

Basic Information

Title	Report of the Abortion Statement Working Party
Contact Name and Details	Ruth Gee ruth.gee@methodist.org.uk (Chair of Abortion Statement Working Group) Paul Morrison MorrisonP@methodistchurch.org.ok (Policy Adviser, Joint Public Issues Team)
Status of Paper	Final
Resolution/s	Should the Conference decide a further large piece of work is essential, two costed options are presented in Section 5

Summary of Content

Subject and Aims	To consider proposals to act on the Conference's request to respond to issues around abortion.
Main Points	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Context of this paper. • Description of options for future work on the issue of abortion. • The current position of the Methodist Church. • Option a: to produce a new Statement of the Methodist Church on the subject of Abortion. • Option b: to produce a report to the Conference addressing the pastoral issues and theological questions in the context of modern British society, and the production of resources suitable for use by churches or individuals. • Recommendations • Resolutions
Background Context and Relevant Documents (with function)	<p>The 2008 Conference Report, <i>Created in God's Image</i> (2008 Daily Record 7/20) and the resolution 19/3 requires the Connexional Team to revise the Methodist Statement on Abortion.</p> <p>MC 09/71 Sets out the terms of Reference of the Abortion Statement Working Group.</p> <p>MC 10/04 Sets out that these options should be presented to the Conference for their consideration.</p> <p>SO 129 sets out the process by which a Statement of the Methodist Conference is made.</p>

Impact	<p>A SO 129 Statement of Conference would require a large Working Party, and two year consultation process before the final Statement can be brought to Conference. This will have substantial resource implications to the Joint Public Issues Team.</p> <p>The relative resource impacts of each option are discussed.</p>
Risk	<p>Abortion is a highly polarising issue. The proposal of a substantial change in position will provoke potentially divisive debate inside and outside the Church, which requires pastorally sensitive handling.</p> <p>Risk in causing harm to individuals who have been touched by issues around abortion if handled insensitively.</p>

1.0 Context of this paper

- 1.1 In 2008 the Methodist Conference received the report '*Created in God's Image* which addressed "the theological, ethical and social principles by which decision-making on medical and scientific development is properly to be exercised"¹.
- 1.2 The Conference approved the recommendation that, "*in the light of the changed social and political context and scientific and medical developments including reduction in the gestational age at which a premature infant may survive, the Methodist Council should appoint a group to do further work on the issues surrounding abortion, including the drafting of a revision of the Methodist Statement on Abortion (1976)*". (2008 Conference Daily Record 7/20)
- 1.3 The Working Group which produced '*Created in God's Image*' brought this recommendation as it was concerned that the language of the 1976 Statement on Abortion was inappropriate for current pastoral needs and the legislation, statistics and science to which it referred were out of date. It did not consider that it was necessary to reopen the Methodist Church's position on abortion which is at the heart of the Statement.
- 1.4 The Methodist Council instigated a working group to revise the wording of the 1976 Statement to enable it to better meet today's needs. This group met twice and a reworking of the original statement was submitted to the Faith and Order network. The network had strong reservations with the new wording. Although many different personal opinions on the issue of abortion were vigorously expressed in the network's comments there was no appetite to change the Church's overall position. The reservations expressed were around the depth of the theological content and the overall style of the 1976 Statement.
- 1.5 Amendments to Standing Order 129 were passed in 1987 which radically changed how the Methodist Church came to make a "statement". Prior to 1987 a statement required a single vote of the Conference. SO 129 now requires a draft to be presented to the Conference, a period of revision and Connexion-wide consultation, as well as a second Conference debate. The complete process would normally take four years.
- 1.6 Since SO 129 was introduced, only three Statements on political or social issues have been adopted as Conference Statements through this process:
 - A Christian Understanding of Family Life, the Single Person and Marriage – 1992
 - Gambling – 1992
 - Political Responsibility – 1995

In addition, *Hope in God's Future* was adopted as a draft Conference Statement in 2009 and is in its first year of a two year consultation process. However, all four of these statements are of considerably greater length than the 1976 Statement on Abortion, and deal with their subjects with a great deal of theological and ethical depth.

