

Guillermin Library
Liberty University
Lynchburg, VA 24502

LIBERTY BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

REFERENCE
DO NOT CIRCULATE

A STRATEGY FOR THE USE OF MINISTRY ACTION TEAMS
IN THE RELOCATION OF A CHURCH OF THE NAZARENE

A Thesis Project Submitted to
Liberty Baptist Theological Seminary
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree

DOCTOR OF MINISTRY

By

Truman Daniel Casey

Lynchburg, Virginia

May, 2000

Copyright 2000 Truman Daniel Casey
All Rights Reserved

LIBERTY BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THESIS PROJECT APPROVAL SHEET

GRADE

MENTOR

READER

ABSTRACT

A STRATEGY FOR THE USE OF MINISTRY ACTION TEAMS IN THE
RELOCATION OF A CHURCH OF THE NAZARENE

Truman D. Casey

Liberty Baptist Theological Seminary, 2000

Mentor: Dr. Donald Clark

When Atlanta First Church of the Nazarene faced the task of relocating their current facilities to a location several miles away, the pastor and the leaders of the church searched for a strategy that would allow the church to relocate without greatly reducing the amount of time the pastor had available for pastoral care. The church also wanted to avoid an excessive increase in the level of stress for other participants in the project. Based upon (1) research of church management literature, (2) research of the Bible, (3) a survey of the people involved in the church relocation project, and (4) a survey of other Nazarene pastors, the church developed a strategy that met its goals through the use of Ministry Action Teams.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT iii

LIST OF TABLES viii

Chapter

1. INTRODUCTION 1

 A. Background 5

 B. The Problem 8

 C. Methodology 8

 D. Statement of Limitations 13

 E. Review of Literature 14

2. BIBLICAL BASIS OF MINISTRY ACTION TEAMS 17

 A. Old Testament Teams 17

 (1) Moses Judging the People 17

 (2) Building the Tabernacle 18

 (3) Spying in Canaan 19

 (4) Rebuilding the Temple and the
 Walls of Jerusalem 20

 B. New Testament Teams 21

 (1) Feeding the Widows 21

 (2) Different Kinds of Ministry 23

 (3) Spiritual Gifts 24

3. MINISTRY ACTION TEAMS AT ATLANTA FIRST
 CHURCH OF THE NAZARENE 26

A.	Interim Worship Ministry Action Team . . .	29
B.	Moving and Storage Ministry Action Team .	31
C.	Plans Development and Construction Ministry Action Team	33
D.	Furnishing and Equipment Ministry Action Team	34
E.	Communication and Presentation Ministry Action Team	36
F.	Sales Contract Completion Ministry Action Team	37
G.	Day Care Development Ministry Action Team	39
H.	Financing Ministry Action Team	40
I.	Stewardship Ministry Action Team	42
J.	Site Selection Ministry Action Team. . . .	43
K.	Incomplete Results	44
4.	EVALUATION BY THE PARTICIPANTS IN THE RELOCATION PROJECT OF ATLANTA FIRST CHURCH OF THE NAZARENE	46
A.	General Information	47
B.	Evaluation of Recruitment	48
C.	Evaluation of Participation	56
D.	Evaluation of the Use of Ministry Action Teams	68
5.	EVALUATION BY CHURCH OF THE NAZARENE PASTORS	78
A.	General Information	79

B. Lay Involvement in the Project	82
C. Effects of the Project on the Pastor and the Church	97
D. Recommendation of Ministry Action Teams .	103
6. CONCLUSION	107
A. Conclusions Regarding the Use of Ministry Action Teams	108
B. Effects of Ministry Action Teams Upon Pastors and Lay Leaders	112
C. Conclusions Regarding the Recruitment Of Ministry Action Teams	115
D. The Success of Atlanta First Church Of the Nazarene	117
E. Recommendations for Other Churches	119

Appendix

A. SURVEY OF ATLANTA FIRST CHURCH OF THE NAZARENE MINISTRY ACTION TEAMS	122
B. SURVEY OF PASTORS OF CHURCHES OF THE NAZARENE	126
C. SURVEY RESULTS FROM ATLANTA FIRST CHURCH OF THE NAZARENE PARTICIPANTS	130
D. SURVEY RESULTS FROM PASTORS OF CHURCHES OF THE NAZARENE	140
E. RELOCATION MINISTRY TEAMS	156
F. Interim Worship Team Action Report at Atlanta First Church of the Nazarene	159
G. Master List of Sites Considered and Report to the Relocation Committee and the Church Board	161

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	165
VITA	171

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Participation by Age	48
2. Understanding the "Chain of Command"	54
3. Impact by Worker Category	73
4. Use of Ministry Action Teams by Church Size . .	82
5. Use of Ministry Action Teams by Pastor's Age . .	83
6. Use of Multiple Ministry Action Teams	84
7. Supervision by Church Size	93
8. Growth Potential according to Age	102

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

American churches can face great challenges as they attempt to meet the facility needs of their congregations. Some of these churches are confronted with a lack of available property when they seek to enlarge their facilities. These churches may also struggle with restrictive sociological and demographic changes in the area surrounding the church campus. Furthermore, these churches may discover that the people who attend the church are moving further and further from the location of the church edifice. Any of these factors can make expansion of the church facility very difficult.

When a church finds itself confronted by circumstances that limit its ability to provide adequate facilities for its members, it may be forced to wrestle with the issues of relocation. Gwenn McCormick describes the trauma a church may experience during this critical time. In a book about church building programs McCormick states:

The relocation issue is now a critical concern for an increasingly large number of congregations. This is one of the toughest questions with which many churches deal. It strikes fear in the minds of many pastors and church leaders. *Relocation* is a word some churches shun like the plague. Few decisions create as much anxiety and uneasiness in the average congregation.¹

When a church decides to relocate, it must begin to handle a myriad of new and difficult tasks. It must immediately make arrangements to sell existing facilities. It must also find a new site that is adequate, accessible, and suitable to a majority of the people attending the church. A church involved in relocation must also develop a sound financial plan to underwrite the additional expenses created by the relocation. It must negotiate contracts, raise money, meet with architects, hire contractors, oversee the actual construction of the facilities, purchase new furnishings and supplies, and must even make arrangements for the actual move itself. A church that relocates can find itself wrestling with a multitude of administrative details during the relocation process.

The issue of relocation is further complicated by the need to continue to minister to the community in which the

¹ Gwenn E. McCormick, Planning and Building Church Facilities (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1992), 171.

church is located. Since many of the people who attend the church may not live in the community anymore, the church could struggle to get support for community-oriented ministries.

The church must also strive to minister effectively to the people within the congregation. Pastoral care, meaningful worship services, evangelism, discipleship, leadership development, and a variety of other ministries must continue if the church is to fulfill its commission to "go and make disciples" Matt. 28:19-20 NIV.

Problems develop if the church fails to maintain a sense of unity within the congregation during the time of relocation. Misunderstandings and strife can occur among church members when the worship and educational needs of the church are neglected or are minimized.

The leadership required by the challenges accompanying relocation can consume enormous amounts of time and energy. In the paradigm of the typical church, the pastor of the church is the one designated to give this leadership. He is asked to administer all or most of the details of the relocation of the church. Alan E. Nelson understands this paradigm to be one that:

basically sees the pastor as a hireling, a trained professional who performs a variety of ministries for the congregation and occasionally recruits a small percentage of others to help him do his job.²

Nelson further describes the tragic effects this paradigm has upon both the church and the senior pastor of the church by stating:

As the church grows, so grows the number of tasks for the senior pastor. The number of hats increases, creating a tired minister and a frustrated congregation whose needs outweigh the capacities of even the finest of pastors. The result is clergy burnout, parishioner consternation, and typically a congregation which plateaus at or before the 250-member mark.³

Whenever a church decides that a relocation of its facilities is necessary, it would be wise to search for ways to avoid or minimize the negative effects of the relocation project upon both the pastor and the congregation. This could help the church keep the possibility of future growth alive.

A look at how one church wrestled with the potential negative effects of relocation upon the church and its pastor, and what it did to avoid or minimize these effects, could help other churches facing the need to relocate.

² Alan E. Nelson, "New Paradigm Pastors," in The New Thing, ed. Alan E. Nelson (Scottsdale, AZ: The Southwest Center for Leadership, 1998), 23.

³ Ibid.

A. Background

Atlanta First Church of the Nazarene, a historic, 72-year old church located in metropolitan Atlanta, Georgia, was forced to struggle with the possibility of relocation. The community around the church has experienced extensive sociological and demographic changes in recent years. At first these changes did not present a major problem since the people who attended the church were not required to drive through any residential neighborhood to reach the church facility. They could access the church easily from the interstate system surrounding the city.

In 1994 the pastor of the church marked on a map where the families of the congregation lived. The map revealed the fact that most of the families attending the church were driving a distance of at least fifteen miles in order to be present. Many families were driving in excess of twenty-five miles in order to attend. As the families of the church moved further and further from the facility, it became increasingly apparent to the leadership board of the church that the church needed to consider relocating if it expected the people within the congregation to continue to attend.

Fortunately, racial issues were not of primary concern to this congregation since the church had been racially integrated since 1981. According to comments made to the leadership board, members of the church from the different races within the congregation were in agreement that the church needed to relocate. Representatives on the leadership board from the different racial segments of the congregation confirmed the need to relocate.

Because the pastor of the Atlanta First Church of the Nazarene had led another church through the process of relocation during the early years of his pastoral career, he knew that the church would soon be confronted with many new challenges and responsibilities. The church would be required to meet with real estate agents, architects, building and financial consultants, contractors, salespeople, bank officers, and denominational boards and committees.

The pastor also knew that most of the responsibility for these meetings and for the relocation project in general would fall upon his shoulders. Adding such enormous time-consuming responsibilities to his already overcrowded schedule would certainly restrict time available for sermon preparation, pastoral visitation, and

normal church administration. It would also increase his level of stress and could potentially affect his family relationships as well.

The structure of the Church of the Nazarene would also contribute to the problem. In the Church of the Nazarene the pastor is the one designated to "sign all conveyances of real estate, mortgages, contracts, and other legal documents of the church."⁴ The pastor is also the "ex officio president of the local church,"⁵ has the "care of all departments of the local church work,"⁶ and is responsible to give leadership to the "expansion programs of the local church."⁷ According to the denomination, the pastor is also:

the chairman of the church board, a member of the board or council of the Sunday School ministries and any weekday Nazarene school organization, the Nazarene Youth International, the Nazarene World Mission Society, and all other subsidiary organizations in connection with the local church.⁸

⁴*Manual/ 1997-2000 Church of the Nazarene*, (Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1997), 59.

⁵*Ibid.*, 67.

⁶*Ibid.*, 172.

⁷*Ibid.*, 173.

⁸*Ibid.*, 174.

B. The Problem

The church and the pastor now faced a great challenge. Could they develop a biblically based relocation strategy that would protect the pastor's time for ministry without violating any of the leadership responsibility assigned to the pastor by the Church of the Nazarene? Furthermore, could this strategy help to reduce the potential increase in stress the pastor might experience, without adding undue stress to the lay leaders who agreed to assume some of the responsibility normally placed upon the pastor?

C. Methodology

The pastor, with the approval of the official Church Board, appointed a Relocation Committee, which gave general oversight to all parts of the relocation effort. The Senior Pastor was an *ex officio* member of the committee but did not serve as its chairman. A layperson from the congregation was the chairperson. Fourteen other members served on the committee as well. This allowed the committee to have representatives from many different areas of ministry within the congregation.

The Relocation Committee, with the approval of the pastor and the Church Board, decided to use Ministry Action Teams for the various aspects of the relocation project.

Stan Toler defines a Ministry Action Team as "a group of church leaders working together for the common purpose of building God's Kingdom."⁹

The Relocation Committee recommended a team leader for each of the Ministry Action Teams. The Church Board reviewed these recommendations and officially appointed the team leaders. A brief, written job description was given to each of the Ministry Action Team leaders. A copy of these job descriptions can be found in Appendix E.

After introducing the Ministry Action Team concept to the congregation and explaining what each Ministry Action Team would oversee, the pastor encouraged members of the congregation to volunteer to serve on one or more of the following Ministry Action Teams: Interim Worship Ministry Team, Moving/Storage Ministry Team, Plans Development/Construction Ministry Team, Furnishings/Equipment Ministry Team, Communication/Presentation Ministry Team, Sales Contract Completion Ministry Team, Day Care Development Ministry Team, Financing Ministry Team, and Stewardship Ministry Team.

⁹ Stan Toler, "Turning Church Committees into Ministry Action Teams." in Alan E. Nelson, The New Thing, 63.

No size limitations were placed upon the Ministry Action Teams. One team had no one to volunteer to serve with the team leader, but another team eventually had thirty-seven people sign up for it. A total of seventy-two people volunteered to serve on the nine different Ministry Action Teams that were formed. A tenth Ministry Action Team, the Site Selection Ministry Team, had already completed its work by the time the other Ministry Action Teams were formed.

To determine how the participants on the Ministry Action Teams evaluated their involvement in the relocation effort, a survey was distributed to all seventy-two team members who participated. The participants were asked to answer questions regarding their service in the project. They were also asked to evaluate their participation on a Ministry Action Team and to evaluate the impact of Ministry Action Teams upon the church and the pastor. Participants were asked if they would participate on a Ministry Action Team again. Finally they were asked if they would recommend the use of Ministry Action Teams to other churches. A complete record of the survey results may be seen in Appendix C. The survey itself can be found in Appendix A.

Sixty-nine percent of those who participated on the Atlanta First Church of the Nazarene Ministry Action Teams responded to the survey. Of the fifty who returned their surveys, three were returned blank with an accompanying note indicating that they did not get to serve in the area where they volunteered. The results, therefore, are based upon the response of 47 individuals, representing sixty-five percent of those who participated. Further discussion of the survey can be found in Chapter Four of this paper.

The answers to this survey were examined according to the age of the participant, the level of the participant's involvement, the gender of the participant, and whether the participant was recruited or volunteered.

A second survey was sent to all of the pastors of the Churches of the Nazarene in the states of Georgia, Tennessee, and Arkansas. These three states were selected because they were believed to have churches and pastors that would be similar to Atlanta First Church of the Nazarene and its pastor, and would, therefore, give a good representation of the viewpoint of the pastors other Churches of the Nazarene. This survey was designed to see if other pastors in the Church of the Nazarene experienced increased stress or a reduced amount of time available for

ministry as a result of relocation or major building efforts. These pastors were also asked if they used any Ministry Action Teams. Then they were asked to evaluate the effect of the building or relocation project upon the church and its ministries. A copy of this survey can be found in Appendix B.

A total of 321 surveys were mailed. One of these was returned by the Post Office, so the true mailing list totaled 320. One hundred thirty-five of these were returned, representing 42% of the group. Of these, twenty-two were returned blank with an explanation that they had not led a church in a relocation project or a major building program. This meant that a total of one hundred thirteen valid responses were received. This number represented thirty-five percent of the original mailing, from which to gather information. These responses were examined in relationship to the size of the worship attendance of the church, the age of the pastor at the time of the project, and the date of the project to see if these factors had an effect upon the opinions of the pastors. Complete survey results can be found in Appendix D.

D. Statement of Limitations

This paper does not address the question of whether or not churches should consider relocation. It is limited to the examination of a strategy that is designed to assist churches that have already made the decision to relocate.

Neither does the paper suggest detailed job descriptions for the various Ministry Action Teams that might be used. Only broad descriptions of the responsibilities of the Ministry Action Teams used by Atlanta First Church of the Nazarene are presented. They will demonstrate what a Church of the Nazarene can do to address its leadership needs when it begins the process of relocation.

This paper does not attempt to measure the levels of stress upon either the pastor or the laity of the church. Any supposed reduction or increase in the level of stress is presented according to the perception of those participating in the surveys. No psychological instruments have been used to measure the level of stress facing these individuals.

The amount of time available for sermon preparation, prayer, and pastoral ministry are treated in a similar manner with no instrument of measurement being used. Only

the opinion of those pastors who responded was used to determine whether or not there was a reduction in available time during the relocation project or building program.

No attempt was made to measure the growth potential of a church either. Survey participants were simply asked to decide whether, in their opinions, the growth potential of the church was affected positively or negatively.

E. Review of Literature

Computerized searches of dissertation abstracts revealed an absence of literature regarding the use of Ministry Action Teams in the relocation of a church. Searches of related topics, such as "relocation and church," "church and congregation," "ministry," and "church transition," produced fourteen abstracts. Of these only one abstract addressed a similar topic.¹⁰ It was apparent from this abstract that the writer approached relocation from the position that the involvement of the congregation in the relocation project would produce greater ownership of the project resulting in a higher level of pride and accomplishment when the relocation was completed. While these results could be understood to be positive results

¹⁰ Sharon Lavonda Adams, "A Model of Equipping Laity of a Local Church for Evangelism in a New Community" (D.Min. diss., Drew University, 1995), Abstract.

from the use of Ministry Action Teams, the author was not presenting a strategy for using such teams.

A dissertation by Kenneth Dale Ardrey¹¹ and one by Charles Brent Madinger¹² were the only other discovered projects written in the last ten years that seemed related to relocation. Both of these presentations presented reasons for relocation instead of presenting a strategy for the actual relocation process, however.

Searches of the 1981-1992 volumes of *Research In Ministry*, an index to Doctor of Ministry project reports and theses submitted by reporting ATS schools, produced 21 dissertations related to relocation and lay leadership.

Studies were made of the following topics: "lay leadership," "laity," "ministry," "church growth," "church buildings," "cultural teaching principles," "spiritual gifts and ministry," "lay training," "pastoral leadership style," "church transition," "multi-cultural ministry," and "ministry in change." Most of these projects studied ministry in racially changing areas.

¹¹Kenneth Dale Ardrey, "Crossroads Church of the Nazarene: A Strategy for Church Growth" (D.Min. diss., Fuller Theological Seminary, 1990), Abstract.

¹²Charles Brent Madinger, "Churches in Transition: The Issues and Proposed Strategy for Post Road Christian Church" (D.Min. diss., Fuller Theological Seminary, 1989), Abstract.

One dissertation by Ronald W. Saari¹³ did present a case study of the factors of relocation. The date of the study, 1984, seemed to leave its value in question, however.

Several new books have been written recently that address the value of using lay leadership. Some of these books even describe the use of Ministry Action Teams although they may call them by different names. A list of these resources is included in the Selected Bibliography at the end of this presentation.

It is apparent from the review of recent literature related to lay ministry that many of the principles regarding the use of Ministry Action Teams in other areas of ministry can also be applied to the use of such teams in the relocation of a church.

¹³Ronald W. Saari, "Leading a Church Through the Change of Relocation" (D.Min. diss., Bethel Theological Seminary, 1984).

