



NORTH AMERICAN MISSION BOARD, SBC
NAMB

Memorandum

To: Harry Lewis
From: Richie Stanley
Date: February 4, 2004
Re: Survey of State Convention Executives

A survey of state convention executives was conducted during December of 2003. The purpose was to seek the executives' evaluation of their partnership with the North American Mission Board. A total of 27 useable responses were received. Several executives failed to complete the entire questionnaire.

The attached copy of the survey instrument tallies the responses. The frequency of responses to each item is given. Frequencies listed are based on the number of respondents to each individual question.

Overall, 23 of the 27 respondents (85%) said that, in partnering with state conventions, the North American Mission Board is very effective (14) or somewhat effective (9). Furthermore, 60 percent said the partnership relationship between NAMB and the states has improved during the past year. Only 8 percent felt the relationship had worsened.

In rating the **development of the Strategic Mission Plan**, the cooperation between NAMB and the states was rated very effective (9) or somewhat effective (12) by 21 of 27 executives (78%).

Two areas of **communication** were rated. Regarding calendar/scheduling of meetings, 78 percent of executives said NAMB communicates extremely well (8) or somewhat well (13). The responsiveness of NAMB's staff was very responsive according to 20 of 27 respondents and somewhat responsive by another 5.

Four areas of **resourcing** were addressed by the survey. In the area of **providing services**, 21 of 22 executives responded either very effective (13) or somewhat effective(8). In **providing materials**, 18 of 23 responded very effective (8) or somewhat effective (10).

Twenty of 21 executives rated NAMB's **providing of personnel** as very effective (12) or somewhat effective (8). Finally, all 23 respondents rated NAMB's **providing processes for funding** very effective (14) or somewhat effective (9).

The **overall personal feelings** about the North American Mission Board was very positive for 16 of the responding state executives, and somewhat positive by 6 others. Only one registered a somewhat negative response.

Verbatim comments to open ended questions are also attached.

Evaluation Questionnaire for State Convention Executive Directors, 2003

North American Mission Board

I. Partnership

Overall, how effective is the North American Mission Board, in partnering with state conventions?

[A-1] <input type="checkbox"/>	Very effective	14	51.85%
[A-2] <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat effective	9	33.33%
[A-3] <input type="checkbox"/>	Neutral (undecided)	2	7.41%
[A-4] <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat ineffective	2	7.41%
[A-5] <input type="checkbox"/>	Very ineffective	0	

Do you feel that the partnership relationship between the North American Mission Board and state conventions has improved during the past year?

[B-1] <input type="checkbox"/>	Yes, it has improved	15	60.00%
[B-2] <input type="checkbox"/>	No, it remains about the same	8	32.00%
[B-3] <input type="checkbox"/>	No, it has worsened	2	8.00%

Please list one or two examples of where the North American Mission Board, **is effectively working** in partnership with state conventions:

Please list one or two examples of where the North American Mission Board, **needs to improve** its working relationship with state conventions:

II. Strategy

The Strategic Mission Plan for your state is the result of the integration of the North American Mission Board's Continental Strategy (for Reaching North America) with your own state strategy. How effectively has your state convention and NAMB been able to develop the Strategic Mission Plan for your state?

[C-1] <input type="checkbox"/>	Very effective	9	33.33%
[C-2] <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat effective	12	44.44%
[C-3] <input type="checkbox"/>	Neutral (undecided)	4	14.81%
[C-4] <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat ineffective	2	7.41%
[C-5] <input type="checkbox"/>	Very ineffective	0	

What suggestions do you have for developing a Strategic Mission Plan for your state?

III. Communication

How well does NAMB communicate with you regarding calendaring/scheduling of meetings?

