

Connexional Grants Committee (CGC) Policy Review and Process Update

Contact Name and Details	Helen Woodall, CGC Chair hwoodall152@btinternet.com
Action Required	Decision
Resolutions	As listed at the end of the report

Summary of Content

Subject and Aims	To facilitate discussion and agreement of the policy for connexional grant making in Britain
Main Points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The paper outlines the policies and criteria currently adopted by the Connexional Grants Committee when assessing Mission in Britain grant applications • It describes changes planned in the way World Church grants applications are considered
Background Context and Relevant Documents	<p>Standing Order 213B makes the Council responsible for connexional grant-making policy.</p> <p>2008 Grant Making Framework, Connexional Grants Committee (CGC) Policy Review (MC14/84), 2016 Conference Report, 26. Mission Alongside the Poor in the 21st Century, CGC Annual Report 2015/16 (MC/16/89)</p>

Connexional Grants Committee (CGC) Policy Review and Process Update

Introduction

1. The 2014 Conference amended SO 213B, making the Council responsible for setting policy that would then be implemented by the CGC.
2. The CGC oversees grants for work in Britain and also amongst World Church partners. Policy questions relating to World Church grants have been addressed in Council papers MC/16/8 Partnership, Focus and Evolution and MC/16/77 Global Relationships Strategic Oversight Sub-Committee. This paper is designed to facilitate consideration by the Council of some aspects of connexional grants policy relating to grants for work within Britain following the conversations at the Council in October 2014 regarding the policy discussion paper (MC/14/84).

Categories of connexional grant

3. The CGC's roles and responsibilities are defined in SO 213B which essentially divides grants into four categories
 - property projects
 - chaplaincy work
 - mission and ministry grants for work of connexional significance
 - grants from the World Mission Fund
4. **In addition, the Connexional Grants Committee has responsibility for grants in the area of Methodist Action on Poverty and Justice (MAPJ).** This was created by the adoption by the 2016 Conference of resolutions relating to a review of the former Mission Alongside the Poor Programme (26. Mission Alongside the Poor in the 21st Century). The CGC **therefore now recommends that SO 213B be amended to include MAPJ grants.**

Policy parameters

5. All grant making decisions reflect *Our Calling* and the *Priorities for the Methodist Church*, the decisions of the Methodist Council and the Conference. Most connexional grants will be applied within Britain to work of connexional significance, the exceptions to this are discussed in this paper.

Mission and Ministry Grants

6. As per SO 213B the majority of mission and ministry grants in Britain have to be of connexional significance. The CGC's current understanding of 'connexionally significant' is of having an impact that is 'larger than local', the full description of connexional significance is shown in Appendix 1. This description appears on the Methodist Church website and grant application forms.
7. The concept of 'connexional significance' was introduced to enable the church to differentiate between circuit ministerial appointments, to be funded locally, and more ground-breaking or risky mission and ministry projects. It also reflected the reality that the majority of Methodist funds are held by churches/circuits/districts, so the finite amounts

held connexionally should be used as part of the bigger connexional picture. This led to the CGC adopting a policy of being 'the only Methodist funder' of connexionally significant projects (as per Grant Making Framework 2008). Since 2008, the policy of the CGC being the only Methodist funder has been gradually relaxed. The reduction in funds available to the CGC demanded a pragmatic response and it was recognised that the key issue was that the CGC would not fund local appointments/work, rather than it would not partner with other Methodist bodies.

8. The CGC is strongly committed to funding projects where there is innovation and/or risk (ie untested, not projects which are managed irresponsibly). Ensuring that this commitment is known and understood, and that many more innovative applications are submitted and sought, is one of the CGC's communications priorities.
9. In the Grant Making Framework document 2008, 'full utilisation of the funds', empowers the CGC to make block grants to districts for local work, which would not be expected to meet the criteria for connexional significance. The principle behind this provision was to enable an efficient use of funds, however the fairness of providing grants to districts whose grant application is not connexionally significant, may be questioned. As a result the CGC has never introduced this facility into its processes and no payments have been requested or made. **The Council is asked to confirm that the policy should be not to make such block grants to districts.**
10. It has to be remembered that connexional funds represent a small fraction of those held across the Church and a key objective of the CGC has been to ensure that these funds are used for maximum impact and not to 'top up' local funding. The clear implication has always been that the CGC should focus on funding a smaller number of 'high quality' (and high value) projects, rather than spreading funds thinly across a wide range of more 'standard' ones. Again, it is key that the CGC continues to own this principle of not 'topping up', rather than definitely saying that it will not partner with circuit or district funding. The overarching principle is that connexional funding is not used to subsidise local mission and ministry that should be undertaken by all circuits, but rather to 'make a difference' by supporting exceptional projects that are deemed to be of connexional significance. **The Council is asked to confirm its commitment to the principle of connexional significance as the key factor in awarding mission and ministry grants.**

