

RESEARCH REPORT

A Publication of Research, North American Mission Board, SBC

Evaluation of the Evangelization Group, NAMB, 2003

Phillip B. Jones

Evaluation of the Evangelization Group, NAMB, 2003

Phillip B. Jones

March 2004

North American Mission Board

Robert (Bob) Reccord, President and CEO

Mobilization & Media Group

Nate Adams, Vice President

Research

Phil Jones, Director

Marilynn Kelly, Administrative Secretary
(770)410-6386

Richie C. Stanley, Researcher

Bob Rennier, Researcher

Paulette Villarreal, Information Specialist

Answer His Call

Tell His Story

Change Your World

Table of Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Partnership	1
Table: <i>Overall, how effective is the Evangelization Group, NAMB, in partnering with your state convention?</i>	1
Table: <i>How responsive is the Evangelization Group to your offices and your state?</i>	2
Communication	2
Table: <i>Do you find the weekly newsletter Fast Facts a helpful source of information?</i>	2
Vision	2
Table: <i>Please rate the Evangelization Group’s vision</i>	3
Resources and Strategies	3
Table: <i>Please rate the following resources, tools, and strategies provided by the Evangelization Group, NAMB, to assist your state strategies.</i>	3
Table: <i>Percentage of Respondents Rating Resources, Tools, and Strategies Good or Excellent</i>	4
Table: <i>Percentage of Respondents Rating a Resource Fair or Poor</i>	5
Table: <i>Percentage of Respondents Unfamiliar with a Resource</i>	6
Table: <i>How effectively do you feel that the Interfaith Team has been integrated into a continental evangelism strategy?</i>	6
Table: <i>Please rate the effectiveness of the resources that have been developed for Student Evangelism</i>	6
Additional Comments	7
Appendix (responses to open-end questions)	8
Please list one or two examples of where the Evangelization Group, NAMB, is effectively working in partnership with state conventions:.....	9
Please list one or two examples of where the Evangelization Group, NAMB, needs to improve its working relationship with state conventions:	11
Please provide any suggested changes for <i>Fast Facts</i>	13
Please provide any comments you have concerning the Evangelization Group’s vision:	14
Please provide any suggestions for improving existing resources:	16
What additional resources should the Evangelization Group provide?.....	17
Please provide any additional comments or suggestions you might have regarding the work of the Evangelization Group, NAMB.	18

An evaluation questionnaire was emailed on February 16, 2004, to 42 people in state conventions that relate to the Evangelization Group at the North American Mission Board (NAMB). These people are state evangelism directors or persons in equivalent positions. (In this report they are referred to as SDOEs.) A reminder was emailed on March 3rd 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 54.8 percent to the survey—a rate close to the one reported in the 2002 survey.

Partnership

The questionnaire asked how effectively the Evangelization Group, NAMB, partners with state conventions. The majority of respondents, 82.6 percent, indicated that the Evangelization Group is effectively partnering. The table below shows comparable figures for 2002, 2000, and 1999. (No evaluation survey was conducted for 2001.) While the combined effectiveness rating (which includes the responses “very effective” and “somewhat effective”) has remained about the same over time, the make-up of this rating improved dramatically from 1999 to 2002 with the percentage responding very effective more than doubling. The overall rating for 2003 was about the same as for 2002. 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 your state convention?*

	2003	2002 ²	2000 ³	1999 ⁴
Very effective ⁵	43.5%	43.5%	21.7%	18.2%
Somewhat effective	39.1	34.8	56.5	54.5
Neutral (undecided)	8.7	13.0	17.4	18.2
Somewhat ineffective	4.3	8.7	4.3	0.0
Very Ineffective	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
No response	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.0

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. 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. 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. Fifteen people provided areas for improvement. One recurring theme is that NAMB needs to get more input from the field, particularly by including SDOEs in the development of materials, programs, and strategies. One respondent suggested that NAMB might facilitate the networking of state conventions so that there is sharing of information relative to what is and is not working. Also, a few respondents noted a lack of communication from NAMB and some mentioned that NAMB staff needs to make field visits and develop relationships with state personnel. Detailed responses are included in the appendix.

¹ In an instance or two, an evangelism associate in a state convention completed the questionnaire.

² The data for 2002 is based on 23 respondents and an adjusted response rate of 57.5 percent

³ The data for 2000 is based on 23 respondents and a response rate of 53 percent.