[D-1] <input type="checkbox"/>	Extremely well	8	29.63%
[D-2] <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat well	13	48.15%
[D-3] <input type="checkbox"/>	Neutral (I'm undecided)	2	7.41%
[D-4] <input type="checkbox"/>	Not very well	4	14.81%
[D-5] <input type="checkbox"/>	Not at all well	0	

When you and your staff contact the North American Mission Board, overall, how responsive is NAMB's staff to you?

[E-1] <input type="checkbox"/>	Very responsive	20	74.07%
[E-2] <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat responsive	5	18.52%
[E-3] <input type="checkbox"/>	Uncertain	2	7.41%
[E-4] <input type="checkbox"/>	Somewhat unresponsive	0	
[E-5] <input type="checkbox"/>	Very unresponsive	0	

IV. Resourcing

How effectively does NAMB resource your state convention in the following areas:

Providing services

[F-1] <input type="checkbox"/> Very effective	13	59.09%
[F-2] <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat effective	8	36.36%
[F-3] <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral (undecided)	0	
[F-4] <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat ineffective	0	
[F-5] <input type="checkbox"/> Very ineffective	1	4.55%

Providing materials

[G-1] <input type="checkbox"/> Very effective	8	36.36%
[G-2] <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat effective	10	45.45%
[G-3] <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral (undecided)	1	4.55%
[G-4] <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat ineffective	2	9.09%
[G-5] <input type="checkbox"/> Very ineffective	1	4.55%

Providing personnel

[H-1] <input type="checkbox"/> Very effective	12	54.55%
[H-2] <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat effective	8	36.36%
[H-3] <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral (undecided)	1	4.55%
[H-4] <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat ineffective	0	
[H-5] <input type="checkbox"/> Very ineffective	1	4.55%

Providing processes for funding

[I-1] <input type="checkbox"/> Very effective	14	60.87%
[I-2] <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat effective	9	39.13%
[I-3] <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral (undecided)	0	
[I-4] <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat ineffective	0	
[I-5] <input type="checkbox"/> Very ineffective	0	

Please provide suggestions concerning where NAMB needs to improve its resourcing of state conventions.

V. Personal Evaluation

Overall, how do you personally feel about the North American Mission Board?

[J-1] <input type="checkbox"/> Very positive	16	69.57%
[J-2] <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat positive	6	26.09%
[J-3] <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral (neither positive nor negative)	0	
[J-4] <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat negative	1	4.35%
[J-5] <input type="checkbox"/> Very negative	0	

VI. Additional Comments

Please provide any additional comments or suggestions you might have regarding the North American Mission Board.

NOTE: How long have you been in your present position?

[K-1] <input type="checkbox"/> Less than 1 year	[K-2] <input type="checkbox"/> 1-2 years	[K-3] <input type="checkbox"/> 3-5 years	[K-4] <input type="checkbox"/> 6 or more years
1 4.35%	3 13.04%	5 21.74%	14 60.87%

Thank you for your help!

Please return by U.S. Mail, E-mail or FAX by November xx, 2003 to:

Richie Stanley

Research Services

North American Mission Board, SBC

4200 North Point Parkway, Alpharetta, GA 30022-4176

FAX (770) 410-6033

E-mail: rstanley@namb.net

Please list one or two examples of where the North American Mission Board is effectively working in partnership with state conventions.

—my present NAMB coordinator; letting the states have more input on how monies are used to meet; getting a quick response to phone calls, emails and inquiries from NAMB Coordinator

Douglas Beggs is a tremendous asset to our working relationship. This past year he was especially helpful in guiding us through the new covenant agreement. Bob Reccord is a competent leader who seeks to communicate to us as well. He was a featured presenter at a leadership event in our state. His presentation was of the highest quality.

the process of coordination is the best element of the relationship. Harry Lewis communicates genuine concern for what we are doing and works to help us on jointly funded ministries.

In the area of Church Planting. We seem to get our greatest help from NAMB in this area. I believe it is made possible because both entities have made church planting a priority.

Harry Lewis has always been there to listen to our concerns and respond to them promptly.

