An evaluation of the Funding Programme for Mission Opportunities in New Housing and other Development Areas

Sally Cupitt with Diana Parkinson and Avan Wadia

Charities Evaluation Services

May 2014

Acknowledgements

Glossary

Church planting: Where a group of people from a congregation start up a new church in a new area.

The Commissioners: The Church Commissioners.

Dechurched: People who were once, but are no longer, part of a church.

Impact: The change, effect or benefit that results from the services or activities on a wider society than its direct users. It is often long term, broad and sustainable and can include affecting policy decisions at government level.

Messy Church: A form of Church for children and adults that involves creativity, celebration and hospitality.

Outcome: The changes, benefits, learning or other effects that happen as a result of services and activities provided by an organisation.

Postholder: A person whose salary is/was all or partly paid for by the Fund.

The Programme: The funding programme for mission opportunities in new housing and other development areas.

Unchurched: People who have never been part of a church.

Contents

Tables and charts

Executive Summary

Background

The Programme

In 2007 the Church Commissioners (the Commissioners) and the Archbishops' Council (the Council), earmarked £7.25 million for new housing and other development areas (for example, business or retail) with the aim of extending the Church's witness into these areas and developing sustainable Christian communities.

Fifteen dioceses were given grants under the funding programme, starting in 2008. Much of the work was delayed due to the effects of the recession, but the projects for which the dioceses have to date used the funding have been involved in three main areas of work: missionary or outreach staff; funding for infrastructure, like church buildings; supporting other outreach projects.

This evaluation

In 2013 Charities Evaluation Services was asked to ascertain the impact of the Programme to date, and identify any learning. We collected initial data for this evaluation through a review of project documentation and monitoring data; the monitoring data from projects was limited. We also undertook a brief online survey, site visits with 13 of the dioceses, and interviews with 52 people across all 15 dioceses and a representative from the Council and Commissioners.

Summary of findings from project delivery

Project planning

- Dioceses did substantial amounts of planning, research and needs assessment to inform their work, particularly involving local stakeholders. Many found little evidence of 'what works' in growing Church in new areas to inform their plans.
- Some postholders found it helpful to do more detailed consultation and planning when they came into post, and as a result changed plans where necessary.
- It was important to be realistic at the planning stage – a few of the projects had overstretched themselves.
- There was perhaps a lack of shared understanding about the level of diocesan time required to run the funded projects.

Recruitment

- Many dioceses found it hard to recruit the right person to deliver the project.

- Although most postholders had experience in pioneering ministry, few had formal training. Personal attributes of postholders were very important, including an ability to do mission rather than ministry, energy, charisma and a willingness to 'get their hands dirty'.
- Recruiting ordained staff sometimes brought benefits in terms of links into the community, but sometimes meant staff struggled to manage competing demands.

Management and staff support

- Most postholders had direct line management, which was offered by people ranging from a local vicar to the bishop. Many had some form of steering group as well. Managerial structures appeared complex.
- Many postholders had developed their own support networks, often in response to what they saw as an exhausting – but rewarding – role.
- Several postholders would have liked more contact with Fund postholders in other dioceses.

Working relationships

- Most postholders found their local clergy supportive; some encountered a lack of understanding about their role, tensions over interpretation of faith or a sense of competition. Lack of resources or capacity in the parish to support pioneer work was sometimes an issue.
- Diocesan support and the strength of the local church were important success factors – those with vibrant congregations were more able to support pioneering work.
- It was suggested that more preparatory work could be done with local clergy before new pioneering projects are set up.
- Where postholders were lone workers, they found it difficult to do their work and to achieve positive outcomes.

Summary of findings about engaging people

- Projects were more successful when the postholder lived in the new area.
- Usually, having a space to meet was found to be really helpful by postholders, but some found the lack of venue had benefits in terms of finding creative solutions.
- Some types of development – for example high rises, dormitory towns, transient populations and places lacking facilities – made outreach work harder.
- To respond to high levels of families in new developments, many postholders put on family-specific events like Messy Church.
- Being highly visible in the community, including getting involved with community issues, was seen as a vital way to gain credibility and engagement.
- Although many projects offered explicitly Christian projects from the start, some offered secular community activities first before introducing Church.

- Attracting people to active involvement in the Church – beyond simple attendance – was found to be hard by many projects. Some felt that it might not be a realistic goal within a three-year timescale.

Summary of findings about accountability and learning

- Monitoring and evaluation within the projects has been very limited to date, although most projects have collected some data, including a small amount of outcomes data.
- There was a lack of clarity in terms of the intended outcomes for each project and, in some cases, a lack of understanding of the difference between outputs and outcomes.
- Reporting to date has been very variable, although the new reporting template, introduced in October 2013, is starting to bear fruit.
- The Strategy and Development Unit has offered support to the projects but has limited capacity.
- Although some dioceses have started to share learning from their work, the potential for learning from the Programme has yet to be fully realised.

The impact of the Programme

Demonstrating the impact of the Programme

- The lack of robust outcomes data on the projects limits what can be said about Programme achievements, and it is simply too early to say what many of the projects have achieved.
- Some projects have taken a much longer-term approach in their work, focusing on community development work initially rather than directly on mission. These projects, if they do help create sustainable Christian communities in the future, may take a long time to do so.
- The Programme has offered capital grants. There are limits to the extent to which the outcomes of activities in these new churches and venues can be claimed by the Programme.
- Projects may well have had an effect on neighbouring churches, but it is hard to evidence this.
- There is a lack of agreement as to what success looks like in this work.

Summary of findings as to whether the Programme's aims have been met

- There is evidence of new sustainable Christian communities emerging in six dioceses.
- The projects have attracted new people into church in target areas, about a third of whom are estimated to be unchurched, a third dechurched and a third children.

- The projects are getting people involved in Church actively, through volunteering and training courses. The postholders have also carried out about 180 ceremonies, mostly baptisms. The projects offering a specific service (Street and Club Angels, Street Pastors, Coffee Plus) have between them involved substantial numbers of volunteers, many of whom offer significant amounts of their time.
- The Programme has helped create a small number of new or improved places for people to worship.
- There is a high level of continuing commitment to the projects at this time. Of the ten dioceses in which projects have ended or are ending soon, nine are planning continuation in some form.

Summary of other outcomes and impacts

- The Programme has added to the capacity of local churches, and leveraged in funding.
- The Programme has contributed to the development of new ways of allocating and evaluating the funding made available by the Commissioners for mission and ministry.
- There is some anecdotal evidence that several projects – particularly those where the faith and secular worlds meet – have improved attitudes towards the Church.
- There is some anecdotal evidence of community benefit as a result of the Programme, in terms of increased sense of community, community safety and economic impact.

Recommendations

For the Programme itself

For the remainder of the Programme's duration, the Commissioners should consider:
- Offering more opportunities for postholders to meet and network.
- How learning might be more regularly shared between postholders and the wider Church, perhaps by developing a learning network.
- What data they require from projects, as a minimum, for the final evaluation, and consider how existing projects might be supported to collect this data.
- Improving the reporting template.
- Whether some long-term impact tracking might be useful for those projects that have focused initially on community development work, to ascertain to what extent these projects lead to sustainable Christian communities in the long run.

Recommendations for future funding programmes

The funding relationship

The Commissioners should consider:

- Being more explicit about the extent and nature of diocesan support required for funding programmes.
- Offering opportunities for postholders to meet and network.
- Whether they might be able to facilitate the recruitment process by signposting to appropriate resources.
- How learning might be regularly shared between postholders and the wider Church, particularly in terms of what is effective in missional work.
- Clearer and more robust requirements for monitoring large grants.
- Whether future pioneering work should include, as part of its planning, preparatory work with local areas to ensure the local clergy understand the nature of pioneer work and are willing and able to support it.

Monitoring and evaluation

The Commissioners should consider ways to improve the monitoring done at project level, to enhance the evidence of the outcomes and impact of their funding:

- Funded projects would benefit from clearer outcomes. Some of these could be specified by the Commissioners, to meet the aims of a specific funding programme. Others might be locally developed by projects.
- Projects should also map out a basic theory of change, describing how their activities will lead to early outcomes and finally to the intended outcomes of the funding programme.
- Projects would also benefit from simple but systematic monitoring and evaluation plans. Reporting should speak to these evaluation plans.
- Some projects might benefit from a better understanding of evaluation and an outcomes approach.
- The lack of suitable tools that fit the demand of missional and outreach work may be hindering the projects in their data collection, and new tools might be explored.
- Projects might benefit from an online reporting system.

Section one: background

1.   Introduction

1.1.   The Programme

The Church Commissioners (the Commissioners) support the work of the Church of England as a Christian presence in every community. They manage the Church's historic resources and their responsibilities include supporting poorer dioceses with their ministry costs, providing funds to support mission activities, paying for bishops' ministry and some cathedral costs, and paying clergy pensions for service prior to 2008. Jointly with the Archbishops' Council, the Commissioners plan their spending in three year periods. Their expected non-pensions distributions in 2014-16 are £284 million.

In 2007 the Commissioners and the Archbishops' Council earmarked £7.25 million to support the Church's mission in new housing and other development areas (for example, business or retail) with the aim of extending the Church's witness into these areas and to help build new sustainable Christian communities. Fifteen dioceses were given grants under the funding programme (the Programme).

In 2013 Charities Evaluation Services was asked to undertake an interim evaluation of the Programme.

1.2.   This evaluation

The purpose of this interim evaluation was twofold:
1. To ascertain the impact of the Programme to date, primarily in terms of meeting its overall aim of creating sustainable Christian communities. Community impact was also an interest.
2. To draw out any learning to date, both for the further life of the funding programme itself and for sharing learning more widely within the Church.

The purpose of the evaluation is to look at the programme as a whole rather than to make an assessment of the effectiveness of individual projects; across 15 dioceses with around 35 projects between them, it was not possible to do justice to all the work involved at project level. The focus is also on outcomes and impact, rather than detailed documentation of activities and outputs.

1.3.   Methodology

We collected data for this evaluation in two main ways:
1. document review
2. primary data collection through site visits and interviews.

Document review

We reviewed a range of documents relating to the funding programme as a whole.

At a project level, across the 15 dioceses we reviewed over 120 documents, including project proposals, reports and newsletters. This varied across projects with some supplying as many as 16 or more documents, and some only two or three.

