

Results of the Evaluation Questionnaire for the Evangelization Group, NAMB, December, 2000

Evaluation questionnaires were distributed by email to 43-state convention Directors of Evangelism (DOEs). Questionnaires were first emailed on November 17, 2000 with a follow-up email to non-respondents on November 28. Twenty-three completed questionnaires were returned which is twice as many as returned for the 1999 evaluation, a response rate of 53 percent.

Partnership

Respondents were asked to rate the overall effectiveness of the Evangelization Group in partnering with state conventions. The results are as follows:

Overall, how effective is the Evangelization Group, NAMB in partnering with state conventions?

	2000	1999
Very effective	21.7%	18.2%
Somewhat effective	56.5	54.5
Neutral (undecided)	17.4	18.2
Somewhat ineffective	4.3	0.0
Very ineffective	0.0	0.0
No response	0.0	9.0

Over three-fourths (78.3%) of respondents indicate the Evangelization group is effective in partnering. Only 4.3 percent (actually one person) indicate the group is ineffective. About 1 in 6 is undecided. The results are a little more positive than for 1999; however, this change may be more a result of increased response rate rather than a true shift in everybody's thinking. While the group is generally perceived as effectively partnering, the fact that over half of DOEs rate the Evangelization Group as only "somewhat effective" indicates there is room for improvement.

State DOEs were asked if the partnership relationship between the Evangelization Group has improved during the past year. Less than half (43.5%) indicated that the relationship has improved, while over half (56.5%) indicated it has remained about the same. No one responded that the relationship had worsened. Given the level of improvement indicated and the lack of indication of a worsening relationship, more improvement between the year-end scores for the first question might have been expected. However, measurement of these "feeling" questions is not precise. It may be that while 43.5 percent of DOEs perceive improvement, the improvement was not substantial enough to increase overall ratings. Based on response to both questions, probably the best conclusion is that there has been slight improvement during the year in the perception that NAMB is effectively partnering with state conventions.

Seventeen persons provided examples of where the Evangelization Group is effectively working in partnership with state conventions. There were several recurring themes. The most frequently cited was the helpfulness and likableness of NAMB staff. The next most frequently cited examples of effective partnership were The NET and the Prayer Evangelism Unit. The winter and summer meetings received multiple mention as well as the observation that NAMB is listening more to the field. (In contrast, many more respondents to the following question indicated that listening to the field is an area that needs improvement.) The Interfaith unit also received multiple mention as an example of effectively partnering. Detailed responses are included in the appendix.

Fifteen people provided information on where the Evangelization Group needs to improve its working relationship with state conventions. There was uniformity of opinion provided in response to this question. The group should listen more to the field. Respondents indicated that communication tends to be one-way from the board. They want two-way communication. One respondent stated "I don't feel that the state conventions are necessarily 'at the table' in planning the direction of SBC evangelism efforts." They want more opportunity to communicate to you what's important to them and they want opportunity to input and help develop national strategy. As addendum to this response, several indicated it is a mistake to do away with the winter meeting. There was also multiple mention of NAMB's not valuing some of the strategy and work of state conventions that has from their perspective proved to be productive and valuable. Verbatim responses are included in the appendix.

A final question asked about the impact that partnership between the Evangelization and Church Planting Groups at NAMB is having at the state convention and associational levels. Almost 4 of 5 respondents think the partnership between these two areas in the field has been enhanced. (See below.)

Is the partnership between the Evangelization and Church Planting Groups at NAMB encouraging the partnership (or integration) of evangelism and church planting in state conventions and associations as they assist local churches?

Yes, to a large degree	39.1%
Yes, somewhat	39.1
No	13.0
Don't know	8.7

Communication

Fast Facts is viewed to be a helpful source of communication. Over three-fourths of respondents indicated it was at least somewhat helpful. The response concerning *Fast Facts* is included in the table below.

Do you find the weekly newsletter Fast Facts a helpful source of information?