- 1.7 It was not possible to modify the five-page 1976 Statement on Abortion to meet the theological standards required of a modern Statement of the Methodist Church by the Faith and Order Committee. It was therefore agreed by Methodist Council in MC/10/04 that:

"The Council directs the Connexional Team, in collaboration with Faith and Order and the Working Group, to prepare resolutions for the Conference offering two alternative pieces of work which it might choose to commission:

1. *a complete rewrite under SO 129 of the formal statement, with a view to such a revised statement being brought to a future Conference; or*

2. *a report to the Conference addressing the pastoral issues and theological questions in the context of modern British society. (This report would be focused on enabling thought*

and resources relevant to the mission of our churches.)”

- 1.8 This paper presents to the Conference costed proposals for both these options. The paper also presents alternative ways of addressing the concerns of the *Created in God's Image* Working Party and makes recommendations as to future work bearing in mind the wishes of the Working Groups, the concerns of the Conference and the resources available to undertake any further work.

2.0 The current position of the Methodist Church

- 2.1 The Methodist Church's position, as stated in the 1976 Abortion Statement, rejects calls for abortion on demand and states that abortion should not occur after the life is viable outside of the womb. Individual Methodists, strongly and in good conscience, hold alternative views to the 1976 Methodist Statement but there is no evidence that the Methodist people as a whole wish for a change.
- 2.2 The process instigated by 2008 '*Created in God's Image*' report has involved a number of working parties and consultation with a variety of Methodist groups including four Faith and Order resource groups. Although some individuals stated that their personal position varied from the position of the 1976 Abortion Statement there was no suggestion that it would be helpful for the Church to change its overall position. Indeed many of those whose personal opinion differed from the 1976 Statement stated that the Church's current position should remain.
- 2.3 The Conference resolution instigating this work stated that a reworked abortion statement should be made "*in the light of ... scientific and medical developments including reduction in the gestational age at which a premature infant may survive*". It is correct to state that developments in medical science have gradually decreased the gestation required for viability outside the womb, and will continue to do so. Subsequent to the 1976 Statement, the law was amended in 1990 to reduce the time limit for abortions from 28 to 24 weeks, largely on these grounds. More recently the House of Commons Science and Technology Select Committee in 2007 concluded that scientific findings at the moment implied that the time limit on abortion should remain as it is. The issue of viability is both contentious and fluid and the Church is not best placed to make a determination on it. The benefits of addressing scientific issues such as viability via the cumbersome process of a Methodist Statement are questionable.
- 2.4 The initial request to update the Methodist Statement on Abortion was part of the '*Created in God's Image*' report. The Working Party intended that any work should restate the agreed position set out in the 1976 Statement in language appropriate to the 21st Century. There was no wish to change the underlying position of the Methodist Church. The Working Party and Joint Public Issues Team has seen no evidence of any widespread appetite for the Methodist Church to change its position on abortion beyond expressing it in a more modern language to make it more inclusive and pastorally sensitive.
- 2.5 The Working Group believes it is possible to address the concerns around the language of the 1976 Abortion Statement without the need to expend a large amount of resource. The recommendations below include a proposal, not required in the Methodist Council resolution, to restate the agreed position in the form of a Joint Public Issues Team briefing, which may be altered to the language of the time, and to address specific issues as they become debated in public.

