

**COMPENSATION COMMITTEE  
ANGLICAN CHURCH OF CANADA  
DIOCESE OF NIAGARA**

Sharon White (Chair)  
David Bucsis  
Ven. Lynne Corfield  
Doreen Haywood  
Jonathan Marler  
Rev. Canon Rob Park  
Gordon Ross

-----  
Rev. David Long (HR Director)  
Bob McKinnell (Treasurer)  
Debbie Young (Secretary)

**FIRST POST-TASK FORCE REPORT TO SYNOD COUNCIL**

March 6, 2007

---

Background

In March 2006, Synod Council established the Task Force on Compensation, with the following mandate:

To: examine the process and the criteria whereby recommendations are made to Synod Council for increases to stipends and housing allowances;

To: consult with all the regions of the diocese to re-examine the way clergy and lay-workers are paid including, but not limited to, the length and structure of the salary scale and the negative impact on clergy living in rectories;

To: make regular reports to all the bodies they represent and present a report to Synod Council.

On September 27, 2006, the Task Force issued its Final Report, which was received by Synod Council at its October 2006 meeting. The Final Report contained five recommendations for immediate implementation, as follows:

**Recommendation 10**

That stipends and housing allowances be replaced by a single salary amount.

Rationale

The current practice in the Diocese of stipulating the amounts for housing allowances and dividing an employee's income between stipend and housing allowance serves no useful purpose, leads to confusion by eligible employees, churchwardens and treasurers and can be a source of perceived inequity.

[For further detail, see Report pages 15/16]

**Recommendation 15**

That a travel allowance for the first 12,000 km/year (for 2006) be included in the annual salary and, beyond that point, salaried employees be reimbursed at \$0.44/km for 2006 for travel relating to parish and diocesan work, with such expenses being logged and submitted annually.

**Rationale**

The inclusion in 1990 of a notional travel allowance of \$4,000 in the salaries of Niagara clergy has had the effect by 2006 of Niagara clergy earning less than their colleagues in both Toronto and Huron. The myth that Niagara clergy earn more than Huron clergy is just that and when the travelling reimbursement of Niagara and Huron are reconciled, Niagara clergy are found to earn less than their colleagues in Huron. The recommendation represents a compromise that will need to be reviewed on an annual basis.

[For further detail, see Report page 17]

**Recommendation 22**

That the Diocese require, where pension benefits are to be provided to lay employees, the enrolment of such lay employees in the General Synod Pension Plan.

**Rationale**

This recommendation could be described as a “justice issue”. From a pension perspective, we have three classes of employees in Niagara. Clergy and Lay members of the Synod Pension Plan; Lay members of the Lay Employees Retirement Plan; and Lay Employees who are members of no plan. The Director of the Pension Office Corporation, Anglican Church of Canada, Ms. Judy Robinson, strongly endorses this recommendation and envisages no problem within her office in its implementation.

[For further detail, see Report pages 19/20]

**Recommendation 27**

That pensions and benefits be made available for all parish employees working twenty hours or more per week.

**Rationale**

As with Recommendation 22, this is a “justice issue” and the implementation of this recommendation would serve to reduce the inequities that currently exist in employment practices in the Diocese of Niagara.

[For further detail, see Report page 23]

**Recommendation 34**

That the Diocese require all parishes to enrol their employees in the centralized payroll service by December 31, 2007, so that the Diocese can address issues of fairness in administrative practices across the Diocese and ensure timely payment of parish employees.

**Rationale**

This is the third and final “justice issue” relating to the employment of laity within the Diocese of Niagara. The apparatus to implement this recommendation is already in place and is being used by all parishes for clergy remuneration and by many parishes for the remuneration of lay employees. Its implementation will enhance the administration of

parish payrolls and be the first step in eliminating inequities that currently exist, in some cases, with respect to the remuneration of lay employees.

[For further detail, see Report pages 23/24]

### Post-Task Force Consultations

In November 2006, the Compensation Committee received instructions to study the implications of implementing the said five recommendations.

At its monthly meeting in December 2006, the Compensation Committee determined that no further study could usefully be undertaken with respect to Recommendation 15 and that Recommendations 22, 27 and 34 would require the gathering of a lot of statistical data that would take at least a year.

With respect to Recommendation 10, the Committee resolved that further study should be undertaken with respect to concerns relating to the impact of the implementation of the recommendation on clergy living in rectories and on pensionable earnings, which are currently set at 160% of stipends (without regard to housing allowances). In this connection a schedule was established that included meetings with the Pension Office (December 14, 2006), Archdeacon Tom Greene (January 23, 2007), all the Archdeacons, the Dean, the Executive Archdeacon and the Bishop (January 30, 2007) and all the Clergy and Lay-workers (February 7, 2007).

The feedback from all aforesaid parties has been positive. The Pension Office has had experience with the combining of stipends and housing allowances in the Dioceses of Calgary and Edmonton and supports the concept; Archdeacon Greene, who had concerns with respect to the impact on clergy living in rectories, supports the concept; the Archdeacons and others who attended the meeting on January 30, 2007, support the concept; and the Clergy and Lay-workers, who attended the February 7, 2007, Clergy and Lay-workers' Day appeared to support the concept.

A number of points were raised at the Clergy and Lay-workers' Day, especially with respect to the matter of compensation of Clergy in rural parishes, but no point or question raised appeared to take issue with the concept of combining stipends and housing allowances into a single salary. One speaker did raise the interesting question of whether the implementation of Recommendation 10 would require approval by Synod or simply by Synod Council.

### Steps to be taken between March and October, 2007

It is the intention of the Compensation Committee to meet with all the Clergy, Churchwardens and Treasurers of every parish that maintains a rectory, to review the procedure for determining the fair market rent of each rectory, which is a step that will be necessary if Recommendation 10 is to be implemented, and to review any other concern raised by these parishes, in particular.

At the same time, the entire Diocese is being kept up-to-date with the work of the Compensation Committee by means of up-dates to the Diocesan website at Resources/Compensation Committee and "e-blasts" sent to all clergy and others who subscribe to that service.

Approval requested of Synod Council

In the meantime, the Compensation Committee is submitting this interim report to Synod Council, with the following requests:

- 1) That the procedures adopted to date by the Compensation Committee in respect of its investigation into the implications of implementing Recommendations 10, 15, 22, 27 and 34 of the Report of the Task Force on Compensation, dated September 27, 2006, be approved;
- 2) That the proposed meetings with the Clergy, Churchwardens and Treasurers of the parishes that maintain rectories be approved;
- 3) That the Compensation Committee be asked to submit a final report on the implications of implementing Recommendations 10, 15, 22, 27 and 34 to Synod Council at its October 2007 meeting, with a view to implementing Recommendation 10, effective January 1, 2008, provided no unresolved difficulty is met along the way.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the Compensation Committee,

Jonathan Marler, Member