Yes, very helpful	34.8%
Yes, somewhat helpful	43.5
Neutral/no opinion	13.0
No, not very helpful	8.7
No, not at all helpful	0.0
No response	0.0

Six people responded with suggestions for *Fast Facts*. Most of these people responded that there needs to be more information from state conventions and the field about strategies being used and what is working. It needs to include helpful resources from outside of NAMB in addition to NAMB resources. A couple of respondents mentioned they would like to get John’s opinion on things and his “key thoughts.” Detailed responses are in the appendix.

Respondents were asked to rate the effectiveness of *Church Planting and Evangelism Today* as a communication tool to Southern Baptist pastors. While more DOEs were positive than negative, only 13 percent rated it very effective. Out of five possible response categories, the largest single response, nearly 40 percent of DOEs, was “neutral/undecided.” Combining both effective categories, only 43.4 percent of DOEs think this publication is accomplishing its purpose of raising evangelism awareness.

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

Very effective	13.0%
Somewhat effective	30.4
Neutral (undecided)	39.1
Somewhat ineffective	8.7
Very ineffective	4.3
No response	4.3

Respondents were asked to provide suggested changes to *Church Planting and Evangelism Today*. While six people made comments, there was little suggested change to this publication. Comments are included in the appendix.

Other than *Fast Facts* and *Church Growth and Evangelism Today*, respondents were asked if they had suggestions for how the Evangelization Group might improve communications. Six people responded to this question. The majority of them indicated they want more personal dialogue and the opportunity for making it a two-way conversation. While a couple of good suggestions were tendered there are no other recurring themes. The appendix contains all six verbatim responses.

Vision

The vision of the Evangelization Group, NAMB is to partner with state conventions and associations in assisting local Southern Baptist churches, to reach and baptize at least 500,000 people in the year 2000 and 1,000,000 in the year 2005. DOEs were asked to rate the appropriateness of this vision. Nearly two-thirds affirmed its appropriateness—44 percent indicated it as very appropriate and 21.7 percent indicated it somewhat appropriate. In contrast, only 1 of 11 respondents rated it inappropriate. There appears to be a little less support of the vision in 2000 than in 1999; however, the response rate was so low in 1999 it is probably best not to give too much attention to this change. Note that 3 of 10 DOEs have not bought into the vision (the neutral response plus the inappropriate response). Detailed information is included in the table below.

Please rate the Evangelization's Group's vision.¹

	2000	1999
It is very appropriate	43.5%	54.5%
It is somewhat appropriate	21.7	18.2
Neutral (I'm undecided)	21.7	9.1
It is somewhat inappropriate	8.7	9.1
It is very inappropriate	0.0	0.0
No response	4.3	9.1

Respondents were encouraged to provide any comments concerning the Evangelization Group's vision. Fourteen people responded in this section of the questionnaire. Responses were disparate and are included in the appendix. One theme that recurred several times was that partners should help establish their portion of the national goals (500,000 in 2000 and 1 million in 2005) or help develop the national goals in order to have ownership. This may be the reason that some DOEs have not bought into the Evangelization Group's vision. They feel that NAMB set the goals (vision), and that partners (state conventions, associations, and even churches) have no say in the matter, yet, are responsible for producing the results.

Resources and Strategies

The questionnaire listed 28 different resources and strategies provided by the Evangelization Group, NAMB and DOEs were asked to rate each of them on a

¹ A mistake was made on the questionnaire and the precise wording was "Please rate the Evangelization Group's vision for church planting." The phrase "for church planting" was included in error. It appears that most respondents overlooked this problem and understood the intent of the rating scale. However, some of the open-end responses to the follow-up question included references to church planting. The wording of the vision changed slightly from 1999 to 2000; however, the meaning and intent remained the same.

scale ranging from “poor” to “excellent.” The ratings for resources are included in the following table. The resources have been sorted from highest to lowest rated.²

Please rate the following resources and strategies provided by the Evangelization Group, NAMB. (Please note that a few of these are still in the development stage.)

