

Theological Education for the Anglican Communion: The Promises and Challenges of TEAC

J. EILEEN SCULLY*

Archbishop Rowan Williams has spoken often and strongly of the high priority theological education ought to have in the Anglican Communion. The assignment of such a place within a province's set of priorities finds its meaning in its very concrete local commitments, engagement with local contexts, the setting of standards, and the provision of resources. Setting such a priority for the life of the Anglican Communion as a whole means including and extending particular provincial concerns into the international forum. With that extension come the particular challenges inherent in any Communion-wide discussion. Within and across our diversities, do we have common language, meaning, and vision about what theological education is, or about Anglican ways of doing ministry, mission, and theological education?

The vehicle set up to begin the Communion-level work on theological education is the Primates' Working Party Theological Education for the Anglican Communion (TEAC). TEAC is one particular initiative, begun in and responsible to the meeting of Primates, around which has grown a Theological Studies department within the Communion office, committed beyond the work of TEAC to sharing information and developing extensive web-based resources. Records of the origins and program content of TEAC are readily available on

* Eileen Scully is Coordinator for Ministry and Worship for the Anglican Church of Canada. She has lectured in systematic and historical theology at St. Jerome's College, Wilfrid Laurier University, and the Waterloo Lutheran Seminary in Waterloo, Ontario, and at Huron College in London, Ontario. She also leads clergy and lay workers study days.

the Communion website,¹ where one can find not only reports, but also working briefs and other background information. TEAC and the staff are to be commended for their commitment to uphold transparency and consultation as high values and for the encouragement of conversation with their work.

My own involvement with TEAC has not been from within the working party, but from the perspective of a national (provincial) staff person with responsibilities for theological education within the Anglican Church of Canada. Receiving the fruits of TEAC's labors, particularly the outcomes-based grids for ordered and lay ministries, has been helpful in beginning conversations about the ways in which we might approach a new phase in shaping expectations and competencies for ministries in our own province. In the pages that follow I shall offer an overview of the development of TEAC, an introduction to their achievements to date, and the beginning of a critical and creative engagement with the process and content of their work. That content includes TEAC's statements of aims and objectives; their outcomes-based analyses of theological education (grids); and the 2007 Singapore Statement "The Anglican Way: Signposts on a Common Journey." One member of TEAC has said recently that their work is now off the ground and they hope to see that it doesn't merely circle around the airport but actually goes somewhere.² The critical engagement offered here is intended to serve that journey.

The Origins of TEAC

A preliminary working party on theological education was mandated at the 2001 meeting of the Primates at Kanuga, North Carolina. The 2002 meeting of Primates reestablished a working party, but it was not until 2003 that the work of TEAC began to take shape under that name and with a Chair and Secretariat established. Archbishop Gregory Venables, the Chair of TEAC, and Clare Amos, Communion

¹ <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/ministry/theological/>, and <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/ministry/theological/teac/index.cfm>. In this essay all factual information regarding TEAC, including its history, aims, objectives, and content, comes from this website, which is still being developed.

² T. W. Bartel, "How to Sabotage Anglican Theology," *Church Times* issue 7530 (July 6, 2007).

Office staff, report the strong commitment of the Primates to theological education.³ In fact, programmatically, TEAC seems to have been something of a unique creation of the meeting of Primates.⁴

TEAC is difficult to classify within the structures of the Communion. It is neither a formal commission of the Communion nor one of the official networks; it is still referred to as a “working party.” The fullest meeting associated with TEAC, in Johannesburg in 2006, included representatives of almost every province of the Communion. Their work built on the substantial and far-reaching preparatory work of those who developed briefs for each major area of work (Bishops; Priests and Transitional Deacons; Vocational Deacons, Catechists, and Licensed Lay Ministers; Laity; the Anglican Way). Membership did not follow a pattern of provincial nomination or representation, but more the pattern of Communion commissions, with appointment based on expertise as determined by the leadership of the working party. TEAC has reported to and led consultations with the Primates’ meetings each year since 2002, presenting its fullest report to the Joint Standing Committee of the Primates and the Anglican Consultative Council in 2006. But just where it sits within the Communion’s organizational structure is at present unclear. Perhaps this reflects the reality that a programmatic focus on theological education at the Communion level is a relatively new and organizationally evolutionary reality. TEAC’s 2006 report emphasizes that theirs is very much a work in progress. It suggests the creation of a network of provincially-appointed theological education officers related to each other through TEAC and, eventually, a permanent commission on theological education.

The evolution of TEAC from a small working party of the Primates’ meeting to a commission of more than thirty-five members

³ TEAC has reported to each of the meetings of the Primates and the Joint Standing Committee since 2002. The report made in 2006 to the Joint Standing Committee of the Primates and the Anglican Consultative Council is the most substantial. (Anglican Primates Working Party on Theological Education [TEAC], “Report to the Joint Standing Committee of the Primates and ACC,” 2006. <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/ministry/theological/teac/reports/rep2006.cfm>.)

