

# Ministry Council: Periodic External Review Report

## Cranmer Hall

February-March 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](mailto:ministry@churchofengland.org) Website: [www.churchofengland.org](http://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.....	15
SECTION C: LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT.....	21
SECTION D: STUDENT OUTCOMES.....	24
SECTION E: PARTNERSHIP WITH UNIVERSITY.....	28
SECTION F: TAUGHT PROGRAMMES.....	34
CONCLUSION.....	39
LIST OF COMMENDATIONS.....	40
LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS.....	41

## GLOSSARY

ASE	Annual Self-Evaluation
BAME	Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic
BAP	Bishops' advisory panel
BCP	Book of Common Prayer
CCR	Cranmer Common Room
DDO	Diocesan Director of Ordinands
DUO	Durham University Online
IME	Initial Ministerial Education
LRC	Learning Resource Centre
NSS	National Student Survey
PER	Periodic External Review
RME	Resourcing Ministerial Education
RTP	Regional Training Partnership
SSC	Staff-Student Committee
SWOT	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats
TEI	Theological Education Institution
ULO	University Liaison Officer

## LIST OF REVIEWERS

*For Ministry Division*

**The Revd Professor Paul Avis, Senior Reviewer**, Honorary Professor, Department of Theology and Religion, University of Durham; Honorary Research Fellow, Department of Theology and Religion, University of Exeter.

**The Revd Professor Frank Berry**, Honorary Professor of Chemistry, University of Birmingham.

**The Revd Canon Dr Jane Freeman**, Team Rector, Wickford and Runwell Parishes, Diocese of Chelmsford.

**Jacqueline Stamper**, University Librarian Emerita, Honorary Fellow, Lancaster University, Member of General Synod.

*For Durham University*

**Professor Mike Higton**, Professor of Theology & Ministry

**The Revd Professor Paul Avis, Senior Reviewer**, Honorary Professor, Department of Theology and Religion, University of Durham; Honorary Research Fellow, Department of Theology and Religion, University of Exeter.

**Miss Alyson Bird**, Quality Assurance Manager (Common Awards)

## 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 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.

### *Criterion-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 use 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 CRANMER HALL

February-March 2018

## SUMMARY

### Introduction

St John's College, Durham, of which Cranmer Hall is one of the two constituent halls, was founded in 1909 and became a College of Durham University in 1919. Cranmer Hall was founded in 1958 by St John's College when it divided into Cranmer Hall, a theological training institution, and John's Hall. Cranmer Hall continues to be a constituent part of St John's College under its overall governance structure. Thus St John's College has a Principal and Cranmer Hall a Warden. Cranmer benefits from sharing certain physical facilities (especially the Chapel, Library and refectories), aspects of worship and pastoral care, and administrative support, across the College.

Cranmer Hall is a diverse and inclusive community that continues to value its Anglican Evangelical foundation, which it shares with St John's College as a whole. On this basis, Cranmer offers a broad and rich experience of theological education and ministerial formation to students of various church backgrounds and welcomes students from across the spectrum of Anglican traditions.

### *Validation by Durham University*

On 11<sup>th</sup> February 2014 Durham University conducted a validation visit to Cranmer Hall (St. John's) to consider the proposed partnership and programmes, in accordance with the Common Awards approval process agreed by the Quality and Standards Sub-Committee on 29<sup>th</sup> May 2013. This visit was combined with a Periodic Review of Cranmer Hall (St. John's) and the Wesley Study Centre, in accordance with the aims and methods of the periodic review process. The visit team concluded that the TEI had met the criteria for partnership and programme approval. A small number of conditions and recommendations were made which were subsequently addressed. The University approved the proposed partnership and undergraduate programmes and re-validated the existing postgraduate provision (outside the Common Awards framework).

For the current revalidation exercise, the review team examined the following Common Awards programmes which have been granted approval for, and are delivered by, Cranmer Hall:

- Certificate in Higher Education (CertHE) in Theology, Ministry and Mission (V60446);
- Diploma in Higher Education (DipHE) in Theology, Ministry and Mission (V60447);
- BA (Hons) in Theology, Ministry and Mission (V604);

The TEI also delivers the following programmes validated by the University (outside the Common Awards framework) which formed part of the present review:

- MA Consultancy for Mission and Ministry (V60607)
- PG Dip Consultancy for Mission and Ministry (V60612)
- MA Digital Theology (V60707)

- Postgraduate Diploma Digital Theology (V60712)
- Postgraduate Certificate Digital Theology (V60714)
- MA Theology & Ministry (V60507)
- PG Dip Theology & Ministry (V60512)
- PG Cert Theology & Ministry (V60514)

The TEI also delivers the following programme in partnership with the Department of Theology and Religion

- Doctor of Theology and Ministry (V6A282)

The review team was satisfied with the quality and standards of the programmes listed above and recommends that the programmes should be revalidated for a period of six years.

#### *Recent changes*

The most important recent change has been the appointment of the Revd Dr Philip Plyming as Warden. In the short period between May 2017, when he began work, and the start of the Review, the Warden has initiated a wide range of measures both consolidating the improvements made under his predecessor as Warden, the (now) Right Revd Mark Tanner, and commencing a major programme of improvement, reform and renewal.

Following the departure of Dr Calvin Samuel to be Principal of the London School of Theology, the post of Academic Dean has been filled by Dr Jocelyn Bryan (formerly Director of Postgraduate Studies). The Revd Dr Nick Moore joined Cranmer in 2017 as Director of Postgraduate Studies.

In terms of plant and facilities, the new Learning Resource Centre, including a new College Library, is due to be completed in 2019 and will significantly improve the facilities for teaching and study.

#### *Periodic External Review: process and evidence*

The Senior Reviewer made a preliminary visit to Cranmer Hall in late November 2017, meeting with the Warden and senior colleagues, and finally with all full-time teaching staff, to outline the purpose and scope of the Review and to respond to questions. The Review itself took place on 26 and 27 February (Ministry Division team) and on 6 March (with Durham University team). The Reviewers are most grateful for the warm and thoughtful hospitality extended to them by the Warden, by the teaching and other staff, and by the students during these visits.

The Reviewers interviewed a range of senior persons within the institution, including the Principal of St John's College, the Warden of Cranmer Hall, the Vice-Chair of the Cranmer Committee, the Director of Finance for St John's College, and the Academic Dean. They also interviewed a wide range of teaching staff, both full-time and part-time, and met with the administrative and support staff of Cranmer and St John's. They held a meeting with all ordinands as a body and with representative students from various pathways. The team attended daily worship and sat in on lectures and seminars, made off-site visits to placement parishes in East Durham, and joined students and staff for meals.

A wide range of stakeholders was consulted and written or oral communications were received from (among others) the President of the St John's College Council (the Bishop of Carlisle), the Chair of the Cranmer Committee (the Bishop of Stockport), the Bishops of Durham and Newcastle, senior figures in



Durham University and Durham Cathedral, DDOs of sponsoring dioceses, training incumbents and former students.

Cranmer Hall made a substantial and comprehensive body of documentation available to the Reviewers in advance, including:

- a. a self-evaluation document;
- b. programme regulations;
- c. module overview tables;
- d. curriculum mapping documents;
- e. external examiner reports;
- f. annual self-evaluation reports;
- g. statistical data;
- h. previous validation and inspection reports;
- i. committee minutes.

The review team also had access to the Common Awards framework and documentation, including:

- a. the core regulations for the Common Awards programmes;
- b. programme specifications;
- c. module outlines;
- d. assessment criteria and assessment guidance;
- e. contact hours parameters;
- f. the Common Awards TEI Handbook;
- g. the Guide for PER Reviewers Appointed by Durham University (incorporating the PER Criteria that were developed in conjunction with the Church of England).

During the academic year 2017-18 Cranmer Hall was providing theological education and ministerial formation for 56 ordinands, 21 students on the Free Church Track and five trainee Baptist ministers. There were 14 independent undergraduate students and 17 postgraduate independent scholars. There were 22 female ordinands and 5 non-white ordinands. Eighteen students are single, 35 are married and three are in civil partnerships.

### Summary of outcomes

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*.

CRITERIA	OUTCOME
A Formational aims	Confidence
B Formational context	Confidence with qualifications
C Leadership and management	Confidence

D Student outcomes	Confidence
E Partnership with university	Confidence, subject to recommendations
F Taught programmes	Confidence, subject to recommendations
<b>Overall Outcome</b>	<b>Confidence with qualifications</b>

### General Observations

- Following several years of improving focus, cohesion and recruitment, Cranmer Hall has now entered on a new phase of self-scrutiny, improvement and expansion.
- There is a prevailing ethos of review, reform and renewal within the institution.
- The relationship between the ‘parent’ institution, St John’s College, Durham, and Cranmer Hall within it is mutually beneficial and is working well.
- Cranmer is blessed with first-class leadership in its Warden, ably supported by senior colleagues of high calibre.
- The teaching staff is susceptible to further strengthening as appointments are made in the months ahead.
- While Cranmer prides itself on its academic rigour, there is scope for fostering a climate of greater intellectual stimulation and theological challenge overall and specifically for structured discussion of sensitive issues by students and the enhancement of a research culture among teaching staff.
- Cranmer should continue to capitalise on – and make more of – its enviable situation, within St John’s College, its proximity to Durham Cathedral and its relation to the first-class Department of Theology and Religion of the University of Durham.
- As a consciously diverse and inclusive community, with a strong evangelical foundation but welcoming ordinands from across the spectrum of Anglican traditions, Cranmer should consider whether it is adequately introducing students to the resources of the catholic Anglican tradition, especially in ecclesiology, including the theology of ordination and the sacraments.
- The process of review, reform and renewal will require enhanced administrative and executive support.
- Altogether Cranmer Hall, within St John’s College, now has the potential to become a powerhouse of excellence in every area of its work.