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't Know/ No Response	Composite Score
Net	52.2	30.4	4.3	4.3	8.7	3.4
Crossover	39.1	26.1	8.7	0.0	26.1	3.4
Lighthouses of Prayer	43.5	47.8	4.3	0.0	4.3	3.4
Praying Your Friends to Christ	39.1	39.1	8.7	0.0	13.0	3.4
Event Evangelism	43.5	39.1	4.3	4.3	8.7	3.3
Commitment Guide	43.5	21.7	17.4	0.0	17.4	3.3
Interfaith Evangelism	39.1	39.1	4.3	4.3	13.0	3.3
Evangelism Response Center	39.1	39.1	13.0	0.0	8.7	3.3
HeartCall	39.1	39.1	13.0	0.0	8.7	3.3
Taking Prayer to the Streets	30.4	43.5	8.7	0.0	17.4	3.3
English as a Second Language	17.4	43.5	4.3	0.0	34.8	3.2
Fish	21.7	39.1	8.7	0.0	30.4	3.2
Ministry Evangelism Toolkit	30.4	30.4	8.7	4.3	26.1	3.2
ICE Teams	21.7	26.1	4.3	4.3	43.5	3.2
Beginning Steps	21.7	26.1	13.0	0.0	39.1	3.1
Family to Family	30.4	47.8	4.3	8.7	8.7	3.1
CJ2000	30.4	26.1	26.1	4.3	13.0	3.0
On Mission to Share Jesus Sunday	30.4	26.1	17.4	8.7	17.4	2.9
Student Missionaries	17.4	30.4	13.0	4.3	34.8	2.9
Internet Evangelism	21.7	34.8	21.7	4.3	17.4	2.9
God's Special Plan for Children	26.1	21.7	30.4	4.3	17.4	2.8
Time to Tell	13.0	21.7	26.1	0.0	39.1	2.8
Alternative for Life Centers	0.0	34.8	0.0	4.3	60.9	2.8
Chaplains Evangelism	8.7	34.8	4.3	8.7	43.5	2.8
Frontliners	13.0	17.4	8.7	8.7	52.2	2.7
Resort and Leisure Evangelism	4.3	39.1	8.7	8.7	39.1	2.6
World Hunger/Refugee Resettlement	0.0	39.1	13.0	4.3	43.5	2.6
Vocational Evangelist Work	8.7	17.4	17.4	13.0	43.5	2.4

The Net was the highest scoring resource/strategy with over half of responding DOEs rating it excellent. Other resource/strategies such as Crossover, Lighthouses of Prayer, Praying Your Friends to Christ were almost as high (just fractionally less). Of special note, 91.3 percent of all DOEs in the survey rated Lighthouses of Prayer as good or excellent. In fact most of the items listed in the

² A composite score for each resource or strategy was developed by assigning a value of 4 for an “excellent” rating, a value of 3 for a “good” rating, a value of 2 for “fair”, and a value of 1 for “poor.” Values were summed for all respondents and divided by the number of persons responding in order to determine an average value. Composite scores can range from a maximum of 4 (all respondents rate it excellent) to a minimum of 1 (all respondents rate it poor).

above table received an average score (3.0 or above), which places them between good and excellent in overall rating.

There were 11 resources/strategies that received a composite score less than 3.0 which would range them between “fair” and “good.” The lowest ranking item, Vocational Evangelist Work, was the only resource/strategy where more DOEs rated it “fair” or “poor” than rated it “good” or “excellent.” Although it did not receive the lowest overall composite score, “God’s Special Plan for Children” received the largest percentage of “fair” and “poor” ratings—35 percent of all DOEs. Two other items, CJ2000 and Vocational Evangelist Work, also received relatively high negative ratings—30.4 percent of DOEs rated them “fair” or “poor.”

There were two resources/strategies where over half of the state convention respondents seemed unfamiliar with them—Frontliners and Alternative for Life Centers.

