Living Ministry

Collaborative Ministry and Transitions to First Incumbency

July 2019

MINISTRY DIVISION

Living Ministry

The Living Ministry Research Project

Background

The work of the Church of England's Ministry Council, 'Renewing Discipleship and Ministry', included in 2015 the aim of increasing the number, range and quality of ordinands, along with effective resource allocation in ministerial education. Fundamental to this was recognition that '[t]he Church of England needs to reflect deeply on the provision, formation and support of lay and ordained ministry in dioceses and parishes.'[1] This was in the context of recent changes to initial ministerial education (IME), including the introduction of the context-based mode of training in addition to the residential and non-residential modes, and diocesan requirements for, among other things:

- A new emphasis on mission, collaboration and adaptability to changing needs, and
- More ministers suited for new forms of church and non-traditional settings.

Aim

The aim of Living Ministry is to build on previous research to explore how different modes of training influence ordained ministers' future ministries. It intends to provide ongoing, consistent information to inform diocesan officers, TEI staff, Ministry Division and other stakeholders regarding decisions about: candidates for ordained ministry, training pathways, continuing development and deployment, and policy relating to the work of the Ministry Council (which directs the work of the Ministry Division).

The overarching question addressed by the research is: 'What enables ordained ministers to flourish in ministry?'. 'Flourishing in ministry' is understood to consist of the two interrelated aspects of:

- Wellbeing (flourishing of the person) and
- Ministerial outcomes (flourishing of ministry).

Objectives

- To gain a better understanding of the factors that enable ordained ministers to flourish in ministry;
- To understand how these factors relate to ministerial education and continuing development;
- To understand how these factors vary according to person, background, training pathway, type of ministry, context etc.;
- To understand how ministerial flourishing changes and develops over time and at different stages of ministry.

Methods

- A longitudinal panel study comprising a large-scale quantitative survey and smaller-scale qualitative research between 2016 and 2026;
- Focussed qualitative studies reporting on specific topics or perspectives.

---

[1] https://www.churchofengland.org/renewal-reform/renewing-discipleship-ministry/resourcing-ministerial-education.aspx

MINISTRY DIVISION

LivingMinistry

Focused Study 1

Collaborative Ministry and Transitions to First Incumbency

CONTENTS

MINISTRY DIVISION

RESEARCH QUESTION

It has been suggested that some curates tend to exhibit teamwork well during Initial Ministerial Education Phase 1 and Phase 2 (IME 1 and 2) but, on becoming incumbents, move back into what might be described as a more 'solo operator' mode. Given that the Renewal and Reform agenda seeks ordained ministers who are more 'collaborative' and the Setting God's People Free programme seeks increased collaboration between lay and ordained, this report explores how collaborative ministry is shaped and enacted in first incumbency. It draws on case-study research with incumbents and Parochial Church Council (PCC) members, before discussing the findings in relation to two recent papers in this area.

METHOD

This is a small study exploring relationships in two parishes with recently appointed first incumbents (in post for 18 months – 2 years), Anna and John.[1] In each of the two case studies, interviews were conducted with the priests and structured discussions were facilitated with a group drawn from PCC members using a participatory research approach.

The case study churches were of similar size and both of largely central Anglican tradition, with John's church identifying as more evangelical. The incumbents were close in age (38 and 40) and both trained for ordained ministry residentially. It is recommended that the findings of this study be tested for relevance to churches of different traditions, sizes, structures and social contexts, as well as incumbents of different socio-demographics and formational backgrounds.

Incumbent interviews

Potential incumbents were identified with the assistance of their Directors of Ministry on the basis of being 12-24 months in their first post after curacy and with responsibility for a single church.

Anna is incumbent of a single church with about 70 people in total attending across two services on a usual Sunday and up to another 30 attending Messy Church. The church is of central Anglican tradition.