⁴ It does not seem that any parallel programmatic work of such scope and potential longevity has been taken on by the Primates’ meeting. Further reflection on the implications for the Primates’ authority of such wide-reaching programmatic work is beyond the scope of this article.

plus staffing⁵ has been fuelled by the energy of the Primates, who have continued to endorse TEAC's project. Much has been said about the leadership of Archbishop Williams in helping to set theological education as a high priority in the life of the Communion.⁶ Communion-level work in theological education was initiated in 2001, before Williams's appointment. However, his personal commitment and passion for theological education at all levels of the church has helped to focus the effort and give it priority, funding, and resources. The Nottingham meeting of the Anglican Consultative Council in 2005 gave further encouragement. There is a general view that healthy theological education is vital to the life of the church.

General expressions of the desirability of healthy theological education float at the surface of much deeper concerns. TEAC has hovered under the radar for most watchers of Communion events; yet there is a correlation of presenting issues in theological education with present crises in the Communion. At both the 2005 Primates' meeting in Dromantine and the Anglican Consultative Council meeting in Nottingham, TEAC's report argued that theological education is necessary for

all Christian people to make sense of all God has given and revealed to us, in other people, in the world, in our place and time, in the Bible and, supremely, in our Lord Jesus Christ. It is the attempt to make connections between our daily life and the Christian experience of God, faith and life in the Spirit. It is the attempt to understand why trust in the Creator, Redeemer and Sanctifier

⁵ The Director of Theological Studies at the Anglican Communion Office, Clare Amos, is assisted by three Regional Associates: the Rt. Revd. Michael Fape, Bishop of Remo, Nigeria; the Revd. Joo Yup Lee, a priest of the Anglican Church of Korea; and the Revd. Sally Sue Hernandez Garcia, a priest of the Anglican Church in Mexico.

⁶ Williams writes, "I am convinced that we cannot be committed to the well-being of our common life and witness in the Anglican Communion without being committed to theological education and its appropriate delivery at all levels. It has become increasingly clear to me that theological education within the Anglican Communion is not as well resourced or rooted as it needs to be and that a communion-wide initiative such as this is urgently required. One of my main priorities at this stage of my ministry as Archbishop of Canterbury is the reinvigoration of theological education and I greatly welcome the decision we took as Primates to set up this working group. I shall be taking a keen interest in the progress of TEAC and offer my prayers and support to those who will be carrying out its work." Rowan Williams, foreword to "Report on the Briefs," <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/ministry/theological/teac/docs/briefs.cfm#s2>.

makes a difference, and, in that knowledge, to be willing and eager to share God's love with others.⁷

To elaborate the case for their mandate, TEAC's report included a list of symptoms reflecting illness in the life of the church:

- a general lack of theological literacy—a challenge to spiritual life and mission in increasingly secular societies and a serious hindrance to Christians in telling the gospel story and making connections between faith and life;
- inadequate engagement with contemporary thinking, culture and society—a challenge of selecting and preparing a new generation to share Christ in a world of apparently competing faiths, secularism and post-modernism;
- some confusion about the particular callings of those involved in the Church's public ministry—a challenge in particular of practising *diakonia* in a range of ministries;
- inadequately or inappropriately trained priests—a challenge of relating theological and biblical understandings to practical situations in preaching, pastoral care, evangelism and ethics, and of refreshing theology and practice;
- inappropriate practice of the particular ministry of a bishop in changing contexts—a challenge of understanding the functions of apostle-missioner, teacher, encourager, team-leader, manager, pastor, disciplinarian, public figure, example and colleague; and
- a weak or selective commitment to Christians (even of Anglicans) of other traditions and perspectives—a challenge of appreciating the positive ethos of Anglicanism and what it can contribute to and learn from others in the Christian way.⁸

The subtext was articulated by the Chair of TEAC, Archbishop Gregory Venables: the “current crisis that assaults the Communion

⁷ Anglican Primates' Working Party on Theological Education (TEAC), “Report to the Primates' Meeting on Theological Education for the Anglican Communion,” Dromantine, 2005. <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/ministry/theological/teac/rationale.cfm>.

⁸ TEAC, “Report to the Primates' Meeting,” 2005.

would not have risen if we had adequate theological education.”⁹ Many may easily agree both with Archbishop Venables’s statement and with the observation of the symptoms above as a basic starting point from which to ponder deeper causes. The question is whether or not the work of TEAC, as expressed in its aims and in the results of its two major pieces of work to date, will push beyond the symptoms toward a diagnosis. Such work would explore more deeply the meaning of certain statements above. What is “theological literacy” in terms of content and of method? What are the ways in which we make a connection between faith and life in Anglican ways of living the gospel? What is the nature of the “engagement with contemporary thinking, culture and society” that is inadequate, and what makes it so? It is easy to agree that inadequate or inappropriate training of priests is a problem; it is harder to move beyond the safety of shared symptoms to determine just what adequacy and appropriateness might be. Therein is the most challenging agenda for TEAC.

The Aims of TEAC

In the face of these challenges, TEAC has articulated a set of “Aims” with Ephesians 4:12–14 and 16 as their biblical inspiration:

to equip the saints for the work of ministry, for building up the body of Christ, until all of us come to the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to maturity, to the measure of the full stature of Christ. . . . Speaking the truth in love, we must grow up in every way into him who is the head, into Christ, from whom the whole body, joined and knit together by every ligament with which it is equipped, as each part is working properly, promotes the body’s growth in building itself up in love.

