



Social Care and Civic Engagement in the London Methodist District:

**A report prepared for the Social Care and Civic Engagement
Commissions of the London Methodist District**

Eva Neitzert
Sociology Department
London School of Economics (LSE)

Professor Jane Wills
Geography Department
Queen Mary University of London (QMUL)

ISBN: 0-902238-46-9

Social Care and Civic Engagement in London

FOREWORD

The creation of the new Methodist London District in September 2006 gave us the opportunity for the first time to have an overview of all Methodist activities in Greater London. Part of the overview involved setting up five Commissions to take responsibility for different aspects of the District's work.

While it was known that many churches in the District are engaged with their communities as an expression of their Christian commitment, there was limited information available about the detail or scale of the work being undertaken. So the Commissions for Social Care and for Civic Engagement decided to undertake some joint research to discover the extent of that involvement. They approached Prof Jane Wills at Queen Mary, University of London, who agreed to conduct the research with the help of Eva Neitzert at the London School of Economics.

On behalf of the two Commissions, I would like to thank all those who responded to the questionnaire and provided the detailed information about the work of their churches. I would also wish to express our gratitude to Jane Wills and Eva Neitzert for their expert work in conducting the research and putting this report together. In addition to this report, Queen Mary has also transferred the information gathered into an electronic map of the District which shows what each church is doing. This is available on the District website at <http://www.londonmethodist.org/admin/Map.aspx>

I commend the report to you as a positive indication of the extensive involvement of our churches in the affairs of the diverse communities of London. What I find particularly encouraging is the number of churches that expressed a desire to be more involved, if only additional resources could be found.

Ermal Kirby
Lead Chair

Executive Summary

- In September 2006, the new London District of Methodist Churches was formed to bring together the 267 Methodist Churches within the M25 orbital. Two Commissions were established to provide guidance on Social Care and Civic Engagement, respectively. The Commissions approached QMUL to conduct research that would map the state of social care and civic engagement in the District and inform strategic planning for the future.
- The research for this report comprised two phases. In the first phase, every Church in the District was asked to complete a survey on their involvement in social care and civic engagement (response rate=42%). In the second phase, interviews were conducted with 24 Ministers and layworkers to further explore issues raised in the survey and present examples of exemplary work within the District.
- The survey found that most Methodist Churches make significant contributions to their communities in respect of services, including activities and groups for the elderly, children and young people, parents and families, and around healthy living.
- In addition, Churches make important contributions through hosting other organisations in their buildings, often at sub-market rents, and by becoming involved in community and faith forums.
- The most striking finding of the survey, however, is that more than half of all Churches would like to be doing more in terms of both social care provision and civic engagement. Commonly identified areas for further provision and engagement are around youth, migrants and refugees, and substance abuse.
- The main obstacles to more extensive involvement are usually some combination of inadequate facilities, staffing or volunteer shortages, and lack of funding.
- The need for better co-ordination, knowledge and information-sharing, and communication was also articulated by numerous Ministers.
- This was raised particularly in regard to civic engagement. Presently, Churches are often involved in community forums. However, a much smaller number engage in structured meetings

with local political leaders and/or have direct involvement in local institutions.

- A number of respondents argued that Methodism should have a greater campaigns focus.
- Ministers identified poverty, poor housing, anti-social behaviour, and crime as key issues facing their communities and would like to see the Church take a more active role in addressing these. In addition, they would like to see more done to address the needs of young people and refugees and migrants.
- The Social Care Commission and Civic Engagement Commissions are ideally located to take on a co-ordinating role. As such, their formation presents an exciting opportunity for extending social care provision and civic engagement within the District.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	ii
1.0 Background	2
2.0 Introduction	2
3.0 Method	5
3.1 Survey	5
3.2 Interviews	6
4.0 Results	7
4.1 Social Care	7
4.1a Services, Activities, Groups at the Church Level	
4.1b Services, Activities, Groups provided OFF-PREMISES	
4.1c Services, Activities, Groups at the Circuit Level	
4.1d Hosting Other Organisations	
4.2 Civic Engagement	11
4.2a Participation in Local Faith/Community Forums	
4.2b Meetings with Local Civic and Political Leaders	
4.2c Direct Involvement in Local Institutions	
4.3 Community Issues and the Role of the Church	13
5.0 Discussion	15
5.1 Social Care	16
5.1a Facilities	
5.1b Staffing and Volunteers	
5.1c Funding	
5.2 Civic Engagement	21
5.3 Further Points to Consider	24
5.4 Conclusion	25
Appendix 1: The Questionnaire Sample	26
Appendix 2: Interview Participants	29
Appendix 3: Services, Activities, Groups at Church Level	30
Appendix 4: Suggestions for Provision at Circuit Level	36

Social Care and Civic Engagement in the London Methodist District

1.0 Background

In September 2006, the new London District of Methodist Churches was launched to bring together for the first time all 267 Methodist Churches within the M25 orbital. Five Commissions were established within the new district to provide guidance on a range of issues. The newly formed Social Care and Civic Engagement Commissions approached QMUL to conduct a research project that would map the state of social care and civic engagement in the District and inform strategic planning for the future.

2.0 Introduction

There has been a long term historical interest in both 'social care' and 'civic engagement' in the Methodist Church. The Wesley brothers saw social concern and social justice as integral to their mission, believing that 'faith' and 'life' could not be consigned to separate domains. Early Methodists were involved in the social issues of their day, including prison reform and abolition, and were intent on reaching out to those who found themselves on the margins of society. Since those early beginnings, a focus on social concern and justice have informed the work of Methodist Churches and their congregations. There are numerous instances of Methodists taking on a prominent role in social activism and social struggles, perhaps most famously among the Tolpuddle martyrs in the 1830s.

Most recently, we have seen this tradition reflected in a report on Social Capital and Methodism by the Social Research Centre at Roehampton University¹. In the survey of 49 Methodist congregations across the UK, more than half of the respondents agreed with the statement that 'the primary role of the church is to provide social support in the local community'. Moreover, respondents ranked 'openness to all people irrespective of difference' and 'promoting social justice' as, respectively, the first and second most important roles of their Church. Of some concern, however, is that despite this commitment to social care and justice among the members, many of those surveyed felt that Churches were actually faring much better on 'inward facing' activities – that is, those characteristics concerned with the Church and Church community – than 'outward facing'

¹ Roehampton Social Research Centre (2006). *Social Capital and the Methodist Church*. London: Roehampton University

characteristics which are concerned with the Church's involvement in the wider community.

