



United Way of Delaware

**A United Way of Delaware Community-University
Partnership:
Assessing Faith Resources for Effective Community
Planning in Wilmington, DE**

Dr. Ram A. Cnaan

Dr. Bob Wineburg

April 20, 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:	iii
KEY FINDINGS AND KEY RECOMMENDATIONS	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
Project Team:	viii
For the congregational study	viii
For social services study	viii
INTRODUCTION	1
PART I:	3
KEY FINDINGS FROM WILMINGTON CONGREGATIONS	3
Overview of Key Findings	3
Denominational affiliation	3
Organizational and residential stability	3
Congregational membership	4
Financial strength	5
Clergy and staff	5
Relationships with the community	6
Social service involvement	6
Using the suburbs to help the city	7
Replacement value	8
PART II:	10
CONGREGATIONAL SUPPORT FOR OTHER SOCIAL SERVING ORGANIZATIONS	10
United Way Agencies	10
PART III:	14
SUBURBAN CONGREGATIONS HELPING WILMINGTON SOCIAL SERVICES	14
APPENDIX 1: Methods and Sample	I
Congregational study	I
Procedures	I
Sample size	II
Interviewees	II
Instruments	II
Human subject approval	III
Agency-congregational partnership study	III
Procedures	III
Instrument	III
Sample size	IV
APPENDIX 2: Areas of Social Involvement by Wilmington Congregations	VI
Agency	VII
APPENDIX 3: List of study's congregations	IX

TABLES

Table 1: Wilmington congregational budgets	5
Table 2: Congregational support for social services organization as described by the organizations' directors	11
Table 3: Areas of social involvement by Wilmington congregations (only those reported by 10% of congregations or higher).....	VI
Table 4: Wilmington agencies (N = 40) that named one or more congregations/parishes providing them any services	VII
Table 5: United Way and Wilmington congregations	VIII

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: KEY FINDINGS AND KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

The goal of this study was to provide The United Way of Delaware and the Jessie Ball duPont Fund with new baseline information about the social contributions of local religious congregations of Wilmington, Delaware and their interactions with the local social services organizations. Combined, the congregations and the local social services organizations along with the public sectors are the key players in the betterment of life conditions in Wilmington.

Part I of this report demonstrates that the local religious congregations in Wilmington are highly active in caring for the quality of life of people in Wilmington. The congregations in Wilmington are small in size compared to national statistics and their resources are limited. Many members do not reside next to the congregations but live far away, often outside the city. Yet their commitment to help the city flourishes.

Regardless of size, budget, or denominational affiliation congregations assume the social responsibility along side their religious mission. Nine in ten congregations are providing some kind of social care through an average of 2.5 different social programs. Larger congregations (by membership and budget strength) provide more programs of greater scale. The desire to help the community is almost universal. Most of the resources used by congregations come from members, and are rooted in the available space, the size of the pool of volunteers, and extent of donated goods. However, some congregations amass broader community resources through collaborations with local social service providers, suburban groups, and government agencies.

Part II of this report demonstrates that the many local social services organizations and especially United Way member organizations rely on the congregations and their resources to meet their own missions. We found that these agencies rely on congregations for volunteers, space, financial support, and goods and service. Clearly congregations are not only serving people directly but are also active in helping local social services organizations serve those in need more efficiently and with fiscal prudence.

Part III of this report demonstrates that completing the field work and writing this report is only a foundational step. In February 2009, United Way of Delaware invited local clergy to attend a meeting in which the findings were presented and in which the data base developed by Incite Solutions was presented. We answered questions and provided individual clergy with relevant information. There was much excitement among the clergy. The United Way staff moderated a discussion regarding using the data from this study for improving the quality of life in Wilmington.

What emerged from the findings we presented can be used in many ways. However, we are pleased to provide the readers of this report with ten key suggestions about what to do with the findings. Most of the suggestions are geared toward the United Way of Delaware, but are applicable elsewhere, while the last two are directed to the Jessie Ball duPont Fund.

First, we identified 131 places of worship in a city of 72,000 residents. This is an average of one place of worship per 550 residents. The national average is one congregation per 700 residents. On average, Wilmington's congregations are smaller in size and resources and more fragmented. In order to better utilize them for effective community service activities in the future, more planning for collaboration is required. Such planning must be done by community stakeholders for the betterment of the community. Every city has a pivotal agency, such as United Way of Delaware, that has the ability to bring all local congregations to the table. Regardless of congregational size and resources such an agency can help coordinate their efforts and link them with the local social service organizations. The United way of Delaware has started this coordination.

Second, unlike most American cities, most congregants in Wilmington do not live near their congregations. Only about a fifth of the members (19%) reside within ten blocks (one mile) of their congregation. An additional 37% of members live within Wilmington city limits while the rest live outside the city. This means that 44% of Wilmington congregational members are not residents of the city. This demographic would be more challenging if we didn't know how much the residents and commuters alike are committed to the quality of life in the city. The next great challenge rests with figuring ways to harness the suburban resources to improve the quality of life within the City of Wilmington. We found that currently congregants are committed to helping the city but the future may be different. We know very little of the commitment and involvement of commuters to Wilmington's congregations and how much they use suburban resources to assist the congregations and the city. While agency directors named 211 congregational partners, they did not name 229 congregations as partners. Most of them are in the suburbs. A conscious marketing strategy could easily attract some of their resources to Wilmington.

Third, while the over 90% of Wilmington's congregations consider the community's well-being a priority and are willing to get involved in strategic work to enhance quality of life, only about one-third report that they know the neighbors living around the congregation. The willingness and care reported by clergy must eventually translate into active work with the neighbors. It is our understanding that a concentrated effort to train clergy in needs assessment and community relations can enhance the quality of life of residents in Wilmington. We suggest that this report be sent to divinity schools with active community ministry programs, especially those who place their interns in nonprofit

organizations. Agencies would do well to seek out “pastors without pews.” Their partnering with congregations will likely grow. With a skill set in community research and a set of skills that can turn congregations into neighborhood centers will help Wilmington greatly.

Fourth, the extensive involvement of almost all congregations in social services provision regardless of denominational affiliation, suggests that community betterment is a transcendent social norm. There was not one clergy who asked “why should we help the broader community?” In the United States religious congregations willingly assume the role of serving the community. This is not the case in most other countries. This study confirms that congregations are a pivotal part of our safety net of services to help the poor and needy meet their basic survival needs. Any community-wide planning for helping the needy, especially in desperate recessionary times, congregations should be supported to work collaboratively and efforts to sustain the collaborations should be built into the United Way of Delaware planning from the beginning.

Fifth, Wilmington is a unique city that is surrounded by a belt of more affluent neighborhoods whose residents consider themselves to be “Wilmingtonians.” When asked where they reside, they say “Wilmington.” However, they do not pay city taxes and they use a separate and better equipped set of public schools and more effective public services. The next challenge is developing sustained ways to link the resources available in “outer” Wilmington with “inner Wilmington. We lack research here and we need better practices in linking the suburb with the city. Still, our findings show that such transfer of resources exists, and evolved organically. The United Way of Delaware needs to sharpen its knowledge and practices that enhance such activities. It needs to know what congregations do to bring suburban resources to the city and what suburban congregations do on their own to assist the struggling city. Planners need to know better what agencies do well to bring the suburban congregations into their sphere of resource development so that the resources that are tapped can be used wisely and untapped resources can be developed effectively. Building ongoing evaluation of these concerns into the United Way of Delaware budget is a logical next step.

Sixth, the United Way or congregational coalitions should follow up on the assessment we completed. The data that were collected is broad-based and relevant. The questions that were studied were vetted by local clergy and local social service directors and were constructed with an eye for implementation. We recommend that an evaluation take place in 3 years to analyze the degree to which this study was helpful in planning social interventions, in coordinating social efforts, and in informing relevant policies.

Seventh, the real value of the contributions of congregations is actually beyond what we were able to measure in this study. Our measure of replacement value only, taps the value of the input of congregational social care. We did not

measure the overall impact of these collaborations on specific concerns like crime prevention, educational achievement, debt reduction, employment training, and the like. It is a challenge to us and other scholars to come up with methods that will estimate the value of congregations from input to outcomes and in between. For now we can only ask “what would these problems look like without these collaborations?” There is no reason for a community that now knows that there are huge voluntary collaborations taking place not to use resources to understand their specific impact on different community concerns. Experts from local colleges and universities could help the United Way understand the impact of partnerships in crime prevention, educational achievement, debt reduction, employment training, by building off of and going beyond the findings here.

