



The d'Youville Report

National Gathering on Theological Education
January 2010
The Anglican Church of Canada

*Theological Education Working Group of Faith Worship and Ministry,
The Right Reverend John Chapman, Chair*

This Report contains the *Proceedings* of the first National Gathering on Theological Education for Presbyteral Ministry in the Anglican Church of Canada. Participants in the conference included the Bishops of the Anglican Church of Canada along with their Diocesan candidacy officials and representatives from a broad base of theological educational institutions. This Report includes the working document *Learning Outcomes: Standards for Theological Education*, as well as summaries of presentations made to the conference, a final report from the “Indaba” process of discussion used during the event, and recommendations for future development of issues raised. It is to be considered as a record of one stage in work that is intended to be continued.

Introduction

From January 5 to January 7 2010, the first ever National Gathering on Theological Education for Presbyteral Ministry was held in Chateaugay, Quebec. Those in attendance included the entire House of Bishops, representatives from seventeen theological educational institutions, and personnel responsible for processes of ordination candidacy within their dioceses. The event was organised under the auspices of the Faith Worship and Ministry committee who designated a Theological Education Working Group to plan the Gathering and to create preparatory studies and other materials in order to facilitate a working process of *Indaba* in Chateaugay.

Chateaugay is a small town on the south shore across from Montreal, Quebec, and home to the Manoir d'Youville, the former Mother House of the Sisters of Charity of Montreal, shrine to Marguerite d'Youville, the foundress of the Order, and a base from which the missions of these "Grey Nuns" went forth to establish their communities and continue their work of service to the poor and vulnerable of society throughout North America. 2009 marked the 50th anniversary of the beatification of this first Canadian-born saint.

It is fitting, then, that leaders of the Anglican Church of Canada should meet at the Manoir D'Youville to wrestle together with the challenges inherent in raising up, discerning, forming and educating future clergy of our Church. What has been clear to the Theological Education Working Group from the beginning was also strongly in evidence in the conversations at the Manoir D'Youville: that the imagination of the future of our Church and of what is needed in those who will lead us, is stimulated and fuelled by a commitment to *mission* — God's mission in the particular localities and contexts in which the children of God live across this vast nation.

The commitment to mission is always a responsibility to be carried out in a particular location and context, culture and language. And, being God's mission, it is of course incarnate particularly and universally. Just to speak within the Anglican Church of Canada: presbyters (priests) are ordained to serve within a diocese, in an ordered ministry that is exercised particularly, and recognised across the Anglican Church of Canada. Priests may and in fact do, travel from place to place within and across dioceses. Doctrinally and canonically, a priest of one diocese is a priest of the whole Anglican Church of Canada. How can theological education and formation for ministry most helpfully equip candidates for ministry and seasoned presbyters alike best to serve, grow and thrive in particular local contexts, and, when applicable, move well from place to place, and in all circumstances exercising an ordered ministry that is recognisably and appropriately presbyteral? What are the foundations needed today to grow excellence in ministries tomorrow?

These are only some of the questions that led to this National Gathering. Eventually the questions led to variously articulated assertions of the need for ‘national competencies,’ ‘national standards’ or ‘commonly recognised expectations’ for theological education. Most recently the language of ‘common national standards, appropriately adapted in local contexts’ has emerged. The strategic vision that emerged at the conference is: national standards regionally interpreted, appropriately adapted, and administered with mutual accountability.

The emerging consensus from the National Gathering on Theological Education is that the work presented on common standards, nationally held and locally adaptable as presented at the conference needs to go ahead. There was an emerging enthusiasm about the possibilities of being able to articulate national standards, “de-M.Divified” — that is, to articulate learning outcomes as distinct from academic degree requirements, to allow for appropriate adaptation with rigour in local training programmes.

Furthermore, the gathering urged that proper high priority be given to this work in the life of dioceses, Provinces and the General Synod. It was agreed that this conference was an excellent beginning, but just a beginning, and that the momentum clearly gathering at the Manoir d’Youville needed to be tended to and kept up. One particularly strong suggestion was that the same group of people meet again in three years’ time to assess progress and to set a next stage.

The high prioritisation of these matters was discerned by the gathering not just in the context of conversations, dialogue, reflection and analysis, but in the contexts of common prayer, eucharistic thanksgiving. This was an experience of the Church at prayerful, story-sharing, strategy-analysing discernment, and above all, it was prayerful.

The following section, on Background and Mandate, trace the development of recent initiatives leading to this National Gathering on Theological Education. The immediate next Sections (2, 3, and 4) summarise the proceedings and content of conversations at Chateauguay. Section 5 is a record of some of the concrete project initiatives that arose as suggestions and topics of considerably positive attention during the Gathering and at the House of Bishops meeting that followed. Following the Acknowledgements and list of Members can be found an *Executive Summary* of this Report, and, ultimately, the *Recommendations* to the Faith Worship and Ministry Committee.

Background and Mandate

This meeting was mandated by both the House of Bishops and the Council of General Synod which charged the Faith Worship and Ministry committee with preparations for full review of Anglican Church of Canada processes and content of theological education for ordained ministries. The original mandating authority is contained within a resolution of the House of Bishops in April of 2006, which then was communicated to the Council of General Synod and was supported in a resolution of that Council in May of 2006. It reads as follows:

That the Council of General Synod convene a national gathering on theological education in Canada, under the auspices of the Faith, Worship and Ministry Committee, in order to:

- a) Develop a strategic plan for the future needs for ordained ministry in the Anglican Church of Canada;*
- b) Make recommendations to the Church about the strategic use of resources to support theological education;*
- c) Review the current patterns of preparation for ordained ministry in the Anglican Church of Canada and make recommendations for their effective use;*
- d) Develop common standards for theological training including core curricula, evaluation, field training, selection, support and recruitment of candidates, and core standards for spiritual and emotional readiness for ordination;*
- e) That such national gathering to be held in consultation with full communion and ecumenical partners in Canada, and our conversations with the work of Theological Education in the Anglican Communion*

Having received the large and strong mandate from the House of Bishops and the Council of General Synod, the Faith Worship and Ministry committee spend substantial time analysing and parsing that resolution.

The resolution from the House of Bishops and Council of General Synod 2006 was made in the context of the 2004–2007 Faith Worship and Ministry’s endeavours to engage both the Bishops of our Church and the Theological Colleges and training centres across Canada in conversations about the future needs for theological education. In that triennium, FWM undertook the following:

- Surveys of the Heads of Anglican Colleges re: worship life at their institutions; the role of, and method used in, biblical studies in the educational processes; and the financial realities of the institutions
- Engagement with the annual meeting of the Heads of Anglican Colleges with regular staff participation in their meetings to communicate and discuss the resolution in question

- Collection and study of curricula of all theological educational institutions
- Conversations (some in person, some by questions sent) with the Provincial Houses of Bishops, asking what they affirm in what is done presently in theological education, and what needs to be let go of, and what needs to be focussed on, in the future
- Collection of all diocesan candidacy process documents
- The creation of a *Theological Education* portion of the website www.anglican.ca from Faith Worship and Ministry, with posting of Anglican and ecumenical resources
- The circulation for discussion and feedback of the various resources, including the “Grids” (learning outcomes) of the Anglican Communion working party, Theological Education in the Anglican Communion
- Staff membership on the Programme Committee for Leadership for Ministry of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada, the body that oversees, on a national basis, the work of candidacy for ordained ministry and theological education for such in the ELCIC. Circulation of the ELCIC *Candidacy Manual* has been made through www.anglican.ca and to the House of Bishops and to diocese
- Regular communication with the Anglican Council of Indigenous Peoples to put forward the desire for ACIP participation in questions of theological education and formation for ministry

Following the General Synod of 2007, the Primate appointed Bishop John Chapman to head up a Theological Education Working Group of the Faith Worship and Ministry Committee, with the understanding that the membership would be appointed (upon consultation with FWM) from outside of the committee. The Theological Education Working Group thus became an *ad hoc* working group of Faith Worship and Ministry.

The Theological Education Working Group met face to face on four occasions, in Ottawa, Toronto and Montreal. By early 2009, they had explored the issues involved to enough depth to be confident to set a date for the National Gathering on Theological Education for January of 2010. At that point, it was expected that the Bishops of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada would have been able to attend. By late summer of 2010 it became apparent that a scheduling difficulty made that impossible. The Manoir D’Youville was secured as the best location for a potentially large gathering.

Presentations were made to the House of Bishops’ meetings in April and October of 2009. With the Primate’s express support, invitations were issued in the summertime of 2009 to bishops, theological colleges, and ecumenical and full communion partners. Furthermore, bishops were invited to bring diocesan personnel who carry responsibilities for ordained ministry candidates. Further support from Archbishop Fred Hiltz resulted in the registration of all bishops (though regrets were received later from several due to unforeseen circumstances).

In the *Letter of Invitation*, the following note was sounded:

“Much has happened since the last consultation in 1998, when the church in Canada was beginning to come to terms with the baptismal foundation and impetus for all ministries, and the multiplex nature of particular exercises of ordained ministry. These insights still need to be explored, within the now deeper-growing awareness of the missional nature of the church.

“Our awareness of the complexities of theological education across the diverse contexts of our church has grown. We now face particular challenges as institutional and financial resources have become strained at a time when the challenge of ministry, including ordered ministry and its preparation has increased. Developments have also been happening at the international level, with the Archbishop of Canterbury’s formation of the think-tank, *Theological Education in the Anglican Communion*. Many Provinces of the Anglican Communion are involved in reshaping their programmes for theological education. Most importantly here at home in Canada, Full Communion with the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada also brings promises and the imperative to work together in mission.

“It is time to call together once again the stakeholders in theological education to review our ways of preparation for church leaders for the next decade and further into the future. Recognizing that all the baptized are called into ministry and mission, and that the foundational theological education ‘textbook’ for this might be said to be our baptismal covenant, this particular gathering will focus on preparation of those in process for presbyteral, or priestly, ministry. This is in no way to dismiss concerns about the needs for quality theological education for all the baptized, nor the urgency for the development of standards for training for the diaconate and episcopate, but reflects both the present ability and scope of national structures to deal with this one set of presenting questions at this particular time, as one aspect within the spectrum of important issues in the church’s mission and ministry.

When the Faith Worship and Ministry Committee, and subsequently the Planning Committee for this conference, received the task mandate and its language describing “national standards,” they recognized that underlying this language are a variety of complexities. These relate to the relationships between local cultural and contextual particularities in ministry and the common beyond-the-local apostolic understanding that Anglicans rightly uphold regarding the presbyterate. We live the challenges of missional engagement in the Canadian context that at once demands local immersion as well as a recognizable ‘priesthood’ across the country, diversity of expressions of ministry within the one ministry which belongs to Christ.”

