

Research Report

A Publication of Research, North American Mission Board, SBC

Evaluation of the Evangelization Group, NAMB, 2002

Phil Jones

Evaluation of the Evangelization 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 Rennie, Marketing Researcher

Paulette Villarreal, Information Specialist

Patricia Findley, Secretary/Research Assistant

(770)410-6388

An evaluation questionnaire was emailed on January 2, 2003 to 41 people in state conventions that relate to the Evangelization Group at NAMB. These people are state evangelism directors or persons in equivalent positions. (In this report they will be referred to as SDOEs or DOEs.) A reminder was emailed on January 13th to those not initially responding. As a result of these two mailings, 23 questionnaires were completed and returned.¹ Overall, there was an adjusted response rate of 57.5 percent to the survey.

Partnership/Strategy

The questionnaire asked how effectively the Evangelization Group, NAMB, partners with state conventions. The majority of respondents, 78.3 percent, indicated that the Evangelization Group is effectively partnering. The table below shows comparable figures for 1999 and 2000. (No evaluation survey was conducted for 2001.) While the combined effectiveness rating (which includes the responses “completely effective” and “somewhat effective”) has remained about the same over time, the make-up of this rating has shown dramatic improvement. The “completely effective” percentage has more than doubled since 1999 to the current level of 43.5 percent. In contrast, note that 1 of 5 respondents either is undecided on the Evangelism Group’s effectiveness or rated the group “somewhat ineffective.”

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

| | 2002 | 2000 | 1999 |
|----------------------|-------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Completely effective | 43.5% | 21.7% ² | 18.2% ³ |
| Somewhat effective | 34.8 | 56.5 | 54.5 |
| Neutral (undecided) | 13.0 | 17.4 | 18.2 |
| Somewhat ineffective | 8.7 | 4.3 | 0.0 |
| Very Ineffective | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| No response | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.0 |

SDOEs were asked if the partnership relationship between NAMB and state conventions improved during the year. A slight majority, 56.5 percent, responded that the relationship improved while 34.8 percent indicated it stayed the same. No one indicated the relationship worsened. Two people did not respond to this question.

Respondents were asked to provide specific examples of where the Evangelization Group, NAMB, is effectively working in partnership with state conventions. Nineteen people provided examples for this section of the questionnaire. Several recurring themes emerged from the comments. The most frequently cited theme is that the Evangelization group is effectively partnering by resourcing the work of state conventions through providing materials, training, and speakers for conferences. Other things mentioned are that the Evangelization Group has become more caring and encouraging toward those in state conventions. In particular, there is more of a listening attitude and willingness to include the state as a partner in planning. Also mentioned several times was the emphasis on prayer. A complete list of verbatim responses is included in the appendix.

Respondents were also asked to provide examples of where the Evangelization Group needs to improve its working relationship with state conventions. Thirteen people provided areas for improvement. Two-way communication is a primary area for improvement. The most repeated suggestion is that there needs to be more one-on-one personal contact with SDOEs. In particular, it was suggested that the V.P of

¹ One state convention indicated that the evangelism position was vacant and no other person in the convention could adequately response.

² The data for 2000 is based on 23 respondents and a response rate of 53 percent.

³ The data for 1999 is based on 11 respondents and a response rate of 26 percent.

Evangelization needs to develop a personal relationship with each SDOE. A second repeated theme is that SDOEs need to be included to a greater extent in planning. The third suggestion is that NAMB events such as Connections and Church On The Cutting Edge need to be better communicated to and scheduled with state conventions. Detailed responses are included in the appendix.

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

Is the partnership between the Evangelization and Church Planting Groups at NAMB 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 | 13.0% |
| Yes, somewhat | 52.2 |
| No | 17.4 |
| Don't know | 17.4 |
| No response | 0.0 |

Two-thirds (65.2%) indicated it has a positive effect; however, the relationship does not appear very strong. Only three respondents (13.0%) indicated the partnership at NAMB had a major effect on the partnership between these two areas in their states. This was a substantial drop for this single response category from the 2000 evaluation (from 39.1% to 13.0%).

