

Report on responses to UK General Assembly Executive Committee Survey on a Code of Ethics

Executive Summary

At the 2021 Annual Meetings a motion was approved for the Executive Committee (EC) to undertake consultations with the UK Unitarian community and to report back on a proposed Code of Ethics. In 2021 and 2022 a small EC working party developed a proposed survey of Unitarians. They reported to the EC via Rev. Celia Cartwright and the Rev. Jo James. In February 2022 the EC approved an invitation to all UK Unitarians, Unitarian congregations, and Unitarian Societies to respond to a survey about the proposal to establish a code of ethics and to share current practice.

This report provides information about the findings from the survey, and a recommendation to the EC on how to take forward the implementation of the 2021 resolution. There is evidence of support for the development of a statement of Unitarian Ethics, and there are also findings about the relevance and utility of the *'Guidelines for Partnership between Congregations and Ministers'*. Most respondents see a clear distinction between a statement of Unitarian Ethics and the Guidelines.

For reasons outlined in the report, the survey tool malfunctioned and much material submitted by respondents, including many of the examples of congregational policies were lost. The survey instrument also created thirty-one duplicated cases, and the data collected was in a form that was not conducive to analysis. It has taken too many hours to establish a reliable dataset in order to prepare this report. More to the point, the loss of material in the data storage meant that the intended analysis of congregational statements could not be undertaken. Nonetheless, the findings indicate support for the development of a Statement of Unitarian Ethics. As noted below some preferred the term 'Unitarian Values'.

The original version of this report was submitted to the EC Steering Committee in March 2024, and received vehement criticism from one EC member. The report was stood aside and the Steering Committee did not reconvene. Recently I received an email from the Ministerial Fellowship urging action on the 2024 and 2025 Annual Meetings motions, and it prompted me to revisit this report. I have amended it to report only the outcomes of the survey responses, and deleted a discussion of the implications for Unitarian theology.

It is evident that most people who responded support the development of a statement of UK Unitarian ethics or values. This will be a challenging task, and might possibly be the basis for an academic thesis? Therefore, I recommend that the GA Executive Committee be asked to now appoint a small group from among the respondents, representing various perspectives within the UK Unitarian community, to bring forward a draft Statement of Unitarian Ethics (or Values) for consultation.

Revd Dr Ralph Catts

October 2025

Report of the Responses to UK Assembly Executive Committee Survey on a Code of Ethics

Introduction

As noted in the above summary statement, the 2021 Annual Meetings approved a motion for the EC to undertake consultations with the UK Unitarian community and to report back on a proposed Code of Ethics. In 2021 and 2022 there were consultations with a small EC working party who reported to the EC via Revd Celia Cartwright and the Revd Jo James.

In February 2022 the EC approved an invitation to all UK Unitarians, Unitarian congregations, and Unitarian Societies to respond to a survey and to share current practice. This report provides information about the findings from the survey, and a recommendation to the EC on how to take forward the implementation of the 2021 resolution.

Survey Distribution

The survey was distributed to all who accessed the survey tool on line, and invitations were also extended to all individual Unitarians attending the 2022 annual meetings. When the survey was closed in June 2022, there were a total eighty-two responses via the survey tool. A further 32 responses were received direct to the email set up for this project. Thus, there were a total of one hundred and eighteen responses. However, there was only one named response in the thirty-two email responses that was not a duplicate of the survey data. There was also one anonymous email response that made no comment on the code of ethics. This respondent was also unaware of the Guidelines so this response was not included, as it contributed no information, and was more than likely a repeat of one of the anonymous responses with no comments received in the survey tool data.

Adding the unique response from the email replies, this means that there was a total of eighty-three responses. However, eighteen responses were void of data. In eight of these cases the respondent had included their name but no further data was recorded. In at least one of the individual cases, it is known that the individual had attempted to provide a detailed response because they contacted me to tell me that they had responded.

After discarding the void responses, there remained sixty-six responses that contain partial or complete information. The responses included three from one congregation. One of these was a void response from the same person, but the third response from a different individual contradicted the other, and both versions claimed congregational endorsement. The void response was discarded and the other two responses are included as individual responses.

