

Research

	RESONATES	DOESN'T SOUND RIGHT	MISSING
QUALITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feeling of 'gap' between formation and living it out in practice • No discernible difference in training pathways in curates • Collaboration • Reflective practice • Pure education definitive • Parish system affirmation • Supervision information is vital • <i>Pathway less important than institution as predictor of growth etc.</i> • Integration with IME 1&2; what to do with the academic stuff • Bishops want more control over budgets and pathways • Practical skills important • Ensure broad training in core skills 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborative, missional & adaptable is not enough • Theology & spirituality is missing! • Tighter definition of 'quality' & what is being measured and by whom • TEI inspection criteria broader than implied • Gender issues and training pathways are important as well as age • Focus on numerical growth rather than both that and spiritual growth? • Positive perception? What of the other 38%? • <i>Low drop-out rate from training – what research has been done among clergy who have dropped out of ministry?</i> • How come people are so happy with the job when we are still in decline? • Not being sure how depth & quality is understood • Tensions around HE ethos & vocational discernment • 30% feeling unprepared more to do with IME2 TIs than IME1? • More investment in transition to first incumbency, when problems are real? • Character formation over time key for preparing for responsibility of incumbency (implications for QA) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recent historical context – changing patterns of ministry • Analysis of pre-selection process • Are the 9 criteria fit for the process? • Research with people trained in context • Lack of nuance about the content & context in IME 1 • Inspection of IME 2&3 → ensuring it is broad • Reporting on transition from SSM to SM • Where is focus on character/depth in a focus on quality? • Community engagement measures • The place of gender in leadership and in selection/BAP • <i>Low drop-out rate from training – what research has been done among clergy who have dropped out of ministry?</i> • <i>Were the Archdeacons included in the research?</i> • <i>What research has been done into what the congregation and the wider parish want?</i> • <i>Churchmanship doesn't appear to feature as a determinant</i> • <i>Were training incumbents asked re outcome of residential/course training?</i> • What happens if 'quality' and 'quantity' are mutually incompatible (i.e. need to reject more to increase quality)? • What is the clergy task now? – pastoral care and/or change management – is this where the gap is? • Impact of changing curriculum over time, e.g. some residential mixed mode less 'integrated' than residential – and how long ago did people train (have we got better e.g. in last 10 years?)? • Drop-out rate in IME phase 2 • Historic data from Aston training scheme on drop-out during Aston • Research on lay ministry • How much do clergy value life-long learning? • - and being a steward of learning and passing it on • Conversations rather than simple box ticking • Stats on overturned decisions (by diocese) • More re unpreparedness – IME 1, IME 2 or ordinand? • Research re stickability in difficult contexts • Other factors determining length of training than education & ministerial experience: character, maturity, ability to work with others • Foundation in baptism & renewal life of people of God

Responses from RME consultations in Manchester, Bristol and London, October 2014.
 Responses in italics are from Ministry Division staff at the London consultation.

	RESONATES	DOESN'T SOUND RIGHT	MISSING
FLEXIBILITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior learning highly influential • Vocational dissonance • Ongoing discernment of vocation • Shift in culture requires flexibility but also theological sophistication • Durham CA offers potential flexibility • Personality & character key at every stage • Open to personal change • College and courses can both deliver quality • Idealised visions • Demonstrable data for pioneer selection – can we extend this to other competencies? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistency of claiming that parish model is primary/central whilst proliferating MPBs • Those with 'OPM' label not always flexible on deployment • Pioneers more complex than implied • Theological one size doesn't fit all • Question needs to be asked about forming a learning community • Need to think about beyond IME • 70% MPB – they are not all the same – different MPBs – urban, rural etc. • Has TEI viability been researched? • Training people to be flexible and feeding them into & out of less/inflexible church structures? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inflexibility of thinking within parishes – clashes with desire for lay ministry • Diversity of age of ordinands • Valuing prior learning – what type? • Equipping for long haul – follow up young ordinands • Discipleship • Comparative with other professions • Discernment as a collective process • More research on culture in which we are operating • Impact of changing gender roles on flexibility • How much geography affects flexibility • Place of church tradition and any effect on deployment • Focus on potential theological educators • Flexibility has costs, e.g. bespoke pathways • What of those from non-HE backgrounds? • OLM training • Investigation of factors leading to 'wheels coming off'! • The effect of legal implications for TEIs/Bishops if training throws up problems • Licensed lay ministers • Training needs different for each generation • A defence for validity of residential training for some • Experience of the ordinand's family • Research on family • Effectiveness of minister in wider community in relation to form of training • Cost of compliance, e.g. Bishops' Regs, QAA, BiS, UKBA, Durham • Competition of marketing • Who sets length of training?