The research project which is the subject of this report was concerned specifically with mapping the 'outward' connections of Methodist Churches in the London District. It finds that many Churches are contributing to their communities in important ways through the provision of services, activities and groups, particularly for the elderly, young people, and families and also by participating in local civic and political forums. However, much like the members in the Roehampton survey, there was a clear sense that Churches could be doing more. Ministers who participated in this study overwhelmingly expressed a strong commitment to engagement with the wider community and social struggles, but were often, and usually for very good reasons, unable to offer services or facilities to address what they considered to be important needs in their communities. Some 70.1% of Ministers surveyed wanted to be offering additional services to the community, especially around the needs of young people, migrants and refugees, and those suffering from substance abuse. Many others articulated the need for greater emphasis on campaigns so that Methodism would have a stronger voice within political and public life.

The strong commitment to social care and civic engagement makes it imperative that this report provides not just a 'map' of what is already happening but also a stimulus to tackling some of the obstacles to more extensive involvement in the community. In this respect, the analysis is informed particularly by the work of several Churches and Circuits where exemplary work is taking place. There is no attempt, however, to propose a 'one size fits all' solution. The key to meaningful and effective community involvement is always an awareness of the local context.

This report is based on a quantitative survey of all Ministers in the London District and 24 follow up interviews to explore more fully the main findings of the survey. The report is divided into three main sections. In the next section, the research methods are outlined. This is followed by a 'Results' section and, finally, a 'Discussion' section.

Before moving on to the discussion of method, it is worth drawing attention to the current political context. The focus on social care and civic engagement by the London Methodist District comes at a time when government and local authorities are again increasingly looking

to faith communities for service provision and leadership². This presents a window of opportunity for Methodist Churches to become involved in their communities and underscores the importance of the discussions taking place within the Church at present.

² See for example, J Flint and A Kearns (2004) “The Role of Church of Scotland Congregations in Developing Social Capital in Scottish Communities: Enabling and Cohesive or Irrelevant and Divisive”, *ESRC Centre for Neighbourhood Research Paper 16: May 2004*

3.0 Method

The research consisted of two phases. The first phase was a quantitative survey distributed to all Ministers in the London Methodist District. The second phase comprised 24 interviews with a purposefully selected sample of Ministers and lay workers.

3.1 Survey

The survey was drawn up after discussions with representatives of the Social Care and Civic Engagement Commissions. A draft of the questionnaire was presented to a meeting of Superintendent Ministers on the 19th of October 2006. Feedback from that meeting was used to revise the questionnaire. Attendees at the meeting also requested that the questionnaire, which had been intended for distribution by post, should be available in an electronic format and distributed to Ministers via Superintendents.

The final questionnaire was emailed to Superintendent Ministers in late October 2006 with a covering letter from the London Methodist District and QMUL to explain the purpose of the research. Two versions of the questionnaire were made available: One for printing and completing by hand, and another that could be completed electronically. Superintendents were requested to pass on the questionnaire to Ministers in their circuit. It was hoped that by distributing the questionnaire via Superintendents, a higher response rate would be attained than if the questionnaire came direct from an external researcher.

By the deadline for completion, 71 out of a possible 240 questionnaires had been received. All Ministers who had not yet returned a questionnaire were then phoned in early December. These phone calls revealed that some Superintendents had failed to pass on the questionnaires. Where we could ascertain that this was the case, additional questionnaires were sent directly to Ministers.

The final count of completed questionnaires was 102, which equates to a response rate of 42%. Given the length of the questionnaire (11 pages) and the amount of detailed information required, this is a good response rate. However, we should also be aware that there could be some response bias. Large sections of the questionnaire were devoted to collecting information about the groups, services, and activities that the Church was involved in and it is possible that some of the less active Churches did not return a questionnaire because they felt that it

did not apply to them. Summary statistics on the samples, including a list of respondents by Church Circuit, can be found in Appendix 1.

All completed questionnaires were inputted into the statistics programme SPSS and also into Excel so that a database of services could be constructed.

3.2 Interviews

The initial analysis of questionnaires identified 23 Ministers or projects for follow up interviews. These were selected on the basis that they either illustrated issues identified in the survey (e.g., a common obstacle to further community involvement) or were involved in work that was in some ways exemplary (eg., a very active Church, such as Parchmore in Thornton Heath, or a unique service, such as the HIV Chaplaincy).

An individual set of questions was devised for each interview from the information supplied on the questionnaire. Where it was felt that a site visit would not add to the information that could be collected, the interview was conducted over the phone. Detailed notes were written up during and after each interview.

The interviews were conducted over a three week period from the end of February. A total of 24 interviews were conducted, including all of those originally identified for follow-up. Of these, 18 were carried out over the telephone and ranged in duration from ten minutes to half an hour. A further six were conducted on-site at Churches or project sites. These lasted between 45 minutes and an hour. The 24th participant was identified through one of the site visits.

The detailed case studies in the 'Results' and 'Discussion' section were generated from the interviews. For a full list of interviewees, please see Appendix 2.

4.0 Results

This section uses the quantitative survey data to 'map' the extent and nature of Church involvement in social care and civic engagement within the London District. It should be read in conjunction with the actual electronic map of services and activities that was created from the survey responses and can be found on the London Methodist District website at <http://www.londonmethodist.org/map.aspx>.

The discussion section, which follows the results, then uses the interview data to explore more fully some of the issues and trends identified through the survey.

4.1 Social Care

Social care was measured in the first instance by the extent to which Churches were directly involved in providing services, activities, and groups to cater for a diverse range needs in their communities. This focuses on formal provision of social care and, unfortunately, does not capture the good deal of work that is carried out by Churches through informal networks, such as pastoral visits.

In addition to provision directly by Churches on their premises, the survey also sought to capture the involvement of Churches at three further levels of provision: firstly, provision directly by Churches but off-premises; secondly, at the Circuit level; and, finally, in a more indirect way through hosting other organisations involved in addressing community needs. The results for each of these will be discussed in turn.

4.1a Services, Activities, Groups at the Church Level

Table 1 summarises the types of services, activities, and groups that Churches are directly providing on their premises. This data shows that the most common profile is for a Church to be involved in the provision of activities for children and young persons, the elderly, parents and their families, and around healthy living. Services to meet more specific needs, such as those for migrants and refugees, are less common, although this in part may reflect the fact that there is not a need for these services in all communities.

Table 1: Does your Church offer any services, activities, or groups for/around ...	Percentage answering 'Yes'
--	----------------------------

Children and young persons?	63.3
Elderly?	52.0
Parents and families?	43.0
Other	28.6
Healthy living, fitness, or sport?	23.2
Homelessness?	11.0
Migrants and refugees?	9.0
Alcohol and drug addiction?	9.0
Counselling or advice?	9.0
the unemployed?	4.0
People with disabilities?	4.0

A breakdown of the types of services offered under each of these categories and their frequency is provided in Appendix 3.

There is a small number of Churches (13) that presently provide no services, groups, or activities at all. Of these Churches, ten said that there are services they would like to be offering but presently cannot due to a lack of funding, inadequate facilities, problems recruiting volunteers, or leadership issues. The desire to 'offer more' extends beyond these Churches to the entire sample, with 70.1% of respondents stating that there are other services, groups, or activities they would like to provide. In the discussion section, the main obstacles to more extensive community involvement and possible ways of overcoming these are explored.

