



South Central Regional Training Partnership

An introduction and brief history

The Hind Working Party (so called after its chair John Hind the Bishop of Chichester) was asked to report on the Structure and Funding of ordination training. The group produced a report entitled Formation for Ministry within a Learning Church.

It was debated in Synod in 2003 and with some amendments was adopted.

Set within the context of the mission of God in the world and the ongoing learning of the whole people of God (known as education for discipleship), the report made a number of recommendations which have had significant impact.

1. The desire to take more seriously the prior experience of people entering training and to have much less of 'a new start for everybody entering training' has led to the proliferation of different training pathways. This has had an impact on those training institutions to deliver more and more custom made packages for ordinands entering training.
2. The recommendation to see training as an integrated 7 years (a maximum of three in college or course and 4 in a curacy) has raised all sorts of questions but delivered few answers, although some real steps have been made in those diocesan local ministry programmes where the same provider has had responsibility for both pre and post ordination training. We now talk about IME (Initial Ministerial Training) 1-7.
3. The report found too many small training institutions, where the cohort of students was small and where the number of theological staff were having to teach in areas where they were not really competent, and where institutional costs were higher than they were in larger organisations. This led to the proposal to establish regions, and Regional Training Partnerships. The intention was to encourage all training institutions and dioceses to co-operate or merge to provide more robust financial and educational communities. These went through a number of iterations and we have the South Central RTP, consisting of the dioceses of Guildford, Portsmouth, Winchester, Salisbury and Oxford, and containing 3 diocesan OLM schemes (now 2) two Courses (OMC and STETS) and three ministerial training colleges in Oxford. The Methodist Church and the United Reformed Church are fully involved in the partnership but recognise the asymmetry that inevitably comes with numbers.
4. There was a realisation that the then current method of asking institutions to produce their own answers to what were known as ACCM 22 questions should be replaced by some nationally agreed learning outcomes. These have been worked at and now we have agreed outcomes for training before ordination and training at the end of a curacy both for a potential incumbent and for those wishing to be assistants or associates. This last grid of outcomes has been woven into a proper assessment of learning for the end of a curacy to be signed off by Bishops and to be reliable enough to be useful in a competency dispute.

In the early days there was quite a lot of resistance to doing anything in the SCRTP, but after a couple of conferences and a good deal of work we formed ourselves into a partnership of all those involved in training in the region. The seven leaders of the sponsoring churches are partners. i.e. 5 diocesan Bishops, the Chair of the Methodist District and the Moderator of the URC Province. Every training institution in the region can become a member and all except Wycliffe Hall have done so. Together, Partners and Members each appoint a representative to the Management Board. (this set out in more detail in appendix 1. There was start up funding from the Ministry Division and Partners and members pay an annual subscription. Keith Lamdin, the principal at Sarum College has been seconded and funded for one day a week to act as the development worker for the RTP. This has been in operation for three years now and a review is in hand.

We operate through a number of organic project groups (also set out in appendix 2) which are appointed by and are accountable to the Board.

We have had a number of significant successes:

1. 4 dioceses, (Guildford, Winchester, Salisbury and Oxford) which deliver local ministry training (some of it for ordinands) have collaborated around a common framework and in 2010 went through a common curriculum validation process and received approval together from the House of Bishops.
2. A fresh expressions training course has been delivered in the region and we have had some consultations for all those involved in pioneer ministry in the region. This has led to all those delivering pioneer ordained ministry training agreeing to develop where possible a common framework and some shared teaching.
3. The CMD group have agreed some policies for ministerial study leave and extended study leave (sabbaticals) and have developed a theology for CMD. Along with the Southern Regional Institute (SRI) which was a collaboration between the diocese of Guildford, Portsmouth, Winchester, Salisbury, Bath and Wells and Bristol and which now includes the Diocese of Oxford and the Southampton Methodist District and the URC Province, the regular provision of programmes for new incumbents, training ministers, Rural and Area Deans, and people in mid ministry have continued.
4. The assessment at the end of curacy process has been developed together and a common quality assurance and appeal process has been developed which is approved by the Ministry Division.