At the Manoir D'Youville

Participants

Those receiving invitations to this national gathering included a broad representation from all areas of Church life most immediately involved in these concerns and best able to prepare constituency conversations both beforehand and afterwards. The Gathering therefore included heads of and teachers at theological colleges and training centres, diocesan candidacy directors, pastors, students, lay parishioners, bishops, ACPO and other assessors, leaders in stewardship and resource management, ecumenical and full communion partners and an international guest from TEAC. The full list of participants follows.

The national House of Bishops had rescheduled its first meeting of 2010 to follow immediately after the national gathering at the same location, thereby enabling the participation of all but four bishops whose regrets were due to illness and diocesan emergency in several cases.

The Anglican Journal sent a reporter who covered the event with several stories in high profile in planned for the February and March issues. The attendance of staff from the Philanthropy Department marked their interest in educating themselves better to equip them for future development of fundraising campaigns for emerging initiatives.

Bishops

1. Barbara Andrews, APCI
2. Barry B. Clarke, Montreal
3. Benjamin Arreak, Arctic
4. Bob Bennett, Huron
5. Claude Miller, Fredricton
6. Colin Johnson, Toronto
7. David Irving, Saskatoon
8. David Torrville, Central Nfld
9. Dennis Drainville, Quebec
10. Derek Hoskin, Calgary
11. Don Phillips, Rupert's Land
12. George Bruce, Ontario
13. George Elliott, Toronto
14. Greg Kerr-Wilson, Qu'Appelle
15. James Cowan, British Columbia
16. Jane Alexander, Edmonton
17. John Chapman, Ottawa (TEWG Chair)
18. Jim Njegovan, Brandon

19. John Privett, Kootenay
20. Larry Robertson, Arctic
21. Linda Nicholls, Toronto
22. Mark MacDonald, NAIB
23. Michael Bird, Niagara
24. Michael Hawkins, Saskatchewan
25. Michael Ingham, New Westminster
26. Patrick Yu, Toronto
27. Percy Coffin, Western Newfoundland
28. Peter Coffin, Military Ordinariate
29. Philip Poole, Toronto
30. Rod Andrews, Saskatoon
31. Ron Cutler, Nova Scotia PEI
32. Stephen Andrews, Algoma
33. Sue Moxley, Nova Scotia PEI
34. Terry Dance, Huron

Regrets: Bill Anderson, Terry Buckle, David Ashdown, Cy Pitman

Theological Colleges

Theological Colleges were also represented at the meeting by individuals also representing other bodies: Paul Jennings (Montreal Diocesan Theological College, TEWG), Eric Beresford (Atlantic School of Theology, TEWG), Jane Barter-Moulaison (University of Winnipeg, TEWG), Todd Townshend (Huron College, TEWG), Don Phillips (St. John's College, Winnipeg, House of Bishops), Cathy Hall (EFM Canada, Diocesan representative), Michael Hawkins (James Settee College for Ministry, House of Bishops), John Harvey (Thorneloe College, FWM)

1. Bill Richards, Emmanuel & St. Chad
2. Cathy Hall, Kootenay, EFM Canada
3. Cliff Dee, Mahmouw Programme
4. David Neelands, Trinity
5. Ellen Aitken, McGill
6. Eric Beresford, Atlantic School of Theology
7. George Sumner, Wycliffe
8. John Mellis, Queen's
9. John Simons, Montreal Diocesan
10. Kevin Flynn, St. Paul
11. Larry Beardy, William Winter School
12. Lee Titterington, Bishop's School, Yukon
13. Marion Jenkins, Henry Budd

14. Megan McKenzie, Centre Christian Studies
15. Paul Sodtke, Henry Budd
16. Robert Derrenbacker, Thorneloe
17. Wendy Fletcher, Vancouver School of Theology
18. William Danaher, Huron College

Regrets: Roger E. Briggs, Arthur Turner Training School; Reed Flemming, Taylor College for Mission and Evangelism; John Stafford, St John's College, Winnipeg

Diocesan and Provincial Officials, Students

1. Alex Faseruk, Eastern Newfoundland & Labrador
2. Bill Harrison, Kootenay
3. Catherine Harper, Qu'Appelle
4. Cathy Campbell, Rupert's Land
5. Christopher Parsons, British Columbia
6. David Fletcher, Nova Scotia and PEI
7. Don Bailey, Ontario
8. Dorothy Mash, New Westminster, ACPO Secretaries
9. Edward King, Western Newfoundland
10. Elizabeth Hardy, Toronto
11. Garth Bulmer, Quebec
12. Geoffrey Hall, Fredricton
13. Gerry Poirier, Central Newfoundland
14. Harry Cleghorn, Ontario
15. Iain Luke, Athabasca
16. Jenny Andison, Toronto
17. John Harvey, Algoma (also FWM)
18. Judy Oatway, Montreal
19. Judy Rois, Toronto
20. Kelly Duncan, New Westminster, new graduate
21. Michael Thompson, Niagara
22. Peter Fenty, Toronto
23. Rachel Kessler, Toronto, student
24. Ronald Harrison, New Westminster
25. Sandra Tilley, Eastern Newfoundland
26. Susan Hermanson, Anglican Parishes of the Central Interior
27. Tim Vickery, Ontario
28. Willi Kammerer, Huron
29. William J. Bellamy, Tri-Dioceses of Newfoundland

The following dioceses were represented by their educational institution representatives: Arctic (Roger Briggs, Arthur Turner), Moosonee (Cliff Dee, Mahmouw programme), Larry Beardy (Keewatin), Lee Titterington (Bishop's School for Ministry, Yukon)

Planning Committee, Facilitators and Chaplains

1. Andrew Asbil, Chaplain
2. Bruce Myers, facilitator, Indaba
3. Eric Beresford, TEWG, presenter
4. Jane Barter-Moulaison, TEWG, presenter
5. Janet Griffith, TEWG
6. Janet Marshall, Chair of FWM and Conference Facilitator
7. Jo Abrams, staff
8. John Campbell, Chaplain
9. John Chapman, TEWG Chair
10. Patrick Yu, Toronto, presenter
11. Paul Jennings, TEWG, presenter
12. Todd Townshend, TEWG, presenter
13. Flo Tracy, Indaba Rapporteur
14. Chris Barrigar, Indaba Rapporteur
15. Mark Rogers, Indaba Rapporteur
16. Karen Chalk, Indaba Rapporteur

Faith Worship and Ministry

In addition to Barbara Shoomski, official FWM representative, Faith Worship and Ministry was also represented at the meeting by Janet Marshall, Eileen Scully, John Chapman, John Harvey, Greg Kerr-Wilson, and George Bruce.

Full Communion, Ecumenical and International Partners

1. Bob Faris, Churches Council on Theological Education
2. Clare Amos, TEAC, Anglican Communion Office, London, UK
3. David Pfrimmer, Waterloo Lutheran Seminary
4. Kevin Ogilvie, Luther Theological Seminary
5. Mark Harris, Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada

Regrets: Representatives of the Presbyterian Church in Canada Support for Ministries office, and of the United Church of Canada Theological Education office received invitations but were unable to attend

Other (Partnerships, Philanthropy, Anglican Journal)

1. Henriette Thompson, Director of Partnerships
2. Holland Hendrix, Director of Philanthropy
3. Jill Cruse, Theological Students, Partnerships
4. John Robertson, Department of Philanthropy
5. Michelle Hauser, Department of Philanthropy
6. Paul Feheley, Principal Secretary to the Primate
7. Tess Sison, Anglican Journal

Preparation

A website was designed for the purposes of preparing participants for the conference. One of the recommendations of the Theological Education Working Group is that this website remain in operation and in fact be developed further, under a new moniker. Included in the website, along with the necessary conference registration and other planning information, are at present several categories of background papers and documents:

- Background papers prepared for the Conference by Presenters (Barter-Moulaison and Beresford, Townshend, MacDonald, Jennings and Yu)
- Background documents from previous FWM work (of the Committee and of its mandated Task Groups, for example, *The Bays Report* (2000) and *The Report and Recommendations of the Consultations on Discernment for Ministry* (1998), and related works)
- Existing “Standards” documents, including:
 - The *Ordinal* from *The Book of Alternative Services* (and other liturgical pieces relating to ordination rites [IALC])
 - ACPO materials, including *The ACPO Handbook*
 - *Ordination Prerequisites – A Statement of the House of Bishops 1986*
- A section with conference papers and Reports relating to Theological Education and the context of Indigenous Ministries
- A “Recommended Readings” section, with links to the Association of Theological Schools and other sources
- Materials from Theological Education in the Anglican Communion, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada, the Churches’ Council on Theological Education

Participants were asked to study the Conference papers (which were available by December 1, 2009) beforehand, and to have a working understanding of the Existing Standards documents, and to be familiar with additional Background materials.

Process and Presentations

At the June 2009 meeting of the TEWG, assignments of presentations were made to Eric Beresford and Jane Barter-Moulaison (on learning outcomes), Paul Jennings and Patrick Yu (on procedures for mutual accountability across the dioceses), John Chapman (overview). Bishop Mark MacDonald had presented a stimulating reflection to a conference on *Theological Education in Contexts of Indigenous Ministries* held at Thorneloe University in May of 2009. He was further invited to present these and additional reflections as the first talk at the National Gathering on Theological Education.

The Theological Education Working Group (TEWG) invited the Chair of Faith Worship and Ministry, Janet Marshall, to facilitate the National Gathering on Theological Education. Janet attended the October 2009 meeting of the TEWG and contributed to the formation of the process for the National Gathering.

It was intended from the beginning of planning to root and hold all of the work of the National Gathering in worship. To that end, the planning group invited John Campbell and the Rev'd Andrew Asbil from the Church of the Redeemer, Toronto, to serve as chaplains to the event.

The Theological Education Working Group was drawn from positive reports from Canadian diocesan and other adaptations of the *Indaba* process to adapt this process to their needs. The *Indaba* process is essentially a facilitated, meaningful conversation amongst participants whose voices are understood to be those of equals. It is a discernment process that has a family resemblance to the *Talking Circle* that is more familiar to the Canadian Church from experiences under the leadership of the Anglican Council of Indigenous People. The principal difference is in the facilitation and reporting processes for *Indaba* and that it does not follow strictly an around-the-circle process (though it may do so).

Five *Indaba* "Rapporteurs" — people outside the process designated to listen deeply, take notes and reflect to the planning group from the *Indaba* conversations — were recruited by Paul Jennings, with Bruce Myers from the Diocese of Quebec as leader of the team. Facilitators of the *Indaba* groups were recruited from the membership of the Theological Education Working Group. Rapporteurs and facilitators met after each *Indaba* group session with members of the TEWG and the Facilitator of the Gathering.

A word about the Indaba process:

The Indaba process is one in which much, if not most, of the work is about naming the problem. Some of the questions involved in this naming include the following:

- What is it that has motivated the gathering and discussion?
- Where have anxieties taken root and why?
- What's really going on that needs to be addressed and to which a solution needs to be found?