## 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 Cranmer Hall are Christ-focused and clearly stated. For example, the Prospectus refers to creating a 'Christ-centred community', being 'centred on Christ in our learning ... our prayer and worship ... our community life ... our formation', and becoming 'a living and dynamic community of faith', linked to a world-class Department of Theology and Religion in the University of Durham. Cranmer justifiably claims that the 'mix of world-class university and a variety of challenging missional settings provides a unique context for formation and learning for ministry'. The Prospectus also fairly claims that the Hall gives 'particular attention to tailoring courses to the needs of individuals'. The Prospectus also identifies the kind of ministers it seeks to form: 'willing to be changed by God's Spirit to be part of God's mission' and speaks of discipleship and ministry 'with Christ at the centre'.
2. Cranmer accurately identifies itself as a 'vibrant and diverse evangelical Christian community which provides a warm and hospitable home for men and women across the breadth of the church' and which 'seeks to offer the best of the evangelical tradition to the whole church'. The governance documents state, as the first purpose of St John's College, 'the education and training of candidates for Holy Orders in the Church of England'. The annual reports and accounts reference Cranmer Hall's 'formation of Anglican ordinands through a rich programme of learning and practical ministry located in the North East of England'. This is clearly referenced in the strategy documents, for example in the strategy appendix to the 'Self-Evaluation I: Formational Overview' document.
3. Of course, these are claims, aims and aspirations, but our report will show that there is a serious intentionality at work throughout Cranmer/St John's to make these aims an ever-greater reality.
4. The guiding vision, embodying these formational aims, is communicated to staff, students, trustees and the wider constituency of stakeholders through the range of documentation produced by Cranmer. It is visible, for example, in the Formational Programme Mapping Overview document, the 'Cranmer Community Covenant' (which was referred to by students in meetings, though not necessarily as something that was an organic part of Cranmer life), in the Academic Handbooks, in the 'Self Evaluation I: Formational Overview' document, which had been reviewed at College Officer level and by the Cranmer Hall tutorial team.

#### **Commendation I**

**We commend Cranmer Hall for its clear articulation and communication of the Christ-centred, ministry-focused vision that underlies its formational aims.**

#### **A2 The TEI's formational aims are appropriate to the ministerial training requirements of its sponsoring church denominations.**

5. The Annual Self-Assessment Exercise 2017 records that 'Cranmer Hall has grown significantly in student numbers and in the diversity of pathways it offers in recent years. We continue to consolidate the Cranmer Undergraduate, Baptist and Free Church Tracks and the ecumenical

diversity within Cranmer Hall. A particular focus has been induction week in October in which we celebrated the common formational strands within the community as well as recognising the differences between our student tracks. We continue to review the parts of the formational programme that are offered to the entire student community and those which are specific to or need adapting for each track.' The document covers in further detail the specifics of that formational vision, with specific reference to the missional, collaborative, flexible and adaptable expectations coming from the national church.

6. The placement supervisors whom we met confirmed that there were suitable opportunities for developing those qualities and capabilities (at least in some cases), and we were impressed by the range of placement opportunities and their tailoring to both the wishes expressed by ordinands and the needs that were identified for them. There is a range of course offerings geared to different forms of ordained ministry, including pioneer ministry. The experience of those studying for Free Church ministry was, by and large, a positive one for current students, though we did not meet any former Free Church Track students. Some students on this track found the focus very different from the day-to-day ministry in which most of them were involved when not at Cranmer, but this is not a criticism of the course.
7. In both formal and informal gatherings of ordinands at different stages of their training, a number of them questioned what kind of ministry Cranmer was modelling: they were concerned that what they perceived as a long-hours culture, heavily timetabled, and with little time for reflection (let alone for family), might inculcate workaholic habits in future ministers, poorly preparing them for protecting time to develop their continuing independent learning and to re-charge their spiritual batteries. Meetings with staff countered this by emphasising that the vacations were largely free, that there was no teaching from Friday to Sunday (though there were placement commitments) and that the 'rule of life' discussions with tutors, etc., were designed to ensure that the work-life balance was maintained appropriately. Discussions with former students did not raise this as an issue; they reported that their experience at Cranmer prepared them very positively for ministry.
8. Under the new Warden, the annual self-evaluation process is planned to be more self-critical than was evident in the earlier documentation, including that for 2017, as it needs to be much more reflexive, basically following the SWOT formula. The meetings between the Academic Dean and the two Directors of Studies also review the effectiveness and appropriateness of the courses to the wider Church's requirements.
9. In terms of strategic direction, ongoing discussions in the Cranmer Committee and the St John's College Council have focused on the key priorities of continuing residential formation and more innovative forms of contextual training. There has been little mention so far of training for lay ministry and the development of its underlying theology, but we believe that the leadership of Cranmer/St John's is wise to adopt a steady and staged approach to future development.

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

10. Cranmer Hall is currently engaged in developing a renewed vision for its formational life and how it seeks to serve the Church through the training of Anglican ordinands and ministers of other

Christian traditions within its open evangelical heritage. A strategy document is in process and it is encouraging that the Hall is addressing its place at a time of rapid change in theological education, which will inevitably require the understanding and support of a wider constituency. Documentation and responses from external stakeholders to the Reviewers' enquiries confirmed that there is currently widespread satisfaction that the Hall is fulfilling its role as a special place of residential training in the North East of England. Our conversations with senior staff assured us that the Hall is aware of the need to consider the provision of more flexible pathways in the future. We noted that many of the ordinands undertake their subsequent ministry in the region.

11. The Hall is well aware of the importance of its relationships with external stakeholders. The current draft strategic document outlines the relationship between the Hall and St John's College – an area which the Reviewers examined in some detail. We were encouraged by the observation of the External Quality Adviser that the relationship between the College as a whole and Cranmer Hall was developing in a more intentional way than hitherto. It was described to us as the best it has been for some time.
12. The relationship between the Hall and the University is also an area of opportunity. The embeddedness of the Hall within St John's College and the University should prove attractive to prospective ordinands. We were advised that many of the current crop of ordinands did not actually choose Cranmer for those reasons and were largely unaware of these advantages. We suggest that, in its recruitment strategy, Cranmer should seek to reach and target potential students who are looking, not simply for an inclusive evangelical training institution or even one situated in the North of England, but for a fine college of a fine university with a first-class department of theology and religion. We endorse the view of the External Quality Adviser that Cranmer should make full use of the new Centre for Learning and Teaching in the University. We believe that there is scope for closer involvement than at present of all the Cranmer teaching staff and post-graduate students with the research life of Durham's Department of Theology and Religion.

## Recommendation I

**In its recruitment strategy, Cranmer should pro-actively seek to reach potential students who would be attracted to a very good college and a first-class university theology department.**

13. The Self-Evaluation document refers to many partnerships outside the Higher Education sector and the Hall recognises the importance of broad external participation in fulfilling its foundational aims. There are good relationships with the Diocese (the Bishop of Durham expressed satisfaction with the Hall's willingness to engage with Diocesan initiatives and with the training given to the students that he is sponsoring). The Dean of the Lindisfarne Regional Training Partnership has noted the strategic importance of the Hall and expressed appreciation of their partnership in initiatives such as *Partnership for Missional Church* and *Talking Jesus* which have been valued by the Dioceses of Durham and Newcastle.
14. The Warden is actively forming new links within the Church and sustaining those that are already in place. Responses received from training incumbents demonstrated satisfaction with the training provided by Cranmer Hall.

15. Links with Durham Cathedral are active and are valued by students. The Hall collaborated with the Cathedral in the 2017 Lumiere event and the *Free to Be* contemplative service which is held five times a year. A former student recommends that the Hall should seek to further develop its relationship with the Cathedral and this is a view that we would endorse. Connections with Christian communities outside the Church of England are being fostered by initiatives such as the Free Church Track and the partnership with the Northern Baptist College. We believe that the Hall should continue to support these programmes which should bring variety and stimulus to the community in which Anglican ordinands live and work. We note that interactions with other faith traditions may require focused attention in the future.
16. The Prospectus is currently available only in hard-copy format and we suggest that an electronic version is desirable. The Web Site is easy to use, and current students confirmed that they found it helpful when considering options for training.
17. The 2017 Self Evaluation document affirms that Cranmer is seeking actively to support the Church of England's aim of increasing the number of ordinands under the age of 30 and this aspiration is endorsed by last year's intake which had an average age of 29.5 years, with 60% being under the age of 30 at the start of training. We understand that withdrawals of ordinands from training is rare.
18. Conversation with academic staff confirmed that, under the Warden's initiative, the Hall will continue to seek applications from a wide constituency of prospective ordinands, including those of non-white ethnicity. The Hall has recently held a DDO day attended by 9 DDOs. We saw correspondence arising from that event expressing appreciation of its usefulness. Conversation with the Warden indicated that embryonic thinking is currently being directed to attracting applications from a greater ethnic diversity of candidates. We would encourage the Hall to continue to prioritise ethnic diversity in the selection of vacation placements, with part of the goal being to enhance its profile and expose itself to a wider range of potential enquirers. In addition, the submission of the Bishop of Newcastle and the Newcastle DDO hoped for stronger links, especially in connection with placements.

