



THE CHURCH
OF ENGLAND

Ministry Council

Follow-up Inspection Report

Local Ministry Framework of
the South Central Regional
Training Partnership

June 2014

**Ministry Division
Church House
Great Smith Street
London SW1P 3AZ
Tel: 020 7898 1413
Fax: 020 7898 1421**

**Published 2014 by the Ministry Division of the Archbishops' Council
Copyright © The Archbishops' Council 2014**

LOCAL MINISTRY FRAMEWORK OF THE SOUTH CENTRAL REGIONAL TRAINING PARTNERSHIP

Senior Inspector's follow-up Report on the Response by the South Central RTP to the Recommendations of the October 2013 Report of the Inspectors

June 2014

INTRODUCTION

1. I met with the South Central RTP co-chairs (Revd Canon Dr Hazel Whitehead and the Rt Revd Jonathan Frost, Bishop of Southampton) and LMF leaders Revd Dr Keith Beech-Gruneberg and Revd Dr Phillip Tovey (both Oxford), Revd Dr Steve Summers (Guildford), Mr Dave Foster (Winchester) and Revd Dr Stella Wood (Salisbury) in Winchester on 22 May. I am very grateful for the good, positive and honest mood of the meeting.

2. I received in advance a document entitled 'Whole RTP progress against Inspection Action Plan'. This provided comment and progress on every Recommendation carefully colour-coded to indicate whether the particular response was from SCRTP or one of the participating dioceses. The responses demonstrated serious engagement with the many different issues that the Inspection raised. This was particularly commendable as the year of the Inspection and the year following were highly pressurized as SCRTP and the participating dioceses prepared for the considerable changes that Common Awards has already brought and will continue to bring in the coming months and years.

3. Turning to the specific recommendations of the Inspection Report, which follow in **bold**, SCRTP and the participating dioceses have made progress on nearly all the matters raised. Their responses are in *italics*. The comments of the Senior Inspector follow on for each recommendation.

Recommendation 1 *[SCRTP¹ and participating dioceses]*
We recommend that SCRTP and the participating dioceses ensure that their worship, teaching and staff recruitment reflects the breadth of traditions in the Church of England.

Comment

The RTP Board and Common Awards Management Committee are committed to ensuring a healthy spread of staff from the breadth of the Anglican tradition and from ecumenical partners where possible and appropriate. Although every effort will continue to be made to ensure that staff are appointed who have the right tradition, gender etc, they must also ensure that they appoint the best qualified person for the post in question. However, it should also be remembered that there are several layers of honorary staff involved in training and formation who come from a variety of places and who are able to redress the balance.

Oxford: The report comments positively on Oxford's actions in this area; we are happy to continue to keep it under review.

Winchester - We pay particular attention to this point. The 2013 Programme Handbook stresses 'Tutors are selected from different places in the tradition, men and women, lay and ordained,' with the encouragement that students embrace this diversity in their encounter, learning and reflective practice.

Progress

The new Durham Common Awards Management Committee will have as one of its tasks the management of staff, policies, training etc and will give this due attention. In recent months, we have not appointed new staff as we have been fully staffed.

Oxford has had some discussion about this but notes the problem of parity between diocesan staff. There may be more flexibility in study days as CPD

We are satisfied that the participating dioceses of LMF are in broad agreement with this recommendation. None the less it is important that it does not slip off the agenda. It cannot be assumed that the 'several layers' of honorary staff 'are able to redress the balance'. Our recommendation came out of the observation that, despite these layers, the balance was somewhat out of skew. It therefore continues to need attention when opportunities to make new appointments arise.

Recommendation 2 *[SCRTP and participating dioceses]*
We recommend that the SCRTP and the participating dioceses draw up clear and concise aims which include the centrality of mission and evangelism and which are readily available to students, staff, tutors, mentors, incumbents and support groups; and that it rewrites its key

¹ We refer often in our recommendations to SCRTP as it has the final responsibility. We understand that the LMF will often have a key role in their implementation

documents to reflect both the contemporary reality and its ecumenical vision for the future.

Comment

This is a welcome recommendation and will be incorporated into revised documents produced over the next year in light of Common Awards.

Winchester: The 2013 edition of the Programme Handbook has already been issued to new students and now opens with this paragraph: 'Winchester's Reader training programme seeks to align itself with the missional potential for growth and renewal of the church. It seeks to develop the vocation of those it trains in the hope of developing people who will flourish in mission and ministry. Students are encouraged throughout training to engage with broad-based thinking and to see themselves as part of the ministry of the worldwide church. Although they will live, worship, train and serve locally, candidates for Reader ministry are encouraged to have a broad vision, understanding and attitudes as they serve their communities. In this way we are aligned with Bishop Tim's vision for Winchester Diocese mission strategy through

*living out Passionate Personal Spirituality
encouraging Pioneering Faith Communities
being Prophetic Global Citizens'*

Which is further unpacked as the ethos and values of the programme are expounded.

Progress

The RTP has been rewriting all its documents for the validation process and is ensuring that mission is central. The report 'From Anecdote to Evidence' has provided useful background material for this. With regard to ecumenical vision, we are dependent on our sister Churches making their own decisions about where and how they train their students but Revd Andrew Wood (Methodist) remains a Partner, and the URC has now become a member instead of a Partner. Please see attached document 'SCRTP aims and objectives'.

Winchester: The vision for Winchester now includes the Diocesan priorities agreed at our September Diocesan conference which are briefly summarised as:

- *Growing authentic disciples*
- *Reimagining the church*
- *Being agents of social transformation*
- *Practicing sacrificial living*

These priorities are led by the new School of Mission under the leadership of our new Archdeacon for Mission Development who joins in September 2014.

