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This report presents key findings from research with over 400 university chaplains, managers and religion or belief organisations, and nearly 200 students. A longer version of the report is available at: www.churchofengland.org/chaplainsoncampus

This summary addresses these questions:

1. Who are today’s university chaplains?
2. What is the purpose of chaplaincy? Do perceptions differ, and with what consequences?
3. What role do chaplains play in universities?
4. How do chaplains relate to others in their universities?
5. What relationships do chaplains have with contexts outside the university? How do these influence their work?
6. How is chaplaincy responding to an increasingly multi-faith environment?
7. How is university chaplaincy equipped and resourced?
8. Is chaplaincy effective? If so, in what ways?
9. Does chaplaincy differ by type of university? Are Cathedrals Group universities – the only group united by affirming a Christian ethos – distinctive, and in what ways?
10. What resources can theology offer? How can chaplains understand their work theologically?

It ends with a set of recommendations for chaplains, universities and religion and belief organisations.

For enquiries, email: kristin.aune@coventry.ac.uk, m.j.guest@durham.ac.uk or jeremy.law@canterbury.ac.uk
1. Who are today’s university chaplains?

Lead chaplains’ calculations for their universities revealed a total of 1032 chaplains, of whom 63% were Christian (including Quakers), 9% were Muslim, 8% Jewish, 5% Buddhist, 4% Hindu, 2% Sikh, 2% Baha’i and 7% ‘other’, as Figure 1 shows.²

![Figure 1](https://example.com/image)

**Figure 1:** Religious affiliation of all chaplaincy roles in 99 universities, 2017

In the ‘other’ category, the largest groups are humanist (1.6%), inter-faith (1.4%) and Pagan (1.4%) chaplains. If distinguished from the general Christian group, Quakers made up 3.7% of chaplaincy roles.

The numbers of chaplains does not give an accurate picture of the amount of chaplaincy work taking place, however. Figure 2 shows the number of chaplaincy roles and the number of full-time-equivalent roles, for each religious group. For each, the number of roles is greater because many chaplains work part-time or occasionally.

---

1. Funded by the Church Universities Fund, the research involved telephone interviews with 367 university chaplains and faith advisors across the UK and 99 lead or coordinating chaplains; face-to-face interviews with chaplains, university managers and local religious leaders at five universities (55 interviews in total); 10 face-to-face interviews with national organisations responsible for managing chaplaincy; and a survey of 188 students at the five case study universities. This summary report presents the main findings of the research. Most data relates to the UK HE sector as a whole, but is occasionally broken down by university ‘type’, with the sector sub-divided into ‘traditional elite’, ‘red brick’, ‘1960s campus’, ‘post-1992’ and ‘Cathedrals Group’ universities. Please see Section 9 of this report for a brief outline of this typology and the full report for a detailed account. Ethical approval was obtained from Coventry University, and the identity of all interviewees and universities is anonymised.

2. In this Executive Summary most percentages are reported to the nearest whole number, for ease of reading. The full report reports these to the nearest decimal point.
Education and training: Chaplains are highly educated: 98% had at least a Bachelors’ degree and 27% a PhD. 61% had undertaken religious training (e.g. were an ordained minister) and, split by religious group, the Christians were the most likely to have done so. Asked if they held a chaplaincy-specific qualification, only 13% of all chaplains and 20% of lead chaplains said yes. This suggests that despite the existence of chaplaincy courses, the vast majority of chaplains have not been trained specifically as chaplains.

Role title

‘Chaplain’ was by far the most common, mentioned by 317 out of 367 people. For a substantial number the word ‘chaplain’ stood alone or was accompanied by a generic term such as ‘University’ or ‘Duty’ or a term indicating level of commitment or seniority, e.g. ‘Coordinating’, or ‘Honorary’ or ‘Associate’ for volunteers. For 84 it was accompanied by a Christian denomination or grouping such as ‘Free Church chaplain’, with ‘Anglican chaplain’ and ‘Catholic chaplain’ the most common, followed by ‘Methodist’ chaplain. ‘Christian chaplain’ was rare, as the denomination was usually mentioned, whereas for non-Christians termed chaplains, their religion was usually mentioned without denominational subdivisions: ‘Muslim chaplain’, ‘Jewish chaplain’ or ‘Sikh chaplain’. Minority faiths were more commonly called ‘chaplain’ than they were ‘faith advisor’. Whether this represents Christian hegemony or religious diversity is unknown: it may indicate that the originally Christian term ‘chaplain’ is becoming accepted for other faiths, or it may indicate the dominance of Christian terminology.

Gender and age: Of the 367 chaplains interviewed by telephone, 63% were male, 37% female. Two-thirds (66%) were 45-54 or older, and while most were below 65, one in ten (11%) were 65 and over (and two were 85 and older). Women were younger and slightly more likely to be paid than men, suggesting that the world of chaplaincy is becoming more gender equal.

---

3. One person (0.3%) identified as trans/non-binary/queer.
2. What is the purpose and role of chaplaincy? Do perceptions differ, and with what consequences?

Chaplains gave many different answers when asked what they saw as chaplaincy’s main aim. They listed pastoral work (supporting students, often on a one-to-one basis to promote their well-being and address challenges and problems) and religious work (facilitating religious understanding and practice) as the two main aims, as Figure 3 shows. One third of chaplains see their primary aim as pastoral, and one sixth as religious.

![Figure 3: Chaplains' views on the primary aim of chaplaincy](image)

There are some differences between how Christian chaplains view chaplaincy compared to chaplains of other faiths. Non-Christian chaplains emphasise the religious and pastoral role of chaplains, but Christians—perhaps because they are established, better resourced and better able to define their role according to their own understanding—have a wider range of aims, including mission, ‘to be a witness to the concern that God has for the whole of the world, not just the religious’ (Methodist chaplain, red brick), and what they call being a visible and available ‘presence’. ‘It is to be who I am in this context from which meaningful doing flows’ (Anglican chaplain, post-1992). Theologically, this is rooted in the notion of gift; being comes before doing.

The majority of chaplains elect to use generic, ‘secular’ language to describe their aims, rather than language that is explicitly theological (the exception being when chaplains talk of mission). Significantly, not a single non-Christian chaplain interviewed by telephone expressed their aim with reference to the beliefs they held. It may be that chaplains are experiencing a pressure to conform to the perceived expectations of university managers, who are likely to understand the language of student support but not the language of theology and belief.

