

MOORE THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE LIBRARY



3 2042 00088208 8

Box 114

GS 359

General Synod

Advisory Council for The Church's Ministry

The second report of the Working Party on Courses

MOORE COLLEGE
LIBRARY

This report has only the authority of the Working Party by which it was prepared.

PREFATORY NOTE

The first report of the Working Party on Courses was published in June 1977 as GS Misc.62. At the November 1977 residential meeting of the Advisory Council for the Church's Ministry we received the second report of the Working Party and resolved to publish it so that it could be considered by the General Synod and the House of Bishops. While the Council generally approved the report it had reservations about certain detailed recommendations, and it will be giving further consideration to the recommendations in the report in the light of the debate in the Synod and the decisions of the House of Bishops.

RONALD PORTSMOUTH

*Chairman,
Advisory Council for the Church's Ministry*

December 1977

INTRODUCTION

1. It is probably necessary that we should begin this second report by recalling that it was in December 1976 that the Advisory Council for the Church's Ministry decided to set up a small working party

'to evaluate the present quality and methods of ordination training in the light of known and foreseeable financial circumstances, and to make recommendations to ACCM Council in two stages: the first set to be presented by 1st May 1977, concerned principally with emergency measures affecting the academic year beginning October 1977; the second set to be presented by 1st November 1977, concerned with longer-term implications.'

In subsequent discussion between the Chairman of ACCM and the Chairman of its Committee for Theological Education it was clarified that the particular areas to be considered would include

the value of University Diplomas and Certificates *vis-à-vis* the General Ordination Examination;

the value of theology *vis-à-vis* other disciplines as a subject for first degree and the value for some candidates of reading theology as a second 'first degree';

the requirement of training theological teachers of the future;

the length of course for holders of first degrees;

the possibility of some non-residential training for most candidates training for stipendiary ministry;

the possibility of non-residential training for younger candidates;

the maintenance of GOE as a minimum academic standard.

At the meeting of the Council in March 1977 the terms of reference were revised to include candidates training for the Inter-Diocesan Certificate and preparing for ministry as deaconesses and accredited lay workers.

2. The Chairman of ACCM invited the following to serve on the working party:

The Rt Rev. Oliver S. Tomkins, formerly Bishop of Bristol (*Chairman*)

The Rt Rev. John Gibbs, Bishop of Coventry

The Rev. A. N. Barnard, Deputy Principal of Salisbury and Wells Theological College – now Residentiary Canon of Lichfield Cathedral

The Rev. Canon S. H. Evans, Dean of King's College London – Dean-designate of Salisbury

The Rev. D. H. Field, Director of Studies at Oak Hill College, London

The Rev. Canon A. A. K. Graham, Warden of Lincoln Theological College — now Bishop of Bedford

Mr J. F. M. Smallwood, Deputy Vice-Chairman of the Central Board of Finance

The Rev. J. M. M. Dalby) Joint
Miss Benedicta Whistler) Secretaries

The Working Party has met on eight occasions.

3. On 24th May the Chairman of the Working Party presented the first report to ACCM. It was received together with the comments of the Committee for Theological Education which had been asked to consider it in advance in order that its views might be available to the Council. The report was then forwarded with the Council's specific proposals to the House of Bishops for their meeting on 15th June. The House gave a general endorsement to the report as a whole, waived certain training requirements in the light of the financial urgency and thus allowed greater flexibility, and asked that certain points which it specified should be given further consideration in the preparation of the second report (see paragraph 21).

4. Although it is hoped that this second report may be read as a document in its own right, this brief survey indicates that it necessarily presupposes and complements the first report. Matters which were fully explored there have not always been dealt with again in detail, nor have all the arguments for each recommendation been repeated in full.

5. In preparing the material for the second report we would again wish to express our thanks for the help we have received and for the ready response given by those to whom we have turned for information or guidance. We have consulted the faculties and departments of theology or religious studies of those universities which have close links with theological colleges and of those which have no links with them, and we have had valuable communications from both. We have welcomed assistance from the Board of Education and through them from principals of church colleges of higher education. We have also shared this report in draft with those responsible for theological training in the Roman Catholic and Free Churches. In particular we have been appreciative of the care and the patience shown in the replies from theological colleges, from their governing bodies and principals, and from the committee of the Principals and Staffs Conference. Throughout our discussions we have been conscious of the burden of uncertainty being borne by the staffs of the colleges, upon whom has inevitably fallen the anxiety of awaiting our recommendations as well as the practical and administrative problem of reacting constructively to the greater flexibility encouraged by the Bishops. We are grateful to them and to the Anglican Ordinands Committee, representing as it does the students whose own training has been under discussion.

6. The Chairman and members of the Working Party would record their gratitude to the members of General Synod staff who have always been available, at

and between meetings, to provide the needed facts and details, Miss B. J. Clark (ACCM Grants Secretary), Deaconess R. E. Wintle (ACCM Lay Ministry Secretary) and Mr David McIntyre (Central Board of Finance). Special thanks are due to Dr Mark Dalby and to Miss Benedicta Whistler; their patience in drafting and re-drafting this report produced lucidity out of often confused discussion, and all members of the Working Party wish to express their thanks to them.

OUR CONTINUING TASK

7. After the debate on finance in the General Synod in July 1977, we were left wondering whether there was any need for the continued existence of our Working Party and for this second report. Our first report was circulated as GS Misc. 62 and was referred to by Sir Arnold France, the Chairman of the Central Board of Finance, in the debate on the Estimates for 1978. Then Sir Arnold challenged the Church to respond to carefully examined estimates by raising the needed money instead of saying 'we can't afford it'. In that context, the response of General Synod to ministerial training was to pass the vastly increased estimates together with an amendment offering extra money if required. Our Working Party was appointed because there was a financial crisis in the plans for ministerial training, to propose 'emergency measures' and to draw out 'longer term implications'. If there is no longer a financial crisis, is there any longer need for our Working Party?

8. We believe that there is, for two reasons. In the first place, on any showing, there is a crisis in the strict sense of a time of judgement. In the Church, as in the nation, there must be a careful weighing of priorities and scrutiny of expenditure. If present standards of training are not to be modified, it must be because we are all convinced that they involve an educational quality which is worth the price. Our terms of reference were 'to evaluate the present quality and methods of ordination training in the light of known and foreseeable financial circumstances. . .'.¹ Of course, evaluation is a continuous process — within the colleges themselves and within ACCM and all its agencies, especially its Committee for Theological Education; our specific remit was to take part in that evaluation at a time when stewardship of the Church's resources needs to be more than ever scrupulous. In the last resort, it must be the parishes which will be called upon to find the increased resources. We must do all we can to assure them that they are getting value for money in primarily educational terms. We believe that financial stringency has called into question some of the courses which developed in a period of comparatively open budgets, so we ask the colleges to scrutinise some of these developments. Many of the recommendations we made in our first report, and further elaborate in this one, are we believe justified by their educational potential and so are good stewardship of resources. Thus we have a continuing task of evaluation, in light of the comments on our first report which we have elicited from the colleges, and from the universities which share in the training

¹ These terms of reference were later enlarged to include 'candidates training for the IDC and preparing for ministry as deaconesses and accredited lay workers'. Throughout our report the term 'ordinand' should be taken to refer to these candidates also.

process. We have responded to those comments in later sections of this second report.

9. Secondly, however positively the General Synod may respond to the challenge, the Church at large will need time. The financial situation is urgent. There are some 1,000 men and women currently in training, and most of them look to the Church for at least a part of their fees. The reserves in the Central Fund for Ordination Candidates are exhausted and there is no International Monetary Fund to bail the Church out of its debts. What happens if, in the course of say 1980, it is clear that there is simply not the money available? However unwelcome some economies may be, they are to be preferred to telling X hundred men and women that the central funds of the Church simply cannot pay their fees in full, in spite of our renewed pledge to do so. There would follow a period of intense anxiety and uncertainty, whilst candidates, colleges, parishes and dioceses sought for other ways of finding the money. Where these failed, there would be no alternative but to leave college and take alternative employment (if it could be found). The General Synod may introduce supplementary budgets, but that does not produce the money if Diocesan Boards of Finance and PCC treasurers do not have the will to meet the increased quotas. *This crisis is indeed moral rather than financial.* As the Chairman of the Central Board of Finance has rightly insisted, the average member of the Church of England is not yet contributing to Church funds at a level which can truly be called 'sacrificial'. Indeed, we echo the belief, expressed by the National Evangelical Anglican Conference earlier this year, 'that God has given to our church all the money that it needs — but that too much of it is still firmly in the pockets of its members'. So we have, in this Working Party, a continuing task to clarify the facts of the financial situation in such a way as to hasten the response of the Church at large. We hope that the response will be great enough and quick enough to make unnecessary any cuts which can be felt as damaging to standards. We still stand by those recommendations which we make because we believe that they are educational improvements, prompted by a scrutiny which stewardship demanded. Our overriding concern is to secure a *higher* standard of ministerial training. This second report is designed to help to bring home to the Church that there is no time to lose if the quality of training is not to suffer.