We reviewed documentation to draw out data on outcomes and learning to date. We also assessed the documentation in terms of strength in a number of areas, including needs assessment and planning and monitoring and evaluation. For more about this exercise see Appendix A.

Primary data collection

To supplement our document review, we undertook our own primary data collection.

We undertook site visits with 13 of the 15 dioceses; the remaining two we interviewed by phone. The lighter-touch data collection in some areas reflects the fact that projects in those areas had started only relatively recently. In total we carried out 29 interviews with 52 people across all the projects, often in groups; most interviewees were either postholders or diocesan staff. The interview schedule for these visits can be found in Appendix B.

We also carried out a short online survey to get data from the projects on who they had worked with and project outcomes. Thirty different people completed the survey.

Finally, we interviewed a representative from the Strategy and Development Unit within the Commissioners and Archbishops' Council.

Understanding the data

To understand the findings of this report, it is important to be aware of the nature of the data presented in relation to outcomes and impact. For a discussion of some of the difficulties in collecting outcomes and impact data on the Programme, please see section 3, chapter 1 below.

Limited outcomes data

Almost none of the projects had collected outcomes data for us to draw on. In many cases what was presented as outcomes data was not about outcomes; it usually described activities in some form, rather than the changes as a result of those activities. We collected some very basic outcomes data within this evaluation to try to fill some of the gaps. While we are very grateful for the time taken by projects to share this data, this data too is patchy. We have outcomes data on projects within 12

of the dioceses; no data was available for three dioceses. This is either because the projects have only just started, or because no data was collected.

The quality of data

Of the data submitted to us, there are limitations, including:

- Some of the data cannot be well aggregated. It is difficult to combine the data from one project with the data from another, and therefore hard to build a picture of the achievements of the programme as a whole.
- Much of the quantitative data (for example, data related to numbers participating in activities, new church members) is estimated as there were no monitoring records to draw on; we have had to rely on the memories of postholders or sometimes diocesan staff for the data.
- It is not always clear if data relates to the same, different or overlapping sets of people, so people may be double counted in some instances.

2. About the Programme

2.1 Background to the Programme

Money has traditionally been given by the Commissioners to dioceses by formula, taking into account factors such as diocesan income, local population and number of clergy in the diocese. This funding is based on need, rather than proactively seeking opportunities.

While needs-based funding remains the main focus of the funding made available by the Commissioners, by the turn of the century the Archbishops' Council and Commissioners began to argue that a more proactive approach was needed alongside. As a first step to addressing this, the Council and Commissioners introduced the mission development funding for dioceses, (originally known as the parish mission funding), focused primarily on investment in new opportunities for mission. However, this funding was still given out by formula.

In 2007, following consultation with dioceses, the Archbishops' Council and the Commissioners agreed that a one-off sum should be made available in 2008-10 to address mission opportunities in new housing and other development areas.

> *In line with the Commissioners' historic mandate to help the Church move to where the people are… Expenditure is needed in these growth areas long before the population figures in the Church's funding formula can ever catch up.*[1]

An allocation of £7.25 million was made for this purpose. A small portion of the funding was set aside for evaluation. The aim was to extend the Church's witness into new areas and build sustainable Christian communities in these areas.

The Council and Commissioners acknowledged that £7.25 million was a relatively small sum to meet that aim. They agreed that, in order to maximise the difference the money could make, it must be focused on a relatively small number of areas of need and opportunity, but with the aim of developing some learning for the wider Church.

2.2 Identifying target areas

Of the £7.25 million, £2.2 million of the funding was reserved for the Northern Province (for investment in new communities within urban re-generation and other significant retail/commercial development areas) and the remaining £5.05m for the Southern Province (primarily for new housing areas).[2] The split reflected the relative population of the two provinces.

---

[1] *The Spending Plans Task Group report 2007*

[2] *The Church of England is arranged into two provinces – Northern and Southern – each led by an archbishop.*

There wasn't a formal application process for support from the new programme – what emerged was a hybrid between a formula-based grants programme and a bidding process. Fourteen dioceses were selected to receive a share, in principle, of the funding, based on the scale of new developments planned. The relative financial resources of dioceses were also taken into account.

Proposals were then invited from these 14 dioceses, asking for plans as to how they might use grants of up to £500,000. A fifteenth diocese was later added, albeit with a reduced grant of £200,000 due to the total funding pot being almost used up.

Part of the requirement for the proposals was that dioceses would make a significant financial commitment to the projects (although the nature of this was not specified) but that there was still a demonstrable need for external funding. There was some negotiation between the dioceses and the Commissioners to shape the bids, but all were eventually agreed.

It was unfortunate that, just as the projects were being planned in 2008, the recession was starting. As a result, funds that would have been spent out by 2013/14 are delayed – eight of the dioceses had drawn down no funds by February 2010. Of the £7.2 million allocated, £4.47 million has been drawn down to date, and the Commissioners expect the majority will be drawn down by 2016/17. This has no serious implications for the Commissioners, although the effect of the recession on the projects had been severe in some cases (see section 2, chapter 1 below).

2.3   About the projects

Each diocese was allocated £500,000, except Canterbury, which was allocated £200,000.

The funding has been used to date in the following ways (note that multiple uses for the funding were possible within a diocese):

- *Missionary or outreach staff*. Twelve of the dioceses used at least part of their funding to pay for pioneer ministers or outreach staff, mostly on three to five year contracts. Of the 24 ministers or outreach staff, 20 were community based; the remaining four were focused on a specific group of people (business, police, night-time economy).

- *Funding for infrastructure.* Nine of the dioceses have used the funding for infrastructure projects. Of these, six were grants or loans for capital projects, like a new or improved church building. Six used the funding for other infrastructure costs, including research, administration/project management staff, and the setup of a coffee shop.

- *Supporting other projects.* Two dioceses used funding to support other mission activity within their dioceses. Both set up funds to which people could apply, one with diocesan matched funding. They also employed a member of staff to stimulate and support these other projects.

The table overleaf describes a typology of funded projects. Brief descriptions of each of the projects and their work can be found in Appendix C.

Having described the Programme's history and the funded projects, the next section describes the considerable learning gained to date by staff across projects.

Table 1: a typology of funded projects (note: this table only lists work started to date)

Diocese	Missionary or outreach staff		Infrastructure funding		Supporting other projects
	Community based	Work with specific groups	Capital grants	Other	
1. Bristol	2				
2. Canterbury	1				
3. Chelmsford	4		Contribution to church buildings		
4. Ely			Contribution towards cost of a new church		
5. Exeter	2				
6. Liverpool		1 (Merseyside Police; Street Pastors)		Rent for staff; administrator	
7. London	1	New businesses and incoming residents		Context analysis; funding for local events	Supported tenants to establish group & new activities
8. Manchester		1 (Media City)	Contribution to two church developments	project manager on building works	
9. Newcastle	1		Purchase of a venue	Coffee Plus shop set up costs	
10. Oxford					New Communities Development Officer: grants scheme
11. Peterborough	4		Contribution to new building		
12. Ripon and Leeds	1	2 (business community; night time economy)			
13. Rochester	1			Asset mapping, community audit	Mission Growth team Leader; grants scheme
14. St Albans	3				
15. Southwark			Vicarage	Research on church and new developments	

Section two: learning from delivery

This section describes learning in four main areas:
- planning
- support, infrastructure and partnerships
- how to engage people
- accountability and learning.

1. Project planning

This chapter outlines the extensive planning undertaken by the dioceses, and the effects of the subsequent UK recession. Considerable learning has been gained through this process, which is outlined.

1.1 How the projects planned their work

Initial needs assessment

Our assessment of project documentation revealed that overall the dioceses had provided comprehensive information on the external context and need for their projects.

All of the 15 dioceses identified new communities developing in their areas. They had particular concerns, primarily:
- Where there was an existing parish, it would not be able to reach these new communities with existing resources.
- The usual methods of engagement wouldn't reach these new communities.
- Some new areas would not have a Church presence at all.

Some projects carried out a review of local developments and initiatives, sometimes setting up steering or working groups – sometimes ecumenical – to have an oversight of developments within the area. In some cases, this work had begun before the project proposal was sent in to the Commissioners.

Project planning

Although aims and objectives were not always expressed in language that we are familiar with, the vast majority of dioceses had set out what they hoped to achieve and how they planned to do this. Most dioceses submitted very detailed project proposals that contained project plans. For example, Chelmsford submitted a 28-page document. For each of the four proposed projects there was a project description plus rationale, a timetable with key milestones, budget and intended outcomes.

After being awarded funding, most dioceses developed job descriptions for the postholders, and some also wrote more detailed project plans. For example, prior to recruiting their two schools-based workers, Bristol diocese wrote three-page project summaries, and drafted job descriptions and person specifications for each worker. Two-page 'outcome planning' tables were also included, that outlined project goals, activities, how data on progress would be recorded and by whom. Goals included a mix of process (eg, *Appointment of Home School Link worker*) and outcome (eg, *Enhanced worship life of school and church*).

Research

Six dioceses went further and undertook research to inform their planning. This was sometimes part of the funding bid to the Commissioners and therefore conducted after funding was received, and sometimes done before the bid was submitted. The research was varied:

- In 2007, London diocese carried out research in partnership with Groundwork[3] that mapped all the new developments across the diocese. From the list of 30 identified they chose to focus on three, one of which – Kings Cross – became the subject of the bid to the Commissioners.
- Supported by the Programme, Rochester carried out an asset-mapping exercise that gave them a detailed understanding of what was going on in the area. It also raised their profile and helped establish partnerships.
- Newcastle worked with a regional development agency to carry out a feasibility study and business modelling exercise.
- Manchester carried out a sophisticated analysis of its context in civic, socio-economic, ethnic and faith terms.
- Bristol allocated some of the funding to a scoping exercise, to ensure that each project was tailored to its local context and that local stakeholders and partners were fully engaged.

1.2 The effects of the recession

The recession had a massive impact on the work of the projects. Developments have been cancelled or delayed; developers have gone out of business. For example:

- In Peterborough, although area development work restarted in 2010/11, the housing developments now being built are ones that had been planned before 2005, whereas the developments that the diocese's bid was responding to have not yet begun.
- In London, and although a lot of development work has been undertaken and the first year of a church plant has been funded, the main project is only really just starting.

---

[3] *Groundwork is a charity that works nationally to create sustainable communities, www.groundwork.org.uk/*

- In another area, a newly-appointed postholder had to be made redundant as the developments they were to work in were cancelled.