There are some on going areas of tension:

1. The national picture is very varied and this has led the House of Bishops to be less eager to devolve to RTPs functions which in the early days were thought possible. An obvious example has been the work of inspection and quality assurance and validation. The new process that has been agreed is much more centralised than the early consultation document suggested it could be. This brings with it the concern that many expressed that

relating to Ministry Division and to RTP just doubles the time taken away from training and teaching.

2. One of the visions of the Hind report was to bring into closer discussion bishops who discerned the needs of the church and were in the business of appointing clergy and training institutions which are independent and answerable to the Ministry Division (in effect), so that they, the bishops could be really sure that the type and quality of ministers they were wanting to appoint were actually coming out from colleges and courses. Although theoretically this happens with the House of Bishops and the Ministry Division, it is the RTP annual conference that does provide a real opportunity for all those involved in discernment, training and appointing and reviewing to be in the same room and engage in productive discussions.
3. We have become aware over the three years that we have been running that it is difficult for us to ensure that the RTP board keeps in close enough contact with the partners. Both partners and Board have acknowledged that for real development to occur we need to find a way of closing this circle.
4. We are a very complex region, with three colleges in Oxford (Wycliffe, St. Stephens and **Ripon, Cuddesdon** and two 'non residential part time training' courses (**OMC and STETS**), all of whom recruit students from outside of the region. The only merger that has happened, following the split of St Albans and Oxford Ministry Course (SAOMC) has been that between OMC and Ripon. This has delivered the things the Hind report hoped for – a larger student body, a larger staff of theological educators and significant savings in costs.

Our experience seems to say that when dioceses wish to co-operate in the region this has been relatively easy to deliver and productive but when we have tried to work across the **traditional divide of ordination, much sought for in Hind, we have 'fished all night and caught nothing'**.

South Central Regional Training Partnership

Foundation Document



Diocese of Guildford



Diocese of Oxford



Diocese of Winchester



Diocese of Portsmouth



CONTENTS

Part One is an introduction to the Region.

Part Two outlines the formal establishment and working of the Partnership. It is shaped in response to the Ministry Division Draft Document on Accountability, Quality and Enhancement. Part Two contains sections on Vision, Governance, Approaches to Learning, Education and Formation, and processes for self evaluation.

Part Three describes the concept of RTP Frameworks. Specific Frameworks will produce separate documentation.

PART ONE Introduction

1. On the Culture, Context and Language of an RTP

1.1 Partners, stakeholders and Church Leaders each form a vital element in the ongoing development of the South Central Regional Training Partnership. From small beginnings, we have established warm relationships across denominational and ecclesial boundaries, as we have sought to work and worship together. Conversations have moved from being tentative to trusting; initiatives from being fragile to fruitful; collaboration from being slight to substantial. We own this development hopefully, mindful that the differences we have continue to define us. Yet we are also finding, increasingly, within our emerging RTP, that a rich commonality of shared discipleship and witness is being discovered as we work and pray together.

1.2 We wish to give thanks for the processes and instruments that have brought us to this point. And we are also attentive to the limits that a document of this kind will necessarily have. There are three points that we ask readers to particularly note.

1.3 First, all the models and metaphors we have to describe the church – whether ancient or modern, biblical or theological – seldom do justice to the density and richness of our ecclesial life. The reality of the church always exceeds the language and concepts that attempt to capture something of its inner and dynamic life. Nonetheless, in our work together, and in this document, we have sought to give some kind of an account of the hope that is within us – for our common life together.