3.0 Description of options requested by Methodist Council for future work on the issue of abortion

- 3.1 Option A: A new Statement of the Methodist Conference on the subject of Abortion.
- 3.2 A working party would be recruited to draw up a draft Statement on the subject of Abortion. This would be presented to the 2012 Conference. The sensitivity and strong opinions held on this issue mean that a shorter process would be unlikely to produce an acceptable draft statement. Should this option be approved, the draft statement would undergo a two year consultation process managed by the Connexional Team. The draft statement would be published to allow widespread consultation throughout the Connexion.
- 3.3 The recruitment of the working party and the consultation process would be carefully tailored to ensure that both vocal and less vocal opinions can be heard. The sensitivity of the subject would require a number of different consultation processes, e.g. interviews, focus groups, and questionnaires. These would be designed to allow all members of the Church to share their opinions in a non-threatening environment.
- 3.4 A statement for final approval would be expected to be put to the Conference in 2014. Should this be passed the major output of the process would be a *Statement of the Methodist Church on the subject of Abortion* which would have the status of a “considered Statement of the judgement of the Conference...with a view to it standing as such for some years”.
- 3.5 Estimates of the resources required for this option are based on the *Hope in God’s Future* process. These estimates are deliberately conservative and, as abortion raises issues around sensitivity and confidentiality, the research and consultation process is likely to prove more resource intensive. Estimates are outlined in Appendix A, but £16,250, at least 2,000 person hours of Connexional Team time (equivalent to one person working full time for a year) as well as 1,500 volunteer hours is a conservative estimate of what would be required. These numbers assume that the process is relatively smooth and that the Conference approves both the draft and the final version of the statement without asking for major revisions.
- 3.6 Option B: A report to the Conference addressing the pastoral issues and theological questions in the context of modern British society.
- 3.7 A working party would be recruited to guide and direct the work, while a member of the Connexional Team would resource the group. The working party would include individuals with the skills necessary to develop resources useful to individual churches or church members.
- 3.8 A research programme under the direction of the Connexional Team’s research officers would seek to investigate the attitudes and experiences of abortion across the Connexion. The purpose would *not* be to try and discern one agreed view for the Methodist people but instead to explore the variety of views held with integrity by Methodists. An exploration of these views and the experiences of those touched by issues related to abortion, including those who have been involved in pastoral care, is intended to provide the raw information required to allow the working party to produce effective resources that meet real pastoral needs.
- 3.9 The Faith and Order Network has pointed to theological thought which is relevant to this area. The working party would both need expertise in this area and should also investigate if a resource exploring this theology would be both practicable and useful to the Church.
- 3.10 Appendix B includes a draft research plan including an estimate of resources required. These would be in the region of £8,100, at least 800 person hours of Connexional Team time (equivalent to one of the Church’s two research officers working full time on this for six months) as well as 500 volunteer hours. The research plan would be reviewed by the working party and altered to allow them to investigate aspects of the issues around

abortion where they perceive most need. Research officers, and if appropriate their line management, would be available to the working party to ensure the research is appropriate and is achievable within the constraints of time and resources.

4.0 Recommendations

- 4.1 It is the recommendation of the Abortion Statement Working Group that Conference does *not* ask for a four year process rewriting the 1976 Statement on Abortion (as detailed in *Option A* above). The costs of this rewrite would be protracted and considerable. These costs are potentially both financial and pastoral as there is a risk of the process being unhelpful and insensitive to church members who have been touched by issues around abortion.
- 4.2 Holding a conversation with the Church on abortion in the context of rewriting the Abortion Statement is likely to lead to an unhelpful polarising argument, with the key question being “are we for or against”. This may be nuanced around well rehearsed positions on when abortions may be viewed as more acceptable eg in cases of incest or rape.
- 4.3 When members of the Joint Public Issues Team have discussed this work this unhelpful binary argument is difficult to avoid. Entrenched positions from either end of the spectrum tend to dominate those who are exploring their views in a more open minded way. There are also concerns such a process would not allow for an environment where those with personal experiences or pastoral needs can be open.
- 4.4 The benefit of *Option A* would be to have an updated statement expressed in modern language. In view of the Joint Public Issues Team and the Abortion Statement Working Party there is no realistic possibility of the two year process of consultation required to rewrite the Statement on Abortion changing the underlying principles of the *1976 Statement on the subject of Abortion*. Any widespread consultation may be better put in the context of an open exploration of the issue rather than the more confrontational question of whether the church views an individual’s actions (past or future) as morally acceptable.
- 4.5 *Option B* was designed in consultation with a number of groups within the Church as the most useful piece of work that could be done by the Connexional Team and in response to the issue of abortion. The resource implications are still considerable but lower than for a new statement as rewritten using the SO 129 process. Its outputs are likely to be more constructive for the Church.
- 4.6 There have been a number of reports to the Conference as well as resources from the Methodist Church and ecumenical partners produced in this area². It is the view of the Working Group that neither *Option A* nor *Option B* is required to address the issues of language and context raised by the *Created in God’s Image* Working Party. Both proposals have been fully and conservatively costed and found to require large amounts of both Connexional Team and other Methodist resources. Given the limited resource available to the Connexional Team, it is the view of both the Connexional Team and the Chair of the Working Group that neither major piece of work is either necessary or appropriate at this time.
- 4.7 **We therefore recommend that the Conference rejects both Option A and Option B.**
- 4.8 Option C: An updated briefing on the issues
- 4.9 The *Created in God’s Image* working party pointed out that the *1976 Statement on the Subject of Abortion* was written in what now appears arcane language. The Joint Public Issues Team has produced a number of briefings on issues related to abortion and early