John is an associate (team) vicar with responsibility for a church and church centre. His church numbers just under 100 in total on a usual Sunday and is in a benefice of five churches, with two ordained colleagues responsible for the other four. He describes himself as charismatic evangelical and the church as 'more conservative' in its teaching and well-established spirituality.

---

[1] Pseudonyms have been used to protect the identity of the research participants.

MINISTRY DIVISION

Interviews were conducted with each incumbent for approximately 60-90 minutes. These covered:

1. **Personal historical context**, eliciting information about:
   - IME 1 training (including on collaboration/ministerial relationships);
   - curacy;
   - vocation/calling;
   - socio-demographics.
2. **Transition into current role**: current role and church, expectations, experiences, changing ways of working and support.
3. **Collaboration in current role**: regarding church structures, roles, vision-setting, decisions, delivery, communication and participation:
   - expectations and experience of realities in ministry;
   - changes in approach.
4. Identifying a **decision or initiative** to use in the group session to explore the process of collaborative working in this situation.

Group discussions

The groups met for two hours and were facilitated in their discussion.

The groups consisted of four or five members of the PCC or DCC (District Church Council) and included a churchwarden in each. To maintain openness and transparency, the incumbent was in attendance in their respective group.

The process for the group discussion was as follows:

1. **Mapping the structure of the church**: governance, groups, roles, systems and changes (e.g. during vacancy).
2. **Following the story of a recent initiative or decision**: exploring what happened, how it happened, difficulties and highlights, as well as whether this was typical or different in terms of working together and what 'better' would look like.
3. **General reflection and discussion** on what collaborative ministry means and how it works.

FINDINGS

In the following paragraphs we consider collaborative ministry from the perspective of the personal history of the incumbent, their transition into their current role, experiences of collaborative ministry in their current role, and implications for training.

1. Personal Historical Context

Personal context

Anna comes from a church-going family and is educated to further degree level. She previously worked in business and in the charity sector and has extensive experience of working with and training volunteers. She describes her accumulated experience as '*enabling*

other people to do things.' She described having a long-held sense of vocation to ordained ministry which she pursued after her experience in business and the charity sector.

- IME 1: 2 years full-time residential;
- IME 2: curacy in a single church parish;
- Moved to present role in 2018.

John comes from a church-going family. His first degree was in Christian Ministry and he occupied two Youth Minister roles before pursuing a vocation to ordained ministry.

- IME 1: 2 years full-time residential;
- IME 2: curacy in a well-established, thriving evangelical church;
- Moved to present role in early 2017.

Understanding of collaborative ministry

Both Anna and John demonstrated an understanding of collaborative ministry as shared leadership, empowering others to see that *'they're not just offering to do more things and bigger things, but sharing in the spiritual and pastoral oversight of the church' (John).*

They saw it as not simply delegating jobs but empowering people to take on leadership of areas of the church's life and having a sense of ownership and authority so that not everything needed to be referred back to the vicar. They were both keen to encourage a culture of *'permission-giving,'* which enabled others to exercise initiative and to be willing to *'give things a try.'*

Anna saw collaborative leadership as the outworking of the 'priesthood of all believers' where the priest works alongside others and encourages them to exercise their faith in ministry both within and without the church. Drawing on her experience of the charity sector and management, she expressed her style of leadership as *'leading from behind,'* which, she said, wasn't always understood by others as it was about enabling and encouraging others to do things rather than *'me leading from the front every time.'*

Anna recognised that growth in her capacity to facilitate collaborative ministry required *'openness and intentionality to broaden my own experience and skills base.'*

Specific training in collaborative ministry in IME 1 or 2

IME 1: both Anna and John described the emphasis of training in IME 1 being more on theological and academic learning while also including the more practical aspects of ministry. While the word 'collaborative' was used, both felt that there was no specific training in collaborative leadership and working.

John described how, in his placement church, he saw how the incumbent was struggling to establish collaborative working, possibly because of a lack of potential leadership capacity in a very deprived area and parish.

