

Ministry Council: Periodic External Review Report

Lindisfarne Regional Training Partnership

January – February 2018

Published 2018 by the Ministry Division of the Archbishops' Council
Copyright © The Archbishops' Council 2018

Church House, Great Smith Street, London SW1P 3AZ

Switchboard: +44(0)20 7898 1000 Email: ministry@churchofengland.org Website: www.churchofengland.org

The Archbishops' Council of the Church of England is a registered charity

CONTENTS

GLOSSARY.....	3
LIST OF REVIEWERS.....	4
PERIODIC EXTERNAL REVIEW FRAMEWORK.....	5
SUMMARY.....	7
FULL REPORT.....	11
SECTION A: FORMATIONAL AIMS.....	11
SECTION B: FORMATIONAL CONTEXT.....	14
SECTION C: LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT.....	19
SECTION D: STUDENT OUTCOMES.....	23
SECTION E: PARTNERSHIP WITH UNIVERSITY.....	31
SECTION F: TAUGHT PROGRAMMES.....	42
CONCLUSION.....	45
LIST OF COMMENDATIONS.....	46
LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS.....	47

GLOSSARY

ASE	Annual Self-Evaluation
BAP	Bishops' advisory panel
BCP	Book of Common Prayer
CASS	Common Awards Student Survey
CCPAS	Churches' Child Protection Advisory Service
DBS	Disclosure and Barring Service
DULTA	Durham University Learning and Teaching Award
DUSSD	Durham University Service for Students with Disabilities
FTE	Full time equivalent
IME1	Initial Ministerial Education, pre-ordination phase
IME2	Initial Ministerial Education, post-ordination phase
LRTP	Lindisfarne Regional Training Partnership
Moodle	Virtual learning environment
NERRC	North East Religious Resources Centre
PER	Periodic External Review
SED	Self-evaluation document
TEI	Theological Education Institution
ULO	University Liaison Officer
VLE	Virtual Learning Environment

LIST OF REVIEWERS

For Ministry Division

Revd Professor Jane de Gay, Senior Reviewer, Professor in English Literature, Leeds Trinity University, and Associate Priest, St Martin's Potternewton, Leeds.

Revd Alan Brown, former Senior Lecturer and Head of Postgraduate Studies, School of Health, Leeds University. Currently, Permission to Officiate, dioceses of Leeds and York.

Canon Christine McMullen, former Vice-Principal of the Yorkshire Ministry Course, Tutor on the Derby Diocese Reader training course, Reader, and Chair of Derby Diocesan House of Laity.

Revd Canon Alwyn Pettersen, Canon Theologian at Worcester Cathedral.

For Durham University's Common Awards team

Professor Mike Higton, Professor of Theology & Ministry, Durham University.

Revd Canon Alwyn Pettersen, Canon Theologian at Worcester Cathedral.

Miss Alyson Bird, Quality Assurance Manager, Common Awards, Durham University.

THE PERIODIC EXTERNAL REVIEW FRAMEWORK

For ministerial training institutions that offer the church's Durham University-validated Common Awards programmes (as most do), Periodic External Review is a joint process that meets the quality assurance needs both of the sponsoring churches and of Durham University, and enables the church to conduct an external quality check of each TEI against national standards and expectations for ministerial training and formation.

On behalf of the sponsoring churches, review 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.

For Durham University, the PER process is the university's mechanism for gathering and evaluating information from multiple sources in order to inform decision-making on: (i) renewal of the Common Awards partnerships with approved Theological Education Institutions (TEIs); (ii) revalidation of Common Awards programmes that have been approved for delivery within TEIs.

Review teams are appointed both by Ministry Division from a pool of reviewers nominated by bishops and TEIs and by Durham University's Common Awards office. The latter will take lead responsibility for PER criteria E and F covering teaching and learning infrastructure and delivery. In effect, this part of the review represents academic revalidation by Durham as the church's partner university, but will also include comment on wider formational matters where appropriate. Evidence-gathering is shared and judgements are owned by the review team as a whole.

Recommendations and Commendations

PER reports will include Recommendations which may either be developmental, naming issues that the reviewers consider the TEI needs to address, or they may urge the enhancement of practice that is already good. They will also include Commendations, naming instances of good practice that the reviewers specially wish to highlight. The reviewers' assessment of the TEI is expressed as much through the balance of Recommendations and Commendations in their report as through its criterion-based judgements.

Criteria-based judgements

Reviewers are asked to use the following outcomes with regard to the overall report and individual criteria A-F. Throughout, the outcome judgements will be those of the Ministry Division-appointed reviewers, as university validation does not apply a similar framework; but in respect of sections E and F those judgements will be especially informed by the views, recommendations and commendations of the Durham-appointed reviewers in the case of TEI offering Common Awards programmes:

Confidence

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

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

Confidence with qualifications

Overall outcome: likely to include commendations as well as a number of recommendations, including one or more of substance that questions the generally acceptable standards found in the review and which can be rectified or substantially addressed by the institution in the coming 12 months.

Criterion 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 review and the capacity of the institution to rectify or substantially address these in the coming 12 months.

Criterion 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.

In respect of Sections E–F, university validation does not currently apply a hierarchy of quality judgements. Instead, the practice is to grant continuing approval subject to the fulfilment of conditions expressed in the reviewers' recommendations. Thus, where Common Awards programmes are part of the PER, the reviewers' shared judgements under these two sections will normally be expressed as 'Confidence, subject to the implementation of the recommendations in this section'.

The Common Awards team's findings will be part of the joint PER report, but will also be included in a stand-alone report prepared for the university's governance bodies, and which can be made available to the TEI under review if wished.

*For training institutions that do **not** offer the Durham-validated Common Awards programmes, PER will be undertaken entirely by Ministry Division-appointed reviewers, applying criteria A-F but with appropriate adaptation in the case of E and F. Some diocesan Reader training schemes, for example, will fall into this category.*

REPORT OF THE PERIODIC EXTERNAL REVIEW OF THE LINDISFARNE REGIONAL TRAINING PARTNERSHIP

January - February 2018

SUMMARY

Introduction

The Lindisfarne Regional Training Partnership (LRTP) provides training for Ordinands and Readers from the Dioceses of Durham and Newcastle, alongside a range of training courses for lay ministries including Authorized Funeral Ministers, and study opportunities for independent students and those exploring their vocations. LRTP was established in 2009 and for its first 7 years it operated as a charity run by the dioceses; since 2017 it has operated as a registered charity and an independent company limited by guarantee, run by a Board of members but no shareholders.

The current arrangement arose from a comprehensive review of LRTP in 2016/2017, which was conducted by external consultants, primarily in response to changes in the external environment, including a reduction in ecumenical training for ministry and the emerging Renewal and Reform programme of the Church of England. The review concluded that whilst the achievements of LRTP had been significant, the existing provision from the LRTP no longer met the needs of the dioceses. LRTP therefore entered a tendering process, the commissioning document being set out by the Newcastle and Durham dioceses, assisted by Social Enterprises ACUMEN, a third-party organisation which was also instrumental in the 2016/17 review. LRTP secured the continuing responsibility for theological ministry and training, and as a result, the existing partnership (which saw LRTP effectively working as a third arm of the dioceses of Durham and Newcastle), was dissolved and LRTP re-engaged as an independent provider of theological and ministerial training and Christian education in the region. The LRTP became an independent company and a registered charity, as evidenced by Articles of Association adopted on 25th May, 2017, within which the roles and responsibilities of trustees/directors are set out alongside the objects of the charity, meeting procedures etc. and the previous partnership between the dioceses was dissolved.

This Ministry Division Review Visit has therefore taken place during a period of transition. The individual contracts between the dioceses of Newcastle and Durham and LRTP, together with a joint diocesan statement, have not yet been signed. Members of the previous LRTP Board had a direct responsibility to their overseeing dioceses/ecumenical partners. A significant number of members of the previous LRTP Board have transferred to the new LRTP governing body, known as the Board, but this body is adjusting to the new institution's operating status.

Programme structure

LRTP students are registered for the Durham University Certificate or Diploma or Bachelor of Arts in Theology, Ministry and Mission (BATMM), taking modules delivered by LRTP core staff and 17 Associate

Lecturers. Currently, the normal expectation is that candidates will complete the diploma over three years before ordination as deacon or licensing as reader.

The programme aims to develop Knowledge and Understanding; Spiritual and Ministerial Formation; and Ministerial Skills. The training takes place in several contexts: in modules where readers-in-training, ordinands and independent students study side-by-side; through ongoing reflection with a mentor, about life, home, work and local and wider church issues; in specific areas of work with a supervisor, normally in the students' home parish (a project described as Fieldwork); in placement settings (the Placement); and (for ordinands) during residential periods, including weekend courses and a week-long annual Easter School, currently a three-year cycle of visits to Auschwitz, Corrymeela Community and the Holy Land.

The Review

The Ministry Division Review took place primarily in a four-day visit encompassing an Ordinand Residential Weekend at the Emmaus Village, Consett (the regular venue for weekend courses) from Friday 12 January to Sunday 14 January 2018, and a day at the Newcastle Diocesan Office, North Shields on Monday 15 January, during which we observed a meeting of the Board of Trustees and two evening classes. Over the course of the visit, we conducted interviews with the Dean, the Senior Formational Tutor, the newly appointed Executive Lead, the Transition Manager, the Senior/Academic Administrator, the Chaplains, students, graduates, associate tutors, personal tutors, incumbents and placement supervisors. We also had the opportunity to learn more about the student experience and staff perceptions through informal conversations. At Diocesan level, we interviewed the Vocations Advisor for Durham; the Director of Mission Discipleship and Ministry for Durham; and the Director of Discipleship and Ministry for Mission for Newcastle; as well as all the Diocesan Bishops: the Bishop of Durham (by phone) and the Bishop of Jarrow (by phone) who is Warden of Readers for Durham; and the Bishop of Newcastle (by phone) and the Bishop of Berwick who is Warden of Readers for Newcastle. We also received written comments collected from key stakeholders by Ministry Division, including comments from the External Quality Advisor.

We were also supplied with a set of documents for the course, including: the Student Handbook for 2017-18; the respective handbooks for the Ministerial Formation Portfolios for Ordinands and Readers; validation documents for existing awards and pathways, programmes and modules; governing documents, including the Articles of Association; the audited annual report and financial statement; the provisional business plan; the risk register and action plan; an organization chart and a summary of staff CVs. We were given access to the Lindisfarne Moodle virtual learning environment (known as Courseway), which includes module handbooks and other learning and teaching materials. We are grateful to the Dean and his colleagues for their help with the visit, including their generosity with their time.

At the time of the review, there were a total of 47 ministerial students on the programme: 17 ordinands and 30 readers-in-training. Of these, 8 ordinands were in their first year (1 from Durham and 7 from Newcastle) and 13 readers-in-training were in their first year (6 from Durham and 7 from Newcastle).

The Ministry Division visit was followed by a meeting on 8th February 2018 at Durham University between Durham University and the Ministry Division team, represented by Revd Canon Alvyn Pettersen. This meeting focused on PER Criteria E and F: Partnership with the University and Taught Programmes. This meeting considered documentary evidence: a Self-Evaluation Document; programme regulations; module overview tables; curriculum mapping documents; external examiner reports (which had not been available at the time of the Ministry Division visit); annual self evaluation reports; statistical data; previous validation and

inspection reports; committee minutes. The review team also had access to the Common Awards framework and documents, including: the core regulations for the Common Awards programmes; programme specifications; module outlines; assessment criteria; assessment guidance documents; contact hours parameters; the Common Awards TEI Handbook; the Guide for PER Reviewers Appointed by Durham University; the Guide for PER Reviewers Appointed by Durham University (incorporating the PER Criteria that were developed in conjunction with the Church of England). Unlike the Ministry Division reviewers, the Durham University reviewers did not undertake site visits, but they held a series of meetings at the University with key members of senior management staff, teaching staff, administrative staff, and students and student representatives from the TEI. The meetings took place at Cuthbert House, Stonebridge Lane, Durham. In each meeting, the team explored key areas of enquiry that had been identified during a pre-meeting that was held at Durham University on 23rd January 2018.

Summary of outcomes

The Report is written in relation to the PER Criteria outlined in the September 2016 edition of the *Quality Assurance and Enhancement in Ministerial Formation Handbook*.

CRITERIA	OUTCOME
A Formational aims	Confidence with qualifications
B Formational context	Confidence with qualifications
C Leadership and management	Confidence with qualifications
D Student outcomes	Confidence
E Partnership with university	Confidence, subject to recommendations
F Taught programmes	Confidence, subject to recommendations
Overall Outcome	Confidence with qualifications

General Observations

The Report is written in relation to the PER Criteria outlined in the September 2017 edition of the *Quality Assurance and Enhancement in Ministerial Formation Handbook*.

