## 27/17 Gender representation on Diocesan boards and committees

(A report from the Standing Committee.)

## Key Points

- The current representation of women on Diocesan boards has increased in recent years. However, there is potential for, and benefit in, further increasing the representation of women.
- The use of terms 'quotas', 'targets' and 'goals' causes confusion and produces strong responses when discussing gender participation. Gender quotas are not recommended for the Diocese of Sydney since tying down membership of boards too tightly by way of any personal characteristic (i.e., gender, race or age) rather than qualification may stifle the ability of those with gifts to serve.
- The levers of change are on the nomination side of the process, rather than goals and targets in the electing side.
- Increasing the participation of women on Diocesan boards needs to address both issues of opportunity and supply, and demand. Various recommendations to address these issues are contained within the report.
- A permanent subcommittee of the Standing Committee is proposed to be established to monitor gender representation on boards and implementation of recommendations.


## Purpose

1. The purpose of this report is to provide the Synod with a response to the request of Synod resolution 27/17 regarding Gender representation on Diocesan boards, committees and councils.

## Recommendations

2. Synod receive this report.
3. Synod noting the report $27 / 17$ Gender representation on Diocesan boards and committees, request the Standing Committee consider implementing the recommendations contained in the report.

## Background

4. At its session in October 2017, the Synod passed resolution 27/17 in the following form -
'Synod requests Standing Committee to bring a report to the next Synod which outlines the composition of the various Diocesan boards, committees and councils in so far as they reflect the gender participation of those groups.
Synod requests the report to include -
(a) the numbers and percentages of women and men on the Synod Diocesan boards, committees and councils,
(b) goals or targets that the Diocesan organisation could work towards to ensure greater balance of diverse representation of Diocesan boards, committees and councils,
(c) recommendations as to how to improve participation by women, and
(d) a summary of any theological considerations involved in reaching their decisions.'
5. At its meeting on 12 February 2018, the Standing Committee constituted a committee (the Committee) comprising Mrs Gillian Davidson, the Rev Nigel Fortescue, Dr Claire Smith and the Rev Zac Veron to undertake the work requested in resolution 27/17 and report to a future meeting of the Standing Committee.

## Analysis of gender balance on Diocesan boards

6. The Committee began its work with an analysis of the current gender representation on Diocesan boards and committees (hereafter, board or boards). In response to Resolution 27/17(a), the attached table provides numbers and percentages of women and men on Diocesan boards where at least some members are elected by the Synod (Appendix 1). The table illustrates the complexity of both measuring and changing gender representation on Diocesan boards. Almost every board has a different composition and many involve quotas for certain kinds of people (e.g., indigenous, region, lay, clergy, or clergy with certain years' standing). The Committee recognised this data was a starting point in understanding the gender composition of Diocesan boards. The Committee considered that this data needed to be refined and maintained.
7. In analysing this data, the Committee was encouraged by the current representation of women on some boards, the overall participation of women on boards, and an observed, albeit slow, increase in recent years. However, the Committee also agreed there was potential for and benefit in increasing the representation of women, for theological and pragmatic reasons (see below). It was recognised that there are other demographics that could be considered to increase the diversity of board representation (e.g., age and cultural background) but determined that these were beyond the remit of the Committee.
8. The Committee recognised that the use of terms 'quotas', 'targets' and 'goals' causes confusion and produces strong responses when discussing gender participation. The Committee was unanimous that we were not discussing or recommending quotas in this context (a quota being a mandated result which must be achieved). The Committee used the terms 'goals' and 'targets' interchangeably and recognised that they were aspirational outcomes, and adopted that terminology and definition as expanded in paragraph 14 below in our discussion.
9. The Committee considered a significant obstacle to greater participation of women appears to be that not enough women are being nominated to fill positions. That is, the Committee believed that if electors (i.e., Synod, Standing Committee) were given the opportunity to elect more women they would do so. This means that the levers of change are on the nomination side of the process, rather than goals and targets in the electing side.
10. The Committee is very grateful for the excellent work of the staff from the Sydney Diocesan Secretariat (SDS) who compiled and analysed the data in Appendix 1 for the consideration of the Committee.

