

Faith Based Social Action

Faith Based Social Action and the Inter Faith Framework

Dr Adam Dinham of the Faiths and Civil Society Unit of Anglia Ruskin University
with Rachael Chapman and Steve Miller Attachment

Size

[right-click to download pdf of](#) 714.55 KB

[both reports](#) [1]

Contexts

The UK government's Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG) is preparing a framework for interfaith working, for which a consultation document is currently in circulation (see *Face-to-Face, Side-by-Side: a framework for inter faith dialogue and action*).

As part of that process, CLG has commissioned the Faith Based Regeneration Network (FbRN) to report on faith based social action and regional activity. This paper reports on the faith based social action dimension of this work.

The report is intended for use by government officials and Ministers in their preparation of the framework. It will also be of interest to policy makers and practitioners in faith based settings, and their partners, outside of government.

Questions, Processes and Methods

The questions addressed in the paper were agreed in consultation with CLG and are specific to them. They are:

- What is the scale and scope of faith based social action?
- What is the relationship of faith based social action to the ideas of social capital?
- What is the relationship between faith based social action and contact theory?
- What Government interventions are effective in supporting bridging and linking social capital?
- How does faith based social action relate to wider community and civil society? What do faiths bring?
- What evidence is there for faith based social action accessing non-faith specific Government funding streams?
- What support mechanisms are there for faith based social action?
- What is the role of Government, national, regional and local, in relation to faith based social action?

We have addressed these questions in four broad categories:

1. The scale and scope of faith based social action
2. The relationship of faith based social action to wider civil society
3. Support mechanisms for faith based social action
4. The role of government

Attachment	Size
We have taken the following approaches:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overview of relevant literature to inform structured interviews with key individuals to produce initial findings and observations (see Appendix A for interview schedule) 2. Review of literature and online sources 3. Search for and review of grey literature and other material held at community and neighbourhood levels 4. Further and extended telephone interviews with key actors in local faith based social action (see Appendix A for interview schedule) 5. Telephone interviews with key actors in national, regional and local government. (see Appendix A for interview schedule) 6. Liaison with Community Development Foundation over the use of material emerging from the Faith Communities Capacity Building Fund 7. Analysis of grant awards from selected non-faith specific government funded grant programmes to establish the patterns of access by faith based groups; followed by interviews with key actors to establish what are the factors that influence a positive pattern 	

A Note on Definitions and Terms

It should be noted that the key ideas underpinning this report mean different things to different people. It is crucially important to acknowledge this, both for the sake of clarity within this report but more importantly in terms of how these ideas are put into practice in the inter faith framework. The terms in question are:

- Faith based
- Social action
- Inter faith

In particular, 'faith based social action', which is the remit of this report, is not necessarily the same thing as the 'inter faith dialogue and social action' referred to in the title of the consultation document. This is because inter faith social action is distinct from faith based social action, which may or may not be inter faith. These categories carry a high degree of practical meaning in faith communities. The framework must be crystal clear whether it means one or the other or both.

Our conversations with people of faith tell us that the idea of 'faith based social action' is preferred because it includes inter faith social action as well as social action initiated in single faith settings.

It should also be noted that even in single faith settings, there can be, and often is, significant bridging and linking activity with others in wider society. It has been observed therefore that

“Members of single faith groups were often from different parts of the same town, of different ages, different genders, different sub-religious groups or different national or sub-national ethnic groups”

(James 2007 p70).

This is often overlooked because of suspicion that single faith groups are motivated by an unchecked desire to evangelise. Experience shows that this is rarely the case in relation to social action. Indeed, in addition, beneficiaries of activities arising out of single faith settings frequently include people of other faiths and none. Therefore, as well as inter faith social action, activities arising out of single faith settings should also be regarded as an important and legitimate part of faith based social action.

Another key issue here is that 'dialogue' is a distinct activity from 'social action' and the relationship between the two varies widely. In some cases the one is rooted in the other. Elsewhere dialogue and social action are completely unrelated. While the two may overlap, complement or coincide they can at the same time be quite distinct and happen independently. Both social action and

Attachment

Size

dialogue are beneficial and many faith groups say that they value the space to engage in dialogue as a basis for their social action. Where reflection does not happen it is often as a result of lack of resources and it is widely felt that potential for social action is unfulfilled in consequence.

Debates about the use of these terms and the contexts in which they are deployed range around the following summary of arguments:

- The 'usefulness' of faiths is a key starting point of the public policy view
 - Faiths have a long tradition of being 'useful' but they also see themselves in terms of the experiences lived by individuals and groups standing in a tradition of their own. They feel strongly that this should be understood and respected
 - That one defining characteristic of faith is belief, an obvious factor but one which is often overlooked - the starting points and values of belief must be respected as well as what faiths can 'offer'
 - That the idea of 'faith' takes some additional starting points which may be unfamiliar to a policy audience
1. 'faith' is about stories, experiences and values and these may be expressed in their own distinctive 'language'
 2. fellowship and worship are important aspects of faith as well as the practice of social action. Many see the one as rooted in the other
- That talk of a 'faith community' belies the sheer diversity of faiths, within and between traditions. Faiths can differ within and between one another in important ways - we cannot talk of one 'faith community'
 - That there can be discontinuity as well as continuity between the various 'parts' of faith communities - leaders, representatives, projects, volunteers and worshippers may or may not have very much to do with one another even though they are all based within the same church, mosque or other religious centre. The meaning of 'faith based' is therefore debated - based in what aspect of faith and/or what part of the faith community?
 - Similarly the relationship between 'dialogue' and 'action' is not always clear
 - And there are many very good examples of faith based social action which is NOT inter faith, even though it may benefit or work with people of other faiths or none.

In terms of social action, there are also debates:

- That social action can be quite challenging, perhaps politicised, on the one hand or may be very locally focused, practical and pragmatic on the other
- That most faith based social action consists somewhere in between the challenging and the locally practical
- At the same time, faiths have shown a capacity for politicised perspectives on poverty and disadvantage, for example in '*Faith in the City*' the Church of England report on urban priority areas
- That policy makers should be ready to hear the critical perspectives of some faiths and make room for faiths to be 'critical friends'

For the purposes of this report, we chose a pragmatic and relatively broad definition which sees faith based social action as projects, programmes or aspects of work undertaken by organisations or

Attachment	Size
groups with a direct relationship with faith communities that intend to achieve positive benefits for the welfare of faith communities and/or wider social groupings.	

Scale and Scope of Faith Based Social Action

Faith based organisations are 'a strong force' in the charitable sector, which encompasses a large range of social action projects and programmes (NCVO, 2007:15). Within this, some charities are engaged in religious activities and NCVO's 2007 report notes that at least one registered charity in seven is thus engaged. Of these, Christian-based charities outnumber charities based on other faith traditions. It is noted that "The total income of faith based registered charities is estimated at £4.6 billion" though income appears to be unevenly spread across organisations so that "those with an income of less than £200,000 account for 90% of organisations but generate only 11% of the total income (NCVO, 2007:16). This reflects the case that many faith based organisations are very small, informal and heavily dependent on volunteers, although others are amongst some of the largest charities.

Over half of faith based charities aim to serve the general public, and two fifths place a particular focus on children or young people (NCVO 2007, p15). Grant-making is the majority area of activity (56% of faith based organisations) followed by service provision (35%) (NCVO 2007, p15). This is supported in other research which shows that a significant amount of work across England focuses on children/ young people and the elderly, although faith based organisations are engaged in many other activities (see Dinham 2006, p9).

At the same time, most faith based social action takes place through projects and associations. Many of these are not established as charities and operate within the formal structures of the wider faith organisation, often the religious framework, such as a diocese or equivalent structure. The majority of these are orientated towards the wider community and not confined only to the faith group itself.

Some faith based social action is distinctive because of its pioneering work with groups that others have found difficult to address. A good example is the work of the Lighthouse Project set up by Hull Community Church.

In each of the nine English regions there has been some sort of mapping of faith based social action activity to identify what faith groups are doing. In some regions this has been extensive. Thus, *Beyond Belief* (March 2004) reports that there are at least two community action projects for each faith centre in the South East. *Faith in the East of England* (July 2005) identifies 180,000 beneficiaries of faith based community development in the East.

Neighbourhood Renewal in London: the role of faith communities (May 2002) identifies 7000 projects and 2200 faith buildings in London. *Believing in the Region* (May 2006) reports that 80% of faith groups deliver some kind of service to the wider community in the West Midlands. *Faith in England's North West* (November 2003) shows that faith communities are running more than 5000 social action projects and generating income of £69m - £94m per annum in the North West.

In Yorkshire and the Humber, *Count Us In* (2000) shows that in Hull 90% of churches are involved in social action and *Angels and Advocates* (November 2002) reports that there are 6500 social action projects in churches across Yorkshire and the Humber. *Faith in the North East* (September 2004) shows that there are more than 2500 faith based projects in the North East. *Faith in Action* (June 2006) demonstrates that 165,000 people are supported by faith groups in the South West by 4762 activities. *Faith in Derbyshire* (May 2006) claims that, on average, churches run nine community activities in the East Midlands.

It should be noted that a major difficulty in establishing an analysis of this faith based social action is that there is no national dataset nor at this stage any standardised tools for building one. This

Attachment

Size

means that the wealth of regional and sub-regional data which is available cannot be effectively compared, except crudely.

A process of agreeing shared definitions of terms would be of great value both to faiths and to policy makers in developing tangible ways of communicating activity within, between and beyond faith groups. This in itself would provide a framework for establishing a standardised tool for analysis across a national dataset and is an important strategic next stage.

It should also be noted that the data does not currently distinguish between activities undertaken by different faiths and there is practically no data therefore on what each tradition contributes. It would be beneficial in terms of targeting capacity building to map activities by faith tradition.

Nevertheless, even in its absence, a review of the regional data shows that there are four key ways in which faith communities engage in their wider contexts (Dinham 2007):

- Faiths in projects (partnerships, projects and associations more widely)
- Faiths in fellowship (within congregations, in faiths forums and their equivalents)
- Faiths in strategies (partnerships, networks)
- Faiths in governance structures (leaders and representatives)

The regional aspect of this last point is addressed in the 'Regional Forums' section of this report.

We can also aggregate the regional data to consider the predominating forms of faith based social action. This is necessarily crude because the data is not comparable. The following table does this, though it should be noted that this is indicative rather than conclusive. These figures should not be read as exhaustive. They indicate the trends and represent what regions report themselves to be active in doing. It is highly likely that there is considerably more activity than the existing data shows and a detailed census of activity nationally would be a very desirable next step in more fully apprehending the scale and scope of faith based social action. It should be noted that this would also give a sharper understanding of the exact nature of those activities, some of which is currently captured in a very general way through the use of self-reporting 'catch all' categories like 'community support'.

Type of Social Action
Child, family, young people
Community support
Education and training
Arts and music
Health
Homelessness and housing

Attachment	Size
Campaigning	
Employment and training	
Older people	
Social activities	
Alcohol related	
Drugs	
Crime prevention	
Social enterprise	
Advice and counselling	
Anti racism	
Support groups	
Environment	
Finance, debt and legal	
Economic activity	

Attachment	Size
Cafes, drop ins, coffee mornings, lunch clubs	
Women	
Transport	
Local issues	
Refugees	
Men	
Disability	

Aggregate of Faith Based Social Action Activities

Source: These data are derived from a range of regional sources reviewed in *Priceless, Unmeasurable: faith and community development in 21st century England* (Dinham A 2007). They are aggregated to give an overall indication of the frequency of the range of activities. They are not exhaustive. The aggregation is crude because there are currently no national data sets nor modes for achieving them which can ensure comparability

Faith and Social Enterprise

Another area in which faiths are active in wider society is through social enterprise. As non-government partners, faiths have increasingly demonstrated a limited but significant capacity for delivering social action, and government has become increasingly interested in how they can be encouraged, with other social actors, to 'stand on their own feet' by generating income from the services provided which are then ploughed back into those services. At its starkest, this is the model of social enterprise which government has committed to.

Faiths have a long tradition of engaging in social enterprise and they are important because they:

- Are seedbeds for this type of enterprise. Many of the most quoted examples of social enterprise began as faith based organisations
- Make a significant contribution to economic and social life in the UK
- Have the potential to reach the most marginalised and excluded groups

Attachment**Size**

Research about the role of faiths in social enterprise carried out in 2006/07 identifies a number of issues which are distinctive to faiths in this regard. Working with multi-faith focus groups, we asked what role faiths think they play in social enterprise. They identified a number of distinctive characteristics which they felt add value. These included a range of values, such as non-judgementalism, hopefulness, compassion, commitment, and a 'whole-person' view of problems.

They also identified distinctive practice orientations, including stability, continuity, long-termism, sustainability, leading by example, buildings and resources, responsiveness & speed and an ability to reach parts others can't reach.