As the subject matter of Indaba discussions expand and contract and wander around, ideas are bounced around and tested for energy and synergy. What needs to be addressed next? What's the call? Where is the pathway, however elusive? Particularly key in the process is the moment at which a group acknowledges that we've come to a shared insight, one that moves the group along to the next question. It is not until the heart of the matter is addressed that solutions can begin to be found.

Indaba is not meant for simple, technical situations that require adaptation, or for tinkering with the system. It can, however, be very helpful for entering muddy and chaotic places — like when we need to find ways to support a system experiencing profound change. This is uncomfortable — as many people culturally are far more used to and at ease with processes that are solution focused.

In the context of this National Gathering on Theological Education, those gathered were still in the process of clarification, a process of discernment to figure out just what is the problem. Within the confusion of diverse questions, perspectives and voices, the gathering followed an Indaba process to seek clarity, and to generate a number of questions regarding what they want to expect from theological education, and the realities of the deployment and transferability of priests.

1. Learning Outcomes: Introduction to Matrix on Outcomes for Education for Ministry

Over recent years, churches and those involved in training for ministry have shared a growing concern for the outcomes of the ministry preparation process. In Anglican polity order is conferred in ordination. A priest is a priest, wherever they serve and however they are trained. However, Anglican polity has usually distinguished between order and office. Office refers to the particular ministry undertaken by an individual as authorized by the church and / or licensed by the bishop. When we speak of office we are speaking of particular contexts of ministry that call for particular sets of competencies (skills, insight, knowledge, attitudes and behaviours) in order to undertake ministry effectively.

Over recent years we have become aware that the church is facing significant challenges that are placing increasing demands on all who minister, including and especially those engaged in the ordained ministry of our church. In Canada our contemporary context includes amongst other factors that have been identified:

- A rapidly shifting culture
- Increasing pluralism
- A growing segment of the population for whom religious faith is allied with suspicion of institutional structures
- Declining church membership
- Shifting patterns of participation for those who still attend

The shifts that are taking place, and the challenges faced by churches require us to reexamine the ways in which we discern and train candidates for ministry. What competencies are needed in leaders who must help churches address the challenges we have identified? This affects the whole process of discernment and ministry education, including the need for lifelong learning.

In assessing theological education this has led to an increased emphasis on the outcomes of the educational process rather than simply the content. It is no longer enough to say that a candidate has completed a course in New Testament, it is important ask if the candidate can use the knowledge they have gained in teaching, preaching, counselling individuals, in giving guidance to congregations seeking to shape a future for themselves in uncertain times, etc. The question is not, what was taught, but what was learned.

Intellectual knowledge is important for those who will teach (as priests are called to do), but detached from the capacity to integrate that knowledge into the wider collection of competencies required for

congregational leadership knowledge alone would represent an inadequate outcome of the learning process for ordered ministry.

The move to outcomes based assessment of learning can be seen in the recent work of a number of bodies, and we have sought to learn from each of them. In the context of the Anglican Communion the document provided here draws on the work of TEAC (Theological Education for the Anglican Communion) who are using outcomes based measures to strengthen theological education across the Anglican Communion. For some years the ATS (The Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada), which accredits most theological schools in Canada has been moving to an outcome based approach to assessing the effectiveness of programs of education for ministry.

We have drawn on the recommendations of our Indigenous Partners, which also suggest particular outcomes by which readiness for ministry is assessed. We have also sought to learn from the work of our partners in the United Church of Canada. However, what holds together these new developments and the diverse sources is a return to our own roots.

The competencies we have outlined are linked to the understandings of ministry made explicit in examination of candidates as found in our ordinals (BCP and BAS). If they are organized here to serve the goal of assessing education processes, they are nonetheless driven by the theological commitments of those foundational documents.

In bringing these materials together the committee is reflecting the growing consensus that the challenges facing our church are such that we need to be very clear in our understanding of what the practice of ministry involves for those who are ordained.

Given this understanding we then must be very intentional in the way in which we identify the competencies necessary to effective ministry. This is true not only in the complexities of the present but all the more so in the emerging future church whose exact shape and leadership needs none of us can fully know. This last point is crucial. It means that our educational programs need to prepare candidates not only to undertake well-known tasks and walk well-known paths, but also to be able to draw on the rich resources of our tradition in ways that enable it to speak to ever-new realities in ways that are both creative and faithful. This last task will require even greater awareness of the tradition and even more insightful analysis of the cultural context of ministry than we have required in the past.

Learning outcomes of the Master of Divinity Program or Equivalent for preparation for ordered public ministry in the Anglican Church of Canada

There are four general standards for theological education according to the Association of Theological Schools (ATS): Religious Heritage, Cultural Context, Personal and Spiritual Foundations, and Capacity for Ministerial and Public Leadership. The following *Learning Outcomes* arise primarily from the guidelines set forth in the “Grids” of the working party “Theological Education in the Anglican Communion” (TEAC), the ATS standards as well as documents on Aboriginal Ministries in the Anglican Church of Canada.

Religious Heritage

The Church is the family of God, the body of Christ, and the temple of the Holy Spirit. (BAS) WILL you then give your faithful diligence always so to minister the doctrine and sacraments, and the discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church hath received the same, according to the commandments of God.... And seeing that you cannot by any other means compass the doing of so weighty a work, pertaining to the salvation of man, but with doctrine and exhortation taken out of the holy Scriptures, and with a life agreeable to the same; consider how studious ye ought to be in reading and learning... (Book of Common Prayer) Will you be diligent in the reading and study of the holy scriptures, and in seeking the knowledge of such things as may make you a stronger and more able minister of Christ? (Book of Alternative Services)

By the end of the degree program, graduates will:

- Understand the development of the Christian tradition, and how that has been received and interpreted in Anglican thought.
- Understand of the diversity of that tradition, historically and globally.
- Articulate core Christian doctrines, including their defences and their critiques, and the particularities of how they have been received within Anglicanism.
- Understand the significance of relationship between the Christian faith to its Jewish origins.
- Understand the significance of philosophy in the development and defence of the Christian faith.
- Become familiar with the writings of several major theologians, including key shapers of the Anglican Tradition.
- Be aware of the challenges and promises facing Christian theology in a pluralistic and secular world.
- Consider the place of the Christian faith in a globalized and pluralistic world.
- Become aware of the teachings and the practices of other faiths that are encountered in the Canadian context and beyond.
- Be equipped to teach the Christian tradition.
- Become familiar with the history of missions in Canada and how that has shaped the heritage and character of the Anglican Church of Canada.

- Become familiar with the history of missions of the Anglican Church globally.
- Have an understanding of the Anglican Communion worldwide, its history, diversity, successes, failings and contemporary challenges.
- Become familiar with the history of the English Reformation.
- Be able to articulate core Anglican doctrines.
- Display an understanding of Anglican spirituality and the importance of liturgy in Anglican self understanding as well as in doctrinal and ethical awareness.
- Have read the biblical canon.
- Be able to exegete select texts from the Bible using appropriate historical critical and literary tools
- Understand the different genres that comprise the Bible
- Gain an awareness of how the biblical text is interpreted through the lenses of gender and culture.
- Demonstrate a growing critical engagement with the Scriptures and the traditions of Christian thought, characterised both by faithful obedience and openness to new insights.
- Develop a practice of study and reflection, and a working knowledge of how to interpret and use Scripture in a range of different contexts.
- Interpret the Bible and make it accessible to the community.
- Understand the importance of the community's reading of the Bible in the light of Christian tradition and God-given reason
- Engage with a reasonably comprehensive range of biblical traditions within the canon of Scripture, and become familiar with how these themes relate to the basic credal doctrine and the teaching of major figures in church history.

A.3.1.2. Cultural Context

All baptized people are called to make Christ known as saviour and Lord and to share in the renewing of his world (Book of Alternative Services).

- Identify the local contexts in which theology is formed and how that context contributes to the shape of the theology and church practice.
- Demonstrate awareness of the pains and stresses in their own context, and of the spiritual and ethical issues raised there.
- Demonstrate an awareness of the cultural contexts that shaped Anglicanism and how this has contributed to the strengths and challenges for Anglicanism in their own context
- Engage the tools of the social sciences to reflect upon issues of race, class and gender and their impact upon theology and church practices.
- Become familiar with environmental issues and be able to articulate a theological response to these.
- Be sensitive to the global character of the Church and the relationship between the North American church and the wider global communion.

- Be aware of and attentive to the contributions of and challenges faced by First Nations people in our context, particularly in aftermath of residential schools.

A.3.1.3. Personal and Spiritual Formation

And that you will continually pray to God the Father, by the mediation of our only Saviour Jesus Christ, for the heavenly assistance of the Holy Ghost; that, by daily reading and weighing of the Scriptures, ye may wax riper and stronger in your ministry; and that ye may so endeavour yourselves from time to time to sanctify the lives of you and yours, and to fashion them after the rule and doctrine of Christ, that ye may be wholesome and godly examples and patterns for the people to follow (Book of Common Prayer)

- Move toward a fuller understanding of one's call to ministry, service or study and its relation to academic preparation.
- Offer leadership in community worship.
- Learn to discern the place of God in one's own life and in those of others.
- Bear witness to one's own experience of God's love and grace for the encouragement of others.
- Show evidence of lives increasingly formed and sustained by trust in and dependence on the gifts and grace of God
- Demonstrate commitment to loving service in the Church rooted in a sustained and growing love of God in Christ.
- Understand the importance of offering their lives in service to the Friend of sinners.
- Become rooted and growing in a disciplined life of prayer shaped in Anglican common prayer and life within the demands of initial training and the expectations of public ministry.
- reflect with insight on personal strengths and weaknesses, their gifts and their vulnerability
- Demonstrate evidence of personal and spiritual growth and self-awareness.
- Exercise appropriate care of self, accountability to others and be aware of how to access support when needed.
- Exercise insight in handling conflict and its resolution
- Show a genuine commitment to the Christian faith as lived through the Anglican Communion
- Demonstrate a healthy, loyal and not-uncritical relationship to their diocese and national church / province

A.3.1.4. Capacity for Ministerial and Public Leadership

As a priest it will be your task to proclaim by word and deed the gospel of Jesus Christ, and to fashion your life in accordance with its precepts. You are to love and serve the people among whom you work, caring alike for young and old, strong and weak, rich and poor. You are to preach, to declare God's forgiveness to penitent sinners, to pronounce God's blessing, to preside at the administration of holy baptism and at the celebration of the mysteries of Christ's body and blood and to perform the other ministrations entrusted to you. (Book of Alternative Services)

Wherefore consider with yourselves the end of your ministry towards the children of God, towards the spouse and body of Christ; and see that you never cease your labour, your care and diligence, until you have done all that lieth in you, according to your bounden duty... (Book of Common Prayer)