IME 2: in this stage both felt that the emphasis was more on the practical aspects of ministry, with nothing specifically on collaborative leadership or collaborative working.

Experience of collaborative ministry in the curacy parish

Both reported having excellent training incumbents who were good role models for collaborative working and who had grown their respective churches to the point where there

MINISTRY DIVISION

was well-established involvement of lay people in leadership and ministry, resourced by a strong team of paid staff, lay and ordained.

Anna recognised that because of the strong staff team in her curacy church, she had had the freedom to offer cover to preside and preach at very different churches, which meant she could broaden her experience and skills base. She said that she knew a lot of curates who '*got very landlocked and could only be in their own parish.*' Her breadth of experience had given her a wide understanding of how different styles of leadership might be expressed in ministry.

John described how, '*in my previous experiences (as a youth worker), I had seen different models of leadership. I'd seen the bulldozer approach where stuff got done but people got hurt. I'd seen the very gentle pastoral approach where no one got hurt but nothing got done.*'

He felt that his training incumbent '*hit the "sweet spot" between the two approaches.*' There had been strong growth in the church there over 17 years in numbers and facilitating involvement in outreach and ministries in a very gentle way; John expressed his desire to emulate that model of leadership in his own ministry. However, he now saw that there had been no intentional training on how to promote collaborative working and leadership and that what he had learnt had been '*more picked up by osmosis.*' He now knew the questions he would want to ask his training incumbent about how exactly he enabled others to become involved.

2. Transition into current role

The following points were highlighted by Anna and John as key factors in their experience of transitioning from curacy into their current roles:

Experience of 'the buck stops here!'

Both reported the feeling that although they knew this would be the case, nothing had prepared them for the weight and loneliness of this on-going experience.

> *That's a real contrast in going from curacy to incumbent. I've found it a huge learning curve in many, many, ways. Even with an excellent curacy, which, I think, gave me very real experience and a genuine opportunity to hold some leadership and some responsibility. Even so, the difference has been huge for me, mentally more than anything really. Just the weight of it on one's mind, lying awake thinking about it, the inability to switch off. All the different things that you have to juggle, all of that has been a big challenge (John).*

Lack of resources/other staff

In contrast to their curacy parishes, their experience in their current churches was of a lack of resources in terms of other paid staff (e.g. youth worker, administrator) and, therefore, as vicar, needing to do more themselves initially:

> *The difference of being part of an employed team, all of whom knew what their jobs were, to that not being in place; [here] willing volunteers for the most part, but…. (John)*

MINISTRY
DIVISION

Embedded cultures of deference and the vicar as 'solo practitioner'

Both reported feeling surprised at the strength and extent of the embedded culture among committed congregation members of 'Father knows best,' or the expectation that 'the vicar is involved in and does everything.' The culture of deference was particularly strong among older church members, but generally there was an expectation that the vicar needed to be involved in every activity and decision and of lay people needing permission from them. Anna described the shift

> from people expecting me to do everything and me saying, 'Well, no, what do you think about that? How does that look? How might we do that?' has been an interesting transition, I think. For this community to realise that, actually, I don't need to tell them to do everything.

This was also illustrated in the description of the decision-making process for establishing Messy Church in Anna's church, where the initial idea had emanated from enthusiastic parents and church members, but the then Vicar had chaired the committee and it was only when he preached a sermon saying that he would be prepared to tolerate the 'mess' involved in Messy Church, that the congregation felt they had his 'permission' to go ahead.

The need to change self-perception of congregation members

In both parishes, there were committed and willing church members who volunteered to help but did not perceive themselves as 'leaders' and able to exercise initiative, rather than simply 'helping the vicar.'