The review team has Confidence 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 students' formational opportunities.**
19. The range of placements that was displayed on posters and described in meetings with placement supervisors was impressive and varied. The meetings with the staff member who coordinates and organizes placements, indicated that a careful balance is maintained between expressed student preferences and the training/formational needs identified by teaching staff, tutors, BAPs, etc. The Bishop of Newcastle had encouraged Cranmer to look to that Diocese for additional placement opportunities.
20. Not all placements could offer the same range of experience and there was some concern expressed by students as to whether all students were enabled to experience a broad range of traditions and ecumenical partners. Ordinands in the open meeting commented that it would be helpful to hear from a wider range of missional and ministry experience, and to spend time in groups where they could be challenged by different experiences. They welcomed exposure to greater diversity. In informal meetings, students welcomed sharing the experience of Baptist students, for example, adding to the range of voices heard. As of 2017-18, the Staff Student Consultative Committee now includes a Baptist representative. The Dean of the Lindisfarne RTP meets termly with the Warden and they are looking into ways of sharing learning about the task of formation and training for ministry with the possibility of joint training days for teaching staff.
21. As an intentionally diverse and inclusive community, with a strong evangelical foundation but welcoming ordinands from across the spectrum of Anglican traditions, Cranmer needs to do justice to the full range of the theological traditions of the Church of England. In the context of the prevailing evangelical ethos, augmented by substantial Free Church and Baptist elements, larger opportunities are needed for students to be introduced to the theological resources of the Anglican catholic tradition, especially in respect of ecclesiology, including the theology of ordination and the sacraments. We believe that this aspect of the Anglican heritage should find a more secure place in Cranmer's provision of theological education and ministerial formation.

### Recommendation 2

**We recommend that, within its evangelical framework and ethos, the TEI should review the opportunities for students to be exposed to the Anglican catholic tradition, especially in ecclesiology, including the theology of ordination and the sacraments.**

- B2 There are well understood and embedded practices of corporate life, so as to enhance the process of students' formation.**
22. Students are referred to Durham University Diversity and Equality (and other) policies in the Academic Handbooks, policies by which Cranmer staff are also bound. The Cranmer Community Covenant underpins the principles of corporate living for the Hall, and the commitment of the wider Cranmer Committee members to that Covenant is commendable. Although the number of BAME students is around 10% of the total number of ordinands, it is still small in absolute terms. There are also questions about how physically accessible the College is (see below), though the Community

Handbook mentions the presence of a Disabilities Representative on the Cranmer Common Room Committee.

23. *Safeguarding*: The Self-Evaluation document confirms that Safeguarding Policy is the responsibility of St John's College and its Council: 'Safeguarding policy for Cranmer Hall is reviewed at a College level by St John's College Council. This was reviewed in September 2017 and approved with only minor amendments. Since this meeting the Church of England has released updated guidance for TElS with respect to Safeguarding, and actions resulting from this guidance (including the appointment of a Deputy Safeguarding Lead) will be taken to the January [2018] meeting of Cranmer Committee for agreement, and then onto College Council. Cranmer has a close working relationship with Beth Miller, Durham Diocese Safeguarding Officer. Advice is sought in the case on questions of DBS forms or wider policy. All ordinands' DBS forms have been seen and checked, together with tutorial staff. All new and continuing students and all staff have attended C2 safeguarding training. The new Warden has completed both C3 and C4 safeguarding training' (ASE 2017 9).
24. The Vice-Chair of the Cranmer Committee (and Lead Trustee Representative on Safeguarding) stated that the Warden had reported to the Audit Committee that they were unable to require DBS checks on independent students, unless they were working with children or vulnerable adults. (All Durham University students are required to make a declaration on criminal records, etc., at admission.) The suggestion at the Audit Committee that some kind of "fitness to practise" licence be developed for independent students subsequently proved impractical owing to the variety of denominations and requirements. Safeguarding vigilance was one of the prompts to develop a Community Covenant.
25. ASE 2017 5a describes some of the inspiration to draft the Community Covenant, after noting that 'in an increasingly diverse institution with free church students, independent students as well as ordinands, it is valuable to be clear about what holds us together', and the need to make 'explicit what was always implicit about how we are seeking to grow more Christlike across a diverse formational community'. This was used in the opening corporate worship at the start of the year, and is intended to be renewed at the start of each academic year. Discussions with students on different tracks confirmed that they experience life and study in very different ways at Cranmer, with some feeling more a part of the community than others. That said, part-time students who had been concerned about feeling less integrated said that, contrary to their expectation, they felt fully part of the community, and experienced considerable peer and tutor support.
26. Discipleship Groups were another valued element of students' mutual support, and students from the different tracks/residential/non-residential are brought together in these groups weekly. The Cranmer Common Room discusses many of the practicalities of corporate life, though both the Warden and CCR (student) President expressed the hope that some contentious issues (e.g. around diverse traditions, differing views on human sexuality, etc.) might be more openly explored in a non-confrontational and safe space, rather than being left unspoken in a potentially damaging way. This was echoed in comments, arising from the ordinands' meeting, that they welcomed the opportunity to meet together and talk about issues of common and community concern, rather than simply about the catering or the social programme. In different meetings and individual comments it became clear that Morning Prayer was much appreciated as a quiet corporate act of worship with which to start each day, and as perhaps the only quiet time that students found each day. Some



married ordinands with young families understood the reasons for the recent introduction of an obligation to attend Thursday evening prayer, but expressed the difficulties for family life in that expectation (borne out by spouses; see below).

### **Recommendation 3**

**We recommend that staff-student consultation take place to work out the best way of providing structured opportunities for the discussion of sensitive issues on which student opinion is divided.**

27. The Prospectus, Community Handbook and online publicity encourage spouses and families to share many aspects of Cranmer community life. Spouses are encouraged to participate in taught courses, either by auditing or by studying (bursaries are available to support formal study). One of the spouses auditing a course was observed to participate fully in the discussion without any differentiation by other students or the lecturer. In the reviewers' meeting with spouses (including a husband and a civil partner) appreciation was expressed for the marriage and family evening event that the Warden and his wife hosted in their home this year.
28. The involvement in the Monday All-Age Worship, preceded by family tea in Hall, was generally appreciated as affirming for families, though for some the timing was difficult. Working spouses with or without children were obviously restricted in how far they could participate in community fellowship, worship and meals, though they were grateful for the encouragement to do so. Spouses, including those with small children, expressed concerns about the pressures and long hours demanded of ordinands during term time. This led to concerns about sustaining family life appropriately. A civil partner of an ordinand reported feeling anxious before arrival about their acceptance as a same-sex couple, but had felt welcomed and included.

### **Commendation 2**

**Cranmer Hall is to be commended for the generous way in which spouses of ordinands are encouraged to share in a wide range of community activities, including learning opportunities.**

29. The teaching staff is mainly ordained, with considerable ministerial experience between them and an appropriate male/female balance. The BAME community is not currently represented at staff level.
  30. There is a clear concern by the Hall for the building of community from a student body which is diverse in background, age, and tradition. The recently-established Community Covenant, shared by both staff and students, is designed as a major tool for this, but is not yet fully owned, to some extent being seen as 'top down' rather than an expression of shared understandings. Staff, students and often their families worship and eat together. A strong commitment to the discipline of corporate worship has helped to embed the communal identity. Part-time students spoke of the value of the Discipleship Groups in encouraging their own sense of belonging.
- B3 The provision of public social and private living accommodation is satisfactory [see also E3 for teaching accommodation]**

31. Single students live mainly on or close to the college site: the quality of their rooms varies considerably. Families occupy houses more widely dispersed, some being rented from private landlords. Some concerns were expressed around student accommodation, but those housed at Brass Thill were pleased with the ready-made community there. All are within reasonable distance from the college: on a very snowy day, most students arrived on time for Morning Prayer. Provision of public, social and private living accommodation is satisfactory: social and private accommodation is fit for purpose. The Chapel and other spaces for worship are adequate and function well and are capable of imaginative and creative use. A programme of year-on-year renovation of the College buildings continues, including ongoing maintenance, plans for accommodation development and periodic review of opportunities to secure alternative spaces.
32. Some students felt that the available study and social space was insufficient for those who were technically 'living in' but not actually living on The Bailey. The Bar and other rooms around College offer social spaces for formal and informal meetings. Carrels are available to non-residential students; there is some space for study in the IT Room and also the Library, and other study spaces can be found in the dining halls when not in use (especially close to exam times). Larger spaces were well used and adaptable, though there were issues around audibility in the Leech Hall, for example, and the ASE mentions inconsistent use of microphones.
33. There is no mention of accessible facilities in the Prospectus. The site is very restricted by the historic and listed nature of the buildings, and it is difficult to see how this could change until the opening of the new Learning Resource Centre frees up space for alternative uses. The mobility challenges are considerable given the different levels of the buildings, and the number of sets of stairs, though there is level access to most buildings. The Warden confirmed that the needs of a student with impaired mobility could be met by always using the Bowes (ground floor) dining room and being accommodated and taught in ground floor rooms, but as there were currently no such students, that provision was not required. The large number of doors between the former houses nonetheless presents a challenge, as does the cobbled street with interrupted and uneven pavement between St John's and Etchells House (and the adjacent location of the new Learning Resource Centre), and the broken steps and sloping path up to the Chapel.
34. Consistent use of microphones in the large teaching spaces that are equipped with an induction loop system would assist those with hearing impairments. Acoustics were poor in some teaching spaces. Time was wasted in one large teaching group in Leach Hall by the discussion having to be repeated for those – with normal hearing – who had not picked up comments the first time. Consistent use of a roving microphone or similar would solve the problem. Students mentioned dyspraxia, dyslexia and other learning difficulties, for which students are referred to the University's central Disability Support Service, though Cranmer timetabling can limit access to this service and recently there have been delays in the identification of and action on barriers to learning for some students.