- Articulate the nature of the priest's vocation and identity.
- Give an account of one's vocation to ministry and mission and one's readiness to receive and exercise ordained ministry as a deacon/ priest within the Church of God.
- Demonstrate familiarity with responsibilities appropriate to the newly ordained working under supervision
- Be able to reflect upon different types of ministry and understand the particular ministries to which they are called.
- Demonstrate the capacity for effective collaborative leadership and an ability to work in teams in a range of settings
- Demonstrate an ability to improve team-working and leadership skill
- Preside effectively and gracefully over worship, especially eucharist.
- Engage in pastoral leadership in a supervised practical setting, monitored by the diocesan bishop or his/her representative.
- Develop skills to recognise gifts in others and to equip them to serve.
- Engage in pastoral leadership in a supervised clinical setting.
- Preach effectively in public contexts with supervised assessment.
- Understand and participate in the drama of worship and gain a sense of the priest's or deacon's role therein.
- Become aware of the public character of theology.
- Assess strategies for active justice-seeking mission.
- Become aware of and exposed to a variety of ministry settings; e.g: Aboriginal ministry, urban ministry, Northern ministry and rural ministry.
- Show a secure grasp of exegetical and communication skills, in theory and in practice, in the contexts of worship, group-study and the media
- Demonstrate gifts and capacity to offer pastoral care
- show understanding of how children and adults learn in order to nurture others in faith development
- Demonstrate an awareness of the church's role and opportunities in public life, and in collaborative and well-informed working with ecumenical partners, other faith communities and secular agencies.
- Understand basic administration including stewardship of resources, vision, prioritisation, collaborative working, finance and accountability.

- Demonstrate an understanding of the theory and practice of mission and evangelism, changing expressions of church life, and their relation to the local context.

Skills for teaching and learning

Will you endeavour so to minister the word of God and the sacraments of the new covenant, that the reconciling love of Christ may be made known and received? (Book of Alternative Services) WILL you then give your faithful diligence always so to minister the doctrine and sacraments, and the discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church hath received the same, according to the commandments of God; so that you may teach the people committed to your care and charge with all diligence to keep and observe the same? (Book of Common Prayer)

- Demonstrate the capacity to write clearly in a way that leads the reader (hearer) through
- the points made in a way that brings clarity and credibility to the teaching purpose of a
- particular piece of work.
- Show the capacity to use appropriate research methods in the preparation of a piece of
- writing intended to support the teaching ministry.
- Show an awareness of the resources that are available to support the research necessary to
- support the teaching ministry
- Assess the merit, usefulness, and applicability of various types of theological publications
- and resources.
- Develop communication skills, both written and oral, that are clear, engaging and effective.

2. Final Report of the Indaba Process

Affirmations and Acknowledgements

First and foremost, there is a strong affirmation of the multiple and diverse contexts of the Anglican Church of Canada, both across and within dioceses. This is simply a given for whatever is to be done into the future regarding the call, formation, education and deployment of priests. There is commitment to ongoing responsible local adaptation of whatever is produced from this endeavour. It leads to questions regarding methods of delivery of our educational resources, the content of programmes and questions of justice regarding access to these resources. It also leads to questions about how can we know and trust that a priest educated in a particular school or programme and ordained by a particular bishop is qualified for other ministry postings elsewhere in the country?

The Gathering acknowledged in a generalised way that indeed the church is in the midst of great change and articulated a general acceptance that for the most part we are not confident that we know, or can imagine, what the church will look like in the future. Some have asked if this is another period of reformation in which we find ourselves. The experience of these complexities leads to questions about what competencies will be needed for this unknown future church. It also brings with it a sense of insecurity about actually naming what these competencies might be. Also expressed was the observation that no matter what future *unknowns* we need to engage toward, we still need to provide priests to the parishes we have now.

Finally, the Gathering expressed a deep awareness of the diminishing capacity of the Church to support and sustain much of our current system: parishes, stipendiary priesthood, future employment opportunities, theological education schools and programmes.

General Comments

Learning Outcomes and Standards

Overall people found the learning outcomes or competencies to be helpful and worked with it. The outcomes offer a more holistic view of what we are looking for. There are a number of specific comments directed to the outcome document that have been collected and listed. While there are few comments about taking any of these competencies or outcomes out of the lists, there are many comments about ordering, organizing and focus e.g. and the need for a more articulately Anglican or missional focus.

Some groups struggled with the task. They identified all the possible categories of jobs and roles for priests and wondered how to apply learning outcomes without having a more secure sense of focus — is this a conceptual ‘priest’ we are trying to identify, a rector or incumbent, something else? This became especially true for some as the conversation of learning outcomes and competencies moved towards questions of common standards. It became more difficult to talk about theological education outcomes without talking about deployment. This becomes very difficult — it’s easier to imagine standards for the educational programmes themselves than for the people going through the education programme and the people whose task is to maintain the accountability to these standards within the system.

This being said, there was a general sense that identifying common standards is a good idea. It seems like a good direction to take but we are quite uncomfortable about wanting them. We haven’t yet gotten into the substance of the discussion of what these standards are. In our conversations this was more likely than not to leads us to tangential questions that need to be clarified before engaging what these might look like. Are there *bona fide* standards that are essential to the carrying out of the job of priest similar to what you might have in other professions?

There are significant questions still about accountability: who is accountable to whom and how will this be supported systemically? These are yet to be resolved.

Some fear that common standards are impossible but noted that if you think standards have mischief in them then imagine the mischief in no standards.

National Standards: regionally interpreted, appropriated adapted and administered with mutual accountability

Comments:

- This is not about lowering standards. Quite the contrary, people seem open to holding ourselves to high standard, and wanting to meet these, when accompanied by creative ways of meeting these core standards. It's about delivery and creative models of delivery of training
- Standards need to be broadly defined and there are concerns about adaptation. How do we make these adaptations so that those who learn differently (especially noting cultural differences) don't end up falling behind? How do we adapt locally and honour national standards?
- There is some affirmation that different dioceses or Provinces would have different standards e.g. competencies in knowledge of language and culture
- The levels of competency may be regionally identified
- Standards may be prioritised through the lenses of (a) must have; (b) should have; (c) may have.
- There is openness to having external assessors and accountability checks and balances nationally to support a mutual accountability. There is no single mind on testing or exams — but the language of testing seems more palatable than the language of exams.
- There is openness to imagining a variety of ways of testing these standards in ways that are culturally appropriate — e.g. exegesis through writing, orally, through dance/music can still measure
- There is some sense that the House of Bishops needs to develop and agree to a list of accountabilities amongst themselves. Is there a way of making these canonically binding for Bishops?
- Standards will be helpful to clergy looking for work
- Standards will be helpful to resource terminations
- Standards do provide another point of gate-keeping

- For some there it is a struggle trying to connect context and mission with standards, structures and systems. For example, there is a fear that raising standards is unrealistic — Don't we just need priests who love Jesus and love people? — is this a frustration default position?
- Who assesses the assessors?
- Is information adequately shared in order to support good assessments and accountability?
- Recognize that colleges have other accountabilities

At this point we have energy, direction and interest in common standards and no specificity about what they are.

Life Long Learning Affirmed as a Value

There is a high value for life-long learning. How might we address the expectations and requirements for on-going, life-long learning?

- The 'complete package' of a priest ought not to be expected all 'at once' — we need to develop and be tested over time
- The "Grids" from Theological Education in the Anglican Communion use a framework that speak of development "over time." This helpfully leads to questions of what we can expect and when.
- Those critical of the language of outcomes and standards suggest that the key is to engage in the process of lifelong learning.
- Who is responsible for monitoring, evaluation and accountability over time?
- Perhaps there are grids or timelines we can suggest to track learning paths?
- The length of the outcome lists (see "Learning Outcomes") can be useful in inspiring life-long learning (post-ordination)
- Continuing education is a missing piece in these outcome lists
- Continuing education needs to be modelled by bishops
- The idea of portfolios — personal file of ongoing learning — has some energy. This is something that can be carried with the cleric as part of their file that they can take with them throughout their professional career.

Master of Divinity and other Ways of Theological Education

- What about the other models and ways: e.g. practice-based learning?

- Need to imagine other ways of getting the training needed
- Note that the term ‘minimal standards’ is dismissive
- For others the Master of Divinity is an important resource or an assumption — the question is how do people access the competencies if not through Master of Divinity. An example might be the bar: you don’t need an LLB to be a lawyer, you need to pass the bar. If you have the degree it’s easier for you but there are other ways.
- Not hearing defensiveness from academy — for example there seems to be an openness to the idea of external examiners
- Do MDiv type standards fit the emerging church ministry types? Don’t know –to - yes, but more needs to be added to the 4 fundamental competency areas.
- Note that “missional” does not sound well to indigenous peoples.

What Sort of Church do we Want?

- The unknown is a big deal for us. It is scary and makes us hesitate. Is it bad enough yet for us to begin to make the changes that will lead us to embrace the leadership competencies and education standards that might equip us for the new emerging church? Do we even know enough to start? It is emerging differently in different places.
- An educated clergy, ready to use their competencies to help them move into an unknown future is a challenge to congregations: are our congregations ready? What further skills for clergy are needed in order to manage these processes?
- It’s difficult to talk about competencies when we don’t know the church’s needs in this time of change — but we have to do this or we will fall even further behind -> this leads us to see the importance of competencies that will equip leaders for change
- Captured our imagination — how to equip priests to draw together identity and tradition to draw a congregation forward - yes – but what about what the parishes want
- It is a necessity to have clergy who are technically capable and use the resources available.
- Sustainability concerns are raised with respect to stipendiary priesthood, professional anxieties and expectations for employment opportunities

Next Steps

- The will was expressed to continue to explore and hone national standards — regionally interpreted, appropriately adapted and administered and mutually accountable
- Continue to collect expressed standards from the dioceses and analyse

- Continue to collect standards from schools and programs and analyse
- Like to see prototype of this in a Province with local examiners (not Ontario — too many resources) — agreed standards with various local adaptations
- Edit and affirm the outcome lists
- Clarify job descriptions for priest — different roles/functions

3. Additional Ideas Emerging

During the course of their work together over nearly two years, the Theological Education Working Group had the opportunity to reflect on a number of ideas which emerged in the context of their work. The following five ideas were presented as such — emerging ideas — in a presentation by Bishop John Chapman. It is hoped that further work might cause these ideas to develop.

a. A National Faculty

Some degree granting institutions already partner with local training programmes to provide high quality theological education in remote areas in time-intensive and locally culturally appropriate programmes. The success of these initiatives could be built upon by inviting all colleges to participate in a “National Faculty”, donating time and other resources to the common cause of theological education provision in rural and remote areas. Such an initiative would also foster a spirit of cooperation both amongst the colleges, and between colleges, training programmes and dioceses.

b. School for Bishops

At present there is no existing formal structure in which new bishops are provided an orientation to matters of candidacy discernment, formation, assessment, education, deployment and other ‘human resources’ matters. It is suggested by the Theological Education Working Group that a regular ‘course’ for new (and refresher for not-so-new) bishops be a regular addition to the House of Bishops’ meetings, perhaps on a day before or after the regular meeting, and that experienced resource people be invited to orient and equip the bishops for this work.

c. National Bursary programme

It is suggested that there be established a National Bursary programme for candidates for ordained ministry (or that the Anglican Foundation be approached regarding its existing programme) with criteria including that the student be a postulant who has been recommended by ACPO and is participating in a diocesan candidacy process that is an accountable process following national standards for such.

d. 1% Tithe

This initiative, requiring further definition, relates to the National Bursary idea. The idea is to encourage parishes to donate 1% of their budgets to theological education through the national bursary, thereby participating directly in the raising up and training of the Church's next generation of leaders.

e. National Criteria for recognition of theological programmes.

