

1-1-2007


An Analysis of Services Provided by Faith-Based Organizations to Cleveland's Ward 17 Community

Mark Salling

Cleveland State University, m.salling@csuohio.edu

How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!

Follow this and additional works at: https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/urban_facpub

 Part of the [Categorical Data Analysis Commons](#), [Databases and Information Systems Commons](#), [Geographic Information Sciences Commons](#), [Longitudinal Data Analysis and Time Series Commons](#), and the [Urban Studies Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Salling, Mark, "An Analysis of Services Provided by Faith-Based Organizations to Cleveland's Ward 17 Community" (2007). *Urban Publications*. 0 1 2 3 355.

https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/urban_facpub/355

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Maxine Goodman Levin College of Urban Affairs at EngagedScholarship@CSU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Urban Publications by an authorized administrator of EngagedScholarship@CSU. For more information, please contact library.es@csuohio.edu.



MAXINE GOODMAN LEVIN
COLLEGE OF URBAN AFFAIRS

Cleveland State University

Prepared for:
The Commission on Catholic Community Action

with partial funding from
The Sisters of Charity Foundation of Cleveland

Prepared by:
**The Northern Ohio Data & Information Service
(NODIS)**

January 30, 2007

**An Analysis of
Services
Provided by
Faith-Based
Organizations
to Cleveland's
Ward 17
Community**

a component of

***Connecting
Congregations and
Community***

a project of

**The Center for Sacred
Landmarks
The Northern Ohio
Data Information
Service
The Center for Public
Management
The Center for
Neighborhood
Development
at the
Maxine Goodman
Levin College of Urban
Affairs**

**and
The Center for
Community Solutions**

Acknowledgments

In addition to the author, this report is the product of work of many organizations and individuals, including the following:

Commission on Catholic Community Action

- Len Calabrese, Executive Director, provided project consultation and review.
- The Reverend Robert Begin provided assistance in project design.

Cleveland City Council

- Matthew Zone, Councilman, Ward 17, and Blanca Salva on his staff provided assistance in contacting service provider organizations.

The Center for Community Solutions

- Joe Ahern, Research Associate, provided assistance with the First Call for Help database.
- Terry Lenahan, Research Associate, provided assistance with geocoding the First Call for Help and Starting Point childcare databases.

United Way of Greater Cleveland, 211/First Call for Help (FCFH)

- Diane Gatto, Marlene Perdan, and Carolyn Ahern, provided guidance on the use of the FCFH database and survey design.

Maxine Goodman Levin College of Urban Affairs, Cleveland State University

Center for Sacred Landmarks (CSL)

- Michael Tevesz, Ph.D., Director, was co-principal investigator and provided project oversight.
- Roberta Steinbacher, Ph.D., provided assistance in project design.

Center for Public Management (CPM)

- Michael McGoun, Research Assistant, assisted with sampling and survey design and implementation.

Center for Neighborhood Development (CND)

- Phil Star, Director, consulted on survey design.
- Susan Burkholder, Program Manager, assisted with project design and initial drafting of the project proposal.

Northern Ohio Data & Information Service (NODIS)

- Sharon Bliss, Project Manager and Community Information Specialist, provided database management and assisted with survey implementation.
- Tammy Barr, Research Assistant/Programmer, assisted with both database management and survey implementation.
- Brian McNamara, GIS Specialist, assisted with geocoding.
- Gaurav Tripathi, Maitryee Gawande, and Hardik Shah, student assistants, helped with survey implementation.

CONNECTING CONGREGATIONS AND COMMUNITY¹

An Analysis of Services Provided by Faith-Based Organizations to Cleveland's Ward 17 Community²

Mark J. Salling, Ph.D.

January 30, 2007

This report, a component of a project titled Connecting Congregations and Community, provides a descriptive analysis of a survey of the houses of worship in Ward 17 of the city of Cleveland on the types of services and resources provided by the faith-based community. The analysis also compares these services and efforts to those of the non-faith-based organizations in the community.

CONTEXT

Issues of religion and involvement in social services and economic development are now common topics in the public rhetoric. Religious congregations are often strong social institutions in distressed neighborhoods long abandoned by secular organizations, leaving them well positioned to effectively solve community problems. Often, the religious community is seen to have a role similar to the philanthropic sector - as an institution that bridges the gap between the needs of the poor and the programs and services of the public and private sectors. Historically, religious organizations were the first resort for people in need, when there was not a consistent, uniform, standardized, secular, government-supported social safety net. Presently, the reductions in the federal government's social spending have once again focused the political debate about providing for the poor on the religious community. Congregations provide money, people, facilities, and goods to assist in service delivery. In addition, congregations often also take on the institutional commitment to become involved in community partnerships aimed at solving or managing social problems.

Religious organizations are also an important part of the social capital of a community. Religious congregations provide a wealth of talented, highly trained professional leadership, large formal memberships, regular meetings, and ties to larger denominational and ecumenical movements. The congregation is a strong social network, and informal leadership opportunities and formal leadership programs may empower lay leaders with the skills to serve community needs. Faith institutions are seen by many to advance a broad moral vision and promote the common good.