Eighth, a major achievement of this project was the development and implementation of an interactive and on-going electronic database. Incite Technologies, which was the fourth partner in this study, proved that data do not have to die in the domain of scholars. They produced the first ever local data base that contains all the data we gathered and made it accessible to all congregations, local social service organizations, and interested citizens. The database is interactive in that people can produce whatever information they want, ranging from which congregations provide help to ex-prisoners to what congregations operate in a certain neighborhood. Furthermore, users can identify which agencies are partnering with which congregations for what kind of help throughout New Castle County. Any congregation can also submit changes to the data and such requests will be verified and then granted. The United Way of Delaware would strengthen its leadership in harnessing these resources by promoting strategies that help agencies and congregations the use of this planning tool.

Ninth, this is a unique and unparalleled research project. Never before were all key players in the local community studied at the same time with the same perspective as to how they all individually and collaboratively help improve the quality of life of local residents. This is a great achievement and we are proud to be part of it. We are certain that many cities want similar replications. This work offers a guide.

Tenth, studies like this are rare. Starting from the vantage point of a local United Way and studying the overall social contributions of local religious congregations alongside the local social services organizations is a major achievement for all of the partners in this project. What has been learned should not stop here. While the United Way of Delaware is expected to use the findings and apply them in Wilmington, the Jessie Ball duPont Fund could easily lead the nation in understanding how community engagement for social betterment unfolds and can be enhanced. It can accomplish this through a national marketing campaign. The Fund might also consider replicating this effort elsewhere with the intention of increasing this new understanding and sharing the experience and knowledge

with foundation leaders and policymakers. The potential for community development and especially in these difficult times is immense and should be broadcasted widely. There is no city in the world with the kinds of tools for community planning that Wilmington has with its new database. These planning tools should become standard in the future. No individual partner could have succeeded in developing this world-wide innovation without the help of the other partners in this effort. The “Fund” could jump start a national effort to by showing communities elsewhere how to do what now has been accomplished.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank a host of people for invaluable support in making this study and its social contributions possible. The Jessie Ball duPont Fund had the vision and understanding that congregations are key players in any American community and no local progress can be made without their inclusion. Dr. Sherry P. Magill, President of the Fund, and Mark Constantine, Senior Fellow at the Fund, and Sally Douglas, program officer for this particular grant, were the visionaries behind the project. We would like to also thank Rev. Edward King and Mary Kress Littlepage for their attentiveness and support throughout this project. John A. "Drew" Langloh was the Executive Director of the United Way of Delaware and his insights and leadership launched the project. When he left, Michelle Taylor, the current President and Chief Executive Officer of the United Way of Delaware, helped us successfully complete the study and plan its implementation.

We want to specially thank Rev. Dr. H. Wade Greer the pastor of Ezion Mount Carmel United Methodist Church who also presides over IMAC (Interdenominational Ministers Action Council). Rev. Dr. Greer made numerous telephone calls on our behalf, contacted local clergy, and provided us with able interviewers. We also would like to thank Rev. Tyron (Ty) Johnson founder and director of founded Churches Take A Corner (CTAC). Rev. Johnson supported the study from its inception and helped us develop sensitive and useful research questions.

Thanks to the agency directors from both Wilmington nonprofit agencies and the State of Delaware agencies – too many to name individually, for their thoughtful input into shaping the final questionnaire sent to agency directors. A special thanks go to Paul Calistro and Jim Kane for the extra time they took to help shape the direction of the agency based part of this study.

We would like to thank Rob Gurnee and Tom Scott partners and managers of Incite Solutions. Rob and Tom took the data we collected, merged it with the data collected by Dr. Wineburg and produced an easy to use, accessible, data base open to all Wilmington residents and especially the faith community. They managed to produce the first ever city-wide data that showcase congregational

characteristics and community involvement. Thanks to their work our research findings are user-friendly and will serve as a national model.

Project Team:

For the congregational study

Project team included: Dr. Ram A. Cnaan (principal investigator), Walter Clayton (project director), Bryan Coleman (research coordinator), Brook Singletary (research coordinator and data manager), and Amy Griffin and Abby Emerson (summer interns and interviewers).

Interviews were conducted by all individuals listed above and in addition by the following individuals: Lissette Alfaro, Sandy Anderson, Sandy Clark, Mercedes Fields, Greg Gordon, David Grant, Jo Klinge, Ruth Legette-Harper, Sylvia Lewis-Harris, Roland Marshall, Jack Stucker, Sylvia Roberts, Aisha Weaver, Bernadette Wilmore

For social services study

Project team included: Dr. Bob Wineburg (principal investigator), Elana Levy (project director and research coordinator), Dr. Kenneth Gruber (research and data director), Jonathan Evans (survey specialist), and Afica Nxumalo (project assistant).

We thank them all!!!

INTRODUCTION

The primary goal of this project was to provide The United Way of Delaware with new baseline information about the social contributions of local religious congregations and the interrelationships between the community of nonprofit social service providers in Wilmington, Delaware and the local congregations. From the start, this project has focused its attention to the United Way of Delaware's continued desire to help its community's most vulnerable people by uncovering the potential of congregational assistance. It is now evident that no American city can overcome its social ills without the help and inclusion of local religious congregations in the reform effort. In the short term, this information will assist the United Way by enhancing its overall capability to upgrade the services delivered by all of the above mentioned organizations. Successful service provision relies on the most effective use of human and financial capital.

This work has already provided a database for the development of a link from the United Way's website for the Wilmington community to see which congregations in Wilmington are providing what types of help to their members, their neighborhoods, and the community at large. Please see: <http://faithsurvey.uwde.org/>, and then click on "congregations." This information was presented to a group of about 60 clergy and is now being used by them. Our report goes beyond the database and the information provided to the clergy.

In Part I of this report we provide information regarding the congregations in Wilmington. We first discuss our sample and then the congregational organizational characteristics. Our focus, however, is on the congregations as units of social care serving the needs of the community. We do not look at them from a theological or religious perspective but from a "community serving" perspective. Thus, we then provide the information on the congregations' involvement in the social service delivery.

Part II of this report changes focus. We move from the congregations as major contributors to the betterment of civic life in Wilmington, to an agency focus. We examine four kinds of help 58 Wilmington United Way agencies receive from a sample of 59 of the 100 congregations we speak about in Part I. That help is: (1) volunteer support, (2) financial support, (3) use of congregational space, and (4) goods and services.

Part III came from the suggestion of agency directors who participated in a focus group. They suggested that we provide a comprehensive list of congregations from in the whole of New Castle County that would serve as prompts. So keeping the spirit of this study, providing "new baseline information about the social contributions of local religious congregations and the relationships among the community of nonprofit social service providers in "Wilmington Delaware," we broadened the term "local Wilmington congregations" to include help from the whole religious community in New Castle County. Please see: <http://faithsurvey.uwde.org/>, and then click on "nonprofits."

Appendix I of this report provides information about the methods we applied to obtain the data. The methods may serve as a model for future works in other cities. Being the first study of its kind in the United Way network nationally our methods may serve to guide others who want to understand congregational and agency partnerships.

PART I: KEY FINDINGS FROM WILMINGTON CONGREGATIONS

Overview of Key Findings

The goal of this part of the study was to provide The United Way of Delaware with new baseline information about the social contributions of local religious congregations of Wilmington Delaware. Without question the 100 congregations we examined thoroughly, contribute substantially to the social, economic, and civic life in Wilmington. Throughout the rest of this report we will show how these contributions unfold, providing not only the details, but commentary as well.

Denominational affiliation

Overall, the 100 congregations we examined (see Appendix 1) belong to 41 different religions and denominations. A wide range of religious pluralism exists in Wilmington. In addition, 15 congregations reported to be non-denominational. Most of the responding congregations were Roman Catholic churches (11) followed in descending order by; United Methodist churches (9); Presbyterian (USA) churches (6); National Baptist Convention churches (5); American Baptist Association churches (4); and Episcopal churches (4).

When grouping the denominations, we find that 22% are Mainline Protestant, 16% are Evangelical Protestant, 16% are Catholics, 35% are African-American Christian congregations, and 11% are other denominations. The others are composed of Jewish synagogues, Muslim mosques, a Baha'i temple, and Seventh Day Adventist churches.