One last question asked about the responsiveness of the Evangelization Group to their state convention. Two-thirds of respondents indicated the group is very responsive. An additional 1 of 5 indicated the group is somewhat responsive. No one reported that the Evangelization Group is unresponsive, although, 3 respondents were undecided on this matter.

How responsive is the Evangelization Group to your offices and your state?

| | |
|-----------------------|-------|
| Very responsive | 65.2% |
| Somewhat responsive | 21.7 |
| Neutral (undecided) | 13.0 |
| Somewhat unresponsive | 0.0 |
| Very unresponsive | 0.0 |
| No response | 0.0 |

Communication

SDOEs were asked if the weekly newsletter, *Fast Facts*, is a helpful source of information. Eight of 10 respondents indicated that it is helpful—only one person indicated that it is not helpful. (There were a couple of respondents who were neutral or had no opinion about it.) Three of 10 (30.4%) responded that it is a “very helpful” publication while 56.5 percent indicated “somewhat helpful.” Overall, the opinion is a slightly more positive than reported in 2000.

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

| | 2002 | 2000 |
|------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Yes, very helpful | 30.4% | 34.8% |
| Yes, somewhat helpful | 56.5 | 43.5 |
| Neutral/no opinion | 8.7 | 13.0 |
| No, not very helpful | 4.4 | 8.7 |
| No, not at all helpful | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| No response | 0.0 | 0.0 |

A follow-up encouraged respondents to suggest changes for the newsletter. Only 6 people responded. Half mentioned that it needs to be kept brief. (See 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 evangelism models and strategies among Southern Baptist pastors?

| | 2002 | 2000 |
|----------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Very effective | 30.4% | 13.0% |
| Somewhat effective | 52.2 | 30.4 |
| Neutral (undecided) | 13.0 | 39.1 |
| Somewhat ineffective | 4.4 | 8.7 |
| Very ineffective | 0.0 | 4.3 |
| No response | 0.0 | 4.3 |

Eight of 10 respondents indicated the publication is effective. Still, only 3 of 10 indicated it is very effective. Note there has been substantial improvement in the rating of this publication over the past two years. (This is an interesting change given that the ratings for the publication provided by state directors of missions as a part of the Church Planting Group Evaluation have significantly dropped during the past year.)

Only one person provided a suggestion to improve this publication. Several others provided commendations or observations. These comments are included in the appendix.

SDOEs were offered the opportunity to provide suggestions for improving Evangelization Group communications (other than *Fast Facts* and *Church Planting and Evangelism Today*). Only seven provided comments. They ranged from “there is already enough communication material,” to “there needs to be more personal communication between the Evangelization Group and state conventions.” (See appendix.)

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 1,000,000 in the year 2005. With the vision statement provided as reference, SDOEs were asked to evaluate the vision.

Please rate the Evangelization Group's vision.

| | 2002 | 2000⁴ | 1999 |
|------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|-------------|
| It is very appropriate | 56.5% | 43.5% | 54.5% |
| It is somewhat appropriate | 21.7 | 21.7 | 18.2 |
| Neutral (I'm undecided) | 8.7 | 21.7 | 9.1 |
| It is somewhat inappropriate | 13.0 | 8.7 | 9.1 |
| It is very inappropriate | 3.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| No response | 0.0 | 4.3 | 9.1 |

Three-fourths indicated the vision appropriate with over half of all respondents, 56.5 percent, indicating it is very appropriate. Conversely, 1 of 6 respondents rated the vision as inappropriate.

The questionnaire solicited comments about the vision of the Evangelization Group. Seventeen people responded. Some of the recurring themes in the responses are 1) that the grass-roots of the denomination needs to participate in development of the vision, 2) that steps need to be developed to implement the vision, 3) that the goal is boldly appropriate, and conversely 4) that the goal is presumptuous and unrealistic. (See appendix for verbatim responses.)

Resources and Strategies

SDOEs were asked to rate 34 resources, tools, and strategies produced or promoted by the Evangelization Group. Responses are included in the table below.