This was illustrated in one church where, although there was a strong involvement of lay people in church activities, they did not perceive themselves as sharing leadership. At a DCC meeting John addressed the members as 'leaders' in the church:

> In my very first meeting, it must have been a few weeks in, I - without thinking about it, without meaning to, without looking to be provocative – described them as a leadership team. Someone put their hand up, which was also interesting. I wasn't used to that really. And said, 'Did you just call us a leadership team?' I said, 'Yes.' They said, 'We've never been referred to as that before, neither do we think of ourselves as a leadership team. However, that sounds great.' Someone else said to xxx…. 'you've just grown an inch.' It was really interesting. It wasn't a, 'Please don't call us leaders.' It was a, 'We've not been considered as leaders before.'

John said that his aim was to enable people to have a sense of ownership and authority in their areas of responsibility, so that they didn't have to refer everything back to him.

Both discussion groups identified that it is often the same core people spread quite thinly across the groups and activities in terms of both involvement and leadership. Through discussion in one group, it was identified that people who come on a Sunday and may attend some one-off activities, do not see themselves as belonging to the church and sharing in responsibility for its life. Reflecting on the reluctance of 'pew–warmers' (those who came to church but didn't want to get involved further), one participant said,

> …it was interesting having a conversation with someone who's been a member of the church for many years who said she couldn't come to church last Sunday for various reasons but said 'oh and anyway you've got your meeting afterwards haven't you,' you've got your meeting, which was our church AGM. 'Well,' I said, 'that's our meeting, isn't it our meeting?' But 'you've got your meeting,' so she doesn't see herself as part of the church in that sense.

MINISTRY DIVISION

Coping with the effects of age or gender differences

Anna, as a relatively younger female priest, reported encountering previously male-dominated power bases in the PCC and other church committees and having to discover and negotiate power and gender inequality dynamics. She described it as, '*having to "stand up for myself" especially in the face of male dominance and female deference; having to be more forceful and assertive sometimes – being prepared to challenge and disagree, and "stand my ground."*'

John, in his late thirties, with the core members of the church being of retirement age, felt that they saw him as 'young' and, therefore, 'inexperienced.' He felt there was a sense in which they 'humoured him,' while 'knowing best really.' As he had learnt from his training incumbent, the building up of trust between incumbent and congregation is vital in building genuine collaborative leadership.

Learning about the limits and complexities of collaborative leadership

Both Anna and John described how they had learnt to accept that 'upfront' leadership is necessary at times and that they needed to be able to access different leadership approaches depending on the nature of the situation or context. Both reflected on how a collaborative stance can be maintained overall whilst also being more authoritative or directive in certain circumstances. They both understood this as a question of discernment, which they felt they were learning from hard experience.

3. Collaboration in current role

The interviews and group discussions proved to be a useful exercise in revealing and mapping the ways in which incumbents and churches were already engaged in collaboration both within the church and across the church boundary with other churches and community groups. Participants in both groups expressed surprise at the nature and extent of this and felt affirmed and encouraged to continue building on this.

John, in a team ministry, described how he worked in collaboration with the team rector and the other associate vicar. He found this to be a very supportive and generative working relationship on a personal level, as well as working together on parish-wide initiatives and policies.

What promotes collaborative leadership/working?

Active support from the diocese

- In relation to collaborative working, Anna said, '*I know I can't do this on my own, so I need to proactively seek help and support for myself and for processes in the parish.*' She identified this as care from senior clergy, the Archdeacon or Area Dean, knowing that they can be contacted for support and advice and that they 'have my back.'

- Good modelling of collaborative leadership by those in more senior church positions.

MINISTRY DIVISION

- One-to-one support in the form of a work mentor, spiritual director or reflective practice group, which give opportunities for specific learning and reflection on the nature of collaborative leadership, especially in terms of development of self-understanding and emotional support. Action Learning Set groups had been provided by one of the dioceses for those in their first incumbency. These had been very helpful and supportive in having a place to bring issues and learn from others, but time and work pressures of parish ministry '*militate against choosing to go to these things because other things seem more pressing.*' Anna reflected that, '*people get "snowed in" in their parishes!*'

- A New Incumbents' Residential provided by John's diocese gave the opportunity to be with others in the same position and to reflect on experience and practice as well as having some very useful input.

