**South Central Regional
Training Partnership**

SOUTH CENTRAL REGIONAL TRAINING PARTNERSHIP

A regional process for Assessing the End of Curacy

April 2013

1. Background

1.1 The Bishops of the 6 Dioceses have decided that it would be more productive to work as a Region rather than as individual dioceses. This could provide a process which allowed for individual creativity and contextual difference and yet at the same time provide a measure of coherence and consistency throughout the Region.

1.2 It was understood that there would continue to be inconsistency when receiving or sending curates from dioceses outside the RTP but that this could not be avoided. It was also understood that such a plan could only work with the full cooperation of the 6 diocesan bishops. They are all supportive.

2. Current Provision

2.1 Each diocese has its own system of IME tutors, mentors, training incumbents and officers who deal with the appointment of curates and their training during 4 – 7. The number of curates involved varies dramatically as does the mode of delivery because of geography and history. The process for appraisal and report writing during 4 – 7 also varies.

3. The Planning

3.1 Using the national guidelines, the existing programmes from each diocese and the Learning Outcomes grids, a scheme was devised and came into operation in July 2010

and has been operated and modified since then in the light of experience.

4. The Process

4.1 The Co-Chair has oversight of the process to ensure accountability, objectivity and parity.

4.2 Each diocese began by producing its own set of portfolio guidelines and requirements for evidence. Close consultation has led to more synergy between dioceses, with everybody learning from good practice. We do not have a standard package – but we do have more cohesion.

4.3 In each diocese, one or two people are responsible for the AEC process: delivery and assessment. These people will also act as mutual assessors for the regional process.

4.4 An annual day in June is set aside for a Moderation meeting. This meeting moderates the process of every diocese and not individual portfolios, though advice can be sought where there is difficulty or lack of clarity. At final assessment (the end of IME 6 or 7), one of the following statements will be made:

   a. The curate has completed the portfolio successfully (with a post of responsibility or assistant ministry focus) and is ready to move on (in the widest sense)

b. The curate has almost completed but with some manageable work still to do during IME 7 (concurrent with applying for posts if a stipendiary candidate) or during IME 7 if an SSM.

c. The curate's portfolio is giving cause for concern and there is some doubt about whether there is time to complete and/or whether the curate has the potential to complete at all.

4.5 Diocesan assessors will present briefly their portfolio data according to their own assessment e.g.

Diocese X

Stipendiaries (6) 4 successful, 1 partial,
1 unsuccessful

Self supporting deployable (6):3 successful,
3 partial

Self supporting locally deployable (5) 1 successful,
3 partial, 1 unsuccessful.

4.6 The 'unsuccessful' recommendations will be discussed by assessors to ensure that the assessment has been fair.

5. 'Unsuccessful' assessments

5.1 Any stipendiary curates who may fall into this category need to be identified as early as possible so that advice can be given regularly to the curate and senior staff. Nothing should come as a surprise at the end of IME 6. This will also allow as much time as possible to address the issues and make informed and intelligent decisions. At the end of IME 7, there may be no future, ordained post open to the person and there is unlikely to be funding available to continue the stipend. A diocese may decide to offer a further QCT post as a second training opportunity.

5.2 Any self-supporting curates who fall into this category will need to be identified early but there will not be the same time pressure with regard to stipend and housing. Each diocese will need to work out the practical and pastoral implications.

6. Reporting to the Bishops

6.1 At the end of the process, the RTP will write to the Bishop saying that the diocesan process has been moderated and is deemed to be fit for purpose, or giving any guidance where appropriate. Of course, it will be the Bishop's responsibility to decide what to do with such recommendations and to issue the definitive letters to curates.

7 Reviewing the process

7.1 The Co-Chair will work with the team of assessors to review and revise the process. The Group is accountable to the SCRTP Management Board and will make an annual report to the Board.

Hazel Whitehead, Co-Chair SCRTP
Revised April 2013