TEAC’s “Aims” are:

- to deliver a well-focused challenge to be a Communion of Christians who read the Bible together in the fullest awareness of who, when and where we are;
- to strengthen the sense of why we are Anglicans and what sort of Church we want to be;

⁹ Gregory Venables, “Provincial Eastertide Statement,” March 24, 2005. <http://titusonine.classicalanglican.net/?p=5585>.

- to make clear suggestions as to how theological education can be delivered with appropriate professionalism and ecumenical alertness;
- to create a culture of teaching and learning in the faith community; because all Anglican Christians need some kind of theological education.¹⁰

Much that is positive can be said about these aims. They reflect an activism on the part of TEAC that involves engaging, challenging, and even inspiring the provinces of the Communion—an approach that is both ambitious and laudable. There are some particular pieces worth pondering with appreciation. For example, the first point speaks of reading the Bible *together* and aims high for a strongly contextual engagement. This offers a subtle description of the communion of particulars whose common life involves commitment to being together and to bringing to that common life “the fullest awareness of who, when and where we are.” And who can take issue with the general intention of the second point? What Anglican does not want “to strengthen the sense of why we are Anglicans and what sort of Church we want to be”?

I offer two points of critique, one of method and the other of content. The “Aims” serve as a note of promise, inspiration, and direction for work that is yet to be done. But what is the content of this work? Presumably we all agree that it is a good thing to strengthen the sense of why we are Anglicans. TEAC’s more recent work, encapsulated in “The Anglican Way: Signposts on a Common Journey” (the 2007 Singapore Statement), fleshes out in more detail a vision of “The Anglican Way” that is hinted at in the “Aims”: that we read the Bible together and from our own particular contexts, that we take theological

¹⁰ TEAC, introduction to “Report to the Joint Standing Committee” 2006. These aims were developed into a statement of principles that are intended to provide the “how, why and what” of TEAC: “Within our common life and worship

- we will encourage a culture of teaching and learning across the Anglican Communion to support the life of all the baptized;
- we will strengthen awareness of Anglican identity and promote an understanding of the Anglican way;
- we will be a communion of Word and Sacrament, Christians who read and study the Bible together; and
- we will strive to deliver theological education with professionalism and ecumenical awareness appropriate to context.”

education seriously in terms of professionalism, that we maintain an ecumenical commitment, that teaching and learning together is a key value for the whole church.¹¹

It would not be fair to request the insertion of another point to define what “being Anglican” is. However, my principal content concern is that at least one important thing is missing here. Where is the language of mystery, of liturgy and worship and prayer? This has to do with the content of “being Anglican” as much as does the whole enterprise of theological education and the conscious doing of theology as Anglicans. It is a good thing to aspire to being a community that reads the Bible together, from the particularity of our cultures: that is one dynamic in doing theology. But that must go hand in hand with the experience of a worshipping community tied to the *koinonia* of past and future, whose language of corporate prayer (which includes biblical language but goes beyond it) is the language of a faith that is both proclamation and mystery. Anglican theological tradition is informed by the dynamic *fides quaerens intellectum* (faith seeking understanding) that sustains the life of faith in its discipleship, its interplay with biblical revelation, and its life of worship together.

TEAC affirms a distinctively Anglican approach to theological education:

This is reflected not only in the way our worship and liturgical life express our belief, and in our attention to Scripture read in the light of tradition, but also in our respect for exploration and experiment. Theological education in the Anglican Communion honours each local context and, at the same time, calls us together into communion and mutual accountability. Therefore, though we wish to develop common standards of theological education world wide, we value the uniqueness of the work of the Holy Spirit in each place.¹²

It may not be fair to give a statement of vision and aim too much attention, particularly since the later work of the Anglican Way Target Group and “Signposts on a Common Journey” treat the distinctiveness of the Anglican way far more substantially. Nevertheless, a few

¹¹ TEAC, “The Anglican Way: Signposts on a Common Journey,” <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/ministry/theological/signposts/english.cfm>.

¹² TEAC, introduction to “Report to the Joint Standing Committee,” 2006.

things need to be said about the relationships among the various elements named here. The juxtaposition of “each local context” and the call into communion suggests that communion is not found within the local church but rather only beyond the particular. Next, worship and liturgical life do not simply *express* our belief; there is a far more dynamic relationship involved. Finally, “exploration” and “experiment” are indeed parts of theology. However, in this context these words seem to be the only hint at reason, and are inadequate to deal with the mediating function of human intelligence in the theological enterprise. The authors have begun to list qualities or characteristics to be developed. The more challenging work will emerge as the dynamics of the relationships between these various elements are explored.

From Aims to Outcomes

TEAC’s 2006 Johannesburg meeting proved tremendously important for the shaping of the working briefs. Engagement with local leaders in theological education led the committee members to explore the methods of outcomes-based education.¹³

We learned more about this from two presentations made at the meeting, one by Revd Mike McCoy, Corresponding Secretary to ANITEPAM and Chaplain to the meeting, the other by Revd James Massey, Principal, and Ms Megan Norgate, Administrator, of the TEE Centre based in Johannesburg. All are South Africans. This transformational nature of education is undergirded by using a framework of ‘Outcomes Based Education’ (= OBE).