⁴ The data for 1999 is based on 11 respondents and a response rate of 26 percent.

⁵ In previous evaluations, the response “completely effective” was used for this question rather than the current “very effective.” Apparently the wording made little change in responses.

One last question in the partnership section of the survey instrument asked about the responsiveness of the Evangelization Group to their state convention. Two-thirds of respondents indicated the Group is very responsive—the same percentage as in 2002. An additional 3 of 10 indicated the Group is somewhat responsive. No one reported that the Evangelization Group is unresponsive, and only one respondent was undecided on this matter.

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

	2003	2002
Very responsive	65.2%	65.2%
Somewhat responsive	30.4	21.7
Neutral (undecided)	4.3	13.0
Somewhat unresponsive	0.0	0.0
Very unresponsive	0.0	0.0
No response	0.0	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 four respondents who were neutral or had no opinion about it.) A third (34.8%) responded that it is a “very helpful” publication, while 43.5.5 percent indicated “somewhat helpful.” Overall, the opinion is roughly the same as in previous surveys.

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

	2003	2002	2000
Yes, very helpful	34.8%	30.4%	34.8%
Yes, somewhat helpful	43.5	56.5	43.5
Neutral/no opinion	17.4	8.7	13.0
No, not very helpful	4.3	4.4	8.7
No, not at all helpful	0.0	0.0	0.0
No response	0.0	0.0	0.0

A follow-up encouraged respondents to suggest changes for the newsletter. Only six people responded. Half of them suggested that it would be helpful if information from state conventions was included in the newsletter—specifically what state conventions are doing in the area of evangelism, some of their stories (stories from the field), and prayer needs. A couple of participants suggested that this newsletter be used to review resources—either NAMB-produced resources or pertinent evangelism books or articles. Responses are included in the 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.

	2003	2002	2000 ⁶	1999
It is very appropriate	47.8%	56.5%	43.5%	54.5%
It is somewhat appropriate	30.4	21.7	21.7	18.2
Neutral (I'm undecided)	8.7	8.7	21.7	9.1
It is somewhat inappropriate	8.7	13.0	8.7	9.1
It is very inappropriate	4.3	3.7	0.0	0.0
No response	0.0	0.0	4.3	9.1

Three-fourths indicated the vision appropriate with over half of all respondents, 47.8 percent, indicating it is very appropriate. Conversely, 1 of 8 respondents rated the vision as inappropriate. There have been modest fluctuations from year to year, but there is no overall trend upward or downward.

The questionnaire solicited comments about the vision of the Evangelization Group. Fifteen people responded. The vision received both praise and criticism. Some of the criticism centered not so much around whether or not a goal was appropriate, but whether it was realistic and that it did not originate with input from either churches or state convention partners. Also, there was concern that strategy is not in place to effect the goal. (See appendix for verbatim responses.)

Resources and Strategies

SDOEs were asked to rate 40 resources, tools, and strategies produced or promoted by the Evangelization Group. Responses are included in the table below.

Please rate the following resources, tools, and strategies provided by the Evangelization Group, NAMB, to assist your state strategies.

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't Know	No Response
Alternatives for Life Centers	4.3%	4.3%	0.0%	4.3%	65.2%	21.7%
Baptismal Celebration	13.0	26.1	8.7	0.0	39.1	13.0
Beginning Steps	21.7	39.1	13.0	0.0	21.7	4.3
Chaplains Evangelism	4.3	8.7	21.7	0.0	47.8	17.4
Commitment Guide	30.4	30.4	21.7	0.0	8.7	8.7
Connect (Youth Evangelism Strategy)	17.4	30.4	17.4	4.3	17.4	13.0
The Cross or the Crescent	13.0	39.1	17.4	4.3	13.0	13.0
Crossover	17.4	34.8	17.4	4.3	17.4	8.7
English as a Second Language	26.1	30.4	0.0	0.0	21.7	21.7
Evangelism Response Center	43.8	30.4	17.4	4.3	0.0	4.3
Event Evangelism	30.4	43.5	8.7	0.0	13.0	4.3
eXit	4.3	13.0	8.7	4.3	47.8	21.7
FiSH	17.4	21.7	4.3	4.3	26.1	26.1
God's Special Plan for Children	30.4	34.8	17.4	4.3	8.7	4.3
HeartCall	26.1	34.8	13.0	0.0	17.4	8.7