Responses from RME consultations in Manchester, Bristol and London, October 2014.
Responses in italics are from Ministry Division staff at the London consultation.

	RESONATES	DOESN'T SOUND RIGHT	MISSING
GROWTH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most everything • Capacity as a significant determinant of growth • Encouraged that talking about growth (numerical, spiritual, capacity, vocation) • Helpful evidence base for resourcing • 5 variables chime • Lack of difference between training pathways • <i>Pathway less important than institution as predictor of growth etc.</i> • 3 years may be better – something different happens in your head • Discussion about drop-out rates – is it good or not? Does it show a strong selection or a lack of robustness in training? • Vocational clarity/role-crafting etc. correlated with spiritual growth • Headlines • Could have written it ourselves • 5 variables seem obvious 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basis of research – need to know more • Language of sacrifice? • How to measure growth accurately? • BAP set-aside statistics – is the number statistically relevant? • 5 variables – what is being measured? • Does ‘doing theology’ make any difference to growth/health etc.? • Is the idea of ‘sacrifice’ used consistently? • Use of ‘pioneer’ category – broader and more mixed; inconsistency • Not naming elephants in the room as money or high-cost routes to close • Question on growth/ role of church in society • The challenge of discerning God’s call even if the candidate doesn’t fit all the boxes • Resources are limited – so we have to decide where to use them (vocations/training/curacy) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of second curacies & team posts • How do we discern lay ministry and how to support? • What do we mean by lay ministry? • Recognition of particular training needs at different times and dependent on age • Clergy families as variable, especially linked to sacrifice • Single clergy as variable – links with appropriate training models • Deployability links with training pathway? • Wider complexity of clergy roles? • Probe into ‘positive’ course training → ministry • Priests as enablers & disciples • Links to lay empowerment/education • Training for children/youth work • Growth in depth of community engagement • Focus on growth as body of Christ • What difference does 2 or 3 year training make? • Theological vision • Evangelism skills for all ministers in training • Life history behind SM ministry on courses needs further research and mirrored to those on residential courses • Is there any correlation between saying Daily Office and growing churches? • Analysis of cost/investment & effectiveness • Evaluation of TEIs for what types of ‘effective’ ‘proper’ ministry/mission • How vocation & ministry develops & changes (MDR?) • Relationship between training and changing patterns of church membership & attendance • Need back-data

Responses from RME consultations in Manchester, Bristol and London, October 2014.
Responses in italics are from Ministry Division staff at the London consultation.

Priorities/Implications

	DIOCESES	TEIs	MINISTRY DIVISION
QUALITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investment in vocations • Funding to enable TEIs to be involved in IME 2 • Pivotal role of training incumbents • More staff needed! • Ongoing CMD (phase 3) needs to be more bespoke • Supervision/ fit to practice • Ongoing vocational investment • Greater variety of phase 2 • Identification of training incumbents & monitoring • No lone ranger • Training for new incumbents • <i>Quality of training incumbent is key</i> • <i>Dioceses need to be more organised in the administration of the vocations/discernment process</i> • Valuing training as a place of academic inquiry • Discernment as an ongoing process through IME 1-3 and allowing for 'failure' • More diocesan control = potential inequalities and inconsistencies – helpful to have national guidance and quality control • Postcode lottery re 'sifting' potential candidates pre selection • Create theological pathways in IME2 (e.g. Lichfield) • Local & central investment in incumbents' ability to train, supervise & discern vocations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEI-specific research • Explore possibilities for TEIs to sustain & support IME 2 • More robust reporting on suitability of candidates for ordinands & early communication with diocese (character, competency, charisma focused) • Greater variety of phase 1 pathways • Do we need consolidation? • Do all need to provide all pathways or have centres of excellence? • How to assess/train independent students? • <i>If pathway not significant in determining outcomes, what future high-cost pathways?</i> • <i>Tutors need recent experience of practical ministry</i> • Discernment as an ongoing process through IME 1-3 and allowing for 'failure' • Do we need to refocus learning outcomes to growth (evangelism)? • More willing to ask tough questions when issues arise that could create problems later • The need to value/address academic questions c/f the immediate practical outworking to guard the Gospel • Depth • Ordinands need to know why they are learning in this way • Consult alumni • Already too flexible re time, category, academic awards etc. – complexity & quality issues • Structured research time for staff, measured for enhancing quality of training • Effect of 'new hybridity' (e.g. colleges running courses/contextual) on theological/ liturgical distinctiveness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to maintain high quality academic theology going forward • Facilitating integration of IME 1&2 & CMD & MDR • Lack of uniformity in dioceses re IME 2 • Need to include lay ministry • Review quality of selection process; secretaries to check paperwork properly included • Tightening inspection & greater coherence for phase 1 • Also for phase 2: how best to do it? • How to assess quality of lay training? • <i>Need greater visibility of success (academic) of candidates through training</i> • Do we need to refocus learning outcomes to growth (evangelism)? • The question of depth of theological evaluation and research and not simply pragmatism • Quality of mind c/f academic qualifications • Selection: access; identifying people too early (e.g. theological educators) • High-cost pathways & intended outcomes • Need good QA re IME2 • Developed TEI inspections to enable better sharing of good practice