STRENGTHS

- The strong community spirit, rooted in prayer and nurtured by fellowship, that underpins respectful working relationships and mutual support between staff and students.
- The strong pastoral care for students, including care with the choice of placements and help with discerning vocations
- The detailed and structured learning materials for modules
- Empathic quality of feedback and report writing
- The quality of engagement in debate and discussion, students' willingness to listen and to share in theological reflection
- The provision of a week-long annual Easter School for ordinands

AREAS FOR ATTENTION

- Financial security and risk management
- The constitution of the Board needs to be reviewed, particularly in order to include student representation at Board level
- There needs to be clarity about roles and responsibilities among staff and Board members
- Policies need to be up-to-date and easily accessible, particularly with regard to safeguarding
- There needs to be greater inclusion of BCP, especially Holy Communion
- Staff workload needs to be kept under review
- Improved public-facing communication

FULL REPORT

SECTION A: FORMATIONAL AIMS

A1 The TEI's formational aims are clearly stated, understood and owned within the TEI.

1. The formational aims of the programme are clearly stated in the Student Handbook, as follows:

To provide a framework for coherent and integrated training in support of the whole people of God in the Dioceses of Durham and Newcastle and equivalent regions in Partner Churches.

Objectives

- 1. To provide training for public ministry within the context of the Churches' mission and ministry.*
 - 2. To further students' personal and spiritual growth and their understanding of mission in the world today in the light of the Bible, Christian traditions and the world's agenda.*
 - 3. To train students for an effective ministry of word and sacrament.*
 - 4. To help students to train and minister in collaboration with others.*
 - 5. To motivate students to undertake lifelong learning, provide them with the necessary skills to continue their own learning and point them towards further resources for personal and ministerial development.*
2. LRTP have also produced a Formational Scene-Setting Overview and SWOT analysis to set particular targets for the next five years in order to fulfil these aims.
 3. From our meetings with current students and graduates, core staff, associate tutors, placements tutors, and incumbents, it was clear that these aims were communicated to them all, and were understood and owned by them all. The Diocesan and Suffragan Bishops also spoke of how they valued LRTP for its contribution to training of candidates for public ministry and for specific missional contexts, including self-supporting and local ministries. The Diocesan Bishops described LRTP as 'vital' and 'really key' to the dioceses.
 4. We noted that, in terms of communicating aims to a wider audience, the LRTP's website is still a work-in-progress, as there is little information publicly available on the distinctive nature of the programme. Development of public-facing information and publicity is in the remit of the recently appointed Executive Lead. We recommend that urgent attention is paid to this matter.

Recommendation 1

We recommend that the LRTP develop public-facing material as a matter of urgency, in order to articulate the distinctive features of the programme for a wider audience.

A2 The TEI's foundational aims are appropriate to the ministerial training requirements of its sponsoring churches.

5. The Ministerial Portfolio Handbook for Readers-in-Training and the Ministerial Portfolio Handbook for Ordinands demonstrate that the training has been closely mapped on the Formation for Ministry Criteria published by the Church of England. However, we noted from reading students' work that more work needs to be done to help students engage closely with these criteria, both analytically and critically (see Recommendation 23). We also established in interviews and from reading written testimonies from the key stakeholders that they saw LRTP as providing appropriate training that suits the needs of the wider church: these stakeholders included the Diocesan and Suffragan Bishops from both dioceses, the Vocations Strategy and Development Advisor for Durham, and the Directors of Mission and Ministry for both dioceses. The IME2 Director for both dioceses commented that 'LRTP has developed real expertise in the delivery of ordained and lay training, especially for those who are studying part-time. ... LRTP's core work has been delivery of IMEI modules that meet rigorous academic standards as well as being consciously geared towards ministerial training.'
6. The LRTP has undergone regular reviews, most recently in 2016/17, resulting in the formation of LRTP as an independent company, as noted above. The programmes of study are also currently undergoing revalidation, including a proposal to change the normal period of study from three to two years for ordinands, keeping the Reader training at three years. Whilst the validation documents demonstrate that it is possible to deliver taught courses within this time-period (see Paragraph 153 below), we note that the two-year period may not provide adequate formational opportunities for some ordinands, such as younger candidates or those with limited practical experience of ministry. We therefore recommend that the LRTP establishes gives due consideration to clarifying priorities for the revalidated programme, especially intended audiences for 3-year and 2-year pathways.

Recommendation 2

We recommend that LRTP give due consideration to clarifying priorities for the revalidated programme, especially intended audiences for 3-year and 2-year pathways.

A3 The TEI's aims, activity and achievement are understood and supported by wider church audiences.

7. As the above evidence attests, the aims, activities and achievements of LRTP are understood by key stakeholders within the dioceses. From our interviews with incumbents and placement supervisors, it is clear that they value the distinctive contribution of LRTP to training in the area, and also that they are willing to support LRTP by mentoring and training students, and by taking LRTP graduates as curates. For example, an incumbent who has taken a reader-in-training on placement commented that LRTP 'is relevant, well-structured and challenging, developing an appropriate and well-rounded training to ensure that its students are well resourced to continue their ministry.'
8. We noted, however, that although both dioceses see LRTP as fulfilling a vital role within the region, their financial support for the programme under the new contract, commencing from 2018-19, will consist of a per capita payment, with no agreed minimum numbers. As the Diocesan Bishops attested, this is in part due to the dire effect on impoverished dioceses when the Church Commissioners started the withdrawal of the Darlow funding, making money available to any diocese on a competitive Bid system: a system that means that these two dioceses work on a limited budget. As we note in Section C4 below, this arrangement will leave LRTP in an extremely vulnerable position (see Recommendation 19).
9. We also noted from the Board of Trustees, that although the Dean gave a very positive report to the Board for an in-house audience, it was suggested that more could be done to promote successes to a

wider audience, for example by submitting graduation stories to the Diocesan news. The new Executive Lead is tasked with improving external communications, so this situation should improve as she settles in to the role.

10. We noted that women are well-represented among the student body at LRTP and that the Programme encourages and nurtures students from low economic backgrounds: for example, one of the youngest students is a former HGV driver who now works in logistics. We noted that there is a lack of ethnic diversity at present and, although we were told that the dioceses are generally less ethnically diverse than many other parts of the country, we recommend that LRTP find ways to reach out to a wider audience with a view to being more inclusive. We heard that the recently-appointed Vocations Advisor for Durham is planning to involve Lindisfarne students in a vocations event, and we hope that this will help with recruitment and lead to a wider appreciation of the opportunities that LRTP can provide students from non-traditional backgrounds.

Recommendation 3

We recommend that LRTP find ways to reach out to a wider audience with a view to being more inclusive.

The review team has Confidence with Qualifications with regard to Criterion A: Formational Aims.

SECTION B: FORMATIONAL CONTEXT

B1 The TEI draws on partnership with theological educators in the region and local faith and community organisations to enhance training and formational opportunities for students.

11. Presently there is no link between LRTP and Cranmer Hall, the only other TEI in the region, and so there is no sharing of educational and/or ecumenical learning, resources and good practice on an institutional level, although some individual students have opted on a personal level to take extra courses at Cranmer Hall. Were there to be such sharing in the future, welcome though it would be, notice will need to be taken of the asymmetry between LRTP and Cranmer Hall, in terms of in numbers; finance; buildings etc.
12. LRTP relates effectively with local churches of differing traditions, and with institutional ecumenical and multi-faith chaplaincies. Students have undertaken placements in a variety of chaplaincies of this sort, e.g. with NHS and County Durham Police, and help is offered to reflect on their various experiences, so as to widen their experience of the Church of England's breadth of self-understanding, and to learn good ecumenical practice.
13. There are other faith communities in the region, more so in Newcastle than Durham Diocese. LRTP has engaged with interfaith chaplaincies, for example in NHS institutions and at Northumbria University, and with the Mosque in West Newcastle. All students visit the mosque as part of their training, thereby adding the experience of a 'face to face' encounter to learning from taught courses.
14. Placements are also offered in civic and community organisations, such as hospitals, hospices, the Metrocentre, Street Pastors, and, using the skills learned in and through their courses on contextual reflection, are encouraged to reflect on their time there. LRTP does recognise that, in future, there will be a need for ministries working collaboratively with stakeholders outside the Church and we encourage them to develop this.

B2 There are well understood and embedded practices of corporate life, so as to enhance the process of students' formation

15. LRTP has appropriate policies for students regarding Safeguarding; Worship; Respect at Work and Study; Placement and Fieldwork; and Common Awards Admission Complaints. The policies are available on the LRTP website, although they are not easy to find. Not all of these are dated; and only some have review dates.

Recommendation 4

We recommend that the policies for Safeguarding; Worship; Respect at Work and Study; Placement and Fieldwork; and Common Awards Admission Complaints be made easier to find on LRTP's website, and that all policies have dates and review dates.

16. Students are DBS checked at the beginning of their courses, are trained in safeguarding procedures, which are in line with the National Guidelines. From interviews with students, we note that they are aware of whether their DBS certificates are transferable or not, that they can name the Course's Designated Safeguarding Officer, and that they know that when on placement, they are required to know who the Parish Safeguarding Officer is and what the local Safeguarding practices are.

17. The name and contact details for the Course's Designated Safeguarding Officer are published in the Safeguarding Policy, but we note that these appear on the final page. We therefore recommend that these details are given greater prominence, so that it can be found more easily in an emergency.

Recommendation 5

We recommend that the Designated Safeguarding Officer's name and contact details be published on the opening page of the Safeguarding Policy.

18. It is LRTP policy that Safeguarding is an item on the Board of Trustees' agenda. At their meeting on 15.01.18 a Safeguarding item was discussed; but it was not a stated item on the agenda.

Recommendation 6

We recommend that Safeguarding be a stated, fixed item on all Board agendas.

19. That there is currently no student representation on the LRTP Board is treated elsewhere in this Review (see Recommendations 14 and 27). In formational terms, however, it is worth noting that, whatever the reason for this absence, the absence could lead students to conclude that in parishes there may be times when not all voices not being heard is justifiable. The absence of student input to the Board models an unhappy practice.
20. LRTP core staff is very small. It is therefore difficult for it to reflect a diverse age and ethnicity profile. That said, when including visiting lecturers, associate tutors etc., there are men and women, of varying ages, teaching on the course. The majority are, however, male, white and senior.
21. The community is built effectively in residential weekends, through worship, quiz nights, formation groups, etc., Monday evening teaching sessions, placements, and, for the ordinands, at an Easter Residential week. If finances were to tighten, these Residential Weeks would be likely targets for cuts, a consequence of which would be to hurt both the formational and ecumenical formation offered by LRTP. Ordinands undertake six residential weekends per year. Readers in training undertake three residential weekends per year - one in September as part of their orientation at the start of the year, a guided prayer retreat in February/March, and one at the end of the year. The latter is shared with the Ordinands, and enables the whole community to end the year together.
22. People on different ministerial tracks, both ordinands and readers-in-training, and independent learners are well supported by staff, the two chaplains and peers alike; and independent learners are commendably aware, and take seriously the course's 'educational and formational character', cognisant of the fact that they are independent learners on a course centred on training people for authorised ministry in the Church of England. The course's 'educational and formational character' is therefore not 'at risk'; but it is precious and always to be prized and guarded.
23. Ministerial Development Portfolios are integral to the Course and are intended to play a significant role in students' formation, by being an enabling instrument for gaining skills to "interpret wisely 'what is going on' among people and places." (LRTP's Formational Scene Setting Overview). The structure of the portfolios was recently revised (see paragraph 57, below). However, on reading a sample of these portfolios, the reviewers noted that often they contained more narrative and less reflection, and two of the six portfolios, selected from many others by the Dean and offered as reflecting a good spread of worked portfolios, had not completed the 'own thoughts' and 'what you have learned' sections (see Recommendation 23).

24. Not being a residential course, and drawing its students from a very wide catchment area, there is little involvement of spouses and families in the LRTP learning community. That said, spouses and families were invited to the LRTP opening service of this academic year, an invitation which was very well received; and there is evidence that the demands of family life are taken into account when a student's workload is considered.

B3 The provision of public social and private living accommodation is satisfactory [see also E3 for teaching accommodation]

25. Accommodation at the Emmaus Village, Consett, where residential weekends are held is fit for purpose. Disabled access is provided, although the Centre is built on a slope, which could present challenges for a wheelchair-user, and there is no loop system in the chapel. There was use of green and red marker pens during teaching sessions, a challenge for any who may have been colour blind. We therefore recommend that LRTP conducts an audit of facilities and practices to ensure that the requirements for potential students with additional needs are met (see also recommendation 30).

Recommendation 7

We recommend that LRTP conducts an audit of facilities and practices to ensure that the requirements for potential students with additional needs are met.

