



THE CHURCH  
OF ENGLAND

## **Ministry Council**

## **Inspection Report**

Local Ministry Framework of  
the South Central Regional  
Training Partnership

March - June 2013

**Ministry Division  
Church House  
Great Smith Street  
London SW1P 3AZ  
Tel: 020 7898 1412  
Fax: 020 7898 1421**

**Published 2013 by the Ministry Division of the Archbishops' Council  
Copyright © The Archbishops' Council 2013**

## CONTENTS

GLOSSARY .....	1
LIST OF INSPECTORS.....	2
THE INSPECTIONS FRAMEWORK .....	3
FULL REPORT .....	11
SECTION ONE: AIMS AND KEY RELATIONS .....	11
A    Aims and objectives .....	11
B    Relationships with other institutions .....	20
C    Curriculum for formation and education.....	28
SECTION THREE: MINISTERIAL DEVELOPMENT .....	37
D    Community and corporate life .....	37
E    Worship and training in public worship .....	42
F    Ministerial, personal and spiritual formation.....	49
SECTION FOUR: EDUCATION AND TRAINING .....	55
G    Teaching and learning: content, method and resources.....	55
H    Practical and pastoral theology .....	63
SECTION FIVE: STAFF AND STUDENTS .....	66
I    Teaching Staff.....	66
J    All staff .....	67
K    Students.....	74
SECTION SIX: GOVERNANCE, MANAGEMENT AND FINANCE .....	79
L    Organisation and governance .....	79
M    Business planning and risk management.....	88
N    Financial policies .....	93
O    Statutory and operating policies.....	97
P    Accommodation.....	98
CONCLUSION .....	100
LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS .....	104

## **GLOSSARY**

AV	Audio Visual
BCP	Book of Common Prayer
CPD	Continuing Professional Development
CMD	Continuing Ministerial Development
CME	Continuing Ministerial Education
CMS	Church Mission Society
DBF	Diocesan Board of Finance
DDM	Diocesan Director of Ministry
DDO	Diocesan Director of Ordinands
HEFCE	Higher Education Funding Council for England
HMRC	Her Majesty's Revenue & Customs
IT	Information Technology
KAC	King Alfred's College (Winchester)
LDMC	Learning for Discipleship and Ministry Council (Salisbury)
LLM	Licensed Lay Minister
LMF	Local Ministry Framework
LMFPG	Local Ministry Framework Project Group
LMP	Local Ministry Programme
LNET	On-line learning network (Winchester)
MBTI	Myers-Briggs Type Indicator
Moodle	On-line learning platform
OLM	Ordained Local Minister
RTP	Regional Training Partnership
SCRTP	South Central Regional Training Partnership
STETS	Southern Theological Education and Training Scheme
TEI	Theological Education Institution
URC	United Reformed Church
YRTP	Yorkshire Regional Training Partnership

## **LIST OF INSPECTORS**

**Revd Canon Dr Peter Williams**, Senior Inspector; formerly Vice-Principal of Trinity College, Bristol and Vicar of All Saints, Ecclesall and then St Martin de Gouray, Jersey

**Revd Professor Paul Bradshaw**, Professor of Theology, University of Notre Dame and Priest-Vicar, Westminster Abbey

**Dr Marion Gray**, Director of Reader Selection and tutor, Reader Training Course, Southwark Diocese. Reader at Immanuel & St Andrew, Streatham, diocese of Southwark

**Revd Ann Leonard**, Vicar of St Peter's North Hayling and St Andrew's Eastoke, Hayling Island, and Vocations Adviser, Portsmouth diocese

**Canon David McGregor**; Retired secondary Head teacher and Diocesan Director of Education.

**Revd Canon Dr Alwyn Pettersen**, Canon Theologian, Worcester Cathedral

## **THE INSPECTIONS FRAMEWORK**

On behalf of the sponsoring churches, inspection teams are asked to assess the fitness for purpose of the training institution for preparing candidates for ordained and licensed ministry and to make recommendations for the enhancement of the life and work of the institution.

Within the structures of the Church of England, this report has been prepared for the House of Bishops acting through the Ministry Council.

In coming to their judgements, inspectors are asked to use the following outcomes with regard to the overall outcome and individual criteria:

### **Confidence**

Overall outcome: a number of recommendations, none of which question the generally high standards found in the inspection.

Criteria level: aspects of an institution's life which show good or best practice.

### **Confidence with qualifications**

Overall outcome: A number of recommendations, including one or more of substance that questions the generally acceptable standards found in the inspection and which can be rectified or substantially addressed by the institution in the coming 12 months.

Criteria level: aspects of an institution's life which show either (a) at least satisfactory practice but with some parts which are not satisfactory or (b) some unsatisfactory practice but where the institution has the capacity to address the issues within 12 months.

### **No confidence**

Overall outcome: A number of recommendations, including one or more of substance which raise significant questions about the standards found in the inspection and the capacity of the institution to rectify or substantially address these in the coming 12 months.

Criteria level: aspects of an institution's life which show either (a) generally not satisfactory practice or (b) some unsatisfactory practice where it is not evident that the institution can rectify the issues within the coming 12 months.

# THE REPORT OF THE INSPECTION OF THE LOCAL MINISTRY FRAMEWORK OF THE SOUTH CENTRAL REGIONAL TRAINING PARTNERSHIP, COMPRISING THE LOCAL MINISTRY TRAINING PROGRAMMES OF GUILDFORD, OXFORD, SALISURY AND WINCHESTER DIOCESES

March – June 2013

## Introduction

Exploration and discussion about an RTP began in 2007 and by the next year the formal agreements and structures of SCRTP were in place. It reaches from Milton Keynes in the north to the most southerly part of Great Britain – the south of Jersey - embracing Guildford, Oxford, Salisbury, Winchester, Portsmouth, Southampton and Bath. Its founding partners were the Wessex Synod of the United Reformed Church, the Southampton Methodist District, and dioceses of Guildford, Oxford, Portsmouth, Salisbury and Winchester. In late 2012 Bath and Wells became a partner. The Partnership is open 'to other Christian ecclesial bodies in the region, with the approval of the existing Partners.' It also includes Members who are 'engaged in Christian theological education and training in the region.' Currently these include CMS, Ripon College Cuddesdon, Sarum College, St Stephen's House, STETS and late in the period of our visit (February to mid-June), Wycliffe Hall moved from being in attendance to becoming a Member. SCRTP has nine Project Groups charged with developing and implementing 'vision in specific areas' and developing 'Frameworks for validation and quality assurance' as necessary.

We were asked to inspect ministerial training and formation delivered by one of these Frameworks - the Local Ministry Framework. It is of course answerable to SCRTP. This means that all our attention has been focused on SCRTP as it is expressed through the LMF. Consequently, when we speak of SCRTP, it is important to understand that we are speaking of it *only in relation to its LMF dimension*. The LMF is at the moment composed of four Dioceses (Guildford, Oxford, Salisbury and Winchester) who participate through their Local Ministry Programmes in the training of OLMs<sup>1</sup> and LLMs. It is, currently, exclusively Anglican in its teaching staff and in its role of training for Local Ministry. We will

---

<sup>1</sup> It should be noted that the term OLM is no longer used in the Oxford Diocese. It speaks rather of ordinands for ministry 'as associate clergy and sector ministers ... in their particular context.' As however the term OLM is used in the Church of England and in this RTP we use it when speaking generically but not when referring to the Diocese of Oxford specifically.

thus sometimes speak of SCRTP in its LMF dimension as if it was Anglican – as in practice it has been in this particular expression of its life.

SCRTP has within it, as its Foundation document says, ‘great areas of countryside, market towns, and large conurbations and in all our counties significant populations of commuters.’ While it appears, the document continues, ‘predominantly white, well educated, and in employment’, there are ‘many significant pockets of deprivation.’ There is also ‘a rich range of ethnic diversity’. This has come from the different waves of immigration – from the West Indies in the 50s to the East European in the recent past. All this has resulted ‘in a cultural and contextual vibrancy.’ Having said all this, the evidence of the students we saw and the areas we visited pointed to an overwhelming predominance of white, middle-class – at any rate so far as those training for local ministry in the area is concerned.

In this context the four schemes of the participating dioceses reflect their different histories.

Local ministry training in Guildford has been in existence since 1988. In its early days there was no university validation and each year group met in a separate church hall. Under a new Principal in 1996 a validation agreement was signed with Bangor University. Validation altered significantly in 2007 when Oxford Brookes became the provider and Guildford became part of the RTP. Its primary focus is OLM and LLM (Reader) training but it also runs short courses for the diocese, and fosters discipleship by welcoming interested learners to join core students for selected modules.

Local training schemes in Oxford began in the early eighties, and took responsibility for Reader training in 1984. From 1999 diocesan training has been undertaken in collaboration with Oxford Brookes. This enabled Oxford to be the pioneer in the development of Portfolios (integrated learning) which are now central in all of the schemes. In 1997 the first generation of OLMs were ordained. They were initially trained through the St Albans and Oxford Ministry Training Scheme but in 2000 ‘a new diocesan programme was nationally validated’. It integrated the training of ordinands with the training of lay people and Readers or Licensed Lay Ministers as they were by then known. It was involved in SCRTP from the beginning. From 2011 that part of the ordinands’ training exclusive to ordination was undertaken by Ripon College, Cuddesdon on behalf of the diocese.

In 1996 Salisbury decided to train its Readers alongside OLMs. However Readers (or LLMs as they became known) felt that their ministry was regarded

as second-class. Whereas Guildford and Oxford met such attitudes by emphasizing collaboration between OLMs and LLMs, Salisbury made the decision in 2007 to separate their training. OLMs were to be trained at STETS while LLMs and interested lay learners had their own learning pathway through Oxford Brookes. Thus, in their own self-description, they ‘developed a sense of pride and understanding in their lay identity and calling.’ This is an interesting example of the flexibility of SCRTP. Two apparently opposite strategies were easily able to be pursued. As it happened they had the same end – the development of effective local ministry with an understanding of the distinctiveness of LLMs – but local realities dictated very different means of achieving this end. This sort of flexibility is a real strength of this RTP.

Winchester trains Readers exclusively and indeed still uses the term Reader. In the late 90s its Reader course used STETS modules but was delivered by Winchester Diocesan Tutors. In the new millennium modules were reconfigured in a way that was distinctive to Winchester’s local needs. This became a joint programme with Portsmouth though all central administration and liaison with HEI’s was carried out by Winchester. In 2004 a relationship with King Alfred’s College Winchester developed with a view to creating a Foundation degree. This was achieved first of all through KAC under the University of Southampton and then, as Winchester became a University, directly through Winchester. In 2008 it became a member of the LMF of the emerging RTP. This worked well but in 2011 the relationship had to be ended because of changes in Government policy and because HEFCE funding for Foundation Degrees was no longer available. This meant that students are currently in consequence on a non-validated programme. In 2012 the relationship with Portsmouth came to an end. Winchester’s staff, like the other participating dioceses, has been fully involved in the Common Awards consultation process and in June 2013 a decision was made to embark on the Durham route.

The table below provided for this Inspection gives the statistics of LMF for 2012-13 in so far as pre-licensing training is concerned:

	Guildford	Oxford	Salisbury	Winchester	<b>Total</b>
OLMs/ <i>OLMs &lt;50yrs</i>	9 incl 5F 4	10 1	n/a	n/a	<b>19</b> <b>5</b>
LLMs/ <i>LLMs &lt;50yrs</i>	13 incl 6F 2	27 1	26 incl 14F 3	21 incl 9F 3	<b>87</b> <b>9</b>
Others	67	57	49	n/a	<b>173</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>279</b>

These statistics indicate a small number of OLMs in training; a much larger number of LLMs and a very significant number in the ‘Other’ or, as it is often

called, 'Interested Learners' category. They also bear out the reality that there are very few training for licensed local ministry who are under 50. Much more comparative analysis than we had figures for (or time or brief to undertake) would need to be done to establish what the overall trends are. Such an analysis would, however, be very helpful. It is fair to say that we came across a measure of anxiety about OLM numbers but more confidence about LLMs. However we do also note that the number being trained, if 'Interested Learners' are included, is considerably in excess of any residential college. More work certainly needs to be done in understanding what statistical weighting should be given to 'Interested Learners' who are often taking a single 10 week module. Only when this is done will it be clear what the actual figures are.

### Summary of outcomes

We speak in several places in the Report of our admiration for what SCRTP and the Providers have achieved with minimal resources and for the central importance of local ministry. We have confidence, with some qualifications, in SCRTP working through the LMF. There is, the Report makes clear, variation across the participating dioceses and there are inevitably many areas requiring attention and development. Our Recommendations are therefore designed to strengthen something that is good. We have confidence or confidence with qualifications, in relation to the vast majority of the criteria we are mandated to inspect.

Our overall conclusion is:

<b>CRITERION and OUTCOME</b>				
<b>SCRTP</b>	<b>Guildford</b>	<b>Oxford</b>	<b>Salisbury</b>	<b>Winchester</b>
<i>A. Aims, objectives and evaluation of the institution</i>				
Confidence w Qualifications	Confidence w Qualifications	Confidence w Qualifications	Confidence	Confidence w Qualifications
<i>B Relationships with other institutions</i>				
Confidence w Qualifications	Confidence	Confidence	Confidence	Confidence w Qualifications
<i>C Curriculum for formation and education</i>				
n/a	Confidence	Confidence	Confidence w Qualifications	Confidence w Qualifications

<b>SCRTP</b>	<b>Guildford</b>	<b>Oxford</b>	<b>Salisbury</b>	<b>Winchester</b>
<i>D Community &amp; corporate life</i>				
n/a	Confidence	Confidence	Confidence w Qualifications	Confidence w Qualifications
<i>E Worship and training in public worship</i>				
n/a	Confidence w Qualifications	Confidence	Confidence	No Confidence
<i>F Ministerial, personal and spiritual formation</i>				
n/a	Confidence	Confidence	Confidence	Confidence w Qualifications
<i>G Teaching and learning: content, method &amp; resources</i>				
n/a	Confidence w Qualifications	Confidence	Confidence w Qualifications	Confidence
<i>H Practical &amp; pastoral theology</i>				
n/a	Confidence	Confidence	Confidence	Confidence
<i>I Teaching staff</i>				
n/a	Confidence	Confidence	Confidence	Confidence
<i>J All staff</i>				
n/a	Confidence w Qualifications	Confidence w Qualifications	Confidence w Qualifications	Confidence w Qualifications
<i>K Students</i>				
n/a	Confidence	Confidence	Confidence	No Confidence
<i>L Governance, management and finance</i>				
Confidence	Confidence w Qualifications	Confidence	Confidence	No Confidence
<i>M Business planning and risk management</i>				
Confidence	Confidence w Qualifications	Confidence w Qualifications	Confidence	Confidence

<b>SCRTP</b>	<b>Guildford</b>	<b>Oxford</b>	<b>Salisbury</b>	<b>Winchester</b>
<i>N Financial policies and cost-effectiveness</i>				
Confidence	Confidence	Confidence	Confidence	Confidence
<i>O Reserves policy and statutory liabilities</i>				
n/a	Confidence	Confidence	Confidence	Confidence
<i>P Accommodation</i>				
n/a	Confidence	Confidence	Confidence	Confidence
<b>Overall Outcomes</b>				
<b>Confidence w Qualifications</b>	<b>Confidence w Qualifications</b>	<b>Confidence</b>	<b>Confidence w Qualifications</b>	<b>Confidence w Qualifications</b>

## **Strengths**

### ***Strengths of SCRTP***

- Staff bonding and relationships
- Integration through the Portfolios
- Flexibility to form a united response to developments such as Common Awards
- Good morale among staff members
- Strong support for the variety of local contexts
- Evidence of strong and meaningful fellowship
- The development of local research projects to improve the quality of training

### ***Strengths of the participating dioceses of LMF***

- Excellent staff/student relationships
- Adequate to excellent teaching
- Links with Oxford Brookes and now with Durham
- Flexibility in designing pathways for students with different backgrounds and needs
- Strong links with their Senior Diocesan staff

## Areas for attention

### ***Areas for attention of SCRTP***

- Willingness to be proactive as well as reactive
- Aims and objectives need to be more visionary
- Mission needs to be more central
- Breadth of tradition needs to be addressed at a SCRTP level
- How to attract younger candidates
- The better use of the other regional theological providers
- Promoting an understanding of local ministry through the Region
- Urging the participating dioceses to use their expertise across SCRTP
- Producing policies for sabbaticals
- Need to analyse the training provision in the Region and to bring forward proposals for its best use in the context of the needs of local training in geographically dispersed area
- Bring forward proposals to become a Theological Education Institution for delivering Common Awards local ministry training in the Region
- Addressing question of pressure on core staff

### ***Areas for attention of the participating dioceses of LMF***

- Training, accountability and commitment of incumbents and parishes to those in training for local ministry
- Better appraisal and, where necessary, training of visiting tutors, mentors and core staff including Principals
- Formal and regular staff development for both core and volunteer teachers (CPD etc)
- Recruiting more tutors with specialist expertise
- Ensuring that mission is always central
- Address question of better use of other Regional Theological Providers
- Determine the most effective vehicle for delivering Common Awards through local TEI(s)
- Address question of whether the training institutions of the participating dioceses should have greater control over their finance, business planning and financial risk management

The Report is written in relation to the Criteria set out in the *Inspection, Curriculum Approval, Moderation, Handbook* June 2012. The paragraphs follow the Criteria which are printed in *italic* type. The inspectors' comments are in normal type and the recommendations in **bold**.

# FULL REPORT

## SECTION ONE: AIMS AND KEY RELATIONS

### A Aims and objectives

#### SCRTP

*Inspectors will consider whether the institution's aims are appropriate, clearly articulated and understood.*

*A.i Its aims, objectives and policies should be appropriate to the preparation of students for ordained/lay public ministry within the breadth of the traditions of the sponsoring churches.*

1. The aims, objectives and policies are generally appropriate to the preparation of students for ordained/lay public ministry within the breadth of the traditions of the Church of England. They are sometimes however insufficiently prominent in the documentation and sometimes defined in language that is less than easily accessible because it was designed for an academic or specialist church readership. Thus there was little of the rhetoric of vision, motivation and challenge which is increasingly evident in Church documents. We believe that an important function of aims, objectives and policies is to remind students, teachers, students and the wider world what training is about. In particular aims need to be distinguished from objectives. Aims 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. What we also missed was the sort of dynamic and relational language that occurs, for instance, in 'Learning outcome statements for ordained ministry within the Church of England'. It speaks of demonstrating 'personal commitment to Christ and a capacity to communicate the Gospel' and having 'a passion for mission that is reflected in thought, prayer and action'. This statement has the sort of clarity and directness which we commend.
2. The SCRTP Foundation Document gives an over-arching picture which is sometimes used as a reference point by the local courses.
3. The dominant aim of the Partnership, it declares, is to meet 'the developing training needs of the church by

- responding to and promoting existing work by the churches and other educational institutions;
  - identifying and promoting new initiatives.’
4. This is to be achieved ‘collaboratively, constructively and creatively’ making ‘efficient use of regional resources’. Transparency and ‘mutual accountability’ are key, as is the commitment not to ‘work apart where working together offers better outcomes’.
  5. Our concern was particularly for the LMF and the courses of its four current participating dioceses. The purpose of the LMF ‘is to ensure effective collaborative working in providing and developing Local Ministry training with the RTP.’ Their vision includes the discernment of vocations, shared formation and learning together, developing collaborative ministry and enabling reflective contextual learning.
  6. While these structural and institutional aims are clear and helpful, the formational aims are not identified in one clear and concise place in SCRTP documents.
  7. Ecumenical relationships are important for SCRTP. It describes itself as ‘a properly constituted multi-partner institution’. Because ‘ecumenical relationships are strong’, it continues, the aim is ‘to work together as one body as far as possible within the limitations of national Church processes’. SCRTP fulfils this aim in the sense that it is in partnership with the Methodist Southampton District and the United Reformed Church Wessex Synod. It does not fulfil it through the LMF, as the following paragraph makes clear.
  8. While we saw evidence of this ecumenical partnership at central Board level and while we were assured that it happened in other aspects of SCRTP’s portfolio such as CMD, there were very few students from other churches and currently none are being trained in any of the dioceses we inspected on behalf of other churches, nor are there any teachers from other churches. Ecumenical outcomes are not, it is obvious, strong at the point of delivering training. We are not however making a recommendation about this failure to deliver a stated aim because we are persuaded that it is for reasons beyond the control of SCRTP.
  9. This highlighted to us the fact that the foundational document is dated. While arguably a foundational document cannot be rewritten, we believe that a fresh document is produced to ensure that SCRTP’s aims and

rationale are reflected in a way which does them justice and which has the characteristics we have identified above (see **Recommendation 2**).