Respondents were asked to provide any suggestions for improving existing resources. Six persons responded (see appendix). There are no recurring themes.

Respondents were also asked what additional resources the Evangelism Group should provide. Only five people responded; however, three of them mentioned providing resources for small churches. Verbatim responses are in the appendix.

DOEs were asked to evaluate how effectively Chaplaincy has been integrated into a continental evangelism strategy. Most respondents do not have an opinion about this matter. Three in 10 think it has been done effectively. Only one person thinks it has been done ineffectively. (See below)

How effectively do you feel that Chaplaincy has been integrated into a continental evangelism strategy?

Very effectively	13.0%
Somewhat effectively	17.4
Neutral (undecided)	52.2
Somewhat ineffectively	4.3
Very ineffectively	0.0
No response	13.0

The Net was singled out in order to test the effectiveness of the resources developed for it. Nearly three-fourths rate its resources as effective with over 40 percent rating them “very effective.” No negative ratings were given for The NET resources.

*Please rate the effectiveness of the resources that have been developed for
"The NET."*

Very effective	43.5%
Somewhat effective	30.4
Neutral (undecided)	21.7
Somewhat ineffective	0.0
Very ineffective	0.0
No response	4.3

Respondents were asked a series of three questions concerning development of language materials. Most respondents think that the board is moving in the right direction in developing language resources. When directly asked, 60.9 percent of DOEs responded affirmatively that the Evangelism Group is appropriately developing language resources. Only 1 in 5 responded negatively to this question. (The remainder had no response.) Those who responded negatively were given opportunity to suggest ways the Evangelization Group might improve language resources. These disparate responses are included in the appendix. In response to a question concerning needed language materials, four people suggested fourteen different language groups. Spanish, Korean, and Chinese were mentioned by three of the four. (See appendix.)

Additional Comments

Respondents were given opportunity to make comments pertaining to any work of the Evangelization Group. Five DOEs responded. There were no repetitive themes. Verbatim responses are in the appendix.

Appendix

Open-ended Questions
Evangelization Group
Evaluation Questionnaire, 2000

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

We feel that the meetings we have with you guys are the best. You have done a wonderful job of letting us look into the future trends of our nation and the work of the ministry. Keep that work going. We feel that The Net evangelism strategy is a tremendous tool and will be widely used in the state of Ohio. The presentation and creativity is refreshing.

The Evangelization Group has been willing to adjust and work with us in a way that helps us minister to our churches most effectively. This has been very refreshing and helpful to us.

Interfaith Unit was helpful to our state convention in partnering on interfaith evangelism training. Prayer Evangelism Unit is helpful in preparing a Great Commission Prayer Conference. The Net materials look very good.

Staff readily available for projects, visits, etc.

The Celebrate Jesus 2000 emphasis was an outstanding success in KY showing how the partnership can work. The Lighthouses of Prayer Ministry is also a good example of how we can work together. There is a more positive attitude in general toward State Conventions. The "big brother" attitude is beginning to fade away. Your response to calendaring needs is prompt.

Communication is up to date and quick using *Fast Facts*. This survey is an example. But, this survey almost came too late for us who are trying to get a few days vacation through the Thanksgiving Day holidays before the winter meetings.

Simply, the relationship with different members have grown tremendously and I have such trust for their input and opinions. We pray together and that personally means a lot to me.

Very helpful with respect to finding quality people for state evangelism conferences. Can't think of a single person in the Evangelization Group that couldn't be a great friend. We love the whole NAMB team! Great people! The First Priority Strategy is a GOOD ONE! Need to attack the issue of creation/evangelism. Because all information sources that students are bombarded with say, "Evolution – there is no God". But, when they read Genesis 1:1, there is, what Henry Blackaby calls, "a crisis of belief." Most reject the Bible because it and the church are in the minority.

The Net.