¹ The Connecting Congregations and Community project is a project of the Center for Sacred Landmarks, Northern Ohio Data & Information Service, Center for Public Management, and Center for Neighborhood Development of the Maxine Goodman Levin College of Urban Affairs at Cleveland State University, The Center for Community Solutions, and the Commission on Catholic Community Action, done in consultation with and support of Cleveland Ward 17 Councilman Matt Zone. It is based on the proposition that religious institutions are an asset to their neighborhoods and play important roles, such as convening, providing space and services, encouraging economic development, and building social and human capital. A section on future work for this project is found at the end of this report and places the report in the context of the overall project.

² This report was prepared for the Commission on Catholic Community Action (Len Calabrese, Executive Director) and was funded in part by the Sisters of Charity Foundation of Cleveland.

Religion is seen as a motivation, or even an imperative, that calls people to act on their faith for the good of others.

Given this context, CSU, with the support of the Commission on Catholic Community Action (CCCA), undertook a project to analyze resources and strengths found in an economically and socially stressed neighborhood in the city of Cleveland. CSU and CCCA, with assistance from The Center for Community Solutions (CCS) and United Way of Greater Cleveland's 211/First Call for Help (FCFH), researched and compiled information about resources provided by congregations and about congregations' perspectives on community assets. It is hoped that the information will directly assist residents of the ward by providing them with better knowledge of services available to them. In addition, this information may assist the ward councilperson in attempting to enhance community engagement among leaders and community residents around the current issues facing neighborhoods in the ward.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The following research questions were addressed by the survey.

1. What services are provided by the faith-based community in the Ward 17 neighborhood?
2. How do these services compare to those offered by the non-faith-based providers?
3. What is the relative level of service to the community for faith-based and non-faith-based service providers?
4. What services or programs are offered by faith-based organizations only for members of the congregation?
5. What do the faith-based and non-faith-based service providers think about how well the community's needs are being met, how aware of available services are those in need, which services should and can be improved?
6. What methods, by faith-based and non-faith-based organizations, are being used to communicate with the community?
7. Are faith-based and non-faith-based service providers planning to expand services (either through program changes or an expanded geographic service area) or offer new services within the next year?
8. Have faith-based and non-faith-based organizations partnered with each other and other local entities to expand existing services or create new programs or services?
9. Have any of the programs or services offered by faith-based and non-faith-based providers had to be scaled back or eliminated due to a lack of funding or available resources within the past year?

METHODS

Three datasets are used for the analysis: 1) data from 211/First Call for Help (FCFH)³ on services offered in the community; 2) these data are augmented with data on child daycare organizations from Starting Point for Child Care and Early Education in Cuyahoga County; and 3) a list of faith-based organizations, primarily houses of worship, collected from a database developed for the Center for Sacred Landmarks and enhanced using the local telephone book.

Need for a Survey

The resources that address the conditions and needs of the community are partially revealed by data found in the FCFH database collected and maintained by United Way of Cleveland. Some places of worship are included among the listed service providers, though a more comprehensive inventory was not possible without further data collection.

Information additional to that provided by the FCFH database was gathered by surveying a sample of the organizations. Because it is important to view the entire array of resources in the community with a standardized listing that includes both faith-based providers and those in the FCFH database, the project designed the data collection instrument by using the standardized classification system of services used nationally by 211 agencies such as FCFH.

The survey also seeks opinions and perspectives of the congregational and community leadership about assets and capacity issues for social and health services in the community, including those that are of particular concern to the faith-based community of providers. These data, in conjunction with a neighborhood indicators profile report produced earlier,⁴ can be used to assess the social, economic, and health conditions and resources of the ward.

Sample Size and Selection

The survey universe consists of organizations identified in Ward 17 and within a mile radius of the Ward 17 boundary (referred to here as the “vicinity”) that are either in the FCFH database or otherwise identified from existing lists of houses of worship, phone directory, or a database on houses of worship developed by the Center for Sacred Landmarks at Cleveland State University. (See Map 1.⁵) The number of organizations identified for the survey and the number for which survey data was obtained are found in Table 1. Thirty-one of the 182 faith-based (17.0%)

³ 2-1-1 is a phone number that connects people with important community services. The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) assigned 2-1-1 nationwide as the phone number to dial for help with health and human services. There are nearly 200 active 2-1-1 systems covering all or part of 40 states, plus Washington, D.C. and Puerto Rico. Cuyahoga County's First Call For Help has been providing service under many forms since 1949, including the Community Information Volunteer Action Center (CIVAC). On February 11, 2004, when 2-1-1 service became active in Cuyahoga County, First Call For Help changed its name to 2-1-1/First Call For Help. 2-1-1/First Call For Help receives funding from the Cuyahoga County Department of Senior and Adult Services, the Western Reserve Area Agency on Aging, the Alcohol and Drug Addiction Services Board of Cuyahoga County, and United Way of Greater Cleveland.