Please rate the following resources provided by the Evangelization Group, NAMB.

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Don't Know | No Response |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| Alternatives for Life Centers | 4.4% | 8.7% | 8.7% | 0.0% | 73.9% | 4.4% |
| Beginning Steps | 13.0 | 65.2 | 13.0 | 0.0 | 8.7 | 0.0 |
| Chaplains Evangelism | 4.4 | 13.0 | 26.1 | 0.0 | 52.2 | 4.4 |
| Church and Community Centers | 4.4 | 21.7 | 8.7 | 0.0 | 56.5 | 8.7 |
| Commitment Guide | 26.1 | 43.5 | 21.7 | 0.0 | 4.4 | 4.4 |
| Connect (Youth Evangelism Strategy) | 13.0 | 39.1 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 39.1 | 4.4 |
| Crossover | 26.1 | 30.4 | 26.1 | 0.0 | 8.7 | 8.7 |
| The Cutting Edge Conference | 43.5 | 8.7 | 17.4 | 13.0 | 8.7 | 8.7 |
| English as a Second Language | 21.7 | 34.8 | 8.7 | 0.0 | 26.1 | 8.7 |
| Evangelism Response Center | 39.1 | 43.5 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 8.7 |
| Event Evangelism | 30.4 | 47.8 | 8.7 | 0.0 | 4.4 | 8.7 |
| EXIT | 4.4 | 26.1 | 13.0 | 0.0 | 52.2 | 4.4 |
| FISH | 30.4 | 30.4 | 13.0 | 0.0 | 26.1 | 0.0 |
| Frontliners | 13.0 | 17.4 | 17.4 | 0.0 | 43.5 | 8.7 |
| God's Special Plan for Children | 26.1 | 34.8 | 30.4 | 0.0 | 4.4 | 4.4 |
| HeartCall | 43.5 | 39.1 | 8.7 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 0.0 |
| ICE Teams | 21.7 | 30.4 | 13.0 | 4.4 | 21.7 | 8.7 |
| Interfaith Evangelism | 39.1 | 52.2 | 0.0 | 8.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Internet Evangelism | 4.4 | 34.8 | 17.4 | 4.4 | 30.4 | 8.7 |
| Ministry Evangelism Toolkit | 43.5 | 39.1 | 8.7 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 0.0 |

⁴ There have been slight changes in the evaluation of the vision statement over the years. In 2000 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. Also, the wording of the vision changed slightly from 1999 to 2000; however, the meaning and intent remained the same.

| | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Don't Know | No Response |
|--|------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| The Net | 43.5% | 34.8% | 21.7% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| On Mission to Share Jesus Sunday (OMTSJ) | 26.1 | 17.4 | 34.8 | 4.4 | 13.0 | 4.4 |
| Operation Starting Line | 0.0 | 8.7 | 13.0 | 0.0 | 69.6 | 8.7 |
| Pray Timer | 13.0 | 60.9 | 8.7 | 0.0 | 17.4 | 0.0 |
| Prayer Strategy | 21.7 | 52.2 | 8.7 | 0.0 | 8.7 | 8.7 |
| Praying Your Friends to Christ | 43.5 | 30.4 | 8.7 | 0.0 | 17.4 | 0.0 |
| Refugee Resettlement | 0.0 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 82.6 | 8.7 |
| Resort and Leisure | 0.0 | 21.7 | 13.0 | 0.0 | 56.5 | 8.7 |
| Student Missionaries | 17.4 | 34.8 | 8.7 | 8.7 | 17.4 | 13.0 |
| Taking Prayer to the Streets | 34.8 | 26.1 | 21.7 | 0.0 | 8.7 | 8.7 |
| Time to Tell | 17.4 | 17.4 | 13.0 | 4.4 | 39.1 | 8.7 |
| Truckstop Ministry | 8.7 | 13.0 | 13.0 | 0.0 | 56.5 | 8.7 |
| Vocational Evangelist Work | 4.4 | 21.7 | 17.4 | 8.7 | 39.1 | 8.7 |
| World Hunger | 13.0 | 34.8 | 4.4 | 0.0 | 43.5 | 4.4 |