CHAPTER 2

BIBLICAL BASIS OF MINISTRY ACTION TEAMS

A. Old Testament Teams

(1) Moses Judging the People

The roots of Ministry Action Teams can be found in Scripture in an episode from the life of Moses. While Moses was leading the Israelites from Egypt to Sinai, he served as judge for the people from morning until evening. When his father-in-law, Jethro, saw what was happening, he evaluated the situation and advised Moses to begin using what could be called Ministry Action Teams.

In Exodus 18:17 Jethro told Moses that what he was doing was not good. He then advised Moses to

select capable men from all the people—men who fear God, trustworthy men who hate dishonest gain—and appoint them as officials over thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens. Have them serve as judges for the people at all times, but have them bring every difficult case to you; the simple cases they can decide themselves. That will make your load lighter, because they will share it with you. If you do this and God so commands, you will be able to stand the strain, and all these people will go home satisfied. Ex. 18:21-23 NIV.

This passage clearly reveals the institution of a team with which to judge the disputes that would arise among the people. It also reveals two major benefits that come from the use of Ministry Action Teams. One benefit lies in the way the responsibility is shared among the members of the team instead of forcing one individual to carry all the responsibility. The second benefit lies in the fact that the level of stress upon the leader is reduced by the involvement of several individuals.

Moses followed the advice his father-in-law gave him as he gave leadership to the people of Israel. Because of the use of this Ministry Action Team, Moses was able to give effective leadership for the next forty years as the children of Israel wandered in the wilderness.

(2) Building the Tabernacle

The application of Ministry Action Teams to construction can be traced to the building of the Tabernacle. According to Exodus 31, God revealed the formation of a Ministry Action Team to Moses. After God had given Moses all the plans for the Tabernacle in which the people were to worship,

the Lord said to Moses, "See, I have chosen Bezalel, son of Uri, the son of Hur, of the tribe of Judah, and I have filled him with the Spirit of God, with skill, ability and knowledge in all kinds of crafts—to make artistic designs for work in gold, silver and bronze, to cut and set stones, to work in wood, and to engage in all kinds of craftsmanship. Moreover, I have appointed Oholiab son of Ahisamach, of the tribe of Dan, to help him. Also I have given skill to all the craftsmen to make everything I have commanded you..."
Ex. 31:1-6 NIV.

This Ministry Action Team was to handle much of the actual construction of the Tabernacle.

(3) Spying in Canaan

One cannot assume that the use of Ministry Action Teams will automatically insure positive results for the organization, however. According to Numbers 13, a Ministry Action Team was formed for the purpose of evaluating the land to which the Israelites were headed at the conclusion of their major relocation from Egypt to the Promised Land. When the children of Israel were near the land of Canaan, Moses sent out a Ministry Action Team to explore the land to see what would be needed in order to complete their relocation process.

Upon their return from their exploration, the majority of the team recommended a course of action that would change their destination completely. They told the people about the size of the inhabitants of the land, and declared

that it would be foolish to try to enter. Only a minority of the team dared to recommend that the group should enter the land immediately.

Scripture reveals the tragic fact that the Israelites listened to the majority report and disregarded what God was telling them to do. Terrible consequences, including the loss of thousands of lives, were the result. Leaders of our day would benefit greatly by exercising caution when allowing the majority to rule. God's will may be aligned with the minority viewpoint at times.

This passage also reveals how important it is for leaders to make sure that their Ministry Action Teams are staffed with people of faith who are willing to follow God's direction even though it may be easier to do otherwise.

(4) Rebuilding the Temple and the Walls of Jerusalem

Ezra and Nehemiah used Ministry Action Teams to rebuild the Temple and the walls of Jerusalem when the exiled Jews returned to Jerusalem following their captivity in Babylon. The use of these teams is evident in Ezra 3:2 NIV where the Scripture tells us that "Jeshua son of Jozadak and his fellow priests and Zerubbabel son of

Shealtiel and his associates began to build the altar of the God of Israel." These leaders continued to function as a Ministry Action Team and even appointed other teams as well. Ezra 3:8-9 NIV explains how the expansion of ministry teams occurred:

In the second month of the second year after their arrival at the house of God in Jerusalem, Zerubbabel son of Shaeltiel, Jeshua son of Jozadak and the rest of their brothers (the priests and the Levites and all who had returned from the captivity to Jerusalem) began the work, appointing Levites twenty years of age and older to supervise the building of the house of the Lord. Jeshua and his sons and brothers and Kadmiel and his sons (descendants of Hodaviah) and the sons of Henadad and their sons and brothers—all Levites—joined together in supervising those working on the house of God.

Other leaders in the Old Testament used Ministry Action Teams as well. David's "mighty men," as listed in 2 Samuel 23, and Solomon's "Chief Officials" and twelve District Governors listed in 1 Kings 4, could be considered Ministry Action Teams who were involved in the administration of the country.

B. New Testament Teams

(1) Feeding the Widows

Ministry Action Teams are also mentioned in the New Testament. Reasons for these teams to exist are given as

well. These teams were established because of the definite needs that confronted the early church.

According to Acts 6:1-8 the early church leaders wrestled with the impact that excessive administrative demands would have upon their ministry. According to this passage of Scripture, the Apostles had to decide whether or not they should get involved in activities that would diminish their effectiveness in the ministries of prayer and preaching.

In the infant church the Greek-speaking believers began to complain about the way assistance for the widows of the church was being administered. It seemed to them that the Hebrew-speaking widows were getting assistance while the Greek-speaking widows were not. Naturally they brought their complaints to the Apostles, who were the church leaders of the day.

The Apostles called for a meeting of the church and outlined a plan that the people of the church found to be both logical and acceptable. They simply stated what should have been obvious. It would not be right for them to get overly involved in the administrative details of operating the church since the time required to administer these details could have a negative affect upon their

ministry. The apostles then suggested the creation of what could be called a Ministry Action Team. They instructed the people to look for a "team" of seven wise, Spirit-filled men who would be given the responsibility of overseeing the distribution of assistance to *all* of the widows of the church. This would allow the Apostles to maintain their focus upon the ministry of the Word and upon prayer.

Evidently this strategy was not only acceptable to the church, but it also had a direct effect upon the growth of the church. According to verse seven of the sixth chapter of Acts, there was a definite cause and effect relationship between their strategy and the growth of the church. This verse contains the report that the word of God spread and the number of disciples in Jerusalem increased rapidly causing even a large number of priests to become obedient to the faith. The commitment of the Apostles to prayer and preaching, working in tandem with the work of this newly created Ministry Action Team, brought positive results to the church.

(2) Different Kinds of Ministry

Further Biblical support for the use of Ministry Action Teams in the New Testament can also be found. This

time it is found among the ministers themselves. They were to function as a Ministry Action Team as they ministered to the people. In Ephesians 4:11 NIV, the Apostle Paul, the newly recognized leader of the church, acknowledged the fact that God had called church leaders to different kinds of ministries. With great conviction he declared, "It was he [Christ] who gave some to be apostles, some to be prophets, some to be evangelists, and some to be pastors and teachers." These ministers were to work together as a team as they declared God's message and equipped the people of the church to do works of service.

Paul then declared that these newly equipped lay leaders were to minister to the other people of the church. In other words, these lay leaders were to become part of the Ministry Action Team that was responsible for ministry within the church. Functioning as a team would have a positive effect upon the church according to words of the Apostle Paul in Ephesians 4:16 NIV.

(3) Spiritual Gifts

The wisdom of Ministry Action Teams receives further support in the Apostle Paul's explanation of spiritual gifts. In 1 Corinthians 12, Paul stressed the fact that people possess different spiritual gifts that are to be

used to help others. Paul mentioned the interconnectedness and interdependence that exists in the church as a result of the use of such a variety of spiritual gifts. Using the analogy of a body that has many parts, but functions as one unit, Paul emphasized the truth that the existence of spiritual gifts in the church requires the church to work as one unit. This can be easily compared to the way a team functions.

It should be noted that Paul expected each member of the team to use his or her gifts for the benefit of the entire team. He also suggested a cause and effect relationship between the health of the group and the performance of the teams. Paul clearly informs us that every part suffers if one part suffers and every part rejoices when one part is honored. In other words the entire "team" benefits if each part of the team carries its responsibility like it should.

From such an abundance of Scriptures that clearly describe the sharing of responsibility, one can conclude that the use of Ministry Action Teams has definite support in the Scripture.

CHAPTER 3

MINISTRY ACTION TEAMS AT ATLANTA FIRST CHURCH OF THE NAZARENE

Early in 1997 Atlanta First Church of the Nazarene decided to use Ministry Action Teams to give leadership to the relocation project it had underway. The church believed that the use of Ministry Action Teams, as defined by Stan Toler to be groups "of church leaders working together for the common purpose of building God's Kingdom,"¹⁴ would provide a Biblically-based relocation strategy. It also believed that this administrative approach was acceptable to the Church of the Nazarene. The church believed that Ministry Action Teams would protect the pastor's time for sermon preparation, visitation, prayer, and pastoral care. Furthermore, it was the belief of the church that Ministry Action Teams would help to reduce some of the increase in stress the pastor might experience due to the relocation process. The church

¹⁴Toler, 63.

believed that the use of Ministry Actions Teams would also help to prevent an increase of undue stress upon the lay leaders who agreed to assume some of the responsibility that would normally be placed upon the pastor.

The Relocation Committee, which had been giving leadership to the relocation project, recommended using eight Ministry Action Teams to work on specifically assigned tasks. An enlistment form, which can be seen in Appendix E, was used to communicate to the congregation the major areas of responsibility each of these teams would have. This enlistment form also served as written job descriptions for the teams. Members of the congregation were then urged to volunteer for service on one or more of the following teams that were approved by the Church Board and presented to the congregation in this order:

- (1) Interim Worship Ministry Team,
- (2) Moving and Storage Ministry Team,
- (3) Plans Development and Construction Ministry Team,
- (4) Furnishings and Equipment Ministry Team,
- (5) Communication and Presentation Ministry Team,
- (6) Sales Contract Completion Ministry Team,
- (7) Day Care Development Ministry Team, and
- (8) Financing Ministry Team.

The Church Board had previously approved a Site Selection Team that had completed its work before the other Ministry Action Teams were organized. It later added a Stewardship Ministry Team giving a total of ten teams.

Each of the team leaders of these ministry teams was recommended by the Relocation Committee and appointed by the Church Board. Team leaders were instructed to give regular reports to the Senior Pastor and to the chairperson of the Relocation Committee. Any item of business that required an expenditure of funds also required a favorable vote of the Church Board before the money could be spent. The chairperson of the Relocation Committee would bring any requests for expenditures before the Church Board for action. The Ministry Action Teams were given the authority to do any work that did not require Church Board approval.

At the time the Ministry Action Teams were formed, the composition of the Relocation Committee was changed. It now consisted of the Senior Pastor, the chairperson of the committee, the leaders of each ministry team, and two to four members at large. By having the team leaders on the Relocation Committee, the Church Board hoped that communication would be improved and the progress of each team would be better coordinated.

A. Interim Worship Ministry Action Team

The Interim Worship Ministry Action Team was formed because the existing facility of the church was to be sold and possession of the building was to be granted to the new buyer before the new facility would be constructed. The church would then meet in an interim facility while construction of its new facility was underway. The Interim Worship Ministry Team would handle matters related to the time spent in the temporary facilities.

The team was given three primary responsibilities. First, it was to determine what kind of temporary facility needs the congregation would have during the relocation project. As the team did its work, it considered the requirements the church had for worship, Sunday School, and administration. It also considered the kind of access the church would have to the facility, how much parking would be needed, and what kind of lighting would be required.

The second major responsibility facing the Interim Worship Ministry Team was that of finding and leasing suitable space. The team looked at schools, shopping centers, motels, and other churches in its search for temporary housing. It prepared a master list of sites that it gathered from every resource available including the

congregation. This master list can be seen in Appendix G. The team worked through the list of sites systematically in its search for temporary facilities. Then it shared a report with the Relocation Committee and the Church Board. This report can also be seen in Appendix G.

Atlanta First Church of the Nazarene was able to find space in a shopping center near its new location. After negotiations were completed, the church signed a contract for worship and education space. A separate space within the same shopping center was also leased for church offices. Work was begun almost immediately to prepare the facility for the congregation. Since there were still some uncertainties in the sales contract, the church had had provided for a sixty-day notice of departure in the contract. This option allowed the church to terminate the contract with a minimum of expense if the conditions of the sales contract on the facility it was selling were not met.

The third responsibility of the Interim Worship Ministry Action Team was to oversee any weekly set-up and clean-up needs during the time of relocation. The team did not get to fulfill this responsibility since the church never actually occupied the interim space.

This team also prepared a list of action items related to the interim facility. It contained detailed items like the establishment of a date for the actual move, notifying utility companies, advertising the new location, and assigning classrooms. A full list of the action items related to interim worship can be found in Appendix F.

B. Moving and Storage Ministry Action Team

Naturally the Moving and Storage Ministry Action Team was the team given the responsibility to oversee the actual move from the church facility to the interim facility. It was also assigned the responsibility for the move from the interim facility to the newly constructed facility.

This team was given four primary assignments. First it worked with the department heads of the church to determine which items would be stored during the time the congregation spent worshipping in the interim facility. These items were to be moved into storage and then removed from storage and moved to the new facility when it was completed.

The second task for the Moving and Storage Team was to obtain appropriate storage facilities. The team checked into commercial storage space and negotiated a lease for storage space in the same shopping center where the church

was planning to worship while it was constructing a new building.

The team was also assigned the responsibility of transferring utilities and phone service to the interim facility and then to the permanent new structure. Due to the inability of the church to complete the relocation project, the team was only able to handle the rental of a new Post Office Box near the new facility.

The final area of responsibility assigned to the Moving and Storage Team was the oversight of packing and moving items to storage. To prepare for this part of the relocation effort, the team used the church fellowship hall as a staging area. The actual move did not occur, but preparations were well underway. Marks were placed on the floor outlining three sections for each of the three major categories of items to be moved. Items for long-term storage were to be placed in one section. Items and supplies that were not used every week were to be placed in a second section. Items and supplies that would be used weekly were to be placed in a third section. The team made self-stick labels available so that the contents of all boxes could be listed on the box itself. It also secured all boxes, padding, and packing materials that were needed.

C. Plans Development and
Construction Ministry Action Team

Like the Moving and Storage Team, the Plans Development and Construction Team was given four major areas of responsibility. First, it was to work with the architect in the development of a full set of plans and working drawings for the project. Of course this involved many meetings with the architect as the project proceeded through its first steps. Meetings were held with the department heads, the ministerial staff, and all other ministry heads within the congregation. The congregation was urged to submit their ideas to this team as well. A "Dream Night" was held to allow the congregation to voice their ideas for the new building.

Working with the architect, the Plans Development and Construction Ministry Action Team developed concept drawings and site development plans for the new project. It also developed construction drawings for the proposed interim facility.

The Plans Development and Construction Team was given the responsibility of assisting with any church meetings that might be held to inform the congregation of either the plans or the construction details. Such meetings had been

held previously and were anticipated again as the Relocation Committee and Church Board tried to keep the congregation informed of the progress of the relocation project.

Contrary to what the title might suggest, the Plans Development and Construction Team was not assigned the responsibility of coordinating any actual construction. The Church Board had already decided to hire a general contractor for the project. The team was to give general oversight to the general contractor from the time of the ground breaking until the completion of the construction of the building, however.

The final area of responsibility for the Plans Development and Construction Ministry Team was specifically designed for the project of Atlanta First Church. Since the new property had been leased for parking by area businesses, the team was asked to consider and recommend action regarding lease requests at the property.

D. Furnishing and Equipment Ministry Action Team

The Furnishing and Equipment Ministry Action Team was the largest of the teams. Thirty-seven people either volunteered or were recruited to help with the five major

areas of responsibility assigned to this team. Not everyone worked on all of the responsibilities. The team formed its own teams to handle each of the assignments. Since these teams were not a part of the original design for the project, they were not included in this paper as separate Ministry Action Teams.

The first responsibility of the Furnishing and Equipment Team was that of assessing the furnishing and equipment needs of the church. This team consulted with the leaders of the various ministries of the church to determine what each area of ministry might need. The team then made recommendations to the Church Board through the Relocation Committee regarding the appropriate time to purchase each of these items.

The second responsibility of the Furnishing and Equipment Ministry Team related to the search for products. The team was to meet with various selected vendors and suppliers to review their products and supplies. In many cases the vendors brought samples of their products for the team to review. The team recommended specific vendors to the Church Board for consideration.

As its third responsibility, the team was instructed to obtain written bids for large expense items. The team

brought written bids to the Church Board for chairs that could be used in the sanctuary of the interim facility and in the new building as well. It also secured bids for classroom chairs, classroom tables, white boards, a sanctuary piano, and an organ. Of these items the piano, the organ, and 100 chairs were purchased immediately so the church could begin to use them. Other items, such as classroom chairs, tables, white boards, cabinets, bookshelves, and podiums were to be purchased later in the project. They had not been purchased at the time of this research, however.

The fourth and fifth responsibilities of the team were related. The team was asked to negotiate the best price based on value for whatever product or products it was considering. It was then asked to recommend necessary purchases to the Church Board through the Relocation Committee.

E. Communication and Presentation Ministry Action Team

The Communication and Presentation Team was given the responsibility of maintaining regular communication with the congregation. They were asked to find ways to develop links between the congregation and the various ministry

teams in order to keep everyone informed and up-to-date on the progress of the various areas of the project. The team also sought ways to improve communication between the various teams that were functioning.

The team was asked to help develop all presentations related to the project. This would include ceremonies such as groundbreaking. They were to work directly with the pastoral staff in fulfilling this area of responsibility.

They also agreed to chronicle the relocation process. While fulfilling this responsibility, they photographed special events, shot videotapes of significant moments, and gathered historical material and items for the archives of the church.

The Communication and Presentation Team believed that part of its responsibility in communication was to make sure that communication took place with God regarding the relocation effort. For that reason they accepted the responsibility for praying for all other teams and the relocation project in general.

F. Sales Contract Completion Ministry Action Team

The Sales Contract Completion Ministry Team was assigned the task of continuing to work with the realtor

who had the listing on the existing church facility. Since the church was not fully satisfied with the work of the realtor, this team agreed to receive reports from the realtor regarding his efforts to sell the church. The team also communicated information from the church to the realtor. When there were questions regarding contract offers, this team resolved the issue with the realtor.

The team was also given the responsibility of overseeing the sales contract to completion. When it appeared that the conditions of the contract might not be fulfilled, this team tried to discover ways to resolve the problems with the contract. They even negotiated a modification of the contract in an attempt to make the purchase possible for the group trying to buy the facility.

