

## 20. Methodist Council Part 2: The Response to the Training Review

<b>Contact name and details</b>	The Revd Ruth M Gee, Chair of the Council ruthmgee@gmail.com
<b>Resolution</b>	20/1. The Conference receives the Report.

### Summary of content

<b>Subject and aims</b>	To summarise the work done in response to the Training Review. To present the 'fuller report' required by the Conference in response to Notice of Motion 2017/106.
<b>Background context and relevant documents</b>	The Summary of the Outcomes of the Training Review (report 43 to the 2017 Conference).

### Introduction

1. The Training Review Group (TRG) was established by the Methodist Council in the autumn of 2015 in response to Memorials M2 to M7 accepted by the 2015 Conference.
2. The Terms of Reference of the group were set by the Methodist Council in October 2015:
  - a. Review the premises and principles upon which current provisions of [ministerial and lay] training were proposed and adopted in the light of subsequent developments and practical experience\*;
  - b. Review provision of ministerial training\*;
  - c. Review provision of resources for lay training\*;
  - d. Review the impact of the post 2013 pattern of training on candidating;
  - e. Evaluate how well the post 2013 pattern of training is preparing ministers for the breadth and variety of ordained ministry\*; and
  - f. Review the discernment process in candidature leading up to and including candidate's portfolio.
3. In practice, the work of the group allowed them to offer evidence and recommendations in relation to the asterisked items. Whilst the group had access to the statistics relating to candidates from 2008 to 2016 (which show a steep decline), it was impossible to determine whether the changes that were made as a result of the Conference's decisions were a cause of any trend. The group concluded

## 20. Methodist Council Part 2: The Response to the Training Review

that it had insufficient time to review the discernment process in candidating but commended the parallel work on vocations that was presented to the Council in January 2017.

4. The TRG interviewed and/or received written submissions from some 40 Methodists and ecumenical colleagues involved in the formation of ministers and/or in the delivery of training. The group visited The Queen's Foundation, Cliff College, The Wesley Study Centre in Durham and Wesley House in Cambridge. The TRG noted that a significant amount had been achieved since the changes introduced in 2012/2013. This included extensive financial work (to create capital plans for remaining centres and review/amend the budgetary picture presented in the Fruitful Field report (FF)); the establishment of working arrangements with remaining centres and withdrawal from others; turning Methodist International Centre (MIC) and Guy Chester House into income generating units; and an extensive staff restructuring and recruitment programme. The Queen's Foundation as a part of the Network had established full-time, part-time and circuit-based pathways for initial ministerial training, as well as a probationer pathway. Cliff College, also as a part of the Network, had introduced new short courses. Very significant progress had been made on a new pathway for Local Preachers and Worship Leaders and other connexional deliverables cited by the Network team (although not specifically reviewed by the TRG) included Bible Month, the One Programme and 3Generate.
5. However, the balance of views and evidence given to the TRG suggests that there are both new external developments and substantive issues in the substance and implementation of the recommendations of the 2012 Review of Training which require attention if the Church is to move forward confidently. These led to the TRG making eleven recommendations to the Council in April 2017.
6. The Council made no decisions in respect of any of the recommendations in the report, including those in relation to institutions or staffing. Rather it considered a number of points that have the potential to support evolutionary developments to structures and patterns of formation, both lay and ordained.
7. The Council directed:
  - i. the Strategy and Resources Committee to present to the Conference a summary of the report noting the points of consensus and concerns raised by the Council;
  - ii. the Strategy and Resources Committee, in consultation with the Ministries Committee and the Faith and Order Committee, to undertake evaluations of the recommendations in order to make detailed provision for any implementation and to make regular reports to the Council.