There were also three responses from a Minister including one that was identified as an individual response, and two that were said to be on behalf of different committees of the congregation, but made no mention of any opinions other than those expressed by the Minister. The language in all three responses was in the first person and the two 'congregational' responses replicated the opinion of the Minister. These two congregational responses were considered a duplication of the view of the Minister and were discarded. I concluded that there are in total fifty-six individual responses and seven congregational responses that are unique.

Limitations of the Survey Tool

All but one of the void responses were recorded by the tool as being received in successive attempts, suggesting that a likely explanation is that individuals made a repeated unsuccessful effort to respond to the survey. Whatever the reasons, the large number of void attempts indicate that the data collection tool was not fit for purpose. For those who wished to remain anonymous it appears, according to one comment, that the survey tool in at least some cases required an email address which would destroy anonymity.

It had been the intention to undertake a textual analysis of congregational documents to provide a description of Unitarian ethics or values. A substantive analysis of Unitarian documents to identify values could not proceed, because no attachments were stored by the survey tool, and just a few responses gave a URL link to the congregational documents. There was therefore an inadequate base for a normative analysis of current Unitarian perspectives. Nonetheless a summary of the data collected is revealing.

No blame is attached to any individual for the malfunctioning survey tool. Perhaps we should have trialled the survey instrument to see if it performed according to the claims, but it seemed to be a credible instrument. The GA officers have indicated that this survey tool will not be used in any further survey work that they undertake.

Delay in Processing responses

The survey tool provided data in an Excel spread sheet that was not conducive to analysis either by hand or using software. It has taken far too many hours to transfer the data into a useful format. An additional complication has been unexpected disruptions in my personal life that meant that time allocated to undertake this analysis was lost. Time to compile the data and prepare this preliminary report was not possible until February and March 2024.

Summary of Responses

Respondents were classified as Ministers, laity, or 'not stated'. This third category was applied where the information in the responses did not allow the primary distinction to be made. However, most if not all of the 'not stated' responses are very probably lay responses, because unless they chose to be anonymous, Ministers names were known to the analyst and hence could be classified as ministerial responses.

The attitudes toward a Code of Ethics are presented in Table One. Of the sixty-three independent responses, forty-two expressed an opinion and twenty-one did not respond to the question. Of those responding only three expressed opposition. Among the positive responses, some identified qualifications which are recorded in the comments in Appendix One, but nonetheless were in support, provided the qualifications raised were addressed.

The responses are summarised in Table One. Of the eleven Ministers who responded, only one was opposed, and a further four did not have an opinion either way. Among Ministers expressing either reservations or opposition to the idea of a Code of Ethics, the common theme was that these would need to be quasi-judicial. This issue had been anticipated in the form of the motion recommended by the GA Motions committee.

Seven congregations offered a response to the idea of a Unitarian code of ethics. Five were in favour, one was opposed, and three made no comment. The comments provided are presented in Appendix One. It is recommended that the comments in Appendix One are read as they illuminate the numbers in Table One.

TABLE ONE : Attitudes toward a Unitarian Code of Ethics

	Yes	Yes – Qualified	No – Qualified	No	Don't know	No answer
Individual						
Minister	2	4		1		4
Lay	13	12		1		7
Not stated	1	3				8
Total						
Congregational						
Minister						
Lay	3	1		1		1
Not Stated						1
Total	19	20	0	3		21

Experience and Attitudes to the Ministerial Guidelines

The view had been expressed that the Ministerial Guidelines were sufficient and hence a Unitarian Code of Ethics was unnecessary. To investigate this view questions were included about the Ministerial and Congregational Guidelines. It should be noted that new guidelines have been issued subsequent to the conduct of the survey, so these findings reflect views about the previous version.

Of the sixty-three opinions recorded, nearly two thirds were aware of the Guidelines, but less than one third of the respondents had used the guidelines. Only eleven respondents considered the guidelines to be useful. Two thirds of the respondents said either they did not know if the guidelines were useful, or gave no response at all.

Several lay respondents considered that the Guidelines are only of relevance to congregations with a minister in post, especially when appointing a minister. One respondent was a GA Associate and not a member of a congregation. This person pointed out that the guidelines are irrelevant to a Unitarian who is not a member of a congregation, but that a code of ethics was welcome. This case highlights the distinction between a statement of ethics that could be relevant to all Unitarians, and a set of Guidelines that are seen to be applicable only to congregations with a Minister in post. Five of the seven congregations that responded were aware of the Guidelines. Three had utilised the Guidelines but only one considered them to be effective. One Minister argued that the Guidelines provide for the removal of a Minister from the GA Minister roll and claimed that ministers had been removed from the roll. The responses are summarised in Table Two.