A third important area they identified is associated with relationships and networks. These include rootedness in communities, reaching into communities more broadly, community cohesion/social capital, an educative bent which includes reaching beyond faith groups, as well as being educative about faith in wider contexts.

At the same time, these focus groups identified some concerns about their engagement with social enterprise. Some of these were to do with a sense of lacking - that they do not necessarily have the skills, resources, partnership experience and capacity, adaptability, governance know-how or time to be effective.

Others were associated with a sense of fear - of not knowing how to professionalise, of competition with others, of getting on the wrong side of legal requirements, of corrupting or diluting their values with a business ethos, and finally a fear of failure.

These are all serious concerns which will need to be addressed through targeted programmes of support and research in framing approaches to interfaith social action as it relates to social enterprise. What is also striking about these findings is that they might apply more widely both to what faiths can offer and also to what they need in social action outside social enterprise as well as within it. It is likely that the lessons here can be applied more widely across faith based social action in general.

But for faiths, social enterprise is not a panacea. It is also crucial to recognise that much of the social action undertaken by faiths is unlikely to attract financial self-sustainability and that resources may need to be committed in the long term in these cases outside of social enterprise.

Across Communities: the Young Peoples' Project

Across Communities: The Young Peoples' Project was launched in Newcastle in February 2003 with the aim of empowering young people in confidence and capacity alongside having their faith and cultural backgrounds validated in an atmosphere of trust and respect. The project brings many of the diverse communities together to work jointly on issues that affect them living in their communities.

The young peoples' involvement and participation have been crucial to the development of the project over the past 5 years. Through many consultation days the young people articulated the main issues that impact on them and created a common agenda for future work. Furthermore, the young people have their own management group, chosen by their peers, which runs in parallel to the adult management group, making this a grass roots youth led project. Many of the young people involved are from traditionally socially excluded communities.

The Churches Regional Commission in the North East is supporting the project and assisting it to grow and develop further.

Attachment

Size

Al Ghazali Multi-cultural Centre, Liverpool

The **Al Ghazali Centre** has refurbished a redundant church on Earle Road in Liverpool 7 and now provides a wide range of support to the whole of the local community. It was established in 1992 by parents from the local Yemeni community led by the current Director, Dr Ustath Ahmed Saif, and originally focused on providing Arabic language and cultural studies to the children of the local Muslim community. Drawing inspiration and vision from the Islamic tradition, epitomised by the great eleventh century thinker, Al Ghazali, and building on the experience gained in setting up an organisation to serve the needs of their Muslim community, the Centre's commitment has been extended to working with a wider and more diverse local community. The purchase and refurbishment of the church building was made possible through local and international fundraising.

Examples of the work at the Al Ghazali Centre

The Parent's Advocacy Project supports parents in dealing with the educational system, advocating and attending school meetings if necessary. It also includes parents' drop-in sessions in schools, an after-school club for children and setting up courses for parents at the centre. Initially funded by grants, now, partnerships are developing with the Liverpool Education Authority and other agencies that will enable this work to be taken forward.

The Health Project aims to increase understanding and awareness in the areas of nutrition, environment, physical activity and general well-being. Sessions and activities have been created for children and adults, and working partnerships have been formed with professional and health agencies.

Sports and recreational activities are provided and are well used by the wider community. Basketball, football, swimming and karate are top favourites for girls and boys both Muslims and non-Muslims.

Many of these activities in response to local needs began as a result of successful funding bids. As partnerships have developed, the way forward for some of them is a community enterprise route. The refurbished Centre, while dependent on fundraising in the first instance, now has the potential for use a venue which can be hired out for events such as the FbRN seminar. It is likely that the Al Ghazali Centre, like many faith based social enterprises, will follow a mixed economy.

Dinham, A. (2007)

Faiths and Frontier on the Starship Social Enterprise, boldly going as faith based entrepreneurs?
London, FbRN UK

East London Mosque and Muslim Centre

ELM takes a holistic view of the community, aiming to provide a range of culturally sensitive services for the communities of London with a view to improving quality of life and enhancing community cohesion. Its work is wide ranging, much of it bearing the characteristics of community development.

Through its unique position in the community, ELM is able to focus on the needs of the diverse Muslim community while ensuring that services are open to all. It meets the needs of the local community by promoting health, education and employment opportunities; provides Muslims and non-Muslims with the opportunity to learn and understand Islam; and contributes to the social, cultural, spiritual and economic enhancement of the whole community through policy and strategy development combined with service implementation.

Attachment	Size
<p>The Improving School Attendance in Partnership project aims to address low school attendance rates by using a faith based approach. Working with families, pupils, teachers and faith leaders, it makes the connection between faith and the need for children to achieve their full potential. Exceptional improvements have been achieved in attendance, punctuality and parental involvement in education. New parenting workshops will aim to empower parents with the necessary knowledge and tools that will enable them to play a greater role in the education of their children.</p>	
<p>The Healthy Living Project starts from the barriers that the Muslim community faces in accessing mainstream health care provision, and the high incidence of certain diseases among the population. In partnership with Tower Hamlets Primary Care Trust, ELM runs seminars on diabetes and heart disease, offers a screening service and has placed 60 people on a three month health and fitness programme.</p>	
<p>The Women's Project, with two female staff, provides support, time and recovery services for women facing a wide variety of social and domestic problems.</p>	
<p>ELM is part of London Resilience, a London-wide initiative that prepares contingency plans for a variety of possible disasters and emergencies. Some of these were put into rapid effect within minutes of the bombings on the London underground network in July 2005 (ELM is a few yards away from Aldgate station). ELM was immediately opened to the general public and some of the victims received initial treatment there. Because of its already good relationships with other faith groups, ELM was able to act with them to counter a possible backlash against the Muslim community.</p>	

www.eastlondonmosque.org.uk [3]

Faith communities contributing to the Bradford New Deal for Communities

Faith organisations have much to contribute towards the regeneration process. Every faith has a social justice agenda, which is supportive of the aims of a regeneration partnership such as, reducing poverty and increasing educational attainment. Faith communities contribute their buildings for social and economic regeneration. They possess a great willingness and desire to improve the well being of their area and community.

Faith organisations share a unique relationship with their members encompassing both a spiritual and moral aspect. A good example of how effective this relationship can be is demonstrated by the Aerobics classes, which were run by a Hindu temple in the area for the elderly. In most cases uptake for this type of project would have been low but because the Temple ran the classes it proved to be extremely successful. Faith organisations have also served as a conduit to access hard to reach groups such as the elderly and those for whom English is a second language. In the Trident area, the mosques have served as a means to access elderly and new immigrant Muslim populations.

Faith Communities, through their faith organisations, have the ability to at times identify and react to situations quicker than either the Local Authority or NDC in our case. The best example of this locally has been the work currently being undertaken by mosques and churches in our area with asylum seekers and refugees and European economic migrants, who have not been engaged as extensively by statutory services.

www.bradfordtrident.co.uk [4]

Attachment Size

FRC Group: Furniture Resource Centre

Liverpool is a city of nearly half a million people. Throughout the 1980's it lost a substantial amount of its manufacturing base leading to high levels of unemployment and poverty. The housing stock also suffered serious decline in this period and there was a concurrent rise in levels of crime, drugs and ill health.

The shift from grants to loans in the UK government's Social Fund in the 1980's made it more difficult for local people to obtain payment for necessary household articles. Recognising the impact on the quality of everyday life, a partnership of churches in Liverpool came together to tackle this issue.

In 1988, the **Furniture Resource Centre** was a project with a staff of 4 supported by volunteers. It supplied donated white goods and furniture items directly to people who needed them. In 20 years Furniture Resource Centre has grown into a nationally and internationally recognised exemplar of social enterprise.

Furniture Resource Centre today delivers a 'one-stop' services of complete packages of furniture, white goods, carpets, curtains and home-starter items. In 2007/08 we made over 4,000 deliveries across the UK. The goods we deliver enable our customers (registered social landlords, local authorities, charities etc.) to provide homes for or to improve the homes of their tenants.

Furniture Resource Centre has won a number of significant contracts to supply furniture to this market including preferred supplier to Procurement for Housing, a collective procurement organisation representing more than 600 Housing Associations. The work of the Furniture Resource Centre has expanded since 1994. FRC Group is now a group of social businesses (including Furniture Resource Centre) addressing issues of poverty, unemployment and social exclusion. Furniture Resource Centre has grown from a project with a turnover of £89k in 1988/89 (80% of which came from grants) to a group of social businesses with a turnover of £3.3m in 2006/07 (7% of which came from grants).

Other businesses within FRC Group are:

- Bulky Bob's – collecting and recycling bulky household waste (furniture and white goods) under contract to local authorities. Since 2000, Bulky Bob's has made more than 400,000 collections and saved 290,000 items from going to landfill sites.
- Revive – selling 'pre-loved' furniture and white goods in a high quality retail environment, marketed to low-income households -more than 20,000 low-income customers since 2000.

and

- Cat's Pyjamas – a joint venture with Urban Strategy Associates, providing consultancy and learning opportunities around social enterprise
- FRC Solutions – consultancy and dissemination of learning and experience

The development of the 'Bulky Bob's' strand was particularly significant as it allowed the project to build up the amount of furniture it collected, to earn income from doing so, and to ensure that this valuable community resource is available to people who need it.

Providing training which can turn people's lives around is at the core of FRC Group. Since 2000, more than 200 people have taken part in our "Driving Change" training programme, gaining experience and qualifications relevant to employment in the logistics industry. Since 2004, 94% of those who completed the programme have gone into sustainable employment.

Attachment

Size

Jewish Care

Jewish Care is the largest health and social care charity for the Jewish communities in London and the South east, caring directly for nearly 7,000 people every week. It believes that Jewish people should have access to specialist services designed to meet their needs and consequently the care provided recognises traditions, beliefs and cultures frequently shared by Jewish people. Jewish Care works right across the community providing care regardless of the level or nature of an individual's religious observance and as such recognises people's differences as well as their similarities. 1,100 dedicated staff and 2,500 volunteers are involved in running over 70 centres and specialist services for

- People with mental health problems
- People with a physical or sensory disability, including those who are visually impaired
- People with Alzheimer's disease or other forms of dementia
- Holocaust survivors and refugees
- People caring for others (Carers)
- Younger people

www.jewishcare.org [5]

Jimmy's Night Shelter

Jimmy's is named in memory of Jim Dilley, who spent much of his life sleeping rough in the region, or spending winter nights in one of Cambridge's temporary shelters. In the last few years of his life, Jim slept under the M11 motorway bridge at junction 13. In the winter of 1993, Jim was told he had lung cancer. Sadly he died in Papworth hospital in June 1994, and subsequently his ashes were scattered at his old 'home' - junction 13 of the M11. His moving story so inspired a small group of people from the churches that they were determined to establish a permanent night shelter in Cambridge. Plans for the Night Shelter were drawn up in early 1995 and in May of that year, the Council gave permission for the Shelter to be established in the basement of the Zion Baptist Church on East Road.

Crucial to setting up the Shelter were funding and donations. Jimmy's was lucky to receive funding from CRISIS, the Opportunities for Volunteering scheme, plus countless donations from many other organisations and individuals. These included kitchen equipment from BT in Ipswich, furniture from the Eaden Lilley department store, a food mountain from the OLEM church.

Even at this stage, Jimmy's was reliant on - and extremely grateful to - an army of volunteers, who worked tirelessly to get the Shelter up and running. These volunteers came from all over: the wider church community, Cambridge's two universities, individuals who had heard or read about Jimmy's in the media, retired people, busy business people, our neighbours in Petersfield - the list really is endless! An especially important group was that drawn from the homeless who helped with decorating, collecting donations, cleaning, cooking, odd-jobbing - already we knew our guests would help make Jimmy's a very special and unique night shelter.

Our services then, although essential, were rather basic: bed, breakfast and an evening meal. It was quickly realised that, important though these are, the needs of the guests were far wider. Working with our guests we have established laundry facilities, a dedicated clothing store, a quiet reading room, pool table, sports afternoons, annual seaside trips, free internet access, guest advocacy,

Attachment**Size**

chiroprody, move-on houses and visiting agencies such as street outreach team, drug & alcohol services, psychiatrist and St.John Ambulance footcare team.

Services like Jimmy's Night Shelter will always be needed. We aim to ensure that whatever the future holds, we will continue to offer love, support and a place of safety and security for all our guests - in memory of Jim Dilley and the many others like him.

Richard, who runs Jimmy's Night Shelter says: Homelessness is often misunderstood because most people have a stereotype image of what a homeless person looks like, what their habits are and what potential threats they present. It is something we at Jimmy's are always ready to challenge, although challenge or confront may be too strong for the way we do it.

Our style of working has always been to keep our heads down and just get on with the work. We do not campaign publicly for understanding of what we do, but we do try to protect our guests from any disadvantages that we are aware of. At meetings particularly, we are able to voice concerns and fears we have for the homeless from unfair treatment, from inequalities that exist, from unreasonable enforcement of the law and from political whims or influences that would ostracise this group of people even more than they experience at present.