## Goals and targets

11. In beginning this work, the Committee gave attention to the matter of goals and targets and engaged briefly with various reports and information from corporate Australia. The Workplace Gender Equality Agency (WGEA) Report 'How to set gender diversity targets' encourages gender diversity but stops short of nominating an exact goal or target that it deemed as "best practice". Rather the encouragement is to "improve the gender diversity" of the Australian workforce. The reasons given for improving gender diversity are -

- gender diversity improves business performance, innovative creativity and agility.
- gender diversity is the "right thing to do".
- gender diversity policies and reporting are increasingly common.

12. In our context, the Committee supports the first reason offered wholeheartedly. A more demographically diverse board usually produces more dynamic and innovative results because a variety of people bring a variety of perspectives and ideas to be considered. The second and third reasons provided in the WGEA Report are less persuasive, in the way they are stated. Reliance on the demand of rights or peer group pressure for improving gender balance or setting gender targets and goals runs contrary to the shape of the gospel. Moreover, the Diocese of Sydney, and the organisations within it, are fundamentally different from a for-profit company or government agency where women have often been systematically denied opportunities for advancement, equal remuneration and career progression. We are a family of churches and organisations, an association of disciples of Christ, with different dynamics and foci from the secular world. Those who serve on boards do so as volunteers as part of their service of Christ. This is not to say that gender diversity is unimportant but that the motivation for it and the method of pursuing it in the church will be different from that in the world.
13. The WGEA report defined targets as 'achievable, time-framed objectives which organisations can set on a regular basis to focus their efforts on achieving improved outcomes'. The importance of achievable and measurable targets was clear in the literature and it was noted that targets can often have a negative impact on organisations and reduce motivation when not achieved.
14. In considering the request to include in this report goals or targets that boards could work towards, the Committee recognised that it was not appropriate to nominate either a number or percentage at this point in time for a number of reasons including -

- the very different nature of our boards,
- the different nominating provisions within the foundation or governing documents of the boards,
- the difficulty in obtaining and maintaining reliable data as to the current composition of boards, and
- changing people's attitudes or openness to participation is more complicated than setting goals or targets.

15. With these things in mind, the Committee set itself to consider how to improve participation by women on Diocesan boards beginning with some theological reflection.