#### **Recommendation 4**

**We recommend that facilities for amplification be used consistently in large teaching spaces to assist audibility of both teaching and discussion.**

35. The Church of St Mary the Less, almost opposite the Hall's main buildings, serves as the chapel, and provides a formal but congenial and flexible space for Morning Prayer and some other services, including Choral Evensong. It is not large enough to contain the whole of the extended community, and the College Eucharist takes place in the Leech Hall, a larger modern meeting and teaching space.
36. Students spoke appreciatively of the prompt and efficient response to needs for repair and maintenance. Some spouses and students expressed concerns about accommodation, though most were satisfied with what had been provided. Students and spouses made several comments commending the facilities team's exceptional commitment to resolving any emergency situation in living accommodation very speedily, even on Christmas Day.

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

37. Much of the liturgical diet follows the contemporary forms in Common Worship, but there is also provision for more informal and experimental services. Cranmer corporately attends High Mass at St Chad's College once a year. A whole week is given over to the BCP and all services during that week are according to the BCP. There is a weekly BCP Choral Evensong.

**B5 Staff model appropriate patterns of spirituality, learning and reflection.**

38. Worshipping and eating together regularly provide opportunities for informal engagement between staff and students. The relationships between students and tutors were highly valued, and tutors, including part-time tutors, were seen as accessible by students; the tutor handbook lays down clear guidelines and parameters for that relationship. A number of formal routes for consultation on particular areas (e.g. curriculum planning) exist, but at present there is no Hall meeting where matters of common concern can be aired more generally; a weekly mid-morning 'info-slot' offers an opportunity principally for notices from the Cranmer Hall staff and students.
39. Most of the teaching staff are actively engaged in research or some other form of continuing learning: Fridays are largely kept as days for private study and preparation, and the opportunities offered by engagement with the university are widely valued. Most staff are also involved both in the life of local churches and in the wider life of the diocese and beyond. In the teaching seen during the review, clear links were made between ministerial practice and the academic subject under discussion, and both students and the External Quality Adviser spoke of the value of the interplay of ministerial experience and theological teaching.
40. We would add that the culture of research and enquiry within Cranmer Hall could be enhanced and that more could be done to promote a general atmosphere of intellectual stimulation. We understand that none of the current crop of ordinands at Cranmer has a doctorate in theology (though there are a few with doctorates in other disciplines). We note that a meeting of teaching staff who are actively engaged in research is convened termly by the Academic Dean so that staff can report to their peers on their current work. We are also advised that progress in research and writing is an area that is covered in the individual annual review of staff by the Warden. We would like to underline the point that even staff who are not seen as 'research-active' need to keep abreast of developments in the areas that they teach and to receive a stimulus to their own reflection.

Although there is already significant participation by staff in the Department of Theology and Religion's numerous ongoing research seminars, we believe that there is scope for this involvement to increase. The current teaching staff includes some notable scholars with impressive publications to their name. For this contribution to be sustained and actually increase in the future, research and publication needs to be given a higher priority, both in terms of incentive or motivation and in terms of opportunity.

41. We note that most teaching staff are entitled to a one-term sabbatical every four years, which we regard as meagre. (We also are advised that the College Council receives a report on how that time has been spent.) We recommend that more generous provision for sabbatical or study leave should be made. Of course, this step would increase the overall pressure on teaching staff (who are also personal tutors). We therefore suggest that, if and when funds become available, several post-doctoral, time-limited, tutorial posts should be created, which would help to take the strain of both basic teaching and tutorial work and at the same time provide stimulus to a culture of enquiry and debate.

#### **Recommendation 5**

**We recommend that Cranmer Hall teaching staff normally be granted a term's study leave not less than every three years, subject to the normal processes of approval and review of study projects.**

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

## SECTION C: LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT

### **C1 The TEI has clear and effective governance structures.**

42. The relationships of Cranmer Hall with St John's College, the Department of Theology and Religion and Durham University as a whole, while complex, seem to work well on the whole. The visibly close collaboration between the Principal of St John's College and the Warden of Cranmer Hall was borne out by comments from the President of the St John's Council and the Chair of the Cranmer Committee and the Vice-President/Vice-Chair of both bodies. This effective working relationship depends on the personalities and qualities of the present Warden and Principal; the phrases 'at present' and 'at the moment' recurred in the comments received from those sources. Nevertheless, the key structures seem sufficiently robust and clear to ensure a strong and secure relationship between senior office-holders of the two inter-related bodies.
43. The Cranmer Committee, as a sub-Committee of the College Council, deals with formational training and pastoral policy, working within a budget agreed by the Finance Committee. It is concerned with the development, monitoring and fine detail of policy. It makes proposals on Cranmer strategy to the Council. The same person serves as Vice-President and Vice-Chair of the two bodies respectively, thus providing continuity, consistency and overlap (reinforced by other common memberships). The fact of student representation on both bodies is also to be welcomed. The Minutes of both meetings indicate that issues are progressed rather than simply repeated, and the use of task and finish groups (e.g. for the Cranmer Hall strategic plan and the LRC project) is a constructive and effective model for using Trustees' time. The chart of meetings within Cranmer itself was also helpful in capturing the structures that exist for the exchange of information and the identification, review and resolution issues in different areas of Hall and College life.

### **Commendation 3**

**The College and within in it Cranmer Hall are to be commended for clear and effective structures of governance and management.**

### **C2 The TEI has effective leadership.**

44. The various relationships between the Principal, the Warden, the President of the College Council and the Chair of the Cranmer Committee are working well at the present time, as was particularly endorsed by the latter two office-holders. The Cranmer Chair endorsed the collaborative style of the Warden, who also demonstrates intelligent and purposeful leadership, for example in driving strategic planning, addressing process and structural issues, and steering the adoption of the Community Covenant. The College Council Minutes show that the Trustees have a clear grasp of Cranmer business and strategy (with Cranmer issues figuring prominently in the College Risk Register).
45. Cranmer staff and student Trustees play an active role. Meetings with staff suggested that there was clarity about individuals' roles within the overall vision and strategy, with a sense of being valued as individuals, and with opportunities to contribute where their voices were heard. The energetic role played by members of staff in fund-raising for the new Learning Resource Centre is a clear indication of their positive motivation. The senior team's care for staff is evidenced by the 'upside-down formal dinner' where cleaning, catering and other support staff are at the top table and waited on by the Principal, Warden and other senior staff.

46. Less positively, some in middle-management positions reported issues around workload and how that was recognised and dealt with, and also concerns around increasingly complex and specialised HR matters having to be dealt with by the already busy Director of Finance and Administration, supported by outsourced support from an agency as and when required (e.g. on role evaluation). A review of roles and responsibilities in Cranmer’s administrative office is now advisable. We also sense that the development of Cranmer would be helped by the appointment of a chief operating officer, reporting to the Warden.

### **Recommendation 6**

**We recommend that a review and restructuring of the administrative support for Cranmer Hall be undertaken and that consideration should be given to establishing a senior post with overarching executive responsibilities for Cranmer, such as a chief operating officer or equivalent.**

#### **C3 Trustees are appropriately recruited, supported and developed.**

47. The intentional recruitment of Trustees to the St John’s College Council, with specific Cranmer Committee roles in mind, is commendable. The website evidences Trustees’ expertise in a range of relevant areas: strategic and operational HR management; communications/media (especially in an educational context); HE administration (the University Academic Registrar); property and facilities management; a significant Church of England presence, both episcopal and lay (including leadership development); business and commercial experience; finance, accounting and audit. The diverse backgrounds offer an appropriate mix of skills to the College and Cranmer, and the *ex officio* membership (Cranmer Committee Chair, Cranmer Common Room President, staff representative, University Council Representative, etc.) ensure links to other constituencies, with appropriate representation from Cranmer.
48. The membership of the Cranmer Committee was reviewed in 2017 to include a local Anglican priest, a new staff member, a Free Church Track representative and a further student representative in addition to the Cranmer Common Room President. The ASE 2017 noted that there was now greater clarity in the Committee’s working methods, especially in distinguishing more clearly which items of business were coming for information and which for action.