The Net should be helpful to us in training our churches to do evangelism. I am hoping it will provide a way to help our churches in evangelism. Also the staff of the Evangelization Group has been helpful with resources and ideas to us personally in our strategy planning for our state. Our winter and summer meetings have been very helpful to me networking with other conventions and interacting with the Evangelization Group staff.

The prayer evangelism office has been the greatest blessing to us in Oklahoma. The best has been their strategies and help in promoting evangelistic prayer with us earlier this year. Schofield and Wright have done all they could to help us.

NAMB: Beginning to listen some to the field ministry people.

The prayer evangelism stuff is solid. It is a good ministry for you to pay for staff to speak in our states as we need to emphasize various things.

Providing transportation to national director's meetings.

Money: much of what we do is very dependent upon the financial cooperative agreement. Evangelism personnel have all been ready and willing to do whatever it took to assist in our state priorities.

Chris Schofield did an excellent job helping me with a prayer summit last year. Toby Frost was very responsive in helping with a saturation project last summer.

Re-establish the annual National State Coordinators' Meeting for Interfaith Evangelism. For over 25 years this meeting accomplished something that no other agency or agency program is equipped to do, and that is to assist state leaders for effective cross-cultural evangelism, especially as it relates to the ever-growing religious pluralism in America. The practical nature of these meetings, as we met and dialogued with members and leaders in various cults, sects, and world religions, provided our state leaders with an equipping that they have described as invaluable and woefully lacking in most of our evangelism efforts. ALSO—Re-establish the annual meetings at Glorieta and Ridgecrest. In a PARTNERING relationship, the effort is greatly compromised when one partner chooses to unilaterally devalue what the other partner has greatly valued, and from which he has derived great benefit.

By keeping us informed as to what we have available from NAMB to offer to our churches. Providing new and innovative ways of evangelism.

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

When our individual state convention comes across an opportunity that is a God thing, that opportunity needs to be given the same weight as Strategic Focus Cities. It is as important to that state as SFC is to the state that host those events. Please give careful consideration to the remedy of this problem. Continue SFC—it is a wonderful idea, but don't leave the other work undone. If you believe that a state's strategy is not working, do not make that determination based on personal experience, look at the numbers. Numbers do not lie!!! If a national agency is seeing an increase in its numbers then the truth is the truth and numbers do not lie. In the same way, a state that is seeing results, confirmed results, must be affirmed in what they are doing even if they are not using every strategy that comes from NAMB.

Fast, fluid and focused response to what God is doing in the churches.

It would be good if NAMB offered familiarization training and strategy consultation on the NET for state DOEs who will be resourcing this in their states. Communication between NAMB and state DOEs is challenging and to do away with the Winter meeting seems to jeopardize it further.

There needs to be better coordination when national emphases are launched, better coordination when themes, etc. are chosen, and more time for discussion, implementation.

Seeking input from the DOE's concerning areas where partnerships are needed.

More personal touch with division leaders in states. More access to your strategy in missions and evangelism.

It appears that the Evangelization Group needs to listen to the states. It was particularly telling that a major revision of the staff went on after the August meeting, and few were included in beforehand. Certainly, NAMB has this prerogative, but it does not indicate partnership.

The NAMB summer and winter meetings seem to be more of a monologue. Communication seems to be one-way. There is little interaction wherein national strategies are discussed, massaged, and ways of state-by-state implementation are discussed. The most valuable meeting we attended last year was the Mid-South meeting in Gulf Shores, AL. The agenda was, "Let's put onto the board ANY area you need help in." These were then prioritized, strategies and ideas were exchanged and the newer men learned VALUABLE lessons from the older men. We need to do more of this kind of thing together. Throw a dream or concern on the board and draw from the collective wisdom in the room. "Here's the dream. Now, how do we pull it off? Can we pull it off and make North American impact?" "The NET" came off the drawing boards and into the field, with little long term field testing. Would love to have Yarbrough and/or Harris visit our state.

Need to reconsider the winter meeting being dropped!