1.4 Second, the same can be said for our pedagogy – the common education, training and formation that we have been considering for local ministry. We have consciously chosen to work **with the metaphor of 'framework'** – for both the openness and composition that it suggests. But we are well aware that our discipleship is shaped through much more than frames of reference. Conceptual language can only partially capture the complexity of the relationships that are envisaged and are present in an RTP.

1.5 Third, as our conversations continue to deepen, we are increasingly conscious of the varied and common calls, responses, reflections and wisdom that have brought us all to gather around the same table. Our Local Ministry Framework Part Three inevitably can only partially express something of the emerging hope and faith with which we sense we have been entrusted.

1.6 This document, as a whole, is, therefore, a significant sign of progress, and not an end in itself. **It represents, as all Christians do, 'work in progress'; where we discover more about one another, as we journey with God.**

1.7 In our sharing together, we have also deepened our sense and understanding of the context and culture in which we find ourselves, which has been vital for us as we have sought to reflect on local ministry. We are well aware that descriptions of context and cultures are complex and contested. No two people will see an object or situation in quite the same way. Similarly, different churches, congregations and denominations experience their common habitats in particular and common Frameworks.

1.8 In addition, it is important to note that in terms of geography, our RTP reaches from Milton Keynes in the north, around the M25 to Guildford and south to the coast, taking in Portsmouth, Southampton and the Channel Islands. From the coast the west of the region includes all of Hampshire, the Isle of Wight, much of Dorset, much of Wiltshire, and Oxfordshire, reaching north as far as Banbury. The region includes great areas of countryside and village life, market towns, large urban conurbations and in all our counties significant populations of commuters.

1.9 There is little heavy industry but significant involvement in trade, tourism, the armed services, higher education and the IT industry, as well as those who work in cities. In a region with a population of 6 million people there is substantial employment in local government, and all the service industries needed to sustain infrastructure, health, education and welfare.

1.10 On the surface, the RTP may appear to be predominantly white, well educated, and in employment. But when we peer below the surface, each part of the RTP is aware of significant pockets of deprivation; of indices that point to varieties of poverty – whether of monetary, education, housing, amenities and employment opportunity. There is also a rich range of ethnic diversity in the RTP, representing the rapid transformation of society in southern England during the post-war era. **Black and Caribbean immigration from the 1950's, Asian from the 1960's, or more recent arrivals from Eastern European in the late 1990's, has resulted in a cultural and contextual vibrancy, affecting everything from faith to consumerism, and from employment to education.** The RTP has a far more diverse, less homogenous population than it would have known fifty years ago. Thus, alongside the new Mosques (including the oldest Mosque in the country), Temples, Gurdwaras and other places of worship, the RTP, and in common with other regions in England, has seen new churches emerge to cater for the burgeoning numbers of communities seeking faith and worship that is more in tune with their ethnic background.

1.11 To many outside the RTP, the region will appear to be prosperous and comfortable. Yet economically, we are also aware that high house prices in many areas can conceal a variety of dependencies. Apparently busy and vibrant communities can mask over-burdened infrastructures in suburban and urban areas, and the attendant stress this induces. Rural communities, whilst still looking idyllic on the surface, can often struggle with the decline in traditional industries (eg, arable or livestock farming, etc), the lack of amenities, and related socio-economic issues.

1.12 The local church, set in any of these contexts, grapples with the mission and ministry issues the context provides. The kind of ministry, and in particular Local Ministry, we have sought to capture and shape in this document seeks to respond to these different contexts with great care. We are mindful that for all those contributing to the RTP, the very diversity and challenge of contexts, and the different ways potential partners have found to respond to these and one

another, provides very real opportunities for mutual learning, support and challenge across the region.