The question of criteria for recognition of theological colleges as 'affiliated with the Anglican Church of Canada' has been an ongoing concern and needs to be explored. There are both programmatic, identity and legal considerations to be made.

4. Recommendations to Faith Worship and Ministry

4.1 That FWM take to General Synod a motion asking the Primate to establish a *Commission on Theological Education and Formation for Presbyteral Ministry*, with the following further recommendations:

- That the membership be by Primatial appointment and include a healthy diversity of members with the skills necessary to do the job
- That funding for such a Commission be secured by the Council of General Synod
- That the Commission work with the Faith Worship and Ministry Committee, reporting to both the Council of General Synod through FWM
- That its work continue on the bases established at the National Gathering on Theological education 2010 with a specific focus on:
 - The development of national standards based on *Learning Outcomes for Preparation for Ministry in the Anglican Church of Canada* and based on analysis of existing practice of standards within dioceses
 - The development of guiding criteria for responsible local adaptation, translation, administration
 - The development of avenues for mutual accountability
- That the Commission work in cooperation with the Programme Committee for Leadership for Ministry of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada
- That the Commission consult ecumenically, making particular use of the Churches' Council for Theological Education.

- That it work with the Philanthropy department toward a national bursary programme (further hone criteria for bursary —)
- That it work to develop a national faculty & programme for effecting cooperation amongst the colleges and training programmes to enable remote theological education

4.2 That Faith Worship and Ministry direct staff to maintain and develop the website originally created for the National Gathering on Theological Education on www.anglican.ca

4.3 That FWM assist the Association of Anglican Deacons in Canada to work with the House of Bishops in the development of Standards for discernment, formation, education and deployment of deacons.

4.4 That FWM forward this Report to the Participants in National Gathering on Theological Education January 2010 and make public on www.anglican.ca

4.5 That FWM to communicate to the House of Bishops the following:

- That the House of Bishops undertake a study of their diocesan standards, values and procedures relating to candidacy for ordained ministries.
- That the House of Bishops undertake initiatives to create diocesan requirements for life-long learning and continuing education
- That the House of Bishops begin a process to create a Bishops' school and/or Handbook to serve as an orientation to matters of discernment, formation and education for ministry, ACPO and diocesan assessment processes, as well as other ministry oversight issues.
- That the House of Bishops form a committee to update the ACPO Handbook and report back to the House of Bishops at their autumn, 2010 meeting. (accomplished, January 6, 2010)

Expressions of Thanks

Very special thanks are due to

The Facilitator: *Janet Marshall*

The Chaplains: *Andrew Asbil and John Campbell*

The Indaba Rapporteurs: *Bruce Myers, Flo Tracy, Chris Barrigar, Mark Rogers, Karen Chalk*

The Staff at the Manoir D'Youville

The Staff for the Committee: *Jo Abrams and Eileen Scully*

Volunteer Drivers from the Diocese of Montreal, especially Ardyth Robinson

The Theological Education Working Group is especially grateful to the Board of the Anglican Foundation for the financial assistance without which this conference would not have been able to take place.



THE
ANGLICAN
FOUNDATION
OF CANADA

Supporting Our Church for the Future

Members of the Theological Education Working Group

The Rt. Rev'd John H. Chapman, Bishop of Ottawa (Chair)

The Rev'd Dr. Jane Barter Moulaison, University of Winnipeg, Diocese of Rupert's Land

The Rev'd Eric Beresford, Atlantic School of Theology, Halifax, Nova Scotia

The Rev'd Paul Gehrs, Assistant to the National Bishop, Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada

The Ven. Janet Griffith, Diocese of Montreal

The Rev'd Paul Jennings, Montreal Diocesan Theological College

The Rt. Rev'd Mark MacDonald, National Anglican Indigenous Bishop

The Rev'd Dr. Eileen Scully, Interim Director of Faith Worship and Ministry (staff)

The Rev'd Dr. Todd Townshend, Huron College, London Ontario

The Rt. Rev'd Patrick Yu, Area Bishop of York-Scarborough, Diocese of Toronto

The D'Youville Report: An Executive Summary

From January 5 to January 7 2010, the first ever National Gathering on Theological Education for Presbyteral Ministry was held in Chateauguay, Quebec. Those in attendance included the House of Bishops, representatives from seventeen theological educational institutions, and personnel responsible for processes of ordination candidacy within their dioceses. The event was organised by the Theological Education Working Group of Faith Worship and Ministry. The conference involved presentations on the priestly vocation, shifting contexts of ministry and mission, and introduced the question of national standards through presentations on learning outcomes and procedures for accountability. The process of *indaba* was used to assist discernment groups in grappling with the wide variety of challenging issues.

The gathering was able to make a number of strong affirmations. There was strong affirmation of the multiple and diverse contexts of the Anglican Church of Canada, both across and within dioceses. A commitment to ongoing responsible local adaptation of whatever is produced from the endeavour of national standards was also asserted. These affirmations led to questions regarding methods of delivery of educational resources, the content of programmes and questions of justice regarding access to these resources.

The Gathering acknowledged that the church is in the midst of great change in the midst of which we cannot know or even imagine we know what the church will look like in the future. The experience of these complexities led to questions about what competencies will be needed for this unknown future church. Also expressed was a deep awareness of the diminishing capacity of the Church to support and sustain much of our current system: parishes, stipendiary priesthood, future employment opportunities, theological education schools and programmes.

Emerging from the conference was a desire to explore national standards for theological education for presbyteral (priestly) ministry in the Anglican Church of Canada, drawing on the *Learning Outcomes* presented during the Gathering. These are based upon existing documents, such as those from the working party *Theological Education for the Anglican Communion*, the Association of Theological Schools and reports and recommendations relating to ministry in indigenous communities in Canada, and built up from commonly agreed existing standards.

The Learning Outcomes are based on five key areas of assessment: religious heritage, cultural context, personal and spiritual formation, capacity for ministerial and public leadership, and skills for teaching and learning.

Recommendations have been made to the Faith Worship and Ministry Committee of General Synod with the intention of continuing the momentum begun at the gathering and move ahead with this work.

Appendix 1. Opening Remarks by Bishop John Chapman

We currently look upon a future that is unknown to any of us. Our world is unfolding with such speed that we are left without breath or opportunity to plan. Religious voices stagger as they struggle to respond, if they respond at all.

Loud voices can be occasionally heard offering simple solutions. The solution is heard, tried by a few, but soon we move on to newer voices, hoping that eventually we will hear from God in a manner that addresses our personal and communal need.

All of us gathered here have struggled faithfully to train and form leaders who are able to draw from the depth of our spiritual traditions; exegete the narratives of our faith and practice in such a manner that the promises of God may be heard by all; and, enable the mission of Jesus to focus all of our hearts and define our work. We long to form ordained leaders able touch this generation of God's people in ways that are faithful to God. For decades we have examined our methodology, funded research, conducted surveys, formed learned societies to help us understand the people and circumstances in which we are called to evangelize, pray, pastor and teach.

Libraries are filled with the research we have requested in response to the question, *what is the place of theological education for today's church?* Typically our conclusions comment upon curriculum content, standards, vocational discernment, the context for ministry, praxis based education versus academic discourse, locally raised leadership and professionally trained leadership, and this list goes on. While the question is good and the ensuing responses helpful, I wonder if we could at least recognize that while much of what we do is good and helpful, we have not faced the very real and most important question,

... are we prepared to make the radical changes necessary in theological education and formation for ministry to meet the needs of today's church?

While we have not hidden ourselves from the hard questions, or even conversations, we consistently step back from taking any concrete action. Our hope, the hope of those who have given much of their time and skill to facilitate this conference, is that we will put in place a process that will be given authority – authority to work, authority to make concrete recommendations to our General Synod and Provincial Synods, authority to work nationally and authority to set priorities. To this end, we will need to do our work mindful of the following:

1. We will need to do what is necessary that will not only encourage but obligate the Church to consider theological education and the making ready of ordained clergy as the highest priority!
 - a. After all, our multiple studies over the decades have pointed to one uncontested truth: God calls us
 - i. to provide good leadership
 - ii. Sound Teaching
 - iii. And loving care to nurture God's children.

That is,

- *Great* leaders
- *Wise and skilled* teachers,
- And, people prepared to *love* the people of God.

2. While many great leaders are called and trained, many as well are ordained for somewhat dubious reasons. I call these “pastoral ordinations” - individuals who present no strong reason to be rejected yet, there is no compelling reason to ordain them. The only beneficiary of a “pastoral ordination” is the individual himself or herself. These people typically do not serve the church well. Yet, every Diocese continues the practice of pastoral ordinations. To this end:
 - a. Will we be intentional about calling out of our communities of faith the people the church needs rather than adjudicate those who feel called but may not necessarily be called by the church to meet the needs of the church?
 - b. Are we prepared to form and hold clear national educational and formational standards for our seminaries and training institutions?
 - c. Will we hold our seminaries and educational institutions accountable to the mandate of God’s call for great leaders, skilled teachers, and clergy able to love their communities?
3. Are we prepared to radically and substantially support those whom the *church* calls to ordained ministry? The people of God called to the priestly office are rare, special people. They need guidance, protection, support, encouragement, and love. They need even greater leaders, even more skilled and wise teachers — they need to be mentored.
 - a. Are we prepared to do what we can to form our clergy into the living sacraments God is calling them to become?
 - b. Are we prepared to provide for them the great teachers and scholars that they will need in order to be formed, educated and trained for their Godly responsibilities.
4. Are we prepared to conduct full and comprehensive evaluations of our training institutions, our seminaries and faculty, our discernment processes, our financial priorities ...
5. Are we prepared to leave behind provincialism and embrace a national strategy regarding theological education?
6. Will we seriously embrace the notion of national standards, appropriately implemented for each region of the country?