Unfortunately the contract in place at the time of the formation of the Ministry Action Teams had to be withdrawn due to the inability of the purchasers to secure financing. The Contract Completion Ministry Team continued to work with any new offers the church received. It negotiated all details regarding the offers. The team prepared the official response of the church to these offers and communicated this response to the realtor or realtors involved.

When the congregation was asked to volunteer to serve on Ministry Action Teams, no one volunteered to serve on the Sales Contract Completion Ministry Team. Instead of expecting the appointed leader to handle the responsibility alone, several members of the Relocation Committee were asked to serve as the Sales Contract Completion Team. This allowed the team to function as a team instead of restricting its work to the production of one individual. The Sales Contract Completion Ministry Action Team was the only team that was comprised totally of recruited members. The other teams had a mixture of volunteers and recruited workers.

What appeared to be a simple responsibility when the team was formed proved to be complex and challenging. Since the contract in place at the time of the formation of the Ministry Action Teams was withdrawn, the team negotiated with other potential purchasers of the property and made recommendations to the Church Board.

G. Day Care Development Ministry Action Team

The Day Care Development Ministry Team was formed to oversee the development of one of the new ministries the church wanted to begin in its new facility. Not all churches involved in building programs or relocation

projects would form such a team, but this team was necessary for Atlanta First Church of the Nazarene since it planned to organize a day care ministry in its new location.

The team was assigned the responsibility of developing a Day Care Implementation Strategy so the church would know what to expect from the creation of such a ministry. It was also charged with the task of providing the construction team with whatever special construction requirements that were necessary for a day care ministry. This allowed the construction team to include these requirements in the plans for the new facility.

The Day Care Development Team was given the responsibility of handling all business details regarding the implementation of the new Day Care Ministry for the church. Much of the work of this committee was never performed due to the delay in the relocation project. The committee did gather some day care guidelines from the state and gathered information from other churches that were involved in a day care ministry.

H. Financing Ministry Action Team

The Financing Ministry Team was asked to work jointly with the regular Finance Committee of the Church Board in

performing its duties. Three major responsibilities were assigned to this team. The first responsibility given to the team was planning and implementing a capital fund-raising project. After doing much research regarding fund-raising, the team recommended securing the services of a professional stewardship company to assist the church with the task of raising funds for the project. When the Church Board approved this recommendation, a new team, the Stewardship Ministry Action Team, was created. The responsibilities assigned to this new team are discussed in the next section of this chapter.

The Financing Ministry Team was also assigned the task of reviewing different long-term financing strategies. In fulfilling this responsibility the team met with banks regarding conventional loans. They also met with representatives of companies that proposed leading the church in a bond program. Comparisons were made, after which the team recommended using traditional bank financing for the project. The Church Board approved the recommendation of the team in this matter.

The final area of responsibility for the Financing Ministry Team involved the actual process of obtaining long-term financing for the project. This team was asked

to meet with bank representatives regarding the details of financing for the relocation project. It was also asked to complete loan applications and to compile whatever information the bank required in order to process the application.

After working extensively with the assignment of arranging long-term financing, the Financing Ministry Team recommended a refinancing of the new property in a manner that would allow the church to finance the construction and secure a permanent loan. The Church Board accepted the financing recommendation and recommended it to the entire congregation. The congregation also approved the details and the new financing was secured.

I. Stewardship Ministry Action Team

The newly created Stewardship Ministry Team was given the task of contacting and interviewing professional stewardship companies. The team brought in representatives of at least four of these companies for interviews. The team then selected one company to recommend to the Church Board. The Church Board approved their recommendation and secured the services of a company to help them raise part of the funds for the project.

The second area of responsibility assigned to the Stewardship Ministry Team was one of coordinating the fund raising project until a stewardship company was employed. As could be expected, the company that was recommended by the team was a company that approached fund raising by using various teams for the different segments of the effort.

Members of the Stewardship Ministry Team were then asked to be involved in the stewardship campaign. Many of them got involved in key areas of the fund raising effort since their interests and abilities were in this area.

J. Site Selection Ministry Action Team

A Site Selection Committee had functioned under the direction of the Church Board as soon as the church decided to relocate. Since this committee was organized around a specific function and was given the authority to conduct its business in a manner like that of the Ministry Action Teams that were formed later in the project, it is included here as one of the ministry teams.

The Site Selection Ministry Team was asked to prepare a list of possible sites to which the church might relocate. The team prepared a list of seven different pieces of property that seemed to satisfy the requirements

of the relocation effort of the church. The team then prepared a packet of information containing descriptions of each of the tracts of land so the Church Board could become acquainted with their work.

The Site Selection Ministry Team also toured each of the properties as a team to gather as much information as possible about each of the properties. Finally it entered into negotiations on two pieces of property. Since the sellers were willing to accept the final proposals from the team, the team decided to recommend one piece of property to the Church Board and the congregation for purchase. Once the recommendation was made, the Site Selection Ministry Team had completed its assignment and was disbanded.

K. Incomplete Results

When the Ministry Action Teams were organized, Atlanta First Church of the Nazarene had already purchased property and had a contract to sell its existing facility. The teams began to work immediately to fulfill the areas of responsibility assigned to them.

Through the efforts of the Ministry Action Teams, schematic drawings and site development plans were soon in place. Long term financing was secured. A fund-raising

campaign was held. A conditional contract on interim facilities was signed, and work was begun to get the interim facility ready for occupancy.

After months of hard work, the church was informed that the purchaser of the existing church facility was not able to qualify for a loan. Some of the work by the teams had to be placed on hold while the church worked to find another purchaser. Most of the planning and organizing had been completed, but the implementation of some of these plans had to be stopped.

Some of the teams, like the Sales Contract Completion Team and the Plans Development and Construction Team, continued to work. Other teams, like the Interim Worship Team and the Moving and Storage Team, had to suspend activity until their services were needed. Every team had done some work, however. Since the teams had not completed all of their assignments, evaluations of their work were based upon the plans the teams had developed and the work the teams had already done.

CHAPTER 4

EVALUATION BY THE PARTICIPANTS IN THE RELOCATION PROJECT OF ATLANTA FIRST CHURCH OF THE NAZARENE

After the Ministry Action Teams of Atlanta First Church of the Nazarene had functioned for nine months, the members of these teams, including the team leaders, were asked to evaluate their involvement in the relocation project. Members of the Church Board and the Relocation Committee were also asked to evaluate this team approach to relocating a church.

Surveys were mailed to 72 individuals who served as Ministry Action Team leaders, Ministry Action Team members, Church Board members, and Relocation Committee members. A sample of this survey and the cover letter that accompanied it are provided in Appendix A.

Of the 72 surveys mailed, 50 individuals (69%) responded to the survey. Three of these participants indicated that they had not actually been able to serve with a team, so they returned the survey without completing it. That left 47 valid surveys (65%) from which to gather

information. The individuals who responded to the survey provided valuable insight into the work of the Ministry Action Teams. They also provided their evaluations of how the use of these teams effected the church. The complete tally results of this survey can be found in Appendix C.

A. General Information

The General Information section of the survey revealed the fact that 82% of those responding to the survey had actually served as a team leader or a team member of a Ministry Action Team. The others who responded were members of either the Church Board or the Relocation Committee. Some individuals served in multiple positions by serving on the Church Board, the Relocation Committee, and at least one Ministry Action Team during the relocation project.

The pastor or a Ministry Action Team leader recruited 51% of those who served on the Ministry Action Teams. Volunteers comprised 40% of those who served in one of the various positions. The remaining 9% indicated that they had gotten involved in some other way, such as being elected to the Church Board.

The survey revealed the fact that only 7% of the participants were less than 30 years of age while 50% were

over 50 years old. According to the Senior Pastor of the church, participation in the project reflected the age distribution of the congregation. Table 1 shows how the participation was divided according to age.

Table 1.--Participation by Age

	<i>NUMBER</i>	<i>PERCENTAGE</i>
21-30	3	7%
31-40	7	15%
41-50	13	28%
51-60	11	24%
Above 60	12	26%
Total	46	100%

Males represented 52% of those who participated in the project. The remaining 48% were females.

Survey participants were asked to make evaluations in three general areas: the recruitment of the Ministry Action Teams, personal participation on the teams, and the effect the teams had upon the project, the church, and the pastor. They were also asked if they would recommend the use of Ministry Action Teams to other churches.

B. Evaluation of Recruitment

When the lay leaders of Atlanta First Church of the Nazarene were asked to rate the overall recruitment of the Ministry Action Teams, 95% of them found the recruitment to

be "acceptable" or "very good." A rating of "very good" was given by 51% of those involved and a rating of "acceptable" was given by 44% of the people. Only 4% of those involved considered the recruitment to be "poor." No one considered it to be "unacceptable."

The Ministry Action Team *leaders*, who did the majority of the recruiting of Ministry Action Team *members*, rated the recruitment much higher than the Ministry Action Team *members*, the Church Board members, and the Relocation Committee members. Recruitment was considered to be "very good" by 83% of the team *leaders*. Only 69% of the Church Board members, 57% of the Relocation Committee members, and 48% of the Ministry Action Team *members* thought the recruitment was "very good," however.

The recruitment process was given an "acceptable" rating by 48% of the Ministry Action Team *members*, 36% of the Relocation Committee members, 25% of the Church Board Members, and 17% of the Ministry Action Team *leaders*.

If two points were given for every percentage point under the "very good" rating and one point was given for each percentage point under the "acceptable" rating, the Ministry Action Team leaders (200 points) still rated the recruitment process higher than all the other groups. The

Church Board members (163 points) were next; followed by the Relocation Committee members (150 points) and the Ministry Action Team members (144 points).

From this information it was evident that those who did the recruiting thought they did a much better job at recruitment than did those who were recruited. It would be an interesting study to investigate the factors that caused the various groups to rate the process like they did.

All of those who rated the recruitment process as "poor" were volunteers. This means the ones who were not directly affected by the actual recruitment process itself were the most critical of the process. Using the same point system described above, it was discovered that those who were recruited by the pastor (175 points) rated the process much higher than those recruited by the Ministry Action Team leaders (147 points) and the volunteers (141 points).

In general terms older participants tended to rate the recruitment process much higher than younger workers did. People in their fifties (173 points) rated it the highest, with people over 60 (158 points) next. People in their twenties (100 points) rated it the lowest.

Males and females rated the recruitment process exactly the same with 50% rating it "very good," 45% rating it "acceptable," and 5% rating it "poor."

Most (74%) of the people who got involved in the relocation project of Atlanta First Church of the Nazarene believed they were recruited to serve in an area of personal strength. This was especially high for those serving as Ministry Action team *leaders* (100%), Relocation Committee Members (94%), and Church Board members (82%).

Only 66% of the Ministry Action Team *members* believed the same thing about their involvement, however. This lower percentage reflects the fact that many of the Ministry Action Team members were volunteers. Therefore, they were less likely to say they were recruited for a personal strength since they did not consider themselves to be recruited. In fact, only 50% of those who volunteered their services believed they were working in an area of strength.

The percentage of those who thought they were recruited because of an area of strength tended to be higher among the younger participants. Of those under 51, 82% considered their recruitment to be in an area of strength, but only 64% of those over 50 believed their

recruitment was the product of their personal capabilities. Gender did not make a difference in the way the participants viewed their involvement.

Ministry Action Team members did not consider the assignment sheets distributed to the congregation when the Ministry Action Teams were organized to be written job descriptions. Only 26% of those responding believed they had received such a description in writing.

A higher percentage of the Ministry Action Team leaders (67%) were convinced they had received written job descriptions, however. Members of the Church Board and the Relocation Committee agreed with opinion of the Ministry Action Team members. Only 24% of both groups believed they had received written job descriptions. The assignment sheet containing the job descriptions can be found in Appendix E.

Job descriptions were provided for 40% of those recruited by the team leaders, but only 25% of those recruited by the pastor received similar documents. This may have been explained by the fact that the Ministry Action Team leaders were working directly with a small group of people who would be carrying out specific job

assignments while the pastor was recruiting leaders for the overall implementation of the project.

Of those who participated, 82% did receive verbal job descriptions, however. All of the Ministry Action Team leaders received such oral instructions while only 75% of those in the other areas of ministry received definite verbal assignments.

The Ministry Action Team leaders did better at providing verbal descriptions of job assignments by providing verbal instructions to 94% of their recruits. The pastor provided verbal descriptions to only 75% of those he enlisted. This could be explained again by the fact that the pastor was casting the vision while the team leaders were referring to specific assignments.

Older participants received more verbal job descriptions than did younger participants. Of those over 50 years of age, 91% received verbal instructions while only 73% of those under age 51 did. A slightly higher percentage of females (90%) received verbal job descriptions than did males (78%).

Training was almost none existent during the time the Ministry Action Teams served. Only 13% of those involved in the project thought they received any kind of training.

The Ministry Action Team leaders thought they received a little more training than the average person did, but only 33% of these leaders believed they were trained.

Of those who were recruited to serve, 25% believed they received training for their assignments. None of the volunteers thought they were trained, however. This supports the idea that people who are recruited are generally given a more complete explanation of the task at hand than are those who volunteer.

Of the lay leaders of Atlanta First Church of the Nazarene, 67% indicated that they were given an explanation of the chain of command that was in place at the time of the relocation effort. In other words they understood the reporting procedure of the organization. Table 2 reveals the fact that this number was consistent among all categories of participants.

Table 2.--Understanding the "Chain of Command"

	<i>YES</i>	<i>PERCENT</i>	<i>NO</i>	<i>PERCENT</i>
Church Board Member	11	69%	5	31%
Relocation Committee	10	59%	7	41%
MAT Leader	4	67%	2	33%
MAT Member	20	63%	12	38%
Other	0	0%	0	0%
All Participants	30	67%	15	33%

At least 75% of those who were recruited had an understanding of the chain of command. Volunteers did not understand the chain of command as well, however. Only 47% of those who volunteered to serve in the project understood where their position was placed within the overall organization of the project. This indicated that those who volunteered were not as likely to receive an explanation of the chain of command before they agreed to be involved.

Males understood it a little better than female participants did. In spite of the fact that everyone was given the same explanation, 74% of the males who participated understood the position of their jobs in relationship to the other tasks. Only 60% of the females had the same understanding.

Of the members of the Ministry Action Teams, 85% understood what the church was trying to accomplish and how it was attempting to reach its goal. In other words, most of the people who were involved on these teams thought they had had received an explanation of the "big picture" of the project at the time they began serving.

Of those who served as Ministry Action Team leaders, 100% indicated that they understood the "big picture" for the relocation project. The percentage of the Ministry

Action Team members (85%) and the Church Board members (82%) was consistent with the rating of the overall group (85%). Not as many of the Relocation Committee members (76%) received an explanation of the "big picture," however.

The response of the different age groups to the question about whether they had received an explanation of the "big picture" was varied. When the age groups were broadened, there was a more consistent response, however. Of those who were involved, 86% of the people less than 51 years of age and 86% of those over 50 years old received such an explanation. About the same percentage of females (86%) and males (92%) received an explanation of the "big picture."

C. Evaluation of Participation

Not all of those completing the survey evaluated their participation in the project since the survey instructions specified this section to be for the Ministry Action Teams only. The responses of all participants, however, including Church Board members and Relocation Committee members, were included in the general results of this section due to the fact that many of the participants served in multiple positions.

When the participants of the relocation effort of Atlanta First Church of the Nazarene were asked to rate the level of satisfaction they felt from their participation in the project, 90% considered their involvement to be at least "somewhat satisfying." Only 30% ranked their participation to be "very satisfying" while 60% considered it to be "somewhat satisfying." Only four individuals, representing 10% of the group, considered their participation to be "unsatisfying." This certainly could be due to the fact that some of the teams had not been able to complete their work by the time the survey was conducted.

Only 13% of the Ministry Action Team members did not consider their involvement to be satisfactory. This meant that 83% of the Ministry Action Team members gave their involvement on a team during the project a positive rating. Members of the Church Board (93%) and the Relocation Committee (91%) were even more satisfied with their involvement.

When points were assigned, giving two points for each rating of "very satisfying" and one point for each rating of "somewhat satisfying," the results changed very little. Members of the Relocation Committee (127 points) were the

most satisfied with their participation. The leaders of the Ministry Action Teams (116 points) were almost as satisfied with their involvement. The Church Board members (113 points) were the next most satisfied group. The Ministry Action Team members (107 points) were the least satisfied with their involvement, but their evaluation was only somewhat lower than the rest of the participants. Overall involvement in the team approach to the relocation of the church was a satisfying experience for everyone involved.

The workers who were recruited by the pastor (100%) were a little more satisfied with their participation than were those recruited by the Ministry Action Team leaders (94%). Of the people who volunteered to serve on a team, 87% were at least "somewhat satisfied" with their experience. Since the project was not completed at the time of the survey, the lower rating by the volunteers could be the result of a high level of expectation that was not fulfilled. If they expected more to be done than was accomplished, for example, they would tend to rate their satisfaction lower than they would if more had been accomplished than they expected.

The age of the individuals who participated made a huge difference in the level of satisfaction they felt. Of those who were not satisfied, 75% were over 60 years of age. The remaining 25% were between 51 and 60 years of age. This clearly indicated that older people were less satisfied with their participation in the project than the younger people were.

This finding was verified when points were assigned to the responses of the participants. By assigning two points to those who indicated they were "very satisfied" and one point to those who were "somewhat satisfied," the results revealed that the 31 to 40 age group (127 points) were the most satisfied, followed by the 41 to 50 age group (127 points). The 51 to 60 age group (110 points) was next, followed by the over 60 age group (108 points). One exception was found to this trend. The 21 to 30 age group (100 points) was the least satisfied with their participation. The idealism of youth could help explain why the younger age group was the least satisfied.

All of the people who were not satisfied with their participation in the Ministry Action Team approach to relocation were males. In fact only 27% of the males who participated were "very satisfied." Females were much more

satisfied with their involvement. Of the females who were involved, 100% were at least "somewhat satisfied," but only 82% of the males felt the same level of satisfaction. This result could reveal the fact that men tend to measure their satisfaction by the level of their accomplishment more than females do.

The most important evaluation made in this section of the survey was the one regarding the possibility that participation in the relocation effort created undue hardship upon the schedule of those who served. Of the lay leaders who were involved, 90% denied any undue hardship from participating in this lay-driven approach to relocation. Only four individuals (10%) considered their participation to be the cause of undue hardship upon their schedules.

A breakdown by the area of involvement of the participants revealed the fact that members of the Ministry Action Teams had less interference with their schedules than did the other participants. Only 13% of the Ministry Action Team members thought their schedules suffered undue hardship due to their involvement. In contrast 33% of both the Ministry Action Team leaders and the Relocation Committee members thought their schedules to be effected

negatively. This can be explained by the fact that the team leaders and the Relocation Committee leaders had much more responsibility than did the team members.

