

RESEARCH REPORT

A Publication of Research, North American Mission Board, SBC

Evaluation of the Church Planting Group, NAMB, 2003

Phillip B. Jones

Evaluation of the Church Planting Group, NAMB, 2003

Phillip B. Jones

January 2004

North American Mission Board

Robert (Bob) Reccord, President and CEO

Organization and Development Group

Mike Day, Vice President

Information Services Section

Mike Carlisle, Director/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 November 19, 2003, 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 December 12th to those not initially responding. A second reminder was sent on January 6, 2004. As a result of these three mailings, 26 questionnaires were completed and returned. The adjusted response rate for the study is 57 percent,¹ slightly lower than the response rate of 61 percent in 2002 and slightly 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, 92.3 percent, indicated that the Church Planting Group is effectively partnering. Only one respondent indicated that the Church Planting group is ineffective. The rating for partnership effectiveness is included in the table below along with the ratings for the past several years. There are only minor changes in the effectiveness ratings from year to year, with no discernable trend.

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

	2003	2002	2001	2000	1999
Very effective ²	42.3%	33.3% ³	40.9% ⁴	44.0% ⁵	26.7% ⁶
Somewhat effective	50.0	63.0	50.0	40.0	53.3
Neutral (undecided)	3.8	0.0	9.1	12.0	3.3
Somewhat ineffective	3.8	3.7	0.0	4.0	10.0
Very Ineffective	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
No response	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7

SDOMs were asked if the partnership relationship between NAMB and state conventions improved during the year, especially since NAMB implemented the Field Partner Service Representative relationship. The majority, 6 of 10, responded that the relationship remains about the same, while 36 percent reported it improved. Only one person indicated the relationship worsened. This rating is different than in 2002 where 7 of 10 indicated the relationship had improved during the preceding year and no one indicated it had worsened. Note that the wording of the question was changed in 2003 to include specific reference to the Field Partner Service Representative. Thus, the wording change is probably responsible for the change in response from 2002 to 2003.

¹ Four completed questionnaires were returned from Tennessee, although only 2 people were surveyed. It appears that one of the two persons surveyed in Tennessee distributed the questionnaire to two other persons on his staff who also relate to the Church Planting Group. All four completed surveys are included in the analysis. No additional adjustments have been made to the data to offset the overrepresentation of state convention personnel in Tennessee. However, only 2 of these 4 returned questionnaires are included in computation of the response rate. Adjustments were also made to remove 2 persons from those surveyed because one responded that he had been in the position such a short time that he was not able to respond to the questions and the other improperly returned a questionnaire without attached responses. Thus, the adjusted response rate is derived by dividing 24 by 42.

² The wording was changed in 2003 from “completely effective” to “very effective.”

³ The data for 2002 is based on 27 respondents and response a rate of 61 percent.

⁴ The data for 2001 is based on 22 respondents and a response rate of 52 percent.

⁵ The data for 2000 is based on 25 respondents and a response rate of 52 percent.

⁶ The data for 1999 is based on 30 respondents and a response rate of 68 percent.

SDOMs were asked to give any comments they might have regarding the assistance provided by the Field Partner Service Representative in helping their state convention address strategic church planting needs. Fourteen people responded to this open-end question. Most of the comments relate that the representative is responsive and helpful. A few mention that contact has been minimal so far. A complete list of responses is included in the appendix. The conclusion is that initiation of the Field Partner Service Representative is viewed positively, but is not yet viewed as a major improvement in the way the Church Planting Group relates to state conventions.

The questionnaire pointed out that during the year (2003) the Church Planting Group restructured and placed three national missionaries in one unit in order to strengthen the focus on lay/indigenous church planting. Survey participants were asked to evaluate the strategic importance of the roles of these three national missionaries for an effective church planting strategy. All three were rated as strategically important. At least 7 of 10 respondents thought each of the three positions is very important or somewhat important. Note that two-thirds of respondents thought the bivocational position is very important and 58 percent thought the multihousing position is very important. The ratings for each assignment are as follows:

Last year, the Church Planting Group restructured and placed three national missionaries in one unit in order to strengthen the focus on lay/indigenous church planting. Please evaluate the strategic importance of the roles of these national missionaries for an effective church planting strategy in North America.