Conclusion:

The challenge my friends, is before us. Are we expecting that at the end of this conference to commission yet another study, which will ultimately draw conclusions already filed in the General Synod Archives. Or, are we prepared to put in place a process and most important, give the process authority to make concrete recommendations to our National Church and Dioceses regarding our future work in theological education and the making ready of our priests for tomorrow’s church. A great opportunity is before us. The Church, our

Dioceses, people in the pews, seminaries, training institutions and students are all asking us to attend to this topic with courage and conviction. Let us seize this opportunity trusting in God's presence and guiding breath.

Appendix 2. *Culture, Context, Parish, Academy* by Bishop Mark MacDonald

The material attached to this introductory page is an outline of a talk given at a summit on theological formation at Thornloe College last May. For now, the outline is an agenda for the future of Indigenous ministries. In this brief page, however, I want to highlight some specifics critical for this conference and, hopefully, a continuing discussion on these matters. Although these observations have come through a lot of experience in Indigenous leadership development, they identify matters of concern to the larger church.

From a Classicist to an Empirical Pluralist Approach

Since the middle of the last century, Western society has, as Bernard Lonergan tells us, begun a major shift in its way of understanding culture. Formerly, it was thought that there was only one culture: that which is found in the higher levels of Western society and education. This “classicist” view was shared by the churches of the West and influenced most of aspects of religious life, especially the training of clergy. Culture was often seen, from this view, as the goal of the training and formation and formation of clergy.

The shift we now witness is to an “empirical and pluralistic” view of culture. With it we have begun to see culture as more fluid, diverse, and local. Unlike those of the past, we believe that culture is always present. We have even begun to understand our churches and diocese as cultures. Somewhat slowly, we are also beginning to see this shift influence our programmes of theological training and formation.

In the classicist view, the Academy was the central place of theological learning. Many of us in church leadership today began our ministry during a time when the centre of gravity in theological formation was in the Academy. Although we said prayers, maintained chapels, and practiced Christian community, the standards of our training and its fundamental rhythms were from the academy.

Finding our Centre of Gravity

The scene has changed dramatically over the past three decades, with a sharp devaluation of the academy and, with it, a much stronger focus on the context of ministry, especially the parish. There has been a proliferation of programmes that provide training outside of traditional academic training. In the more marginalized areas of society served by the church, the pace of this development was more rapid. We could say that the centre of gravity has shifted towards the parish and, in some cases, completely away from the academy.

We are now in a time of very appropriate mid-course evaluation. It appears that putting the centre of gravity in the parish was not the answer to all of our problems and we must now make some

necessary and critical adjustments. In this presentation, we suggest that the centre of gravity for theological education must be found in the balance of four centres:

1. Mission
2. Cultural Context
3. The Congregation
4. The Academy

We note that, in this scheme, the order is reversed from the direction of formation in the past. Though it is necessary to maintain a careful balance between the different centres, the discussion begins and is shaped by mission.

Raising Standards and Distributing Formation and Educational Assets

In the course of the many attempts to expand the reach of ordained ministry, particularly in marginal areas, it is often expressed, directly or indirectly, that standards need to be lowered to allow more people access. This is neither wise nor responsible. In a world like ours, with the adaptation it will require, it seems that we can and must raise our standards overall to meet the challenge. Experience in bush ministry would suggest, however, that a redistribution of responsibility, along with our educational assets is required by our church nationwide. In the bush, things have always gone best when we have high standards of discipleship, coupled with a high degree of sharing in a collegial and communal ministry. Applied broadly, it would require a demonstrated commitment to life-long learning as the foundation of ordained leadership development and, at the same time, a pattern of formation and of being-church that involves constant and continual engagement in the essential aspects of our faith. It would also mean that we would expand the educational responsibility beyond a single clergy person acting alone in an area of mission and ministry. This would demand the development of a strategy for Education and Formation that would be church-wide and catechumenal. More than that, it would require a very different way of thinking about how we relate to Western society, since much of our educational system today is based on a hidden assumption that other institutions cooperate in the overall training and formation of our church members.

The Missiological Renewal of Church Structures

Most of us have grown up with a structure of congregational life that served the church well for a number of decades. What we think of as the normative parish is something that we would like to give everyone, yet financial and cultural realities make this impossible. Indeed, the aspirational norm is no longer close to being the statistical norm. Though the style of parish churches that became the norm during and after the industrial revolution may always remain an important part of our missiological strategy, we must find other ways to be church, especially in marginal areas. We cannot restrict the church to those communities and congregations that can afford our preferred way of being church. If we respond adequately to the concerns mentioned above, we will begin to see increasing

pressure, not to eliminate the way we are church today, but to expand the ways in which communities may become churches in the future.

Outline for Consultation on Anglican Theological Education in the First Nations Context

May 20-23, 2009 at Thornloe College, by Mark MacDonald

Training Standards

- I. We have not moved forward, since Hendry and Deloria either in providing more pastoral leadership for Indigenous Ministries or in providing institutions or programmes that will help. We can, however, identify some stable patterns that have, over time, been successful and life giving. Standards must emerge in concert with these patterns.
- II. Programmes that have worked in Indigenous communities have had these elements:
 - A. They have been incremental, modular, progressive
 - B. Vocational discernment is on-going, on the job, as is learning
 - C. Seminary connection is very helpful (but not necessary)
 - D. Practical effectiveness is critical; people must be directly helped and served
 - E. Scripture is critical as a living narrative interwoven with the narrative of Indigenous life
 - F. Focused broadly but not obsessed with priesthood — catechists, deacons, lay pastors (some have found it useful to describe people with vocational potential in ministry as catalysts).
 - G. Goal is to assist the “grandmas” and “uncles” (catalysts in Indigenous communities) in their desire to help others
 - H. Programmes must have a business model that works — for everyone: sustainable, replicable (and mobile), transformational, and local
 - I. Very ecumenical but is related to Anglican Church (local effectiveness takes lead)
 - J. Connecting disciplines are emphasized: daily prayer, daily study
 - K. Identity that is Aboriginal and Christian is affirmed and developed
 - L. It never stops: participation in the programme continues after completion of the basic required units, especially for seminary trained clergy
 - M. Sacred Circle Leadership (as opposed to War Chief leadership — acting alone to seize power in a time of extreme crisis) — leadership where a circle of “elders” (including church workers and clergy) support and assist one another in leadership, often times serving as the incumbent
- III. Finding the Centre of Gravity in Theological Education
 - A. It used to be in the Academic World
 - B. For a time it was in the Parish
 - C. Today it is found in the balance of Four Things:
 1. The Academic World
 2. The Parish
 3. Cultural Context

4. God's Mission

IV. Standards: Equivalence or more is the key, in terms of academic performance; generally, this will mean a critical stance towards colonial bias in evaluation and aboriginal communities doing the evaluation (Note: The following is a general pattern and would not exclude the possibility of a standard seminary education. It would actually insure more folks would enter into the standard seminary education and other forms of advanced educational work.). Character of an Indigenous minister:

- A. Gospel based
- B. A good relative and maintains a respectful stance towards all (K'e), which includes regular community with two groups in the Gospel
- C. A Wicasa Wakan — a Holy Person working in a council
- D. Has authority of a call (rather than institution sanction alone)
- E. Deals with spiritual issues relevant to the population
- F. Takes seriously local sovereignty
- G. Almost always an elder as opposed to a "war" chief (see II. M, above)
- H. May be quite counter the larger culture
- I. A scholar of Indigenous language and culture and is practiced in the translation of ideas into local thought
- J. A practical/mystical approach
- K. Begins to speak the language of the larger church (TEAC)
- L. Able to make disciples and is bringing people to new life

V. Luke 10:1-12 is a key text for Indigenous ministries (and now all the way to vs. 20 is sometimes added)

- A. First there is a local focus: Ecological and Catholic:
 1. Ecology, Theology, Spirituality, and Morality are interdependent.
 2. Healing and training is "on the land" (which is not just an expression of convenience)
 3. This demonstrates the "Catholic" character of Aboriginal life, as it is revealed in Christ — Because our unity and wholeness is in Christ — the local contains the whole church and the whole contains the local without destroying its identity.
 4. This catholicity may be experienced and demonstrated in something like the Taiwanese church's practice — after completion of the basic work and five years on the job, they send someone to a year at some seminary in the Anglican Communion
 5. Seminaries could establish an Indigenous Ministries programme that would involve students in the work in aboriginal communities
- B. This is a spiritual battle (2 Cor. 10, Rev. 12 — are very practical in contemporary Indigenous communities.)

- C. Although equivalence must be demonstrated, success is not dependent upon it and can never be equated with mimicking Western cultural forms: success must be Aboriginal and Formational (Catechumenal)
 - 1. Aboriginal in that its success is Christian in that context
 - 2. Formational in that it raises the questions of spiritual formation in Christ for the whole family and nation(s) at a Catechumenal level:
 - a. It should allow more effective living on many levels: effective function in the larger culture and economy in a manner consistent with Indigenous values (transformed) and provide for the safety and independence of Indigenous families and their future
 - b. Self-determination
 - c. Will allow the full scope of the Indigenous prophetic role to emerge
- D. Following lead of effective predecessors in Indigenous ministry formation and education: NATA, NAM, NAIITS
 - 1. We form a council that could include: Elders, NAIITS, NAM, NIAB, ACIP, reps from CoN, the organizations represented here at this consultation, interested ministries and bishops — Sacred Circle
 - 2. Initially, this could be a working group, set up to advise us at a future consultation and laying the groundwork for the way ahead for a council and our work
 - 3. This council could set standards, advise work, and focus on formation for God's mission and providing life skills for the nations
- E. Always remember, it is all about Jesus and entering God's future

Appendix 3. Reflections on Ordained Ministry: A Three-Dimensional Vision by the Rev'd Dr. Todd Townshend

In order to fulfil its mission, the Church needs persons who are publicly and continually responsible for pointing to its fundamental dependence on Jesus Christ, and thereby provide, within a multiplicity of gifts, a focus of its unity. The ministry of such persons, who since very early times have been ordained, is constitutive for the life and witness of the Church.¹
*The term ordained ministry refers to persons who have received a charism and whom the church appoints for service by ordination through the in-vocation of the Spirit and the laying on of hands.*²

Purpose: to check for *Default Sensibilities that implicitly underlie the discussions about ordained pastoral ministry.*

- Bringing to consciousness (becoming aware of / remembering) our “leanings”
- All of what follows is vastly oversimplified. This is not “academic” –
- Important because distorted understandings conspire to weaken the church

Example 1. “Who is your favourite member of the Trinity?”

The Triune God is One! Yes, but functionally, undergirding our relation to God, there is usually both a “cognitive schema / pattern” and a “devotional attachment”. Leaning towards one “person” — not to the exclusion of the other two, but potentially creating an imbalance. . . distortion

Eg.

God, God, God . . . but referring only to “the Father” – or “the Creator”

Jesus, Jesus, Jesus . . .