It is clear that SCRTP supports the direction of this recommendation. It was, for example, evident in the document 'SCRTP aims and objectives' that was made available for us in the sense that the language was being used but not yet, we felt, with the sort of crisp directness we had in mind. 'Aims', we said in our Report (Ai, 1), 'are a general statement of intent and should be set out in short,

plain, highly accessible and hopefully inspirational, even passionate, sentences and/or bullet points.’ The sort of language we had in mind was evident in one diocesan example that was cited to us - Winchester.. We would urge that this becomes a positive model for SCRTP and the other participating dioceses.

Recommendation 3

[SCRTP]

We recommend that the SCRTP becomes more confident in its calling, to develop its regional role in its own way and at its own speed and seeks ways of reminding the wider Church of the vision that lay behind its creation.

Comment

The RTP welcomes this recommendation. It has demonstrated its desire to be a recognised and reputable training facility by its continual engagement with Ministry Division and universities, by its production of helpful papers and policies which it shares with the national Church, and by its unfailing efforts to increase the degree of collaboration within the region. The RTP Chairs co-lead the national Chairs’ consultation with Yorkshire RTP. They also meet every new Church Leader in the region to ensure cooperation and communication. It is also aware that there are limitations – since the national Church has not seen through the original ‘Hind’ vision, and because of the complex nature of the RTP with its 3 theological colleges.

Progress

The current proposal to merge STETS with the RTP, to do away with the name STETS, and to train all ordinands and lay people through the RTP TEI – is doing just this. It is the original Hind vision which spurs us on and we hope that within 2 years, this will be much more obvious. We continue to use our regional relationships and decision-making ability to influence the national church in different ways, and we induct all new bishops into the RTP.

We were very satisfied that SCRTP is fully supportive of this recommendation. We were pleased to learn of the links with Yorkshire RTP

Recommendation 4

[SCRTP and participating dioceses]

We recommend that SCRTP meets with the Colleges and Courses in and perhaps adjacent to the region to:

- **explore ways of co-operating more closely for all local training in its entire region**
- **review the current course provision for training LLMs/OLMs**
- **make recommendations on future provision ensuring local access to courses in the most cost-effective way**
- **identify the most effective vehicle for delivering courses for Common Awards**
- **agrees how a local TEI for Durham University is to be established.**

Comment

The RTP provides excellent opportunities for these kinds of discussion, at the Board, the annual conference and in the project groups. New arrangements to enable the introduction of Common Awards are clearly a priority on which action is being taken. The fact that STETS are actively considering being part of the RTP Common Awards consortium is a welcome development.

Progress

Our RTP is so large that we have no desire to involve any other neighbours in working with us – otherwise, we would in effect be the southern half of the country! The Durham validation process has challenged us in all these things and we are making more flexible the opportunities on offer. The diocese of Guildford is the legal entity for validation.

On the one hand the whole process of Common Awards is creating the sort of links and co-operation we had in mind. The much greater involvement of STETS was mentioned a number of times in our discussion. It is now fully a part of SCRTP is a very good example of the sort of co-operation we had in mind. On the other hand, we detected a certain defensiveness in the progress comment above. We had in mind was not imperialism but the even more effective and efficient use of the resources that lie within the region – and perhaps sometimes just beyond it.

Recommendation 5

[SCRTP and participating dioceses]

We recommend that SCRTP, in the context of teaching to degree level through Common Awards, gives urgent attention to staff development, the promotion of individual research and a sabbatical and vacation policy.

Comment

It is important that the difference between a diocesan training scheme and a theological college is noted – it seems unrealistic to think of a term/vacation rhythm, for example. However articulating what staff development and research might be expected within the generic policies for all diocesan staff might be a helpful step, including liaison with other RTP partners.

In the LMF, all staff are DBF employees; there are no long vacations – our terms end in mid July and begin in the second week of September; there are no spare staff to cover for 3 month absences. And yet we teach to first degree (and MA) level with good results. A few of our staff have managed to complete doctoral studies and/or to write books or contribute to them. In the future, we intend to consider more carefully how core staff may find time to research and write more, after consultation with our Diocesan Secretaries. As the only national Church funding we receive is for ordinands, the dioceses are funding the bulk of the training costs and exercise their right to determine the conditions of service for staff.

Progress

The Durham validation process has led us to do this and we are developing staff development policies. We hope that the RTP TEI, with STETS incorporated, will set up a research forum – encouraged by the efforts made by Durham to include us all in this. We are still unable to tell our employing dioceses that all staff must have sabbaticals but we are working towards proper study leave opportunities.

This recommendation clearly touches a very sensitive area – particularly as much of the funding comes from the dioceses and not the national Church. We fully accept the difference between diocesan training schemes and theological college. But, because both are teaching for qualifications of the same standard, teachers need to be given reasonable opportunities to develop their expertise and teaching skills. Common Awards promises to be instrumental in achieving this. We welcome the recent agreement of a staff development policy for academic staff including the clear recognition of the importance of staff engaging in research activity. For the first time there is a clear statement of what appropriate professional development for theological educators needs to include. The LMF also strongly welcomed it. Indeed the impression we had in the discussion at the follow-up meeting was that it was much more positive about the direction of our recommendation than it appeared on paper. We encourage these developments and continued thinking about sabbatical/study leave policies. This, it is clear from all we heard and saw, may sometimes encounter some resistance from a rather different diocesan mind-set. It is therefore particularly important that SCRTP takes a strong leadership role in working through what good and effective teaching at this level means for diocesan training schemes.