	Bivocational	Multihousing	Town & Country
Very Important	65.4%	57.7%	46.2%
Somewhat Important	15.4	26.9	26.9
Neutral	7.7	7.7	15.4
Somewhat Unimportant	3.8	3.8	3.8
Not at all Important	3.8	3.8	3.8
No response	3.8	0.0	3.8

SDOMs were asked to provide specific examples of where the Church Planting Group, NAMB, is effectively partnering with state conventions. Nineteen people gave examples for this section of the questionnaire. Providing training was frequently mentioned along with supplying materials. Help with developing strategy was referenced several times along with specific mention of the new Field Service Partner Representative approach. Also, words of praise for specific Church Planting personnel were provided as examples. Verbatim responses are provided 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. Nineteen people provided responses; however, there was little in the way of repetitive themes. Detailed responses are included in the appendix.

Communication

SDOMs were asked if the weekly newsletter, *Planter Update*, is a helpful source of information. Nine of 10 respondents (88.5%) indicated that it is helpful—only a couple of people indicated that it is not helpful. (Only one person was neutral or had no opinion about it.) About a fourth (23.1%) responded that it is a “very helpful” publication while 65.4 percent indicated “somewhat helpful.” Overall, the rating is a little less positive than reported in 2002. A follow-up question encouraged respondents to suggest changes for the newsletter—12 people responded. Again, the information provided was disparate and thus comments are relegated to 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?

	2003	2002
Very effective	19.2%	7.4%
Somewhat effective	42.3	29.6
Neutral (undecided)	19.2	51.9
Somewhat ineffective	7.7	7.4
Very ineffective	3.8	0.0
No response	7.7	3.7

The perception of this publication improved during the year. In 2003, 6 of 10 respondents indicated the publication as being very effective or somewhat effective. In contrast, only 37.0 percent of respondents in 2002 indicated the publication as being effective. Despite the improvement in rating, only 1 in 5 think this publication is highly effective. Only four people provided a suggestion to improve this publication and these suggestions 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*, *Planter Update Language Supplement*, and www.churchplantingvillage.net). The most often repeated theme is that the Church Planting Group needs to develop personal relationships with state convention personnel through phone calls or personal visits. All comments 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 through the Light Up the Nation emphasis. 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 for church planting through the Light Up the Nation emphasis?

Extremely well	3.8%
Somewhat well	23.1
Neutral (I'm undecided)	26.9
Not very well	38.5
Not at all well	7.7
No response	0.0

Only about a fourth of respondents (26.9%) indicated that the Church Planting Group is doing well in this area. In contrast, a much larger percentage of respondents (46.2%) indicated the Church Planting Group is not performing well in this area. In previous surveys similar but more generic questions were asked about how well the Church Planting Group is increasing awareness of church planting. While response in previous years has been described as tepid, still the majority of respondents for the past two years have indicated the Church Planting Group is performing well. The decline in effectiveness appears to be due specifically to sub par performance related to the Light Up the Nation emphasis.

A question was asked about the Acts 1:8 Challenge strategy. Specifically, respondents were asked their opinion of the potential of this strategy for increasing churches involvement in church planting and missions. Seven of 10 respondents indicated it is likely that church involvement will be increased as a result of the strategy. However, only 2 in 10 indicate this is highly likely. There are no respondents who indicate it is unlikely to work.

During the summer leadership meeting, we presented the Acts 1:8 Challenge strategy. What potential does this strategy have for increasing churches involvement in church planting and missions?