## Theological considerations

16. It is clear from the Scriptures that men and women are created equally in the image of God with equal dignity and capacity to serve in a multiplicity of ways both inside and outside the church (Genesis 1:27-30; Romans 12:3-8; 1 Thessalonians 4:11). Men and women are not identical, and have been created to work together with complementary differences given by God, for our good and for the good of those we serve.
17. Scripture does not directly address the composition of boards. Neither does it describe boards that might provide examples for consideration. However for our purposes, it is significant that women are seen in gospel support roles throughout the New Testament. There are many instances of the support women provide to the ministry of Jesus (Matthew 27:55; Luke 10:44; John 12:2). Acts 16 describes Lydia as a generous gospel host who supports Paul's work. Romans 16 describes a long list of men and women who were benefactors and contributors to Paul's ministry, but they were not members of a committee. We might say that in addition to the 'vine' work of promoting the gospel, both men and women were involved in the 'trellis work' in the New Testament period.
18. Boards generally are not occasions of public worship, teaching or pastoral discipline. For this reason, the New Testament instructions about church leadership do not directly apply to board membership (cf. 1 Timothy 2:11-3:13; Titus 1:5-9). Boards are hubs for discussion and debate on governance and policy. Although itself concerned with public worship, Colossians $3: 16$ probably comes closest to addressing the mutual participation and instruction that may occur on boards, as members teach 'one another' informally from the Scriptures. Accordingly, there is no reason why both men and women ought not generally be welcomed onto boards. However, the Committee did note there may be some boards which, because of their responsibilities, may require incumbents or people of a particular biological sex and that the specific tasks of a board should be taken into account in any plan to increase gender representation.
19. There is a variety of views on board leadership found within the complementarian framework broadly adopted throughout the Diocese. Some would deem it inappropriate for a woman to lead a board despite its purpose being governance and policy. At the same time, there are several women in leadership positions of boards (e.g., chair) in the Diocese. This matter is considered beyond the remit of this Committee.
20. Besides mature Christian character and conviction, suitability for Christian leadership is a matter of competency or 'gifts'. Broadly speaking, we are to serve according to the gifts we have been given, and those gifts create a beautiful diversity in the body of Christ (Romans 12:3-8). God gives gifts to the church so that it may function well as the body of Christ for the common good (1 Corinthians 12:7). Not everyone has all gifts and it ought not be assumed that everyone in the church has the gifts to serve on boards. Among the gifts mentioned in the New Testament are antilemphis (perform helpful deeds) and kubernesis (govern or guide, administration) (1 Corinthians 12:28), indicating that it is God's provision that we might expect to find able persons who can serve on our boards in the body.
21. The encouragement of the Scriptures is that if one has a gift, they ought to use it for the common good and gospel benefit. 1 Corinthians 12 challenges those who either look down on some gifts or assume every Christian can do everything (12:11, 29). Rather, Christian people ought to be encouraged to determine the gifts God has given them and to serve using those gifts (1 Corinthians 12:12-26). While this is to happen in an orderly fashion (1 Corinthians 14:26-35), the only justification for barring someone with gifts from service where a need exists appears to be lack of godliness (1 Corinthians 14:36-40; 1 Timothy 3:1-13) or considerations related to the specific context in which those gifts would be used (1 Timothy 2:1115). There is also a warning against stifling the gifting of the Spirit (1 Thessalonians 5:19).
22. The Committee concluded there are no real theological arguments either for or against targets. This Committee decided against setting specific targets because it considered tying down membership of boards too tightly by way of any personal characteristic (i.e., gender, race or age) rather than qualification may stifle the ability of those with gifts to serve.

## Recommendations for improving participation by women

23. Increasing the participation of women on Diocesan boards needs to address both issues of opportunity and supply (paragraphs 25-34) and demand (paragraphs 35-41).

## Equipping women to serve

24. Build confidence: Many women cite felt lack of confidence as a reason for not joining boards. Confidence grows when people experience success, and so graduated pathways of recruitment and service are needed (e.g., Bible study leader, parish councillor, regional councils, Synod). As women grow in their
knowledge, skills, and experience, they will be more aware of and have more confidence in their ability to contribute to Diocesan life. They will also have more to contribute.
25. Provide encouragement: Rectors and mentors can encourage women to consider how they might contribute to boards and in other roles within the Diocese. This can be done generally as part of the preaching/teaching program of the church, or specifically in personal conversation. Anecdotally, rectors can be reluctant to 'lose good people' to ministry outside the parish, so encouraging women in this way may require some sacrifice on the part of rectors and the local church community. Often the demands of board membership will impact a whole family, not just the individual member, so the encouragement and support of family is also a factor.
26. Provide vision: Many lay people, in particular, are not aware of the strategic value of boards to the work of the gospel. This vision can be provided by the 'centre' (e.g., Southern Cross or Synod), or by individual organisations (e.g., school newsletters, Moore College prayer diary). However, it also touches more broadly on the place of volunteerism, and the need for believers to have a ministry-mindset, which are best addressed through the preaching/teaching and discipleship programs at the parish level.
27. Provide information: There is little contact between and awareness of the operations of 'the Diocese' (including organisations and school boards) and regular congregation members. Providing information sessions for those interested (and possibly invited) might increase understanding, buy-in, and participation of both lay women and men. It is possible existing Synod members would also benefit from such events. We recommend that SDS commission an Educator/consultant within the Diocese to write a program that may be run in conjunction with Synod information evenings each year. There may be a one-off cost, but SDS would own the Intellectual Property and could run the program each year.
28. Provide training: Training women (and men) for board membership, would both build confidence and competence. Such training could be provided by SDS, or other groups. The cost of attending such training might be subsidised or discounted for women not in full-time employment, if the cost is to be borne by attendees.
29. Provide models: The adage is that 'you cannot be what you cannot see'. To this end, we need to provide examples of women serving on boards, in addition to those examples of women serving that are currently available. This might be done through Southern Cross, and the participation of women at Synod in various capacities.