## 20. Methodist Council Part 2: The Response to the Training Review

8. The Conference received the summary report and adopted Notice of Motion 106, viz:

*The Conference notes that because of the sensitive nature of some of the recommendations of the review group the report to the Council in January 2017 was not made public, or shared with Chairs of District in the normal way so they could have conversations with the District members of Council, and was dealt with under confidential business. The April 2017 Council considered a further report which was shared with the Chairs but dealt with under confidential business so did not appear in the public domain. Consequently, the summary report to the Conference does not contain specific recommendations but alludes to issues, responding warmly to some, and expressing concerns in respect to others. The nature and reasons for the Council's direction is not known and cannot be assessed by the Conference because the summary report lacks the necessary detail. Yet the Conference is being asked to agree to direct the Strategy and Resources Committee, in consultation with the Ministries Committee and the Faith and Order Committee, to undertake evaluations of the recommendations in order to make detailed provision for any implementation. The Conference requests a fuller report in response to the six memorials from the Synods of the East Anglia, Manchester & Stockport, Northampton, York & Hull, South East and Cumbria Districts to the 2015 Conference so that the Conference can consider what provisions need to be implemented. The Conference requests that report to be presented to the Conference of 2018.*

9. In order to comply with the second of the Council's directions, the Chair of the SRC requested from the Connexional Team a summary of each of the recommendations alongside the reflections from the Council on the points raised and responses to how plans are progressing to take work forward. That summary was considered by the SRC in November 2017 and referred for discussion to the Ministries Committee.
10. The SRC meeting in March 2018 again reviewed the recommendations of the Training Review as laid out in the report to the Council of April 2017. The committee agreed responses to the eleven recommendations and mandated the Assistant Secretary of the Conference in consultation with the Chair of the Ministries Committee and the Secretary of the Faith and Order Committee to report to the Council in April 2018 with a draft of the report to the Conference in response to Notice of Motion 2017/106.
11. The Council was presented with the report of the SRC in April 2018 and invited to comment on the eleven recommendations and to agree the substance of the 'fuller report' to the Conference in response to NoM 2017/106.

## 20. Methodist Council Part 2: The Response to the Training Review

12. In what follows, each recommendation of the Training Review Group, together with a summary of the reasons for the recommendation is shown in italics in the boxes. The comments of the SRC and the decisions of the Council are shown after each recommendation. The Council's comments are shown in bold.

### **Recommendation 1**

---

*The TRG considered the language used about a learning Church in the 2012 report but came to the view that this expressed an aspiration rather than a lived reality. The TRG concluded that to become a learning church, all Circuits now need to be actively encouraged to develop their capacity and support for formation and learning, and for the best experience to be shared with other Circuits.*

*The TRG's first recommendation, therefore, was*

**R1** *Since the basic unit for all learning must be the Circuit, the TRG recommended:*

- a. *that the purposes of the Circuit in Standing Order 500 should be amended to include the specific task of nurturing and encouraging the whole Circuit as the key unit of a learning church*
  - b. *Circuits should be supported to create learning communities, reflecting examples that already exist and the diverse circumstances of individual congregations.*
  - c. *the priority actions for support to Circuits should include:*
    - i *a programme to support circuit and church stewards;*
    - ii *publishing examples of ways to create a learning community - one relatively ambitious model of what might be put in place is given in Appendix 3 by way of illustration; and*
    - iii *a phased approach in which a range of distinctive Circuits, across several Districts, pilot ways in which they can become effective learning Circuits.*
- 

- 12.1 As with many of the recommendations, the SRC bore in mind the changes that are already in train with a realignment of the regional resources of the Connexional Team. As the TRG noted, the Methodist Church comprises Circuits and Districts of different size and structure. From September 2018, each District will have a learning officer aligned to them. Whilst agreeing with the conclusion of the Training Review that all Circuits need to develop their capacity and support for formation and learning (although also wanting to note the considerable amount of learning that is done in circuits as members develop their discipleship), the revised ways of working within the learning network will need time to become embedded in the learning experience of the Church. Part of this embedding will be the sharing of good practice within the Network, Regional Fora, and Superintendents' gatherings.