Recommendation 6

[SCRTP and participating dioceses]

We recommend that SCRTP seeks ways of co-operating with other RTPs, Colleges and Courses to ensure that the advances in reflection and integration achieved by portfolio assessment are built on by Common Awards.

Comment

This is happening in discussion about assessment in the CA process. The LMF will be submitting its modules and assessment proposals to the Validation meeting in March 2014. Some of the modules will include assessment by portfolio and, where possible, we will try to encourage the use of portfolio more widely when we engage in the Durham CA staff meetings and at the Durham Management Board. Good practice will be shared as usual at the RTP CA Management Committee. We will also enjoy the range of assessment processes which will be on offer and will choose the most appropriate way for the module and students concerned. Integration is very important to us all so we shall be sure to maintain that wherever possible.

Progress

Portfolio assessment will be one of the modes of assessment in the RTP. We are in touch with Yorkshire RTP re good practice generally, and also the diocese of Rochester (SE RP). We attend the national meetings of Directors and officers and discuss these matters.

We were very satisfied the direction of this recommendation is being followed.

Recommendation 7 *[SCRTP and participating dioceses]*
We recommend that SCRTP develops very clear and mandatory guidelines, with some strong system of oversight, making clear the responsibility of individual training ministers and local churches for the training and effective later use of their local ministers.

Comment

We will be looking at this carefully within the RTP. We commit to being vigilant where it is possible to be selective about who is a training minister and will do our best with others. We will, as recommended in the main report, consider the excellent model which Salisbury has provided and see whether this can become an RTP model of good practice; we also expect to develop role descriptions for placement supervisors (likely to include all training incumbents) within Common Awards. It is beyond our remit to instruct incumbents about how they must use the staff in their own teams but we will liaise with our Bishops, Archdeacons and Directors of Ministry so that we are all doing our best in this area.

Progress

This has been done during the validation process, including agreeing common nomenclature.

Progress is being made here. While it is indeed beyond the remit of the participating diocese to instruct incumbents about the later use of their local ministers it is, we are convinced, very much within their remit to be part of a process which helps during the training period to create a culture of expectation, good practice and vision setting.

Recommendation 8 *[Salisbury and Winchester]*
We recommend that Winchester and Salisbury review whether their teaching on other faiths is adequate given the importance of this dimension in the context of our multi-ethnic, multi-cultural society.

Comment

Salisbury: This will be considered as part of pathway planning for the non-accredited element of our LLM training from 2014 when we move to Common Awards. Autumn 2013.

Winchester: The area of teaching on other faiths will be addressed with the introduction of Common Awards.

Progress

Salisbury: The core Level 5 Common Awards module, Texts and Traditions in Christian Spirituality has been incorporated into the new programme: this includes in-depth study of a text from a non-Christian faith and encourages good depth of analysis about the synergies and divergences between religious traditions.

Winchester: There will be substantial teaching content on other faiths delivered under Common Awards in the module 'Mission & apologetics in Contemporary Culture'.

Satisfactory progress is being made.

Recommendation 9

[Salisbury]

We recommend that the Course reviews its understanding of mission within the context of training people to be 'teachers in a pastoral context', lest mission be so widely spread across all training that it loses its focus and challenge.

Progress

Salisbury: The course will review this recommendation within the diocesan review of Licensed Lay Ministry which begins work in September 2013. The course will seek the advice of the Bishop of Sherborne, Warden of LLMS and missiologist as LLM pathways are developed. Autumn 2013.

Comment

Both action points were acted on in the Autumn of 2013. It is planned to draw out the missiological implications of each module to provide a clear current through the new programme. In addition a specific section on Fresh Expressions of worship has been incorporated into the present L5 Planning and Leading Worship module to consider the overlap between mission & liturgy.

Clearly excellent progress has been made in relation to this recommendation.

Recommendation 10

[Salisbury and Winchester]

We recommend that, as a matter of course, evaluation sheets are handed out at the end of lectures and residentials, and that such feedback properly and in a timely fashion informs programme planning and delivery.

Comment

Salisbury: The purpose and most effective methods of feedback will be the primary item of a core staff meeting. Autumn 2013.

Students will be consulted through the VLE and at the November Foundation Degree day to establish that any new system of feedback fits student needs. November 2013.

Winchester: Evaluation sheets for each module are automatically available to students and tutors from the module-specific area of the LNET. These are reviewed regularly by the Core Tutor Team.

Progress

Salisbury: Students were consulted in November and recommended a two point feedback system, piloted in Spring 2014. A check-point initial feedback is requested after 3 sessions and a full version at the end. Feedback sheets are sent and received by the office rather than by the Tutor, allowing students greater freedom of expression. Students did not welcome the chance to feedback after every session.

Winchester: Students are reminded of the need to complete evaluation sheets after each weekend and the response rate is good.

Good progress is being made.

Recommendation 11

[Winchester]

We recommend that the Winchester Course revises its rationale, as well as its vocabulary, in the light of the diocese's and the national Church's thinking concerning LLM.

Comment

Winchester: This point is under active consideration by the Bishop. It is clear that the national Church is in a process of transition. This area of Ministry is still overseen by the Central Reader Council, their web pages are headed 'Church of England Readers' and their regular publication is still called The Reader.

Progress

Winchester: This point remains under consideration by our Diocesan Bishop and no doubt will be progressed as our new School of Mission develops

While we take the point that the language of 'Reader' is still used in the Church of England we would still want to recommend Winchester to revise its rationale and vocabulary as the other participating dioceses have done.