## Enabling women to serve

30. Address logistical barriers: Anecdotally, many women decline nomination to boards because they are unable to attend meetings at times and in locations that conflict with their family or employment responsibilities. Arguably this is also an issue for lay men. Boards might need to reconsider the location and time of meetings. One way of assessing this would be for SDS to survey all Synod members about their preferences and logistical obstacles to their availability and participation. This could then be compared with a corresponding survey of the meeting times and places of boards. One member of the Committee did not consider such a survey was necessary.

## Addressing supply issues

31. Articulate biblical factors for consideration: As a Diocese, Scripture is to be our rule in all aspects of our life together, including structures and governance practices. There are biblical reasons for ensuring and increasing the current participation of women on boards that arise from the God-given equality and complementarity of the sexes. These reasons have been articulated above.
32. Address gate-keeper issues: As noted above, many rectors are reluctant to 'lose good people' to responsibilities beyond the local church. This is understandable, and there is a proper priority that should be given to ministry in the local Christian community. However, in doing so, rectors can intentionally or unintentionally discourage women from roles beyond the local church. Ideally rectors will be facilitators for the broader involvement of women in the life of the Diocese. Striking the balance will depend on the needs of the parish, and the gifts and needs of individual women. Assisting rectors to be facilitating gatekeepers could be addressed through the Centre for Ministry Development, Ministry Training \& Development, at regional conferences, senior clergy in discussion with rectors, at Synod, and in Southern Cross. The Committee believes the role of rectors as gatekeepers is key to increasing the participation of women in boards, as they are best placed to know the character, competency, and availability of members of their congregations.
33. Identify suitable women: Given the size of the Diocese and the number of boards within it, it is difficult to be aware of lay women who may be qualified and willing to fill vacancies. The same could be said about lay men. Two ways of addressing this would be to survey/audit Synod members, and formally ask rectors
to identify suitable women within their congregations. This could happen during Synod with a simple paper survey to be filled out and returned, or a survey of Synod members by electronic means.