**The Council has therefore concluded that a period of further reflection is needed before any changes to SO 500 need to be considered; such consideration, if it were to occur, would need to be in relation to all four aspects of *Our Calling* and not simply to learning.**

### **Recommendation 2**

---

*The TRG was alerted to a widely held regret that the Connexional Team did not foster and build on the original Open Learning Centre. It recognised the significance of the work being done on Virtual Learning Environments (VLE) as a way of developing supported distance learning but did not presume that it is necessarily the best environment for all supported distance learning. The TRG asked, therefore, that the Council consider establishing a 'Methodist Open Learning' function.*

**R2** *The TRG recommended that the Connexional Team explore:*

- a. *the possibility of establishing a 'Methodist Open Learning' function in the full recognition of the implications, and of the lessons to be learned from the previous efforts to establish it;*
  - b. *where the resources of the former Open Learning Centre now reside.*
- 

12.2 The SRC considered carefully the valid points that the TRG makes about the importance and limitations of virtual learning; it is important to recognise that all those undertaking training, education, learning and formation in the life of the Church need to be able to access necessary resources and that this has been a priority for staff in the Discipleship and Ministries Cluster. However, it also noted that technological and pedagogical change has been considerable since the days of the Open Learning Centre and that the material used then, and still held within the Connexional Team, is now dated. The SRC therefore believes that the investment that the Church is making in VLE will offer necessary, appropriate and effective support to today's learners.

**The Council has therefore encouraged the Connexional Team to continue to develop its virtual learning environment as part of a mixed mode of learning.**

### **Recommendation 3**

---

*The TRG considered how a learning Church would be resourced and concluded that it requires a Community of Expertise in Methodist Formation and Education. Such a Community would be the catalyst and support for all in the Church to be nurtured and enabled to grow in understanding and faith. This means that the Community would provide (directly or through signposting) to the Conference and individual Circuits the resources*

## 20. Methodist Council Part 2: The Response to the Training Review

*and expertise needed to meet their learning priorities year by year. It would also offer a stimulating academic context for existing experts in Methodist formation, and would support the growth of new theological educators within the Methodist tradition, whether working within the church or outside it.*

*Such a community would enable the church to 'learn and re-learn the gospel, and how to proclaim it, in the context of the changed world and increased knowledge encountered by succeeding generations'. The TRG believes that with intentionality and clear governance such a learning community might evolve from the learning network, but noted that there was confusion in the governance relationships between the responsibilities of the Network Committee and the Ministries Committee and that a clearer governance and management structure was required.*

**R3** *The TRG therefore recommended that steps be taken to create a Community of Expertise in Methodist Formation and Education. The first steps towards this would be:*

- a. *Appointment of a highly experienced theologian as Secretary of Methodist Education and Formation ('Secretary'), with managerial responsibility for the DMLN including responsibility for relationship with centres. It would be a matter for the Secretary of the Conference to determine internal reporting lines, including the possibility for the newly appointed Secretary to report to the Connexional Secretary. S/he would be a member of those committees that have an interest in educational and formational issues, as well as being able to report directly to the Methodist Council and to the Conference.*
- b. *A move to make the Ministries Committee solely responsible for policy matters concerning ministry (lay and ordained), to include consideration of the appropriate priorities for the DMLN/Community of Expertise given budgetary constraints. The Senior Leadership Group of the Connexional Team should have full responsibility for managing work in line with agreed priorities and budget, including managing staff. If this pattern is adopted, it would provide greater clarity, in terms of policy, formation, managerial responsibility, and accountability. We recognise that, to deliver this, the Ministries Committee may need amended Terms of Reference and/or changed working approaches to manage its own workload. Under this suggested structure the Network Committee would be redundant.*
- c. *A senior management team reporting to the Secretary of Methodist Education and Formation that includes expertise in both ordained and lay formation.*
- d. *Work to ensure that the DMLN evolves to make full use of the skills and knowledge of centres with which the Church is associated (see R10 and R11 below) and proactively links with and accesses the resources of people with relevant expertise who work*

*elsewhere. We believe that many may well be able to contribute to our formational life in innovative ways, including in particular people in university theology and religious studies departments and relevant staff of ecumenical partner churches.*