THE FINANCIAL PERSPECTIVE

10. Our first report acknowledged that 'it would be wrong to disguise the fact that our Working Party was set up because of the considerable current anxiety about the rapidly increasing cost to the Church of the training of ordination candidates and also about the possibility of further sharp increases in the immediate future' (para.4). Expenditure from the Central Fund for Ordination Candidates was estimated to rise from £541,000 in 1976 to something in the region of £800,000 in 1977 and an estimated net sum of £1,050,000 in 1978. Since that report was written nothing has occurred which has caused ACCM or the CBF to adjust the estimated expenditure in 1977 and 1978 except that it is now more probable that expenditure in 1977 will be in the range of £725,000—

£750,000. This is because first indications — and it must be emphasised that these are first indications only — are that LEA discretionary grants have been maintained to a greater degree than was anticipated. The CBF has therefore decided that, by using all the reserves of the Fund and savings obtained elsewhere, it will not be necessary to ask dioceses to pay Supplementary Quota in 1977.

11. The Budget for 1978 made no allowance for rebuilding reserves and it is not proposed to increase the Budget in that year merely to provide a buffer, as opposed to spending more on training. Nevertheless, 1978 could well present problems for the CBF in a situation where (a) there is a moral commitment to see a candidate through training, once that training has commenced, (b) it is recognised that, because of decisions taken outside the Church, expenditure may fluctuate wildly, (c) it is not possible to react quickly if there is a shortfall in money available for training, and (d) there are no CFOC reserves available. Therefore a Supplementary Quota in 1978 may be necessary.

12. As we have noted, at the Summer Session 1977 the General Synod carried the Motion which provided in 1978 £1,050,000 for the Central Fund for Ordination Candidates, and to this it added an amendment requesting the CBF to reconsider the vote with a view to making further provision for the training of ordination candidates. The estimate for 1978 was based upon the assumption that the policy of training all those who offer and are accepted would continue. That assumption still obtains and is reflected in our first recommendation, 'That the General Synod should reaffirm its traditional commitment to the training of all who are recommended for the Church's ministry'. At the present time, therefore, ACCM and the CBF have no grounds for amending their estimate of expenditure — either up or down — for 1978. It should not be assumed that, as a result of the amendment to the Money Motion carried by the Synod, the financial problem has gone away, nor should it be assumed that, if less than £1,050,000 is spent in 1978, standards of training will have dropped.

13. While the General Synod invited the CBF to ask for more, many Diocesan Boards of Finance when consulted by the CBF early in 1977 expressed doubt about their ability or willingness to contribute their full share of the General Synod Budget including the Central Fund for Ordination Candidates in 1978. In the light of this the Central Board has recently been in discussion with the Chairmen of Diocesan Boards of Finance. In general, dioceses now expect that they will be able to meet their full Quota assessment both to the General Synod Budget and to the CFOC in 1978, but they have made the point that if church-people are to give the money needed for ordination training they will need to be kept well informed about training policies and progress and to be reassured that:

- (a) standards of selection are being maintained at a rigorous level
- (b) the relevance of the training syllabus is being continually scrutinised
- (c) candidates are receiving the best possible training
- (d) there is no waste of money
- (e) the best use is being made of the resources available to the Church.

14. In the short term it is effectively too late to make any substantial changes to the pattern of training in 1978. In the long term we are confident that, if the need for money for training is clearly explained and if it can be demonstrated that efficient and economical use is being made of the resources available to the Church, then the necessary money will be forthcoming. Finance for training is a question of confidence. If the laity are told clearly of the needs, if they have confidence in the quality of ordinands, in the relevance and the quality of their training, and if they are assured that training resources are being used as effectively and economically as possible, then they will provide the necessary funds.

THE WIDER CONTEXT

15. We for our part are very conscious of the need to promote this confidence and assurance. But, especially in this second report, we have also tried to look more widely. We have tried to discern the signs of the times and to set ministerial training in its right context. In doing so, we have recognised that since the second world war there have been noteworthy developments in the life of the Church affecting both the understanding and the structure of her ministry and the process of theological education. The parochial ministry, for instance, is being modified by the diminished number of sole cures, by the formation of groups and teams, by concentration on the active ministry of all Christian people. As a consequence the word 'ministry' no longer connotes something almost exclusively clerical, and the distinction between ordained and unordained is becoming blurred. In addition to these developments, there has been the wide extension of non-parochial 'sector' ministries which now have an acknowledged place in the total pattern of the Church's ministry. Alongside both the parochial ministry and the 'sector' ministries are various other ministries, for instance the auxiliary pastoral ministry and the local ministry. These newer forms of ministry intersect and overlap the more traditional forms in a great number of unplanned and unpremeditated ways. In other words, there is a fluidity about the pattern of ministry in today's Church which would have surprised Christian people only a generation ago, and also a diversity and untidiness which would have appalled their leaders.

16. Yet in this situation full-time professional parochial ministry is quite as important as it has ever been, even if its precise role and function will not be understood exclusively or predominantly in terms of the exercise of pastoral care towards a settled community. *The clergy and lay workers of tomorrow, instead of concentrating on the pastoral care of the whole local community, will be increasingly concerned with the education and training of articulate and consciously Christian disciples within that community, and with the work of prophecy and interpretation in respect both of the Church and of secular society.* Moreover, with the likelihood that an increased use will be made of men exercising an auxiliary pastoral ministry, there is need for stronger parochial structures and for better trained full-time professional ministers. In the developing pattern

of ministry parochial clergy will play a role of vital importance, and for this reason it is imperative to look for a higher standard in their natural gifts and in their professional training. They will be the trainers of their fellow Christians in ministry and mission.

17. Not surprisingly, with such a changing pattern of ministry, theological education has changed as well. Twenty years ago, it was more or less limited to residential training through university and theological college. In England, non-residential training began with the Southwark Ordination Course in 1960, to be followed by the North West Ordination Course in 1969 and ten more courses in the '70s. All these courses provide training for the auxiliary ministry. The first two train also for stipendiary ministry, while others provide opportunities for lay study and training for Readers. Elsewhere the principle of 'theology by extension' has opened up theological education, and courses of lay education are growing up in many areas. Our understanding of theological education has changed too, so that the desire for better vocational training and for the integration of theology and experience has been reflected not only in imaginative schemes like that at Lichfield, and Intermet in Washington, but also in the proliferation of practical training experiences within the curriculum of the residential college. Important too in this area has been the increasing use of extra-mural departments, polytechnics and colleges of education, supplementing the help traditionally given by the universities.

18. It is against this background, then, that we consider the future course of ministerial training: (a) Training should no longer be construed solely in terms of the ordained ministry. Theological education will primarily aim to train Christian people for ministry, rather than ordinands for the priesthood. In this connection, it is significant that there is already a growing number of lay people who have university degrees in theology. (b) As we have seen, an important element in the total pattern will be the training of ordinands and of professional lay workers. These will benefit from some non-residential training, since ministry and secular life are now seen to be much more closely interrelated. We develop this argument more fully in paras. 62-63. But, equally, some residential training will be appropriate in order that they may learn high standards of professional competence. (c) The traditional role of theological colleges is bound to be modified in at least two respects which may already be observed. On the one hand, they will cease to have a near-monopoly in the training of ordinands, and wider use will be made of other educational faculties, not least in subjects which have generally lain outside the scope of theological colleges. In this respect their work will be supplemented and to some degree taken over by other agencies. On the other hand, theological colleges will cease (and indeed are already ceasing) to be concerned solely with the professional training of ordinands and of lay workers. They will have an important part to play in the life of the Church in their particular region, providing resources for the training of candidates for local ministries, of leaders, of adult lay people, as well as for the retraining and refreshment of priests and lay workers. (d) Already a wide diversity of methods is being employed in the

training of candidates for both full-time and part-time ministry, and the ecumenical dimension in the work of theological education and ministerial training is becoming increasingly important. *As we look to the future, it seems clear that the proliferation of schemes for lay-training and lay-education¹ should lead to a greater understanding on the part of those who embark on ministerial training. This in its turn should help to meet the need which we have already noted for a higher standard of training and competence among the full-time clergy.*

19. The proposals which follow in the body of our report need to be evaluated in the light of this changing pattern both of ministerial life and of theological education. Both parochial structure as we have known it for a millenium and also theological colleges as we have known them for a century are being drastically modified. They still recognizably exist, but already there is emerging a variety of new ways of shaping Church life and of accomplishing both theological education and ministerial training.

ORIGINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

20. In our first report, as well as promising further consideration of points which at that stage we had not been able to treat adequately, we made eighteen specific recommendations²:

1. That the Church should reaffirm its traditional commitment to the training of all who are recommended for its ministry (para.11).
2. That churchpeople, congregations and voluntary societies should be urged to give further help towards the necessary costs of training in whatever ways they can, and that individual candidates should also explore the possibilities of eliciting further support (para.11).
3. That as great a part of training as is possible should take place in institutions or on college courses which qualify for mandatory grants (paras. 15 and 16).
4. That discussions be held with representatives of the Church Colleges of Higher Education to arrange for some ordinands to read degrees there, and to encourage with the co-operation of the theological colleges the formation of new vocational degree courses which will attract mandatory grants (paras. 15 and 16).
5. That theological colleges should offer degree courses in conjunction with universities and polytechnics only where these carry a mandatory grant or can be financed independently of central church funds (paras. 15 and 16).
6. That ordinands should be encouraged to read theology as a first degree, and that the possibility of reading it should also be brought to the notice of young lay people in general (para.17).

¹ Already the number and variety of such schemes is impressive. There are diocesan certificates in theology in Lichfield and several other dioceses; there are institutes of Christian studies at centres like All Saints, Margaret Street; and there are an increasing number of shorter courses throughout the country.

² The paragraph numbers here refer to our first report.

7. That a limited number of bursaries should be offered for non-theology graduates to read theology degrees while at a theological college (para.18).

8. That university diplomas and certificates be individually scrutinised to see whether they are financially and educationally justified as alternatives to GOE, and that in general students should not be supported on such courses by central church funds (paras.19 and 20).

9. That GOE should be promoted as the Church's normal pre-ordination requirement (para.20).

10. That the Archbishop of Canterbury be respectfully invited to consider the possibility of conferring a Lambeth Licentiate in Theology on those who successfully complete GOE or the IDC (para.21).

11. That ACCM should indicate clearly those university theology degree courses which most nearly approximate to GOE (para.22).

12. That the period of residential training required of theology graduates should be reduced from two years to one year, with men under 25 spending the previous year working under the general direction of their college (paras. 22 and 23).

13. That non-theology graduates should be expected to complete their training in two years where they are capable of doing so (para.24).

14. That the CTE should be asked to consider the possibility of revising GOE so that, without educational loss, it could constitute a two-year course for many more non-theology graduates (para.24).

15. That any implications of these proposals with regard to the time when men are ready for ordination should be communicated at once to the House of Bishops (para.26).

16. That the length of training for deaconesses and lay workers should be brought into line with that of ordinands (para.35).

17. That constructive use be made of the deacon's year as a continuation of training (para.36).

18. That urgent attention should be given to the general provision of in-service training for all clergy and lay workers, that the feasibility of providing this in the theological colleges be explored and that consideration should be given to the possibility of financial provision being made for it by the General Synod (para. 37).

21. In general ACCM was sympathetic to these recommendations, and it submitted the report, along with certain specific recommendations of its own, to the House of Bishops. Subsequently the House of Bishops informed ACCM:

- (i) that in the light of the present financial urgency, while retaining their other requirements, they have agreed to waive —
 - a. the requirement of a university component for non-theology graduates

- b. the requirement of a two-year residential training for theology graduates
- c. the requirement of a three-year residential training for non-theology graduates.

(ii) that individual sponsoring bishops will take immediate steps to get in touch with appropriate ordinands and with the Principals concerned, to urge them to consider carefully the reasons for abbreviating training and to take every advantage of the greater flexibility immediately available.

(iii) that they give a general endorsement to the first report as a whole, as a first step in a process of discussion with the other authorities concerned.

(iv) that, while recognising the greatly improved character of GOE within theological training as a pre-ordination requirement, they would issue a clear caution at this stage about the proposal to make it the norm, and ask that ACCM and the Working Party should at the next stage carefully consider the effect upon the universities and also the ecumenical implications, and report fully to the House.

(v) that they attach particular importance to the Working Party's recommendation 18 regarding in-service training, and ask ACCM to report as to how it may best be implemented.

The effect of paras. (i) and (ii) we shall consider later. We were happy to note that the Bishops gave 'a general endorsement' to the report. They saw it, as we ourselves did, 'as a first step in a process of discussion with the other authorities concerned'. In preparing this second report, we have continued the process of discussion, and have paid careful attention to the many helpful comments we have received, as well as to points raised in the General Synod debate on the estimates, in the Church press, and in paras. (iv) and (v) of the House of Bishops' communication.

SUBSEQUENT DEBATE

22. It is clear that our first two recommendations have been generally accepted. Indeed we have been much impressed by the strong conviction in many quarters that the resources of churchpeople, congregations, trusts and voluntary societies remain largely untapped as far as ministerial training is concerned, and that these could provide much more assistance for individual candidates. We welcome this, and recognise that in the future there may well be greater provision from local sources and less demand on central funds. Nonetheless, the position of individual candidates varies greatly, and we should not wish a candidate's training to be dependent on voluntary sources. Even if local and voluntary giving are encouraged much more than they have been in the past, in the last resort the responsibility for ministerial training lies fairly and squarely with the Church as a whole, i.e. with the General Synod and the Central Fund for Ordination Candidates.

23. Our third recommendation (from which the fourth and fifth followed naturally) seemed to us obvious. It did not imply that theological colleges were in any sense redundant or that the study of theology at other institutions was in itself a full and adequate preparation for ordination. It implied simply that where several options were available, preference should be given to those which would

entitle the candidate to a mandatory grant. In subsequent discussion, however, two points have emerged. In the first place, it has been objected that training at another institution cannot be equated with training at a theological college. The function of a theological college, it has been stressed, is different from that of a university faculty of theology, a polytechnic or even a church college of higher education in that it provides academic training in the context of pastoral training and spiritual formation. With all this we entirely agree. And we also share the concern of several correspondents that the distinctive role of the theological college in fostering spiritual development and teaching pastoral theology should not be lost in an attempt to provide the training in the study of academic theology normally gained in university courses. We are wholly in favour of theological studies being undertaken at universities, polytechnics or church colleges of higher education. We urge only that this should be done at such a time, and on courses structured in such a way, that the candidate obtains a mandatory grant, and fully recognise that this does not constitute the whole of training.

24. But secondly it has been urged that the grounds on which the Department of Education and Science distinguishes between courses entitled to a mandatory grant and those entitled only to a discretionary grant should be strongly challenged. One principal wrote,

The claim that vocational theological degrees should be mandatory for grants ought to be pressed to the limit. These degrees are rated, I understand, as internal degrees of the Universities concerned, and for this reason the increased tuition fee is charged for them. It follows that they ought to attract mandatory awards in the same way as in other internal University degrees. The Education Authorities cannot have it both ways. Either the degree is external, does not involve the full tuition charge, and does not attract a mandatory award, or alternatively it is an internal degree for which the full tuition fee is charged and which qualifies for a mandatory grant.

The Chairman of a governing body wrote similarly,

We should like to suggest an official approach to the DES, either on an ecumenical level to ask for mandatory grants for approved theological courses (basing the claim on the contribution made by clergy and ministers on the social level), or in conjunction with other independent colleges asking for grants for those courses we run which are validated or examined by external bodies (the universities or CNAAs).

These suggestions seem to us eminently reasonable, and we hope that they will be taken up vigorously on an ecumenical basis by the most appropriate authorities.

25. In the meantime, however, we see no reason to modify our earlier proposals, one clear consequence of which is that candidates should not be entered on four-year courses at theological colleges except where these carry a mandatory grant or can be financed independently of central church funds. There is sufficient provision for initial theological education in other institutions as to render it unnecessary — and in present circumstances indefensible — for any candidate to be supported residentially for four years from central church funds.

26. Our sixth recommendation, which commended theology as a first degree, has been warmly welcomed by university faculties and departments, and it is clear that there are enormous resources in the universities which the Church as a whole is lamentably neglecting. At the same time the content of theology courses varies considerably and (as we suggested before in our eleventh recommendation) it would be helpful if ACCM could indicate from time to time those courses or options which most nearly approximate to the requirements of GOE. Our seventh recommendation, which sought to ensure that outstanding non-theology graduates could still read theology as a second first-degree, has also been widely welcomed. But, having taken appropriate advice and considered the figures for such graduates over the past five years, it has become clear to us that the bursary scheme we originally proposed would not only pose administrative problems for the colleges but might also give rise to a measure of unfairness in some years. It is now our considered recommendation that grants from central church funds (i.e. in excess of the normal grant for a GOE course) should be made available for non-theology graduates who have been awarded not less than an upper second in their first degree *and* have a recommendation from the principal of their theological college that they should read a theology degree. This would have several advantages over a bursary scheme, not the least being that it would retain flexibility in the number of students reading theology as a second degree in any given year, in accordance with the number of suitably qualified candidates.