Developing a quality of 'presence'

Both John and Anna were aware of the importance of listening and people being 'heard,' which enabled shifts in stance and perspective as well as enabling them to be more open to change:

> *I think a lot of my ministry is about hearing people and certainly a lot of collaborative ministry is making sure that people are heard. When people feel listened to, they're more inclined to do the things that you've got going on and encouraging them forward. That can be time consuming and can make you very vulnerable and can be very painful. (Anna)*

Facilitation for group working

This is especially relevant for PCC Away Days, and discussion of more complex or difficult issues in managing change. It was modelled within the research process itself: one of the groups reflected on how helpful it had been to have outside facilitation for the mapping process and ensuing discussion to enable them to address more difficult issues with the vicar in a productive way.

Clear channels of communication and accountability

Through discussion in one group, the need to develop improved channels of communication and accountability was identified if collaborative leadership is to progress and free up the vicar from having to be involved in everything, e.g. members of the PCC having responsibility for being the point of communication for and involvement with various church activities and groups, and working out with the vicar which groups were important for them to be at and directly involved with developing.

What hinders collaborative leadership/working?

Emotional costs and pressures

Both incumbents spoke of their experience of vulnerability in encountering the emotional pressures and costs of changing the culture of leadership towards a more collaborative

MINISTRY DIVISION

structure and understanding. They realised their need to know how to be vulnerable, and how to handle and sustain this;

> I think you need to be able to hear things you don't want to hear. There are days when that is incredibly wounding, when you think, 'I'm trying my best here and this isn't good enough,' but I think for collaborative ministry to work, people need to know that you are on their side. (Anna)

The difficulties and challenges of engaging in culture change

This includes learning how to hold, or contain, one's own and others' anxieties and conflicts with the need to develop emotional intelligence, resilience and robustness, and the willingness to work at this proactively with appropriate support. In the group discussion, Anna spoke about only discovering what the church culture or expectations of others were when she had failed to meet them and was criticised for this. She spoke of '*taking the wounding*' in this situation while, nonetheless, trying to stand firm in challenging the prevailing culture. She spoke of wrestling with others' expectation that she would come in and '*simply fill my predecessor's shoes,*' which, she said, '*was never going to happen,*' and she discovered some groups felt they were floundering without direction from the vicar. In response to a potentially critical observation by one of the group members about Anna not regularly attending a mid-week lunch club, where the vicar's presence was appreciated and seen as validating their importance to her, Anna stated that part of the cultural change needed was

> people being able to say to me, 'Could you explain?' and actually I'm quite happy to hear that and to feel the pain of that feeling like criticism, whilst it's not. Part of my individual growth is to be able to hear those things and go, 'She's criticising me, that's really mean', and then going, 'Actually she's not.' … So there's the culture change here and for me as well.

Persisting with culture change in the face of criticism and personal vulnerability is hard to do without good support and emotional resilience, and is thought to be one of the key factors in discouraging ministers in pursuing collaborative leadership.

Labour and time intensive nature of collaborative working and culture change

Both John and Anna reflected on just how wearing and psychologically costly collaborative working was proving to be, in taking more time, energy and patience to do and in encouraging others to use their gifts and skills. With a more directive, solo-practitioner style of ministry, as John expressed it, '*you decide what you want to happen, tell others to do it and it's done. But it can also be exhausting because you end up doing everything.*'

Coping with expectations from self and others

Both ministers described struggling with self-imposed expectations such as feeling that they should be doing things because they're the 'paid person' and handling the expectations of others. They reflected on the importance of discernment in when to resist the pull to 'do it oneself' because of inner pressures ('it's quicker and better if I do it, they'll think I'm shirking') or outer pressures ('but you're the vicar, you're paid to do it,' and 'the previous vicar did that'). John spoke of '*those deeper drivers of wanting to be seen in a certain way, wanting to be seen as the person with great capacity who can handle it all.*'