University managers also see pastoral and religious aims as the main purposes of chaplaincy and clearly appreciate chaplains’ student support role. As the Deputy Director of Student Services at the post-1992 university said, highlighting chaplains’ pastoral contribution:

‘Chaplaincy makes a significance difference to…individual students’ experience and lives – particularly students who may be vulnerable, or be looking for some support.’

The Director of Student Experience at the red brick university emphasised chaplains’ religious role:

‘We turn to [chaplains] for advice and guidance about specific things that crop up during the year. That might be how we should best deal with Ramadan during exams, for example, and we’ll liaise with the Muslim chaplain and talk about that. In some cases, we’ve had anti-Semitism and unfortunate things like that. We might talk to [the Jewish Chaplain] about…what does it feel like on the ground for Jewish students from your perspective?’
University managers have little conception, however, that chaplaincy might include a prophetic or a missional role. Neither do they necessarily appreciate, unlike the students who use chaplaincy services, that maintaining integrity of faith while serving the university is a live issue for chaplains and the religious organisations responsible for chaplaincy: chaplains do not see themselves simply as delivering a service, rather their role flows from embodying and representing their faith and belief tradition in the university. Managers tend to see chaplains from the ‘outside’ as those who can deliver certain outcomes, rather than from the ‘inside’ as people who wrestle with questions of religious motivation and identity. This may also reflect relatively low levels of religious literacy among some university managers.

Students also emphasised the importance of chaplains’ pastoral care role. They particularly appreciate chaplains who are, in their words, ‘approachable’; ‘friendly’; ‘warm’; ‘visible’; ‘a presence’; ‘available’; ‘non-judgemental’. University managers and students both agree that chaplaincy provides something unique that cannot be replicated elsewhere in a university. Four out of five students agreed with the statement ‘Chaplains provide pastoral support in a way professional support services cannot’. Students said:

‘[chaplains] can listen to students and provide help or advice without a predetermined plan, agenda, or expected end goal as usually professional services do.’ (Christian, EU student, traditional elite)

‘I think they promote an important part of life that can be forgotten amidst the stress of studying and deadlines. And this cannot be neglected. A couple of years ago in a close-by university, a student took his own life. Stress is dangerous and having faith and nurturing the spiritual side of life is important to balance things up.’ (Muslim, international student, traditional elite)

‘It’s so vitally important. Although we have student services, the chaplaincy offers a different type of advice and solace on a spiritual, more personal level. Knowing it is there and that I won’t be judged for whatever my views are on religion is a quiet relief and a unique, special element to the university used by students and staff alike. Very important.’ (Christian, home student, traditional elite)

3. What role do chaplains play in universities?

Who chaplains work with, and what they do in practice, largely reflects their main aims (pastoral and religious). Pastoral and religious activities are a major part of their work. They spend most time on pastoral activities such as one-to-one support and counselling for students and staff, with a secondary priority being religious activities such as conducting religious services and running inter-faith events. They spend much time on administration, and a very significant amount of time fulfilling their aim of ‘presence’, through building a sense of community in the chaplaincy and wider university. ‘Being there’ is manifested in such things as running weekly lunches and being available to chat over a cup of tea with whoever might come into the chaplaincy space. ‘Being there’ and offering hospitality depends in many cases on having a chaplaincy space in which to welcome students and staff, a space that can be crafted to be a welcoming environment for all who might enter.

Which four activities do chaplains spend the most time on? (%)

- Pastoral support / counselling for students: 71.1%
- Building community: 38.1%
- Administration: 34.9%
- Pastoral support / counselling for staff: 31.6%
Chaplains work first and foremost with students of their own religious tradition, supporting religious student societies, and running spiritual development activities such as religious discussion groups or meditation, but they work with other student groups too, particularly with non-religious students, international students and students of a range of faith and belief positions. For international students this might involve English language support or trips to places of interest, while for non-religious students it might involve providing a listening ear. With staff, chaplains work both in a pastoral capacity, and alongside them as colleagues in the student welfare support structure, staff managed by a senior member of student services or fellow members of, for instance, university equality and diversity committees. Religious services convened by chaplains bring their student and staff constituencies together. Christian chaplains work with a wider range of people than non-Christian chaplains; the latter tend to focus primarily, given their limited time, on working with students from their own tradition, creating a bridge also to local religious communities.

4. How do chaplains relate to others in their universities?

Chaplains relate to their universities in a variety of ways, and these are shaped by available resources (time, people and money), the nature of relationships with other staff, the infrastructure of collaboration set in place, and the ethos of the institution. Chaplains engage with academic departments to varying degrees depending largely on individual relationships and common points of intellectual interest, but this is often uneven and unstructured. Chaplains’ involvement in university governance appears to have received renewed momentum on account of recent legislation concerning equality and diversity and counter-terrorism. These oblige universities to attend to human complexities about which chaplains are thought to have expertise or skill, either in religious literacy or pastoral sensitivity. Student services departments offer the most potential for collaboration, given a common focus on student welfare. Chaplaincy appears increasingly to be treated as an overflow service for oversubscribed professional support departments, although the success of this arrangement depends on adequate resourcing, communication and trust between parties. None are guaranteed, and the heavy reliance on volunteer labour presents challenges in striking a balance between retaining the good will of volunteer chaplains and retaining the systems of accountability, safeguarding and quality control that university managers prioritise. Unsurprisingly, then, the university case studies with the most functional and apparently successful patterns of collaboration involved a full-time paid chaplain who was well integrated and respected across their institution.

Managers and chaplains sometimes have different visions for what chaplaincy ought to be about, and these can mask deeper agendas. Nevertheless, most chaplains and managers view their universities as ‘friendly to faith’ and the majority of chaplains are satisfied with the level of support they receive from university management. While some recall past times when there was more hostility or scepticism, the majority appear to function in universities where chaplaincy is recognised as having a legitimate and valuable role to play. How this is expressed practically varies hugely; our comparison of university types confirms that institutional identity and levels of investment (both finance and trust in key individuals) matters a great deal.
5. What relationships do chaplains have outside the university? How do these influence their work?

