

**Evaluation of the Church Planting Group, NAMB,  
December 2001**

An evaluation questionnaire was emailed on November 19<sup>th</sup> to 42 people in state conventions that relate to the Church Planting Group at NAMB. These people are state directors of missions (SDOMs) or persons in equivalent positions. (For this study all respondents will be referred to as SDOMs.) A second questionnaire, along with a reminder note, was emailed to non-respondents on December 6<sup>th</sup>. As a result of these two mailings, 22 questionnaires were completed and returned for an approximate response rate of 52 percent.<sup>1</sup>

**Partnership/Strategy**

The questionnaire asked how effectively the Church Planting Group, NAMB, is partnering with state conventions. Most respondents, 90.9 percent, indicated that the Church Planting Group is effectively partnering. No one indicated that the Church Planting group was ineffective, but a couple of people were neutral on this issue. The rating for partnership effectiveness is included in the table below along with the ratings for the past couple of years. There was slight improvement in the effectiveness rating in 2001 over the 2000 rating, which in turn was significantly improved over the 1999 rating.

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

	2001	2000	1999
Completely effective	40.9%	44.0% <sup>2</sup>	26.7% <sup>3</sup>
Somewhat effective	50.0	40.0	53.3
Neutral (undecided)	9.1	12.0	3.3
Somewhat ineffective	0.0	4.0	10.0
Very Ineffective	0.0	0.0	0.0
No response	0.0	0.0	6.7

SDOMs were asked if the partnership relationship between NAMB and state conventions improved during the year. The majority, 6 of 10 (63.6%), responded that the relationship improved while the remainder indicated it stayed the same. No one indicated the relationship worsened.

SDOMs were asked to evaluate the Church Planting Group strategy document that was distributed at the State Leadership Meeting earlier in the year. Specifically, they were asked to evaluate its content and strategic direction. The overwhelming majority (77.3%) rated it good, while 13.6 percent rated it excellent. No one rated it fair or poor. (Two people did not answer this question.)

The questionnaire pointed out that during the year that the Church Planting Group had added two national missionaries with assignments for Town & Country and multihousing. Also, existing staff were reassigned to give attention to lay church planting. SDOMs were asked to evaluate the strategic importance of these new assignments. All three were rated as strategically important. Three-fourths of

---

<sup>1</sup> An exact determination cannot be made because in a few instances the person surveyed forwarded the questionnaire to other persons who relate closely to the Church Planting Group. Thus, it cannot be easily determined how many people actually received the questionnaire. Furthermore, in one or more instances more than one questionnaire was completed and returned from a state convention.

<sup>2</sup> The data for 2000 is based on 25 respondents and a response rate of 52 percent.

<sup>3</sup> The data for 1999 is based on 30 respondents and a response rate of 68 percent.

respondents indicated the multihousing and lay church planting assignments were very important. Half indicated the Town & Country assignment was very important. No one indicated these assignments were unimportant. The ratings for each assignment are as follows:

*During recent months, the Church Planting Group added two national missionaries for church Planting (Town & Country and Multihousing), and specifically assigned staff to give priority attention to lay church planting. Please evaluate the strategic importance of these personnel additions and strategy to address the church planting challenges in North America.*

	Town & Country	Multihousing	Lay Church Planting
Very Important	50.0%	77.3%	77.3%
Somewhat Important	40.9	13.6	18.2
Neutral	9.1	9.1	4.6
Somewhat Unimportant	0.0	0.0	0.0
Not at all Important	0.0	0.0	0.0
No response	0.0	0.0	0.0

SDOMs were asked to provide specific examples of where the Church Planting Group, NAMB, is effectively partnering with state conventions. Nineteen people provided examples for this section of the questionnaire. As in last year’s evaluation survey, well over half mentioned training. The training cited most frequently was Basic Training, but was closely followed by Mentor Training. Other areas such as CPMS were mentioned multiple times. A complete list of verbatim responses is 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. Seventeen people provided response; however, responses were difficult to categorize because themes did not reoccur frequently. Thus, the detailed responses are left to 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:

*Did the partnership between the Evangelization and Church Planting Groups at NAMB hosting the State Leadership Meeting (i.e., Summer Leadership Meeting on Multiculturalism) encourage the partnership (or integration) of evangelism and church planting in state conventions and associations as they assist local churches?*

Yes, to a large degree	9.1%
Yes, somewhat	59.1
No	13.6
Don’t know	18.2
No response	0.0

Two-thirds of 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. These ratings are very similar to those given in 2000 for an identical question.