Organizational and residential stability

A wide range exists in the length of time that the congregations have served the Wilmington community. The average congregation in Wilmington is over 100 years old beginning its operation in 1927. This average takes into account two congregations that were established in 2006 (Great Seal Moorish Science Temple of America Branch #2 and Peniel Fellowship Church) as well as some that were established long before nationhood: Trinity Episcopal Parish was founded in 1638 and 1st and Central Presbyterian Church that was founded in 1737.

On average, each congregation has been located in its current building for 49 years. Again, this number varies widely, as both Harriet Tubman United Methodist Church and Manna Christian Fellowship Church have moved to new facilities. At the other end of the spectrum, Cathedral Church of St. John, Westminster Presbyterian Church, Mount Salem in Rockford Park United Methodist Church, Cathedral of St. Peter, and Wilmington Friends Meeting have been in the same building for an average of 150 years.

Fluidity is ongoing however, as one-sixth of Wilmington congregations (16.5%) are contemplating relocation. The majority of them claimed that they need more space as they have either outgrown the capacity of their current location, or they are located in a rented space and are seeking to own a permanent edifice. In the interview process, we met some pastors who initially tried to start new congregations in Wilmington but were unsuccessful. These pastors then moved to a nearby community, but ultimately they came back to Wilmington to try again. This is a unique phenomenon not observed in research on Philadelphia congregations. Interestingly many people in the region knew of these clergy and admired their entrepreneurial attempts to build a successful strong church after their periodic failure. They were not viewed negatively but admired for rooting their religious commitments to Wilmington as part of a community process much the same way Americans admire people who bounce back from defeat.

Congregational membership

The average congregation in Wilmington has 320 members including children. Again, the range is large. There are very small congregations like Wilmington Baha'i Community with seven members and St. Luke's Church with 13 members. But there are very large congregations like St. Elizabeth Catholic Church with 6,000 members and The Resurrection Center with 2,000 members. In all cases the numbers include children and youth. If we only counted adult members of the congregations, the average congregational average size would be about 40% lower, but children and youth participate, benefit and contribute to congregational life so we see them as members. Looked at a bit differently, half of the local congregations have over 170 individuals of whom about 102 are adults while half are under 170 members. When asked to compare their membership today to three years ago, almost half (48%) reported that their numbers are on the rise, about a third (30%) reported no change, and only a fifth (22%) reported a decrease.

In 55% of the congregations 75% of the members are Black. Just over, a quarter of the congregations, or 27%, are mostly White. A few congregations are comprised of Hispanics (5%). No Wilmington congregation had a majority of members who are Asians. However, one congregation came close, with its membership comprising almost fifty percent of people from Asian origin. The remainder of the congregations reported a membership comprising a mix of ethnic backgrounds, with no one group dominating.

As in most American cities, almost two-thirds of those regularly attending religious congregations (at least monthly), are women make up the bulk of attendees at a rate of 64%. However, unlike most American cities, most congregants attending Wilmington congregations **do not live near their congregations**. Only about a fifth of the members or 19%, reside within ten blocks (one mile) of their congregation. An additional 37% of members live within Wilmington city limits. Forty four percent of Wilmington's congregational membership live outside the city. This is a higher rate than any other city that has been systematically studied, and indicates that people in Wilmington are willing to drive to their congregation of choice. One possible reason for this difference is

that the official limits of the city of Wilmington, does not include the wider Wilmington metropolitan area. So many people technically reside outside city limits, but see themselves as part of the city. Another explanation for congregants not living near their place of worship might be because many who moved to live in the suburbs have a desire to keep in touch with the church of their childhood. It is also possible that in cities of the size of Wilmington, one has to travel to find a congregation of choice, while in larger and denser cities, greater religious variety is available within shorter distance. Finally, it is possible that many of the clergy who move from a bedroom community back to Wilmington congregations also bring loyal followers who reside outside of Wilmington.

Financial strength

The congregations in Wilmington, by and large, are not affluent. What follows is a quick synopsis of table 1 below. Nearly eight and one half percent of the congregations reported an operating budget of over one million dollars. The majority of congregations reported much smaller budgets. In fact, almost a quarter (23%), reported an operating budget of under \$50,000, while an additional 13% reported a budget of between 50,000 and \$100,000. Another fifth of the congregations reported a budget between \$100,000 and \$200,000. This picture mirrors what we know about congregational finances nationwide.

Table 1: Wilmington congregational budgets

Budget	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Under \$50K	23.2	23.2
\$50K-\$100K	12.6	35.8
\$100K-\$200K	20.0	55.8
\$200K-\$500K	25.3	81.1
\$500K-million	10.5	91.6
\$million+	8.4	100.0
Total	100.0	

Over 80% of the congregational income comes from pledges and offerings. Six percent comes from endowments. Special gifts earn them 4% of their budgets while rental income and fundraising earn 3% each. Three out of ten congregations in Wilmington applied for some kind of grant in the past five years. Most of these applications were to city, state or federal governments or religious denominations.

Clergy and staff

Sixty nine percent of the congregations have one or more full time clergy. Fifty three percent of the congregations reported having only one full-time clergy,

while 16% reported more than one clergy, (two to five) and the rest, 31% have no permanent full-time clergy. Congregations without full time clergy often use volunteer clergy. On average, a senior clergy in Wilmington serves for about ten years. The longest serving clergy member is 45 years while the shortest serving is one year. Just over a fifth or 21.4% of the senior clergy are women. Interestingly this figure is far above the national average of 12%. Furthermore, two thirds of Wilmington clergy are graduates of a theological seminary which is slightly below the level found in other cities.

Most congregations, 62% do not employ a full-time staff member. Twelve percent employ one full time staff member, usually a secretary or a maintenance/building manager. Thirty congregations, or 30%, reported no full or part time staff and fully rely on volunteers to maintain their congregations. On average, each congregation employs three part-time employees, usually on an hourly basis.

Relationships with the community

While the 92% of the congregations consider the community's well-being a priority and are willing to get involved in strategic work to enhance quality of life just over a third, or 35%, report that they know the neighbors living near their congregation. This finding corresponds well with the fact that many local congregations in Wilmington are comprised of commuters who are willing to help the community but don't live in it.

Over three-quarters of the congregations, or 76.5% reported that they hold joint worship services with other congregations. Three-fifths of the congregations are engaged in social service provisions with another congregation or a religious partner (59%). However, just over two-fifths, or 43% partner with a secular organizations to serve people in need. As you will see in Part II this is actually an undercount. Finally, just over a quarter of the Wilmington congregations (26.5%) reported having any collaboration with congregations or organizations outside city limits.

It should be noted that having social-service collaboration either with religious or secular organizations was not statistically associated with denominational affiliation, budget size, membership size, or the presence of clergy. This finding supports the idea that congregations, regardless of their organizational and theological background, are responding to the demonstrated community norm of social involvement for the betterment of Wilmington.

Social service involvement

When we asked the congregations what percentage of their annual budget is dedicated social care and helping others, the answers ranged from no budgetary designation to 60%. An average congregation, however, reported that just under a fifth, 19.75% of its budget, is dedicated to social care and helping others. As above, the percentage of the operating budget devoted to social care was not statistically associated with denominational affiliation, budget size, membership size, or the presence of clergy.

One way that many congregations are involved in their community is by “donating” the time of the clergy to represent them in community affairs. Clergy are spending hours maintaining quality of life in the community by participating in faith and nonprofit collaborative coalitions addressing all kinds of community issues. Among the congregations that employ a full time clergy, on average, the clergy spends 11 hours a week (almost a quarter of their weekly work hours) supporting social programs and causes in the community. Of the non-clergy staff, almost a quarter of their time, 24% is devoted to supporting social outreach and social programs.

Table 3 (in appendix 2) reports the social needs that the Wilmington congregations are most engaged in addressing. It should be noted that for some congregations, a single program covers more than one initiative listed in table 3.

Similar to Philadelphia and many other urban cities, over nine out of ten congregations or 93% of Wilmington’s congregations provide at least one social program to help needy people and improve the quality of life of local residents. On average, each congregation in Wilmington provides 2.5 different programs, slightly lower than Philadelphia. However, given that Wilmington congregations are smaller in size and budget compared with Philadelphia congregations, their investment in the City’s quality of life is relatively larger. Denominational affiliation does not explain why congregations have larger numbers of social programs. However the size of membership, the size of the budget, and the existence of a full time clergy were all significantly associated with number of programs. Congregations with larger memberships, higher budgets, and congregations that have clergy have more programs and partnerships than smaller congregations without large budgets or fulltime staff.