Most university chaplains are happy with the support they receive from their own religion or belief organisation, although arrangements of recognition and training seem to make a difference. In particular, those not officially recognised as representing their tradition or organisation are significantly less satisfied with the support they receive from it. It is unclear whether this is a matter of orthodoxy (e.g. some chaplains viewed as heterodox by their own tradition’s standards are denied recognition and support), structures of governance (e.g. some traditions not having systems of support or official recognition within certain regions), or simply communication (e.g. communities and their leaders not knowing that a chaplain has been appointed to represent them). Actual engagement with local organisations appears most effective and enduring when built on well-developed relationships, including inter-faith initiatives for which this is essential. For many chaplains, though, this relationship is primarily one of endorsement and/or informal support; legitimacy of this kind can help build links with local churches, synagogues and mosques, but only when backed up by energy and enthusiasm for building links between campus and community. When this energy and enthusiasm is effectively tapped and mobilised – for example by the Christian organisation Friends International, which supports international students – it appears to provide a service valued equally by both.

At a national level, the support received by university chaplains from the traditions and organisations they represent varies significantly, with the most developed and extensive available via the established Church of England and the least developed evident among the smaller minority faiths. Some of the latter have begun to emulate Christian models of chaplaincy in order to establish appropriately robust support structures for chaplaincy within their own traditions that are recognised within the broader context, reflecting how profoundly university chaplaincy is shaped by the distinctive circumstances of the British setting; University Jewish Chaplaincy is a good example of this. The case of Humanists UK reveals how having a well-resourced national organisation, including legal representation, can reinforce the status of chaplains, especially when equality legislation can be invoked as a means of securing a place at the table. Chaplains appear to be increasingly involved in universities’ compliance with equality legislation. The same goes for the counter-terrorism Prevent strategy, and chaplains are called upon to respond to, comply with

Relating to the broader university

“With student services, I think there’s a very, very good relationship. I think the chaplaincy is seen by student services as another place that students can go to. Which is valued by student services, because their resources are always being trimmed. So chaplains can pick up some of the slack on that…Go to chaplaincy, have a cup of tea…They’re nice people. They’ll give you time.”

(Roman Catholic chaplain, Cathedrals Group university)

“…[student support services] don’t really know what we do. But they’re getting better and they’re beginning to realise that actually we offer great listening services and pastoral care and that sort of thing. They’re not allowed to talk about religion really, so they need to be signposting us a bit more. I think the trouble is, also in amongst the academics, this university has been avowedly secular really from the word go. The diocese has provided chaplains; the [university] didn’t ask for them.”

(Anglican chaplain, 1960s campus university)
or carry out ‘preventing violent extremism’ in their universities. Our case studies reveal how, often unlike their funding organisations, some chaplains have been strategic in their engagement with new national policy agendas, meaning that responses at the local level have included creative initiatives that sometimes enhance chaplaincy provision. For example, in one case study, the Prevent strategy had been invoked to secure further funding for Muslim chaplaincy, as part of a broader initiative of building stronger relationships between the university and local Muslim community.

### Building Local Connections

“Even though it’s a Christian chaplaincy here, there are good relationships with other religious organisations around the city...which again I think is really important...for the student body because we have Muslim students and Buddhist students, so actually being able to make those connections in my view is a really important part of their work. When a Muslim student goes to them they may be able to help them pastorally but actually they really also need to know who to pass them onto in the city or how to help a student from another religion find a group that they can worship with. I view that as a really important part of their role.”

(Pro Vice Chancellor for Student Experience, Cathedrals Group university)

### Negotiating with National Legal Frameworks

“I sort of brokered a meeting between the presidents of the faith societies and the two people who are leading the Prevent agenda here, it took a bit of time to persuade them that the most important people for them to talk to were the presidents of the Jewish, Christian and Muslim societies. And as of this year I have, we have, as a matter of course, told all groups who are using this building that if they are having an external speaker, let us know who that is in advance. We didn’t do that until this year, so that’s a change.”

(lead Christian chaplain, traditional elite university)

### 6. How is chaplaincy responding to an increasingly multi-faith environment?

In the twenty-first century, university chaplaincy is often organised around a multi-faith model, under the auspices of a full-time coordinating chaplain who is most likely to be Anglican. Consequently, chaplaincy is simultaneously predominantly Christian and multi-faith. Chaplains are becoming more religiously diverse, reflecting the increasing religious diversity of the student population. This was noted in Clines’ study over a decade ago, and it is more so today. A decade since Clines’ 2007 study, there has been a rise in the proportion of chaplains who are Muslim, Buddhist, Hindu, Baha’i, as well as a significant rise in numbers who are humanist, inter-faith, or Pagan, as Table 1.1 shows. The Christian proportion has fallen from 70% to 59% (if Quakers are not included within the label ‘Christian’), or 63% (if Quakers are included).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tradition</th>
<th>2007 proportion</th>
<th>2017 proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikh</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baha’i</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Religion of chaplains 2007 and 2017

---

4. Our telephone interviews were conducted in 2017, 10 years after Clines’ research, to enable a 10-years-on comparison.

5. To enable comparison with Clines’ study which subsumed ‘Quaker’ under ‘Christian’, we cite both figures. Quakers are increasingly eschewing being identified as Christian. Figures from a longitudinal study of British Quakers demonstrate a declining proportion identify as Christian, from 51.5% in 1990, to 45.5% in 2003, to 36.5% in 2013 (Dandelion, forthcoming).
One in five chaplaincies are called ‘multi-faith’ chaplaincies or centres, up from one in ten in 2007. This signifies universities’ increasing desire to meet the religious needs of students from diverse religious backgrounds, perhaps in response to the Equality Act 2010, which treats religion or belief as an equality issue and ‘protected characteristic’ equal to gender, ethnicity, disability and others.

Should chaplaincy be multi-faith or single-religion? There are some tensions or differences in how universities and chaplains view the notion of ‘multi-faith’ chaplaincy. Multi-faith is sometimes a term favoured by university managers charged with prioritising equality and diversity as a way of signalling an inclusive campus. A ‘multi-faith’ centre is viewed by managers as somewhere many or all faiths are welcome. But the reality of chaplaincy is that although most chaplaincy teams comprise members of several different religions, as well as several different Christian denominations, Christians do the lion’s share of chaplaincy work and are much more likely to be paid and work full-time. Christian chaplains often lead multi-faith chaplaincy teams, but this does not mean they are ‘multi-faith chaplains,’ and asking them to be so risks alienating them. While most chaplains are committed to inter-faith and multi-faith work, they are also committed to representing their own religious organisation; they wish to do (and are charged by their religious organisation with doing) ‘Jewish chaplaincy’, ‘Sikh chaplaincy’ or ‘Roman Catholic chaplaincy’. They are not commissioned by their religion or belief body as a ‘multi-faith chaplain’. Chaplains have to deliver single-religion chaplaincy in universities that might prefer them to be ‘multi-faith’ chaplains. This has to be negotiated continually, and as universities increasingly rename their chaplaincies as ‘multi-faith centres’, they must ensure that chaplains are able to practice single-religion chaplaincy alongside their colleagues from other faiths. Moreover, unless universities are paying chaplains’ salaries (see below), how much they can or should shape what chaplaincies or individual chaplains call themselves is debateable.

