

# RESEARCH REPORT

---

A Publication of Research, North American Mission Board, SBC

*Evaluation of the Church Planting Group, NAMB, 2002*

Phillip B. Jones

***Evaluation of the Church Planting Group, NAMB, 2002***

Phillip B. Jones

February 2003

**North American Mission Board**

Robert (Bob) Reccord, President and CEO

**Organizational Development Group**

Mike Day, Vice President

**Information Systems Development**

Mike Carlisle, Chief Information Officer

**Research Services**

Phil Jones, Director

Marilynn Kelly, Administrative Secretary

(770)410-6386

Richie C. Stanley, Strategic Information Researcher

Bob Rennier, Marketing Researcher

Paulette Villarreal, Information Specialist

Patricia Findley, Secretary/Research Assistant

(770)410-6388

An evaluation questionnaire was emailed on October 25, 2002, to 44 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 reminder was emailed on November 4<sup>th</sup> to those not initially responding. A second reminder was sent on November 11<sup>th</sup>. As a result of these three mailings, 27 questionnaires were completed and returned for a response rate of 61 percent—higher than the 52 percent response rate in 2001.

### Partnership/Strategy

The questionnaire asked how effectively the Church Planting Group, NAMB, partners with state conventions. Most respondents, 96.3 percent, indicated that the Church Planting Group is effectively partnering. Only one respondent indicated that the Church Planting group was ineffective. The rating for partnership effectiveness is included in the table below along with the ratings for the past several years. In 2002 there was continued improvement over previous years in the combined effectiveness rating (which includes the “completely effective” and “somewhat effective” categories). However, the “completely effective” rating was down a little from 2001.

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

	2002	2001	2000	1999
Completely effective	33.3%	40.9% <sup>1</sup>	44.0% <sup>2</sup>	26.7% <sup>3</sup>
Somewhat effective	63.0	50.0	40.0	53.3
Neutral (undecided)	0.0	9.1	12.0	3.3
Somewhat ineffective	3.7	0.0	4.0	10.0
Very Ineffective	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
No response	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7

SDOMs were asked if the partnership relationship between NAMB and state conventions improved during the year. The majority, 7 of 10 (69.2%), 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 revised 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, and particularly the strategy of assigning a field service partner representative to a state convention to assist in customizing strategy. The majority (55.6%) rated it good, while 25.9 percent rated it excellent. Two rated it fair (8.3%). (Three people did not answer this question.)

The questionnaire pointed out that during the prior year (2001) 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 assignments. All three were rated as strategically important. Three-fourths of respondents indicated the Town & Country assignment as very important. More than 4 of 5 indicated Multihousing and Lay Church Planting very important. The ratings are a little higher in 2002 than in 2001. The ratings for each assignment are as follows:

---

<sup>1</sup> The data for 2001 is based on 22 respondents and a response rate of 52 percent.

<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.

*Last year, 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.*

	<b>Town &amp; Country</b>	<b>Multihousing</b>	<b>Lay Church Planting</b>
Very Important	74.1%	81.5%	81.5%
Somewhat Important	18.5	14.8	11.1
Neutral	0.0	9.1	3.7
Somewhat Unimportant	3.7	0.0	0.0
Not at all Important	0.0	3.7	0.0
No response	3.7	0.0	3.7

SDOMs were asked to provide specific examples of where the Church Planting Group, NAMB, is effectively partnering with state conventions. Eighteen people provided examples for this section of the questionnaire. As in the last couple of years' evaluation surveys, half mentioned training. The training cited most frequently was Basic Training. Other repeating themes included an appreciation of specific individuals in the Church Planting Group and teams within the group. 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. One repeated theme is that the Church Planting Group needs to listen to the field in order to determine its needs rather than assuming needs. Furthermore, there needs to be more partnership with states in developing national strategy. Detailed responses are included 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:

*Did the partnership between the Evangelization and Church Planting Groups at NAMB hosting the State Leadership Meeting (i.e., Summer Leadership Meeting on Making a Difference in the Urban Contexts) 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	11.1%
Yes, somewhat	51.9
No	18.5
Don't know	14.8
No response	3.7

Seven of 10 SDOMs indicated it had a positive effect; however, the relationship does not appear very strong. Only three respondents indicated the partnership at NAMB had a major effect on the partnership between these two areas in their states. These ratings are very similar to those given for identical questions for the past two years.

### **Communication**

SDOMs were asked if the weekly newsletter, *Planter Update*, is a helpful source of information. Nine of 10 respondents indicated that it is helpful—no one indicated that it is not helpful. (There were a couple of respondents who were neutral or had no opinion about it.) Four of 10 (40.7%) responded that it is a “very helpful” publication while 51.9 percent indicated “somewhat helpful.” Overall, the opinion is a little more positive than reported the previous two years. A follow-up question encouraged respondents to suggest

changes for the newsletter. Only 6 people responded. The only theme repeated more than once is to continue or resume including the training schedule. All comments are 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	7.4%
Somewhat effective	29.6
Neutral (undecided)	51.9
Somewhat ineffective	7.4
Very ineffective	0.0
No response	3.7

At best, respondents seem lukewarm toward this publication. Only slightly more than a third rated the publication positively and most of these only rated it somewhat effective. Half were neutral toward the publication. Only two respondents evaluated the publication negatively. While ratings have never been particularly strong for this publication, they have significantly dropped within the past year.

Only four people provided a suggestion to improve this publication. These comments 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*, the Virtual Church Planting Village, and the NAMB Church Planting Web pages.) Comments were disparate and 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?*

	2002	2001	2000
Extremely well	11.1%	18.2%	8.0%
Somewhat well	51.9	36.4	40.0
Neutral (I'm undecided)	22.2	22.8	28.0
Not very well	11.1	18.2	16.0
Not at all well	3.7	0.0	8.0
No response	0.0	4.6	0.0

Nearly two-thirds indicated the Church Planting Group is doing well in this area, but overall most of this response was tepid. For example, as many indicated “not very well” as responded “extremely well.” Also, 1 in 5 either was undecided (or neutral) or did not respond to this question. The ratings in 2002 are slightly higher than in the previous two years.

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 a little less positive 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 2002 are reasonably similar to those in 2001 and 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?*

	<b>2002</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2000</b>
Extremely well	3.7%	9.1%	4.0%
Somewhat well	48.2	40.9	52.0
Neutral (I'm undecided)	29.6	27.3	20.0
Not very well	14.8	18.2	16.0
Not at all well	3.7	0.0	8.0
No response	0.0	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. Five people responded. Two responded with affirmation of the vision and two pointed out the lack of inclusion of associations in the vision. Verbatim comments are included in the appendix.

## Resources

SDOMs were asked to rate 25 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.*

	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Non-effective</b>	<b>No Response</b>
Acts 1:8 Challenge	18.5%	37.0%	3.7%	7.4%	3.7%	29.6%
Assessment Process	44.4	29.6	22.2	0.0	0.0	3.7
Basic Training I	59.3	40.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Basic Training II	29.6	48.2	7.4	0.0	0.0	14.8
Calling Out the Called	7.4	55.6	11.1	0.0	0.0	25.9
Church Planter Inquiry Packets	11.1	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	55.6
www.churchplantingvillage.net	14.8	51.9	7.4	11.1	0.0	14.8
Church Planting Network	14.8	37.0	29.6	3.7	0.0	14.8
Compass	7.4	22.2	7.4	7.4	0.0	55.6
CPAT	0.0	22.2	7.4	0.0	0.0	70.4
CPMS	29.6	40.7	7.4	0.0	0.0	22.2
Discovery Tools	40.7	22.2	7.4	0.0	0.0	29.6
ESCaPaDES	3.7	25.9	3.7	3.7	0.0	63.0
Language Resource Catalog	25.9	37.0	3.7	0.0	0.0	33.3
Laser	3.7	22.2	22.2	0.0	0.0	51.9
Light Up the Nation	7.4	22.2	25.9	14.8	0.0	29.6
Macedonia	0.0	11.1	0.0	3.7	3.7	81.5
Media Kits						
Hispanic	11.1	11.1	3.7	0.0	0.0	74.1
Multi-Ethnic	7.4	7.4	3.7	0.0	0.0	81.5
Mentor Training	33.3%	51.9%	3.7%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%
Multiplying Church Network	14.8	37.0	25.9	3.7	0.0	18.5

	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Fair</b>	<b>Poor</b>	<b>Non-effective</b>	<b>No Response</b>
Nehemiah Project	11.1	48.2	25.9	11.1	3.7	0.0
PREP	3.7	37.0	18.5	0.0	0.0	40.7
Probe	18.5	37.0	11.1	7.4	0.0	25.9
Seven Step to Plant a Church	29.6	44.4	18.5	0.0	0.0	7.4

Out of this list of 25 resources, Basic Training I is a shining star. It was rated good or excellent by all respondents. Specifically, 6 of 10 rated it excellent. The second most highly rated resource is Mentor Training—85 percent rated it good or excellent. Four other resources were rated good or excellent by at least 70 percent of respondents—Basic Training II, Assessment Process, Seven Steps to Plant a Church, and CPMS.

The following table lists all resources in order of their combined good and excellent scores. Note that those scoring toward the bottom of the list are those where the item “non response” rate is high. Presumably, SDOMs are not familiar with the resources or have not formed an opinion of them.

*Percent of Respondents Rating a Resource Excellent or Good*

Basic Training I	100.0%
Mentor Training	85.2
Basic Training II	77.8
Assessment Process	74.0
Seven Step to Plant a Church	74.0
CPMS	70.3
<a href="http://www.churchplantingvillage.net">www.churchplantingvillage.net</a>	66.7
Calling Out the Called	63.0
Discovery Tools	62.9
Language Resource Catalog	62.9
Nehemiah Project	59.3
Acts 1:8 Challenge	55.5
Probe	55.5
Church Planting Network	51.8
Multiplying Church Network	51.8
Church Planter Inquiry Packets	44.4
PREP	40.7
Light Up the Nation	29.6
Compass	29.6
ESCaPaDES	29.6
Laser	25.9
CPAT	22.2
Media Kit Hispanic	22.2
Media Kit Multi-Ethnic	14.8
Macedonia	11.1

It is noteworthy that three resources received excellent ratings by at least 40 percent of respondents. In addition to Basic Training I, the Assessment Process scored a 44.4 percent excellent rating and Discovery Tools scored a 40.7 percent excellent rating.

At the other end of the spectrum, six resources scored tepid or negative rating by at least a fifth of respondents. These six resources are listed in the table that follows along with their combined percentages of fair, poor, and non-effective ratings. Note that these percentages are dominated by fair responses. Out of this list, Nehemiah Project and Light up the Nation received the highest negative scores (poor and non-effective ratings). One of 7 respondents (14.8%) rated each of these two as poor or non-effective.

*Percentage of Respondents Scoring a Resource Fair, Poor, or Non-effective*

Nehemiah Project	40.7%
Light Up the Nation	40.7
Church Planting Network	33.3
Multiplying Church Network	29.6
Assessment Process	22.2
Laser	22.2

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 (92.6%) indicated these resources are much needed. No one indicated they weren't needed. (One person indicated they were undecided 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 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. Eight people responded to this question. Over half expressed their appreciation for The Church Planting Group's partnership. A couple mentioned they would like have more personal interaction by having field visits from the group to their state convention. Verbatim 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:**

- The resource team was a great help. Thanks Ken Tan.
- Producing materials for mentor and Basic Training.
- Basic Training of church planters and assessment of potential church planters.
- The Cross Functional Team visit was a positive experience for our convention and, hopefully, helped us better communicate our Northwest strategy with NAMB. NAMB's support and cooperation with "Embracing Seattle" in the SFC implementation year has been much appreciated.
- Mentor training, basic training and multihousing.
- Basic training module.
- Basic training and Basic training II.
- Hispanic church planting is an area of effective and mutually rewarding partnership with NAMB in Kentucky. NAMB is providing the necessary training for Alan Witham to be more excited about and effective in Multihousing training for our DOMs and pastors.
- George Thomason is doing a great job with his presentation of the "Purpose Driven Church." Communication is good.
- Providing materials for basic training and helpful tools supporting church planting.
- The Church Planting Group has worked effectively with the D.C. Baptist Convention over the past five years, essentially by allowing the staff to interact with the local environment and by resourcing the Convention. Since 1994, the Convention has grown from 80 churches to 140 congregations (108 churches and 32 missions). Seemingly, a similar pattern of growth has occurred in Pennsylvania/S. Jersey.
- We have received enormous help from the mentoring team as it relates to training. David Putman helped our group put together a church planting strategy. A job well done!
- Financial support and material for training.
- The mentoring group has worked very closely with Louisiana Baptist Convention to develop our assessment and training process for church planting. Louisiana has been a pilot state for lay church planting and is developing a field implementation guide for calling out the called. We appreciate our close relationship and partnership.
- CPG staff (Joe Hernandez and Van Kicklighter) assisted 24 of our leaders in a Strategic Master planning seminar in July. This seminar is about mobilizing all believers in church planting movement principles. That means rapid reproduction in houses, marketplace using believers who may be only one week old as leaders. Thanks for loaning us two people who were gifted to think radically in

developing new ways to penetrate unbelief. Church Planting staff has been willing to assist us in resourcing bold new expressions of church and equipping personnel to be on mission in their setting. Thanks for the resources in developing training events in English, Spanish and Korean for the Basis Training events held in Colorado this past year. We will multiply all of it again next year.

- Multiplication system, conferencing and funding.
- Strategy planning with church planting and associational missions, Basic Training, Nehemiah, Mentor, CPMS, Tom Cheyney growth conferences, big multihousing assistance for Cross over 2004, Douglas Beggs is great help, Missionary Personnel is outstanding in every respect to name a few. All relationships are good.
- Most recently Dennis Mitchell helped us identify an excellent candidate for a church planting staff position with our convention. The candidate is now on board.

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

- Please call and check with us.
- Language materials (Spanish) are lagging behind or not received on time for mentor and Basic Training.
- Helping friends in churches build partnership with associations and conventions, and improve listening to needs of field.
- Continue to support the concept and practice of letting each state convention be the specialist for their region, as opposed to the implementation of a national strategy that may or may not fit individual regions.
- Strategic Focus Cities and Nehemiah.
- Clarification of role with state partners and or resourcing—personnel and R&D.
- Lay church planting and languages other than English church plants.
- We have had some delays at times getting personnel approved based upon the “wording” of a job description. It is sometimes perceived that the job description is driven by NAMB and not by the needs of the local field. I would suggest more flexibility. Most of our new work in Kentucky is rising up from the local field and coming to us for partnership and resources. Local ownership does not guarantee success in new work starts, but it sure goes a long way in helping the new start to grow. I would suggest more flexibility in responding to the local needs both at the NAMB and KBC levels.
- Coordinate requests for statistical information (i.e. same area asking for duplicate information). Our needs vs. what you think our needs are.
- The Church Planting Group, NAMB, needs to strengthen its efforts in probing experimental efforts and new paradigms in starting churches. The group should critically analyze the claims of the International Mission Board to discover to what degree that Board’s policies are influencing growth in National Unions and in what contexts effective methodologies are used.
- We have very little if any contact with the church planting team. To me it is very foggy as to the purpose of the X team. Having said that I do hear often and get help from Sena’s group.
- Language materials need to be improved and show more quality.
- When developing national strategies, there needs to be state involvement with development. The states need to be partners in more than name.
- CPG has been quick to respond to my needs. I have no recommendations for change.
- Communication and networking, implementation follow-through with end in view when piloting. Stay thoroughly field-based strategy.

- Need a person to meet with us regularly to help us know how to access the correct department or group for resource people and materials.
- I've always been treated as a valued customer by the CPG. Just continue to make all resources as user-friendly and adaptable to state convention use as possible.

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

- Have people from Church Planting give input personally. Write stuff for it.
- Send when there is something we need to know or you need to inform us of.
- Please keep listing the training events schedule.
- Change the format occasionally.
- Principles not models. Send email (pleased with changes).
- Continue/resume attaching list of training opportunities and CPG events.

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

- Keep us aware of who receives copies. Print extra copies for states to use and distribute beyond NAMB mailing list.
- I don't feel that there is anything wrong with the content nor format. I just have a level of frustration that more key people are not taking advantage of the materials.
- Broader mailing—church planters.
- An emphasis on church planting churches, small and medium size, as an ongoing emphasis. Teach churches different ways to become a church planting church.

**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?**

- Talk to each other within NAMB Church Planting before contacting us from multiple offices about the same matter.
- All of these are depersonalized methods. Might help to pass out the tickets and go reenlist the customers. All of this tends to focus on NAMB as “the answer” to all church planting needs and many may not believe this, thus avoid reading and thus lowering communication.
- These are good, please keep tweaking.
- I hear no “buzz” within my ministry area about either of these publications. Given the state of relationships between NAMB and this state convention, this is not surprising. Strategic decisions hamper tactical efforts. Further, the presentation of material in the publications appears out of touch with the strategic decisions. This lessens the credibility and integrity of the publications. Such could also be true in states such as Texas, Missouri, Virginia and others as the confronting tendencies continue to develop.
- I still have difficulty finding my way around the village. I know new materials are being added but my skill level in finding it is still growing.
- Be sure state knows of meetings.
- Teach all of us how to use the NAMB online information and utilize it with potential church planters, strategists, and associational missionaries. Many of our missionaries are not aware of how to use the online resources.
- Consolidate statistics gathering. I get multiple requests for the same information.

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

- The association aspect is not obvious.
- I don't think this is the Church Planting Groups vision at all. If it is, it has little opportunity to see "its" vision. It appears that NAMB has very little concern about associations as partners.
- The statement is right on target.
- The vision is clear. It is an excellent picture of what could be. I hope that it comes to full fruition, along with all the incremental goals set between now and then. It is the implementation phase that may hinder us. This vision is not something that will be accomplished at the national, state, association or church level. It is the individual believers grasping the seriousness of non-belief that will trigger the movement of God that is needed. There is much to do in preparing the average Christian in North America for a spiritual awakening. The intensity will be too great for many. We need prayers voiced daily by millions of believers and leaders trained rapidly for service in weekly increments. I believe the church planting movement will come from the millions of people who are not yet believers. As the unbelievers become new believers they must be taught to share their faith experience immediately and teach their neighbor from the first day of conversion. They need tools to tell their story from the first hour of belief and daily thereafter until they can feed themselves.
- The initial presentation of the Multiplying Church Network approach was not helpful. Too "touchy-feely" and vague. Need a more nuts-and-bolts approach to really implement MCN.

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

- Field service materials when produced. Jointly plan with states to introduce materials.
- Develop contextualized profiles. They could relate to areas (i.e. new work states, T&C, cities less than 1000,000 – 101,000 to 300,000 – 301,000 to 500,000 – 501,000 to 1 million and 1 million and beyond.). Do not develop strategy plans. Develop system to assist with plan development. The system must be easily understood and managed.
- I applaud you for the continuing efforts you are putting forth to assist state conventions, associations, and churches in fulfilling the Great Commission.
- Recheck translations, some of them have obvious mistakes.
- Calling Out the Called needs an implementation guide. Nehemiah Project needs to focus more on short term internship and equipping. Long term resources should be placed more strategically in new work areas.
- I have appreciated the permission to contextualize materials for our setting. The materials are meeting our needs and we are using most of them to great advantage. I have no new suggestions.
- Need to be sure they are requested, needed, and will be used in state strategy before delivery.
- Please put PIF, Reference, Monthly Reports, Hunger Monthly and Quarterly Reports and other file forms on a CD for us to use for training in the field. A great need.
- As much as possible, give the state conventions the resources in a form (such as CD or downloadable files) that we can adapt, change, or reformat to our needs. Goal: maximum flexibility in application.

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

- African, Russian, Bosnian materials needed now.
- Church Planter Tool Kit and Sponsor Church Tool Kit.
- You will have to ask each convention/fellowship.
- Support lay church planting with materials.
- Tools for church planter multiplication. This is an expressed value in all of our training materials, but we lack strategies to foster multiplication.
- One of the needs expressed by some new church planters is a self study guide for developing the first church budget. We give some counsel at the Basic Training and in the CPNs. But there is a need for a self study for pastor/leaders to review in setting up accounting systems that will not create difficulties later.
- Materials in diverse formats to be selected by state, and also multiple languages.
- Put on a CD all the necessary information for potential church planters, sponsor churches to lead them through the basic process of effectively starting new churches.
- Something along the lines of “Seven Steps to Planting an Urban/Inner City Church.” How-to guide for inner city contexts, targeting neo-tribal groups, etc. Something along the lines of “Moving a Multihousing Ministry from Ministry Point to Autonomous Church.” Maybe a “seven steps” focusing on multihousing.

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

- Work with what and who you have at NAMB. Keep the organization in place long enough to be productive and understood.
- I would focus 80% of the efforts of the CPG in the 250 associations where 80% of the people in the US live with stronger focus in these associations where there is an even stronger support base.
- Appreciate your work and your sensitivity to the field as even evidenced by this survey.
- It seems more difficult to evaluate the overall effectiveness of the group since we have less opportunity to interact directly with the team. I think this is partially because of the elimination of winter meeting, and the combination meetings with other teams. This may prove more effective in the long run, but leaves a lot of the interaction with states to “long distance” methods. On another note, I rated the overall “new strategy” as good, but I found the assigning of a field service representative to help customize strategies a bit unclear. Maybe I overlooked something but it did not appear obvious in the strategy document.
- Thank you for your partnership.
- Thanks for your partnership in all that we do in Colorado.
- Keep talking to us and send us a personal representative to meet with us regularly. Thanks.
- Thank you! You do an overall excellent job.