#### **C4 The TEI has effective business planning and fundraising.**

49. The budget for Cranmer Hall is held within the overall budget for St John’s College, with a section detailing specific expenditure for Cranmer within the annual report and the regular management accounts, and with monthly reports reviewed by College Officers before review by the Finance Committee and College Council. Financial risks are around levels of ordinand recruitment, particularly with the changed funding landscape introduced by RME, where the middle- to long-term impact is yet to be seen (being reviewed in the strategic plan being discussed in Cranmer Committee and College Council) and the completion of fund-raising for the LRC, with £500,000 still to be found at the time of the PER visits.
50. It was noted that a number of key administrative staff are scheduled to retire at around the same time. While this is not a financial risk *per se*, it might impact on the current motivated, dedicated and ‘extra mile’ culture and ethos and in turn affect the character of the institution, with a resulting impact on student satisfaction (which is currently extremely high, according to the NSS) and in turn on future recruitment and funding.

51. Annual Staff Reviews are designed to pick up on performance management issues, though these are also addressed in termly reviews and informally as required. Institutional financial performance is regularly monitored by the Finance Committee, the Audit Committee and the Council.
52. Stakeholder engagement is a mix of College and Cranmer, with the latter reaching out to placement supervisors, diocesan bishops and DDOs (in dedicated open days and by contact with the Warden and others), those discerning vocations and considering potential pathways – all these initiatives being designed to encourage recruitment of residential students and to nurture good diocesan and placement links.

**C5 The TEI has sound financial and risk management and reporting.**

53. Risk is overseen by the College Audit Committee, reporting to the College Council. The last College Risk Register (Feb 2017) showed that key risks 2, 3 and 7 related to Cranmer and particularly to (a) the financial impact of potentially lower levels of recruitment on the College (though risk 3 had fallen away since the Lindisfarne opportunity disappeared, as noted by the Audit Committee in November 2017) and (b) reputational impact affecting recruitment owing to the fact that the Cranmer community includes a number of independent students who are not subject to the same level of oversight as ordinands are.
54. The Cranmer strategic plan, currently under development, was scheduled to go to the Audit Committee in February 2018 for assessment of potential risk before going to Council in March 2018. One potential risk might be an over-ambitious diversification of pathways, as identified in the SWOT analysis. The fourth identified risk (financial and reputational) concerns the funding of the LRC project (construction work started in early 2018, with anticipated completion in early 2019). Risks (inherent/residual) are scored according to the Durham University practice, with the specifically Cranmer risks having the Warden as responsible officer, supported by the Cranmer Committee for the major strategic risk following the impact of RME. There was no evidence of a separate Cranmer risk register, nor of discussion of risks at staff or officer level meetings in Cranmer. We suggest that 'Risk' become a termly item on the agenda of the Cranmer Hall Officers' meeting.
55. Budgets are set in March each year (initially drafted by the senior officer team before proceeding through the formal committee processes) and are then revised in September to reflect Cranmer's actual recruitment numbers and levels of occupancy, to which the College budget is especially sensitive. The most recent ASE indicated that the College Director of Finance and Administration oversees any review of operating procedures, with no significant action being undertaken in 2016-17, though the Warden is reviewing how operational procedures might be handled in future. The review team raised a question of potential risk about the terms in which the College's reserves policy was expressed, and whether this might merit reconsideration, but the auditors had been satisfied and there appears to be no immediate risk to Cranmer.

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

## SECTION D: STUDENT OUTCOMES

### **D1 Students are growing in their knowledge of Christian tradition, faith and life.**

56. As would be expected, given the Hall's consciously evangelical tradition, particular weight is given to biblical studies in the academic programme. Introductory teaching on the Bible and a class in New Testament Greek, which were observed, drew students into critical engagement with the text in ways which for some were new and challenging. The variety of pathways of studies, and the opportunity for personalised programmes of training for those with previous missional and theological experience were appreciated by sponsoring dioceses. Where ordinands have the potential to contribute more widely to theological scholarship or teaching, there is a concern to integrate formation with the vocation to further study; a post-graduate research day is an intentional contribution to this.
57. While a majority of ordinands is drawn from a broadly evangelical tradition, a significant minority comes from more central or catholic traditions. Comments from a sponsoring diocese recognised Cranmer's willingness to engage with, welcome, and learn from other traditions in the Church of England and that diocese has been happy for ordinands from a variety of church traditions to train there. Placements offer important opportunities to experience different styles of worship and theological understanding: both placement supervisors and students spoke of the value of this.

### **Commendation 4**

**We commend Cranmer Hall for intentionally creating and sustaining a diverse and inclusive student community, across the spectrum of Anglican traditions of theology, spirituality and liturgy.**

58. Intentional reflection is particularly required in the students' self-assessments, prepared with reference to Ministry Division criteria for ordinands and discussed with their tutors, and in the experience of and response to the extensive programme of placements. Both placement supervisors and, more particularly, a receiving diocese, perceived skills in theological reflection to be well-developed. Student-led Discipleship Groups offered informal opportunities for shared reflection.

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

59. The Hall's self-description is that it is 'not about here', though the rider is not that it is for the world, but for the wider church. There are conscious attempts to counter the almost inevitably centripetal nature of a theological college: engagement with the University as a secular institution is helpful in this respect, as is the range of events and lectures offered within St John's College. Placements across the region, and perhaps especially those in some of the area's most deprived parishes, including those served by the East Durham Mission Project (set up in 2014), are a practical introduction to ways in which the church responds to and serves those in need. The project is developing into a 'partnership' and although some aspects of the Hall's involvement will therefore change, the Hall is still committed to supporting and engaging with the specific parishes in East Durham. Wider perspectives observed during the Review included a Discipleship Group learning about the work of Jean Vanier and the L'Arche communities, and the inclusion of matters of local, national, and international concern in intercessions in corporate worship.



60. Ordinands are involved in a various missional and evangelistic undertakings in partnership with Durham Diocese, and with the Cathedral, including a faith-sharing weekend for all first-years, based in local communities and churches, and a recent event, 'Lumiere', at the Cathedral. Students' written responses to the weekend showed their awareness of the challenges that were presented, including from at least one the ability to reshape what was done so that it was more effective. For most, if not all students, engagement with mission is a significant part of their placement experience. A particular aspect of contemporary mission is covered in the popular MediaLitMission Study Block, addressing the communication of faith in a digital world. Another significant element of the mission programme is the schools week. There was, however, relatively little evidence of opportunities to experience or engage with other faith communities; this was raised with the Reviewers by a couple of students.

### **Recommendation 7**

**We recommend that the theological study of non-Christian faiths and of the dynamics of inter-faith dialogue be strengthened, alongside practical opportunities to experience the worship and traditions of other faiths.**

61. Involvement in prayer, nurture, and study groups plays a part of many of the placements undertaken by ordinands, and placement reports and reflections provide evidence of the value placed by students on working with such groups, including stories of particular individuals seen as growing and responding in faith and vocation.

#### **D3 Students are growing in personal spirituality and engagement with public worship.**

62. Students share in responsibility for preparing and leading Morning Prayer and BCP Evensong and all-age worship, and they participate in a variety of roles in the weekly College Communion. A diaconal role in the practical preparations for worship is assigned to tutor groups. Students receive immediate oral feedback from their tutors on their leading of worship and this is also recorded and reviewed. Students are expected to preach several times during their placements, with informal feedback and one assessed sermon.
63. There is a clear expectation of regular attendance at corporate worship which is widely observed.
64. Ordinands reflect on their own spiritual life within the context of self-assessment and in conversation with their tutors. They are strongly encouraged to work with a spiritual director or soul-friend, although this is not mandatory. They participate in college quiet days, and there is a rich and varied provision of retreats, including for first-year students and those about to leave.

#### **D4 Students' personality, character and relationships.**

65. Although it was evident that for some students the upheaval of moving to college and the pressures of community life weighed heavily, very few leave without completing their studies, and a number of ordinands spoke very warmly of the support received from the community and from staff.
66. The diversity of the student body, in age, tradition, family circumstance, educational background and (to a limited extent) ethnicity was generally seen as a strength and a source of learning to respect difference. The Discipleship Groups provide an informal and safe space for acknowledging some of the challenges of formation, alongside relationships with personal tutors which were generally

valued. Given the range of views on sexuality within the community, students of same-sex orientation spoke very positively of the welcome and courtesy with which they were treated.

67. There was some confusion among students about the availability (especially for ordinands) of a pastoral person who stood outside the reporting structure. Although we were assured that students had been advised that the St John's College Chaplain was available to them, it seems that this fact needs to be underlined.
68. Professional boundaries and Church of England Guidelines are explicitly covered in the curriculum, and safeguarding training modules C1 and 2 are undertaken (see also comments on Safeguarding under B2). The Handbooks provide careful, detailed and rigorous guidance for staff-tutor interaction.

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

69. The Discipleship Groups offer opportunities for students to exercise leadership among their peers and at their best are inherently collaborative. For many ordinands, placements provide both the chance to observe the leadership of those in ministry and to work with both laity and clergy in particular projects. Receiving dioceses were largely positive in their comments about the quality of preparation for parish ministry, and a former ordinand commented that he had been well prepared both to work in a team and to be a leader of leaders. Equipping students for leadership is evidently 'a work in progress', but one that is being given time and priority.