27. Over the past five years the proportion of non-theology graduates in training at any one time has increased steadily to the 1976-77 figure of 247, or approximately 37 per cent of all candidates in training; the average number of such candidates with first class degrees in training at any time during that period has been eighteen (or six per annum). Even with the addition of students with good seconds (the exact proportion of which is unrecorded) the number of new candidates in any year would be unlikely to rise above twenty. This might not, in most years, represent a significant reduction in the number of candidates reading for a second degree rather than a diploma or certificate, and provides an indication of the care already being exercised by principals in guiding candidates to appropriate courses. For this reason it is difficult to assess whether our revised proposal would still provide any significant saving; but we are aware that second degrees involve not only university fees but also the cost of a third year of theological college residence for able men who might otherwise complete their training in two years. This being so, on current costs the additional liability for each such candidate would be in the region of £2,700 and, assuming that the full cost fell on CFOC, there would be a total bill of approximately £54,000 per annum. But this, in our opinion, should not by any standard be considered too high a price to pay for the equipping of a small but vital group of able candidates.

THE GENERAL ORDINATION EXAMINATION

28. Our next group of recommendations, numbers 8-11, centred upon the promotion of GOE as the Church's normal pre-ordination requirement. This pro-

posal, while welcome in some quarters, has aroused anxiety in others. Thus the House of Bishops informed ACCM

that, while recognising the greatly improved character of GOE within theological training as a pre-ordination requirement, they would issue a clear caution at this stage about the proposal to make it the norm, and ask that ACCM and the Working Party should at the next stage carefully consider the effect upon the universities and also the ecumenical implications, and report fully to the House.

29. In one sense GOE is already the norm. It represents, in syllabus and standard, the Bishops' requirements for pre-ordination training, and all ordinands are expected to meet these requirements either through GOE itself or through some other course which has been judged alongside it and deemed at least its equivalent. But, as we have already mentioned (cf para.8), in a period of comparatively open budgets there has been a proliferation of alternative courses and, provided they have been the equivalent of GOE, no one has asked whether, or in what ways, they are an improvement on it. As long as the additional costs were small, there was little need to ask these questions. But with the steep increase in university fees these costs may in some cases be very considerable — as much as £750 per student per annum. We fully recognise that there may be educational or ecumenical advantages in some courses which more than compensate for the additional expenditure, but this cannot be assumed. Hence our proposal that the courses should be individually scrutinised. We understand that the Committee for Theological Education is now conducting such a scrutiny through its Courses and Examinations Sub-Committee, and we still maintain that students should not be supported on these courses from central church funds except where this scrutiny reveals clear advantages.

30. The House of Bishops made particular reference to the ecumenical implications of this proposal and to its effect upon the universities. We hope that both these factors will be given full weight in the process of scrutiny. Our own strong impression, however, is that the ecumenical implications will vary considerably from course to course. In some, the ecumenical element is crucial. In others, it has been exaggerated and tends to be largely nominal. But the principle that we should not do separately what we are able to do together is one to which we would seek to pay much more than lip-service, and we have therefore shared a draft of this report with some of those responsible for training in other denominations. Where there is significant ecumenism, as evidenced in a joint college or federation of colleges, we would happily envisage some variations in the normal patterns of training and would strongly urge the creation of joint syllabuses.

31. The effect of our proposals on the universities is also likely to vary. In some cases the relationship between universities and theological colleges is close and of long-standing. Its disturbance would be extremely unfortunate, and here too exceptions might be contemplated. In other cases, however, the relationship is much less close. Universities have responded generously to approaches from theological colleges, but the courses they have provided as alternatives to GOE

represent only a small part of the total activity of the faculty or department, and their loss of these faculties would not be a grievous one.

32. It is fair to add here that some of the early reactions to our recommendation revealed an exaggerated emphasis on the importance of ordinands to theological faculties in general. While making every allowance for local variations, we do not think it true that the cessation of some of the GOE equivalent courses (or even a reduction in the number of men reading theology as a second degree) would have a significant effect on university faculties as a whole. It is necessary, if humbling, to remind ourselves that there are many flourishing departments which have no links with the theological colleges. The head of one told us, 'the proportion of Anglican ordinands that we have in the Department is comparatively small'. Another wrote, 'As a Department we have never depended on ordinands to keep us supplied with students'. A third, who anticipated a first year entry of 30 this year, spoke of ordinands as 'a small minority'. A fourth, whose faculty has a full-time staff of sixteen, spoke similarly of a 40 per cent rise in applications this year. The willingness of all these departments to help in the training of ordinands, if opportunity arose, is extremely impressive. But our overall impression is that the present significance of ordinands to university faculties is less than we often imagine, and that our best contribution to their life would be the encouraging (as already suggested, cf. para.26) of young churchpeople in general to consider theology as a first degree.

33. The response to our recommendation that the Archbishop of Canterbury be invited to confer a Lambeth L.Th. on those who successfully pass GOE has been cautious, but generally sympathetic. Questions have been raised on two grounds. In the first case, there seems to be doubt as to the exact standard of GOE. One professor wrote, 'GOE is not equivalent to a pass degree'. Another declared 'The man who passes GOE has at least the equivalent of a general B.Ed. degree'. The second question concerns the ecumenical factor. Some have suggested that since training in several colleges is now ecumenical, it is an ecumenical status which should be conferred on GOE and that our own proposal would be regarded as a 'piece of Anglican colonialism'. A college principal, however, stated that 'ecumenical arguments need not be thought to invalidate the proposal' and that it would be possible for Anglican candidates who satisfied the demands of an ecumenical course deemed equivalent to GOE to be held to have satisfied the requirements of a Lambeth licentiate. Another suggestion (which our preliminary soundings indicate is not unrealistic) is that a Lambeth licentiate might also be acceptable to Free Church candidates on joint courses.

LENGTH OF TRAINING

34. Our next group of recommendations, numbers 12-17, concerned length of training and, perhaps because the House of Bishops has already taken action as a result of these recommendations, it is here that we have received the strongest reactions. It is worth emphasising, however, that the House of Bishops has not, as was suggested in the press, cut the length of almost all courses by a year. It has simply removed the *requirement* of a three year training for non-theology gradu-

ates and of a two year residential training for theology graduates so as to create a situation of greater flexibility. We believe that the House acted wisely in the circumstances. But for theology graduates we hope, as we recommended before, not so much for a shorter course as for a differently structured one. It is for non-theology graduates that the case for flexibility is strongest, and, if in some case flexibility has resulted in administrative inconvenience and occasional inconsistency, we hope that our further discussion in paras. 44-47 will help to reduce these to a minimum.

THEOLOGY GRADUATES¹

35. Our proposal with regard to theology graduates under 25 is that, while their period of residential training should be reduced from two years to one, they should spend an interim year working under the general direction of their college. Many principals have objected that a one-year course would in fact be an eight- or nine-month course only, that students would come to their colleges with their titles already arranged, and that there would be insufficient time either for the college staff to get to know the candidate or for the candidates to absorb the ethos of the college. They have urged that theology graduates are among the youngest and least experienced of their students, and that, even if they have already fulfilled most of their academic requirements, there is more to ordination training than the passing of examinations. A theological college is concerned not least with the whole area of 'spiritual formation', and this cannot be done in eight months. With all this we are in substantial agreement. We repeat, however, that our own proposal is that these candidates should spend an interim year under the general direction of the college as well as a residential year, and we believe that the objections which may fairly be levelled at a course of eight or nine months have much less force where an interim year is an integral part of the course. We should like now to argue the case for an interim year in more detail.

36. Since the purpose of a theological training is to enable Christians to make clear the activity of God in the world, both by word in prophecy and interpretation and by deed in pastoral reassurance, to achieve this there is the need of a knowledge of God, gained through personal reflection and the study of scripture and tradition, and of man and his world, gained through personal experience and the careful appreciation of contemporary knowledge and culture.

37. Those who undertake the work of a theologian do so from many standpoints. At one end of the spectrum, the lay person and the trainee minister, who is, and will continue, in secular employment, will generally have a wide experience of man in the world, limited time for the study of the tradition, and an important role in expressing their interaction. Younger students in theological colleges with a generally more limited experience of man and the world must train to relate that experience to a knowledge of God over a wide area. The

¹ By a theology graduate we understand for present purposes a student with a degree or diploma in theology or religious studies (or a component in a more general degree or diploma) which enables exemption to be claimed from at least half the General Ordination Examination.

deepest immersion in the tradition is found amongst those studying theology at our universities, who not only have a more limited experience of the world, but for whom also theology may be studied as an academic rather than a vocational discipline. The expression of the interaction of God and the world is thus made more difficult for these students, though it is vital to the Church's developing theological tradition. Indeed the Church's professional theologians, who may come largely from this background, will need a capacity for reflection on the Church's tradition which should not and may not take place without the prompting of that knowledge of the world in which they must make God known. There is then a strong case for arguing that the theology graduate needs further help (and supervision) in coming to an understanding of the world in which he or she will be a theologian, and in particular of man in his complex of inter-relationships.