Property grants

11. By their very nature most property projects have local impact and thus do not meet the connexional significance criteria. Therefore property projects funded from the restricted Property Fund, or from other funds specifically restricted or designated for general property work are not required to meet the criteria for connexional significance according to the current wording of SO 213B. The CGC has used this freedom to review and introduce new criteria linked specifically to the General Secretary's report to the 2011 Conference, in the section 'A fluid mixed economy'. This move was widely welcomed and means that connexional property grants are not available for maintenance or minor works, but only now for new builds or substantial remodelling. It was envisaged that this would result in a much smaller number of grants being made, with the possibility for some to be of substantial size – the maximum grant was increased from £30k to £200k. However, the phrase 'significant alterations and/refurbishments' has maybe been interpreted a little flexibly and the CGC intends during 2017/18 to evaluate how the definition could be tightened; informed by the emerging work of the new Property Development Committee. **The Council is asked to confirm the policy position that property grants are only for projects which involve significant missional refurbishment, while not requiring them to**

meet connexional significance criteria.

12. It was hoped (in 2012) that increasing the maximum grant to £200k might result in more radical grant-making. This has happened and more larger grants (many over £100k and a significant number of the maximum £200k) are now being made. However, the CGC is also wrestling with whether or not to award grants to a small number of large refurbishment/rebuilding projects with total costs over a million pounds where around a million is still needed to fund the project *after* the grant has been awarded.
13. The eligibility criteria for property grants are listed at Appendix 2.

Chaplaincy grants

14. In line with *Chaplaincy Everywhere* the CGC has broadened its consideration of chaplaincy applications to include support of workplace and other chaplaincies. *Chaplaincy Everywhere* was one of the outcomes of The Chaplaincy Development Project (established in 2011). The *Chaplaincy Everywhere* course seeks to develop teams of voluntary chaplains who are members of the local church, embedded in their community. This has also sharpened the mission focus of chaplaincy projects and the willingness of the CGC to take risks on missional chaplaincy projects. Chaplaincy may be a first step into mission and the subsequent development of new expressions of church
15. The connexional significance supplementary criteria of being good practice and a replicable model are being used to help assess these applications. However, the main change that has been made to SO 213B since it was introduced has been the addition of the ability of the CGC to make grants for chaplaincy that do not meet the criteria of connexional significance. The justification for this was the desire for the Methodist Church to continue to be involved in local chaplaincies, whether sector or more modern forms of chaplaincy, some of which have to be in a particular location that was outside of the control of the Church. Where there are educational or other chaplaincies based in institutions it may be difficult for some districts to support the relatively high number of chaplaincies within their area, particularly as for many of them the Church works in many ecumenical partnerships. Free Church chaplaincies are often allocated on a rotational basis, so if, for example, a Baptist chaplain decides to move on and it is the Methodist turn to provide a replacement, the Council did not want to be in a position where this could not happen because of a lack of funds from the district involved. Such appointments are for five years and cannot be entered into the stationing matching process without the full funding having been agreed in advance. This is an area where funding is often a partnership between district and connexional grants and the CGC asks for a demonstration of an overall plan for HE chaplaincy within the district as part of the application process. **The Council is asked to confirm its commitment to funding chaplaincy projects where there is a local financial contribution, without requiring connexional significance criteria to be met.**
16. Even before the 2015 Conference Report on Fellowships (39) the CGC had, however, also awarded grants via the chaplaincy stream for support of the fellowships such as Fijian or Ghanaian under the connexional significance criteria.

Current and future considerations

17. In recent Conferences the common theme of the need for the Methodist Church to be more active and committed in evangelistic mission has arisen in a number of debates, including those adopting the One Mission report and some hard truths from Statistics for Mission

reports. The Secretary of the Conference made the following comments in his reflections to the 2016 Conference:

- ‘We are not short of anything.’
- ‘How do we channel and enthuse this extraordinary body of resource?’
- ‘[We should be] thinking rather differently about money.’
- ‘It is not that we are in need of the necessary financial resource, it is in the wrong place to sustain the vital and urgent ministry.’