10. This question also focuses on aims and objectives being 'within the breadth of traditions of the sponsoring churches'. We had evidence that the breadth of traditions needed attention. A past student, who self-defines as 'liberal, traditional, mildly Anglo-Catholic', notes to us that those 'from conservative, fundamental, charismatic or evangelical backgrounds seemed to have greater difficulty aligning with the course and, while conflict was always handled generously, there was nevertheless still conflict over many issues of belief and liturgy in particular'. Our own conversations with students, together with our observation of teaching and worship confirmed that those from both a more evangelical and a more Anglo-Catholic tradition could feel that their tradition was insufficiently recognized. While this presented itself more as an occasional reflective grumble than a persistent or widespread dissatisfaction or cause of disharmony, it is something to be watched. Oxford (also able to draw on the remarkable breadth of traditions in the staff and students in Ripon College, Cuddesdon) had made greater strides than the others in SCRTP in appointing staff who would be perceived as reflecting and understanding a wider breadth of traditions. We commend this consideration of the need to reflect the breadth of traditions to all the participating dioceses as they make new appointments, as they teach and as they encourage different liturgical expressions.

#### **Recommendation 1**

*[SCRTP<sup>2</sup> 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.**

*A.ii They should be consistent with the current published policy statements of the sponsoring churches.*

11. They are consistent save for one significant area of reservation. A couple of years ago the General Synod passed overwhelmingly resolutions calling for mission to be central and consequently for 'a national mission strategy that will support dioceses, deaneries and parishes in their own

---

<sup>2</sup> 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

church growth and mission planning'.<sup>3</sup> In the papers from SCRTP and the dioceses (with the exception of Oxford) the emphasis was primarily on learning, developing 'collaborative ministry', contextual learning and on teaching, preaching and pastoring. There was much less frequent reference to mission and evangelism. Indeed it was put to us by a senior diocesan figure that lay ministry training must necessarily be focused on preaching, teaching and producing 'lay theologians' who would enable others. This understanding does not seem to us to square with *Learning Outcomes for Reader Training* where Mission and Evangelism figure prominently. In brief there was, with the exception of Oxford, a failure to give mission and evangelism the primacy that they have in the national church and also, as it happened, to reflect the often creative mission and evangelistic concerns that were evident in our conversations with and observations of many of the students.

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

*A.iii The institution should show that it has built on earlier learning, including through action in response to previous inspection, curriculum approval and follow-up reports; other external bodies' evaluation; and self-evaluations.*

12. This is the first inspection of SCRTP as such. Its relationship with Oxford Brookes has helped it to develop a system of 'Accountability, Quality and Enhancement'. This is a central task of the Board of SCRTP. It takes 'responsibility for overseeing all the RTP's approvals and its internal quality assurance.' We were impressed by the thoroughness and critical honesty of the 2010 document, 'Submission Document for Curriculum Validation'. That document drew attention to a 'major issue'. It is the 'dilemma for national church structures that is posed by RTPs being at very different stages of development and life.' RTPs have developed in different

---

<sup>3</sup> 'Private Member's Motion: Mission Action Planning in the Church of England (GS 1835A and GS 1835B),' General Synod, *July Group of Sessions, 2011: Report of Proceedings*, Vol 42, no 2, Church House Publishing, London 2011, 145

ways and at different speeds. When SCRTP, for example, sought to develop an initiative a few years ago relating to devolved validation and quality assurance for training, it felt strongly that it received the message that such a development is not possible 'until it can be done equally by all RTPs'. This policy flies, the Submission Document concludes, 'in the face of public commitments to the development of RTPs in their own way and at their own speed.' We picked up a good deal of evidence across the dioceses and in the Board meeting we attended that SCRTP feels somewhat undervalued by the wider Church. This has led to a considerable amount of frustration and even anger. The dioceses, we were told frequently and independently, were asked post-Hind to form an RTP. This they did reluctantly. Having embarked on this course they are now enthusiastic for what SCRTP has to offer in terms of collective working and providing a strength together that they did not have apart. They now have the confidence, for example, to contemplate becoming a Theological Education Institution (TEI) in Common Awards.

### 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.**

<b>SCRTP: The inspection team has Confidence with qualifications with regard to Criterion A, Aims, Objectives and Achievements.</b>
---

13. Turning to the individual diocesan schemes:

#### **Guildford**

*A.i Aims, objectives and policies should be appropriate to the preparation of students for ordained/lay public ministry within the breadth of the traditions of the sponsoring churches.*

14. The aim of the course is to 'to develop those qualities in students which will enable them to minister as ordained people; faithfully, competently, professionally and effectively with, and for, the whole people of God and the wider community, proclaiming, releasing, interpreting and realising the redemptive activity of God in the world'. These are appropriate aims but thought could be given to their restatement in a more readily accessible and relational ('personal commitment to Christ' for example) way. Guildford has taken a step towards the sort of clarity we had in mind with its

catching, meaningful and oft-repeated strap line –‘Minister locally – think globally’.

- A.ii *They should be consistent with the current published policy statements of the sponsoring churches.*
15. Our comments at paras 10-11 and Recommendations 1-2 apply here.
- A.iii *The institution should show that it has built on earlier learning, including through action in response to previous inspection, curriculum approval and follow-up reports; other external bodies’ evaluation; and self-evaluations.*
16. Guildford was inspected in 2005. It has made substantial strides in the recommendation of that Inspection to develop relationships with SCRTP and in working with the Oxford Ministry Course. It has clearly built significantly on this and now has, for example, a clear system of Quality Assurance. In relation to the recommendation to develop ‘greater partnership’ with Ripon College, Cuddesdon it has developed somewhat through the mutual membership of SCRTP and through second marking of the Portfolios. It has not however been able to develop this in the way the recommendation suggested (see also Bi below). It has since that Inspection transferred its academic partnership from the University of Wales, Bangor to Oxford Brookes University.

<b>Guildford: The inspection team has Confidence with qualifications with regard to Criterion A, Aims, Objectives and Achievements.</b>
---

## **Oxford**

- A.i *Aims, objectives and policies should be appropriate to the preparation of students for ordained/lay public ministry within the breadth of the traditions of the sponsoring churches.*
17. The course documentation identifies knowledge and skills. While it does describe the aims and objectives of the different parts of the course, the central formational aims and objectives are not as clearly and centrally laid out as we believe they should be.
- A.ii *They should be consistent with the current published policy statements of the sponsoring churches.*
18. Our comments at paras 10-11 and Recommendations 1-2 apply here.

A.iii *The institution should show that it has built on earlier learning, including through action in response to previous inspection, curriculum approval and follow-up reports; other external bodies' evaluation; and self-evaluations.*

19. The Oxford course was inspected in 2007. It had a similar recommendation to Guildford's about SCRTP and Ripon College, Cuddesdon. So far as SCRTP is concerned it has progressed in a similar way to Guildford. In relation to the recommendation to develop 'greater partnership' with Ripon College, Cuddesdon, there has been considerable progress which is outlined below (Bi). The evidence was of a meaningful and influential relationship with Oxford Brookes who have been the validators for the course since 1995. Indeed Oxford is the 'lead partner' for SCRTP in its relationship to Oxford Brookes by virtue of its location and the networking that a long-standing and positive relationship provides. It provides Programme Managers for the Foundation Degree and BA and administration of the course for SCRTP. It has good Quality Assurance.

<b>Oxford: The inspection team has Confidence with qualifications with regard to Criterion A, Aims, Objectives and Achievements.</b>
--

## **Salisbury**

A.i *Aims, objectives and policies should be appropriate to the preparation of students for ordained/lay public ministry within the breadth of the traditions of the sponsoring churches.*

20. Salisbury goes back to the SCRTP vision statement but then points forward to its own good and clear vision statement. It has a high view of lay ministry which is well expressed starting with a splendid Dostoevsky quotation. Nonetheless it has some phrases which ordinary people do not use – 'engagement with the Academy' - and probably have some difficulty in understanding. It needs moreover to be made sharper and shorter.

A.ii *They should be consistent with the current published policy statements of the sponsoring churches.*

21. Our comments at paras 10-11 and Recommendations 1-2 apply here too, but the quality of the course's external and self-evaluation give the inspectors overall confidence under this heading.

A.iii *The institution should show that it has built on earlier learning, including through action in response to previous inspection, curriculum approval and follow-up reports; other external bodies' evaluation; and self-evaluations.*

22. Neither Salisbury nor Winchester have had a Bishops' Inspection before as they train lay ministers exclusively and these, until recently, were 'moderated'. Evaluation of the Foundation Degree part of the Reader Training programme in Salisbury in 2011-12 by Oxford Brookes University noted 17 starters on the course in 2011, and includes comments of 'a flagship programme in the world of ministerial training and practical reflective theology'; positive comments on the curriculum offered and the rigour of assessment processes; together with a detailed analysis of the provision for community life, corporate worship and ministerial formation including positive self evaluation by students and teachers. We saw the 'Programme self-evaluation report' for 2011-12. It used the Ministry Division criteria and demonstrated a very careful review of strengths and weaknesses against these criteria. It identified detailed 'areas for improvement' and the evidence from the 2012-13 draft self-evaluation document and elsewhere is that these are public and being acted on, when still relevant in the light of the transition to Common Awards.

<p><b>Salisbury: The inspection team has Confidence with regard to Criterion A, Aims, Objectives and Achievements.</b></p>
--

### Winchester

- A.i *Aims, objectives and policies should be appropriate to the preparation of students for ordained/lay public ministry within the breadth of the traditions of the sponsoring churches.*
23. The course aims 'to develop the knowledge, understanding and skills that are appropriate to the lay ministry of preaching and teaching and the leading of worship within a pastoral context.' We did not however find the succinct definition of purpose we believe would be helpful to people seeking to understand what it means to minister in the light of the resurrection hope in His Church and world. We very recently received a paper which shared the Diocesan Bishop's vision for the Diocese which had the sort of characteristics we are recommending:
- Living out Passionate Personal Spirituality
  - Encouraging pioneering Faith Communities
  - Being prophetic global citizens
24. We would encourage the course aims to be rewritten with these over-arching aims in mind – see **Recommendation 2**

- A.ii *They should be consistent with the current published policy statements of the sponsoring churches.*
25. Our comments at paras 10-11 and Recommendations 1-2 apply here.
- A.iii *The institution should show that it has built on earlier learning, including through action in response to previous inspection, curriculum approval and follow-up reports; other external bodies' evaluation; and self-evaluations.*
26. The Moderation report from the Ministry Division of the Church of England in March 2008 on the provision in Winchester and Portsmouth commends the course 'considering it to be an excellent programme, comprehensive in content, and potentially powerful in formation of ministers'. A recommendation around recruiting experienced readers to support training of new readers by assisting in the training programme has been partially met through the appointment of core team members who are Lay Ministers and who have been recently trained. It has not, however, been possible to allocate a recently trained reader to each student. Other recommendations on handbooks and review of assignments have been fully implemented. A recommendation around training for tutors by the university has been limited by finance and the decision to discontinue validation of the course by Winchester University in 2011/12.
27. The University of Winchester external report for 2011/12 was largely supportive though it commented that the integration of theoretical and practical course elements merited further examination. The assessor found the course 'efficiently administered, well delivered, professionally taught and examined'.
28. Internal self-evaluation of the course in the form of student and tutor written comments at the end of each module and comments from the second marker/quality assurer are considered at core team meetings. There is good evidence in minutes of these meetings of effective responses to any concerns through changes to taught materials or assessment processes.

**Winchester: The inspection team has Confidence with qualifications with regard to Criterion A, Aims, Objectives and Achievements.**

## **B Relationships with other institutions**

*Inspectors will look at how well the institution engages with partners:*

*B.i There should be evidence of the institution's commitment to partnership with the other providers of theological education in the region.*

### **SCRTP**

29. SCRTP is committed to partnership in the region and indeed four of the five Colleges/Courses (Cuddesdon, STETS, Sarum College and St Stephen's House) in the Region are Members of SCRTP and the other (Wycliffe Hill) was in attendance for much of the period of our inspection (but see page 4). These five institutions are physically located in two Dioceses (Oxford and Salisbury). Some use is made of them.
30. There are two overlapping debates which affect how other institutions are perceived and used. One is whether OLMs and LLMs should be trained together. When a decision is made to separate their training then co-operation with Colleges and Courses is bound to be limited as they train ordinands. Oxford and Guildford train OLMs and LLMs alongside each other, Guildford with a very large degree of integration; Oxford with somewhat less. Winchester has no OLMs. Salisbury, as a matter of policy, trains ordinands and licensed lay ministers separately. The other related and long-standing debate is whether training in Colleges or Courses is appropriate for local ministry.
31. On the one hand, there are undoubted advantages, we were told by staff and students, in meeting in a more Collegiate-like setting and learning from each other:
  - students like it;
  - there is an obvious benefit from the more widely-spread specialist professionalism and expertise of the teaching staff
  - it seems a sensible use of resources with probable economies of scale.
32. On the other hand there are difficulties:
  - a single learning-centre provides near-insurmountable challenges for the geographically large dioceses they happen to be in

- experience has led to a negative assessment of Colleges/Courses because of their 'failure' to understand the local element, because the Colleges/Courses are seen to favour the 'deployable' over the 'local' and because there has often been a sense of the superiority of one route and the inferiority of another
  - Salisbury, in particular, is seeking to enhance the calling and role of the laity in what is described by senior staff as a very 'clericalist' diocese and this requires, it is argued, a system of training that is both local and lay-centred
  - the advantage in local ministry of the same group of people in the Diocese having an oversight from selection through to the end of IME 4-7
  - the reality that non-diocesan Colleges for residential training have, or are perceived to have, a more distinct tradition than the central commitment of the diocesan courses
  - reluctance to alter the *status quo*
33. The consequence is that partnership with other providers is varied. Most progress has been made by Oxford in relation to Ripon College, Cuddesdon. The whole of the ordinand-specific programme (three residentials, five training days and a retreat each year) is provided by Cuddesdon as is personal tutoring. The residentials include OMC ordinands. Ordinands for local ministry are full members of the College, accessing all its facilities. We attended a residential at Cuddesdon. It had input from the College staff and others. The link with a larger, collegiate institution was much appreciated by the students, though there was considerable evidence from students that they sometimes felt somewhat peripheral and second-class in a residential college with a different rhythm and, in some measure, different purpose. The Director of Local Ministry Training is also a staff member of Cuddesdon. We were told that when approaches were made to Cuddesdon some time ago about co-operation for the training of LLMs it responded negatively because it did not have 'expertise in the training of LLMs'.
34. There have been, in other words, significant developments but, while fully accepting the need for teaching by those with an understanding of the local dimension, more exploration of the possibilities for joint teaching needs to be undertaken.
35. We also attended a Salisbury residential in Sarum College. There was no input from STETS or Sarum staff. We were told that there is an inter-

changeability between the local ministry course staff and STETS and we saw evidence of meaningful relationships. But there appeared to us to be untapped potential for greater co-operation here.

36. Neither Guildford nor Winchester has another theological provider in their area. Guildford has not been able to deliver significantly on the 2005 recommendation in relation to Cuddesdon (see Aiii above). Geography presents, we heard, an insurmountable barrier to closer co-operation. However we attended a Guildford residential at Pershore – much further from Guildford than Oxford! We believe that, in so far as geography is a factor, that argument needs re-examination.
37. It seems obvious to us that the rich resources on tap in the immediate area *and perhaps beyond* (parts of Salisbury are close to Bristol which has a theological College) need to be explored with diocesan bishops. This exploration can be undertaken, we are persuaded partly from the experience of ordinands for local ministry in Oxford, without compromising SCRTP's commitment to a significant training input from those with an understanding of and a sympathy for local ministry, locally supported and locally supervised. One as yet very small but potentially significant example of this creative use of common resources we noted was the willingness of one Diocese (Oxford) to use a neighbouring Diocese (Guildford) because it was more geographically proximate to the student concerned. Such co-operation is more pressing because of the commitment of all the participating dioceses to Common Awards.

#### **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.**

*B.ii The institution should draw fully on the resources of universities in teaching, quality assessment, staff development and the promotion of research.*

38. While SCRTP has made considerable progress in developing a culture of quality assurance, it has still a long way to go with respect to staff development and the promotion of a culture where staff research is encouraged. We did not find that there was a systematic and appropriate programme for staff development; indeed we were told by senior staff that though there is on paper some staff development entitlement through Oxford Brookes it could be substantially improved. Nor did we find any clear policy for 'the promotion of research'. For example staff on the courses were frustrated that there was a confused attitude towards sabbaticals. Policies dictated by dioceses made comparisons which do not seem to us to do justice to the special needs of those teaching adults at this level. Oxford makes the comparison with other employees of the Board of Finance. Guildford's and Winchester's teaching staff are DBF employees but, because they operate under different rules, they have no sabbatical entitlement. Salisbury makes its comparison with other licensed ministers. Even, consequently, where there is a sabbatical entitlement it means a long, or very long, period before staff qualify to apply for it.
39. Attention needs also to be given to achieving some sort of comparability in relation to study time. The comparison should be with the expectations of the tertiary educational world for teaching at degree level rather than with some sort of uniform diocesan policy for all its staff. Obviously comparison with Colleges and Courses seems a good starting place. It was put to us that it was unfair to compare the staff of a college or Course with those teaching a local ministry programme – not least because most local ministry teachers had active ministry beyond that of the institution in which they taught. This may be so but we feel that, as such programmes are or will be teaching to degree level, much more attention needs to be given to staff development and the encouragement of research. It is crucial that OLM/LLM teaching staff are up to date in their knowledge and skills and that their governing bodies provide them with opportunities for further study and the refreshment that is deemed to be particularly necessary for teaching at this level. SCRTP should consider providing guidance in recommending common practice which will help to ensure the quality of teaching.

## 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.**

40. There have been constantly changing relationships with HEIs for all the institutions. Bangor, Winchester and Oxford Brookes have, between them, provided validation in the recent past. By the time of our visit three of the dioceses were relating to Oxford Brookes and another (Winchester) had had its relationship with the University of Winchester severed rather suddenly. Winchester was, therefore, without any validating body and, though it was able to draw on some of the resources of SCRTP, this was a very unsatisfactory situation which would have raised fundamental questions had we not been reassured that this was very temporary and would be rectified by Common Awards.
41. The Oxford Brookes relationship is working well. It provides academic professionalism, in service training and a long-standing understanding of the need for practical integration in courses which are concerned with application and skills as well as academic knowledge. Those who have been working longest in this relationship (Oxford) see it as providing a significant national model of integrated theological education. We were helped in our understanding by a paper co-authored by the Deputy Warden of Readers in Oxford.<sup>4</sup> Their conclusion that the system developed in the Oxford Diocese and now used by SCRTP as a whole 'kept knowledge and skills together' was supported almost uniformly by the students we spoke with and by the portfolios we read. It was however obvious, and is readily admitted by teachers, that some of the 'gifts and competencies' links are a little forced and unhelpful and perhaps that some subjects do not lend themselves to portfolio assessment. Portfolios would therefore need some restricting and reworking if this learning method was to continue.