38. There has recently been a growing emphasis in theological colleges on an integrated approach to study — integrated both across the various disciplines of theology and also between the study of theology and our experience. It is clear that at best the two areas of study, of God and of man and his world, should run concurrently, but if this is not possible then consecutive experience may be the only alternative. We would argue therefore that unless the theology student at university can be given time for serious attention to this world and to the interaction of God and the world, his intensive study of theology should be followed by an equally intensive study of the world and of man within it. It is for this reason that we recommend the adoption of an interim year for all theology graduates under 25.

39. The use of an interim year is not simply a question of youth and inexperience. It could also form a vital part of the training of those who may well become the Church's leading theologians, by ensuring that those most thoroughly trained in the tradition are given the capacity to reflect also on the world in which God is active.

40. Arguably such a year could take place at many different points in a five year training programme. Theological study would undoubtedly be enriched if the student brought to his studies an understanding of the world and questions arising from his experience which demanded theological answers. Many would see this as the ideal condition for the study of theology. The value of a grounding in the tradition, which facilitates theological reflection, would suggest the interim year being a sandwich year within the degree course, on the Lichfield model. The impracticability of this led us to suggest in our first report that it should take place at the end of the university course and before the student proceeds to his theological college. But we now accept that this would mean that he would be closely involved with his theological college only for the last eight or nine months of his training. There could be problems in the supervision of the year, and the man might well come to a theological college with his title already arranged. A much better solution, therefore, at least for most candidates, would be for the interim year to be a sandwich year *within* the theological college

course. The student would have an introductory term at a theological college beforehand, and he would return to the college at the end of his interim year well-motivated and equipped for further integrated theological study.¹

41. But there is more to preparation for ministry than the acquiring of a skill in theology. In 1973 ACCM published a report on assessment in which it was pointed out that for too long the Church had given the impression that a capacity to pass examinations was all that was necessary to qualify a person for ordination. The report suggested that attention should also be paid to the practical work of ministry and to the development of the individual. Throughout training, a profile of each student should be developed which would indicate strengths and weaknesses in all these areas and assist in the process of developing the person's potential. More recently, the report *Education for Pastoral Ministry* has rightly stressed the need for more adequate pastoral training to equip a person for ministry. From autumn 1978 pastoral training will form an integral part of GOE, and it would not be difficult to incorporate in the interim year the placement and possibly the pastoral studies units which will then be required. Here, therefore, we would emphasise that the interim year has a potential value in the wider aspects of training. But we would also recognise possible drawbacks. With the exception of King's College London, universities have not reckoned on exercising a special care of ordinands, and they have certainly not placed their emphasis on training for ministry. Personal development and the identification and development of ministerial skills has been the task of the theological college, and indeed one of the great justifications for residential training. Can as much be achieved in what is effectively eight months of residence?

42. It may help to itemise some of the areas with which we are concerned: the definition of aptitudes, strengths and weaknesses in the work of ministry; the growth of a pattern of prayer, worship and meditation; self-understanding; understanding of our mutual interdependence, etc. Although some might argue that any or all of these are best developed in a rigorous worldly atmosphere, they have traditionally been seen as best developed in a residential community ethos. A residential community, particularly today when it necessarily has ramifications through the wider community, may yet provide the best opportunity for the social interaction and theological debate so vital to ministerial formation. And here it might be noted that the development of group and team ministries, with the wider view of ministry and lay involvement which this involves, and the consequent change in the role of the stipendiary minister, make this area of preparation even more important for the Church in the coming decades.

43. We believe that the quality of training may be safeguarded in the following way:

(a) **At University** — Particularly since we have asked that more ordinands should

¹ We do not think that this suggestion will cause significant administrative difficulties to the colleges. While one group of men is away on the interim year, another group will be in residence. If there is any variation in numbers from one year to another, the empty places may be filled by men doing in-service training (see paras. 64-72).

study theology as a first degree, further recognition should be given to the valuable work which can be done by university chaplains in developing the candidate's vocation and deepening the Christian experience of students as a whole. In many universities there is the opportunity for initiating the process of theological reflection, for developing community awareness and even for finding the beginnings of a pattern of spirituality. If the Church were to capitalise on this, then ordinands would be better known and they would themselves know more about their vocation by the time they entered theological college. It might be that, for some, the opportunity could be seized to gain the greater confidence in discipleship which comes from an informed theological position, and that for others limited ministerial work in local or home parishes could be undertaken during their time at university. In some cases it will be appropriate too that the guidance of the university chaplain should be sought when plans are being made for the interim year.

(b) **The Interim Year** – This can take place in a number of ways, and the most suitable pattern should be determined by the college principal in consultation with the student and his diocesan authorities. At more than one polytechnic a student is to become Assistant Chaplain for a year. Some might continue the parish work to which they were introduced in their third year. Indeed, as we suggested in our first report, a variety of other openings could be found. Although we recognise the difficulty of the present job situation, we do not believe this will be a serious hindrance to a student who can see the value of a year spent gaining a wider experience of man and his world. The year will be undertaken under the auspices of the theological college where the student has already spent an introductory term. During it, he will attend occasional college activities in addition to receiving occasional tutorials, and clearly the college will be entitled to payment for its supervision. But it will be important that the student is not living too sheltered a life, but is genuinely finding for himself and gaining valuable experience of the world. He should be encouraged not only to reflect on the working experience, but also to gain parochial experience by being associated with a local Christian community. Here his theological training may be put to good use, for example, in the running of lay study groups. It is essential that the interim year experience is related as closely as possible to the final terms in college.

(c) **The Final Terms** – Although the final terms of training (two if the college has a three-term year, and three if it has a four-term year) will constitute a relatively short period the college will already know the student. The precise way in which the period is used will be especially significant. He will probably, of course, still have some further examinations to do, but the emphasis of this period should be on relating further theological study to the interim year experience, and priority should also be given to personal development. For example, most colleges now recognise the importance of group work, but intensive group training may become a necessary and important part of the curriculum.

NON-THEOLOGY GRADUATES

44. For theology graduates, then, we propose not a reduction in the length of training but a reduction in the length of residential training. It is for non-theology graduates that we propose in some cases an overall reduction. We recognise that some of the ablest among them – candidates with a first or an upper second – will be reading for a theology degree and thus must inevitably spend three years. But, even allowing for these, the remainder vary very considerably in knowledge of Christian faith, in the extent to which their previous studies have prepared them for the study of theology and in their general ability. We remain convinced that, for all the improvements in theological training over the past ten years, some of these men are still capable both of completing GOE and of responding to the wider demands of their training in two years rather than three. When the House of Bishops added the third year for non-theology graduates (and this was done as recently as 1966) they added the proviso, which was quickly forgotten, that they believed there would be exceptions to their new norm and that they assumed they would be consulted on these. They also asked that there should be a further study of the financial implications, and it is significant that in 1970, when the three-year norm first became fully operative, there was a rise in CFOC expenditure of £50,000, after allowing for inflation, in spite of the fact that there were 250 fewer candidates in training. We also understand that at the same time ACCM's Ordination Candidates Committee was consulted in an increasing number of cases where ordinands sought permission for additional courses in order to fill up the three years which were now assumed to be mandatory. All this indicates that the third year is not only expensive but also, for some men, unnecessary.

45. The number of men who could complete their training in two years would be increased if the present GOE syllabus could be reduced without educational loss, and, at our request, ACCM asked its Committee for Theological Education to investigate this possibility. The Committee concluded that the syllabus could be reduced with only minimal educational loss if the papers for New Testament Greek and the Use of the Bible were omitted and if the number of set texts studied was reduced. But it considered that GOE could constitute a two-year course for all graduates only if Church History were no longer taught to examination level (as is already the case with candidates over 30 who do the Essay Scheme) or if there were some reduction in the coverage of the Old Testament, and it felt that here there would be a more substantial loss.

46. We are dealing here, of course, with relatives. Quite over and above the demands of GOE, the professional theologian may need Hebrew for the Old Testament, Latin for the Fathers and German for modern writers. He may also need a thorough grounding in philosophy and, especially today, a knowledge of comparative religion. The number of subjects which could feature in theological education and ministerial training is endless, and a good case could be made out for any of these subjects. We clearly do not hope, and have never hoped, to provide a student with everything that might prove relevant or useful. We have set out rather to familiarise him with those tools which will enable him 'to make

clear the activity of God in the world, both by word in prophecy and interpretation and by deed in pastoral reassurance' (para.36). But in the present day this task is no easier than in the past, and many would see it as much harder. Clergy and lay workers need a more thorough, rather than a less thorough, training and, although it may be that a few reductions could be made with only minimal educational loss, even minimal loss in the area is something we must avoid if we possibly can. We still maintain that some students can meet the demands of the syllabus and of their training in general in two years, but in view of the educational loss that would ensue we do not think that the syllabus should be reduced to enable others to do so.