In his presentation on this the Revd. Mike McCoy said:

“Theological educators in the region . . . have had to grapple hard with this fundamental shift. For a century or more, we and our predecessors have mostly offered content-based courses built on the inherited Western model of cognitive (knowledge-centred) education. This model asked: What must students know and understand in order to gain this qualification? The required knowledge was delivered through lectures and written texts; it was assessed through assignments and exams; and it was validated with a degree, diploma or other qualification. . . . The challenge that OBE poses is quite different. The question that now has to be answered

¹³ TEAC “Report to the Joint Standing Committee,” 2006.

is: What competence does the learner need to gain in order to be able to fulfil this or that task/job/vocation? The required competence is gained through an integrated process of learning that addresses the head (knowledge), hands (skill), and heart (values); it is formally assessed through a range of tools that include written work, practical projects, field research, workshops, and the like; and it is validated when the learner is able to demonstrate her/his capacity to carry out the required tasks, using all the intellectual, practical, and attitudinal resources that have been acquired.”¹⁴

TEAC’s deliberations led them to adopt the outcomes-based model in developing the briefs. The result of this work is the “TEAC Ministry Grids,”¹⁵ one grid each for bishops, priests and transitional deacons, vocational deacons, lay readers and catechists, and laity. An additional grid on “The Anglican Way” was folded into each of them, and served as background to the development of “The Anglican Way: Signposts on a Common Journey.”

In all, the grids present thirty-two pages of material and are impossible to reproduce here. I offer the following brief outline and evaluation, noting that they require a first-hand viewing by the reader.

Each grid lays out a general timeline across the top, and a selection of categories of life and ministry vertically. Perhaps the best developed of these grids focuses on the ministry of bishops. It is divided into three sections horizontally, corresponding first to the time of nomination or election of a bishop, second to a period of training (or the first year after consecration), and finally to the period of maturity in the exercise of the office. The categories explored are vocation and discernment; clarity about the nature of the ministry; spirituality and faith; personality, character, and integrity; relationships; leadership and collaboration; having the mind of Christ; being a guardian of the faith; biblical and theological competence; practical competence (preaching, pastoral care, liturgy, education, ecumenical life, administration); mission and evangelism; management and vision; the Anglican way; awareness of context; and spouse and family. The layout presents a comprehensive consideration of these categories and aspects of ministry.

Under the category of “Vocation and Discernment,” for example, the following are offered:

¹⁴ TEAC, “Report to the Joint Standing Committee,” 2006.

¹⁵ TEAC, “Ministry Grids,” <http://anglicancommunion.org/ministry/theological/teac/grids/index.cfm>.

At nomination or election as a bishop the following qualities (or actions) should be apparent:

- The candidate will be aware of the needs of the province / national church and the diocese / episcopal area.
- The candidate will have a thorough knowledge and understanding of the apostolic tradition that is to be guarded, passed on, and communicated, and ability to teach it effectively with grace (1 Timothy 3.1–7; Titus 1; Irenaeus; Tertullian).
- The candidate has a pastoral heart for others, good self-awareness, and is a leader in mission, with the capacity to look beyond the merely local.

With training between election or nomination and consecration or up to first year as bishop the following should take place:

- The bishop-designate or incoming new bishop engages in prayerful reflection on what gifts of grace are needed for what new tasks, seeking also to discern the impact of new, wider responsibilities, on changes in self-perception and the nature of this new calling.
- Orientation before consecration should include reading, discussion with the archbishop / presiding bishop or another senior bishop, and a time of retreat.
- The bishop should seek a deeper appreciation of Anglican understandings of episcopal ministry and authority, and ways in which the bishop shares this collaboratively with others.

During tenure of office for all bishops evidence of the following qualities should be evident or actions occur:

- The bishop regularly and rigorously reviews the vocation of *chief pastor*, re-assessing how well clergy and people have been enabled, resourced and empowered, and the role of *representative of the diocese* in public life and for laity assessing how effective this has been.
- In later years the bishop asks whether or when retirement should be in view, and what might re-invigorate vision.¹⁶

¹⁶ TEAC, “Bishops Target Group Grid,” 1. <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/ministry/theological/teac/grids/BishopsGrid110406.pdf>.

TEAC hopes that these categories may be used “to assist electors or nominators to apply the biblical, theological and practical qualities required for episcopal ministry” in their processes, noting that “no candidate will possess all of these qualities; but to possess the most basic in some measure is necessary.”¹⁷ Condensing all the categories from the initial phase presents a picture of processes of discerning vocations for episcopal ministry.

Vocation and discernment: The candidate will be aware of the needs of the province / national church and the diocese / episcopal area. The candidate will have a thorough knowledge and understanding of the apostolic tradition that is to be guarded, passed on, and communicated, and ability to teach it effectively with grace (1 Tim. 3.1–7; Titus 1; Irenaeus; Tertullian). The candidate has a pastoral heart for others, good self-awareness, and is a leader in mission, with the capacity to look beyond the merely local.

Clarity about the nature of ministry: The candidate will have initial understanding of the role of guarding and maintaining the faith, and of leadership in mission, and an informed understanding of what episcopal ministry entails.