Whether the space of the chaplaincy is multi-purpose/multi-faith or single-faith-specific is also a live issue for chaplains. Space reflects prioritisation. The traditional model of one or more Christian chapel, combined with one or more smaller space for other religious groups is starting to be replaced by either shared spaces, bookable by different groups at different times, or by multiple spaces for use by each specific group, with some religion-specific requirements for some (for example wudu facilities for Muslims). Shared spaces hold potential for student inter-faith engagement, but it is up to their users to mould them in this way; otherwise, the danger is that they become spaces which different groups of religious students use at different times, never communicating with each other.

Moreover, chaplaincy’s student users are not evenly spread across faith groups – the majority are Christian and Muslim (in most universities the majority are Christian, but in a few Muslims now outnumber Christians, at least among regular users of chaplaincy services), because these are the largest religious groups in the UK among students. These student users often come to the chaplaincy seeking a place to express their religion, and while chaplaincies do (and should, in our view) encourage students to relate well to those of other faiths, their desire for chaplains to help them understand or practice their own religion must be respected.
7. How is university chaplaincy equipped and resourced?

The majority of chaplaincy roles are voluntary. When lead chaplains were asked to state the approximate time commitment of every one of their chaplaincy staff and whether they were paid, of 1032 chaplaincy appointments, 63% of chaplaincy roles were cited as voluntary (654 people), 37% (378) as paid. The average university has 10.4 chaplains.6

The time they offer equates to 3.3 full-time equivalent (FTE) roles.

2.4 FTE of chaplain time is paid and 0.9 is given voluntarily.

Each year, university chaplains contribute around £4.5 million of volunteer labour to the higher education sector.7 Volunteer university chaplains give around 3,500 hours of free labour each week.8

The average (mean) UK university has 10.4 chaplains:

3.8 paid
6.6 volunteers

Volunteer chaplains give a huge amount of time to universities. Universities are receiving a substantial amount of chaplaincy work for free, from volunteers and religious organisations. Figure 4 indicates the proportion of chaplaincy time given by chaplains in 99 universities that is given voluntarily, by faith group.

Figure 4: Proportion of voluntary chaplaincy time, as a percentage of total time given by each faith group in 99 universities
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6. This might seem generous provision, but as many of these roles are not full time or paid, chaplaincy provision is less than this. Calculating a full-time equivalent figure reveals the true amount of chaplaincy provision in each university. The mean FTE was 3.3, of which 2.4 was paid and 0.9 of time was given voluntarily. FTEs were calculated as follows: working over 30 hours was classed as full-time (1.0), working 5-30 hours was classed as half-time (0.5), working regularly but below 5 hours was classed as 0.07 (estimating an average of 2.6 hours in a 37.5 hour week) and working ‘occasionally’ as 0.02 (estimating an average of three-quarters of an hour per week). These were then added up to produce a total FTE figure for each university and for each religion or belief group. These are estimations of time, so will not be entirely accurate (for example, some people who work occasionally do an hour every fortnight, while others attend only one or two events per year).

7. The figure is given for 144 universities rather than the larger 167. The 23 excluded from the calculation includes many new, small and private providers that we did not include in the list of universities we sampled from – the vast majority of these appear to have no chaplaincy. The £4.5 million is derived from the assumption that a modest chaplain salary of £25k, including overheads and pension, would cost a university £35k. At 0.9 FTE given voluntarily, 90% of this amount (£31,500) was then multiplied by 144 universities.

8. Hours calculated by multiplying the 92.6 FTE volunteer chaplains give, by the typical working week (37.5 hours).
Table 2 outlines the numbers of chaplains working in the 99 universities for which we have accurate figures, differentiated by religion/belief group and by whether they are paid or volunteers. For each religious group, their number of chaplains is listed alongside the number of chaplain roles as a full-time equivalent. For example, if a university had two Muslim chaplains, both working as paid chaplains for half of the week, this would be listed as two Muslim chaplains and 1.0 FTE.

In total, there are 1032 chaplains working in the 99 universities, and this equates to 330.9 full-time equivalent posts. Of the 1032, 378 are paid, which equates (because some of them are part time), to a paid FTE of 238.3. The remaining 654 of the 1032 are volunteers, and this volunteer labour equates to 92.6 FTE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faith or belief</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Paid</th>
<th>% of the 238.3 FTE paid time</th>
<th>Voluntary</th>
<th>% of the 92.6 FTE volunteer time</th>
<th>% of the FTE per faith group that is voluntary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baha'i</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>265.6</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>200.3</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindu</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>64.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanist</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-faith</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pagan</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikh</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other New Religious Movements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1032</td>
<td>330.9</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>238.3</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Christian chaplain roles in 99 universities by paid/voluntary status and denomination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Christian denomination</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Paid</th>
<th>% of the 238.3 FTE paid time</th>
<th>Voluntary</th>
<th>% of the 92.6 FTE volunteer time</th>
<th>% of the FTE per faith group that is voluntary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>112.6</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quaker</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecostal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Christian</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Chaplain roles in 99 universities by paid/voluntary status and religion or belief group (Christians combined)

Christians occupy the majority of paid roles, making up 84% of paid chaplain time. The variation among Christian denominations is illustrated by Table 3. Volunteer time extends a little more broadly across faith groups, with Christians giving 71% of volunteer time. The smaller and/or least established the religious group, the more likely it is that its chaplains work without payment. In the larger and longer-established religious groups, chaplains’ time is mostly paid. The growth of paid Muslim chaplains has been significant over the last decade, and now most chaplaincy time given by Muslims is funded rather than voluntary. Beyond the Abrahamic faiths, chaplains receive virtually no remuneration.
Who pays chaplains?

