

Evaluation of the Church Planting Group, NAMB, December 2000

An evaluation questionnaire was emailed to the 48 people listed on the State Convention Directors of Mission (SDOMs) contact list on November 15, 2000. A second questionnaire along with a reminder note was emailed on November 28. As a result of these two mailings, 25 questions were completed and returned for an approximate response rate of 52 percent.¹

Partnership

The questionnaire asked how effectively the Church Planting Group, NAMB is partnering with state conventions. Eighty-four percent indicated that the Church Planting Group is effectively partnering. These specific respondents were about evenly divided between a “completely effective” rating and a “somewhat effective” rating. There were a few undecided respondents regarding the effectiveness of the Church Planting Group, but, only one person who rated the group as ineffective. The ratings for partnership effectiveness are included in the table below along with the ratings for last year.

*Overall, how effective is the Church Planting Group, NAMB
in partnering with state conventions?*

	2000	1999
Completely effective	44.0%	26.7% ²
Somewhat effective	40.0	53.3
Neutral (undecided)	12.0	3.3
Somewhat ineffective	4.0	10.0
Very Ineffective	0.0	0.0
No response	0.0	6.7

There is an improvement in the effectiveness ratings in regard to partnership during 2000 as evidenced by an increase in the “completely effective” rating and a decrease in the “somewhat ineffective” rating.

SDOMs were asked if the partnership relationship between NAMB and state conventions improved during the year. The majority, 6 of 10, responded that the relationship improved while the remainder indicated it had remained the same. No

¹ An exact determination cannot be made because in a few instances the person listed on the DOM list forwarded the questionnaire to other persons who relate closely to the Church Planting Group. Thus, it can not be easily determined how many people actually received the questionnaire. Furthermore, it appears that in one or more instances more than one questionnaire was completed and returned from a state convention.

² The data for 1999 is based on 30 responses and a response rate of 68 percent.

one indicated the relationship worsened. Evidence from both the first two questions indicate that the partnership relationship is perceived by SDOMs as improving during the past year.

A third question explored the partnership relationship by asking respondents if they feel they have opportunity to provide input into national church planting strategies, such as Lay Church Planting, Basic Training, and the Key Church Strategy. Nearly 7 of 10 (68%) indicated they did have opportunity to affect national strategy. In contrast, 28 percent indicated they did not have such opportunity. Those who did not feel they had ample opportunity to affect strategy were asked how the Church Planting Group, NAMB could better incorporate state conventions into its development. There were seven people who responded to this question. Most of them mentioned that state conventions need more opportunity for input and they need more opportunity before strategy is initiated rather than afterward. There needs to be two-way communication. Specifically, a couple of respondents mentioned that meetings usually involved us “telling” them something rather than listening to what they have to say. Respondents want to be full partners in developing national strategy. Detailed responses are in the appendix.

SDOMs were asked to provide specific examples of where the Church Planting Group, NAMB is effectively partnering with state conventions. Twenty-two people provided examples for this section of the questionnaire. Well over half mentioned training. The training cited most frequently was Basic Training (by more than half of respondents to this question) followed by Mentor Training. Communication was also cited as an example of effectively partnering. Some referred to this as a dialogue indicating that they perceive it as two-way communication. Relationships and friendships with some of the Church Planting Group personnel were cited. Specifically, several people were referenced and appreciation was expressed for them. Also mentioned was NAMB’s recognition and funding of state developed strategies for church planting. Verbatim responses are included in the appendix.

On the other hand, respondents were asked to provide examples of where the Church Planting Group needs to improve its working relationship with state conventions. Fifteen people provided response; however, responses were difficult to categorize. One of the repetitive themes (not cited frequently) is that some in the Church Planting Group do not respond in a timely fashion. A second is that states need to be involved in dialogue before implementation of something rather than after the fact. Another theme repeated a couple of times is that there needs to be a way of involving associations in church planting. Detailed responses are in the appendix.