1.13 In all of this, we are profoundly conscious that throughout our deepening conversations, we have begun to find much strength in our common Christian language. Although our variable ecclesial accents (eg, Baptist, Anglican, Methodist, etc) sometimes accentuate our differences, it is our belief that we have begun to develop into something of the vision that Paul may have glimpsed for the early Christian church. Twice in his letter to the Colossians, **he uses the word 'knit' – first of 'hearts knit together', and then of 'the whole body knit together' (Col 2: 2 & 19).** 'Knitting' is a compelling and suggestive concept. It mirrors the density and complexity of the cultures and contexts that we find ourselves in. And it also suggests that somehow, different strands of theology, and the variety of threads, materials and colours that make up the whole of the church, can be woven together to make something richer and stronger. This is, of course, only possible, in Christ, who interweaves our lives with his own, as we worship and work together, and continue to become his body.

PART TWO

1 Vision statement and primary aim

1.1 Vision statement

1.1.1 The South Central Regional Training Partnership (RTP) is an instrument of communion, enabling the body of Christ in this region to discern and develop its gifts for its growth and for the building of the kingdom of God.

1.1.2 As partners working collaboratively, we seek to foster the formation of the whole church, in which the call to and nurture of both the individual and the community are inseparable. A learning church involves both individuals and communities in a process of lifelong learning supporting discipleship and ministry.

1.1.3 We seek to enable partners to be responsive and accountable to the churches and dioceses they serve, and to one another.

1.2 Primary aims, purpose and activities

1.2.1 The overall aim of the Partnership is to meet the developing training needs of the churches by:

- responding to and promoting existing work by the churches and other educational institutions;
- identifying and promoting new initiatives.

1.2.2 The purpose of partnership is to perform such work collaboratively, constructively and creatively, making more efficient use of regional resources.

1.2.3 It proposes to achieve this aim through:

- collaborative networking and action on common tasks via development groups;
- the development of a range of Frameworks, within which appropriate educational programmes can be devised, validated and managed.

1.2.4 This aim and these purposes are informed by, grounded in and critiqued by the following values:

- **Integrity** Partners will make their decision making transparent to each other and will be open and honest with each other. We will accept a mutual accountability for observing our values and behaviours as part of our agreement with one another. We will not work apart where working together offers better outcomes: that is, is more in line with our values or is more likely to realise our vision for the future. We will combine hopefulness with realism in our decision making. We will share and discuss fresh initiatives before they are planned and implemented.
- **Accessibility** Partners will work together to ensure that what is provided is clear to those who may wish to use it and that there is ease of access. We will be more concerned with **the needs of the 'user'** – the individual, the wider church, the community at large - than protecting individual partner interests.
- **Diversity** We will continue to offer a range of resources, styles and learning approaches and value that diversity. We will not act in ways that suggest these different approaches are in competition with one another. We will value the different churches and traditions represented in the partnership and fully respect all partners. In meeting the needs of the partnership we will respect the legitimate needs of the individual partners.
- **Progressive** We will be forward-thinking and innovative where it offers us a chance to better express our purpose, values and vision. We will not block positive change out of narrow self interest. We will play to the strengths of the partners, building upon what is there, recognising existing achievement in learners and within partnerships. We will actively share best practice and be willing to learn from one another.
- **Stewardship** We will look for ways to be cost effective, share resources and offer value for money. We will always look for a collaborative solution. We will avoid unnecessary duplication and will learn from good practice elsewhere – **we will not keep 'reinventing the wheel'**.

2 Structure and Governance of the South Central RTP

The Church Leaders and Partners have approved the structures outline below as a framework for the Governance of the SC RTP for a period of three years from February 2008 after which there will be a thorough internal review (including external contributions) of their appropriateness and effectiveness.