26. The Chapel at the Consett site and the room used for worship in Church House were adequate for the present number of students, flexible, and so capable of imaginative and creative use, and were furnished with appropriate IT, so as to allow a wide variety of words and images during worship.

27. The accommodation at Consett is rented and learning space at Church House, North Shields, is provided *pro bono* by the Diocese of Newcastle. There is therefore no planning for accommodation development and so no need to find new funding for this particular cost centre. Further, given the satisfactory accommodation, the current and expected student numbers, and the 'free' provision of the space at Church House, North Shields, there is no present review of opportunities to secure alternative space.

B4 The TEI's corporate worship and liturgy are balanced in range and tradition, including authorised and innovative rites.

28. Corporate worship is built into LRTP's life at many levels – residential weekends, teaching evenings, small group gatherings etc. The current guidelines of attendance at the worship which begins the weekly Monday teaching evenings is 'All may; none must'. This is, in part, to take account of the distances which some have to travel and of people's work commitments. In the light of the relative shortness of some people's training, two years, which, in reality, amounts to eighteen months, and the importance of formation of candidates for ministry, ordained and lay, there should, in formation terms, be stronger encouragement to attend corporate prayer.

Recommendation 8

We recommend that the guidelines on attendance at corporate worship at the weekly Monday teaching evenings should be amended to 'all should; none must'.

29. The liturgical rites, for the offices, the Eucharist and pastoral services, used by LRTP are largely according to those of Common Worship. Students of differing theological traditions are respected by their peers, feel at home in the various rites used and traditions reflected in that usage, and take a full

part in the devising and leading services. Services at the more 'innovative' end of the spectrum are well presented and received.

30. During the Spring term when the Review took place, the BCP was being used for evening prayer, and a traditional form of Compline was recited at the Monday evening teaching sessions at Church House, North Shields. We did not have the opportunity to experience BCP Holy Communion during our visit, but it is included in the year's programme. We are glad to see this range of provision, given that BCP rites are still in use in many parishes in the two dioceses, and students will need to be able, after ordination or licensing, to lead BCP worship with confidence and in such a manner as honours those for whom the BCP embodies and nourishes their spirituality.

Commendation I

We commend the use of BCP Evening Prayer within the worshipping life of the community.

31. The worshipping community, both in its worship policy and in practice, is inclusive in terms of tradition and differing theological convictions. Traditional and 'free' worship was evident, as were formal and informal forms of prayer. Men and women lead worship, and acted as deacon, readers, intercessors, communion administrators etc. At present, there is only one ordained member of the core staff, a man. In the past, some students chose not to receive the consecrated elements at the Eucharist when the president was a woman. What the situation would be now, if the president was a woman, is unknown. We therefore recommend that the Course produces a policy for any conscience issues, for both individuals and the course as a whole, if and when the president at the Eucharist is a woman and that the Course considers inviting a woman to preside on occasion.

Recommendation 9

We recommend that the Course produces a policy for any conscience issues, for both individuals and the course as a whole, if and when the president at the Eucharist is a woman.

Recommendation 10

We recommend that the Course considers inviting a woman to preside at the Eucharist on occasion.

B5 Staff model appropriate patterns of spirituality, continued learning and reflection on practice.

32. The interaction between staff and students is open, honest, friendly, respectful and good. Each is able and willing to challenge the other, listen and learn from the other: this is reflected in student feedback, given both at the end of residential weekends and at the end of the year, and demonstrated in the interim and final reports on students. Each respects the other's backgrounds, learning and skills. Learning and authority, though worn lightly, are clearly valued.
33. Since LRTP's winning the recent Bid, the core staff have been under great pressure, fleshing out and delivered the successful bid. Their hours have been very long. A consequence of this is that their pattern of work and wider life and their time for continuing learning, spiritual development and reflection has been very limited. Although LRTP is considering appointing a new member of staff, this may be a challenge given its present financial state of and so it needs to create space for individual members of staff to realise, and so to model, a better balance of work, private life, research and spiritual renewal. For their sake and for the sake of such students as the one whose final pre-licensing

report mentioned that she found it hard to say 'no', the Board of LRTP needs to address the matter of workload. (See also Recommendation 30.)

Recommendation 11

We recommend that the Board of LRTP keeps the workload of the core staff under review, factoring in opportunities for continued learning, research, reflection on practice, and spiritual renewal, as well as ensuring that legal standards for annual leave and rest days are met.

The review team has Confidence with Qualifications with regard to Criterion B: Formational Context.

SECTION C: LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT

CI The TEI has clear and effective management structures.

34. As noted earlier (see Summary above), the Review has taken place during a period of transition for LRTP. As a result of a comprehensive review in 2016/17, LRTP was established as a provider of theological and ministerial training and Christian education in the region, independent of the dioceses of Durham and Newcastle. The LRTP became an independent company and a registered charity, as evidenced by Articles of Association adopted on 25th May, 2017, within which the roles and responsibilities of trustees/directors are set out alongside the objects of the charity, meeting procedures etc. and the previous partnership between the dioceses was dissolved. However, the individual contracts between the dioceses of Newcastle and Durham and LRTP, together with a joint diocesan statement, have yet to be signed.

Recommendation 12

We recommend that the LRTP Directors/Trustees ensure that LRTP are fully conversant with all sections of the commissioning contracts and the joint statement by the two dioceses.

35. Following the formation of the new institution, LRTP's structure was revised. The post of Principal was dissolved, and the responsibilities normally associated with such a post have been divided between the Dean (1 fte) and the Executive Lead (0.6 fte), whose responsibilities include finance, business planning, company and business development and safeguarding.
36. A new Board of Governors was also constituted. Members of the previous LRTP Board had a direct responsibility to their overseeing dioceses/ecumenical partners, but the Board no longer has this direct responsibility. Given that a significant number of members of the previous LRTP Board have transferred to the new LRTP Board, it will be important the members who transferred from the previous Board, reflect the new institution's operating status.
37. The new structure needs time to bed down. New ways of working between the Board and the staff are having to be worked through, given that the new structure is operating on the basis of a shorter line management than previously, with revised line management responsibilities. Similarly, the introduction of the Executive Lead post, with their attendant responsibilities, will mean that the established members of staff will need, on a day to day basis, to keep in mind new divisions of duties. It will be important that the new structure and the new ways of working are carefully monitored, both by the Board and in every day working between the staff, so that each part of the organisation can properly undertake its duties without overlap.

Recommendation 13

We recommend that the Board (governing body) establishes clear roles and responsibilities for governors and staff.

38. It was not the previous LRTP's practice to have the benefit of regular staff and student representation at Board (governing body) meetings, such representation being made at Board of Studies meetings. The new Board may well be missing out here, in that such representation can enable key messages to be heard earlier than might otherwise be the case. (See also Recommendation 27.)

Recommendation 14

That LRTP considers opening up its structures to enable regular staff representation and student input at meetings of the Board (governing body).

C2 The TEI has effective leadership

39. As a consequence of the changes, leadership is also in transition. A temporary Transition Manager, who assisted with the bidding process, is currently assisting LRTP to work through significant issues, assisting with budgeting, risk management and team building. It is envisaged that as the Executive Lead (0.6 fte), who took up the post in January 2018, builds up their organisational knowledge, the Transition Manager's input will reduce.

Recommendation 15

We recommend that the Board fully supports the Executive Lead in taking on the new role, including enabling her in terms of time and capacity to take over the tasks of the Transition Manager.

40. The permanent staffing is somewhat thin. In addition to the Dean (1 fte) and Executive Lead (0.6 fte), there is a Senior Formational Tutor (0.8 fte), who has been made full time for one year, with the addition of Placement Co-ordinator responsibilities (0.2 fte). The Academic Administrator's hours under the new institution have been reduced to 0.61 fte. Given both the changed and slimmed-down nature of the permanent staffing structure, it will be important that the staff team work as efficiently and effectively together, as quickly as possible. This aspiration has been verbalised by all the permanent members of staff, but it may be that it is not easily achieved, due to the split-site methods of working, including two-centre teaching, out of office activity such as placement co-ordination, and working from home.

Recommendation 16

We recommend that the LRTP permanent staff find suitable time to further engender cross-working and team-building in order to fulfil the aspiration of developing positive relationships within the new structure.

41. The Board is currently undertaking a skills audit of its Board members, facilitated by one of its members. This audit is not yet complete; thus far, further needs in marketing, media and public relations skills, have been identified.

Recommendation 17

We recommend that the Board and staff regularly review progress in meeting the aims and objectives of the organisation and identify landmarks for determining confident ways of working in the new setting.

C3 Trustees are appropriately recruited, supported and developed

42. The Chair of the Board was Vice-Chair of the previous governing body. The recently appointed Vice-Chair of the new Board is the only new member of the Board. There is a feeling of a new dawn about the institution, but a working confidence will need to be gained, given the changed designation of staff, a new staff member and changed staff line management responsibilities to individual members of the Board. Given that LRTP is effectively a new institution from its governance, contracting and financial perspectives, it may be useful if the new Board could be mentored in a supportive fashion by an external consultant, or for new Board members to be mentored by an experienced trustee.

Recommendation 18

We recommend that the LRTP considers putting in place a mentoring process for its Board members.

C4 The TEI has effective business planning and fund raising

43. LRTP does not yet have a business plan in place, although this is one of the tasks ear-marked for the new Executive Lead, in association with financial leadership and company and business planning. A SWOT analysis has been undertaken and a risk analysis was agreed at the January 2018 meeting of the Board.
44. LRTP is primarily dependent upon the dioceses of Durham and Newcastle for its income. During the first year of its operation as an independent organisation, transitional funding has been agreed between the dioceses of Durham and Newcastle. From the Year 2018/19, the new contracts arranged with the dioceses will move to a set of per capita payments.
45. The contracts contain annual aspirational proposals for the number of ordinands and lay reader students coming forward on a per capita payment basis. There is a differentiation between ordination and reader student fees. The number of students provided for ordination and reader training, thus far, is variable between the two dioceses. The contracts from 2018/19 onwards do not include either a minimum number of students to be brought forward by each of the dioceses, nor is there any contingency arrangement should the numbers of students aspired to not materialise. It is acknowledged that LRTP proposes to discuss this with each of the dioceses, however, until this matter is properly settled, LRTP is financially standing all the risk. LRTP is clearly held in high regard by the two dioceses; however, discussion between the reviewers and one of the diocesan bishops made clear that it was not for the dioceses to provide funding should LRTP begin to fail financially due to a lack of students. Whilst LRTP holds some reserves, these could well be depleted in the early years of the contract if student numbers are not forthcoming.

Recommendation 19

We recommend that LRTP enters into discussion with its commissioning dioceses as a matter of urgency to ensure that an adequate financial contingency arrangement be put in place should the aspirational numbers of per-capita funded students not materialise.

46. Income is also received from private students. LRTP's web-site does not sell the institution's positive ways of working, range of modules available and high quality pastoral care, related to student education. In order to maintain and perhaps grow this stream of income, then serious attention needs to be given to LRTP's web-site and associated publicity methods (see Recommendation 1).
47. Should other business elements which in turn support possible diocesan developments, such as resource curates, pioneer ministries, be developed by LRTP, there are currently insufficient permanent staff members to undertake new work, without the need to buy others in to support LRTP's current streams of work. It is questionable, therefore, whether new streams of work will shore up particular deficits in mainstream student numbers, should these occur.

Recommendation 20

We recommend that LRTP puts in place a robust and realistic business plan at the earliest opportunity.

C5 The TEI has sound financial and risk management reporting

48. The reviewers were supplied with the management's accounts for the last three financial years. Current financial support is provided by the diocese of Newcastle. LRTP recognises that this is not an appropriate arrangement for the future, given its changed contractual relationships and independent status. In-year financial reporting is taking place during the current financial year and it is hoped that a

balanced budget +/- £5,000 is to be achieved, by the end of the financial year. This is not the current position and the Board will need to work closely with its financial support arm and the Executive Lead, to ensure that a clear financial picture is maintained and that timely financial action is taken.

49. As noted earlier, a detailed risk analysis with likelihood scores for the individual risk elements contained within, has been completed and this was accepted by the Board at its January 2018 Board meeting. Discussion of progress or otherwise, in the neutralisation of risk, is to be a standing item at each of its meetings. It may be helpful, in addition, to have review dates inserted alongside the individual risk elements, to ensure that individual risk items are not overlooked and overall risk is transparent.

Recommendation 21

We recommend that the LRTP Board considers extending its membership to include a member with management accounting expertise, especially during the first phase of the contract to 2021, to ensure that its financial responsibilities are met.

Recommendation 22

We recommend that the LRTP Board considers the inclusion of review dates for particular risk items within its risk register, to ensure that the balance of risk versus the number of items to be monitored becomes more transparent.