One diocese did note that, although the projects were functioning in 'difficult faith times', there were also tremendous opportunities. The recession has meant that local authorities were asking more of churches, for example in helping troubled families and with community engagement.

1.3   Learning from planning stages

Respondents identified a number of learning points from their planning work.

Knowing what works

Some areas had experience of what works in growing Church in new areas and drew on this; for example, London Diocese has been carrying out community work in the new residential area of Hale Village in Tottenham Hale. Others reported having a lack of evidence as to what works:
- One explained that they only had two previous pieces of work experience to inform their choice, and chose to model the new project on the successful one of the two – but in retrospect felt they had made the wrong choice.
- Another reported that, despite visiting another diocese and looking at national research, the project development team couldn't find a model they could use that fitted the specific local circumstances of their work.
- There was tension in a few areas in terms of approach, with some favouring a church plant model and others favouring a pioneer ministry approach.

Research

Those dioceses that undertook specific research projects to inform their planning found them very helpful. These research projects helped develop dioceses' understanding of their local area, raised the profile of the project and built networks.

Many projects reported doing some work to get an overview of opportunities and developments within the whole diocese, and found this helpful; in one diocese staff reported that the lack of such an overview meant they were pulled towards the city centre rather than looking at the diocese as a whole.

Involvement of key stakeholders

The clergy

While some dioceses were quite top-down in their planning, others consulted with local clergy to supplement the information dioceses had from their own assessments. Some undertook local action planning to inform their initial bid, sometimes at the

parish level with deanery support. Top-down and bottom-up support and involvement was found to be helpful; the involvement of people with a deep understanding of the area, combined with knowledge of the planning and development processes and regulation, was useful. Early engagement at the parish level was particularly helpful.

In a couple of areas, dioceses reported that the initial planning had been led by a particular individual's views and this had sometimes constrained their plans.

Involvement of the Council and Commissioners

A few dioceses noted that the Archbishop's Council and Commissioners' support and guidance during the planning phase was helpful. One would have liked more guidance on what focus was wanted from the projects.

Being realistic

A number of dioceses felt that it was vital for projects to be very realistic in their plans, both at the bidding stage and when postholders are planning their work. One project noted that their pioneer minister had simply been given too large and diverse an area; in another, a planned building development was reported to have been so overambitious that matched funding was never found. One project summarised their learning on this in a 2011 report to the Commissioners:

> *Be clear about the amount you can take on. Put on the agenda projects which are achievable, in the sense that you can see how your time, commitment and resources, along with others' likely contributions, can enable outcomes to be achieved. If you can't see how something can be achieved in this way then don't mention it until you can.*

Clarity about diocesan input

There may have been some lack of clarity about the expectations of the Commissioners regarding diocesan input. The Commissioners always expected some diocesan support for the projects, either financially or in terms of staff time. The level and type of support was not specified, as the Commissioners wished to be flexible. However this may have led to some misunderstanding from the projects. Many noted that substantial diocesan time had been required by the project, and for some this appeared to have been more than expected. One noted that the lack of paid time at the diocesan level meant leadership of the project steering group shifted between people; this means there was a lack of clear oversight of the development of the projects. With hindsight, this diocese noted that the work needed a senior manager on a short-term contract for whom this was their sole brief.

Flexibility

When postholders came in, some undertook further extensive consultation to help them develop more detailed plans tailored to their specific contexts. For example, in

Ripon and Leeds the three postholders consulted widely with their respective communities to establish areas of need. Newcastle found it helpful to talk to people on the developers' sales desks as they had a good understanding of the type of people moving into an area.

A number of postholders noted that they had needed to change plans when they came into post, and often appreciated the flexibility to do so. This was usually in response to changes in planned developments, but sometimes due to a change in approach. For example in one area, the postholder felt that the original plans to establish a new Christian community would undermine the existing church, which was felt to be fragile. So they decided to try and boost the existing church and congregation instead, by drawing people from the new communities into the existing church.

Timing

Many dioceses noted the benefits of coming in early to an area of new development, to enable them to build relationships from the start and to 'be at the negotiating table' to influence developments. For example, in one project, the postholder came into the project a year before the new business development was opened. This enabled her to build good relationships with developers, and she was already an accepted figure on site when people started to move in.

Conversely, another diocese came to the new development quite some time after the development had started. As a result, the project was not on the developers' agenda, and they had no meeting space on the site, even for community activities.

Recruitment

The dioceses reported considerable learning around recruitment. They stressed the need to take time and get it right; in one or two projects the wrong person had been recruited, and the post had ended early. In others, a very strong candidate had been found, who was felt to have significantly contributed to project success. Fit with the specific context of the project was needed. For example, one project noted that they had needed postholders able to work within two very different areas; one very evangelical, the other liberal-catholic.

One diocese noted that lack of experience in human resources (HR) was a real issue for clergy, who are not trained in HR but often end up employing people. This project reported that simply drawing up employment documents took a lot of time. Since then the diocese has employed an HR specialist.

Skills and experience
Dioceses reported looking for a specific mix of skills and experience, including:
- a track record in mission work

- manager-level experience
- a background in town planning, so the postholder could talk the language of the planners and support local clergy in this.

Finding people with experience and/or training in pioneer mission was hard for many dioceses. One suggested it would be helpful for the Church to help with identifying a pool of ministers. Training for pioneer ministers is still relatively new.

Projects employed both lay and ordained ministers, and some ordinands. Two ordained postholders reported that being involved in 'traditional' work, like funerals, helped build relationships and establish them in the community. One reported being able to bring their own congregation with them into the mission work. Some lay ministers found that people didn't understand the role of a lay minister, and expected them to be able to carry out traditional church duties.

But there were also drawbacks in having ordained postholders. Two postholders found it hard managing the competing demands of parish duties and mission work.

Personal attributes

Dioceses reported that the personal qualities of the postholders were important, with them needing:
- an ability to do mission rather than ministry
- energy and enthusiasm
- to be inspiring and charismatic
- to be prepared to 'get their hands dirty'.

1.4. Summary of findings from planning

Project planning
- Dioceses did substantial amounts of planning and needs assessment to inform their work, particularly involving local stakeholders. In-depth research both before and after a funding award was helpful, although many found little evidence of 'what works' to inform their plans.
- Some postholders found it helpful to do more detailed consultation and planning when they came into post, and appreciated the flexibility to change plans as necessary.
- It was important to be realistic at the planning stage – a few of the projects had overstretched themselves.
- There was perhaps a lack of shared understanding about the level of diocesan time required to run the funded projects.
- The UK recession started in the same year as the dioceses were doing their initial project planning; for many of them severe delays in new developments meant plans had to be delayed, altered substantially or even stopped.

Recruitment

- Many dioceses found it hard to recruit the right person; some reflected on the value of taking time with recruitment. It is important to get the right person, especially one who can fit with the local context; the wrong person may simply struggle to bring about change.
- Although most postholders had experience in pioneering ministry, few had formal training. Personal attributes of postholders were also very important, including energy, charisma and a willingness to 'get their hands dirty'.
- Recruiting ordained staff sometimes brought benefits in terms of links into the community, but sometimes meant staff struggled to manage competing demands.

2. Support, infrastructure and partnerships

2.1. Management and staff support

Line management

Most postholders had regular supervision or line management, either from diocesan staff (including archdeacons, an archbishop and a bishop) or by local clergy. Almost all reported feeling well supported in their roles, including those who didn't get regular formal support, and many were pleased that they also had the freedom to develop their work as they felt best.

Some staff, whose line management was provided at diocesan level, reflected that linking postholders to a particular parish might have provided the postholder with more support. Conversely, some postholders felt under pressure to focus on the parish in which they were based, rather than cover the wider area within their remit.

Line management structures were often complex and – from an outside perspective – sometimes hard to understand. One postholder in a high profile role was overseen by six reference groups and a line manager.

One postholder felt that while support was available for them personally, there was no one overseeing the project itself. A few projects noted the need for more support for innovative projects and/or ministers who are in the first few years of their ministry.

Personal support networks

Several postholders emphasised that their role was hard work ('exhausting but amazing'), and that the support of family and friends – particularly spouses – was really helpful. Several had built their own support networks with other ministers and/or pioneers.

Only one postholder had had much contact with postholders in other dioceses, reporting this as being useful as it demonstrated different ways to approach the work. Several others mentioned that being a pioneer could be a lonely job, and they would appreciate more contact with other postholders across the programme.

2.2. Relationships at parish level

Relationships with local churches

At the local level, many postholders described being facilitated in their work by supportive clergy; for example, in one case the local vicar understood the potential effect of the new development on their parish, and was keen to explore new ideas.

However, one postholder found their local clergy so preoccupied with maintaining the existing ministries that they had little energy or enthusiasm for outreach initiatives.

Some postholders commented that there was occasionally a lack of understanding at the local level of the role of the pioneer minister or outreach worker – some people didn't understand that such staff may go to pubs and bars to connect with people. A few others had encountered tension with the local clergy over issues like female priests and lesbian and gay Christians.

A few postholders described feeling a sense of competition with other Church of England churches, or that these churches were sometimes protective, or had a desire to influence new developments. One diocese described overcoming this by bringing local clergy into the project reference group, so difficulties could be ironed out at that level rather than through the postholder.

The strength of the local church

Where neighbouring churches have strong active communities, these people have been able to support pioneering work. Weaker churches have not been able to do this. Developments in local churches could be positive (when new or better venues are opened) or negative (the local church being in poor condition).

One postholder argued strongly that it was crucial to partner the pioneer with an existing church with the spiritual and physical resources to support the pioneering work, and which could bring a sense of shared mission.

Another felt that it might be helpful to do more preparatory work with local clergy before a pioneering post is created. Another noted that it was important to recognise that pioneering work often involved change management within existing churches. If you are doing mission work in an area near an existing church, not only does that work need the support of that church, but that church may also need to develop the way it works too.

2.3.   The placing of the postholders

The criteria against which diocesan applications to the Fund were assessed included there being a plan to include a cluster of pioneer ministers rather than to deploy lone workers. However, in a few projects, postholders were quite isolated, lone workers. It is not known whether this was a result of changed plans, or whether plans didn't have such a cluster from the start. In some of these projects, staff reflected that a church plant model might have been more successful, bringing a core group to support the work.

Respondents stressed how hard pioneer ministry could be. One postholder described how exhausting it was constantly meeting new people and trying to get them

interested in new activities; 'out of every 20 to 30 you meet, only one is interested in working with you'.