18. None of these debates pointed towards the end of the Methodist Church in Britain, but rather the need to be more focused in using the people, property and financial resources available most effectively in mission. Should connexional grants be used in a more strategic and radical way? eg they could be directed only towards the establishment of new local church communities, towards pioneering projects reaching out specifically to the unchurched, or to work that satisfies other tightly defined missional criteria.
19. The CGC has separate application processes for mission and ministry and property. However many fledgling projects require grant backing for a combination of people and property components and applicants potentially have to fill in two sets of forms. While the CGC would welcome more MiB projects and fewer property ones consideration needs to be given about how to respond to these joint mission and ministry and property project applications.
20. Further, the CGC notes the work of the new Property Development Committee and suggests that as its work develops there could be some thought given to how the use of funds available for property or non-property grants interact.

Methodist Action on Poverty and Justice (MAPJ - formerly Mission Alongside the Poor Programme)

21. This grant programme is defined by SO 1004 (amended following the MAPP report to the 2016 Conference). The 2016 Conference accepted the recommendations of the MAPP report and these form the guidelines that the CGC offers to applicants, these are listed in Appendix 4 together with the criteria that are listed on the application form. Also as agreed in the 2016 report to the Conference, the CGC will usually fund up to a maximum of £50,000 and no more than 50% of project costs. As this approach was agreed by Conference the CGC is not asking Council to confirm this implementation of policy.

Monitoring and evaluation

22. Since it was established in 2008 the CGC required grant recipients to submit annual reports regarding the progress made throughout that year. In practice these rarely enabled the CGC to establish a full picture of projects or provide evidence that there is a robust process for disseminating any learning from the project across the Connexion.
23. The CGC therefore established a Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning and Dissemination (MELD) Group, to evaluate effectively how the methodology of the work demonstrates excellence and good practice, or that the model is reasonably replicable across the Connexion. MELD’s work is part of seeking a cultural shift to ensure grant recipients are properly held accountable for the monies received and for how effectively they are used in achieving the objectives defined in the application.
24. The natural extension of such a shift would be to consider the policy regarding situations where grant recipients would be required to repay some or all of the money that they had received. In some instances there is an automatic link – property grants are, in theory,

accessed via a payment request on the Consents system until work is underway and the money is required; where a grant is to fund a particular post it is often not paid until an appointment has been made. However, there is currently no link between a grant being paid out and a close evaluation of the project's success against the critical success factors to be found within the application, except where a MELD review is carried out (up to 20 projects per year from around 90 live projects). The CGC proposes that if, following a MELD review, a project is found not to have achieved its objectives, due to poor project management rather than unforeseeable or unavoidable external circumstances, then the grant should be subject to withdrawal and/or an appropriate level of repayment (but not ruling out the possibility of negotiation and additional grant conditions being imposed). **The Council is asked to confirm this policy proposal.**

25. Research carried out for this paper has revealed that there is no basis in Standing Orders for repayment of property grants when Methodist buildings are sold, though TMCP have been reclaiming in full grants made from the Property Fund. The Conference Office has invited the CGC to make proposals for reclaiming grants, to be included in Standing Orders. The Grants Team has been commissioned by the CGC to develop appropriate proposals during the current connexional year relating to the circumstance in which grants should be repaid.

World Church Grants Processes

26. 2016/17 is the first connexional year, following CGC being given permission to review and alter World Church grants processes, which brought together Annual and SALT grants for scrutiny alongside each other. This was facilitated by a combined application form which was introduced in summer 2016. This created a significant peak of workload for both Connexional Team staff and CGC members. The experience of working on two streams together showed that it would not be feasible to bring all three grant programmes (NMA, Annual, SALT) together at the same time, as the workload would be too great, making it impossible for CGC members to assess all the applications.
27. A solution has now been developed, after much consultation with CGC members, World Church Relations and Grants Teams, which combines the three grant programmes, while dividing the applications into two parts each year. 2016/17 will be a transitional year where half of the Methodist Church's partners NMA applications are processed during the summer. This enables applications from the remainder of the partners to be processed during the autumn (for all three programmes). This further enables applications to be processed in two tranches each year, in June and November, hence the partners are divided into J and N groups. Within this approach the CGC members have been organised into regional groupings.
28. All partners have now received a communication from the World Church Relations Team advising them of this change and informing them of the group into which they have been placed. This division is based on dividing the workload as evenly as possible between the two groups. **The CGC asks the Council to agree to this new approach which will complete the planned programme of changes.** Having been implemented further work will be carried out on a revised application form (taking into account revised assessment criteria) and report form(s).
29. The CGC has also agreed criteria for Annual and General grants, these were not previously stated in a formal document. The criteria are set out at Appendix 5.

