent land acquisition at Marsden Park cost \$3 million, and so the levy is likely to fund 1 new site approximately every 1 1/2 years. However, this is insufficient to provide the amount of land and construct the new churches required to serve the rapid population growth in the greenfield areas of the Diocese. Greater funding would allow the MPC to make a greater number of strategic land acquisitions at a significantly reduced price. For example, in 2012 the MPC identified suitable land at Box Hill to acquire for a 2 hectare site for \$2 million, however there were insufficient funds available. Land prices have now more than tripled in this time due to land rezoning and infrastructure provision, and MPC may not be able to afford to purchase a much needed church site for that locality. An increase in funding could also allow the MPC to bring forward the construction of more churches on the 5 sites acquired that are currently vacant. This would enable the MPC to facilitate the provision of churches to effectively catch up with the population growth.

The Archbishop’s New Churches for New Communities aims to raise funds for the cost of construction of new churches on MPC sites.

It is noted that a number of parishes have already recognised the funding needs of the MPC and have donated funds above and beyond the levy towards the MPC to support the mission in greenfields areas of the Diocese.

The MPC acknowledges that the need for new churches is greater than funds available, and has expressed its thankfulness to Synod for allocating the current land acquisition levy and also to parishes for their financial support. Any increase in the levy will enable MPC to provide the abovementioned land and new churches in a shorter time frame.

22. Safe Ministry training program costs

The Rev Roger Cunningham asked the following question –

Questions & Answers for the 2015 session of the 50th Synod

Regarding Youthworks' responsibility to implement the Safe Ministry Training program across the Diocese on behalf of the PSU, for each of the years 2013, 2014 and 2015 –

- (a) What is the total expense of this undertaking broken down in the form of an itemised list?
- (b) What are the sources of income currently utilised to meet this expense?
- (c) What is the break-down of amounts received from each source as an itemised list?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

The answer is shown in tabular form and will be available on the notice board in the foyer and on the SDS website.

SAFE MINISTRY	12.5%	14.0%	14.0%
* Proportional to the total staff allocation to support Safe Ministry in the year received.	Youthworks Ministry Support employed 1.2 staff tasked to support Safe Ministry in 2013. This figure represents 12.5% of the total team capacity. The team employed a total of 9.6 staff.	Youthworks Ministry Support employed 1.2 staff tasked to support Safe Ministry in 2014. This figure represents 14% of the total team capacity. The team employed a total of 8.6 staff.	Youthworks Ministry Support employed 1.4 staff tasked to support Safe Ministry in 2015. This figure represents 14% of the total team capacity. The team employed a total of 9.6 staff.

Safe Ministry Item	2013	2014	2015 Budget
Income	\$	\$	\$
Training	29,205	26,498	37,000
PCR	100,000	100,000	103,000
TOTAL	129,205	126,498	140,000

Expenses	\$	\$	\$
Staff Salaries*	90,394	87,737	109,152
Staff on-costs*	12,096	14,776	19,633
Marketing/ Promotions*	11,875	13,300	22,065
Financial Fees*	875	586	1,008
Depreciation*	527	485	588
Safe Ministry Program Expenses	22,108	8,000	6,000
Communication/ Information Technology*	2,582	2,458	3,158
Office Costs	2,040	2,463	2,436
Accounting and Head Office*	11,962	13,398	13,300
TOTAL	154,459	143,203	177,340

SURPLUS / DEFICIT	(25,254)	(16,705)	(37,340)
--------------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

23. Special Religious Education training program costs

The Rev Roger Cunningham asked the following question –

Questions & Answers for the 2015 session of the 50th Synod

Regarding Youthworks' responsibility to implement the Special Religious Education (SRE) accreditation program across the Diocese on behalf of the Archbishop, for each of the years 2013, 2014 and 2015 –

- (a) What is the total expense of this undertaking broken down in the form of an itemised list?
- (b) What are the sources of income currently utilised to meet this expense?
- (c) What is the break-down of amounts received from each source as an itemised list?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

The answer is shown in tabular form and will be available on the notice board in the foyer and on the SDS website.

SRE MINISTRY			
ASSUMPTIONS	55%	55%	55%
* Proportional to the total staff tasked to support SRE in the year received.	Youthworks Ministry Support employed 5.2 staff tasked to support SRE in 2013. This figure represents 55% of the total team capacity. The team employed a total of 9.6 staff.	Youthworks Ministry Support employed 4.6 staff tasked to support SRE in 2014. This figure represents 55% of the total team capacity. The team employed a total of 8.6 staff.	Youthworks Ministry Support employed 5.2 staff tasked to support SRE in 2015. This figure represents 55% of the total team capacity. The team employed a total of 9.6 staff.

SRE Item	2013	2014	2015 Budget
Income	\$	\$	\$
SRE Training	32,972	44,760	52,000
Donations	400,658	504,966	523,000
Grant*	176,000	177,300	200,000
TOTAL	609,630	727,026	775,000

Expenses	\$	\$	\$
Staff Salaries*	398,191	344,680	428,811
Staff on-costs*	55,715	58,052	77,131
Marketing/ Promotions	52,250	52,250	86,687
Fundraising*	76,750	140,740	207,000
Financial Fees*	3,444	2,304	3,960
Depreciation*	2,321	1,745	2,310
SRE Program Expenses	10,589	16,369	21,000
Communication/ Information Technology*	11,361	10,818	12,408
Office Rent*	8,973	9,681	9,570
Sundry*	968	310	1,015
Accounting and Head Office*	52,635	52,635	52,635
TOTAL	673,197	689,584	902,527

SURPLUS / DEFICIT	(63,567)	37,442	(127,527)
--------------------------	-----------------	---------------	------------------

24. Review of Regional Councils

The Rev Roger Cunningham asked the following question –

When was a review of the purpose and effectiveness of Regional Councils last conducted?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

The Standing Committee conducted a review into the effectiveness of regionalism in 2006. This was in response to a proposal in the explanatory statement for the bill for the Regions Ordinance 1995 that such a review be undertaken.

The 2006 review involved canvassing the views of regional bishops and regional councils and considered that major changes to regionalism at that time were not justified. Instead a number of minor changes were recommended and adopted by the Synod in passing the Regions Amendment Ordinance 2006.

25. Online delivery of Safe Ministry Training

Mrs Pat Low asked the following question –

In light of the increasing number of our parishioners who are required to do Safe Ministry Training, has consideration been given to making the process easier (but not less rigorous) by making the theory component an online course, with a hard copy for those not wishing to do it online, to be completed and tested before a single, shorter face to face session?

To which the President replied –

I am informed that the answer is as follows –

Consideration has not been given to structuring safe ministry training in the manner specified in the question. However, this will be taken as a suggestion to be considered by the SMB as part of its investigations into this matter referred to in the answer to Question 5. Thank you for the question.