**Communication**

SDOMs were asked if the weekly newsletter, *Planter Update*, is a helpful source of information. Most respondents indicated that it is helpful—no one indicated that it is not helpful. (There were a couple of non-responses to this question.) About a third responded that it is a “very helpful” publication while two-

thirds indicated “somewhat helpful.” These are almost identical responses to the same question that was asked in the 2000 evaluation. 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 and evangelism models or strategies among Southern Baptist pastors?*

Very effective	13.6%
Somewhat effective	54.6
Neutral (undecided)	22.7
Somewhat ineffective	4.6
Very ineffective	0.0
No response	4.6

Most respondents rated the publication positively; however, the ratings were not particularly strong. Still, only one respondent evaluated the publication negatively. Two-thirds rated *Church Planting and Evangelism Today* “effective,” but the bulk of these respondents said it was only “somewhat effective.” About a fifth of SDOMs are neutral or undecided about the effectiveness of this publication in communicating to pastors. Overall, the rating of this publication was a little higher in 2001 than in the 2000 evaluation.

Only one person provided a suggestion to improve this publication and it was to give attention to small churches that are involved in planting churches. Another respondent indicated the publication would be effective if pastors would read it.

SDOMs were offered the opportunity to provide suggestions for improving Church Planting Group communications (other than *Planter Update*, *Church Planting and Evangelism Today*, the Virtual Church Planting Village, and the NAMB Church Planting Web pages.) The most frequently repeated theme was the necessity for personal contacts between Church Planting staff and state convention staff. Verbatim responses 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?*

	2001	2000
Extremely well	18.2%	8.0%
Somewhat well	36.4	40.0
Neutral (I'm undecided)	22.8	28.0
Not very well	18.2	16.0
Not at all well	0.0	8.0
No response	4.6	0.0

Slightly more than half indicated the Church Planting Group is doing well in this area, but overall most of this response was tepid. As many indicated “not very well” as responded “extremely well.” Also, one in five either were undecided (or neutral) or did not respond to this question. The ratings in 2001 are very similar to those in 2000.

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. Note that the ratings for the year 2001 are very similar to those in 2000 suggesting that not much has improved in this area during the past year.

*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?*

	2001	2000
Extremely well	9.1	4.0%
Somewhat well	40.9	52.0
Neutral (I’m undecided)	27.3	20.0
Not very well	18.2	16.0
Not at all well	0.0	8.0
No response	4.6	0.0

The final question in this section of the evaluation instrument solicited comments regarding the vision statement set forth by the Church Planting Group. Ten people responded with disparate comments. Verbatim comments are included in the appendix.

**Resources**

SDOMs were asked to rate eight resources produced by the Church Planting Group. Responses are included in the table below.

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

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Response
Basic Training	59.1%	36.4%	0.0%	0.0%	4.6%
Basic Training II Manual	31.8	50.0	0.0	0.0	18.2
Church Planter Management System	72.7	13.6	4.6	0.0	9.1
Mentor Manual	40.9	36.4	4.6	0.0	18.2
7 Steps to Plant a Church Manual	36.4	54.6	4.6	0.0	4.6
Virtual Church Planting Village	40.9	31.8	0.0	0.0	27.3
Light Up the Nation	4.6	36.4	45.5	4.6	9.1
Multiplying Church Network	0.0	59.1	18.2	4.6	18.2

Out of this list of eight resources, two seem to favorably stand out. Basic Training is rated good or excellent by 95.5 percent of respondents. Likewise, the 7 Steps to Plant a Church Manual is rated good or excellent by 91.0 percent of respondents. The Church Planter Management System is close behind with 86.3 percent rating it good or excellent. It is noteworthy that the Church Planter Management System had the largest percentage of excellent ratings—almost three-fourths of respondents. In contrast to these three resources, only one resource was rated good or excellent by less than half of respondents. Slightly more than half of respondents rated Light Up the Nation as fair or poor.