⁶ 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 HOPE Video	30.4%	34.8%	8.7%	4.3%	13.0%	8.7%
ICE Teams	13.0	30.4	13.0	4.3	26.1	13.0
Interfaith Evangelism	26.1	43.5	4.3	4.3	8.7	13.0
Internet Evangelism	13.0	13.0	30.4	8.7	17.4	17.4
JoePix	21.7	34.8	8.7	13.0	8.7	13.0
Language Resources	4.3	30.4	21.7	8.7	17.4	17.4
Ministry Evangelism Toolkit	13.0	52.2	17.4	0.0	4.3	13.0
The NET	30.4	56.5	8.7	0.0	0.0	4.3
On Mission to Share Jesus Sunday (OMTSJ)	17.4	26.1	30.4	4.3	8.7	13.0
One Day Personal Evangelism Training	34.8	34.8	8.7	0.0	8.7	13.0
One Hour Evangelism Training	26.1	21.7	8.7	4.3	17.4	21.7
One in a Million Prayer Emphasis	30.4	30.4	21.7	4.3	4.3	8.7
Operation Starting Line	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.7	69.6	21.7
PrayTimer	8.7	30.4	21.7	4.3	21.7	13.0
Prayer Strategy	13.0	21.7	21.7	4.3	21.7	17.4
Praying Your Friends to Christ	34.8	21.7	21.7	4.3	4.3	13.0
Refugee Resettlement	0.0	0.0	8.7	0.0	65.2	26.1
Resort and Leisure	0.0	13.0	17.4	4.3	39.1	26.1
Student Missionaries	30.4	13.0	8.7	4.3	21.7	21.7
Taking Prayer to the Streets	26.1	30.4	4.3	8.7	13.0	17.4
Time to Tell	4.3	13.0	0.0	13.0	47.8	21.7
Truckstop Ministry	4.3	4.3	13.0	8.7	47.8	21.7
Vocational Evangelist Work (COSBE)	4.3	8.7	8.7	13.0	43.5	21.7
What Now Overview Guide	4.3	26.1	30.4	8.7	8.7	21.7
World Hunger	13.0	30.4	13.0	0.0	26.1	17.4

There are several ways to analyze this information. One is to combine the good and excellent ratings. Out of this list of 40 resources, The NET received the highest combined rating—86.9 percent of respondents rated it good or excellent. This is the only resource rated good or excellent by at least 3 of 4 respondents. 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

The NET	86.9%
Evangelism Response Center	74.2
Event Evangelism	73.9
Interfaith Evangelism	69.6
One Day Personal Evangelism Training	69.6
God's Special Plan for Children	65.2
The HOPE Video	65.2
Ministry Evangelism Toolkit	65.2
HeartCall	60.9
Beginning Steps	60.8
Commitment Guide	60.8
One in a Million Prayer Emphasis	60.8

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

English as a Second Language	56.5%
JoePix	56.5
Praying Your Friends to Christ	56.5
Taking Prayer to the Streets	56.5
Crossover	52.2
The Cross or the Crescent	52.1

As a subset of these highly rated resources, it is noteworthy that three of these resources were rated excellent by at least a third of those participating in the survey—Evangelism Response Center (43.8%), One Day Personal Evangelism Training (34.8%), and Praying Your Friends to Christ (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 ratings were received by JoePix, Time to Tell, and Vocational Evangelist Work (COSBE). Each was rated poor by 13.0 percent of respondents. 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 eight resources where at least 1 of 4 respondents rated them fair or poor. They are included in the table below

Percentage of Respondents Rating a Resource Fair or Poor

Internet Evangelism	39.1%
What Now Overview Guide	39.1
On Mission to Share Jesus Sunday (OMTSJ)	34.7
Language Resources	30.4
One in a Million Prayer Emphasis	26.0
PrayTimer	26.0
Prayer Strategy	26.0
Praying Your Friends to Christ	26.0

Note in particular that there is diversity of opinion about the One In A Million Prayer Emphasis and Praying Your Friends to Christ. They were rated favorably by at least half of the respondents and unfavorably by at least a fourth. Also note, of these eight items, the negative scores (fair and poor) outweighed the positive scores (good and excellent) for Internet Evangelism and the What Now Overview Guide.