A final question pertaining to partnership inquired if the relationship between the Evangelization and the Church Planting Groups at NAMB encourages partnership between evangelism and church planting in state conventions. The responses to this question are listed as follows:

Is the partnership between the Evangelization and Church Planting Groups at NAMB (i.e., coordinated strategy, summer and winter leadership meetings) encouraging the partnership (or integration) of evangelism and church planting in state conventions and associations as they assist local churches?

Yes, to a large degree	8.0%
Yes, somewhat	52.0
No	24.0
Don't know	12.0
No response	4.0

Six out of 10 SDOMs indicated it is having a positive effect; however, the relationship does not appear very strong. Only two respondents indicated the partnership at NAMB is having a major effect on the partnership between these two areas in their states. (Interestingly, State Convention Directors of Evangelism perceive that the NAMB partnership is having a much greater impact on their states when asked a similar question on the evaluation instrument for the Evangelization Group.)

Communication

SDOMs were asked if the weekly newsletter, *Planter Update*, is a helpful source of information. All 25 respondents indicated it helpful. About a third responded that it is a "very helpful" publication while two-thirds indicated "somewhat helpful." A follow-up encouraged respondents to suggest changes for the newsletter. Only 4 people responded, all with dissimilar suggestions and all included in the appendix.

Respondents were also asked to evaluate *Church Planting and Evangelism Today*. The specific question and response are included in the table below.

How effective is the publication Church Planting and Evangelism Today in raising awareness of church planting models and strategies among Southern Baptist pastors?

Very effective	16.0%
Somewhat effective	40.0
Neutral (undecided)	44.0
Somewhat ineffective	0.0
Very ineffective	0.0
No response	0.0

No one evaluated the publication negatively. However, the ratings for it were not particularly strong. Fifty-six percent rated *Church Planting and Evangelism Today* "effective," but the bulk of these respondents said it was only "somewhat effective." There are also a sizeable number of SDOMs who are neutral or undecided about the effectiveness of this publication in communicating to pastors.

(SDOMs rated *Church Planting and Evangelism Today* a little higher than did SDOEs in the Evangelization Group evaluation. Still, the response was similar.)

Only three people provided response in the call for suggestions to improve this publication. Responses are included in the appendix.

SDOMs were offered the opportunity to provide suggestions for improving Church Planting Group communications (other than *Planter Update*, *Church Planting and Evangelism Today*, and the NAMB Church Planting Web pages.) Five different suggestions were tendered. All are included in the appendix.

Vision

The vision of the Church Planting Group, NAMB is to work in partnership with state conventions to assist associations and churches to increase the number of SBC congregations to 100,000 by 2020 through planting healthy, reproducing churches with evangelistic passion.

With the vision statement provided as reference, SDOMs were asked to evaluate how well the Church Planting Group is doing in promoting awareness of church planting. The precise wording for this question and response to it are as follows:

How well is the Church Planting Group, NAMB doing in partnership with state conventions to assist associations in creating an increasing awareness in churches for church planting?

Extremely well	8.0%
Somewhat well	40.0
Neutral (I'm undecided)	28.0
Not very well	16.0
Not at all well	8.0
No response	0.0

Slightly less than half indicated the Church Planting Group is doing well in this area and most of this response was tepid, i.e., only 2 respondents indicated the group is doing extremely well. In contrast, a fourth of SDOMs indicated the group is not doing well.

A variation of this question inquired about how well NAMB is doing in getting churches involved in church planting movements in North America. The response is very similar as evidenced in the table below. Responses to both this and the previous question indicate there is room for improvement in the Church Planting Group's effort. Evidence from the question which follows suggests that this results from a "disconnect" in partnering with associations.

How well is the Church Planting Group, NAMB doing in partnership with state conventions and associations in getting churches involved in church planting movements in North America?