## Addressing demand issues

34. Articulate biblical guidelines: It is the view of this Diocese that Scripture teaches that men and women have different responsibilities within the church in regard to doctrinal and pastoral oversight, and discipline. While boards are not 'church', some boards exercise roles and authority that significantly affect the doctrinal and pastoral oversight, and discipline of churches (e.g., nomination board). Accordingly, the appropriate gender-mix of boards should be decided on a case by case basis, to ensure it is aligned with the biblical teaching.
35. Create awareness of need: Boards and those electing their members need to be aware of the need to recruit and appoint women to vacancies. This will be an ongoing task that needs to be addressed at various levels. Possible measures include the following: it could be required on the Standing Committee agenda that, where appropriate, vacancy notices and election motions provide details of the current gender balance; tracking of board membership (annually); boards could be actively encouraged to increase representation of women; and the Archbishop could be encouraged to fill appropriate 'Archbishop's appointments' with women.
36. Consider gender composition: Boards are to be encouraged actively to consider their current and ideal gender composition, and any constraints or requirements of the composition of that board regarding gender (e.g., a single sex school council might be rightly weighted towards the biological sex of the student body; the biblical constraints noted in paragraph 35). Boards should consider if current positions requiring an 'incumbent' might be filled by a 'clergy person'. The Committee encourages boards to provide detailed information to electors about all the above within the board's skills matrix, with the understanding that all information provided is considered when an election is held.
37. Review long-term membership: The common practice of re-electing sitting members to boards has the unintended effect of slowing the appointment of women, and raises broader questions about board renewal. If fixed term appointments are not desirable, boards could be encouraged to consider active steps to ensure board renewal.
38. Review 'ideal' qualifications: The career pathways of many women do not always track identically to those of their male counterparts. This can be due to child-rearing, family responsibilities, decisions to work part-time, and decisions to be involved in ministry. From a worldly perspective, these might not seem impressive on a CV, but Scripture and experience remind us that they are valuable, and would contribute a distinctive competency and perspective to the skills matrix of some boards. Accordingly, boards might review their 'ideal' qualifications for new members to determine if a vacancy could be filled by a suitable woman with the desired formal qualifications (e.g., degrees, professional membership), but without the career pathway that might be found in their male counterparts.
39. Track board membership: The Committee recommends that the data compiled for this report reviewing the gender composition and requirements of Synod elected positions on Diocesan boards be maintained and periodically updated by SDS.
40. Subcommittee for board composition: The Committee responsible for this report recommends that a permanent subcommittee of Standing Committee, the Gender Representation Oversight Committee, consisting of four Standing Committee members (comprised of 1 lay woman, 1 lay man, 1 clergy woman and 1 clergy man) appointed by the Standing Committee triennially with review at the end of term, be established to oversee the composition of boards. This new subcommittee would review the membership of boards (annually), ensure information about the gender mix of boards accompanied notices of vacancies and election motions on the Standing Committee agenda, consider the merit of other suggestions in this report and if desirable, ensure appropriate organisations implement them (e.g., training sessions on board membership; encourage rectors as gate-keepers). The subcommittee would not be responsible for identifying or recruiting individual women for vacancies or ensuring they are elected to particular boards. It would only review progress and the implementation and effectiveness of initiatives.
For and on behalf of the Standing Committee.
THE REV ZAC VERON
Chair, Gender Representation on Diocesan boards and committees Committee
27 September 2018

Gender composition summary table (as at 5 May 2018)

| Council / Board | Org. Type | Appointing Organisation | Gender comp. actual numbers (female) | Gender comp. actual numbers (male) | \% Females elected by Synod (regardless of reqs) (a) | \# female only positions | \# male only positions (b) | Org w reqs precluding women (incumbency, male only) (c) | \% <br> Females on seats open to either sex (d) | \% Females elected or appointed to nonclergy positions (e) | \% ABP appts (f) | \# clergy female appted by ABP | \# ABP clergy female appt as proportion of total \# clergy females |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Anglican Church Property Trust Diocese of Sydney | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Diocesan } \\ \text { Org } \end{gathered}$ | Synod | 1 | 9 | 10\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10\% | 14\% | 0 out of 1 | 0 | 0 of 0 |
| Anglican Community Services (Anglicare) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Diocesan } \\ \text { Org } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Synod | 3 | 5 | 33\% | 0 | 1 | 1 | 43\% | 40\% | 1 out of 3 | 0 | 0 of 1 |
| Anglican Education Commission | Diocesan Org | Synod | 2 | 5 | 33\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29\% | 29\% | 0 out of 2 | 0 | 0 of 0 |
| Anglican Media Council | Diocesan Org | S-C | 2 | 5 | 20\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29\% | 29\% | 1 out of 2 | 0 | 0 of 0 |
| Anglican National Superannuation Board | $\begin{gathered} \text { Diocesan } \\ \text { Org } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Synod | 1 | 6 | 14\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14\% | 14\% | 0 out of 1 | 0 | 0 of 0 |
| Anglican Schools Corporation | $\begin{gathered} \text { Diocesan } \\ \text { Org } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Synod | 3 | 8 | 33\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27\% | 22\% | 0 out of 3 | 0 | 0 of 1 |
| Arden Anglican School Council | Diocesan School | Synod | 2 | 8 | 11\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20\% | 25\% | 1 out of 2 | 0 | 0 of 0 |
| Blue Mountains Grammar School | Anglican School | S-C | 3 | 3 | 50\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50\% | 50\% | 0 out of 3 | 0 | 0 of 0 |
| Camperdown Cemetery Trust | Other | S-C | 2 | 2 | 50\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50\% | 50\% | 0 out of 2 | 0 | 0 of 0 |
| Council of Anglican Youth and Education Diocese of Sydney (Youthworks) | Diocesan Org | Synod | 1 | 6 | 17\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14\% | 25\% | 0 out of 1 | 0 | 0 of 0 |
| Council of St <br> Catherine's School, Waverley | Diocesan School | Synod | 4 | 4 | 57\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50\% | 50\% | 0 out of 4 | 0 | 0 of 1 |
| Council of Tara Anglican School for Girls | Diocesan School | Synod | 5 | 5 | 44\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50\% | 63\% | 1 out of 5 | 0 | 0 of 0 |
| Council of Trinity Grammar School | Diocesan School | Synod | 1 | 11 | 8\% | 0 | 6 | 1 | 17\% | 17\% | 0 out of 1 | 0 | 0 of 0 |