---

<sup>4</sup> Martin Groves and Phillip Tovey, 'Portfolio, Partnership and Pedagogy', *Discourse*, vol 7, no 1, April 2011, 136-152

(<http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/documents/subjects/prs/PrsDiscourse/24.pdf> )

42. But the practical reality is that Common Awards beckons. A concern that is raised by Groves and Tovey that the 'more traditional universities' may 'have reservations about the teaching and assessment of practice-based activities' was echoed independently across the dioceses. The concern was that some of the valuable reflection and integration achieved in Oxford Brookes courses would be lost in Common Awards because it was validated by a more traditional university. 'There is no doubt', said one paper commenting on an earlier draft of Common Awards, 'that the practical skills [in Common Awards] are secondary to the theological understanding.' This paper evidenced some concerns as to whether Common Awards would enable people to become "catechists / apologists as *Reimagining Ministry* suggests'. These fears are now much allayed but the suspicion that Common Awards may return to a more traditional 'academic' approach remains beneath the surface as several teaching staff made clear to us. It would however, in our view, be a serious loss if the knowledge/skills link were to be lost or significantly diluted by the new course.
43. Our visit came in the middle of the process of moving validation to the Common Awards system of Durham. Each of the dioceses has agreed to commit to the Durham relationship.

#### **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.**

*B.iii It should engage effectively with local churches, other faith communities and secular organisations so as to enhance formation for public ministry.*

44. Training for local ministry necessitates working with the local church and its incumbent. Such working together is the central key to its success. Generally speaking this seemed to be working well with the local incumbent meeting regularly with the student and with Local Support Groups standing with the student through the joys and stresses of the course and its demands. Quite often students were as well already members of Ministry Teams.
45. We did however come across some evidence that this was not always so. This was often because sponsoring incumbents were replaced by someone who did not share their predecessor's vision. It was also

because Support Groups were not available (LLMs, Guildford), not mandatory (Winchester) or not clearly enough defined and could thus occasionally end up being little more than a group of people who passed on comments on sermons. Salisbury had an excellent and clear policy for incumbents and support groups and this could serve as a model for others. Despite this, we heard evidence from within the diocese of Salisbury of widely different levels of implementation.

46. SCRTP needs to ensure that there is a uniform policy. In particular the definition of what the local incumbent and church are taking on in developing local ministry needs to be re-examined. Support Groups, or something very like them, need to be mandatory.

#### **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.**

47. The mismatch between the encouraging of gifts through training and the too frequent reality that these were not valued or used in an appropriate way after licensing or ordination was a recurring theme in conversations with chairs of governing bodies, staff and students. This was accentuated for lay ministry students because they were sadly but typically regarded as 'second rate clergy' and therefore faced with the expectation that they would only have really arrived in ministry when they were ordained! While the participating dioceses work constantly to combat such views their frequent presence was a reminder of how many issues the Church of England faces in making the best use of its local ministers. The experience of having a placement in a church of a different tradition seemed to work well in widening horizons and experience.
48. Many of the students were working in the secular world and constantly engaging with the relationship of the Christian to that world. Considerable attention is being given to the development of a track for Pioneer Ministry.
49. There were opportunities for chaplaincy experience.

<b>SCRTP: The inspection team has Confidence with qualifications with regard to Criterion B, Relationships with other institutions.</b>
---

50. We have addressed most of our comments on 'relationships' to the LMF and therefore SCRTP, as we believe that is where much of the

responsibility in this area lies. As to the individual diocesan schemes, the inspectors comment further only as follows. The dioceses (with the exception of Winchester) have engagement with and teaching about other faiths. Guildford devotes two of its nine study days to interfaith-learning. Oxford has a residential on engaging with those of other faiths and some additional optional courses. Salisbury has an optional course. It, however, makes the point that many students ‘come from rural parishes where there is little or no ethnic or faith diversity’. While this perspective may be valid in some dioceses, it needs to be remembered that training is for what is in practice regarded as a national ministry. It was also pointed out to us that ‘the new draft pathways through Common Awards based around Reader Learning Outcomes do not make it a specific subject’ but that there is exposure to other faiths through mission studies, doctrine, church history and biblical studies.

#### **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.**

**The inspection team has**

- **Confidence in the *Guildford Local Ministry Training Scheme***
- **Confidence in the *Oxford Local Ministry Training Scheme***
- **Confidence in the *Salisbury Lay Ministry Training Scheme***
- **Confidence with qualifications in the *Winchester Lay Ministry Training Scheme***

**with regard to Criterion B, Relationships with other institutions.**

## SECTION TWO: CURRICULUM FOR FORMATION AND EDUCATION

### C Curriculum for formation and education

#### SCRTP

*Inspectors will consider the curriculum's design and content.*

51. Curriculum design and content are currently the responsibility of the individual diocesan schemes. That said, the Dioceses in SCRTP are committed to planning and delivering courses under Common Awards and have project groups planning the modular delivery of the courses for September 2014. The SCRTP Board is actively exploring the overall shape of provision and pathways that will lead to effective preparation for different types of ministry. See also **Recommendation 4**

#### Guildford

*C.i There should be a theological, formational and educational rationale for the institution's approach to mission and to formation for ministry and discipleship.*

52. The educational philosophy and method of the course is clearly stated in the handbook which students receive prior to each new academic year (page 9). The gifts and competencies being assessed by Oxford Brookes are also set out in the 235 page document. The course is open to LLMs and ordinands and makes virtually no distinction between them in the skills and competencies taught other than that ordinands undertake a placement in their 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> years, whereas LLMs only have a placement in their 3<sup>rd</sup> year. Ordinands also have a summer school each year specifically for them.
53. Evidence for a rationale for mission is hard to find. However, mission and evangelism form a major part of the course in term 2 of year 2.
54. The course has a strap-line 'minister locally – think globally' which is memorable but only the first half is clearly evident for both LLMs and OLMs – the local parish is the community which sends the student for training, supports through training and receives the trained minister back again to serve in the local parish. Evidence for 'thinking globally' is hard to find in the documentation. Though one week of the mission module is

devoted to global mission, we felt that mission needed to have a higher priority through the content of the course. This underlines the importance of **Recommendation 2** above.

- C.ii The institution should offer, and periodically review, a set of programmes that will enable candidates to be prepared for their ministries and/or meet their learning needs.*
55. Programmes are clearly set out and regularly reviewed at core staff meetings. Students evaluate each module and their feedback is incorporated into the evaluation of the teaching modules. There is student representation on the governing council where student views can be expressed and are noted. Students told the inspectors that they value this opportunity to give feedback and appreciate that it is heard and acted upon. Collaboration with RTP colleagues on the curriculum is appreciated by the core staff. There is a reciprocal arrangement whereby colleagues from the other courses in SCRTP appraise teaching sessions and the core staff find this an enriching part of their work.
56. Because the course is modular it is accessible to interested learners who are invited to join with the LLMs and OLMs to study the modules on the Bible, ethics, doctrine and church history.
57. Most of the academic teaching in the modules is the same for OLMs, LLMs and interested learners. OLMs have their own extra training for their distinctive ministries. OLMs have a summer school each year across the year groups and during the time of the inspection eight ordinands attended this summer school (three first years, two second years and three who are about to be ordained). There was also one other ordinand about to be ordained who was not present because she had attended this summer school three years ago.
58. OLMs and LLMs have a separate formation handbook, covering formational theology, formation for ministry, expectations, prayer and personal reflection and self-assessment. However the majority of the handbook is identical for each ministry. The difference lies in the outcomes which for LLMs are set by the national church under nine headings (Formation handbook for LLM training 2012-13, page 13 onwards).
59. For OLMs the expectations are set out under four headings used for reporting purposes by the Ministry Division. These relate to preparation for

public ministry rather than academic achievement or ministerial skills. (Formation handbook for OLM training 2012-13, page 15 onward).

- C.iii The academic and formational assessment methods should enable the institution to advise church leaders on the suitability of candidates for their ministry.*
60. The portfolio method of assessment run by Oxford Brookes University and set out in the long handbook ensures that both the academic and formational aspects of the course are clearly and thoroughly assessed. Members of the core staff act as year tutors and mentors and therefore have thorough knowledge of their students' capabilities and suitability for OLM or LLM ministry.
  61. The inspectors saw evidence that students not deemed suitable for ministry were encouraged to face up to that reality in discussion with core staff. The policy and procedure for leaving the course has been clarified in the student handbook.
  62. One area that is harder to assess is the parish aspect of the training. Incumbents, as was clear from the inspectors' conversations with some of them, have a vital role in the training process of both LLMs and OLMs and it is regarded as a partnership by the staff. The responsibilities of the incumbent are set out in a document (checklist for training incumbents). There is also a training day each year for incumbents.
  63. OLMs have a local training group to support them and in most but not all instances students reported that these work well. From meetings with students inspectors noted that incumbents are mostly, but not invariably, supportive. Where problems occur students can be moved, and this has happened.
  64. LLMs do not have this formal support structure in their parish settings and the inspectors learned from talking with some of the current LLM students that the reasoning for this difference was not fully understood or accepted and this was a cause for regret.
  65. We also learned from talking with former students that not all are well used once they have been ordained/licensed especially if they are part of a large ministry team. See **Recommendation 7**.

<b>Guildford: The inspection team has Confidence with regard to Criterion C, Curriculum for formation and education.</b>
--

## Oxford

*C.i There should be a theological, formational and educational rationale for the institution's approach to mission and to formation for ministry and discipleship.*

66. The educational philosophy and method of the course is clearly stated in the handbook which students receive prior to each new academic year. The gifts and competencies being assessed by Oxford Brookes are also set out in the handbook for the Foundation degree in Ministry.

67. LLMs especially have mission and evangelism as one of their five priorities, the others being sustaining the sacred centre (prayer, spiritual life and worship), making a difference in the world, creating vibrant Christian communities and shaping confident collaborative leadership.

68. Inspectors were surprised at and impressed by the number of different people involved on a voluntary basis in supporting students in training – mentors, supervisors, incumbents and parish training groups, unofficial support groups, parish advisers. Oxford is fortunate in possessing particularly rich learning resources from which to draw.

*C.ii The institution should offer, and periodically review, a set of programmes that will enable candidates to be prepared for their ministries and/or meet their learning needs.*

69. Courses on the rolling programme open to LLMs, ordinands for local ministry and interested learners are of a high academic standard and flexible. Samples of student feedback show that most really value the high standard of academic teaching at both levels 4 and 5 and the input of peers. There were occasional questions about whether a particular module can meet the needs of such a variety of students. There is also a weakness with the rolling programme in that the natural progression from one course to the next, building on what has gone before is lost. Students told the inspectors that occasionally this meant that learning which would have been enhanced by being connected - e.g. baptism and Eucharist - seemed disjointed.

70. Programmes are clearly set out and regularly reviewed at core staff meetings. Students evaluate each module and their feedback is incorporated into the evaluation of the teaching modules. There is student representation on the governing council where student views can be expressed and where these views are noted.

- C.iii The academic and formational assessment methods should enable the institution to advise church leaders on the suitability of candidates for their ministry.*
71. The Director of Local Ministry Training oversees the ordinands for local ministry training and reports and advises on suitability for ordination.
  72. Evidence for recommendation to the Bishop about readiness for ordination is provided from the student's portfolio – but the parish also has to provide evidence through a parish portfolio. Portfolio mentors are available to guide parishes and students in this process.
  73. The Director of LLM Training oversees the training of LLMs and reports to and advises the Bishop on the suitability of candidates to be licensed.
  74. Most of the academic teaching in the modules is the same for ordinands for local ministry, LLMs and interested learners.
  75. Ordinands for local ministry and LLMs have their own distinctive pathways which are clearly set out in the respective handbooks.
  76. All LLMs complete the level 4 part of the foundation degree during the first two years of training, which ensures they can preach and lead worship. Then at Level 5 they can choose one of two pathways, teaching or pastoral work. The LLM training includes a compulsory course 'preparing for licensing'.

**Oxford: The inspection team has Confidence with regard to Criterion C, Curriculum for formation and education.**

### **Salisbury**

*C.i There should be a theological, formational and educational rationale for the institution's approach to mission and to formation for ministry and discipleship.*

77. The course aims to enable those selected for locally licensed ministry to be preachers, teachers in a pastoral context and lay theologians. Its theological, formation and educational rationale is outlined in its *Growth in Faith and Ministry. An Introduction to training by Portfolio [revised January 2013]* and its *Portfolio Mentor's Handbook [revised January 2013]*. These documents are written in the light of the National Guidelines. The rationale is embedded in the residential training, tutorials, private study and pastoral placements with training incumbents.

78. Theological reflection is addressed at both Levels 4 and 5, and each portfolio concludes with a summative theological reflection on how the student engages as a disciple and minister in the subject under consideration.
79. Residentials begin with prayer, make use of evensongs at the nearby cathedral, and conclude with a eucharist in Sarum College's chapel. There is an 'informal expectation of attendance' [Inspection document for Salisbury Diocese's Local Ministry Framework, 2013, page 7]. All attend, one outcome of which is that the relationship of study and formation is obvious and sustained. Students on the course readily admitted that, through study, worship and placements, they 'have changed', or, in inspectors' terms, 'are being formed'.
80. The presence of students on the course who are not training for LLM is an important factor in helping the course negotiate the differences between LLM and the ministry of the laity not called to be LLMs.
81. There is a danger that in shaping people as 'preachers, teachers in a pastoral context and lay theologians' the Course's focus on mission is too widely spread and so may lose the attention mission rightly should have.

#### **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.**

*C.ii The institution should offer, and periodically review, a set of programmes that will enable candidates to be prepared for their ministries and/or meet their learning needs.*

82. The Course does offer and deliver a set of programmes which enable those selected for LLM to preach, teach in a pastoral context and reflect theologically.
83. The set of programmes consists of coherent learning in the fields of scripture, doctrine, Anglican identity, worship and liturgy, listening skills, and pastoral care. It is delivered through individually tailored learning pathways. It is reviewed through tutors and students, through biennial reviews by staff of modules [including reviews of bibliographies], through annual moderation by Oxford Brookes, and peer moderation within

SCRTP. There is also indirect reviewing insofar as 10 per cent of work submitted by students on the Salisbury Course is marked by people beyond the course but within SCRTP. These reviews are conducted in the light of the 'Gifts and Competencies' agreed with Oxford Brookes and are written by the Core staff.

84. Evaluation sheets were not obviously issued at the end of either teaching sessions or the early June 2013 residential.

#### **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.**

*C.iii The academic and formational assessment methods should enable the institution to advise church leaders on the suitability of candidates for their ministry.*

85. Individual academic and formational assessment occurs at various levels - through tutors, mentors, course staff and training incumbents, and through Rolling Records, completed regularly by the student and sent, when completed, to the Course, and then discussed with a core staff member.
86. Assignment criteria are clear and rigorous (see *Growth in Faith and Ministry. An Introduction to learning by Portfolio*, revised 2013, and *Portfolio Mentor's Handbook*, revised 2013). These academic and formational assessment methods enable the Course to advise the bishop on the suitability of students for LLM ministry in the diocese.

<b>Salisbury: The inspection team has Confidence with qualifications with regard to Criterion C, Curriculum for formation and education.</b>
--

#### **Winchester**

*C.i There should be a theological, formational and educational rationale for the institution's approach to mission and to formation for ministry and discipleship.*

87. The course aims to enable those selected for reader ministry to preach, teach and lead worship in a pastoral context. Its theological, formation and educational rationale is outlined in its Quality Assurance in Ministerial Education [2010], its Study Guidelines for Readers in Training [2012], its Reader Training, Information and Guidelines for Tutors [2012] and its

Programme, information and guidelines for incumbents of Readers in Training [2012]. However, these documents are not written in the light of the National Guidelines. The rationale is embedded in the residential training, tutorials, private study and pastoral placements.

88. There was some strength of feeling among students that the term 'Reader' was still being used. A past student in his response to us commented that he felt assumptions about the nature of ministry were 'limited by the more narrow "Reader" remit'.

**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.**

89. Study days begin, and sometimes end, with prayer. Residentials include morning prayer, a night offices, and a eucharist on a Sunday. All students, though not all the staff involved in the weekend, attended those acts of corporate worship which this inspector saw. Attendance at worship is, however, not mandatory; and the modelling of mutual support in corporate prayer, especially important for those students who are completing shortened, 'bespoke' courses, is less obvious when all the staff who could attend the services do not attend.

**Recommendation 12**

[Winchester]

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

*C.ii The institution should offer, and periodically review, a set of programmes that will enable candidates to be prepared for their ministries and/or meet their learning needs.*

90. The Winchester Course offers and delivers a set of programmes which enable those selected for LLM to preach and teach in a pastoral context and reflect theologically.
91. The practice of theological reflection is being addressed. We attended a third year session on theological reflection and were told by both staff and students that this group was the last group to be studying theological reflection in this way at this late stage in the course. In the future, work with final year students would be part of the first year course. This is a

recognition that theological reflection is difficult and needs to be addressed earlier in the course.

*C.iii The academic and formational assessment methods should enable the institution to advise church leaders on the suitability of candidates for their ministry.*

92. The matters of formation in prayer and of the practice for theological reflection apart, the Winchester Course does offer and deliver a set of programmes which enable those selected for Reader ministry to preach, teach and lead worship in a pastoral context.
93. The set of programmes is reviewed through tutors and students, through biennial reviews by staff of modules [including reviews of bibliographies], and through peer review by people associated with the Oxford and Salisbury courses. The reviews are conducted following the Oxford Brookes 'Gifts and Competencies' and are written by the Core staff. Again, the inspectors did not see evaluation sheets being issued to students.

**Note that Recommendation 10 is made for Winchester also.**

94. The process of review, it was acknowledged, was more robust when there was a link between the Winchester Course and the University of Winchester. Currently there is no external body equivalent to the University of Winchester.
95. Despite these qualifications, the academic and formational assessment methods do enable the Course to advise the bishop on the suitability of students for Reader ministry in the diocese.
96. There may, however, be an issue of one of the assessors needing to declare a conflict of interests when he chairs the final assessment board [see K.i].

<p><b>Winchester: The inspection team has Confidence with qualifications with regard to Criterion C, Curriculum for formation and education.</b></p>
--

## SECTION THREE: MINISTERIAL DEVELOPMENT

### D Community and corporate life

#### SCRTP

*Inspectors will consider the institution's quality of common life. Is it a good place in which to live, work and study?*

97. We address most of our comments under this heading to the individual schemes, but it will be evident from the text below that there is sometimes student uncertainty as to how the course fits together, and we make the following recommendation to SCRTP and participating dioceses.

#### **Recommendation 13**

*[SCRTP and participating dioceses]*

**We recommend that the students are sign-posted clearly and easily to the Course's policies.**

98. We also note that within the diocesan local ministry programmes there was no agreed time when Safeguarding teaching should take place. For example, in Winchester the Core Team's minutes record that Safeguarding is to be addressed '*some time in the first three years*' [14.11.2012, our italics]. We feel that it is very important that there is teaching about safeguarding at the beginning of the Course.

#### **Recommendation 14**

*[SCRTP and participating dioceses]*

**We recommend that there is both DBS clearance and safeguarding training at the beginning of the course.**

- D.i The institution should offer a clear statement of how it understands corporate life, reflected in its training for ministry and the working relationships between members.*

#### **Guildford**

99. Whilst there is no clear statement of the institution's understanding of corporate life, reflected in its training for ministry, it is clear that the ethos of the course is one of inclusivity and mutual support and respect. Students value the care and support they receive from each other and their year tutors. The second and third year groups had gelled well and acted as a strong peer support group in touch with each other between meetings. The first year group is taking time to gel in this way. We heard,

on more than one occasion, students refer to their year tutor and the course principal as 'parents'. This, together with our observations of staff-student interaction, made us question whether the ambience was too cosy and whether this renders it difficult to give constructive criticism when it is needed.