47. At present, the final decision as to the length of training of non-theology graduates is made by the sponsoring bishop in consultation with the candidate and with the principal of his college. We believe this to be right. Nonetheless, it is unfortunate if different criteria are used by different bishops and if, as we understand is the case at the moment, one candidate is expected to do three years while another from a different diocese but with precisely the same qualifications and ability is expected to do only two. We cannot offer rigid guidelines here, but we suggest that while three years should continue to be regarded as the norm the position of each candidate should be considered individually to see whether he constitutes an exception to this norm. The decisive factors here are likely to be the length of his Christian experience and the extent of his knowledge of Christian faith, the subject he has previously studied, his general educational ability, his personal maturity and the needs of his family. If these are recognised as the crucial factors, we suspect that the present inconsistencies will be greatly reduced.

NON-GRADUATES

48. For non-graduates our earlier proposals were not perhaps as clear as they should have been. Indeed, the present category of non-graduate is a very wide one, and there is a considerable difference between a candidate who has had no formal education since leaving school at 16, and a teacher who has successfully completed a three-year course and perhaps had two or three years teaching experience as well. For training purposes there is no justification for treating the latter as a non-graduate; he should be seen rather as a non-theology graduate.

49. At present, candidates under 23 are normally expected to have at least five passes in the GCE, including two at 'A' level, and most candidates thus qualified are able to obtain admission to a university course. There is also nowadays the alternative possibility of a course at a church college of higher education, and we are anxious that this new possibility should be much more widely known and used than it is at present. We would certainly not wish to close the door to ordination to those candidates who can qualify for a place neither at a university nor at a church college of higher education, but we believe that candidates in this category should be expected to give strong evidence of gifts of a non-academic kind, and that it will often be impossible for them to offer such evidence until they are around twenty-five. Where there is evidence of real potential in younger

candidates, there is the possibility of their taking part alongside older men in the two-year non-residential Aston Training Scheme. We welcome this scheme, and see it as the way forward for some of the candidates of whom we are speaking. We note too that some of those taking part in the scheme will be linked with the Open University and believe that it is at this point that at the moment the Church may best use the resources of the Open University. Once candidates have satisfactorily completed the Aston Training Scheme, they should proceed straight to a theological college for a three-year course.

50. The only other possibility for non-graduates under 25 is a four-year course (normally leading to a degree) at a theological college. But while these four-year courses are satisfactory in themselves, most of them originated at a time when it was thought that they carried a mandatory grant, and now that it has been realised that the majority do not, their justification is much more difficult. Admittedly present experience suggests that discretionary grants are sometimes more easily obtainable for degree courses than for GOE courses, but we have already recommended (para.25) that theological colleges should offer degree courses for non-graduates only where these carry a mandatory grant or can be financed independently of central church funds and, unless the DES alters the basis of its grants (cf para.24), the only courses in this category for which we see a future are those where a theological college is operating in real partnership with a polytechnic or church college of higher education.

GENERAL POINTS

51. Four further points should be noted with regard to length of training. In the first place, although we look forward to increased lay training and the consequent emergence of better equipped ordinands, at present we are in an interim period in which the traditional Christian culture has almost disappeared while the better trained laity has still to emerge. Many young people are growing up with only a minimal understanding of Christian faith. In their late teens or early twenties they may reach a point of clear commitment. They may display much enthusiasm and a strong sense of vocation. Yet their background knowledge of Christian faith is far sketchier than that of a more nominal Christian generation or two back. They are familiar neither with the Bible nor with the liturgical year. Several principals have lamented that it is now necessary to give much more of a theological 'ABC' to ordinands than was the case a generation or even a decade ago. The colleges are well able to do this, yet their original vocation was to teach at a more advanced level and it is questionable whether their specialised resources are rightly used in teaching at a more elementary level. Some have suggested a preliminary examination in basic knowledge before the commencement of training, and it may be that serious consideration should be given to this. But at the very least candidates should be encouraged to undertake preliminary study at the earliest opportunity, and we hope that sponsoring bishops and their DDOs will give careful attention to this. At the moment, despite the care which some dioceses take, it is not uncommon to find candidates of all ages at selection conferences who have done no preliminary reading whatever and to whom the idea has

never been suggested. If churchpeople at large are to give sacrificially in order that standards of training may be maintained, it is only right that the candidates themselves should see to it they are as well prepared as possible when they begin their training.

52. Secondly, the argument has been pressed from several quarters that a reduction in the length of training does not lead to a reduction of expenditure, since the candidate ceases to be a charge on the CFOC but becomes instead a charge on a diocesan stipends fund. In one sense, of course, this is true. Yet the argument is misleading, and it could be equally logical to argue that there would be no extra expenditure if a candidate was kept in training for ten or twenty years before ordination! While accepting that there is a correlation between effective training and effective ministry, we would have thought it obvious that an ordained man is able to make a 'productive' ministerial contribution to the life of the Church of a kind which a man still in pre-ordination training cannot make.

53. Thirdly, we would emphasise again that we have envisaged men and women spending an equal time in training, and that the amended regulations which should follow from our recommendations should apply equally to both.

54. Lastly, we would urge once more that we cease to think in terms simply of 'ordination' training. What is usually meant by that phrase is 'pre-ordination' training, i.e. initial training. Training must continue throughout a man's ministry and, while we have reserved to a later point our consideration of in-service training as a whole (cf paras. 64-72), we would repeat here our recommendation that constructive use should be made of the deacon's year as a continuation of training. The difficulties of putting too much into the deacon's year have been brought forcibly to our notice, and, in the present situation when the Church is re-thinking its understanding of the diaconate, we do not wish to make detailed proposals here. Nonetheless, as we stated in our first report (para.36) 'it is essential that deacons are so placed in their titles that the continuation of training is not only a possibility but an actuality'.

RESIDENTIAL AND NON-RESIDENTIAL ELEMENTS IN TRAINING

55. In our first report we touched only briefly (paras. 27-32) on the question of non-residential training. In moving to a fuller discussion on this subject, we would emphasise that there are some elements which should feature in the training of every ordinand and lay worker: Christian community, common worship, mutual support, group discussion, intellectual and spiritual stimulus, staff/student contact time, and time for study and reflection. These elements may be found in every residential college and on every non-residential course. The proportions, however, vary, and each form of training has its own particular advantages. Thus, at least potentially, and allowing for varying personal circumstances,

Residential training provides

More time for study and reflection.
More contact time with staff.

Non-residential training provides

More opportunity to relate academic input to daily life.

Greater interaction with fellow students.

Opportunity to cover more ground.
More time for study of pastoral theory.

More opportunity for withdrawal and for regular common worship.

Stimulus to relate across barriers in close community.

More time with family, and their closer involvement in training.

More opportunity to share theological ideas with those unacquainted with language or unsympathetic to content.
More opportunity to learn by doing.
Linking of spirituality with local church and secular world.

Continuing stimulus of secular world.

Less danger of institutionalisation.

Less upheaval to family and fewer moves.

56. The crucial factor in determining whether a candidate should train residentially or non-residentially is not a doctrinaire preference for one form against the other, but a consideration of the candidate's particular needs as an individual (and, of course, the needs of his family and the demands of his job). Dioceses must ask how the essential elements may best be provided *for him*, and which particular set of advantages will be most beneficial *for him*.

57. It was in order that these questions might be posed more realistically that the report *Alternative Patterns of Training* (para.90) called for 'a more flexible scheme of training which . . . will enable those who advise ordinands to tailor a pattern of training to fit each man's needs'. We endorse this call, and as a first step we propose that ACCM should encourage the formation of a national network of non-residential training for stipendiary ministry. The basis for this is already at hand in the various courses already recognised for training for non-stipendiary ministry and now covering most of the country. Some of these courses were founded with the express intention of training for non-stipendiary ministry only, and suspicions have been expressed that in some undefined sense they would be less than adequate for training for stipendiary ministry. Others, however, have wished to train men for stipendiary ministry also (as do the Southwark Ordination Course and the North West Ordination Course), but have hitherto been discouraged from doing so. The view of SOC and NWOC that training must be for ministry as such, rather than for some particular form of it, is challenged by some who hold that the nature of training must be determined in part by the form in which it is expected that a man will exercise his ministry, i.e. that identical training for both stipendiary and non-stipendiary ministry is undesirable. But this is a question which will be resolved only in the light of greater experience. For the moment, the evidence to sustain the objection is not forthcoming and, should it appear subsequently, it would not be impossible to introduce variations *within* the courses. Nonetheless ACCM should not recommend courses for wider recognition until any reasonable suspicions of their adequacy have been removed, until there is at least one *full-time* member of staff, and until they have demonstrated the likelihood of their having a realistic number of students and of their attaining the high all-round standards which are already apparent in SOC and NWOC. In this connection it is worth adding that ultimately,

whether for residential or non-residential training, the quality of staff is all-important, and it is significant that there is already a movement of staff from colleges to courses and vice-versa.