2.4. Diocesan support

Respondents noted the importance of support for the project at all levels. From the top, support for and understanding of a pioneering approach was vital. The value of some individual leaders was very positive. One project felt that the vision, reputation and entrepreneurial attitude of their previous Archdeacon had helped to realise their project, and several projects stressed the importance of a strong strategic lead and support from the bishop. One noted that their Bishop, who was very supportive of the work, was perhaps constrained by the fear of upsetting parishes with such new work. The postholder felt this had led to them being rather isolated as the Bishop was wary of putting more resources into contentious work.

2.5. Partnership working

All fifteen dioceses described partnership working, some of it significant. All were doing some partnership working with local churches, and most were also working with the wider faith sector and statutory, public and private sectors too. Although the aims of the partnership working were not always clear, they included identifying community needs, finding ways to work together, and bringing a Christian perspective to the table.

Some postholders were working in partnership to deliver projects – in Chelmsford for example, three of the four postholders run events with partners outside the Church.

Interdenominational relationships

One postholder described how churches from other denominations were able to move faster in terms of delivering activities, because their decision-making was faster than at the Church of England – they didn't need to wait for approval from head office. In this case the gaps for activities had already been filled. In other areas, other denominations had similar pioneer mission roles, and postholders had to tread carefully round these other initiatives.

In some cases there was strong ecumenical work taking place. For example, in St Albans, the Wixams project was set up and managed by the Methodist Church, the United Reformed Church, Baptist Church and Roman Catholic Church. In this case, the sharing of resources across the churches has enabled the project workers to put on lots of different events and activities. In other areas, different denominations were not keen to work together.

2.6. Summary of findings from support, infrastructure and partnerships

Management and staff support

- Most postholders had direct line management; many had a form of steering group as well. Line management is being done by people ranging from a local vicar to the bishop. Managerial structures appeared complex.
- Many postholders had developed their own support networks, often in response to what they saw as an exhausting – but rewarding – role.
- Several postholders would have liked more contact with Fund postholders in other dioceses.

Working relationships

- Most postholders found their local clergy supportive; some encountered lack of understanding of their role, tensions over interpretation of faith or a sense of competition. Lack of resources or capacity in the parish to support pioneer work was sometimes an issue.
- The strength of the local church was a real success factor in many projects – those with vibrant congregations were more able to support pioneering work.
- It was suggested that more preparatory work could be done with local clergy before new pioneering projects are set up.
- Diocesan support was an important success factor in some projects.
- Where postholders were lone workers, they found it difficult to do their work and to achieve positive outcomes.
- A number of projects told us about how some individual contacts had been key in their work. However, when individuals had left this had been problematic. Building up other networks, in case of the departure of key people, might be useful.

3. Engaging people

Postholders encountered both barriers and enablers in terms of engaging with communities and attracting people to active involvement in the Church.

3.1. Location

Where the postholder lives

In most projects the postholder was located within the area of new development, and felt this was enormously helpful. It helped them more easily negotiate with developers, for example for a prayer space. It also helped them make connections with the local community, to understand their needs, to be readily available and to be seen to be one of them. For those on site at the very beginning, they were able to welcome people as they moved in. Living in the development also provided some postholders with a venue to meet.

The nature of new residential developments

The nature of new housing areas has implications for mission work:
- In areas of high-rise development, contacting residents can be hard as they usually have entry phones. Some postholders had got round this by getting to know the concierges so they could get into the building to deliver leaflets and cards, and to access notice boards. Others had prioritised having a visible presence in public spaces.
- Lack of community facilities – for example, shops, community spaces, schools – can make it very hard to engage with people. Conversely, in some areas lack of services or infrastructure has helped people come together as a community.
- Geographical barriers between areas (for example, large roads, barbed wire) sometimes make access between the areas difficult.
- Some new housing areas contain a high percentage of rented properties, leading to a very transient – and thus hard to engage – population.

3.2. Having a venue

For many projects, the lack of a worship space, at least initially, was problematic, especially for events like Messy Church.[4] One postholder explained that 'I did morning and evening prayer in a little box room'.

However, not having a venue was actually found to have benefits by a number of projects. One project noted that although it was initially difficult not having a venue, they now felt that it had been beneficial to be seen to experience the same difficulties

---

[4] *A form of church for children and adults that involves creativity, celebration and hospitality.*

as the new residents. Another felt that not having a venue had had benefits in terms of staff having to be creative in establishing networks and building relationships; they couldn't just sit back and wait for people to come to them. For example, not having a church in Barking Riverside initially meant that the postholder got to know the local school and build relationships with the staff.

Lack of a physical space and/or equipment for administrative or coordination work was also an issue for a few postholders, including the lack of a phone and internet. One postholder in a high-profile project had to respond to media interest when very new in post, while lacking both an office and a phone.

3.3. People issues

Communication
Regular and varied communication with communities was helpful. This ranged from the more traditional newsletters to regular columns in church magazines, to social media including prayer tweets.

Key stakeholders
Many projects noted the importance of certain key individuals to the project – people who could 'open doors'. In some cases these were people with whom the projects needed to work, for example, the head teacher within a school where a postholder was based. Others were people with whom the postholder made contact by chance.

The value of these relationships was illustrated in a few projects where key people had left, leaving the postholder without much-needed support.

Understanding the role
Some local communities struggled to understand that the postholders were there to facilitate the development of community activities rather than lead them.

3.4. Who you are working with

Type of people
Postholders noted that the type of people living in an area could affect engagement. Poorer areas may have fewer resources to engage; wealthier areas may have more working professionals with less time available. Where areas were mixed, there could be huge cultural gaps between existing church communities and new communities.

People who move into new developments can be tied to their previous communities. For example, Christians who move to new developments often go back to their own

churches to worship. Similarly, some new developments are primarily 'dormitory housing', where people live their lives elsewhere – this can make engagement hard.

Postholders found that identifying a few people to become involved in mission work helped, as did putting on events to bring people together.

Families

A number of projects noted that new housing developments tend to have a high percentage of younger people and families in particular; others also noted that traditional church events and services did not always attract families. As a result, the majority of projects have offered some form of family activities – for example Messy Church or carol services – and have found this a good way to engage a wide range of people of all ages, and good numbers of un- or dechurched[5] people.

3.5. What you offer

Being seen

Postholders stressed the importance of being visible – making oneself accessible and seen within the community, for example by holding community events, like carol services, car boot sales or theatre. These are also a good way to draw in people who are not currently engaging with the Church. A number of postholders talked of the need to try things and also to fail.

For a number of postholders, it was important to be willing to 'get your hands dirty', and place oneself 'at the heart of the community, campaigning on issues of importance to the community and fighting their battles with them'. Some have become members of the local residents' forum or school governors; other individuals have variously become a chair of the parish council, a street pastor and a support worker in a rehabilitation project.

When to bring Church into the mix

For some projects, it was possible to run explicitly Christian activities from the outset, often involving worship. Many postholders found that activities like Messy Church, which is explicitly Christian, worked from the outset. In Ripon and Leeds, missional communities have been developed that allow people to worship in different ways, and 'to explore faith, hope and love within their own culture'.

Occasionally, organising non-religious activities was seen as a necessary precursor before the introduction of more explicitly Christian activities. One postholder felt that

---

[5] *Dechurched people were once, but are no longer, part of a church. Unchurched people have never been part of a church*

'if you put a church badge on any activity, it puts people off'. Another noted that although she had been recruited to build a Christian community, she rapidly had to become more careful in her approach: 'if I had proselytized in any way, I'd have been thrown off straight away'.

For most projects, organising non-religious community activities, alongside Christian events, was seen as vital in establishing contacts and credibility. In an annual report to the Commissioners, one postholder argued that:

> *Mission in new housing areas must involve a balance of doing two things quite strategically and determinedly: 1) serving felt needs of the community and 2) speaking out the gospel. It is not 'either-or'. There will always be pressures on the Mission Enabler to downplay one area in favour of the other.*

3.6.   Engaging volunteers

The criteria against which applications made by dioceses to the Fund were assessed included there being a core team of lay people in place to work alongside any pioneer minister appointed; it is not clear the extent to which this was in place for some projects.

All postholders have tried to get the local community involved as volunteers, for example running events. Most found this difficult, especially with transient local populations or in areas where the local church didn't have a congregation that was used to getting involved. Large numbers of volunteers wasn't always felt to be a necessity – one postholder advised that even a small congregation could be very effective. Another felt that it was important to be realistic – establishing a core group of people who commit to coming regularly to something may simply not be realistic.

For more about success in attracting volunteers, see section 3, chapter 2 below.

3.7.   Summary of findings about engaging people

- Projects were more successful when the postholder lived in the new area. Usually, having a space to meet was found to be really helpful by postholders; some found the lack of venue had benefits in terms of finding creative solutions.
- Types of development – for example high rises, dormitory towns, transient populations and places lacking community facilities – often made outreach work harder.
- To respond to high levels of families in new developments, many postholders put on family-specific events like Messy Church.
- Some local communities struggled to understand that the postholders were there to facilitate development of community activities rather than lead them.
- Being highly visible in the community, including getting involved with community issues, was seen as a vital way to gain credibility and engagement.

- Although many projects offered explicitly Christian projects from the start, some offered secular community activities first, before introducing Church.
- Attracting people to active involvement in the Church – beyond simple attendance – was found to be hard by many projects. Some felt that it might not be a realistic goal within a three-year timescale. Projects that have asked for help with a specific initiative or service have been more successful in recruiting volunteers.

4. Accountability and learning

4.1. Monitoring and evaluation

The Commissioners required some plans for monitoring and evaluation and key performance indicators as part of the bidding process. Although some dioceses had described how they planned to monitor and evaluate their work, these plans were often not followed through with data being collected.

In our assessment of project documentation, we found that none of the dioceses submitted good information on how they were monitoring and evaluating their work; four submitted adequate evidence. Many had presented some evidence of outcomes although it was often hard to disentangle this from information on their activities. Three of the fifteen were rated as submitting good outcomes information. Projects were better on the submission of output data, with ten submitting good information.

What data exists cannot be easily extracted or aggregated from primarily narrative reports. Some have records of attendance or lists of contacts, and some have kept unstructured diaries to record activities. One of the Bristol schools projects collected feedback data from stakeholders, and the Street and Club Angels projects in Ripon and Leeds were able to share some data that include early outcomes.