Spirituality and faith: The elected candidate’s spirituality is grounded in Anglican liturgy and in classics of devotion. Personal devotional practice and discipline will have been established that involves daily prayer, reading of scripture, and study of theology and modern thought in openness to God’s Spirit.

Personality, character and integrity: Holiness in word and life, love for God’s people, humility and lack of self-promotion will be seen. The candidate will be secure enough to avoid becoming defensive or authoritarian; warm and outgoing to clergy and lay and to men and women; with ability to listen to others sensitively. It is expected that the bishop will be in good physical and mental health.

Relationships: The candidate is readily approachable, sensitive to the perceptions of others; able to build and sustain relationships, to keep and protect confidences, and to invite and render reciprocal loyalty to and from others.

Leadership and collaboration: The candidate has shown ability to share responsibility, and praise or blame with co-workers; humility to share decisions with others; and also confidence to take

¹⁷ TEAC, “Bishops Grid,” 6.

initiatives and to lead from the front when required. The candidate practises courageous servant-leadership.

The mind of Christ: The nominee is one who accepts the role of servanthood and suffering; and seeks to follow Jesus as teacher, example, intercessor, and chief pastor.

Guardian of the Faith: See 'Vocation', above. The candidate is able to take active responsibility for maintaining the apostolic faith and ecclesial unity and order, within a proper balance between unity and diversity.

Biblical and theological competence: The candidate has been well trained in biblical studies and theology, and has had sufficient experience of presbyteral ministry.

Practical competence: Preaching, Pastoral care, Liturgy, Training & Education, Ecumenical, Administration: The candidate is alert to ecumenical and inter-faith issues as they may affect the diocese and as these arise in the global context. The candidate can express his/her thoughts clearly and judiciously, and would be willing to take advice and seek to achieve greater effectiveness in public communication.

Mission and evangelism: The candidate is proven as a leader in mission and is able to give vision to others for mission and outreach, with a heart of compassion for the many.

Management and vision: The candidate must show appropriate responsibility in all matters of church administration, including managing a large budget, a diary and personnel. The candidate must be likely to ensure a fair allocation of all resources to implement a vision; and sensitivity in the exercise of episcopal jurisdiction in the future is also needed.

The Anglican Way: Scripture, tradition and reason will be accepted and respected as the basis of Anglican doctrine. The candidate will be well informed in Anglican doctrine and liturgy, aware of Anglican diversity, with a potential to become a focus of unity in a diocese and beyond. The candidate will be a person who welcomes Anglican tolerance and a degree of diversity, within the boundaries of Anglican formularies, canons, liturgies, and traditions.

Awareness of context: The candidate will have a heart of compassion and be sensitive to diversities of contexts (urban, rural, rich, poor, politically delicate, or with known difficulties from the past), and be capable of exercising ministry across the range of diversity.

Spouse and family: The spouse will be willing to accept burdens and/or tensions arising from the partner's ministry. The spouse may need to offer support or hospitality outside the family

(although no universal pattern is applicable). The spouse must be aware that he/she will be exposed as a witness to Christian truth more than most others.

The remaining entries under the periods of training time and maturity in ministry offer developments in each of these categories, emphasizing the need for ongoing formation, training, self-awareness, and collegiality in ministry. All this requires extensive work. It will be interesting to see it adapted in particular contexts of discernment, whether bishops are elected or appointed.

In the grids dealing with the orders of the presbyterate (and transitional diaconate) and (vocational) diaconate and with the treatment of “catechists and licensed lay ministers,” the categories are generally the same. The grid for laity includes categories of commitment; discipleship and mission; biblical knowledge and doctrinal understanding; spiritual growth; worship; awareness of context; and the Anglican way.

I strongly commend TEAC’s work on the grids as an expression of what Anglicans can say together, keeping in mind that both fleshing out of the content and adapting it locally are in order. For example, the grid dealing with the (permanent, vocational) diaconate assumes the principal locale of ministry is a parish. That would not be the case in the Anglican Church of Canada, where the deacon’s primary ministry setting is often very much outside the parish, and without stipend from the parish (for example, in education, social service, or health care). Further, what is intended by the category of “licensed lay ministers and catechists” is fluid, with different canonical or practical parameters from place to place. So there is need for careful theological consideration of this category of ministry in relation to the orders, but more carefully in relation to the category of “laity.”

The grids make clear the need for lifelong learning and spiritual and personal growth; this is one of their great strengths. They underscore the principle that a basic Christian spiritual attitude is openness to ongoing formation and education that comes with engagement with others in community for mission. The integration of vocational responsibilities and personal maturity, integrity of character, and faith is another strength of the grids, whether a reflection of the outcomes-based approach or of the orientations of the members of TEAC.

One of the benefits of TEAC’s systematic approach is the point-by-point clarity coming from breaking a large set of interrelated issues into component pieces—in this case, not only particular ministries,

but particular points in the life of these ministries broken into functional specialization. Perhaps the challenge for a next stage of TEAC's work, or for any who wish to engage with the grids, will lie in reassembling the pieces and asking what holds them together. The function of treating specific ministries as particular elements and focusing on the outcomes rather than content of theological education leaves two challenges: how to relate each of the pieces into a whole, and how to deal adequately with content. A next stage of TEAC's work might be to explore these two areas.