Recommendation 12

[Winchester]

We recommend that, especially to the end of formation, the Course models more obviously the integration of worship and study.

Comment

To offer students a breadth of styles of engagement and delivery, a range of tutors are used over the course of a weekend/day. If their session is at a time of day when worship is not taking place, it is unreasonable to expect them to stay

(most are volunteers). However, there is an expectation that if they are in the building at a time of worship, then they should attend and share. Tutors will be reminded of their obligation to integrate study and worship in this way.

Progress

All tutors have been reminded of their responsibility to attend corporate worship when they are involved in residential training and study days.

We believe that significant progress has been made.

Recommendation 13 *[SCRTP and participating dioceses]*
We recommend that the students are sign-posted clearly and easily to the Course's policies.

Comment

The participating dioceses are committed to being vigilant to ensure that all students are well directed to all the information they need. This will be by using hard copy Handbooks, individual paper handouts the websites, by email attachment, Dropbox and by word of mouth. Where possible, policies and procedures will be held in common.

Progress

This has been done, they have been rewritten for Durham and agreed communally. They are on line and in handbooks.

Satisfactory progress has been made in relation to this recommendation

Recommendation 14 *[SCRTP and participating dioceses]*
We recommend that there is both DBS clearance and safeguarding training at the beginning of the course.

Comment

We are all committed to ensuring that every student for authorised ministry completes safeguarding training before the end of their first year. All students will have DBS clearance before they begin training.

Progress

We have all introduced this and will continue to do so.

Satisfactory progress has been made in relation to this recommendation

Recommendation 15 *[Guildford]*
We recommend that the logistics of having all three year groups for the residential weekends are re-examined.

Comment

Current year group numbers allow for a residential weekend to be organised with all year groups together in 2014. The benefits of doing so are offset by significantly reduced opportunities for students to lead worship sessions when compared with year specific or 'two year groups' residentials, so a balance will be sought.

Progress

This all-year group weekend has been booked and organised for 14-16 Nov 2014. However a potential increase in new yr 1 numbers now means that this venue is now unlikely to be large enough.

As this re-examination proceeds, we continue to believe that it would be better for students if a solution could be found that would allow all three year groups to be together for residential weekends.

Recommendation 16

[Salisbury]

We recommend that the role of Mentors is clarified, for the sake both of fairness for all students and the building of wider corporate life.

Comment

*A dedicated CPD meeting in **November 2013** will focus on achieving clarity on the Mentor role, especially as students change mentors post-licensing. Mentors will not be part of the new Common Awards structure from 2014 and this will therefore not be a long term concern. For current students, the Mentor team is now smaller as students complete the Foundation Degree.*

Progress

This meeting took place and resulted in a clear statement of expectations both of Mentor and student within the Mentoring relationship. This was sent to all students and put on Moodle and had the support of all Mentors

Satisfactory progress has been made in relation to this recommendation

Recommendation 17

[Salisbury and Winchester]

We recommend that a timescale be introduced to the Students' Appeal Procedure within the new Disciplinary Procedure.

Comment

Salisbury: This will be implemented and put to the November 2013 meeting of the governing body, LDMC. November 2013.

Winchester: A timescale for the submitting an appeal to the relevant Suffragan Bishop and the notification of the outcome will be included in a revised policy.

Progress

Salisbury: This action point was fulfilled at the November 2013 LDMC meeting.

Winchester: The revised policy includes a timescale.

Satisfactory progress has been made in relation to this recommendation.

Recommendation 18

[Winchester]

We recommend that a clear statement of corporate life, including a statement on Corporate Worship, be readily accessible to all, and be embodied by all in the Course's daily life.

Comment

The 2013 Programme Handbook now includes a clear statement on corporate life but written expectations around corporate worship still need to be strengthened. This will be done for the 2014 edition of the Programme Handbook.

Progress

Further details are being included under the Common awards programme Handbook.

Progress has been made but we have not seen the new details in the Handbook and so are unable to form a judgement.

Recommendation 19

[Guildford]

We recommend that an authorised form of worship is normally used and that students are made fully aware of their canonical obligations in leading worship.

Comment

Guildford: authorised forms of worship are normally used and students are made fully aware of their canonical obligations in leading worship. We will also seek to expose students to a wider range of liturgical material, such as they encounter in their parish context, in order to train them in a range of liturgical practice.

Progress

Students continue to use a range of worship materials with the emphasis being on Common Worship. When alternatives are used it is made clear that these are unusual and context specific.

Satisfactory progress has been made in relation to this recommendation.

Recommendation 20

[Guildford]

We recommend that, as leading worship is such a key part of ministry both for LLMs and OLMs, more time and care be taken on the feedback given to students when they lead worship and this to include feedback from their peers.

Comment

We will ensure that more time and care is taken when we write up the staff feedback sheet immediately following student-led worship. Students will be encouraged to utilise student feedback forms for their peers following Monday evening worship.

Progress

Carried out as per recommendation at last residential weekends November 13 and January 14.

Satisfactory progress has been made in relation to this recommendation.

Recommendation 21

[Winchester]

We recommend that consideration be given to exploring ways of enhancing the variety of traditions experienced by students in addition to the placement.