⁴ *Social Indicators in Cleveland's Ward 17*, prepared by The Center for Community Solutions and the Northern Ohio Data & Information Service in the Maxine Goodman Levin College of Urban Affairs at Cleveland State University, December 2005. The report was a project of the Center for Sacred Landmarks, Northern Ohio Data & Information Service, Center for Public Management, and Center for Neighborhood Development of the Levin College of Urban Affairs., the Center for Community Solutions, and the Commission on Catholic Community Action. It was prepared for City of Cleveland Councilman Matt Zone and funded in part by city of Cleveland city Council and the Sisters of Charity Foundation of Cleveland.

⁵ Several organizations were located just outside a one mile radius around the ward but were included since they are located on major streets with such organizations; most if not all of which serve the west side of the city.

organizations and 13 (13.5%) of the 96 non-faith-based organizations in the ward and its vicinity are included in the study. Twenty-four of the faith-based and 13 non-faith-based organizations in FCFH system were surveyed. One hundred and six (106) faith-based organizations not in the FCFH system were identified in the area, seven of which were surveyed. Thus 44 of the 278 organizations (15.8%) identified within and near Ward 17 are included in the survey.

Because the sample size is small, particularly in the case of the non-faith-based organizations, inferential statistics cannot be applied and definitive statements about similarities and differences between these two types of organizations are not possible. Thus the discussion presented is entirely descriptive of only those organizations included in the survey. The reader is cautioned not to assume that the data necessarily reflect the characteristics of all organizations in the community.

Table 1: Sample Size


	Faith-based	Non-faith-based	All	Percentage that are Faith-based	Percentage that are Non-faith-based
Universe	182	96	278	65.5%	34.5%
Sample	31	13	44	70.5%	29.5%
Percent Sampled	17.0%	13.5%	15.8%		


Relation of Sampled Organizations to Ward 17

Figure 1 shows that almost all of the organizations in the survey indicate that they serve Ward 17 residents. More than a third of the faith-based organizations assert that all of those they serve are in the ward, and more than an additional third indicate that most of their services are used by Ward 17 residents. One-sixth of them say they serve persons inside and outside the ward about equally.

The non-faith-based responding organizations are somewhat less geographically focused on serving Ward 17. While almost half (46.2%) indicate that all or most of their services are focused in the ward, the other half (53.8%) indicate that Ward 17 residents constitute “only some” of those they serve.

Figure 1: Percentage of Organization’s Services Utilized by Ward 17 Residents





RESULTS

The results are organized by the nine research questions posed above.

Question 1: What services are provided by the faith-based community in the Ward 17 neighborhood? How do these services compare to those offered by the non-faith-based providers?

Based on the FCFH database, there are a known 69 faith-based and 93 non-faith-based organizations providing services in the study area. There are also 34 child daycare providers listed in the Starting Point database, some of which may be in the FCFH system providing other services.⁶ Based on their names, we estimate that 10 of these daycare organizations are faith-based. We also identified another 113 faith-based organizations, including houses of worship and nonprofit organizations known to be part of or affiliated with a religious organization. Seven of these are included in the survey. In addition, three other organizations were identified as known or likely non-faith-based organizations providing services in the area.

Because the method of contact also included a mailing to all organizations that could not be reached by telephone, it is likely that a disproportionate number of non-responding faith-based organizations (among those 113 noted above) do not offer social services compared to those that were included in the survey. It is assumed that some of these chose not to respond since they offer no services or may be so small an organization that they do not have a sustained presence in the community.

Nevertheless, faith-based and non-faith-based organizations that are not in the FCFH database and went un-surveyed may also provide social services. Thus the data discussed here represent minimum numbers of organizations with these services; this may be particularly true for the faith-based community of organizations. The FCFH system excludes faith-based organizations that provide services only to their congregants. This study, while addressing that issue (see Question 2), is also interested in including all services provided to the community.

Based on those in the FCFH system and the child daycare facilities it is clear that a considerable number of faith-based organization provide a wide range of social services to the community. All of those in the FCFH system and the daycare organizations provide services and all but one of the 31 surveyed faith-based organizations provide some services.

As indicated in Figures 2 and 3, faith-based organizations outnumber the non-faith-based ones in providing **food, clothing, and household goods**⁷ in the area. Thirty-nine (20.3%) of the faith-based organizations provide these to residents in the ward and its vicinity, versus 12 (10.0%) of

⁶ Because the FCFH database does not include organizations that provide only child daycare, we augmented the count of types of services provided in the study area by including those organizations that are included in a file obtained from Starting Point for Child Care and Early Education in Cuyahoga County. We exclude from that list in-home daycare providers. The daycare programs and organizations were not included in the survey, only the count of childcare organizations.

⁷ To help the reader identify in the text the terms concerning categories of services provided, we make them bolded text. Later in this report we use italics to help the reader identify the terms concerning categories of community and service needs.

the non-faith-based service providers there. Two-thirds (76.5%) of the organizations that offer such services are faith-based (see Figure 4).