These two challenges—theological content and the relationships among particular ministries—are deeply related if one takes the view that all ministry is Christ's and is rooted in baptismal belonging and call. Clare Amos has explained that, for the purposes of TEAC's work, the definition of theological education is "learning and training for ministry in the church."¹⁸ All ministry is rooted in that one ministry which is God's own mission in Christ; therefore, ministry *in* the church is ministry *for* the world, none more so than the ministry called forth in baptism. That sense of shared ministry could be developed by grounding each grid in a stronger sense of baptismal vocation, identity, mission, and ministry. From this one might deepen an understanding of the unifying nature of all mission and ministry as Christ's own in which we all participate by virtue of baptism. Then what is to be developed is framed by the particular responsibilities of those in orders to call forth, nurture, and equip the whole church for mission. This is true of all the grids, not only the one relating to laity. Where do presbyters, deacons, and bishops ground and renew their own sense of baptismal calling? What is the role of the ordained in calling forth the presbyteral, diaconal, and episcopal ministries in which we all participate? The grid on the laity mentions the need to explore ways of sharing in *diakonia*. But how are laity educated and formed to share in those parts of episcopé shared by all in the councils of the church (synods, governance structures) and in serving the unity of Christ's church?

There are other, more specific questions that should be asked about the contents of the grids. When the grids were first posted on

¹⁸ Clare Amos, "Listening: Making a difference in Anglican theological education," Episcopal News Service (March 20, 2006). http://www.episcopalchurch.org/3577_72996_ENG_HTM.htm.

the Anglican Communion website in 2006, the category of vocational deacons with catechists and licensed lay ministers was included; these were later separated. The relationships among these three categories are still somewhat unclear. This points to a general problem with the grids. Each order is encouraged, for example, to reflect on and have a clear understanding of the nature of the call to its particular ministry. However, the content of these callings is not clearly spelled out. Could it be that the general assumption of TEAC was that we all know what a bishop, presbyter, and deacon are supposed to be? I am convinced that there is a step missing between aims and outcomes; I would suggest that time would be well spent returning to some basic consideration of the nature of ministry and mission. If, as TEAC has offered, theological education is about equipping the saints for ministry, an exploration of the nature of ministry itself, particularly in relation to mission, is a necessary step between the aims and outcomes. Here, the shift from content-based courses to outcomes-based models may present a false dichotomy; to opt for one against the other may not be the best approach. The greater challenge is to discern together what the best content of study might be for the best contextually appropriate and faithful exercise of particular ministries.

The Anglican Way

The Anglican Communion Office's Department of Theological Studies has endeavored to be consultative in its work; to that end, it sent surveys to theological colleges and provinces asking a series of questions about the nature of Anglicanism.¹⁹ Responses have been collated and are included in the working documents section of the TEAC website. From these materials, as well as from the deliberations of the Anglican Way Target Group, TEAC began to assemble a vision of the Anglican Way. Each of these initiatives culminated in May 2007 in Singapore in a consultation involving some members of TEAC and others identified by the Communion Office as specialist theologians and theological educators. The task of the consultation was to articulate "characteristic ways in which Anglicans understand

¹⁹ It must be said, however, that the various surveys sent by TEAC were not received in my province in a timely manner, and in some cases after the due date had passed, thereby limiting our participation.

themselves and their mission in the world.”²⁰ Careful to note that the understanding of Anglicanism is something that has developed historically and will continue to develop, the consultation affirms commonalities to be upheld, particularly in the teaching of theology within Anglican churches. The resulting statement is “The Anglican Way: Signposts on a Common Journey.” The authors emphasize that this is not an attempt at offering a complete definition of Anglicanism. The statement is quoted here:

The Anglican Way is a particular expression of the Christian Way of being the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church of Jesus Christ. It is formed by and rooted in Scripture, shaped by its worship of the living God, ordered for communion, and directed in faithfulness to God’s mission in the world. In diverse global situations Anglican life and ministry witnesses to the incarnate, crucified and risen Lord, and is empowered by the Holy Spirit. Together with all Christians, Anglicans hope, pray and work for the coming of the reign of God.

Formed by Scripture

1. As Anglicans we discern the voice of the living God in the Holy Scriptures, mediated by tradition and reason. We read the Bible together, corporately and individually, with a grateful and critical sense of the past, a vigorous engagement with the present, and with patient hope for God’s future.
2. We cherish the whole of Scripture for every aspect of our lives, and we value the many ways in which it teaches us to follow Christ faithfully in a variety of contexts. We pray and sing the Scriptures through liturgy and hymnody. Lectionaries connect us with the breadth of the Bible, and through preaching we interpret and apply the fullness of Scripture to our shared life in the world.
3. Accepting their authority, we listen to the Scriptures with open hearts and attentive minds. They have shaped our rich inheritance: for example, the ecumenical creeds of the early Church, the Book of Common Prayer, and Anglican formularies such as the Articles of Religion, catechisms and the Lambeth Quadrilateral.

²⁰ TEAC, introduction to “The Anglican Way: Signposts on a Common Journey.”