There are several ways to analyze this information. One is to combine the good and excellent ratings. Out of this list of 34 resources, Interfaith Evangelism received the highest combined rating—91.3 percent of respondents rated it good or excellent. Three other top performers were rated good or excellent by at least 80 percent of respondents: Evangelism Response Center, HeartCall, and Ministry Evangelism Toolkit. The following table lists those items where at least half of respondents rated it good or excellent.

Percentage of Respondents Rating Resources, Tools and Strategies Good or Excellent

| | |
|-------------------------------------|-------|
| Interfaith Evangelism | 91.3% |
| HeartCall | 82.6 |
| Ministry Evangelism Toolkit | 82.6 |
| Evangelism Response Center | 82.6 |
| The Net | 78.3 |
| Event Evangelism | 78.2 |
| Beginning Steps | 78.2 |
| Praying Your Friends to Christ | 73.9 |
| Prayer Strategy | 73.9 |
| Pray Timer | 73.9 |
| Commitment Guide | 69.6 |
| Taking Prayer to the Streets | 60.9 |
| God's Special Plan for Children | 60.9 |
| FISH | 60.8 |
| Crossover | 56.5 |
| English as a Second Language | 56.5 |
| The Cutting Edge Conference | 52.2 |
| Student Missionaries | 52.2 |
| ICE Teams | 52.1 |
| Connect (Youth Evangelism Strategy) | 52.1 |

As a subset of these highly rated resources, it is noteworthy that five resources were rated excellent by 43.5 percent of respondents. The table below lists all those that were rated excellent by at least a third of those participating in the survey.

Percentage of Respondents Rating a Resource Excellent

| | |
|--------------------------------|-------|
| HeartCall | 43.5% |
| Ministry Evangelism Toolkit | 43.5 |
| The Net | 43.5 |
| Praying Your Friends to Christ | 43.5 |
| The Cutting Edge Conference | 43.5 |
| Interfaith Evangelism | 39.1 |
| Evangelism Response Center | 39.1 |
| Taking Prayer to the Streets | 34.8 |

In contrast to those rated good or excellent are those that were rated fair or poor. Obviously poor is a negative rating. Very few poor ratings were given by respondents. In fact, the highest percentage poor rating was received by The Cutting Edge Conference—13.0 percent. (This is interesting in that this conference was among those with the highest excellent rating.) We can also assume that fair is a tepid rating and at best indicates lackluster performance. Combining the fair and poor ratings provides a measure of the more poorly performing resources, strategies and tools provided by the Evangelization Group. There were six resources where at least 1 of 4 respondents rated it fair or poor. They are included in the table below

Percentage of Respondents Rating a Resource Fair or Poor

| | |
|----------------------------------|-------|
| On Mission to Share Jesus Sunday | 39.2% |
| The Cutting Edge Conference | 30.4 |
| God’s Special Plan for Children | 30.4 |
| Crossover | 26.1 |
| Vocational Evangelist Work | 26.1 |
| Chaplains Evangelism | 26.1 |

Note in particular that there is diversity of opinion about The Cutting Edge Conference, God’s Special Plan for Children and Crossover. They were rated favorably by at least half of the respondents and unfavorably by at least a fourth.

A final way in which the original data can be analyzed is to combine don’t know response with non response. This provides a measure of the lack of familiarity that SDOEs have with a particular resource, strategy, or tool. There are eight resources where at least half of the respondents are not familiar with them. In particular, 9 of 10 SDOEs are not familiar with Refugee Resettlement. Likewise, 3 of 4 are not familiar with Operation Starting Line. The list below highlights areas where increased communication and promotion are appropriate.