4.2. Reporting

Until last year, reporting from projects to Commissioners varied both in frequency and quality across the projects. Some were reporting quarterly, others annually; some sent detailed reports, others simply sent leaflets about their work.

Since October 2013 the projects have reported annually, with a focus on learning. There are clearly some areas in which reporting could be improved; in particular the reporting of outcomes and identifying how to monitor and evaluate their projects. Some of this has already been addressed by the introduction of the new reporting template, although we would like to suggest some minor revisions to the template in order to address some of the weaknesses identified (see section 4, chapter 2 below).

4.3. Support from the Commissioners

To support funded projects, the Commissioners have:
- organised two national seminars to share learning, although a planned learning network fell through
- begun a programme of visits – most projects have been visited at least once
- had fairly regular contact regarding reporting and payments.

Grants support is provided by the Strategy and Development Unit, a team of eight people. The unit straddles both the Archbishops Council and the Church

Commissioners, and has various responsibilities, part of which include servicing three funding programmes (the funding for mission in new housing and other development areas, the deprived areas development funding and the strategic development funding), that between them total £25 million.

The Unit recognises that it has limited capacity to support the projects funded by the new housing and other development funding and that the potential for learning has not yet been fully realised.

4.4. Sharing learning

In our assessment of project documentation, we found that many of the projects had also identified learning points in the reports they submitted as well as what had worked particularly well and what had not. This was particularly true for those who had submitted reports in the new format as it specifically asks for this information.

About half of the dioceses told us about ways they had shared learning through the diocese and sometimes beyond. For example, Chelmsford Diocese was just about to share learning on their website using case studies. It also shares information with all new projects and feeds back any learning from the management committees to the Mission Focus Group and the diocese in general. Some learning has also been shared at a conference on Fresh Expressions.

4.5. Summary of findings about accountability and learning

- Monitoring and evaluation within the projects has been very limited to date, although most projects have collected some data, including a small amount of outcomes data.
- There was a lack of clarity in terms of the intended outcomes for each project and some project paperwork indicated a lack of understanding of the difference between outputs and outcomes.
- Reporting to date has been very variable, although the new reporting template, introduced in October 2013, is starting to bear fruit.
- The Strategy and Development Unit has offered support to the projects but has limited capacity.
- Some dioceses have started to share learning from their work, but the potential for learning from the Programme has yet to be fully realised.

Having described the learning from the delivery of work to date, the next section outlines our findings on the outcomes and impact of the Programme to date.

Section three: outcomes and impact

There is evidence of some good outcomes and early impacts as a result of the Programme in four main areas:

1. There is evidence that funded projects are getting people into church, some of whom are actively engaging as volunteers or on training courses.
2. There are early signs of some sustainable Christian communities being set up.
3. There are positive impacts for the Church locally and nationally in terms of increased resources, improved public perception and learning.
4. There is some indicative, mostly anecdotal data showing community impacts in terms of increased sense of community, community safety and economic benefits.

However, data on the outcomes and impact of the Fund is limited; much of what we have is illustrative, and may underestimate the impact of these projects to date. Please see section 1, chapter 1 for more discussion of this.

1. Demonstrating the outcomes and impact of the Programme

To understand the findings of this report, it is important to be aware of the nature of the data presented in relation to outcomes and impact.

1.1 Defining the terms

The words *outcome* and *impact* both describe changes as a result of project activities, but refer to different levels of change. We define the terms in the following ways:

Impact: The change, effect or benefit that results from the services or activities on a wider society than its direct users. It is often long term, broad and sustainable and can include affecting policy decisions at government level.

Outcome: The changes, benefits, learning or other effects that happen as a result of services and activities provided by an organisation.

The situation is complex within the Programme. Because of the different approaches taken by the projects, developing a sustainable Christian community might be an outcome (albeit a long-term one) for some projects. For others, it might be a very long-term impact, something that takes place years after initial community development work. For this reason, we have not separated changes into outcome or impact.

1.2   It's too early

Almost all dioceses reflected that the timescale of the projects was too short, particularly those lasting just three years. Even in areas where the pioneering work was considered successful, sustainable Christian communities are only just starting to develop. Many projects felt that even a five-year timeframe was unrealistic; one project felt that it might take 15 years for the results of their work to really be seen. For some postholders this was a source of frustration; one noted that their work was just getting going by the end of three years, when their post ended. A diocesan staff member in another area noted that 'exiting [the postholder] at this point would almost undo everything he's done'.

In two dioceses, staff reflected that they might have been able to achieve more with fewer projects, over a longer period of time.

In some projects, especially Ely and London, the work is only really getting going; the Exeter posts have only been going for one year.

Because of the short amount of time since the projects have been set up, it is too early for evidence of impact – and many of the longer-term outcomes – to be found. We simply do not know at this stage whether some of the projects will achieve the Programme's aim of extending the Church's witness and creating sustainable Christian communities.

This timescale issue is exacerbated in projects where their route to sustainable Christian communities is more complex. Where projects have directly sought to build a Christian community, three to five years might be a fair timescale to at least start to achieve the aim. However, for projects that have tried to build community engagement first, if they are to achieve the goal of sustainable Christian communities, this will take place much further down the line.

1.3   Problems with demonstrating outcomes and impact in this work

Who can claim outcomes

There are a number of issues that make it hard to claim outcomes for the Programme, including:

- The outcomes from capital grants most credibly relate to the resulting development of activities only, rather than individual or community benefits which may result from the activities carried out by others.
- Most of the funded projects involved financial support from the dioceses, some of it substantial. In the Chelmsford opportunities fund, the funding for mission in new housing and other development areas accounted for only 25 per cent of the total pot.

- Much of the work was delivered in partnership. In some dioceses, the postholders were part of a team doing mission or outreach work, and it would be impossible to isolate the outcomes directly attributable to one person.

Where outcomes can be found

Postholders described how hard it can be to evidence the success of their work. In terms of church attendance, their work might stimulate attendance at a neighbouring church. However, not only would it be hard to get their attendance figures, but it would be hard to ascertain what was due to the postholder.

How to measure success

Many projects felt their work was hard to measure – that 'bums on pews' was a limited measure, as they were trying to stimulate real engagement, not just attendance. Others felt that the outcomes of their work went beyond engagement with the Church and was sometimes intangible.

1.4   Summary of issues affecting the impact of the Programme

- There is a lack of robust outcomes data on the projects that limits what can be said about Programme achievements, and it is simply too early to say what many of the projects have achieved.
- Some projects have taken a much longer-term approach in their work, focusing on community development work initially rather than directly on mission. These projects, if they do help create sustainable Christian communities in the future, may take a long time to do so.
- The Programme has offered capital grants. There are limits to the extent to which the outcomes of activities in those venues can be claimed by the Programme.
- Much of the work has been delivered in partnership or by teams of people, so attributing success is difficult.
- Projects may well have had an effect on neighbouring churches, but it is hard to evidence this.
- There is a lack of agreement as to what success looks like in this work.

2. Meeting the aims of the Programme

The Programme has one central overarching aim: to extend the Church's witness into new areas and help build new sustainable Christian communities in these areas. This chapter examines the extent to which funded projects have achieved this to date. Appendix D contains a table summarising the quantitative data.

2.1 Increasing church attendance

Twelve dioceses gave us data on the numbers of people attending events or services of worship (as distinguished from wider church events like carol services) as a result of work paid for at least in part by the Programme. In total they estimated it to be about 1,800 people, of whom 435 were estimated to be attending regularly. Where more detail was known about these people:

- 31% (386) were estimated to be unchurched (n=1,250)
- 32% (339) were estimated to be dechurched (n=1,058)
- 35% (422) were estimated to be children (n=422).

To the extent that these figures can be considered accurate (please see the introduction for a discussion of this), it appears that the events and services of worship put on by these projects are reaching a large number of un- and dechurched people, and a young audience.

In Rochester, one of the recipients of the mission opportunities funding set up by the diocese (part funded through the Programme) explained how their outreach was leading to increased church attendance:

> We're now beginning to see the benefits of this outreach as several residents are now attending church… without the grant we would have missed our opportunity to contact them at an early stage.

Some projects are actively bringing Christian worship to specific communities, for example the Riverforce project in Liverpool and the schools projects in Bristol. One of the schools outreach workers explained that her pastoral support is now actively sought by several members of staff. A parent at one of the schools commented[6] about the postholder:

> [The postholder] has fully endorsed the Christian ethos of the schools in her approach to situations. She has also sat and prayed with us which is a good witness to our children that it isn't only us that pray.

Many projects reported active involvement of their communities in Christian events, if not explicitly worship. For example, in Media City in Manchester, the postholder reports that initially only about six people attended her 'business breakfasts'; by the end of the projects 45 to 50 people were attending. Similarly in Liverpool, the

---

[6] *In an evaluation form distributed by the post holder*

postholder relaunched the 'Rector's breakfast' (renaming them 'City leaders breakfast'), and 100 people attended the first meeting.

Getting people into other churches

Several projects across four dioceses felt they had had a positive impact on the congregations in the nearby churches, although it would be hard to accurately evidence this. In Newcastle one of the postholders explained that the congregation in the church near the Ark in the Park had increased from about 30 to about 100-120, and they felt this was a result of the church being reinvigorated through the mission work in Ark in the Park. In Canterbury, the postholder noted that attendance at their local parish church had grown from about 10 to nearer 70, and felt that the church had been given new energy due to the project.

More or better places to worship

Although only a few capital grants were made under this funding programme, they have resulted in new or improved places to worship:
- In Beswick, Manchester, the funding has contributed to the building of a new church.
- In Ordsall, Manchester, the Fund paid for a new church boiler.
- In Newcastle, the funding helped pay for the Ark in the Park community centre.
- In Ely, the Fund is contributing to the building of a new church.
- In Chelmsford, the Fund paid for some building work at the Church at Church Langley and St Mary's, Old Harlow.
- In Peterborough the funding contributed to the building of the Kairos centre.

In the longer term it may be possible to ascertain the extent to which these improved facilities have led to an increase in people attending church.

2.2 Involvement in Church

Active participation

The projects are getting people actively involved in the Church. Sixteen projects (from nine dioceses) estimated that, across all the projects, 245 people were involved in the Church, for example as volunteers.