---

### **Recommendation 4**

---

*The TRG also noted what it believed to be a lack of flexibility within the learning network with it appearing to be difficult for staff to be deployed beyond their region or for additional skills to be brought in as needed.*

**R4** *The TRG therefore recommended that the Conference and Council should, within an agreed governance and financial framework and subject to agreed priorities, allow the Secretary to determine the resourcing model (including staffing structure and roles) best suited to the task of the DMLN, so that it can be adjusted as needs dictate.*

---

### **12.3 The SRC and the Council considered Recommendations 3 and 4 together:**

12.4 The SRC agreed that the work that the Training Review identified to create a learning community with greater flexibility needs to be done, but felt it difficult to justify the creation of a new post at a time when many other changes are being made to the shape of the Connexional Team. The movement of some staff from the Discipleship and Ministries Cluster into the Conference Office has seen the creation of the 'Ministries: Vocations and Worship' Team which will enable the effective management of resources that the Training Review rightly deemed to be necessary without the creation of a new executive post. The Network Committee has now been disbanded and many of its responsibilities subsumed by the Ministries Committee. Further work needs to be undertaken to agree (a) the management of the workload and revised terms of reference for the Ministries Committee and (b) how those already appointed with responsibility for theological education in the life of the Church (in learning institutions and in the Connexional Team) ensure a coherent strategy and the best use of available resources.

**The Council decided against the creation at this time of a new post of 'Secretary of Methodist Education and Formation' and affirmed the direction of travel described by the SRC.**

### **Recommendation 5**

---

*The TRG noted that the DMLN was established to receive requests from the Conference and the Council and with a defined responsibility to consult with the Regional Forums. The TRG found the Terms of Reference of these Forums (as set out in SO 340(1)) which pre-date 2012 to be out of date and in urgent need of amendment.*

## 20. Methodist Council Part 2: The Response to the Training Review

*The TRG therefore proposed that the focus of the Forums should be on purpose rather than process. In order to discern and prioritise the learning needs of the church it is important to ensure the effectiveness of the Regional Forums in representing the views of the Circuits and Local Churches in relation to their discerned needs and in relation to feedback about how DMLN provision is meeting those needs. The TRG was concerned that there is an imbalance between connexionally and locally allocated intentional learning resources which should be corrected.*

**R5** *The TRG recommended that the newly appointed Secretary should:*

- a. Review the Terms of Reference of the Regional Forums and the most effective method of ensuring that the local voice is heard in establishing priorities and providing feedback on current provision.*
  - b. Review the existing regional structure in the light of the decisions on the Larger than Circuit process and if need be amend it.*
  - c. Review the way in which the DMLN supports districts and circuits, and give consideration to models that would give District Chairs a greater control over part of the DMLN resource. Where District Chairs feel the present Network is successful, it needs to be sustained, but where it is felt that it is not working properly, the Connexional Team, together with the Chairs, should provide an alternative solution.*
- 

12.5 In response to this, the SRC reported that a strategic piece of work has already been undertaken by members of the Connexional Team to look at the nature and purpose of regional forums. Proposals regarding the policy concerning the purposes and operations of the Regional Learning and Development Forums are contained in the Connexional Team update to this Council. In the light of agreement in that area, subsequent work will be undertaken to ensure that the resources of the Connexional Team are deployed to best advantage. The redefining of the regional forums, the aligning of a Learning and Development officer to each district, and the flexibility to deploy personnel and to draw in others with gifts to share in accordance with their areas of expertise should achieve the responsiveness to both connexional and local needs that the TRG recommends.