Comment

A clearer statement on policy for corporate worship will be included in the 2014 edition of the Programme Handbook. Most students beginning the programme are completely unfamiliar with Common Worship Daily Prayer. As the default daily office for the Church of England, it is used in corporate worship to bring a sense of commonality and community but also to instruct and inform about received traditions of prayer and worship, and the structure of liturgy. These aims are enhanced by the diversity students encounter in the modules on Liturgy, Developing Pastoral and Professional Practice (DPPP), and Developing the Practice of Liturgy and preaching (DPLP). Students are encouraged to offer input from their own tradition at every stage of the programme and to reflect on what they encounter from others in terms of being different from their 'home' context and tradition. We shall continue to seek opportunities to enhance the variety of traditions experienced by students.

Progress

The move to Common awards will provide a much more diverse placement experience including visits to other traditions.

Progress is being made but the language here is of general good intent. We do not have evidence as yet to judge how this will happen.

Recommendation 22 (see also Recommendation 7) [Salisbury & Winchester]

We recommend that all training incumbents be given additional training prior to working with a Reader candidate and attend on-going support sessions during the period of training.

Comment

*Salisbury: The course will review this recommendation within the diocesan LLM review in **September 2013** and in particular its ongoing consideration of LLM discernment.*

Winchester: All training incumbents attend an induction day and in addition to the Programme Handbook a separate extensive Training Incumbent's Handbook which clearly sets out their responsibilities and the resources available to support them in the role. Students are required to meet regularly with their incumbent to plan and to engage in reflective supervision. Support for incumbents in this aspect of their role is given as part of the induction process. The majority of training incumbents also oversee (or have recently overseen) a curate and so will have accessed additional training to support them in their supervisory role. Consideration will be given to expanding the support offered as the programme progresses.

Progress

Salisbury: Two new discernment secretaries for LLM ministry began work in November 2013 making good contact with incumbents. We will continue to encourage full engagement from training incumbents.

Winchester: This is further enhanced with the move to Common Awards as expectation of training Incumbents supervision of students are increased.

We are confident that both dioceses want to implement this recommendation. The evidence is not as yet forthcoming as to how and when this will happen.

Recommendation 23

[Winchester]

We recommend that consideration is given to providing a larger fit for purpose worship space (not necessarily on a permanent basis) at Old Alresford Place.

Comment

The challenge of delivering Reader training in a multi-use building which needs to remain flexible in terms of the accommodation it offers is acknowledged. Current cohort sizes fit comfortably within the Chapel for daily offices and it is generally acknowledged to offer a space that is conducive to worship. Eucharists are held in one of the two larger training rooms on offer. Both accommodate 50 people and are also conducive to worship.

Progress

Little to add to previous response except that some of the training will now take place at Wolvesey which has its own Chapel and the Cathedral is nearby.

We had a very creative exchange with the LMF team about the sort of buildings the Church should seek to encourage for worship during training. The general tenor was to agree that the contemporary challenges of mission demand great

flexibility. This we fully accept while always wanting to emphasize the importance of creating 'an atmosphere conducive to worship' (para 150) .

Recommendation 24 *[Winchester]*
We recommend that urgent attention is given to ways of creating more corporate life for those in training.

Comment

The Core Tutor team will give active consideration to this recommendation. The constraints of budget and geography are strong factors which mitigate against implementing the recommendation as fully as we or the inspectors may wish.

Progress

Common Awards provides more opportunities for corporate sessions. We are also working hard to determine how tutors' professional development can be enhanced.

We were less than satisfied that any significant imaginative progress has been made in relation to this Recommendation. This is probably because the training department is being reorganised with key appointments yet to be made. We would hope that there will soon be evidence that this recommendation is being implemented.

Recommendation 25 *[SCRTP and participating dioceses]*
We recommend that more use be made of the expertise and strengths of the other RTP colleagues and/or to buy in particular expertise.

Comment

Sharing teaching across the RTP is a good idea and something we do fairly regularly within the limits of commitments to our courses and part-time staffing. The LMF will consider ways in which it might increase this, and also consider where it needs to buy in expertise.

Progress

We are working on this through the Durham validation process. The incorporation of STETS and new staff to be employed by Winchester will provide us with extra skills. Sarum College is more involved as a deliverer in different ways.

See also our comments on Recommendation 4. As Professor Gareth Lloyd demonstrates the use of external teachers can be hugely positive. We would urge that the exploration of the rich resources in SCRTP *and beyond* continues.

Recommendation 26 *[Guildford]*
We recommend that consideration be given to making the Course's Old Testament teaching more widely available through video or podcast.

Comment

We are delighted that Professor Gareth Lloyd Jones continues to teach on our modules and will open his sessions to others within the RTP. However, we do not consider that there would be as much benefit for those who simply watch a podcast or read his notes. His style depends on an inter-active and personal presentation, he often asks people to read large portions of scripture and the face to face engagement is key to his popularity. In addition, the cost of recording and making this material available in a professional quality is prohibitive for the number of people who are likely to take advantage of the resource. We continue to invite independent students to attend these sessions and will ensure that they are more widely publicised.

Progress

Course is advertised widely around the diocese and six additional auditing students have begun the new module.

We are not convinced by the cost argument. The capacity to make recordings and videos of moderately good quality for virtually nothing is a reality in many spheres – including churches. We are even less convinced that the teaching impact would not survive being podcasted. We would hope that this possibility continues to be explored.

Recommendation 27 [see also Recommendation 33] [Guildford and Oxford]
We recommend that those who appraise the visiting tutors check that tutors are pitching the level appropriately and with sufficient academic rigour.

Comment

Guildford: We will endeavour to create time for core-staff to sit in on visiting tutor led sessions, in order to determine the level and quality of teaching.