Other than these material goods, there are more non-faith-based organizations providers of social and health services in the area:

- Twenty-four (20.0%) of the non-faith-based organizations provide **mental health/counseling** services. A comparable number (22) but a smaller percentage (11.5%) of faith-based organizations provide mental health/counseling services in the community.
- Similarly, while **recreational/club** services are among the more frequently provided services by the faith-based and non-faith-based organizations, more of the non-faith-based organizations provide them - 31 versus 20. More than a quarter (25.8%) of the non-faith-based organizations and 10.4 percent of the faith-based ones provide recreational and club opportunities to the community.
- **Educational and tutoring** and/or **healthcare** services are offered by 19 (15.8%) of the non-faith-based organizations. Slightly fewer faith-based organizations in the area offer these two categories of services (16 and 14, respectively).
- **Housing assistance** services are offered by 11 (5.7%) of the faith-based organizations and 17 (14.2%) of the non-faith-based organizations in the area.
- **Family support/parenting** services are provided by 12 (6.3%) of the faith-based organizations and by 18 (15.0%) of the non-faith-based ones.

Other significant numbers of organizations offering services to the community include **employment/job placement, child daycare, and legal/criminal justice counseling** services and those to **community groups. Substance abuse, budget/financial management, and transportation** services have the fewest number of organizations providing them in the area.

Figure 2: Number of Services in Area by Type




Figure 3: Percentage of Organizations Offering Services in Area by Type





Figure 4: Percentage That Are Faith-Based Organizations by Type of Service




Question 2: What is the relative level of service to the community for faith-based and non-faith-based service providers?

The overall level of service in the community is difficult to evaluate and there are no clear measures of the relative contributions of the faith-based and non-faith-based providers. Nevertheless we compare the numbers of providers of services and the size of the organization as seen in the number of staff persons and the reported estimated average number of persons served each week among those surveyed. We also asked survey respondents to indicate whether they thought of their organization as a “major,” “medium,” or “small” provider in the community.

Number of Providers. When all services are tallied, overall the faith-based community of organizations represents about 45 percent of all providers in the area (see Figure 5). Returning to Figure 4, we can observe that exceptions include **food/clothing/household goods**, which is over-represented by the faith-based organizations (76.5% of all such organizations), and **transportation** for which two of the three organizations offering these services are faith-based. The other 12 service types are more represented by the non-faith-based organizations, though several, such as mental health/counseling (47.8% faith-based), community group support (47.6), and education/tutoring (45.7%), are almost equally represented by both types of organizations.

Figure 5: Percentage of All Services That Are Offered by Faith-Based and Non-Faith-Based Organizations



Number of Employees and Persons Served. Catholic Charities is located in Ward 17 and reports in our survey that approximately 1,350 employees serve more than 6,000 residents a week in the West Side area in which Ward 17 is located. Because it skews the analysis, we exclude this large organization from statistics concerning staff size and number of persons served.

Figures 6 and 7 (based on data in Table 2) show that, excluding Catholic Charities, non-faith-based service providers have more staff and serve more persons on average than faith-based providers. Faith-base providers in the area report having an average of 13.4 employees, serving an average of 329 people per week, compared to 26.1 employees serving 1,540 persons per week for the non-faith-based providers in the area. Faith-based providers have an average of 9.8 fulltime and 2.4 part-time employees, whereas the non-faith-based organizations employ an average 21.8 fulltime and 9.2 part-time employees.

Volunteers play an important role in providing services. The surveyed faith-based and non-faith-based organizations in the study area both report having about 50 volunteers per organization.

Figure 6: Mean Measures of Organizational Size





Figure 7: Average Number of Persons Served per Week



The providers in the survey indicate that they play a significant role in service delivery in Ward 17 and its vicinity (see Figure 8). More than a third (38.7%) of faith-based organizations describe themselves as “major” providers of social services in the community, and another third (35.5%) describe themselves as “medium” in size, and a quarter classify themselves as “small” providers.

Reflecting some of the differences in staff size and service levels noted above, the non-faith-based organizations classify themselves as just a little larger than the faith-based providers do - almost half indicating they are “major” and only about 15 percent as “small”.

Figure 8: Self Evaluated Relative Size of Organization as a Provider




Table 2: Measures of Size of Organization (including and excluding Catholic Charities)

	SAMPLE RESULTS							
	Excluding Catholic Charities						Including Catholic Charities	
	Total		Percentage		Average		Faith-based	
	Faith-based	Non-faith-based	Faith-based	Non-faith-based	Faith-based	Non-faith-based	Total	Average
Number in Universe	181	96	65.3	34.7	-	-	182	-
Number of organizations surveyed	30	13	69.8	30.2	-	-	31	-
Number of employees	401	339	54.2	45.8	13.4	26.1	1,752	56.5
Full-time	295	284	50.9	49.1	9.8	21.8	1,646	53.1
Part-time	72	120	37.5	62.5	2.4	9.2	72	2.3
Volunteers	1,426	667	68.1	31.9	47.5	51.3	6,726	217.0
Full and Part time	367	404	47.6	52.4	12.2	31.1	1,718	55.4
Total staff (incl. volunteers)	1,793	1,071	62.6	37.4	59.8	82.4	8,444	272.4
Congregation members	10,357		100.0	0.0	345	-	10,357	334
Number served	9,866	20,020	33.0	67.0	329	1,540	15,996	516

Question 3: What services or programs are offered by faith-based organizations only for members of the congregation?