*D.ii There should be a clear statement of its understanding of issues of gender, ethnic grouping and disability and other matters of natural justice; its training, governance and community life should reflect this (see also I.v and J.ii).*

100. There is a clear but brief statement on page 2 of the handbook that "LMP welcomes those whom the Church, national or local, has selected and placed in our charge for ministerial training; regardless of their ethnicity, gender, or sexual orientation: reflecting the Guildford diocesan equal opportunities policy. Any discrimination experienced will be dealt with according to the 'Student Grievance Procedure' on p 37 of the handbook".

101. The Guildford course is currently numerically small and this enables a strong and inclusive community feel especially within year groups. Monday evenings are crucial to this sense of community as all three year groups meet at the same venue (Christ's College in Guildford), for their teaching. Care has been taken to guard the worship time at the beginning of the evenings and to have all three year groups together at the coffee break but this has its own logistical problems (queues for the coffee machine) and constant pressure on teaching time. Year groups also come together at the weekly meeting of all students, on Saturday study days and at the Summer School. Our conversations with students indicated that, while inter-year interaction could be very good, cross-year group interaction was not as strong as we had expected. When we asked staff why all three years cannot meet together for weekend residential we were told it was because of the limited size of St Columbas. There is also an issue of staffing three different years at the same time. We believe that these issue are surmountable and that the gains of having all students together at the same time through such weekends would be considerable.

#### **Recommendation 15**

*[Guildford]*

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

<b>Guildford: The inspection team has Confidence with regard to Criterion D, Community and corporate life.</b>
--

## Oxford

- D.i The institution should offer a clear statement of how it understands corporate life, reflected in its training for ministry and the working relationships between members.*
102. The main learning community for all students is their home parish and local ministry team. The inspectors learned from meetings with students that these local contexts vary in how helpful and supportive they are.
103. Whilst the diocesan local ministry programme is excellent in its breadth of courses, accessibility to all who wish to learn, flexibility of venue and quality of teaching, a weakness is that there is no continuity of student group and students have to form a new learning community at the beginning of every ten week course.
104. The inspectors asked about this and students unanimously replied that groups were quick to form, united in the desire to learn and that the academic excellence outweighed any lack of 'common life' aspect of learning together. They valued the richness and diversity of the wide range of participants on each course.
105. LLMs have opportunities to meet as a group at their annual conference, training weekend and the annual Quiet day.
106. Ordinands for local ministry are able to form an on-going community in their year group through the extra formational training they receive at least twice a term on either residential weekends, or training days and they have termly tutorial days. There is also an annual two day retreat.
107. They meet as a whole group residentially once a year and informally at the annual Christmas party.
108. Both ordinands for local ministry and LLMs are encouraged to form their own informal peer support groups usually geographically based and many but not all are part of a virtual community supporting each other by prayer and 'conversation'.
109. The inspectors experienced the sense of community in the Cuddesdon Common Room during the residential weekend there.
- D.ii There should be a clear statement of its understanding of issues of gender, ethnic grouping and disability and other matters of natural justice; its training, governance and community life should reflect this (see also I.v and J.ii).*

110. There is a clear statement of understanding of issues of gender, ethnic grouping and disability and other matters of natural justice in the Oxford Diocesan Equal opportunities policy which the course sets out fully in its handbook.
111. The diocesan local courses programme also states that they have an open and welcoming policy on matters of gender and sexuality, age race and ethnicity, disability and special needs.
112. The inspectors saw no evidence of any failure to follow the policy guidelines.

**Oxford: The inspection team has Confidence with regard to Criterion D, Community and corporate life.**

### **Salisbury**

- D.i The institution should offer a clear statement of how it understands corporate life, reflected in its training for ministry and the working relationships between members.*
113. The Course has an Inclusion Policy, an Inclusive Language Policy and a Corporate Worship Policy. These help to sustain a clear 'house style', which exemplifies corporate existence, marked by mutual support, not uncritical friendships, and a warm welcome of visitors.
114. Two out of the four students asked by the Course to meet with Inspectors remarked both that they were unclear as to the exact role of Mentors, there was variability in the way in which Mentors related to their students, and that some students no longer attended Mentors' meetings.

### **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.**

115. There are clear statements of learning requirements. These clear statements of requirements are reflected in tutorials, group work and more formal teaching sessions.
- D.ii There should be a clear statement of its understanding of issues of gender, ethnic grouping and disability and other matters of natural justice; its training, governance and community life should reflect this (see also I.v and J.ii).*

116. Through its several policies the Course does have a clear understanding of such issues as gender, disability and the like. It values the variety of the unique God-given gifts of individuals within the wider community.
117. The course has a Student Code of Conduct and Discipline Policy, There is, however, no time scale in the Students' Appeal Procedure within the new Disciplinary Policy.

**Recommendation 17**

*[Salisbury and Winchester]*

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

<p><b>Salisbury: The inspection team has Confidence with qualifications with regard to Criterion D, Community and corporate life.</b></p>
---

**Winchester**

*D.i The institution should offer a clear statement of how it understands corporate life, reflected in its training for ministry and the working relationships between members.*

118. The Course, at the time of the Inspection, as recognised by the Reader Training Co-ordinator, had no clear statement of what constitutes corporate life, and there were no obvious structures to deal with or foster difference. That having been said, there is a clear 'house style', which exemplifies corporate existence, marked by mutual support, not uncritical friendships, and a warm welcome of visitors. Since the inspection a new Student's Grievance Policy and a new Disciplinary Procedure have been introduced.
119. There are clear statements of learning requirements, whose goals are the preparation of Readers who shall be able preachers, teachers and leaders of public worship. These clear statements of learning requirements are reflected in tutorials, group work and more formal teaching sessions.
120. There is also a clear mind that corporate worship is not mandatory.

**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.**

*D.ii There should be a clear statement of its understanding of issues of gender, ethnic grouping and disability and other matters of natural justice; its training, governance and community life should reflect this (see also I.v and J.ii).*

121. The Course does have a clear understanding of such issues as gender, disability and the like. The course seeks, as far as it is able, to reflect its understanding of such issues in its training. A visiting lecturer, for example, leading a session on ministry to the deaf/hard of hearing/deaf-blind, and in a subsequent act of worship, powerfully addressed the issues of ethnicity, disability and inclusion. The Course also, for example, is mindful of the diocese's proper emphasis on training in Safeguarding. That having been said, the Course's policies are not clearly sign-posted.

**Note that Recommendation 17 is made for Winchester also**

<b>Winchester: The inspection team has Confidence with qualifications with regard to Criterion D, Community and corporate life.</b>
---

## **E Worship and training in public worship**

### **SCRTP**

*Inspectors will look at whether the arrangements for common worship and the policies underlying them are satisfactory.*

122. Our only comment under this heading is that liturgical space for the most part is that of the trainees' home parish church and that context is of crucial importance in training. As is clear from paragraph 127, we believe that faithful adherence to what the Church of England requires its ministers to do is of central importance.

### **Guildford**

*E.i The institution's policy and practice in corporate worship should reflect the tradition of the wider church and the liturgical inheritance of faith.*

123. The programme for worship is set by the course tutors on a half-termly basis, so that there is a balance between BCP, Common Worship and alternative approaches. First and second year students get a good grounding in BCP and Common Worship before using more informal approaches in the third year.

*E.ii There should be a policy on and provision for a balance of worship, including authorised and innovative forms, which recognises and equips candidates to work within the variety of practice within the sponsoring church.*

124. All students are Anglican with a variety of churchmanship. The core staff members, all ordained, are of central churchmanship and whilst in free worship the evangelical and charismatic students can express their own preferences, inspectors learned from talking to students that Anglo-Catholic/Modern Catholic worship was in danger of being marginalised (see also para 10 above). At least one of the occasional tutors is an Anglo-Catholic priest. The parish placement is designed to give the students an experience of a different churchmanship. Here we reiterate the importance of **Recommendation 1** in relation to worship.

*E.iii Ministerial candidates should be effectively trained to plan, prepare and conduct public worship and they should receive critical and constructive comment from staff and peers.*

125. The worship the inspectors experienced both on Monday evenings and at residential weekends was competently led.

126. Worship sessions are peer-assessed by two members of the year group, but it seemed from our observation that this was unlikely to result in rigorous or even objective criticism. The worship at the summer school was well led but the services of Morning Prayer, Midday Prayer and Compline had been prepared by one of the tutors. The reason given for students not preparing the worship was concern for their workload. The summer school was in the form of an extended Eucharist and had the feel of a retreat especially with 24 hours of silence.

127. We experienced an alternative Celtic Eucharist as the main Sunday worship at one residential. It did not use any Common Worship material though it did adhere to a Common Worship shape. While accepting this as 'experimental', we were concerned that students are alerted to the dangers of an 'anything goes' approach to the leading of worship. It is crucial that they are well-grounded in the authorised liturgical forms and aware of their canonical commitment to them.

## **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.**

128. Tutors formally assess student led worship on residential weekends. The feedback is given very promptly and whilst this is a good thing the evaluation sheets seen by the inspectors gave minimal and rather general feedback.

**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.**

*E.iv The liturgical space should be adequate for its purpose.*

129. The chapel at Christ's College which is used on Monday evenings is more than adequate for purpose, as are the chapels at the venues used for residential training.

<b>Guildford: The inspection team has Confidence with qualifications with regard to Criterion E, Worship and training in public worship.</b>
--

**Oxford**

*E.i The institution's policy and practice in corporate worship should reflect the tradition of the wider church and the liturgical inheritance of faith.*

130. The course handbook acknowledges that students will have a variety of different experiences of worship and practice. The worship policy aims to help form LLMs and ordinands for local ministry as worship leaders in a diverse church with diverse liturgical expression.

131. For both LLMs and ordinands for local ministry the parish context is central to their formation as worship leaders.

132. The annual conference provides an opportunity for LLMs to experience and reflect on different styles of worship.

133. Ordinands, and the inspectors, at a Cuddesdon residential weekend experienced a BCP Eucharist where the president was one of the Cuddesdon members of staff.

*E.ii There should be a policy on, and provision for, a balance of worship, including authorised and innovative forms, which recognises and equips*

*candidates to work within the variety of practice within the sponsoring church.*

134. At worship on the evening teaching sessions on the diocesan local courses programme, students are exposed to a variety of traditions which may not be part of their parish experience. (e.g. Taizé, Iona and Compline).
135. For both ordinands for local ministry and LLMs, the placement is also designed to give experience of other worship traditions.
136. Ordinands are expected to plan and lead services collaboratively at residential weekends and on their Saturday study days.
137. LLMs are expected to lead worship on evening courses as well as in their parish and in the placement. Students have to reflect on their experience of this variety of worship as part of their portfolio work.

*E.iii Ministerial candidates should be effectively trained to plan, prepare and conduct public worship and they should receive critical and constructive comment from staff and peers.*

138. The acts of worship the inspectors saw at residential weekends, day courses and evening teaching session were all competently led.
139. Written feedback is given by staff when ordinands lead acts of worship and constructive criticism is part of that feedback.

*E.iv The liturgical space should be adequate for its purpose.*

140. The worship spaces vary from the memorable new chapel at Cuddesdon to church halls and the seminar room in Church House. Clearly some are more conducive to worship than others, but all were at least adequate in the inspectors' judgement.

<b>Oxford: The inspection team has Confidence with regard to Criterion E, Worship and training in public worship.</b>
---

## **Salisbury**

- E.i The institution's policy and practice in corporate worship should reflect the tradition of the wider church and the liturgical inheritance of faith.*
141. The course requires that LLMs in training are involved in leading worship and preaching in their own parish only, with the option of undertaking a

- placement in a parish of a different tradition. The opportunity for experiencing other traditions may therefore be limited, although it is noted that discussions are currently taking place between parishes to have reciprocal arrangements for placements. Residential weekends and Foundation Degree days are an opportunity for the training community to share together in worship, sometimes using alternative liturgical material, but mainly Common Worship. This includes the Eucharist which is seen as an important part of the event.
142. Student feedback shows that the experience of meeting and learning with others from a diverse range of traditions has been helpful and instructive. However, corporate worship on the course tends to be fairly central in tradition with a slight bias towards the evangelical wing. It would be helpful to students if more experience of the Anglo-Catholic tradition could be provided centrally. Unless particular attention is paid to this aspect there is a danger that the corporate experience will reflect only the range of traditions represented, rather than the full extent of the Anglican spectrum.
- E.ii There should be a policy on, and provision for, a balance of worship, including authorised and innovative forms, which recognises and equips candidates to work within the variety of practice within the sponsoring church.*
143. Within their own parishes LLMs in training are encouraged to lead and plan worship of different kinds, both authorized and innovative. The extent to which this happens is dependent on the incumbent and the practice of the particular parish. Further experience of a variety of traditions and practices is possible through a placement if this is requested. Training incumbents are aware of the gifts and competencies which are expected to be achieved in this area, and also of the guidelines for working with a trainee; they are also asked to attend regular meetings to discuss progress of candidates on the course. While their oversight of incumbents is more developed than for Winchester, **Recommendation 22** below applies to Salisbury also.
- E.iii Ministerial candidates should be effectively trained to plan, prepare and conduct public worship and they should receive critical and constructive comment from staff and peers.*
144. Within the parish there is on-going assessment of the candidate's development as a liturgical minister as they prepare and conduct public worship. According to the course handbook, feedback is given by the

incumbent and the candidate's support group. Candidates are required to reflect on their experience of preparing and leading worship. Students report that they very much value the support and training they receive from their training and placement incumbents, and they feel well prepared for ministry by the time of their licensing.

*E.iv The liturgical space should be adequate for its purpose.*

145. During residential weekends and Foundation Degree days use is made of Sarum College chapel and Salisbury Cathedral.

<b>Salisbury: The inspection team has Confidence with regard to Criterion E, Worship and training in public worship.</b>
--

### **Winchester**

*E.i The institution's policy and practice in corporate worship should reflect the tradition of the wider church and the liturgical inheritance of faith.*

146. There is no clear statement of policy in the course documentation regarding corporate worship and the expectations placed on students. The standard of student-led worship observed at the residential weekend was adequate but was not aided by being held in a very constricted space. That led by staff was generally good but the temporary nature of the worship space was not, in the inspectors' view, particularly conducive to a spirit of worship. There was no attempt to address the issue of breadth of tradition.

147. The course requires that Readers in training are involved in leading worship and preaching in their own parish only, other than during the third year placement. The opportunity for experiencing other traditions may therefore be limited. Worship as part of residential weekends and training days is limited by time pressures to a minimum. The celebration of the Eucharist observed on a residential weekend was mainly staff-led, and again subject to time limitations. The experience of worshipping corporately as a body of Readers in training was therefore minimal. Student feedback indicates that the breadth of Anglican tradition may not be being explored as part of the course.

### **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.**

*E.ii There should be a policy on, and provision for, a balance of worship, including authorised and innovative forms, which recognises and equips candidates to work within the variety of practice within the sponsoring church.*

148. Within their own parishes Readers in training are encouraged to lead and plan worship of different kinds, both authorized and innovative. The extent to which this happens depends on the incumbent and the practice of the particular parish. Incumbents are aware of the gifts and competencies which are expected to be achieved in this area. Experience of a variety of traditions and practices is possible through the placement during the third year of training. It is not clear to what extent incumbents receive training and support during this process. To ensure consistency of approach for all Readers in training across the diocese there needs to be a clear policy on expectations regarding input from the training incumbent, and this needs to be reinforced with an on-going review process including further training and support.

**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.**

*E.iii Ministerial candidates should be effectively trained to plan, prepare and conduct public worship and they should receive critical and constructive comment from staff and peers.*

149. The course includes the setting of assignments which require the planning, preparation and conduct of public worship. These are formally assessed by tutors and by peers. Sermons preached and services led in the parish and during the placement are assessed locally by the training or placement incumbent. Course policy is to be flexible and focus on worship rather than assessment of worship and leadership of it, though tutors will give comment to those leading worship on occasion. The flexibility allows those with special gifts in music etc to use these in preparing worship. The main training and feedback happens on placement.

*E.iv The liturgical space should be adequate for its purpose.*

150. There is a chapel at Old Alresford Place for use on residential weekends which is suitable for small groups only, although creation of a worship space is possible in a larger room. Whilst this room is of sufficient size it does not particularly create an atmosphere conducive to worship. On Old Alresford Place see also P.i below.

**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.**

<p><b>Winchester: The inspection team has No Confidence with regard to Criterion E, Worship and training in public worship.</b></p>
---

**F Ministerial, personal and spiritual formation**

*Inspectors will consider how well the institution helps learners in their ministerial, personal and spiritual formation and self-awareness.*

**Guildford**

*F.i The institution should enable candidates to be immersed in the traditions of their own church and to gain an empathetic understanding of church and faith traditions other than their own.*

151. As students stay in their own parish setting for the majority of the course they remain immersed in its traditions. The carefully thought out placements help to widen the students' experience of other church traditions.

*F.ii It should offer corporate and individual guidance for learners, including encouragement to seek confidential spiritual counsel and to maintain a regular private prayer life.*

152. Each year tutor, who acts in the role of mentor as well as tutor on some modules, is always available for guidance by telephone and, by arrangement, early on a Monday evening before the worship and teaching sessions begin. The inspectors observed very close relationships between the students and their year tutor. All students are encouraged to have spiritual directors. As mentioned elsewhere in this report, some students have a lot of support in their parish. The spirituality and ministerial

- formation aspects of the course give corporate guidance. Evidence for this is seen in the portfolios where students reflect on their learning both academic and personal.
- F.iii *Its common life and the guidance offered should enable students to grow in Christian discipleship with a view to exercising a public role in ministry and engaging with the world.*
153. Evidence gained from listening to the students themselves showed us that they can articulate their growth in confidence, understanding of their faith and calling and their ability to exercise this calling in public ministry.
- F.iv *The teaching and ministerial staff should model an appropriate pattern of spirituality, continued learning and reflection on practice.*
154. Members of the core staff and visiting tutors are present at the worship at residentials. The core staff attends the worship on Monday evenings. Students interviewed expressed confidence in their tutors and principal as people of faith and reflective practitioners. All the year tutors are involved in parish ministry.

<b>Guildford: The inspection team has Confidence with regard to Criterion F, Ministerial, personal and spiritual formation.</b>
---

## **Oxford**

- F.i *The institution should enable candidates to be immersed in the traditions of their own church and to gain an empathetic understanding of church and faith traditions other than their own.*
155. As students stay in their own parish setting for the majority of the course they remain immersed in its traditions. The carefully thought out placements help to widen the students' experience of other church traditions.
- F.ii *It should offer corporate and individual guidance for learners, including encouragement to seek confidential spiritual counsel and to maintain a regular private prayer life.*
156. For ordinands for local ministry the course director is always available for guidance by telephone. The inspectors observed a very close relationship between the students and the course director. They valued his accessibility, thoughtfulness and willingness to listen and to find solutions to any problems. All students have an academic mentor.

157. LLMs are supported by the Director of LLM training and they are able to contact him by telephone or email throughout the course. In addition students are supported by their home parish, both by the incumbent and the parish support group. They also have a mentor.
158. It is mandatory for all students to have a spiritual director. As mentioned elsewhere in this report, some students have a lot of support in their parish.
159. The spirituality and ministerial formation aspects of the course give corporate guidance. Evidence for this is seen in the portfolios where students reflect on their learning both academic and personal.
- F.iii *Its common life and the guidance offered should enable students to grow in Christian discipleship with a view to exercising a public role in ministry and engaging with the world.*
160. Evidence gained from listening to the students themselves showed us that they can articulate their growth in confidence, understanding of their faith and calling and their ability to exercise this calling in public ministry.
- F.iv *The teaching and ministerial staff should model an appropriate pattern of spirituality, continued learning and reflection on practice.*
161. Members of the core staff and visiting tutors are present at the worship at teaching sessions and at residentials.
162. Students interviewed expressed confidence in their tutors and principal as people of faith and reflective practitioners.