MINISTRY DIVISION

Coping with the expectations of church members was highlighted in the discussion groups. In the group from Anna's church, when discussing the number of groups operating in the church Anna acknowledged the expectation that she would be involved in all of them without the realisation that there physically were not enough hours in the day. The group members felt that others didn't see that and that '*the vicar's always got to be the vicar in their eyes and sometimes nobody but the vicar will do. It goes with the territory.*' A main block to collaborative working was identified tentatively by a group member as the expectation of '*a lot of people in this church who want to be told what to do and the only person who can tell them what to do is the vicar.*' Although Anna responded to this by saying that wasn't how she worked, one group member said '*I think they think you do. I'm going to dare to say that. I think they think you do, so it's going to take time.*' It was clear in the discussion that group members were feeling uncomfortable with expressing things that they thought the vicar might not want to hear, but with the presence and containment of a facilitator felt able to do so. This part of the discussion concluded with the acknowledgement that the process of change and challenging expectations would take time and, as said to Anna, '*you haven't been here very long and you are emerging as the kind of vicar you want to be and they have to come on board or not.*'

Fear of overburdening church members

The incumbents expressed concerns about overburdening church members and tying them up in church business. As John expressed it; '*I'm mindful of burnout among people. Actually, if we're not careful, people are just busy all week with church. We want people to have lives outside of church and do normal things, and go and be Christians with friends outside of the church.*'

Both incumbents encountered some reluctance among congregation members to take on more leadership responsibility in the church context. For those with work/time pressures relating to families and work commitments there is less availability for more sustained commitment and regular involvement in leadership. As became very apparent in both discussion groups from the mapping exercise of church activities and who was involved in leading them, this means that the older and early-retired members of the congregation tend to have to take up, and stay longer in, positions of responsibility at church and deanery level.

4. Implications for training in IME 1-2 and in a first post of responsibility

Within the limitations of this study, the following areas were identified as best placed for collaborative leadership to be taught and learned:

IME 1

Both incumbents in this study trained residentially. Anna suggested that theological college may not be the best place for learning about leadership and collaborative working as there was '*too much else going on.*' However, she made the point that '*living and working in a learning community teaches you about yourself and belonging to community rather than leading a community.*' This would seem to be an important aspect of learning that could be made more intentional in this context, i.e.

- understanding and managing oneself in group situations;
- understanding group and community dynamics and how to handle them.

MINISTRY DIVISION

IME 2

- Good role modelling by training incumbents and senior church leaders, with learning about collaborative leadership made more intentional in curacy.
- Workshops on the theory and practice of collaborative leadership.
- Establishing the discipline of reflective practice both with the training incumbent and with peers.

First post of responsibility

- Reflective practice and 'learning on the job', especially in a first post of responsibility. This could include one-to-one mentoring, work consultancy, facilitated peer supervision groups and/or training days (ideally for congregations as well as clergy), explicitly incorporating learning on the nature and implementation of collaborative ministry.
- The provision of facilitation to work alongside the incumbent and the church/PCC in certain stages of vision building and decision-making, as well as in times of difficulties or conflict.

CMD

- Specific training on styles of leadership from different perspectives and especially on the nature, implementation and challenges of collaborative working and leadership.

CONCLUSIONS

The following factors were identified from the interviews and group discussions regarding the nature and practice of collaborative leadership, and the kind of on-going support and reflection that is required to facilitate it for ministers and congregations:

Meanings of collaborative leadership

The experience and reflections of the priests who were interviewed underscore the need to investigate more fully exactly what is meant by collaborative leadership and how this is enabled and supported. In order to deliver the above suggestions effectively within a coherent and integrated model, a shared understanding of collaborative ministry at a national level is desirable.