Extremely well	4.0%
Somewhat well	52.0
Neutral (I'm undecided)	20.0
Not very well	16.0
Not at all well	8.0
No response	0.0

The final question of this section of the evaluation solicited comments regarding the vision statement set forth by the Church Planting Group. Thirteen people responded and verbatim comments are included in the appendix. The major recurring observation is that associational DOMs are not included in the strategy process. As stated by one respondent, "The Church Planting Group can work in partnership with associations only to the extent that NAMB values, affirms, and resources associations in the new millennium. Concern continues to be expressed by DOMs regarding their perception of the de-emphasizing of associationalism at NAMB and the propensity on the part of the agency to deal directly with churches without going through the historic channels of partnership." Otherwise, there were repeated words of endorsement for the vision statement but little else in recurring themes.

Resources

SDOMs were asked to rate five resources produced by the Church Planters Group. Responses are included below.

Please rate the five following resources provided by the Church Planting Group, NAMB.

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Response
Basic Training	56.0%	36.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Basic Training II Manual	24.0	36.0	4.0	0.0	36.0
Church Planter Management System	52.0	44.0	4.0	0.0	0.0
Mentor Manual	36.0	48.0	8.0	0.0	8.0
7 Steps to Plant a Church Manual (draft)	32.0	32.0	8.0	0.0	28.0

All five of the materials are highly regarded. Still, Basic Training and the Church Planter Management System are in a class by themselves—92 percent and 96 percent of respondents respectively evaluated these resources as "good" or "excellent."

Respondents were also asked to evaluate four resources/strategies that are still in the development stage. Responses are included in the table below.

The following are under development, but the basic concepts have been shared with state mission directors. Please share your initial reactions to each as to potential for church planting.

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Response
Rural Church Planting Strategies	28.0%	44.0%	4.0%	4.0%	20.0%
Light up the Nation	24.0	48.0	16.0	4.0	8.0
Multiplying Church Network	28.0	48.0	16.0	0.0	8.0
Virtual Church Planting Village	20.0	52.0	12.0	0.0	16.0

At least 7 of 10 SDOMs consider these pilot projects to be good or excellent concepts. Some seem to be reserving judgement or are a little skeptical. Still the evidence indicates that you should proceed with these plans. Possibly these reservations can be overcome when the resources/strategies are fully implemented.

SDOMs were requested to provide suggestions for improving existing resources as well as to suggest new resources. Most of the suggestions forthcoming are unique with no recurring themes and are included in the appendix.

Additional Comments

Persons completing the survey were given a final opportunity to provide comments about the work of the Church Planting Group. Eleven people responded to this question and their remarks are included on the last page of the appendix. The majority of respondents to this portion of the questionnaire expressed appreciation for Richard Harris and his team. This is the only recurring theme.

Appendix

Open-ended Questions
Church Planting Group
Evaluation Questionnaire, 2000

In what ways can the Church Planting Group better incorporate state conventions into development of national strategy?

Include the state convention prior to major program development not after the fact.

Give us the opportunity to have significant input. Most of our meetings represent a “telling session”, rather than an “asking forum”.

Listen and give opportunity for input. I do feel that a step was made with the development of the metropolitan group. It remains to be seen if the overtures to hear from the states will truly affect the strategies. Further, it remains to be seen if this listening and development will bring an institutional pattern or whether it is merely tactical at this time. Care should be taken to continue finding staff who have dealt in the states with the issues of Church Starting effectively.

If related to “National Strategies” as a whole, we have had some opportunity for input on the programs mentioned. Work with the states in the early planning stages of all events that will be in their state, making sure that these events or church planting efforts are consistent with their strategies. This is still not the apparent philosophy in many instances. It continues to foster a we/they atmosphere in too many instances. No national strategy can be effective that does not include the states where the work will be done, from the beginning to end. The “nation” is the states – we sound like they are two different things.

Ask the field missionaries. Don’t think and plan for field missionaries.

Since I am new to this position I really have no basis upon which to compare the presence or absence of opportunity in relationship to the past. However, I affirm every attempt to be inclusive in planning with partners and am disappointed anytime we are presented with decisions greatly impacting our partnership in which we have had little or no input.