**The Council affirmed the plans for the review of the Forums.**

### **Recommendation 6**

---

*The TRG believed that that if the Church shares its ambition that it should become intentionally a learning church, then the cost implications of that need to be accepted and funded. In that regard, while it is helpful to have some designated funds where these help to support fundraising and contribute to the longer-term security of the work on formation and education, it does not make sense for the budget for this work to be varied according to*

*the performance, good or bad, of so-called income generating centres.*

**R6** *The TRG recommended:*

- a. *that the funding model adopted since 2012 should be revised to give greater long-term security to the work of formation and education; and*
  - b. *that the following potential sources of funding be thoroughly explored:*
    - i. *the re-introduction of specific advocacy for a, possibly renamed, Methodist Fund for Training;*
    - ii. *the best use of freehold assets available at the Westminster College, Oxford site and the Mount Clare property at the University of Roehampton; and*
    - iii. *funds which can be released from the Model Trust funds held by many circuits following property sales over the last 50 years.*
- 

12.6 The SRC agreed that a learning church needs to be properly funded and noted that the funding model has already been revised and there is ongoing work in the Property Development Committee and in conversation with the Southlands Methodist Trust about the future of the Mount Clare site. Methodists can give (eg, in the collections at ordination services) to the Fund for Training and many do so. As with many other recommendations, the way in which training is resourced financially will need to be reviewed in the light of any other changes that are to be made (eg, the final response to Recommendation 7, below, and the future development of Methodist scholarship).

**The Council's response to the recommendations is that it has already approved appropriate changes to the funding model.**

### **Recommendation 7**

---

*The TRG reported that its members were struck by the breadth of concerns, raised by those who were consulted, about the existing framework within which the church currently supports formation for ordained ministry.*

*The TRG was concerned to understand the circumstances in which candidates accepted for initial training can gain the right formational opportunities at a time when the number of world-class theology departments is declining, and the need for cross-disciplinary understanding and engagement grows in an increasingly secular world. The TRG therefore expressed the view that the church needs to explore further the opportunities for student ministers to have the opportunity to learn in association with the best theology departments, alongside ecumenical colleagues, and with the chance to engage actively with those studying a wide range of other disciplines.*

## 20. Methodist Council Part 2: The Response to the Training Review

**R7** *For initial ministerial formation, the TRG recommended:*

- a. *to allow adequate time for discernment, the opportunity for greater breadth of experience (including diverse placements), catch-up where prior theological knowledge is limited, and completion of first degrees where relevant, the normal period of initial ministerial formation for most students should be lengthened from 2 to 3 years for those studying full time and 3 to 4 years for those studying part time;*
  - b. *to ensure that ministers can support and facilitate the creation of learning Circuits and local formational communities, there should be a greater emphasis within initial ministerial formation on the skills needed to enable the theological and formational growth of their congregations and of those in their pastoral charge; ministers need to be confident in leading short courses and house groups, tutoring, mentoring, providing spiritual guidance and supporting others in 'open learning' environments, as well as in preaching in a way that enables congregations to strengthen their faith and grow in their own theological and biblical understanding in the context of a complex world;*
  - c. *given that we are recommending three years as normal for each student (see R7a above), most should attain at least Undergraduate Diploma level (and the majority a degree), while some of those starting with an access course might attain an Undergraduate Certificate level;*
  - d. *the Church should publicise its expertise in supporting all students, including those who have had little experience of academic learning since schooldays. Our theological colleges have always had experienced teaching staff who have given individual students the time, encouragement and practical help they have needed*
  - e. *that the opportunity for part time training delivered primarily by distance learning (rather than attendance at an institution) using VLE materials together with tutorial support provided either face-to-face locally or through use of electronic media such as Skype, should be maintained and, if possible, enhanced. We commend the work that is already taking place at the Queen's Foundation and encourage the continuing development of their Distance Learning Programmes, but we think that more use could be made of local enablers who could provide a local sounding board and help with the motivation of isolated students.*
- 

- 12.7 The Ministries Committee was concerned in seeing this recommendation that there may be a lack of understanding within the Church of the work that is done at the Queen's Foundation and the quality of formation that those in initial training for ministry receive. The Ministries Committee was therefore pleased to respond to a direction of the SRC that a separate report on initial training be submitted to the Conference [see the Methodist Council report, part three section O].