50. Given the proposed change to a per-capita student payment system from 2018/19, potential diocesan changes in policy developments relating to reader numbers, recent reductions in the number of people obtaining successful recommendations from BAP experiences in one diocese, LRTP could, in the relatively near future, find itself in a more fragile financial position, than is currently the case, a problem that would not be of its own making. This was acknowledged in various parts of the bid which LRTP made to its commissioning partners and was also acknowledged during various discussions during the course of this Review. Whilst funding mechanisms with per-capita payments are not uncommon, LRTP must cover its fixed costs: staffing, pensions, travel, office rental, financial and human resources support, irrespective of the number of students coming forward, especially in the early part of the contract. Whilst module tutor staffing costs might be seen as variable, the modules will need to run, irrespective of the number of students, therefore, these are also realistically also part of the fixed costs, leaving very few elements as variable costs. Any use of reserves to ensure that current fixed costs are met, may militate against the hoped-for appointment of a further 0.3/0.5 fte tutor, to help reduce the arguably unsustainable workload which the current full-time academic staff are having to deal with; an issue, which in itself, could put the future of LRTP at risk.

The review team has Confidence with Qualifications with regard to Criterion C: Leadership and Management.

SECTION D: STUDENT OUTCOMES

51. We met a committed and motivated staff who have made in-depth changes to the content of the Course in the last 12 months, and have maintained a high-quality student experience in the face of great changes at the institutional level. This was achieved at some personal cost, foregoing time spent on their own academic interests and their leisure time.

Commendation 2

We commend the staff for their loyalty and hard work in facing the challenge of a revised programme and for their positive and hopeful attitude towards the new structure.

D1 Students are growing in their understanding of Christian tradition, faith and life.

52. From our observation of taught sessions during the visit, we noted that students are introduced to topics and ideas from the Christian tradition and that they are encouraged to reflect on how they can apply these to their own lives and ministries. At the residential weekend, we observed some in-depth, engaging and well-delivered teaching about the Cappadocian Fathers and Basil the Great's relevance to contemporary ethical questions. From observing small-group discussions at these sessions, we saw that the students were able to make the connections and see the relevance of this ancient teaching to their life today. We also observed an evening class on Augustinian doctrine, which was also well delivered, and we observed about 12 students from early 30s to retirement age from a variety of social and educational backgrounds helping each other and learning together. The teaching included one student delivering a short timed 'talk' relevant to the topic, assessed by the tutor later. We saw evidence that the taught elements of the course highly effective in preparing students for ministry: a placement tutor commented that 'the influence of Theological Reflection is profound, even on those students with no academic background'.
53. We also saw evidence of students growing in faith by sharing in prayer and worship. We learned that the Dean had instituted a more embedded pattern of prayer and worship over the past year. At the weekend residential, we joined in with Compline and Morning Prayer (Common Worship) where there was a time of open prayer which was well used by the students, offering brief prayers for each other and others in need. Students led these services and preached at them, with staff giving feedback later. On Sunday we had a Eucharist that drew on different traditions – using vestments and the Common Worship rite, alongside some well-presented graphics – and noted that there was no hint of partisanship. Again, a student led the prayers and another gave a homily. The weeknight teaching too was framed by prayer, starting with Evening Prayer (BCP) and finishing with Compline: these were led by the students and highly valued by them. The Formational Tutor for Clergy Training IME2 for Durham Diocese affirmed our impression, noting that LRTP is good at training for the local context that the teaching was good and the atmosphere prayerful.
54. Former students, on the whole, told us that they valued their training and we also heard from supervising ministers who spoke highly of their Lindisfarne curates and Readers. A former student (now SSM) valued learning new skills in the context of placements and meeting a fairly wide range of traditions. A Reader commented that they found the input of the occasional tutors stimulating.

Commendation 3

We commend the student body and the staff for the fellowship and coherence of the community, built at residential and evening sessions.

55. We saw evidence of generous respect among the students, who come from a wide range of ages, educational background and employment. However, although the Course gives students the chance to meet people of traditions different from their own, none of the students we met identified as either Evangelical or High Church and so we suspect that students from these traditions choose appropriate residential courses. We also noticed that the (male) Dean, who is the only cleric on the regular staff, presided at the Eucharist, and so students do not have the opportunity to experience a woman celebrant. We therefore recommend that the course team considers inviting a woman to preside sometimes (see Recommendation 10).
56. From examining course outlines and validation documents, we noted that reflective practice plays a large part in the syllabus, including well-thought-out use of placement supervisors and home parish supervision. We observed an evening session on Theological Reflection, which used case studies from recent news reports as well as asking students to draw on placement experiences. This engaged the students and was well received. A former student also attested to the fact that reflective practice introduced in the first year made an impression and became clearer and more significant to them as the course progressed.
57. LRTP has introduced newly designed Ministerial Development Portfolios, for both Readers-in-training and Ordinands, which is a structured means of encouraging students to reflect theologically about their preparation for ministry. The portfolio is made up of three parts: part 1, a general introduction to the formation process; part 2, student formation as a practical, reflective theologian, as the student develops their ministerial skills and competencies; part 3, formation in the light of the Church of England's Selection Criteria and the Formation Criteria at the point of licensing. Key to the learning process is a four-fold model of Experience, Exploration, Reflection and Action. From reading a wide selection of portfolios from students from different academic backgrounds and different cohorts, we noted that this new system has encouraged a more reflective approach, but that some students would still require a greater level of supervision in order to achieve this. We recommend that students be given further guidance and support with the analytical and reflective aspect of the Portfolios.

Recommendation 23

We recommend that students be given further guidance and support with the analytical and reflective aspect of the Ministerial Development Portfolios.

D2 Students have a desire and ability to share in mission, evangelism and discipleship.

58. The students have ample opportunity to engage in mission, evangelism and discipleship, because the course involves extensive periods of placement, especially for the Readers and the ordinands on the three-year programme. From our interviews with students, they clearly valued these experiences. The supervising ministers meet with staff and receive some training: the supervisors appreciated this training and also the clarity of the objectives they were given. Students keep a log of their work as well as doing a presentation on it to their peers, to which supervisors are invited. Students were then encouraged to discuss work done in placement and the situations they had met there in the evening teaching on Reflective practice (see paragraph 56, above).
59. Care is taken by both staff and supervisors to encourage students in confidence and make sure that the placement is 'the right fit', for the individuals. One former student spoke feelingly of how her placement nearly went awry but staff stepped in and carefully found another placement for her, where she flourished. Another former student spoke about how the dog collar gave him courage to speak out as he experienced its potential to make him a representative of the faith: this is also a testimony to the confidence he had gained from the Course to take into his curacy. Another spoke of her moment of enlightenment, in the middle of a placement, about the value of taking baptism seriously in

a local church setting and making it appropriate to the family. A police chaplain who supervises said 'I let them loose then teach them how to lurk with intent in a very secular setting.' A supervisor of a deeply rural benefice tries always to take a student on a funeral visit, because it takes most of the day as they follow up connections across the farms in the area.

Commendation 4

We commend the care taken by staff to ensure that the placements are useful for the students.

60. From our interviews with students, we noted that many are enthusiastic about evangelism. We also heard from a Placement Supervisor, a minister in a deprived area, who attested to the importance of an LRTP student's contribution to a mission week in the parish, noting how refreshing it was for the congregation to hear the student's witnessing voice in their activities. We met a Placement Supervisor who is a police Chaplain who said that was pleased that he was able to offer some interfaith experience. Another training incumbent said, 'I found the students very well trained and able to appreciate there was more than one way of doing things.'
61. We also noted that there can be a lack of confidence regarding a sense of vocation among some readers-in-training, and we met some students and former students, who had initially been accepted to train as readers but had then realised that their call was to ordination. In some cases, this had meant training for a total of five years. However, the reviewers saw this as an indication that doing the Reader training gave some students the confidence to consider that ordination was their vocation. This in turn is related to the Church of England's approach to lay vocations more widely, with increasing opportunities for Lay people to be trained outside the Reader course for a more flexible variety of ministries, such as worship leading, funeral taking or pastoral visiting. The Warden of Readers and the Director of Mission, Discipleship and Ministry for Durham both spoke to these issues. Perhaps it is right to wait until the Central Readers' Council has come to a decision about the future of the Reader role, and indeed the need for lay theologians. We noted the Archbishop's Council endorsement of 'Setting God's People Free' and the Ministry Division paper on 'Serving Together', which we will watch with interest. We encourage LRTP staff to reflect on these documents, but we also commend the care the LRTP takes in helping students discern their vocation and in responding to changes in their sense of vocation.

Commendation 5

We commend the care the LRTP takes in helping students discern their vocation and in responding to changes in their sense of vocation.

62. The students we interviewed expressed a desire to help others grow, though students who had not done any teaching or mentoring in their earlier Christian life said that they found it harder in the parish to perceive and take opportunities as they arise. We also heard from some students (predominantly Readers-in-training) who expressed a lack of self-confidence in going out to do evangelism. We encourage the Course team to help students reflect on their professional and spiritual growth in order to build their confidence, and to make sure that Readers-in-training feel that their experience is just as valuable as those in ordination training (see also paragraph 77 below and Recommendation 28).
63. Some LRTP students demonstrated the ability to foster vocations among people they work with. We heard examples of students already showing leadership in their parishes, such as one who runs a church plant, and others who show leadership in their secular work, including two students who were involved in the life of retreat houses. All of these students spoke about being able to draw on their learning from the course within their current roles.

D3 Student are growing in spirituality and engagement with public worship.

64. From our observations of worship at the residential and at evening sessions, it is clear that LRTP is effective at preparing students to lead worship (see paragraph 53, above). We observed the use of both Common Worship and the Book of Common Prayer and we valued the prayerful setting at weeknight teachings. We were impressed by the confidence with which students led the services or gave a homily or led the intercessions. They are also expected to preach in their home parish (an increasing number of sermons over the years of the Course) and whilst on Placement, where evaluation sheets are given out to selected members of the congregation and gone through with the placement supervisor. The students leading worship at weekends and in the evenings are supported by one of the two core members of staff and are given feedback.
65. From our meetings with students, and from observing worship over the weekend, we noted that students owned and clearly knew their way round Daily Prayer and appeared to use it regularly. With Holy Island and Shepherd's Dene currently having close links to the Course, some people favoured the Northumbrian Rite for personal daily prayer. Prayer and worship did appear to be a strong support structure with which the students were at ease.
66. Most students had an individual Spiritual Director and those that did not were being helped by the staff to find someone to meet their needs. Ordinands on the course were organized into formation groups, comprising students from different year-groups, and time was scheduled for these on the residential. The weeknight teaching groups are seen as rich ground for regular fellowship across all groups of students, though this can be limited because travel distances can be great, the weather hard and secular jobs take up a lot of their time. Spirituality is taken seriously and the Director of Mission, Discipleship and Ministry for Durham Diocese noted that 'Formation is a strength among Lindisfarne students.'
67. We also met former students who had gone on to form cell groups. They said that they found the Cell Group system helpful and sometimes found their IME1/IME2 colleagues the people they formed a cell group with. One of the Associate Tutors, who is also a member of the Council, has taken on the task of Former Student/Curacy Liaison. He is planning an association of former students which will centre on an annual Lindisfarne Lecture for all alumni. He is hoping that it will give opportunities for cell groups to form and foster a continuing interest in theology. As it develops it could perhaps facilitate Continual Professional Development for clergy.

D4 Students' personality, character and relationships

68. We saw evidence that LRTP students are teachable, resilient and stable. The students we met demonstrated a real enjoyment of learning: we saw this in interviews and in the lively atmosphere as they gathered for evening teaching in North Shields. We do not know if there is the same atmosphere at St Cuthbert's, the Centre in Durham. From an interview with an Associate Tutor we learned that LRTP is effective at engaging students from academic and non-academic background in learning: 'Academic students will pursue learning with vigour; the non-academics may not, but they will know the door is ajar.'
69. Training on a course and living in a distant rural area whilst holding down regular work is stressful, and we saw signs of great resilience in students in managing that. One of the Occasional Tutors said the students he had taught showed 'enormous resilience' and an incumbent who is also a placement supervisor said he found that LRTP gave 'rigorous and flexible training and encouraged resilience.' One of the bishops commented that the 'Course serves local people well and is formationally strong.' Additionally, we did not find any evidence of students dropping out of the Course because of stress.