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

70. As a result of our extensive conversations and observations, we are satisfied with the general level of dedication, sense of vocation and awareness of the opportunities and constraints of ordained ministry among the ordinands. Of course, there is always more that could be done to sharpen such awareness.

**D7 Pioneer ministry training**

71. The Reviewers were satisfied that Pioneer Ministry students had enthusiasm for and skills in ministry and mission in unfamiliar contexts, and were flexible, resourceful and innovative in their approach to mission and ministry.

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

72. There is a robust system of formative and summative assessment of students' progress through training, evidence of which was made available to the Review Team.

**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 discipleship.**

73. Students at Cranmer Hall follow a variety of pathways. Our conversations with students and academic staff lead us to believe that the regular personal one-to-one meetings between students and their personal tutors are key to the monitoring of progress and discernment of future needs. Sight of reports to sponsoring dioceses gives us confidence that the current practice informs the reporting process in a robust fashion and that, consequently, students are aware of their progress in meeting their learning goals and IME I criteria and of their formational needs for the future. At a

meeting with senior staff, the Reviewers were advised that such information is also embedded in a documented personal learning pathway for each ordinand which relates to learning outcomes and gives guidance as to the meeting of IMEI criteria and future learning goals.

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

74. There are robust and effective systems of feedback and monitoring in most areas; see further under EI below.

**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

75. The overall quality control and assurance procedures governing the partnership were confirmed through the initial validation process.
76. It was clear to the review team, through its discussions with staff and students and through the draft strategy, self-evaluation and other documentation submitted that the senior management team are providing leadership in the process of review and enhancement.

#### *Management and oversight*

77. The review team noted that the TEI's Common Awards Management Committee (referred to by the TEI as the 'Board of Studies') was established, and operates, in alignment with the Terms of Reference that are specified in the standard validation contract.
78. The Board of Studies minutes address the review of modules, programmes, and teaching facilities. Minutes of the Board confirm that student representatives attend each meeting and the Board receives minutes of the Student-Staff Consultative Committee (SSCC). The Minutes are clearly written and evidence robust processes for quality management and reflective practice. Discussion of Module Evaluation Questionnaires, Common Awards and Joint Management Committee business are standing items on the Board's agenda.

#### *Engagement with the University*

79. The review team noted that the TEI's engagement with the University Liaison Officer (ULO) has been positive; the ULO had attended most meetings of the Board of Studies on which he was an ex officio appointment, engaging in the discussions while also providing advice and information.
80. The Cranmer team has also been in regular contact with the Common Awards administrative team. This has been a combination of formal and informal engagement. Formal requests (such as curriculum changes, concession requests and the consideration of APL applications) have been appropriately communicated to the Common Awards Team. The representatives of the senior management team at Cranmer welcomed the advice and support it had received from the University and the flexibility offered by the Common Awards framework.

#### *Applications and admissions*

81. The TEI's admissions policy and entry requirements apply to all programmes. All admissions and APL decisions relating to the Common Awards programmes are managed through Cranmer; the Warden is responsible for admission decisions in conjunction with the Academic Dean. The APL Officer is responsible for reviewing AP(E)L applications in consultation with the Academic Dean. Admissions and APL processes are monitored by the Board of Studies. As part of this review Cranmer provided example paperwork which showed that it operated robust processes for admission and consideration of AP(E)L, which was in line with the University's requirements

#### *Assessment*

82. Cranmer Hall has effective internal processes and practices for managing assessment. Plagiarism detection software (Turnitin) is used for all assignment submissions; students submit their assessed

work via the DUO virtual learning environment (Blackboard platform). All marking and moderation is carried out anonymously by the module tutors. The quality of feedback is monitored by the internal moderators and the external examiner.

#### *Student Engagement*

83. In respect of the Common Awards and Postgraduate programmes the student body is well-represented on Cranmer and St John's College committees including the Board of Studies and Student-Staff Consultative Committee. Views on the formational and community aspects of the TEI provision are represented on the Cranmer Committee, Cranmer Common Room and the St. John's College Student Experience Subcommittee. However, the review team heard from some Ordinands on the "Durham Pathway" (i.e. those studying for a degree in the Department of Theology and Religion at the University) that they did not feel they had a sufficient representative channel at Cranmer as they were not directly represented on the SSCC or Board of Studies.

#### **Recommendation 8**

**We recommend that the TEI should consider how the views of students on the 'Durham Pathway' are best represented.**

84. Cranmer Hall uses a range of effective mechanisms to gather student feedback in order to assure and enhance the quality of provision. All modules are reviewed using module evaluation forms, and students can also submit feedback on assessment throughout the year in DUO. The responses to MEQ feedback and committee minutes are posted on DUO.

#### **Commendation 5**

**The review team commends the TEI for its widespread commitment to gathering student feedback, reviewing module evaluations and improving teaching in light of feedback received.**

#### *Conclusion*

85. In light of the above, 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.**

86. The adequacy of overall provision for academic and pastoral support and guidance was confirmed through the initial validation process.

#### *Course information and Induction*

87. Academic resources, study skills support, module information, and assessment feedback are provided through the TEI's dedicated DUO system. All students are also provided with a hard copy of student handbooks.
88. The students with whom the review team met felt that information could be clearer and presented more consistently, particularly in DUO. On arrival students spoke about confusion about their individual pathway (e.g. how the formational requirements worked alongside the academic requirements). Staff told the reviewers that students were provided with an individualised pathway guide and students in later years of the programme had a clear understanding of their requirements.

89. Some of the students with whom the panel met reported feeling overwhelmed by the workload. Discussion with those students suggested that some of this was due to a lack of initial clarity about the kind, level and distribution of work that they could expect. They suggested that clearer guidance at induction might have alleviated the problem.
90. Some of the strongest comments on workload related to modules audited by Cranmer Ordinands who were concurrently reading for the Theology and Religion degree at the University (referred to as the 'Durham pathway'). Students on that pathway expressed frustration at the severe difficulty of fulfilling all the requirements for their degree modules alongside the requirements of the formational modules audited in Cranmer, and the other Cranmer activities in which they were expected to take part.

## **Recommendation 9**

### **The review team recommend reviewing the workload of students on the Durham pathway.**

91. The initial validation exercise had flagged up issues with the induction process and had recommended that the TEI reconsider whether more tailored induction sessions could be offered based on student's mode of study, background and ability, and linked to provision of study skills support. Cranmer reported through its ASE in 2015 and in the current review that it had introduced streaming. Nevertheless, it appeared through talking to students that there remained scope to enhance the induction process.
92. The TEI has a diverse student body undertaking various programmes in different modes of study (representing independent students, readers in training, ordination candidates, and curates). Given the diverse nature of the student body, study skills support is particularly important. Undergraduate students who were relatively new to higher education or who had returned to study as mature students found it difficult to adjust to the regime of academic study and had wanted more scaffolding support in academic skills such as essay-writing and more opportunities to see examples of well-written essays. Conversely the postgraduate students with whom the panel met found the induction (which happened a week before the undergraduate induction) to be fully effective. They particularly valued an exercise in "marking" example essays designed to familiarise them with marking criteria. The programme team stated that several study skills sessions were provided during and after the induction week. Extra lunchtime sessions had been offered, at student request, but had been poorly attended.

## **Recommendation 10**

**The review team recommends that the TEI consult with its students on the effectiveness of the induction processes, and on possibilities for its development. The team recommends in particular that the TEI discuss ways of providing clearer information about individual student pathways and about workload, and explore means of strengthening the preparation provided to students to help them manage their workload.**

### *Tutorial Support*

93. Students with whom the review team met confirmed that they were aware of what they needed to do in order to succeed on their programme of study. They also spoke of the friendly and open learning community that enabled them to access informal and formal support.

94. There are effective means of supporting student progress, contributing to a high rate of retention and completion. Students are provided with a Personal Tutor who is responsible for monitoring and academic and formational progress, providing guidance on module choice and pastoral support.
95. Student representatives described effective support for independent learning projects and dissertations. In the case of postgraduate programmes, a supervisor is allocated in Michaelmas following the submission of a project proposal. Workshops are provided in October and June and academic advice is also provided in the student handbook and guidance on DUO.

#### *Complaints and Appeals*

96. The student complaints and appeals policies are described in the student handbook. The students with whom the review team met confirmed that they were aware of the process for submitting a complaint to the TEI. However, one student spoke of a reluctance to use the complaint processes and a perceived conflict with the TEI's formal duty to report on formation to Dioceses, and other students indicated that they had similar concerns. The programme team spoke of the confidential nature of the complaints process and informal and formal means of resolution. Bishops' Reports were shared with Ordinands in an open way prior to submission.