Holy, Holy, Holy Spirit . . .

Example 2. “What is your Myers-Briggs ?”

personality-type indicator has really helped people when they work in teams. Why? Because they understand one another better. . . and why people tend to behave . . .

A Three Dimensional Vision

In some parts of Canada, in some parts of our history, there have been two “default sensibilities” — that have lurked under the discussions about ordained pastoral ministry. . . and identity.

- “High Church” / “Low Church

¹ *Baptism, Eucharist, and Ministry*, Faith and Order Paper 111 (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1982, paragraph M8).

² *Ibid.*, M7, c

However, these are so overly caricatured (and therefore, loaded with distortion), that they ceased to be accurate long ago. Most of us would have difficulty identifying solely with one of them now.

Here is what I think to be a better description of what underlies our understanding:³

Each has something important to contribute to the shaping of faithful Christian ministry

- *Calling*
 - *Profession*
 - *Office*
-

Calling:

- the significance of a clear, distinctive call from God to ordained ministry
- the desire for evidence of spiritual fire and depth that come from encounter/relationship with God

Following H. Richard Niebuhr (*The Purpose of the Church and It's Ministry*):

Four Basic Elements

1. the call to be a Christian
 - called to be a disciple of Jesus Christ
2. the secret call
 - the inner persuasion or experience of being directly summoned to take up the work of ministry
3. the providential call
 - recognizing that God has provided a person with “the gifts” required
4. the ecclesiastical call
 - the summons, invitation, extended by some community or institution of the Church to engage in the work of ministry

What happens when there is a gap or conflict amongst these? The person never gets to the point of inquiring, the summons / recognition never happens. Or there is a lack of confirmation of the call, (for good reasons and bad ie. gender, race, ethnicity).

If all four are there: Might say — “that’s all you need”, (God equips the called — no need for external standards) OR move on to “profession” (test, confirm, equip the called — meet some standards)

Q: Is a profound sense of personal calling sufficient to sustain pastoral leadership over time?

³ In what follows I am drawing on two sources. *Resurrecting Excellence*, Greg Jones & Kevin Armstrong, Eerdmans, 2006., and *God's Potters*, Jackson W. Carroll, Eerdmans, 2006.

Q: "I remain convinced that if you are called to it, being a pastor is the best life there is. But any life can be the best life if you're called to it." Eugene Peterson. What does he mean by "call"?

Profession:

the importance of education and training for the practice of a vocation
the desire for having a learned, competent clergy

This emphasis became increasingly prevalent in early 19th century in North America. The clergy were seen as "professionals" along with lawyers, doctors, etc., vocations where there was a need for specialized knowledge, training, and service that addressed human problems. This had as much to do with social status as it did with shaping and equipping people for a vocation. Over time, seminary education became a norm.

This also has roots in religious orders where a person commits his or her life to service.

Critics arise: the accusation of "professionalism"
and

A "profession of ministry" can be maintained apart from any convictions about God, or any convictions about the community's commitment to life patterned in the life, death, resurrection of Jesus or in the Kingdom of God . . .etc.

Still, most of us here would affirm some education, training, standards, provision of resources etc.

Office:

(NOTE: Differs from use in the introduction to the "Learning Outcomes" doc.) This is a modern emphasis on "office as function, official role", particular responsibility in a particular context, rather than "representative character of Christ – exemplars of holy living."

From Outcomes- "Anglican polity has usually distinguished between order and office. Office refers to the particular ministry undertaken by an individual as authorized by the church and / or licensed by the bishop. When we speak of office we are speaking of particular contexts of ministry that call for particular sets of competencies (skills, insight, knowledge, attitudes and behaviours) in order to undertake ministry effectively."

Here "office" means:

the importance of Christ-like character, or holiness, in the clergy.
the desire for clergy who can represent Christ in and for the community

This is primarily found in the ordained person being an “official” representative — bearing witness to Christ and in the imitation of Christ — bearing the “symbolic capital” of the whole community.

Here notions of being “set aside” to live exemplary lives, and to model, inspire, encourage, “adorn” Christ.

Pastoral vocation as office is to bear the office of Christ and the commitment to grow into it, diminishing the gaps between their character and the definitive Christ. To strengthen the coherence between “office” and “person”.

(Austin Farrar, “Walking Sacraments” . . . we are like pigmys, in giants armour)

GOAL: to recognize the overlapping strengths and mutually reinforcing complementarity of all 3.
Draw on the strengths of all three.

Suggested Reading:

___ St. Gregory the Great, *Pastoral Care*, Henry Davis, S.J., Newman Press

___ *Resurrecting Excellence*, Greg Jones & Kevin Armstrong, Eerdmans, 2006

___ *Reclaiming the Great Commission*, Claude E. Payne, Jossey-Bass, 2000

___ *Pastor: The Theology and Practice of Ordained Ministry*, William Willimon, Abingdon, 2002

___ *Faith as a Way of Life: A Vision for Pastoral Leadership*, Christian Scharen, Eerdmans, 2008

Appendix 5. Learning Outcomes Introduction: Part I

The Rev. Canon Eric Beresford
President: Atlantic School of Theology, Halifax, NS

Kenneth Leech is a well known priest in the Church of England. For many years he has conducted his ministry very much in the places where the rubber hits the road, amongst the poorest and most deprived communities in the east end of London. As a result of the realities that he dealt with in his ministry he became the founder of what is now the UK's largest charity dealing with youth homelessness, Centrepont. The centre of Ken's ministry however is as, what you and I would call, the rector of St. Botolph's Aldgate. But that is not what his license from the Bishop of London says, it reads that he is, "Theologian in Residence in the Parish of St. Botolph's..."

Ever since I first saw it many years ago, I have coveted that licence. Now some of you are going to say, "Of course you do. You are an academic!" But that actually misses the point. Although he was offered many academic appointments Kenneth Leech never understood himself as an academic, and he did not understand his role in the parish as "academic", and neither did I. In any case I don't think that the theological task can be defined in ways that are "merely" academic and detached from the life, worship, witness, and ministry of the church.

Anselm, medieval Abbot of Bec and Archbishop of Canterbury, famously defined theology as, "Fides quaerens intellectum" (Faith in search of understanding). Surely, if this is the theological task then it is also a task that is central to the mission of the church that we are all involved in. To be engaged in the task of faith in search of understanding is not simply something done in our theological colleges. It happens in our pulpits and in our pews, at bedsides, and at meetings where we do the business of the church and shape its present and future. It is the task and goal of every liturgy. It is the heart of faithful Christian living, faith seeking to be articulate not just in its words and ideas, but in lives lived, communities shaped and justice made visible.

When I was teaching Ethics at McGill University, I would often use case studies to help students to gain a deeper understanding of the ethical questions that we were addressing. Not infrequently, however, when students presented their case studies, I found myself asking "What is theological about this?" Put in other words, why is this particular ethical concern a matter for faith? Why is it a question for the church as church?

It seems to me that in the context of a church that is changing, whether we like it or not, and that serves a world that is changing rapidly around us, the task of faith in search of understanding is increasingly urgent. Let me just put forward the following points.

- 1) We can no longer do things that used to work but have not worked for some time. Gil Rendle, the well known author on congregational development, talks of building canoes in the desert! There used to be water here, and then canoes made sense. But there has been no water for some time and yet we continue to build canoes. We hope against hope that they might prove helpful, all contrary experience notwithstanding. Yet, as he reminds us, to continue to do the same thing expecting a different outcome is a definition of madness.
- 2) It is not simply a matter of our programs, of what we do, it is a question of who we are. The real question in front of us is who we are called to be in the place where God has called us to minister. It is about bringing together the deepest sense of who we are as the people of God (our scriptures, our traditions, our stories, our memories of the rogues and saints who have made us who we are), into conversation with where we are (the context in which we find ourselves). It is about identity and context.

Too often I find that clergy engage in ministry with only the haziest and most generalized sense of the context in which we minister. Sometimes that sense is disastrously inaccurate. There was one congregation in a small community in Western Ontario that was deeply committed to youth work. They were so committed that they had fired two Youth Ministers for being ineffective. Before they were going to be allowed to hire a third they were required to go through a careful visioning process with a consultant. What they discovered was, that they were a *retirement community*. There were no young people. At least, there were very few and most of them were in church. Now my point here is that this is not simply a programmatic concern. Rather, what the church needed to address was their deep sense that being a faithful church meant having successful youth work expressed in all the usual trappings of a youth group and youth presence in Sunday worship. What this community needed to address was the question of what it means to be church (identity) in a place without youth (context). They were engaged in the question of faith in search of understanding.

So what is the significance of all of this for the competencies, the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and comportments that are essential to healthy and effective ministry in this context? Well obviously the first answer is that we need to equip our leaders with the skills not only to read and understand and interpret the faith but also to read understand and interpret the context within which that faith is proclaimed. This double task is immensely challenging. It requires that we see ourselves more clearly than we ever have. It requires that we can understand our context with greater precision, with greater critical insight, and greater generosity, than our current understandings give us.

Not only *have* things changed but they continue to change. In truth those of us who are engaged in preparing candidates for ministry need to recognize that we are training priests for a church where

none of us knows what it will look like ten or twenty years from now. That means that we are training people who need to be flexible and responsive to situations that we do not yet understand, and they need to have the capacities to lead change in a church that has become quite expert in resisting change.

To understand what this demands of theological preparation for ministry I find it helpful to make a distinction between training and education. The two obviously overlap, but in essence I want to suggest that training is about developing the skills and knowledge that help individual to cope with situations that are known, understood, and to a degree, predictable. We can train people on how to deal with a wide variety of situations because those situations have been experienced before and we have a fund of information about different ways in which we can respond and the effects of those responses on the situation at hand. We can with some confidence speak of “best practices”, and what they look like. Education, on the face of it, often looks much less practical, but it is about developing the degree of understanding and insight that enables the student to respond to new, unforeseen, unpredicted and unpredictable situations. Often we do this by drawing on ideas or insights that we had not thought of for a long time. Sometimes those insights come from areas of our lives and experience that seem quite removed from the problem at hand. This sort of insight is more like improvisation than like reading music. Like successful improvisation it demands a greater, not a lesser, understanding and control of the fundamentals. A great improviser needs to know harmonic theory far better than someone who is simply reading a part.

Similarly a church leader facing new situations with few direct parallels in past experience needs more not less understanding of what it is that essentially shapes Christian identity. They need greater not lesser insights into what is going on in the wider society within which the Church is trying to find new patterns of being and ministering.

In this context, the reasons for the shift in theological education to a theologically informed outcomes based language, and to the language of competencies, becomes very clear. It is not enough to ask what we teach postulants but rather we need to ask what they learn; the skills, insight, knowledge, attitudes and behaviours that develop as a result of the educational process. We are being asked to assess the educational process, and the readiness of an individual candidate for ministry in a way that puts the emphasis on outcomes not on inputs. It is not enough to say I took certain courses, I need to indicate what I have learned in those courses, and how what I have learned relates to the competencies we seek in those who minister.