The average number of users for services provided directly by Churches on their premises tends to be fairly high, as can be seen from Table 2 below. The number of paid staff, on the other hand, is low when compared to users, suggesting that many of the services rely to a significant extent on volunteers.

Table 2: Service for/around ...	Average Number of Users	Average Number of Paid Staff
Homelessness	40.4	1.17
Parents and families	34.8	0.67
Counselling or advice	33.5	1.33
Children and young persons	32.2	0.91
Alcohol and drug addiction	26.3	0
Elderly	25.7	0.50
Healthy living, fitness, or sport	22.4	0.18
People with disabilities	20.0	2.75

The Unemployed	16.0	3.33
Migrants and refugees	14.3	1.71

4.1b Services, Activities, Groups provided OFF-PREMISES

In some cases Churches also directly provide services, activities, and groups but delivery occurs off-site. As many as 34.7% of respondents were involved in social care provision at this level, often (74.2%) in partnership with other organisations, such as local authorities or other Churches through local ecumenical partnerships. Most often services at this level were aimed at children and young people, the elderly, or the homeless.

Table 3: If participating in activities, services, or groups OFF-premises, are they for/around ...	Percentage answering 'Yes'
Children and Young People?	29.4
Elderly?	26.5
Homeless?	17.6
Community?	17.6
Counselling and Advice?	5.9
Parents and Families?	5.9
Mental Health?	5.9
Holiday Club?	2.9
Adult Education?	2.9
Music/Choir?	2.9
Volunteering?	2.9

4.1c Services, Activities, Groups at the Circuit Level

Some social care provision also occurs at the Circuit level, with 33.3% of respondents indicating that they were involved in at least one service, group or activity at this scale. The total number of services, activities, and groups reported was 41, meaning that on average these Churches are involved in 1.32 groups each.

As indicated in Table 4, the most common activities at this scale were services for children and young people, although it also was significant for the provision of services to the homeless.

Table 4: If participating in activities, services, or groups at the circuit level, are they for/around ...	Percentage answering 'Yes'
--	----------------------------

Children and Young People?	64.5
Elderly?	22.6
Homelessness?	16.1
Community?	12.9
Housing?	6.5
Charity?	6.5
Other?	3.2

Interestingly, only 15.3% of the sample wanted to provide more services at the Circuit level. This is in sharp contrast to the 70.1% of respondents who would like to offer more at the Church level, and suggests that the Church is still the preferred scale for provision of many services. The extra services suggested by those wanting to do more at the circuit level are diverse. As they cannot easily be summarized, the full set of verbatim responses has been reproduced in Appendix 4.

4.1d Hosting Other Organisations

Churches may not always be the most appropriate provider of a service or activity. In some cases, another organisation or community group may be better suited to addressing a particular need. Churches, therefore, can play an important role in facilitating the provision of social care by making space available for what are often emerging, or poorly resourced, organisations. In the survey, 89.8% of respondents said their Church acted in a landlord capacity to at least one other group or organisation. The mean number of groups or organisations hosted was 6.81. The services provided by these groups and organisations were wide-ranging, with hosted groups including, for example, the Citizens Advice Bureau, playgroups, Alcoholics Anonymous, and refugee groups.

The survey also identified several Churches that were founded on a principle of such community provision. One of these, Christ Church in Uxbridge, is profiled in Box 1 below.

Box 1: Christ Church, Uxbridge (Methodist and United Reformed)

Text Provided by Peter King, Church Elder

From the first planning of Christ Church as an ecumenical partnership in the late 1960s/early 1970s one important aim was for the church to provide a 'home' for a wide variety of local community groups and activities: but it was also realised that it was impossible, and not really appropriate, for the church to 'run' many of these.

What we could contribute was well designed, well cared for, and well managed, premises that could be 'offered' to the local community and so effectively be partners with a great range of services in the community. Also, individual members of the church could always feel free to involve themselves in community activities to which they felt called.

As a result of the original 'vision', we have purpose built premises – named 'Christ Church and Communicare' - which are adaptable for a variety of uses and which are open each weekday from 9am to 10pm with permanent staffing, and also for shorter periods at weekends as required. A large number of community groups – now over 100 including activities run under the auspices of London Borough of Hillingdon and the local health authorities - use the premises at frequencies varying from several days a week to once or twice a year. One outcome for the church is that it has to book the facilities it needs for its own activities like any other group - nothing is reserved for its "sole use".

From time to time, where the church (or some of its members) have seen needs which they have been interested in meeting, they have helped to set up services to meet these needs – the local Samaritans branch, for example, started and grew at Christ Church, the then minister of the church being its first Director.

From the outset the provision of good quality, user-friendly premises for the local community has been seen as an expression of our faith in service to those around us, and so we see our partnership as more than a simple letting operation (though there are some users for whom the relationship is primarily a commercial letting). We have permanent staff who relate regularly with all these groups (some of whom have had their 'home' at Christ Church for very many years), and these represent 'Christ's Church' for them. All groups would expect to, and do, make financial contribution towards maintaining the premises and its management, but we are fortunate that we have access to funds which allow us to keep these as low as possible, while maintaining a good standard of provision.

4.2 Civic Engagement

Civic engagement was measured in terms of three main indicators: the involvement of the Minister or Church representatives in local faith or community forums; the frequency of meetings with local civic and political leaders; and the direct involvement of the Minister and other Church members in local institutions.

4.2a Participation in Local Faith/Community Forums

Table 5 shows that 62.9% of respondents reported that their Church participates in at least one local faith or community forum. The most common forum for Churches to be involved in are interfaith bodies, often at the borough level.

Table 5: If participating in a forum, is it ...	Percentage
---	------------

	answering 'Yes'
Interfaith?	49.2
Other civic forum?	36.1
Non-denominational Christian?	27.9
Community issues group?	18.1

There was a clear concentration of activity; with 29 Churches being involved in two or more forums and, at the other end of the spectrum, 36 Churches not being involved in any forums.

4.2b Meetings with Local Civic and Political Leaders

As indicated in Table 6, 58% of respondents said that they or a representative from their Church meets with at least one local civic or political leader, while 42% responded that they do not meet with any such leaders. The breakdown by each 'type' of civic and political leader is as follows:

Table 6: Do you or members of your Church meet with ...	Percentage answering 'Yes'
Councillors?	48.0
Local MPs?	36.7
GLA representatives?	8.2
Other local office holders?	3.2

The meetings with local councillors are the most regular, with 48.5% of those who meet their Councillor stating that they do so either monthly or quarterly.

