

Extraordinary PCC meeting, Wednesday 29 August 2018

Present

Neil Rowe (NR) (Chair)
Tamsin Gilbert (TG)
Ruth Atkins (RA)
Grace Burfitt (GB)
Rosemary Siebert (RS)
Chris Nutman (CN)

Cathie Little (CL)
Caroline Manders (CM)
Kevin Mentzel (KM)
David Burfitt (DB)
Jill Rowe (JR)
Tim Jack (TJ)

The meeting started at 7:50pm

Item	Discussion	Action
1	Welcome and opening prayer	
1.1	NR warmly welcomed everyone to the meeting and opened with prayer.	
2	Apologies for absence, Richard Zair, Charles Gaisford, Mary Embleton, Alicia Davies, Michelle Herbert and Malcolm Denton.	
3	Declarations of Interest There were no declarations of interest.	
4	Appointment of Mark Newman as an associate priest	
4.1	The background information to the appointment of Mark Newman as an associate priest was in the agenda sent out prior to the meeting.	
4.2	NR said the proposal is for a 6-month trial with an internal review by the PCC and then after a further 6 months decide whether to continue or not.	
4.3	CN asked what would happen if after 6 months it is not working.	
4.4	NR responded that the Bishop and Archdeacon would intervene.	
4.5	KM asked where this initiative had come from.	
4.6	NR responded, from the PCC and the Bishop.	
4.7	RS added, a lot has centred on the thinking of the leadership team.	
4.8	TJ said there is a sense of mutual movement, but this is not a done deal. He understands the Bishop will not licence Mark until his hours and remuneration are sorted out.	
4.9	NR said the PCC would appoint Mark as an associate priest with a job description and agreed remuneration and this will not form part of the Parish Share.	

4.10	KM asked what drives this, is it Mark's availability or Richard's forced absence?
4.11	NR responded, Rachel has left her role and the team is down by one and if the PCC goes ahead with this there may not be a need to replace her.
4.12	NR added, Mark has given this a lot of thought and has suggested the title community chaplain.
4.13	KM asked what the difference would be between this role and an associate priest.
4.14	NR responded, Mark would not do funerals or weddings but would visit people in the community as needed, undertaking outreach community work, supporting the ALM team and supporting Sunday services.
4.15	KM said, money is tight, and we have four clergy already: Chris Hancock, Mark Newman, Kevin M and Rosemary S and many who are gifted in preaching. KM added, can the acute need due to Richard's being on sick leave be met without appointing Mark.
4.16	TJ responded that Mark may or may not be remunerated and Mark has expressed an interest in this.
4.17	NR added, Richard is warm to this and has already been mentoring Mark.
4.18	KM asked if this is common tenure and NR responded yes.
4.19	TJ said, if the PCC should approve this, then Mark could be licensed in a few weeks' time, but clarity is needed on the funding. TJ also asked how this fits with the budget decisions.
4.20	NR responded, Mark would not be licensed until the end of September and a working agreement needs to be in place.
4.21	KM asked if the licensing is for a certain period. NR responded it would initially be for 6 months with a review taking place.
4.22	KM added, a lot could happen in the next 12 months. TG responded, the Bishop and Archdeacon are aware of the challenges.
4.23	TJ added, as a PCC we need to specify flexibility as we do not know where the church and parish will be in a year's time.
4.24	NR responded, we would ensure there is clarity on a break clause / way out as required.
4.25	GB commented, this is a good idea and she supports the proposal. GB added, Mark is very good in the community and with families.

- 4.26 CN said he could not see any downsides and the PCC should go with it.
- 4.27 CM said she supports the proposal and does understand the no go areas but is concerned Mark would not lead funerals or weddings.
- (20:20 DB arrived at this point)
- 4.28 KM queried why Mark feels he wants to not take funerals or weddings. RS responded, the reason is personal to Mark, but the situation could change, and the role develop.
- 4.29 KM requested that any working agreement does not exclude weddings and funerals. NR responded, this could be built into the 6-month review.
- 4.30 TG added, Mark can only give a certain amount of time to this role as he does work to enable him to support his family.
- 4.31 NR advised the suggested hours for the role could be half a day a week and some evenings and weekends.
- 4.32 TJ suggested the commitment could be in hours over a month rather than on a weekly basis.
- 4.33 KM recommended that Mark keeps a monthly worksheet of his hours.
- 4.34 CN asked if it is normal to pay a stipendary and NR responded yes.
- 4.35 TG added, this would be a working agreement between Mark and the PCC and not a contract. Mark would have an honorarium agreement.
- 4.36 CN asked what Mark would do that is different.
- 4.37 TG responded, Mark could do the pastoral care, join the staff team, support JR and Rob Finch and help with school assemblies.
- 4.38 DB said the PCC would be foolish not to support the proposal.
- 4.39 CL asked if the role would just be for Marcham. RS responded, it is for the benefice, so Shippon, Marcham and Garford.
- 4.40 NR added, Mark still wants to maintain his army cadet role.
- 4.41 KM asked if Mark would be mentored and NR responded, yes, primarily by Richard and then the staff team.
- 4.42 The following resolution was proposed: the church wardens will continue to talk with Mark and put together a working agreement and speak to the Bishop.