A final way in which the original data can be analyzed is to combine don't know response with no response to an item. This provides a measure of the lack of familiarity that SDOEs have with a particular resource, strategy, or tool. There are eleven 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 and Operation Starting Line. Likewise, 4 of 5 are not familiar with Alternatives for Life Centers. 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	91.3
Alternatives for Life Centers	86.9
eXit	69.5
Time to Tell	69.5
Truckstop Ministry	69.5
Resort and Leisure	65.2
Vocational Evangelist Work (COSBE)	65.2
Chaplains Evangelism	65.2
FiSH	52.2
Baptismal Celebration	52.1

SDOEs were asked to provide suggestions for improvements to existing resources. Verbatim responses are included in the appendix. There were no recurring themes; however, a good suggestion was that a copy of every resource (or appropriate information about a resource) be sent to each state convention—this might help alleviate lack of familiarity with some of the resources.

Respondents were asked if there are additional resources that the Evangelization Group needs to provide. Only 3 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. The plurality of folks (the largest number) indicated that it has been done effectively, but note that few indicate it has been done very effectively. Also, more than 4 of 10 have no opinion about this issue. The data suggests they do not feel strongly about this matter.

How effectively do you feel that the Interfaith Team has been integrated into a continental evangelism strategy?

Very effectively	8.7%
Somewhat effectively	39.1
Neutral (undecided)	17.4
Somewhat ineffectively	8.7
Very ineffectively	0.0
No response	26.1

Respondents were also asked to rate the effectiveness of the resources that have been developed for Student Evangelism. No one indicated that these resources were ineffective; however, over half of those participating in the survey either did not respond to this question or specifically stated they were undecided about the resources. Presumably, respondents are not familiar with these resources. People who are familiar with the resources think they are effective and they are roughly divided between those who think they are very effective and those who think they are somewhat effective.

Please rate the effectiveness of the resources that have been developed for Student Evangelism

Very effective	21.7%
Somewhat effective	26.1
Neutral (undecided)	26.1
Somewhat ineffective	0.0
Very ineffective	0.0
No response	26.1

Additional Comments

Persons completing the survey were given a final opportunity to provide comments about the work of the Evangelization Group. Only five people responded to this question. A couple expressed words of encouragement and appreciation for The Evangelization Group. The other responses were unique. 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:

- Getting us materials and training help quickly.
- If NAMB Evangelization Group is helping with Hunger Funds, then that is one point where we are working effectively.
- I appreciated the orientation to help familiarize me with the people and the process. The responsibilities I have are heavy and the time to dig into every aspect of the work and become acquainted with the resources will take some extended time.
- Sending speakers and conference leaders to our state evangelism conference and to our state missions retreat for men. Providing materials for RAs, Baptist men, and other witnessing opportunities. Representatives at our annual convention meeting. Extending gracious financing and time to get budget funding in place—also helping us strategize how to reach out to rodeo events such as Pioneer Days in Cheyenne.
- I have appreciated John Yarbrough and Thomas Hammond's availability at our State Evangelism Conferences and their availability on the telephone. Other members of the Evangelism staff have made service calls as well
- The Direct and Student evangelism teams are irreplaceable to me and what I am doing. They have been a huge help. They have assisted me with wise counsel, creative ideas, and even resources when appropriate. I would have lost my mind trying to figure out what's expected of me here had it not been for the friendships I have with those two teams in particular.
- Great Commission Prayer Conference, Crossover
- Doing a great job, always willing to help. The student group helps with every request. Childress always gets the job done!
- Great Resources provided
- The Evangelization Group has been very responsive to our requests for funding as we have attempted innovative evangelism methods. We asked for special funding for ministry to internationals last year related to Jesus film distribution and other methods, and you were quick to respond. My first year as executive director, we asked the evangelism section to come to our annual meeting to do a demonstration of evangelism products and methods, and Dr. Yarbrough and two staff members came to help us. It was a great experience.
- Working on an Engage conference for the Northeast
- NAMB has been supportive in participating in our State Evangelism Conference and responding to emails and telephone requests when made.
- One In a Million Prayer site, One day evangelism training, evangelism conference breakout leaders
- NAMB staff has been very cooperative in responding to requests for supplying personnel for conferencing. NAMB has also worked to respond to our desires for staffing in accomplishing our vision.