| Council / Board | Org. Type | Appointing Organisation | Gender comp. actual numbers (female) | Gender comp. actual numbers (male) | \% Females elected by Synod (regardless of reqs) (a) | \# female only positions | \# male only positions (b) | Org w reqs precluding women (incumbency, male only) (c) | \% <br> Females on seats open to either sex (d) | \% Females elected or appointed to nonclergy positions (e) | \% ABP <br> appts (f) | \# clergy female appted by ABP | \# ABP clergy female appt as proportion of total \# clergy females |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Diocesan Retirements Board | Diocesan Committee | S-C | 2 | 7 | 22\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22\% | 50\% | 0 out of 2 | 0 | 0 of 0 |
| Endowment of the See | Diocesan Committee | S-C | 2 | 4 | 33\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33\% | 33\% | 1 out of 2 | 0 | 0 of 0 |
| Evangelism and New Churches | $\begin{gathered} \text { Diocesan } \\ \text { Org } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Synod | 1 | 6 | 17\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14\% | 25\% | 0 out of 1 | 0 | 0 of 0 |
| Georges River Regional Council | $\begin{gathered} \text { Diocesan } \\ \text { Org } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Synod | 3 | 4 | 43\% | 0 | 3 | 1 | 75\% | 50\% | 0 out of 3 | 0 | 0 of 1 |
| Macarthur Anglican School Council | Diocesan School | Synod | 4 | 3 | 50\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57\% | 50\% | 1 out of 4 | 1 | 1 of 1 |
| Ministry in Socially Disadvantaged Areas | Diocesan Committee | S-C | 1 | 2 | 33\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33\% | 33\% | 0 out of 1 | 0 | 0 of 0 |
| Ministry Training and Development | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Diocesan } \\ \text { Org } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Synod | 1 | 8 | 13\% | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0\% | 20\% | 0 out of 1 | 0 | 0 of 0 |
| Mission Property Committee | Diocesan Committee | S-C | 2 | 6 | 33\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25\% | 25\% | 0 out of 2 | 0 | 0 of 0 |
| Moore Theological College Council | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Diocesan } \\ \text { Org } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Synod | 1 | 7 | 13\% | 0 | 3 | 1 | 20\% | 25\% | 0 out of 1 | 0 | 0 of 0 |
| New College Limited | Anglican Org | S-C | 2 | 4 | 33\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33\% | 33\% | 0 out of 2 | 0 | 0 of 0 |
| Nomination Board | Diocesan Committee | Synod | 0 | 6 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0\% | 0 out of 0 | 0 | 0 of 0 |
| Northern Regional Council | $\begin{gathered} \text { Diocesan } \\ \text { Org } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Synod | 1 | 5 | 17\% | 0 | 2 | 1 | 25\% | 25\% | 0 out of 1 | 0 | 0 of 0 |
| Panel for the Professional Standards Board | Diocesan Committee | S-C | 4 | 4 | 50\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50\% | 60\% | 0 out of 4 | 0 | 0 of 1 |
| Professional Standards Committee | Diocesan Committee | S-C | 2 | 3 | 40\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40\% | 50\% | 0 out of 2 | 0 | 0 of 0 |
| Robert Menzies College | $\begin{gathered} \text { Anglican } \\ \text { Org } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | S-C | 3 | 5 | 38\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38\% | 38\% | 0 out of 3 | 0 | 0 of 0 |
| Safe Ministry Board | Diocesan Committee | S-C | 5 | 4 | 33\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56\% | 80\% | 3 out of 5 | 1 | 1 of 1 |
| SCECGS Redlands | Anglican School | S-C | 2 | 2 | 50\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50\% | 50\% | 0 out of 2 | 0 | 0 of 0 |
| SCEGGS Darlinghurst | Anglican School | S-C | 3 | 1 | 75\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75\% | 75\% | 0 out of 3 | 0 | 0 of 0 |