Percentage of Respondents Unfamiliar With a Resource

| | |
|------------------------------|-------|
| Refugee Resettlement | 91.3% |
| Operation Starting Line | 78.3 |
| Truckstop Ministry | 65.2 |
| Resort and Leisure | 65.2 |
| Church and Community Centers | 65.2 |
| Chaplains Evangelism | 56.6 |
| EXIT | 56.6 |
| Frontliners | 52.2 |

SDOEs were asked to provide suggestions for improvements to existing resources. Verbatim responses are included in the appendix. There were no recurring themes.

The questionnaire listed five resources that are in development at NAMB. SDOEs were asked to rate the need for each of them in their state. Four of the 5 resources were rated as needed by the large majority of respondents. Few of the respondents indicated the resources were not needed. The 5-16 Home was the only 1 of the 5 resources that appeared to be unfamiliar to SDOEs and as a result they did not indicate it as being a needed resource. Responses are included in the table below.

Please rate the need for each in your state.

| | Much Needed | Somewhat Needed | Not Needed | Not Familiar |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|--------------|
| The 5-16 Home | 21.7% | 4.4% | 0.0% | 73.9% |
| Baptismal Celebration | 65.2 | 13.0 | 0.0 | 21.7 |
| One-Day Personal Evangelism Workshop | 69.6 | 13.0 | 8.7 | 8.8 |
| One-Hour Personal Evangelism Workshop | 60.9 | 21.7 | 8.7 | 8.8 |
| What Now, America/Canada? | 60.9 | 26.1 | 0.0 | 13.1 |

Respondents were asked if there are additional resources that the Evangelization Group needs to provide. Only 5 people responded. There are no recurring themes. (See appendix.)

SDOEs were asked to rate how effectively Chaplaincy has been integrated into a continental evangelism strategy. No one indicated that it has been done ineffectively. Still, hardly anyone provided endorsement that this has been done very effectively. It appears that nearly two-thirds are undecided or have no opinion about this issue.

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

| | |
|------------------------|------|
| Very effectively | 4.4% |
| Somewhat effectively | 30.4 |
| Neutral (undecided) | 60.9 |
| Somewhat ineffectively | 0.0 |
| Very ineffectively | 0.0 |
| No response | 4.4 |

Although The Net was included in the list of resources, strategies, and tools earlier in the questionnaire, a separate question was specifically included regarding the effectiveness of all the resources that have been developed specifically for The Net. Nearly all the response was positive; however, only 3 of 10 indicated they were very effective. See below.

Please rate the effectiveness of the resources that have been developed for “The Net.”

| | |
|----------------------|-------|
| Very effective | 30.4% |
| Somewhat effective | 56.5 |
| Neutral (undecided) | 4.4 |
| Somewhat ineffective | 4.4 |
| Very ineffective | 0.0 |
| No response | 4.4 |

Respondents were asked if the Evangelization Group is moving in the right direction in developing language and ethnic resources. Nearly three-fourths (73.9%) responded yes while 17.4 percent indicated no. (Non response was 8.7%.) Those answering no were asked to provide suggestions for improvement. Only five people responded and the only comment provided more than once was that progress is too slow. (See appendix.)

Another open-end question asked about additional languages where the Evangelization Group should develop resources. Only four people responded. Three of the 4 mentioned Korean. (See appendix.)

Additional Comments

Persons completing the survey were given a final opportunity to provide comments about the work of the Evangelization Group. Nine people responded to this question. Over half expressed words of encouragement and appreciation for The Evangelization Group. Verbatim remarks are included on the last page of the appendix.