Only one organization in the survey, a house of worship, indicated that the services it provides are only for members of the congregation. It provides **education, food/clothing/household goods, family support/parenting,** and **recreation** services to its congregates.

Other houses of worship that did not respond to efforts to include them in the survey may also provide services only to their congregants.

Question 4: What do service provider organizations feel are the most critical needs of community residents and do these opinions and insights differ between the faith-based and non-faith-based organizations?

Figure 9 shows that, mentioned by eight respondents, *Education and Training*⁸ services are considered the most critical community needs in the Ward 17 area. Not counting the two that did not respond to this question, this category of need is almost one-fifth (19.0%) of the noted needs and is recognized as a high priority need by both faith-based and non-faith-based organizations in the area. *Housing/Rent* related services, *Food*, and *Employment* were each identified by seven (16.7%) of the respondents, with faith-based organizations noting the need for *food*. Recall that the faith-based providers were also the more frequent providers of food-related services in the community.

Other high priority needs identified by the survey include *Safety* issues and the need for *Referral and Coordination* of services to those in need were each mentioned by two respondents. A variety of others were mentioned as well.

Housing/Rent, Education/Training, and *Employment* are the most frequently noted needs among those listed as second in importance by the respondents (see Figure 10). *Transportation, Food, Counseling/Social/Family, Access to Affordable Healthcare, Safety,* and *Childcare* needs are also mentioned by multiple respondents. All of these except *Access to Health Care* were identified by the faith-based respondents. Caution is warned in noting these differences due to a small number of respondents, especially among the non-faith-based providers. Figure 11 shows results concerning the respondent's indication of what the third most important need in the community is.

When we combine these responses and tally them by the frequency at which they are listed as either first, second, or third most important needs in the community, we see that *Housing/Rent* is the most cited need with 14.4 percent of the total of all tallies (see Figure 12). Housing needs are closely followed by *Health/Addiction Treatment* and *Education/Training* both with 12.7 percent of the tallies. *Employment* is next with 11.9 percent. *Food* is mentioned 10 times (8.5%) among the three opportunities to note community needs, all by the faith-based organizations in the survey.

⁸ To help the reader identify the terms concerning categories of community and service needs we italicize these terms in the text.

Since the needs are indicated in priority, we also tallied all responses after weighting them by priority, with those in the most critical needs list weighted by a factor of 3, those in the second list by 2, and those in the third list by 1. The results are shown in Figure 13. *Housing/Rent* assistance, *Education/Training*, and *Employment* remain as the most important needs in the community according to surveyed organizations. Faith-based and non-faith-based organizations agree that these are top priorities. *Food* is also seen as a critical need in the community by the faith-based organizations.

Figure 9: Most Critical Community Need (Missing = 2)




Figure 10: Second Most Critical Community Need (Missing = 3)




Figure 11: Third Most Critical Community Need (Missing = 9)




Figure 12: Community Needs Based on All Three Most Often Listed





Figure 13: Community Needs Based on All Three Most Often Listed and Weighted by Priority



Question 5: What do the faith-based and non-faith-based service providers think about how well the community’s needs are being met, how aware of available services are those in need, which services should and can be improved?

Adequacy of Needs Met. Overall, almost three of four surveyed respondents (29 of the 41 responding organizations to this question) think that “only half,” “only some,” or “none” of the community’s needs are being adequately met. Faith-based organizations in the community are more inclined to think that most of the needs of the community are being met than are the non-faith-based organizations (see Figure 14). While half of the respondents from both types of organizations think that about half of the needs are being adequately met, a third of the faith-based ones indicated that “most” or “all” of the needs are addressed. Conversely, a third of the non-faith-based providers think that “only some” of these needs are being met.

Most Critical Need. In regard to what is thought to be the most critical need in the community, again the faith-based organizations indicate that they are more convinced that it is being met by the service providers (see Figure 15). Thirty-eight percent think it is “mostly” or “all” being met, whereas more than four out of five (81.8%) of the non-faith-based providers believe that “less than half” or “none” of the most critical need in the community is being adequately met.

Community Awareness. Approximately 90 percent of the surveyed organizations, both faith-based and non-faith-based, believe that the community is generally “somewhat aware” of the services available to them (see Figure 16). Yet as seen in Figure 17, almost half (46%) of the service providers also indicate that among those residents who are in need of services “less than half” or “none” of them are accessing services that are available to them. Four out of five (81%) think that “about half” or fewer are accessing needed services that are available to them.

Services Needing Improvement. When asked what existing services needed improvement respondents frequently indicated that *employment, training, and job placement* services need attention, followed closely by *transportation and transportation-related access to services, medical and healthcare assistance, and affordable housing*. *Education and tutoring* was also mentioned frequently (see Table 3 and Figure 18).