Some of the projects which have focused on a specific initiative have been very successful in mobilising volunteers:
- In Liverpool, the Street Pastors scheme involves about 50 people. This group is now self-sustaining and the postholder retains only a consultative role.

- In Ripon and Leeds the Street Angels project involves 37 people, the majority of whom are Christian. From January 2012-January 2014, Street Angels clocked up 2300 hours of volunteer time.
- In Ripon and Leeds the Club Angels project involves 20 people, all of whom are Christian. They began fortnightly in two nightclubs from December 2011, moving to weekly in term time from May 2012. Between December 2011 and January 2014 they recorded 525 volunteer hours.
- In Newcastle the Coffee Plus project is involving local people as volunteers running the coffee shop.

On training courses

The projects are increasing people's engagement with the Church through courses, for example discipleship courses. The 14 projects that submitted data on this (from 10 dioceses) estimated that 344 people had attended such courses. Where the background of these people was known:
- 37% (53) were estimated to be unchurched (n=142)
- 33% (58) were estimated to be dechurched (n=175).

In Rochester, no data was available on the training undertaken, as the postholder left some time ago. However, it was reported that they offered a Fresh Expressions Mission-shaped Introductory Course in all 17 deaneries in their area. This was reported to be helpful in engaging people in mission work.

Ceremonies

Staff employed by the projects have been involved in carrying out a good number of ceremonies, in particular baptisms. They estimated they had carried out:
- 103 baptisms
- 26 confirmations
- 23 weddings
- 19 funerals.

2.3   Building sustainable Christian communities

There is early evidence that some projects are starting to build sustainable Christian communities:
- The pioneer minister for new communities in Ripon and Leeds has developed a thriving community congregation that wouldn't have been there without him.
- The pioneer minister for Riverside Church in Ripon and Leeds has been successful in establishing a healthy congregation at Holy Trinity Church which had not previously existed.
- In one of the Peterborough projects the postholder reported that a new congregation, albeit small and still fledgling, has been planted which is drawing a significant proportion of unchurched people.

- In Newcastle, interviewees felt that a sustainable Christian community is developing at the Ark in the Park, consisting of about 10 families.
- In Devonport in Exeter a fledgling congregation is gaining in confidence.
- The project in Iwade in Canterbury appears to be making good progress towards establishing a sustainable Christian community.

In others, the postholder has contributed to the development of sustainable Christian communities in other churches:
- The new Kings Cross church already has a 300-strong congregation.
- The Kairos Centre in Peterborough has provided the already-formed Christian community with a place to meet and worship.
- The building works on the two churches in Manchester appear to have enabled the parishes to maintain or increase the attendance and involvement of local people and thus support more sustainable Christian communities.

What works?

It is hard to say which approaches represent more effective uses of the Commissioners' funding. If we compare the six projects listed above as having begun to build sustainable Christian communities, we find, perhaps unsurprisingly, that they have all involved pioneer ministers, focusing directly on building a new Christian community. However, it would be unwise to draw conclusions from this evidence for two reasons:

1. There is such a wide range of projects, started in very different contexts, that it is hard to compare them; this is exacerbated by there being, overall, a relatively small number of projects from which to generalise.
2. The capital projects, and those focusing on community development work as a first step to building Christian communities, simply have not yet had enough time to show their true impact.

2.4   Sustainability of projects

The signs are that almost all the funded projects will continue beyond the Commissioners' funding, at least in some form.

The London, Ely, Oxford and Exeter projects are still in the early stages of their funding, so it is too early to say what the future holds for them. In Peterborough, although the projects are well established, they are funded for five years and still have time to go. The Diocese plans to look at the sustainability of the projects in the future.

Of the other 10 dioceses, nine look set to continue in the near future, although details of how this will be done are still emerging:
- In Newcastle, the Ark in the Park project will be continuing with support from the parish. The future of Coffee Plus is less certain, as it currently makes a

loss that is covered by the diocese. However, the shop is currently being run by a volunteer and there is some prospect of this working in the longer term.

- In St Albans, the diocese hopes to continue the Wixhams and deHavilland projects in some form.
- In Manchester, the diocese hopes to continue all three projects, albeit with part-time staff.
- In Liverpool the diocese has been able to extend the postholder's funding; beyond that the diocese hopes to carry on his work in some form. The Street Pastors scheme is now self-sustaining and the postholder retains only a consultative role.
- In Chelmsford, all projects are continuing in some form.
- In Bristol, the parish is actively looking to fund the post in Emerson's Green.
- The Southwark project was a loan that has provided the diocese with a vicarage in the long term.
- In Canterbury, the diocese is committed to carrying on this work, both in Iwade and in other places.
- In Manchester the full-time Media City post has already come to an end; it wasn't possible to find further funding. However it has been continued in part-time-form in collaboration with a local college.

For the final diocese, Rochester, the future looks less certain. The diocese would like to continue the Strood deanery project, but cannot do so without further external funding.

The Commissioners are not planning to refund the projects, but the new Strategic Development funding is focused on helping dioceses to invest in projects which will make a significant difference to their long-term mission and financial strength. It is possible that existing projects supported by the new housing and other development areas funding could get some funding from this, but only as part of a wider funding application.

A few projects noted that it was important to build sustainability in from the start of the project; this had not always been done. In our assessment of project documentation, information was weak in terms of how the dioceses were planning for sustainability. Only one diocese submitted documentation that we rated as 'good' in terms of sustainability and forward planning; three were rated as adequate.

2.5 Summary of findings as to whether the Fund's aims have been met

- There is evidence of new sustainable Christian communities emerging in six dioceses.
- The projects have attracted new people into Church in target areas, about a third of whom are estimated to be unchurched, a third dechurched and a third children. There is anecdotal evidence that some churches in neighbouring parishes may have also have seen increases in their congregation.

- The projects are getting people involved in church actively, through volunteering and training courses; the postholders have also carried out about 180 ceremonies, mostly baptisms. The four projects offering a specific service (Street and Club Angels, Street Pastors, Coffee Plus) have between them involved substantial numbers of volunteers, many of whom offer significant amounts of their time.
- The Programme has helped create a small number of new or improved places for people to worship.
- There is a high level of continuing commitment to the projects at this time. Of the ten dioceses in which projects have ended or are ending soon, nine are planning continuation in some form.

3. Other outcomes and impacts

Funded projects have achieved more than set out by the aims of the Programme, in terms of impact for the Church, and community impacts.

3.1 Benefits for the Church

Adding to local capacity

The postholders have brought increased skills and capacity to their dioceses. In some cases the added capacity has allowed existing clergy to concentrate on other areas of need.

Bringing in money

A requirement of the Commissioners' funding programme was that dioceses offered in kind support to the projects; for some this was fairly minimal, for others, it was extensive. For example in Oxford the diocese match funded the project. Others have leveraged additional funds in other ways, for example:

- In Ripon and Leeds, the funding from the Commissioners has helped the diocese bring in additional funding, including funding from the Methodist Church.
- In Oxford and Chelmsford, the Funds created by the Commissioners' funding had themselves to be match funded by any projects applying to the dioceses own funds.
- In Liverpool the postholder has attracted a small honorarium for the work they do with the Police Service.
- In Canterbury the Church Army provided housing and administrative support for the postholder.

Local learning

A number of dioceses reported that the projects were providing them with valuable learning as to what works in mission work and outreach. For example, Bristol explained that they were clear that this wasn't about parachuting someone into a new area to set up a new church; it was about putting Christian people at the heart of an emerging community.

The more unusual projects are providing particular learning for their host dioceses – the Coffee Plus project in Newcastle, Street Pastors in Liverpool and Club/Street Angels in Ripon and Leeds. The Club Angels project (which is a development of the Street Angels scheme) is being replicated in other cities.

Learning for the Commissioners

It is worth noting that since the Programme was started, the Council and Commissioners have moved further towards a bidding process, based on proactively responding to opportunities, for their deprived areas development funding and strategic development funding programmes. A respondent from the Strategy and Development Unit reflected that the funding for mission in new housing and other development areas was an important first step along that journey:

> *I think the culture has moved on tremendously. I think this new housing funding was probably quite an important part of that, just making a step change along the way to being more strategic in the way we distribute funding.*

With this new strategic direction has come a much more rigorous approach to funding. The deprived areas development funding and strategic development funding programmes, for example, have a signed contract, greater clarity about the purpose of the grant, and clear guidance as to the conditions under which funds might be withdrawn. There is also a greater allowance for evaluation within the funding programmes. For both programmes, a structured reporting template has been in place from the outset.

Improving attitudes to the Church

Some of the projects have enabled postholders to present a positive view of the Church to people who might previously have either not encountered the Church or have had negative views.

In Manchester, the work of the Chaplain to Media City was not initially welcomed by secular agencies on the site, including the main developer Peel Media. However, as the position bedded in and became more valued, the Chaplain was asked to provide pastoral support to businesses on site, including to people involved in disputes. The success of this was evidenced by the decision of Peel to provide an office for the Chaplain in their main headquarters – a significant turnaround in their attitude to an explicitly Christian presence. The postholder feels the developers now have a better understanding of the value of the faith community.

In Newcourt, Exeter, the establishment of the Community Association by the postholder was felt to have added to the 'positive attitude by the community to the Christian presence'.

While the contribution of Street Pastors, Club and Street Angels to sustainable Christian communities has yet to be seen, it could be argued that they have considerable benefits for the Church in terms of a visible, positive Christian presence. The postholder in Ripon and Leeds felt that her work has given the Church a higher profile and a voice in terms of issues like drug taking and drinking.

3.2 Community benefits

Sense of community

Many of the projects felt they had impacted positively on the local community, bringing it together and creating community. One postholder argued that this would in turn contribute to community sustainability as people who felt a sense of belonging, and who enjoyed an area, would be more likely to stay there. Another felt her role was to help new and old communities integrate, so she became 'a bit like a hub in a wheel, connecting all these different parts of the community'.

The Coffee Plus project in Newcastle is providing a meeting place in an area lacking such facilities. Another postholder felt that their activities were providing a constant presence in a very transient community.

In Chelmsford, respondents reported that the church had enabled the community to work together to lobby for change, for example, they now have a local bus route diverted to their estate. This has brought together people who wouldn't normally engage with each other and empowered them in negotiating with the local council.

In Bristol, a social worker who attended an Advent Service arranged by one of the schools outreach workers commented:[7]

> *I have been attending the service for many years, we have always enjoyed them. The service yesterday was an exceptionally nice one. I think having the primary children taking part is really positive for them and the community. It seems that Mangotsfield has really come together as a community.*

Economic impact

The programme as a whole has provided funding for 28 new posts, 24 of which were for pioneer ministers.