APPENDIX

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

- NAMB group has reached out to me as a State DOE in answering questions and supplying materials. Also, they have made a consistent emphasis on prayer, and that is key.
- There seems to be a listening attitude toward State leaders that was not as recognizable before. Also, the NAMB Evangelization Group has become more caring, rejoicing with those who rejoice and weeping with those who weep.
- Helping with great training and speakers for conferences.
- Their willingness to come to any event or training that the state is planning.
- Evangelism Conference – prayer team from NAMB is providing leadership and funding to help focus on prayer as the foundation of evangelism.
- 1) They partner well with our state evangelism conference, sending workshop leaders and materials. 2) The Family to Family evangelism.
- They have partnered with us in resources and training for the NET. There is a continual sense of encouragement from the people within the Evangelization Group.
- 1) Chris Schoffield and the prayer division goes the 2nd mile in being personable, immediately responding to calls, helping in planning specific prayer strategies that meet our needs and then resourcing with personal participation and financial assistance to help make it happen (actually calls with no agenda but to pray with over the phone). 2) The NET group in the past year has been very responsive and creatively responding to some of our ideas with training CD's, etc. This year our emphasis at our Evangelism Conference is the NET. The NET personnel have been helping us resource our plans and ideas.
- 1) Great working relationship in Crossover, St. Louis on Illinois side. 2) Great working relationship in E. St. Louis ICE Team. 3) Randy Singer and Gary Frost greatly helped our state evangelism conference.
- Although I am new to my position, it seems that there is usually a desire to help in whatever way they can. I have found most of the staff to work to offer resources to help us reach people for Jesus. I have had more contact with the prayer group, personal evangelism, and special ministries and find their attitudes to be extremely helpful.
- I am brand new, but I have had nothing but good experiences with my friends at NAMB.
- The Interfaith Evangelism Team has partnered with us on several occasions, and the response has always been very positive.
- They are trying to keep the DOE's informed as to upcoming projects and allowing us to have a part in that planning.
- This is difficult to answer in light of the relationships between NAMB and the DC Baptist Convention as influenced by strategic discussions.
- Summer leadership meeting and Evangelism Response Center.

- Communication and inclusion with input and development.
- Strategic Focus Cities in NYC is one example.
- Having the opportunity to meet with you at the summer meeting, and the recent meeting at the Billy Hanks ranch in Texas was so helpful – especially the meeting in Texas. Dialogue is so important and greatly appreciated.
- 1) Providing visionary national plan and direction. 2) Providing staff to help in state events. 3) Providing fellowship and friendship. 4) Designing new printed and visual media resources. 5) Providing financial resources for partnership funding.

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

- None I can think of other than: Keep it simple.
- Dr. Yarbrough needs to communicate with ALL State Evangelism Directors. Establish personal relationship with State Evangelism Director
- There needs to be more one on one personal contact with State Directors of Evangelism. Visionary planning needs to include a greater number of State Directors of Evangelism perhaps through regional contact before decisions are made. Smaller states need more contact with larger ones for ideas and encouragement. NAMB can provide that opportunity.
- Communication with states when planning a regional meeting, such as a “Connection” conference.
- Listen to the needs from the churches and be willing to provide resources/consultation based on the needs. Visit the state DOE’s to learn their needs.
- Continue the need to understand that NAMB works in partnership with the State Convention and local association to then assist the local church in its mission.
- Because of the huge number of churches in the SBC, I am not sure they can address this concern for Canada. My great desire is to see churches begin to think long term and strategically about evangelism. It would be great if we could develop a network that would help churches and pastors, especially smaller congregations learn to do this effectively.
- Some in the department you still only hear from them when they have something to push or sell. That’s not a partnership.
- I don’t have any since I’ve not been here very long to make a credible assessment.
- Because of the illness of my wife which disallowed my attendance at a couple of national events, and since my position has been in a state of transition (I have been serving as co-director of evangelism), I am really not in a position to offer any informed suggestions in this area.
- The scheduling of events that are going to take place in our state needs improvement. The Church on The Cutting Edge was a great conference but it fell about a month before our annual meeting which was in the same city. Please work with us before you set a date for something.

- NAMB and its Evangelization Group will be hard pressed to develop evangelism plans and processes without working cooperatively and at times as the initiative of the regional unit, like the state convention or the association. It would appear that processes to discuss with these groups need to develop more fully.

Please provide any suggested changes for *Fast Facts*.