4.43	PCC members at the meeting unanimously supported the resolution. TG advised that MD also supported the proposals.
4.44	A discussion took place on Mark's remuneration.
4.45	TG proposed a £200 monthly honorarium payment to Mark.
4.46	CN added, the honorarium would be taxable.
4.47	KM asked how many hours a month would the £200 equate to. TJ responded, this would depend on discussions with Mark about his duties and Mark would probably not be thinking of it as an hourly rate.
4.48	CL added, used what was Rachel's salary for this makes sense, but there will still be a negative situation with the budget.
4.49	CL asked if Richard is off sick, does the Diocese claim Statutory Sick Pay and would this be reflected in the parish share. NR responded, no.
4.50	CL asked what year the Dioceses work to and NR responded the calendar year. CL added, Richard has a £300 a quarter travel allowance which has not been used since he has been ill.
4.51	A proposal was put forward to pay Mark £200 a month for a calendar year, starting when licensed.
4.52	All PCC members present approved this proposal.
5	Review of stipendary clergy cost across the united benefice
5.1	The background information to the review of stipendary clergy cost across the united benefice was in the agenda sent out prior to the meeting.
5.2	NR reported that churches in benefice situations have more financial challenges.
5.3	NR added, discussions will also take place with St Mary's PCC and then the Deanery.
5.4	CM asked if the discussion is about how we share the costs with St Marys. NR responded, yes, and looking at hoe it is working with St Marys in continuing to share Richard.
5.5	CL asked if it is likely St Mary's would become separate from All Saints. NR responded, we would be talking 10 years ahead for this. He added, if we must write our Parish Profile then we could influence this.
5.6	CL said the split is 75/25 with Richard leading a service there one Sunday a month. NR added, although Richard has been taking two services a month at Shippon.

5.7	TJ added, it is hard to quantify, apart from the two Sunday's a month. Shippon always has an uphill struggle and is often fund raising to meet their .25 and are not wanting to move to a single parish.	
5.8	In summary for Richard: 0.6 All Saints 0.2 St Mary's 0.2 Diocese	
5.9	TJ responded, therefore the Deanery Share Group is asking the PCCs to look at this.	
5.10	NR added, on St Mary's would be having their own discussions on 12th September after which we would need to organise a meeting with them.	
5.11	Further discussion then took place.	
5.12	CL said, we pay for .75 but have between .5 to .6 as St Mary's are using more.	
5.13	TJ added, there will be no changes before Richard's retirement.	
5.14	TJ proposed two possibilities: 1. Go back to the Deanery for 2019 and stay with 0.75 of the stipendary post and the house. 2. Give a warning to the Deanery that if move to an interregnum our profile may change the 0.75.	
5.15	CL responded, so we are happy to continue as it is and St Mary's getting more than is paying for.	
5.16	KM asked what has happened since Richard has been off as Rosemary has only been taking one service a month at St Mary's.	
5.17	NR, responded, when Richard comes back he could do three services a month at All Saints and only one at St Mary's.	
5.18	TJ suggested an alternative view point of returning to 0.6.	
5.19	CL responded she understands this, but it would impact on Richard's pension.	
5.20	TJ added, the 2019 share must be agreed in November 2018.	
5.21	TJ proposed a strong message being sent to the Deanery. 75/25 for 2019 bit not endorse for 2020 onwards and if the church goes into an interregnum this may reduce. (21:15 - JR left the meeting at this point)	

<p>6</p> <p>6.1</p> <p>6.2</p> <p>6.3</p> <p>6.4</p> <p>6.5</p> <p>6.7</p> <p>6.8</p>	<p>Budget discussion</p> <p>The background information to the budget discussion was in the agenda sent out prior to the meeting.</p> <p>CL started the discussion by saying the budget for 2019 needs to be set and provided the following commentary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The same items in the 2018 budget will need to be covered in 2019 • This is the last year Rob’s salary comes out of his restrictive pot • There will be some of Rob’s salary, costs and expenses left from the 3 years • A letter will need to be written to those who pledged to fund Rob’s post asking to put the funding in the main pot. <p>CL added, she has linked with the Diocese and suggested it employs a book keeper to help churches and she was told there was no funding for this.</p> <p>TJ commented on the onerous nature of a treasurer’s role.</p> <p>CL added, regarding the youth work, we can either afford it or not. CL said she will write to the people who are funding Rob’s post and thank them for giving but not as an add on role but an integrated part of the church.</p> <p>Action: TG and NR to draft a letter about the vision for the church and then Cathie will add the financial elements and once approved CL will email out.</p> <p>TG suggested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the parish admin post salary in the budget could be reduced to three mornings a week so £3,000 a year • the older persons salary post could be removed and used for Mark’s role <p>Action: TG to speak to the bell ringers about the need for repairs etc</p>	<p></p> <p>TG/N R/CL</p> <p>TG</p>
<p>7</p> <p>7.1</p>	<p>Appointment of external auditor</p> <p>NR reported that an external auditor is still needed, and MD is speaking to Jane Fabes to see if she could do the role.</p> <p>Action: TG/NR to put a note in Madnews seeking an auditor if needed</p>	<p>TG/ NR</p>
<p>8</p> <p>8.1</p> <p>8.2</p>	<p>Appointment of stand in for Richard on the MCG board</p> <p>NR advised a stand in is needed for Richard on the MCG Board and has had initial discussions with Adam Grady and mark Newman (Mark would need to resign from the Anson Trust Board).</p> <p>PCC members agreed either Adam or Mark would be suitable for this.</p>	<p></p>
<p>9</p> <p>9.1</p>	<p>AOB</p> <p>NR said the Parish Council have a new approach for bids for funding being submitted and any ideas need to be in by 30 September. The bids must be non-religious and not related to salaries.</p>	<p></p>

	<p>Ideas put forward were funding any work on the church bells, the Village Café and the Welcome to Marcham pack.</p> <p>Action: TG will discuss any potential bids with JR and Rob.</p> <p>The meeting closed at 21:45</p>	TG
	<p>Date of next meeting</p> <p>The next meeting is taking place on Wednesday 26 September 2018.</p>	