Of all the groups of people I meet, the most hardened are those who have some political agenda and those who have to follow a political line. Surprisingly, the Police do not fall into this category, most of those we meet are quite sympathetic of the lot of the homeless and will move them on rather than arrest, or even direct them to Jimmy's! Defending our ethos; our principles and values, also becomes hard, but it always good to be able to talk about the standards, the morality and the ethics of our work, that is - love. It often falls, though, on deaf ears.

In all of this we are mindful of the need for funding, where it comes from (central government) and the fact that the Government does not like nightshelters and soup runs and clothing runs, etc., because they "sustain people in a street lifestyle" and do not assist them out of it. We should invite more politicians to visit Jimmy's and see just how we do assist people out of homelessness.

www.jimmysnightshelter.org.uk [6]

Lighthouse Project / Hull Community Church UK

This project, working with women in the sex industry in Hull, began as a voluntary service by women from two churches in the Hull area. However, they quickly learned that offering "tea and love", although a positive start welcomed by the target group, was not enough. In conversations with them it became clear that a drop-in centre was required.

"One of my most vivid memories is of a woman who came into our drop-in covered in blood. She didn't want to talk she just wanted to go into the toilets and clean up. Not long after, her boyfriend came in shouting for her, and she left with him, shouting and screaming at each other down the street. We sat there helpless, looking at each other. We prayed. And did nothing. A few months later she was murdered. What could we have done?"

Anne Dannerolle volunteer and trustee, writing about the early days of the project.

www.emergingchurch.info/stories/hull/index.htm [7]

Recognising that women who accessed the service had drug addictions and needed support with that as well as child care, health services, domestic violence, homelessness and welfare rights led to the realisation that a full time worker was needed. The volunteers began the task of raising sufficient funds. Importantly the first funder was the Church Urban Fund (CUF). This gave the project a strong air of "respectability" that would encourage others to contribute to the effort. The funding criteria required evidence of working together with other service providers and agencies, so this

Attachment	Size
encouraged and supported the churches' belief that integrated working was necessary. With the aid of CUF on funding proposals, the workers obtained funds to employ a full time project manager.	

The service is accessed via the project outreach bus, a mobile resource travelling around the two red light districts of the city. The bus acts as a venue for sex workers to meet people from the project and is intended as a safe space in which to befriend them as a starting-point for identifying practical support as needs arise. Following a one to one assessment, and preparation of a care plan, the project workers act as advocates and co-ordinators to facilitate access to local services.

The Project, which grew out of churchwomen's concern for women in the sex industry, now provides practice learning for social workers as well as support and consultation for others setting up similar services nationally.

"The Lighthouse project is regarded as a pioneer in this work and its input in the development of other projects has been sought and highly valued."

Adam Dinham *The Mustard Seed Effect* (Church Urban Fund, 2005)

Operation EDEN - Faiths4Change

Inspired by the Bishop of Liverpool the Rt Rev James Jones, Operation EDEN enabled volunteers from faith communities in Liverpool to work in partnership with other local residents to create small scale environmental projects that transformed Merseyside communities. Projects undertaken included community food growing, a recycling service for housebound people, and cleaning up the Leeds Liverpool canal in Bootle town centre. Volunteers received support from the Project Team, including one to one advice, training, network events and grant funding to develop projects.

In Anfield, Liverpool, a Pentecostal church - Liverpool Lighthouse - receiving donations of furniture, needed to create a showroom to enable local people to view the low cost, good quality furniture available. The Al-Ghazali Multi Cultural Community Centre, set up by members of Liverpool's Muslim communities wanted to create a space where young people could come together to grow their own food and learn to care for the environment. Operation EDEN was able to support Liverpool Lighthouse and Al-Ghazali with training, networking events and grant funding to make both projects a reality.

In total EDEN supported 57 projects which involved more than 1500 volunteers and over 200 partners including faith communities, local authorities and residents groups.

Now, a new regional project Faiths4Change has received funding of just over £1 million to use the experience gained through Operation EDEN to develop a multi-faith, environmental transformation project in urban areas within Merseyside, Greater Manchester, Burnley and Preston. The funding is mainly from the Northwest Regional Development Agency (NWDA), the Environment Agency and local authorities. The project is supported by world faith communities.

www.faiths4change.org.uk [8].

John Devine, Churches Officer for the Northwest and patron and board member of Operation EDEN said: "Research undertaken by the NWDA has demonstrated that faith communities are strongest in areas of highest social need, Operation EDEN was a perfect example of how statutory and voluntary bodies could work in partnership with faith communities to engage with hard to reach groups in the community. With further funding now being given to the Faiths4Change programme, we can take those lessons forward and continue to allow people in deprived areas to enhance their skills and make positive changes to their environment."

www.operation-eden.org.uk [9]

Attachment

Size

RISE Project

The **Refugees into Sustainable Employment** project was set up in 2003. It arose from the Northumbria Churches Training Consortium [NCTC] in Newcastle upon Tyne which closed in December 2007. However, RISE was an independent project with its own management systems and sources of funding and is now in the Walker area of the city and under the umbrella of the St Anthony of Padua Community [but without affiliation to any faith].

The Project is based around providing the participants, all with refugee status, a 26 week employment opportunity. A minimum wage is guaranteed and paid by the RISE project. The placement enables refugees to gain experience of the UK job market and working culture. The Project earns money through contract agreements, for example with New Deal for Communities Scheme, and Job Centre Plus as well as other funders; it also does some education work for employers.

Although initially employers had some concerns about the refugees' legal status, they were motivated to support the project for a number of reasons including: social concern, skill shortage, personal interest, cultural benefit and diversity. The Project is pro-active in approaching enterprises, large or small in private and public sectors, to take the refugees on placement. RISE covers the whole of Tyne and Wear, at the moment they have placements in Gateshead, Durham, Sunderland, Jarrow and several in Newcastle itself.

Overall, the RISE Project is a successful and enterprising initiative. Currently there is a 77% success rate into permanent employment. It is measurably providing a useful and meaningful service to the refugee communities around the Tyne and Wear area. The project is also proving to be a learning experience for employers and the related infrastructure organisations such as Guidance Services and Job and Employment agencies. The success of the project is evidenced by secured funding for five years, from both statutory and charitable sources, and holds the Learning and Skills Beacon status from the Quality Improvement Agency (QIA)

www.thebiggive.org.uk [10]

Swindon Young People's Empowerment Programme (SYEP)

The Swindon Young People's Empowerment Programme (SYEP) was started in January 2001, by Bahá'ís of Swindon, in order to work with young people on such things as anti-social behaviour, uncontrollable anger, bullying, depression, fear of failure and poor school attendance. Its main aim is to develop a healthy human spirit in children and young people, and adults who work with them, which means developing one's full and positive potential as a human being. Originally funded by the Bahá'ís of Swindon, the European Social Fund (ESF), the Learning and Skills Council (LSC) and the Partnership Development Fund, SYEP now has several other funders including Lloyds TSB and the Tudor Trust.

Developing a healthy human spirit isn't new or radical. It is mentioned in many government documents including OFSTED's document of 2004 called Promoting Spiritual, Moral, Social and Cultural Development.

Measuring/evaluating the development of a healthy human spirit.

The impact of SYEP is measured in 3 main areas:

Attachment	Size
Increase in sense of self worth, which helps develop an enquiring mind.	
Increased motivation to learn and improve behaviour.	
Desire to be of service to others.	

These have been identified as characteristics of a healthy human spirit and as SYEP has been expanding in eight local schools, much evaluation has been carried out both within the project and externally, providing compelling evidence that this approach is working. Dr Stephen Bigger, of the University of Worcester, has been working as an external evaluator over the past few years. In a recent report he stated: "SYEP sets out to change the way young people think about themselves and their potential. It seeks to help them realise that their lives can be meaningful ... It is innovative, and we can find no systematic provision similar to it countrywide.

"In my view, the Swindon Young People's Empowerment Programme has distinctive methods in focusing on the needs of 'dispirited' young people which are already beginning to grow beyond Swindon and have the potential to become much more widespread. This concern for building self-esteem and personal meaning is an important factor in truancy and disaffection, and is very appropriate for a faith community. This Bahá'í contribution, in the experience of those involved, has been open and inclusive social action, bringing benefits to a wide range of young people in Swindon. This could also make a major contribution to the government's concern for both spirituality in schools, and the social and emotional aspects of learning."

Dr Stephen Bigger, Director of the Centre for Education and Inclusion University of Worcester in his evaluation of SYEP.

www.syep.org.uk [11]

What Faiths Bring to Wider Society

It is clear that faiths contribute significantly in terms of social action through projects and initiatives at local level, through social enterprise, and, as the 'regional forums' section of this report shows, in governance and extended forms of participation.

But there are other more intangible but no less practical and important dimensions to what faiths bring.

NCVO shows that "faith based organisations are integral to civil society; that is they are part of associational life, they are part of the space and place for dialogue within civil society, and they contribute to negotiating collective notions of what a 'good society' might look like" (NCVO 2007:53). They also often provide and participate in spaces for argument and deliberation (e.g. dialogue groups/inter faith councils) as well as participating in external deliberative activities (e.g. through participation in governance structures such as LSPs).

In addition, there are two key concepts which are also useful in exploring the relationship between faith based social action and wider society.

These are:

- Social capital
- Contact theory

These are pertinent because evidence suggests that faiths are particularly effective agents of social capital and that contact between faiths, and between faiths and others, has the potential to promote community cohesion.

Attachment

Size

Faith & Social Capital

Field (2003) offers a useful definition of social capital. At the heart of the concept is the idea that relationships matter. “By making connections with one another, and keeping them going over time, people are able to work together to achieve things that they either could not achieve by themselves, or could only achieve with great difficulty. People connect through a series of networks and they tend to share common values with other members of these networks; to the extent that these networks constitute a resource, they can be seen as forming a kind of capital” (Field, 2003:1).

Different types of social capital can be identified (see Furbey, Dinham et al 2006:7):

Bonding: “based on enduring, multi-faceted relationships between similar people with strong mutual commitments such as among friends, family and other close-knit groups”

Bridging: “Formed from the connections between people who have less in common, but may have overlapping interests, for example, between neighbours, colleagues, or between different groups within a community”

Linking: “Derived from the links between people or organisations beyond peer boundaries, cutting across status and similarity and enabling people to exert influence and reach resources outside their normal circles”

The Gujarat Hindu Society of Preston illustrates the progression from bonding social capital, to bridging and linking. It was first necessary to build up the confidence of the Hindu community in Preston, and secure a base from which they could inter-act with the wider community. This path has taken many years, and is one that is increasingly being followed by the faiths that are newer to Britain. A forthcoming report from the Community Development Foundation examines the issue of single identity funding. The authors of the current report agree with the findings of the CDF report that; funding should depend on an organisation's ability to deliver outcomes and not on its identity, single faith or other and; single identity groups need support to develop diverse leadership, provide culturally appropriate services to their communities, link with other communities, and engage with the public agenda.

A major Joseph Rowntree Foundation study on faith and social capital in 2006 found the following:

Faith communities contribute substantial and distinctive bridging and linking social capital through:

- Co-presence in urban areas
- Connecting frameworks (infrastructure)
- Use of their buildings
- Spaces that their associational networks open up between people
- Engagement in governance
- Work across boundaries with others in the public domain

On the other hand there are also difficulties and obstacles identified including:

- Misunderstanding and suspicion of faiths amongst partners
- Financial barriers
- Inappropriate buildings
- State managerialism and regulation
- Bridging and linking is undertaken by a small minority within faith communities

The evidence shows that women and young people participate less in bridging and linking forms of social capital and more in bonding, probably because of issues of power and the role of women (and

Attachment	Size
young people)	

It is also noted that faith buildings stand as physical markers of faith presence and diversity and in many cases they become places where community activity is focused.

At the same time, it is observed that some faith communities can bond so tightly, within their buildings and more widely in their associational spaces, that they never move on to bridging and linking and in fact resist attempts to do so. This has been called the 'dark side' of social capital.

Examples of social capital connection include:

- National faith, interfaith and multifaith structures (e.g. Inter Faith Network for the UK; FCCC; Faith Based Regeneration Network UK; Council of Christians and Jews; informal dialogue groups for Muslims and Jews, Christians and Muslims)
- Regional and local structures (e.g. faith representatives on regional groups; faith forums and councils; friendship arrangements via informal associations for discussion and action)
- Linking with the wider voluntary and community sector
- Participation in formal governance structures (eg LSPs and Regional Assemblies on which regional faiths forums have seats), which promotes linking social capital.
- Partnerships and projects at community level - this is where most faith based bridging and linking takes place (as the case studies, below, show)

Baker and Skinner (2006:4-5) develop the idea of social capital by talking about spiritual and religious capital:

Religious capital: “is the practical contribution to local and national life made by faith groups”. This relates to the practical actions and resources FBOs contribute in the spaces of civil society.