If you answered 'yes' above, what is the frequency of meetings with ...	Monthly	Quarterly	Annually	Other
Councillors?	17.1	31.4	11.4	40.0
Local MPs?	3.7	18.5	29.6	48.1
GLA representatives?	0	16.7	33.3	50.0
Other local office holders?	15.4	46.2	23.1	15.4

The high percentage of respondents selecting 'Other' in the table above points, on further investigation, to an interesting feature. Those ticking 'other' were asked to state how often meetings take place. The response was almost always either 'as needed' or 'occasionally'. This points to the ad hoc nature of many of the connections with local civic

and political leaders. Furthermore, the interviews revealed that where regular meetings are taking place this is usually where a MP or Councillor uses the Church as a venue for a community forum or a constituency surgery. While this is an important aspect of the Church's participation in the community, it may be somewhat limited as a means of the Church furthering a particular political cause. That is, hosting an event, such as a community forum, fulfils a different purpose to meeting with an Councillor to discuss concerns that the congregation may have.

The ad hoc nature of some of the meetings with local leaders, especially when added to the 42% of responding Churches where no meetings take place at all, is of concern if we consider the reported benefits from the structured meetings that do take place. Those meeting regularly stressed the importance of these engagements to ensuring that the concerns of the Church were heard in the political process and, conversely, that the congregation was kept abreast of local issues. Moreover, many felt these meetings were crucial to the Church maintaining a profile within the community.

4.2c Direct Involvement in Local Institutions

As indicated in Table 8, 49% of Churches report that at least one of their congregation members is directly involved in a local institution as an elected or appointed office holder. Most commonly, this is as a School Governor (32.3%). The full breakdown by office type is as follows:

Table 8: Are you or any members of your Church ...	Percentage answering 'Yes'
School Governors?	32.3
Holders of other civic offices?	8.8
Councillors?	8.6
Representatives on PCTs?	7.5
Members of the GLA?	3.2
MPs or MEPs?	3.2

4.3 Community Issues and the Role of the Methodist Church

The questionnaire asked respondents to list the social or economic issues facing their community. The open-ended answers were coded into clusters. The most frequently cited issue was 'poverty and/or poor housing', with 50.5% citing this as a problem within their

community. Other high ranking concerns were anti-social behaviour, crime, provisions for youth, drug and alcohol abuse, and the needs of asylum seekers, refugees and migrants.

Table 9: Issue	Percentage identifying this as a concern in their community
Poverty and/or poor housing	50.5
Anti-social behaviour	32.6
Crime	31.6
Needs of asylum seekers/refugees/migrants	30.5
Provisions for young people	29.8
Drug and alcohol abuse	28.3
Traffic and/or pollution	20.2
Unemployment	13.7
Education	10.9
Homelessness	6.4

The majority of respondents felt that it was the responsibility of the Methodist Church to become involved in attempts to address these kinds of issues. A number of different roles were proposed for the Church. These can broadly be summarized as follows:

- An increased campaigns focus (one respondent called on the Church to be an 'irritant to a complacent society');
- Facilitating understanding and dialogue, particularly between different faith and ethnic groups;
- Working in partnership with other faith and community organisations;
- Informing, sharing expertise, and providing spiritual leadership;
- Supporting other groups and organisations to do 'good' work (eg., by letting out space to emerging community organisations);
- Having an 'open doors' policy to support people of diverse backgrounds;

These roles were fleshed out through the interviews with Ministers and layworkers, and are addressed more fully in the discussions section below.

5.0 Discussion

The survey reveals that many Churches within the London Methodist District are involved in their community in significant ways. Churches are often important providers of services, activities, and groups for parents and families, the elderly, and children and young persons. There are also several instances of Churches within the London District, both on their own and in partnership with others, providing vital and innovative services in relation to homelessness, HIV, and immigration. Moreover, Churches often provide facilities for other groups in the community to deliver services and many Ministers are active within local faith and community forums.

While this level of activity is both encouraging and heartening, the research has revealed a strong desire for greater involvement in the community both in terms of social care provision and political participation. In the words of one interviewee, there was a clear sense that the Church was not simply about 'bums on pews'. More than two-thirds of the survey respondents stated that they would like to offer additional services and many articulated an active, sometimes explicitly campaigns-oriented, role for their own Church and also Methodism more broadly.

The discussion here outlines the barriers that survey and interview respondents identified to more extensive community and political involvement. It draws, wherever possible, on 'best practice' examples from within the London Methodist District to begin a conversation about finding ways to overcome these barriers. This is not an attempt to suggest a 'one size fits all' solution: Every Church community will have different needs, and its community and political involvement will need to reflect its particular locality if it is to be meaningful and effective.

Given the broader context of this project, and the fact that it has been initiated by the newly formed Social Care and Civic Engagement Commissions, the discussion also draws attention to ways in which these bodies might facilitate the increased involvement of Churches and Circuits in social care provision and the political process. What emerges most strongly is that the Commissions have an important role to play in facilitating information and knowledge exchange. There are examples of outstanding work within the District, but without the structures and mechanisms to disseminate experience and to connect people across the District, this expertise often remains at the local level.

5.1 Social Care

The most common profile in the survey was for a Church to be involved in provision of services, activities, and groups for children and young persons, parents and families, the elderly, and healthy living. There was, however, a strong sense that there were other needs in the community that the Church should be meeting, with 70.1% of respondents stating they would like to offer additional services, groups, or activities. Most often the user groups or areas identified for intervention were associated with young people, substance abuse, and migrants and refugees. As these were commonly mentioned across the sample, the Social Care Commission may want to investigate how it can provide guidance and support to Churches wanting to address these user groups and needs. Possible roles for the Commission could, for example, include collating and disseminating information about successful projects and initiatives or developing a London-wide strategy for interventions around these groups and their issues.

In so doing, the Commission will also need to be aware of the barriers that currently prevent more extensive social care provision. These were remarkably similar across the different kinds of interventions that were being proposed and centred around three core, and interlinked, concerns: Facilities, staffing and volunteers, and funding.

5.1a Facilities

There were numerous respondents who cited inadequate buildings as an obstacle to more extensive social care provision and community involvement. In some cases, the problem centered on buildings that had fallen into disrepair. In one extreme case, the congregation had to move out of the main Chapel as the dome was beginning to collapse. In most cases, the poor state of buildings was further compounded by the layout of the older buildings being ill-suited to the kinds of services, groups, or activities that the Church now wanted to offer. For example, a common issue was a shortage of smaller rooms that could be used for "drop in" services or as offices by groups in the community.

The prospect of redeveloping facilities, however, raises a number of issues. Most immediately, there is the problem of funding as congregations are usually not able to raise the often very large sums required for a redevelopment. Grants, therefore, become very important. Yet it was clear from both the survey and interviews that information about the grants that are available and how one successfully prepares an application is very piecemeal and patchy across the District. Ministers involved in a redevelopment often

described how they had to teach themselves about grants. It seems that the Commissions could play an important role in co-ordinating and sharing information here. Several Ministers felt that it would be useful to have a central list of grant-giving institutions and also of Ministers with experience of completing grant applications. In addition, it was requested that the Commissions organize workshops, perhaps run by Ministers who'd been successful in getting grants, to share information with those who are newcomers to this area.