NAMB has been extremely flexible in meeting the needs of Colorado since I've been here (about 2 1/2 years. The Board has "morphed" two traditional state office positions allowing me to craft a prayer position and a pastoral care position.

Our coordinator Douglas Beggs is outstanding.
Good open communication with leadership.

Starting new churches and developing church-based evangelistic ministries. Especially effective: basic training for church starters.

We have been grateful for the help with Crossover Indianapolis. Douglass Beggs has been a tremendous help to me personally as a new Exec.

In funding new church starts both Anglo & Ethnic
In providing resources in Training & Leadership development

Through the Coordinators, Dialogue sessions, Cooperative Agreement ministries to reach North America for Christ, Next Level Leadership Training

Through jointly planned projects.
By meeting 2 times annually to discuss common goals

You are helping us improve our strategy and support for church planting and our church planting pastors and helping us explore innovative ways to impact unreached areas through simple church or points of light. Basic Training has been especially helpful. Obviously, we couldn't plant many churches without your financial partnership.

1. Church Planting Materials are VERY GOOD. Lots of good help. 2. CPMS is wonderful! 3. Appreciate the new emphasis on personal evangelism in the Church Planter Basic Training.

Special needs in church planting

Our relationship between BCNE and NAMB has been and continues to be effective. I can't speak for all conventions, but our relationship with our coordinator, Jim Akins, is excellent. Jim has been

flexible and has worked hard to support us as we have sought to be more responsive to field needs. We have had transitions in our DOMs and in our state staff, and Jim has worked very effectively with us to assist us as we sought to meet the needs of our state while in transition.

I recently had what could have been a real crisis situation with an appointed missionary who was leaving his position. Randy Wood was very helpful and supportive of us in our handling of this situation, and the fact that he supported our position and communicated our partnership helped divert the crisis. There have been several other situations in this past year in which individuals or groups have attempted to go straight to NAMB with an issue, some innocently and some deliberately, only to be told that NAMB works through the state convention. That response is greatly appreciated.

Douglas Beggs works faithfully with us to help achieve the maximum from the funds available for missions in N.M.

The annual meeting of state executive directors is a great help for information and input.

We had a state planning meeting with a representative from the Florida Baptist Convention and Turner Research. Randy Singer, Terry Fox and the other trustee officers from NAMB were in attendance. Great conference.

It is a joy to work with Jim Akins. We have not always been able to do some of the things I feel were important to us in our mission through the North American Mission Board. However, I can say that Jim has worked with us even in those things we couldn't accomplish with the highest of integrity and loyalty both to the Kingdom and to NAMB.

Training trainers and releasing the resources to the State (BT). Development of relevant products (assessment, discovery tools)

Disaster Relief

Coordination by Jim Akins

Our relationship with Harry Lewis has been extremely positive. He approaches us with a high degree of professionalism and spiritual attention.

Funding church planting.

Assisting in leadership training of church planters (Basic Training).

Funding flexibility and state-controlled budgeting process is appreciated.

Strategy Planning

strategic mission plans, clarification in areas where our constituencies are unclear, budgeting and reallocations,

Please list one or two examples of where the North American Mission Board needs to improve its working relationship with state conventions.

Work to change NAMB's image. At present the image is CEO not missions. The leadership does not give the image of understanding the "average" Southern Baptist Church. Involve the state conventions in planning themes and major emphases where you expect the state conventions to be a part.

My greatest concern is with the appearance of direct solicitation to churches which can unintentionally undercut the Cooperative Program. Global Focus is one area where this concern is most obvious.

1) the tendency to decide what is in the best interest of state conventions without consultation with us is huge. the "Acts 1:8 initiative" is an example. I read in Baptist Press that NAMB and IMB had decided how to help me be more effective. Thanks a lot. I never knew such discussions were going on, nor did anyone that I know of have any input. 2) the failure of NAMB to support the Cooperative Program is also a concern. The "Elevate" meetings for instance will feature people who are not SBC, not involved with reaching the world and it will use CP funds to do so. For an organization that is CP dependent to be so silent about support for the CP and to be enamored with people who at the very best are minimal supporters of the CP seems to be counter productive.