Oxford: We will review our peer review policy and recruitment of tutors to ensure effective continuation of this monitoring

Progress

Guildford: Implemented and continued throughout Autumn and Spring terms as teaching commitments allow.

Oxford has been a part of discussion about a common policy in light of CA on peer review.

We are glad that progress is being made. We would however want to underline how important we felt this to be. We were sent a paper 'Peer review of teaching' which indicated satisfactory progress in reviewing tutors who teach substantial proportions of modules. In the ensuing discussion it became clear that tutors who teach less than 30 per cent of a module are not covered by this paper. We felt in our visit that this 'light-touch' appraisal should include such tutors. Because it does not, it remains an area for continued attention.

Recommendation 28

[Guildford]

We recommend that, as library access is a priority for students in training, the diocese invest every possible resource in making it as accessible as possible to as many as possible.

Comment

The Guildford team is working very closely with the staff at the Cathedral, where the library is housed. We are grateful for this spur as we have been trying to improve the accessibility – physically and electronically – for some time. We are assured that both elements are in progress and we hope that all will be well by spring 2014.

Progress

Library is now electronically catalogued and new library card system is in process. Diocesan launch to be held on 5th June. A revised team budget for new acquisitions has been agreed.

We are delighted with the excellent progress.

Recommendation 29

[Salisbury]

We recommend that mentors be included in CPD programmes and be given further clarity and guidance as to their role.

Comment

As with recommendation 16 which covers very similar ground, we will work with the smaller group of Mentors working with students to achieve clarity with a dedicated CPD meeting in November 2013. Mentors in their current role will no longer be part of the programme from the summer of 2014 when the last students will complete the Oxford Brookes Foundation Degree course.

Progress

Please see comment on recommendation 16.

Satisfactory progress has been made in relation to this recommendation

Recommendation 30

[Salisbury]

We recommend that tutors who lack experience or training in further or higher education should be included in CPD programme.

Comment

This is part of an ongoing discussion within the diocese as to what is affordable and realistic within the diocesan budget and given the approach of Common Awards. The need for academic study time is recognised as important by Senior Staff.

Progress

Agreement in principle has been taken by the Diocesan Secretary. A new HR director is joining later this year. She comes from a University and therefore has the experience to determine what is appropriate. She will draw up the policy by September 2014.

This has some overlap with Recommendation 5. We are gratified that progress is being made.

Recommendation 31 *[SCRTP and participating dioceses]*
We recommend that all teaching staff have formal employment contracts.

Comment

We are unable to accept this recommendation as it stands and will continue to use a wide range of tutors and teachers. We believe it is not possible to give all staff contracts because as soon as a person has a contract, they become an employee with all the rights and responsibilities that entails. All core staff have employment contracts. Some tutors are free-lance and submit invoices. Tutors who receive a stipend are not allowed to claim further income.

Progress

Although this might not be legally possible, in the spirit of the recommendation, under CA we are developing a document outlining role descriptions for the different types of course tutors. Relating to this please see document 'SCRTP staff development policy – May 14'.

Though this recommendation is not accepted we do accept that its spirit has been. Working in tandem with CA policies seems a fruitful way forward.

Recommendation 32 *[SCRTP and participating dioceses]*
We recommend that a 'light touch' appraisal process for tutors be put in place, so that suitable support and training may be given to tutors and that the quality of the tutors' teaching is assessed, with an agreed procedure to be followed if this has become unsatisfactory.

Comment

Guildford: We do this at the twice yearly tutor meetings where all tutors are present, but are considering how we might meet the tutors after each module is delivered, based on the evaluation forms from students and work has been marked and returned.

Oxford: All tutors are subject to regular peer review, and receive written feedback from this. We will consider whether to develop a formal process to be followed if the teaching is judged to be unsatisfactory.

Progress

A complete revision of tutor meetings has been implemented with an ‘all tutor’ training session set for 11th June to set out the new requirements and support under Durham, to review the student feedback process, and to elect new tutor representative on the DVMC. The newly formed CAMC will ensure that this happens more rigorously. 1st meeting Sept 2014.

Oxford: The Durham categorization of tutor will require some deeper appraisal of more regularly used tutors and this is underway.

Winchester: How we assess tutors is under further discussion for Common Awards.

This recommendation was to SCRTP. Individual dioceses – and not all – have responded. We understand that the direction they point to is being followed by SCRTP and the other participating dioceses. We were sent good SCRTP papers on staff appointment and staff development. They were evidence of satisfactory progress but with the significant proviso we made in our response to Recommendation 27.

Recommendation 33 *[SCRTP and participating dioceses]*
We recommend that formal arrangements for regular staff appraisal and development be adopted and implemented.

Comment

Guildford: Core staff are regularly and formally appraised and reviewed. Those who hold the Bishop’s Licence have Ministry Review every two years according to national guidelines. They also have appraisal with their line manager (the Principal with the Director, the core staff with the Principal). They also have peer conversations within the RTP. At this meeting, future developmental issues are discussed.

Oxford: This is already true of the core staff. The validation with Durham will entail the need to work out policies about associate staff, and visiting staff.

Progress

Guildford: LMP staff annual reviews are set to happen in the month of July 14. CAMC will do this as part of its governance - 1st meeting Sept 14.

Oxford: See comment on 32

Winchester: Staff reviews take place under the terms of employment contracts. With the changes to the School of Mission and the arrival of the new Archdeacon, policies for associate teaching staff will be reviewed with respect to Common Awards.