Responses from RME consultations in Manchester, Bristol and London, October 2014.
 Responses in italics are from Ministry Division staff at the London consultation.

	DIOCESES	TEIs	MINISTRY DIVISION
FLEXIBILITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selection of pioneers & deployment • Ministry review – ongoing discernment – training • Mid-ministry training • Flexible curacies for working parents • Relationships with TEIs • Lay/ordained: how to distinguish between them? • How do you embed sociality of training, i.e. formation/self-awareness? • Greater integration IME 1 & curacy training • Being more flexible with vocation & deployment – diocesan structures, candidate, selection, selectors (younger & more flexible) • DDOs to note prior learning in selection (implications for those without HE learning) • Connection to TEIs • Ongoing discernment • <i>Extremes of ecclesiology use Rabbinic form of mentoring, which tends to favour male vocations – recruiting for division?</i> • ‘Skills’ that someone has doesn’t necessarily mean shorter training needed – formation takes longer • Short curacy following short training damages formation • Selection of TIs who understand fully the training role • Training of supervisors/TIs by diocese • MPB is not a ‘one size fits all’ description – different contexts require different skills • ‘Individualised’ pathways → expectations of ‘my ministry’? – how far do pathways promote collaborative working? • What are dioceses ready to invest in training? • Demonstrable evidence of skills & character before putting forward • Ordination/ministry/licence not the same • Lay ministry – how resourced & who’s in charge? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifying specific gifts • Ongoing discernment of vocation • Monitoring future career of ordinands systematically • Question of specialisation in institutions • Rural ministry training • Different models of ministry • How do you embed sociality of training, i.e. formation/self-awareness? • Greater integration IME 1 & curacy training • What is the role of / how to integrate APEL? • Whatever is done for ordained and lay training in future can’t mean thinning of communal bonds • Theological sophistication to train ‘jazz’ capable people (yes!) • Train in areas of understanding yourself & interacting with others • Good communication between dioceses & TEIs re candidates • Connection to parishes/context • <i>Training needs to be different for younger candidates</i> • 3 year FTE training may be better • Skills training vs. formation? • 70% MPB – what do we do to prepare people for this? • Training for 10 years’ time, not 10 years ago? • Curriculum does not cover all learning outcomes (particularly relationships, character, vocation, formation, leadership) • Cost/benefit analysis of flexibility in training pathways re loss of cohesion in student cohorts • Implications for TEI viability? • National guidelines give clarity & agreed processes & avoid wide differences & arbitrary decisions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual tailoring of students • Ongoing discernment of vocation • Who ‘commissions’ the training? • What is the role of / how to integrate APEL? • Whatever is done for ordained and lay training in future can’t mean thinning of communal bonds • Review of selection process for pioneers – why not possible to discern this during IME 1? • Danger of ‘zero-centre’ model – negative impact on deployability and national church (also an opportunity) • Reworking of ‘personal profile’ form at point of ordination • Select for training not ordination – reinforce this • Recognition of those from under-represented backgrounds • <i>Greater emphasis on strategic/evangelistic ability within discernment process</i> • Why one size fits all 3-fold order of ministry training? Why not ordain e.g. evangelists & teachers who do not exercise parochial ministry? • OLM ministry over-engineered; SM/‘episcopal’ ministry under-engineered or just not pitched right? • Look at other institutional models of ‘leadership’ training in a ‘professional’ environment • Why not have formal learning prior to training as part of vocations process? • How far could training partners be as effective on lower budgets? • Research into discrepancy between BAP scores & outcomes • Research into failure rate during / at end of curacy • Much more lay training

Responses from RME consultations in Manchester, Bristol and London, October 2014.
 Responses in italics are from Ministry Division staff at the London consultation.