Those who were recruited were more likely to consider their schedules unduly effected than were those who volunteered. Only 6% of the volunteers acknowledged such a negative impact while 13% of those who were recruited felt like their schedules suffered.

The schedules of persons between the ages of 31 and 50 years of age were negatively affected the most by their participation. The fact that these ages would be the time when most families would be devoting a large amount of time to their families suggests a reason for this impact. Neither the younger age group nor the older age group felt any hardship upon their schedules. This could have been due to the availability of a greater amount of discretionary time.

The schedules of the males who were involved were much more likely to be adversely affected than were the schedules of the females. Seventeen percent of the men felt like their schedules suffered undue hardship, but none of the women acknowledged a similar impact. This could mean that more men had schedules that were already close to

being overcrowded before they began to participate in the relocation project.

The positive way the participants in the project viewed their involvement helped to explain why they did not consider their involvement to be an undue hardship. Of the participants in the relocation project, 88% considered their participation to be a ministry. A full 90% of the Ministry Action Team members and 100% of the Ministry Action Team leaders considered it to be a ministry.

A high percentage of both the workers who were recruited (87%) and those who volunteered (100%) viewed their involvement as a ministry. Since a smaller percentage of those recruited viewed their participation in such positive terms, it might be thought that some were involved simply because they were recruited. They may not have shared the same sense of mission held by those who were willing to volunteer for service.

Age was not a major factor in the way the workers in the church viewed their involvement. All (100%) of both the oldest and the youngest lay workers considered their involvement to be a ministry, but only 88% of those between ages 31 and 50 viewed their role as a ministry.

Male leaders in the relocation project were more likely to view their involvement in the relocation project as be a ministry. Of the men involved, 96% considered their participation to be a ministry compared to 88% of the females.

In spite of the fact that Ministry Action Teams were loosely organized and functioned in a less formal way, supervision was still required. While 90% of all those in the relocation effort considered the supervision to be adequate, only 84% of the Ministry Action Team members evaluated the supervision as highly.

A much higher percentage of the Ministry Action Team Leaders (100%), the Church Board members (94%), and the Relocation Committee members (92%) gave a favorable opinion of the supervision. Since these leaders provided a lot of the supervision, it is interesting to note that they thought they did a good job supervising the workers. Apparently, the Ministry Action Team members did not fully agree with them.

Of the people who were recruited to serve, 95% thought they received adequate supervision. Only 75% of the volunteers gave the same favorable evaluation of the supervision. Of the females who were involved, 100%

considered the supervision to be adequate. Only 87% of the males considered their supervision to be sufficient.

People who were under the age of 60 were in unanimous agreement that the supervision was adequate, but only 73% of those over 65 years of age considered the supervision in a positive light. This was due to either a desire for more supervision or a breakdown in the supervision that was given.

The opinion of the lay workers toward the supervisors, themselves, was very similar to their view of the supervision they received. Of those involved in this approach to relocating a church, 95% considered their supervisors to be understanding and helpful. Only the Ministry Action Team members had any reservation regarding their supervisors and this was minimal since they gave the supervisors a 93% favorable rating. Of all other groups, 100% considered their supervisors to be understanding and helpful.

Volunteers were only slightly less favorable when rating their supervisors. Their 93% approval rating was nearly as good as the 100% rating given to the supervisors by the people who were recruited.

There was no consistent trend among the various ages. The overwhelming majority of all age groups considered the supervisors to be understanding and helpful. About 95% of both males and females expressed their approval for the helpful contributions of the supervisors.

Of course, Atlanta First Church of the Nazarene attempted to provide resources for the Ministry Action Teams to use as they attempted to fulfill their responsibilities. When asked if these resources were adequate, 78% of those responding considered the resources to meet the demands of the assignments.

All of the Ministry Action Team leaders considered the resources to be completely adequate, but only about 75% of the Church Board members, the Relocation Committee members, and the Ministry Action Team members, considered the resources to be adequate for the performance of their duties. This could be explained by the fact that Ministry Action Team members, the Relocation Committee members, and the Church Board members were actually resources for the Ministry Action Team leaders to use in the completion of their assignments.

Apparently volunteers received less resources than did those who served in appointed positions since only 63% of

the volunteers considered the resources to be adequate while 86% of those who were recruited gave a favorable opinion concerning the resources.

People of all ages were in general agreement about the adequacy of the resources with the exception of the youngest age group. Only 50% of this group considered the resources to be adequate, compared to 82% of the rest of the group.

Females (88%) were somewhat more likely to consider the resources adequate than were their male coworkers (74%).

Effective communication is difficult to achieve, but 79% of the people involved in the relocation effort considered the level of communication during the endeavor to be acceptable. Ministry Action Team members (78%) gave a more favorable rating to the level of communication than did the Church Board members (69%), the Relocation Committee members (62%), or the Ministry Action Team leaders (67%). This suggested that the communication from the top down was more effective than was the communication among peers.

Those who were recruited to serve in the relocation project were somewhat more inclined to give a favorable

rating to the communication effort than were those who volunteered. Only 71% of the volunteers approved the communication efforts while 83% of those who were recruited gave a favorable nod to the level of communication.

Older lay leaders were more inclined to consider the communication acceptable than were the younger ones. Of the participants over fifty years of age, 91% reacted positively to the communication attempts, but only 72% of those under fifty-one years old gave their stamp of approval. Responses were very similar from both males and females.

One of the most refreshing discoveries in the survey was the one that revealed the fact that 100% of the team members with which people served were considered to be cooperative. This meant that people serving in all areas of ministry, all those who were recruited, all volunteers, all age groups, and both genders were in complete agreement in their assessment of the cooperative response of their fellow workers. This response left little doubt that the teams functioned together as teams and achieved a high level of cooperation from the various members of the team.

An overwhelming majority (95%) of the people who participated in the project responded in the affirmative

when asked if they would participate on a Ministry Action Team again if given an opportunity. In fact at least 50% of those who were not satisfied with their participation in the project indicated they would be willing to get involved again. Clearly, the workers in the Atlanta First Church of the Nazarene project considered the team approach to relocation to be a good approach. They were certainly willing to get involved in a similar approach again. Only 5% of the participants would not participate again if given another opportunity.

D. Evaluation of the Use Of Ministry Action Teams

In the final major section of the survey, the Ministry Action Team leaders, the Ministry Action Team members, the Relocation Committee members, and the Church Board members were asked to give evaluations regarding the impact of the use of Ministry Action Teams. They were asked to share their perception of the impact the teams had upon the pastor, the church as a whole, and the project itself.

The participants in the project thought the use of the teams had a positive effect upon the pastor. Of those who served, 95% thought the use of Ministry Action Teams allowed the pastor to have more time for prayer and sermon

preparation. Only two individuals did not believe the teams provided the pastor with more time for his pastoral responsibilities. This percentage was consistent among members of all of the different areas of service.

There was a difference between those who served because they were recruited and those who volunteered to serve, however. Of those who were recruited, 100% believed the Ministry Action Teams provided more time for the pastor to use in the performance of his pastoral duties. Only 94% of those who volunteered to serve had the same belief.

Only the leaders between 21 and 30 years of age were less sure of these results. Just 67% of the younger participants were convinced that the Ministry Action Teams provided the pastor with more time for prayer and sermon preparation. At least 90% of all other age groups affirmed their belief that the teams were a benefit for the pastor.

Females (100%) were slightly more convinced that the use of Ministry Action Teams provided more time for the pastor than were males (91%).

Of those involved in the relocation project, only 33% were actually told that their involvement would allow the pastor to give more attention to ministry responsibilities. A higher percentage of the Church Board members (38%) and

the Ministry Action Team leaders (33%) were told their involvement would allow the pastor to give more attention to his ministry responsibilities than were the Relocation Committee members (29%) and the Ministry Action Team members (23%).

When they were recruiting people to serve in the project, the pastor shared the idea that lay involvement in the project would allow him to give more time to his ministry responsibilities a little more frequently than did the Ministry Action Team leaders. This information was shared with 43% of the people recruited by the pastor, compared to 40% of the people who were recruited by the Ministry Action Team leaders. The people in both of these categories of recruited workers certainly understood the concept that their involvement would benefit the pastor.

Only 25% of the volunteers were told that their involvement would provide more time for the pastor to perform his ministerial responsibilities, while 41% of the recruited workers were told of this benefit. Again this reveals the fact that more information was shared with those who were recruited than with those who volunteered.

More of the younger workers and more female workers were told that involvement in the project would provide the

pastor an opportunity to spend more time on his other ministry responsibilities. Of the people under 51, 42% were given this information. Only 30% of the people over 50 were told about the benefit. Of the female workers, 41% were told how their involvement would benefit the pastor. Only 30% of the male workers were informed of this help for the pastor.

Of the lay people involved in the relocation project of the church, 84% were convinced that Ministry Action Teams reduced the level of stress upon the pastor. This percentage was consistent for Church Board members (88%), Relocation Committee members (85%), and Ministry Action Team members (82%). Only the Ministry Action Team leaders (67%) had fewer people believe the level of stress upon the pastor was reduced.

Those who volunteered to get involved in the project were a little less inclined to believe that the level of stress upon the pastor was reduced by the use of Ministry Action Teams. Of the volunteers, 79% held this belief compared to 86% of the people recruited by the pastor and 93% of the people recruited by the Ministry Action Team leaders.

There was no difference at all in the way the older workers and the younger workers perceived the effect the use of Ministry Action Teams had upon the level of stress placed upon the pastor. Of those under 51 years of age, 84% believed the level of stress was reduced by the use of the teams. The same percentage of those over 50 years old held the belief that the stress upon the pastor was reduced by the team approach to relocation.

There was also very little variation in the perception of the male workers and the female workers. Male participants (86%) and female participants (82%) were in general agreement in their belief that the use of Ministry Action Teams reduced the level of stress upon the pastor.

The participants in the relocation project of Atlanta First Church of the Nazarene also evaluated the impact of the Ministry Action Teams upon the church. When asked if the use of the teams had a positive or negative impact upon the growth of the church, 45% of the lay workers thought it had a positive impact. Only 5% thought the teams had a negative impact. The remaining 50% did not think the use of the teams had a direct effect upon the growth of the church. The workers of the church clearly attributed the growth of the church to other factors.

Ministry Action Team leaders were more inclined to rate the impact of the project to be positive than were all other workers. No more than 6% of the workers in any category rated the impact to be negative, however. The evaluations of each category of workers can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3.--Impact by Worker Category

	<i>Pos. Imp.</i>	<i>Neg. Imp.</i>	<i>No Imp.</i>
Church Board	56%	6%	38%
Relocation Comm.	46%	0%	54%
MAT Leaders	67%	0%	33%
MAT Members	42%	6%	16%
All Workers	45%	5%	50%

Workers who volunteered to serve in the project were not impressed by the impact of the Ministry Action Teams upon the church. Only 28% of those who volunteered to serve considered the impact of the teams to be positive. Recruited workers were much more positive in their view of the impact of the teams, however. Of the workers who were recruited, 52% considered the impact to be positive. These results could be influenced by the fact that the recruited workers were involved in the overall project, but the workers who volunteered were only involved with specific assignments.

The lay workers of the church between the ages of 41 and 60 were much more inclined to give the Ministry Action Teams a positive rating than were people of other ages. Of the participants in this category 56% considered the impact on the growth of the church to be positive. Only 25% of the people in all other age groups gave the teams a positive rating.

In spite of the fact that less than one-half of the work force of the church thought the teams had a positive impact upon the growth of the church, 73% of the people thought the use of Ministry Action Teams produced a greater level of harmony within the congregation. Ministry Action Team leaders (100%) were more inclined to have this opinion than were the Church Board members (76%), the Relocation Committee members (60%) and the Ministry Action Team members (75%).

There was very little difference in the assessment made by the volunteers (79%) and that made by the recruited workers (73%), but workers over 50 (77%) tended to consider the impact upon the harmony of the church to be greater than the view of the people under 51 (66%).

The females who were involved in the relocation effort were much more likely to believe that the Ministry Action

Teams produced a greater level of harmony within the congregation than the male workers were. Of the female participants, 89% thought the level of harmony was greater, but only 61% of the males agreed with their assessment.

Workers in the project were also positive in their evaluation regarding the discovery of new talent and abilities as a result of the use of Ministry Action Teams. Of those who participated, 88% of the workers thought the teams did allow the church to discover new talent as the teams did their work.

Only nineteen percent of the Ministry Action Team members and one Relocation Committee member were of the opinion that the teams did not allow the church to discover new talent. All other workers acknowledged the fact that the use of the Ministry Action Teams did allow the church to discover new talent and ability. None of the various categories within the survey varied significantly with the overall results.

Of all those who were involved in the relocation project, 91% thought the use of Ministry Action Teams produced a higher level of involvement in the project. This evaluation was expected since the teams were designed to provide many ways for people to be involved.

Participants in all categories of service, of all ages, and of both genders agreed with this assessment.

Of the participants in the relocation effort of Atlanta First Church of the Nazarene, 95% thought the use of Ministry Action Teams resulted in a higher level of ownership for the project. Again there was general agreement by all categories of workers. This result is consistent with the findings regarding the level of involvement in the project.

The participants in the relocation effort were not as positive about the way the Ministry Action Teams effected the time line of the project, however. Only 77% of the lay workers thought the time line was reduced by the efforts of the teams. This could have been partially caused by the fact that the project was not completed at the time the evaluations were made.

Only gender seemed to reveal any kind of disagreement in the way those involved in the project thought the use of the teams effected the time line of the projects. Females (89%) were much more inclined to believe the time line was reduced than were the males (67%) involved in the project. This could be due to the fact that males do not have a sense of accomplishment unless they are able to complete a

project. Since the project was not completed, several of the males did not think the time line was reduced.

When the participants in the relocation project of Atlanta First Church of the Nazarene were asked if they would recommend the use of Ministry Action Teams to other churches, 98% expressed a willingness to recommend the teams. In fact, only one individual was not willing to make such a recommendation to other churches. This individual was a female Ministry Action Team member between the ages of 51 and 60 who volunteered to serve.

From the responses of the participants, one may conclude that the participants in the relocation project of Atlanta First Church of the Nazarene would wholeheartedly recommend the use of Ministry Action Teams to other churches.

The responses of the workers of Atlanta First Church of the Nazarene were thoroughly studied to see whether or not the use of Ministry Action Teams helped the church reach its goals for the relocation project. The conclusions made as a result of this study can be found in Chapter six of this paper.

CHAPTER 5

EVALUATION BY SELECTED CHURCH OF THE NAZARENE PASTORS

In order to determine how relocation projects and major building programs effected other Nazarene pastors and churches, a second survey was conducted among the pastors of the Churches of the Nazarene in the states of Arkansas, Georgia, and Tennessee. These states were selected primarily because they were believed to have churches and pastors that would be similar to Atlanta First Church of the Nazarene and its pastor. Therefore, the responses of these pastors would provide a good representation of the viewpoint of other pastors in the Church of the Nazarene.

The pastors of other nearby states, such as Florida, were not selected because it was believed that factors such as the influx of people from northern states who migrate to Florida during the winter could alter the results of the survey.

Surveys were mailed to the 321 pastors of the Churches of the Nazarene in the selected states. One of these

surveys was returned by the post office due to an inadequate address. This left a total of 320 surveys from which to gather information. A sample of the survey and the letter that accompanied it can be found in Appendix B.

Responses were received from 135 pastors. This represented 42% of the number of surveys that were mailed. Of the surveys that were returned, 22 were returned blank. Most of these surveys contained an explanatory note indicating that the pastor had not been involved in a relocation effort or a major building program.

Valid responses were received from 113 pastors. This number represented 35% of the original mailing, from which to gather information regarding the use of lay leadership in other Churches of the Nazarene. The complete tally results of this survey can be found in Appendix D.

A. General Information

The general information section of the survey revealed the fact that only 25% of the pastors who responded to the survey had been involved in relocation projects. An additional 59% of the pastors had given leadership to major building programs. The remaining 16% of the pastors had given leadership to other building projects, such as

sanctuary renovations, parsonage remodeling, and the purchase of additional properties.

Since the leaders of all of the projects would face many of the same needs for lay leadership, responses from all groups were included in the overall results. The results were then compiled showing how the leaders of the relocation projects responded, how the leaders of the major building projects responded, and how the leaders of the "other" projects responded. A small number of pastors gave leadership to more than one type of project. Their responses were included in every category they listed.

Of the pastors who gave leadership to some kind of building-related project, 47% served in churches with a Sunday morning worship attendance under 100. An additional 38% gave leadership to churches with a Sunday morning worship attendance between 101 and 250. Of the pastors who responded, 14% served in churches with an attendance between 251 and 500. Only one pastor served in a church with a morning worship attendance over 500. The survey was analyzed to see whether or not the size of the church had an effect upon the way the pastor used lay leadership. No conclusions were made regarding churches with an attendance

over 500, however, since only one of the pastors of the churches in this category responded.

The survey was also analyzed to see if the date of the project had any effect upon the viewpoint of the pastor. Of the total number of projects, 63 projects (50%) occurred after 1995. Another 32 projects (26%) were conducted prior to 1990. The remaining 30 projects (24%) occurred between 1991 and 1994.

Comparisons were made to see if the age of the pastor at the time of the project had any effect upon the way the pastor used or did not use lay leaders to complete the project. Of those pastors who responded, 58% were between 36 and 50 years of age at the time they gave leadership to a building or relocation project. Another 20% of the pastors were between 51 and 65 years old. Pastoral leaders between 21 and 35 years of age represented 18% of the total. Only 4% of the pastors were above sixty-five years of age.

The pastors of all categories were asked to respond to questions in three primary areas. First, they were asked to reveal the way they recruited and supervised the lay people who were involved in the project. Then, they were asked to assess the effects the project had upon them

personally and upon the life of the church during the project. Finally, the pastors were asked whether they would recommend Ministry Action Teams to other churches.

B. Lay Involvement in the Project

When they used the definition that a "Ministry Action Team is a loosely organized group of church leaders who work together in an accountable manner to accomplish a specific task,"¹⁵ 82% of the pastors believed they used Ministry Action Teams in the projects to which they gave leadership. Only 12% of the pastors did not use Ministry Action Teams. A few pastors (5%) were unsure whether they used Ministry Action Teams or not.

About the same percentage of pastors in all types of projects used the teams, but pastors of larger churches were more likely to use Ministry Action Teams than were pastors of smaller churches. Table 4 reveals how many churches of each size used Ministry Action Teams.

Table 4.--Use of Ministry Action Teams by Church Size

	<i>Yes</i>		<i>No</i>		<i>Uncertain</i>		<i>Total</i>	
Under 100	42	76%	9	16%	4	7%	55	100%
101-250	39	89%	4	9%	1	2%	44	100%
251-500	14	93%	1	7%	0	0%	15	100%

¹⁵ Toler, 63.