human life. A briefing could be produced to meet specific requirements of the 2008 resolution. It would explain the Methodist position on abortion in modern language and place this in the context of modern law and science. The team produces a number of briefings on topical issues which do not hold the weight of a Statement of Methodist Church but are widely used as an accessible way of sourcing information. They have the added advantage of being able to be rapidly changed to address questions of the day. The Connexional Team would then be given the task of monitoring developments in this area, keeping the briefing papers(s) current and bringing to the attention of the Council or the Conference any issues as appropriate.

4.10 The initial production of such a briefing would require considerably fewer resources than the original options. It would take around 100 Connexional Team hours and as briefings are published electronically the production of the briefing would be met from existing budgets and resources.

4.11 We therefore recommend that the Conference adopts Option C.

*****RESOLUTION**

10/1. The Conference directed the Joint Public Issues Team to produce and keep up to date a briefing on the subject of abortion. The Connexional Team is asked to keep under review work on the theological, pastoral and legislative issues relating to abortion and to report to the Conference or the Methodist Council when circumstances change such that further resources or policy are needed to aid the Church's mission.

The Conference agreed to withdraw the following resolutions:

10/2. The Conference directs the Methodist Council to approve the membership and terms of reference of a Working Party to produce a report examining the impact of abortion within the Church and the communities it serves. The report should be presented to the Conference no later than 2012 and include references to resources which are accessible and relevant to situations faced by individual churches and church members.

10/3. The Conference directs the Methodist Council to approve the membership and terms of reference of a Working Party, to produce a statement replacing the 1976 Statement on abortion. This working party should present a draft statement to the Conference no later than 2012

Appendix A: Estimate of resources needed for the drafting, consultation and adoption of “A Methodist Statement on the subject of Abortion”.

Table A1: Preparation of Draft Statement

Action	Individuals	Time needed	Volunteer Hours	Staff Hours
Working Group Selection, recruitment + TOR³	CT ⁴ staff members	7 days	-	35
Working Group Meetings	Volunteer group members (approx 8) and CT staff member	2 x weekend residential meetings	290	35
Initial and Final meetings	Volunteer group members (approx 8) and 2 x CT staff members	2 x 1/2 day meetings	70	20
Servicing Working group	CT staff members	20 days	-	140
Meeting preparation	Volunteer Group		230	
Write up Working Group Report and Proposed Statement	Working Group Chair Volunteer Group CT Staff Member	~2 weeks	70	10
Editing	CT staff member and Working Group Chair	~1 hr a day for 3 weeks	20	20
Governance reports & attendance	CT staff member and Working Group Chair	5 days	35	35
		Subtotals	715	295

Table A1: Estimate of time used by volunteers and Connexional Team staff to produce a *Draft Statement of Conference on the subject of Abortion* to the Conference 2012.