Need to understand each states personal goals and strategies for reaching that state. (Those do NOT come from NAMB.) Also better way of re-sourcing fund requests for state projects.

Discontinuing the NAMB sponsorship of the winter meetings seems to me a mistake. I'm relatively new to this, but the time in Denver last week was invaluable for the chance to network with what other states are finding effective.

I don't feel that the state conventions are necessarily "at the table" in planning the direction of SBC evangelism efforts. BIG MISTAKE, in my humble opinion.

I think it is helpful when evangelism personnel have opportunities to visit convention areas. In the pioneer, our work is much different than deep south. I think it would be helpful for a team from NAMB evangelism to do constructive critiques of state convention evangelism priorities.

Decisions are frequently made that impact our work. I can't recall a single time when DOEs were consulted or asked to give input. E-mail letters are not a substitute for communication when unilateral decisions are made that have negative impacts on our work.

Just continue to keep the communication lines open.

Please provide any suggested changes for Fast Facts.

Including stories of what people are actually doing is encouraging. Sharing ideas that folks are using is a great resource. Knowing that any idea must be adapted to a local context.

This frequency may have been necessary in the beginning, but I feel that it is of little value now. It is seen mostly as a update on what the national office is doing.

Have some articles on some of the latest strategies and ideas from other conventions. Maybe share their states conferences and promotions. I just spent some time with some of our Directors of Associational Missions and they have shared with me the ABLE conference. Would be good to have some of Lenaord Sweets ideas shared with us.

It has become obvious to me that John Y. is not as involved in the writing of this piece. It contains much less reflection and has become a listing of facts and figures with dates for events that have relevance for just a few. It needs more information on it for the general state evangelism guys. Nelson Searcy in his Evangelism On-line has been able to do this. John needs to tell us his opinion on things. I need to know about resources that are coming out, but don't just tell us about NAMB resources. Tell us about great books like the new one by Mark Mittleburg on *Building a Contagious Congregation*. John could even call and ask some of the state guys to submit something from their state on what is working, or what they could use help on or ideas on. This may not fit with the purpose of *Fast Facts*, and it should not be long.

Needs to be a better way of including all state requests and information to be included in *Fast Facts*.

Good source of information, could be expanded to include evangelism stories from the field, schedule of personnel, pray concerns, praises, key thoughts from John Y. on where God is working, etc.

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

Focus more on the fastest growing churches in our nation. Be on the cutting edge as far as strategy.

With multi-assignment folks, getting so much material for my job assignment, it is difficult scanning all the periodicals and materials that I am responsible for. It is a good tool.

I don't know how to answer. But it is not the kind of publication that I just can't wait to read. Sometimes, it sits on my desk for a couple of weeks before I read it. So, it's not a "must read" type of publication. I think because we are all under information overload. Sort of like Winston Churchill, who refused to read anything longer than ½ page – I find myself going for the very brief, fast bullet.

In New State work the image of Southern Baptist is in terrible shape. Something needs to be done to spread the word of SBC involvement in missions and our passion to help and share the claims of Christ. Anything we can do to promote a good image, healthy and wholesome ministry.

Do they receive the magazine free?

I cannot remember reading a copy!

Other than Fast Facts and Church Growth and Evangelism Today, do you have other suggestions on how the Evangelization Group can improve communications?

Face-to-face time at winter or summer meetings with guided dialogue between NAMB and state DOEs would be most helpful. Some good time to fellowship together and get to know one another seems to be needed.

A periodic phone call from John just to check on how things are going and to dialogue about what is happening at NAMB.

More personal contact with division directors.

Maybe provide a site where we from the state conventions can share some of what we're doing in our own states with each other.

Yes, have regular articles in the "On Mission" magazine about work in new state area...feature stories, have an awareness section, wish list page for state projects.

Ask DOEs directly for their input. Partnerships are generally a two-way street.