<p><b>Oxford: The inspection team has Confidence with regard to Criterion F, Ministerial, personal and spiritual formation.</b></p>
---

### **Salisbury**

- F.i *The institution should enable candidates to be immersed in the traditions of their own church and to gain an empathetic understanding of church and faith traditions other than their own.*
163. Candidates receive part of their training within their own parishes under the supervision of their incumbent. This close working relationship enables candidates to be immersed in the traditions of their own parish. There is an option to undertake a placement giving the opportunity for widening this experience, and discussions are underway to arrange exchanges between

partnered parishes so that complementary experiences can be offered to candidates. Student feedback confirms that learning with people from traditions other than their own had broadened their understanding of the breadth of Anglican practice and helped them discover some of the riches in other traditions.

*F.ii It should offer corporate and individual guidance for learners, including encouragement to seek confidential spiritual counsel and to maintain a regular private prayer life.*

164. The primary responsibility for the candidate's guidance and spiritual counsel lies with the training incumbent. This includes ensuring that the candidate makes proper time and space in their lives for reflection and private prayer. The incumbent is also responsible for ensuring that the candidate receives spiritual direction: this needs to be someone other than the incumbent, as this an area of potential conflict. Students are given help and advice from the Co-Ordinator for Vocations and Spirituality in the process of finding an appropriate person to fulfil this important role. Guidance for candidates for the academic part of the course lies with the central teaching staff who hold regular review meetings; individual advice and support is available from via the LLM Learning Co-ordinator. Training incumbents are aware of the guidelines for working with a trainee; they are also asked to attend regular meetings to discuss progress of candidates on the course.

*F.iii Its common life and the guidance offered should enable students to grow in Christian discipleship with a view to exercising a public role in ministry and engaging with the world.*

165. In terms of the aim of the course as stated in the Handbook - i.e.to develop students' skills, knowledge and understanding so that they can function as effective reflective practitioners in ministry - this is clearly happening, and confirmed by feedback from those recently licensed. As well as the emphasis on reflective practice, the programme aims to help students develop ministerial skills for a range of settings and situations. The programme also enables students to engage with the world beyond the church, by relating academic and experiential learning. However, the common life of the course is limited since a large part of the students' training takes place in their home parish. A further limiting factor is the structure of the course which is based on individual learning pathways. This means that the same group of students may not meet together

sufficiently frequently to get to know one another as well as they would if they met regularly over a three or four year period.

*F.iv The teaching and ministerial staff should model an appropriate pattern of spirituality, continued learning and reflection on practice.*

166. From observation, the teaching staff clearly models an appropriate pattern of spirituality and reflection on practice. Teaching staff are involved in other work within the diocese, including further research, and other training activities, although it is noted in G.iii below that there some areas in which further CPD would be beneficial. Reports from students on their experience of their training and placement incumbents are also positive, although it is not clear to what extent training incumbents are involved in CPD themselves.

<b>Salisbury: The inspection team has Confidence with regard to Criterion F, Ministerial, personal and spiritual formation.</b>
---

#### **Winchester**

*F.i The institution should enable candidates to be immersed in the traditions of their own church and to gain an empathetic understanding of church and faith traditions other than their own.*

167. Candidates receive a large part of their training within their own parishes under the supervision of their incumbent. This close working relationship enables candidates to be immersed in the traditions of their own parish, and the third year placement gives the opportunity for widening this experience. The training combines academic rigour with an approach that takes seriously the context in which Readers exercise their ministry, since most Readers will be licensed to their training incumbent at least initially.

*F.ii It should offer corporate and individual guidance for learners, including encouragement to seek confidential spiritual counsel and to maintain a regular private prayer life.*

168. The training incumbent plays a significant part in the preparation of a candidate for ministry, and there is a detailed ministry specification which has to be completed at the beginning of training and kept under review throughout. This specification places an appropriate emphasis on the spiritual life and development of the candidate. Individual tutors provide support and individual guidance as required with academic work. Candidates are encouraged to seek the support and counsel of a spiritual

director as well as maintaining a regular private prayer life. Pastoral support is available to all candidates throughout the course as required, from the Course Co-ordinator, as well as from the candidate's home church.

*F.iii Its common life and the guidance offered should enable students to grow in Christian discipleship with a view to exercising a public role in ministry and engaging with the world.*

169. The content of the course, particularly within the section entitled 'Developing Pastoral and Professional Practice' is aimed at enabling students to grow as disciples so that they can exercise a public ministry which engages with the world. The course material is challenging and is delivered in an engaging and helpful way, as observed on the study day. However the corporate life of the course is very limited since there are relatively few opportunities for the whole body of Readers in training to meet together. Much of the training takes place in the students' home parishes; those course units which are taught in tutor groups away from the centre involve only small numbers of students since the groups meet on a geographical basis. For those who live in the Channel Islands meeting fellow students is a relatively rare occurrence, and there is an inevitable sense of isolation. Accordingly:

**Recommendation 24**

*[Winchester]*

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

*F.iv The teaching and ministerial staff should model an appropriate pattern of spirituality, continued learning and reflection on practice.*

170. From observation of staff at the residential weekend and training day, it is apparent that teaching staff model appropriate patterns of spirituality and reflection on practice. Professional development for the teaching staff, especially for those who run tutor groups away from the centre is patchy at best. We comment further on this in section Jiii, where see also **Recommendations 33 and 41.**

<p><b>Winchester: The inspection team has Confidence with qualifications with regard to Criterion F, Ministerial, personal and spiritual formation.</b></p>
---

## SECTION FOUR: EDUCATION AND TRAINING

### G Teaching and learning: content, method and resources

*Inspectors will consider the quality and effectiveness of teaching and learning activities, methods and resources*

#### SCRTP

171. We observe – as the following text bears out - that while SCRTP has developed considerable partnership in terms of planning and marking, sharing teaching across SCRTP is not as strong as we believe it might be; and we address the following recommendation to the SCRTP as a whole:

**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.**

#### Guildford

*G.i The units of teaching and learning should be well structured, with clear and appropriate aims.*

172. Each module of teaching has a clearly stated aim in terms of learning outcomes, teaching and learning experience and gifts and competencies. The assessment requirements are also clearly stated and reading lists provided in the units. The students who met with the inspectors appreciate the clarity of content and assessment expectation even though they sometimes complained about the work load caused by producing portfolios at the same time as preparing for leading worship and attending residentials.

*G.ii There should be a proper balance between the academic, formational and practical aspects of training.*

173. All modules have formational and practical aspects but some modules are necessarily more academic than others. The balance over each year and between the evening teaching sessions and the study days and residentials is very good.

174. The key place of the academic, formational and practical aspects of preaching throughout the course is commendable and a real strength of

the course. It prepares LLMs and OLMs alike to a high standard, giving them confidence to preach in a diocese which generally has high expectations of preaching.

*G.iii Learning programmes should be varied in format and method, with use of student experience, courses, seminars, tutorials, one-to-one, groups, placements and private study.*

175. Due to the timing of the inspection the inspectors were limited in the teaching observations we could make. Two of the core tutors were not teaching at all in the summer term when the inspection took place.

176. The outstanding teaching of the Old Testament module was exceptional and greatly appreciated by the students – hence our recommendation below.

### **Recommendation 26**

*[Guildford]*

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

177. Other teaching we observed was variable in quality. Some of it was satisfactory but often it was not as challenging or provocative as we believe teaching at this level should be. This was evident, for example, in the use of the MBTI without any theological or academic critique and with a general tendency to avoid challenging engagement with the issues being taught.

178. A variety of teaching methods is used and one of the strengths of the course is its emphasis on informal participation of the students in discussion and shared learning. However this is sometimes at the expense of formal teaching. The core members of staff do most of the teaching at residentials and teach key areas of formation (e.g. spirituality and preaching) on Monday evenings. Where the emphasis is on formation and the practical, this teaching is good and well received. Where subjects require more academic knowledge, the teaching input was observed to be patchy and found to lack rigour. A tendency to throw open the given topic to discussion before any real meat had been introduced was observed on several occasions and the inspectors questioned whether this was a lack of in-depth knowledge on the tutor's part or a lack of adult education teaching experience.

179. The question was raised in the inspectors' minds as to whether there is enough of a cutting edge to some of the formational teaching. There is a very relaxed comfortable style of communicating, which whilst enhancing the learning environment also seemed to mean that the teaching was insufficiently critical and avoided raising awkward questions and any hint of conflict.
180. One experienced tutor struggled to fit the material into the time available and was felt by three inspectors (on three separate occasions) to be too ambitious both in the amount of excellent material offered and in the level at which it was pitched. Some third year students were lost in the philosophical aspects of this teaching and therefore could not contribute to the discussion whereas one or two students were allowed to dominate.

**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.**

*G.iv There should be an appropriate learning environment, with adequate resources including library and information and communications technology.*

181. The class rooms in Christ's College and the residential settings experienced by the inspectors are all fit for purpose.
182. The LMP course administrator enables access for students to all course materials on the LMP *Drop box* folder. This system is well run, up to date and gives students, staff and inspectors all the information they need.
183. The Diocesan Library is housed at the Cathedral and is a fairly well stocked resource, quite heavily used by course students and others around the diocese - most of the course books are represented there. However, there are on-going issues around accessing the collection, as it is constrained by Cathedral opening times and an antiquated catalogue system that does not allow students to check what is available without travelling to the library.

**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.**

*G.v Staff should provide students with constructive formal and informal feedback assessment, against published assessment criteria, both in terms of academic progress and in terms of preparation for beginning public ministry.*

184. Students who met with the inspectors expressed satisfaction with the feedback they receive both formally in the form of mark sheets and comments on essays and their portfolios and informally from their year tutors. They also expressed satisfaction with the mostly prompt return of marked assignments. All assignments are double marked against the criteria published in the course handbook and some portfolios are double marked by tutors on other courses in SCRTP to help ensure parity. Portfolios inspected showed substantial agreement in marks given and careful maintenance of the standards set.

**Guildford: The inspection team has Confidence with qualifications with regard to Criterion G, Teaching and learning, content, method and resources.**

#### **Oxford**

*G.i The units of teaching and learning should be well structured, with clear and appropriate aims.*

185. Each module of teaching has a clearly stated aim in terms of learning outcomes, teaching and learning experience and gifts and competencies. These are the same for LLMs and ordinands for local ministry. The assessment requirements are also clearly stated and reading lists provided in the units. The students who met with the inspectors appreciate the clarity of both content and assessment expectation.

*G.ii There should be a proper balance between the academic, formational and practical aspects of training.*

186. Each ordinand for local ministry has their own learning track worked out with the course director. This makes for a complex overall picture but seems to work well thanks to the oversight and accessibility of the course director.

187. The training for LLMs consists of a number of structured evening courses, parish based ministerial training and placements, and courses on prayer and leading worship. This approach ensures an appropriate balance

- between the academic, formational and practical aspects of training and their integration is designed to prepare students for public ministry. The formational aspects of training are further supported by an annual conference, annual quiet day, training weekends/days, tutorial reviews and other training meetings.
188. For ordinands for local ministry the academic and formational aspects of training are covered in the diocesan rolling programme of courses and the residential components and study days. The practical ministerial training takes place mainly in the parish and on the placement.
- G.iii Learning programmes should be varied in format and method, with use of student experience, courses, seminars, tutorials, one-to-one, groups, placements and private study.*
189. Inspectors observed teaching in various settings - a study day for incumbents, ministry teams and students; a residential weekend for ordinands for local ministry at Cuddesdon; study days and evening teaching on the diocesan rolling programme. A variety of tutors were observed and almost invariably the teaching was of a very high standard. However, inspectors were disappointed that some teaching they observed was pitched at a rather general level and had minimal theological input. Hence, we address **recommendation 27** to Oxford also (as well as **recommendation 33**).
- G.iv There should be an appropriate learning environment, with adequate resources including library and information and communications technology.*
190. Both ordinands for local ministry and LLMs have access to Oxford Brookes library and to Ripon College Cuddesdon's library. All the course material and other supplementary resources for each module are available on Moodle the diocesan web resource.
- G.v Staff should provide students with constructive formal and informal feedback assessment, against published assessment criteria, both in terms of academic progress and in terms of preparation for beginning public ministry.*
191. The portfolio method of assessment ensures that both academic work and formational progress are monitored and evaluated. Evidence for all the formal and some informal feedback is to be found in the portfolios. Inspectors were able to look at two portfolios and were impressed with the feedback and the careful double marking.

192. Essays are marked by the tutor concerned. The process for marking is the same for LLMs as for ordinands – the first marking by the mentor, with second marking centrally.

**Oxford: The inspection team has Confidence with regard to Criterion G, Teaching and learning, content, method and resources.**

### **Salisbury**

*G.i The units of teaching and learning should be well structured, with clear and appropriate aims.*

193. There are 8 modules at level 4 and a further 8 at level 5 constituting the Foundation Degree, each module having a set of gifts and competencies so that the aims are appropriate and clear. Each student can have an individual pathway through the course reflecting their particular needs and prior knowledge and experience. Some modules are taught over a period of weeks and others over weekends or on study days.

*G.ii There should be a proper balance between the academic, formational and practical aspects of training.*

194. The practical and formational aspects of the course are on-going over the period of training and take place in the student's home parish. This runs concurrently with participation in the more academic modules studied at the various study centres of the diocese. This means that the overall structure of the course ensures a proper balance between the different strands of training – academic, practical and individual study.

*G.iii Learning programmes should be varied in format and method, with use of student experience, courses, seminars, tutorials, one-to-one, groups, placements and private study.*

195. Learning takes place through a variety of formats and methods including lectures, tutorials and private study, as well as practical experience of ministry within their parish. Each candidate has a mentor who helps them identify what they need to learn in order to prepare each portfolio. However feedback from students shows that this support is varied in effectiveness. Additional support and training is required for mentors to ensure that they are able to fulfil their role effectively and for all students. Also, it was observed that teaching on the residential weekend is not always to the same standard: further CPD is required for tutors who lack educational training and experience of teaching adult learners. Some good

to excellent teaching was observed on two study days at Sarum College. We also observed good examples of learning by doing. All members of the group were involved and teachers took note of the fact that some were already in licensed ministry.

**Recommendation 29**

[Salisbury]

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

**Recommendation 30**

[Salisbury]

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

*G.iv There should be an appropriate learning environment, with adequate resources including library and information and communications technology.*

196. The learning environment includes accommodation at Sarum College and the Diocesan Education Centre at Wilton. The students are enrolled with Sarum College library and also have access to the Oxford Brookes library. An extensive bank of study material is also available via Moodle.

*G.v Staff should provide students with constructive formal and informal feedback assessment, against published assessment criteria, both in terms of academic progress and in terms of preparation for beginning public ministry.*

197. All course work is assessed using published assessment criteria by the tutor and second marker. Each module requires the student to produce a portfolio of work which is part formative and part summative, showing the integration of learning across academic and practical learning. A mentor gives advice on the construction of each portfolio, although not on its precise contents. Feedback is given by tutors on marked assignments and an opportunity is given to resubmit if the assignment is failed. In the case of the portfolio, feedback is given without marks with a chance to resubmit if the mentor believes the portfolio would not be passed by the external marker. Reference has been made under G.iii to the inconsistent levels of support given by different mentors, which may have resulted in some students receiving lower marks than they would otherwise have done.

**Salisbury: The inspection team has Confidence with qualifications with regard to Criterion G, Teaching and learning, content, method and resources.**

## Winchester

*G.i The units of teaching and learning should be well structured, with clear and appropriate aims.*

198. The course consists of seven modules of teaching and learning each of which is spread over several weeks. These are well structured with clear and appropriate aims, as set out in the gifts and competencies listed for each module. In addition there are five residential weekends/study days and a parish placement. There is also a final residential weekend prior to licensing.

*G.ii There should be a proper balance between the academic, formational and practical aspects of training.*

199. There is a good balance between academic, formational and practical aspects of the course, although if students are conscientious in their reading of set material they will spend more time on academic work. A more experiential approach is adopted for residential weekends. The Ministry Specification agreed between the student and their incumbent is designed to ensure that an appropriate level of involvement in the parish is maintained, in conjunction with guidelines set out in the handbook.

*G.iii Learning programmes should be varied in format and method, with use of student experience, courses, seminars, tutorials, one-to-one, groups, placements and private study.*

200. The learning programme is varied in format, making use of lectures, seminars, tutorials, group work, a placement, and private study. One-to-one sessions take place between tutors and students as required.

201. On the residential weekend and study day a variety of approaches were observed, with some excellent teaching on designing liturgy for people with disabilities and some good, if rather formulaic, teaching on exegesis. A number of sessions were supported with the use of PowerPoint and/or hand-outs; others made use of a flip-chart and note-taking by students. The level of contribution to discussion by students was good throughout with good rapport between staff and students: students enjoyed the opportunity to meet with their peers and were clearly energised by sharing ideas and experiences.

*G.iv There should be an appropriate learning environment, with adequate resources including library and information and communications technology.*

202. The learning environment at the Diocesan training centre is appropriate to lectures and seminars. Home based groups for tutorials provide an informal and comfortable learning environment for small group work. Students have access to Winchester University library. The Diocese also has a resource centre. Some tutors are willing to lend books on a personal basis. LNET contains a large amount of reading material relevant to each unit. Training in use of IT is given at the beginning of the course if required.

*G.v Staff should provide students with constructive formal and informal feedback assessment, against published assessment criteria, both in terms of academic progress and in terms of preparation for beginning public ministry.*

203. All course work is assessed by the course tutor and the second marker in accordance with published criteria, contained in the Student Handbook, and also available with each module outline. Essays are commented on and feedback is given by the tutor. Towards the end of the second year, each student's academic progress is reviewed to ensure they are ready to move from level 4 to level 5 of the programme. Progress in ministerial formation is discussed with the training incumbent on a regular basis, as agreed in the Ministry Specification.

204. Student feedback indicates that occasionally there has been insufficient feedback from a tutor, and this has been discussed by the core staff team so that the issue can be resolved. There is inconsistency regarding the level of support which tutors give to students meeting in home-based groups as some will read a draft essay and give comments and others will not. There is a need for some consistency here so that students are not disadvantaged. This point is not covered in the relevant job description.

<b>Winchester: The inspection team has Confidence with regard to Criterion G, Teaching and learning, content, method and resources.</b>
---

## **H Practical and pastoral theology**

### **Guildford**

*H.i The institution's learning structures and formational activity should integrate theory and practice and enable students to grow as theologically reflective practitioners in the context of the developing and diverse society in which they will minister.*

205. The LMP course consists of a variety of learning structures and formational activity including formal teaching, peer group discussion, presentations to peers, leading worship, assessed preaching in the home parish and during the placement and the use of a 'foreign' pulpit. The portfolio method of assessment ensures that the students reflect on their learning and their own developmental progression in their formation as ministers in diverse contexts and with high expectations of them as preachers and leaders of worship.
206. Inspectors saw evidence in the portfolios of real engagement with theological reflection in the context of the diverse society in which they live and will minister. There were also some examples where this quality of reflection was lacking and here students were marked down. Students are clear that a key aim of the course is to enable them to be theologically reflective practitioners. The inspectors were impressed by the overall quality of the portfolios and the careful and constructive marking by tutors.

**Guildford: The inspection team has Confidence with regard to Criterion H, Practical and pastoral theology.**

#### **Oxford**

*H.i The institution's learning structures and formational activity should integrate theory and practice and enable students to grow as theologically reflective practitioners in the context of the developing and diverse society in which they will minister.*

207. The training for both LLMs and ordinands for local ministry consists of a variety of learning structures and formational activities including formal teaching, peer group discussion, leading worship, assessed preaching in the home parish and during the placement.
208. Students are clear that a key aim of the course is to enable them to be theologically reflective practitioners.
209. The portfolio method of assessment with its clear learning outcomes for each module ensures that the students reflect on their learning and their own developmental progression in their formation as ministers in diverse contexts and with high expectations of them as preachers and leaders of worship.