David Heywood, Deputy Director of Ministry in the Diocese of Oxford has written a paper[2] on the nature of collaborative leadership as the basis for a new paradigm in ministry and, consequently, in selection procedures and training. This new paradigm, he suggests, is one in which we need to move away from the role of the ordained minister as 'sole practitioner' to the ordained minister as the animator of the ministry of the whole church. In this paradigm, he maintains, ministry is by its very nature corporate and collaborative in seeking to discern together where the Holy Spirit is at work and how the church responds in mission and ministry in their given context. The role of the collaborative leader is to facilitate the church

---

[2] Heywood, David; *Reimagining Ministerial Formation*, November 2018

MINISTRY DIVISION

in shaping vision and direction as a body, not coming up with the vision oneself and then recruiting others to support and join in.

David Tomlinson, in his recent book on church leadership, also argues for a greater scrutiny of what we mean by collaboration and when and how it is best employed. Tomlinson writes:

> the collaborative leader needs to be humble, generous and courageous, driven by outcomes not by personal success. The gains of successful collaboration are considerable, but it is costly in terms of time, energy, and personal commitment.[3]

Tomlinson gives a very useful and insightful analysis of the characteristics of a collaborative leader and of what makes for, and militates against, collaboration.

Collaborative leadership is inherently relational

The need to build relationships of mutual trust was referred to several times by both Anna and John as a key factor in developing collaborative leadership and collaborative working. This requires a high degree of self-awareness and patience in the minister, along with the abilities to listen attentively to others and to handle conflict and others' projections. However, they also both recognised their responsibility to bring the listening process to a conclusion and the need for them to make a decision if not everyone agreed on the outcome. The dynamics of influence rather than 'positional power' and asserting one's own authority have to be understood and worked with if genuine collaborative leadership is to be effective in facilitating a body of people to discern the way forwards and in developing the gifts and leadership of others.

The emotional and psychological costs of being a collaborative leader need to be acknowledged and worked with

The experience and reflections of the ministers in this project confirm what Heywood states, that collaborative leadership is a much more demanding role for ministers requiring a high degree of emotional intelligence, people skills, and ability to work with organisational dynamics.

Likewise, Tomlinson speaks of minsters facing testing times in seeking to bring about change and development, often in the face of inertia and opposition. As the interviewees in this research reported, the temptation is to react emotionally or to withdraw. However, Tomlinson maintains that the challenge is for ministers to stay engaged (present) and rational which requires 'holding one's nerve'. This is not easy for ministers, as the interviewees in this study reported, and can be one of the main factors that discourages ministers from pursuing true collaborative working. As Tomlinson underscores, collaborative leadership is time-consuming, psychologically and emotionally demanding, and requires a capacity to tolerate anxiety and vulnerability. As he states, many leaders 'underestimate the costs and over-estimate the benefits.'[4]

---

[3] Tomlinson, David (2019), *Leading a Church to Maturity in Love: A Theological and Practical Guide to Church Leadership,* Sacristy Press, Durham UK, p.193.

[4] *ibid* (p.187).

MINISTRY DIVISION

Requirements for training and support in collaborative leadership

Equipping ministers for this type of ministry and leadership, Heywood suggests, cannot all be 'front-loaded' in IME 1 and 2, but needs to be seen as a life-long process where the model of learning shifts from a 'theory to practice approach' to one of experiential learning and reflective practice in context. Thus the need for intentional learning in emotional intelligence and the on-going provision of reflective practice as a means of forming the minister in practical wisdom is essential if ordained ministers are to be nurtured and sustained in collaborative leadership. Likewise, Tomlinson stresses the need for on-going reflective practice, practical support, and the commitment to personal learning and integration as fundamental to the practice of collaborative leadership.

Authors:
Hilary Ison
with
Liz Graveling

© The Archbishops' Council 2019

For further information or enquiries about this report please contact Liz Graveling
liz.graveling@churchofengland.org

Ministry Division
Church House
Great Smith Street
London SW1P 3AZ

https://www.churchofengland.org/ministry-development

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND