



# CHRIST CHURCH CLIFTON

Our vision is to be a community of people who reproduce the life of Jesus

## PCC MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.30pm on Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2018

### STATUS

Approved  
24.02.2018

<b>Present</b>	Brendan Biggs, Alex Creavin, David Daniels, Derek Hadden (Chair), Ryan Langdon, Paul Langham, Janet Lee, Sian Lowe, Andrew Macpherson, Adam Marriott, Val Moore, Cluff Noon, Di Noon, Mark Orriss, Mark Parsons (Minutes), Neil Shepherd, Catherine Simmonds, Kevin Stone, Graham Stuart, Sara Wadsworth.
<b>Apologies</b>	Erica Bebb, Alice Denyer, Jill Garfitt, Peter Smithson, David Troughton.

Ref	Item	Notes	Action (what)	Who and by when
	<b>Introductions and Bible Reflection</b>	MP introduced a time of silent bible reflection using Haggai 1:1-2:8 along with a commentary from Nicky Gumbel after which members shared in groups their reflections and then fed back to the wider group.		
<b>A</b>	<b>MAIN ITEMS</b>			
<b>A 1</b>	<b>Finance Report Paper 01 a-f</b> <i>(SL took the minutes for this item)</i>	<p><b>Draft accounts for 2017</b></p> <p>MP took the meeting through a paper from the Finance Team (paper 01b) showing that despite having budgeted for a small surplus of £3,000 for 2017, the draft end of year accounts show a deficit of £40,000.</p> <p>MP briefly outlined the reasons for this:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Giving - there has not been sufficient increase in giving to cover costs. The reasons for this were outlined in the paper.</li> <li>2) Reduction in gift aid from HMRC, mainly due to fewer givers paying tax.</li> <li>3) The decision to provide the basement flat rent free to an asylum seeker.</li> <li>4) A net shortfall on a couple of residential events run during the year.</li> <li>5) Increase in energy costs for the church as usage of the building increases.</li> </ol> <p>MP noted that the deficit takes the closing General Fund reserve down to £3,000 and therefore breaks the principle adopted by PCC in 2014 of keeping the General Fund reserves in the range of £25,000 to £75,000.</p> <p>MP asked for questions or comments and after a couple of points of clarification MP put forward the proposal from the FT to transfer £40,000 from the legacy fund to the general fund to cover the deficit.</p> <p><b>This proposal was made by A Marriott, seconded by A Macpherson and unanimously agreed.</b></p> <p>Some discussion then took place regarding the best way of investing the designated funds. With the withdrawal of £40k the legacy fund will stand at £408,000 and there is no restriction on the use of this money.</p>		

		<p>MP explained that the designated funds were currently in a deposit account but to obtain a higher interest rate would require transferring funds to a different type of account, which would require action by PCC members (who as trustees need to provide ID to enable accounts to be open) and would also involve an element of risk and the locking up funds for a period of time. The view of the PCC was that if this meant a significant return on the money, then this process would be worth it. MP agreed to raise this with the Finance Team for their consideration.</p> <p>The Renew project was briefly raised and PL assured PCC that it is still alive and that meetings with architects are still happening. The PCC will be updated in due course.</p> <p><b>2018 Budget</b></p> <p>A draft budget (Paper 01a) was presented at the PCC meeting in November 2017. MP explained that following that meeting the Finance Team have revised the budget (circulated in Paper 01c) so that it achieves a balance in the General Fund.</p> <p>This has been achieved by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Reducing the global mission budget by £10k</li> <li>2) Regrettably no inflationary pay rise for CCC staff.</li> <li>3) Giving £10k of the parish share from the legacy fund rather than the general fund.</li> <li>4) Developing a culture of generous giving expecting to see a net increase of £14k in giving income.</li> </ol> <p>JL raised a concern that a £10k reduction in global mission would be too much and that a £5k reduction is the minimum that could be managed. It came to light that there had been a misunderstanding regarding the proposed global mission budget and it was agreed that the £10k cut would not be appropriate.</p> <p>Other points raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff inflationary pay rise – there was concern that this pay rise should not be affected. PL suggested that this could be reviewed during the year as giving increases. MP declared a conflict of interest and also pointed out that the PCC needed to adopt a balanced budget by the end of the evening.</li> <li>• Global Mission – it was mentioned that some church members are giving less to the church due to the cuts in our global mission giving and giving directly to missions instead.</li> <li>• Use of the legacies – it was suggested that the legacy could be used to fund a deficit budget. PL talked about the timing of the legacies, as explained in the paper, and said that ultimately we need to focus on increasing giving.</li> </ul> <p>DD requested that PCC hear the strategies for increasing giving before any decisions on the budget were taken.</p>	<p>Consider investment of designated funds for higher return.</p>	<p>Finance Team</p>
--	--	---	---	---------------------