The date of the project had no effect upon the use of Ministry Action Teams. Projects completed prior to 1990 were as likely to use Ministry Action Teams as those conducted since 1990. About 85% of the projects in all time frames used Ministry Action Teams.

The age of the pastor at the time of the project had a definite effect upon the use of Ministry Action Teams. Maturity seemed to bring a greater use of the teams until the pastors reached the normal retirement age of sixty-five. At that time the use of teams declined slightly. Table 5 reveals how the pastors of various ages used the teams.

Table 5.--Use of Ministry Action Teams by Pastor's Age

	Yes		No		Uncertain		Total	
21-35	18	78%	5	22%	0	0%	23	100%
36-50	59	83%	8	11%	4	6%	71	100%
51-65	25	93%	1	4%	1	4%	27	100%
Over 65	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%	4	100%

Of the 452 responses concerning the areas of responsibility that were entrusted to Ministry Action Teams, more pastors committed the responsibility of architectural design than any other area to the teams. The next major area of responsibility involved the purchase of furnishings and equipment, followed by long range planning,

and some kind of financial planning. If fund raising and long-term financing responsibilities were combined, financial arrangements would be the area most assigned to the teams.

Table 6 shows how the pastors assigned responsibility to Ministry Action Teams during relocation or building projects.

Table 6.--Use of Multiple Ministry Action Teams

	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Long-range Planning	44	10%
Site Selection	37	8%
Contract Negotiations	57	13%
Architectural Design	79	17%
Furnishing and Equipment	69	15%
Interim Location	8	2%
Moving and Storage	25	6%
Fund Raising	43	10%
Long-term Financing	46	10%
Communications	29	6%
Other	15	3%
Total	452	100%

The number of areas of responsibility assigned to Ministry Action Teams by each pastor gives a more accurate reflection of how the pastors used these teams in their churches. Of the pastors who used the teams, 61% used them to direct fewer than five of the areas of responsibility and 38% used them in three or fewer areas. An additional

5% of the pastors did not use Ministry Action Teams for any area of responsibility.

Pastors who led their churches in relocation projects were more inclined to use multiple Ministry Action Teams than were pastors who gave leadership to major building programs. Of the pastors who led relocation projects, 75% used these teams for more than three areas of responsibility. Only 65% of the pastors who gave leadership to major building programs entrusted the responsibility to Ministry Action Teams. This can be partially explained by the fact that pastors leading relocation projects have more areas of responsibility to consider.

Larger churches tended to use Ministry Action Teams more than smaller churches. Of the churches with a morning attendance over 100, 83% used teams in 4 to 7 areas. Only 47% of the churches with an attendance under 100 used a similar number of teams. This could be partially explained by the fact that larger churches have more people with which to form teams.

There was no apparent difference in the number of teams used in projects that were completed before 1995 and those that were conducted after 1995. Pastors leading

projects in all time frames used Ministry Action Teams for a variety of areas of responsibilities.

Younger pastors tended to use Ministry Action Teams in fewer areas of responsibility than pastors with more maturity. Of the pastors between 21 and 35 years of age, 24% used teams for 5 or more areas of the project. Approximately 48% of pastors over 36 years of age used teams for this same number of responsibilities. Both the level of maturity and the fact that pastors who are young often serve smaller congregations explain this difference.

Most of the pastors recognized the fact that the church needed leaders who were qualified to serve in the area where they were asked to be involved. For that reason 75% of the pastors recruited their lay leaders on the basis of their individual strengths "most of the time." An additional 19% of the pastors recruited lay leaders on the basis of individual strengths at least "some of the time." Only 6% gave very little consideration to the individual strengths of the lay leaders they recruited.

The type of project had no effect upon the recruitment of the lay leaders. About 96% of the lay leaders in both types of projects were recruited because of individual strengths at least "some of the time."

Church size did have an effect upon the recruitment of lay leaders, however. Larger churches recruited workers on the basis of their strengths more consistently than smaller churches did. Of the pastors of churches whose worship attendance was between 251 and 500, 93% recruited their workers because of personal strengths "most of the time." Only 70% of the pastors of churches with a worship attendance under 100 and 77% of the pastors of churches with a worship attendance between 101 and 250 recruited lay leaders based on strength with the same frequency.

Pastors of churches that entered building and relocation projects after 1995 were the least likely to recruit lay leaders on the basis of individual strengths. Only 68% of these pastors recruited lay leaders on the basis of qualifications "most of the time." About 82% of the other pastors recruited workers on this basis "most of the time." Of the pastors of churches with projects since 1995, 15% gave little consideration to individual strengths when recruiting lay leaders. None of the churches involved in projects prior to 1990 omitted individual strengths from consideration when recruiting lay leaders.

The survey also revealed the fact that the older pastors were less likely to recruit workers on the basis of

individual strengths. Only 62% of the pastors between 51 and 65 years of age recruited lay leaders on this basis "most of the time," compared to 82% of the youngest pastors (21-35) and 80% of the middle age group (36-50). When the percentage of those recruited on the basis of individual strengths "some of the time" was added into the totals, however, the more mature pastors compared more favorably. About 95% of the pastors of all ages recruited their lay leaders on the basis of personal strengths at least "some of the time."

Most (68%) of the pastors who responded to the survey were committed to securing lay leaders both by recruiting them and by allowing them to volunteer. Only 14% of the pastors recruited all lay leaders. About 18% of the pastors depended totally upon volunteers.

Smaller churches tended to depend more on volunteers for leadership than did the larger churches. For example, 27% of the churches with a worship attendance of less than 100 depended totally upon volunteers. On the other hand, none of the churches with an attendance over 251 depended solely upon volunteers. In fact, 40% of these pastors recruited all lay leaders and workers.

Pastors of churches conducting projects since 1995 depended a little more on recruitment than pastors of earlier projects. Of the pastors involved in a project since 1995, 19% recruited all lay leaders and workers. Only 6% of the pastors with projects prior to 1995 depended exclusively on recruited leaders and workers.

Older pastors were more inclined to use a combination of recruiting some leaders and allowing others to volunteer. Of the pastors between 51 and 65 years of age, 77% used both methods of getting lay leaders. Only 50% of the pastors between 21 and 35 years of age used both methods, however.

Written job descriptions were not widely used by the pastors involved in major expansion projects. Only 15% of them used written job descriptions. In contrast, 68% of the pastors shared verbal job descriptions with their lay leaders. Unfortunately, 16% of the pastors did not provide any kind of job description for the lay leaders.

The percentage of pastors providing some kind of job description did not vary much between relocation projects (90%) and major building programs (87%), but the size of the congregation did have some effect. Of the churches with a worship attendance under 100, 28% failed to provide

any kind of job description to lay leaders. Only 6% of the pastors of churches with a worship attendance over 101 failed to provide a job description. This difference in approach is further accentuated by the fact that about 20% of the pastors of larger churches provided written job descriptions. Only 9% of the pastors of the smallest churches did.

More pastors of churches that started projects after 1994 (21%) failed to provide written job descriptions than did pastors of churches that started projects before 1995 (16%). However, there was very little difference in the percentage of pastors that provided verbal job descriptions, leaving one to conclude that the date of the project had little impact on the possibility of the pastor providing job descriptions.

The age of the pastor made a definite difference in the kind of job description provided. For example, 20% of the pastors under 51 years of age provided written job descriptions, but only 6% of the pastors over 50 years old provided this same kind of job description.

In spite of the importance of training for any kind of job, 53% of the pastors provided "very little training" for lay leaders. Only 11% of the pastors provided training

"most of the time." The remaining 36% provided training "some of the time."

There was little difference in the amount of training provided by pastors of relocation projects (18%) and that provided by pastors of major building programs (10%), but pastors of larger churches did better at providing training than pastors of smaller churches did. Of the churches with an average morning worship attendance over 250, 60% provided training at least "some of the time." Only forty-two percent of the pastors of churches with an average morning worship under 100 provided training "some of the time," however.

The date when the project occurred had little effect upon the amount of training provided by the pastors, but the age of the pastor at the time of the project was a different matter. Older pastors provided more training than did the younger pastors. Of the pastors over 50, 60% provided training at least "most of the time." Only 42% of the pastors under 51 provided this same degree of training.

When it came to explaining the "chain of command" to lay leaders, 68% of the pastors explained the reporting procedure to lay leaders at least "some of the time." In fact, 46% of the pastors explained the chain of command

"most of the time." Only 32% of the pastors did not use a chain of command.

Smaller churches did not use a chain of command as much as larger churches did, according to the survey. Of the churches with an average morning worship attendance of less than 100, 47% failed to use a chain of command, but only 20% of the churches with a worship attendance over 250 failed to institute a chain of command. This could be explained by the fact that lay leaders in smaller churches might have more direct access to the leaders of the church than would lay leaders in larger churches.

Pastors did a very good job of giving the lay leaders frequent glimpses of the "big picture" of the project. Of all pastors who responded, 78% provided glimpses of the big picture "frequently" with an additional 20% providing glimpses "occasionally."

Church size had a little effect upon the frequency of sharing the big picture. A higher percentage of the larger churches (87%) provided "frequent" glimpses of the big picture. Only 77% of the medium-sized churches and 75% of the smaller churches provided "frequent" views of the overall project. Almost all churches provided glimpses at least occasionally.

Most of the pastors (89%) provided supervision for the lay leaders who were involved in the project at least "some of the time." It would be interesting to study this matter further to see if micro or macro supervision was provided. Twice as many pastors involved in building programs (11%) gave "very little supervision" to lay leaders than did the pastors of relocation projects (5%).

Larger churches were more consistent in providing supervision. Table 7 clearly reveals the difference in the level of supervision provided by churches of different sizes.

Table 7.--Supervision by Church Size

	<i>Most of the time</i>		<i>Some of the time</i>		<i>Very Little provided</i>		<i>Total</i>	
Under 100	25	42%	26	43%	9	15%	55	100%
101-250	23	58%	13	33%	4	10%	40	100%
251-500	11	73%	3	20%	1	7%	15	100%

More supervision was provided for the leaders of the older projects than for the leaders for the more recent projects. Supervision was provided at least some of the time to 97% of the leaders of projects that started prior to 1990. Only 90% of the projects between 1990 and 1994 and 86% of the projects between 1995 and 1999 gave this same level of supervision. This downward trend indicated

that pastors are gradually learning to trust the abilities of lay leaders more.

Of the pastors responding to the survey, 96% did not believe that the use of lay leaders threatened the authority of the pastor. When it came to actually granting that authority, however, the pastors were not as willing to give the lay leaders the authority to make decisions. Only 62% of the pastors gave the lay leaders the authority to make decisions "most of the time." An additional 38% gave them such authority at least "some of the time."

Pastors leading relocation projects were more likely to grant the lay leaders the authority to make decisions than were pastors leading major building programs. Of the pastors leading relocation projects, 68% granted the authority to make decisions "most of the time." Only 59% of the pastors of major building programs were willing to grant this same level of authority.

Pastors of churches in the most recent projects were less likely to feel like their authority was threatened by the use of lay leadership. Of the pastors of projects since 1994, 98% did not consider the use of leaders to be a threat. In projects beginning prior to 1990 only 91% believed there was no threat. This difference in belief

regarding the threat of lay leaders upon the authority of the pastor was reflected in the level of authority granted to the lay leaders to make decisions during the projects. In the projects started since 1995, 75% of the pastors granted lay leaders the authority to make decisions "most of the time." Only 58% of the pastors of projects prior to 1990 granted this same level of authority.

Younger pastors were less likely to feel threatened by the use of lay leaders than were older pastors. None of the pastors under 36 felt threatened, but 4% of the pastors over 35 thought using lay leaders threatened the authority of the pastor. This belief was not reflected in the way the pastors of different ages granted the lay leaders the authority to make decisions, however. The younger pastors (12-35) and the older pastors (51-65) granted decision-making authority (54%) to the lay leaders "most of the time."

Of the pastors who responded, 100% considered the use of lay leadership to be at least "somewhat effective." The use of lay leadership was considered to be "very effective" by 79% of the pastors. The type of the project had no bearing upon this opinion. An equal percentage of the pastors of churches in relocation projects and the pastors

of churches in major building programs considered the use of lay leaders to be effective.

The size of the church did yield different results in how highly the pastors rated the use of lay leaders, however. Only 71% of the churches averaging less than 100 in morning worship considered the use of lay leaders to be "very effective." In contrast 87% of the churches averaging over 250 considered the use of lay leaders to be "very effective."

The date of the project had some effect upon how the pastors rated the use of lay leaders. Of the pastors who lead projects that began prior to 1990, 87% considered the use of lay leaders to be "very effective." Only 76% of the projects since 1994 shared this high rating for the use of lay leadership.

The age of the pastors at the time of the project influenced the way the pastors rated the use of lay leadership. A higher percentage of the pastors in each age category gave "very effective" ratings to the use of lay leadership during their projects. Lay leaders were considered "very effective" by 73% of the pastors under 36 years of age, 79% of the pastors between 36 and 50 years of age, 81% of the pastors from 51 and 65 years of age, and

100% of the pastors over sixty-five years of age. This escalating ranking could be due either to an increase in the ability of the older pastors to direct lay leaders or to a lower level of expectation older pastors might place upon the lay leaders.

C. Effects of the Project On the Pastor and the Church

In this section of the survey the pastors were asked to give their opinions regarding the way the relocation project or building program affected the pastor and the church. Three of these questions asked for opinions regarding the effects of the project upon the pastor. The other four questions wanted to know the opinions of the pastors regarding the effects the project upon the church.

More of the pastors thought the project had an effect upon their level of stress than anything else considered in the survey. Of the pastors who participated, 72% considered the level of stress to be increased by the project in which they were involved. No change was detected by 25% of the pastors. Only 3% of the pastors thought the level of stress was decreased by the project.

The type of project to which the pastor gave leadership did not change the way the pastor perceived the

effect of the project. About the same percentage of pastors giving leadership to relocation projects and pastors leading major building programs thought the level of stress increased.

The size of the congregation to which the pastor gave leadership did effect the way the pastors perceived changes in the level of stress, however. Only 65% of the pastors of churches with an attendance under 100 experienced an increase in the level of stress, but 76% of the pastors of churches with an average morning worship attendance over 101 thought their level of stress increased.

Pastors of churches involved in the earlier projects once again acknowledged more increase in stress than did the pastors of more recent projects. Only 64% of the pastors who led projects since 1994 thought their level of stress increased as a result of the project. Of the pastors involved in projects prior to 1995, 79% experienced an increase in their level of stress.

The age of the pastor at the time of the project had a direct effect upon the way the pastor thought the level of stress changed. Of the pastors under 51, 73% thought the level of stress increased. Only 61% of the pastors over 50

considered the level of stress to be higher during the project.

Of the pastors who responded to the survey, 65% believed that the time they had available for prayer and sermon preparation was reduced by the project. No change in the amount of time available for such activities was detected by 30% of the pastors. Only 5% of the pastors thought the project increased the time they had available for such important activities as sermon preparation and prayer.

More pastors leading relocation projects (74%) than pastors leading building programs (65%) thought their time for pastoral care was reduced. Likewise, more pastors of churches with an attendance over 250 (80%) experienced what they considered a reduction of time than did pastors of churches with an attendance under 251 (64%).

Fewer pastors (56%) of churches involved in projects conducted since 1994 noticed a reduction in time available for pastoral care than pastors (73%) of churches involved in projects prior to 1995 did. The effects of the projects upon pastors of different ages followed no consistent pattern.

Of the pastors involved in relocation projects and building programs, 60% thought the projects reduced the amount of time they had available to spend with their families. No noticeable effect upon this time was perceived by 38% of the pastors. The remaining 2% of the pastors thought they had more time available as a result of the project.

The type of project, the size of the morning worship attendance in the church, and the age of the pastor at the time of the project had very little effect upon the way the pastors perceived the amount of time they had available for their families. A higher percentage of pastors of projects prior to 1995 (68%) expressed their belief that they had less time for their families than pastors of projects since 1994 (53%), however.

The pastors who responded to the survey were less inclined to believe that the project had a negative effect upon the church than they were to believe it had negative effects upon them. Only 22% of the pastors believed the project hindered other areas of ministry within the church.

More pastors involved in relocation projects (30%) considered the project to be a hindrance to other areas of ministry in the church than were pastors of major building

programs (23%). Church size, project date, and the age of the pastor at the time of the project did not effect the way the pastor viewed the impact of the project on other areas of ministry in the church.

Pastors viewed the effects of the project upon the growth potential of the church during the actual time of the project in a positive way. Of the pastors who responded, 74% thought the project had a positive effect upon the growth potential of the church. Another 15% thought the project had no effect upon the growth potential of the church. Only 11% of the pastors thought the project had a negative effect upon the growth potential of the church.

The type of project had little effect upon the evaluation made by the pastors, but the pastors of the larger churches tended to view the project from a more negative viewpoint than did the pastors of the smaller churches, however. Of the pastors of churches with an average worship attendance over 250, 20% thought the project had a negative effect upon the growth potential of the church. Only 10% of the churches with an average morning worship attendance of less than 251 agreed with this assessment.

The date of the project had little impact upon the way the pastors viewed the effects of the projects upon the growth potential of the churches, but the age of the pastor at the time of the project did effect the results in an observable way. As the age of the pastor at the time of the project increased, the percentage of positive ratings decreased, according to Table 8. The older pastors were less sure the project had a positive effect upon the growth potential of the church than were the younger pastors. Pastors over 65 were an exception to this finding.

Table 8.--Growth Potential according to Age

	<i>Positive</i>		<i>Negative</i>		<i>No Effect</i>		<i>Total</i>	
21-35	19	83%	2	9%	2	9%	23	100%
36-50	57	78%	7	10%	9	12%	73	100%
51-65	17	68%	3	12%	5	20%	25	100%
Over 65	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%	4	100%

The pastors certainly thought the project allowed the church to discover new talents and abilities. Of those who responded, 83% thought the church discovered new talents and abilities among the workers in the church as a result of the project. Only 5% of the pastors did not agree with this evaluation. The remaining 13% were unsure whether or not there was any new discovery of talents and abilities.

Most of the pastors (78%) also believed that greater harmony within the congregation was a result of the project. Only 7% of the pastors thought there was less harmony. The remaining 14% did not observe any effect upon the harmony of the congregation during the project in which they were involved.

Differences in project types, church sizes, and pastoral ages yielded little variation in the way the pastors rated the effects of the project upon the discovery of new talent and the level of harmony within the church, but the date when the project occurred effected both of these areas. Earlier projects experienced more negative results than did later projects. Of the pastors of churches whose projects were conducted before 1990, 10% found no new talent or abilities and thought there was less harmony as a result of the project. Only 2% of the pastors of the projects that occurred after 1994 failed to find new talents and abilities. Less harmony within the congregation as a result of the project was felt by only 3% the pastors who responded.