Churches have historically paid chaplains in many universities. A few universities have historical trusts providing funding. At others, the Church of England, Roman Catholic, Methodist or other free churches in the past agreed to fund or part fund a chaplaincy role, and have continued to do so. But the churches’ financial resources are shrinking, meaning that funding chaplains at the current level may not be sustainable. The Church of England is the largest funder of chaplaincy, providing 98.3 paid FTE across the 99 universities we collected information from; next was the Roman Catholic Church with 48.2 FTE, followed by the Methodist church, with 27 FTE.

The stark difference in the situation of Christian chaplains compared to non-Christian chaplains is revealed in the responses of the 367 chaplains to the question of who pays them, as Figure 5 shows.

77% of non-Christian chaplains were volunteers, compared to 30% of Christians. But this differs by religion. After Christians, the religious group with the largest proportion of chaplains being paid are Jews (55% are paid), followed by Muslims (29%).

Religious bodies are the largest funders of chaplaincy, with 28% of chaplains receiving a salary or stipend from one or more religious body. Only 23% chaplains are paid solely by the university. A further 7% are paid jointly by the university and a religious body. In a very few cases (2%) there is another arrangement (e.g. a local trust). Muslim chaplains we spoke to were more likely than any other group – including Christians – to be paid by their university.10 Jewish chaplains are paid by Jewish organisations, most by the body University Jewish Chaplaincy, not by universities.

Do universities provide other resources for chaplains?

Asked if their university provides them with resources contractually made available to paid employees, including opportunities for staff development, travel expenses or IT support, many said no, as Table 4 shows.11

Figure 5: Proportion of chaplains receiving remuneration from different sources, by religious category (% of 367 chaplains interviewed)9

Table 4: % of chaplains receiving resources from their university for their work

9. In this table, percentages are reported to the nearest decimal place. In the main text these are simplified for ease of reading.

10. The raised profile of the Preventing Violent Extremism agenda in recent years seems to have been one factor in why universities have started employing Muslim chaplains.

11. 10% said ‘no’ to all seven measures. 68% said ‘yes’ to at least three out of seven measures. 19% (70 out of 367 chaplains) said ‘yes’ to all seven measures. Of this 70, over 90% are paid. Only 9% of the chaplains receiving all provisions are volunteers.
It seems that many universities do not provide these for their chaplains, especially volunteer chaplains. Including training provided by religion and belief organisations and universities, almost three-quarters (74%) of chaplains said they attended training and development to support their chaplaincy role at least annually. Whether or not they were paid was a strong predictor of attending training – paid chaplains were more likely to attend training than volunteer chaplains. 55% of unpaid chaplains attended training annually compared to 87% of paid chaplains. Not only are volunteer chaplains giving their time for free, but they are also not given resources they are likely to need to do their jobs well.

Consistently less than 50% of volunteer chaplains are given access by their university to IT or phone equipment (40%), travel expenses (28%), administrative support (45%), staff development and training (44%), chaplaincy staff and volunteers (45%), an activities budget (26%). 54% are given a line manager.

In conclusion, although the majority of chaplaincy time is paid, the majority of it by religious organisations, the majority of chaplains are not paid. Universities have many (654 in the 99 universities we have data for) volunteer chaplains on their grounds who are neither paid nor well-resourced, giving around 3500 hours free labour each week to support religious students, but with a marginal, perhaps precarious, status in the university.

The part-time work they do with students of their own faith is valuable and valued, but without a formalised role, they are unable to perform as well as they should be able to, and they are not fully accountable to the university for their work nor able to understand their role within the university’s mission. As the recommendations suggest, universities should increase the resources (financial and other) for chaplaincy, especially in the light of government policies on religion and belief equality, student safety and safeguarding.

8. Is chaplaincy effective? If so, in what ways?

Recording or ‘measuring’ impact is not yet done in a systematic way by most chaplains, nor is it required by university managers or religion and belief organisations. When students and university managers and chaplains are asked how effective chaplaincy is in their university, most are very positive, with managers more positive than the (more modest) chaplains. But effectiveness is often articulated in terms of things that would be hard to measure quantitatively: the importance of chaplains being visible on campus; the need for at least one or two very visible and active chaplains. Effectiveness is dependent on time available for chaplaincy work, and the current extent of chaplaincy provision makes it challenging to sustain both chaplaincy visibility (for example, walking around the campus with time to stop to talk with whoever is encountered), alongside a lot of one-to-one pastoral support in the chaplaincy offices. By this kind of measure, chaplains are effective but over-worked.

By asking 367 chaplains whether they had observed certain kinds of impact in the last twelve months, we have captured encouraging results: three-quarters of chaplains reported impact on individual students; two-thirds reported changes in atmosphere or sense of community; around a half noted a change in organisational practice or evidence of increased support or buy-in from their universities or external bodies. Chaplains recounted many examples of this, from a student recovering from a mental health crisis to a new chaplaincy post being created and funded by the university. Further analysis suggests that the most impactful chaplains may be those who work more hours, are paid, and are paid by the university rather than by a religion or belief organisation.

Data from students who use chaplaincy sheds light on chaplains’ impact. Chaplaincy is used by a minority of a university’s students, but those who use it tend to use it often: more than half of the chaplaincy users we surveyed used chaplaincy at least once a week, and its users were more likely than an average student to be socially marginalised, e.g. to be an international, ethnic minority or lonely postgraduate student. Students use chaplaincy to participate in religious services run by chaplains, for pastoral support from a chaplain, to join group or social activities, and for prayer and reflection. The presence of chaplains in
the chaplaincy space, even if they are not the prime reason a student enters that space, is important, and casual conversations with a chaplain about a film, a student’s course or life in general are experienced by students as just as important as, for instance, attending a religious event. Creating a safe space for students to explore life questions, values, and spirituality, and giving them time in a non-structured way, are things unique to chaplaincy that students value highly.

Student voices

“[Chaplains] are always there, you can always talk to them. You don’t need an appointment, they have a vocation, and they always want to help.”
(Christian, home student, traditional elite)

“Without the support of the chaplaincy, both chaplains and other groups, I don’t know how I would have coped. It has been central to my university experience.”
(Christian, home student, 1960s campus)

9. Does chaplaincy differ by type of university? Are Cathedrals Group universities – the only group united by affirming a Christian ethos – distinctive, and in what ways?