³ TOR: abbreviation for Terms of Reference

⁴ CT: abbreviation for Connexional Team

Table A2: Connexion-wide consultation on Draft Statement

Action	Individuals	Time needed	Volunteer Hours	Staff Hours
Design Focus Groups	Research Officers x 2	1 week	-	70
Focus Groups	Research Officers x 2 and Focus Group participants (approx 10)	6 days	560	85
Individual Interviews	Volunteers Assisted by Research Staff	~20	50	20
Transcription services	Purchased externally	50	-	50
Analyse data from Focus Groups	Research Officers x 2	5 days	-	70
Design Online Questionnaire and Consultation	Research Officers x 2	2.5 days	-	35
Ongoing web support for online questionnaire	Internet support team	2 days a month for ~5 months	-	70
Ongoing research support for online questionnaire	Research Officers x 2	1 day a month for ~5 months	-	70
Analyse data from online questionnaire	Research Officers x 2	5 days	-	70
Research Report	Research Officers x 2	2 days	-	25
Contribute to redraft for final Council report	Research Officers x 2	3 days	-	35
Project Management	CT staff member	4 hrs pr week for ~2 years	-	400
Policy Input	CT staff member	2.5 days per month ~2 years	-	430
Inter-church Communications	CT staff member	1 day per month ~2 years	-	160
		Subtotals	610	1590

Table A2: Estimate of time used by volunteers and Connexional Team staff to put the conference agreed *Draft Statement of Conference on the subject of Abortion* to Connexion-wide consultation.

Table A3: Preparation of Final Statement for approval by the Conference 2014

Action	Individuals	Time needed	Volunteer Hours	Staff Hours
Response to consultation	Working Group CT Staff Member	1 day meeting + preparation	120	15
Redrafting final statement to be adopted by Conference	CT staff member and Working Group Chair	~2 weeks	70	20
Governance reports & attendance	CT staff member and Working Group Chair	5 days	35	35
		Subtotals	225	70

Table A3: Estimate of time used by volunteers and Connexional Team staff to agree and submit a final version of the *Statement of Conference on the subject of Abortion* to the Conference 2014.

A1: The total figures are 1550 hours of volunteer's time and 1955 hours of Connexional Team time. This assumes a relatively smooth process, with the draft and final versions of the statement being agreed by the Conference on their first presentation.

A2: The major cost to the Connexional Team would be staff time. Other cash costs in the production of a final statement, relating to the servicing of a working party and the publication of a consultation document are itemised in Table A4.

Table A4: Estimated Costs, after staff and volunteer time, of process to agree a “Statement of the Methodist Church on the Subject of Abortion”.

Item	Cost	Notes
<u>Working Party</u>		
Working Party residential	£4,160	
1/2 day meetings	£1,760	(1 meeting at MCH)
	£5,920	Sub-Total
<u>Chair/Individuals of Working Party</u>		
Write / editing up (draft)	£100	
Governance (draft)	£180	(1 visit with o/n stay)
Interviews	£300	
WP Research consultation/ redraft	£300	
Governance (final)	£180	(1 visit with o/n stay)
	£1,060	Sub-Total
<u>Connexional Team</u>		
Working Group residential	£520	
1/2 day meetings	£220	(1 meeting at MCH)
Governance (draft)	£180	(1 visit to with o/n stay)
Focus Groups (x6)	£1,800	(1 group at MCH)
Interviews (x10)	£360	(2 requiring CT member)
Governance (final)	£180	(1 visit with o/n stay)
	£3,260	Sub-Total
Publication Costs	£6,000	1500 Copies of consultation report
	£16,240	Total estimate

A4: Estimates were obtained by using records from the Abortion Statement Working Party, the Hope in God’s Future consultation process and by judgements made as to the time required by the Working Party. The Chair in consultation with other members of the working party and CT staff could alter these as appropriate. These estimates do not include the work of the Faith and Order networks, the Law and Polity Committee or governance bodies of the Methodist Church such as the Conference or the Council.

Appendix B: Research Proposal for Option B. A report to the Conference addressing the pastoral issues and theological questions in the context of modern British society

B1. British Legislation on Abortion

B1.1 The Abortion Act- 1967 set out the legal conditions under which an abortion could be performed in the United Kingdom until the 28th week of pregnancy. In 1990, this was amended by the Human Fertilisation and Embryology Act which reduced the time limit to the 24th week of pregnancy, except in exceptional cases. The letter of the law is broadly in accordance with the stated position of the Methodist Church, there are however areas where its interpretation and implementation are of concern. Most notable is the use of the “risk to the physical and mental health of the mother” clause which can be misused to allow abortion on demand.