Using the suburbs to help the city

Across the United States today middle and upper class people flee the city and move to the suburbs. Consequently, the city is left with fewer resources to address numerous social problems. Wilmington is no exception. Indeed, the city faces numerous social problems and fewer resources, while the suburbs are flourishing. We found that in Wilmington however, congregations serve as conduits to bring suburban resources to assist the city.

One example illustrates the large point. A congregation in center city Wilmington was recently approached by a lucrative suburban Friends school. The city congregation provided space and support for the school to run a kindergarten for local children. Children who attended this kindergarten were then invited to study in the suburban primary school free of charge. The school provided daily transportation for these children as well. These exchanges for the betterment of Wilmington take place regularly but usually go unrecorded without ceremony because they are routine community norms.

Of the 100 congregations we studied 27 reported such collaborations. Programs can range from coat give-aways to simple financial support of the congregation’s

social ministry. Forty five congregations told us they are seeking partnerships with suburban nonprofit organizations and 40 told us they are seeking non-religious relationships with suburban organizations.

Replacement value

Congregations make valuable contributions to the social betterment of the Wilmington community. If we ask the question: what would it cost Wilmington to buy what congregations contribute, economists would say we are determining “the imputed economic value” or the “replacement value.” We aim to establish a measure of the congregational contribution to the quality of life of people in Wilmington by placing a monetary cost on replacing these programs with market driven programs. The replacement value assesses the cost of producing the same public goods produced by local religious congregations. We are not speaking about dollar amount it costs for congregations to run their programs. In this construct of replacement value, we mean congregational utilization of many available resources, like their property, staff, and volunteers. Such resources are so ingrained in the consciousness of the community that they may seem cost-free. Yet when another secular service organization offers the same service, it must pay the costs for renting space, paying salaries for managers and wages for employees. What we therefore mean by replacement value is the amount it would cost others to provide the same services or programs at the level stipulated, if they did not have the congregational property and member volunteers at hand.

We combined seven components of the Wilmington census of Congregations (WCC), that, accounted for the replacement value of congregational services.: 1) the financial support the congregation provides to the community which is often an actual budget item in the congregation’s budget; 2) the value of in-kind support like transportation, food, clothing, printing, telephone costs, and postage); 3) the value of utilities (such as heating, cooling, electricity, and cleaning) for programs held on the congregation’s property; 4) the estimated cost of renting equivalent space from a commercial vendor for programs held on the congregation’s property; 5) the number of clergy hours spent on community affairs; 6) the number of staff hours (of program directors, secretaries, and other congregation employees); and 7) the number of volunteer hours.

For each congregation in our study, we determined its estimated cost per month. When respondents were unable to provide an assessment of program costs, we assigned the value of zero cost. To determine the value of the time spent in providing these programs, we multiplied the number of clergy hours by \$20 and the number of staff hours by \$10. To determine the value of volunteer hours, we used the standard of \$19.51 per hour established in 2008 by the Independent Sector, an umbrella organization that tracks nonprofit activities nationally.

An average congregation in Wilmington provides \$6,506 of social care monthly. This estimate is significantly below Philadelphia’s congregational estimates, and reflects what we noted above in size and budget strength of Wilmington’s congregations. To see the larger picture of the replacement value annually, we

multiplied the monthly contribution by 12, which amounts to a replacement value of \$78,072 per congregation and then multiplied that number by the 100 congregations we assessed. That set of simple multiplications gives the “community replacement value” of just over 7.8 million dollars. If we assume that the 31 congregations in Wilmington that we were unable to assess were similar to the other 100 that we did assess, then we see that the overall replacement value of the social care provided by congregations in Wilmington is estimated annually to exceed ten million dollars.

When attempting to find out what explains higher replacement value, membership size and denominational affiliation were not the factors that explained this value. However, budget and the existence of a full time clergy were both significantly associated with the replacement value. Congregations with higher budgets and congregations with active clergy provided larger number of programs.

As we move to Part II and turn things around to examine the United Way agencies’ partnerships with 59 of the 100 congregations in Wilmington, it becomes clear that even though we spent hours with leaders of Wilmington’s congregations, they quite likely under reported the contributions they provide to the social betterment of the community through partnerships with intermediary nonprofit organizations. The groundbreaking aspect of this study is that a group of professional agency directors were asked to tell us how they use the “betterment resources” from a large set of congregations, independent of what the congregational leaders told us. They actually told us that they have more partnerships with congregations in Wilmington than the congregational leaders told us they had with nonprofit organizations.

PART II: CONGREGATIONAL SUPPORT FOR OTHER SOCIAL SERVING ORGANIZATIONS

In this part of the report we re-emphasize that our major focus is to provide data and insight on how the social betterment of Wilmington unfolds and sustains itself. Keep in mind, that those congregations in and of themselves also help in this effort without partnering with agencies in Wilmington's professional network of social care. The social services organizations in this network however, like congregations, are separate organizations, and likewise conduct many of their affairs separately from congregations. In the same breath, they are intertwined both with each other and the religious community. Since our focus is not on the individual organization like it was with the congregation in Part I, but on how most of these organizations work toward the social betterment in Wilmington, in concert with the religious community, we will proceed with some helpful organizational background data but will quickly zero in on the partnerships they have with Wilmington congregations.

This act of community generosity is an "institution to institution" giving on behalf of "the stranger." Historically, congregations were rooted in communities before their agency partners and provided sustenance for both their members and the immediate neighborhood when needs arose. The congregational data reported in Part I above provide evidence that giving on that level is still an essential part of congregational "in-house" ministries of caring and a major form of direct social service. When we step back and consider what the other forms of generosity listed below mean, we see a tremendous amount of indirect care going from congregations through agencies to Wilmington recipients. If one were to consider that the congregations support local social services and also have food pantries, provide transportation to doctors' offices, provide money to those who show up at their door step, and even shelter, the contributions they are making to the agencies take on a deeper community significance.

So we have to view all of the generous congregational giving to local social services organizations through the lenses of two sets of community institutions that have as one of their multiple missions, the betterment of "the stranger and citizen of Wilmington." As we talk about the partnerships below it would be a mistake to think that somehow congregations who were not in "the numbers we put forth" provide the community fewer goods and services because fewer agencies named them for that kind of assistance. Congregations may help improve the quality of life in the city in many ways, by directly assisting people, by supporting agencies, by collaborating with the suburban congregations, or even by praying for and with non-members.

United Way Agencies

Almost 81%, or 58 of 72 agencies in Wilmington, responded to the 17 page survey. The agency directors were asked to check off the kinds of services they

provided. While many agencies focus on serving a specific population or a specific concern, like teen moms or elder care, in effect, they cover community problems that span the entire life cycle. As such, they have become multi-service agencies. (Forty of the 58 agencies that named a congregation are listed in Table 4 in Appendix 2). An example is the Red Cross which uses many congregations for assistance. At one time it was known for its disaster relief and its blood drives, which still are often conducted at congregational sites and drawn from people 18 years and over. Yet, its distribution is for the whole community regardless of age or means. Today it assists military families, worked in many communities to find goods, shelter, and other assistance, with the help of congregations, for Katrina survivors who migrated to different cities nationwide when they became homeless. We thought that the best way to portray the agencies is that they cover the range of life cycle services that help the social betterment of Wilmington residents, since they often do so in concert with congregational support. What follows is a breakdown of how the Wilmington agencies and in what proportion, get help from the 59 congregations in Wilmington we examined.

Forty four or 76% of the 59 congregations, provided help of any kind to 36 of 58, or 62.1% of the responding agencies: (1) volunteers (2) money, (3) use of their facilities (4) providing goods/services. Agency leaders told us what the congregations provide. Table 2 below is a snapshot of what congregations provide in the exact words of the directors who answered the survey.

Table 2: Congregational support for social services organization as described by the organizations' directors

Have held educational/advocacy programs at these locations
Churches often host "mission fairs" that our volunteers attend and recruit volunteers for our programs.
Churches also frequently have child care centers located within their buildings and we set up our Volunteer Reading Program within those facilities.
Sometimes the child care center is independent; sometimes it is an outreach of the church. Many churches invite us to provide programs for parents.
Volunteers assist staff in running special events, providing clerical support in our offices and procuring items needed for our holiday programs.
Shared advocacy, volunteers, program planning and grant writing, shared meeting space, facilities rental. Several congregations donate annually to the LACC.
School & Youth Program within their schools
Furniture use, use gym for recreation activities, use hall for annual board meeting
Tutor training workshop space, tutoring space for student and tutor team, in-service workshops, recognition dinners, food and clothing distributions
Support Group Meetings, Educational events
They call us for services, we don't typically go to them.
The churches above provide food for the Emmanuel Dining Rooms and/or donate money for food.
Churches often donate food, clothing or household items in addition to financial supporting these sites.
Consumers receive food bank contributions at these locations.