Universities were divided into five types: 1) traditional elite (long-established, research-intensive universities); 2) red brick (established in major cities in the nineteenth and early twentieth century to serve the needs of industry and science); (3) 1960s campus university (also known as ‘plate glass’ universities, established in the wake of the 1963 Robbins report recommending university expansion); (4) post-1992 or ‘new’ universities (mostly former polytechnics, known as ‘post 1992 universities’ because they were granted university status in 1992, originally focusing more on vocational training but now offering a wide range of courses); and (5) ‘Cathedrals Group’ (the name given to a group of 16 universities established as teacher training colleges by the Anglican, Roman Catholic and Methodist churches, mostly in the nineteenth century, which, like the post-1992 universities, now offer a wider range of subjects).

Differences in spread of chaplains across universities

Chaplaincy provision differs across the university sub-sectors. A 2017 web search of chaplaincy websites revealed that the older the university sector, the more chaplains there were. The traditional elites had the most chaplains (an average of 13), then the red brick universities (11.1), the 1960s campus universities (7.4), the post-1992 universities (5.5), then the Cathedrals Group (4.9). But this does not take into account the different sizes of the institutions. When the number of chaplains is compared to the number of students enrolled, the picture changes. The best chaplain to student ratio remains in the traditional elites, but the Cathedrals Group is in second place, followed by red bricks, then the 1960s campus universities, with chaplain numbers proportionally lowest at post-1992 universities.
Table 5: Average number of chaplains, average FTE, paid FTE and chaplain-student ratio across five university types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Average no. of chaplains</th>
<th>Average full-time equivalent (FTE)</th>
<th>Average paid FTE</th>
<th>Chaplain: Students ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional elite</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1 to 1108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red brick</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1 to 2180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s campus</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1 to 2994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-1992</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1 to 3043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedrals Group</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1 to 1439</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences in remuneration

There are large differences in whether chaplains are paid and by whom, by type of university, as Figure 6 shows.

Among the traditional elite universities and the Cathedrals Group, payment by the university is most common, with figures highest for the Cathedrals Group, where there is also the lowest ‘no remuneration’ figure. Cathedrals Group institutions therefore invest the most financially in chaplains; however, almost all the Cathedrals Group paid chaplains are Christian. Traditional elite universities, with the next highest proportion paid by the university, usually have a Christian (generally Anglican) history, chapels and many years of chaplains being part of their tradition, especially in collegiate universities such as Oxford and Cambridge, so funding of chaplains is often still embedded within these institutions as standard practice. Receiving no payment is the most common option in the red brick, 1960s campus and post-1992 universities, reflecting their more secular foundation; in these universities, chaplaincy was often added later. As Gilliat-Ray (2000: 28) notes, ‘In 1952, there were just eight university chaplains outside Oxford and Cambridge, of which only three were full time. By 1985 most universities, polytechnics and colleges of higher education had some kind of Anglican chaplaincy provision.’ Where chaplains in red bricks, 1960s campus and post-1992 universities are funded, it is usually by religious organisations, who have stepped in to fill the gap.
Differences in faith spaces and religious student societies

A (mean) average university* has:

- One prayer space for every 3,524 students
- 4.9 prayer spaces
- 6.4 religious student societies
- which represent 4.5 different religions

* Based on interviews with 99 lead chaplains.

There are differences in the amount of provision at different university types. The most abundant space for prayer and worship for students (calculated using a students-to-spaces ratio) is at Cathedrals Group universities, followed by traditional elites, 1960s campuses, and post-1992 universities, with red bricks having the smallest amount.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Traditional elite</th>
<th>Red brick</th>
<th>1960s campus</th>
<th>Post-1992 university</th>
<th>Cathedrals Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average number of spaces of prayer &amp; worship</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average ratio of spaces for prayer &amp; worship to students in universities 2016-17</td>
<td>1 space for 2,874 students</td>
<td>1 space for 5,550 students</td>
<td>1 space for 3,026 students</td>
<td>1 space for 4,392 students</td>
<td>1 space for 1,421 students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Provision of prayer and worship spaces across five university types

A collective act of Christian worship takes place in 81% of universities on a weekly basis, mostly organised by the chaplaincy, with no major differences between types of university. More variation exists for Muslim Friday prayers: these happen in three-quarters of universities, but much less in Cathedrals Group universities (they happen in only 40%, compared to 94% of 1960s campuses, 85% of traditional elites, 76% of post-1992 universities and 71% of red bricks).

Numbers of religion and belief-related student societies is another indicator of the level of religious provision. An average university, according to the ‘lead’ chaplain’s reporting, has 6.4 religious student societies, which represent 4.5 different religions; the number of religions is lower mainly due to large numbers of Christian societies. The numbers of societies for minority religious students was lower than average at Cathedrals Group and post-1992 universities, with few such societies at Cathedrals Group universities.

12. See forthcoming study of religious student societies by Simon Perfect and Ben Ryan at Theos and Kristin Aune.
Cathedrals Group universities may have excellent chaplaincy provision, but with generally poor facilities for prayer or mixing with students of the same minority faith (57% of Cathedrals Group universities do not have a permanent Muslim prayer room, almost double the 30% average of the whole sector\(^{13}\)), chaplaincy provision may seem sparse to Cathedrals Group students from non-Christian religions.

**Differences in overall resources**

Certain types of university resource chaplains better. There are big differences between resources offered by traditional elite and Cathedrals Group universities, who are much more likely to provide pay and resources, and red brick, 1960s campuses and post-1992 universities, who are much less likely to. It might be expected that universities who do not pay chaplains make up for the lack of pay in other ways. But this is not the case apart from, to some extent, in the 1960s campus universities, as Table 7 shows, where ‘more’ and the colour green represents better provision than average and ‘less’ and the colour orange represents worse than average provision.

In the case of physical space for chaplaincy, the mean average number of worship and prayer spaces for chaplaincy at traditional elite universities is 6.5. 1960s campus universities have 5.6, higher than Cathedrals Groups who have 4.9 and red bricks for red bricks who have 4.4. Post-1992 universities provide the smallest amount of dedicated chaplaincy space, an average of 4.2 spaces.

\(^{13}\) The proportion of universities with at least one permanent Muslim prayer room has risen slightly from 65% ten years ago (Clines 2008: 109) to 70%.

---

**Table 7:** Range of resources provided by universities to chaplains and to religion on campus more generally, by university type, highlighting where universities provide more or less than the national figure
The superior resourcing of traditional elite and Cathedrals Group universities can be explained by their historical connection to the churches and their associated trusts, while the inferior resourcing of the other three groups can be explained by their secular foundation, despite moves towards recognising the newer multi-faith context. Having secular foundations means a variety of things, however, and what it meant historically may not be what it means today. For some universities, secular means ‘religion-free’ or unfriendly to faith, but for some, it means ‘faith-rich’, open to all.