That report includes the beginning of an evaluation of this recommendation which requires detailed and careful examination. The SRC noted that the TRG makes

some important points about the foci and delivery of learning in initial ministerial training which need to be considered in the light of R7a and the proposal to increase the length of training. Whilst there is a broad recognition that an additional year of initial formation would have considerable benefits for some students, the Ministries Committee needs further time to consider this proposal. There would need to be clarity about the purpose of the additional year and consideration must be given to the effects of modifying the current pathways offered through the Queen's Foundation, the financial implications for both the accepted candidate and the Church, and the diversity of previous experience and learning with which candidates enter initial training.

**The Council therefore declined to propose any change in the 'normal period' of initial training but asked the Ministries Committee to give further consideration to this recommendation.**

### **Recommendation 8**

---

*Beyond the pathway already in development for probationers, the TRG recommended that provision is made for:*

- a. *specific training for those identified as having potential for, or actually entering, specific roles (eg superintendency, those entering ministry in local ecumenical partnerships);*
  - b. *continuing training needs during the first five years of ministry; and*
  - c. *continuing professional development for all ministers.*
- 

12.8 The SRC affirmed this as the direction of travel. The Ministries Committee considered and approved in March 2018 a framework of competencies based on the revised selection criteria (2016). The Ministries: Vocations and Worship team will be tasked with ensuring that programmes of continual development are in place and all presbyters and deacons are encouraged to discern their call to particular roles in the Church through Ministerial Development Review and supervision.

**The Council concurred with this recommendation and approved the work being done by the Connexional Team in relation to it.**

### **Recommendation 9**

---

*The TRG voiced its support for those who argue that there is an urgent need for a strategic approach to the development of this and future generations of theologians and theological educators within the Methodist Church. Without an ability to re-learn, reflect on, develop and share the Methodist tradition and understanding of church, ministry and mission the Church will inevitably lose its relevance. Theologians and theological educators might be ordained or lay, and they may have capacity to engage in long-term academic scholarship or*

## 20. Methodist Council Part 2: The Response to the Training Review

*to benefit from a shorter sabbatical and/or course.*

*It is essential that the church enables those with academic potential to become not only the liturgists, church historians, biblical scholars and systematic theologians of the future, but also ensures that they are enabled to become imaginative, engaging and exciting communicators who can enable others to capture their enthusiasm not only for study but also for the task of interpreting the gospel of Christ in an increasingly complex world.*

**R9** *The TRG recommended that the Church develops a strategy and identifies commensurate funding sources to enable:*

- a identification and support for those with potential to be future theologians and future theological educators; and*
  - b identification of gaps in current Methodist scholarship and ways in which those gaps could be filled into the future.*
- 

12.9 The SRC agreed that this is a vital matter if the Church is to encourage the next generation of theological educators and ensure that there is lively and well-informed theological conversation in every part of the Connexion. It is also, as the Training Review notes, a matter of urgency but is not susceptible to any quick fix. The Ministries: Vocations and Worship team in consultation with the learning institutions and the Secretary of the Faith and Order Committee plans to review the ways in which scholarship is supported in the life of the Church and to advise the Ministries Committee on the longer term strategic development of scholarship and research and the nurturing of future theological educators. It is critical that all developments in this area focus on resourcing the whole Church and not simply the equipping of experts in particular fields.

**The Council approved the direction of travel outlined by the SRC.**

### **Recommendation 10**

---

*Having visited Cliff College and The Queen's Foundation and taken into account the range of responses to the decisions of the 2012 Conference, the TRG concluded that there is a strong case for the Methodist Church to engage with more than the two centres currently in the DMLN. This case is fourfold:*

- a. Notwithstanding the quality of the work done at Queen's, the TRG agreed with those who have argued that the decision to place all initial ministerial formation in one institution created unwarranted risks for the Church.*
- b. There is value in creating contexts in which initial and continuing ministerial training happens alongside lay training;*