- Great Resources and have helped with input in areas of need. Always are available to help. Have been consistent partners with our State and Youth Evangelism Conferences.
- 1. The E-Group is helping me develop and test pilot an Evangelistic Christmas Card strategy in 2004 for the state of Illinois. The strategy has the potential for planting the gospel in thousands of homes at “Christ”mas.
2. The E-Group will be working with people from the Church Planting area in helping Illinois develop a statewide Evangelism/New Work strategy.
- 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) Personal Evangelism with training in the NET intro.
2) Prayer in our setting up of an annual meeting.
- THE NET training with Mike Lee and Dick Church.....and Thomas Hammond and Toby Frost in “FOR YOU MIAMI” needs.

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

- There continues to be a desire from the perspective of NAMB totally to drive the work forward. This is an old, indeed ancient paradigm. I do not fault the current vice-presidential leadership, for they seem to be struggling to find ways to let a field driven direction emerge. Still, it is a major problem. NAMB may need to go into a “discovery” mode rather than a production mode.
- Field visits are time consuming but good for service and relationships
- Instead of the occasional phone calls from folks telling me what they can do for me OR asking me to consider doing something they want to lead or do, it is much more effective to develop the relationship - then I’ll call on you for everything. That’s what the guys in the student and direct teams have done. I feel as if I’m calling on my friends, and their input is always well received. I have never felt like they had an agenda that they wanted me to adopt. They have always made me feel as if they would break their backs to support what’s happening in our state.
- Include State Evangelism Directors in the development of materials and in planning programs.
- I have no problems and really see no areas that are in great need of improvement.
- In the field, hands on, participation with state conventions
- When new strategies are put in place, it would be great to involve the State Evangelism Directors earlier in the process. I believe that is where the “What Now” strategy got bogged down. If the states had been directly involved in the strategy process from the beginning, I believe the outcome would have been different.
- Not much communication from the board.
- During staff vacancy have not personally heard from NAMB inquiring if assistance was needed. Have talked in person about recommendations and not received names as were promised. The vision statement talks of partnering. Apart from funding any other information is promotional of NAMB program and material.
- It is alarming to me that we are told by NAMB that What Now is very much on going and LifeWay rep’s come and say that it is very much dead. It is hard to get on board when we don’t know which ship is going to still be floating after all the shots are fired.
- I know that NAMB works to provide resources at discounted rates however even those discounted rates for materials such as “The Hope” or “Jesus film” are strains on our budgets. I’m not sure what the answer to this need would be. Secondly, it would help to work to Network state staff so that we would be aware of what is working or is not in other states. I’m not sure that is the role of NAMB but it would help if there were a way to more openly communicate with others in a similar boat. Thirdly, I would like to see an evangelism summit created where there is an opportunity to take a look at different strategies and where other experts could give input on what God is using from a state perspective. We as leaders need some occasional training on leading states to impact for Christ.

- 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.
- It seems there is less cooperation today than in the past. Example: NAMB's going directly to churches in regard to new evangelism training. There are many examples. Frankly, when you come in on top of one of our meetings, one of the meetings will suffer. It's not smart. It's not good stewardship. We all work with the shortcomings of our calendars in each of our conventions. But in a smaller convention, it becomes very problematic.
- More time together to discuss nation and state strategy to be able to coordinate better...example: not getting the strategy already designed etc. Appreciate being more of the focus and decision process...i.e.,...goals for the "What Now America" baptism numbers. I was never approached with input!
- More accessibility, communication of available resources, programs and training.

Please provide any suggested changes for *Fast Facts*.

- Publish as a Microsoft Word document so all can download it easily.
- It would be helpful to hear more about what other states are doing in the area of evangelism. It would also be helpful to see a review of resources; books, articles, etc.
- More stories from the field.
- Prayer needs for other states and personnel
- As long as it deals with the bare essentials of information it is helpful. There is much abuse of the email thing that eats into the effectiveness of the medium. Keep it to the bare essentials please.
- Just received a forwarded copy. Does not come to our email site. Please auto send when it comes out.
- [Also included with the resource section is the following note: I think it would be helpful to include a monthly review of these resources in FastFacts with recommendations of how they can be used in large and small churches.]