Faith-based organizations, consistent with evidence noted earlier that they both more frequently provide *food* in the community and see food and hunger as one of the more important needs in the community, strongly indicated that food assistance was still an area needing significant improvement. None of the non-faith-based organizations mentioned food as an area needing improved service in the community. The faith-based providers also noted improvements needed in providing such material things as *clothing, household supplies, furniture, and appliances*. On the other hand, the non-faith-based service providers, in addition to more strongly indicating that *employment/training/job placement* services need improvement, also expressed more frequently concern for improvement in *reaching those in need and communicating better information about the services* that are available to them.

Figure 14: Proportion of Service Needs Being Adequately Met




Figure 15: Critical Need Being Met




Figure 16: Community's Awareness of Needs




Figure 17: Proportion of Community Not Accessing Needed though Available Services





Table 3: Improvement in Services Needed

Service Need	Number of Times Mentioned			Percent of Total Times Mentioned		
	Faith-based	Non Faith-based	All	Faith-based	Non Faith-based	All
Drug/alcohol treatment	2	1	3	3.5	4.8	3.8
Other	2	1	3	3.5	4.8	3.8
Temporary/emergency assistance	2	1	3	3.5	4.8	3.8
Financial assistance, better pay	3	0	3	5.3	0.0	3.8
Youth facilities/programs/outreach	3	2	5	5.3	9.5	6.4
Counseling-families/children/adults	3	2	5	5.3	9.5	6.4
Clothing/furniture/appliances	5	0	5	8.8	0.0	6.4
Education/tutoring	5	1	6	8.8	4.8	7.7
Food	6	0	6	10.5	0.0	7.7
Outreach/knowing what is available	3	4	7	5.3	19.0	9.0
Transportation/access to services	7	0	7	12.3	0.0	9.0
Affordable/available housing	6	2	8	10.5	9.5	10.3
Medical/healthcare assistance	6	2	8	10.5	9.5	10.3
Employment/training/placement	4	5	9	7.0	23.8	11.5
Total	57	21	78	100	100	100

Figure 18: Improvement in Services Needed



Question 6: What methods, by faith-based and non-faith-based organizations, are being used to communicate with the community?


The previous discussion of the community's awareness and use of needed and available resources raises the question of what the service provider community is doing to reach people and families in need.

Both faith-based providers and non-faith-based providers use a variety of methods to communicate availability of services offered. Faith-based providers use an average of 5.7 (44%) of the 13 methods of communication we asked about in the survey, and non-faith-based providers use an average of 6.1 (47%) of them (see Figure 18). One each of both the faith-based and non-faith-based organizations use none of these methods.

Announcements at various venues, community flyers and postings, newsletters, and community newspapers are major methods of communication and advertisement of services for both types of organizations. Interestingly, approximately 40 percent of both types of organizations use emails. Non-faith-based organizations are more inclined to use the major daily newspaper (*Plain Dealer*), Internet websites, and television to get their messages out into the community. The faith-based organizations rely more heavily on church bulletins and telephone calls.

Respondents were also able to indicate other means of communicating about their services to the community and eight (18%) - six of the faith-based and two of the non-faith-based organizations - mentioned "word of mouth" as important. Two mentioned the yellow pages and one each said "library listings," "phone chaining," "RTA bus," and "passing out 'Cuyahoga County street cards,'" which list other providers.


Figure 18: Methods of Communication about Programs/Services



Question 7: Are faith-based and non-faith-based service providers planning to expand services (either through program changes or an expanded geographic service area), or offer new services within the next year?

Figure 19 illustrates that about half of the surveyed organizations (56.8%) plan to increase or expand services in the next year. A slightly greater proportion (61.5%) of the non-faith-based organizations expressed such plans than did the faith-based organizations in the study area (54.8%).


Figure 19: Plans to Expand Programs/Services



Question 8: Have faith-based and non-faith-based organizations partnered with each other and other local entities to expand existing services or create new programs or services?

Almost two-thirds (63.6%) of the surveyed organizations indicated that they have partnered with other organizations in the community to provide services. Figure 20 shows that a slightly higher proportion of the surveyed non-faith-based providers said that they had done so in the last year - 69.2 percent of them versus 61.3 percent of the faith-based organizations.


Figure 20: Partnered with Other Organizations in Past Two Years



Question 9: Have any of the programs or services offered by faith-based and non-faith-based providers had to be scaled back or eliminated due to a lack of funding or available resources within the past year?

More than a third (36.4%) of the surveyed organizations in the Ward 17 study area said that they had to scale back (decrease) services offered in the past year due to lack of funding or available resources (see Figure 21). Faith-based providers indicated that they were more often affected by these conditions than were the non-faith-based organizations in the area - 41.9 percent versus 23.1 percent respectively.

