**Use of the Education Fund**

The current Leadership of GPC would like to formally describe and document the rules by which the Education Fund should be administered. This paper represents our current understanding and practice.

* The Education Fund began as a bequest of Mrs Enid Titterton. A letter was received by the Leadership Meeting of Feb 1990 from her husband and Executor, Mait, which detailed her bequest for the support of missionary and/or theological students in training. Regrettably neither this letter nor the original bequest are on file. Our current understanding of their contents relies on personal discussions with those involved at the time and our previous practice.
* It is assumed that the current Leadership of GPC acts as the Executor of the Fund. The accounts for the fund and their proceeds are tabled at the Leadership Meetings and the normal Business meetings of the Church.
* At subsequent meetings of the Leadership that year (1990) guidelines were formulated for the investment of the funds and the distribution of the proceeds. The principal was to be held in relatively secure deposits (rather than the share market). Only the proceeds were to be available for distribution.
* Our understanding is that Enid’s original desire was to assist in the support of those who were

1. involved in full time study directed towards a vocation in ministry, either on the mission field or in pastoral work
2. connected with the life of GPC

* We acknowledge that the mindset of Enid’s generation equated study at “Bible College” with a goal towards “full time Christian ministry”. She may not have envisaged the kind of flexibility that would develop in the sourcing, supply and delivery of Bible training that exists today.
* The proceeds of the fund have in the past been distributed to assist in the costs of training for those attending Bible or Missionary College (Anne Noller, Gordon McMartin, Bruce and Marilyn Rivett, Lenny Webb, Hadleigh Smith). They have been used for at least one course of training that Daniel Gollan did by correspondence, and also to assist Andre Hill’s theological study done via “distance education” from the U.S. Each of these recipients had either present commitments or future goals related to a vocation in ministry.
* There was at least one instance where a request for use of the funds was rejected because it was felt that it did not meet the criteria as then understood. This was related to the provision of teaching materials to be used in ministry by Daniel Gollan (some funds were made available to assist in this project from the General Fund).
* It is our conviction that all Christians should be involved in ministry, and that adequate preparation should be undertaken for that task by individuals. This would include a commitment to regular Bible Study personally, in small groups, from the Pulpit ministry and possibly from a more formal course of study offered (these days) by a variety of institutions in a variety of ways (e.g. face to face lectures, distance education via the internet, full time, part time, casual... ).
* In relation to the future administration of the Education Fund the questions we need to clarify include:
  1. Does the prospective recipient need to be formally in membership at GPC? If not what level of connection, past, present or future, do they need to have?
  2. Should there be an informal means test (i.e if people have employment and an adequate income while they are studying do they really need assistance from this Fund)?
  3. Are we limited to assisting only those who are in “full time” study, and if so what does “full time” mean? (Many “full time” students in this or other training situations have the opportunity or even necessity to continue part time employment to sustain themselves while studying).
  4. Are we limited to assisting only those who have vocational goals related to ministry?
  5. Are we bound by our current understanding of the intended uses of the Fund, or could its future use be modified to suit a changing cultural landscape that the original bequest might not have envisaged?
* In relation to the future administration of the Education Fund:
  1. As Executors of the Fund we feel bound by our current understanding of the original bequest.
  2. We believe that as a means of assisting and encouraging the intended beneficiaries, the original bequest intended the proceeds of the fund to be distributed to those who had *vocational goals related to ministry*.
  3. Beneficiaries should *not* be limited to those in full time study.
  4. Beneficiaries should have present connections with Gymea Peoples Church. If not in formal membership they should at least be in agreement with our Doctrinal Statement and Objectives. Assessment of potential beneficiaries may, among other things, consider the strength of our connections with them as well as their independent financial means.
  5. Because the value of the fund is decreasing with time, consideration may be given in the future to add some of the proceeds back into the capital to help offset this deterioration.
* The needs of others whose status might fall outside the strict guidelines of this fund should still be considered by the Leadership for encouragement and support in other ways or from other sources.
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