		<p><b>Increasing Giving</b></p> <p>PL outlined the proposals from himself and MP outlined in Paper 01d. This focused on Communication and Capacity.</p> <p><u>Communication</u> - PL explained that we have not adequately communicated our financial need to the church family. Provision in the past has been a great process for encouraging those who already give but not for encouraging those who are new to CCC.</p> <p>In addition we have also not yet communicated our vision effectively enough.</p> <p><u>Capacity</u> – we have approx. 800 names on our database of which 500 do not yet give to CCC.</p> <p>The paper outlined a number of practical suggestions which address these two points.</p> <p><b>Approval of the 2018 budget</b></p> <p>MP reminded the PCC that a budget for 2018 needed to be adopted by the end of the meeting.</p> <p>Following discussion, the following changes were proposed to the draft budget circulated in Paper 01c:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reversal of the proposed £10k reduction to the global mission budget</li> <li>• Reversal of the proposed £10k reduction to parish share but to fund this from the Legacy Fund</li> <li>• Implementation of the 2.5% inflationary pay rise for staff at a cost of £5k</li> <li>• Increasing the new giving expectation from £14k to £29k to cover these changes.</li> </ul> <p>It was proposed that if income does not increase significantly enough then the legacy fund should be used to cover mission giving and the inflationary pay increase.</p> <p>It was further proposed that the PCC review progress on increasing giving in April.</p> <p>There was some concern expressed that continuing to dip into the legacy fund is unsatisfactory. PL emphasized again his confidence that the giving strategies outlined in Paper 01d would result in a significant giving increase.</p> <p><b>This proposal was made by SL, seconded by CN with approved with 4 abstentions.</b></p> <p>It was noted that 4 abstentions is a significant number and PL invited those who abstained to speak to him, MP or the wardens at the end of the meeting, should they want to explain their reasons for abstaining.</p> <p>DH thanked the Finance Team for all their work.</p>	<p>Review progress on increasing giving</p>	<p>PCC (April)</p>
<p><b>A 2</b></p>	<p><b>Safeguarding Paper 02</b></p>	<p>Richard Bebb, Parish Safeguarding officer for adults at risk was welcomed to the meeting for this item.</p> <p>GS introduced the two papers which had been produced by the Parish Safeguarding Officers (PSO's). The first was the Safeguarding Policy Document for children, young people and vulnerable adults. It has been based on the model policy supplied by the Diocese of Bristol.</p>		

		<p>GS reminded the PCC that responsibility for safeguarding lies with the PCC, not with the PSO's, who act as officers of the PCC.</p> <p>The second document contains the guidance notes for those working with children and vulnerable adults. SW explained that this document outlines how the policy works in practice and has been requested by those who work with the relevant groups, who have also fed into the document. As a result some tweaks will be needed in due course, but it is anticipated that as a working document the guidance notes will be updated regularly.</p> <p>A member asked how PSO's will ensure that staff and volunteers have read the document. SW explained that a procedure will be put in place before the APCM to ensure this happens and records will be kept.</p> <p>GS noted that the PCC is still short of a female PSO for children to work along himself and SW and RB as PSO's for adults at risk. There are a steady stream of safeguarding issues at Christ Church which the PSO's deal with, so this appointment is vital.</p> <p>RB raised the issue of lone working which covers risk management, personnel issues as well as safeguarding. It was agreed that a separate conversation with members of each of these groups was needed to address this.</p> <p>RB reminded members of the importance of not promising confidentiality when entering into conversations as disclosures need to be acted on.</p> <p><b>Adoption of the Policy and Guidance notes, alongside a process for ensuring staff and volunteers have read it was proposed by Graham Stuart, seconded by Catherine Simmonds and agreed unanimously.</b></p> <p>Thanks expressed to those who created the documents.</p>	<p>Develop a process for ensuring staff / volunteers have read the documents</p> <p>Convene a conversation on lone working</p>	<p>PSO's (April)</p> <p>Risk Management, Personnel and PSO's</p>
A3	<p><b>Apostleship Paper 03</b></p>	<p>PL had produced a discussion paper on the issue of apostleship. The paper was based on four questions raised by KS following previous discussions at PCC on issues of theology and authority.</p> <p>There was a wide ranging discussion mainly in the form of additional questions to PL. The issues discussed included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What difference would it make to your ministry if gifting is not acknowledged? <i>None! PL isn't seeking to be identified as an Apostle and feels more comfortable with the title Teacher. However if Eph 4 means all those 5 offices are alive in the church today, where do we find them in Christ Church?</i></li> <li>• Could it be that all 5 of them do exist but are just known by other names? <i>If God has given these offices we need to attend to them. If Pastor, Teacher and Evangelist are important, why not Prophet and Apostle?</i></li> <li>• Are the checks and balances in the CofE compromised by these offices?</li> </ul>		