Figure 21: Had to Scale Back in Last Year



SUMMARY

This report, a component of a project titled “Connecting Congregations and Community,” provides a descriptive analysis of a survey of the houses of worship in and near by to Ward 5 of the city of Cleveland on the types of services and resources provided by the faith-based community. The analysis also compares these services and efforts to those of the non-faith-based organizations in the community.⁹

Thirty-one of the 182 faith-based (17.0%) organizations and 13 (13.5%) of the 96 non-faith-based organizations in the ward and its vicinity are included in the study. Almost all of the organizations in the survey indicate that they serve Ward 17 residents. A third or more of the organizations assert that all of those they serve are in the ward, although the non-faith-based responding organizations are somewhat less geographically focused on serving Ward 17.

The results are organized by nine topics as noted below.

Services provided

Based solely on the First Call for Help (FCFH) database, there are a known 69 faith-based and 93 non-faith-based organizations providing services in the study area. It is clear that a considerable number of faith-based organization provide a wide range of social services to the community.

Faith-based organizations outnumber the non-faith-based ones in providing food, clothing, and household goods in the area. Approximately 75 percent of the organizations offering these material goods are faith-based.

More non-faith-based organizations provide other social and health services in the area, including child daycare, recreational/club, legal/criminal justice counseling services, employment and job placement, housing assistance, family support/parenting services, and healthcare. Substance abuse, budget/financial management, and transportation services have the fewest number of organizations providing them in the area.

Relative level of service to the community

The overall level of service in the community is difficult to evaluate and there are no clear measures of the relative contributions of the faith-based and non-faith-based providers. Nevertheless we compare the numbers of providers of services and the size of the organization as seen in the number of staff persons and the reported estimated average number of persons served each week. We also asked survey respondents to indicate whether they thought of their organization was a “major,” “medium,” or “small” provider in the community.

When all services are tallied, overall the faith-based community of organizations represents about 45 percent of all providers in the area. Exceptions include food/clothing/household goods, which is over-represented by the faith-based organizations, and transportation (for which two of only three organizations offering these services are faith-based). The other 12 service types are

⁹ With the small sample obtained, it is not feasible to infer that observations made here necessarily represent the larger community of service providers in the study area.

more represented by the non-faith-based organizations, though several such as mental health/counseling, community group support, and education/tutoring, are almost equally represented by both types of organizations.

Except for the presence of Catholic Charities in the ward, non-faith-based service providers have more staff and serve more persons on average than faith-based providers. Faith-based providers in the area report having an average of 13.4 employees, serving an average of 329 people per week, compared to 26.1 employees serving 1,540 persons per week for the non-faith-based providers in the area. Faith-based providers have an average of 9.8 fulltime and 2.4 part-time employees, whereas the non-faith-based organizations employ an average 21.8 fulltime and 9.2 part-time employees.

Volunteers play an important role in providing services for both types of providers, averaging about 50 per organization.

The providers in the survey indicate that they play a significant role in service delivery in Ward 17 and its vicinity. More than a third of the faith-based organizations describe themselves as “major” providers of social services in the community, and another third describe themselves as “medium” in size. Reflecting some of the differences in staff size and service levels noted above, the non-faith-based organizations classify themselves as just a little larger than the faith-based providers do - almost half indicating they are “major” and only about 15 percent as “small.”

Services or programs offered only for members of the congregation

Only one organization in the survey, a house of worship, indicated that the services it provides are only for members of the congregation. Other houses of worship that did not respond to efforts to include them in the survey may also provide services only to their congregants.

The most critical needs of community residents

After weighting responses by their occurrence in the three categories of priority needs *Housing/Rent* assistance, *Health/Addiction Treatment*, and *Education/Training*, and *Employment* remain as the most important needs in the community according to surveyed organizations. Faith-based and non-faith-based organizations agree that these are top priorities. *Food* is also seen as a critical need in the community by the faith-based organizations.

How well the community’s needs are being met

Overall, almost three of four surveyed respondents think that “only half,” “only some,” or “none” of the community’s needs are being adequately met. Faith-based organizations in the community are more inclined to think that most of the needs of the community are being met than are the non-faith-based organizations. In regard to what is thought to be the most critical need in the community, again the faith-based organizations indicate that they are more convinced that it is being met by the service providers.

The surveyed organizations, both faith-based and non-faith-based, believe that the community is generally “somewhat aware” of the services available to them. Yet almost half of the service providers also indicate that among those residents who are in need of services, “less than half” or

“none” of them are accessing services that are available to them. Four out of five think that “about half” or fewer are accessing needed services that are available to them.

When asked what existing services needed improvement, respondents frequently indicated that *employment, training, and job placement* services need attention, followed closely by *transportation and transportation-related access to services, medical and healthcare assistance, and affordable housing*. *Education and tutoring* was also mentioned frequently.

Faith-based organizations, again consistent with evidence noted earlier that they both more frequently provide *food* in the community and see food and hunger as one of the more important needs in the community, strongly indicated that food assistance was still an area needing significant improvement. None of the non-faith-based organizations mentioned food as an area of needed improved service in the community. The faith-based providers also noted improvements needed in providing such material things as *clothing, household supplies, furniture, and appliances*. On the other hand, the non-faith-based service providers, in addition to more strongly indicating that *employment/training/job placement* services need improvement, also expressed more frequently concern for improvement in *reaching those in need and communicating better information about the services* that are available to them.