Highly likely	19.2%
Somewhat likely	50.0
Neutral (I'm undecided)	26.9
Somewhat unlikely	0.0
Very unlikely	0.0
No response	3.8

Resources

SDOMs were asked to rate 24 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	Not Effective	No Response
Assessment Process	53.8%	34.6%	3.8%	3.8%	0.0%	3.8%
Basic Training I	73.1	23.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8
Basic Training II	50.0	19.2	3.8	7.7	3.8	15.4
Calling Out the Called	19.2	26.9	26.9	3.8	3.8	19.2
Church Planter Inquiry Packets	15.4	23.1	23.1	0.0	3.8	34.6
Church Planting Network	23.1	38.5	15.4	0.0	7.7	15.4
CPG Ministry Resources Catalog	23.1	42.3	3.8	3.8	0.0	26.9
CPMS	30.8	38.5	19.2	0.0	0.0	11.5
Discovery Tools	42.3	23.1	15.4	0.0	0.0	19.2
eQuip	15.4	23.1	0.0	11.5	3.8	46.2
Language Resource Catalog	34.6	34.6	11.5	0.0	0.0	19.2
Laser	19.2	30.8	15.4	0.0	0.0	34.6
Light Up the Nation	3.8	23.1	30.8	15.4	3.8	23.1
Media Kits						
Hispanic	7.7	26.9	11.5	0.0	0.0	53.8
Multi-Ethnic	7.7	19.2	3.7	0.0	0.0	81.5
Mentor Training	46.2	23.1	23.1	0.0	0.0	7.7
Multihousing	26.9	15.4	11.5	0.0	0.0	46.2
Multiplying Church Network	34.6	15.4	26.9	0.0	3.8	19.2
Nehemiah Project	26.9	34.6	30.8	3.8	3.8	0.0
PREP	3.8	26.9	34.6	0.0	0.0	34.6
Probe	23.1	50.0	23.1	0.0	0.0	3.8
Seven Steps to Plant a Church	34.6	30.8	23.1	3.8	0.0	7.7
Straight Street	15.4	19.2	11.5	3.8	3.8	46.2
www.churchplantingvillage.net	23.1	38.5	15.4	11.5	0.0	11.5

Out of this list of 24 resources, Basic Training I is a shining star. It was rated good or excellent by all but the one person who did not respond. Specifically, 7 of 10 (73.1%) rated it excellent—this is a

higher rating than it received in 2002 when it was also the highest rated resource. The second most highly rated resource is the Assessment Process—88.5 percent rated it good or excellent. This is higher than it scored in 2002. Five other resources were rated good or excellent by 7 of 10 respondents—Probe, CPMS, Basic Training II, Language Resource Catalog, and Mentor Training.

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 “nonresponse” 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	96.2%
Assessment Process	88.5
Probe	73.1
CPMS	69.2
Basic Training II	69.2
Language Resource Catalog	69.2
Mentor Training	69.2
Seven Steps to Plant a Church	65.4
CPG Ministry Resources Catalog	65.4
Discovery Tools	65.4
www.churchplantingvillage.net	61.5
Church Planting Network	61.5
Nehemiah Project	61.5
Multiplying Church Network	50.0
Laser	50.0
Calling Out the Called	46.2
Multihousing	42.3
Church Planter Inquiry Packets	38.5
eQuip	38.5
Straight Street	34.6
Media Kits: Hispanic	34.6
PREP	30.8
Media Kits: Multi-Ethnic	26.9
Light Up the Nation	26.9
Light Up the Nation	50.0
Nehemiah Project	38.5
PREP	34.6
Calling Out the Called	34.6
Multiplying Church Network	30.8
Seven Step to Plant a Church	26.9
www.churchplantingvillage.net	26.9
Church Planter Inquiry Packets	26.9
Probe	23.1
Church Planting Network	23.1
Mentor Training	23.1
CPMS	19.2
Straight Street	19.2

It is noteworthy that three resources received excellent ratings by at least 50 percent of respondents. In addition to Basic Training I, the Assessment Process scored a 53.8 percent excellent rating and Basic Training II scored a 50.0 percent excellent rating.