- Always the information is best in its shortest form.
- You might make it less wordy so that we can gain the information faster.
- Each division of evangelization should have information for *Fast Facts* to the state convention.
- A little more information relative to the status of programs and materials being developed e.g. The One Hour Evangelism Training.
- I think the present format is fine. Keep it brief and informative.
- I have trouble sometimes opening the file on my computer. Make it readable. Maxwell's Injoy Group has several e-newsletters that come directly without having to download, etc. Try looking at that as a format.

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

- Put in some practical things for the churches to do for evangelism on a regular basis. Could be very short and simple.
- Good information.
- I like it.
- I hear from the churches of the DC Baptist Convention no discussion of the periodical.

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

- Dr. Yarbrough needs to visit, phone, and to communicate personally with State Evangelism Director.
- Telephone and personal email.
- Include a section of what other conventions are doing that is working in evangelism.
- Summer meetings need more dialogue and less moving from one workshop to another (having to pick and choose), for some of us, it's just not possible to attend each workshop. Be good to have the five divisions of evangelism, meeting across the three days.
- I would enjoy a piece where maybe quarterly different state DOE's share "what's working" around the nation.
- I believe that there is plenty of communication.
- I think you cover it well with what you have. It is easy to become so overwhelmed with so much reading material that we don't have time to do the work. In my particular area of ministry, I cover other areas besides missions and evangelism and time is at a premium.

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

- Please keep it prayer driven and doctrinally sound (as opposed to strategy driven and organizationally driven) i.e. it needs to have the “smell” of God on it and not the “smell” of management gurus. I think there have been some good improvements here but we need to keep this improved direction going.
- How many State Evangelism Directors were included in the planning?
- Since we are a long ways from fulfilling the goal, perhaps more detailed action plans would be helpful to states, associations and church. Many of us will find creative ways to challenge churches and associations toward the goal, but some will not. Also, all goals must be the sum total of grass roots input. For example, who came up with the vision? Could we not plan a year-by-year goal that climaxes in the year 2005 with 1,000,000 people reached and baptized? Why not find out each year the number of people saved in churches as well as the number baptized? Some we reach may go to other churches than Southern Baptist. Some saved may, like Catholics, make a second decision to follow Jesus in believer’s baptism. While Paul believed strongly in baptism, he stated “God sent me not to baptize but to preach the gospel.” We cannot be weak on baptism but we must recognize salvation where baptism may not happen immediately. Let churches, associations, and state conventions establish goals so that they are owned by them. No one is more excited about my goals than me. However, if I want others on board, then the goal must be theirs as well.
- The goal is very large and may seem unattainable to the local churches. Also, the local churches can assume that someone else is working hard to reach the goal unless it is perceived as being their goal. Maybe it could include a goal that each church doubles their current goal for the year 2005 and following.
- The “how to” is then key.
- The 2003-2005 emphasis is right on target.
- I always believe it is appropriate to challenge our churches to reach and baptize. My concern is that if this vision came from NAMB and not our churches it might be difficult to get “buy in.”
- One piece of advice – gear up some special volunteers to help state conventions and major cities like Chicago collect the ACP data and get it in so it can be counted. Offer this help to state conventions early on.
- I think the vision is most appropriate but NAMB will need to work to see it as a partnership with state conventions. We have a vision that will work with that goal and will look to see how that can come along side our vision to see a 10 fold increase in baptisms in our state.
- I believe that it is very presumptuous to put a number on what we hope to accomplish. The vision statement would be very good to say, after the word “baptize,” “... as many people as the Lord will choose to give us.” To ascribe a number to a goal (vision) presumes that we have control over the results, and it also has a tendency to direct our focus on the wrong thing. Just an opinion that I have discovered is shared by very few.