The second issue related to building projects also suggests a need for more information sharing. Ministers often said they felt out of depth when thrust into the role of 'project manager' for what was often a significant undertaking. In some cases, the Minister was fortunate enough to be assisted by members of the congregation with expertise in design or construction. Where this was not the case, Ministers often struggled through the design and planning processes. It was felt that the Commissions might be able to assist by constructing a database of individuals with knowledge and expertise in this area so that Ministers could then call on them for assistance.

The importance of sharing information is underscored by the cautionary tales offered by Ministers who have been through a recent building project. Several were interviewed in the course of this project and two main points are worth highlighting from their experiences (see also the case study of the Trinity at Bowes building project in Box 2 below). Firstly, Ministers and congregations need to be prepared for the fact that building takes a long time and that there may be significant cost and time overruns. Delays can occur at various points in the building project and these will often lead to increases in cost even if the actual nature of the work does not change. A planning problem, for example, delayed one building project for several years in which time the cost of the project increased almost two-fold simply due to inflationary rises in building costs. Secondly, anyone considering a redevelopment or building project should first identify how the building is to be used by the congregation and community. This will usually require some kind of consultation with the community and mapping its needs. Failing to do so can have costly consequences. One Church that was redeveloped only five years ago is now finding that some parts of the building will have to be redesigned as there is a lack of storage and not enough small spaces to accommodate community groups.

**Box 2: TAB Centre Plus
Trinity at Bowes**

In March 2007, Trinity at Bowes launched the second part of its building project, TAB Centre Plus. This was the culmination of an eight year process that had begun with attempts to rectify defects in the 1970s era Church building. Early on in the planning, the Church conducted a review of the local area and found it to be a pocket of deprivation. Several specific needs were identified and the design of the building project was informed by these. For example, the review revealed that the building should be able to function as a 'community centre' with smaller rooms that could be used by groups. The need for a nursery was also identified by the review and incorporated into the design of the project.

The project was funded partly by the sale of a defunct tennis court and various grants, including from the Lottery, Bridgehouse Trust, and Rank Trust. David James, the Minister at the Church, said that finding out about grants was hard work and that he found it important to network with others who had experience of grant applications and building projects.

5.1b Staffing and Volunteers

There was a general sense across both the survey and interviews that it is increasingly difficult to find volunteers to run Church activities, groups, or services. In part, this is the product of societal shifts that have seen increasing numbers of women enter the workforce.

Churches are, therefore, faced with having to employ staff if they want to provide activities. This places an onus on Churches to find funding. Some Ministers interviewed for this project had been successful in obtaining funding for 'community development officers' from local authorities and the lottery, although this usually had the downside of being only short term (normally for a 12 month period). The Commission might again be able to assist by pooling and disseminating information on sources of funding.

5.1c Funding

Funding has already been discussed in relation to facilities and staffing. Several points, however, remain to be made. The first is that congregations are rarely able to generate sufficient income to develop new social care interventions. The exceptions are where there is some kind of historical legacy (eg., the Church is the trustee of an income-generating Estate) or where innovative, new sources of income have been created (eg., including flats in a building project). This means that in the main, congregations are reliant on funding from outside organisations. There are two problems with this: The first is that the funding is often short term and subject to shifting political priorities. Several respondents to the survey reported instances of a local authority refusing to renew a contract because the service no longer

fitted in with a 'key priority'. The second problem concerns the difficulty of getting funding for a project that is already up and running. Ministers reported that while there were numerous bodies offering 'start up' funding, it was hard to find any organisations offering financial assistance to keep a project running. This is particularly problematic as the kind of social care projects started by Churches are unlikely to be income-generating and, hence, able to be self-sustaining.

There are no simple answers to the funding problem. It is an issue, however, that needs to be foregrounded in any discussions about the future of social care provision in the District. It is clearly absolutely fundamental to a Church's ability to deliver social services and activities.

5.1d Some Exemplary Cases

Having talked about barriers to involvement, it is important to also celebrate some of the successful examples of social care provision and community involvement in the London District. Four such examples – the Parchmore Centre and Church, the Harold Rd Centre, HIV Chaplaincy, and Chinese Asylum Ministry – are presented in the case studies below. Parchmore is an example of a Church that has over several decades built up extensive social care services and activities for its community. The Harold Rd Centre is interesting because it is a project that was in some sense thrust upon the local circuit, Newham. Finally, the HIV Chaplaincy and Asylum Ministry were both designed around a specific issue rather than a locally based Church community and so provide alternative models for organizing the delivery of social care.

Box 3: The Parchmore Centre & Church Thornton Heath

(Text supplied in part by The Parchmore Centre)

The Parchmore Centre has been making a difference to people's lives for over 100 years. Originally just a church, Parchmore was selected in 1966 to become one of the 'Ten Centre' Churches within the Methodist Connexion. These Churches were to be redeveloped to places where a range of community activities could take place.

Today, an extraordinary number of activities occur at Parchmore each week. Twenty staff and 120 volunteers provide services to the local community which include Pre-School, The Pop-In, Meals-on-Legs, The Healthy Living Centre, and the Good Neighbour Scheme.

A staggering 1,700 people use the premises each week, representing over 45 different groups, participating in social, recreational, educational, cultural and religious activities. This is on top of the everyday life of the church which meets for

worship on Sundays, and mid-week, and provides different fellowship groups to its members.

The work of the Parchmore Centre is funded by a range of sources, including service contracts with the local authority and PCT, Lottery grants, circuit grants, and income from the on-site preschool and other services. Despite being a well-established Centre, however, Rev Andy Shepherd-Dart says that everything is still run on a 'wing and a prayer' as there is never enough money to do everything they would like to be doing.

The Centre has also at times been the victim of shifting funding priorities at the local authority and PCT. At the time of the interview, for example, the Healthy Living work is threatened as it is no longer seen as a priority area by the funder and the Centre has been unable to find funding for the staff member from other sources.

That said, Rev Shepherd-Dart believes that Churches should not sell themselves short when applying for service contracts. Churches are often perceived as more reliable and trustworthy than other potential providers because they have long histories within communities. Moreover, they often have resources (eg., buildings) that are vital to service delivery. He attributes much of Parchmore's success with funding bodies to the good reputation it has built up over the years.

For more information, see: www.parchmore.org

Box 4: Harold Rd Centre Newham Circuit

The Harold Rd Centre is perhaps best described as an 'accidental' community development project in the Newham Circuit. It is housed in buildings that for thirty years had been rented out to a community organisation, the Newham Community Renewal Programme. When this organisation abruptly gave notice in August 2005, the fate of a series of small community groups with subleases in the building was uncertain. The Circuit stepped in and agreed to run the building as a community centre until at least March 2006, at which point the project was given an extension to December 2006.