At the other end of the spectrum, 13 resources scored tepid or negative ratings by at least 1 in 5 respondents. These 13 resources are listed in the table that follows, along with their combined percentages of fair, poor, and not effective ratings. Note that these percentages are dominated by fair responses. Out of this list, Light up the Nation received the highest negative score (combined poor and not effective rating)—1 of 5 respondents rated it poor or not effective.

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

Light Up the Nation	50.0%
Nehemiah Project	38.5
PREP	34.6
Calling Out the Called	34.6
Multiplying Church Network	30.8
Seven Step to Plant a Church	26.9
www.churchplantingvillage.net	26.9
Church Planter Inquiry Packets	26.9
Probe	23.1
Church Planting Network	23.1
Mentor Training	23.1
CPMS	19.2
Straight Street	19.2

SDOMs were requested to provide suggestions for improving existing resources and 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. Ten people responded to this question. Most of the comments were unique and have been relegated to the last page of the appendix.

APPENDIX

Please provide any comments relative to how our Field Partner Service Representative has assisted you in addressing your strategic church planting needs:

- He has made himself available and offered to help in any way. I have used him as a resource person for general questions and information on NAMB related matters. I am confident that he will respond and do what he says.
- I am a new SDOM so I have not felt the impact of the field reps, but based upon their intentional contact and their expressions of willingness to help, I would think that relationships have improved.
- Contact has been minimal thus far.
- It has provided an opportunity to discuss more specifically the needs of our field, and to look more directly at strategies that will meet those needs. It also improves the sense that we have someone specific to call on when needs arise, and feel that he will get us in touch with the right person at NAMB
- John Shepherd came in November and worked with our team on strategy development for 2004-2006 and was very helpful.
- Our Field Service Representative has done an excellent job and has responded as needed.
- Bob Sena has been very responsive and available to help the Northwest Convention.
- John Shepherd has helped us with associational church planting strategy training, with upgrading the components of our church planting process, and with numerous documents and print resources that have been very helpful. He stays in regular contact and has a great servant spirit.
- I don't remember having gotten a visit in the past year. Dewey Hickey came here at his advent with NAMB. The only visit I recall having had is Douglas Beggs and Herb Brisbane, neither of which works with CP. Please understand: I have no complaints about the situation. I simply have seen no change in relationship during the past year.
- I know who to get in touch with now. He has always been there for me if I have any questions and puts me in contact with the right person.
- We've just started to work with him.
- Called and asked for strategy
- We had one meeting with George. He was very upbeat and well informed. I was absent from the Fall meeting with him and Douglas Beggs so missed out on part of what he had to offer. When I have contacted him requesting information, etc., he has been prompt and most helpful. How to include him in strategy planning is my biggest question.
- Until the present it has been just a contact or two a year.

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

- Development of training for Church Planting missionary's Nehemiah program
- The bivocational emphasis at Glorieta this summer was an encouragement and a help. We have felt the work of the Town and Country missionary and his service has impacted our plains association. Materials from the multihousing area continue to have an impact
- 1. Providing more field contact through the field service partner reps. 2. More of the NAMB folks getting to the fields to see the work first hand, and expressing a new understanding of the particular needs of the field.
- The Field Partner Service Representative is by far the most effective/significant help to us
- The Church Planting Group is effectively working with state conventions in assistance with Basic Training for church planters, especially in providing materials. This has been a big help.
- George Garner's work is helping to point up the need for a holistic approach to church planting on a regional scale, including towns as well as cities into the mix. Much needed.
- Chris McNairy is outstanding in resourcing us in multihousing ministries. His visits and materials are wonderful.
- Our NAMB Coordinators, Eduardo as well as Jim Akins, have been very responsive as we have made budget and position adjustments to better suit our field-based strategy.
- We continue to see great benefits from Strategic Focus City--Embracing Seattle. Over 50 new churches have begun in Puget Sound over the past three and one-half years.
- Providing help with associational church planting strategy development.
- Church planter assessment training and resources.
- Nehemiah Project.
- Regarding the above: Town and Country is who SBC is. Our resources are near to T&C US, at least in the South. On the other hand, we need bivocational and multi-housing ministries and starts in order to reach the cities. There we have never been strong, especially in the urban areas outside the traditional South. At that, we are losing ground, except for congregations already in place which join our SBC/local associational expressions.
- RE Effectively Working: Ed Stetzer continues to work with us effectively. He has made important NP resources available to us. Gerald Colbert is a prince. Although he no longer comes to KY for BT's, his capable work continues to influence the quality of our materials and ministry of growing planters. I feel a greater closeness with the two of these men than with anyone else on your staff. Rodney Webb has been very helpful in founding our ASL BT program here. Roberto Gama and Eliseo Aldape have made significant contributions to our work with Hispanics, although they have not taught BT recently. Douglas Beggs, obviously not in your area of NAMB, is eternally helpful and responsive to us.
- Resources for Basic Training and other training materials
- Nehemiah program