D. Recommendation of Ministry Action Teams

When asked if they would recommend Ministry Action Teams to other churches, a very high percentage of pastors

(88%) responded in the affirmative. The remaining 12% were not sure whether or not they would make such a recommendation. None of the pastors were unwilling to consider such a recommendation, however.

The pastors of churches involved in relocation projects (92%) were slightly more willing to recommend the use of Ministry Action Teams than were the pastors of churches conducting major building programs (88%).

As the size of the morning worship attendance increased so did the willingness of the pastor of the church to recommend the use of Ministry Action Teams to other churches. Of the pastors of churches under 100, 86% would recommend them. A somewhat larger percentage (90%) of the pastors of churches with an morning worship attendance between 101 and 250 would give them a recommendation, and an even larger percentage (93%) of the pastors of churches between 251 and 500 would recommend Ministry Action Teams.

Younger pastors were again more enthusiastic in their definite support of Ministry Action Teams. Of the pastors between 21 and 35 years of age, 96% would definitely recommend the use of these teams, but only 83% of pastors

between 51 and 65 years of age would make such a strong commitment.

When asked if they would use Ministry Action Teams in future relocation projects or building programs, 88% of the pastors responded in the affirmative. Only 2% of the 111 pastors who responded would not use such teams again. The remaining 10% of the pastors were not sure. Pastors leading relocation projects (92%) were slightly more inclined to use Ministry Action Teams again than were pastors of major building programs (88%).

Pastors of larger churches were more enthusiastic about their willingness to use Ministry Action Teams in a future project than were pastors of smaller churches. For example, only 82% of the pastors of churches with a morning worship average under 100 would definitely use them again, but 100% of the pastors of churches over 250 would definitely use Ministry Action Teams in future relocation or building projects.

The pastors of churches more recently involved in relocation or building programs (92%) were more inclined to commit to using Ministry Action Teams again than were the pastors of earlier projects (87%).

Younger pastors were a little more ready to commit to using Ministry Action Teams again than were more mature pastors. Of the pastors under 51 years of age, 90% were ready to commit to using them again, but only 85% of pastors over 50 years of age were willing to make such a commitment.

These survey results from the pastors of the Churches of the Nazarene in Georgia, Tennessee, and Arkansas were further analyzed and then compared to the survey results from the Ministry Action Teams of Atlanta First Church of the Nazarene. The conclusions gained from both of these surveys can be found in Chapter Six of this paper.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

Many conclusions regarding the strategy of using Ministry Action Teams during the relocation of a Church of the Nazarene were drawn from the material in this research. The investigation of Bible verses related to Ministry Action Teams, the survey of the participants in the relocation project of Atlanta First Church of the Nazarene, and the survey of the pastors of the Churches of the Nazarene in Arkansas, Georgia, and Tennessee revealed at least four categories of conclusions.

Some of these conclusions revealed ways Ministry Action Teams benefited the churches that used them. Conclusions were also made about the way the use of Ministry Action Teams effected both the pastors and the workers during relocation projects. A third set of conclusions offered guidelines for better recruiting when establishing teams. The final set of conclusions revealed the level of success Atlanta First Church of the Nazarene

had as it sought to accomplish its goals through the use of Ministry Action Teams.

A. Conclusions Regarding the Use Of Ministry Action Teams

From the information in Chapter 2, it was discovered that the use of Ministry Action Teams is biblical. It was shown that both the Old Testament and the New Testament offered strong support for the use of these teams. The Old Testament even offered specific instructions regarding the use of teams in building projects. Such teams were used in the building of the Tabernacle. The New Testament compared the work of the church to that of a team by using the analogy of a body that functions as a single unit. From this information it was accurate to conclude that Ministry Action Teams are biblical.

The research in Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 also revealed the fact that the use of these teams helped churches address some of the fears they had when they faced the challenge of relocating their facilities. With such a high number of pastors using Ministry Action Teams, it was clear that they offered a definite and tested strategy for relocation projects. The teams also enabled churches to face the anticipated increase in the number of tasks and

responsibilities expected from the relocation effort. By revealing the fact that the use of Ministry Action Teams helped churches discover new talents and abilities, the surveys verified the concept that more people would be available to do the higher number of tasks. Ministry Action Teams also produced greater unity within the church since they produced greater harmony among the people of the church, according to the surveys in Chapter 4 and Chapter 5. All of these benefits would work together to help reduce some of the fears of relocating.

The use of Ministry Action Teams offered a variety of other strong benefits to the churches that used them. Discovering new talents and abilities among the people of the church, according to the surveys in Chapter 4 and Chapter 5, would make the church stronger since it enabled the churches to increase the number of qualified workers they had available. This benefit would last long after the project was over since the additional workers could be used in other areas of ministry and service.

A similar benefit was found in the fact that the use of Ministry Action Teams helped to produce a higher level of ownership and involvement in the relocation project, according to the survey of the Atlanta First Church of the

Nazarene participants. This would help the church avoid some of the pitfalls that could create strife and friction among the members of the church. With a lesser degree of disharmony and friction, the church could focus more directly upon ministry.

It was also valid to conclude that the use of Ministry Action Teams would help to reduce the time line of relocation projects. In spite of the fact that the Atlanta First Church of the Nazarene project was incomplete, the participants could already see a reduction in the time required for the project according to their responses in Chapter 4. With the increased number of people involved in both decision-making and follow-through, assignments were completed more quickly. This allowed the church to reach its goals in an expedient manner.

Ministry Action Teams also produced a greater level of cooperation among the workers involved in the task of relocating the church, according to the survey in Chapter 4. The participants in the Atlanta project verified the fact that team members cooperated with one another to accomplish the assigned tasks they had. This would also contribute to the reduction of strife and friction within the church.

According to the results of both surveys, the use of these teams had a positive effect upon the growth potential of the church. Since most of the pastors did not think the teams hindered any other areas of ministry in the church, according to the results in Chapter 5, it is safe to conclude that Ministry Action Teams help to reduce the negative effects of building programs. The responses to both surveys verified this conclusion. Both the Atlanta participants and the selected pastors shared their belief that the use of the teams had a positive effect upon the church.

With the surfacing of these great benefits from the use of Ministry Action Teams, the use of such teams should be recommended to other churches facing relocation, according to both surveys. Both the participants in the Atlanta project and the pastors of other Churches of the Nazarene were very positive in their recommendation of the use of the teams to other churches. They were also positive in their willingness to participate in future projects that use the teams as well. The high endorsement by those experienced in the use of Ministry Action Teams should cause other churches to consider using them when facing the need to relocate.

Churches could also benefit greatly from the use of a large number of Ministry Action Teams. Most of the churches represented in the survey results in Chapter 5 used a small number of Ministry Action Teams according to their own evaluations. They could have used more. Atlanta First Church of the Nazarene used ten different teams in their project. They also had these teams formally organized and aware of the proper approval procedure. It is safe to conclude that the other churches might have been helped more if they had used more teams and had made sure the teams were formally organized with each team fully aware of the requirements placed upon the team.

B. Effects of Ministry Action Teams Upon Pastors and Lay Leaders

Pastors also benefit greatly from the use of Ministry Action Teams, according to the results from both surveys. The first major benefit lies in the fact that pastors can expect to experience a lesser degree of stress when they use the teams than they might experience if they did not use them. Both the lay people involved in the use of Ministry Action Teams and the pastors of other Churches of the Nazarene verified these findings. By experiencing less stress during such major undertakings, the pastor would

have a greater potential of giving at least his normal level of leadership to the church. The relocation project, therefore, would not effect him as negatively as he might otherwise be effected.

Ministry Action Teams can also help to protect the time the pastors have available for the fulfillment of pastoral responsibilities and family matters. Both the lay leaders participating in Ministry Action Teams and the pastors leading relocation and building projects recorded their belief that the use of the teams increased the amount of time the pastor had available for pastoral responsibilities and family concerns. Of course this is no guarantee that the pastor will take advantage of this available time, but the time is protected if the pastor wants to use it.

The use of Ministry Action Teams provides lay leaders a way to contribute to the success of relocation projects. This conclusion is verified by the fact that the lay leaders thought they were recruited because of their talents and abilities. It is also verified by the fact that they considered their involvement to be a ministry, according to the survey results in Chapter 4. Lay leaders also found their involvement in this approach to relocating

a church to be satisfying. When given an opportunity to use their strengths, as most of the lay leaders in the Atlanta project felt like they were doing, lay leaders can contribute to the overall success of the project.

Ministry Action Teams also help to protect lay leaders from overextending themselves. By working cooperatively with other team members, they can spread the responsibility among many people instead of trying to do it all themselves. This conclusion is confirmed by the fact that the lay leaders of the Atlanta project did not experience any undue hardship upon their schedules as a result of their involvement in the project.

Finally, it is save to conclude that the use of Ministry Action Teams convince both pastors and lay leaders that the use of these teams is a good approach to relocating Churches of the Nazarene. The pastors of the Churches of the Nazarene, according to Chapter 5, and the participants in the Atlanta First Church of the Nazarene project, according to Chapter 4, were very positive in their willingness to use or participate in future uses of the teams.

C. Conclusions regarding the Recruitment Of Ministry Action Teams

It is fair to conclude that the use of Ministry Action Teams could have produced even better results if the pastors and church leaders had done a better job of recruiting. Weaknesses were found in the recruitment processes considered in both Chapter 4 and Chapter 5. Those who recruited lay workers in both of these surveys relied too heavily upon verbal job descriptions. The Atlanta leaders did give an abbreviated written job outline, but it was not even viewed as a written job description by most of the participants. When people do not understand fully what their job entails, they may not perform up to their highest capabilities. This, therefore, could have reduced the effectiveness of the teams.

The effectiveness of the teams was further limited by the lack of training provided, according to both surveys. Lay leaders should be provided any training that is needed for optimum performance. By providing training the leaders of relocation projects could improve the results of the use of the Ministry Action Teams.

The failure of the pastors, represented in the survey results found in Chapter 5, to give enough authority to the lay leaders of the teams could also have had a limiting

effect upon the effectiveness of the teams. In spite of the fact that these pastors did not believe the use of lay leaders threatened their authority, they did not give these leaders as much decision-making authority as they could have. This decision-making authority could have helped the churches to achieve the highest results possible from the use of Ministry Action Teams.

Those who recruited the workers in both groups represented in the surveys did do a good job of sharing the "chain of command" for the project. They also tried to explain the "big picture" as often as they could to those who were involved in the projects. It is safe to conclude that the sharing of this information helped the lay workers on the Ministry Action Teams know what part of the overall project their job helped to accomplish. This knowledge would, in turn, help to enhance the results obtained from the use of the Ministry Action Teams.

By improving their approach toward the recruitment of lay workers in their projects, most of the churches could have improved the performance of the teams as well as the overall results of the project. Explanations of ways the leaders of the projects might do that are listed above and in the survey results mentioned in Chapter 4 and Chapter 5.

D. The Success of Atlanta First Church of the Nazarene

When Atlanta First Church of the Nazarene faced the task of relocating their facilities, they searched for a biblically based strategy for using lay leadership in the project. By using Ministry Action Teams, the church succeeded in finding such a strategy, as can be seen in the research of the Bible as recorded in Chapter 2.

The church also wanted to protect the amount of time the pastor had for prayer, sermon preparation, and other pastoral care. This research verifies the fact the use of Ministry Action Teams accomplished that goal. Both the lay members of the teams and the pastors of other Churches of the Nazarene verify the fact that this was one of the primary benefits of the project.

A third desire of the church was the reduction of the level of stress placed upon the pastor during the project. Again the church accomplished this goal through the use of Ministry Action Teams. Most of the participants in both surveys verified this benefit for the pastor.

The church was also concerned that it did not merely transfer the increased stress to the lay people who were willing to assist the pastor in providing leadership to the

project. Ministry Action Teams allowed the church to accomplish this goal. Only a few of the participants in the project felt like their participation added undue hardship upon their schedules. This indicated that the level of stress placed upon the lay leaders was kept at a manageable level.

Concern for upholding the denominational responsibilities placed upon the pastor was also a concern of the church. Ministry Action Teams provided the solution for the church to use since the pastor of the church continued to give leadership to the project and remained the official head of the organization that guided the relocation process. Instead of giving micro-management to the project, the pastor assumed a macro-management position and allowed many lay leaders to oversee the details of the project. By including the pastor in all major decisions and by keeping him informed of the details of the work of the teams, the leaders of the relocation allowed the pastor to fulfill his denominational requirements without having to assume all of the responsibility for the project. At any point the pastor could have taken steps to correct any potential error he observed.

The research and survey results contained in this paper confirm the fact that Atlanta First Church of the Nazarene successfully accomplished its goal of finding a strategy that met its criteria. The use of Ministry Action Teams, as described in Chapter 3 of this paper, allowed the church to approach its relocation project with confidence. It also enjoyed a high level of ownership for the project and achieved a high level of involvement on the teams.

E. Recommendations for other Churches

My project clearly indicates that churches should use, or at least consider using, Ministry Action Teams when they face the monumental task of relocating their facilities. The use of such teams helps to minimize some of the concerns churches have when they undertake such tasks. Teams also bring some very positive results to churches during the actual process of relocation. For example, churches that use Ministry Action Teams enjoy a higher level of involvement in the project than do other churches.

When organizing these teams, churches need to allow as many people as possible to get involved in the work of the teams. This provides greater ownership and spreads the stress among a larger number of people. By recruiting the

team leaders and inviting volunteers to serve on the teams, churches can involved a maximum number of people.

My paper further indicates that churches should use many different Ministry Action Teams to accomplish the assignments of the relocation project. Other teams, besides the ones mentioned in this paper, could be used if the need is present for the work of the team. Churches must be careful to make sure that each one of the teams understands its assignment and knows how to coordinate its work with the work of the other teams. Just having more teams will not solve problems unless they are correctly organized and adequately trained.

It is clear from this paper that the churches that do use Ministry Action Teams need to provide a high level of training for those involved on the teams. They need to provide written job descriptions instead of relying so heavily upon the verbal communication of job requirements. This reduces the chances of miscommunication and helps to insure a more successful project.

According to my research in this paper, churches should be prepared to grant decision-making authority to the teams when decide to use Ministry Action Teams. That is the only way these churches are going to reap the full

benefit from the use of the teams. By instituting clear policies for reporting and securing necessary approvals, churches can allow the Ministry Action Teams to make many of the normal operational decisions that must be made during the time of the relocation.

Since the pastor is the God-ordained leader of the church, churches that use Ministry Action Teams must make sure that each of the teams submits regular reports to the pastor as they perform their assignments. By receiving and reviewing these reports, the pastor can give leadership to the project without trying to perform all of the jobs mentioned in the reports. This procedure helps to protect the pastor from much of the stress normally associated with relocation projects.

By following the recommendations mentioned in this paper, churches that use Ministry Action Teams can face the task of relocation with great confidence. They will have the assurance that they are following biblical procedures as they attempt to relocate. They will also be using an approach others have used successfully. In addition, they will be using the resources of a greater number of people. This paper indicates that churches would be wise to use Ministry Action Teams when relocating.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY OF

ATLANTA FIRST CHURCH OF THE NAZARENE

MINISTRY ACTION TEAMS

CHURCH LEADERSHIP SURVEY

INSTRUCTIONS

This survey is designed to help in determining the affect relocation projects have upon the growth of a church and what role the use of lay ministry teams could have in helping to minimize any negative affect a church may experience. Please answer each question as accurately as possible. Return completed survey to:

Dan Casey, Atlanta First Church of the Nazarene, 1600 Agape Way, Decatur, GA 30035

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Area of service (Check all that apply): Church Board Member Relocation Committee Member Relocation Ministry Action Team Leader Relocation Ministry Action Team Member Other _____
2. By whom were you recruited? Pastor Ministry Action Team Leader Volunteer Other
3. Age: 21-30 31-40 41-50 51-60 over 60
4. Gender: Male Female

RECRUITMENT

5. Were you recruited because of one of your areas of strength? Yes No
6. Were you given a written job description of your assignment? Yes No
7. Were you given a detailed verbal explanation of your assignment? Yes No
8. Were you provided training? Yes No
9. Were you given an explanation of the proper "chain of command"? Yes No
10. Was the "big picture" of the project explained to you? Yes No
11. How do you rate the recruitment of the relocation ministry action teams? Very Good Acceptable Poor Unacceptable

EVALUATION OF YOUR PARTICIPATION (Relocation Ministry Action Teams only)

12. Did you view your participation as a ministry? Yes No

13. Did you receive adequate supervision? Yes No
14. Were you provided adequate resources? Yes No
15. Was the level of communication acceptable? Yes No
16. Were your supervisors understanding and helpful? Yes No
17. Were other team members cooperative? Yes No
18. Did your participation create any undue hardship upon your schedule? Yes No
19. Were you told that your involvement would allow the pastor to give more attention to his ministry responsibilities? Yes No
20. How satisfying was your participation? Very Satisfying Somewhat Satisfying
 Not Satisfying
21. Would you participate in a ministry action team again? Yes No

EVALUATION OF THE USE OF RELOCATION MINISTRY ACTION TEAMS

In your opinion did the use of ministry action teams...

22. ...produce a higher level of involvement in the project? Yes No
23. ...allow the church to discover new talents and abilities? Yes No
24. ...result in a higher level of ownership for the project? Yes No
25. ...reduce the over-all time line for the project? Yes No
26. ...produce a greater level of harmony within the congregation. Yes No
27. ...allow the pastor more time for prayer and sermon preparation? Yes No
28. ...reduce the level of stress upon the pastor? Yes No
29. ...have a positive or negative impact upon the growth of the church? positive impact negative impact no impact
30. Would you recommend the use of relocation ministry action teams to other churches?
 Yes No

Letter Accompanying Survey

November 17, 1998

Dear XXXXXXXX,

As a part of my doctoral thesis I am evaluating the use of Ministry Action Teams in the relocation of a church. I want to determine if they have any positive or negative impact upon the church during its relocation.

Here is a list of the Ministry Action Teams Atlanta First Church used: Contract Negotiation Team, Interim Worship Team, Moving/Storage Team, Plans Development Team, Furnishings Team, Communication Team, Day Care Team.

Since you are familiar with the use of these teams, please complete the following survey and return it to me as soon as you can. Your assessment is very important to me.

Thank you for your quick reply and thank you for being involved in this challenging process. As soon as the surveys are returned, I will begin to analyze them and will be happy to share the results with you if your are interested.