70. We saw considerable staff time spent in helping those for whom formal learning was a new or long forgotten experience. Students spoke of flexibility and being given extra help when moving into this course from elsewhere in the UK. They spoke of care over placements for those students who are clergy spouses, and practical encouragement given to people who have never written an assignment before in their life. Some students spoke warmly of the individual study skills that were shared with them in the early stages of the course and of the help they were given in getting their ideas put in order and down on paper.
71. Flexibility is also shown in deciding how long a student's programme would last, and it has been the practice for students with sufficient prior ministerial, professional, or educational experience to be granted permission to undertake a two-year programme as opposed to the validated three-year programme. Since these cases are now becoming more common than exceptional, the programme is being revalidated with a standard two-year duration. This change should be viewed with caution, and we heard some concerns expressed about this. For example, a training incumbent whose curate had done a two-year course, said: 'These days, students do not know the scriptures or how to use them and shortened courses do not give them time to for it.' We therefore recommend that careful monitoring is carried out to ensure that students are placed on the most appropriate pathway for their training needs (see also Recommendation 2).

Recommendation 24

We recommend that initially a careful monitoring is carried out to ensure that the students are placed on the most appropriate pathway for their training needs.

72. From our observations of small-group work, we noted that students were prepared to listen to each other. In meal-time conversations we were party to discussions of things people were finding difficult, including concerns about moving house on ordination, fears about placements in unknown situations, problems over employment, sickness in the family and the difficulties of fitting in work and study. Students were able to discuss these with empathy and consideration. We did not see any students in their own home setting so it is hard to comment on the Course's relationships there.
73. Issues like professional boundaries in Pastoral Care, Policies, Safeguarding Procedures and Professional Conduct of the Clergy were all given a place in the Handbook, though as noted, these could be given greater prominence (see Recommendations 4 and 5). We also noted that these have a place on the curriculum in the special Transitions module at the end of the Course, and it is commendable that training incumbents are invited to attend these sessions alongside the students. We also noted a sharing of good practice, as a large number of the students come from careers where these matters are an everyday part of the working life.

D5 Students are developing in the dispositions and skills of leadership, collaboration and the ability to work in community.

74. From our observations of formal group-work and informal discussions, we noted that the students appeared to form a cohesive group when they were together. We also observed evidence of collaborative working in the free-style evening worship at the residential, which had been devised and led by a group of students. We also heard from a tutor of an example of effective and supportive collaboration in a group presentation, when one student was under pressure and arrived late from work, and the rest of the group covered for him seamlessly. Clearly, a few students transferred the skills they had learned in their professional lives, whilst others without these experiences learned by joining in the group work and growing into the authority their place on the Course gave them.

75. On placement students learned to recognize the gifts of others, such as their supervisors, even when things were done differently. One supervisor said a student had asked ‘Why did you do the baptism that way?’ with real doubt in her voice, but having helped with a baptism, she later told him how much she had learnt.
76. We saw some evidence that the course gave its students confidence in their learning. We heard from a former student, a Reader, who said that her new incumbent assumed that the Lindisfarne training was inferior to the incumbent’s own residential training, so they sat down together and listed what they had both covered on their courses. After that they had a new respect for each other and all went well. We also saw evidence of some understanding of group dynamics at evening lectures.
77. However, from our interviews with students and from reading their portfolios, we noted that, while some students were comfortable about assuming any authority ordination or licensing would give them, recognizing it from their earlier careers, others felt that they still needed to learn to accept power and responsibility. This may reflect a wider lack of confidence among students from certain socio-economic groups, which may be particularly prevalent in the North East, where there is a lower rate of acceptance for applicants at BAPs. We encourage staff members to be mindful of this and to use the portfolio and reflection process to encourage those students who may be lacking in confidence to grow and express their sense of calling (see Recommendation 23).

D6 Students show a calling to ministry within the traditions of the sponsoring church denomination.

78. From our conversations with ordinands and readers-in-training, and from reading their pre-licensing reports, we observed that they have a strong sense of God’s calling through the Church to minister in the Church of England. This calling they were able to articulate, some articulating how, initially, they had known a call be a reader and then to ordained ministry, a call confirmed through a BAP. Others were able to annunciate a similar call, from deepening their understanding of the Christian faith through their studying independently, to either Reader or ordained ministry, again confirmed in and through the appropriate selection procedures.
79. In worship and when discussing theological issues in lecture ‘break out’ sessions, LRTP students show not simply a willingness to serve within the breadth and diversity of Anglican traditions, but also a readiness to respect and engage with traditions other than their own. Tutors overseeing placements of students in parishes of traditions other than those of the students spoke of the willingness of the students to be accountable in the exercise of their ministry to the frameworks of those parishes.
80. In their placements, parochial and otherwise, students encountered and then reflected, on the very wide range of opportunities for ministry and mission, as is recorded in their Ministerial Formation Portfolios. An NHS chaplain to mental health patients spoke very positively of the way in which those on placement with him not only saw wider possibilities for ministry and mission, but also challenged him to see new, as yet untried possibilities for the same.

[D7 Pioneer ministry training - not applicable to this review.]

D8 The TEI has clear and robust procedures for end-of-training assessment of students’ knowledge, skills and dispositions, and reporting on students’ achievement.

81. Ongoing formational assessment is taken very seriously on the course, and assignment marking was clear and helpful, not just pointing out errors and omissions, but suggesting ways of improving things when appropriate. The reports to the Bishops that we saw were carefully written, detailed, listed the strengths of the student and pointed to things that could be improved under supervision in their title

parish. In fact, all the student information we saw in handbooks and policies was clear, detailed and helpful to an exemplary level.

Commendation 6

We commend the detailed quality of the various handbooks and the empathetic quality of feedback and report writing.

82. Students' skills were measured under the reporting criteria. Along with the academic and internal assessments, reports from placement supervisors, incumbents and congregations in placements (where appropriate) were all used in forming the final report.

D9 The student has, during and at the end of initial training, a personal learning plan or other clear basis from which to learn and grow further in ministry and development

83. The TEI's procedures enable tracking and development of students' learning goals from selection into IMEI training and from the end of IMEI into first curacy/ministerial role. We saw evidence that the newly designed Ministerial Portfolios, are providing a structured means of encouraging students to think theologically about their preparation for ministry, though there is further work to be done in this area (see Paragraph 57 and Recommendation 23).

84. The reflection and discernment of students is aided by other students on the programme, in module groups, formational groups and at residential weekends. Each student is allocated a personal tutor, with whom there is a termly meeting. Students also meet with their individual Incumbent/Priest-in-Charge/Local Supervisor, to discuss personal/spiritual growth and ministerial issues. The expectation is that such meetings are in addition to any parish staff meetings and other planning/operational gatherings.

85. Students' personal learning plans include development needs in key areas of meeting the formational criteria. A three-way meeting of Student, Incumbent and Personal Tutor takes place at the student's home within the first six weeks, to clarify expectations, opportunities for learning in the home context, thus establishing a culture of open relationships and of a shared journey. Given that individual students come from a variety of backgrounds and educational experiences, it may be worth having some form of initial learning agreement, drawn up following this meeting, as part of the portfolio, so that the student feels supported from the very beginning of the learning journey. This is less of an issue in subsequent years, as the completion of the portfolio and the annual reports provide the impetus for further development.

86. End of year reports on a student's progress, which follow the Church of England formation criteria, are developed by staff in conjunction with the student's own reflections. These are copied to Diocesan Bishops, Wardens of Readers, Incumbents and to the Ordinand or Reader-in-training. The sample reports which we saw were comprehensive, well-rounded and included areas for development, where applicable.

87. LRTP is no longer responsible for IME2 development, as this function having been taken over by the local dioceses. From our interviews with core staff, we note that they wish to make LRTP as supportive to past students as they can, through its alumni processes.

D10 The TEI learns from the pattern of its students' ministerial and formational achievement and acts on areas of particular need.

88. LRTP is able to draw on the views and experiences of several tutors and personal tutors who are former students of the programme and can have an input to the development of the programme.

Former students whose views have been invited by the Course have been a good source of continuing assessment for the course and for students, and the proposed Alumni group will help with this. We also noted that the Course team had made changes in response to feedback from training incumbents, for example, the revision of the portfolio as described in paragraph 57 above had been made in response to such feedback. However, we noted that LRTP tended to rely on these more anecdotal sources of information and we noted that statistics about progression, student outcomes, and title placements were not presented to the Board (see also paragraph 130). We therefore recommend that such a system be put in place.

Recommendation 25

We recommend that the Course collect and review statistical data on progression, student outcomes and title placements, and use the information for planning purposes.

The review team has Confidence with regard to Criterion D: Student Outcomes.

SECTION E: PARTNERSHIP WITH UNIVERSITY

E1 Quality control and assurance procedures governing the partnership are robust.

89. The overall quality control and assurance procedures governing the partnership were confirmed through the initial validation process.

Management and oversight

90. The Lindisfarne Board of Studies (the equivalent to a TEI Management Committee) has primary responsibility for the oversight of the programmes which LRTP delivers. The Chair is appointed by the Board of Trustees, and membership includes at least one Trustee; the Dean; the Senior Formational Tutor; student representatives from each year group for each programme (and whom are appointed annually by the student body); and academic tutor representatives who are appointed to the Board of Studies by the Dean in consultation with the Chair of the Board. The Dean is in attendance at each meeting. The Board of Studies leads the process of Annual Self-Evaluation on behalf of the Board of Trustees. The minutes and reports of the Board of Studies are received by the Board of Trustees. The review team noted that the TEI's Board of Studies operates in alignment with the Terms of Reference, as specified within the validation contract.
91. The Board of Trustees is currently comprised of six trustees and meets regularly; although the TEI reported that it sought to increase the number of trustees on the Board and to diversify its members' experience, particularly in relation to business planning expertise, and in light of a key priority for the TEI [paragraph 93]. Skills currently represented include adult education, contextual ministry, finance, HR, business development and governance. A significant number of members of the previous LRTP Board transferred to the new LRTP governing body, following the aforementioned institutional changes [see Introduction]. Students are not currently represented on the Board of Trustees [paragraph 112].
92. The review team read documentation which demonstrates the governance structures operating effectively, although the review team notes that careful consideration should be given to Recommendation 15, with respect to how the student voice is represented at the Board of Trustees.

Business Plan and Risk Register

93. LRTP informed the review team that the existing business plan dated from before the significant strategic and operational changes made during 2017, and recognised that it was therefore in urgent need of revision. The TEI confirmed that this was a key task for the newly appointed Executive Lead and that it was expected that work would start on this imminently. The TEI considered its key priorities to be to deliver the IMEI commission for the Dioceses of Durham and Newcastle to the highest possible standards, and to seek additional financial resources to support the appointment of a further 0.5FTE member of the core academic staff from September 2018.
94. The TEI provided the review team with its existing risk register. The review team explored with the TEI its use of the risk register, noting that there was an unusually high use of the most severe categories. The TEI reported that this had not yet been updated to reflect the current position of the TEI, but instead reflected the position of the TEI when in its period of change. LRTP further reported that the Board of Trustees had recently reviewed its risk register and adjusted its risk categories accordingly. The risk register had also been added as a standing item on future agendas of meetings of the Board of Trustees.

Staffing

95. The core staff at LRTP is made up of the Dean (1 FTE); the Senior Formational Tutor (0.8 FTE) who is also the Placement Tutor (0.2 FTE) and Learning Support Tutor; and the Academic Administrator (0.61 FTE). All core staff have role descriptions and which have been reviewed and updated within the last 12 months in light of the recent changes. Contracts of employment specify 3 months' notice for the Dean and Senior Formational Tutor, and one month for other members of staff (who are currently on fixed term contracts). The TEI recognises that there is a risk in the event of a concurrent absence of the Dean and Senior Formational Tutor for an extended period of time. This is also appropriately reflected in the LRTP's Risk Register; although, as noted above, this associated level risk may have been revised [paragraph 94]. The TEI confirmed that a contingency plan was not in place should the Dean and Senior Formational Tutor be unexpectedly unavailable; however, as part of its 'transition phase' the TEI had introduced weekly meetings to ensure that all core members of staff were kept abreast of ongoing developments, priorities and current activities. This practice had continued and it was therefore anticipated that any immediate priorities could be appropriately covered by existing staff.
96. LRTP has recently appointed an Executive Lead (0.6 FTE) who serves as the Chief Operating Executive of Lindisfarne RTP. This post is designed to provide leadership for the institution's administrative and financial management and lead on the development of a long-term strategy, budget and the Business Plan. At the time of the PER visit, the Executive Lead had been in post for c.6 weeks. The TEI hoped to seek additional core staffing resources and that this would be reflected within the emerging Business Plan. The review team noted that the TEI had already alerted the University to its intention to increase its core staffing team via the most recent Annual Self-Evaluation (2016-17).
97. Given the importance placed on the development of the Business Plan for the TEI, and with particular respect to human resources [paragraph 96], and sustainability of student numbers [paragraph 148.] The review team requires that the TEI provide the Business Plan, updated Risk Register and any supporting documentation (such as reports and minutes of the Board of Trustees) to the University within three months of the publication of PER report. This documentation will be considered, and a recommendation on revalidation will be made to the University in light of that consideration.