Outcomes based language is also active rather than passive. It used to be said that the point of a lecture was to get the information from the notes of the professor to the notes of the student without passing through the minds of either. Be that as it may, in theological education today the lecture is

only one pedagogical format amongst many and successful programs combine a range of practices both of teaching and for the assessment of learning.

Having said this, I want you to notice that we are not speaking about standards yet. We are talking about competencies. If we wish to go on to talk about standards we will need to also say something about how highly developed we expect these competencies to be when a student begins their theological education, or at the point of ordination to the diaconate, or later still at the point of ordination to the presbyterate, perhaps even to the episcopacy. The lists of competencies we expect at each of these points will probably have some overlap. However, the degree of development of those competencies might be expected to be markedly different at each step in this journey. In other words standards do not simply list competencies but also go on to indicate the level of achievement that is expected across the range of competencies.

Finally, where do the competencies you have before you come from? Jane Barter-Moulaïsson will address some of the details of the document in front of you as a starting point for our discussions in this consultation. Let me just indicate that this document is a product of work that has been going on around the communion, and across North America. Sources that were used include the standards that are set up by the Association of Theological Schools, which is the body that oversees and accredits most of the theological schools across this continent. Secondly we have drawn on the work of TEAC (Theological Education for the Anglican Communion). This was a working group established at the request of the Primates. It is worth noting that in the early work that led to the establishment of TEAC there was a sense that strengthening theological education across the Anglican Communion was essential if we were to be effective in mission and to address the current challenges facing the communion. We also incorporated elements from the work of the National Indigenous Conversation. In shaping this document we also paid attention to the work of ecumenical partners. For example, the United Church of Canada has recently gone through a significant process of looking at outcomes of theological education for ministry. Whilst we have a different understanding of the nature of ordained ministry we have learned from both the insights and challenges of that process. Last, but by no means least, we wanted this to be an Anglican document. So in choosing what resources we worked with, and how we drew on those resources, our thinking was shaped by the ordinals in which our Church gives liturgical expression to what it is that we believe we are doing when we ordain candidates to the priesthood.

This is surely where we must start. In truth we already have some standards. They are expressed in agreements that the Bishops have made together and articulated as a house, but these are, and should be built upon the Ordinal. It is after all in the ordinal that we commit ourselves as a Church to what we mean by ministry and what it is we expect of those who will minister as priests in God's Church.

Appendix 6. Procedures for Accountability — A Flow Chart Approach, by The Rev'd Paul Jennings and the Rt. Rev'd Dr. Patrick Yu

The purpose of this summary is to give an overview of various existing approaches to the problem of upholding common standards around ordination and licensing for ministry, and to try to put some kind of order into these several distinct approaches.

We are approaching this task through a “flow chart” method, which attempts to identify the fundamental decisions we face as a church on the question of standards, the ramifications of each possible choice, and the practical measures to which they might lead.

Two disclaimers must be given at the beginning:

- this survey in no way claims to be exhaustive. There may well be other solutions than the ones mentioned here – indeed the hope is that this will be a tool that will help us find novel solutions.
- this is in no way intended as an endorsement of the solutions surveyed. Some of them may have some promise for our context, others may not. The purpose here is to survey some of the ways in which various churches have responded to some of the challenges we face.

We begin with the fundamental question:

Do we ordain priests for the local church, or are we accountable to the larger church?

Clearly the answer must be in some sense both: in the Anglican tradition, priests are ordained and licenced by a specific bishop first of all for ministry within a specific diocese. Yet they are ordained according to a common ordinal into an order of ministry that should be recognized throughout the Anglican Church of Canada (indeed throughout the Anglican Communion). In practical terms, however, this alternative may present us with a dilemma. The particular needs of a diocese may make it appropriate in the local context to ordain someone whose training and discernment may not fulfil commonly agreed-upon standards. Yet this priest may then later transfer into another diocese.

I. If we choose to consider only the needs of the local church, another question arises:

Do we somehow distinguish a priest who does not meet common standards?

A. No, all priests are ordained and licenced without distinction. This is in effect the status quo.

Advantages: - responsive to local need
- simple

Disadvantages:- undermines any sense of common standards

- lack of clarity about a cleric's discernment and training for other bishops, selection committees, other Anglican jurisdictions and full communion partners

B. Yes, we attempt to retain a distinction between those priests chosen and trained according to a common standard, and those not. *How then do we make this distinction?*

1. Distinction made between different orders of priest. This is not really an option in Anglican tradition and polity, as we continue to use a single ordinal.
2. Distinction made in licencing by the diocese. This has been tried in some dioceses through the ordination of “locally called priests”, and in ECUSA by Canon 9 priests.

Advantages: - may be useful in geographically isolated communities, and in some ethnic communities

Disadvantages:- either we end up creating a two-tier priesthood
- or the distinction is lost altogether. The original intention of licencing for non-stipendiary work in a single community may not always be followed through. What if the priest moves to another community or diocese?
- the priest may not have the training to meet the demands of running a parish, or even of living up to the expectations of the ordinal
- the community may not fully recognize the authority of the priest

3. Distinction made by the national church by an additional level of certification. This is practised in the ELCiC in the form of a national church clergy “roster”. This is a list of all clergy who meet the national church standards of discernment and training, and thus are certified as eligible to apply for a call anywhere in the ELCiC. In an Anglican context, this could be adapted to allow for the freedom of individual bishops and dioceses to respond to local need. Clergy who do not meet the standard could still be ordained and licenced for a particular context, and could of course transfer dioceses at the discretion of the receiving bishop, but would not be listed on the roster without further training.

Advantages: - a common standard would be upheld
- clarity for other bishops and selection committees about a priest’s qualifications
- yet still flexibility to respond to local need
- priests ordained for local need would not be permanently sidelined, but could work towards certification by further training
- perhaps a tool to uphold professional standards by requiring ongoing continuing education for all clergy

Disadvantages:- who would administer the roster?

II. Returning to our original question, if we wish to remain accountable to the wider church

How do we assess common standards?

- A. An absolute, objective standard. This is the *status quo* in theory: the Ordination Prerequisite Document of 1986 names as the requirement for ministry in the ACC “a Bachelor’s degree plus a degree or diploma program of studies in a Theological College recognized by the ACC” — i.e. an M.Div. or equivalent.

Advantages: - a clearly articulated common standard
- ATS accreditation for M.Div. degree ensures an intentional and constantly developing program

- a high level of academic training

Disadvantages:- impracticable. There are simply not enough M.Div. trained candidates around to cover the need, at least in remote dioceses

- the high and increasing cost can no longer be born by the student or the church, particularly as it includes an undergraduate degree

- the standard is not being upheld, so to continue to pretend it is the standard leaves us with no effective standard at all

- questions as to whether the model of training reflects the needs of the church in a missional context

B. No clear standards. This is the *status quo* in practice.

C. Another standard, modelled perhaps on the M.Div. but adapted for our context.

Advantages: - a clearly articulated common standard

- flexibility to respond to our changing needs

Disadvantages:- the danger of simply “dumbing down” the M.Div. How do we ensure that the ideal of an educated clergy is not abandoned by inches?

If we need another standard, *who assesses, and how?*

1. Standards maintained by academic institutions, by identifying different programs as equivalent (in varying degrees) to the M.Div. This is in effect widely practised.

Advantages: - allows flexibility in program offering, while still orienting training on similar goals (e.g. ATS standards)

- allows the church to draw on the strengths of various local institutions, not all of which are ATS accredited

Disadvantages:- danger of sliding standards. Pressure from the church, from students, from competition between colleges tends to drive standards downward. Who can offer training with as little investment as possible?

2. Standards built into discernment process, by adding a theological component to our current practice. *What level of church should do the assessing?*

a. At the diocesan level. By Examining Chaplains, or similar.

Advantages: - responsive to local context

Disadvantages:- do dioceses have the resources to assess theological readiness to give leadership in the complex missional context of the church?

- danger of becoming meaningless, as it is too subject to the pressures and personal preferences of the diocesan administration. How does

this process produce a *common* standard, accountable to the wider church?

- b. At the provincial level, by adding a theological component to the ACPO process. This would be similar to the Colloquy in the ELCiC process. (For an example of a Colloquy, see below, Appendix 1)

Advantages: - works with an existing structure
- integrates the discernment of theological education with other aspects of the discernment process

Disadvantages:- danger of overburdening the ACPO process. Would require another set of assessors with a different skill set.
- would not work in terms of the timing of ACPO: the assessment of theological education would be at the end of the process, just prior to ordination, whereas the assessment ACPO is currently doing should be earlier in the process.
- this would then involve the cost of adding a second phase to the ACPO process, a colloquy just before ordination

- c. At the national level. Here we would be looking at some kind of nationally administered test, on the model of ECUSA's General Ordination Exams. (For an example of GOE questions, see below, Appendix 2)

Advantages: - a genuinely standard tool, that would give us comparative data on students' theological competence
- an opportunity for the church to set forth its expectations on theological competencies directly

Disadvantages:- considerable administrative and financial cost to set and mark the exam
- pressure on seminaries to "teach to the exam"
- requires a considerable investment of time by final year students, which would be disruptive of curriculum. A particular challenge in our context where most institutions develop curriculum in ecumenical partnerships.
- tendency of standardized exams to discriminate against cultural minorities

3. Standards assessed by a partnership of diocese, province, national church and theological schools.

What is the role of the church, and what tools might make the partnership more transparent, intentional, and accountable?

- a. A more clearly articulated list of competencies, academic as well as practical. The TEAC grids, as well as the ATS outcomes, would serve as a basis, but it would need to be contextualized. The United Church of Canada “Leadership Outcomes” standards would be an example of this approach.

Advantages:

- the church would enter into a more transparent process of reflection on its needs for the education of its clergy
- orientation on existing inventories would keep the church’s expectations consistent with that of the seminaries, and our ecumenical partners in education
- TEAC standards in particular integrate expectations for pre- and post-ordination training

Disadvantages:- how would the standards be determined? We would need a process to ensure that they are themselves theologically grounded, and agreed on by the church

- without some tools to assess and enforce these expectations, they would have little meaning

- b. A roster might be a tool to enforce these standards. See above.

- c. Co-ordination and co-operation with the theological schools, using their various strengths to fulfil different needs, such as remote education or continuing education.

Advantages:

- more efficient use of existing resources
- support for a variety of regional schools
- greater breadth and flexibility than any one school could achieve on its own

Disadvantages:- this must not become an instrument for church control of the schools. Ownership and planning of these programs would have to be negotiated between the church and the schools

- if we are not relying only on the free consumer market, how do we ensure a fair distribution of responsibilities and resources among the schools.