By September 2006, the ten office spaces in the building were all tenanted by community groups and the Circuit agreed to continue to run the Centre indefinitely but on condition of financial self-sufficiency. Presently, there are two employees at the Centre, one of whom is funded from a grant. In addition to offering office space, the halls are available for hire and use by local groups and several English classes are run in the Centre.

The building has been badly neglected and one of the main challenges is finding funds to cover repairs and some limited redevelopment. The Centre is at the moment investigating grant opportunities and also looking at other possibilities for generating revenue, such as including flats in the redevelopment plans.

Box 5: Steve Penrose HIV Chaplaincy

The HIV Chaplaincy was started in 2002. At that time, Steve was the Chaplain at Chelsea & Westminster Hospital and was increasingly being requested to visit people living with HIV in their homes. He approached the Secretary to the London Committee, who agreed that there was a role that the Methodist Church could play in addressing this need. Special projects funding was used to establish the service, which even today is the only faith-based Chaplaincy service for people living with HIV in London.

The Chaplaincy provides pastoral support and care to people living with HIV as well as to their family, partners, and friends. The aim is to help people living with HIV to come to a realistic understanding of their future that allows them to see how they might lead a fulfilling and creative life. The service has been accessed by 78 clients for face to face support.

The continued stigma of HIV means that for many people contact with the Chaplaincy Service is their first positive faith experience. It also means that part of Steve's role is raising awareness in the wider Church and faith community about HIV. Steve does this partly through the London Ecumenical Aids Trust (LEAT), of which he is the Director.

Box 6: Asylum Ministry Chinese Congregation, King's Cross

The Asylum Ministry was established in the wake of the Dover tragedy in 2000, which claimed the lives of 58 illegal immigrants. It provides a range of services to Chinese asylum seekers, including general pastoral care, a job service, English classes, outreach visits, and assistance with Home Office documentation. More than two thousand people use the services of the Ministry annually. The main challenge is funding and resourcing. The workload is heavy as there are not enough people to staff the Ministry and it is difficult to raise the £10,000 pounds it needs every year.

Rev Lawrence Law, who runs the Ministry, says that it is the only one of its kind in the UK. For most Chinese congregations in the UK, the subject of illegal immigrants is 'taboo'. The task of the Ministry is, therefore, also to raise awareness. To this end, the Ministry publishes a magazine. They've also assisted television production companies to make films about the situation of Chinese asylum seekers in the UK and Rev Law has traveled internationally to educate others about the Asylum Ministry model.

5.2 Civic Engagement

The survey measured civic engagement in terms of three main criteria: Involvement in community and faith forums, meetings with local civic and political leaders, and direct involvement by the Church or Church members in local institutions. The most extensive involvement was through forums, with 62.9% of Churches being involved in at least one. The meetings with local civic and political leaders, on the other hand, tended to be on an 'as needed' basis or, where more regular, a byproduct of other involvements (eg., being

involved in a community forum also attended by the local Councillor; hosting the local MP surgery once a month). Finally, the direct involvements in local and political institutions were usually described as the result of 'good fortune': A member of the congregation, for example, who also happened to be an MP or Councillor.

A significant trend in the survey responses was that the extent of civic engagement was very polarized: Churches tended to be engaged in civic life either very extensively or almost not at all. So, while 29 Churches were involved in two or more community or faith forums, 36 Churches were not involved in any forums. The same pattern was visible in the other two criteria for civic engagement.

This divergence is significant as those Ministers and Churches who are involved more extensively in civic life cited many benefits to their congregations and wider communities, including those listed in Box 7.

Box 7: Benefits of Civic Engagement

- "Meetings provide an insight into the issues and concerns of the local community and allow our voice to be heard."
- "The meetings maintain a high profile for the church as interested in being a player in the local voluntary, community and faith sector; they enable us to lobby on matters of concern, eg planning."
- "Oils the wheels of communication, people expect to be able to raise issues with MP or local councillor, or invite them for discussion at the church."
- "Local MP very useful in dealing with immigration and similar matter of church members."
- "Keeping in touch with the concerns of local people - and plans for you and church"
- "Informs preaching, members congregation have a clear understanding of issues, leads to appropriate action"
- "Increase mutual understanding and trust, exchange of views, modify policy or action"

The interviews with Ministers at particularly engaged Churches suggested that extensive civic involvement was usually the result of either an individual Minister's commitment to such engagement or the legacy of a previous Minister who had developed strong links with civic institutions and leaders. Maintaining these relationships was often described as time-consuming and difficult to juggle with the day-to-day responsibilities of being a Minister.

In addition to the time element, two further issues were raised both by the very engaged Ministers and those who would like to become more active. The first concerns the difficulty of engaging the congregation in civic work. For example, one Minister commented that while she sat on various committees and forums, she found it hard to get the congregation interested in these. Indeed, she wondered whether many of them were even aware that she did this work. Another Minister, who was involved in an anti-gun crime community forum, noted that it was hard to get members of the congregation to attend events organized by the forum. Several Ministers had achieved some success by incorporating these activities into their preaching. A particularly innovative approach was adopted by Bonni-Belle Pickard during the Make Poverty History campaign (see Box 8).

The second issue that was raised repeatedly was the need for civic engagement to extend beyond the work of individual Churches. This was expressed in two respects: Firstly, in a sense that Churches should be more involved in community organisations. A good example of this kind of civic engagement is the Stratford Methodist Church's ten-year involvement with the East London Communities Organisation (TELCO) (see Box 9). Secondly, it was expressed as a desire for greater co-ordination of political work across Churches in the London District and also nationally. This could take the form of organizing Methodist campaigns around specific issues (eg., immigration was raised repeatedly) or communicating more effectively about how Churches can get involved in wider campaigns (eg., Make Poverty History). It was felt that the

Box 8: Bonni-Belle Pickard, Minister

**The Bourne Methodist Church
Oakwood Methodist Church**

Rev Pickard inherited a good relationship with the local MP from the previous Minister at the Church and has maintained it because political engagement is also important to her work. Key to maintaining the relationship, she says, is regular contact to 'let them know we're here' and allowing them to use the Church facilities for events. She feels that the contact with the local MP is important because it keeps the congregation abreast of issues and, conversely, also lets the MP know what the priorities and concerns of the congregation are.

Civic engagement also extends beyond the relationship with the MP. Social issues are discussed more generally within the congregation. During the 'Make Poverty History Campaign', for example, Rev Pickard traveled to Edinburgh for the demonstrations to accompany the G8 meeting. Several members of the congregation who were also interested in the issue decided to lead worship on the 'Make Poverty History' campaign on the same weekend. As the demonstration was on Saturday, Rev Pickard was able to email photographs to the group and they incorporated it into the worship presentation.

current lack of co-ordination meant that it was difficult to be an effective political force and that increased co-ordination would strengthen the Methodist voice. One of the roles the Commissions may want to investigate, therefore, is how they might be able to lead or co-ordinate campaigns within the London District.