| Council / Board | Org. Type | Appointing Organisation | Gender comp. actual numbers (female) | Gender comp. actual numbers (male) | \% Females elected by Synod (regardless of reqs) (a) | \# female only positions | \# male only positions (b) | Org w reqs precluding women (incumbency, male only) (c) | \% <br> Females on seats open to either sex (d) | \% Females elected or appointed to nonclergy positions (e) | \% ABP appts (f) | \# clergy female appted by ABP | \# ABP clergy female appt as proportion of total \# clergy females |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| South Sydney Regional Council | $\begin{gathered} \text { Diocesan } \\ \text { Org } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Synod | 1 | 4 | 20\% | 0 | 3 | 1 | 50\% | 50\% | 0 out of 1 | 0 | 0 of 0 |
| St Andrew's Cathedral Chapter | $\begin{gathered} \text { Diocesan } \\ \text { Org } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Synod | 2 | 6 | 33\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25\% | 33\% | 0 out of 2 | 0 | 0 of 1 |
| St Andrew's House Corporation | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Diocesan } \\ \text { Org } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Synod | 1 | 6 | 14\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14\% | 14\% | 0 out of 1 | 0 | 0 of 0 |
| St John's Parramatta Endowment Fund | Diocesan Committee | Synod | 1 | 4 | 20\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20\% | 20\% | 0 out of 1 | 0 | 0 of 0 |
| St John's Regional Cathedral Parramatta Chapter | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Diocesan } \\ & \text { Org } \end{aligned}$ | Synod | 1 | 2 | 33\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33\% | 50\% | 0 out of 1 | 0 | 0 of 0 |
| St Michael's Regional Cathedral Wollongong Chapter | Diocesan Org | Synod | 1 | 3 | 25\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25\% | 50\% | 0 out of 1 | 0 | 0 of 0 |
| Sydney Anglican Indigenous Peoples' Ministry Committee | Diocesan Committee | S-C | 2 | 8 | 20\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20\% | 20\% | 0 out of 2 | 0 | 0 of 0 |
| Sydney Anglican Loans Board | $\begin{gathered} \text { Diocesan } \\ \text { Org } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Synod | 2 | 7 | 22\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22\% | 33\% | 0 out of 2 | 0 | 0 of 0 |
| Sydney Church of England Grammar School Council (SHORE) | Diocesan School | Synod | 3 | 9 | 25\% | 0 | 6 | 1 | 50\% | 50\% | 0 out of 3 | 0 | 0 of 0 |
| Sydney Diocesan Secretariat | Diocesan Org | S-C | 2 | 6 | 14\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25\% | 33\% | 1 out of 2 | 0 | 0 of 0 |
| Tertiary Education Ministry Oversight Committee | Diocesan Committee | Synod | 2 | 7 | 22\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22\% | 22\% | 0 out of 2 | 0 | 0 of 0 |
| The Archbishop of Sydney's Anglican Aid | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Diocesan } \\ \text { Org } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Synod | 2 | 7 | 33\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22\% | 29\% | 0 out of 2 | 0 | 0 of 0 |
| The Council of Abbotsleigh | Diocesan School | Synod | 3 | 5 | 38\% | 3 | 5 | 1 |  | 43\% | 0 out of 3 | 0 | 0 of 0 |
| The Council of Barker College | Diocesan School | Synod | 3 | 5 | 38\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38\% | 25\% | 0 out of 3 | 0 | 0 of 2 |
| The Council of the Illawarra Grammar School | Diocesan School | Synod | 3 | 8 | 27\% | 0 | 4 | 1 | 43\% | 43\% | 0 out of 3 | 0 | 0 of 0 |