The questionnaire pointed out that the Church Planting Group has formed a Language Resource Task Force to identify 10 or 12 essential resources that every church planter needs. Furthermore there is a commitment to translate these into different languages and distribute them free. SDOMs were asked to evaluate the need for these resources. Overwhelmingly, most (86.6%) indicated these resources are much needed. No one indicated they weren't needed. (Two people indicated they are somewhat needed and one person did not respond.)

SDOMs were requested to provide suggestions for improving existing resources as well as to suggest new resources. Most of the suggestions forthcoming were unique with few 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. Only five people responded to this question and their remarks are included on the last page of the appendix.

## **APPENDIX**

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

Basic Training

Nehemiah Project

Basic Training

CPMS

Assistance with assessment training for assessors. The development and deployment of Tom Cheney's work in computerizing record keeping and management concepts for new church planters.

For our state, the Mentoring team more than any other has been an invaluable resource. Ken Tan also has kept in touch wanting to know what we need.

Certifying presenters for Mentor and Basic Training, CPMS training (second step from awareness), cooperative agreement monies, NAMB resource notebook [is a] good resource, development of new tools is helpful, more access of information through the web is also very helpful.

In multi-housing with Chris and with George in Town & Country and Van in Lay Church Planting and in Basic Training.

CPMS is WONDERFUL! We are also using the Basic and Mentor training quite successfully.

Mentor/Basic Training and Nehemiah Project.

Assessment tools/training and basic training/mentoring.

1. Regular communication with state staff through updates, publications and email, 2. Consistent in responding to vmail or phone inquiries quickly, 3. Providing visionary leadership and direction for national strategy, 4. Helping state staff see the bigger picture through publications and during NAMB/state staff meetings, 5. Providing partnership funding, 6. Providing counsel to state staff when needs arise and sharing examples of what is working in other locations.

Basic Training support resources and personnel—Basic Training II is excellent and personnel support is quality.

Financial partnership and training.

Basic Training, Mentor Training

Mentoring and basic training (Van Kicklighter and Gerald Colbert have gone above and beyond the call of duty in helping the church planting system.)

The group has sought out people working in the field to provide a needed direction for new strategy, i.e. lay church planting, Nehemiah CP. When bringing state leaders together with NAMB, you have requested input for agenda building.

Basic Training/Mentor Training; Partnership; Lay Leadership Development; SFC.

Development of planter enlistment and training resources.

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

Nehemiah Project

Lay Church Planting development

Hispanic leadership people resources

more national ministry funds

Much needed development of a complementary track to Nehemiah that will assist states in deploying language, African American and Anglo church planters that do not qualify for assistance in the Nehemiah plan. Greater inclusion of state leaders prior to launch of new concepts.

I think that more coordination among the different teams and groups at NAMB. At times, we get visits from different teams that could have been handled in one visit.

MCN work.

The Personal Evangelism area of the Church Planting Basic Training needs much more work. Most men Do Not Know How to Effectively Share Christ.

National Missionaries and Multiplication Team Managers.

Language resources for church planting.

(The following is one response:)

I am very pleased with and appreciative of the relationship NAMB leadership offers for state staff. I am very thankful for the spirit and attitude of NAMB staff. I have always found them to be ready, willing and desirous to assist state staff. Thank you for your spirit of partnership.

NAMB needs to recognize and plan for the newer administrative structures of some state conventions where SDOEs and SMDs are the same person. It is impossible for one person to be in different places at the same time. During NAMB meetings, it is important to have the subordinate leaders present for vision and planning.

Please provide at least two times annually for state staff to meet with NAMB staff for sharing information, providing personal contact, planning, encouragement and inspirational motivation. NAMB needs state staff to be an extension of SBC ministries in states. Because people are relational, quality time spent together learning from each other and sharing our life tremendously exceeds any kind of printed or electronic communication. This type of training fellowship helps and encourages state staff promote NAMB work in churches. I recognize the cost of meetings is great, but over a period of time, I am concerned that the results of failing to do this may be more costly when you measure achievement. Because of the large numbers of churches in the SBC, the national organization needs the contact through local people (state convention and association staff) to help promote continued and increasing participation. If the reverse were true, secular business would eliminate thousands of sales consultants who made direct contact with customers. In addition, membership of our new church plants are reaching people groups who know little or nothing about the SBC. They will need to be educated. The logical process of orientation should be to utilize state staff to help

tell the story to local church leaders who will in turn share it with their members. People are relational beings.

Although I recognize the importance of reaching the mega metropolitan areas of the U.S., I do have concerns that new funds are being directed away from old line states and invested in areas where there is not a strong intra-structure to carry through to completion evangelization, including new work, that will be done in those areas. A limited number of new mega churches cannot reach this population. Baptist history will show that even though large SBC churches have contributed financially to our SBC mission endeavors, by in large we have been and still are a convention of small churches. A large portion of the lifeline mission support in dollars, prayer support and manpower has come from our small churches. Population growth is strong in the South too with many evangelization needs, especially with non-English speaking people groups. It becomes increasingly more challenging for our state conventions to receive new NAMB dollars to reach and develop these lost residents. It will take a long time to shift the heart of SBC financial mission support to newly evangelized people in the metropolitan areas and during this time momentum is being lost. Because many people from the Northwest and other countries have migrated to the South, it is imperative that we provide resources to promote a positive SBC image, launch new churches and communicate the Gospel in ways for a 21<sup>st</sup> century culture living in the South to be reached. A study of history will show that a majority of manpower for national and international mission involvement has come from the old-line states. We can continue to provide this in the future if we can reach and develop the population around us. We must not choose between the metro and the suburban sprawl. It's not "either or" it is a "both and" required effort. Dollars are needed in the North, Midwest, West and South just as they are needed in selected metropolitan areas. We have been taught by experience in SBC mission efforts that unless a strong intra-structure is built into an organization, that the long-term value of invested dollars is short lived. As one man said, "everything rises and falls on leadership."

Translation of materials.

[Do] not make commitments to field personnel without consulting with state. Example: They sometimes tell field personnel that there are National Ministry funds available if they can get the state leadership to ask for the money. The project may be one that the state does not buy into.

Basic Training for Church Planters and Mentoring.

Need better coordination so two meetings are not scheduled in the same state at the same time. Need a general coordinator of Crossover.

Nehemiah needs to be put back on the table after a couple years of a valiant attempt to do something significant. The plan is not working but could if it was revised. There is a need to do consensus building to create ownership prior to launching a national strategy and then to provide adequate lead time. You would be more successful. Strategic Focus Cities needs to be put into the hands of the states/local associations to determine priorities and strategy. NAMB is controlling what has become unwanted and unsuccessful.

Partnership development in recruiting medium size churches in doing team partnering in church planting.

The flagship church planting strategy has a serious flaw. Rather than the state planting team members being at the design table, state planting team members are invited to the implementation table. There is a major difference, at least for my state.

**Please provide any suggested changes for *Planter Update*:**

Change to once a month

Listing the training dates throughout the USA would be very helpful. We have adopted this idea for our state calendar.

As many product/resources notices as possible!

Give some bullets of information—make it brief.

**Please provide any suggested changes for *Church Planting and Evangelism Today*:**

Focus on small churches planting churches.

It would be very effective if the pastors would read it.

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

Timely field visits; aids in an understanding of the work. DO NOT COME WITH A PROGRAM SOLUTION.

The above are very helpful and I think on the right track, not familiar with distribution of the Church Planting and Evangelism Today publication—good piece, but is it getting the right readers?

Richard Harris needs to visit my state more often.

Personal contacts.

Some way of communicating what you see happening 1-3 years down the road—vision, products/resources, changes, etc.

Keep up the emphasis of telling the story of the missionaries in the small towns, and rural America because they have much to share and few forums to tell it.

I do not know about Update Language Supplement, if you can give me information.

Pound on MCNs.

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

The goal is probably not realistic.

Excellent vision—our state has adopted recently the theme “Healthy Leaders Influence Healthy Churches to Evangelize and Plant Churches.”