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

I just don't want to buy into only one form of church planting. Neither do I want one form highlighted at the expense of other equal strategies for church planting.

Encouraging state conventions to partner in this vision, setting goals of how many baptisms they would like to see in their state by 2005.

Keep on doing good work. Great staff of people.

I find little interaction and sometimes a bit of competition between the two. I have yet to see the matrix really working, although it is a good idea.

My concern is more for church planters. They must see the biblical mandate to evangelize, to congregationalize, instead of just doing survey work, start a church and then attempt to reach people.

Keep on track. We need more churches! Can't plant and/or build them fast enough! I am about to the point of getting excited when I see a Catholic church parking lot full. At least people are being exposed to Jesus.

Give some practical how-to's in how churches can bring about this vision of baptizing 500,000 and 1,000,000 in that time frame. A vision must not only include goals, but how-to's in reaching those goals, i.e. action plans.

Somewhat appropriate: If NAMB sets baptism goals they should take an active calendar check on each state as to how they are doing and be ready to provide needed funds for evangelism projects as per request. (Not just look at major cities focus) A major part of our population is still rural and rural isn't going away. We can do both and should. Many projects in new state areas that have no mega cities have suffered greatly because funds and other resources would not be made available because of the major focus to selected major cities. Somehow we need to do both. One of our major heart beats as Southern Baptist is that we do not set selective people to evangelize. The whole world is our field. We can have major focus, but let's not be out of focus on anyone anywhere, at any time.

God-sized!

While the stated vision is appropriate, I don't believe that the present NAMB structure or "M.O." reflects such a candid partnership with state conventions and associations. I get the strong impression that those in executive leadership of some of our key SBC agencies discount the role that state conventions and associations play in Kingdom work. The fact is that EVERY ORGANIZATION beyond the local church is a parachurch organization, and to assume that the national agencies play a more vital role in the denomination is faulty and unfortunate. A mega church mindset seems to prevail at NAMB these days. By this I'm referring to the uncooperative attitude and lack of involvement many megachurches have regarding the local association and the state convention. Mega churches don't "need" those groups like other churches, but most churches are not mega churches. Therefore, our denomination should be careful (extremely careful) about modeling ministry after mega churches. Time does not allow me to discuss the fact that many mega churches that I'm familiar with are "growing" at a rate that pales in comparison to the rate of many of our "smaller" churches.

I am not sure what the vision for church planting is! (Editor's note: This is in response to the error in the question asked. See footnote 1 in the text.)

This is a good example of the need to involve DOE's in goal setting, etc. The goal belongs to NAMB. There is no ownership in the states. I support the need and desire to reach people with the gospel. What portion of the one million am I asked to win? Have associational DOE's been consulted? Have pastors convention-wide been asked to set individual goals? What is the process for reporting these goals?

Baptism, including the setting of goals, must be the exclusive activity of local churches. A goal is appropriate only when those who are responsible for its attainment have ownership. Put another way: Your goals for me are bad; My goals for me are good. Perhaps the statement would be much more realistic if it said, "...assisting local Southern Baptist churches to realize their evangelism goals." Then you wouldn't be striving for some arbitrary number, but would be fulfilling the responsibility of faithfulness of service to the churches, allowing God's Spirit to take care of how many are reached and baptized.

I believe you are on target and would encourage you to continue to provide more practical ministries for our churches.

Please provide suggestions for improving existing resources.

Children's resources are awesome considering the monies they are given. The Net is strong. Tell the states how to promote. Model a strategy for promotion.

Train and make partners of state DOEs in The NET; develop and promote ERC – this is a valuable tool for follow-up in media and resort evangelism.

The marketing for The Net is confusing. People think it is Internet evangelism. The box itself looks more like something about computers than fishing. I would suggest a new marketing approach. Overall it is very good material, but I have found I must explain it is not Internet evangelism.

My "Don't Know" means I know very little about them. I don't know if it is something to continue or not.