Assign someone to be my representative liaison person to work with me to improve NAMB resources and NAMB’s impact in Indiana. I feel lonely and often overwhelmed.

Please list one or two examples of where the Church Planting Group, NAMB, is effectively working in partnership with state conventions.

I am updated regularly by Rodney Webb on any and all changes that impact Florida.

The metropolitan work group is a good example. I hope that the same will be true for the rural position, though it affects me only a little.

The areas where we are funding state strategies, and working with them from the beginning, not running two separate tracks. There are many instances where we are being effective to the degree we are supporting the state strategies, but there are many instances where the state strategies are lacking, because so many resources are being funneled to “national strategies” and the resources for the state work are not increasing nearly enough to keep up with the need and potential.

Basic Training/Mentor Training resources and funding for new church starts.

Being open for comments and suggestions. Being willing to come to South Carolina Baptist Convention to assist us in strategy planning.

Great to work with Basic Training and CPMS training events. Always helpful on the telephone.

Communication, Nehemiah Project, Church Planter/Strategists missionaries, Basic Training, development of rural strategy and rural missionary position.

You request our input into strategy and strategy development. You have become willing to give away needed tools such as Basic Training and BT2. There is comradeship between NAMB personnel and our staff to the point that we feel that you genuinely care about us and our needs.

All training requests have been responded to in an excellent fashion.

Funding process.

Mentor, Basic Training and Nehemiah Project.

Making states responsible for basic and mentor training.

Basic Training, Mentor Training, funding processes and evaluation of potential mission pastors. Strategy planning with state staff, provision of faithful friendships.

To be honest with you we are still in our development stage and I have not requested any assistance from you. This will change as of January 1, 2001 since I will have an associate in Church Planting on board and things will drastically change. Please have patience with me. His name is Robby Partain.

Mentor, Basic Training - Gerald Colbert. David Putnam - Nehemiah.

In the Nehemiah projects, and in training events for training Church Planters.

Nehemiah Project and the willing for Vice-President Harris to “listen” to SDOMs.

The team has helped in the resourcing and assisting with our Church Planting System – i.e. Basic Training, Mentor training, and Assessor Training. They have been open to dialogue about special projects.

Develop vision to reach America together. NAMB shares national strategy and state shares state strategy. Always room for dialogue. Mentoring Training and Basic Training.

Visits by team leader to our state convention. Positive attitude toward state cooperation.

By providing training events that equip state leaders and church planters. By providing practical helpful resources.

I appreciated Richard Harris' personal visit some months ago. Basic Training has been wonderful for us. Gerald is a prince; deeply committed and passionate about his presentation. I have seen Richard grow dramatically in his skills with SDOMs and state staff. Way to go, Richard!

Please list one or two examples of where the Church Planting Group, NAMB, needs to improve its working relationship with state conventions.

When major changes are anticipated in Nehemiah or planting support involve states in dialogue before implementation, not after the fact. Respond in a more timely fashion. I am still waiting for a response on Graham crusade funding for the Jacksonville crusade and the crusade is over. No response, no information, no support.

Church Planting Group needs to define what "mission" means, as does NAMB. I do see it trying to define what Church Planting is. I commend this effort.

First let me say that I do believe that there has been vast improvement in the relationship in some areas, and I am grateful for the "listening" and effort on NAMB's part; however, I sense we still have a lot of work to do in some areas. In addition to the things mentioned above, work on an attitude of service that does not give the appearance that we will put pressure on the states until they agree to go with NAMB's agenda, and then, act like we are all in agreement. It is like saying "if you play by my rules we can have game, but if not, you will come around, and then we will play".

Some staff are long on returning calls – this is minor. Simplistic ways to understanding funding matters with state conventions – this is big!

Continue to do the things you are presently doing, especially getting input from the states for major changes in programming.

Try as best you can to infect the other divisions with your same attitude. The CP Group suffers due to a bad attitude emanating from the whole. There is still the perception of a top down dictator mindset. This is not true for the CP Group, but you are labeled by some due to this problem (not LBC).