2.1 Partners

2.1.1 The Partnership is established by a Covenant made between the Wessex Synod of the United Reformed Church, Southampton Methodist District, and the Anglican dioceses of Guildford, Oxford, Portsmouth, Salisbury and Winchester for the purposes of enhancing Christian communion by delivering high quality theological education and training efficiently. These bodies are known as **'The Partners of the South Central RTP'**. **The Partnership will be open to other Christian ecclesial bodies in the region, with the approval of the existing Partners.**

2.1.2 The Partners form the Governing Body which is responsible for holding and developing the vision of the Partnership, and for oversight of the work undertaken in and by the Partnership. The Governing Body also includes the two co-Chairs of the Board (see below). **The Governing Body is responsible for the Partnership's Funds. The Governing Body will meet at least once a year.**

2.2 Members

2.2.1 Partners and other independent institutions engaged in Christian theological education and training in the region are able to become Members of the South Central RTP. Members must be prepared to be bound by the covenant and by articles of agreement which will be drafted as required and be prepared to pay any agreed subscription.

2.3 Management

2.3.1 The developing life and responsibility for the RTP are shared by all members through the following structures.

2.3.2 The Board is responsible for generating the vision and strategies of the partnership, for discerning work that needs to be done, for supervising work done by and within the partnership, and for making recommendations to the Governing Body.

2.3.3 At the appropriate times, the Board acts as the Accountability, Quality and Enhancement Panel in relation to any process of validation and inspection agreed with national church structures.

2.3.4 The Board will meet at least three times a year, and report to the Governing Body at least once a year.

2.3.5 The Board consists of:

- ✓ One representative of each of the Partners.
- ✓ One representative of each of the Members who are not also partners
- ✓ Two people appointed by the Partners acting together, one of whom will act as co-Chair (see below).
- ✓ Up to three members co-opted by the Board to ensure a proper balance of representation and relevant expertise.

2.3.6 Two Co-Chairs will be appointed from among the members of the Board. One of these will be one of the two members appointed by the Partners acting together (see above). The other will be elected by the Board Members. **One of these Chairs will Chair the management aspects of the Board's life and the other will Chair the Accountability, Quality and Enhancement aspect of the Board's life.**

2.4 Project Groups work to develop and implement the vision in specific areas and develop Frameworks for validation and quality assurance if necessary. Project Groups consist of representatives of Members and Providers (see below). Each member of the Board will normally belong to one of the Project Groups. The Chair of any Project Group which would otherwise not

include a member of the Board shall also be co-opted to the Board. Project Groups meet as need determines and at least twice a year; all members of the groups are also invited to the annual residential conference. Project Groups report at least once a year to the Board. The Chair of each Group is appointed by the Board.

2.5 Framework is the metaphor we use to describe a structured approach to Learning, Training, Validation and Quality assurance. Such validation and quality assurance is required by the National Churches to which the Partners belong for those ministries having national accreditation. Some of the Project Groups do not need to develop a Framework, while others do.

2.5.1 A Framework will have a statement of vision, practice and quality assurance agreed by the Partnership and a separate set of statements from each provider setting out how each provider will deliver programmes and courses relevant to the Framework. As the life of the Churches in the Region develops and responds to changing contexts and need other Frameworks may well be needed.

2.6 Providers: There may be training institutions, universities, colleges or local churches which wish to be involved in the work of the RTP by delivering education and training within one of the Frameworks, but which do not wish to take up the full status of membership. Providers will be able to be fully involved in the life of the project groups by permission of the Board and in the Framework quality and enhancement processes.

2.7 There will also be an open, annual Residential Conference which will call together Partners, Members and Providers to reflect together on our work (past and future).

2.8 Finance: For the initial three year period the Diocese of Winchester DBF will provide banking and accounting resources at the instruction of the Co-Chairs and Board and will be responsible for any legal responsibilities for liability and employment to be taken.

3 Approaches to learning, education and formation

3.1 Learning: All learning is founded upon the underlying belief that God longs for all, young and old, to grow and develop in their Christian discipleship, to fulfil their calling to love and serve. The RTP recognises that learners are best able to do this when they:

- ❖ feel valued as individuals;
- ❖ discover that their real learning needs are recognised and addressed;
- ❖ have their experience acknowledged and are enabled to reflect critically on it;
- ❖ have the opportunity to learn from one another;
- ❖ nurture a learning community that is both valuing and challenging;
- ❖ are asked to question current assumptions and practice;
- ❖ are expected to take responsibility for their own learning;
- ❖ recognise, use and **celebrate each other's gifts** in communities of learning;
- ❖ are given safe spaces to be able to talk about and explore the connections between faith and their experience.