4. In our proclamation and witness to the Word Incarnate we value the tradition of scholarly engagement with the Scriptures from earliest centuries to the present day. We desire to be a true learning community as we live out our faith, looking to one another for wisdom, strength and hope on our journey. We constantly discover that new situations call for fresh expressions of a scripturally informed faith and spiritual life.

Shaped through Worship

5. Our relationship with God is nurtured through our encounter with the Father, Son and Holy Spirit in word and sacrament. This experience enriches and shapes our understanding of God and our communion with one another.
6. As Anglicans we offer praise to the Triune Holy God, expressed through corporate worship, combining order with freedom. In penitence and thanksgiving we offer ourselves in service to God in the world.
7. Through our liturgies and forms of worship we seek to integrate the rich traditions of the past with the varied cultures of our diverse communities.
8. As broken and sinful persons and communities, aware of our need of God's mercy, we live by grace through faith and continually strive to offer holy lives to God. Forgiven through Christ and strengthened by word and sacrament, we are sent out into the world in the power of the Spirit.

Ordered for Communion

9. In our episcopally led and synodically governed dioceses and provinces, we rejoice in the diverse callings of all the baptized. As outlined in the ordinals, the threefold servant ministries of bishops, priests and deacons assist in the affirmation, coordination and development of these callings as discerned and exercised by the whole people of God.
10. As worldwide Anglicans we value our relationships with one another. We look to the Archbishop of Canterbury as a focus of unity and gather in communion with the See of Canterbury. In addition we are sustained through three formal instruments of communion: The Lambeth Conference, The Anglican Consultative Council and

The Primates' Meeting. The Archbishop of Canterbury and these three instruments offer cohesion to global Anglicanism, yet limit the centralisation of authority. They rely on bonds of affection for effective functioning.

11. We recognise the contribution of the mission agencies and other international bodies such as the Mothers' Union. Our common life in the Body of Christ is also strengthened by commissions, task groups, networks of fellowship, regional activities, theological institutions and companion links.

Directed by God's Mission

12. As Anglicans we are called to participate in God's mission in the world, by embracing respectful evangelism, loving service and prophetic witness. As we do so in all our varied contexts, we bear witness to and follow Jesus Christ, the crucified and risen Saviour. We celebrate God's reconciling and life-giving mission through the creative, costly and faithful witness and ministry of men, women and children, past and present, across our Communion.
13. Nevertheless, as Anglicans we are keenly aware that our common life and engagement in God's mission are tainted with shortcomings and failure, such as negative aspects of colonial heritage, self-serving abuse of power and privilege, undervaluing of the contributions of laity and women, inequitable distribution of resources, and blindness to the experience of the poor and oppressed. As a result, we seek to follow the Lord with renewed humility so that we may freely and joyfully spread the good news of salvation in word and deed.
14. Confident in Christ, we join with all people of good will as we work for God's peace, justice and reconciling love. We recognise the immense challenges posed by secularisation, poverty, unbridled greed, violence, religious persecution, environmental degradation, and HIV/AIDS. In response, we engage in prophetic critique of destructive political and religious ideologies, and we build on a heritage of care for human welfare expressed through education, health care and reconciliation.
15. In our relationships and dialogue with other faith communities we combine witness to the Lordship of Jesus Christ with a desire for peace, and mutual respect and understanding.
16. As Anglicans, baptized into Christ, we share in the mission of God with all Christians and are deeply committed to building ecumenical

relationships. Our reformed catholic tradition has proved to be a gift we are able to bring to ecumenical endeavour. We invest in dialogue with other churches based on trust and a desire that the whole company of God's people may grow into the fullness of unity to which God calls us that the world may believe the gospel.²¹

There is much here that is celebratory of our common calling as Anglican Christians. Once again, we have a list of elements on which there can be basic agreement at the relatively superficial level. There are several items in need of further theological digging and exploration if the gift of such agreed statements is to find fuller life within our various contexts.

It is classically true that "Anglicans discern the voice of the living God in the Holy Scriptures, mediated by tradition and reason." What would deeper attention to the power, duty, responsibility, and creativity of the acts and processes of mediation yield? Historically, Anglicans have had lively discussions about the nature of this mediation and the roles and meanings of tradition and reason. It is here that some of the principal theological arguments of our present day find their ground. How we approach the processes of this mediation, the authority of the past, and the function of the human intellect in the theological enterprise will order the different ways by which we do theological education; this is surely worth exploring. The category "reason" has been noticeably missing from many Communion-wide discussions of late, or it has been treated poorly.²² We would do well to take reason to mean more than mere rationalism, seeing it, rather, as that category in our classical Anglican vocabulary that points to the fullest application of human intellectual powers in the pursuit of wisdom. Thus reason becomes a category requiring much attention both when working out what it means to be Anglican, and when pondering the present challenges to theological education. This is a major area of future work for TEAC.

Similarly, what does it mean to "apply the fullness of Scripture to our shared life in the world"? The language of application calls for careful unpacking, relating to the various understandings across our

²¹ TEAC, "The Anglican Way."

²² The concept "reason" is scarcely present in the conversations about an Anglican Covenant, and does not appear in the early drafts. The Windsor Report gives only cursory treatment of the concept.