Recommendation 26

The review team requires that the TEI provide the Business Plan, updated Risk Register and any supporting documentation (such as reports and minutes of the Board of Trustees) to the University within three months of the publication of PER report. (The University of Durham review team have made this a Condition.)

98. Students with whom the review team met were very complimentary about their experiences overall, but particularly in light of the changes undertaken at LRTP over the last 12 months. In particular, students commented that the level of service received from members of staff, and their responsiveness, had remained excellent. The results of the Common Awards Student Survey (CASS), which reviews all aspects of the educational experience at LRTP, demonstrated that student satisfaction remained high in all areas during the 2016/17 academic year. The review team commends the TEI on the support provided to students whilst in its transition period.

Commendation 7

The review team commends the TEI on the support provided to students whilst in its transition period.

Engagement with the University

99. The review team noted that the TEI's engagement with the University has been very positive. LRTP highlighted that engagement with the University Liaison Officer (ULO) had been particularly effective with the ULO attending at least one Management Committee meeting a year, and a Board of Examiners once every two years, in line with expectations; in fact, the TEI felt that the ULO had often gone above and beyond in terms of giving up their time to LRTP. The TEI had also welcomed the warm, supportive and 'critical friend' approach to the role of ULO and particularly welcomed the ULO's - and the Common Awards Team's - support through the recent institutional changes [see Introduction].
100. The TEI highlighted that whilst the regular 'Bulletins' provided by the Common Awards Team were helpful, they often contained a plethora of information which sometimes made it difficult for the TEI to digest; it was not always immediately clear to the TEI which information was relevant to them or where actions were required of them.
101. The TEI was positive about the responsiveness of the Common Awards Team but would welcome, where appropriate, a phone conversation to relay information as opposed to email. Notwithstanding that, the TEI recognised that emails were often helpful to refer back to at a later date.
102. The review team noted that the TEI welcomed the opportunity for Common Awards students (on certain programmes) to attend the Durham University Winter Graduation Ceremonies. The TEI did however wish to convey its disappointment that the Vice Chancellor's speech at the Ceremony did not acknowledge that a large proportion of attendees were Common Awards students (and staff) and thus could not fully relate to the experiences described of students who studied at, and lived in, Durham.
103. The TEI also commented that the Fora organised by the Common Awards Team and Ministry Division could be improved.

Applications and admissions

104. Ministry students are received from their sponsoring diocese; whereas independent students make individual approaches to the TEI. The Dean and Senior Formational Tutor interview applicants to assess their academic ability and if questions remain, candidates are asked to complete a short assessment in support of their application. Since joining the Common Awards scheme, LRTP have also sought a recommendation or reference from the applicant's church to ensure that applicants are in good standing and to maintain the student experience for all students. For 2017/18, LRTP had enrolled with the Churches' Child Protection Advisory Service (CCPAS) process of Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS); from 2018-19, the TEI intends to introduce the completion of a DBS application as part of the admission process.
105. The review team reviewed a sample of APL requests considered by the TEI and confirmed that the process for considering and approving APL requests was operating effectively, and in line with the University's policy and processes.

Concessions

106. The review team reviewed a sample of concessions requests considered by LRTP and confirmed that the process for considering and approving concession requests was operating effectively, and in line with the University's policy and processes.

Assessment

107. A single TEI-level Board of Examiners confirms module marks and considers progression decisions for all students on Common Awards programmes. A good working relationship has been developed with the University to ensure that the required data and meeting documents are provided for the TEI's completing students to be considered by the overarching Common Awards Board of Examiners. The TEI does not currently make use of the Ministry Division Moodle which means that marksheets for LRTP completing students are provided to the University.
108. In discussions with the review team, LRTP reported that they felt the time between the TEI Exam Board and being informed of the outcome of the overarching Common Awards Board of Examiners was too long. Currently, the University reported candidates' outcomes to the TEI within 2 weeks of the Overarching Common Awards Exam Board; parchments for students were sent to the TEI within 6 weeks of the Overarching Common Awards Exam Board. The TEI asked whether the process could be speeded up.
109. The review team also discussed with the TEI the process of recommending awards to the Common Awards Board of Examiners. TEI Boards of Examiners are responsible for confirming progression decisions and for making recommendations for awards to the Overarching Common Awards Exam Board where: either students had achieved enough credit to leave the programme with their chosen award; or where students had failed modules, had exhausted any resit opportunities, and could not progress, and were therefore required to exit with an alternative award. It was noted by the review team – and at the Overarching Common Awards Exam Board – that LRTP also classified student outcomes. The TEI explained that this practice had continued as a result of its previous validation arrangement with the University, and which pre-dated the introduction of the Common Awards scheme. The TEI recognised that the classification of degrees and the confirmation of all awards was the responsibility of the Overarching Common Awards Exam Board and that this structure ensured consistency across the Common Awards partnership. The TEI also confirmed that whilst it had classified student outcomes at its Board of Examiners, students had never been informed of this. The review team also clarified that the classifications provided in the TEI's minutes of the Board of Examiners were not reflected on the anonymous marksheets considered by the Overarching Board of Examiners in order to ensure a fair, equitable and consistent process for all students registered on Common Awards programmes.
110. LRTP has effective internal procedures in place to maintain the security of assessment. A secure online marking site is used by staff and which is not accessible by students. All new markers receive an induction and training before undertaking marking responsibilities; LRTP also double mark all students' assessments where a new tutor is undertaking marking for the first time in order to assure themselves of both the quality of marking and feedback. LRTP also provided examples of training exercises for all staff with respect to assessment and feedback practices at the TEI. Marking and Moderation processes allow for any assessment irregularities to be identified although the TEI does not currently make use of Turnitin. The External Examiner confirmed that the TEI's practice for detecting academic misconduct is appropriate and has no reason to suspect any undetected cases as a result of not using plagiarism detection software.

Student Engagement (See also F6)

111. LRTP uses a range of effective mechanisms to gather student feedback in order to assure and enhance the quality of provision. Upon the completion of every module, students are requested to complete a module evaluation form. The feedback is reviewed by the module tutor, the Dean and the Senior Formational Tutor. Module evaluations are considered across the whole programme on an annual

basis and reviewed at the Autumn Board of Studies meeting, where students are also present. Results of module evaluations are also considered as part of the appraisal process for core and associate staff. Residentials are also evaluated by students and via a similar mechanism: feedback forms are completed by students which are then reviewed by the Dean and Senior Formational Tutor. The Academic Administrator creates a summary of these evaluations for review by LRTP.

112. In addition to student surveys, the TEI also ensures student representation within its governance structures. At the last residential weekend of the year, students elect their representatives to serve on the Board of Studies for the following academic year; one student from each year of the programmes is represented on the committee. A standing item on the Board of Studies' agenda allows students the opportunity to discuss matters related to their academic programmes. It was confirmed by the TEI that students do not routinely receive the minutes of the Board of Studies but that it is the responsibility of the student representative to provide feedback from the meetings to their peers. Students with whom the review team met confirmed that this was an effective process. Also at the last residential weekend of the year, staff facilitate an annual review of the academic year via student-staff discussions convened by year group. The topics for discussion vary year to year but recent discussions have focused on the experience of community, the academic journey, and formation and residence. A summary of these discussions is presented to the Summer Board of Studies meeting for consideration and action, as well as to the Board of Trustees. The TEI confirmed that students are not represented on the Board of Trustees. Whilst members of staff of the TEI are also not represented on the Board of Trustees, staff attendees were present at meetings. The TEI recognised that the reconstituted Board of Trustees [paragraph 92] provided a greater opportunity for the student voice to be directly represented on the Board of Trustees and was open to the possibility of student representatives attending meetings of the Board of Trustees in future. The review team therefore recommends that the TEI considers how best to ensure the student voice is represented at the Board of Trustees.

Recommendation 27

The review team recommends that the TEI considers how best to ensure the student voice is represented at the Board of Trustees.

113. LRTP had highlighted within its most recent Annual Self-Evaluation that there was a need to reflect on how it could help independent students integrate more fully into the learning and praying community of LRTP. There was a recognition that independent students often had different motivations, and studied in different contexts to ministerial students which created a distinct experience for this cohort of students. For instance, independent students did not attend residential weekends and to do so would likely result in an increase in costs for students. The TEI reported that its commitment to reviewing this matter had been in response to student feedback, and as such, had introduced two 'Quiet Days' for Independent students and Auditors at Residential events and ensured that one Personal Tutor was dedicated to independent students. The TEI was also committed to ensuring that its academic tutors were inclusive in their activities and communication to ensure that all students felt part of the LRTP community.
114. Whilst the TEI had identified independent students primarily, there was also a need to ensure that Reader and Ordinands had an equitable student experience. It was recognised for instance, that Dioceses finance different elements and activities of their academic programme and that this in and of itself could possibly lead to a differential experience, compounded further by the nature of the close-knit community that is evidence at LRTP. Furthermore, there was a recognition that the necessary focus on topics of specific relevance to Anglicans, meant that there was also a careful balance to be maintained for Anglicans and Non-Anglicans.

- I15. The review team was mindful that the TEI had indicated its intention to increase the number of independent students (and which was to be reflected in the emerging Business Plan) and that this could have a further effect on the overall parity of the student experience. Whilst students who met with the review team were grateful of the opportunity to study alongside students with different motivations, some students reported that they felt there was clear need to separate some activities to maintain the culture for ministerial students. The review team recommends that the TEI keeps under review the parity of experience for all groups of students, and the relative value of joint versus tailored activities.

Recommendation 28

The review team recommends that the TEI keeps under review the parity of experience for all groups of students, and the relative value of joint versus tailored activities.

- I16. The students with whom the visit team met spoke very positively about the seriousness with which their views were considered by staff at LRTP and in particular, the speed with which feedback was responded to. The review team heard several examples of how provision had been improved as a result of student feedback; for instance through the purchasing of new or supporting learning materials. Students confirmed that they were satisfied that they had sufficient formal and informal opportunities for ensure their voice was heard, collectively and individually. The Common Awards Student Survey (CASS) strongly reinforced this view. The review team commends the TEI for its responsiveness to student feedback.

Commendation 8

The review team commends the TEI for its responsiveness to student feedback.

Conclusion

- I17. The review team was satisfied that the overall quality control and assurance procedures governing the partnership are robust.

E2 Overall provision for academic and pastoral support and guidance is adequate.

- I18. The adequacy of overall provision for academic and pastoral support and guidance was confirmed through the initial validation process. Academic and welfare support and guidance are provided to students through: the Student Handbook; the annual Induction Day; briefing by module tutors at each stage of the programme; on-going tutorial support from the student's tutor; and individual academic support is given by the Study Skills Tutor. For ministerial students, there is a meeting between an LRTP core staff member, the student and the student's incumbent, to discuss appropriate integration of the student's LRTP pathway, engagement in the life of the home church and the Church's Ministerial Outcomes.

Induction

- I19. An annual Induction Day is held for all new students. This provides students with an opportunity to meet their peers, tutors and key college staff. Students also meet with their personal tutors to discuss the nature of the relationship and to schedule the dates for their first meeting(s). Chaplains are also present on the day. The Induction Day also serves as an initial introduction to their academic programme; however, there is a separate bespoke induction to study skills [paragraph I22].
- I20. Students with whom the review team met felt that the induction process was valuable and commented favourably on the amount of information provided by the TEI in advance of commencing their studies.

Students reported that information was shared with them over the summer prior to the start of the academic year which allowed them to become familiar and confident with the materials and ask pertinent questions at the Introduction Day. The TEI also felt that interviewing students as part of the application process had made a significant difference to the process of induction for new students training for public ministry. Students who commenced their studies later, and thus did not attend the Induction Day, also felt supported by members of staff and did not feel disadvantaged by being unable to attend.

Programme information

121. The VLE contains information on programme documentation, relevant policies and procedures, and teaching materials. Students with whom the review team met spoke positively about the importance of the VLE as a central space to access key information and learning materials and in particular welcomed the regular communication from the Academic Administrator to notify them of when learning materials (such as presentations and notes) from recent teaching sessions has been uploaded and could be accessed. Whilst the VLE was used well and effectively as a repository for information, LRTP recognised that its full potential for supporting learning and teaching had not yet been exploited.

Recommendation 29

The review team recommends that the TEI considers using the VLE more creatively, and not simply as a repository for programme information.