**Oxford: The inspection team has Confidence with regard to Criterion H, Practical and pastoral theology.**

## Salisbury

*H.i The institution's learning structures and formational activity should integrate theory and practice and enable students to grow as theologically reflective practitioners in the context of the developing and diverse society in which they will minister.*

210. The course depends on the combination of practical learning and formation within the home parish and academic study provided by the course tutors. The system of constructing a portfolio of formative and summative material ensures that theory and practice are integrated. In this way students are encouraged to develop their reflective skills and to grow as ministers within the context of their parish in particular and within the wider church.

**Salisbury: The inspection team has Confidence with regard to Criterion H, Practical and pastoral theology.**

## Winchester

*H.i The institution's learning structures and formational activity should integrate theory and practice and enable students to grow as theologically reflective practitioners in the context of the developing and diverse society in which they will minister.*

211. Integration takes place as a function of the mixture of on-going practical experience in the student's home parish, residential weekends and training days during which the training is more experiential, and the academic modules. The extent to which this integration is successful is apparent in the reports of third year students returning from placements describing their positive experiences in unfamiliar and sometimes demanding settings.

**Winchester: The inspection team has Confidence with regard to Criterion H, Practical and pastoral theology.**

## SECTION FIVE: STAFF AND STUDENTS

*Inspectors will consider the recruitment, expertise, resourcing, appraisal and development of staff.*

### I Teaching Staff

#### Guildford

*I.i The gender, lay/ordained and denominational balance of ministerial and teaching staff should model appropriate patterns of learning and of ministry and comply with denominational guidelines.*

212. The balance among the ministerial and teaching staff is appropriate although it would be desirable that in due course at least one member of the core staff should be a lay person; and we would urge the Course to bear that point in mind when a vacancy next occurs.

**Guildford: The inspection team has Confidence in regard to Criterion I, teaching staff.**

#### Oxford

*I.i The gender, lay/ordained and denominational balance of ministerial and teaching staff should model appropriate patterns of learning and of ministry and comply with denominational guidelines.*

213. The balance among ministerial and teaching staff is entirely appropriate.

**Oxford: The inspection team has Confidence in regard to Criterion I, teaching staff.**

#### Salisbury and Winchester

*I.i The gender, lay/ordained and denominational balance of ministerial and teaching staff should model appropriate patterns of learning and of ministry and comply with denominational guidelines.*

214. In both of these dioceses the staff, full time and part-time, reflects an appropriate gender balance, though this would seem to be the result of chance, not design. All are Anglican.

215. The tutors also reflect an appropriate balance of gender. Some are ordained, others not. There is some mix of church traditions.

**Salisbury; Winchester: The inspection team has Confidence in regard to Criterion I, teaching staff.**

**J All staff**

### **SCRTP**

216. Most of the inspectors' comments on staff relate to individual schemes, below. We note, however, that there are varieties of practice about formal employment contracts; that the appraisal of tutors varies considerably; and that in respect of CPD, again, there is variety across the participating dioceses. All staff (volunteer and core) should have access to regular appraisal which identifies personalised CPD to improve the quality of delivery of courses and personal knowledge and skills. Accordingly, we make the following recommendations to the SCRTP:

**Recommendation 31** *[SCRTP and participating dioceses]*

**We recommend that all teaching staff have formal employment contracts.**

**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.**

**Recommendation 33** *[SCRTP and participating dioceses]*

**We recommend that formal arrangements for regular staff appraisal and development be adopted and implemented.**

217. Turning to the individual schemes:

### **Guildford**

*J.i Staff recruitment and selection procedures should be transparent, fair and consonant with the policies of the relevant partner bodies.*

218. The process of recruitment and selection of core staff is managed by the diocesan Human Resources staff and is in accordance with the diocesan policies. Subject tutors are usually approached by the Principal and appointed for the duration of a single course. There is a formal policy statement concerning the expectations of their engagement and its remuneration, but tutors do not receive an individual contract.
- J.ii Job descriptions, terms of service and reporting lines should be clear at the time of appointment and reviewed at regular intervals.*
219. Job descriptions follow diocesan guidelines and are reviewed annually at the time of the employee's appraisal.
- J.iii There should be an effective programme for the continuing professional development of staff, including annual appraisals for all staff.*
220. All core staff have an annual appraisal, conducted by the Principal in the case of the rest of the staff and by the Director of Ministerial Training in the case of the Principal. While tutorial staff receive course evaluation and feedback, they are not currently appraised. As the paragraphs below (see particularly 236 and 245) and Recommendation 32 make plain, the issue of the appraisal of tutorial staff is one that merits attention across the RTP.
221. There does not seem to be in place a regular programme for staff development, although it was said that if an individual wished to undertake a particular course of study, the diocese was usually supportive. Clergy appointed to the staff lose the entitlement to a sabbatical they had as diocesan clergy when they become employees of the diocese. For whatever reason, there has not been the regular pattern of staff development that we would have expected, and feel to be necessary.

**See also Recommendation 33 above**

- J.iv Staff should be sufficient in number and expertise, and resourced to fulfil their role adequately for the institution's and students' needs.*
222. The range of expertise offered by the core staff is as great as could reasonably be expected from such a small number. However, the expertise of the tutorial staff is rather varied in academic standard and does not always provide the students with the highest quality that might be offered.

### 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.**

<b>Guildford: The inspection team has Confidence with qualifications with regard to Criterion J, All staff.</b>
---

### Oxford

*J.i Staff recruitment and selection procedures should be transparent, fair and consonant with the policies of the relevant partner bodies.*

223. The process of recruitment and selection of core staff is managed by the Diocesan Human Resources staff in accordance with diocesan policies. Subject tutors and mentors are usually approached by the Principal and appointed for the duration of a single course or for work with a specified student. They do not have formal contracts and are not usually paid for their work – a point we believe the course should look at, especially as at least one individual thought to have specialist skills is already paid to lead particular sessions.

*J.ii Job descriptions, terms of service and reporting lines should be clear at the time of appointment and reviewed at regular intervals.*

224. Initial Job descriptions, terms of service and reporting lines are clearly specified for core and ancillary staff, and the expectation is that job descriptions are reviewed annually at the time of the employee's appraisal. While this review happens, there is evidence that the process of approval for new job descriptions can be excessively prolonged.

### 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)**

*J.iii There should be an effective programme for the continuing professional development of staff, including annual appraisals for all staff.*

225. Core staff receive an annual appraisal; course tutors are subject to regular peer review. There is a diocesan policy on professional development for staff, but its implementation with regard to the course staff seems rather

vague, especially with regard to regular study leave. We noted in paragraphs 38, 39 and 221 and Recommendation 5 that there has not been the regular pattern of staff development that we would have expected, and this is true for Oxford.

226. Collaboration with RTP colleagues on the curriculum is appreciated by the core staff. There is a reciprocal arrangement whereby colleagues from the other courses in SCRTP appraise teaching sessions and the core staff find this an enriching part of their work.

**See also Recommendation 33 above**

*J.iv Staff should be sufficient in number and expertise, and resourced to fulfil their role adequately for the institution's and students' needs.*

227. Although the course has sufficient staff with appropriate expertise to fulfil the teaching and mentoring requirements, the inspectors have concerns arising from the evidence of their conversations both with ancillary and teaching staff and their general observations about the sufficiency of the ancillary staff, especially with the extra work that it is anticipated will be necessary during the implementation of Common Awards.

**Recommendation 36**

*[Oxford]*

**We recommend that the level of administrative support be reviewed.**

<b>Oxford: The inspection team has Confidence with qualifications with regard to Criterion J, All staff.</b>
--

**Salisbury**

*J.i Staff recruitment and selection procedures should be transparent, fair and consonant with the policies of the relevant partner bodies.*

228. The full time members of staff have been appointed in and through the diocesan processes.

229. There is no formal selection procedure for local tutors and Mentors. The staff are however proactive [eg. through annual advertising] and have been successful in recruiting new tutors and lecturers. The qualities sought in new tutors include a sympathy to LLM ministry, an ability to lead a small group well, and theological capability. Nonetheless:

**We recommend a careful process for the selection of tutors.**

230. Tutors new to the course are inducted into their new role by the Co-ordinator for Learning for Discipleship.
231. There is no formal deselection process, other than that tutors deemed not suitable are not asked again to tutor students.
- J.ii Job descriptions, terms of service and reporting lines should be clear at the time of appointment and reviewed at regular intervals.*
232. There are job descriptions for core staff. These include terms of service and lines of accountability.
233. Training incumbents have detailed role descriptions and must complete a Training Agreement for Incumbent and Trainee.
234. Mentors have clearly expressed expectations of their roles [see *Portfolio Mentor's handbook*, revised January 2013]. The students' experience as reported to Inspectors and as observed is that Mentors carry out their roles with such variability that they used the word 'unfair'.

**See Recommendation 29 above in section Giii.**

- J.iii There should be an effective programme for the continuing professional development of staff, including annual appraisals for all staff.*
235. Core staff are appraised annually; but there is no ensuing tailored CPD. We heard evidence of excellent CMD provided by the diocese. This, however, is not equivalent to CPD tailored to annual appraisal outcomes.
236. The tutors' appraisal amounts to the double marking of course work and student feedback, given on completion of a module. In the autumn of 2012, c.66 per cent of students gave feedback, a 'normal percentage', according to the Co-ordinator for Learning for Discipleship.
237. Tutors do meet twice annually for support; and there is an annual training meeting convened by Oxford Brookes, which covers such topics as dealing with plagiarism. But, as the LLM Training Officer mentioned, 'we don't have laid down procedures', there is no formal appraisal of tutors, and 'there is not much formal on-going training' for them.

*J.iv Staff should be sufficient in number and expertise, and resourced to fulfil their role adequately for the institution's and students' needs.*

238. There are sufficient core staff. The team includes a Co-ordinator (0.8 fte), two part-time administrators (both 0.5 fte) two volunteers and (0.5 and 0.2 fte). However, their responsibilities include all lay learning and not all of their time is given to the inspected programme. The team will be significantly strengthened and better gender-balanced with the arrival of a 0.5 appointment in September. These people's work is supported by guest lecturers, tutors and incumbents, though, as recorded in the Core Team's minutes [07.03.11 & 14.11.12], there is a challenge to find new tutors.

239. The above group is sufficient in expertise, as was reflected in the groups, classes and lectures which the inspectors attended.

240. Resources [e.g. the written modules; the on-line resources; Sarum College library] are also satisfactory.

**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.**

<b>Salisbury; The inspection team has Confidence with qualifications with regard to Criterion J, All staff.</b>
---

## **Winchester**

*J.i Staff recruitment and selection procedures should be transparent, fair and consonant with the policies of the relevant partner bodies.*

241. Recruitment and selection processes (including the qualities sought) are virtually the same as those in Salisbury and we make the same **Recommendation** (no 37).

*J.ii Job descriptions, terms of service and reporting lines should be clear at the time of appointment and reviewed at regular intervals.*

242. There are job descriptions for both Core staff and tutors. There are terms of service and lines of accountability for both the Core staff and tutors, though in the case of the latter, these are 'light touch', and more suited to the volunteer status of the tutors. Job Descriptions do not, however, state what is expected in terms of a post holder's involvement in the Course's corporate worship.

### Recommendation 39

[Winchester]

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

*J.iii There should be an effective programme for the continuing professional development of staff, including annual appraisals for all staff.*

243. Now that the University of Winchester is no longer a formal partner of the Course, there is a *lacuna* in the provision of CPD for the Core Staff. Formerly the University helped with training in assessment, providing updates in theological research etc. This *lacuna* is not being addressed. For, as a member of staff reflected, there presently is no capacity to deliver targeted CPD for Course staff members. These two facts mean that there has been a sense of waiting to see what may be offered, if the Course opts for Common Awards which it has during the editing process of this Report. We saw evidence that the absence of CPD was beginning to have an adverse effect on the course's ability to deliver training well.
244. The part time Core staff have not been appraised; and there is no obvious 360° review of the full time staff. Certainly the two part time staff are not involved in the appraisal of the full time staff.
245. The tutors' appraisal amounts to the double marking of course work and student feedback, given on completion of a module. This feedback is discussed by the Core team. It must be noted that the feedback is given anonymously. If therefore some students either forget or choose not to give feedback, it is impossible to pursue these students for the desired feedback.
246. Insofar as there is training for tutors, it amounts to training by a Core Staff member on the Course's marking scheme, to what may be delivered at the 6 monthly meeting of tutors with Core staff, and to any CME in which tutors may choose to engage – though it must be noted that CME is not tailored to the specific needs of tutors for a Readers' Course.

### 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.**

*J.iv Staff should be sufficient in number and expertise, and resourced to fulfil their role adequately for the institution's and students' needs.*

247. Conclusions as to the sufficiency of staff and resources are the same as for Salisbury. Resources [e.g. the written modules; the on-line resources; the Resources Centre at the Cathedral Education Centre, Winchester] also are sufficient. They will, however, be greatly strengthened as they move to Common Awards.

**Winchester: The inspection team has Confidence with qualifications with regard to Criterion J, All staff.**

## **K Students**

*Inspectors will examine procedures for student admission, welfare and support, appraisal and discipline.*

### **Guildford**

*K.i Policies on students' admission, welfare, complaints, discipline, assessment, reporting to sponsoring churches and arrangements for first appointments should be publicly available; and there should be evidence that they are applied.*

248. Substantial written material on most aspects of the course is readily available to students, especially in the handbook. Although the procedures for discipline and possible suspension or dismissal were previously not fully described there, in response to the inspector's visit this omission has now been rectified in the current edition of the handbook. Feedback from students indicated a high level of satisfaction with the implementation of the policies of the course.

*K.ii The institution's decision-making structure should enable students to take an appropriate part in its governance, provided that students take responsibility for their participation.*

249. Two elected student representatives, one OLM and one LLM, are members of the Council, which meets three times a year, and are able to raise issues there.

**Guildford: The inspection team has Confidence with regard to Criterion K, Students.**

## Oxford

*K.i Policies on students' admission, welfare, complaints, discipline, assessment, reporting to sponsoring churches and arrangements for first appointments should be publicly available; and there should be evidence that they are applied.*

250. The student handbook provides comprehensive information for many aspects of the course, including student complaint procedures and the student code of discipline, and feedback from students indicated a high level of satisfaction with the implementation of the policies of the course.

*K.ii The institution's decision-making structure should enable students to take an appropriate part in its governance, provided that students take responsibility for their participation.*

251. Each element in the course, the ordinands, the LLM students, and the Interested Learners, has its own elected student representative, who meet regularly with the students they represent. The three representatives sit on the Oversight Body of the LMP, which meets three times a year. Here they can bring concerns from the students and participate in discussion about teaching and other issues affecting the course as a whole.

252. Two of the inspectors sat in on a students' meeting where they reviewed the year and gathered together any points they wished to raise at the next governing body meeting. Students told the inspectors that they value this opportunity to give feedback and appreciate that it is heard and acted upon.

<b>Oxford: The inspection team has Confidence with regard to Criterion K, Students.</b>
---

## Salisbury

*K.i Policies on students' admission, welfare, complaints, discipline, assessment, reporting to sponsoring churches and arrangements for first appointments should be publicly available; and there should be evidence that they are applied.*

253. There are policies on the above areas, which are evidenced in the Course's life.

254. Students for the Course are selected through the diocesan selection process, which is peculiar to LLM. The process is 'evidence based', the criteria being the CofE's selection criteria. Selected candidates are admitted to the Course, and the Course, and not the selection system, decides upon the length and nature of an individual's training.
255. Continuing assessment of students occurs through academic assignments, tutorial work, course involvement, the observation of students and the reflections of training incumbents. Criteria used are the National Church's Gifts and Competences. These are listed for students in *Growth in Faith and Ministry. An Introduction to Learning by Portfolio*, revised 2013.
256. Disclosure and Barring Service checks and Safeguarding training occur at the start of a student's training.
257. Final assessment is made following conversations between the Co-ordinator for Learning for Discipleship, the Vice-Warden of Readers and the Bishop with oversight of LLM. Training incumbents contribute to the assessment, but do not take part in the decision making.
258. The Student Code of Conduct and Discipline Policy clearly states both that at least six months notice of any likely postponement of licensing as a result of not reaching Level 4 will be given, and that staff will work with such a student to reach Level 4, and so enable licensing.
259. There is, however, no formal complaints process for appealing against not being recommended for licensing. Should a person feel disquiet about not being recommended, it was reported that that person 'should speak to the vice-Warden of Readers and to Bishop Graham [sc. the bishop with oversight of LLM]'.
260. Students are selected on the basis that generally they will be deployed in their training benefice. The diocese, however, is planning to review its policy on the deployment of LLMs.
- K.ii The institution's decision-making structure should enable students to take an appropriate part in its governance, provided that students take responsibility for their participation.*
261. There are year representatives who have full, voting rights on the Course's Governing Body, on the Oxford Brookes Liaison Group and on the LLM Co-ordinators Group.

**Salisbury: The inspection team has Confidence with regard to Criterion K, Students.**

### **Winchester**

*K.i Policies on students' admission, welfare, complaints, discipline, assessment, reporting to sponsoring churches and arrangements for first appointments should be publicly available; and there should be evidence that they are applied.*

262. The policies, the selection of students and their continuing assessment are the same as for Salisbury. The minutes however of the Core Team lists a number of students who find the Course's guidelines on assignments and assessment unclear. When such uncertainty arises in the mind of a student, it is the tutor's responsibility to address it. The Reader Training Consultant, who leads on QA, however did agree that 'the forms [in the Handbook] may need tweaking'. This has now been done in a document received after our visit. It included a formal student complaints procedure and gave guidance on appeals.

#### **Recommendation 41**

*[Winchester]*

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

263. Final assessment is made by the Core Team, with the Warden of Readers in the chair. Past assessments and incumbents' references are used. Insofar as the Warden of Readers is a lecturer on the course, an assessor, chair of the final assessment Board, and the diocesan warden of readers, there would seem to be an issue here of a conflict of interests.

#### **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.**

264. Students are selected on the basis that they may be deployed as the diocese has need. Generally, students are deployed in their sponsoring benefice.

265. Welfare and support generally is good. In the last 13 years, only two students have not been retained.

266. At the time of the Inspection there were no clear statement of what constitutes corporate life, and so the process of the management of complaints and discipline was not patent. New policies on Discipline and Grievances have since been written and given to us. These we found to be satisfactory. There are clear statements of what is required for the training in preaching, teaching and leading public worship, and minutes of the core team reflect good handling of complaints and discipline in these areas. Please also note **Recommendation 14** on safeguarding above

*K.ii The institution's decision-making structure should enable students to take an appropriate part in its governance, provided that students take responsibility for their participation.*

267. There are year representatives. These act as 'post boxes' for issues which their fellow students wish to raise (normally by email) with the Core team. They have, however, no right of attendance at meetings of the Core team. According to the 2<sup>nd</sup> year representative, the reason is that the Core Staff sees the business of the Core team as confidential. The present practice is unsatisfactory both because the students were part of the governing process when there was the partnership between the Course and the University of Winchester, and because it models a form of governance which is not appropriate for students, once they are licensed as Readers.

**Recommendation 43**

*[Winchester]*

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

<p><b>Winchester: The inspection team has No Confidence with regard to Criterion K, Students.</b></p>
---

## **SECTION SIX: GOVERNANCE, MANAGEMENT AND FINANCE**

### **L Organisation and governance**

*Inspectors will examine the effectiveness of the institution's governance structures and processes.*

#### **SCRTP**

*L.i The institution should have clear financial, administrative and management structures and an up-to-date governing document, and the governing body should be constituted in line with it.*

268. Partners in SCRTP have agreed the structures of Governance established in the form of Covenant between the 5 Anglican Dioceses of Salisbury, Guildford, Winchester, Portsmouth and Oxford; the Wessex URC; and Southampton Methodist District; and their structure is described in their Foundation Document. (Subsequently Bath and Wells Diocese has been accepted into Partnership.) While the partnership still includes the Wessex URC and Southampton Methodist District and the 5 Anglican Dioceses, the URC and Methodist role in training local ministers is increasingly under question because there is less emphasis on the local and more on the national than there once was (see also paras 7 & 8). In addition to the Governance group, a Board manages day to day affairs, and comprises a representative from each of the partners, two co-chairs, representatives from members who are local Christian theological education provider organisations and with up to 3 additional co-options to broaden expertise. The Board takes responsibility for generating a vision and strategies for the oversight of SCRTP's validation approvals and internal quality assurance and reports to Governors at least once per year. Framework documentation is agreed at Board level and delivered through local Ministry courses. The major issue over the period of our inspection was that of Common Awards. Now all the participating dioceses are committed to this. One of the implications is not only being involved in the writing of new courses but also SCRTP revising its key documents.