In Manchester, Newcastle and Chelmsford, postholders report that volunteer programmes have enabled participants to develop their experience and confidence, in some cases resolving personal issues like addiction. Some people have apparently moved into further training or employment as a result.

Community Safety

The Street Angels, Club Angels and Street Pastors projects have all focused on increasing people's health and safety, particularly on the streets. Some data exists on the Street and Club Angels projects. Between January 2012 and January 2014, the Street Angels recorded 198 'significant assists', and the Club Angels about 630. They define significant assists as:

---

[7] *In an evaluation form circulated by the postholder*

The situations where we believe we have been able to care for someone in place of (or as well as) calling one of the emergency services. Often it involves us sitting with someone while they sober up, walking them home, getting them into a taxi, finding their friends, or keeping them safe. Obviously there are occasions where we will still need to call an ambulance.

During that time period the Street Angels also picked up 1,867 pieces of glass. They do this because of the high rate of glassing incidents in the UK. The Street Angels also give out hundreds of bottles of water.

Inspector Richard Clarke, of the West Yorkshire Police, City–Centre Neighbourhood Policing Team, commented to the postholder about the benefits of Street Angels:

Your Team makes a massive impact in keeping the vulnerable people who have possibly over-consumed and been separated from their friends to find a safe haven and not become a victim of crime. To quantify this work is very difficult as the Team prevents other services like the ambulance and ourselves receiving a call and committing our resources with concern and care issues.

Your Team are an effective partnership between the emergency services, Leeds Watch, BACIL and other street user groups such as the Triage Unit. Increasing the number of visible support agencies in the City and providing a range of support and advice.

3.3   Summary of other outcomes and impacts

- The Programme has added to the capacity of local churches, and leveraged in funding.
- The Programme has contributed to the development of new ways of allocating and evaluating the funding made available by the Commissioners for mission and ministry.
- There is some anecdotal evidence that some of the projects – particularly those ones where the faith and secular worlds meet – have improved attitudes towards the Church.
- There is some anecdotal evidence of community benefit as a result of the Programme, in terms of increased sense of community, community safety and economic impact.

Having identified the outcomes and impacts of the Programme to date, the next section makes recommendations for the future.

Section four: recommendations

In this final section we give recommendations for the future, both of the Programme and other funding programmes developed by the Council and Commissioners.

1.   Recommendations for the Programme

There are limits to the extent to which the Council and Commissioners will be able to take on recommendations within what remains of this funding period. We therefore make very limited suggestions for the development of the Programme. The next chapter gives more general recommendations for future funding programmes, although some may be applicable to the Programme as well.

For the remainder of the Programme's duration, the Commissioners should consider:
- Offering more opportunities for postholders to meet and network.
- How learning might be more regularly shared between postholders and the wider Church, perhaps through the development of a learning network, involving more regular contact between postholders.
- What data they require from projects, as a minimum, for the final evaluation, and consider how existing projects might be supported to collect this data.
- The reporting template could be improved. For example, an explanation of what is expected in each section, with examples. Two new sections might also be added in; the first one to ask dioceses to provide statistics such as numbers of people who have attended church or had baptisms and then to ask diocese to explain how these statistics demonstrate their intended outcomes.
- Whether some long-term impact tracking might be useful for those projects that have focused initially on community development work. It would be helpful to know to what extent these projects lead to sustainable Christian communities in the long run.

2. Recommendations for future funding programmes

2.1 The funding relationship

The Commissioners should consider:

- Being more explicit about the extent and nature of diocesan support required for funding programmes.
- Offering opportunities for postholders to meet and network.
- Whether they might be able to facilitate the recruitment process by signposting to appropriate resources.
- How learning might be regularly shared between postholders and the wider Church, particularly in terms of what is effective in missional work.
- Clearer and more robust requirements for monitoring large grants.
- Whether future pioneering work should include, as part of its planning, preparatory work with local areas to ensure the local clergy understand the nature of pioneer work and are willing and able to support it.

2.2 Monitoring and evaluation

The Commissioners should consider ways to improve the monitoring done at project level, to enhance the evidence of the outcomes and impact of their funding:

- Funded projects would benefit from clearer outcomes. Some of these could be specified by the Commissioners, to meet the aims of a specific funding programme. Others might be locally developed by projects.
- Projects should also map out a basic theory of change, describing how their activities will lead to early outcomes and finally to the intended outcomes of the funding programme.
- Projects would also benefit from simple but systematic monitoring and evaluation plans. Reporting should speak to these evaluation plans.
- Some projects might benefit from a better understanding of evaluation and an outcomes approach.
- The lack of suitable tools that fit the demand of missional and outreach work may be hindering the projects in their data collection. The use of diaries as a monitoring tool may have potential that should be explored. These could be made a little more structured to allow the easy extraction of data and the aggregation of data across projects.
- Projects might benefit from an online reporting system.

Appendices

A. Document assessment exercise

Our assessment of project documentation involved reading through the documentation for each diocese and rating the quality of the information sent by each diocese in the following areas:

- external context / need, ie, whether the dioceses have identified clear aims and objectives for the work
- delivery/outputs, ie, whether there was clear information on what activities the dioceses have carried out
- outcomes, ie, whether there was clear information on what progress had been made towards their aims
- monitoring processes, ie, whether there was clear information on how they are monitoring and evaluating their work
- learning, ie, whether there was clear information on how they are learning from their monitoring and evaluation
- partnership working, ie, whether there was clear information on how they are working with others
- infrastructure/support to postholders, ie, whether there was clear information on what support/infrastructure is in place to support the project
- enablers/barriers, ie, whether there was clear information on what is helping or hindering their work
- Sustainability/forward planning, ie, whether there was clear information on how they are planning for sustainability.
- Monitoring.

We devised the following rating system:
- good – plenty of clear evidence
- adequate – some evidence but not comprehensive or clear
- poor – no evidence or very weak evidence.

We also carried out a moderation exercise to ensure our assessment was fair across the projects.

B. Schedule for interviews with postholders

Before interview, review response(s) to online survey and adapt schedule accordingly.

Name of diocese
Interviewer:
Interviewee(s):

Introduction
- Introduce evaluation and self.
- Thank them for completing the questionnaire and explain that the purpose of this interview is to get understand the project from their perspective and to draw out learning from their experiences.
- Explain that we will not use any names in the final report however it will be presented to the Church of England so please be aware of that; we would like to record this interview so that we can be fully involved in our discussion.
- Ask interviewee(s) to describe their roles in terms of the work funded by the Mission Opportunities funding.

As you know, the focus of this work is to extend the Church's witness into areas subject to significant new housing and other development areas and to help build sustainable Christian communities

Setup of local projects
1. So when did you (each) take up your post(s)?
2. Were you (all) involved in setting up the project you are working on? [If yes, what did this involve?]
3. What factors, if any, facilitated the setup of the work? [Probe external context esp. re in particular pre-existing church infrastructure they were able to tap into e.g. in terms of contacts, existing work, goodwill etc.]
4. What barriers, if any, impeded the setup of the work? [Probe external context]
5. Are any volunteers involved and if so, how are they involved?

Delivery of the project
So in terms of delivering the project on a day-to-day basis…
6. Which groups of people has your project reached? [Probe in terms of age, gender, ethnicity, background etc.]

7. What has worked well in terms of reaching and engaging people?
8. What has been difficult in terms of reaching and engaging people?
9. Have there been any other difficulties or challenges?

Partnership-working

On the survey, it says that you have been working in partnership with…
10. What would you say has worked well in terms of work with…?
11. What has been difficult in terms of working in partnership with…?

Outcomes and impact

I would now like to focus on the progress the project has made in terms of extending the church's witness and building sustainable Christian communities.
12. On the survey, it says [summary of survey data] - probe/clarify survey data
13. Were any of these outcomes unplanned?
14. What has been the wider impact of your project on the communities you serve (e.g. schools)? [probe link with the funding]
15. What has helped you to achieve your outcomes?
16. What have been the barriers?

Project management

17. What support have you received from the diocese? How well has this worked?
18. Have you had much contact with other projects outside of this diocese that have been funded through the Mission Opportunities fund? [Has it been helpful and why?]
19. How are you monitoring the project? How well has this worked?
20. How are you using/sharing any learning?

Ending

21. Looking back, what would highlight as the key learning points from your experiences so far?
22. Is there anything else you like to tell us about this work?

C. Project summaries

Each of the 15 dioceses supported by the programme was allocated £500,000 with the exception of Canterbury diocese which was allocated £200,000.

Bristol

In the long run the funding for Bristol diocese will fund four pioneering posts, although one hasn't yet been appointed and one has only just started. Delays in the local developments have led to a delay in the draw-down of funding.

The two longstanding posts began in 2011. One will end in 2014 and the other in 2015. Both are based in schools in areas of new development, on the rationale that 'new housing areas tend to have a disproportionately high number of children and young people... and that local schools are the primary point of community formation in these areas' (initial application). Both workers have been involved in a wide range of activities, for example organising social events, group meetings, supporting events of worship, undertaking home visits. Many of the activities have had an explicitly Christian focus (for example, nativity and carols events.)

Canterbury

Canterbury Diocese appointed a pioneer missioner on a five-year contract, 'to establish a free expression of Christianity in the new housing development in North Sittingbourne'. Focused in a new development called Iwade, this project was developed with the Church Army, who is covering some of the costs of the work. The postholder has undertaken a wide range of activities and social events, including supporting worship events at the parish church and setting up a new home-based worship group.

Chelmsford

Between 2009 and 2012, Chelmsford Diocese has employed four pioneer ministers in four areas of new housing. Each post is match funded by the diocese itself. The programme funding for two of the posts has come to an end. Three of the postholders are still in post and projects ongoing.

Postholders have run social events, and put on group meetings, undertaken outreach and home visits. Many of the activities were explicitly Christian, or were linked to the Church, for example Messy Church, weekly worship and Sunday school.

Ely

In the diocese of Ely, the £500,000 grant from the Programme has covered a third of the building costs for a new church in Hampton, where the population is increasing

substantially due to new housing developments. Building work started about six months ago.