Crossover! It appears to me that Crossover leadership is stuck in old style of HMB. They were here in Arizona for 18 months and never asked us how our state convention or our local associations were organized to accomplish evangelism and missions. Rather insensitive don't you think??? The new leadership at NAMB gets it. I believe that Bob, Randy, Mike and Harry understand the flow of strategy from the field. There are however, a few leftovers from the olden days who seem to ooze this old idea that "Hi I'm from HMB (I mean NAMB) and we are here to help you." We don't want something done to us, we want it done with us. With that said I continue to be a big supporter of the new direction of NAMB.

I honestly have to search for areas of so I would say none of significance.

I think it is vital that those of us at the state level hear those at the national level promoting the Cooperative Program as much as we believe we do, which is significant promotion continuously.

Sometimes the communication message seems to be that NAMB has it all together while the state conventions seem to be in a state of confusion. We need partnership language that makes it clear that we are partners, learning from one another, teaching one another, cooperatively striving to fulfill the Great Commission.

I am too new to evaluate

More budget support of state strategies

More time when NAMB leadership meets with & listens to field missionaries

Be more flexible in funding creative approaches to reach North America for Christ such as International Students on university and college campuses. There are over 600,000 international students studying with student visas in the USA.

Continue to improve your sensitivity to regional and cultural distinctions within North America. Southern Baptists are less and less southern everyday. Some of our NAMB speakers don't seem to realize the "smallness" of our churches in the north. God has blessed Southern Baptists with an

incredible expansion and influence due in large part to the work of the Home Mission Board and the North American Mission Board; I'm not always sure we understand who we've become.

1. Evangelism - Personal evangelism training materials could use some help. Especially in vision casting for small churches and getting materials down to the single staff churches. 2. Harry Lewis ... needs a raise.

Not to act as a welfare agency handing out money to starving, begging states.

I believe NAMB needs to involve state conventions earlier in the planning of major initiatives. The "What Now, America?" initiative is a good example. If State DOEs had been involved in the process from the beginning, some of the issues you heard about this past summer and fall could have been avoided, and a changing of the timetable might have been avoided. The communication issues that have arisen could also be partially solved by involving the appropriate state convention representatives in the initial stages of planning.

I honestly can't think of any.

You need to improve at the point of inter office communication. Many times we have to sort out just what the real answer is to opportunities or questions. For example we hear something from a team leader and mention it to our coordinator (Jim Akins) and he has no knowledge of what we are talking about. Having been put in an embarrassing position many times we have learned to check early on with Jim. I get the feeling that some employees are trying to make decisions, promises, commitments that they are not authorized to make. Another problem is that some team leaders will allow some of our folks to approach them and make commitments to them when they haven't checked if their questions are within our state strategy. We try to avoid this by working on this end, however we need some help to assure that while the team leaders should listen to their requests and suggestions, they should not make commitments until the coordinator has looked at the situation. I have to say also that there have been times in the past that NAMB has taken action unilaterally without checking with us to see if an action is within our state strategy. That makes it extremely difficult to carry out a state program of missions with integrity and continue to publicly defend and promote NAMB.

Launching initiatives without input from field (Connections Conference). Continual shifting of structure and staff.

We have continually asked that events in our state be, if not jointly planned, at least coordinated with state convention events. Several NAMB sponsored events over an 18 month period conflict with dates or creates hardship upon the SBTC.

Fact: I hear nothing from NAMB as a Western state executive apart from promotional material. I have asked for recommendations for prospective staff and made a specific request for a partnering for church planting.

Basis Training needs to be tailored to strengthen CP and missions partnering information to church planters.