		<p><i>This is a legitimate concern, but plenty of people with other titles (eg Vicar, Bishop) can abuse their position.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does PL's paper have any implications for how we operate at CC? <i>If Eph 4 is significant, we need to ask where the apostolic leadership / prophetic leadership of CC is. PL is not comfortable with is having a gap scripturally or theologically.</i></li> <li>What about Elders and Deacons in the NT? <i>PL outlined that there were a number of different leadership models in the NT which we needed to take seriously.</i></li> <li>The answer to Q3 is quite brief. Could we have more information about the criteria for allowing people to preach at CC? <i>PL agreed that the answer was brief. A concern being expressed was that only those with formal theological training should preach. A longer discussion followed in which a range of views were shared. SL shared here story of speaking at Christ Church for the first time. DD shared his experience of helping with communion on Christmas Day. CS asked if lay leaders needed a Bishops licence. CN stated that it was quite common for lay people to preach in smaller churches. AC noted the importance of growing and training new leaders.</i></li> </ul> <p>KS and PL agreed to continue this aspect of the conversation outside the meeting.</p>	Discuss qualifications for teaching at CC	PL and KS
<b>B</b>	<b>STANDING ITEMS</b>			
<b>B 1</b>	<b>Approval of minutes Paper 04</b>	The minutes of the PCC Meeting on 27 <sup>th</sup> November 2017 were approved with no amendments.		
<b>B 2</b>	<b>PCC Action Tracker Paper 05</b>	MP explained that the PCC action tracker has been introduced to enable a record of actions to be kept in one place. It will be revised regularly and circulated with the minutes.  The action tracker was reviewed.		
<b>B 3</b>	<b>Other Minutes Paper 06, 07</b>	The Standing Committee Minutes from 13 <sup>th</sup> November 2017 were noted.  A report from Risk Management Group Report was noted, but no members of the group were present to speak to this.		
<b>B 4</b>	<b>Finance Report</b>	None.		
<b>B 5</b>	<b>Paul's Points</b>	PL gave a brief update on the work of the Core Team. Good progress is being made on the role profile for Associate Vicar and this will be circulated to PCC members in due course.  PL reminded members that the Core Team was appointed by the PCC on 14 <sup>th</sup> October 2017 to work with		

		him on the day-to-day strategic leadership and direction for Christ Church.		
<b>B 6</b>	<b>Warden's Points</b>	DH asked if Elliot and Sophie Mocharrafie could be invited to a future PCC meeting to share their vision for youth work.	Invite Youth Pastors to future PCC	MP
<b>B 7</b>	<b>Operations Manager's Points</b>	MP gave a brief verbal report from the Coffee Shop Management Team including some of the recent encouragements from the coffee shop. One notable encouragement being an 80:20 split between non-church and church customers as tracked at the point of sales. MP outlined plans to recruit a second coffee shop worker / cleaner utilising money which is currently being spent on contract cleaners. This would allow the coffee shop to open for extended hours and open up the potential for serving lunch. <b>MP asked if the PCC supported these plans and this was proposed by Janet Lee, seconded by Val Moore and passed unanimously.</b>		
<b>B 8</b>	<b>Safeguarding Update</b>	None.		
	<b>Review of the Meeting</b>	RL was asked to give his views on his first meeting. It was recognised that more time could've been spent on the budget discussions and that a discussion of this complexity should be ideally scheduled for a Saturday morning meeting.		
	<b>Conflicts of Interest</b>			
	<b>Confidentiality</b>			
	<b>Communication</b>	No one volunteered to write a summary for the Friday email this time.		
	<b>Next Meeting</b>	Saturday 24 <sup>th</sup> February, 9:30am in the Church.		

The meeting closed with prayer at 21:57pm

**Future Meetings:** Sat 24th Feb, Mon 19th March, Fri Eve, 11th & Sat 12th May, Mon 25th June, Sat 14th Jul