Exeter

Exeter Diocese has employed two Church Development Workers in areas of new housing. The postholders were recruited in 2013 on four-year contracts, although work had been underway for several years to plan and scope the work, which aims to 'generate the momentum to enable the churches themselves to build sustainable Christian communities...in places that would otherwise be largely or entirely without'. Despite only starting in 2013, both workers run a wide range of activities and events, some explicitly Christian (for example, monthly prayer meetings) and some more general community activities (for example, running a weekly work club).

Exeter has also used part of the funding to support staffing at diocesan level to engage with councillors and developers.

Liverpool

Liverpool Diocese is using its funding to 'establish a sustainable, led and transforming Christian presence in Liverpool'. The funding paid for a pioneer minister, appointed in 2010 to minister in the Liverpool city centre commercial and cultural redevelopment areas. The funding also paid for rented accommodation for the diocese's then Director of Pioneer Ministry, and for housing rental support for two lay leaders working alongside a pioneer minister at a church plant in a new housing development in Warrington, 'The Ford'. The latter is a group of Christians from different churches who believe that God is calling them to share Jesus with people on Chapelford, which actively and intentionally seeks to develop meaningful relationships with their neighbours through weekly coffee mornings, community fairs, and other events – with the aim of sharing their faith openly and allowing people to see God at work in their lives.

The city centre pioneer minister has established and led a missional Chaplaincy service, emerging from the Riverforce Network for Christian officers and support staff within Merseyside Police. Alongside this ministry the pioneer minister formed Liverpool City Centre Street Pastors to support the work of the police in the city centre. The postholder brought in funding from the police in Liverpool and other charities.

In addition, the city centre pioneer minister has worked extensively in forming working partnerships between the diocese and business, public sector, and social enterprise, becoming '…a presence in the city centre; someone who is stimulating new conversations and relationships, nurturing new ideas and mapping out space for new collaborations and practical initiatives'.

London

The Diocese of London has yet to draw down the £500,000 grant allocated to it for mission and ministry in the new Kings Cross development. The delay was due to delays in the Kings Cross development itself, an internal delay as the diocese decided where to locate its headquarters, and some protracted negotiations with developers.

The work in London has really only just begun, although to date there has been some research undertaken, funding for a postholder for one year to establish the new Kings Cross church plant (this post is now self funded) and ongoing running costs of delivering activities and events that include social events, and prayer sessions. In the future, the funds will be used to buy a venue for events and employ a full-time priest missioner.

Manchester

Manchester Diocese has used its funding for infrastructure and staffing costs. The grant has contributed to the building of a new church in Beswick and a new boiler in a church in Ordsall; a third new church development didn't go ahead. In terms of staff, the Programme paid for a project manager to oversee the building works, and a chaplain to the Media City development. The chaplain was appointed in 2010, and the post ended in 2013. The aim of the post was to build a Christian community within Media City, and also to unite the new community with existing, extremely impoverished neighbouring community.

The Media City Chaplain undertook outreach and community advocacy, put on group meetings and social events, and offered pastoral support to people on the media city site.

Newcastle

In 2009 Newcastle Diocese was given a grant of £500,000 towards two five-year projects, following quite extensive local consultation:
1. The purchase of Ark in the Park, a community centre in a housing development and a salary for a postholder. Ark in the Park offers a range of social and community activities, some explicitly Christian.
2. The setup costs for Coffee Plus, a coffee shop/drop in centre in the centre of a new residential development. Some Christian activities take place at the shop, and it provides volunteering opportunities and employment training. Some of the work is done in partnership with the Church Army.

Oxford

Oxford Diocese has used the funding to employ a New Communities Development Officer to oversee new communities development work across the diocese

Oxford has also created an Opportunities Fund to match fund local projects across the diocese in areas of significant new housing. This fund, for which the Commissioners Fund has paid for 25 per cent, has to date approved funding for three projects, including a New Communities minister in Bicester, a pioneer minister in the new Berryfields community, and a small grant for a parish to distribute welcome leaflets to incoming residents in new housing developments. One of the ministers has been in post since 2012 and has run events, meetings and a study group, and has been involved in community advocacy.

Peterborough

Between 2010 and 2012 Peterborough Diocese appointed four pioneer ministers in areas of substantial housing development; three are still in post and are on five-year contracts. Between them the ministers have offered outreach, home visits, in schools support and community advocacy; they have also run events and group meetings. Many have run Messy Church events for families and regular meetings for worship or discussing aspects of Christianity. Many have also been involved in secular community activities.

The grant was also used towards the costs of a new, ecumenical meeting space in Grange Park, which also offers a variety of Christian and secular activities.

Ripon and Leeds

Ripon and Leeds Diocese used its funding to pay for three pioneer ministers:
- A pioneer minister to the business community to set up a project to support people working in businesses in the city centre. This involved outreach work providing pastoral care to individuals as well as prayer breakfasts, lunches and other events.
- A pioneer minister to the night-time economy in Leeds city centre. She set up a Street Angels project, a group of volunteers who go out on a Friday and Saturday evening to look after people who are out on the streets and/or vulnerable, and initiated Club Angels, who go into Clubs and pubs providing a similar service. Her work has helped to spark other Club Angel groups in other cities.
- A pioneer minister to new communities, who runs the Riverside Church. This minister ran a range of events and activities, including the setting up of eight local missional-shaped communities who meet regularly to worship in whatever way they choose.

Rochester

In 2008 Rochester was awarded £500,000 from the Fund, to:
- Undertake two pieces of research

- Employ a Mission Growth team Leader who supported parishes in their outreach to people in new housing areas. This has included running Fresh Expressions' *mission-shaped intro* course in all 17 deaneries across the diocese.
- Set up a Community Champions Grants Scheme, offering grants of up to £500 to enable parishes to engage with their new communities (for example, family fun days).
- Employ a pioneer curate in Strood, who has offered events (for example, carol services), social activities and home visits, and been engaged in community advocacy (for example, starting a residents association) and in-school support. The pioneer curate has created a café-style church, established a 20's/30's encounter home group, developed a fresh expression of Church for all ages, begun a regular car boot stall exploring body, mind and spirit issues, and created an ecumenical group to pray for children and youth work on the Strood peninsula.

A further pioneer post has been agreed, but an appointment has yet to be made.

St Albans

The Diocese of St Albans has used its funding to create two posts, a pioneer minister in Wixams and a youth and community development worker in the deHavilland development (the latter post ended in January 2014). The workers have offered a range of activities, support and events. Both have been involved in events with a Christian focus. But the Youth and Community Development Worker in particular has had significant engagement in secular community activities.

Funding for a third pioneer minister post has just been agreed.

Southwark

The Diocese of Southwark was allocated the majority of its funding in the form of a loan in order to purchase a vicarage for the local vicar, in an area of new housing development. The vicarage has been used as a base for social events and group meetings; the vicar also offers Messy Church and Sunday worship at a temporary prayer space shared with other faiths.

Southwark used a small part of the funding to support a research project on the Church's relationship to new housing and other developments in the Thames Gateway.

D. Outcomes table

Before reading this table, please read about the limitations of this data, set out in section 1, chapter 1. Also note that the totals at the bottom must be treated carefully. For example, the numbers of dechurched people are not available for all those attending discipleship courses. Therefore the total number of dechurched people on courses (in this case, 58) cannot be compared to the total number of people on courses (344). It can only be compared to the number of people on courses about whom we know whether they were dechurched or not (179). This is because for 165 of those attending courses, we don't know if they were dechurched or not.

Diocese	Project	Numbers attending worship	Of those attending worship:			Numbers attending Church regularly	Numbers involved in Church, eg as volunteers	Numbers attending discipleship courses (or similar)	Of those on courses:		Ceremonies			
			Un-churched	De-churched	Children (under 16)				Unchurched	Dechurched	Baptisms	Confirmations	Weddings	Funerals
Bristol	*North Swindon*	77			37 (48%)									
	Emerson's Green	92			67 (73%)									
Canterbury		35	25 (70%)	7 (20%)	9 (25%)		8	10		8 (80%)	4			
Chelmsford	*New Hall*	250	75 (30%)	50 (20%)	50 (20%)	50	20	50	30 (60%)	10 (20%)	5	3	5	6
	The Hythe	22	2 (9%)		1 (5%)	22	15				4	1	1	
	Barking Riverside	20	4 (20%)		3 (16%)	20	20							
	New Braiswick Park	100				20		2		2 (100%)	9	2	8	
Exeter	*Newcourt*	48	1 (2%)	2 (4%)	15 (31%)	25	2	4	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	3			
	Devonport	10	3 (25%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	2	1				2			
Liverpool	*River in the City*	200	50 (25%)	150 (5%)				25		4 (16%)				
Newcastle	*Ark in the Park*	25	10 (40%)	10 (3%)	8 (30%)		15	8	2 (25%)	2 (25%)	22	10	1	3
Oxford		71	30 (42%)	5 (7%)	16 (23%)	25	3	2	2 (100%)		4			4

Diocese	Project	Numbers attending worship	Of those attending worship:			Numbers attending Church regularly	Numbers involved in Church, eg as volunteers	Numbers attending discipleship courses (or similar)	Of those on courses:		Ceremonies			
			Un-churched	De-churched	Children (under 16)				Unchurched	Dechurched	Baptisms	Confirmations	Weddings	Funerals
	deHavilland (Hatfield)	15	14 (90%)		8 (50%)						2			
	Coffee Plus	3				3		20	6 (30%)	6 (30%)	1			
Peterborough	*Oakley Vale*	25	6 (25%)		12 (50%)	18	4							
	Northampton West	40	16 (40%)	8 (20%)	16 (40%)	30	5	2	2 (100%)		5			
	The Kairos centre	250	37 (15%)	50 (20%)	138 (55%)	180	20	24	3 (12%)	14 (60%)				
	Corby Town Missioner	150					20	12	4 (30%)	8 (70%)				
Ripon & Leeds	*Night Time Economy*	10	10 (100%)				62							
	Riverside Church	100	10 (10%)	50 (50%)	30 (30%)			153			6		5	
Rochester	*Strood*	100	90 (90%)		10 (10%)	20	6	20	2 (10%)	2 (10%)	33	9	3	3
St Albans	*Wixhams*	43				20	9				2			1
Southwark	*Vicarage*						35	12						
	Temp. prayer space	29	3 (10%)	6 (20%)	1 (5%)						1	1		2
	Chapelford	79												
Totals		1794	386	339	442	435	245	344	53	58	103	26	23	19

Charities Evaluation Services