Box 9: Community Organising

Bryant St Methodist Church & TELCO Rev Jan Atkins

Bryant St Methodist Church has been involved with TELCO, the East London Communities Organisation, for much of its ten year history. TELCO is made up of more than 35 community, faith, trade union, university, and school groups who come together to campaign around issues facing the local community. Most recently, TELCO has been active in pushing for an ethical Olympics that will have lasting benefits for the people of East London. Other campaigns have centred around safer streets, the living wage, and immigration.

For Rev Jan Atkins participation in TELCO has provided many positive opportunities for the Bryant St Church to become involved in the wider community and also to work together with other faith groups. Members of the congregation have been involved in a variety of ways. Some have been active in campaigns, while others with less free time have attended the annual TELCO assemblies. One of the TELCO organisers even ran a series of sessions with the Sunday School children.

Rev Jan Atkins understands that it is not feasible for every Church to be involved in their local chapter of London Citizens, but would like to see the Methodist Church more generally provide support to their campaigns as the Chairs have done recently in endorsing the 'Strangers into Citizens' campaign. Rev Jan Atkins would particularly like to see the London Methodist District declared a Living Wage zone.

5.3 Further Points to Consider

Across both the social care and civic engagement sections of the survey, two themes emerged that are worth commenting on. The first concerns the importance of working in partnership. It was stressed repeatedly that addressing needs in the community and political campaigning was best done in partnership with others, be they local authorities, community organisations, political bodies, other faith groups, or local institutions. The Social Care and Civic Engagement Commissions may want to investigate forming or strengthening relationships at the District scale.

The second theme to emerge from the survey centered on theology. Numerous Ministers expressed an interest in learning more about how social care provision and civic engagement could be understood theologically. Yet others articulated a very strong theological

understanding of their work. It might, therefore, be appropriate for the Social Care and Civic Engagement Commissions to convene a forum where such ideas can be discussed.

5.4 Conclusion

Methodist Churches are performing important roles in their communities. However, the survey and interviews identified a strong desire to become more involved. There is a very real need for more co-ordination, communication, and knowledge sharing to connect up the work of Churches across the District. The Social Care and Civic Engagement Commissions seem ideally positioned to take a lead in this future work.

The formation of the London District presents an exciting opportunity for developing social care provision and civic engagement across London. As this report has shown, there are already multiple examples of exemplary work being carried out by Methodist Churches with scope to do more.

Appendix 1: The Questionnaire Sample

A total of 102 questionnaires were returned. Of these, 100 were returned on behalf of Churches, equating to a response rate of 41.7%. A further two questionnaires were returned on behalf of projects that are not associated with a specific Church congregation.

This appendix summarises the main characteristics of the Church sample. These statistics should be treated as indicative only, as they are based in some cases on estimates by the Minister completing the questionnaire rather than actual counts.

a) Attendance

Average Attendance at Sunday Services: 78.4

When asked whether attendance had changed over the last ten years, 10.9% responded that there had been 'no change', 48.9% said there had been a 'decrease' and 40.2% said their congregation had 'increased' in size.

The average decrease by those reporting a drop in attendance was 25.4% and the average increase for the growing congregations was 35.6%.

The Churches experiencing a decrease in attendance were most often suburban (54.8%) and characterised by an older and predominantly white congregation (on average 46.9% of congregation classified as aged 65+ and 68.8% as 'white British').

The Churches with growing congregations, on the other hand, tended to be categorized as 'inner city' (44.4%) and have younger congregations (26.8% classified as 65+). The proportion of white British in the congregation was also significantly lower (29.9%) than for the declining congregations. The most common non-white ethnic groups in the growing Churches were West-African and African-Caribbean.

b) Age Distribution

The average age distribution in the congregations of responding Churches was as follows:

Age	Percentage
-----	------------

0-15	13.9
16-30	10.2
30-50	20.3
50-65	21.6
65+	36.2

c) Ethnicity

On average, 50.9% of congregations were classified as 'white' and 49.1% as 'non-white'. When asked to list the most common non-white ethnic group in their congregation, 48.2% responded with 'African-Caribbean' and 35.3% with 'West African'.

It is important to note that in regards to ethnicity there was considerable variation in the sample. Although there were some Churches which were very mixed, there were also a good deal that were either almost exclusively characterized by a 'white' or 'non-white' congregation and so the averages listed above are rather misleading. For example, 60% of the Churches surveyed either had a congregation that was predominantly white (80% or more of congregation described as white) or predominantly non-white (80% or more of congregation described as non-white).

d) Urban Status

Category	Percentage
City Centre	8.6
Inner City	30.1
Inner Estate	2.2
Outer Estate	4.3
Suburban	40.9
Town	12.9
Rural	1.1

e) Responses by Circuit

Circuit	Number Received	Total Churches
City Road	1	1
Westminster	1	1
West London Mission*	3	2
Victoria & Chelsea	1	1
Battersea	0	1

North Lambeth	0	2
Walworth	0	1
London Mission South	2	3
Tower Hamlets	1	6
Hackney	4	4
Islington	0	4
North West	4	4
Harlesden	1	1
Notting Hill	1	1
Hammersmith & Fulham	1	5
Wandle Valley	1	7
Clapham	2	3
Brixton	0	4
London Mission South East (Deptford)	1	2
Newham	5	7
Stoke Newington	0	2
New River	5	9
Wembley	3	4
Ealing Trinity	5	10
Richmond & Hounslow	3	10
Wimbledon	0	6
Streatham & Dulwich	0	5
Sydenham & Forest Hill	0	4
Blackheath & Lewisham	2	5
Plumstead & Thamesmead	0	5
Barking, Dagenham & Ilford	4	11
Romford	0	13
Forest	7	14
Enfield	6	11
Barnet & Queensbury	3	9
Harrow & Hillingdon	5	17
Teddington	2	5
Kingston Upon Thames	3	4
Sutton	2	10
Purley	5	8
Croydon	3	7
Bromley	2	5
Orpington	3	6
Chislehurst	3	4
Shooters Hill	5	5
Total	100	240

*Two responses were received as there are two separate congregations at this Church

Appendix 2: Interview Participants

Telephone Interviews

Person	Church
Judy Turner-Smith	Welling Methodist Church
Madeleine Andrews	Harlesden Methodist Church
Anne Rusbridge	Downsview Methodist Church
Jenni Sweet	Shern Hall
Bob Richards	Trinity Church, Enfield
Peter Summers	Kings Hall, Southall
Peter King (Elder)	Christ Church, Uxbridge
Jed Davis	Chelsea Methodist Church
David Ashby	Deptford Methodist Church
David James	Trinity at Bowes Methodist Church
David Mullins	Muswell Hill Methodist Church
John A Cooke	Putney Methodist Church; Roehampton Methodist Church
Roger Dunlop	Kingsdown Methodist Church
Roger Wiig	Keston Methodist Church; West Wickham Methodist Church
Bonni Belle-Pickard	Bourne Methodist Church; Oakwood Methodist Church
Iris Axon (Secretary)	Acton Hill Methodist Church
Anthony Walton	Kingston Methodist Church
Jan Atkins	Stratford Methodist Church