	DIOCESES	TEIs	MINISTRY DIVISION
GROWTH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resources for selection and vocation need to be increased • Support for new incumbents • Encouragement of SSM vocations • Length of time in process might deter vocation • More vocations → more DDOs • Need for more curacies • CMD aimed at fostering vocations • Investing in ongoing vocations • Investment in lay education/funding • Cross-pollination of practice/ideas • Need to be better connected to TEIs • Training for TIs • Vocations = place of significant intervention – potential • Vocational clarity → more than a role description • Courses train SM people as well as residential – they are not second best → more consideration for course training • Vocational dissonance – dioceses need to ‘re-imagine’ ministerial & missional opportunities • Are dioceses adaptable/flexible/missional etc.? • Do curates get wide/good enough training & formation? • Support in transitions IME1 → 2 → CMD & development/career re pioneers; how vocation develops & equipping & encouraging 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pray! • Training for collaborative practice • Helping ordinands in their personal growth, founded in theology & spirituality • Vocations • Investment in lay education • Embed expectation early to be an enabler of vocation/supervisor/collaborator • A discussion about the length of training • Working with dioceses • Vocational clarity – how to encourage/deepen • Reporting is important → being more robust? • Curriculum • Modes of assessment – preparation for practicalities of contextual ministry • Realistic assumptions about patterns of ministry – and how to transcend • What difference does having other kinds of training & business make to TEIs? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explore the question: what are the vocations of the people of God? • National/regional events for IME 2 • National online resources • Integration of RME, RtF, Leadership & Development project, Anecdote to Evidence, Evidence to Action – consistency? • Broader use of ‘pioneer’ & ‘pioneering’ • Focus on lay education • Does this all need a central MinDiv? • <i>Recruit more young people who can relate to young people</i> • <i>Realism over resources required if we are to increase the number of young vocations</i> • Funding of training • Challenge of increased financial support for ordinands as training throws up issues that need care • Criteria questions → personality/character/leadership more important • Assumption that we need pioneers rather than make mission/evangelism a criterion which everyone needs to demonstrate • Why not resource or start ministry thinking with laity, who are the greater number of ministers in the CoE? • Why not think about ministry in schools as more people go to a CoE school than ever go into a church? Could MinDiv work with EdDiv? • Develop good practice for MDR