Spiritual capital: “energises religious capital by providing a theological identity and a worshipping tradition, but also a value system, moral vision and a basis of faith.” This relates to the motivation of FBOs to act in civil society.

Of great importance to faiths is that government and other partners take seriously the relationship between their spiritual and their religious capital. One is often grounded in the other and there is very strong feeling amongst faiths about the importance of policy nurturing both rather than 'taking' the social or religious capital without acknowledging or understanding the spiritual capital that underpins it.

Contact Theory

Whilst there is much evidence and data concerning the role of social capital in relation to faith, there is very little in relation to contact theory.

In his 1954 volume, *The Nature of Prejudice*, Allport proposed that under certain conditions, bringing together individuals from opposing groups could reduce intergroup prejudice. This clearly has potential in terms of government's agenda for community cohesion, particularly as it relates to faiths. At the same time, Allport warned that superficial contact between members of different groups would, in fact, reinforce stereotypes.

The basic formulaic version of the contact hypothesis has four elements: that those in contact with each other should have

- equal status
- common goals
- institutional support
- a perception of similarity between the two groups.

Attachment

Size

There are three practical approaches associated with how contact works:

The *decategorization* model (Brewer & Miller, 1984) proposes minimizing the use of labels altogether, and instead interacting on an individual basis (focusing on relationships between people of different traditions).

The *recategorization* model (e.g., Gaertner, Mann, Murrell, & Dovidio, 1989) suggests that intergroup contact could be maximally effective if perceivers reject the use of “us” and “them” in favour of a more inclusive, “we” category (giving a focus on acting together aside from differences in faith traditions).

The *categorization* model (Hewstone & Brown, 1986), points out practical problems with personalized, as opposed to group-based, interactions and instead promotes keeping group boundaries intact during intergroup encounters (eg faiths remain highly identified with their traditions and engage with one another from within them).

The research presented here thus suggests that ignoring or overlooking group membership during contact may not necessarily result in better intergroup attitudes and relations. Rather, it is suggested that clear but co-operative assertion of different faith identities in inter faith interactions is helpful in promoting better relations between the different groups. This has very important implications for inter faith working.

That said, the faith based evidence for contact theory is very limited. Though it may have application to faith based contexts, and potentially promise much for strengthened and resilient communities, the evidence currently needs to be built up significantly. A programme of research would be required prior to an effective application of contact theory to faiths and community cohesion policies and this would be a beneficial part of an inter faith framework.

A Key Related Idea: Community Cohesion

Embedded in the idea of social capital, and contact theory as a mechanism for promoting it, is the related notion of community cohesion. The CLG response to the report of the Commission on Integration and Cohesion adopts the Report's vision and definition of an integrated and cohesive community as being based on three foundations:

- People from different backgrounds having similar life opportunities
- People knowing their rights and responsibilities
- People trusting one another and trusting local institutions to act fairly

And three key ways of living together:

- A shared future vision and sense of belonging
- A focus on what new and existing communities have in common, alongside a recognition of the value of diversity
- Strong and positive relationships between people from different backgrounds

Faith based social action, emerging from the needs and realities of community life, can be an important contributor to many of these aspects of community cohesion, as the case studies below show. Cohesion is a particularly important concept for faith communities as faith is increasingly acknowledged to be a marker of identity along with race and ethnicity and it is along these 'fault lines' that cohesion is ensured, or fractures emerge.

At the same time, it is crucial that faith and ethnicity are not confused. Whilst they may often overlap, ethnicity cannot be taken as a predictor of faith, nor vice versa. To do so risks forming a

Attachment

Size

framework which does not reflect the real diversity and local contingencies of faiths, and therefore to alienate rather than to engage.

Faith Together in Leeds 11

Leeds 11 is home to around 170,000 people living in 7,761 households, 20% of whom belong to ethnic minorities – an area suffering from multiple deprivation and social exclusion, reflected in high levels of unemployment and crime. It is an area where poor health and bad housing go with living in the most deprived ward in Leeds and well within the 5% most deprived wards nationally. It was against this background that this unique grassroots partnership of Christian Churches and Muslim and community organisations took shape.

A team of staff and volunteers provide a range of services for the local community that are sensitive to the cultural backgrounds of the people involved. For example, the luncheon club takes into account differences in diet, languages and customs, open to different groups on each day. In 2003 a £1.5 million Hamara Centre was completed with backing from the Single Regeneration Budget, the Community Fund, local churches and community fundraising, Church Urban Fund, Methodist Multi-Racial Projects Fund and Tudor Trust. This encompassed a Healthy Living Centre, Community Hall and Parenting Centre which aims to meet the project's objective of 'improving educational attainment and reducing crime and the fear of crime by tackling some of the longer-term social and economic factors that contribute to it.'

During a visit in February 2006, Archbishop Sentamu praised local people for working together.

www.faithtogether.org.uk [12].

Based on an extract of *Angels and Advocates: Church social action in Yorkshire and the Humber* published by Churches Regional Commission for Yorkshire and the Humber www.crc-online.org.uk [13].

ICLS (West Yorkshire)

The Intercultural Communication and Leadership School (ICLS) is a programme of residential seminars for young adults (generally aged 20-30) from diverse cultures and backgrounds. In West Yorkshire it is run by the Active Faith Communities Programme (AFC) - an independent, multi-faith infrastructure support organisation with a specific focus on building the capacity of the faith sector to engage in social action and community cohesion.

Since 2002 AFC has organised 10 seminars with over 100 participants. Each seminar runs for five days and is held at Scargill House, near Kettlewell in the Yorkshire Dales. In the last two years seminars have also been held in other cities in the UK, including Leicester, Peterborough and the West Midlands.

The content of the seminar includes:

- Leadership skills
- Conflict resolution
- Working with the media
- Culture, beliefs and identity

Just as important as the programme content is that participants have a chance to learn about each

Attachment**Size**

other and from each other in a space where they are able to ask difficult questions and have honest discussions. After the seminar, all participants become members of a growing network of people who are active in their own communities and committed to developing healthy and positive relationships between communities. Many of the participants to date have demonstrated the effectiveness of the programme through community projects they have set up or engaged in, and by the life choices they have subsequently made.

The ICLS in West Yorkshire is part of an international programme with links in Europe and Asia. Recently a UK-wide ICLS organisation has been formed and is currently seeking funding to develop the programme nationally.

www.activefaiths.org [14]

The Gujarat Hindu Society, Preston

The community centre and temple with its portico of carved marble is a remarkable sight in a Preston suburb. Founded in the early 1960s by a small group of Hindus, GHS was set up to serve the religious and cultural needs of the Hindu residents of the area.

At first the funding came from the faith community members, and they bought and refurbished an old school building. When this became too small, grants, further community efforts and a loan made the new building possible. The smart new, well equipped premises are well managed and used, providing an income stream as well as benefitting of the community.

"Other organisations like to use our Centre because it's in the right place, it's convenient for the town centre and the station, it's well equipped and there's plenty of parking."

Ishwer Tailor, President of GHS

"It is also about the type of building, it's about relationship. Lancashire County Council sees GHS as a faith organisation that has achieved a great deal against the odds. They are proud to be associated with a Hindu faith organisation that has raised the profile of the area."

Vijayanti Chauhan, External Relations Policy Officer, Lancashire County Council

For local people the Centre provides: Jobs information and advice IT Training A youth development programme A lunch club run by elders Sports activity for all ages A worship centre Over the years it has established itself as one of the major community organisations in the borough, and worked in partnership with Social Services to provide services for older people, the Youth Service to train leaders and support youth work, the Learning and Skills Council, and, with the North West Lancashire Health Promotion Unit, has set up a Gujarat Health Users Forum.

GHS has thrived and grown because, while remaining rooted in its own community, it has had the vision to make a place for itself in the wider world, and has never been afraid of a challenge.

www.ghspreston.co.uk [15]

Support Mechanisms for Faith Based Social Action

There is a range of support mechanisms for faith based social action operating at national and regional levels. It is also certain that there is a degree of local support in some areas but this is almost entirely undocumented and rather patchy. Support activities are predominantly characterised by activities including dissemination of information, seminars and training, promotion

Attachment
and support of networks, advice, consultancy and mentoring.

Size

National Structures

At the national level, there is one multi-faith organisation, the Faith Based Regeneration Network UK (FbRN UK) which supports faith based social action and one key interfaith organisation, the Inter Faith Network for the UK (IFN UK), which, though not focusing on social action, is key in building social capital with faith groups.

Faith Based Regeneration Network UK (FbRN)

The Faith Based Regeneration Network UK (FbRN) is the leading national multi faith network for community development and regeneration. Set up in 2002 by practitioners of faith based community development, regeneration and social action, it aims to:

- link practitioners to learn and gain inspiration from each other across the different faith traditions in the UK
- encourage the active engagement of faith groups in regeneration
- build their capacity for this
- provide an interface between policy makers and communities.

It is managed by a Trustee body drawn from nine faith traditions: Bahá'í, Buddhist, Christian, Hindu, Jain, Jewish, Muslim, Sikh and Zoroastrian.

FbRN has 1,400 individuals and organisations on its contact list. By cascading through other organisations, its newsletters and email bulletins reach 9,000. It produces a Toolkit for practitioners, *Tools for Regeneration: Practical Advice for Faith Communities*, 4,000 of which are in circulation. It runs seminars and training events, for example in 2006/7 on Faith in Community Development and Faith Communities and Social Enterprise, resulting in policy focused publications and further good practice guides.

FbRN is a member of the Government's Faith Communities Consultative Council and the CLG Third Sector Partnership Board. With the Inter Faith Network for the UK, FbRN facilitates the developing English Regional Faiths Forum Network.

FbRN is developing a new website which aims to be a major resource for practitioners and policy makers.

Inter Faith Network for the UK (IFN)

The Inter Faith Network for the UK was founded in 1987 to promote good relations between people of different faiths in Britain. Its 150 member organisations include national representative bodies of the Bahá'í; Buddhist; Christian; Hindu; Jain; Jewish; Muslim; Sikh; and Zoroastrian communities; national, regional and local inter faith organisations; and academic institutions and educational bodies concerned with inter faith issues.

The emphasis of the IFN's work is on linking, co-operation and communication. It provides information and advice to a wide range of organisations and individuals on inter faith matters and on how to contact communities at both national and local level. It holds regular national and regional meetings and organises seminars and conferences on a variety of issues and projects and publishes material to help encourage and resource inter faith activity.

In recent years a Faith Communities Forum has been developed within the framework of the Inter Faith Network for the UK to provide a mechanism for consultation between national faith community representative bodies on matters of mutual concern, including issues on the public agenda as well

Attachment

Size

as the development of inter faith relations. IFN services, with FbRN, the recently formed English Regional Faith Forums Network.

Alongside these multi and inter faith organisations, a number of bodies springing from a single faith (though often working with others) are also key. They are as follows:

Church Urban Fund (CUF) provides support in the form of funding for small faith based community projects, practical advice and information for them and acts as a vehicle for representing their voices at all levels. CUF has been operating for 20 years and emerged from the 'Faith in the City' report (see also Dinham, 2005). The overall aim is to tackle poverty and deprivation. CUF does this via targeting funding at small and local faith based social action projects that are open to all. These projects need to be located in the top 10% of poorest areas in England in accordance with the Index of Multiple Deprivation and/or serving intrinsically deprived communities. They make grants totalling between £1.5 and £3 million per year. The average annual grant is £5,000. CUF is also funded by the Cabinet Office in support of its CUF Xchange (CUFX) initiative, aimed at creating a voice for small faith based social action projects and encouraging them to network together (mostly at national level, but also at regional and local too). Through this they run an interactive website. The longer term aim is to broaden this network to include all faiths and projects that are not receiving CUF funding but that meet CUF's funding criteria as well as the 500 projects that are currently supported. Other support activities offered by CUF and CUFX include conferences, training workshops, tool kits, one to one consultancy, signposting, infrastructure development and advocacy work.

A recent study showed that CUF funding results in much greater impacts than originally intended by the grant itself (Dinham 2005) and that these arise out of a number of distinctive factors, many of which are shared with other faith based support structures and indicate something of what can be distinctive about the faith 'offer':

- Strategic and prophetic insight - seeing beyond the immediate to the long-term and sustainable
- Making small grants targeted towards needs that would otherwise be unmet or find difficulties in getting support
- Strong local and historical presence via diocesan and parish structures - giving voice to grassroots organisations
- A developmental approach which is responsive, flexible and creative
- Linking up local work with diocesan, regional and national agendas
- Commitment to building capacity
- Challenging others to 'join in' - setting an example
- Encouraging and allowing people to take risks and be distinctive

Churches Community Work Alliance (CCWA) is an infrastructure organisation with a remit to work across all parts of the UK and Republic of Ireland to advance and encourage church-related community development work. It promotes community development values and principles as the most effective and authentic way to engage with communities and it seeks to support frontline workers and organisations in delivering training and services. CCWA has a comprehensive website to help build capacity in the sector (www.ccwa.org.uk [16]). CCWA is currently undergoing a major review of how it will provide capacity building support in the future and is looking at the major challenge of how it will sustain itself financially and structurally as an organisation. This is likely to result in CCWA becoming a virtual network of organisations and workers, with its website being the major tool for providing information, advice, resources and discussion. In accordance with community development values, CCWA wants to equip frontline organisations and workers to become better informed about a range of issues and policies, and be able to participate in networks and policy critique more effectively and to reflect on the theological motivations for community engagement, as well as how their own work can have more impact.