Methods used to communicate with the community

Both faith-based providers and non-faith-based providers use a variety of methods to communicate availability of services offered. Announcements at various venues (including worship services for the faith-based organizations), community flyers and postings, newsletters, and community newspapers are major methods for both types of organizations. Interestingly, approximately 40 percent of both types of organizations use emails.

Non-faith-based organizations are more inclined to use the major daily newspaper (*Plain Dealer*), Internet websites, and television to get their messages out into the community than are the faith-based providers. The faith-based organizations rely more heavily on church bulletins and telephone calls.

Plans to expand services within the next year

More than half of the surveyed organizations plan to increase services in the next year, with only a slightly greater proportion of the non-faith-based organizations expressing such plans.

Partnering with others to expand services

Almost two-thirds of the surveyed organizations indicated that they have partnered with other organizations in the community to provide services, with a slightly higher proportion of the non-faith-based providers indicating such activity.

Scaled back or eliminated programs or services due to a lack of funding or available resources within the past year

More than a third of the surveyed organizations in the Ward 17 study area said that they had to scale back (decrease) services offered in the past year due to lack of funding or available resources. Faith-based providers indicated that they were more often affected by these conditions than were the non-faith-based organizations in the area.

CONCLUSION

This report, a component of a project titled “Connecting Congregations and Community,” provides a descriptive analysis of social and health service providers in Ward 17 and its vicinity in the city of Cleveland. It includes an analysis of the types of services and resources provided by both the faith-based and non-faith-based communities of providers and the results of a survey of a sample of these organizations. The analysis compares services and efforts to those of the non-faith-based organizations in the community.

While the survey is limited to a relatively small sample of organizations, both data on the number of organizations and the survey results show clear (and possibly unique) evidence that the faith-based organizations provide essential and substantial assistance to this urban community, a neighborhood that has clearly major social and economic needs (extensively documented in the previously referenced social indicators report). The public and nonprofit social service agency network is not merely “supplemented” with but is essentially matched by the offerings of the houses of worship and other faith-based efforts in the community. One can ask what the community might endure if these services were not present.

FUTURE WORK

This report is to be presented to the community and should be viewed as a complement to other capacity-building initiatives in Ward 17, especially the councilman’s Community Forum, which is intend to serve as a foundation for building community and establishing trust and dialogue in the neighborhood. Both the Community Forum and the Connecting Congregations and Community projects reflect principles of strong and inclusive civic society, community building, and contact and sharing of opportunities for collaboration.

The Connecting Congregations and Community demonstration project includes several components. The first, the Neighborhood Indicators Profile, was completed at the end of 2005. The report presented here is *An Analysis of Services to the Community Provided by Faith-Based Organizations*. Five additional components were envisioned. The seven components to the project are listed below.

- 1. Neighborhood Indicators Profile.** The neighborhood data profile provides the basic information about the demographic, social, economic, and health conditions of the neighborhoods of Ward 17. It helps to provide a picture of community need.
- 2. Survey of Services Provided by Faith-Based Organizations.** The survey, presented here, provides data on the types of services and resources provided by the faith-based and, by comparison, the non-faith-based community of service entities in the community.
- 3. Combined Human Services Directory.** If implemented, a directory of all service providers in the ward and its vicinity would be produced. The faith-based organizations identified as providing services (beyond to their own congregations) that are not in the First Call for Help (FCFH) database will be provided to FCFH so that they might be

solicited for inclusion in the 211 system. This would contribute to enhancing the FCFH database and provide a more comprehensive database of human resources.

4. **Survey of Needs.** Originally conceived as a survey of houses of worship and community leaders, we now suggest that a survey of residents concerning their use of available resources and need for others be undertaken. The survey would seek opinions and perspectives
5. **Analysis of Community Resources.** The neighborhood indicators profile report, data on services offered in the community, and the data on needs expressed by the surveyed resident population would be combined into a descriptive analysis of the assets available for social and health services in the community. This analysis would identify existing programs and compare identified needs based on the social indicators profile and the survey of residents to provide insights for future program development and allocation of community resources.
6. **Report to the Community.** The report to the community would be an opportunity to discuss ways to build on the community's present assets. The project would include presentations to and dialogues with the community about the project and its findings. One meeting would be with the community and congregational leaders in the ward; a second would be with the ministers of the houses of worship; and a third would be an open forum with residents if the community.
7. **Summary and Evaluation.** The research team would prepare a summary and evaluation of the project based on input from key community leaders and participants in the project. The potential for replicating the project for other neighborhoods would be assessed.

Through this pilot project, CSU and the Commission hope to share the resources accessible through congregations with their surrounding community, creating more vibrant congregations and a more vibrant community. Congregations would benefit by increasing their exposure in the community and by identifying new ways to fulfill their mission and ministries. The neighborhoods would benefit by improving access to and use of existing resources and by rallying the support of more engaged partners in the community's revitalization and social fabric.