58. Advice whether a candidate should train residentially or non-residentially should presumably be offered by the Bishops' Selectors when, on the balance of the evidence, one or other form seemed clearly preferable to them. The final decision, however, would naturally lie with the diocesan bishop. Other things being equal, individual diocesans might well vary in their general evaluation of the merits of the two forms and, at a time when the Church as a whole is divided on this point, such variations may well be inevitable. But we emphasise again that the whole point of the flexibility we propose is that the needs of the individual should be the determining factor.

59. Some people have expressed the fear that if residential and non-residential training are both available for all candidates, decisions will be made in the light not of the candidate's needs but of the financial savings involved in non-residential training. It is true, of course, that non-residential training is less expensive.¹ But it would be wholly contrary to the spirit of our recommendation if it were chosen for a candidate on that ground alone. It is sometimes alleged that certain dioceses already place an undue emphasis on the financial aspect but, while we do not have the evidence either to confirm or refute this, it is clear that in general the availability of non-residential training has not removed the option of residential training. A survey of 149 men recommended for training for stipendiary ministry over the past two and a half years shows that of the 35 men over 30, at least a dozen lived in the catchment areas of SOC or the NWOC, but only four proceeded to train on these courses. If residential training is more expensive it is also shorter, and no doubt for many men this is an important consideration, as is their conviction that, for them, it provides the most appropriate training.

60. In any case, against the fear that the wider availability of non-residential training may lead to too much emphasis on the purely financial aspect, there must be set the fact that the present limited availability of non-residential training undoubtedly leads to too much emphasis on the purely geographical aspect. There is currently at least one diocese where, to the understandable annoyance of both the diocesan and his ordinands, men living in one part of the diocese may train non-residentially while men living in another part may not. We repeat that the determining factors must be neither financial nor (except in remote areas) geographical, but pastoral and personal.

¹ The average cost of residential training is £1,604 per year, and of non-residential training £475 per year. Thus two years of residential training costs £3,208, while three years non-residential training costs £1,425. LEA grants are less common (though by no means unknown) for non-residential training, but in some cases candidates are able to make a significant contribution themselves. Moreover, residential training usually involves heavy additional charges (though not from central funds) for family maintenance. The rising costs of travel add to the expense of non-residential training, but it needs to be remembered that the allowance for travel to and from college for those in residential training may be as much as £80 a year.

61. The question of the age-limit for non-residential training is different from the question of the principle. But if our general principle is valid, i.e. that the individual needs of the particular candidate are of paramount importance, a rigid demarcation on the basis of age is extremely difficult to defend. It may be helpful to speak in general terms of 'men under 30' and 'men aged 30 and over' (and at the moment it is necessary to do so as far as the GOE syllabus is concerned, since the latter are exempt from New Testament Greek, Biblical set-texts and Church History), but it is not helpful to treat this distinction as absolute. We understand and appreciate the reasons why 30 has previously been regarded as the minimum age for non-residential training, but we also understand why some dioceses resent this minimum. It may well be that a man of, say 22, educated at a boarding school and a traditional university and of sufficient ability to be able to complete the full GOE course in two years, has less need of the residential experience of a theological college and much more need of the experience of earning his own living and worshipping with a local Christian community, while a man of, say 45, who has never enjoyed a fully residential experience has more need of residential training. Here, therefore, we suggest that the apparently absolute age-limit should be removed from the Bishops' Regulations and that for the time being there should be substituted a rubric to the effect that 'candidates under 30 will normally be required to train residentially, but the final decision on this will be taken in the light of the individual candidate's circumstances by the diocesan bishop who, before authorising non-residential training, will first obtain the advice of the appropriate ACCM Candidates Committee'.

62. So far (except in paras. 35-43) we have spoken of residential *or* non-residential training, but these should not be seen simply as alternatives. When *Alternative Patterns of Training* called for 'a more flexible scheme', it had in mind a scheme 'which includes for some people both residential and non-residential elements'. Such a scheme might be operated in several ways. Some might begin their training non-residentially and conclude it residentially; others might do a 'sandwich course'. As we wrote in our first report (para.32):

'There are considerable practical difficulties, yet there is already a network of non-residential training facilities in connection with the APM courses and there will soon be a further network in connection with pre-theological training. The main problem would lie in the integration of these facilities with those of the existing colleges, but when Regional Institutes come into being as envisaged in the Bishop of Guildford's report, this integration will become much easier. Some regions at any rate might experiment along these lines, and some colleges might adapt their courses accordingly. In this way there could be, as was once envisaged, an alternative pattern alongside the existing ones.'

63. A first step, which we have already proposed, is that the network of non-residential training courses should be expanded to cover men training for stipendiary ministry. We do not believe that, when this has been done, the problem of integration will be insuperable. At this stage it would be difficult to legislate precisely or to lay down rigid norms, but, granted goodwill, appropriate structures

and the availability of LEA grants, we envisage an increasing co-operation both formal and informal. Colleges and courses should not be seen as providing rival forms of training, but rather of being partners in training. For many ordinands, the combination of residential and non-residential training enabled by this partnership would provide the ideal training. We hope that one or more colleges and courses will be encouraged by ACCM to enter into such partnerships as soon as possible.

IN-SERVICE TRAINING AND THE COLLEGES

64. At this point it is worth pausing to consider the enormous resources both of people and plant which the Church possesses in its theological colleges. It is true, of course, that throughout history God has called institutions into being for particular purposes at particular times. Sometimes, when they have served their purpose and the times have changed, they are best allowed to die. The preservation of every inherited institution at whatever cost is not a Christian policy, and in fact eleven colleges have closed since 1960.¹ But sometimes institutions are called to expand their understanding of their purpose, and if the fourteen remaining colleges were called to expand their purpose to include not only lay training and non-residential training but also the in-service training of clergy and lay workers we believe that for the foreseeable future there would be abundant work for all of them.

65. We are talking here, of course, about diversification, a concept which is rightly regarded with suspicion if it represents only a frantic attempt to preserve an institution by finding for it new work which bears little relation to its existing purpose. But the colleges do not need to look round frantically for new work. New work awaits them. Although much lip-service has been paid to in-service training in recent years, very much still needs to be done. Now, however, we are encouraged to note that the House of Bishops attaches particular importance to our earlier recommendation on this subject, and we believe that the Church as a whole attaches similar importance to it.

66. In-service training takes many forms, some of which are (and must continue to be) quite unrelated to the theological colleges. We are not suggesting that the colleges 'take over' the whole of in-service training. Rather we are pointing to it as a much neglected area in which they are ideally suited to play a significant part. More particularly we see two possibilities here:

(a) that colleges which close for the training of ordinands should be developed into colleges for in-service training;

(b) that all colleges should be asked to take a certain percentage of their allocation from priests and lay workers who are nominated by their bishops for in-service training.

Of these possibilities, we would be unhappy about the first and our strong pre-

¹ Some correspondents have suggested that, in a time of financial stringency, the closure of more colleges would be a far wiser course of action than the erosion of training standards which they thought inevitable on our earlier proposals.

ference is for the second. There might be an initial administrative convenience in the first, but it is the second which has the ultimate advantages.

67. Some colleges have already diversified to some extent. Others have been less successful, and their difficulties have been largely due to the lack of adequate financial provision for anything other than initial training. But the ministerial training which represents a high proportion of the General Synod's budget represents less than 1% of the Church's total budget, and we believe strongly that there must be a further investment in the field of in-service training. The raising of new money for what in many cases will be a new purpose is a challenge with which the Church as a whole must be firmly confronted. And if in some dioceses the provision of such money would be extremely difficult, it is worth emphasising that in one sense some of it would be money saved by our earlier proposals.

68. It is important, though, that the amount required should not be exaggerated. If we think, in the very simplest terms, of some 14,000 full-time clergy and lay workers each ministering for 40 years, and each spending at some point in his or her ministerial career one term at a theological college, there would be 350 people each year having an in-service term. If the average college fees are £400 per term, the cost of this would be £140,000 a year. In other words, by paying £10 a year for each clergyman and lay worker, the Church would ensure an in-service term for each man and woman once during his or her ministry. This is little enough when we remember that in 1972 the James Report proposed that teachers should have a sabbatical term for further training every seven years!