New Members of the CGC

30. A recruitment day was held in February to select new CGC members. Seven candidates took part and all seven have been invited to join the CGC across the various streams. The proposed new structure of the CGC and names of new members are shown at Appendices 6 and 7.
31. There remain vacancies within the CGC and a further round of recruitment is underway with another recruitment day planned for July. **The CGC requests permission to bring the names of candidates selected in July to the October Council meeting.**
32. To manage the period of transition for the assessment of World Church grant applications the following CGC members are being proposed for a one year extension to their six-year term: Mr Edwin Fowler and Mr Ivan Kilpatrick.

Grant-funded project presentations at the 2017 Conference

33. One of the recommendations of the CGC's MELD Review was wider recognition and sharing of the impact of successful funded projects. The Secretary of the Conference has invited the CGC to recommend suitable projects to make a presentation during Conference 2017. The CGC's recommendations, having been discussed with CGC members, the Grants Team and other Connexional Team colleagues are shown below.

1. HIV Chaplaincy, London

Provides pastoral support for people affected by HIV/AIDs and publishes material collected from the interchange between clients and the Chaplain. Clients are met on an informal basis due to the very nature of this ministry which is on the fringes of both society and religious faith. Many suffer from bad experiences of religious organisations, and are well informed on the many negative attitudes of some of the different faith traditions. The response of some of the clients to these attitudes means that the support offered is of a very sensitive nature. A key element of the work plan is to publish the material from the interchange with the chaplain and his clients. The material is aimed at theological students, ministers of religion and other interested parties on the issues that arise from this ministry.

2. Who is your Neighbour? Community Reconciliation, Sheffield

The needs of local communities in South Yorkshire for unity and mutual understanding are crucial for wellbeing at neighbourhood level. A focus on exploring 'Who is your neighbour?' and on the injustice of prejudice, encouraged through fear of difference, is the core emphasis. This project was established to learn through experience how Methodists and local communities in South Yorkshire can better engage with, understand and value our different cultures, ethnic groups and faiths, and become more resilient to racist and divisive ideologies. The expected project outcomes are improved community understanding, increasing individual confidence in meeting and challenging prejudice, and communicating alternative positive narratives to the media stories which foster fear and divisiveness. The project is also funded through Sheffield District and is managed by a multi-faith management committee. The project works with communities which are vulnerable to racist and divisive ideologies in Barnsley, Doncaster, Rotherham and Sheffield.

3. The Welcome Church, Lay Pastor, Alderley Edge (MAPJ)

The Welcome Church is one of the newest churches in Methodism (founded 2010). The Lay Pastor role is to be in the café on a day-to-day basis, acting as a signposter, a visible presence of the church community, a support to the work of the new Welcome Counselling Service and to pray for people as appropriate. Time is spent with families on the local estate running children and family sessions, including accessible Bible study groups. The project has resulted in dynamic growth in the church.

*****RESOLUTIONS**

- 50/1. The Council receives the report.**
- 50/2. The Council approves the policies as set out in paragraphs 9, 10, 11 and 15 and directs the Committee to present the complete policies to the Council in October 2017.**
- 50/3. The Council encourages the development of the MELD practice in paragraph 24.**
- 50/4. The Council approves the ongoing changes and streamlining of World Church grants.**
- 50/5. The Council appoints Ms Helen Woodall as Chair of the Committee for a further period of three years from 1 September 2017.**
- 50/6. The Council appoints the members of the Connexional Grants Committee, its sub-committee and streams as follows:**
Ms Helen Woodall (Chair), Mr Bala Gnanapragasam (Mission in Britain Sub-committee Chair), Dr Daleep S Mukarji (World Church Sub-committee Chair), the Revd David John Crouchley, Mr Terence W Ilott (non-voting)

Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning and Dissemination (MELD)

Mr Terence W Ilott (Convenor), Mr Peter Broekhuizen, Mr Christopher Finbow, Dr Russell Ong, the Revd Richard W Thompson, Ms Christine Preece

Mission in Britain Sub-Committee

Mr Bala Gnanapragasam (Chair), Mrs Susan Johnson, the Revds Dr John A Illsley, Beverley D Boden, Mr Terence W Ilott (non-voting)