We noted in Part I that clergy are averaging 11 hours a week in brokering connections for the betterment of Wilmington and their staff is spending 10 hours doing this work. The examples above could not have come to be without clergy and staff participation with agencies and serve as few examples of the connections that they are constantly making on behalf of their membership and the community. What takes place in sealing these connections is organic, has evolved over time, and by and large is informal. This is the 21st century embodiment of the kind of mutual assistance that Alexis de Tocqueville touted about the American voluntary spirit, on his 1830s tour of what was then rural America.

Our respondents told us that they use flyers, websites, and personal contacts through the old fashion networking process to keep their concerns alive in the minds of their religious partners. Congregants may indeed come in from the suburbs to worship, but our data tell quite another story about their contributions to the betterment of Wilmington through the congregations they commute to. Thirty one of the congregations, or almost 53%, provided **volunteers** for 18 or 31% of the 58 agencies in Wilmington. We did not measure the extent of their volunteer contributions, but it is safe to say that the volunteer contributions are an integral part of the total giving that these congregations provide the agencies. While we noted, that by and large, those Wilmington congregations are not wealthy compared to Philadelphia congregations for example, it is quite a positive sign that 20 congregations, or almost 34%, give money to help support the operations of Wilmington United Way agencies. These 20 congregations support the social services agencies with **cash**.

One way to tell whether a congregation is committed to the betterment of its community is when it offers its facilities for broader community use. Congregations are first and foremost gathering spots for like minded worshipers, thus making their space sacred both in a personal and public way. Congregations are not taxed. When a congregation offers its **space** for community use for free, or well below fair market value, it is inviting the community to share a part of its sacredness. It is making a community-wide statement that it is there to serve. Twenty two or 37% of the Wilmington congregations offer their sacred space for use by 19 of the 58 Wilmington United Way agencies.

We all know that congregations conduct food drives for the needy during holiday times, and the food at times is distributed through non-profit organizational efforts. But often hidden from sight is how agencies receive services from congregations. One of our agency respondents told us that congregations provide use of their vans to pick up and return elderly and children home after they have received a flu shot at a local congregation. In between the lines in Table 2 above, are numerous kinds of services that congregations are assisting agencies – and they do so routinely and without fanfare. Twenty six, or 44.1 % of the congregations in

Wilmington, provide **goods and services** to 12, or 20.5% of the Wilmington's United Way agencies.

Step back for a moment and reconsider some of the previous points when we focused our analysis specifically on the Wilmington's congregations in Part I. We noted that the combined replacement value of their assistance would be over 10 million dollars. If we were to look at the economic contributions now, considering what agency directors told us these congregations contribute to their resource base, the replacement value would be much higher. This is simply a new learning and will have to be considered in future studies. Our approach to understanding congregational contributions is novel and was never tested before. While we shed new light on this phenomenon, future studies will be able to ascertain the exact scope and value of the support congregations provide to the local social services organizations.

As we will show in Part III the same demographic forces that shape the commitment of "commuters" to sustain their city congregations and nurture Wilmington's social betterment are at play beyond the borders of Wilmington and extend into New Castle County. While this section focused only on the nexus of Wilmington congregations and their support of Wilmington social services organizations, in fact, added support for these organizations come from congregations outside of Wilmington. This is additional congregational support for improving the quality of life in Wilmington and should not be neglected. In urban America, the city often is left with dwindling tax revenues while the suburbs find themselves with fewer needs and ample tax base. As such, suburban resources that go to the city are of special importance and Part III will focus on the congregational efforts in this respect.

PART III: SUBURBAN CONGREGATIONS HELPING WILMINGTON SOCIAL SERVICES

Wilmington has a population of 72,000 people and is a comparatively small but densely populated. In 1940, Wilmington had 112,000 people, so there has been a considerable decrease in population in 70 years. About 6,700 people live in each of the 11.5 square miles of land. Wilmington is the largest city and county seat of New Castle County. The county has about 430,000 people who don't live in Wilmington. About 1,000 people reside in each square mile in the county. Three factors summarize the shrinkage of Wilmington's population and growth of New Castle County: (1) middle class flight to the suburbs for more space, (2) the growth of the banking industry in Wilmington that attracted professionals who chose to reside in suburban New Castle County, and (3) professionals from the area who work in Philadelphia metropolitan area but wanted to stay in less populated communities such as New Castle county. The convergence of these forces created a smaller Wilmington with high level of social need, and limited resources, but surrounded by an affluent county.

It is against this backdrop that we see a large number of congregants residing in New Castle County but being members of a Wilmington congregation: Thus there is: A commitment to a community where one once lived but now only works, only works in, or only has a psychological roots. In all cases the religious congregation is an important vehicle to express a personal and collective commitment to Wilmington. The other side of this equation is that the population growth of New Castle County saw the development of new congregations and expansion of existing congregations. While the county was outside the purview of our study, we noted a major role for the suburban organizations and congregations in helping maintaining the quality of life of residents in Wilmington. In Part I of this report, we discussed how congregations in Wilmington use suburban resources to enhance their social care. The same process takes place when the social services organizations use suburban congregations to enhance their service capacity.

Given that United Way agencies started their relationships with congregations in Wilmington, it is no surprise that they would see their resource base expand to the suburbs as the needs in Wilmington grew and resources at hand shrunk. Agency directors told us as much in the focus groups so we provided them a list of 440 congregations in the whole of New Castle County. What follows are some of the general findings of what agencies in Wilmington received from the pool of congregations in the county.

Like the congregations discussed in Part I, many agencies have constituencies in the bedroom communities that care about Wilmington. Agency directors told us that their "congregational resource base" extends beyond the city of Wilmington

itself and into the small towns and cities that make up the rest of the county. We were, thereby, able to examine suburban congregational contributions to all responding Wilmington agencies.

One finding is indisputable; the commitment to the social betterment of Wilmington is unyielding whether it comes from the congregations in Wilmington itself, between the congregations in Wilmington and agencies in Wilmington, or between agencies in Wilmington and congregations throughout New Castle County. To make this general point we will first show the kind of resources the entire body of New Castle County congregations who were named as partners with Wilmington United Way agencies contribute to the social betterment of the Wilmington community. The data show this in several ways. First, Wilmington agencies collaborate with a comparatively small number of congregations in Wilmington (44) as compared with New Castle County congregations (167). Second, only a total of 40 of 58 studied agencies named a congregation inside Wilmington or in the county as a partner. Yet, 36 of the 58 agencies that responded to the survey reported collaboration with a Wilmington congregation as their service focus apparently **is** the city. This means that agencies have a commitment to Wilmington, but when they need more help they reach out to the broader county. If we look at this in a slightly different way, in terms of percentages, the idea that once the resource base in Wilmington is exhausted, agencies turn outward but still with their eyes on helping the Wilmington community and to a lesser degree those who have needs in the county. Seventy six percent of the Wilmington congregations have a partnership with a Wilmington agency, while 48% of the total 440 New Castle County congregations have a partnership with a Wilmington agency. This difference in percentages is the same in favor of Wilmington congregations as opposed to county congregations across each category of giving: volunteers, money, space, and goods and services (See Table 5 in Appendix 2).

When we focus solely on the 167 county (but not city) congregations that we found to support the work of the city's social services organizations, similar trends of support emerge. Thirty seven out of the 58 agencies, (3 agency directors reported using congregations from the 31 Dr.Cnaan was unable to contact and were not included) just one more than the 36 that used Wilmington's congregations use them for help. Again, very similar percentages to those reported in the previous part were reported regarding the use of volunteers, money, space, and goods and services. As may be expected, percentage wise, just about the same percentage of agencies were collaborating with a fewer percent of the county congregations. Having a larger number of potential congregation partners actually gives real clues for agencies to expand their resource base countywide and improve their base of support.