United Reformed Church (URC) Community Development Programme was a pioneer in Church Related Community Development. Its CRCW programme has been running since 1982. It

Attachment**Size**

trains community development workers who are then deployed in local areas and are paid a stipend in the same way as the clergy. It also encourages local church congregations to become involved in community development and produces resource packs and a video. The CRCW Programme is serviced centrally by the URC.

Caritas is the umbrella organisation for Catholic social care organisations working within England and Wales. It produces research reports and resources for Catholic social action.

United Synagogue, Community Development Group encourages community development and volunteering by the Jewish community. It works to develop strong leadership and community empowerment. The CDG recognises that the faith community needs encouragement to build up their confidence and capabilities and supportive relationships through which they can develop social capital. It runs a range of programmes including networking and training, and publishes resources.

Faithworks is a national second tier support agency specialising in the Christian faith sector which has three core aims:

- Empowering and inspiring individual Christians and local churches to develop their role in their community
- Challenging and changing the public perception of the Church by engaging the media and government
- Encouraging unity and partnership to meet needs of the community

Faithworks offer training resources, telephone advice, consultancy and tool-kits and are active in supporting and encouraging the development of networks between Christian faith based organisations.

The above organisations have as their primary purpose the supporting of faith based social action. There are, in addition, national bodies of faith traditions, some of which support and encourage their members in social action as part of a wider remit. It is not feasible to list all these organisations here and a full list can be found on the website of the Inter faith Network www.interfaith.org.uk [17]

Support Structures at the Regional Level

Faith Councils/Forums of Faiths

A range of regional faith bodies have been developed which work in various ways as structures of support to faiths. (For details see the 'Regional Forums' section of this report). Faith councils or forums exist in eight of the nine English regions:

- Northwest Forum of Faiths
- South East of England Faith Forum
- West Midlands Faiths Forum
- Yorkshire and Humber Faiths Forum
- Forum of Faiths for the East Midlands
- East of England Faiths Council
- South West Council of Faiths
- London has a Boroughs Faiths Network and is developing a Faiths Forum

The regional section of this report explores the regional forums in detail. For the purposes of this report it should be noted that, at regional level, it is predominantly the Christian Churches that have geographical spread of population, physical presence and infrastructure. Thus, in each region a number of Anglican and Roman Catholic Dioceses, United Reformed Church Provinces, Methodist

Attachment**Size**

Districts and other groupings may well map onto the footprints of regional governance, as also the ecumenical Churches Together bodies that exist at county level in many parts of the country. That said, they are all working with other faiths to one degree or another (as the regional section of this report shows). The issue of differing capacities and resources between the faiths is an important one in framing a way of interfaith working. Faith forums recognise that it is crucially important to avoid institutionalising inequalities of capacity as this will further disadvantage the faiths which are newer to Britain, many of which also share minority ethnicities.

FaithNetEast and Faithnetsouthwest

In addition to the regional forums of faith, in two regions there are also information and learning hubs which support the social action activities of faiths. These are in the East of England and the South West. The following case study gives examples of the work of one of these hubs, for more information on FaithNetEast and faitnetsouthwest please see the regional section of this report.

Churches Regional Network

CRN coordinates the input of the Churches into regional development, supports the Churches Regional Officers. The Churches regional structures have different names in the different regions. CRN frequently acts to support social action through good practice, experience and information sharing either informally or formally via events.

A particularly active example of a regional structure is the Churches Regional Commission (CRC) for Yorkshire and the Humber which provides advice, training, conferences, seminars and briefings. It has given funding to projects in the past, but its primary activity involves engaging at regional level with policy and strategy, and acting as a catalyst for action and networking. CRC Y&H supports the sharing of good practice and has provided help with funding bids, especially in the area of heritage and tourism. It also employs two people in North Yorkshire who work with a Christian organisation called Farm Crisis Network, providing (alongside volunteers), free advice and support to farmers. CRC Y&H was also key in setting up the Yorkshire and Humber Faiths Forum. With the Faiths Forum they run 'Faith Matters', a programme which trains people in secular organisations to better understand faith communities and how to work with them; 4,000 people have completed this training.

Sub-Regional & Local Structures

Specific faith based support is also available through structures at sub-regional level. The availability of other support varies greatly across the country. There are models of good practice to build on and we focus here on two: the Active Faith Communities programmes in West Yorkshire, and the Hull Search project.

It should also be noted that the Anglican Church is particularly strong in having staff located in most dioceses across England that have as at least a part of their role the support of church based social action. The other larger Christian denominations (Catholic, Methodist, Baptist, United Reform) have their own equivalents.

A recent survey by the Church Urban Fund (CUF 2007) found that the projects it supports (mostly Christian and with links to churches) are most likely to seek help from a Church or faith organisation and it uses the Anglican diocesan structures to 'reach' those communities in need.

The next most likely source of support is the local authority or a local council for voluntary service. The local 'Churches Together' (see the Hull Search case study) frameworks in towns and cities provide the most used opportunities to engage in partnership work.

There is no comparable information about other non-Christian faith communities, most of which do not have similarly well established structures, though their faith based social action itself is

Attachment**Size**

extensive. As noted above, it would be beneficial to map activities by faith tradition. It would also be useful to map and database structures of support in order to target capacity building in these area and as a resource for faiths everywhere.

Faith Communities Capacity Building Fund

The Faith Communities Capacity Building Fund (FCCBF) has been another key source of support. In its two years of funding faiths (2005/06 and 2006/07) it has supported 338 faith based capacity building initiatives and 238 interfaith initiatives. Funded projects gave an indication of which faiths they would be working with. Of 139 projects reporting, in receipt of large grants, 609 faith groups were identified as end beneficiaries of their projects. Of those, the breakdown by faiths is as follows:

- Christian 114 (17.3%)
- Muslim 111 (16.9%)
- Hindu 85 (13%)
- Sikh 79 (12%)
- Jewish 71 (10.8%)
- Buddhist 62 (9.4%)
- Bahá'í 48 (7.3%)
- Other 33 (5%)
- Jain 32 (4.8%)
- Zoroastrian 22 (3.3%)

Source: Derived from data on p14, *Faith, Cohesion and Community Development*: an evaluation report from the Faith Communities Capacity Building Fund

The breakdowns for small grants follow a similar distributive pattern amongst faiths.

The evaluation of the Faith Communities Capacity Building Fund indicates that there are several key learning points in relation to interfaith dialogue and social action:

- That capacity needs to be built from the 'bottom up' and reflect the diversity of faiths by being supported at regional, sub-regional and local levels
- That funding streams should use these networks to respond to local needs and be set up in such a way as to hear them
- That there needs to be a realistic mix of paid and unpaid staff and volunteers at the local level. It should not be assumed that faiths have an unlimited supply of labour and other resources
- Projects dominated by one faith may have diverse beneficiaries but often find it hard to attract diverse governance. There is a specific capacity building need around some of the faiths which are newer to Britain.
- It is important that when capacity is built in one place it is not at the cost of effective existing work in another.

Our discussions with faith groups also indicate that there is concern that FCCBF was effective in building capacity in year one but subsequently squandered much of it by not funding some of the year one initiatives in the second phase. It is important to strike a balance between supporting innovation on the one hand and consolidating excellence on the other. Faith based social action should not be regarded as solely or perpetually innovative. It must be allowed also to become established.

A Note on Non-faith Based Support Structures

Faith based organisations are also able to turn to secular VCS organisations at national, regional and local levels in the same way as other organisations can. It has been noted by Barnes and Berkeley (CUF 2007:6) that faiths are most likely to seek help from a faith organisation, local authority or local Council for Voluntary Service. This may reflect the fact that many of them feel their voice is

Attachment Size
heard by faiths themselves or at the local rather than national level.

There is also strong evidence from users that faiths appreciate and express a need for support that is informed by awareness of and sensitivity to the culture and practices of their organisations and, indeed, preferably by faith based organisations. Partners in the VCS and elsewhere need to develop faith literacy.

A 2007 report by the National Council for Voluntary Service concluded that while many of the support needs of the faith sector could be provided by generic VCS infrastructure organisations 'there may be a case for targeted support to meet the needs of particular constituencies'.

Whilst some communities and faith based organisations are aware of and will use voluntary, and occasionally public, sector support agencies, others are ignorant or suspicious of the support they provide and do not access them. Research based in Guildford for the Governance Hub concludes that smaller 'faith based organisations are unlikely to search for VCS support or belonging' and that 'existing faith sector infrastructure needs greater recognition and support'. (Jones, P 2007).

Some CVSs and culturally specific support agencies are well attuned to the needs of faith groups and report a significant take up of their services from faith communities, but there is still a mismatch with the perceptions of some faith groups who feel their faith-specific contexts are not adequately understood. A clear written compact between VCS structures and faiths would be of great value.

What do Support Structures Do?

At present there are five main ways in which faiths are supported. They:

- Provide mechanisms for communication with membership/clients/contacts: this may be through email/telephone help lines, attendance at events
- Conduct research: some organisations undertake specific research and consultation with faiths
- Facilitate dialogue amongst networks and between groups and individuals
- Disseminate literature, for example guides, toolkits and other sources and resources
- Formulate and interpret policies, information and opportunities around all parts of faith based activity

Many of these sources and resources are produced at local and regional level. While some are effectively and widely disseminated, others seem to be bound by their localities and it is likely that opportunities for support and learning could be more widely shared round.

Barriers to Using Support Structures

Some of the barriers to accessing support structures include:

- Many faiths do not see themselves as part of the VCS and therefore do not go to those wider structures for support
- There can be misunderstanding and, in some cases, hostility towards faiths from non-faith support structures
- Suspicion of official bodies, especially in the context of a focus on prevention of extremism
- Such suspicion can transfer from suspicion of government to suspicion of other 'official' sounding bodies such as CVS's
- Poor publicity/knowledge of support available
- In some cases there are limited resources and lack of capacity for seeking support
- A key barrier is lack of time where reliance is placed on volunteers with many other commitments. This is often consolidated by the perception by others that faiths are time and

Attachment

Size

resource rich whilst in reality this may only apply to paid officers and within the more established traditions

Active Faith Communities - West Yorkshire

Introduction

The potential for faith groups as a stimulant and focus for community activity has long been recognised: 'The vital regenerating, life-enhancing role of faith communities re-connecting people and encouraging them to work together to serve each other must no longer be neglected' *John Battle MP*

John Battle went on to argue that faith groups along with their buildings have a supremely significant part to play in the rebuilding of a more inclusive and more human 21st Century Britain.

Active Faith Communities is an innovative multi-faith, multi-cultural charity set up in 2003, specifically focused on equipping faith communities in West Yorkshire to unlock their potential for developing social and community projects in partnership with the wider VCFS. Faith groups are uniquely placed to work with the local communities in which they are based to develop projects for the common good; however they often need advice, information and support to develop projects. AFCP exists to fill this gap.

AFC's vision is of a world where faith communities work in partnership to create a fair, inclusive and sustainable society and its mission is to maximise the ability of faith groups to work with others to play a part in fulfilling the potential of their communities, and to build bridges between communities of all faiths and none.

AFC's current aims for the period 2008 to 2011 are:

- To build the capacity of the sector
- To build bridges and create cohesion
- To empower local faith-based organisations to lobby and influence decision makers

AFC's current activities include:

- Organising and delivering regular Intercultural Communication and Leadership Seminars, a residential Programme aimed at 18 to 30 year old community activists from different cultural and faith communities
- A capacity building project supporting faith based community development and social action projects with areas such as governance, organisational development, and fundraising.
- Cohesion projects on the Holmewood Estate in Bradford and in Beeston, South Leeds .

AFC's Structure - AFC is governed by a Board of Directors drawn from a number of different faiths including Islam, Christianity, Hinduism and Sikhism.

www.activefaiths.org [14]

FaithNetEast

FaithNetEast has been funded by the Faith Communities Capacity Building Fund and its remit is as

Attachment	Size
a regional infra-structure to mediate information and learning about policy, skills, funding and community development between the regional and the local. This body is not representative but rather acts as an agency to support the region's faith communities in social and community activity, including engagement with the public sector.	

At the same time FaithNetEast fosters a strategic focus, linking up initiatives across the regions where it is thought that networking and co-working might be of benefit, and tying locally based activities in to regional thinking and practices. It is also careful to respect the power and autonomy of faith structures for social action at the neighbourhood level and sees itself as a facilitator of the local as and where it is sought out and welcomed. FaithNetEast also works with the Regional Development Agency to reflect the regional priorities as they relate to faiths.