Chaplaincy Stream

The Revd Dr John A Illsley (Convenor), the Revd Patricia A Brooks, Mr Cliff Everitt

Mission and Ministry in Britain Stream

Mrs Susan Johnson (Convenor), Mr Timothy J Baker, Ms Charity Nzegwu, Dr Hans Ekema Njoh, Mr Stephen Duckworth, the Revd David Jebb

Property Stream

The Revds Beverley D Boden (Convenor), Nicholas C Bentley, Mrs Sylvia White, Mr Les Sudron, Mr Peter Taylor

World Church Sub-committee

Dr Daleep S Mukarji (Chair), the Revd Laurence Graham (Methodist Church in Ireland), Ms Janice M Clark, the Revd Dr Wendy Kilworth-Mason

World Church Approvals Group

Ms Janice M Clark (Convenor)

Asia & Pacific – Mr Edwin Fowler (Coordinator), the Revd Chris Collins, Dr Liz Harris, Mr Martin Rees

Africa – Mr Ivan Kirkpatrick (Coordinator), the Revd Dr Wendy Kilworth-Mason, the Revd Marcus Torchon, Revd Brian Fletcher

LAC & Europe – Mr Paul Spray (Coordinator), Ms Louise Murray, the Revd Laurence Graham

Reasoned Statements:

Candidate	Reasoned Statement
Stephen Duckworth	Chartered accountant, trustee of John Wesley's New Room in Bristol and a member of the London District Finance Resources Group. Member Notting Hill Methodist Church
Martin Rees	Recently retired business control accountant work included international businesses and partner operations overseas. Former Circuit Steward in the Cardiff Circuit.
David Jebb	Presbyter stationed in the Romford Circuit
Christine Preece	A probationer presbyter from September 2017. She has previous experience of school educational leadership.
Russell Ong	Academic in various UK universities as well as in the private sector. He has extensive experience in research grant processes in the higher education sector.
Peter Taylor	Recently retired after 25 years as CEO of a regional charity in Lancashire. Wide experience in dealing with a range of funding bodies, currently chairs Lancashire's Rural Community Council and is senior steward at his local church.
Marcus Torchon	Presbyter stationed in the Wirral Circuit. Completing thesis on aid-dependency in Haitian Protestantism with a particular focus on the Methodist Church in Haiti.

Appendix 1

Definition of Connexional Significance

1. The project involves, or has the potential to involve, several Districts. The involvement could be at church or circuit level but must cross district boundaries. Or,
2. Although the work will only take place in one location it will fulfil at least one of the following:
 - The project's outcomes will benefit the wider Connexion through the furthering of God's mission in innovative and far reaching ways.
 - The work will be mission-focused and targets an aspect of society outside church culture where the applicant's specific geographic or demographic situation offers the potential to achieve a very high impact to both individual and community.
 - The project will be an ecumenical* partnership which has the potential to achieve a very high impact for the wider Connexion.
 - The project will be focused on innovation where the level of risk is high but the possible level of benefit is commensurately high.
 - It will be considered strategically important by the Methodist Church, and is impossible or overwhelmingly difficult to do elsewhere, and places an unreasonable financial burden on the District/Circuit in which it is placed. Or,

3. The Project will celebrate the story of the Methodist Church through using Methodist heritage to:
- challenge and deepen the faith of Methodists from different parts of Britain, or from other countries, in a way which enables them to engage more fully in mission;
 - inspire members of the local community, outside the Church, to think about the meaning and practice of Christian faith or engage with Methodism;
 - inspire people from different parts of Britain, or from other countries, to explore the meaning and practice of Christian faith or engage with Methodism.

While not formally stated as criteria, in practice the following are also considered when assessing mission and ministry connexional significant grant applications:

- that the methodology of the work demonstrates *excellence* and *good practice*, and the model is reasonably *replicable* in other parts of the connexion;
- the work has potential to *learn lessons* that will benefit the wider Connexion by providing new information to deepen understanding on how effectively to pursue *Our Calling* and the *Priorities*.
- grants are awarded for fixed periods of time and would not normally be awarded for more than the initial five years. However in exceptional cases and subject to a thorough evaluation a further grant might be made.