Regarding what seals partnerships with religious congregation, we found that if an agency had a clergy member as either its director or on staff, that agency was more likely to have many more partnerships with congregations than if an agency

did not have a clergy member. We refer to these clergy as pastors without pews. Planners might consider developing an advisory group with these religious/social service leaders because it is obvious that, even though they may not run congregations, these pastors know how to tap into the spirit of giving that is prevalent throughout the congregational community. Serving as advisors may be one way to harness what is, at this stage, private knowledge. This knowledge could be turned into a broader series of actions that could help agencies that may not have the same understanding, leading to increased activity within what appears to be the still untapped markets for community giving from the religious congregations of New Castle County and probably across Delaware.

If an agency partnered with one of the 12 larger congregations either in Wilmington or New Castle County, it was many times more likely to have other congregational partners (average of **11** partnerships versus **.5** partnerships). In this instance we believe that the larger congregations serve to legitimize partnering with the agencies in two ways. First, those large congregations are well respected and serve as models for the other congregations to follow their lead. Second, these congregations command many resources and working with them makes the work of agencies more effective and thus they seek additional partnerships with other congregations.

The key message from Part III of this report is that the support for betterment of quality of life in Wilmington is not limited to actors in the city of Wilmington. Other partners countywide are willing to lend a hand. One such set of partners is the county's religious congregations. Social services agency directors figured out that those suburban congregations are an untapped resource and are actively recruiting them to assist in helping Wilmington residents. This side of the story is hardly ever revealed, yet it is indispensable for maintaining quality of life in Wilmington.

APPENDIX 1: Methods and Sample

Congregational study

Procedures

All in all, 20 people participated in the data collection. Four of them belonged to the University of Pennsylvania research team and 14 were local residents of Wilmington recommended by local clergy. All interviewers received both a lengthy orientation and weekly group in-service training that included the history and overview of the study, benefit to the congregations and broader community, ways to use and disseminate data, and an introduction to the survey instruments. Each interviewer was also given a training manual that documents the information outlined above with specifications and clarification for the survey instruments. For more in-depth training, interviewers observed an interview conducted by a trained researcher followed by a question and answer session. The interviewers were closely supervised and observed for the first three interviews and provided with feedback after each session. Interviewers received ongoing training and supervision through weekly meetings where questions were answered and the survey instrument was routinely reviewed. This training and supervision were to ensure that interviewers were familiar with the survey instrument, understood the intent of questions, learned to phrase questions properly, recorded responses accurately and completely, learned to probe interviewees for more complete responses, and addressed issues of confidentiality. Interviewers were also trained to understand religious customs and language of the particular congregation being interviewed. Many of the interviewers were familiar with the religious ecology in Wilmington and knew most local clergy and the location of the various congregations.

To assure collaboration with regards to each congregation, a phone call was made to the congregation to schedule an interview, letters of explanation as well as a letter of invitation were mailed, local social networks and alliances of clergy were utilized, and unannounced visits were made to secure participation. We offered participating congregations a signed dedicated copy of my book on Philadelphia congregations and/or \$100. Almost all rejected the money and asked for the book. Still, some congregations outright refused to participate such as: Bethel Church of The Living God, Ebenezer Baptist Church, Joshua Harvest Ministries, Metropolitan Baptist Church, St. Anne Catholic Church, and First Assembly Of God. Two other congregations were interviewed, however this data could not be included as an interviewer lost the interview documents and the clergy refused to be re-interviewed. Other congregations that we failed to interview were not accessible through any of the means we applied: telephone calls, letters, invitations, asking neighbors, visiting mid-week, and visiting on day of worship.

Sample size

While we aimed to interview each of the 131 identified Wilmington congregations (visited to confirm that the building exists and the sign is in place), we were successful at completing 100 interviews for a response rate of 76.3%. This is a higher response rate than that achieved in the Philadelphia Census of Congregations (66%). In fact, this is the highest rate of response for any study of congregations to date. It should be noted that only 107 congregations are registered with the Mayor's office. As such, we managed to identify many more congregations than anyone previously managed to assemble.

Interviewees

We studied one key informant in most congregations. One can ask whether a clergy or key lay leader will not be biased in his or her responses. In a previous study we interviewed a clergy and one lay leader and if there was a discrepancy between them a third leader was to be interviewed. Only in one of 50 cases was there a discrepancy. Furthermore, one of our interviewers, mistakenly, interviewed a clergy and four lay leaders for 11 congregations. The level of compatibility between these respondents was very high and it became clear that clergy or one lay leader can provide accurate data regarding the congregation. Similarly, McPherson and Rotolo (1995) measured four different characteristics (size, sex composition, age composition, and educational composition) by three different methods (reports from group official, reports from a randomly chosen respondent to a survey, and direct observation of a group meeting). They found very high correlations (between .8 and .9) among all three logged measures of size and sex composition, and only slightly smaller correlations between the leader report and direct observation for age and educational composition (.73 and .77, respectively). They conclude that, for these four variables, "reports from an officer are just as reliable as direct-canvass measures and could reasonably be substituted for the latter" (McPherson & Rotolo 1995:1114).

Instruments

Each participating congregation was interviewed for two to four hours regarding their history, religious affiliation, membership, political involvement, finances, organizational structure, relationships with the community, involvement in social programs, and a detailed review of up to five of their social programs. We used three research instruments. The first part of the interview (the General Form) gathered background information about the congregation, its history, membership, financial information, staff, governing structure, and relations with the wider community.

The second part (the Inventory of Programs) compiled information about the congregation's social services. The interviewers covered 215 areas of possible social and community involvement, with numerous follow-up questions concerning the formal or informal nature of the program, where it was provided, and so on. We asked respondents to identify those services that had been

offered in the past twelve months and to omit any that were no longer available. We used a 12-month time frame to ensure that seasonal programs such as summer camps and heating assistance programs would be included and that responses would reflect the current social program agenda of the congregation.

The third part of the interview (the Specific Program Form) was used to gather information about the most important social programs provided by the congregation, up to a maximum of five programs. With regard to these five programs, the interviewee was asked detailed questions about the program's history, legal status, staffing, who benefits, how many times a week/month/year it was offered, cost to the congregation, and much more. Due to the length of interviewing time, congregations with more than five social programs were asked to choose only the five "most representative of their work." We asked respondents to start with those programs that have budgets and paid staff.

Human subject approval

The study was approved by the University of Pennsylvania, office of Regulatory Affairs. The Office of Regulatory Affairs approved the study and affirmed that it did not pose any potential harm to human subjects. This approval is also known as ethics review board approval.

Agency-congregational partnership study

Procedures

Originally, our intention was to examine each of the 109 Member and Affiliate agencies in the United Way of Delaware system by way of an electronic survey sent with a cover letter from the President of The United Way of Delaware to directors of agencies. Prior to sending the survey, Dr. Bob Wineburg met with 26 different representatives of United Way and State of Delaware Service Agencies to ensure that the questions we were posing captured the nature and scope of the service partnerships we were trying to measure. After several revisions of the original survey, we were convinced that we could capture the service partnerships we were seeking to understand.

Instrument

The survey instrument was 17 pages that elicited demographic information about each agency, a series of questions about the kinds of services agencies provide, their future needs, the way they solicit help from congregations and the kinds of training they offer volunteers. Nine pages, comprising the names 440 congregations in New Castle County, had places for agency directors to check if the specific congregation provided volunteers, money, facility space, and goods/services.

Sample size

We surveyed all 109 United Way Agencies in Delaware. Our response rate across Delaware was 70%, or 76 of 109 agencies. In Wilmington, the actual **focus of the study, 72 agencies were surveyed. Our response rate was 58 agencies or 80.5% of the 72 possible** responding agencies. What we would like to point out here is that the universe of agencies that we focused most on is 58 United Way of Delaware member and affiliate located in Wilmington and the kind of resources they receive from 59 of the 100 congregations in the Wilmington sample.

Overall these are extraordinarily acceptable response rates on all accounts, assuring high validity of our findings and claims we might make about their implications. A survey of state agencies was done as well. Dr. Bob Wineburg spent 5 full days in Wilmington and Dover interviewing State of Delaware agency leaders and direct service workers in Public Health, Safetynet Social Services, and The Division of Children, Youth and Families. Dr. Bob Wineburg also spent 2 hours in an afternoon meeting with the State Director of the Delaware Crime Council and another 90 minute morning session with him. While there were many promises made from leaders of each governmental unit, and quite a bit of anecdotal data about the nature and scope of state relationships with congregations, in the end we were only able to get 24 surveys returned from 3 units of state government in New Castle County. Three Wilmington congregations not cited in the data of 59 congregations actually helped state agencies, bringing the partners in Wilmington to 62. This is a fertile area of study, but unless there is 100% buy-in from top government officials, even a relentless telephone strategy would not have yielded the kind of response rate we got from the more independent nonprofit directors. Nevertheless, there is enough partnering among “on the ground” with state agencies to pursue this line of inquiry further.