Study Skills Support

122. The TEI hosts a Study Skills Day for all new students at the start of their studies, which is considered to be an extension of the Induction Day. Typical sessions include referencing; time management; higher education academic reading and writing skills; oral presentation skills and general skills development such as how to take effective notes. The Study Skills Day is complemented by study skills workshops throughout the year and which are often organised in response to the identification of specific needs. It was confirmed that these sessions, and the Study Skills Day, were not compulsory but highly recommended by LRTP, and were often made available multiple times during the academic year to allow students to seek support, when required. Students confirmed that they made effective use of the Study Skills Day, with some students reported they had attended the events in subsequent academic years as a form of refresher training.
123. LRTP has a Learning Support Tutor (who is also the Senior Formational Tutor) who provides advice and guidance to students when required. Academic tutors are able to refer students to the Learning Support Tutor at any stage of their studies but are encouraged to do so during the teaching of the initial modules at Level 4 in particular in order to provide support and encouragement at an early point in their studies.
124. LRTP seeks the advice of Durham University Service for Students with Disabilities (DUSSD) where required, to ensure the provision of appropriate care and support for students with a disability, dyslexia, medical or mental health condition which significantly affects study.

Personal Tutors

125. All students are allocated a personal tutor at the start of their programme who they are required to meet with at least once a term. For 2017/18, LRPT have introduced a Personal Tutor with specific responsibility for independent students, supported by a bespoke portfolio handbook. The allocation of personal tutees is shared between two members of core staff at the TEI and four associate tutors. Staff are provided with additional support and guidance to undertake the role of Personal Tutor.

126. Personal Tutors meet together at least three times a year: firstly, at the start of the academic year to clarify expectations; secondly in Epiphany term to review the progress of tutees, and finally in the Easter term to review the final reports. Personal Tutors review reports from local supervisors, placement supervisors and review students' academic progress in order to generate their final report.
127. The TEI has already committed to undertaking a review of the operation of the new personal tutor system after its first year of operation (2017/18); and to devising a clear programme of training for personal tutors. The review team recommends that this be considered as part of Recommendation 32 [paragraph 143].

Complaints and Appeals

128. The TEI maintains a student complaints policy; this is available to students and staff via the VLE and is set out in the student handbook. LRTP encourages complaints to be dealt with informally in the first instance and felt that the close relationships they have built with their students allows students to feel comfortable doing this. Students confirmed that this was the case and reported that staff had explained the formal complaints process to them at induction. The policy outlines the formal mechanisms for raising a complaint, the timescales for its consideration, and the stages involved. For 2017/18, LRTP had also introduced a 'respect at work and study' policy in respect of student complaints, drawing upon a corresponding policy in use at Durham University. No formal complaints or appeals had been made since the beginning of the Common Awards partnership.

Feedback on Assessed Work

129. Students with whom the review team met were happy with the provision of feedback they received. Students felt that markers gave full and helpful feedback on their assessments and that the use of feedback templates meant that there was a clear link between the comments received and the assessment criteria. Feedback on assignments is provided through written and/or oral comments with respect to formative work, and through written comments for all summative work. Students provided the review team with examples where the comments on their formative assignment had helped them achieve in their summative work. LRTP's External Examiner has also commented favourably on the provision of feedback provided to students noting that feedback was often extensive and developmental. The results of the Common Awards Student Survey (CASS) strongly reinforce this view. The TEI also encourages students to speak with their module tutor or personal tutor about their work; a practice which many students welcomed. Students and staff confirmed that the 4-week turnaround time for feedback on assessment was adhered to and in the few cases where this was not possible, students had been informed of a new return date.

Graduate destinations

130. The TEI reported that they had a process for staying in touch with their alumni but did not formally track the graduate destinations of their alumni. The TEI recognised that there was benefit to doing so in the future.

Conclusion

131. The review team was satisfied that the overall provision for academic and pastoral support and guidance was appropriate.

E3 The overall learning support and infrastructure in relation to the ability to meet requirements for awards are adequate.

Learning Resources

132. Through the initial validation process the TEI had confirmed the adequacy of its learning resources for its students.
133. The LRTP works closely with the North East Religious Resources Centre (NERRC) which has two centres – one based in Church House (North Shields) alongside the LRTP offices and main teaching space, and one in Cuthbert House in Durham City – and which is open to students when teaching is in progress, as well as on weekdays from 9.30am – 5.30pm, and once a month on Saturdays. NERRC is a separate company, providing resources to churches and schools across the region as well as to LRTP students and others. The theological library forms a significant part of the NERRC, which also has an on-line search facility. The LRTP pays an annual Service Level Agreement fee to NERRC, ensuring their students have free and full access. The NERRC currently houses 38,000 titles, including printed and other materials, with staff who are able to offer advice and regularly procure additional materials for students. The NERRC invests around £4,000 annually on theological titles, working in close partnership with LRTP; the Director of Studies is the theological adviser to the Board of the NERRC.
134. The LRTP also has agreements in place regarding library access for their students with the Sharp Library in the Cathedral, the University's Bill Bryson Library, and with St John's College, including online access to journals. The visit team were also informed that the LRTP invests in theological books and resources from its own funds. The LRTP is aware of copyright arrangements when sharing materials digitally via the VLE. Although the TEI felt that this was sometimes time-consuming for the Academic Administrator, students spoke very highly of being able to access either core textbooks or relevant material via the VLE. Students with whom the review team met commented that the LRTP was very responsive to student requests for additional textbooks and provided several examples of where the TEI had been able to source such materials for their use. This contributes to the commendation in paragraph 116. Students also welcomed the ability to request inter-centre loans and to return items to an alternative centre to the one borrowed. The results of the Common Awards Student Survey (CASS) reinforced students' views on the provision of learning materials, and the review team commends LRTP for its provision of resources for students.

Commendation 9

The review team commends LRTP for its provision of resources for students.

Teaching venues

135. Teaching accommodation is provided by the Dioceses of Durham and Newcastle in their respective Diocesan Offices. In both venues, worship takes place in one of the teaching rooms. At Church House, there are three main teaching rooms with facilities for small teaching groups and a chapel. The rooms are equipped with IT facilities. At Cuthbert House, there are two teaching rooms, with the ability to create a third via a sliding partition. There are two supporting small group rooms and a chapel. The main teaching rooms are equipped with IT facilities. The residential venue has a main lecture room, teaching rooms and break-out rooms. The accommodation is all en-suite. Students spoke very positively of the teaching space and residential venue.
136. Accommodation at the Emmaus Village, Consett, where residential weekends are held is also fit for purpose. The review team heard that although disabled access is provided the Centre is built on a slope which could present challenges for a wheelchair-user. Furthermore, the review team also heard

that there loop facilities for the hard of hearing was not consistent throughout the venue. The review team therefore recommend that LRTP ensure that systems are in place to routinely check the continued accessibility of premises and their suitability of students with additional needs.

Recommendation 30

The review team recommend that LRTP ensure that systems are in place to routinely check the continued accessibility of premises and their suitability of students with additional needs.

Conclusion

I37. The visit team was satisfied that the overall learning support and infrastructure was adequate.

E4 The overall staffing (academic and support) in relation to the ability to meet requirements for awards is adequate.

I38. The adequacy of the overall staffing was confirmed through the initial validation process. The TEI ensures that core and associate teaching staff are appropriately qualified to teach on the Common Awards programmes.

Teaching Staff

I39. The TEI relies upon a team of 17 associate tutors across the two dioceses. Most associate tutors teach modules to the value of 20 credits per year in one of the teaching centres. Each associate tutor is required to sign a contract for their services setting out the terms and conditions. This also includes a schedule with a specific 'tutor agreement' for the year, and makes clear the expectations for teaching, marking, and staff training. In addition to the Dean and Senior Formational Tutor, four associate staff act as Personal Tutors.

I40. Reports from the ULO and discussions with the TEI confirm that the process seeking feedback from Durham in advance of advertising positions, and for sharing and overview of its staffing arrangements with the University, operates well. The review team concluded that members of academic staff were suitably qualified and experienced to deliver the approved programmes.

Teaching quality

I41. The students with whom the review team met commented very positively on the quality of the teaching, referring to their experiences as excellent, dynamic, outstanding and responsive to student queries in the classroom. Students spoke highly of teaching staff who encouraged challenge and debate.

I42. The TEI monitors and enhances teaching quality in a number of ways including, marking and moderation processes; an institutional-wide teaching observation scheme; the effective use of the External Examiner reports and ULO reports; through the Annual Self-Evaluation process; and seeking regular student feedback. Results of module evaluations feed into the process of appraisal of core staff and associate tutors. Experienced staff oversee new associate tutors in the first instance, which acts a type of mentoring for new staff to the TEI; no modules are entirely unsupervised externally taught modules, and the Dean has responsibility for ensuring appropriate oversight.

Staff development

I43. The TEI does not currently have a policy on supporting staff development but confirmed that staff development activity does take place at LRTP. For instance, the TEI reported that there has been good engagement from both core staff and associate tutors with: the Tutor Training Days organised by the TEI; bespoke opportunities to shape the new, emerging curricula; the Durham University

Learning and Teaching Award (DULTA) and shared development activities such as improving the provision of feedback on assessments. The TEI also confirmed that individual development needs would be identified via the appraisal process. The review team recommends that the TEI creates a strategic approach to the identification, implementation, and review of staff development needs for all staff (including core and associate tutors), with a particular focus on supporting research-led teaching.

Recommendation 3 I

The review team recommends that the TEI creates a strategic approach to the identification, implementation, and review of staff development needs for all staff (including core and associate tutors), with a particular focus on supporting research-led teaching.

Conclusion

I44. The review team was satisfied that the staffing within the TEI is appropriate to enable the requirements for the awards to be met.

E5 The TEI has appropriate mechanisms to ensure the accuracy of all public information, publicity and promotional activity relating to the partnership.

I45. The appropriateness of the mechanisms to ensure the accuracy of public information, publicity and promotional activity was confirmed through the initial validation process. The TEI confirmed that it undertakes an annual review of its programme documentation to ensure its accuracy. The approved programme regulations, module and programme handbooks are made available to students via the 'Courseway' VLE; programme handbooks are also provided to students in hard copy at the start of their programme. The accuracy of information is checked by the Dean, Senior Formational Tutor, and the Chair of LRTP Board of Studies. Weekly staff meetings are a further mechanism used by LRTP to identify any matters with respect to programme information that require addressing. LRTP felt that their complex timetabling arrangements, and their ability to accurately and concisely convey this information to students, was a demonstration of their care and attention in providing accurate and up to date information.

I46. LRTP was aware of the need to liaise with colleagues in the Common Awards Team at Durham University to ensure that any publicity materials and promotional activity related to the partnership or its programmes in advance of making use of such materials.

Conclusion

I47. Having considered the evidence encountered before and during the visit, the review team considers that Lindisfarne Regional Training Partnership successfully meets all the PER criteria relating to partnership with the University, subject to satisfactory completion of the recommendations, outlined in the above paragraphs and summarised below. The review team also identified one condition. This documentation requested with respect to this condition will be considered and a recommendation on revalidation will be made to the University in light of that consideration.

Subject to the implementation of the recommendations in this section, the review team has Confidence with regard to Criterion E: Partnership with the University

SECTION F: TAUGHT PROGRAMMES

F1 The programme is viable in terms of market and likely numbers of entrants.

148. The TEI has experienced consistent student recruitment to its programme and in 2017-18 recruited 66 students. As with other Common Awards programmes, future student numbers are difficult to predict. Changes to patterns for resourcing ministerial education contribute to the uncertainty regarding future student numbers. It was more difficult to predict student numbers for other pathways, such as lay ministries, as recruitment depends on the sending dioceses; however, LRTP was hopeful that its continued partnership with the Dioceses of Durham and Newcastle to deliver non-residential training (IMEI) for those preparing for Reader and ordained ministry would ensure sustained student numbers.
149. The review team heard that the TEI intended to grow its independent student numbers and that this would likely be reflected in the emerging Business Plan. Whilst the steady trend in student numbers indicated that programmes would be viable in terms of market and likely student numbers, the review team felt that the Business Plan should be provided to the University, within three months of the publication of the PER report to confirm expected student numbers. See paragraph 97 and **Recommendation 26**, which for Durham University is a required Condition.
150. The review team also recognised that this planned student numbers would need to be considered in light of the TEI's curriculum development proposals, currently under consideration by the University.

F2 The structure and design of the curriculum are appropriate to the aims and learning outcomes, and to the target student body.