- Basic Training for Church Planters and Assessment
- Helping the state to develop strategy that can be implemented. NAMB's input was very helpful in the development of a strategy that will make a difference in our state.
- All training materials
- Providing materials for use in equipping and resourcing planting.
- Resource state staff
- Providing materials
- In the area of training events and specialized consultations
- Training and resourcing for Basic Training I, Basic Training II, and Assessment Trainer preparation
- George has been very intentional in reaching out, listening, and implementing strategies for town and country.

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

- Intentionally raising up new church planting missionaries
- The teams and reps that I have experienced in my short tenure have been great. Presently I can't suggest areas of improvement, but perhaps later.
- NAMB would do well to perceive its work as that of Research and Development while the state conventions develop strategies that are applicable to their unique settings.
- Need to work at making sure that the old image of "Planning in Alpharetta w/o the field representation," continues to be laid to rest. Need to deal with perception that some folks far removed from the field, and somewhat out of touch, are really driving the ultimate strategies at NAMB.
- I feel the working relationships are very good. The only improvement I would wish for is improved financial pictures for all of us so we could develop some "new money" in the cooperative agreement.
- NAMB Church Planting Group could improve the partnership with state conventions by providing a more focused emphasis on language missions. This could be done by having a language unit with a language director. Also, additional language materials would be helpful, and a Spanish language web site.
- I think the Field Partner Service Representative program creates some confusion between NAMB, state conventions and association/church relationships. I think this occurs because local entities (associations/churches) do not realize the importance of working through the state partnership process when there is a NAMB representative working directly with them. They do not see the necessity of working with state staff
- It's hard to keep up with who is doing what. And I never have understood the structure. I guess I'm pretty dense.
- Build in flexibility and a "give it away" approach to every resource you develop
- I genuinely feel that I do not benefit from national meetings in the summer. The sessions seem long. The only really enjoyable part of the meetings is catching up with a few trusted friends (something I can do almost as well with email or by phone. I understand that I am cantankerous about your meetings, and that I am probably much too negative about them. This problem is mine, not yours. I just don't like being away from my family for that (unnecessarily) long and for the purposes usually on the agenda.
- Needs to survey or dialog with states about needs. Thought needs to be given to "handing off" new church plants to Church Growth Teams as one example.
- There has been a time or two that I have made the initial contact for an event and 3 months later and one prompting I have still not heard. It may have gotten lost in the process.
- More emphasis on reaching Anglos as well as all other people groups.
- Addressing the need for "missionary" work in the south as well as other areas.
- Build relationship with state convention by visiting the state program leaders.