We assumed that because the United Way was a major funder, recipients of the survey would readily return it and that we would have the kind of high response rate that would allow us to talk confidently about the findings. Once we examined the data on the budgets of the responding agencies we concluded that, while the United Way was an important funder, it was one of five major funding sources, and that the incentive to get a survey back to a major funder was not as strong as we originally assumed. Our initial response rate was 27% -- certainly not enough responses to make more than the vaguest claims about the extent of the existing partnerships. We employed a telephone strategy where we continued to call United Way agency directors across Delaware until we got a respectable response rate by current social science standards. The 80% response rate in Wilmington is by any survey standard stellar.

For some excellent examples of what may be found if government agencies wanted throw full support behind determining their organic local partnerships can be found on the websites set up by United Way of Delaware's partners at:

<http://faithsurvey.uwde.org/renderState.asp?EntityID=959&tab=4>

<http://faithsurvey.uwde.org/renderState.asp?EntityID=960&tab=4>

Here one can find congregations with which 'DSCYF - Division of Youth Rehabilitative Services' partners.

<http://faithsurvey.uwde.org/renderState.asp?EntityID=960&tab=4>

Congregations with which 'Public Health - Health Promotion and Disease Prevention - Immunization Branch' partners.

APPENDIX 2: Areas of Social Involvement by Wilmington Congregations

Table 3: Areas of social involvement by Wilmington congregations (only those reported by 10% of congregations or higher)

Area of social involvement	% reporting	Area of social involvement	% reporting
Visiting the sick/homebound	49.0%	Family values	15.6%
Recreational programs for children	32.3%	Peace	15.6%
Music performances	31.3%	Computer training for teens	14.8%
Choral groups	31.2%	After school programs	14.6%
Food pantries	29.8%	Soup kitchens	14.6%
Summer programs for teens	29.2%	Computer training (all ages)	14.6%
Summer day camps	27.1%	Sports activities	14.6%
Prison ministry	25.2%	Historic preservation	13.6%
Tutoring for school based youth	25.0%	Women's' issues	13.6%
Visitation of sick/homebound seniors	22.9%	Parenting skills classes	12.5%
Scholarships for students	22.9%	Organized tour for the elderly	12.5%
Radio/TV programs	22.9%	Day-care (pre-school)	12.5%
Clothing closets	21.1%	Music classes	12.5%
Mentoring/Right of passage programs	19.8%	Voter registration	12.5%
Health education	19.4%	Helping ex-prisoners	12.1%
Intergenerational programs	18.8%	Financial assistance	11.6%
Recreational programs for seniors	18.8%	Transportation services for the elderly	11.5%
Book clubs	18.8%	Nutrition programs	11.5%
Summer programs for teens	18.7%	Parish nurse	11.4%
Health screening	17.7%	Sex education	11.4%
Street outreach to homeless people	16.7%	Social justice campaigns	11.4%
Artistic dance classes	16.6%	Poverty advocacy	11.4%
Lecture series	16.6%	School	10.6%
Drug & alcohol prevention	15.8%	Couples counseling	10.4%
Financial counseling	15.6%	Scouts programs	10.4%
Interfaith collaborations	15.6%	Arts exhibits	10.4%
Community bazaars/fairs	15.6%		

Table 4: Wilmington agencies (N = 40) that named one or more congregations/parishes providing them any services

Number of Congregations	Agency
75	Ministry of Caring
48	Boy Scouts of America, Del-Mar-Va Council, Inc.
40	Saint Anthony's Community Center
39	Catholic Charities, Inc.
37	A Door of Hope
35	American Red Cross of the Delmarva Peninsula
29	Lutheran Community Services, Inc.
29	Neighborhood House, Inc.
23	Wilmington Senior Center, Inc.
18	West End Neighborhood House, Inc.
18	Catholic Youth Ministry, Office for Wilmington
17	Literacy Volunteers Serving Adults, Northern Delaware, Inc.
16	YMCA of Delaware
10	READ-ALOUD Delaware
10	YWCA of Delaware, Inc.
10	AIDS Delaware
8	Ronald McDonald House of Delaware
7	Mental Health Association in Delaware
7	Limen House, Inc.
7	Latin American Community Center
7	Leukemia & Lymphoma Society, Delaware Chapter
6	CareLink Community Support Services
6	Peoples Settlement Association
6	Hilltop Lutheran Neighborhood Center
5	Milton & Hattie Kutz Home, Inc.
4	Bernard & Ruth Siegel Jewish Community Center
4	Jewish Family Services of Delaware, Inc.
3	Connections Community Support Program, Inc.
3	Children & Families First
3	Delaware Center for Justice, Inc.
2	Planned Parenthood of Delaware
2	Supporting K.I.D.D.S.
1	American Diabetes Association of America
1	Delaware Futures, Inc.
1	Delaware Adolescent Program, Inc.
1	Big Brothers Big Sisters
1	Delaware Elwyn Institute
1	Alzheimer's Association – Delaware Valley Chapter
1	Girls Incorporated of Delaware
1	Boys and Girls Clubs of Delaware, Inc.

Table 5: United Way and Wilmington congregations

Support Type	Congregations		United Way Status			
	Congregations (N = 59)		Congregational Partners			
	Agencies (N = 58)		Members* (N = 32)		Affiliates* (N =26)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<u>Any Support at all</u>						
Congregations with Agency Contacts	44	74.60%	41	69.50%	12	20.30%
Agencies with Church Contacts	36	62.10%	22	68.80%	12	46.20%
<u>Volunteers</u>						
Congregations with Agency Contacts	31	52.50%	26	44.10%	14	23.70%
Agencies with Church Contacts	18	31.00%	12	37.50%	6	23.10%
<u>Money</u>						
Congregations with Agency Contacts	20	33.90%	15	25.40%	11	18.60%
Agencies with Church Contacts	15	25.90%	10	31.30%	5	19.20%
<u>Facility Space</u>						
Congregations with Agency Contacts	22	37.30%	17	28.80%	12	20.30%
Agencies with Church Contacts	19	32.80%	12	37.50%	7	26.90%
<u>Goods & Services</u>						
Congregations with Agency Contacts	26	44.10%	22	37.30%	20	33.90%
Agencies with Church Contacts	12	20.70%	9	28.10%	3	11.50%

* More Member agencies have more affiliations with Wilmington congregations than Affiliate agencies.

APPENDIX 3: List of study's congregations

Clergy	Organization	Address	Zip Code
Rabbi Sanford Dresin	Adas Kodesch Shel Emeth	4412 Washington Blvd.	19802
Rev. Steve Ackerman	Aldersgate United Methodist	2313 Concord Pike	19802
Pastor Joyce Cofield	Anointed Word Evangelistic Fellowship	109 West 26th St.	19802
Pastor Martin Wilson	Apostolic Christian Tabernacle	3707 N. Market St.	19802
Pastor Lottie Lee	Be Ready Jesus Is Coming Apostle Church	1411 W. 4th St.	19805
Rabbi Peter Grumbacher	Beth Emeth Congregation	300 W. Lea Blvd.	19802
Rabbi Michael Beals	Beth Shalom Congregation	1801 Baynard Blvd.	19802
Pastor Silvester Beaman	Bethel AME Church	604 N. Walnut St	19801
Pastor Tony McCleave	Blessing Place	608 N. Market St.	19801
Pastor Bob Richardson	Calvary Presbyterian Church	701 S. Maryland Ave.	19804
Pastor Shane Moran	Calvary United Methodist Church	219 W. 36th St.	19802
Pastor Christopher Bullock	Canaan Baptist Church	1201 N. Van Buren St.	19801
Very Reverend William Lane	Cathedral Church of Saint John	10 Concord Ave.	19802
Rev. Joseph Cocucci	Cathedral of St. Peter	500 West Street	19801
Pastor Arnold	Central Baptist Church	839 N. Pine St.	19801
Rev. Laverne And Curtis Ford	Chosen Outreach Ministries, Inc.	1628 Tulip Street	19805
Father Michael Carrier	Christ Our King Church	2810 Monroe St.	19802
Pastor Billy J. Lane	Christian Growth Ministry	341 S Heald St.	19801
Pastor Joe Robinson	Christian United Fellowship Baptist Church	632 E 9th St.	19801
Rev. Danny Mitchell	Church Of Our Savior- Presbyterian	1006 E. 28th St.	19802
Pastor Randall E. Laakko	Church Of The Holy City	1118 N. Broom St.	19806
Pastor Donald Dunnigan	Cornerstone Fellowship Baptist Church	20 W. Lea Blvd.	19802
Pastor Canon Lloyd Casson	Episcopal Church Of Saint Andrew & Matthew	719 Shipley St.	19801
Pastor Lawrence Irving	Evangelistic Temple Of Truth	307 S. Franklin St.	19805
Pastor Christopher Curry	Ezion Fair Baptist Church	1230 N. French St.	19801
Pastor Ward Greer	Ezion Mt Carmel United Methodist Church	800 N. Walnut St.	19801
Clergy	Organization	Address	Zip