B2. Further Work Proposed in Option B

B2.1 Preliminary work has shown the diverse range of opinions held on this issue, and the reluctance of many people to compromise their views. Therefore, it is envisaged that any work to revisit the principles behind the 1976 Conference Statement, already agreed as the position of the Church, will be a very long, complex and expensive process. It is unlikely that such a process will result in a clear cut outcome for a new Conference Statement, as has previously been stated.

B2.2 Preliminary work identifies an important role that the central infrastructure of the Church can play in which to aid those seeking pastoral support on the issue of abortion. The subject of abortion is evidently a very sensitive issue that generates strong opinions but it is also an area in which the Methodist Church is sought out to offer practical help, spiritual guidance and other support. Therefore, thought also needs to be given to current provision in this area and how pastoral resources could be developed to offer better help to those who require it.

B2.3 It is therefore proposed that further work investigating the attitudes to and experiences of abortion across the Methodist Church is concentrated on the pastoral needs within the Church. Exploratory work will be conducted so as to ensure that experiences, as well as views, of abortion across the Connexion are heard. These stories can then be used to help identify pastoral needs and useful resources that can be produced for the Church.

B3. Proposal to Canvass Attitudes to and Pastoral Experiences of Abortion

B3.1 Anecdotal evidence shows that there are many, varied views on abortion across The Methodist Church. As this is also a very sensitive issue, this makes the process of canvassing attitudes on abortion a difficult process. Therefore, extra attention needs to be given to the process employed so as to ensure that the results of any research are not distorted by any concerted efforts to affect disproportionately its outcome.

B3.2 This work is designed to build on the experience of the research into attitudes towards the 1993 Resolutions on Human Sexuality which reported to Methodist Conference in 2008. It is not suggested that the same methodology is employed for this piece of research, although lessons can be learnt from previous work that has been carried out to ensure views across the Connexion are appropriately canvassed.

B3.3 Such an approach, asking for tightly defined contributions, would include:

- General invitation for contributions published in the Methodist Recorder;
- Links to contribute from the Methodist Church website;
- Direct approaches to Presbyters and Deacons through their quarterly mailings;
- Direct approaches to stakeholder groups, including the Faith and Order Committee.

Responses to any invitation to contribute to this consultation need to be closely and professionally monitored so as to ensure that they are a true and fair representation of opinions held across the Methodist Church. Special care should also be taken to ensure that groups that are often overlooked or unheard in such a consultation process are also able to contribute.

The use to which this data is ultimately put will depend on the results of the mapping exercise.

B4. Proposal to Develop Pastoral Resources

B4.1 The Methodist Church can support both those seeking advice and those in a position to offer advice by producing useful pastoral resources on the topic of abortion. Work is needed in this area to establish what ministers need to help them in this role and what kind of support Methodists are seeking from the Church. This will involve:

- Desk research investigating advice and resources offered by other organisations (primarily religious but also appropriate secular organisations);
- Consulting experts offering professional advice in this area to benefit from the best knowledge available on the issue;
- Focus groups to discuss pastoral experiences surrounding abortion issues;
- Sharing stories through regular communications with ministers, chaplains and others;
- Consultations with the Faith and Order Committee.

B4.2 Asking individuals to talk about their own personal experiences on the issue of abortion in the more public occasion of a focus group would be inappropriate in a large number of cases. In many circumstances, such work would also contravene the best practice guidelines for research recommended by the Methodist Council. Focus groups can, however, prove to be very useful in initiating debate on a variety of issues around professional experiences of those offering pastoral support.

B4.3 The research conducted in this area will be used to develop recommendations for further work to be done by the Methodist Church in resourcing proper pastoral care of those affected by abortion and support for those offering that care. These findings, and stories heard in this process, will help to shape a useful resource created specifically to address these pastoral issues.

B5. Oversight and Skills

B5.1 A small resource group would be appointed to oversee this work. However, to ensure that the methodology is appropriate and that the responses received are as valid and legitimate as possible and their analysis as complete and useful as possible professional researchers will be required to undertake the work.

B6. Resources required

B6.1 These are described in the tables below.