TABLE Two: Experience of and attitude towards Guidelines

	Aware of Code		Used Code		Useful				
Respondent	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Unsure	Don't know	No answer
Individual									
Minister	10	1	7	4	4	3		1	3
Lay member	16	17	7	26	6	1	1	3	22
Not stated	6	6	4	8		1	3		6
Sub-total	32	24	18	38	10	5	4	4	31
Congregation									
Minister									
Lay member	5	2	3	4	1	1		1	4
Not stated									
subtotal	5	2	3	4	1	1		1	6
TOTAL	37	26	21	42	11	6	4	5	37

The comments on the Guidelines from Respondents are reported in Appendix Two, and once again it is recommended that these be read in conjunction with the figures reported above.

The Role of the GA in the Administration of the Guidelines

Given the autonomy of each congregation, it is argued by some that the only responsibility of the Executive Committee and staff is to issue guidelines. However, by maintaining a roll of Ministers, and including a capacity in the guidelines for a Minister to be removed from the roll, the GA exercises some measure of authority.

It is evident that some respondents expect the GA to take a more active role in the use of the guidelines. There were several respondents who were critical of the actions of the Executive Committee and Officers of the General Assembly. One comment that summed up several more long-winded remarks was:

The GA needs to have some sense of responsibility to support people through tricky times. I was involved (as a volunteer) in supporting a congregation and minister when they had problems with one individual - the GA took several steps back. It was not helpful.

Those of us who have witnessed or experienced discord among members of a congregation appreciate that it is a difficult task to achieve reconciliation when matters have escalated to the point where the GA is asked to intervene. If Unitarians agreed to a process for resolving disputes as part of their community of practice, and if this process were embraced by those in dispute, then this might aid reconciliation. Could this be a Unitarian value?

Relationship between GA Guidelines and a Code of Ethics

As is evident from the many comments in Appendix Two, the '*Guidelines for Partnership between Congregations and Ministers*', is seen by most as relevant for managing the relationship between a congregation and a Minister. For example, one lay respondent said the Guidelines were useful for addressing the (inappropriate) actions of a retired Minister, and in another example, a Minister argued that the guidelines had been used to remove ministers from the GA roll.

These examples do not address the values that a congregation might embrace to guide their fellowship, and the Guidelines are seen as of little effect for either a Lay Leader or an interfaith Minister as they are excluded from the GA roll. It could be argued that people providing ministry to a congregation without the benefit of training as a Unitarian minister are the ones most in need of guidelines, but there is no provision for these situations and furthermore, the GA does not appear to have a role to play in the conduct of those accepting such appointments. It was also noted that the guidelines run to about 80 pages which is too long and too dense for a statement of ethics or values.

A Rose by any Name

Some respondents expressed concern about using the words 'Code of Ethics'. Their experience in professions that have a Code of Ethics was that such a code implies a quasi-judicial or disciplinary element, with an authority having the power to apply sanctions. Another term suggested which may have similar implications was a Code of Conduct. It was pointed out by some Ministers that the Guidelines for Partnership between Congregations and Ministers, has a section on disciplinary options for Ministers and others on the GA rolls. There is general agreement that we do not need to replicate that document, and note also that it does not apply to the actions of lay members. What many respondents suggest is needed is a short statement about what guides our search for truth and meaning that is longer than a three-word strap line, shorter than an 80-page guide, and will help congregations to envisage their mission and purpose.

Some suggest that a statement of UK Unitarian Values might avoid the quasi-judicial connotation. Another term suggested was UK Unitarian Principles. For some, this might trigger a negative reaction, for while many UK Unitarians acknowledge the usefulness of the UUA Principles, there are some UK Unitarians who express opposition to the UUA approach. It is of interest that the UUA has recently adopted a statement of values. This has led to some controversy, both in relation to the replacement of the UUA Principles, and in terms of the values expressed.

UK Unitarians pride ourselves on our capacity to be unified within our diversity. Perhaps therefore, we should aim to establish a statement of Unitarian values from which individuals and congregations can select those that meet their expectations.

Some congregations have a behavioural code. This local approach could be enriched by a UK Unitarian statement of our values.