3.2 Education: The RTP expects all those providing theological education and training within its Frameworks to honour the values of learning listed above and to:

- ❖ have effective working practice of recognising and accrediting prior experience and learning;
- ❖ have high quality teaching in reflective practice;
- ❖ acknowledge and develop different learning styles, use differentiated learning methods and provide a range of learning opportunities;
- ❖ model collaborative and shared learning as a means of mutual development;
- ❖ take seriously the contexts from which learners come, in which they will train, and within which they will minister;
- ❖ foster stable learning communities;
- ❖ have a partnership relationship with a Higher Education Institution where it is appropriate to have one;
- ❖ provide appropriate assessment for all kinds of learning and formational development;
- ❖ work within the defined learning outcomes for ministerial education approved by participating Churches and denominations.

3.3 Formation: **The church's understanding of its call to mission and ministry informs its formation** in communities of faith. Within this, people are enabled to discern gifts and grow holistically as disciples of Christ. We recognise that formation for public ministry involves the individual, their community of faith, the wider Church and their training institution helping the individual grow towards the role to which they are called. Within formal training contexts this process is fostered by:

- ❖ belonging to and contributing to a community of faith;
- ❖ worship, prayer and the study of scripture;
- ❖ a truthful engagement with peers and tutors;
- ❖ engaging with the whole person;
- ❖ engaging with the processes of personal development;
- ❖ a growing capacity to explore and articulate faith;
- ❖ **being aware of the diversity of theological positions and of one's own stance within it;**
- ❖ **discerning and taking responsibility for one's contribution to the work of the Kingdom.**

4 RTP processes of Quality Assurance in Formation

4.1 The RTP seeks to work within the guidelines set out in the report on Accountability, Quality and Enhancement. In particular the RTP supports:

- the learning outcomes.
- **trust in the HE institutions' quality assurance where it is applicable.**
- the need for the Churches to have a distinctive interest in formational aspects of learning and training.
- the development of processes relating the work and relationships created in the RTP to the validation and Quality Assurance requirements of the national churches
- the development within the RTP of its own internal Quality Assurance and enhancement processes

4.2 **As set out above, the Board will take responsibility for overseeing all the RTP's validation approvals and its internal quality assurance, and will report to the Governing Body and work with the National Churches.**

4.3 As each Framework is established the Board will agree with appropriate national bodies (and others as required) a validation and quality assurance procedure that is appropriate to that Framework.

4.4 Providers of training through any particular Framework will agree that they are:

- committed to the RTP vision and the general approaches to learning and the particular ones for that Framework.
- able to deliver the training and self evaluation processes effectively, as set out in their Provider submission.
- committed to the quality assurance process set out for the Framework.

4.5 Each provider will have in place normal self evaluation processes and will be able to show proper audit trails for the 6 yearly external audit of the RTP approved by the national churches. These would normally include HE validation annual reviews and external **examiners' reports, and reports of any 'minor changes' to the curriculum made year by year.**