On rare occasions CPG personnel have arranged and conducted visits and business in California without informing or coordinating with CSBC counterparts. Best to work together.

Funding of Nehemiah Project interns, urban/mega city church planting, church planting to the upper class.

Need more lead time to give input. New work directors need to be involved in winter meeting. New work strategists need to be included in summer meeting.

They need more support and more prayer from those of us who work with them.

I have none at this time.

Assign someone to be my friend, my buddy to help me develop my state in church planting. I have many acquaintances but no friend. I met with Dennis Mitchell's team, shared my heart, sent my tasks – but no response to date. There is no clear integration of evangelism and church planting. There must be a way to have a total strategy. Evangelism here is not connecting to church planting.

At the moment I have no difficulties. The team has been quick to respond to any concerns as they arrive. So all my issues were addressed.

Continue to realize every "layer" of denomination life is on the same level. No "top," no "bottom" positions. All exist to serve the local church in accomplishing their vision of the Great Commission.

Added dollars in national ministry budget. Comprehensive strategy for church planting (cities, towns, country). Refocus on Nehemiah Project. More emphasis on lay mobilization/network with missionary mobilization.

Plan events involving DOMs to help them be informed and “on board” with C.P. Help DOMs know how to encourage C.P. and become area strategists.

If there were a way to “touch” associational gate keepers (re: planting) it would help us SO MUCH!

Please provide any suggested changes for Planter Update.

You might make the Update less frequent, every two weeks or monthly. Further, you might handle themes like varied issues in the ministry, periodically. Promotion is good, but not necessary all the time.

I am not sure of a better way to communicate. Perhaps voice mail or phone call followed by a memo of the conversation.

Besides dates and note from Richard, useful resource tips for church planters would be helpful (6 ways to develop a core group, how to find a worship leader, resources for sermon illustrations, etc.)

Excellent as is.

It is one link to Church Planting. Need some professional development section, listing good solid books on church planting. Tell what key articles in *Church Planting and Evangelism Today* may be helpful. Too much comes across my desk to read everything.

Keep them short and to the point!

Please provide any suggested changes for Church Planting and Evangelism Today.

More information about what is working and where. Less material that comes across as denominational/promotional.

No one has ever explained this to me or why I should read it amidst all my stacks of mail.

Believe it or not, I don't recall having seen the publication.

Other than Planter Update, Church Growth and Evangelism Today, and the NAMB Church Planting web page, do you have other suggestions on how the Church Planting Group can improve communications?

I would suggest a Church Planting/Evangelism presence at State Evangelism conferences. Make a booth, materials, and a person available to State Evangelism Directors at their request for their State Evangelism conferences.

You are doing an excellent job.

Stop advertising projects which are not in place already for the public, e.g. Church Multiplication Network was not ready when I gave a DOM name. Also Village was not ready when pin numbers were sent out. We can decrease frustration.

A forum for the missionaries to interact with lay people and church leaders meeting in the same place. Telling person to person is still a very important part of the Christian mission.

State visits to get to know us.

A regular mailing to associations seems a good idea, even a video each month or quarterly, which could strike a chord with leaders.

Please provide any comments you have concerning the Church Planting Group's Vision.

To some degree, the end point of the vision statement is the crux. What is healthy and what is evangelistic per definition. Southern culture, northern culture, African-American culture and ethnic cultures all answer those questions differently. Southern Baptists have demonstrated over the past decades an inability to produce healthy and evangelistic churches in many cases. Why?

As it is stated above, I do not have any problem with the Church Planting Group Vision Statement. My concern is that we are not working according to it in relationship to the "partnership with the states," at least not nearly so well as we can.

Church Planting is a cooperation between NAMB, state convention, and local associations.