151. The aims and learning outcomes for the Common Awards programmes are defined in the relevant programme specifications. Each programme contains a 'syllabus' to define the programme structure, including credit requirements at each level of study and for each sub-discipline. The framework ensures that the structure and design of the curriculum are appropriate to the aims and learning outcomes. Through the initial validation process, the University reviewed the TEI's proposed programme regulations, module overview table, and curriculum mapping document. These documents confirmed that the structure and design of the curriculum was aligned with the programme specifications, and that the curriculum design was appropriate to the target student body.
152. The TEI has engaged with the curriculum development process to review and update its curricula in response to institutional review and student feedback. The TEI sought and received approval for each of the programme amendments, which included: the addition of new programmes for new and existing delivery centres; the inclusion of approved Common Awards modules, and changes to assessment options within modules. Despite the incremental changes brought about through the curriculum development process, the TEI's current programmes remain similar to those that were originally approved.
153. Notwithstanding this, the TEI sought approval for significant changes to its curricula. The TEI sought approval for a suite of programmes which closely aligned with wishes of its Diocesan Partners for Ordinands to be trained over two years, and for Readers to be trained over three. As paragraph 6 reflects, the Ministry Division reviewers believe that the formational appropriateness of any two-year ordination pathway will need careful consideration, hence **Recommendation 2**.

F3 The programme employs teaching, learning and assessment methods that will enable the learning outcomes to be achieved by typical students and that achievement to be measured.

154. The initial validation team had confirmed that the methods of teaching, learning and assessment would enable the learning outcomes to be achieved and that achievement to be measured.

Teaching, Learning and Assessment

155. The External Examiner has consistently confirmed that the range of assessment is appropriate to the curriculum and the intended learning outcomes.
156. Students felt that, on the whole, the volume of assessments was appropriate and supported them in their learning. Students with whom the review team met were positive about their experiences with assessment. Students confirmed that they were aware of the assessment criteria and knew where the criteria were published. Students were confident that they understood what was expected of them with regards to different types of assessment and welcomed the diversity of assessment employed by the TEI, recognising the benefits of engaging with a variety of assessment methods. The results of the Common Awards Student Survey (CASS) strongly reinforced this view.
157. The students with whom the review team met confirmed that they perceived and experienced a marked progression throughout their programmes, with higher levels of work demanding a greater depth of engagement, providing more academic challenge, and requiring more independent learning. The students reported that developmental feedback was often provided by markers to enable them to achieve at a higher level in their studies; this is reinforced by comments from the External Examiner. The results of the Common Awards Student Survey (CASS) also strongly reinforced this view.

Learning Hours

158. Students with whom the review team met reported that information on learning hours is provided to students at the beginning of each module and is easily accessible via the Module Handbook, which in turn is available on the VLE. Students generally felt that the information was clear and helpful but reported different experiences with having sufficient time to be able to engage with the pre-reading relative to time available whilst studying part-time.

F4 There are appropriate arrangements for placements.

159. The report of the initial validation visit documented the TEI's mechanisms for ensuring that arrangements for placements are appropriate.
160. Placement learning for most students happens in four distinct modules which fall in each year of part-time study. At Level 4, the placement learning takes place in a chaplaincy setting; at Level 5, the learning takes place in the students' own parish setting; and at Level 6, two modules are taken in connection with a 4-6-month placement in a parish context away from the home parish. The TEI monitors the contexts for placement learning carefully, working with colleagues in chaplaincy and parish contexts who have a track record of being effective supervisors.
161. The TEI supports students to seek their placements, and organises a three-way meeting between LRTP, the placement holder and the student to clarify the expectations of all involved; these responsibilities are articulated in a Learning Agreement which must be agreed to, and signed, prior to commencing the placements. Students and staff confirmed that visits to the placement were undertaken and open lines of communication were maintained between all parties. Mechanisms are in

place to identify any potential problems whilst students are on placement, and intervene, if required. The TEI is in the process of reviewing its practice with respect to Safeguarding and Risk Assessments to ensure that it is aligned with best practice in the sector. Placement supervisors receive an introduction to supervision skills from the TEI. Students confirmed that they felt supported before, during and after their placement, a view strongly reinforced by the results of the Common Awards Student Survey (CASS).

- I62. Students enjoy the placement element of the programme and feel that there is a progression between levels with respect to placements, as well as the classroom-based content. Placement supervisors will complete a report, which is also reviewed by their Personal Tutor.

F5 The programme appropriately addresses the University's Principles for the Development of the Taught Curriculum.

- I63. The validation visit process confirmed that the programmes appropriately addressed the University's Principles for the Development of the Taught Provision.

- I64. The students with whom the review team met confirmed that they perceived and experienced a marked progression throughout their programmes, with higher levels of work demanding a greater depth of engagement, providing more academic challenge, and requiring more independent learning. The students reported that feedback on assessments was often linked to what was required at a higher level, if shortcomings were found within students' assignments.

- I65. Students reported that appropriate support and guidance is provided when undertaking independent learning projects. Students are allocated a specific academic tutor and three tutorials are specifically tailored towards supporting students in their independent learning projects. Students also reported that tutors were readily available via email to answer questions or provide additional support and guidance. The External Examiner commented favourably on the use of independent research programmes in the first year, which was effective in helping students become self-conscious about the processes of learning, research and reflection.

- I66. The TEI uses a Dissertations and Assessments Panel, to ascertain the viability of students' proposals for independent learning projects and dissertations and ensures that empirical research follows University guidelines on ethical research. This panel also approves questions or titles for summative assessments.

F6 The programme is subject to appropriate processes for curriculum review, including mechanisms for student representation and engagement (see also E3).

- I67. Members of staff in the TEI are involved in the TEI's processes for curriculum monitoring, review and enhancement. Student feedback on teaching is requested frequently.

- I68. The TEI had previously sought minor modifications to its existing curriculum and the introduction of a further programme within the Common Awards framework, demonstrating the TEI's appropriate engagement with the curriculum development process. A more substantive proposed redevelopment of the TEI's provision, currently under consideration by the University, was also made available to the review team.

- I69. Teaching staff actively request student feedback via module evaluation questionnaires, and feedback at the end of residential events. Summaries of the feedback are provided at Boards of Studies, of which student representatives are members. Module leaders have the responsibility for implementing any agreed changes. The reviewers have recommended consideration of some form of student input into

the Board of Trustees (paragraph 112 and **Recommendation 27**), but that is not to suggest any shortcoming in the current engagement of students with curriculum review.

170. Members of staff from within the TEI contribute to the Common Awards Annual Self-Evaluation (ASE) process. The TEI expressed the opinion that the ASE process was helpful, and set a barometer for the rest of the year. LRTP commented that it may look to conduct its annual review process earlier in the academic year in the future as November was particularly busy for the TEI with undertaking marking, moderation and preparing for its TEI Board of Examiners. LRTP confirmed that Associate Staff were involved in the ASE process with two annual meetings dedicated to seeking their involvement in curriculum development and offering constructive comments on the operation of LRTP processes. Associate staff with whom the review team met confirmed that they welcomed and valued this opportunity and felt that they could provide fair challenge to LRTP as part of the ASE process. The TEI highlighted that it still wished to seek further feedback from their associate staff members and would look to introduce mechanisms to do so in the near future.

Subject to the implementation of recommendations relating to this section, the review team has Confidence with regard to Criterion F: Taught Programmes

CONCLUSION

Overall outcome:

The review team has Confidence with Qualifications in Lindisfarne Regional Training Partnership in preparing candidates for ordained and licensed lay ministry.

LIST OF COMMENDATIONS

Commendation 1

We commend the use of BCP Evening Prayer within the worshipping life of the community. [B4]

Commendation 2

We commend the staff for their loyalty and hard work in facing the challenge of a revised programme and for their positive and hopeful attitude towards the new structure. [D]

Commendation 3

We commend the student body and the staff for the fellowship and coherence of the community, built at residential weekends and evening sessions. [D1]

Commendation 4

We commend the care taken by staff to ensure that the placements are useful for the students. [D2]

Commendation 5

We commend the care the LRTP takes in helping students discern their vocation and in responding to changes in their sense of vocation. [D2]

Commendation 6

We commend the detailed quality of the various handbooks and the empathetic quality of feedback and report writing. [D8]

Commendation 7

The review team commends the TEI on the support provided to students whilst in its transition period. [E1]

Commendation 8

The review team commends the TEI for its responsiveness to student feedback. [E1]

Commendation 9

The review team commends LRTP for its provision of resources for students. [E3]

LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1

We recommend that the LRTP develop public-facing material as a matter of urgency, in order to articulate the distinctive features of the programme for a wider audience. [A1]

Recommendation 2

We recommend that LRTP give due consideration to clarifying priorities for the revalidated programme, especially intended audiences for 3-year and 2-year pathways. [A2]

Recommendation 3

We recommend that LRTP find ways to reach out to a wider audience with a view to being more inclusive. [A3]

Recommendation 4

We recommend that the policies for Safeguarding; Worship; Respect at Work and Study; Placement and Fieldwork; and Common Awards Admission Complaints be made easier to find on LRTP's website, and that all policies have dates and review dates. [B2]

Recommendation 5

We recommend that the Designated Safeguarding Officer's name and contact details be published on the opening page of the Safeguarding Policy. [B2]

Recommendation 6

We recommend that Safeguarding be a stated, fixed item on all Board agendas. [B2]

Recommendation 7

We recommend that LRTP conducts an audit of facilities and practices to ensure that the requirements for potential students with additional needs are met. [B3]

Recommendation 8

We recommend that the guidelines on attendance at corporate worship at the weekly Monday teaching evenings should be amended to 'all should; none must'. [B4]

Recommendation 9

We recommend that the Course produces a policy for any conscience issues, for both individuals and the course as a whole, if and when the president at the Eucharist is a woman. [B4]

Recommendation 10

We recommend that the Course considers inviting a woman to preside at the Eucharist on occasion. [B4]

Recommendation 11

We recommend that the Board of LRTP keeps the workload of the core staff under review, factoring in opportunities for continued learning, research, reflection on practice, and spiritual renewal, as well as ensuring that legal standards for annual leave and rest days are met. [B5]

Recommendation 12

We recommend that the LRTP Directors/Trustees ensure that LRTP are fully conversant with all sections of the commissioning contracts and the joint statement by the two dioceses. [C1]

Recommendation 13

We recommend that the Board (governing body) establishes clear roles and responsibilities for governors and staff [C1]

Recommendation 14

That LRTP considers opening up its structures to enable regular staff representation and student input at meetings of the Board (governing body). [C1]

Recommendation 15

We recommend that the Board fully supports the Executive Lead in taking on the new role, including enabling her in terms of time and capacity to take over the tasks of the Transition Manager. [C2]

Recommendation 16

We recommend that the LRTP permanent staff find suitable time to further engender cross-working and team-building in order to fulfil the aspiration of developing positive relationships within the new structure. [C2]

Recommendation 17

We recommend that the Board and staff regularly review progress in meeting the aims and objectives of the organisation and identify landmarks for determining confident ways of working in the new setting. [C2]

Recommendation 18

We recommend that the LRTP considers putting in place a mentoring process for its Board members. [C3]

Recommendation 19

We recommend that LRTP enters into discussion with its commissioning dioceses as a matter of urgency to ensure adequate block funding should the aspirational numbers of per-capita funded students not materialise. [C4]

Recommendation 20

We recommend that LRTP puts in place a robust and realistic business plan at the earliest opportunity. [C4]

Recommendation 21

We recommend that the LRTP Board considers extending its membership to include a member with management accounting expertise, especially during the first phase of the contract to 2021, to ensure that its financial responsibilities are met. [C5]

Recommendation 22

We recommend that the LRTP Board considers the inclusion of review dates for particular risk items within its risk register, to ensure that the balance of risk versus the number of items to be monitored becomes more transparent. [C5]

Recommendation 23

We recommend that students be given further guidance and support with the analytical and reflective aspect of the Ministerial Development Portfolios. [D1]

Recommendation 24

We recommend that initially a careful monitoring is carried out to ensure that the students are placed on the most appropriate pathway for their training needs. [D4]

Recommendation 25

We recommend that the Course collect and review statistical data on progression, student outcomes and title placements, and use the information for planning purposes. [D10]

Recommendation 26

The review team requires that the TEI provide the Business Plan, updated Risk Register and any supporting documentation (such as reports and minutes of the Board of Trustees) to the University within three months of the publication of PER report. (The University of Durham review team have made this a Condition.)

Recommendation 27

The review team recommends that the TEI considers how best to ensure the student voice is represented at the Board of Trustees. [E1]

Recommendation 28

The review team recommends that the TEI keeps under review the parity of experience for all groups of students, and the relative value of joint versus tailored activities. [E1]

Recommendation 29

The review team recommends that the TEI considers using the VLE more creatively, and not simply as a repository for programme information. [E2]

Recommendation 30

The review team therefore recommend that LRTP ensure that systems are in place to routinely check the continued accessibility of premises and their suitability of students with additional needs. [E3]

Recommendation 31

The review team recommends that the TEI creates a strategic approach to the identification, implementation, and review of staff development needs for all staff (including core and associate tutors), with a particular focus on supporting research-led teaching. [E4]