Appendix 2

Criteria for Property Grants

- Projects will be new builds or significant alterations and/or refurbishments;
- All property projects will be missional, the alterations that will be made to buildings must enable mission, through inclusion, building-related outreach activities and community engagement. Once alterations have been made they should make a significant impact;
- Where they are significant alterations and/or refurbishments, projects will put the fabric and structure of the building into a good state of repair;
- Projects will address all of the relevant criteria for efficient energy use and sustainability, as detailed in the CIBSE standards¹;
- Projects will at least conform to the requirements of the Equality Act as it applies to disability access, and all other relevant buildings regulations;
- Projects contain multi-use, flexible spaces², and will obtain the necessary energy performance certificates so that they can be let out/used in this way;
- Projects will provide space for either a congregation which is growing or for several congregations (or fellowships) to share;
- The maximum grant is £200,000.

¹ including high performance insulation as well as addressing pre-existing issues, reduction of incoming mains power, ensuring use of energy efficient heating and lighting, installation of solar panels.

² ie buildings which allow people to use sanctuary space throughout the week for a range of activities singly or at the same time, in addition to fulfilling the requirements as a place for worship.

Appendix 3

Criteria for Chaplaincy Grants:

- Where they are district chaplaincies, they will be within the context of a district chaplaincy plan;
- The district or another body will contribute at least one-third of the total cost;
- If HE chaplaincy, evidence will be provided that the beneficiary institutions/organisations have been approached for funding;
- Each chaplain's performance must be monitored and reviewed annually.

Appendix 4

MAPJ Principles and Criteria

- That grant applications to support the Mission Alongside the Poor Programme (MAPP) should be welcomed and encouraged and that when funds are scarce applications to support MAPP work would be given priority.
- That project proposals should not be tied to any one set of available definitions, but they should show, when stating the need for the project, that the group of people they wish to serve are unable to live in dignity because they have difficulty accessing material resources such as, but not limited to, food, housing, clothing, transport, services that support work such as childcare.
- That project proposals be required to provide evidence that the project supports those for whom material resources prevent them from living in dignity, using the Action for Children definition as a guideline for what that means in practice.
- That the definition of poverty used within MAPP focuses on people having "sufficient resources available to meet their material needs."
- That the assessment of grant applications should not be based on a project's geographical location, but on the people whom the project is intended to serve and that this be made clear in any guidance.
- That the Connexional Grants Committee should encourage hybrid projects which combine local service delivery with advocacy of action on poverty and justice.
- That all projects be asked to consider if the project could provide an opportunity for the stories of those facing poverty to be more widely understood.
- The Conference decided to rename the programme as Methodist Action on Poverty and Justice.
- That resources be made available to provide a connexion wide launch for Methodist Action on Poverty so as to promote the availability of grants and inspire the Methodist people to be innovative and bold in seeking new ways to serve the communities within which God has placed

Criteria for MAPJ grants

In addition to the usual criteria about meeting missional priorities and demonstrating the need for the project, in MAPJ applications:

- There will be evidence of relative poverty, whether in a rural or urban area.
- There must be a commitment to work alongside those in need, the vulnerable and disadvantaged.
- The project will be born out of a response to a local point of need, as part of God's mission to build love and better opportunities.

Appendix 5

World Church Grants Criteria

Annual Grants

This type of grant seeks to:

- build the capacity, leadership and long term stability of partner churches
- encourage evangelism, outreach and engagement with the wider society (including Interfaith and peace initiatives)
- support partners who have a special emphasis on issues of justice, inclusion, education, health and empowerment, and support for those who have been marginalised because of their identity, faith, ethnicity, gender or economic status

These are the strategic principles from MC/16/8 Partnership, Focus and Evolution.

The proposed eligibility criteria for an annual grant (these have not been set out previously) are therefore as set out below.

Annual grant applications should be:

- strategic, programmatic or, high priority as determined by Partner Relationship Review, for the sustainability of partners
- in line with the partner's strategy (or sustainability) and MCB's priorities
- missional, in all its senses
- impactful with long term benefits
- capable of being monitored

General Grants

This type of grant seeks to:

- assist partner churches [and partner organisations] in responding to emergencies, natural disasters and where there has been human violence or ethnic conflict

This is a strategic principle from MC/16/8 Partnership, Focus and Evolution.

The following eligibility criteria are already set out:

- additional, or one-off, funding for unforeseen work that could not have been included in an Annual Grant application, or
- one off pieces of work by a partner who does not normally receive an Annual Grant
- grants for use in an emergency either within the church or the local community

The following additional criteria are proposed:

- The maximum grant will, normally, be £15,000. Requests for more than £15,000 must be agreed by the World Church Sub-Committee.
- There must be sufficient urgency that a planned application cannot be considered in the next funding round.
- Applications for funding of travel to World Methodist Council, or similar, should be included in an Annual Grant application.