Associational DOMs still feel that they are not being included, listened to nor a part of the strategy process. Several DOMs in Kentucky feel that NAMB and KBC at times will do whatever they plan without input, and even in spite of input, from the associations. There is a perception that associational church planting strategies (where they exist) are ignored and bypassed by NAMB, and this perception sometimes includes the KBC. My feeling is that there must be an intentional forum designed to communicate with the DOMs the heartbeat and strategy of the NAMB Church Planting Group, and the KBC/NAMB Church Planting leaders must listen to the concerns, perceptions, dreams and ideas of the DOMs. (The NAMB "Think Tank" with SDOMs and ADOMs is a great start. Absent from this group are rural ADOMs. Thanks for providing this opportunity.)

The vision is clear and well stated.

Need more materials in the languages of the people groups we need to reach, i.e. Spanish, Korean, Chinese, Arabic and Vietnamese.

How to fund and supply church planters for 100,000?

The Church Planting Group can work in partnership with associations only to the extent that NAMB values, affirms, and resources associations in the new millennium. Concern continues to be expressed by DOMs regarding their perception of the de-emphasizing of associationalism at NAMB and the propensity on the part of the agency to deal directly with churches without going through the historic channels of partnership. My perception is that the CPG is doing the best it can operating within the overall philosophy of the entity.

Robert Logan in *Beyond Church Growth* says vision is based on "awareness" of need and what God wants us to do to meet the needs. We do not have dependable psychographics reason material or vital information to set the vision.

The vision is doing well. The implementation at the associational level is weak. We need to involve the associational missionaries in the larger body of mission leadership. They are key ministers in implementing any church planting strategy. They are engaged at the state level. But the national forum is missing.

Don't think it's NAMB's responsibility to create awareness in associations. I don't think many churches will be directly influenced by NAMB to plant churches.

Provide state leaders with training on working with DOM's and churches to create a climate for church planting.

I personally cannot see any difference that the Church Planting Group is doing in partnership with state conventions to assist associations in creating an increasing awareness in churches for church planting. I hope I am wrong! Nehemiah direct contact with students and larger churches seems to be motivating some

growth. A portion of our constituency no longer adheres to increasing “denominational” churches. Please help them plant churches to grow the kingdom.

Please provide any suggestions for improving existing resources.

I am sorry to say I don't know all I need to know about these.

Make all of the resources available to the states in an electronic format so that we can add state logo and other information, and then print as needed. We need to have the ability to customize the materials.

Definitions of terms: e.g. mission, church. Steps in church planting: legal, spiritual, organizational, financial.

Keep the focus on the field. We are a denominational entity with a vision that we believe to be of God. If we remember to follow that vision to the point of need surely God will bless.

I need copies of LUN if I am going to promote this in my state. I understood there was to be a mailing all over our states to push our 2001-2005 thrust. I have made a state presentation – but where are the resources? Am I on the mailing list?

Don't forget the personal touch on visiting the field to get to know our state/people/vision/resources.

Richard, we really need to revisit the college and Bible school Nehemiah question. Seminary Nehemiah will get only 25-30% of our needs. Okay?

What new resources should the Church Planting Group provide?

Research and development has not been looked at. For the state with a strong planting staff and mission team R&D is not usually an option in terms of a staff position. I see this as a major element in a NAMB strategy.

A Church Planter's Packet – contain material from NAMB on financial issues like in Basic Training, Annuity Board info, Lifeway – how to get started with ordering literature, etc.

It may be helpful to develop a brochure or information piece that will assist local churches to intentionally put church planting/missions, in their budgets. This could be a piece related to stewardship or budget Planning that the local missions council/committee, finance committee, pastor, or layman could use to follow in developing a specific plan for church planting. Some churches are dedicating 5% or more of their budget specifically to starting new work. I would relate this to the vision of starting a lay church planting movement, involvement of volunteers, etc. I would specifically target laymen with this piece, especially deacons, and leaders in local congregations that have a heart for evangelism and missions. The piece should be simple, short, focused, but contain information about “How Your Church can Start a Church Planting Movement” or something similar that would outline the steps a church can follow to make church planting/evangelism a priority. Basically, if the churches do not put it in their budget, they are not going to do very much. This is just a suggestion. There may be other ways to do this, but the idea is to put something in the hands of local church leaders to assist the church in developing an intentional church planting strategy that impacts budget.