#### **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.**

*L.ii There should be evidence that the governing body recognises and discharges its role and legal duties in respect of stewardship of the assets; setting and safeguarding the vision, values and reputation of the institution; operational and staff oversight and support.*

269. The board meets at least 3 times per year to ensure a structured approach to Learning, Training, Validation issues and Quality Assurance across the region. It has established a range of project groups that report regularly on projects commissioned by the Board which enhance mutual support and economies of scale. Examples of current projects include the production of teaching modules for Common Awards and research into the effectiveness of Training Incumbents - both of which will have significant impact on quality of local provision in future. The Foundation document describes a common approach to learning, education and formation across the region and it is clear from discussion in the Board meetings and their minutes, that the responsibility to ensure courses deliver these aspirations is accepted by the Partners and Members.

*L.iii It should have the mix of skills and experience appropriate to its role; there should be a clear understanding of the respective roles of trustees and staff, with job descriptions for key officers; induction for new trustees; and ongoing training needs should be met.*

270. The Governing Body and Board are not trustees as the Body is unincorporated and acts through a covenant between partners. It acts through mutual consent and influence and it is clear there is a high level of consensus for the vision and aims of SCRTP at a time when RTPs across the Church of England may have lost their former importance. The Governing Body and Co-Chairs are appropriately qualified and contribute well to strategic planning and discussion on research into operational matters for the future. The partners enhance this discussion well. SCRTP provides limited direct training as the individual members have this responsibility, but there is an annual conference which cements relationships and mutual accountability to the vision.

*L.iv There should be evidence of a structured contribution made by all community members - teaching staff, ancillary staff, the student body and individuals - so that they play an effective role in decision-making.*

271. Contribution by partners and members to discussion of the continued existence of SCRTP and its place in delivering future courses has been strong.

*L.v The institution's audited annual reports should be produced in good time and filed with the Charity Commission/Companies House as appropriate.*

272. As an un-incorporated body with limited funds Audit requirements are very limited. Accounts are provided to the Board and Governing Body regularly and expenditure and income are discussed and agreed as appropriate.

<b>SCRTP: The inspection team has Confidence with regard to Criterion L Organisation and governance.</b>
--

### **Guildford**

*L.i The institution should have clear financial, administrative and management structures and an up-to-date governing document, and the governing body should be constituted in line with it.*

273. Although the Discipleship, Vocation and Ministry Council of the Guildford Diocese has immediate oversight of the course, it is really the Diocese itself that has ultimate responsibility for it and might be described as its governing body with financial, administrative and management functions. The Council meets three times a year, is chaired by the Bishop of Dorking, and includes the Principal and the Director of Ministerial Training in its membership, as well as two student representatives. Nonetheless we believe it would be beneficial to create an oversight body with specific responsibility for the course, as there is for Oxford, for the reasons further suggested at paragraph 303.

### **Recommendation 45**

*[Guildford]*

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

*L.ii There should be evidence that the governing body recognises and discharges its role and legal duties in respect of stewardship of the assets; setting and safeguarding the vision, values and reputation of the institution; operational and staff oversight and support.*

274. Because the Council is concerned with many other areas besides the course, its meetings consist chiefly of receiving reports, and the allocation of time to course issues is necessarily limited. Nevertheless, at the meeting observed by the inspectors it was given a fair proportion of the agenda. However, it was not immediately apparent that the Council as a whole understood itself to have a corporate responsibility for such issues

as the transition to Common Awards or the lower number of new students entering the course that were presented by the Principal.

*L.iii It should have the mix of skills and experience appropriate to its role; there should be a clear understanding of the respective roles of trustees and staff, with job descriptions for key officers; induction for new trustees; and ongoing training needs should be met.*

275. The composition of the Council is appropriate to its wide tasks.

*L.iv There should be evidence of a structured contribution made by all community members - teaching staff, ancillary staff, the student body and individuals - so that they play an effective role in decision-making.*

276. As noted above, two elected student representatives are members of the Council, and at the meeting observed by the inspectors they were able to make appropriate contributions to the discussion. The one ancillary staff member does not sit on the Council but does attend all meetings of the core staff and contributes significantly to its decision-making there.

*L.v The institution's audited annual reports should be produced in good time and filed with the Charity Commission/Companies House as appropriate.*

277. This responsibility belongs to the Diocesan Board of Finance.

<b>Guildford: The inspection team has Confidence with qualifications with regard to Criterion L Organisation and governance.</b>
--

## **Oxford**

*L.i The institution should have clear financial, administrative and management structures and an up-to-date governing document, and the governing body should be constituted in line with it.*

278. The course has an Oversight Body, consisting of a non-executive chair appointed from the Bishop's Staff, one member from the Board of Mission of the diocese, three members with experience of local ministry, each appointed by an area bishop, three students, the core staff of the LMP, the Director of Mission and other appropriate staff from the Department of Mission, and up to three other co-opted members. It concerns itself with the general administration of the LMP but not with financial planning, which is the responsibility of the Board of Mission of the diocese. Thus, it

is really the Board of Mission, the Diocesan Board of Finance, and the Diocesan authorities as a whole that are the ultimate governing body.

*L.ii There should be evidence that the governing body recognises and discharges its role and legal duties in respect of stewardship of the assets; setting and safeguarding the vision, values and reputation of the institution; operational and staff oversight and support.*

279. The activities of the Oversight Body observed by the inspectors indicated that it regarded itself as responsible for these matters, although ultimately legal responsibility rests with the diocesan authorities.

*L.iii It should have the mix of skills and experience appropriate to its role; there should be a clear understanding of the respective roles of trustees and staff, with job descriptions for key officers; induction for new trustees; and ongoing training needs should be met.*

280. In general this seemed to be the case, although there was no particular evidence for the induction of new trustees or their ongoing training.

*L.iv There should be evidence of a structured contribution made by all community members - teaching staff, ancillary staff, the student body and individuals - so that they play an effective role in decision-making.*

281. As noted above, the core staff and student representatives sit on the Oversight Body, which meets three times a year, where they can participate in decision-making that relates to the course as a whole. There is no evidence that tutorial or ancillary staff are involved in any formal way in decision-making.

*L.v The institution's audited annual reports should be produced in good time and filed with the Charity Commission/Companies House as appropriate.*

282. This responsibility belongs to the Diocesan Board of Finance.

<p><b>Oxford: The inspection team has Confidence with regard to Criterion L Organisation and governance.</b></p>
--

## **Salisbury**

*L.i The institution should have clear financial, administrative and management structures and an up-to-date governing document, and the governing body should be constituted in line with it.*

283. Salisbury Diocese has a clear structure of Governance through the Learning for Discipleship and Ministry Council (LDMC) which covers all Diocesan provision for CMD and wellbeing, the Aldhelm Certificate course and LLM training. This council has a Terms of Reference document defining its scope and accountability to Bishop's Council. The Director for Learning for Discipleship is line manager for the staff with the Co-ordinator for Learning for Discipleship having responsibility for managing the work of the team. Regular reports are provided from the LLM course by the Co-ordinator of Learning and Discipleship and the Council is actively planning a strategy for ministry training in light of the Common Awards model. The LLM course is co-ordinated through the Learning for Discipleship team who meet regularly to monitor student progress, quality assure teaching and learning and plan the content and teaching of course modules, including staff training and matters of formation of students. Minutes and the observed meeting confirm the strategic planning and management of courses are effective. Additional layers of leadership and management are provided through regular meetings of Training Incumbents and those planning the delivery of future taught modules.
284. Administrative and financial management is provided by the Diocesan Board of Finance and Bishops Council and these structures are well founded and fully audited on an annual basis.
- L.ii There should be evidence that the governing body recognises and discharges its role and legal duties in respect of stewardship of the assets; setting and safeguarding the vision, values and reputation of the institution; operational and staff oversight and support.*
285. The minutes of the LDMC and the observed meeting confirm the council addresses the strategic and operational aspects of training for ministry and mission in a highly effective way.
- L.iii It should have the mix of skills and experience appropriate to its role; there should be a clear understanding of the respective roles of trustees and staff, with job descriptions for key officers; induction for new trustees; and ongoing training needs should be met.*
286. The LDMC is well constructed to represent Bishop's Council, students, staff, (Lay and Ordained) and other representatives of the Diocese. The Bishop's chairing of the meeting and membership including an Archdeacon demonstrate the commitment of the Diocese to the Council's work. As an unincorporated body there is recognition by members of the

Council that the DBF holds the roles of trustees and that Bishop and Synod have the residual responsibility for the governance of the LLM course. Officers of the Council have clear job descriptions.

*L.iv There should be evidence of a structured contribution made by all community members - teaching staff, ancillary staff, the student body and individuals - so that they play an effective role in decision-making.*

287. A student representative usually attends the meetings of the LDMC and provides written papers on the student views of the modules taught and assessment processes.

288. Staff are well represented on the Council, as are the volunteer tutors and LLM Training Officer and they all make a significant contribution to the discussion of future direction and the quality assurance of current courses.

*L.v The institution's audited annual reports should be produced in good time and filed with the Charity Commission/Companies House as appropriate.*

289. The Diocese produces annual reports which are audited and sent to the appropriate bodies. Income and expenditure streams for the Reader Course are within these accounts.

<b>Salisbury: The inspection team has Confidence with regard to Criterion L Organisation and governance.</b>
--

### **Winchester**

*L.i The institution should have clear financial, administrative and management structures and an up-to-date governing document, and the governing body should be constituted in line with it.*

290. The Winchester Diocese Reader Training Course is governed through the Diocesan Bishop. While a member of the SCRTP, that Board has no responsibility for oversight of the Winchester Training Programme, though it does provide peer moderation and support for delivery of some modules. The full expectations of governance for a Training Institution would be unreasonable in a small Diocesan LLM course, though the lack of any document covering governance, and lack of minutes of a Diocesan Representative Group covering strategic decisions of the course, are a concern. The requirement to ensure access to equality and justice for students; to outside stakeholders for the outcomes of the courses; for spending the Church's money and for ensuring the quality of the training

process is held by the Bishop and Diocesan Director of Ministry with financial scrutiny being exercised by the DBF through the Finance Director. It is the Bishop's clear wish that these arrangements continue in future and that a more formal board is unnecessary. However, in modelling governance practices around justice, equality and probity, staff will equip LLMs for their future ministry. There are issues in clearly codifying policy and practice that we believe need improvement and these are referred to below. The inspection team welcomed receipt of the new student grievance procedure; and processes, ethos and values paper after visiting the Diocese.

#### **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.**

*L.ii There should be evidence that the governing body recognises and discharges its role and legal duties in respect of stewardship of the assets; setting and safeguarding the vision, values and reputation of the institution; operational and staff oversight and support.*

291. As there is no Governance group for the LLM course it cannot meet the criterion. It is desirable that the vision and values for the course are more clearly explained in the staff and student handbooks - see section A.

292. Asset management is very clearly documented in DBF financial policies and the practice is audited annually and the audited report confirms there are no concerns over stewardship of assets.

*L.iii It should have the mix of skills and experience appropriate to its role; there should be a clear understanding of the respective roles of trustees and staff, with job descriptions for key officers; induction for new trustees; and ongoing training needs should be met.*

293. The Diocese is legally constituted and the roles of employed staff, and Diocesan Trustees are clearly delineated.

294. As there is no Governance group for the LLM course it cannot meet the criterion.

*L.iv There should be evidence of a structured contribution made by all community members - teaching staff, ancillary staff, the student body and individuals - so that they play an effective role in decision-making.*

295. Feedback from students and tutors is invited at the end of each module and these written comments are considered by the Core Team meetings. Minutes confirm issues raised are addressed and acted on. In addition, each student year group has appointed a representative who collects any views/ issues/ concerns of the group to present to the Reader Training Team each term. The Reader Training Co-ordinator feeds back to each year group representative the comments of the team. There are practical issues around small numbers of students travelling to attend core team meetings and the team awaits guidance around the future course validation before changing practice.

296. It should, however, be noted that the tutors do not have representation on the Core team, though they do have ready access to individual members of the Core team. One tutor also reported that he had no knowledge of the possible arrangements to be offered by the University of Durham, nor was he aware of any mechanism for contributing to the debate concerning the diocesan Readers' Course and a possible link with Durham University through Common Awards.

**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**

*L.v The institution's audited annual reports should be produced in good time and filed with the Charity Commission/Companies House as appropriate.*

297. The Diocese produces annual reports which are audited and sent to the appropriate bodies. Income and expenditure streams for the Reader Course are within these accounts.

<p><b>Winchester: The inspection team has No Confidence with regard to Criterion L Organisation and governance.</b></p>
---

## **M Business planning and risk management**

*Inspectors will look at evidence for the existence and implementation of the institution's strategic policies.*

### **SCRTP**

*M.i There should be a regularly-updated long-term strategy document agreed by the trustees and, in line with it, a business plan covering 3-5 years which identifies short and medium term aims and objectives and identifies how the institution intends to meet them.*

298. The SCRTP Foundation Document governs the organisation and strategy is agreed at Board meetings. The Board recognises that a lead body is necessary for the local validation of Common Awards and sees SCRTP as an option to be considered. If this were to happen SCRTP would need to be reconstituted as an incorporated body and trustees appointed. The participating dioceses would need, individually, to come to a formal agreement with SCRTP as to their responsibilities for delivery and validation of courses if this route is to be followed.

### **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.**

299. We would also urge that, within its business planning, SCRTP take the opportunity to press the case for appropriate and fair resourcing for the different ministry training strands within its region. We note that, while resourcing of training for ordained ministry is supported by Vote 1 money, funding for Lay Ministry training is far less secure and with the advent of Common Awards SCRTP is ideally placed to recommend to Dioceses a level of future funding that provides equality of access to training across the South Central area. Current funding of LLM courses varies from Diocese to Diocese with some expecting parishes to support residential training and some having taken decisions to reduce staff CPD due to lack of funding. In adopting Common Awards across the region the new business plan from SCRTP could include appropriate funding to resource: the staffing and staff training; assessment and quality assurance costs; as

well as costs of delivering training including residential and the costs of producing high quality teaching resources.

**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).**

*M. ii Annual budgets should be prepared in line with the business plan.*

300. SCRTP has an annual budget income of some £30,000. Expenditure is currently £40,000 but there is healthy balance of some £50,000 (May 2013). The income annually is from Partners' subscriptions of £3000 and Members' subscriptions of £1000 each. Annual expenditure is for the administration of the board, training sessions and expenses from project groups. The other main expenditure is a planned expenditure for 5 years to fund a Pioneer Ministry hub. This is being deliberately funded from the accumulated balance.

301. In each of the 4 diocese the DBF sets a budget which includes specific sums to cover the delivery and assessment of LLM and OLM courses. The course team in each diocese meets regularly with DBF officers to consider management budgets and ensure the budgets are adhered to.

*M.iii There should be an effective risk assessment, review and management process, which should include physical (e.g. health & safety and fire), financial, business and reputational risks.*

302. A full risk assessment is carried out at Partner level and under current arrangements is not appropriate at RTP level, though this will become a requirement if SCRTP becomes the TEI for Durham University.

<b>SCRTP: The inspection team has Confidence with regard to Criterion M, Business planning and risk management.</b>
---

## **Guildford**

*M.i There should be a regularly-updated long-term strategy document agreed by the trustees and, in line with it, a business plan covering 3-5 years which identifies short and medium term aims and objectives and identifies how the institution intends to meet them.*

303. When interviewed, the Principal and staff did not give the impression to the inspectors that they were concerned with advance planning and risk management issues because these were matters for the Diocese. While they were concerned to make the opportunities of ministerial training widely known in the Diocese, even if numbers of students were to fall dramatically and/or costs rise substantially, the effect on the overall diocesan budget would be minimal and easily absorbed. The fact that business planning and risk issues appear not to be directly 'owned' by the course is something of concern, hence our **recommendation 45** above and qualified confidence under this heading.

*M. ii Annual budgets should be prepared in line with the business plan.*

304. Annual budgeting is done by the Principal and monitored in conjunction with the Diocesan Secretary.

*M.iii There should be an effective risk assessment, review and management process, which should include physical (e.g. health & safety and fire), financial, business and reputational risks.*

305. All this is the responsibility of the diocese and we are confident that it is done.

<p><b>Guildford: The inspection team has Confidence with Qualifications with regard to Criterion M, Business planning and risk management.</b></p>
--

## **Oxford**

*M.i There should be a regularly-updated long-term strategy document agreed by the trustees and, in line with it, a business plan covering 3-5 years which identifies short and medium term aims and objectives and identifies how the institution intends to meet them.*

306. Because the course is ultimately underwritten by the diocese through its Department of Mission, which is committed to maintaining it, neither the Oversight Body nor the staff concerns themselves with business planning or financial risk management issues, although the Board of Mission does

have an overall risk register. Even if numbers of students were to fall dramatically and/or costs rise substantially, the effect on the overall diocesan budget would be minimal and easily absorbed. However, the concern we reflect in paragraph 303 above also applies to Oxford.

*M. ii Annual budgets should be prepared in line with the business plan.*

307. A budget is provided for the LMP within the overall budget of the Department of Mission of the diocese and comes under the responsibility of the Director of Mission. The Oversight Body is responsible for making sure that the LMP stays within its budget and that the budget is adequate for the needs of the LMP.

*M.iii There should be an effective risk assessment, review and management process, which should include physical (e.g. health & safety and fire), financial, business and reputational risks.*

308. All this is the responsibility of the diocese and we are confident that it is done.

<b>Oxford: The inspection team has Confidence with Qualifications with regard to Criterion M, Business planning and risk management.</b>
--

## **Salisbury**

*M.i There should be a regularly-updated long-term strategy document agreed by the trustees and, in line with it, a business plan covering 3-5 years which identifies short and medium term aims and objectives and identifies how the institution intends to meet them.*

309. The Diocese has business development plans with future budget forecasting as part of the work of the Bishop's Council and Diocesan Synod. The Annual Report of the DBF has a paragraph describing the courses provided by the Learning for Discipleship team and the uncertainty when we visited over future links to Oxford Brookes in light of the Common Awards model. A decision has been made recently by the Council to follow the Common Awards route. The Council is actively discussing the most appropriate model for delivering future LLM courses and this decision will have significant resource implications in terms of staffing, planning teaching materials and assessment.

*M. ii Annual budgets should be prepared in line with the business plan.*

310. The Diocesan Accountant agrees annual budgets with the Director for LDM who has responsibility for income and expenditure from this account. The main expenditure for Learning for Discipleship is a regular commitment to salaries of the Co-ordinator and administrators for the courses and has risen to £81798 in 2013 with the addition of a 0.5 Support Officer from September 2013. Other expenditure for course materials, residential training and expenses are very limited and are offset by LLM grants from parishes of £1875 in 2013.

*M.iii There should be an effective risk assessment, review and management process, which should include physical (e.g. health & safety and fire), financial, business and reputational risks.*

311. The Diocese has a full risk assessment process and the annual report confirms there is regular review of major risks and a risk register which identifies: falling parish share, reputation and key staff as the main risk areas.

312. The DBF has a full Health and Safety Policy and employees are trained in expectations of playing their part in the processes.

313. Staff and Students have DBS clearance and students are expected to attend Diocesan courses on the risks associated with safeguarding.