#### **Recommendation 11**

**The reviewers recommend that the TEI should look for ways of communicating more clearly and directly to students the nature of the complaints process, and of reassuring students of the confidentiality of the process and its separation from the assessment of their formation.**

#### *Disability Support*

97. Support for students with disabilities is provided through the University's Disability Support service. The review team noted that the timetable and physical location of the service could deter students from accessing this service. The team also heard about delays in testing students who had declared a disability after they registered (the mechanism for reporting disabilities before arrival is normally through UCAS but students at Cranmer Hall apply directly).
98. **The Ministry Division Review team** adds the following note with regard to pastoral and academic support. Pastoral support: the personal tutor system seems normally to work well for most students, though some students reported inconsistencies between tutors in respect of flexibility to accommodate students' family obligations. Not all ordinands were aware that the College Chaplain was also available to them as someone independent who would not be in the position of writing a report that might affect their future.
99. Although students with additional needs were directed to the Durham central support services, students on more than one occasion said that timetabling was so tight that they had difficulty availing themselves of the services within their office hours. Where UCAS students could state their needs at application, sometimes Cranmer students only became aware of needs (or only made the staff aware of needs) some significant way into their studies, with inevitably adverse effect. For the many students coming with less academic experience, most appreciated the level of support they received, but would have welcomed sample model essays, with some explanation of what would make an

outstanding, a good, an adequate or a less than adequate piece of work, so that there was some way of judging how to achieve better results.

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

100. Through the initial validation process the TEI had confirmed the adequacy of its learning resources for its students. Extensive library resources suitable for all levels of study are available through the St John's and University libraries and specialist collections such as the Cathedral library. Additional study resources are provided through DUO. Students with whom the review team met confirmed their satisfaction with these resources and the responsiveness of the TEI to requests for additional material. In this respect the review team heard of increased holdings of Baptist material to support the Free Church pathway.

**Commendation 6**

**The review team commends the TEI for the excellent learning resources available to students.**

101. The students with whom the reviewers met noted some considerable variability in the amount, currency and presentation of academic material across modules in DUO. The programme team told the review team that it was aware of the University's minimum requirements for DUO.

**Recommendation 12**

**The review team recommends that the TEI consider how to monitor the clarity and consistency of the materials provided on DUO across all its modules, and consider establishing a more demanding baseline for such provision.**

102. **The Ministry Division Review team** notes that Cranmer is well provided in terms of libraries available, with the College Library especially rich in theology and ministry, alongside the University Library and Cathedral Sharp Library. The librarian stated that they did not normally buy multiple copies of key texts, relying on the provision of a copy restricted to use within the Library, though if the tutor insisted further copies would be purchased. Students were by and large satisfied with hard copy provision. Online resources through DUO are also extensive, but staff acknowledged there was scope for greater creativity in using technology for teaching, and students noted different levels of IT literacy and familiarity with the use of the online learning environment between their lecturers. Teaching and study spaces are also widely acknowledged as needing improvement; the LRC will offer improved provision of both from 2019.

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

*Teaching staff*

103. 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.
104. The College Council is responsible for approving the appointments process for the Principal and other members of the core teaching staff.



- I05.** An updated ‘Staff CV Summary’ document has been provided, and reviewed in light of the academic programmes delivered by the TEI. The review team concluded that members of academic staff were suitably qualified and experienced to deliver the approved programmes. There is an annual appraisal process which is informed by student feedback and peer observation and results in staff working to a set of objectives over the following year. Staff take advantage of University staff development including the Durham University Teaching and Learning Award (DULTA) and access seminars provided by the Department of Theology and Religion. **See also the Ministry Division reviewers’ commentary at section B5 and Recommendation 5.**
- I06. Associate tutors who work closely with core members of staff teaching similar topics are given regular feedback and there is an external teaching day dedicated to staff development and discussion around the curriculum, delivery and assessment.

*Teaching quality*

- I07. The majority of students with whom the review team met commented positively on the quality of the teaching. A number of staff development activities take place across the TEI and focus on specific matters of teaching and learning as well as more strategic issues. See Criterion F3 below.

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

- I08. The appropriateness of the mechanisms to ensure the accuracy of public information, publicity and promotional activity was confirmed through the initial validation process.
- I09. The Warden is responsible for ensuring the accuracy of all public information, publicity information, and promotional activity. The TEI was reminded that approval should be sought from the University for any materials referring to the validated partnership or programmes.

**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.**

- I10. Recruitment remains stable both to Common Awards and postgraduate programmes. 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. Confirmation of numbers from some of the TEI's sponsoring dioceses has provided some reassurance for the upcoming academic years.
- I11. Early indications suggest that student recruitment for 2018/19 is not being adversely affected by changes in funding patterns, but that it was still too soon to draw conclusions. The TEI would continue to monitor student numbers throughout the year. The TEI should keep student numbers under review, in order to identify any potential issues arising from changes in funding patterns.

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

- I12. 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.
- I13. The TEI has engaged with the curriculum development process to review and update its curricula in response to institutional review and student feedback.
- I14. The structure and design of the postgraduate programmes appropriately underpin the learning outcomes. The new MA in Digital Theology was approved by the University in 2017 following consideration of the programme specification, module outlines and a report from an external subject specialist who confirmed the appropriateness of the learning outcomes, structure, content, delivery and assessment.

### **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.**

- I15. The initial validation and review exercise in 2014 had confirmed that the methods of teaching, learning and assessment for both undergraduate and postgraduate programmes would enable the learning outcomes to be achieved and that achievement to be measured. Subsequent reports from external examiners and the University Liaison Officer have also found that the assessment methods enable the learning outcomes to be demonstrated.

### *Teaching and Learning*

116. Feedback from summaries of Module Evaluation Questionnaire results and responses to the National Student Survey revealed that students are broadly very satisfied with the teaching provided by Cranmer. MEQ results are fully discussed by the Board of Studies and evidence was provided that the TEI has responded appropriately where issues have been identified.
117. Students with whom the panel met shared their view that most teaching was of a high quality. In respect of postgraduate study students found the teaching enjoyable and intellectually stretching with an appropriate balance between contact and independent learning. Many teaching sessions last an hour and 45 minutes. Student opinion on the length of these sessions was equally divided between those who found this the right length and those who viewed the sessions as too long. Some students found the organisation of the timetable into blocks made best use of the schedule and fitted well with part-time study. Others found that the extended nature of these interactions helped develop a good rapport between staff and students. The teaching sessions took different formats from a full lecture to a mix of lecture and interactive seminar, with most sessions containing a break.

### **Recommendation 13**

**The review team recommends that Cranmer consider how best to identify, share, and build upon best practice in the use of the 1 hr 45-minute teaching blocks, in order to support student attention and engagement.**

118. Given the nature of the cohort with its mix of students with ministerial and pastoral experience, some undergraduate students believed there was greater scope to employ more peer-to-peer learning. Nonetheless both staff and students were able to provide examples of the use of peer-to-peer learning (e.g. in sharing liturgy or other case studies) and modules offered opportunities for students to give seminar presentations.
119. Several modules are delivered at two different levels with some shared delivery (e.g. Mission and Evangelism) under separate module descriptions. Students with whom the panel met were not clear that there was sufficient differentiation between the levels within the mixed teaching ('only 15 minutes out of 1'45 dedicated to separate reading groups'). The programme team however pointed to expectations on differentiated reading (separate bibliographies are provided) and assessment.

### **Recommendation 14**

**The review team recommends that the TEI review the ways in which it explains and presents mixed-level teaching to students, in order to ensure that the differentiation in Learning Outcomes and assessments is clearly and directly communicated to them (directly, as well as in handbooks), and that the reinforcement of this distinction by the provision of differentiated activities oriented to those Learning Outcomes and assessments is clearly explained.**

120. The TEI has a process of peer observation that is used for developmental purposes and which informs the annual staff appraisal. The team was also told about regular away days and teaching development.

## Assessment

121. The undergraduate programmes are assessed by a broad range of methods and in accordance with the module descriptions and guidance material of the Common Awards framework. Methods include, *inter alia*, essays, presentations, liturgy, reflective journals, portfolios and projects). The external examiner has confirmed that the range of assessments is appropriate to the curriculum and intended learning outcomes.
122. Postgraduate programmes are similarly assessed through an appropriate range of methods (e.g. projects, portfolio, essays, presentations, professional resources) that test the achievement of the learning outcomes.
123. The module outlines include details of a range of formative assessments, which appear broadly to complement and support the summative assessment, often in the form of smaller pieces of work or oral feedback through class discussion. The review team heard however from some students with whom it met that it was not always evident to them what the purpose of the formative assessment was and how it related to and supported the summative assessment. In the context of a broader concern about workload, students also told the panel that the volume of formative assessment required was unmanageable. A further concern to the reviewers was that students reported that the feedback on formative work was often provided too late to help them tackle the summative assessments (and in some cases was returned after the summative assessment deadline). Members of the programme team expressed a variety of views on the purpose of formative assessment.