## 20. Methodist Council Part 2: The Response to the Training Review

- c. *There is a challenge for the Methodist Church to make best use of contexts where lay and ordained can be formed alongside those from other denominations and other world faiths; and*
- d. *There are time-limited opportunities for the Church to re-engage with two Methodist institutions which are no longer engaged in initial ministerial formation: Wesley House, Cambridge and St John's College in the University of Durham.*

*The TRG therefore looked at ways in which, in addition to working at The Queen's Foundation and Cliff College, the Church might engage with ecumenical and theological communities with international reputations. Opportunities are readily available in Cambridge and Durham, and may be in the future in Oxford.*

**R10** *The TRG recommended that the Church extends the range of institutions with which it engages by:*

- a. *pursuing existing relationships in Cambridge and Durham, with each institution supporting Methodist formation in an appropriate way:*
  - ii. *In Cambridge this should include making provision for continuous professional development for lay and ordained members of the Church and placing a small number of student ministers. We consider that development of a new partnership with Wesley House would therefore be beneficial to the Church, and that discussions to understand the desirable shape of this relationship (including any funding issues) should be expedited.*
  - iii. *In Durham we recommend that the focus should be on postgraduate studies for ministers and lay people as part of their continuing development. While this should be the major activity in Durham, we envisage the possibility of sending occasional student ministers to Durham who have already obtained a good degree in Theology. In this case, we consider that it would be highly beneficial for the Methodist Church to fund a Chair in Methodist Studies within the Theology Faculty alongside the existing Chairs in Anglican and Catholic Studies.*
- b. *in due course exploring what might be possible in Oxford.*

*The TRG noted the sensitivities of these proposals but believed that the Church needs a breadth of provision which can be achieved if the Church needs to review carefully the nature of its relationship with each institution with whom it deals in respect of learning and development, learning in particular from the case of The Queen's Foundation where talking of a service level approach for all purposes seems to us to have been detrimental. The relationship in each case in respect of governance and finance needs to be transparent and clear to both parties and will vary from one institution to another. Notwithstanding this, it is also helpful for the Church to work in partnership where this can facilitate access to the*

## 20. Methodist Council Part 2: The Response to the Training Review

*skills and expertise that each institution can offer.*

---

12.10 The SRC took careful note of the recommendation and also of the fact that, in the wake of the training review, the Secretary of the Conference has received draft proposals from institutions in Durham, Cambridge, and Oxford. The Secretary is mandated to have conversations with those institutions and others about the possibility of future arrangements for work in the areas of scholarship and the continuing development of those in ordained and authorised ministries. However, the Council needs to be alert to the fact that the number of student ministers in training at present makes unlikely the viability of having students placed in more than one institution.

**The Council approved the SRC's response to recommendation 10.**

### **Recommendation 11**

---

*The TRG recommended that the Connexional Team reviews its approach to relationships with institutions involved in learning and development, ensuring that each is tailored to combine partnership with such transparent, clear governance and financial arrangements as are relevant in the particular case.*

---

12.11 The SRC noted that the Council will be presented with the revised Memorandum of Understanding with the Queen's Foundation and with proposed lines of accountability in the wake of the disbanding of the Network Committee. The Council also takes responsibility for the transparency of arrangements with other learning institutions that report to it or to the Conference. That relationships have to be tailored to each institution and be transparent and robust is essential but the conversations outlined in response to R9 and R10 will need to happen and to be evaluated before any other formal agreements can be considered.

**The Council approved the SRC's response to this recommendation.**

### Conclusion

13. The Council is grateful for the work of the Training Review Group. It recognises the complexity of the task with which it engaged. The Council is also grateful to the SRC for the work that it has set in train to respond to the concerns raised by the TRG and to members of the Connexional Team who have addressed those concerns, even when some of the consequences have not been easy to enact.

14. There is still considerable work to be done in response to these recommendations. That work will now be overseen by the Ministries Committee, which will report

through the Council to the 2019 Conference on progress and further developments.

### **\*\*\*RESOLUTION**

**20/1. The Conference receives the Report.**