On-site Interviews

Person	Church
Lawrence Law	Chinese Congregation, Kings Cross
Andy Shepherd-Dart	Parchmore Methodist Church
Alan Partridge (Co-ordinator)	Harold Rd Centre, Newham
Dr Leslie Griffiths & Jennifer Potter	Wesley's Chapel, City Road
Steven Penrose	HIV Chaplaincy
Rachel Bending	Fulham Broadway Methodist Church

Appendix 3: Services, Activities, Groups at the Church Level

The tables which follow provide more detailed information about the services, groups, and activities offered directly by Churches on their premises. The information is organized by the main user groups (eg., Children & Young Persons, Elderly, etc.).

a) Children and Young Persons

Churches offering at least one such service, activity, or group: 63.3%

Average Number of Users: 32.2

Average Number of Paid Staff: 0.91

Type	Percentage of all groups/activities/services for children and young persons
Girl guides/scouts etc.	41.9
Youth Group	25.8
Saturday/Sunday School	14.5
Preschool groups	11.3
After School groups	3.2
Choir/Musical	3.2

Frequency of Service, Group, or Activity	Percentage
Daily	8.2
Weekly	77.0
Fortnightly	4.9
Monthly	6.6
Other	3.3

b) Parents and Families

Churches offering at least one such service, activity, or group: 43.0%

Average Number of Users: 34.8

Average Number of Paid Staff: 0.67

Type	Percentage of all groups/activities/services for children and young persons
Parent and Toddler Group	90.0
Family Counselling	4.5
Spiritual Education	2.3

Safe Meeting Place for Parents and Estranged Children	2.3
---	-----

Frequency of Service, Group, or Activity	Percentage
Daily	6.8
Weekly	75.0
Fortnightly	4.5
Monthly	0
Other	13.6

c) Elderly

Churches offering at least one such service, activity, or group: 52.0%

Average Number of Users: 25.7

Average Number of Paid Staff: 0.50

Type	Percentage of all groups/activities/services for children and young persons
Lunch	30.8
Friendship and socializing	17.3
Women's group	17.3
Keep fit	13.5
Coffee morning	9.6
Spiritual fellowship and socializing	9.6
Speakers	1.9

Frequency of Service, Group, or Activity	Percentage
Daily	8.0
Weekly	62.0
Fortnightly	14.0
Monthly	12.0
Other	4.0

d) Migrants and Refugees

Churches offering at least one such service, activity, or group: 9.0%

Average Number of Users: 14.3

Average Number of Paid Staff: 1.71

Type	Percentage of all groups/activities/services for children and young persons
Assistance and Advice	75.0
Socialising	25.0

Frequency of Service, Group, or Activity	Percentage
Daily	14.3
Weekly	28.6
Fortnightly	14.3
Monthly	0
Other	42.9

e) Unemployed

Churches offering at least one such service, activity, or group: 4.0%

Average Number of Users: 16.0

Average Number of Paid Staff: 3.33

Type	Percentage of all groups/activities/services for children and young persons
Volunteer Work	33.3
Socialising	33.3
Advice	33.3

Frequency of Service, Group, or Activity	Percentage
Daily	33.3
Weekly	0
Fortnightly	0
Monthly	0
Other	66.7

f) Homeless

Churches offering at least one such service, activity, or group: 11.0%

Average Number of Users: 40.4

Average Number of Paid Staff: 1.17

Type	Percentage of all groups/activities/services for children and young persons
Shelter/Accommodation	36.4
Food	27.3
Counselling	18.2
Fundraising	18.2

Frequency of Service, Group, or Activity	Percentage
Daily	20.0
Weekly	40.0
Fortnightly	10.0
Monthly	0
Other	30.0

h) People with Disabilities

Churches offering at least one such service, activity, or group: 4.0%

Average Number of Users: 20.0

Average Number of Paid Staff: 2.75

Type	Percentage of all groups/activities/services for children and young persons
Fellowship	50.0
Socialising	50.0

Frequency of Service, Group, or Activity	Percentage
Daily	25.0
Weekly	25.0
Fortnightly	0
Monthly	25.0
Other	25.0

i) Healthy Living, Fitness, and Sport

Churches offering at least one such service, activity, or group: 23.2%

Average Number of Users: 22.39

Average Number of Paid Staff: 0.18

Type	Percentage of all groups/activities/services for children and young persons
Badminton	48.8
Keep Fit	29.2
Family Sport Evening	4.2
Holistic Therapy	4.2
Medical Advice and Assistance	4.2
Dance	4.2
Walking Group	4.2
Team Sports	4.2

Frequency of Service, Group, or Activity	Percentage
Daily	5.0
Weekly	75.0
Fortnightly	0
Monthly	5.0
Other	15.0

j) Alcohol and Drug Addiction

Churches offering at least one such service, activity, or group: 9.0%

Average Number of Users: 26.33

Average Number of Paid Staff: 0

Type	Percentage of all groups/activities/services for children and young persons
Addiction Meetings (eg., AA)	75.0
Youth Work	12.5
Other	12.5

Frequency of Service, Group, or Activity	Percentage
Daily	0
Weekly	60.0
Fortnightly	0
Monthly	0
Other	40.0

k) Counselling and Advice

Churches offering at least one such service, activity, or group: 9.0%
 Average Number of Users: 33.50
 Average Number of Paid Staff: 1.33

Type	Percentage of all groups/activities/services for children and young persons
General Advice/Drop In	62.5
Youth Advice	12.5
Women's Advice	12.5
Other	12.5

Frequency of Service, Group, or Activity	Percentage
Daily	42.9
Weekly	57.1
Fortnightly	0
Monthly	0
Other	0

Appendix 4: Suggestions for Provision at the Circuit Level

The following are the verbatim open-ended responses by those who would like to offer more services, groups, and activities at the Circuit Level.

"Cafe church to reach Missing generation, exploring at present but lack of suitable premises"

"Community outreach"

"Computer services for the community, food parcels and support to vulnerable people, support to alcoholics."

"Counselling and advice, but lack of people to provide"

"Homeless accomodation."

"Local community social issues, ie HIV/AIDS, Drugs, Inter-racial education"

"Services for refugees and migrants"

"Social housing project, but concerns about the laws on letting property, we are taking advice"

"Sport and physical development for groups of young people, eg football, netball, dance, drama, music, opportunities to make presentations."

"We always look for more work with 'people on the edge', but it is always difficult in terms of resources and complex partnerships with local authorities and funding organisations"