<p><b>Salisbury: The inspection team has Confidence with regard to Criterion M, Business planning and risk management.</b></p>
--

### **Winchester**

*M.i There should be a regularly-updated long-term strategy document agreed by the trustees and, in line with it, a business plan covering 3-5 years which identifies short and medium term aims and objectives and identifies how the institution intends to meet them.*

314. The Diocese has business development plans with future budget forecasting. With the appointment of a new Diocesan Bishop an extensive review of all Diocesan activity has been started and that review will not report for some time. Until such time as the report is produced it would be inappropriate to confirm a Diocesan business plan. Very recently, and after our visit, Bishops' Council made a recommendation to follow Common Awards. This will have significant resource implications in terms of staffing, planning teaching materials and assessment.

*M. ii Annual budgets should be prepared in line with the business plan.*

315. The Diocesan Finance Manager agrees annual budgets with the DDM who has responsibility for income and expenditure from this set of management accounts. The main expenditure is a regular commitment to salaries of the DDM, Training Officer and Administrator with additional annual expenditure on the consultants for Reader Training and QA lead. Other expenditure for course materials, residential training and expenses are very limited and are offset by request of Parishes to provide £500 per year to their readers in training for books, and other expenses and a contribution of approximately £100 per residential session to defray costs.

316. The DBF is in conversation with deanery and parish officers on a new 3 year budget for the years 2014-16. This budget includes the Department for Discipleship and Ministry which itself covers the Reader Training course.

*M.iii There should be an effective risk assessment, review and management process, which should include physical (e.g. health & safety and fire), financial, business and reputational risks.*

317. In March 2013 the Diocese established a full review of the Departmental Risk Register identifying potential risks, their impact and likelihood and mitigating actions that lead to a residual risk status. The Diocesan wide assessment covers reputational, business, financial and health and safety risks in some depth. The Discipleship and Ministry department risk analysis covers the possibility of reducing numbers coming forward to training for Reader roles (medium risk); for CMD failing to meet needs of lay ministers (medium risk); for the possibility of failing inspection or QIF requirements (low risk). This is an effective risk management strategy.

<b>Winchester: The inspection team has Confidence with regard to Criterion M, Business planning and risk management.</b>
--

## **N Financial policies**

*Inspectors will consider the effectiveness of day-to-day operating processes:*

### **SCRTP**

318. Operational processes under Section N are mainly the responsibility of the individual courses or dioceses. Management accounts showing

performance against budget are regularly considered at the SCRTP Board's meetings. Income is via subscription and meets planned expenditure needs.

## **Guildford**

*N.i The institution should have policies to control and manage investments, expenditure and borrowing, and the annual report and accounts should contain an appropriate reserves policy.*

319. The Diocesan Director of Finance confirms that the DBF has standing Financial Instructions which incorporate schemes of delegation and financial approval limits, and the DBF annual report has detail of the free reserves policy.

*N.ii Management accounts showing performance against budget should be produced at least quarterly and reviewed regularly by the trustees.*

320. The Directors of Finance of the Dioceses agree an annual budget with the Lead Officers who have responsibility for managing the budget.

*N.iii The institution should consider its sources of income and have strategies to identify and raise the funds it needs.*

321. The Diocesan Partners have such strategies and the lay ministry teams engage strongly with Parishes to ensure they support their sponsored lay ministers in training.

*N.iv The institution should have adequate financial controls aimed at minimising waste and loss, and should be appropriately advised on tax-efficiency.*

322. Financial controls are well documented in Diocesan Standing Financial Instructions and Audit processes confirm these are applied appropriately.

<b>Guildford: The inspection team has Confidence with regard to Criterion N, Financial policies.</b>
--

## **Oxford**

*N.i The institution should have policies to control and manage investments, expenditure and borrowing, and the annual report and accounts should contain an appropriate reserves policy.*

323. The Diocesan Director of Finance confirms that the DBF has standing Financial Instructions which incorporate schemes of delegation and

- financial approval limits and the DBF annual report has detail of the free reserves policy.
- N.ii Management accounts showing performance against budget should be produced at least quarterly and reviewed regularly by the trustees.*
324. The Directors of Finance of the Dioceses agree an annual budget with the Lead Officers who have responsibility for managing the budget.
- N.iii The institution should consider its sources of income and have strategies to identify and raise the funds it needs.*
325. The Diocesan Partners have such strategies and the lay ministry teams engage strongly with Parishes to ensure they support their sponsored lay ministers in training.
- N.iv The institution should have adequate financial controls aimed at minimising waste and loss, and should be appropriately advised on tax-efficiency.*
326. Financial controls are well documented in Diocesan Standing Financial Instructions and Audit processes confirm these are applied appropriately.

**Oxford: The inspection team has Confidence with regard to Criterion N, Financial policies.**

### **Salisbury**

- N.i The institution should have policies to control and manage investments, expenditure and borrowing, and the annual report and accounts should contain an appropriate reserves policy.*
327. The Diocesan Director of Finance confirms that the DBF has standing Financial Instructions which incorporate schemes of delegation and financial approval limits and the DBF annual report has detail of the free reserves policy. Accounts are managed through Sarum College administrators and a reserves policy is not considered necessary.
- N.ii Management accounts showing performance against budget should be produced at least quarterly and reviewed regularly by the trustees.*
328. The Directors of Finance/Diocesan Accountant for the Dioceses of Winchester and Salisbury agree an annual budget with the Lead Officer, who has responsibility for managing the limited sums available to spend. A set of 2013 management accounts were seen and give detail of the sums

budgeted and spent on the Reader Ministry part of the wider departments. Expenditure is regularly reviewed by the DBF and Lead Officer.

*N.iii The institution should consider its sources of income and have strategies to identify and raise the funds it needs.*

329. The Dioceses have such strategies and the Reader Team engages strongly with Parishes to ensure they support their sponsored Readers in training.

*N.iv The institution should have adequate financial controls aimed at minimising waste and loss, and should be appropriately advised on tax-efficiency.*

330. Financial controls are well documented in Diocesan Standing Financial Instructions and Audit processes confirm these are applied appropriately. As the accounts are managed through Sarum College the policies of that institution apply and were not investigated as part of the inspection.

<b>Salisbury: The inspection team has Confidence with regard to Criterion N, Financial policies.</b>
--

### **Winchester**

*N.i The institution should have policies to control and manage investments, expenditure and borrowing, and the annual report and accounts should contain an appropriate reserves policy.*

331. The Diocesan Director of Finance confirms that the DBF has standing Financial Instructions which incorporate schemes of delegation and financial approval limits and the DBF annual report has detail of the free reserves policy.

*N.ii Management accounts showing performance against budget should be produced at least quarterly and reviewed regularly by the trustees.*

332. The Directors of Finance / Diocesan Accountant for the Dioceses of Winchester and Salisbury agree an annual budget with the Lead Officer, who has responsibility for managing the limited sums available to spend. A set of 2013 management accounts were seen and give detail of the sums budgeted and spent on the Reader Ministry part of the wider departments. Expenditure is regularly reviewed by the DBF and Lead Officer.

*N.iii The institution should consider its sources of income and have strategies to identify and raise the funds it needs.*

333. The Dioceses have such strategies and the Reader Team engages strongly with Parishes to ensure they support their sponsored Readers in training.

*N.iv The institution should have adequate financial controls aimed at minimising waste and loss, and should be appropriately advised on tax-efficiency.*

334. Financial controls are well documented in Diocesan Standing Financial Instructions and Audit processes confirm these are applied appropriately.

**Winchester: The inspection team has Confidence with regard to Criterion N, Financial policies.**

**O Statutory and operating policies**

*O.i Proper books of account should be kept, with computerised data regularly backed up and stored offsite.*

335. The Guildford and Oxford courses do not operate their own bank accounts, but all financial transactions are carried out by the diocese.

336. For the Guildford scheme, all requests for purchase are subject to the Control of the Diocesan Board of Finance, and require the signatures of two members of the core staff

337. For Oxford, all requests for purchase are subject to the control of the diocesan Board of Finance. Staff have limits to the level of expenditure each can authorise: The Director of Local Ministry Training (£10,000), his administrator (£500), the Deputy Warden of LLM (£1,000) and his administrator (£200). Any larger amounts require the signature of the Director of Mission or his deputy.

338. Similarly, the Salisbury and Winchester Finance Director/ Diocesan Accountant confirms proper accounts are kept by the DBF team in accordance with Companies Act and Charities Act and inspectors have been assured back ups are taken daily and stored off site.

*O.ii Bank mandates should be up to date, with appropriate authority levels.*

339. The Finance Directors/Diocesan Accountants confirms Bank Mandates are kept up to date by the DBF team and inspectors have been assured two people from the mandate sign off payments.

**Guildford, Oxford, Salisbury, Winchester: The inspection team has Confidence with regard to Criterion O Statutory and operating policies.**

## **P Accommodation**

### **SCRTP**

340. The LLM course is non-residential except for training weekends and as such does not provide housing for staff or students. We comment below on the diocesan schemes' teaching and public accommodation.

### **Guildford**

*P.i The i) public, ii) teaching and iii) provided private living accommodation should be fit for purpose and suited to students' needs.*

341. The course uses Christ's College, Guildford for its teaching evenings and St Columba's House, Woking for its residential weekends. Both provide adequate rooms for teaching with appropriate audio-visual equipment; both have suitable chapels for worship; and St Columba's provides a very high standard of accommodation and catering. St Columba's is not able to accommodate all three years of the course at one time, however, and the staff are also aware that it may not be the most economical choice of venue. Although there may be other reasons than financial for wanting to maintain the connection with this venue, alternatives are being, and need to be, explored (see also para 36).

*P.ii There should be adequate provision for the needs of disabled students.*

342. Provision for the needs of students with disabilities appeared adequate.

<b>Guildford: The inspection team has Confidence with regard to Criterion P, Accommodation.</b>
---

### **Oxford**

*P.i The i) public, ii) teaching and iii) provided private living accommodation should be fit for purpose and suited to students' needs.*

343. The course uses various locations for teaching and Ripon College, Cuddesdon for residential weekends. These seem entirely fit for purpose.

*P.ii There should be adequate provision for the needs of disabled students.*

344. There seemed to be adequate provision for the needs of students with disabilities.

**Oxford: The inspection team has Confidence with regard to Criterion P, Accommodation.**

**Salisbury**

*P.i The i) public, ii) teaching and iii) provided private living accommodation should be fit for purpose and suited to students' needs.*

345. The LLM course is non-residential except for training weekends and as such does not provide housing for staff or students. Teaching occurs in seven centres around the Diocese and accommodation varies from the challenges of the Grade 1 listed Church House to the outstanding Diocesan Education Centre opened in 2012. Sarum College is used for residential events and has recently upgraded its residential accommodation. This accommodation was praised by students on the June residential weekend. Inspectors observed highly effective teaching spaces in Sarum College, with good AV facility, induction loops and comfortable seating. Social facilities with a common room and good dining space are appreciated by students. The Chapel in Sarum College is an appropriate space for the numbers on the residential weekend and access to Salisbury Cathedral a great asset to the course.

*P.ii There should be adequate provision for the needs of disabled students.*

346. While Church House has limited disabled access to certain areas, the spaces that students need to access for administrative purposes or meetings with tutors are fully wheelchair accessible. The disabled WC access is being upgraded this year.

347. Sarum College and the Diocesan Education Centre have full disabled access and students report no accessibility issues in other centres where they meet.

**Salisbury: The inspection team has Confidence with regard to Criterion P, Accommodation.**

**Winchester**

*P.i The i) public, ii) teaching and iii) provided private living accommodation should be fit for purpose and suited to students' needs.*

348. The main teaching space in Old Alresford Place has good accommodation for teaching, social and residential functions (see also **Recommendation**

- 23 above). Two teaching rooms with AV equipment are good-sized spaces and flexible in use. For the model of working when one year group at a time meets for residential there are several breakout rooms to facilitate small group work. Study bedrooms are well equipped and allow 16 to stay overnight which is sufficient for current course numbers. The Chapel has limitations on numbers and cannot meet the needs of a full residential course when one of the teaching rooms is used for worship.
349. The three tutors' homes used as teaching bases and visited by inspectors provide appropriate accommodation for the teaching.
- P.ii There should be adequate provision for the needs of disabled students.*
350. There is good disabled access to study bedrooms on the ground floor and to teaching spaces in Old Alresford Place. A deaf student on a recent course was fully supported by a signing tutor demonstrating the inclusion policy applied in practice.

**Winchester: The inspection team has Confidence with regard to Criterion P, Accommodation.**

## **CONCLUSION**

We are very impressed by the way SCRTP has developed and for its midwife role in the birth of the Local Ministry Framework Project Group. SCRTP and the LMF have, between them, created a sense of bonding and purpose which is very strong, influential and creative for the staff of the different diocesan projects who are brought together under its umbrella. SCRTP demonstrated these qualities in an impressive way during the period of our inspection as staff engaged with the demanding task of being involved in the emergence of Common Awards with a strength and cohesion which would have almost certainly been impossible if they were four separate units. Through the staff SCRTP impacts on the students, though in the main they know little (and need to know little) about it.

We are also impressed by the professionalism of the participating dioceses. The students had a commitment to their training and a vision for their future ministry which was very encouraging. The mismatch between their vision and the reality of the low expectations of their role in many parishes and benefices was very sobering (see also para 47). It was students who in various ways, sometimes very openly in plenary discussion, made us very aware of the issue and the pain and frustration it caused them. We felt acutely the need for local churches to enlarge their ministry vision. At the same time we saw encouraging signs that re-

envisioning is beginning to happen. Oxford in particular have made considerable strides in pioneering what appears to us to be a relevant and contemporary understanding of ministry and of Ministry Teams. Parish Development Advisers (and those with similar roles but different titles) are beginning to make an impact in the dioceses and on the development of Ministry Teams. These Teams are often the catalyst for new creative local vision and this of course makes the role of those who train for local ministry even more important.

Our Report makes clear, however, the distance that still has to be travelled. It was put to us frequently by those involved in governance, by staff and by students that a clericalist, hierarchical, dependency model is still powerful. It is not easy for those destined for local ministry, students often told us, to be regarded as near the bottom of the tree. That is an obvious area for continued diocesan attention if the best strategic use is to be made of its high-quality candidates and the investment the Church is making in their formation for ministry.

We do not need to rehearse our recommendations in detail as they are listed immediately below (some of them broad sweep for SCRTP and some of them very specific to the participating dioceses). We would underline that the focus on mission needs to be much more obvious. SCRTP will have a key role in carrying through some of these recommendations and in enabling and encouraging others.

We encourage it to continue to ask the difficult questions so that, in the words of its Foundation document, it 'progresses ... as individual initiatives come to the fore'. It will need to be very imaginative in discovering, responding and enabling these individual initiatives. CMS is a member of its Board. It has developed specialist courses for 'pioneers', both lay and ordained. The Board meeting we attended agreed to put £10,000 per annum for the next three years into financing the Pioneer Hub Facilitator. This is a creative and welcome step. There remains however a gap between creative ideas and their delivery. For example the Oxford LMP has an imaginative 'Ordained Pioneer Training' track. But nobody has, as yet, followed it!

In this connection we became aware of many fundamental strategy questions during our Inspection. How, to mention three, can the providers recruit people with a much lower age-profile? How can they appeal to a much wider churchmanship spread? How can they meet the desire of people in some churches who have no thought of becoming licensed local ministers to understand the Christian faith and its relevance better? SCRTP and the participating dioceses are grappling with some of these questions and we were

made aware of, to take one example, the Aldhelm Certificate – a creative and successful initiative to enable the Christians in the Salisbury Diocese to become ‘a community of learning’.

In relation to the wider churchmanship question students either from large evangelical churches or from markedly Anglo-Catholic churches were not much in evidence. In this connection there may be things to be learned from what is happening elsewhere. The YRTP, to take one example from this country, is part of the enabling process for some of the larger evangelical churches in the Yorkshire area to develop a consortium for ministry training.

In relation to meeting the needs of churches the participating dioceses increasingly encourage ‘interested learners’ to take discrete courses (often 10 weeks). From the evidence we heard and saw this was having very positive outcomes including not infrequently leading to the fostering of local licensed ministry vocations.

Such creative flexibility to the opportunities for ministry and the new needs for training, amid both the fresh expressions of church and the much more traditional expressions in this Region is a hard ask. Ultimately, however, local ministry training is about the local church. As Rowan Williams put it, the question to churches is this: ‘Is this a place and a community where people are expecting the Risen Jesus to be tangibly at work and the Holy Spirit making a difference? Is this a place and a community where people can begin to see that what makes the Church what it is and holds it together is the sheer strength of God’s promise and invitation through the living Jesus?’ Local ministry is vital to creating the sort of vibrant, Christian community that Lord Williams points to and that should in turn lead to new vocations and ministries. That is why what SCRTP is doing is so important.

Our overall conclusions from this inspection are that SCRTP is providing training for local ministry in which the wider Church can have confidence. There are of course many qualifications as the number of recommendations makes very clear. They represent a significant challenge, but the Inspection convinced us not only about the quality of the training and the students but that local ministry is a central dimension of the Church’s life and growth.

**Overall outcome: The inspection team has Confidence with qualifications in the *South Central Regional Training Partnership* for preparing candidates for ordained and licensed ministry.**

**Overall outcome: The inspection team has Confidence with qualifications in the *Guildford Local Ministry Training Programme* for preparing candidates for ordained and licensed ministry.**

**Overall outcome: The inspection team has Confidence in the *Oxford Local Ministry Training Programme* for preparing candidates for ordained and licensed ministry.**

**Overall outcome: The inspection team has Confidence with qualifications in the *Salisbury Licensed Lay Ministry Training Programme* for licensed ministry.**

**Overall outcome: The inspection team has Confidence with qualifications in the *Winchester Licensed Lay Ministry Training Programme* for preparing candidates for licensed ministry.**

## LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS

### Recommendation 1

*[SCRTP 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.

### Recommendation 2

*[SCRTP and participating dioceses]*

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

### 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.

### 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
- agree how a local TEI for Durham University is to be established.

### 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.

**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.**

**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.**

**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.**

**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.**

**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.**

**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.**

**Recommendation 12**

*[Winchester]*

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

**Recommendation 13**

*[SCRTP and participating dioceses]*

**We recommend that the students are sign-posted clearly and easily to the Course's policies.**

**Recommendation 14** *[SCRTP and participating dioceses]*

**We recommend that there is both DBS clearance and safeguarding training at the beginning of the course.**

**Recommendation 15** *[Guildford]*

**We recommend that the logistic of having all three year groups for the residential weekends are re-examined.**

**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.**

**Recommendation 17** *[Salisbury and Winchester]*

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

**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.**

**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.**

**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.**

**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.

**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.**

**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.**

**Recommendation 24 *[Winchester]***

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

**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.**

**Recommendation 26 *[Guildford]***

**We recommend that consideration be given to making the Course's Old Testament teaching more widely available through video or podcast**

**Recommendation 27 [see also Recommendation 33] *[Guildford & Oxford]***

**We recommend that those who appraise the visiting tutors check that tutors are pitching the level appropriately and with sufficient academic rigour.**

**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.**

**Recommendation 29 *[Salisbury]***

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

**Recommendation 30** *[Salisbury]*

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

**Recommendation 31** *[SCRTP and participating dioceses]*

**We recommend that all teaching staff have formal employment contracts.**

**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.**

**Recommendation 33** *[SCRTP and participating dioceses]*

**We recommend that formal arrangements for regular staff appraisal and development be adopted and implemented.**

**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.**

**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)**

**Recommendation 36** *[Oxford]*

**We recommend that the level of administrative support be reviewed.**

**Recommendation 37** *[Salisbury and Winchester]*

**We recommend a careful process for the selection of tutors.**

**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.**

**Recommendation 39** *[Winchester]*

**We recommend that all Job Descriptions detail expectations regarding a post holder's involvement in corporate worship**

**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**

**Recommendation 41** *[Winchester]*

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

**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**

**Recommendation 43** *[Winchester]*

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

**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.**

**Recommendation 45** *[Guildford]*

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

**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.**

**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**

**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.**

**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).**