Focus piece on leadership multiplication in a mission setting. This could directly relate to a lay church planting movement.

Video training components for all existing training courses.

More language material.

Immigration assistance for multi-language church planters.

Until I get the basics – “blocking and tackling” down pat we don't need anything else new. Send Henry Blackaby down again.

Continuing skills development for planters beyond the birth process.

Please provide any additional comments or suggestions you might have regarding the work of the Church Planting Group, NAMB.

My comments above may seem very negative, and in some instances they are, but the attitude with which they are given are more a plea for continued work in these areas, rather than just criticism. I do appreciate the progress that has been made. Also the Church Planting personnel themselves seem to be working hard to help us, both in understanding, and in practical ways. It is much appreciated. There should probably be a distinction drawn between Church Planting and NAMB as a whole, I could rate higher on the former than the latter.

Please continue the excellent work you are doing.

The Church Planting Group continues to be the positive side of the relationship our state has with NAMB. Somehow the other divisions need to understand what you are doing in building a team network with the states, seeking input and building relationships. If this does not happen, NAMB is at risk.

It is very evident that you are working very hard to provide the state conventions and churches excellent materials for training. Keep up the good work.

In response to question D (Is the partnership between the Evangelization and Church Planting Groups at NAMB...encouraging partnership...), I'm unsure about this concern. I benefited from separate meetings because the combined meeting makes it difficult for me to "divide myself" between all the areas that relate to my work. Still, I do appreciate the intent/motivation that generated the joint meeting. (I also regret the fact that Arkansas commitments have kept me away from two of our meetings. Asi es la vida!)

I sincerely thank God for Richard Harris and his wonderful crew of leaders. Secretaries, consultants, strategists, the entire crew, has blessed my life and the extension of God's Kingdom.

It is really unfair for me to give an opinion on all that you are doing in Church Planting since I have not really done much with you yet! We will have a better feel for things next year.

Douglas Beggs has been my lifeline. He is great. However, I need a personal contact person for Indiana from the Church Planting Group. Also need a 1-800 telephone number so we can call from all over our state for help. Where is all the "Light up the Nation" materials to be mailed to our state by September – October 2000 to promote church starting in 2001? I am puzzled. Very little response is coming from our local churches across the board on church starting based on a recent DOM report. You sense a lot of loneliness and frustration above. I thought I would have someone who would help me as a new SDOM. I asked, presented my case but have no answer. What can I do to be your partner?

Church Planting staff is cooperative in assisting us in helping us fulfill our church planting assignment. Communication is developing between CP group and state conventions (i.e. listening as well as selling products). In Arizona we have for the past 15 years had a significant partnership between Church Planting and Evangelism. We are a team.

All the people in the C.P. Group have been very helpful to me and our state convention. They have a passion for what they do!

Overall, Richard, you all are doing well. I appreciate your re-definition of your role perception over the past several years!

Please provide any suggestions for improving existing resources.

I am sorry to say I don't know all I need to know about these.

Make all of the resources available to the states in an electronic format so that we can add state logo and other information, and then print as needed. We need to have the ability to customize the materials.

Definitions of terms: e.g. mission, church. Steps in church planting: legal, spiritual, organizational, financial.

Keep the focus on the field. We are a denominational entity with a vision that we believe to be of God. If we remember to follow that visit to the point of need surely God will bless.

I need copies of Light up the Nation if I am going to promote this in my state. I understood there was to be a mailing all over our states to push our 2001-2005 thrust. I have made a state presentation – but where are the resources? Am I on the mailing list?

Don't forget the personal touch on visiting the field to get to know our state/people/vision/resources.

Richard, we really need to revisit the college and Bible school Nehemiah question. Seminary Nehemiah will get only 25-30% of our needs. Okay?