## Recommendation 15

**The review team recommends that a thorough review of the modes, purpose and volume of formative and summative assessment is undertaken by Cranmer in consultation with the student body. Consideration should be given to scaling back the overall volume of formative assessment. The review should distinguish clearly between the purpose of summative assessment (which measures students' achievement of module Learning Outcomes) and formative assessment (which helps students develop the skills needed to complete summative assessment successfully), and should avoid seeing formative assessment as a means of covering aspects of the Learning Outcomes not covered in summative assessment.**

124. Written feedback on assessed work is provided to support students' learning and personal development. The most recent external examiner's report commended Cranmer for the quality of its feedback on assessed work. Evidence provided on Module Evaluation Questionnaires and through the meeting with students suggested that students value the quality of feedback provided. However, the students with whom the review team met commented negatively on the *timeliness* of feedback on assessed work, reporting that they regularly receive feedback past the TEI's published target turnaround time (although the delays are communicated to them). The average turnaround target published in DUO was three weeks. However, the undergraduate student handbook states that "*Markers will aim to return feedback on formative assessments within a fortnight and summative assessment within a period which varies from a month to about two months. This does not amount to a guarantee that work will be returned by the end of these periods.*" This timescale seemed unduly and inappropriately long to the reviewers.

## Recommendation 16

**The review team recommends that the TEI should review its policy on turnaround times for assessment feedback, and take a more robust approach to monitoring the return of feedback to ensure that, wherever reasonably possible, turnaround times are met.**

### *Learning Hours*

125. Module learning hours are clearly stated in module outlines available to students and provided to the review team and students with whom the review team confirmed that they were aware of this information.

### *Conclusion*

126. The review team concluded that the methods of teaching, learning and assessment remained appropriate to support students' learning, development, and achievement of learning outcomes.

## **F4 There are appropriate arrangements for placements.**

127. The report of the initial validation visit documented the TEI's mechanisms for ensuring that arrangements for placements are appropriate. Placements are assessed for Church formational purposes but not for the award of credit (although experience gained on placement will inform reflective-based summative assessments)
128. Detailed briefing documents are provided to all students undertaking placements including an individual learning agreement and outline the requirements for the placement, the learning outcomes, and the required assessment.
129. The students with whom the review team met spoke positively of the support received for undertaking placements, and particularly valued having the choice of where they would spend this time.
130. **The Ministry Division Review team** adds that Cranmer provides an excellent range of placements which mixes student preference and out-of-comfort-zone options well. Placement supervisors are well briefed and supported. Placement opportunities were of a huge variety, which is admirable, but this richness could make the experience rather 'hit and miss'. Students wanted clearer expectations, especially in their first year, of what is expected of them and of how much initiative they should themselves be taking. In at least one case, a placement supervisor was also a member of staff, thus raising the question of a potential conflict of interest, and potentially making it more difficult for the student on placement.
131. The Hall places considerable emphasis on its programme of placements in the north-east, elsewhere in the country, and overseas, and sees this as one of the strengths of its training programme. Greater use of the opportunities for placements offered by Newcastle would be welcomed by that diocese.
132. For students, the structure of placements, expectations, practicalities, and provision for assessment are laid out in the Ministerial Practice handbook. Placement supervisors, some of whom had worked with the college and its ordinands over a number of years, were clear about the purpose and structure of the placements and received appropriate briefing beforehand. Communication with the

Hall was largely effective, and supervisors were made aware of particular learning goals for students, and in turn felt that their own feedback concerning matters to be addressed was valued.

- I33. Only 'block' placements feed directly into the formal assessments via theological reflection assignments; however, supervisors on all placements submit formal reports which feed into the overall reporting process.
- I34. Students reflect on placement experience both with the placement supervisor and as part of the process of self-assessment with a tutor. While the programme as a whole is clearly valued, it was suggested a) that there might be a place for exploration of the contribution of the varied character and length of the placement to the learning experience, and b) that there might be greater integration between academic understanding and the experience of the placement, perhaps especially where there was no formal assessment.
- I35. Students discuss the nature and choice of placements and what challenges and learning opportunities they offer with their tutors and with the Director of Ministerial Practice. A previous ordinand commented that the careful advice he had received led to a stretching placement which contributed importantly to his future ministry. There was evidence of good communication between Hall and placement where issues over a student's experience or conduct arose. The appropriateness of placements is discussed with tutors and the Director of Ministerial Practice; practical provision for transport and residence is laid out in the handbook.

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

- I36. The validation visit process confirmed that the programmes appropriately addressed the University's Principles for the Development of the Taught Provision.
- I37. 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.

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

- I38. 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, and responded to promptly.
- I39. Teaching staff actively request student feedback via module evaluation questionnaires. Feedback is requested after each module so that the data can be reviewed and necessary improvements can be made to benefit the next cohort of students. The Module Tutor is responsible for reviewing the detailed module evaluation data and responding to the Board of Studies on actions to be taken. Students confirmed that summaries of MEQ results and corresponding responses were published in DUO.
- I40. The review team commends the TEI for its deep commitment to working with students to review and enhance academic provision and support continuously. The students whom the review team met spoke extremely positively about the frequent opportunities for engagement and providing feedback to staff.

141. Members of staff from within the TEI contribute to the Common Awards Annual Self-Evaluation (ASE) process. While the last two years' ASE submissions have been quite detailed in respect of Section B, the senior management team acknowledged that this was a new process for the TEI and there is scope to better coordinate the process and to be more self-reflective. Further work would be undertaken prior to the next submission.

**Subject to the implementation of the recommendations in 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 Cranmer Hall in preparing candidates for ordained ministry.**

## LIST OF COMMENDATIONS

### Commendation 1

We commend Cranmer Hall for its clear articulation and communication of the Christ-centred, ministry-focused vision that underlies its formational aims.

### Commendation 2

Cranmer Hall is to be commended for the generous way in which spouses of ordinands are encouraged to share in a wide range of community activities, including learning opportunities.

### Commendation 3

The College and within in it Cranmer Hall are to be commended for clear and effective structures of governance and management.

### Commendation 4

We commend Cranmer Hall for intentionally creating and sustaining a diverse and inclusive student community, across the spectrum of Anglican traditions of theology, spirituality and liturgy.

### Commendation 5

The review team commends the TEI for its widespread commitment to gathering student feedback, reviewing module evaluations and improving teaching in light of feedback received.

### Commendation 6

The review team commends the TEI for the excellent learning resources available to students.



## LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS

### **Recommendation 1**

In its recruitment strategy, Cranmer should pro-actively seek to reach potential students who would be attracted to a very good college and a first-class university theology department.

### **Recommendation 2**

We recommend that, within its evangelical framework and ethos, the TEI should review the opportunities for students to be exposed to the catholic Anglican tradition, especially in ecclesiology, including the theology of ordination and the sacraments.

### **Recommendation 3**

We recommend that staff-student consultation take place to work out the best way of providing structured opportunities for the discussion of sensitive issues on which student opinion is divided.

### **Recommendation 4**

We recommend that facilities for amplification be used consistently in large teaching spaces to assist audibility of both teaching and discussion.

### **Recommendation 5**

We recommend that Cranmer Hall teaching staff normally be granted a term's study leave not less than every three years, subject to the normal processes of approval and review of study projects.

### **Recommendation 6**

We recommend that a review and restructuring of the administrative support for Cranmer Hall be undertaken and that consideration should be given to establishing a senior post with overarching executive responsibilities for Cranmer, such as a chief operating officer or equivalent.

### **Recommendation 7**

We recommend that the theological study of non-Christian faiths and of the dynamics of inter-faith dialogue be strengthened, alongside practical opportunities to experience the worship and traditions of other faiths.

### **Recommendation 8**

We recommend that the TEI should consider how the views of students on the 'Durham Pathway' are best represented.

### **Recommendation 9**

The review team recommend reviewing the workload of students on the Durham pathway.

### **Recommendation 10**

The review team recommends that the TEI consult with its students on the effectiveness of the induction processes, and on possibilities for its development. The team recommends in particular that the TEI discuss ways of providing clearer information about individual student pathways and about workload, and explore means of strengthening the preparation provided to students to help them manage their workload.

### **Recommendation 11**

The reviewers recommend that the TEI should look for ways of communicating more clearly and directly to students the nature of the complaints process, and of reassuring students of the confidentiality of the process and its separation from the assessment of their formation.

### **Recommendation 12**

The review team recommends that the TEI consider how to monitor the clarity and consistency of the materials provided on DUO across all its modules, and consider establishing a more demanding baseline for such provision.

### **Recommendation 13**

The review team recommends that Cranmer consider how best to identify, share, and build upon best practice in the use of the 1 hr 45-minute teaching blocks, in order to support student attention and engagement.

### **Recommendation 14**

The review team recommends that the TEI review the ways in which it explains and presents mixed-level teaching to students, in order to ensure that the differentiation in Learning Outcomes and assessments is clearly and directly communicated to them (directly, as well as in handbooks), and that the reinforcement of this distinction by the provision of differentiated activities oriented to those Learning Outcomes and assessments is clearly explained.

### **Recommendation 15**

The review team recommends that a thorough review of the modes, purpose and volume of formative and summative assessment is undertaken by Cranmer in consultation with the student body. Consideration should be given to scaling back the overall volume of formative assessment. The review should distinguish clearly between the purpose of summative assessment (which measures students' achievement of module Learning Outcomes) and formative assessment (which helps students develop the skills needed to complete summative assessment successfully), and should avoid seeing formative assessment as a means of covering aspects of the Learning Outcomes not covered in summative assessment.

### **Recommendation 16**

The review team recommends that the TEI should review its policy on turnaround times for assessment feedback, and take a more robust approach to monitoring the return of feedback to ensure that, wherever reasonably possible, turnaround times are met.