Assessment needs to be improved. Candidates need to be better assessed for working in Western church culture and need to be assessed on understanding the Cooperative Program

Eduardo's absence has been a problem. While those who have replaced him have done an admirable job, we have lost a coordinator who knows and understands our work. I'm not sure what can be done about this, but it has limited our partnership. Another problem has been connecting with senior

executive leaders at NAMB. Efforts have been made but I still don't feel we have the kind of relationship we could have if we knew each other better.

soliciting input/ listening before making major plans

What suggestions do you have for developing a Strategic Mission Plan for your state?

We have a plan on paper. It is a start. We have needs that must be addressed before the strategy will show positive results.

Better communication between the state and associations on church starts would be a good beginning place.

talk to us about it.

Please do not send us a strategic blank of Goals, Objectives and Action Plans and ask us to fill in the blanks. Rather, begin with our mission plan and adapt your structure from the state plan. Sit down with us long enough to get a feel for our plan, rather than ask us to sanitize our plan to fit your form.

At present, the NAMB SMP is a “format,” as to computer organization and as to systematic thinking processes. The state convention is expected to “plug” into the format. That is a situation that will likely be corrected through prayer, honest dialogue and higher levels of joint planning.

I would say, based on my limited knowledge to this point, that we need to think more wholistically when it comes to some of the church planting and evangelism strategies, if we’re going to improve church health in our state.

We have an SMP—the verbiage is not in NAMB’s format, which seems to create some problem—our dialogue with NAMB persons at national meetings does not help as our staff come back and work together with our DOMs in strategy planning.

We have just completed our strategic plan so we can be more specific in the future.

Don’t ask us to rewrite our strategy to fit your forms.

I am new to this process but have found it valuable. I believe our process will improve as I continue to grow in my ability to understand our needs and your resources.

We have one and at least annually we re-visit its goals, objectives and effectiveness

I have both a positive and a somewhat negative response. Positively, the Associational Strategy team was extremely helpful last year in assisting us in helping each association in New England develop a new or revised strategic mission plan. They provided consultants for us and partnered with us in underwriting the whole process. It was a tremendous help for our associations. In one instance it probably saved the DOM’s job, and in two other instances, helped associations get off dead center. Right now, we are in the process of adjusting our state strategy to the association’s strategy. However, that provides the negative feedback as well. I believe our state strategy, as much as possible, ought to originate from the associations, who in turn develop their strategy from the churches. I disagree with the premise of your first sentence in this section. I believe our BCNE Strategic Mission Plan should be the result of the process I have just described, not how well we fit in with the Continental Strategy. Now, if we have the Kingdom of God as our focus, there will be tremendous integration in our local, state and Continental strategies. But I believe state convention strategies ought to be weighted toward the strategies of our associations and churches.

We feel we have a good plan. Our major emphasis is on new church starts. We have an excellent program with our bi-vocational pastors and one-third of our pastors are bi-vocational. I know we can always improve but I feel we are on track

My suggestion is that NAMB should cease to appear so paternalistic and encourage the State conventions to develop their own strategy in their own context. One very good example is the difference in a “successful church plant” held by NAMB and by a New work state. You are always thinking in terms of a large church, Mega church, or something modeled after the “successful” churches in the South. In a state convention where there are two or three churches with over 500 in attendance after many years of hard work it is difficult and discouraging to church planters to be expected to build large congregations at the same pace you model for them. Another issue is your church planting models are all built around Anglo Suburban culture. In a state where we are 45% Ethnic and have over one hundred ethnic people groups yet untouched it is hard to use those models in church starting.

One more issue is that it seems that rather than a “program” of missions, your late emphasis is on events and projects. In my judgment it is the day to day “in the trenches” continuous church planting and one on one personal evangelism and ministry work that satisfies your objectives, not the big meetings, projects and events. What I desire is to have a balance in your strategy.

EKG is our plan.