As with the previous recommendation the response was from the same individual dioceses. We were sent good SCRTP papers on staff appointment and staff development. They were evidence of satisfactory progress but with the significant proviso we made in our response to Recommendation 27

Recommendation 34

[Guildford]

We recommend that the course seeks to recruit more tutorial staff with specific expertise in various areas of study and provides them with training and help in fulfilling their task effectively.

Comment

We will endeavour to recruit and train tutorial staff with specific skills when we are rewriting the new course modules under Common Awards

Progress

Three new tutors have been recruited with subject specific skills for the Christian Discipleship, Doctrine and Intro. to Doctrine and History modules.

Satisfactory progress is being made in relation to this recommendation

Recommendation 35

[Oxford]

We recommend that whenever job descriptions are agreed at the annual review, the process of approval meets reasonable expectations. (See also recommendation 33.)

Comment

This will be raised with the diocesan HR department.

Progress

This is being discussed.

Progress is being made. It will need to be monitored.

Recommendation 36

[Oxford]

We recommend that the level of administrative support be reviewed.

Comment

An administrative review in the Department of Mission is already in place.

Progress

This review has taken place and changes have been made to the staff.

We make the same comment for the previous recommendation.

Recommendation 37

[Salisbury and Winchester]

We recommend a careful process for the selection of tutors.

Comment

*Salisbury: A process for selecting tutors for teaching Common Awards will be formalised into a policy in the **autumn of 2013** and put to the governing body, LDMC. The introduction of Common Awards gives an opportunity to review tutor selection and conditions for new courses taught from September 2014.*

Winchester: as tutors are volunteers, we have found that an informal though nonetheless robust, selection process for new tutors delivers the best outcome. Suggestions for who might be approached to take on a role come from colleagues within the Department of Discipleship and Ministry and from senior staff in the diocese/ Curates are especially targeted.

Progress

Winchester: Selection processes for new tutors will be further reviewed by the new Archdeacon for Mission Development.

'... an informal though nonetheless robust selection process' needs to be carefully and regularly monitored. We are reassured that this whole process will be reviewed in the immediate future.

**Recommendation 38 (see also Recommendation 4) [Salisbury]
We recommend that the Course explores how it may use the staff and resources of Sarum College and STETS in the delivery of its LLM training.**

Comment

Salisbury: There is an ongoing discussion within the diocese and the RTP about how we can work even more collaboratively with STETS and with Sarum College.

Co-Chair: STETS is going to be validated for Common Awards through the RTP and this is a move towards greater unity.

Progress

A policy for the selection, payment and CPD of tutors was put to and endorsed by LDMC. It has been used for approaches to potential new tutors who will teach under Common Awards.

We are satisfied that progress is being made

**Recommendation 39 [Winchester]
We recommend that all Job Descriptions detail expectations regarding a post holder's involvement in corporate worship.**

Comment

Job descriptions will be amended to incorporate this.

Progress

There has been a long and intense series of discussions and consultations about this which is ongoing.

We were assured in the meeting that this had now been done.

Recommendation 40*[Winchester]*

We recommend that all roles are subject to annual appraisal, and ensuing CPD; and that all Job Descriptions, including for those running study groups away from the centre, include reference to annual appraisal and ensuing CPD.

Comment

Consideration will be given to implementing this recommendation. We will seek to identify the resource implications of the recommendation in liaison with the diocesan HR Adviser. The Ministry Training Officer and Administrator both receive a formal annual appraisal against a job description for their respective roles. Annual appraisals will be introduced for the Reader Training Co-ordinator and the Reader Training Quality Assurance Adviser. All tutors are themselves licensed ministers and as such are expected to access ongoing CMD provision as part of their own ministerial and professional development. Two training sessions are offered to tutors annually – one relating to a specific area of theology and the other to pedagogical theory and practice. On the 4th July a member of the Education Faculty at the University of Winchester delivered a training session on working with Small Groups as part of the ongoing support of tutors.

Progress

Discussions are ongoing

As is admitted not much progress has been made. This Recommendation depends on the outcome of discussions which possibly depend on staff who have not yet taken up post and on appointments that have not yet been made. It will consequently need to be monitored.

Recommendation 41*[Winchester]*

We recommend that, in consultation with students, or their Representatives, the Course clarifies its guidelines on Assignments and Assessment.

Comment

Active and urgent consideration will be given to how best this recommendation can be fully implemented

Progress

Assignments and assessment criteria are being fully reviewed and revised to meet the Common Awards criteria

We are satisfied that this Recommendation has been implemented

Recommendation 42*[Winchester]*

We recommend that issues of conflict of interest be addressed and that there is a Complaints Process available to any student who is not initially recommended for licensing.

Comment

The Warden of Readers has departed his post to take up a role in another diocese. This role is currently being held by a Suffragan Bishop (Basingstoke) who is neither part of the tutoring or recommendation processes. With the imminent restructuring of our Department and the roles within it, it is unlikely that such a conflict of interests will arise again.

Progress

The department is in the process of restructuring. The Bishop of Southampton now has oversight until the new Archdeacon for Mission development arrives in September 2014. The conflict of interest will not arise with the new structure.

We are very reassured by the progress that has been made in relation to this Recommendation

Recommendation 43

[Winchester]

We recommend that students' year representatives have full, voting rights on all boards at which they are the year representatives.

Comment

The changes this recommendation seeks will be implemented through the imminent restructuring of the Discipleship and Ministry Department and the introduction of Common Awards.

Progress

This issue is fully addressed by the proposals for Common Awards Management Committee.