Communion about the nature of the authority of Scripture. Accepting the authority of Scripture is a potentially unifying act. But do we have the courage and the grace to explore together the different ways we understand the meaning and function of that authority in our lives in relation to the contents and contexts of the Scriptures? “The Anglican Way” states that “we value the tradition of scholarly engagement with the Scriptures.” Is there something beyond “valuing” that we want to say? What sort of scholarly engagement do we value and employ? What were the ways in which our predecessors engaged with the Scriptures in the creative and critical tasks of discerning the word for their day when they formed the ecumenical creeds, the Book of Common Prayer, the Articles of Religion, the catechism, and the Lambeth Quadrilateral? Do the ways in which they engaged with the world—the call of faithful discipleship in their time—and the Scriptures have anything to say to us today?

Each of these questions has to do with exploring the avenues that are opened by the verbs and connecting words that lie between the various elements listed. The questions could be continued through all sections of the document. The section “Shaped through Worship,” for example, speaks of worship that is shaped by both order and freedom. What is the relationship between these two elements? Similarly, what does it mean to integrate rich traditions of the past with varied cultures of the present?

These are points in need of further development within particular contexts. First and foremost, it is the responsibility of provinces and dioceses throughout the Anglican Communion to explore these questions in light of their own reception of Anglican ways of mediating Scripture through their intellectual, faithful engagement with the call of discipleship within their own contexts. However, if the gift of being in the Anglican Communion means that we value learning together and from each other, it is to be hoped that the fruits of local engagement with the questions and with the document itself will be brought into a relationship of mutual listening, learning, and creative dialogue. To provide such a forum for dialogue would be an immeasurable—and risky—gift of TEAC to the provinces of the Communion.

Concluding Remarks

I cited an image at the beginning of this paper, offered by a member of TEAC who hoped that the plane now lifted off the ground

won't merely circle the airport but will actually go somewhere. TEAC and the Department of Theological Studies of the Communion Office have ambitious plans for the next stages of their work, building on both the grids and the Singapore Statement, and enlarging the offering of resources provided by the Communion Office. They also hope to provide a comprehensive list of Anglican theologians worldwide, to foster stronger relationships among the theological colleges of the Communion, to develop networks of provincial theological education officers, and eventually to set up a commission on theological education for the Communion. They also plan to publish educational materials based on their work; one set is mentioned specifically for new bishops. They hope to raise the question of whether there is need for work on a Communion-wide common curriculum and standards for theological education.²³

I appreciate deeply TEAC's willingness to be transparent (as shown by the extensive publication of briefs and working documents) and their self-consciousness about being *in via*. They have shown a desire for consultation; and the provision of resources thus far has been with a view to enlarging the conversation and engaging the provinces in order to develop insights further. I imagine this vision was deepened at their Johannesburg meeting in 2006. Clearly there were present the energy and insight and bonds of communion that come from such meetings of people from very different contexts who care passionately for and are engaged in theological education. The experience of their learning from each other and from engaging with a particular local context is striking. It has clearly shaped the emphases that theological education is necessary for all, and that learning together is a priority.

In keeping with the metaphor of the airplane, I suggest a voyage of multiple destinations. Not much work gets done up in the air, and long-haul flights are nothing if not tedious and disconnected from real life. Perhaps the metaphor of my Canadian colleague, Iain Luke, is more apt: the mandate of national-level work is akin to driving the cross-town bus rather than the express. The cross-town bus picks up some passengers and lets off some along the way. Passengers on the bus share stories and engage with each other about the gifts and

²³ TEAC's 2006 "Report to the Joint Standing Committee" concludes with a comprehensive list of future projects.

challenges and insights from their own contexts. All are left with much to ponder and are enriched by the process to the extent that they engage each other.

Rather than TEAC's moving immediately to create resources based on the existing grids and Singapore Statement, I hope for a time of extended conversation wherein the churches of the Communion can host their own conversations about the present and future of theological education, engaging vigorously with the TEAC resources within their own contexts, and perhaps even pushing some of the questions that I have raised in this essay. Beyond listing elements of the Anglican way, we need to explore the various ways in which we bring these elements together in the service of Christ's mission. Much more needs to be done in many contexts to encourage, nurture, grow, and provide resources for a culture of theological education for all. TEAC has done much to inspire and provoke creatively what might be a critical conversation within provinces.

It would be highly problematic to move to a conversation about standards and common curriculum at this point; perhaps it always will be. The nature of the authority of international standards and common curriculum is unclear, and I cannot imagine the worth of such an enterprise at this point. Time is required to work at a deeper theological level with some of the core, substantive themes, questions, and issues—to deepen the theological aspect within talk about theological education in the various contexts of the provinces of the Communion. That theological talk involves vigorous engagement with the challenges for ministry and mission within our churches. One of the great gifts of TEAC will be its ability to bring particular voices together to explore our common mission in the world, and to create and grow a culture that values theological education for all within our diverse contexts.

Apart from whatever local results we develop, the real fruit will be borne when we commit to listening and learning with churches in other contexts beyond our particular provinces—when we can meet to share the reflections and ways and insights from our own contexts. The questions that emerge from open and committed learning will raise new challenges and insights for us to take home. That will be TEAC's "going somewhere."