| Council / Board | Org. Type | Appointing Organisation | Gender comp. actual numbers (female) | Gender comp. actual numbers (male) | \% Females elected by Synod (regardless of reqs) (a) | \# female only positions | \# male only positions (b) | Org w reqs precluding women (incumbency, male only) (c) | \% <br> Females on seats open to either sex (d) | \% Females elected or appointed to nonclergy positions (e) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% ABP } \\ & \text { appts (f) } \end{aligned}$ | \# clergy female appted by ABP | \# ABP clergy female appt as proportion of total \# clergy females |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The Council of the King's School | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Diocesan } \\ \text { School } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Synod | 1 | 9 | 10\% | 0 | 5 | 1 | 20\% | 20\% | 0 out of 1 | 0 | 0 of 0 |
| The Mission to Seafarers, Sydney Port Committee | Diocesan Committee | Synod | 0 | 3 | 0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0\% | 0 out of 0 | 0 | 0 of 0 |
| Western Sydney Regional Council | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Diocesan } \\ \text { Org } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Synod | 1 | 5 | 17\% | 0 | 2 | 1 | 25\% | 25\% | 0 out of 1 | 0 | 0 of 0 |
| William Branwhite Clarke College Council | Diocesan School | Synod | 2 | 5 | 40\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29\% | 25\% | 0 out of 2 | 0 | 0 of 1 |
| Wollongong Regional Council | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Diocesan } \\ \text { Org } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Synod | 2 | 9 | 18\% | 0 | 5 | 1 | 33\% | 33\% | 0 out of 2 | 0 | 0 of 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 28\% |  |  |  | 31\% | 35\% |  | 2 | 2 of 11 |

## Comments -

Summary table above of all current Synod/Standing Committee elected positions on Diocesan boards, committees and councils. The data, as at 5 May 2018 , excludes appointments by the board itself and ex officio positions however does include Archbishop appointments.
(a) - total women elected by Synod (excl. Archbishop appointments)
(b) - men only positions across elections and appointments (eg incumbency)
(c) - "1" indicates that the organisation has any position which is effectively for men only (ie incumbents or "a man" or "clergy man").
(d) - the number of women in positions open to either sex (i.e. exludes positions only for women, and only for men).
(e) - any females appointed or elected to non-clergy positions, divided by total number of non clergy positions.
(f) - the number of Archbishop-appointed women out of the total number of women on the committee.

Actual number of female clergy elected or appointed to any committee (and \# men for comparison): 11 female clergy across 13 appointments ( 2 women appointed to more than one committee); 98 male clergy across 123 positions.
The Registrar's Department notes the complexity in calculating "total" number of female clergy rather than under a list of different categories.