The motion at the 2021 GA annual meetings called for consultation with UK Unitarians, and therefore, if we acknowledge the sensitivity about the term 'Code of Ethics', then it seems appropriate to consider dropping the word 'code', and preparing a statement of Unitarian Ethics (or Unitarian Values). A supporting document of recommended steps for individual and congregational consideration of the statement was suggested by several respondents. It is evident

from comments in Appendix One that if the GA adopted a position of guidance for congregations that this would be welcome. It is also clear that most respondents want a statement that avoids any quasi-judicial implication.

Source of a Statement of Unitarian Ethics

The source of a Statement of Unitarian Ethics is something that needs to be made explicit, because many religious traditions claim that the source of their ethics is deemed to be the 'word of God' as provided in wisdom texts and interpreted by their God's representatives on earth. This leads to some followers of Christianity, Islam and Judaism insisting on certain matters being outside acceptable behaviour, according to their interpretation of the 'word of God'. This is termed prescriptive or normative ethics. The Ten Commandments are an example of a prescriptive statement of ethical behaviour.

In contrast, descriptive ethics, also known as comparative ethics, is the study of people's beliefs about morality. It was the intention of those who moved the GA motion to develop a code of ethics that would be informed by congregational statements of ethical practice, be it described as a Code, or implicit in the policies and the values expressed in documents adopted by the congregation.

One of the three respondents who expressed opposition to the development of a Unitarian Code of Ethics indicated that it would be a human expression of ethics, and as such subject to errors of judgement. Adopting a descriptive statement of ethics (or values) is a collective human expression of ethics and as such is subject to critique and revision.

The General Assembly approved a motion to ask the executive Committee to develop and adopt a recommended descriptive statement of Unitarian Ethics. This is consistent with the notion that each congregation is autonomous, because the GA statement would be open for each congregation to consider, adopt, modify, or reject. To implement this recommendation, people would have to step forward and volunteer to be part of a working party appointed, I suggest, by the GA Executive and responsible for preparing a Unitarian Ethics Statement for circulation, consultation, and after review, to be considered for adoption by a meeting of the General Assembly. This should not be a task assigned to either the Executive Committee or to the GA Officers, both because they have enough on their plates, and because it should involve a wider range of Unitarians.

The process, if undertaken in a constructive manner, could help congregations clarify their values. Several respondents argued that guidance on implementation would be as important as the adoption of a Code of Ethics per se. It follows that the working party should be asked to provide advice on how both individual Unitarians, and Unitarian congregations, can use a Statement of Unitarian Ethics. In the USA, the Council of Reform Jewry¹ place emphasis on the ways that congregations can engage with and implement a statement of ethics.

At our annual meetings I have frequently heard reference made to Unitarian values. Rarely is there any attempt to articulate what these values are. Like a lot of aspects of Unitarian practice, the values are tacit understandings. Unitarians who are seekers for meaning and understanding are

¹ Link: <https://urj.org/what-we-do/congregational-life/congregations-ethics-codes>

engaged continuously in ethical considerations as part of their human endeavours. For such people it seems appropriate to attempt to devise a 'Statement of Unitarian Ethics' (or values).

Ralph Catts,

October 2025

APPENDIX ONE: Comments about the proposed Code of Ethics

Typical of the responses in favour of a Code of Ethics were the following:

- *I think this is a good idea, long overdue. (Minister)*
- *I feel that when people understand and buy into the values of an organisation they will always understand how to manage boundaries and behaviour better. Very important to do this, I feel. (Lay)*
- *I suggest you get on and prepare this a.s.a.p., particularly with regard to safeguarding etc (Lay)*
- *In the long run, the existence of a code should lead to greater harmony within groups of all kinds within the denomination. (Lay)*
- *I would be glad to see one, and feel it should be developed by a very broad range of people from both within and outside the Unitarian community, including representatives of other faith communities. It should be readily available to any enquirer. And it should be utterly breathed in and encultured (adopted) by anyone who wishes to claim the label "Unitarian" in UK. (Lay)*
- *As a church without a creed and a broad church we need to be careful in what we include but we should be able to agree on some ethical principles (Lay)*
- *It prompts congregations to think about behaviour. It provides a basis for taking actions in the case of bad behaviour. It provides some authority if agreed by the GA & other congregations (Lay)*
- *Having to sign up to the Code (a workplace code of ethics) at regular intervals, annually in some cases, meant the Code was always fresh! (Lay)*
- *I hope it will set out clearly what unacceptable behaviours such as bullying are, so that they can be challenged more easily. I think it can only be helpful to set out an expectation that members of the church behave well. (Lay)*
- *There needs to be a behavioural code. It was as if it was OK for people to sound off at someone. I am female. Both perpetrators are both male. (Lay)*
- *The code of practice should be one which allows discussion and exchange of views without argument. Honesty in word and deed. (Lay)*
- *A useful resource for unfortunate times of conflict, and more importantly for the heading off of conflict before it arises. Can't really see any weaknesses, other than the palaver and bureaucracy of formulating it !! (Minister)*
- *The outcomes of the work on a Unitarian Code of Ethics will provide a helpful framework on which our church can build. The Code will serve as a prompt for us to define boundaries which will in turn protect all members of our church community. We feel that the Code will be something we can share with visitors and enquirers to articulate our values and 'what we stand for'. (Minister)*
- *Everyone is made aware of standards, and accountability is ensured (Congregation)*
- *Lay down guidelines, useful check list useful ideas to help clarify thinking Sounds like a good idea. Likely to have to stay generic with some case studies (lay)*
- *We welcome and value this initiative and the work being carried out in response to the resolution passed at GA Annual Meetings 22. The process of answering the questions in the survey has raised awareness of possibilities for development in our community. We look forward to widening the scope of future discussions to engage all members of our congregation.*

Other reservations that were expressed by those in favour included:

- *As our places of worship are autonomous, I wonder about the ability to uphold a code of conduct/ethics. (Minister)*
- *Code of ethics need to be accepting of differences (Lay)*
- *My concern re the unitarians is that for an organisation that only *just* passed the motion to support trans rights, the morality of the conservatives will try to impose itself on all, under the guise of reputation, and will effectively police people's private, personal, practice...*
- *The code needs to be in step with the Guidelines for Ministers, and ideally an Annexe to the Guidelines as well as available separately. Congregations need to be aware of it and to feel relaxed about bringing issues of concern to the Committee, Minister or others in the congregation. Code should reflect Unitarian values of humanity and reason and lean towards the expectation that members would resolve issues informally where possible. Anticipating issues and raising them in the congregation could be a helpful strategy (Lay)*
- *Keep it simple and avoid anything that can't be clearly observed or measured. (Lay)*
- *How do Unitarian notions of individual conscience correlate to fostering a collective ethic? (Minister)*
- *I personally think, though it is fraught with danger, it is long overdue. It would say a lot about who we are and what we believe in and, as long as it is not swayed by extremist views, would be useful too to enable disputes to be settled and problems settled in a timely and less painful manner.*
- *Being the contrarians that Unitarians so often are, a code may be best stated as a set of principles, and then laid out more fully in a code of applications. (Minister)*
- *Strength – Guidance; Weakness - No substitute for understanding and compassion (Lay)*
- *The GA needs to be very clear about its role in supporting those of are feeling that codes are not being followed. Whoever the people involved are - be they ministers or lay people - the GA needs to have some sense of responsibility to support people through tricky times. I was involved (as a volunteer) in supporting a congregation and minister when they had problems with one individual - the GA took several steps back. It was not helpful, (Lay)*
- *It's difficult to identify any code of ethics which is specifically Unitarian, because it's our experience that many other churches are moving towards a non acceptance of creed*
- *After 30 years as a Unitarian, member of several different congregations, I had experienced problems both with congregational members and ministers for which there was no base to work from and insufficient guidelines/support. (Lay)*
- *I it should be as simple as possible, since so many congregations are struggling to keep even a basic presence in the community. Also, if legal matters are being covered, it would be useful to refer to the different jurisdictions in the UK, since different practices are likely to obtain (lay)*
- *the strengths of this approach are that it protects my interests, my employer's interests, and most importantly my research participants' interests. The limitations are that it is extremely detailed and complex, although as this is my profession this is less of an issue that it would be were I a volunteer. (Lay)*
- *It supports the expectation for good behaviour. Unfortunately, as our places of worship are autonomous, I wonder about the ability to uphold a code of conduct/ethics. (Minister)*
- *The code of ethics is limited if it primarily is aimed at the minister (Minister)*

The three voices opposed to the development of a Code of Ethics made the following comments:

- *Prescriptive – does not cover all situations. Other than politeness, I believe that imposing another ethical code is fraught with danger (Lay)*
- *We believe that the powers vested in the Church Trustees by the Members of our CIO, and the relevant clauses in our Constitution, should be sufficient to deal with any problems that may arise in respect of "conduct and behaviour". (Congregation)*
- *I think it important to note the Ministerial Fellowship has a Constitution and Rules, and one of its Objects is: "To encourage professional standards in the practice of ministry and adherence to General Assembly Guidelines, I believe that a Unitarian Code of ethics will be difficult, time consuming, expensive and potentially open to legal process. Indeed it would have to be a quasi legal process as a minimum.*
I think this reflects the potentially punitive element that such a code implies. I think it that it is a mistake to utilise the term ethics if what is required is a code of conduct. I think that a code of conduct is more achievable in the short term and question why this current work seems to overlook the work in progress towards a Code of Conduct currently being undertaken by the Ministerial Fellowship for inclusion in the GA Guidelines. Creating a code to police social interaction is not a credible or sensible goal. (Minister)

APPENDIX TWO: Comments about the Guidelines

- *Helpful as a general Guide but not very specific Strength is it provides a focal point for discussion, limitation is that Unitarianism is a very individual thing and we encourage people to form their own judgments, so that what we can agree on as a core code is quite limited (Lay)*
- *Diabolical (Minister)*
- *only work if the minister is also using them (Lay leader)*
- *Somewhere between moderate and good, particularly when appointing a minister. (Minister)*
- *Guidelines limited value (Not stated – lay?)*
- *We do not have a minister and so have not referred to the guidelines for any practical purpose (Lay).*
- *'Guidelines for Partnership between Congregations and Ministers', runs to about 80 pages. All ministers and congregations get copies of this. Under the section on Conflict Resolution, procedures are set out whereby a minister involved in serious misbehaviour in a congregation (or elsewhere), can be called to an investigatory meeting by the Director of Ministry, which can result in removal from the Roll. Actions that can lead to removal: Theft or dishonesty; Serious breach of confidentiality; conduct prejudicial to the interest or reputation of the congregation or denomination ... (several more are listed). There's a significant section on the GA Roll itself, on how one is placed on it, and how one can be removed -- including for serious misconduct. Several ministers have been removed from the Roll (Minister)*
- *When appointing a new Minister.(Lay)*
- *One way it has been useful in a joint ministry is to stipulate the value of a joint committee for certain purposes, even if this meets infrequently (e.g. once or twice a year). (Minister)*
- *They are very broad with only a small section re: conduct (Not stated – Lay?)*
- *Not needed Lay*
- *The Guidelines have often been useful in my work as a church officer; when problems have arisen, it has been helpful to consult them and to act accordingly. The information is clearly displayed and set out, which makes it easy to access, and the points made are stated with good common-sense and awareness of what problems might cause congregations the most trouble. For example, we had problems with a retired minister, who kept on engaging with the congregation, despite the awareness that this was strongly discouraged. The problem did not disappear, altogether, but it was reassuring to feel that we were dealing with the problem and were proceeding along the right lines. (Lay)*
- *Over the years this has been a "bible" for how we recruit and maintain our relationship with our Minister (Lay)*
- *Useful during conflicts and also recruiting Ministerial help. But they are only Guidelines and I am aware of times when they have been ignored by both congregations and Ministers. (Lay)*
- *no minister (Lay)*
- *Many years ago. Dispute with minister (No indication as to whether these were useful) Lay*
- *It's much too long and should be broken down into manageable, separate documents. It only applies to ministers and not lay leaders. and it assumes that the congregation speaks as one.*
- *We do not have a minister at present.*
- *Yes We did many years ago (Lay)*
- *New minister - useful in making sure both sides were aware of rights and responsibilities (Lay)*
- *They were very useful to me (and I imagine to the congregations I have served) during the process of application, 'candidating' and appointment to the position of minister. I don't remember using them otherwise. (Minister)*
- *Yes. Three of the five respondents were aware of the Guidelines prior to involvement with the Code of Ethics discussions, and a further two became aware as a result of engaging with the*

survey.

The Guidelines were helpful in the appointment of a new minister. The guidelines provided clarification during the induction period of the minister and beyond. (lay Congregational)

- *As they were only guidelines the congregation attempted to ignore them (Minister)*