We are very reassured by the progress that has been made in relation to this Recommendation

Recommendation 44 (see also Recommendation 2)

[SCRTP and participating dioceses]

We recommend the definitive documents are revised in the light of the adoption of Common Awards in September 2014.

Comment

We agree that this needs to be done and will be working on the documents together in preparation for the validation visit in March 2014

Progress

Done

We are very reassured by the progress that has been made in relation to this Recommendation.

Recommendation 45

[Guildford]

We recommend the creation of a dedicated governance oversight body for the Guildford course.

Comment

This will change with the arrival of the Common Awards Management Committee which will have oversight of all the validated courses. We will be considering the best ways to revise the current DVM Council in order to incorporate the necessary level of local governance.

Progress

Currently the LMF is restructuring in order to fit into a pattern of meetings that covers RTP interests not associated with Common Awards, Local Preachers specific interests, and matters covered by the Common Awards Management Committee.

While this Recommendation has not yet been implemented there was a firm intention of moving towards it.

Recommendation 46

[Winchester]

We recommend that, while respecting the Dioceses' wish to minimise bureaucracy, the course should have formal structures to clarify how strategic decisions are made, how outcomes are validated and what procedures are in place to ensure justice in the case of student appeals.

Comment

The changes this recommendation seeks will be implemented through the imminent restructuring of the Discipleship and Ministry Department and the introduction of Common Awards across the RTP

Progress

This has been addressed through the new Common Awards Management Committee and policies.

We are reassured by the progress that has been made in relation to this Recommendation

Recommendation 47

[Winchester]

We recommend that the Course explore ways in which tutors may be more involved in the Course's corporate life and decision making processes

Comment

Active consideration will be given to how tutors can appropriately feel more part of the process. The fact that day-today leadership and governance is in the hands of a 'core team' means that those beyond the core are inevitably at a

greater distance. The difficult task of balancing the need to manage a dynamic and demanding programme against the availability of volunteers is a significant factor. All tutors have a ready channel through which to communicate, ask questions or voice concerns – the Reader Training Co-ordinator who does an excellent job in keeping tutors informed and maintaining healthy relationships.

Progress

The core management team includes six tutors. Tutors are invited to meetings of the whole group of tutors once per year and regular newsletters are sent out to them.

We are reassured by the progress that has been made in relation to this Recommendation.

Recommendation 48 *[SCRTP and participating dioceses]*
We recommend that participating dioceses determine at their local Governance level the implications of Common Awards for LLM and OLM courses. They should separately decide whether they wish SCRTP to be their lead local validation body.

Comment

The bishops and diocesan secretaries have decided that they do not wish to be a legal entity but are content to work through the auspices of the diocese of Guildford. Agreements are being drawn up between Guildford and other dioceses and institutions. An RTP Common Awards Management Committee will be set up as a subsidiary of the RTP Board. Within each institution or diocese, local management boards will continue to exist for the day to day management of the courses and these local boards will send at least two people to the CAMC. We envisage that some members of the CAMC will be members of the Durham CA Management Committee.

Oxford: These matters have already been discussed by the Oxford LMP Oversight Body, and will continue to be on its agenda.

Progress

As in comment section.

We are reassured by the careful consideration given to this Recommendation and by the fact that it will continue to be reviewed.

Recommendation 49 *[SCRTP and participating dioceses]*
We recommend SCRTP provides a framework business plan to manage, for example, the process of adoption of Common Awards and that each diocesan team has a business plan with key objectives, milestones, responsibilities for delivery and costs to demonstrate how Common Awards will be delivered locally. This will include identifying staff and other

resources needed to plan successfully for the transition period and for delivery of the new courses (see also Recommendation 4 above).

Comment

This is what the Local Ministry Framework and the Board are doing. It cannot be a business plan in that we are responsive to what University of Durham and Ministry Division require of us and this is a changing and developing thing. The Co-Chairs are working closely with other institutions and groups which wish to be validated through the RTP and the timeframe is set out carefully by Durham. The Standard Validation Contract details most of the above and we are working within this. We are negotiating with one another via the Diocesan Secretary of Guildford about staffing requirements. There are several dates set for planning and writing: 4th November, 5th November, 10th December, 12th December, 20/21st January.

Oxford: The business plan for local Ministry within the diocese of Oxford is a part of the plan of the Department of Mission. This plan includes key objectives, milestones and responsibilities. It has not been the policy of the Department to separate out subsections of the Department and ask them to produce individual business plans.

Progress

The validation meeting with the University happened on 17th March where we were given some conditions and recommendations. The first set were met by 30th April; May 15th is the next deadline. We are on track to sign contracts before Sept.

Salisbury: This has been an ongoing discussion but working via the RTP is the accepted way forward.

Oxford has discussed this issue as have the RTP and at this point the RTP is a federation in terms of planning budgets.

We are reassured by the careful consideration given to this Recommendation and by the fact that it will continue to be reviewed as structures evolve and morph into the new world of Common Awards.

CONCLUSION

1. We are impressed by the detailed response and the enormous progress that has been made. In the vast majority of the Recommendations the process of implementation has begun. Occasionally it has been completed. If it has not, there is a firm commitment to completion and we have every reason for confidence that this will happen.
2. There were a number of Recommendations (5, 11, 15, 27, 32 & 33) where we felt that the LMF needs to review its reactions and actions to ensure that it implements the spirit and direction of these Recommendations.

3. There were others (particularly 1, 2, 4, 7, 25, & 40) where further attention is required.
4. Finally there were those (18, 21, 22 and 24) where there was insufficient evidence to have any clarity as to the probable action outcome.