- Put as much effort and resources in the southern states as you do the outlying states. There are large groups of lost people in the southern states.
- Calling to talk with state program leaders. Currently there is little communication. Come to visit state conventions.
- Multihousing contact
- Meetings in state need to be coordinated and communicated in my office
- Keep us in the loop as matters develop program wise. Network within the NAMB structure yourselves to enhance church planting. Get started yesterday dealing with cell/home and simple churches. Associational Missions seems to be taking the initiative, and needs to be a partner, not competition. The What Now? Emphasis is vital, but seems to be lagging behind the actual calendar. Don't think that you have to load everything into the summer state leadership meeting. We can receive information about innovations, new emphases earlier in the year than that late summer meeting.
- The bivocational area is very important not only in NM but in many states. I think that the Bivo leader needs to be very intentional in reaching out and working closely with the state conventions. LifeWay now has a person dealing with bivocationals.

Please provide any suggested changes for *Planter Update*:

- Utilize other CPG personnel to write articles. There are some very talented men there with great things to share
- The Church Planter Update is an excellent tool. However, every two weeks, or once a month would be sufficient.
- Occasionally highlighting a church plant that is doing well somewhere in the nation with profile and principles emphasized.
- Would like to hear more from Ed Stetzer regarding the emerging (postmodern) church and what he is learning about the importance of the church planting process.
- I am pleasantly surprised by the interest I feel in the publication. It is brief, to the point, and MAKES a point. I used to ask supervisees to read and recommend things I need to read. Now I read it for myself. That's a high compliment to the quality of your publications. Thanks, Richard.
- Really have enjoyed and appreciated the recent theological segments on Calvinism
- Translation in different languages
- Usually written for a “pastor.” Needs to be written to those with a passion for planting.
- Articles from different authors
- More information pertaining to language ministry
- Who is audience?
- Keep it fresh related to Church Planting, personnel changes, etc. Has tended in recent months to be more educational than news related.

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

- No suggestions for changes.
- Less big or mega church focus, more focus on small and medium size churches that are doing things well. That's what most pastors and church leaders can relate to.
- It just does not make much of a difference to me.
- Does not address the need in traditional SBC areas to be strongly engaged in planting.
- More information on language missions
- Is it available in bulk for states to use in conferences, etc. to give it wider exposure?
- I think the life stories are very helpful.

Other than *Planter Update, Church Planting and Evangelism Today, Planter Update Language Supplement*, and www.churchplantingvillage.net, do you have other suggestions on how the Church Planting Group can improve communications?

- Keep on responding to the field in ways that make it apparent that the communication is two way, and being heard. You have good tools, but you want to stay engaged with the audience, not just sending them messages. Continue to improve the resources of the website, to a point where it is simple to operate. It still seems very complicated to really find what you are looking for, even with the implementation of the Bridge
- Use the telephone more to build personal relationships. We are no more effective in our work than the relationships we build.
- Assigning Field Partner Service Reps has made a big difference in communication. Stick with it!
- Perhaps as a supplement to the Updates, have practitioners with skills and capabilities for missiological thinking and writing to add succinct, bullet-point articles...at least perhaps mention them in the Update and post them on the website. I am not aware that such is happening right now. We have lots of decent, effective practitioners out there. We do need more thinkers, whether the practitioners agree or not.
- I suggested, in your other survey which arrived this week, that our associational DOMs have no real sense of teamship with NAMB. I recommend that Bob Reccord and our state exec co-write and co-sign a letter which is as highly personal as possible (to avoid the "form letter" taste and feel). Ask the DOMs to join both our agencies in starting churches. Somehow make it a heartfelt appeal for collegial cooperation. At least some of our guys will respond, I believe. Give them needs, points of state contact, any other "helps" which they might utilize. Tell them about the CP Village, CPMS, etc. Let the letter come from NAMB.
- Encourage small group dialogs among states with needs and characteristics.
- Yes, call and talk to us personally.
- Spend time on the field with us. Walking into meetings and congregations will tell more than we can describe to you in a meeting or written report.
- Continue to highlight church planting in the "On Mission" magazine. Look for every available avenue to highlight church planting in seminaries, and with state conventions.