I believe it would be good to have a church planting strategy session with both NAMB and SBTC representatives. This could facilitate what NAMB would like to see accomplished in Texas while better communicating the work of the SBTC.

I have never been informed of the “Continental Strategy” apart from “What Now”. Is there more? How is does a smaller convention fit in a strategy from an agency? You did a good job at orientation regarding NAMB teams and personalities but the concept of our development of a joint strategy has not been on the table. The cross-functional team spent time here and the meetings were pleasant but there is no difference here as a result of them being here. Am I lacking in understanding?

This process has frustrated me because our entire strategy plan rests on developing local initiative, not creating the kind of master plan NAMB seems to want.

We are early in our process and so we are still 1-2 years away from optimized integration.

Please provide suggestions concerning where NAMB needs to improve its resourcing of state conventions.

Listen and learn about smaller, single staff churches and honestly brag on those churches. They are the ones that brought Southern Baptist where they are today.

This evaluation is a good starting place. Alabama is one of your best partners. We know we are to give more than we receive and we are glad to do able to do it.

Ask us what and who we need. Then provide the people and resources. This is not rocket science.

Problems with Personnel Committee where staff's mistakes creates deep pain with persons who were processed for strategist positions and were rejected on the divorce issue. NAMB is inconsistent in this area. You indicate a person is forgiven for their sins, yet young people who were married as teens before conversion and divorced are rejected for appointment. God saved them, but you hold the sins of their past over their heads. I have a real problem here, as these individuals were not Christians when the divorce took place, yet they are punished for the sins of their past, before conversion. This problem has existed since the days of HMB. These positions are not pastoral, and in two cases, the wives were the ones suffering from abusive physical harm. **YOU NEED TO CLEARLY INDICATE THAT ANYONE WHO HAS BEEN DIVORCED, EVEN IF THEY WERE NOT SAVED AT THE TIME, THAT THEY ARE NOT WELCOME AT THE CROSS AND THE BLOOD OF CHRIST IS NOT SUFFICIENT TO FORGIVE. I GUESS IF THEY WERE ON DRUGS OR PROBABLY DESTROYED LIVES LIKE SAUL, FORGIVENESS IS AVAILABLE. I DO NOT QUESTION THE ISSUE OF PASTORAL POSITION, BUT TO NOT EVEN REVIEW A SITUATION, IS UNTHINKABLE. I PRAY NONE OF YOUR CHILDREN EVER FACE THIS ISSUE OF DIVORCE.**

We would welcome NAMB's re-engagement with funds for community ministry centers. We are missing the funds that used to come from you. We use World Hunger money retained in the state, but it is not sufficient for the need. We also miss the support we used to receive for student summer missionaries in our state. The absence of those funds is a limiting factor on our summer missionary program.

With the emphasis on internet access, we have lost valuable printed materials in the areas of church starting, ministries and associational missions. There are still times when printed materials are the best. Missions education materials are developing in commendable fashion. I say that despite the fact that the computer is central to my own work and communication.

There needs to be some event where NAMB ministers to missionaries & their families—like the HMB Glorieta/Ridgecrest events.

The visits arranged by coordinators were very effective. The state staff could give you the best response to the above since they are the ones most involved.

Please be aware of the significant difference between starting a new church in the south from starting a church in the north. Southern church planters frequently have greater access to resources due to the presence of strong church partnerships. Northern plants rarely have these additional resources and frequently have sponsoring churches in name only (both financially and relationally.) Southern planters frequently can reach other evangelicals within their communities to form core groups-- northern planters rarely have such a luxury. The generosity of our southern brothers and sisters is beyond question, but few realize how difficult the work can be outside the Bible belt.

Send cooperative budget funds on a 1/12th method.