Yours in Christ,

Dan Casey

APPENDIX B

SURVEY OF PASTORS OF
CHURCHES OF THE NAZARENE

CHURCH LEADERSHIP SURVEY

INSTRUCTIONS

This survey is designed to help in determining the affect relocation projects have upon the growth of a church and what role the use of lay ministry teams could have in helping to minimize any negative affect a church may experience. Please answer each question as accurately as possible. Return completed survey to:

Dan Casey, First Church of the Nazarene, 1200 Mississippi St, Little Rock, AR 72207

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. To which of the following have you given leadership? (Check all that apply.)
 Relocation Project Major Building Program Other _____
2. What was the size of the worship attendance of the church at the time of the relocation/building project? Under 100 101-250 251-500 Above 500
3. When did the relocation/building project occur? Prior to 1990 1990-1994
 1995-1999
4. What was your age at the time of the relocation/building project? 21-35 36-50
 51-65 Above 65
5. Using the definition that a "ministry action team is a loosely organized group of church leaders who work together in an accountable manner to accomplish a specific task," did you use some kind of "ministry action team" during your relocation/ building project?
 Yes No Uncertain

LAY INVOLVEMENT IN THE RELOCATION/BUILDING PROJECT

6. Did you recruit lay leaders on the basis of their individual strengths? Most of the time
 Some of the time Very little consideration was given to individual strengths
7. What kind of job description did you provide your lay leaders? Written Job Description
 Verbal Job Description or Explanation No Job Description was provided
8. Did you provide training for your lay leaders? Most of the time Some of the time
 Very little training was provided
9. Did you explain the "chain of command" to your lay leaders? Most of the time
 Some of the time No "chain of command" was used
10. How often did you give the lay leaders a glimpse of the "big picture"? Frequently
 Occasionally Not very often
11. Did you provide supervision for your lay leaders? Most of the time Some of the time
 Very little supervision was provided

12. Did you give your lay leaders the authority to make decisions? Most of the time
 Some of the time Very little authority was given
13. Were your lay leaders and workers recruited or did they volunteer? Recruited
 Volunteered Both recruited and volunteered Neither recruited or volunteered
14. How effective was the use of lay leaders? Very effective Somewhat effective
 Not effective
15. In your opinion does the use of lay leaders threaten the authority of the pastor? Yes
 No Not sure
16. Which of the following areas of the relocation/building project were entrusted to lay leadership? Long range planning Site Selection Contract negotiations
 Architectural design Furnishings & equipment Interim Location (if required)
 Moving and Storage Fund Raising Long term financing Communications
 Other (Please specify: _____)

EVALUATION OF THE RELOCATION/BUILDING PROJECT

In your opinion did the relocation/building project...

17. ...hinder other areas of ministry within the church? Yes No Not sure
18. ...have an affect upon the growth potential of the church during the time of the actual relocation/building project? positive affect negative affect no affect
19. ...affect the amount of time available for prayer (pastoral care) and/or preparation for preaching? Reduced the time Increased the time No noticeable affect
20. ...affect the amount of time available to be with your family? Reduced the time
 Increased the time No noticeable change in the time available
21. ...affect your level of stress? Increased stress Decreased stress No change in stress
22. ...allow the church to discover new talents and abilities? Yes No Not sure
23. ...affect the level of harmony or unity within the congregation? greater harmony
 less harmony had no affect upon the harmony
24. Would you use "ministry action teams" in a future relocation/building project? Yes
 No Not sure
25. Would you recommend "ministry action teams" to other churches? Yes No
 Not sure

Letter Accompanying Survey

August 12, 1999

Dear Pastor,

As part of my Doctor of Ministry project I am doing research about the use of lay leadership during the relocation and/or major building programs in the Church of the Nazarene.

Would you please complete the enclosed two-page survey to help me understand how you used lay people in these projects during your ministry? I have included a stamped, self-addressed envelope for your convenience in replying.

Thank you for sharing your insights and opinions with me. Please send your reply as quickly as possible, but no later than September 20, 1999.

Yours in Christ,

Dan Casey

APPENDIX C

SURVEY RESULTS FROM

ATLANTA FIRST CHURCH OF THE

NAZARENE PARTICIPANTS

Questions

1	Church Board Member	17	23%		
	Relocation Committee	17	23%		
	Min. Action Team Ldr.	5	7%		
	Min. Action Team	34	47%		
	Other	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>		
	Total	73	100%		
2	Pastor	8	17%		
	Min. Action Team Ldr.	16	34%		
	Volunteer	19	40%		
	Other	<u>4</u>	<u>9%</u>		
	Total	47	100%		
3	21-30	3	7%		
	31-40	7	15%		
	41-50	13	28%		
	51-60	11	24%		
	Above 60	<u>12</u>	<u>26%</u>		
	Total	46	100%		
4	Male	23	52%		
	Female	21	48%		
	Total	44	100%		
		<u>Yes</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>%</u>
5	Recruited for Strength	34	74%	12	26%
6	Written Job Descrip.	12	26%	34	74%
7	Verbal Job Descrip	37	82%	8	18%
8	Provided Training	6	13%	39	87%
9	"Chain of Command"	30	67%	15	33%
10	"Big Picture" explained	40	85%	7	15%
11	Very Good	23	51%		
	Acceptable	20	44%		
	Poor	2	4%		
	Unacceptable	0	<u>0%</u>		
	Total	45	100%		
		<u>Yes</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>%</u>
12	View as ministry	36	88%	5	12%
13	Adequate Supv.	36	90%	4	10%
14	Provided Resources	31	78%	9	23%
15	Acceptable Commun.	34	79%	9	21%
16	Supv. Understanding	36	95%	2	5%
17	Team Cooperative	36	100%	0	0%
18	Create Undue hardship	4	10%	37	90%
19	Told Help Pastor	13	33%	26	67%

20	Very Satisfying	12	30%
	Somewhat Satisfying	24	60%
	Not Satisfying	4	10%
	Total	40	100%

		<u>Yes</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>%</u>
21	Participate Again	39	95%	2	5%
22	Produce More Involve.	40	91%	4	9%
23	Church Disc. Talent	38	88%	5	12%
24	Produce Ownership	41	95%	2	5%
25	Reduce Time Line	34	77%	10	23%
26	Produce Harmony	30	73%	11	27%
27	Pastor More Time	38	95%	2	5%
28	Reduce Pastor Stress	32	84%	6	16%

29	Positive Impact	19	45%
	Negative Impact	2	5%
	No Impact	21	50%
	Total	42	100%

		<u>Yes</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>%</u>
30		41	98%	1	2%

AREA OF SERVICE

Ques	<u>Ch. Board Member</u>				<u>Relocation Committee</u>				<u>Min.Action Team Ldr.</u>				<u>Min. Action Team Mbr.</u>				<u>Other</u>
	<u>yes</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>yes</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>yes</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>yes</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>%</u>	
5	14	82%	3	18%	16	94%	1	6%	6	100%	0	0%	21	66%	11	34%	0
6	4	24%	13	76%	4	24%	13	76%	4	67%	2	33%	6	19%	26	81%	0
7	13	76%	4	24%	14	78%	4	22%	6	100%	0	0%	25	76%	8	24%	0
8	3	18%	14	82%	2	12%	15	88%	2	33%	4	67%	5	17%	25	83%	0
9	11	69%	5	31%	10	59%	7	41%	4	67%	2	33%	20	63%	12	38%	0
10	14	82%	3	18%	13	76%	4	24%	6	100%	0	0%	28	85%	5	15%	0
*11	*See next page																
12	15	94%	1	6%	12	92%	1	8%	6	100%	0	0%	28	90%	3	10%	0
13	15	94%	1	6%	12	92%	1	8%	6	100%	0	0%	26	84%	5	16%	0
14	12	75%	4	25%	10	77%	3	23%	6	100%	0	0%	23	74%	8	26%	0
15	11	69%	5	31%	8	62%	5	38%	4	67%	2	33%	25	78%	7	22%	0
16	15	100%	0	0%	12	100%	0	0%	6	100%	0	0%	28	93%	2	7%	0
17	14	100%	0	0%	12	100%	0	0%	5	100%	0	0%	27	100%	0	0%	0
18	3	19%	13	81%	4	33%	8	67%	2	33%	4	67%	4	13%	27	87%	0
19	6	38%	10	63%	3	23%	10	77%	2	33%	4	67%	9	29%	22	71%	0
*20	*See next page																
21	15	94%	1	6%	14	100%	0	0%	6	100%	0	0%	30	97%	1	3%	0
22	17	100%	0	0%	15	100%	0	0%	6	100%	0	0%	31	94%	2	6%	0
23	21	100%	0	0%	13	93%	1	7%	6	100%	0	0%	26	81%	6	19%	0
24	17	100%	0	0%	15	100%	0	0%	6	100%	0	0%	30	94%	2	6%	0
25	14	82%	3	18%	11	73%	4	27%	6	100%	0	0%	25	76%	8	24%	0
26	13	76%	4	24%	9	60%	6	40%	6	100%	0	0%	24	75%	8	25%	0
27	14	93%	1	7%	11	92%	1	8%	4	80%	1	20%	28	93%	2	7%	0
28	14	88%	2	13%	11	85%	2	15%	4	67%	2	33%	23	82%	5	18%	0
*29	*See next page																
30	17	100%	0	0%	14	100%	0	0%	6	100%	0	0%	31	97%	1	3%	0

AREA OF SERVICE continued

11	<u>Very Good</u>		<u>Acceptable</u>		<u>Poor</u>		<u>Unaccept</u>		Church Board Member Relocation Member Ministry Action Team Leader Ministry Action Team Other
	11	69%	4	25%	1	6%	0	0%	
	8	57%	5	36%	1	7%	0	0%	
	5	83%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	
	15	48%	15	48%	1	3%	0	0%	
	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	
20	<u>Very Satis.</u>		<u>Some Sat.</u>		<u>Not Satis.</u>		Church Board Member Relocation Member Ministry Action Team Leader Ministry Action Team Other		
	3	20%	11	73%	1	7%			
	4	36%	6	55%	1	9%			
	2	33%	3	50%	1	17%			
	6	20%	20	67%	4	13%			
	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%			
29	<u>Pos. Impact</u>		<u>Neg. Imp.</u>		<u>No Impact</u>		Church Board Member Relocation Member Ministry Action Team Leader Ministry Action Team Other		
	9	56%	1	6%	6	38%			
	6	46%	0	0%	7	54%			
	4	67%	0	0%	2	33%			
	13	42%	2	6%	16	52%			
	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%			

BY WHOM RECRUITED

<u>Ques</u>	<u>Pastor</u>				<u>MAT Leader</u>				<u>Volunteer</u>				<u>Other</u>			
	<u>yes</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>yes</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>yes</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>yes</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>%</u>
5	7	88%	1	13%	14	88%	2	13%	9	50%	9	50%	4	100%	0	0%
6	2	25%	6	75%	6	40%	9	60%	4	21%	15	79%	0	0%	4	100%
7	6	75%	2	25%	15	94%	1	6%	14	74%	5	26%	3	75%	1	25%
8	3	38%	5	63%	3	19%	13	81%	0	0%	16	100%	0	0%	4	100%
9	6	75%	2	25%	12	80%	3	20%	8	47%	9	53%	3	75%	1	25%
10	7	88%	1	13%	13	81%	3	19%	16	84%	3	16%	4	100%	0	0%
*11	*See next page															
12	6	86%	1	14%	14	88%	2	13%	16	100%	0	0%	3	100%	0	0%
13	7	100%	0	0%	14	93%	1	7%	12	75%	4	25%	3	100%	0	0%
14	7	100%	0	0%	12	80%	3	20%	10	63%	6	38%	3	100%	0	0%
15	6	86%	1	14%	13	81%	3	19%	12	71%	5	29%	2	67%	1	33%
16	7	100%	0	0%	14	100%	0	0%	14	93%	1	7%	3	100%	0	0%
17	6	100%	0	0%	15	100%	0	0%	14	100%	0	0%	3	100%	0	0%
18	1	14%	6	86%	2	13%	13	87%	1	6%	15	94%	1	33%	2	67%
19	3	43%	4	57%	6	40%	9	60%	4	25%	12	75%	1	33%	2	67%
*20	*See next page															
21	6	86%	1	14%	16	100%	0	0%	16	100%	0	0%	3	100%	0	0%
22	8	100%	0	0%	15	94%	1	6%	17	94%	1	6%	4	100%	0	0%
23	7	88%	1	13%	12	75%	4	25%	15	94%	1	6%	4	100%	0	0%
24	8	100%	0	0%	15	94%	1	6%	16	94%	1	6%	4	100%	0	0%
25	7	88%	1	13%	12	75%	4	25%	15	83%	3	17%	3	75%	1	25%
26	6	75%	2	25%	10	71%	4	29%	15	79%	4	21%	2	50%	2	50%
27	6	100%	0	0%	15	100%	0	0%	15	94%	1	6%	3	75%	1	25%
28	6	86%	1	14%	14	93%	1	7%	11	79%	3	21%	3	75%	1	25%
*29	*See next page															
30	8	100%	0	0%	16	100%	0	0%	16	94%	1	6%	4	100%	0	0%

BY WHOM RECRUITED continued

11	<u>Very Good</u>		<u>Acceptable</u>		<u>Poor</u>		<u>Unaccept</u>		
	6	75%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	Pastor
	7	47%	8	53%	0	0%	0	0%	Ministry Action Team Leader
	9	53%	6	35%	2	12%	0	0%	Volunteer
	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	Other

20	<u>Very Satis.</u>		<u>Some Sat.</u>		<u>Not Satis.</u>		
	2	29%	5	71%	0	0%	Pastor
	5	31%	10	63%	1	6%	Ministry Action Team Leader
	5	31%	9	56%	2	13%	Volunteer
	0	0%	2	67%	1	33%	Other

29	<u>Pos. Impact</u>		<u>Neg. Imp.</u>		<u>No Impact</u>		
	4	50%	0	0%	4	50%	Pastor
	9	53%	0	0%	8	47%	Ministry Action Team Leader
	5	28%	2	11%	11	61%	Volunteer
	2	50%	1	25%	1	25%	Other

AGE

Ques	<u>21-30</u>				<u>31-40</u>				<u>41-50</u>				<u>51-60</u>				<u>over 60</u>			
	<u>yes</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>yes</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>yes</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>yes</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>yes</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>%</u>
5	3	100%	0	0%	6	86%	1	14%	10	77%	3	23%	7	64%	4	36%	7	64%	4	36%
6	1	33%	2	67%	0	0%	6	100%	4	31%	9	69%	3	30%	7	70%	4	33%	8	67%
7	2	67%	1	33%	5	71%	2	29%	10	77%	3	23%	10	91%	1	9%	10	91%	1	9%
8	0	0%	3	100%	1	14%	6	86%	2	15%	11	85%	2	18%	9	82%	1	10%	9	90%
9	2	67%	1	33%	4	67%	2	33%	8	67%	4	33%	8	73%	3	27%	7	64%	4	36%
10	2	67%	1	33%	6	86%	1	14%	12	92%	1	8%	11	100%	0	0%	9	75%	3	25%
*11	*See next page																			
12	2	100%	0	0%	5	83%	1	17%	10	91%	1	9%	10	100%	0	0%	11	100%	0	0%
13	2	100%	0	0%	5	100%	0	0%	11	100%	0	0%	9	100%	0	0%	8	73%	3	27%
14	1	50%	1	50%	4	80%	1	20%	8	73%	3	27%	9	90%	1	10%	10	83%	2	17%
15	1	50%	1	50%	4	67%	2	33%	8	73%	3	27%	9	90%	1	10%	11	92%	1	8%
16	2	100%	0	0%	4	80%	1	20%	10	100%	0	0%	10	100%	0	0%	9	90%	1	10%
17	2	100%	0	0%	6	100%	0	0%	9	100%	0	0%	9	100%	0	0%	9	100%	0	0%
18	0	0%	2	100%	1	17%	5	83%	2	18%	9	82%	1	10%	9	90%	0	0%	11	100%
19	0	0%	2	100%	2	33%	4	67%	6	55%	5	45%	1	11%	8	89%	5	45%	6	55%
*20	*See next page																			
21	2	100%	0	0%	6	100%	0	0%	9	100%	0	0%	9	90%	1	10%	11	100%	0	0%
22	3	100%	0	0%	6	100%	0	0%	12	100%	0	0%	11	100%	0	0%	10	83%	2	17%
23	3	100%	0	0%	5	83%	1	17%	11	92%	1	8%	9	82%	2	18%	9	82%	2	18%
24	3	100%	0	0%	6	100%	0	0%	12	100%	0	0%	9	90%	1	10%	11	92%	1	8%
25	2	67%	1	33%	3	50%	3	50%	10	83%	2	17%	9	82%	2	18%	10	83%	2	17%
26	0	0%	3	100%	4	67%	2	33%	10	83%	2	17%	9	82%	2	18%	8	73%	3	27%
27	2	67%	1	33%	5	100%	0	0%	11	100%	0	0%	9	90%	1	10%	12	100%	0	0%
28	2	67%	1	33%	4	100%	0	0%	10	83%	2	17%	8	80%	2	20%	8	89%	1	11%
*29	*See next page																			
30	3	100%	0	0%	6	100%	0	0%	12	100%	0	0%	9	90%	1	10%	12	100%	0	0%

AGE continued

11	<u>Very Good</u>		<u>Acceptable</u>		<u>Poor</u>		<u>Unaccept</u>		
	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	21-30
	2	33%	3	50%	1	17%	0	0%	31-40
	5	42%	6	50%	1	8%	0	0%	41- 50
	8	73%	3	27%	0	0%	0	0%	51-60
	7	58%	5	42%	0	0%	0	0%	over 60

20	<u>Very Satis.</u>		<u>Some Sat.</u>		<u>Not Satis.</u>		
	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%	21-30
	2	33%	4	67%	0	0%	31-40
	3	27%	8	73%	0	0%	41- 50
	2	20%	7	70%	1	10%	51-60
	4	36%	4	36%	3	27%	over 60

29	<u>Pos. Impact</u>		<u>Neg. Imp.</u>		<u>No Impact</u>		
	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	21-30
	1	17%	0	0%	5	83%	31-40
	6	50%	0	0%	6	50%	41- 50
	7	64%	1	9%	3	27%	51-60
	4	33%	2	17%	6	50%	over 60

GENDER

Ques	<u>Male</u>				<u>Female</u>			
	<u>yes</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>yes</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>no</u>	<u>%</u>
5	17	71%	7	29%	15	75%	5	25%
6	6	26%	17	74%	6	29%	15	71%
7	18	78%	5	22%	19	90%	2	10%
8	5	21%	19	79%	2	11%	17	89%
9	17	74%	6	26%	12	60%	8	40%
10	22	92%	2	8%	18	86%	3	14%
*11								
12	22	96%	1	4%	15	88%	2	12%
13	20	87%	3	13%	16	100%	0	0%
14	17	74%	6	26%	14	88%	2	13%
15	18	78%	5	22%	15	83%	3	17%
16	19	95%	1	5%	16	94%	1	6%
17	20	100%	0	0%	16	100%	0	0%
18	4	17%	19	83%	0	0%	17	100%
19	7	30%	16	70%	7	41%	10	59%
*20								
21	23	100%	0	0%	16	94%	1	6%
22	23	96%	1	4%	18	95%	1	5%
23	20	83%	4	17%	16	89%	2	11%
24	23	96%	1	4%	17	94%	1	6%
25	16	67%	8	33%	17	89%	2	11%
26	14	61%	9	39%	17	89%	2	11%
27	21	91%	2	9%	17	100%	0	0%
28	19	86%	3	14%	14	82%	3	18%
*29								
30	24	100%	0	0%	17	94%	1	6%

* See below.