Thus it has set up 'specialist support networks' (mostly facilitated by ICT but also in face to face meetings) for faith groups doing work with migrant workers, refugees and asylum seekers, skills improvers and lifelong learners, social enterprise and people wishing to return to employment. It also runs seminars and events to support faiths in their social action.

www.faithneteast.org.uk [18]

Hull SEARCH

In Hull the KEY Churches Together Group, with the support of the local CVS established Hull SEARCH in 1999 to support local church-led community action in Hull and district. It is ecumenical in both its structure and its approach, and works at grass roots level. The work of SEARCH is primarily aimed at the poorer and least well resourced churches, it is for all churches and Christian groups.

Hull Search provides help with:

- **Finding out:** helping churches find out about the needs and resources in their local communities, to ensure new developments meet real, identified need.
- **Project development:** helping churches to make a realistic assessment of their current resources, strengthen existing social action and plan future developments
- **Signposting:** pointing churches in the direction of information and resources to assist their development plans
- **Training:** helping churches to identify training needs and supporting them in accessing relevant training for staff, volunteers and participants
- **Networking:** helping churches develop links with other local churches and projects, community groups and organisations/agencies that may be thinking or working in a similar way.
- **Funding:** working closely with other local agencies to provide up-to-date funding information, support and advice in applying for grants for projects and activities
- **Information:** a bi-monthly newsletter with information about training, funding, resources, events and local developments. An E-mail bulletin service, providing an, up-to-date source of information
- **Database:** a database of existing church-based social action and community activities, which can be accessed by churches and other organisations
- **Conferences and events:** an annual training programme of training events, enabling networking and sharing of best practice

www.keyct.org.uk/SEARCHhomepage.htm [19]

Attachment Size

'Non-Faith Specific' Central Government Funding

The Funding Environment

The Third Sector has had a key role in government policy for over a generation but it is only in the last ten years that

- the language of partnership has become all-pervading
- faith communities have been drawn into this framework alongside other sections of the Third Sector

To receive public funding, organisations, including faith organisations, must demonstrate that they are working in ways that enable key policies and strategies to be delivered. Within this context, whilst faith communities have increasingly been seen as groups with much to offer the government agenda, at the same time they are viewed in some quarters with suspicion as a result of:

- an historic assumption that public sector funding should not be used to 'promote' religion
- the perception by some that faith communities are in some sense culpable for some of society's ills such as discrimination, social disturbance, and violent extremism

Politicians have repeatedly stated the importance of faith communities for delivering social change but in practice the funding environment is potentially confusing both for public sector officers and for faith communities. From the perspective of public officials the sheer diversity of organisations and traditions amongst faiths can be overwhelming and the language of faith can be very different from the language of government. From the perspective of faith communities, there is a concern that their independence might be compromised, and about a lack of experience and capacity to engage.

The Faith Communities Capacity Building Fund and, with a much tighter policy focus, the Preventing Violent Extremism Pathfinder Fund primarily aimed at supporting integration and positive civic engagement in the Muslim community, have made steps towards addressing these concerns. In the context of these specifically targeted funds, it is important also to identify the extent to which faiths have been successful in accessing mainstream government funding programmes too.

Despite best efforts, it is not always the case that major government departments co-ordinate their funding programmes. This often means that applicants are faced with a confusing range of potential targets and criteria. The broad policy streams that are supported by funding include:

- Economic development, social inclusion and regeneration
- Healthy Communities
- Community cohesion and integration
- Active citizenship and volunteering
- Delivering more effective public services

Some of the key funding programmes to deliver these objectives include:

- **Cabinet Office - Futurebuilders, £150million over four years**
- **Cabinet Office - Capacitybuilders Improving Reach, £18million over three years**
- Cabinet Office - Community Assets Programme, £30million (operated by Big Lottery Fund)
- DCFS - Local Network Fund, £150million over five years
- **DCSF - Parenting Fund, £14million over two years.**
- **DCLG - Connecting Communities Plus, £18million over three years.**
- **Department of Health - Opportunities for Volunteering, £6.7million in current**

Attachment	Size
year.	
Department of Health - Section 64 Grant Scheme, £17.2million in current year.	
Home Office - European Refugee Fund, £1million in current year.	
Government Offices for Regions - Community Champions, £9million over three years.	

The focus is on the six funds identified in **bold italic** in this list as these funds represent a considerable volume of funding for the Third Sector, four different government departments and a range of policy objectives.

It should also be noted that there are a number of other funding sources. These include:

- Government supported or mixed programmes in the arts and sport
- Lottery funding through programmes such as the Big Lottery Fund, Awards for All, and the Heritage Lottery Fund.
- Regional and local regeneration funds
- Learning and Skills Councils
- Connexions
- Primary Care Trusts
- Local authority funding

Some methodological considerations

Data

Given the limited resources for this study it was only possible to survey funds where information was publicly available (on the internet). Although the majority of funds do give good information in this medium, the format and quality varies from fund to fund so comparability is not possible. Some funds have insufficient information and have therefore been excluded from this study.

Websites of recipients of funding have also been used to determine whether they were faith-based organisations or not. This raised further questions, (see below), but in relation to the data itself it should be noted that not all organisations have a website and that the quality of those that do varies.

Timing

The initial time frame for the study was the 2006-7 financial year as it was assumed that this would be the most recent year in which all the funds would have full reporting information. In fact, some of the funds only give information for the most recent funding round (2007-8). Nevertheless all six of the funds have good information available for either one or both of the years from 2006-8 and cross-checking, where possible, showed that there was little difference in the broad patterns over this two-year period.

Classification

This important issue is not just a methodological inconvenience. It also goes to the heart of the discussion about the nature of faith-based organisations and recurs in the analysis of the funding programmes. An important aspect of this is that there is a significant confusion in some cases between ethnic minority organisations and faith based organisations. This points up a more general confusion between ethnicity and race. As far as possible all organisations that claim to be faith based have been classified as such. So, for example, with regard to major national organisations, The Children's Society, Barnardos and YMCA all still claim in their literature to be Christian or Christian-based and this is reflected in their long histories and current governance although it may not be reflected in their staffing, volunteers or users. On the other hand the YWCA, another historically important Christian agency, makes it very clear that they are **not** a faith-based organisation any longer. A more recent example of this confusion is the

Attachment**Size**

Bromley-by-Bow centre in East London. Although it is regularly hailed as one of the most successful faith based social enterprises and was based around the Bromley-by-Bow church, in current literature it is difficult to detect any remaining indication of its faith connections. Where it is not stated but historical information indicates a faith base, it has been included.

Analysis of funding programmes

In each funding programme this report presents a summary of the purposes, criteria and scope of the programme, together with some of the basic figures relating to faith-based recipients. This will be followed by a brief discussion of one or two salient issues that arise from the examination of the pattern of grant making. What is presented here is indicative. Each theme is identified in connection with just one of the funding schemes. There then follows a general summative discussion.

Cabinet Office - Futurebuilders

www.futurebuilders-england.org.uk [20]

Summary

Start date: 05/07/2004 / End date: 30/01/2011

With an emphasis on service delivery, it has become important for government to invest in the Third Sector so that it can actually compete for service delivery contracts from statutory bodies. A key feature of Futurebuilders is that a significant proportion of any funding is in the form of low-interest loans. The loans are paid back with revenue from contracts with public sector agencies such as local authorities and primary care trusts.

Total Fund Value: £150,000,000. The Total Fund Value represents the amount allocated to Futurebuilders for 2004-08. The minimum amount offered is £50,000 in the main programme although smaller development grants are also available.

The website reports that since its launch in 2004, Futurebuilders has offered over £108 million of investments in over 235 organisations, although these figures are increasing all the time as funding decisions are made at any point.

Basic figures

The publicly available information on the website shows funding of £69.2million from the start of the funding, spread over 164 projects. Of these, there are 14 projects that are identifiably faith-based - either by name (League of British Muslims) or clearly stated on their website. These projects are in receipt of approximately £9.5million.

Discussion

In the Futurebuilders criteria, unlike many other funding programmes, there is no mention of faith or religion, either as a qualifying or disqualifying factor. The implication seems to be clear - as long as an applying organisation can show that they can deliver the outcomes required it makes no difference to the funder whether they are faith based or not. Perhaps because of this 'faith neutral' approach, Futurebuilders has attracted a rather different range of recipients than some of the other programmes.

They appear to fall into three main categories.

- Organisations which are clear about, both their faith base and the intention to serve a primarily, although not exclusively, faith-connected community where this is meeting a real need that is unmet in other ways. This includes the Bayis Sheli project for children with

Attachment	Size
<p>special needs in the orthodox Jewish community, and the League of British Muslims offering a range of services to Muslims and others in east London.</p> <p>Physical and social regeneration projects centred around church re-building programmes. These include InSpire at St Peter in Walworth, London which, like many inner-city churches is reconstructing its building to serve local needs, and Cottingley Cornerstone Centre in Bradford and All Saints in Birmingham which are both concerned with re-developing 'village' communities on the edge of major cities.</p> <p>Most interesting are a third group whose faith and operational profile are significantly different from a previous generation. Primarily Christian, these organisations, are confidently 'up-front' about their religious motivation, but serve a wider community regardless of faith. These include the following (which have been anonymised):</p> <p>***** <i>Christian ***** Project ... Practical, emotional and spiritual needs are cared for during and beyond a person's residency.</i></p> <p>***** <i>Enterprise is a charity which seeks, out of Christian conviction, to help the most disadvantaged in the local community.</i></p> <p>***** <i>As a Christian organisation we prayerfully seek to bring out the best in the people we serve, pursuing excellence in all we do.</i></p>	

Clearly the model of 'investment' and loan operated by Futurebuilders has attracted some exciting initiatives but it is equally likely that it has discouraged others who might otherwise be well able to deliver local services. In a mixed funding environment it may be a positive factor to have a range of funding approaches. It is noted that the format of Futurebuilders may change, although it is unlikely to be substantive, from 2008 when the operating authority changes to the Adventure Capital Fund.

Cabinet Office - Capacitybuilders Improving Reach

www.capacitybuilders.org.uk [21]

Summary

Start date: 30/10/2007 / End date: 31/03/2008

Capacitybuilders has grown out of the government's ChangeUp programme to build up infrastructure, support and capacity building services in the voluntary sector. The focus of the Improving Reach programme is to ensure that this initiative is accessible to "frontline organisations working in and with excluded communities; including BME communities, refugee and migrant communities, faith communities and isolated rural communities". The first round of funding under this programme applied to 2006-8, and it is this round that is discussed here, and a second round of applications for funding in 2008-9, has just closed.

Basic figures

In the two year period of 2006-8 allocations equivalent to a total fund of £10.5million are listed. This fund is spread over 126 projects. The programme currently proposes that in the three year period beginning April 2008 the total fund value will be £18million.

For a break down of funding amongst different groups see the discussion below.

Discussion

The analysis of the Improving Reach funding programme highlights the confusion between the category of 'faith' and the category of 'BME'.

In the funding criteria for 2006-8, four priority categories were identified

- Black and minority ethnic groups (BME)
- Refugee and migrant groups

Attachment	Size
Faith groups	
Isolated rural groups	

In addition, the fund specified that grants “may not be used to support or promote religious activity.” This phrase or similar phraseology in other programmes has often served more to confuse than to clarify. As has already been seen in the Futurebuilders discussion, there are many organisations which see serving the community as central to their religious activity.

In the end a judgement on these issues needs to be made and more than one approach is possible. In this report the view has been taken that if an organisation did not mention any faith connection anywhere in their self-description, and were not otherwise known as a faith-based organisation, then they were not a faith-based organisation.

A potential confusion arises where an organisation is working in settings where there is an overlap of the BME and faith identification (e.g. Bangladeshi or Somali) and where there is no indication that it is a faith-based organisation. More than one possibility exists - they have made a deliberate choice to focus on ethnicity rather than faith as their distinguishing characteristic, or they may have downplayed their faith character either deliberately or accidentally. Following an 'inclusive' approach which acknowledges applicants as faith based where there is evidence of either dimension, the analysis of the Improving Reach recipients shows several groupings:

- Secular organisations whose target is BME communities including those who mention faith communities. There are 26 of these organisations who are in receipt of £2.2million.
- Secular organisations who specifically mention faith communities in their target groups i.e. a sub-set of the above. There are 8 of these organisations in receipt of £644k.
- Faith-based organisations working with any of the priority groups (i.e. including BME, refugee and faith groups). There are 14 of these organisations in receipt of £1.2million.
- Faith-based organisations who are working specifically with faith groups (as opposed to the other target groups) i.e. a sub-set of (c). There are 9 of these organisations in receipt of £710k.