I would appreciate the opportunity to talk about the parameters of church planting funding. Perhaps I do not have the complete picture. In talking with Ed Stetzer recently, I have learned about creative ways the Nehemiah program can be used to help plant churches, and I deeply appreciate that. I also appreciate the fact that NAMB is going to seriously consider my request to add a third year to Nehemiah funding. However, in many instances, I wish I had access to funding that would help me put a seasoned church planter on the field who is starting his second or third church and give him the same temporary benefits that the Nehemiah program provides for first time, right out of seminary planters. I know that Nehemiah was not designed to be the main process for funding church planting. However, NAMB has put so much of its church planting funding into this program that we on the field, especially in emerging conventions, are forced to try to use it as the main funding source.

There are many men who have a desire to plant a church. However, they do not have the people gathering skills that a church planter needs. They are great disciplers and have wonderful pastoral skills, but do not have the ability to gather people from nothing. By contrast, those that have those people gathering skills usually do not make very good long term pastors because they get bored with the administrative and shepherding required of a pastor. I wish that we could fund full time positions for those people gatherers. They are not necessary strategists, and they will not, after their first plant, fit the Nehemiah requirements. But this is a great need. Perhaps this would fit the old catalyst role. At any rate, we have a great need for men who are called to be starters, not full planters. We have many men who want to be involved in something new and fresh, and would be able to grow a core group, but they can't gather the core group. These starters would allow us to plant many more churches, as they moved from place to place in an area, gathering core groups and leading them until a founding pastor could be called.

Ask us what we need to do our work better instead of telling us what we need.

More funding for new work

Please provide any additional comments or suggestions you might have regarding the North American Mission Board.

I do not walk in your shoes. It is easy to offer suggestions when you don't understand what goes on at NAMB. Some how we need to get Southern Baptist leaders together so they can interface with the local church leadership without coming to speak or promote something. Resurrect the old Home Mission Week at Glorieta and/or Ridgecrest. We must to network. That is where I met missionaries and learned that God could use me.

Thanks for allowing me to express my thoughts in this form.

I, nor my staff are opposed to NAMB. We just see NAMB becoming increasingly irrelevant to reaching North America.

I am thankful for our relationship. I am pleased with the overall working relationship. I hear complaints from some of our staff about having difficulty with communication issues when they call to ask for information/funding or whatever. They have complained at times about not getting good answers or help when they call. I have not personally had any such problems, but I am not generally calling you about anything. Our staff does that on a pretty constant basis.

As to NAMB staff - - Superb. As to the way in which the "NAMB organization" sometimes seems to treat its staff - - Concerned that the value of the individual staff person is not as high as I would like for it to be. As to strategic planning with state conventions - - A national strategy needs to be in place. That strategy needs to be flexible enough to include the visions and goals of NAMB's partners.

It would be helpful if more monies were directly supportive of state and associational strategies and less on national events

(NAMB resources state providing personnel: very effective) when money is available

It is very helpful to receive new information and the most recent ways of doing ministry that can be helpful to state conventions. Thanks for conducting the survey.

I am a total supporter of all we are trying to do in our SBC Cooperative efforts.

I appreciate our partnership with the North American Mission Board. I commit myself to being a good partner and supporter and will not talk about your work critically but will bring any issues I have before you. I am impressed by the quality and commitment of the NAMB staff and am thankful for all that you do.

I was in a meeting with a strategic NAMB staff member ... he is out-of-place. The Peter Principle is working. He will slow you down. I sat in a meeting he lead and will never do it again. It was a waste of time. He is a wonderful man personally. I believe him to be a godly man ... but he is NOT a national level leader. I will speak only to Bob Reccord about him.

NAMB has been very responsive to Nevada Baptists. This includes Bob Reccord, Randy Singer, Harry Lewis and the Trustee officers . . . especially Terry Fox. I have worked with Richard Harris on a couple of projects and he is fantastic to work with, as always. Randy Wood has been a great help to me!

I and many of my colleagues complain that we seem not to be able to get through to a "real live person" until after several attempts when we make a telephone call. Please let us talk to a person, even if it is a secretary in a group instead of the hated "voice mail".