			Code
Pastor Douglas Gerdts	First & Central Presbyterian Church	1101 N. Market St.	19801
	First Church of Christ Scientists Wilmington	900 N. Tatnall St.	19801
Pastor Lolita Jackson	Friendship Baptist Church	530 E. 4th St.	19801
Bishop Patricia Williams	Glorious Full Gospel Tabernacle Center	1930 Hutton St.	19802
Pastor Robert Mongold	Grace United Methodist Church	900 Washington St.	19801
Grand Sheik Ahdul Rahim- El	Great Seal Moorish Science Temple Of America	3037 N. Market	19802
Rev. B. Ivan Broomer	Mount Calvary Temple Church Of God In Christ	922 N. Lombard St.	19801
Pastor Arrie M. Fisher	Greater Deliverance Temple	403 N. DuPont St.	19805
Pastor Drewy Richardson	Greater St. John Baptist	504 Jefferson St.	19801
Pastor Robert Undercuffler	Hanover Presbyterian Church	1801 N. Jefferson St.	19802
Pastor Marilyn Rembert	Harriet Tubman Community United Methodist Church	2200 N. Market St.	19802
Rev. Dr. Gus George Christo	Holy Trinity Greek Orthodox Church	808 N Broom St.	19806
Pastor Andrew Williams	House Of God Church	1401 Garasches Lane	19801
	Iglesia Luz y Verdad	1509 Lancaster Ave.	19805
Pastor William Breon	Immanuel Church	2414 Pennsylvania Ave.	19806
Rev. Ray Nelson	Immanuel Church Highlands	2400 W. 17th St.	19806
Pastor Shannon McNeil	Kingdom Harvest Fellowship	3014 Governor Printz Blvd.	19802
Rev. William Sanford	Love Fellowship Free Will Baptist Church	623½ S. Heald St.	19801
Imam A.H. Muhammad	Masjid Al-Kauthar	2102 Northeast Blvd.	19802
Minister Robert Muhammad	Muhammad's Mosque #35	2800 Washington St.	19802
Pastor Lawrence Livingston	Mother African Union Church	812 N Franklin St.	19805
Rev. Derrick E. Porter	Mount Joy United Methodist Church	451 Townsend St.	19801
Rev. John Holden	Mount Salem United Methodist Church	2629 W. 19th St.	19806
Pastor Robert Revelle, Sr.	Mount Zion Greater Harvest Ministries International	3607 Governor Printz Blvd.	19802
Pastor Pricilla Bloodsworth	Mount Zion Greater Harvest Ministry International II	2501 Market St.	19802
Pastor Richard A. Reeves, Sr.	Mount Zion Miracle Church	408 E. 11th St.	19801
Pastor Wanda Reeves	New Apostolic Life Ministries	321 S. Heald	19802

Clergy	Organization	Address	Zip Code
Pastor Vincent Oliver	New Calvary Baptist Church	610 S. Heald St.	19801
Bishop Thomas Weeks	New Destiny Fellowship	906 E. 16th St.	19802
Pastor Walter C. Brown	New Hope Baptist Church	1230 N. Heald St.	19802
Pastor Samuel Richardson, III	New Mt Bethel Baptist Church	504 W. 5th St.	19801
Pastor Lavina Smith	New Mt. Olive Baptist Church	1402 N. Market St.	19801
Dr. Louvenia Dickerson	New Pentecostal United Holy Church Of America	721 Monroe St.	19801
Bro. Franklin Watson	Northeast Church Of Christ	2611 Governor Printz Blvd.	19802
Bishop Bruce Parhon	Oasis of Refreshing Ministry	226 N. Broom St.	19805
Mr. Jose Carmona Jr.	Pena de Horeb Pentecostal Church	1401 "A" St.	19801
Rev. Cheryl Taylor Jensen	Peninsula-Mc Cabe United Methodist Church	2200 Baynard Blvd.	19802
Dr. Donald Morton	Perfected Life Church	P.O. Box 2063	19899
Pastor Jorge Diaz	Primera Iglesia de Dios El Pelegrino	313 Broom St.	19805
Bishop Riley Richardson	Real Life Ministries	109 E. 26th St.	19802
Pastor S. Todd Townsend	Resurrection Center	3301 N. Market St.	19802
Msgr. J. Thomas Cini, V.G.	Saint Ann Parish	2013 Gilpin Ave.	19806
Rev. John F McGinley	Saint Anthony of Padua Church	901 N. Du Pont St.	19805
Pastor Charles Dillingham	Saint Elizabeth's Catholic Church	809 S Broom St.	19805
Pastor Andrew Molewski	Saint Hedwig's Roman Catholic Church	408 S. Harrison St.	19805
Rev Crystal Moultray	Saint James A. U. M. P. Church	1106 E. 16th St.	19802
Father John Frambes	Saint Joseph's	1012 French St.	19801
Fr. David Murphy	Saint Patrick's Church	1414 King St.	19801
Very Rev. Daniel Gerres, V.F.	Saint Thomas The Apostle Rc Church	301 Bancroft Pkwy	19805
Pastor Stephen Boyce	Sharon Temple SDA Church	2001 Washington St.	19802
Pastor Clifford Johnson	Shiloh Baptist Church	215 W. 23rd St.	19802
Pastor Clarence Pettit	Spirit Of Life Lutheran Church	500 Concord Ave.	19802
Rev. Betty Knight	St Jude Bread of Life Christian Church	805 Shipley St.	19801
Pastor Curtis Connor	St. Luke Temple of Apostolic Faith	605 N. Church	19801
Rev. Canon Kenneth W. Gunn-Walberg	St. Mary's Anglican Church	4201 Washington St.	19802

Clergy	Organization	Address	Zip Code
Pastor Volodymyr Klanichka	St. Nicholas Ukrainian Catholic Church	800 Lea Blvd.	19802
Father William McIntyre	St. Paul's Church	1010 W. 4th St	19805
Pastor Charles Amos	St. Paul's UAME Church	3114 N. Market St.	19802
Pastor Matthew M. Hummel	St. Stephen's Lutheran Church	1301 N. Broom St.	19806
Rev. Edward Kaczorowski	St. Stanislaus Kostka Church	901 E. 7th St.	19801
Bishop Aretha Morton	Tabernacle Full Gospel Baptist Church	501 Washington St.	19801
Apostle John Graham	Temple United Church	602 Washington St	19801
Pastor America Barriera	"Templo Cristiano" Jesus Es El Camino	401 Shipley St.	19809
Reverend Brad Hinton	Trinity Episcopal Parish	1108 N. Adams St.	19801
Pastor Gloria Kennard	True Believers Of Apostolic Faith Inc	1604½ Howland St.	19805
Pastor Lebarron Mcadoo	Union Baptist Church	2616 Carter St.	19802
Pastor Ronald Hayes	United Independent Methodist Church	2500 N. Jefferson St.	19802
Rev. Karen B. Walker	Walk By Faith AME Zion	226 Walnut St.	19801
Rev. Randy Clayton	West Presbyterian Church	500 W. 8th St.	19801
Pastor Kit Schooley	Westminster Presbyterian Church	1502 W. 13th St.	19806
	Wilmington Baha'i Community	2601 N. Van Buren St.	19802
	Wilmington Friends Meeting	401 N. West St.	19801
Rev. Dr. Gregory Johnson	Zion Lutheran Church	2101 Lancaster Ave.	19805