Resource allocation responses

- What's the 'pay-out' of the theology on offer in TEIs on long-term growth? E.g. do people 10 years into ministry still engage theologically?
- More joined up thinking between Archbishops' Task Groups' reports
- If not good enough what are we doing? (cf. CAs)
- Whole person formation in a changing missional context as a life-long vocation – what assumptions and practices in prayer & mission? E.g. where are the best places for 'leadership', transition from curacy to first incumbency – but where's the resource?
- Young vocations – some form of context-based training. Look at what we're doing now, not just historic data
- All dependent on greater resources – is there a finite ball or will it grow?
- Resource allocation to national selection systems – there is more work to be done
- Lay discipleship and ministry – where does it fit? Space, time, where, how held? Do resources need to be put into this?
- A vision for ministry for the CoE – how related to a vision for ministerial education?
- If research identifies things that don't make a difference, what things do? E.g. TEI level research; prior experience/ background. What is it that shapes people to lead the churches?
- Process: it is very inductive – can we also 're/imagine'?
- Theological literacy and profundity – as well as being missional, collaborative etc., what are you bringing to this?
- TEIs have other roles and functions, e.g. shaping the mindscape in HE
- How can the TEI sector flourish? Wisdom and experience of the sector
- Process and theology – theologically reflect on the results of the research
- Most people involved in discussions about 'lay ministry' are ordained. Structures and distance between lay & theological educators
- A flatter more networked structure with more partnership
- Balance between clerical and lay training – learning culture of the local church as focus
- More into lay ministry
- Increasing quality – improving ministry of the word on a Sunday – resources to help
- Min/Ed Divisions – equipping around Christian witness/educators – in a variety of contexts starting in schools. E.g. Open the Book
- A chaplaincy style of engagement exercised by lay people not resourced – could we?
- LICC
- Clarity on who needs to have an academic theological education
- Spread £50k cost of training across life of ministry
- Move from HE to FE model / apprenticeship model, or equivalent to law conversion course
- More clergy who believe in lay ministry (not an equal and opposite need) – more resources to increase numbers of younger ordinands, i.e. more frontloaded costs
- Invest in retraining in CMD, cf. Truro AMD (also Monmouth)
- Accompanied facilitation process with parishes
- Kill George Herbert and Richard Baxter – priest as mini-bishop? How about specialising – teachers, evangelists, administrators etc. as part of the vocations process
- Vote 1 fund ministry – the ones we need, all ordained & lay from the one pot
- More resources in 'process' (not just skills & theological education) – skilled at local level working to help group, collaboration
- Mismatch between ministries growing and the ones we need, i.e. gifted people for rural ministry – colleges not offering preparation for rural ministries/priorities & imagination elsewhere
- MinDiv / Common Awards outcomes – tension around producing ticks in boxes, not creative pathways – for the people's future vocations – where's the discussion with dioceses about what they want the TEIs to produce?
- More effort into vocations
- How many theological educators have spent real time in rural ministry?
- Vocations variable rural/urban
- Specialisation – Phase 1 putting people into general practice curacy – is this broken? Should we look to more flexible pathways?
- Allocation across Phase 1 & 2 and across pathways (in context of research and cost)
- Regional access points

Responses from RME consultations in Manchester, Bristol and London, October 2014.
Responses in italics are from Ministry Division staff at the London consultation.

- Maintenance grants – present ‘Byzantine system’ – contextual (drop in income)
- Parity across all context-based pathways – a levelling up or down (and maintenance)
- We need to be putting resources into vocations etc., but what if it’s spread too thinly?
- Desirability of more lay training – impact on budget. Central or local – more pressure on incumbents as effective trainers and supervisors – are we investing?
- Analysis of actual shortfall between fee funding and cost of training (since 2008 greater shortfall in real terms) – summer school filling the gap; assess money in/out
- No more central allocation of funds – Phase 2 & CMD should be resourced as near to the local church as possible – no extension of Vote 1... If not need clarity of vision across the Church – disparity is large – realism about what it actually costs
- Adequate funding to manage TEI fluctuations of intakes
- Current approach market driven – no strategic or geographic support?
- Cost of competition – could we do creativity in a different system?
- If funding of Phase 1 is devolved to dioceses then same impact as of CMD will happen
- Have we done research into other countries/churches?
- HE: 1 student FT p.a. £12.5k, 30-50:1 student/lecturer ratio; TEIs: £7.8k, much lower ratio
- Why degrees? Do these bring the most benefit? E.g. nursing

Messages for Task Group (Bristol/London)

- Evolution rather than revolution
- Ongoing formation needs work – be more strategic and joined up
- Let the theological and aspirational have the last word (not economic)
- Think and talk about PTE as a category/ministry
- Gather questions to interrogate research findings
- Ask the laity what they think and what they’ll pay for
- Flexibility – holding alongside the TEIs’ capacity to be as flexible as desired
- Doors between DDOs, TEIs, Vocations etc. need to open
- Sticky points – having to answer to BiS, QAA etc. – TEIs under stress
- Look at success, e.g. Church of Ireland – what might be transferable?
- Listen to dioceses as customers – it’s not working on the ground and it needs to change
- MinDiv – to do fresh thinking about approving pathways – look at knock-on impact of changes
- Lack of cooperation between colleges and courses – could they work/communicate better – and view dioceses as customers?

‘What do we want?’ (Manchester)

- Spirit of God at work in the Church of England!
- Continuous → discontinuous → radical change – the jam is getting thin – are we at this point?
- Theological resources across regions serving churches/networks, for lay/ordained people to dip into – is this the journey that warrants the risk?
- Want to serve:
 - Quality formation & discipleship with sufficient resource
 - Quality to all congregations & clergy
 - Capacity to generate new theological resources/insights