1960s campus universities may be offering superior non-financial resources because of geography: located away from, or at the edges of, towns and cities, there are limited local places of worship or religious resources to point students to, so demand from students has necessitated the creation of bespoke ones on campus. In contrast, red brick universities and post-1992 universities are often located in cities with an existing supply of churches and other religious spaces students can be directed to. The fact that secular-foundation universities have made these adaptions shows that they are attempting to accommodate religious requests.

Different perspectives on chaplaincy’s aims

The aims of presence and mission are, distinctively, the aims most commonly articulated by chaplains of Cathedrals Group universities, as Figure 7 shows. Additionally Christian chaplains at Cathedrals Group universities are most likely than at other types of university to use explicitly Christian language when expressing their primary aim.

![Chaplains' views on the primary aim of chaplaincy, by university type](image)

Differences in how chaplains relate to others in their universities

There are differences in how chaplains relate to others in their universities. Most strikingly, the wider institutional embeddedness of chaplaincy pays significant dividends within the traditional-elite, post-1992 university and Cathedrals Group case studies that are noticeably absent from the red brick and 1960s campus universities. The more avowedly secular foundations of the latter two appear relevant in informing enduring perspectives among staff, but more important are matters of governance and lack of investment. It is also worth noting that the explicitly Christian ethos of the Cathedrals Group university manages to bind staff together in a common project, but this is to some extent frustrated by an overly complex accountability structure which lacks singular leadership. The two lead chaplains at the traditional elite and post-1992 universities appear to thrive in part because they are given autonomy to lead on account of them being trusted by the broader university management. Much can be learned from their example.
10. What resources can theology offer? How can chaplains understand their work theologically?

From an Anglican perspective, a Kingdom of God theology offers a fruitful way to see chaplaincy.

The Kingdom of God is the organising principle of Jesus’ ministry. Jesus enacts the Kingdom, in word and miracle, in anticipation of a promised new creation. The Kingdom is a gift: it begins to emerge as the transformation of the world, within the existing fabric of the world, for the sake of the world. Reality is understood in the light of what it can become with and through God.

In this light, chaplaincy has to do with life in all its fullness wherever this may be glimpsed. Chaplaincy concerns the renewal and revitalisation of life, anticipating what could be through God's possibilities. Foretastes of the Kingdom include acts of kindness, the search for truth, the opening up of creative prospects, or the grace to endure that which will not change.

These Kingdom purposes for chaplaincy must be realised within twenty-first-century universities. Different understandings of what universities are for exist, as Barnett (2011) proposes: the medieval notion of ‘the metaphysical university’ open to the transcendent realm; ‘the research university’ concerned with ‘knowledge for its own sake’ pursued via ‘academic freedom’ of enquiry; and the contemporary ‘entrepreneurial university’ focussed on performance as the ‘impact’ of its ‘knowledge products and services’. These notions exist in varying portions in every university.

Chaplains must be multilingual: able to understand themselves within, and make themselves comprehensible to, a competing range of perspectives on the university’s purpose.

Kingdom of God theology meshes with some of the key findings of this project. As a ‘sacrament’ of the Kingdom of God, chaplains can be seen as harbingers and anticipatory agents of a better future. In the performance-driven ‘entrepreneurial university’ they witness to the priority of gift: that inherent worth is not dependent on performance. Students and university staff, we found, receive chaplains in this way, appreciating chaplains as good news, unique contributors to the university.

It follows that if chaplains only allow themselves to be judged by a framework of measurable performance, this undercuts their symbolic value and actual function. Chaplains point to a beyond that cannot yet be achieved: the consummation of creation. This means there is a theological basis for chaplains’ reluctance to ‘record’ their ‘impact’. Yet chaplains need to find a way to live within an audit culture and celebrate the tangible difference they make, while resisting this culture’s ultimate claim. Chaplaincy is the offering of a gift in response to the prior gift of God.

Kingdom of God theology suggests that chaplaincy’s primary aim is theological – it is about enacting the Kingdom of God – yet most Christian chaplains we interviewed expressed their primary aim in generic ‘secular’ language. They may be using language they think will be understood by their universities. In universities where the metaphysical aspect of a university finds endorsement, chaplains are more inclined to speak in explicitly Christian terms. In universities where the research aspect of a university is emphasised, chaplains may prefer to express a prophetic aim or desire to encourage spiritual exploration outside specific religious traditions. Finally, in universities with an ‘entrepreneurial’ conception of their role, with an emphasis on ‘customer care’ and service provision, chaplains emphasise their pastoral and religious aims.

Kingdom of God theology provides a way to integrate the seven primary aims of chaplains we identified within the conception of mission. Through loving care, religious symbol, presence and availability, concern with the spiritual, the prophetic quest for justice and the building of good relationships, the mission of the Kingdom goes forward. This broad conception of mission stands in tension with some readings of the present ‘Renewal and Reform’ initiative of the Church of England in response to declining church attendance. Renewal and Reform’s emphases on evangelisation and numerical growth could be read as an attenuated view of mission as more concerned with the self-replication of the church, than the wider flourishing of life.
From the perspective of other forms of religion and belief might the notion of the Kingdom constitute a form of Christian imperialism? Given that Christian chaplains provide 84% of all paid time and 71% of all volunteer time across university chaplaincy dissonance can arise between the ‘multi-faith’ labelling of chaplaincy and its actual day-to-day functioning. Christians have a responsibility to use their position of power to open up ways of working collaboratively with others while seeking to safeguard the religious integrity of all involved. Kingdom of God theology can help. Central to Christian theology is the discernment of a fundamental distinction between the ‘now’ and the ‘not yet’. Just as the coming of the Kingdom in its fullness must be awaited, so must the final unveiling of the truth. Living ‘between the times’ Christian chaplains cannot claim to possess the whole picture.

Kingdom theology can nurture an authentic Christian identity that is genuinely relevant to the needs of universities. In a context where the ultimate purpose of a university is disputed, at a time when chaplains are increasing asked to view themselves as an extension of professional support services, theology is vital. Theology can provide a frame of significance within which the work of chaplaincy can find meaning, value, affirmation and orientation. Universities are inherently theological in nature; they are places where chaplains do not just work, but belong.