69. It is important too that the practical difficulties should not be exaggerated. In the average diocese there would be only three clergy away at any one time, and parishes and deaneries already have established procedures for coping with the absence of their clergy during sickness or interregnums. It may be that in some cases the in-service term should be linked with the natural break when a man moves from one post to another. It may be that in other cases two periods of a month, each at a different time, might be better than one term. But there is no need at this stage to argue about the details. We are concerned at the moment only with the principle, and we do not believe either that the practical difficulties would be excessive or that £10 per clergyman and lay worker per year would be too high a price for the Church to pay. Indeed, if the Church is serious in its concern for in-service training, it will be willing ultimately to pay much more.

70. What we hope at this stage is that the General Synod and the House of Bishops will make a firm declaration of support for our basic proposal. We mention the House of Bishops specifically here both because of their overall concern for the pastoral care of the clergy and also because, with clergy moving as they do from diocese to diocese, the success of our proposal depends on its acceptance at an inter-diocesan and national level. We appreciate that some dioceses already have their own arrangements for in-service training, and we would not wish our own proposal to jeopardise these. But we have already recognised (para. 66) that in-service training takes many forms, and we see our own proposal as adding to, rather than replacing, what in some areas is already being done. We

doubt if there is any major problem here, and we suspect that it is in fact the dioceses who are doing most at the moment who are most aware of how much more still needs to be done.

71. Once the General Synod and the House of Bishops have made a firm declaration of support, we hope that ACCM, in liaison with the House of Bishops, will then make speedy suggestions as to how our proposal can best be implemented. These suggestions should take into account whatever decision the Synod has made on the financing of the scheme, and should also deal with such points as how places are to be allocated between the colleges, how men are to be chosen, and what kind of courses or opportunities for study the colleges will be expected to provide.

72. We call for an *early* declaration and for *speedy* suggestions partly because the in-service training of the clergy is an urgent matter in itself and partly because the situation of the colleges demands it. We recognised in our first report (para. 33) that our proposal to reduce the length of certain residential courses would reduce the number of students in the colleges at any given time. Our present proposal to extend the availability of non-residential training is likely to lead to a further reduction. Yet there are already too many places in the colleges for the existing number of ordinands, and, if the colleges are to be financed only for initial training as at present, it is highly probable that, unless the number of ordinands rises very quickly, more colleges will have to close. Indeed, even if one or two did close, the remaining ones would still be able to cope with an expansion in numbers. The position of the colleges, therefore, is an urgent one, and the disparity between the places available and the number of ordinands to fill them is such that sooner rather than later one or more colleges is likely to run out of money and close. Yet in talking about possible closures, there are pastoral issues as well as financial and administrative ones. The colleges are living communities, and, if the Church is to act responsibly and pastorally towards those of its members who are engaged in their work, it is essential that the uncertainty as to their future, which has caused so much disturbance in recent years, should be firmly resolved. The issues are clear: on the one hand, the colleges are grievously threatened, but on the other hand — if the Church has the will — they are confronted with new and exciting possibilities not least in the area of in-service training. We believe that the Church does have the will. The Synod should express this will, and then decide how to distribute the necessary financial responsibility between its own budget and that of the dioceses.

CONCLUSION

73. And so we draw to the conclusion of our task. We did not undertake it at our own request, nor has it always been a pleasant one. Yet with many indications that the cost of ministerial training was getting out of hand, ACCM would have been irresponsible if it had shrunk from commissioning a thorough scrutiny. As it is, we believe that some of the proposals which we have made in the course of this scrutiny have an educational value in their own right. We believe too that the very fact that our scrutiny was taking place created a climate which not only

helped colleges to make some perfectly proper economies but also encouraged the General Synod in its impressive response in July. To some extent the Synod's response has relieved the situation. But only to some extent, for if the money it has offered is not forthcoming from the dioceses, some of the suggestions which we have rejected on the ground of educational loss will in fact have to be implemented. If, as we hope, it is forthcoming, there will still be need for the utmost care in ensuring that it is wisely used. Even now, therefore, a note of caution is necessary.

74. It is also necessary to remember that the large sums we are already committed to paying are in fact providing the training of a total number of candidates much smaller than it should be. We have made it abundantly clear that we welcome the development of a wide variety of ministry, ordained and lay; we have also made clear our conviction that the full-time stipendiary ministry is as necessary now as ever it was. If recruitment is to have the priority it deserves, and if, as we hope, the number of candidates in training rises — and rises considerably — the cost of training will also rise. The next few years may well reveal that the challenge to the Church as a whole in this area is much greater than we have yet begun to realise. Yet in welcoming this challenge we would end on a note not merely of caution but equally of confidence. It is God who has called the Church into being, and ministry in all its varied forms is his gift. We believe that he will supply the men we need, even as he has already supplied the money we need. What is still needed is our response.

SUMMARY OF FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the General Synod should reaffirm its traditional commitment to the training of all who are recommended for the Church's ministry (paras. 12 and 22).
2. That the General Synod should urge churchpeople, congregations and voluntary societies to give further help towards the necessary costs of training in whatever ways they can, and that individual candidates should also explore the possibilities of eliciting further support (para.22).
3. That ACCM and DDOs should encourage as great a part of training as is possible to be taken in institutions or on college courses which qualify for a mandatory grant (para.23).
4. That ACCM should hold discussions with representatives of the church colleges of higher education to arrange for some candidates to read degrees there, and to encourage with the co-operation of the theological colleges the formation of new vocational degree courses which will attract mandatory grants (para.23).
5. That theological colleges should offer degree courses in conjunction with universities and polytechnics only where these carry a mandatory grant or can be financed independently of central church funds (para.23).
6. That ACCM should arrange an approach, if possible on an ecumenical basis, to the Department of Education and Science with the request that it reconsider

the grounds on which it refuses mandatory grants to students on externally-validated courses (para.24).

7. That the CFOC should support candidates in residential training for a maximum of three years (para.25).

8. That DDOs and parish priests should bring the possibility of reading theology as a first degree to the notice of young lay men and women in general and of ordinands in particular (para.26).

9. That ACCM should indicate from time to time those university theology degree or diploma courses, or course options, which most nearly approximate to GOE requirements (para.26).

10. That the CFOC should support non-theology graduates in reading for a university degree in theology at a theological college only if they have not less than an upper second in their first degree and have a recommendation from their principal (paras. 26-27).

11. That ACCM should restore and promote GOE as the Church's norm in pre-ordination training (para. 28-33).

12. That the CFOC should support candidates taking university diplomas and certificates as equivalents to this norm only if such courses have been shown to be justified after scrutiny on financial, educational or ecumenical grounds (paras. 28-33).

13. That ACCM should invite the Archbishop of Canterbury to consider the possibility of conferring a Lambeth Licentiate in Theology on those who successfully complete GOE or the IDC (para.33).

14. That theology graduates under 25 should spend one year training non-residentially under the direction of a theological college and one year training residentially at that college (paras. 35-43 and footnote).

15. That ACCM should consider how university chaplains may be involved more closely with the training of ordinands (paras. 35-43).

16. That non-theology graduates should be expected to complete their training in two years where they are capable of doing so (paras. 44-47).

17. That non-graduates under 25 should either spend two years training non-residentially on the Aston Training Scheme and three years training residentially at a theological college or spend four years training residentially at a theological college on a course for which they can obtain a major award from public funds (paras. 48-50).

18. That sponsoring bishops and DDOs should ensure that all candidates have a good background knowledge of Christian faith before they begin their formal training (para.51).

19. That ACCM should bring the length of training for deaconesses and lay workers into line with that for ordinands (para.53).

20. That Bishops and their POT directors should ensure that constructive use is made of the deacon's year as a continuation of training (para.54).

21. That ACCM should encourage the formation of a national network for non-residential training for stipendiary ministry (para.57).

22. That ACCM should give further consideration to the practicalities of combining residential and non-residential elements in training and should encourage one or more colleges and courses to start on a pioneer scheme (paras. 62-63).

23. That the General Synod and the House of Bishops should endorse the principle that, as part of the wider provision of in-service training for all clergy and lay workers, arrangements should be set in hand as quickly as possible to enable each clergyman and lay worker to spend a sabbatical term at a theological college at least once during his or her ministry (paras. 64-72).

24. That the General Synod should decide how to distribute the necessary financial responsibility for such in-service terms between its own budget and that of the dioceses, and that ACCM, in liaison with the House of Bishops, should make more detailed proposals for the early implementation of the scheme (paras. 71-72).

Published by the Church Information Office and obtainable from Church House
Bookshop, Great Smith Street, London SW1P 3BN. Price 50p.
Bocardo and Church Army Press Ltd., Cowley, Oxford.