B6.2 The total figures are 475 hours of volunteer's time and 825 hours of Connexional Team time.

B6.3 These estimates are based on previous research projects undertaken by the Methodist Church. As this is a relatively novel approach and the latitude the Working Group needs is considerable in order to enable it to respond to identified needs the estimates are liable to change.

Table B1: Work Required from Resource Group

Action	Individuals	Time needed	Volunteer Hours	Staff Hours
Resource Group Selection and TOR	Team staff member	5 days	-	35
Resource Group Meetings	Volunteer group members (approx 5) and Team staff member	3 x 1 day meetings	100	25
Servicing Resource group	CT staff member	7 days		50
Write up Resource Group Report and Research Plan	Working Group Chair	~1 week	35	
Editing	CT staff member and Working Group Chair	1 hr a day for ~1 week	10	10
Governance reports & attendance	CT staff member and Working Group Chair	3 days	20	20
Drafting any pastoral resources required	CT staff member and Working Group	~2 weeks	70	70
Editing pastoral resources	Editor/writers	~2 weeks	-	70
Reviewing report and resources	Working Group and CT staff member	~1 week	50	10
		Subtotals	285	290

Table B1: Estimate of time used by volunteers and Connexional Team staff to direct research work into Abortion and how it impacts upon the Methodist Church, and to draft resources to meet the identified needs.

Table B2: Research into the Abortion and its impacts on the Methodist Church

Action	Individuals	Time needed	Volunteer Hours	Staff Hours
Desk research of pastoral resources on abortion	Employed research assistant	1 week	-	35
Individual Interviews	Volunteers Assisted by Research Staff	~20	50	20
Design Focus Groups	Research Officers x 2	1 week	-	70
Focus Groups	Research Officers x 2 and Focus Group participants (approx 10)	2 days	140	20
Transcription services	Purchased externally	15	-	15
Analyse data from Focus Groups	Research Officers x 2	2 days	-	30
Design Online Questionnaire and Consultation	Research Officers x 2	1 day	-	15
Ongoing web support for online questionnaire	Internet support team	2 hrs per week for 4 months	-	35
Ongoing research support for online questionnaire	Research Officers x 2	2 hrs per week for 4 months	-	30
Analyse data from online questionnaire	Research Officers x 2	3 days	-	40
Research Report	Research Officers x 2	2 days	-	30
Contribute to redraft for final Council report	Research Officers x 2	1 day	-	15
Project Management	CT staff member	2 hrs per week for ~1 year	-	100
Policy Input	CT staff member	1 day per month for ~1 year	-	80
		Subtotals	190	535

Table B2: Estimate of time used by volunteers and Connexional Team staff to undertake a programme of research into Abortion and its impacts on the Methodist Church under the direction of the Resources Working Group.

Table B3: Estimated Costs, after staff and volunteer time, of process to produce pastoral resource.

Item	Cost	Notes
Working Party		
Working Party 1-day meetings	£1,800	(assume half need o/n accommodation)
	£1800	Sub-Total
Chair/Individuals of Working Party		
Write / editing up	£100	
Governance	£180	
Interviews	£300	
Working Party resource editing	£300	
	£880	Sub-Total
Connexional Team		
1 day meetings	£200	(1 meeting at MCH)
Governance	£180	
Focus Groups (x6)	£1,800	
Interviews	£360	
Governance (final)	£180	
Contract researcher	£700	(1 week @ £20 per hour)
	£3,420	Sub-Total
Publication Costs	£2,000	This figure is based on similar project (Peacemaking a Christian Vocation), but may vary greatly depending on research.
	£8,100	Total estimate

B6.4: The major cost to the Connexional Team would be staff time. Other cash costs in the production of a final statement, relating to the servicing of a working party and the publication of a consultation document are itemised in Table B3. The estimates are subject to change in response to the research project. The figure given for publication costs is based on an earlier resource produced by the Joint Public Issues Team (Peacemaking a Christian Vocation), but the working party would be encouraged to think innovatively as to how to present the resource. This may involve much cheaper electronic methods or they may justify higher costs than set out above using other methods.