Recommendations

For chaplains:

1. Chaplains should undertake training in chaplaincy where it is available, and ask their religion and belief organisations and universities to provide it where it is not. The vast majority of university chaplains have not received specific training in chaplaincy and this should be remedied. The demands of university chaplaincy are, as this report has demonstrated, distinct, and likely to become more so as student numbers grow, the student population diversifies, and their pastoral support needs become more extensive and complex.

2. Complementing and building upon their commitments to their faith tradition, chaplains should strive to work in ways that are particularly fruitful within universities: via relationship-building, pastoral presence and inclusivity. The findings illustrate that chaplaincy works best when chaplains: 1) build strong relationships across university departments; 2) build a ministry of presence by offering non-judgemental pastoral support among staff and students; and 3) work with their universities to further a culture of inclusivity and respect. This is a more realistic aspiration for full-time and coordinating/lead chaplains, so chaplains in these positions should consider how such practices can be better embedded in chaplaincy in their universities.

For universities:

3. Universities should appoint chaplains and faith advisors from the diverse religion and belief groups represented among their students and staff. This may not always extend across the full range of world religions in the UK, but should reflect the spread of orientations to religion (including humanism) among the staff and student body. An annual anonymous survey of staff and student faith identities would ensure that this arrangement is accurately maintained. Universities should, whenever possible, ensure that those they appoint as chaplains are officially recognised by a specific
religion or belief group. When this is not possible – e.g. among smaller, less well-resourced traditions – it is especially important that these chaplains are offered relevant support via the appointing university.

4. Universities should increase their funding of chaplaincy. Chaplains provide a huge amount of voluntary labour to universities. Volunteer chaplains play a vital role, but full-time and paid chaplains are better equipped for chaplaincy work and more embedded within their university structures. Our findings illustrate the range of contributions chaplains make to university life, including supporting students to integrate, progress with their university studies, develop their identities and practice their religion. As student pastoral needs grow, universities increasingly depend on chaplains to supplement other student support services. As religion and belief groups are becoming unable to sustain their current levels of funding for chaplaincy, universities need to increase budgets for chaplaincy across the sector. Universities should, in particular, commit to providing funds for chaplains’ salaries.

5. Universities should provide all chaplains, paid and volunteers, with office and meeting space, IT and phone facilities, a line manager, an activities budget and staff development and training. This space is vital for chaplains to do effective work with students and staff, for example hosting events for students and offering one-to-one pastoral support. Attention should be given to providing resources that meet the religious needs of the staff and student bodies (e.g. faith-sensitive prayer, kitchen and washing facilities).

6. Universities should recognise the unique, positive and broad-ranging contribution chaplains make to the lives of university students, staff and their wider communities. They should strive to treat chaplains as integral to the university’s aims and mission, and to balance the need for chaplains to be accountable to the university with the need to exercise their religious role freely. Whichever model of managing chaplaincy universities use (e.g. locating chaplaincies within student services departments, or supporting their autonomy as a separate unit), universities should balance chaplains’ freedom and accountability. Finally, universities should recognise that chaplains’ contribution extends beyond serving the needs of people of faith; chaplains also serve the wider university and the non-religious.

7. Universities should reflect on how their history and institutional identities shape their approach to chaplaincy, and whether their approach needs to change. Traditional elite universities and Cathedrals Group universities should ensure that chaplaincy provision meets the needs of a religiously-diverse and international student body and is not simply or overwhelmingly Christian. Red brick and post-1992 universities should consider increasing their funding of chaplaincy and its resources (e.g. space, budgets and facilities). 1960s campus universities should consider increasing their funding of salaries for chaplains. Those committed to the idea of universities being thoroughly secular spaces should reflect on whether this approach truly meets the support needs of their students.

For religion and belief organisations:

8. Religion and belief organisations should reflect on how they might recognise and value the major positive contribution chaplains make to the lives of university students, staff and their wider communities. Chaplains contribute a great deal to university life and are also representatives and ambassadors for their traditions among a large and diverse population. Not all religion and belief organisations appear to have recognised this opportunity or invested in it. Our research suggests university chaplains achieve most when they are trusted and recognised as integral to their religious community’s aims and mission.

9. National religion and belief organisations should, when resources permit, provide management, training and support for their chaplains. Not all chaplains are affiliated to or authorised by a religion or belief organisation, but there are obvious advantages to this being the case. National organisations should consider what they can do to reinforce systems of training, mentoring and accountability in order to support chaplains more effectively. Religion and belief organisations should, where possible, enable their chaplains to work with local communities and religious groups.
10. The Church of England should reflect on how it might enhance its capacity to support, nurture and develop university chaplaincy in a wider sense. As this research has demonstrated, the Church of England occupies an influential place in university chaplaincy. Its established status and greater resources relative to other traditions mean it is in a stronger position to steer and support chaplaincy; it often does so via coordinating or lead chaplains. The Church of England should use its influence to uphold voices of religion and belief across the higher education sector, and its resources to build partnerships of trust and mutual respect. This will enable others to speak and be heard, enhancing university chaplaincy for the good of all.

For all parties:

11. Chaplains, universities and religious organisations should reflect on whether and how best to record their impact on universities. The research in this report demonstrates that chaplains contribute to the life of their universities in a variety of important ways. It is hoped that those sceptical about the value of having chaplains in universities will read about these wide-ranging contributions and revise their view. The future of chaplaincy will be more firmly secured if universities have access to a record of how their chaplains are contributing to their work and life.

12. Staff working in student support and professional services and in chaplaincy should build collaborative working relationships. Our research highlights how chaplains and university managers sometimes understand chaplaincy in different ways, but when the two groups work together, strong working relationships are built which benefit both students and staff. Induction programmes should provide a starting point for this. Integration of chaplains on university committees is also important. The fostering of religious literacy (for university staff) and university literacy (for chaplains) would both be wise aspirations for universities to embrace if these relationships are to flourish.

13. Universities, chaplains and religion and belief organisations should work together to support and develop religion-specific chaplaincy within a multi-faith context. Multi-faith and inter-faith approaches within chaplaincy teams are vital, especially as this better reflects the religious diversity of the wider UK and is more likely to foster broader religious literacy. But this religious literacy also needs to acknowledge that chaplains who pursue an approach that is primarily shaped by their own faith tradition are not thereby less qualified or less likely to foster inclusivity and community in the broader university. Part of enhancing the work of chaplains involves respecting their prerogative to work from and for their own religious or belief tradition as part of a wider community of practice.
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