Keep hammering the message about church planting in every venue and publication you can.

Where are we going to get the Church Planters? How are we going to resource them?

I just can say, that if we are going to have all those churches, we need to start planting more. And in many conventions the idea looks like, first fix the old, weak churches and later we plant more.

I feel more emphasis needs to be given to involving the local association in NAMB's strategy. Funding and initial training of the church planters are a success, but absent is an attempt to involve the local association in a more visible way in our church planting strategy. I do not feel that we will ever have any effective strategy for reaching North America without a genuine partnership with the local association.

Be certain to avoid a program orientation, i.e. “Light up the Nation.”

Please note church planting movements are not planned and promoted, but climates are built for them to be birthed. In this sense, you have done well in areas such as the lay church planting strategy and multi-housing. If a movement is going to start, we must be willing to no longer define what it must look like. Brick buildings and steeples will not house the next church planting movement.

Stay the course.

It appears to me that NAMB has a national strategy that is something other than a summation of the strategies of the states. I would like to see a greater focus on national resourcing and a greater focus on local strategy building.

**Please provide any suggestions for improving existing resources:**

Resources should be based on the needs out on the field and not necessarily on what we think they should have.

Please insure the continuance of the CPMS tool. With the development of the tool and the foundation of training and a continuing database it would be unwise to build this only on one person.

Make a simpler version to 7 Steps while maintaining this thicker one.

You are on the right track! We need more material in Languages. We have nothing to offer language pastors in personal evangelism training. So, we are sending all our language pastors to Evangelism Explosion Leadership Clinics in their native tongue.

Expansion of the “7 Steps” booklet—Maybe a binder of resources, worksheets, directions for each step.

The text called Foundations of the Faith at LifeWay is an essential for new believers. I recommend that it be considered for translation.

Continue effort to acquaint churches with these resources.

## **What new resources should the Church Planting Group provide?**

Resources for training associational leaders in church planting. The lay materials are excellent but additional materials are needed.

Do you have a resource piece, or a conference/seminar, to help associational directors of missions in old line states in their efforts to be more effective as missions strategists? The DOMs in my state already have a heavy load in administrative and program areas, plus ongoing pastoral ministries. They want to grow in their effectiveness at leading their associations to develop specific strategies for church planting.

The CPG should be very proud of the tremendous resources you have provided for our state convention and churches.

Please address the latest accessibility for acquiring demographics through NAMB, especially Lifestyle Segmentation.

Help with sponsoring churches and enlistment and training of planters.

Translate everything into Language groups. Especially Spanish.

Help for state church planting leaders on developing a comprehensive church planting strategy for a state. Training, tools, etc.

How about palm pilots for missionaries with the Bible in several languages already dedicated in them. Just a thought. It would also be a good in-reach tool for effective evangelism. Once you buy several million, I would like to be a part of the distribution plan.

Material about evangelism and interfaith evangelism for ethnics.

Some instruments for predicting church planting potential that go beyond behavioral assessment.

The lay church planting material is in process. This will be a part of the climate building needed for a church planting movement.

Regional interactive training events.

Resources that tie the development of existing ethnic churches to that same church's ability to positively impact the growth and development of a regional church planting movement.

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

I really like the emphasis on Calling Out the Called. And the three national missionaries are assigned in areas where the water hits the wheel. The stuff at the summer meeting was excellent. A really bright change from what I had expected before I arrived. Sweet and Wilkinson hit home runs, of course.

I have always been treated as a valued customer.

I am very pleased with and appreciative of the relationship NAMB leadership offers for state staff. I am very thankful for the spirit and attitude of NAMB staff. I have always found them to be ready, willing and desirous to assist state staff. Thank you for your spirit of partnership.

I am glad to be a partner with folks who share the common vision of transformed lives for Jesus.

One of the best resources is the Discovery instrument introduces this year. Church planting group could do a better job of keeping its records updated! This questionnaire was sent to Keeny Gooch. He left this position 3 years ago and still gets the important emails. Geoff Hammond is the interim coordinator at [ghammond@sbcv.org](mailto:ghammond@sbcv.org).