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

- It should not be dated. Otherwise the idea is great!
- At this time the Evangelization Group is prevented from partnering with the DC Baptist Convention through the action of NAMB leadership and the NAMB board. This is very disconnecting for both them and us. The vision statement while appropriate is not relevant to the direction the Group has taken.
- I believe your vision is on target. The front line is the local church and we as denomination workers are here to serve the local church.
- Keep rural and ranching America in your vision, we have very few large cities but lots of rural communities.
- For us in New England, relational evangelism is the key to reaching our universities, and our towns and villages. We will continue to use seed sowing methods such as one church is currently doing--handing out packets of tissues to all movie goers at the Passion with the church's name and phone number on the bottom. However, the emphasis for us will be helping individual Christians learn how to assess the receptivity of those within their circle of influence and methods to help those Christians learn how to minister to their lost friends and neighbors at each level of receptivity with the goal of bring them to the place where they not only are willing, but ready to hear the gospel. Any resources and strategies you can create or emphasize to help us with that task will be greatly appreciated.
- I do not like the word appropriate. The vision is "appropriate" in the sense that reaching people is what we are about. It is not realistic—we have never even neared that many baptisms before, and there is no additional funding to make it all happen.
- The goal to reach 1,000,000 is fine. I'm not sure every church has been made aware of the goal. Secondly, will we be only relying on the ACPs to provide the data? Monthly reports through FastFacts, and state papers would inform the entire convention of our progress toward this goal. Waiting an entire year before we receive the final report could be disappointing.
- The problem with the goal is that nobody on the State level (to my knowledge) was brought in on setting the goal. It is a grand idea but we have hit a fifty year low in baptisms in Oklahoma and your own board in your conference room shows that nationally we have lost ground the last several years. I don't feel we have an adequate strategy in place to turn our baptisms around that quickly. I believe it will take a national spiritual awakening for that to happen.
- I think there needs to be a summit that looks at ways this can be done rather than giving us a NAMB plan. I would rather spend the time at the State Summer Leadership meeting visiting this and hearing from other experts in the field than looking at programs already in place.
- It is the heart and passion of NAMB to reach the world for Christ. It shows in their staff and their ministry.
- I feel that it is good to be challenged to see a God Thing. We can't do it on our own. Only God! We are marching forward in Illinois and I'm excited.

- 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”.
- Stay true to your vision by not doing end runs around state conventions and associations with events and training directed directly at a church. Or at least coordinate with us. In our setting it can be very disruptive if you ignore our events. Pastors here cannot attend two meetings in a short period of time as pastors do in other parts of the country. It is different here in regard to that.
- I was never a part of helping to pray through and decide on the number goals.....we just got them and were asked to agree etc. No coordination was given with major decisions toward our staff. State DOE’s were, for the most part, in the dark on the preparation of What Now America.....
- Is it realistic? What research was conducted to support this as an attainable vision?

Please provide any suggestions for improving existing resources:

- Any evangelism training (or trainer) that does not address the existence of lost people in the class (or folks unsure of their salvation) is very inadequate. For years we have thrown around many statistics about how few SBC church members share their faith...how few tithe...etc. The bigger problem is not training, of promotion. It is lost church members. I'll stop short of giving a sermon but this is real and desperate and needs to be addressed at every opportunity.
- I think it would be helpful to include a monthly review of these resources in Fast Facts with recommendations of how they can be used in large and small churches. [This note included with Fast Facts above.]
- Praytimer is too busy, needs to be simplified.
- More languages needed from the beginning of each...not looking like an afterthought
- Please send one copy of each resource to our office. (Free of charge?)

What additional resources should the Evangelization Group provide?

- A theologically sound tool to address the huge number of people in churches who are unsure of their salvation. Many of these are at this time actually lost
- Stuff for new churches--start up materials--evangelism strategies/materials for home groups, etc.
- A basic guide to apologetics which could be used with adults and even with children. Further development of internet resources for evangelism. A state director of evangelism's state strategy guide with how-to's to leading a state in evangelism.

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

- Very good to Wyoming.
- You guys have a tough job--thanks for all you do!
- The work of the board must be to resource local churches, associations, and conventions through effective partnerships. All other is secondary.
- [We are] In an area of great potential for evangelism and results, and from state that has grown in giving. NAMB needs to work more directly with Western states.
- Evangelism training through NAMB has to be more connected with Sunday School. LifeWay has to just get over it or you guys work out some agreement. Evangelism training has to work through the structure that Southern Baptists continue to work with most often - the Sunday School. We need to lift high the positions of Church Outreach Leader and Sunday School class outreach leaders.