Department of Children, Schools and Families - Parenting Fund

www.familyandparenting.org/Parenting [22]FundHome

Summary

Start date: 09/12/2005 / End date: 31/03/2008

Deriving from the policy emphasis on education - in its broad sense - and enabling children to fulfil their potential, good parenting is seen by the Government as an important strategy. This fund assists voluntary and community sector organisations who support parents where families are at risk, for one reason or another, and who may have not been able to get hold easily of the services they need. The Family and Parenting Institute (FPI) is managing the Parenting Fund on behalf of the DCSF. Funds examined here were allocated in 2006 for a two year period from 2006-8.

Basic figures

In this two year period just over £14million has been allocated to 131 organisations.

Of these there are twelve projects working with BME communities which might include faith communities but which are not specified. These organisations are in receipt of £1.2million.

There are six faith-based projects in receipt of funds totalling £724k.

Discussion

Attachment

Size

Of the six faith based projects, all are Christian organisations - two are Barnardos, two are YMCA and one is the Southwark Diocese in London. The sixth is also a Christian organisation based in south London. This spread of recipients does raise some questions, particularly if it may be assumed that in the locations identified as priorities for parenting support work there is an over representation of BME populations and, whilst the overlap between faith and ethnicity is not clear cut, it could be assumed that many of these people would come from faiths which are newer to Britain.

Is it assumed that either the secular organisations or the Christian organisations work most effectively with those whose prime identification is with their non-Christian faith? In practice this is unlikely to be the case and it may well be therefore that there are existing local parenting support groups who are receiving no support from this fund.

Department for Communities and Local Government - Connecting Communities Plus
www.cdf.org.uk [23]

Summary

Start date: 10/04/2006 / End date: 31/03/2009

The policy focus is the Government's strategy to increase race equality and improve community cohesion. There are two parts of the Connecting Communities Plus programme. A fund for "strategic and project grants" (£12million) and a fund for community grants. We will be focusing on the latter.

The four themes for the fund are

- Improving access and outcomes for Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) communities in education, employment, health, housing and the Criminal Justice System.
- Increasing BME communities' confidence in public services.
- Tackling racism and extremism.
- Bringing together communities from different races and faiths, and promoting a shared sense of belonging (community cohesion).

Basic figures

The total fund value over a three year period is £3million.

In the first round (2006-7) a total of 122 organisations were in receipt of £1.1million. Of these 17 projects mentioned faith or religion at some point in their project description, and were in receipt of £143k. There were five specifically faith based organisations in receipt of £37k.

In the second round (2007-8) a total of 99 organisations received £999k. 20 organisations mentioned faith or religion and were in receipt of £190k. There were eight specifically faith based organisations in receipt of £79k.

Discussion

This fund emphasises ethnic minorities as the prime target for funding so it is not surprising that there is a relatively low level of funding to faith based organisations. But, questions might be raised as follows.

- In order to include as many projects as possible we have included all projects that have even a passing reference to faith. In some it is clear that this is just seen as an extra term to use in a package of other characteristics and there would be some doubt regarding whether the project actually linked to faith communities in any meaningful way.

Attachment	Size
	<p>Did the funding criteria actively deter faith based applicants? Although faith is mentioned in one of the themes, the following were specified as activities which 'could not be funded' services or events where the key purpose is to promote a religious doctrine; mission or proselytisation;</p> <p>promotion of the beliefs of a particular faith (beyond basic religious/cultural awareness raising);</p> <p>acquisition of religious artefacts or publications for the use of followers in worship;</p> <p>the cost of supporting religious personnel in their normal duties in their place of worship;</p>

Although these are all legitimate in themselves, together they give a very off-putting impression and are not necessary for the fulfilment of the programmes objectives. As has been seen in the Futurebuilders criteria, an emphasis on the positive characteristics can be equally effective.

In addition, at a time when government was actively pursuing faith based groups as potential partners it might be assumed that a changing pattern might be witnessed between the first and second round of funding. But, although there is a change, it is relatively small - from five to eight faith-based groups funded.

The total fund is relatively small and the majority of grants were in the £5k-£10k range. Yet there are a huge number of BME and faith-based organisations. This sets up a competitive environment which often leaves those who 'fail' with strong emotions, often directed at successful recipients and at government. This is unlikely to result in a positive environment to foster partnership working.

Department of Health - Section 64 Grant Scheme

www.dh.gov.uk [24]

Summary

Start date: 01/01/1968

This is a long-standing grants programme which originated in the Health Services and Public Health Act 1968. For the 2008/09 funding round there was an over-arching aim of 'making a difference to the quality of people's lives'. The Section 64 scheme then identifies a range of priorities - in 2008-9 there were 32 separate priority themes - in line with departmental policies. Within these themes projects of national significance are prioritised. The Section 64 scheme provides for both project funding and core funding. It is very common for organisations to have several projects funded at the same time as well as a core grant.

Basic figures

In both of the years 2006-7 and 2007-8 the total funds made available were in the region of £17.2million.

In 2006-7 311 projects were funded and 113 core grants made. Of these there were eight projects from faith-based organisations (seven separate organisations) receiving £202k in funding. There was one core grant to a faith based organisation of £140k (this grant is unusual in nature and arose from particular historical circumstances).

In 2007-8 287 projects were funded and 91 core grants were made. Of these there were eleven projects from faith based organisations (ten separate organisations) receiving £437k in funding.

Discussion

National and strategic funding.

The Section 64 scheme is unusual amongst the schemes surveyed in that it places most

Attachment

Size

emphasis on funding national organisations or, at least, projects with national significance.

Clearly for those organisations operating in the health sector - broadly defined - the core funding provided by this scheme is of significance. The majority of the funded organisations are directly related to health provision but there are a few who are receiving a core grant and whose aims are more generally related to a 'healthy society'. But this does raise questions regarding the funding of national or strategic organisations in other sectors.

Department of Health - Opportunities for Volunteering

www.dh.gov.uk [24]

Summary

The purpose of Opportunities for Volunteering is to use the expertise of the Third Sector “to identify new health and social care needs and to contribute to the development of innovative service models that involve volunteers”. Unlike other programmes described in this report, the main channel for distributing the funds is through sixteen 'national agents'. These agents include many 'household names' including the Children's Society, Barnardos and Churches Together in England.

Basic figures

In the year 2006-7 £6.7million was distributed to the national agents who in turn funded 311 local projects.

Discussion

Regional variation.

Several of the funding reports break their narrative down into regional categories so this analysis for this particular fund could be repeated for the others.

In the table (below): column one shows the total amount in grants given for that region, and below that the number of actual projects; column two shows the amount channelled through the faith-based organisations. Below that is the percentage channelled through faith-based organisations and to the right is the number of organisations.

The Children's Society and Barnardos use the majority of their funding to support local projects within their organisations. Churches Together encourages applications from local groups - they say that they should be Christian groups although there appear to be some exceptions to this rule. In addition are a small number of faith based groups who receive grants from one of the other national agents.

Department of Health Opportunities for Volunteering	
TOTAL	
East of England	
£606,527	
37 projects	
East Midlands	
£513,967	

Attachment	Size
24 projects	
London	
£1,397,281	
56 projects	
North East	
£348,833	
16 projects	
North West	
£722,073	
38 projects	
South East	
£728,274	
39 projects	
South West	
£581,913	
29 projects	
West Midlands	
£362,431	

Attachment	Size
18 projects	
Yorks & Humber	
£1,021,725	
33 projects	
TOTAL FOR ENGLAND (EXCLUDING NATIONAL PROJECTS)	
£6,283,024	
290 projects	

The analysis above appears to show considerable regional variation. The most obvious is the case of the West Midlands with no faith-based projects. (The 2007-8 figures were also checked and showed two faith based projects in the West Midlands.)

Without knowing the detailed approach adopted by each of the national agents it is difficult to draw firm conclusions from the clear variation between regions - and it should not be assumed that the national organisations were failing to engage in important work in these regions - possibly, only that they were not using this particular funding stream to support their work. Yet, even at the most basic level, the variation raises some questions about its possible causes. Although not part of this exercise, a parallel analysis was undertaken of projects that indicated work with BME communities and this showed a similar regional variation.

Involvement of minority faith communities.

The three faith based national agents are all Christian organisations. All would claim to deliver their scheme across all sectors of society - although through different mechanisms. Barnardos and Children's Society mainly use this funding to deliver their own programmes, and Churches Together takes applications from local Christian groups who are responsible for delivering local projects. While there is no doubt of the high quality of the work undertaken, there must be a question regarding the ability of these organisations to deliver these services in areas of high need where minority faith communities form a significant part of the population.

General questions and issues arising from the data

What is a faith based organisation?

This study has focused on the receipt of funds from government funding schemes by faith based organisations. But it raises the question, 'What is a faith based organisation'? It may be that a worship congregation (church, mosque, gurdwara etc) is easily defined as such - but there are very few of these who are in receipt of government funds. Is an organisation which was founded

Attachment

Size

200 years ago out of a strong faith conviction, but is now seen as part of the general voluntary sector, still a faith based organisation? Is an organisation that defines itself in terms of its ethnicity (Bangladeshi, Pakistani, Somali, for example) but is rooted in what otherwise would be recognised as a faith community, a faith based organisation? Is an organisation that includes the name of a faith tradition in its title but, in practice operates on a purely secular basis (i.e. there is no religious motivation to its work) a faith based organisation? Is an organisation founded by a religious cleric, and still with clerics among its staff, but otherwise completely secular in nature, a faith based organisation?

A clear working out of what makes an organisation 'faith based' would be extremely useful. It would have to be developed in partnership and consultation with faiths, however, in order to ensure credibility.

A useful typology might include the following determining characteristics:

- by its governance,
- by the nature of its volunteers, staff and activists,
- by the nature of its users,
- by the nature of its history.

But all of these important policy initiatives will be futile if faith based organisations do not have the capacity and supporting infrastructure to enable them to engage properly with government programmes. Discussions informing this report suggest that much of the good work started under the FCCBF programme will simply cease to exist at the end of this financial year, with little replacement support available.

Some strategic considerations.

Government programmes are far from being the only potential funding source for faith based organisations. But the crowded funding environment does not work to the advantage of organisations and sectors which are low on capacity and experience in the first place. While, in theory, a diverse funding environment may be a good thing, in practice, those who are experienced in negotiating this territory will continue to be more successful, leaving many smaller or less experienced organisations struggling.

Just looking at a small number of Government funding programmes will lead an outside observer to ask why there is such a confusing number and type of schemes. From the perspective of Government the answer is simple - there are many Government departments, each with a variety of policy and strategic objectives and each operating in its own way to engage with the Third Sector as appropriate. From the perspective of faith based organisations, and other Third Sector bodies, it appears to be a confusing and uncoordinated world. At the same time it is a very important world to the Third Sector and the faith communities, as funding is one of the main ways that policy is turned into practice.

There is clearly a need for a mixed funding environment but there is a danger that important organisations may fall between the cracks. These may be local organisations which are unaware of funding streams or lack the capacity to apply to them, but it may also be organisations whose principal function is strategic rather than service delivery. There are a small number of grants being made available at national level for organisations, including faith based organisations, but, as yet there is little funding for regional organisations which often provide a unique role - in touch directly with local 'front-line' groups, and able to take a strategic view on policy and delivery issues.

What Government and Faiths Can Do

Attachment

Size

In extending the public policy table to include faiths, government must clearly play an active role in helping to make that work. Faiths are generally very welcoming of the policy agenda that is unfolding in their direction and many recognise that there have been significant efforts to support them, for example through the Faith Communities Capacity Building Fund, the Faith Communities Consultative Council and the Cohesion & Faiths Unit in CLG.

At the same time our discussions indicate that there are a number of important perceived unmet needs:

- There could be much understanding and openness between faith and non-faith partners, and this must be cascaded down to the local government level where it is currently largely unheard
- There needs to be better evidence and research which is nationally comparable as well as locally and regionally descriptive so that the added value of faiths, and the challenges and opportunities for engagement, can be communicated and addressed
- There needs to be a clear understanding of what faith networks and infrastructure already exist. Developing new structures risks creating parallel spaces which duplicate effort, dilute support and introduce competition where there has been partnership. This would result in the breakdown of trust and reciprocity in contexts where years of work have been done to build them up
- The wider VCS should make a stronger commitment to reaching and engaging faiths at local, regional and national levels, working in partnership with existing faith agencies rather than setting up their own new 'faith units' or equivalents
- There is also a significant need for intensive, face-to-face, medium to longer term, tailored support to build capacity, developing what has already been started under the Faith Communities Capacity Building Fund
- Support is needed to help faiths engage in extended forms of governance, especially among minority faiths and smaller community projects which are stretched
- Faiths need to have time to reflect on practice in order to maintain the crucial relationship between their worshipping communities and the social action which arises from them. Meanings matter greatly to faiths and reflection upon them is the bedrock of their social action. This will support a continuing creative grassroots constituency of 'active citizens'

Our interviews and discussions with faith groups, and our review of the evidence and other sources, indicates that faiths have some strong views on what would help government and faiths to work together within an effective framework for interfaith dialogue and social action, in a range of areas:

Network & communicate

Opportunities for sharing information and learning should be resourced and embedded in neighbourhoods and supported by the regions. Regional infrastructure should be consolidated by national networking to ensure the dissemination of good practice.