Precious little material is offered in any language. Question to ask yourself: "What do our NAMB shelves have on them to help our language churches grow and evangelize?"

Continue to streamline materials for easy grasp.

What additional resources should the Evangelization Group provide?

Church growth mentors and models would be a great place to start.

The churches that have brought HMB/NAMB or the SBC to the strength it enjoys today are small. That doesn't mean the mega-churches are not important and necessary. We are still a convention of small churches. **DON'T FORGET WHO BROUGHT US TO THIS POINT!**

Evangelization with NAMB and Evangelism with the HMB are always working on resources (publications). This has provided a "stable state" approach. It appears to me that more creativity in NAMB is needed to move beyond publication resources. Increased percentages of resources demands new creativity on the part of the group and staff.

There is TREMENDOUS need for a full frontal attack on the philosophy of evolution. Most of our pastors and church people accept it as fact. We have lost the battle for the next generation because they are confronted daily with many high performance evolution brainwashing machines; TV, magazines, school book curriculum, museums, and even pulpits. The problem is that you cannot believe in evolution and make it "fit" into Genesis 1. When a student has all other information sources crying out, "There is NO GOD, because we are products of random change." And then they pick on ONE source – Genesis 1:1 and read it, they reject Christianity because it is a minority report. We are losing the philosophy battle. My personal opinion – only. What does NAMB have on its resource shelves that a single staff or bi-vocational staff church readily and effectively implement? A church of less than 100 in attendance with only a pastor or staff?

Rural evangelism materials, regional materials for open country evangelism.

In what ways can the Evangelization Group improve its language resources?

I am not sure what NAMB is doing to provide language resources. In our convention, we desperately need language resources.

All resources need to be the same quality.

I would make resources available on the Internet to reduce production and storage costs. Make sure that developers are leading-edge evangelists within their cultural groups.

Question: "What resources do you have that I can now offer to our language churches? Do you have anything in Vietnamese, Chinese, Spanish, Hmong, Thai, Cherokee, Navajo, or any other language group with regard to personal evangelism training? ANSWER: none. We are sending our language pastors to EE clinics to get personal evangelism training in their own languages. Question: "What resources are on the NAMB shelves that can be readily utilized and implemented by a single staff church?": "bi-vocational pastor?"

We need a stronger approach to setting up "Spanish as a second language".

It has taken a very long time to get language resources in place. I understand the difficulties of translating language and concepts. I wish we could get language versions of products faster!

Speed.

In what other languages would you like for the Evangelization Group to develop resources?

Mandarin, Spanish, Korean, French.

Spanish, Korean, Chinese, Russian.

Chinese, Spanish, French, Vietnamese, Hmong, Thai, Cherokee, Navajo.

We need language material in Russian, Chinese, Korean, Japanese, Vietnamese, Cambodian and Spanish.

Vietnamese, Korean and Spanish.

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

You guys are doing a good job. We must be more responsive to the DOMs and to what we hear the pastors saying. They like the NET but what is next. Can we find a good strategy to use tract as well as a memorized program?

Strive to develop the fellowship and strategy among state DOEs, particularly with regard to The NET.

Study to see what a plateaued church is in Southern Baptist terms. Some churches, just remaining consistent means growth, especially a military church and its rotation of members. Are the churches that are embarrassed at evangelism meetings that report no baptisms, is it because they baptized no one or that they didn't file an ACP? Having the Church Planting Group and the Evangelism Group working together is good. Evangelism should be a part of everything we do – Sunday school, missions, men and women's ministries, etc. Get evangelism leadership involved with VBS. It is the single event where more people come to Christ than any other event.

Continue to try to understand that each state is important and strategic to North American missions. Sometimes it takes just as much resources to fund a smaller community evangelism project as it does a larger city evangelism project. Chaplaincy needs to play a major role in evangelism and should be funded to respond to the opportunities to go where other evangelist, pastor's and others can't.

I am beginning to understand a little better the direction that you are going and am slowly beginning to implement some of your ministries.