- I believe it is bold and so it should be. We simply need to continue to encourage our churches to catch the vision.
- I see this vision as something which was promised in 1997. Additionally, I remember the promise of 500,000 baptisms in 2002. Both were stated at that time to be “challenge goals.” I am not sure how the words vision and goals are related in the NAMB use of terms. It seems that if the above is truly a vision, it would be too limiting in both time and expectation.
- I was very energized by the vision for the 2005 evangelism emphasis – “What Now America/Canada.” I hope to continue on through 2005 instead of resigning my position in 2003. It will probably require me to raise the funds my convention puts into my salary since they were not going to replace my position for several years.
- The number of 1 million baptisms for one year, considering that the SBC has never even reached 500,000 seems a little too much. I appreciate the challenge, but think that it is a little too unreasonable. To mobilize the church and see this take place would require a divine movement I am not sure we can orchestrate.
- Where did the number of one million in 2005 come from? What are the steps that are to be taken to get there? How can a goal be set that you have no control over?
- I like the boldness and enthusiasm of the vision.

Please provide any suggestions for improving existing resources:

- Let’s make sure the message is more important than method or format.
- Be sure to include mentoring or equipping people with a mentoring approach in all that we do.
- It would be good to have major focused state emphasis: Example – five states per year for 10 years, with major focused emphasis in evangelism/church planting, and within the 10 year time frame, we would have covered the entire nation by 2010.
- No suggestions at this time. I still need some time to familiarize myself with the resources, and to discover how many churches are employing them in their ministries.
- I didn’t even know some of these ministries existed and I have been on the field for five years now. You might want to send a sample of each to each director.

What additional resources should the Evangelization Group provide?

- I believe you should encourage state leaders to write needed resources as well. They can address the culture of their given ministry field perhaps better than those living in other fields. Help them financially when necessary. You should develop resources for specific locations and needs as well especially ethnic people groups.
- Overall the resource book that lists all evangelization departments (contact person) and resources is a handy reference, other than the internet.
- Need some new pieces in helping churches build an effective annual evangelism strategy.

- It would be good to create a self-standing piece on finding and categorizing prospects like the piece that is in The Net kit.
- I believe you have enough right now; we just need to use what we have!

Do you feel that the Evangelization Group, NAMB is moving in the right direction in developing language & ethnic resources? If no, in what ways can the Evangelization Group improve?

- The Group should allow the ethnic fellowship groups to design and modify the materials as necessary. I would think that funding for internet and desktop publishing would be the best way to go. In such a way, NAMB develops leaders, writers and maintains the indigenous approach that will be most productive.
- It seems that your heart is in the right place in this area. However, in areas such as Native Americans, I see very little progress.
- I appreciate the efforts to get program materials into other languages but it seems too slow of a process. Need a faster response.
- We need permanent staff (office and field) who are leaders in our non-English language people groups.
- The ethnic and language material is second class to the English material. An example is the CD produced for the net and for the God's special plan.

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

- Korean and Spanish.
- Chinese, French and Korean.
- Spanish.
- Haitian-Creole, Portuguese, Korean and Japanese.

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

- Just one practical one: Never make Gospel tracts etc. that do not fit easily into a man's shirt pocket. The one's that don't fit now are not used as they could be and end up ragged looking too often when they are.
- Thank you for asking.
- My overall concern is that we work together, partner together, and encourage together our ministry to the local church, in such a way, that the local church understands that we can assist them in their ministry. Today, many local churches and associations are not denominationally loyal. Some churches view the state, national and some associations as controlling and restrictive to their ministry. We talk about kingdom growth, but how is that viewed on the local church level? Are we (NAMB, state convention and association) viewed as assisting, helpful, partners with the local church or only self-serving with our general interests?
- I am very burdened over the promises publicly made when moving from HMB to NAMB – still prayerfully waiting!!!!
- Thank you for your partnership!
- I look forward to working more closely with the Evangelization Group in the years ahead.
- I really believe you are trying real hard to assist us in the work that we are doing in our state. Communication will continue to be the key for successful partnerships (on both ends). I personally appreciate all that you are doing and want to encourage you to keep on keeping on.
- Thank you for your continued passion to reach North America (minus Mexico) for Christ!
- Thanks for the work you do. We do need to find a way to coordinate the many programs and evangelism strategy titles that encircle us in our states. Right now we must find a way to coordinate and assimilate such titles as: Healthy Kingdom Churches; What Now, America?; Empowering Kingdom Growth; etc. It does become confusing.