PART THREE - FRAMEWORKS

- 1.1 Within the RTP there are several institutions which provide a wide range of training and learning opportunities. In order to provide some cohesion and collaboration, the Board agreed that, rather than attempt to straitjacket any particular institution or produce monochrome courses which all institutions must deliver, it would work with the concept of Frameworks.
- 1.2 This would have the dual effect of releasing institutions and deliverers of training to be creative and respond to context, as well as providing a sense of communal ownership and common ground. Once the Framework documentation had been agreed by the RTP Board, it would be up to any party wishing to deliver training within that Framework to demonstrate that it could agree to the principles and ethos expressed and would commit to working within them. A potential, new deliverer would have to apply to the Board and be accepted within the Framework.
- 1.3 As Local Ministry courses were in the process of inspection and validation work, and as several members expressed interest in developing it, it was agreed that the Local Ministry Framework would be the first to be set up. This work was done, the Framework accepted and the relevant officers have begun to form their curriculum validation documents based upon it. This involves a number of providers of Local Ministry training such as the present Local Ministry (ordained and lay) schemes for Oxford, Guildford and Salisbury and Winchester/Portsmouth. Each provider has committed to this RTP Framework and will provide supplementary evidence that they are able to provide the training as it is set out in the framework.
- 1.4 As the work of the RTP progresses, and as individual initiatives come to the fore, further Frameworks are envisaged e.g. Ordained Pioneer Training, Mixed Mode Training.

Responsibilities of RTP project groups

1. All groups share in the overall purpose of the RTP to develop training that is as excellent and ecumenical as possible so that the people of God can enable the church in the region to be as fit as possible for its calling. (limits to the work are suggested by the words 'training' 'ecumenical as possible' and 'regional')
2. All groups have a responsibility to bring to the Board policy issues that arise through their work.
3. The Chair of each group is appointed by the Board and the life of the group reviewed immediately after the annual residential so that groups can be wound up, if necessary, and new ones started.
4. The Chair or members of the group may be asked to represent the RTP at national level consultations.
5. The Chair is responsible for producing reports for every Board meeting.
6. All groups are expected to consider where their work overlaps with that of another group and to be sensitive in communicating and discussing such overlaps.

Local Preachers and Licensed Lay ministers

Chair: Phillip Tovey (Oxford Diocese)

To develop and coordinate the training of local preachers and licensed lay ministers and to participate collaboratively in all validation and inspection processes.

Education for discipleship

Chair: David Isaac (Portsmouth Diocese)

To develop and coordinate training that supports the local churches calling to the formation and development of discipleship.

Local Ministry Framework

Chair: Simon Baker (Winchester Diocese)

To coordinate the institutions that are validated within the framework and to participate in and develop its annual process of quality assurance.

Fresh Expressions (on ice to be reviewed Oct 2011)

Chair:

To coordinate training for those involved in Fresh Expression (especially the nationally approved course) and to publicise and develop understanding of Fresh Expressions in the RTP.

Pioneer Trainers group

Chair: Jane Charman (Salisbury Diocese)

To develop between those who already train and those who wish to be validated to train OPMs an agreed framework for their training which recognises their distinctive needs both for contextual training and the need to belong to a peer community.
To coordinate a collaborative validation and quality assurance process.

Continuing Ministerial Development

Chair: Jane Charman (Salisbury Diocese)

To develop policies that are agreed by those who provide CMD, and to provide training courses which member churches believe will be better provided together than separately.

Initial Ministerial Education

Chair:

To provide an arena in which all providers of IME 1-3 and 4-7 can discuss common issues and develop agreed strategies for fulfilling the proposals in the Hind Report in this area.

To propose to the Board new project groups to undertake specific and limited work within the spectrum of IME.

End of Curacy

Chair: Duncan Strathie (Winchester Diocese)

To coordinate an agreed process for the quality assurance of those members engaged in end of curacy assessments and to monitor national policy and guidance.

Training of Ministers involved in Supervising ordinands and newly ordained ministers in IME

Chair: Duncan Strathie (Winchester Diocese)

To develop common practice in the training and support and quality assurance of all 'placement supervisors' and 'training ministers' (during IME 1 – 13) and training ministers (during IME 4 – 7)

Curriculum Group (1-7) (in abeyance at the moment)

Chair:

To develop agreement about which aspects of training belong best in which phase of IME (pre or post authorisation for public ministry), and to develop some commonly agreed policies and practices that form a framework for all future curriculum development