Make available clear channels of communication up and down the policy/practice/research ladder which are sensitive to the lived experiences of faiths at community levels, for example through regular focus groups in local situations, perhaps facilitated by bodies such as the Faith Communities Consultative Council.

Ensure that organisations and agencies, whose policies and practices have a major impact on faith based social action, work together positively.

Promote effective working between faiths and VCS structures at all levels but especially the local.

Attachment**Size**

Faiths themselves need to work to ensure effective relationships between worshipping communities, which are the bedrock, and the wider social activities in which they engage. They could do so using techniques such as 'congregational development'.

They also need to work to ensure that there is trust and confidence in leaders and representatives as they increasingly work in new public spaces.

Resource & support

Signal clear support for faiths at the public table at all levels of government, especially the local where it is largely unheard. Articulate clear rationale which emphasise respect for faiths as well as the value they can add.

Continue to provide resources for building capacity, distributed in partnership with local and regional partners.

Provide resources for maintaining effective and established infrastructure for faiths' engagement, in consultation with the regional faiths forums.

Promote opportunities for faiths to be represented and develop and resource training for skills to engage effectively (eg 'mutual concepts and values literacy' training, and training for participating in formal structures such as LSPs and other partnership bodies)

It should be recognised that there is a need for funding as well as for extending social enterprise approaches to faith based social action. Faiths often work with the hardest to reach and with approaches which will not attract self-sustainability.

In some cases, particularly amongst faiths which are newer to Britain, help is needed to build up infrastructure to ensure effective engagement.

Research & evidence

The building and maintenance of an evidence base on the added value of faiths is key to identifying what needs they are fitted to respond to and how to address them. It is also a key part of communicating added value to partners and funders.

A national dataset requires the development of a shared language for measurement and a process needs to be gone through with faiths to achieve this.

Faith based social enterprise activities should be mapped, their benefit audited and activities categorised in order to establish the potential for extending a social enterprise dimension to faith based social action, and for understanding its limits.

Contact theory has potential as a tool for understanding and promoting better interfaith relations and community cohesion. A programme of research would be required prior to an effective application of contact theory in this area.

Policy & processes

Building on broad support for the Faith Communities Consultative Council, work with it to identify an effective practical and grounded role

Work with and build up existing structures at national, regional, sub-regional and local levels Avoid introducing new ones which do not have the networks, trust, confidence and track records and which risk duplicating effort and introducing competition where there is currently effective

Attachment	Size
partnership	
<p>Make support structures more faith friendly, for example through funding and monitoring criteria which reflect what is valuable to faiths as well as how faiths are valuable to wider society</p> <p>Build the faith dimension into all new policies and initiatives to ensure that their contribution is part of the natural and established landscape of policy formation and implementation</p> <p>But make efforts, working with faith communities, to refresh, renew and 'grow' the people who appear in that landscape to ensure that they reflect what is really happening at local level - the likelihood of hearing repeatedly from a small number of the same people is higher amongst some faiths where there is growing demand for 'voices' to be heard and a limited number of people available to respond. This compromises representativeness at the same time as 'burning out' key figures</p>	

Bibliography and Further Reading

Barnes, S. and Berkley, N. ((2007)
Church Urban Fund Impact Study
 London CUF

Baker, C. and Skinner, H. (2006)
Faith in Action; the dynamic connection between spiritual and religious capital
 Manchester: William Temple Foundation

Berkeley et al, (2006)
Faithful Representation: Faith representatives on local public partnerships
 London: Church Urban Fund

Brewer, M. B., & Miller, N. (1984)
Beyond the contact hypothesis: Theoretical perspectives on segregation
 (pp. 281-302). in N. Miller & M.B. Brewer (eds.), *Groups in contact: The psychology of desegregation*.
 Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Commission on Integration and Cohesion. (2007)
Our Shared Future

Communities and Local Government
The Government's Response to the Commission on Integration and Cohesion
 (2008)

Dinham, A. (2006)
The Mustard Seed Effect
 London: CUF

Dinham, A. (2007)
Faiths and Frontiers on the Starship Social Enterprise, boldly going as faith based entrepreneurs
 London: Faith Based Regeneration Network UK

Dinham, A. (2007)
Priceless, Unmeasurable? Faiths and community development in 21st century England
 London: Faith Based Regeneration Network UK

Faithworks (2005)

Attachment	Size
<i>Building the capacity of London's faith groups</i> London: Faithworks	
Field J. (2003) <i>Social Capital</i> London: Routledge	
Finneron, D and Dinham, A. (2002) <i>Building on Faith: faith buildings in neighbourhood renewal</i> London: Church Urban Fund	
Furbey, R. et al, (2006) <i>Faith as Social Capital: Connecting or Dividing?</i> Bristol: Policy Press and Joseph Rowntree Foundation	
Gaertner, S. L., Mann, J., Murrell, A., & Dovidio, J. F. (1989) <i>Reducing intergroup bias: The benefits of recategorization</i> in <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i> , 57, 239-249.	
Greater London Enterprise & London Churches Group for Social Action (2002) <i>Regenerating London: Faith communities and social action</i>	
Hewstone, M., & Brown, R. (1986) <i>Contact is not enough: An intergroup perspective on the 'contact hypothesis'</i> In M. Hewstone and R. Brown (Eds.). <i>Contact and conflict in intergroup encounters</i> . Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.	
James M (2007) <i>Faith, Cohesion and Community Development: an evaluation report from the Faith Communities Capacity Building Fund</i> London: CDF/CLG	
Jochum, V. (ed.) (2007) <i>Faith and Voluntary Action: an overview of current evidence and debates</i> London: NCVO	
Jones, P. (2007) <i>The Guildford Report: governance support needs of smaller and local faith based organisations</i> an unpublished report to the Governance Hub	
Lowndes, V and Smith, G. (2006) <i>Faith Based Voluntary Action</i> ESRC in the Mapping the Public Policy Landscape series	
Lowndes, V. and Chapman, R. (2005) <i>Faith, Hope and Clarity: Developing a model of faith group involvement in civil renewal</i> Leicester: Local Government Research Unit, De Montfort University	

Regional Sources for Faith and Social Action

- Booton.B & Hindley.A (2004)
Supporting Faith and Community Action in the East Midlands - feasibility study report
(December 2004)
- Churches Together in Hastings and St Leonards, (2004)
Faith Action Audit

Attachment	Size
Derby Diocesan Council for Social Responsibility, (2006) <i>Faith in Derbyshire: Working towards a better Derbyshire; faith-based contribution</i>	
Diocese of Liverpool (2003) <i>Faithful to Knowsley's Communities</i>	
Diocese of Liverpool (2004) <i>Faithfully Serving Rural Communities - A Survey of the Contribution by Rural Churches in Greater Merseyside to their Communities</i>	
Diocese of Liverpool (2003) <i>Living Faiths in Sefton - Report & Recommendations on a mapping exercise of faith communities in Sefton</i>	
East of England Faiths Council and the University of Cambridge (2005) <i>Faith in the East of England: a research study on the vital role played by faith communities in the social, economic and spiritual life of a region</i>	
Greater London Enterprise and London Churches Group (2002) <i>Neighbourhood Renewal in London: the Role of Faith Communities</i>	
Greater London Enterprise and London Churches Group (2002) <i>Regenerating London: Faith Communities and Social Action</i>	
Jackson.M & Kimberlee.R (2004) <i>Daily Service: How faith communities contribute to neighbourhood renewal and regeneration in the South West of England</i> University of the West of England	
Northwest Forum of Faiths (2003) <i>Faith in England's Northwest: the contribution made by faith communities to civil society in the region</i>	
Patel.P (2006) <i>Faith in Action in the South West - a survey of social and community action by faith groups in the SouthWest of England</i> DCLG	
Ravat.R (2004) Leicester Faiths Regeneration Project <i>Embracing the present, planning the future: social action by the faith communities of Leicester</i>	
Regional Action West Midlands (2006) <i>Believing in the Region: a baseline study of faith bodies across the West Midlands</i>	
SE England Faith Forum (2004) <i>Beyond Belief? - Faith at work in the community</i>	
Smith. K, North East Churches Regional Commission (2002) <i>Faith in the North East: Social action by faith communities in the region</i>	
West Midlands Faiths Forum (2005) <i>Believing in the West Midlands: Report of the first conference of the West Midlands Faiths Forum</i>	
Yorkshire & the Humber Churches Regional Commission (2002) <i>Angels and Advocates: Church Social Action in Yorkshire and the Humber</i>	

Appendices

Attachment

Size

Appendices to **Faith Based Social Action and the Inter Faith Framework**

1 Interview schedule

1. Does your organisation support social action by faith based organisations?
2. If so what do you do?

(You may find the following helpful)

Dissemination of relevant information to faith based organisations
Seminars and training
Networking
Advice (eg on legal status, constitutions etc)
Consultancy to individual organisations/people
Mentoring to individual organisations/people
Support services such as payroll
Other: please list

3. How do you know what support is needed?
4. Do you know of other organisations that also provide support to FBOs? (either faith based or non faith based)
5. What support needs are you aware of that are currently unmet?
6. Do you consider that FBOs experience barriers when accessing support services?
7. If yes: What is the nature of these barriers? Do you have any evidence or examples of this? (probe for whether there is a difference between support offered by faith based organisations and non faith based organisations)
8. What can or should the government do at local, regional and national level to increase the amount of faith based social action and to make it more effective?
9. Explain the definitions of bonding, bridging and linking social capital (use the JRF work). What do you think is the relationship between these types of social capital for FBOs? (possible prompts: faith groups are sometimes perceived as being good at bonding but not at bridging and linking; sometimes a view is expressed that faith groups need to move on from bonding)
10. What can or should government do to increase the bridging and linking social capital of FBOs?
11. Explain 'Face-to-Face' and 'Side-by-Side' (see below). Is there a relationship between these activities? What do you think it is? For example, does one lead to the other? Do they exist independently?
12. In your experience, does faith based social action connect faith groups with wider society and/or make a contribution to civil society? Could you explain how and give examples?

2 List of interviewees

Name

Attachment**Size**

Syd Bill

Liz Carnelly

Ian Chisnall

Vijayanti Chauhan

Nils Chittenden

Billy Dann

Anne Dannerolle

Doreen Finneron

Jenny Kartupelis

Aurangzeb Khan

Shaynul Khan

John Kuhrt

Barney Leith

Leonie Lewis

Attachment	Size
Virginia Lockett	
Fidelma Meehan	
Annie Merry	
Dorab Mistry	
Ian Owers	
Ernest Schlesinger	
Natubhai Shah	
Sandra Spence	
Paul Southgate	
Ishwer Tailor	

3 Abbreviations

- CRC** Churches Regional Commission
EEFC East of England Faiths Council
EHRC Equality and Human Rights Commission
FFEM Faiths Forum for the East Midlands
GO Government Office
LA Local Authority
LSP Local Strategic Partnership
NWFF North West Forum of Faiths
PET Primary English Tests
RAISE The Voluntary and Community Sector in the South East
RDA Regional Development Agency
RFF Regional Forum of Faiths

Attachment	Size
SEEDA South East England Development Agency	
SEEFF South East England Regional Faiths Forum	
VCS Voluntary and Community Sector	
WMFF West Midlands Faiths Forum	
YHFF Yorkshire and Humber Faiths Forum	

Source URL: <http://www.fbrn.info/faith-based-social-action>

Links:

- [1] http://www.fbrn.info/files/FbRN-report_0.pdf
- [2] <http://www.northeastchurches.org.uk>
- [3] <http://www.eastlondonmosque.org.uk>
- [4] <http://www.bradfordtrident.co.uk>
- [5] <http://www.jewishcare.org>
- [6] <http://www.jimmysnightshelter.org.uk>
- [7] <http://www.emergingchurch.info/stories/hull/index.htm>
- [8] <http://www.faiths4change.org.uk>
- [9] <http://www.operation-eden.org.uk>
- [10] <http://www.thebiggive.org.uk>
- [11] <http://www.syep.org.uk>
- [12] <http://www.faithtogether.org.uk>
- [13] <http://www.crc-online.org.uk>
- [14] <http://www.activefaiths.org>
- [15] <http://www.ghspreston.co.uk>
- [16] <http://www.ccwa.org.uk>
- [17] <http://www.interfaith.org.uk>
- [18] <http://www.faithneteast.org.uk>
- [19] <http://www.keyct.org.uk/SEARCHhomepage.htm>
- [20] <http://www.futurebuilders-england.org.uk>
- [21] <http://www.capacitybuilders.org.uk>
- [22] <http://www.familyandparenting.org/ParentingFundHome>
- [23] <http://www.cdf.org.uk>
- [24] <http://www.dh.gov.uk>