Please provide any suggestions for improving existing resources:

- Most of the resources provided by NAMB are excellent. Provide them in electronic if possible.
- Make a simplified version of 7 steps.
- Do more in developing the CPNs.
- Interactives (at the village) for kids, perhaps kids whose parents are state staff and church planters (to help them deal with concerns about absentee parents, for example), and for use with GA and RA's in missions programming might be helpful. Such things might help our children come up with a sense of mission to the US
- We need Mentor Training II AND ALL THE SPANISH MATERIALS AT THE SAME QUALITY.
- More information in other languages
- Resourced AM's without facilitator training for MCN without state strategy timeline for implementation of this component.
- Resource, highlight, and staff LASER. It is seemingly on a distant back burner.

What new resources should the Church Planting Group provide?

- Information, training, stories that validate, etc. for: hybrid church planting models where the form is a cell model, but the cells function as mini-churches; missional churches; and simple churches in neighborhoods, multifamily housing, market place, etc.
- I would suggest providing more resources to be used with lay leaders in developing church planting strategies. These resources should be simple, uncomplicated and focused on providing the tools lay leaders can use where they are.
- Additional resources to promote sponsoring/partnering church involvement in new starts
- "Seven Steps" guides for particular types of plants or contexts.
- Creativity in types of planters and strategists deployed through the Nehemiah Project.
- Updated training video on DVD for Assessment Training.
- Resource lists of Bible study materials for use by new church plants using small groups, contemporary worship styles, etc
- I'm not aware of a resource that would help a local church to develop a strategy for church planting. If a movement broke out a strategist would not be able to keep up with the demand.
- Better resources for sponsoring churches.
- Demographic information
- Discovering leaders
- Kit/Package for Multihousing like On Mission/Planter kit
- More materials above in languages other than English and Spanish
- A very simple guide for partner churches as to what they can do to reach their community by planting new churches.

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

- Guys, the biggest issue facing us presently is validation for simple (house, apartments, etc.) church expressions as another component of NAMB's strategy. We must continue our emphasis on traditional (site based, event centered, etc.) church models, but we must also gather the courage to develop strategies for simple church networks where multiplication can have an opportunity. We will not have an impact on our lost culture until we can tune out the vision cultures and embrace a both/and mentality that allows and encourages the planting of all kinds of churches—in order to reach all kinds of people.
- We appreciate greatly the continued efforts on behalf of Church Planting Group to be in touch and real with the field. As many have struggled through the last few years, it has not been so much with the CPG as with overall administrative decisions that have limited input, and redirected resources, etc. Another example is the continuing reorganization and change of personnel in many areas that relate to the mission support system. It leaves the field not knowing who will we talk to next, and feeling that new people are always in the learning curve, thus decreasing current effectiveness.
- The Church Planting Group can help the states by providing all resource material in electronic format so that we can customize and reproduce in as needed. Also, by providing facilitator training for state convention leaders to teach and lead conferences in all program areas will be helpful.
- Overall, I think you are doing a fine job. I have always been treated as a valued customer. Please keep pushing the envelope of creativity and always think, "How can this be designed for flexible use in lots of contexts" when preparing a new resource.
- I appreciate the fact that you guys can stay in a ministry environment which does not at all recognize the worth of your personal commitment or your giftedness. I could not last in a low-morale situation like yours. I admire your commitment, and wish that it were better for you all. God's peace and blessings be yours. Happy Thanksgiving.
- Use small focus groups to discover needs of states. Dialog with states on needs.
- Regarding how well NAMB is partnering with state conventions to assist local associations ...through Light up the Nation: NAMB by-passed the state convention and went directly to the association.
- Language church planting group needs to make more personal contact with state convention
- When any team meets with church planters in Georgia, our team needs to be invited to the table and part of the initiative.
- Regarding NAMB partnering with state to assist association through Light Up the Nation: dropped promotion/implementation too soon
- Regarding Multiplying Church Network: Dropped too soon
- I think that we, by the grace of God, have achieved great success in church planting. However, one suggestion is to take advantage at the tremendous window of opportunity to reach ethnic America with the gospel of Christ.