11	<u>Very Good</u>	<u>Acceptable</u>	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Unaccept</u>	Male Female
	11 50%	10 45%	1 5%	0 0%	
	10 50%	9 45%	1 5%	0 0%	

20	<u>Very Satis.</u>	<u>Some Sat.</u>	<u>Not Satis.</u>	Male Female
	6 27%	12 55%	4 18%	
	6 35%	11 65%	0 0%	

29	<u>Pos. Impact</u>	<u>Neg. Imp.</u>	<u>No Impact</u>	Male Female
	11 46%	2 8%	11 46%	
	8 42%	1 5%	10 53%	

APPENDIX D

SURVEY RESULTS FROM PASTORS
OF CHURCHES OF THE NAZARENE

GENERAL TALLY

141

<u>No.</u>	<u>Answer</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
1	Relocation Project	37	25%
	Major Building Program	88	59%
	<u>Other</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>16%</u>
	Total	148	100%
2	Under 100	54	47%
	101-250	43	38%
	251-500	16	14%
	<u>Above 500</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1%</u>
	Total	114	100%
3	Prior to 1990	32	26%
	1991-1994	30	24%
	<u>1995-1999</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>50%</u>
	Total	125	100%
4	21-35	22	18%
	36-50	73	58%
	51-65	25	20%
	<u>Above 65</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4%</u>
	Total	125	100%
5	Yes	94	82%
	No	14	12%
	<u>Uncertain</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5%</u>
	Total	114	100%
6	Most of the time	85	75%
	Some of the time	21	19%
	<u>Very little consideration</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>6%</u>
	Total	113	100%
7	Written job description	19	15%
	Verbal job description	84	68%
	<u>No job description</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>16%</u>
	Total	123	100%
8	Most of the time	12	11%
	Some of the time	40	36%
	<u>Very little training</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>53%</u>
	Total	111	100%
9	Most of the time	53	46%
	Some of the time	26	22%
	<u>No "chain of command"</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>32%</u>
	Total	116	100%

10	Frequently	89	78%
	Occasionally	23	20%
	<u>Not very often</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2%</u>
	Total	114	100%
11	Most of the time	64	56%
	Some of the time	38	33%
	<u>Very little supervision</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>11%</u>
	Total	115	100%
12	Most of the time	68	62%
	Some of the time	38	35%
	<u>Very little authority</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>4%</u>
	Total	110	100%
13	Recruited	16	14%
	Volunteered	20	18%
	Both	74	66%
	<u>Neither</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2%</u>
	Total	112	100%
14	Very effective	88	79%
	Somewhat effective	24	21%
	<u>Not effective</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>
	Total	112	100%
15	Yes	3	3%
	No	110	96%
	<u>Not sure</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1%</u>
	Total	114	100%
16	Long range planning	44	10%
	Site selection	37	8%
	Contract negotiations	57	13%
	Architectural design	79	17%
	Furnishing & equipment	69	15%
	Interim location	8	2%
	Moving & storage	25	6%
	Fund raising	43	10%
	Long term financing	46	10%
	Communications	29	6%
	<u>Other</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>3%</u>
	Total	452	100%
17	Yes	24	22%
	No	81	73%
	<u>Not sure</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>5%</u>
	Total	111	100%

18 Positive effect	83	74%
Negative effect	12	11%
<u>No effect</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>15%</u>
Total	112	100%
19 Reduced the time	72	65%
Increased the time	6	5%
<u>No noticeable affect</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>30%</u>
Total	111	100%
20 Reduced the time	67	60%
Increased the time	2	2%
<u>No noticeable affect</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>38%</u>
Total	111	100%
21 Increased stress	79	72%
Decreased stress	3	3%
<u>No change in stress</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>25%</u>
Total	110	100%
22 Yes	91	83%
No	5	5%
<u>Not sure</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>13%</u>
Total	110	100%
23 Greater harmony	87	78%
Less harmony	8	7%
<u>No affect upon harmony</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>14%</u>
Total	111	100%
24 Yes	98	88%
No	2	2%
<u>Not sure</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>10%</u>
Total	111	100%
25 Yes	98	88%
No	0	0%
<u>Not sure</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>12%</u>
Total	111	100%

Number of Action Teams Used by Responding Churches						
16*	0	6	5%	6	11	10%
	1	7	6%	7	11	10%
	2	8	7%	8	1	1%
	3	23	20%	9	0	0%
	4	26	23%	10	<u>1</u>	<u>1%</u>
	5	19	17%		113	100%

PROJECT TYPE TALLY

	<u>Relocation</u>		<u>Major Bldg.</u>		<u>Other</u>	
5 Yes	33	89%	75	85%	16	70%
No	2	5%	11	13%	5	22%
<u>Uncertain</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>9%</u>
Total	37	100%	88	100%	23	100%
6 Most of the time	30	79%	67	78%	17	74%
Some of the time	7	18%	15	17%	3	13%
<u>Very little consideration</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>13%</u>
Total	38	100%	86	100%	23	100%
7 Written job description	9	21%	15	16%	5	22%
Verbal job description	29	69%	66	71%	11	48%
<u>No job description</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>10%</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13%</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>30%</u>
Total	42	100%	93	100%	23	100%
8 Most of the time	7	18%	9	10%	1	5%
Some of the time	14	37%	34	40%	8	36%
<u>Very little training</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>45%</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>50%</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>59%</u>
Total	38	100%	86	100%	22	100%
9 Most of the time	19	50%	44	51%	9	39%
Some of the time	9	24%	15	17%	5	22%
<u>No "chain of command"</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>26%</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>31%</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>39%</u>
Total	38	100%	86	100%	23	100%
10 Frequently	33	87%	69	80%	16	70%
Occasionally	5	13%	16	19%	6	26%
<u>Not very often</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1%</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4%</u>
Total	38	100%	86	100%	23	100%
11 Most of the time	21	55%	47	56%	9	39%
Some of the time	15	39%	28	33%	10	43%
<u>Very little supervision</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>11%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>17%</u>
Total	38	100%	84	100%	23	100%
12 Most of the time	26	68%	51	59%	11	48%
Some of the time	11	29%	31	36%	11	48%
<u>Very little authority</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4%</u>
Total	38	100%	86	100%	23	100%
13 Recruited	4	11%	13	15%	2	9%
Volunteered	6	16%	13	15%	6	26%
Both	27	71%	56	67%	15	65%
<u>Neither</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>
Total	38	100%	84	100%	23	100%

14	Very effective	29	76%	67	78%	18	78%
	Somewhat effective	9	24%	19	22%	5	22%
	<u>Not effective</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>
	Total	38	200%	86	100%	23	100%
15	Yes	2	5%	3	3%	1	4%
	No	35	92%	84	95%	22	96%
	<u>Not sure</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3%</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>
	Total	38	100%	88	100%	23	100%
16	Long range planning	15	9%	38	10%	4	5%
	Site selection	19	11%	28	8%	5	7%
	Contract negotiations	20	12%	46	13%	8	11%
	Architectural design	25	15%	67	18%	11	15%
	Furnishing & equipment	25	15%	54	15%	13	18%
	Interim location	2	1%	5	1%	4	5%
	Moving & storage	12	7%	20	5%	4	5%
	Fund raising	19	11%	37	10%	9	12%
	Long term financing	18	10%	41	11%	4	5%
	Communications	11	6%	22	6%	6	8%
	<u>Other</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>3%</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>2%</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>7%</u>
	Total	172	100%	365	100%	73	100%
17	Yes	11	30%	21	23%	3	15%
	No	24	65%	64	71%	16	80%
	<u>Not sure</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6%</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5%</u>
	Total	37	100%	90	100%	20	100%
18	Positive effect	26	70%	69	77%	14	70%
	Negative effect	7	19%	11	12%	1	5%
	<u>No effect</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>11%</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11%</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>25%</u>
	Total	37	100%	90	100%	20	100%
19	Reduced the time	28	74%	57	65%	13	65%
	Increased the time	6	16%	4	5%	2	10%
	<u>No noticeable affect</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>11%</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>31%</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>25%</u>
	Total	38	100%	88	100%	20	100%
20	Reduced the time	25	68%	55	62%	13	65%
	Increased the time	0	0%	1	1%	1	5%
	<u>No noticeable affect</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>32%</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>37%</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>30%</u>
	Total	37	100%	89	100%	20	100%
21	Increased stress	27	75%	65	75%	14	70%
	Decreased stress	1	3%	1	1%	1	5%
	<u>No change in stress</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>22%</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>24%</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>25%</u>
	Total	36	100%	87	100%	20	100%

22 Yes	31	82%	69	80%	16	84%
No	3	8%	4	5%	0	0%
<u>Not sure</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>11%</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>15%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>16%</u>
Total	38	100%	86	100%	19	100%
23 Greater harmony	28	78%	70	80%	17	85%
Less harmony	3	8%	6	7%	1	5%
<u>No affect upon harmony</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>14%</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>14%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>10%</u>
Total	36	100%	88	100%	20	100%
24 Yes	34	92%	78	89%	17	85%
No	0	0%	2	2%	0	0%
<u>Not sure</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>8%</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>15%</u>
Total	37	100%	88	100%	20	100%
25 Yes	34	92%	72	88%	17	85%
No	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<u>Not sure</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>8%</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>12%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>15%</u>
Total	37	100%	82	100%	20	100%

Number of Action Teams Used by Churches Responding to Question 16

16*	0	1	3%	4	5%	2	9%
	1	2	5%	3	3%	2	9%
	2	2	5%	9	10%	0	0%
	3	5	13%	14	16%	8	36%
	4	9	24%	18	21%	3	14%
	5	6	16%	16	19%	4	18%
	6	6	16%	11	13%	1	5%
	7	6	16%	9	10%	2	9%
	8	1	3%	1	1%	0	0%
	9	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	10	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>
	Total	38	100%	86	100%	22	100%

CHURCH SIZE TALLY

	<u>Under 100</u>		<u>101-250</u>		<u>251-500</u>		<u>Above 500</u>	
5	Yes	42 76%	39 89%	14 93%	1 100%			
	No	9 16%	4 9%	1 7%	0 0%			
	<u>Uncertain</u>	4 7%	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%			
	Total	55 100%	44 100%	15 100%	1 100%			
6	Most of the time	38 70%	33 77%	14 93%	1 100%			
	Some of the time	11 20%	9 21%	1 7%	0 0%			
	<u>Very little consideration</u>	5 9%	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%			
	Total	54 100%	43 100%	15 100%	1 100%			
7	Written job description	5 9%	10 21%	3 20%	1 100%			
	Verbal job description	37 64%	35 73%	11 73%	0 0%			
	<u>No job description</u>	16 28%	3 6%	1 7%	0 0%			
	Total	58 100%	48 100%	15 100%	1 100%			
8	Most of the time	4 7%	7 16%	1 7%	0 0%			
	Some of the time	19 35%	14 33%	8 53%	0 0%			
	<u>Very little training</u>	32 58%	22 51%	6 40%	1 100%			
	Total	55 100%	43 100%	15 100%	1 100%			
9	Most of the time	16 29%	27 51%	8 53%	1 100%			
	Some of the time	13 24%	19 36%	4 27%	0 0%			
	<u>No "chain of command"</u>	26 47%	7 13%	3 20%	0 0%			
	Total	55 100%	53 100%	15 100%	1 100%			
10	Frequently	41 75%	33 77%	13 87%	1 100%			
	Occasionally	14 25%	9 21%	2 13%	0 0%			
	<u>Not very often</u>	0 0%	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%			
	Total	55 100%	43 100%	15 100%	1 100%			
11	Most of the time	25 42%	23 58%	11 73%	1 100%			
	Some of the time	26 43%	13 33%	3 20%	0 0%			
	<u>Very little supervision</u>	9 15%	4 10%	1 7%	0 0%			
	Total	60 100%	40 100%	15 100%	1 100%			
12	Most of the time	34 62%	26 62%	10 67%	0 0%			
	Some of the time	18 33%	15 36%	5 33%	0 0%			
	<u>Very little authority</u>	3 5%	1 2%	0 0%	1 100%			
	Total	55 100%	42 100%	15 100%	1 100%			
13	Recruited	4 7%	5 11%	6 40%	1 100%			
	Volunteered	15 27%	6 13%	0 0%	0 0%			
	Both	35 64%	34 74%	9 60%	0 0%			
	<u>Neither</u>	1 2%	1 2%	0 0%	0 0%			
	Total	55 100%	46 100%	15 100%	1 100%			
14	Very effective	40 71%	36 84%	13 87%	1 100%			
	Somewhat effective	16 29%	7 16%	2 13%	0 0%			
	<u>Not effective</u>	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%			
	Total	56 100%	43 100%	15 100%	1 100%			

15	Yes	2	4%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%
	No	53	95%	42	98%	15	100%	1	100%
	<u>Not sure</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>
	Total	56	100%	43	100%	15	100%	1	100%
16	Long range planning	17	8%	19	10%	8	11%	1	33%
	Site selection	29	14%	17	9%	1	1%	0	0%
	Contract negotiations	18	9%	31	16%	10	14%	0	0%
	Architectural design	35	17%	32	17%	13	18%	1	33%
	Furnishing & equipment	30	15%	28	15%	13	18%	0	0%
	Interim location	5	2%	2	1%	1	1%	0	0%
	Moving & storage	10	5%	13	7%	2	3%	0	0%
	Fund raising	17	8%	18	9%	11	15%	1	33%
	Long term financing	16	8%	23	12%	8	11%	0	0%
	Communications	14	7%	9	5%	6	8%	0	0%
	<u>Other</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>6%</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1%</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>
	Total	203	100%	193	100%	74	100%	3	100%
17	Yes	13	24%	9	21%	3	19%	0	0%
	No	40	73%	31	74%	11	69%	1	100%
	<u>Not sure</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>4%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>13%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>
	Total	55	100%	42	100%	16	100%	1	100%
18	Positive effect	40	74%	32	74%	10	67%	1	100%
	Negative effect	6	11%	4	9%	3	20%	0	0%
	<u>No effect</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>15%</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>16%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>13%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>
	Total	54	100%	43	100%	15	100%	1	100%
19	Reduced the time	38	69%	23	56%	12	80%	0	0%
	Increased the time	3	5%	2	5%	1	7%	0	0%
	<u>No noticeable affect</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>25%</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>39%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>13%</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>100%</u>
	Total	55	100%	41	100%	15	100%	1	100%
20	Reduced the time	33	59%	25	61%	10	67%	0	0%
	Increased the time	0	0%	1	2%	1	7%	0	0%
	<u>No noticeable affect</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>41%</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>37%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>27%</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>100%</u>
	Total	56	100%	41	100%	15	100%	1	100%
21	Increased stress	37	66%	32	78%	11	73%	1	100%
	Decreased stress	0	0%	1	2%	2	13%	0	0%
	<u>No change in stress</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>34%</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>20%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>13%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>
	Total	56	100%	41	100%	15	100%	1	100%
22	Yes	46	82%	31	78%	13	87%	1	100%
	No	2	4%	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%
	<u>Not sure</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>14%</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>15%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>13%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>
	Total	56	100%	40	100%	15	100%	1	100%
23	Greater harmony	43	77%	28	78%	12	80%	1	100%
	Less harmony	3	5%	4	11%	0	0%	0	0%
	<u>No affect upon harmony</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>18%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>11%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>20%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>
	Total	56	100%	36	100%	15	100%	1	100%

24 Yes	46	82%	38	93%	15	100%	1	100%	149
No	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	
<u>Not sure</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>14%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>7%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	
Total	56	100%	41	100%	15	100%	1	100%	
25 Yes	48	86%	37	90%	14	93%	1	100%	
No	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	
<u>Not sure</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>14%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>10%</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>7%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	
Total	56	100%	41	100%	15	100%	1	100%	

Number of Action Teams Used by Churches Responding to Question 16

16*	0	4	7%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%
	1	6	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	2	5	9%	3	7%	0	0%	0	0%
	3	15	27%	3	7%	2	14%	1	100%
	4	8	14%	10	24%	6	43%	0	0%
	5	10	18%	11	27%	2	14%	0	0%
	6	2	4%	7	17%	2	14%	0	0%
	7	5	9%	6	15%	1	7%	0	0%
	8	0	0%	0	0%	1	7%	0	0%
	9	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	10	<u>1</u>	<u>2%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>
	Total	56	100%	41	100%	14	100%	1	100%

PROJECT DATE TALLY

	<u>Prior 1990</u>		<u>1990-1994</u>		<u>1995-1999</u>	
5	Yes	27 84%	26 84%	52 85%		
	No	5 16%	3 10%	6 10%		
	<u>Uncertain</u>	<u>0 0%</u>	<u>2 6%</u>	<u>3 5%</u>		
	Total	32 100%	31 100%	61 100%		
6	Most of the time	25 83%	25 81%	44 68%		
	Some of the time	5 17%	4 13%	11 17%		
	<u>Very little consideration</u>	<u>0 0%</u>	<u>2 6%</u>	<u>10 15%</u>		
	Total	30 100%	31 100%	65 100%		
7	Written job description	6 17%	5 14%	13 21%		
	Verbal job description	24 69%	24 69%	41 65%		
	<u>No job description</u>	<u>5 14%</u>	<u>6 17%</u>	<u>9 14%</u>		
	Total	35 100%	35 100%	63 100%		
8	Most of the time	4 13%	4 13%	8 13%		
	Some of the time	14 45%	9 29%	23 38%		
	<u>Very little training</u>	<u>13 42%</u>	<u>18 58%</u>	<u>30 49%</u>		
	Total	31 100%	31 100%	61 100%		
9	Most of the time	12 39%	18 58%	30 49%		
	Some of the time	8 26%	5 16%	14 23%		
	<u>No "chain of command"</u>	<u>11 35%</u>	<u>8 26%</u>	<u>17 28%</u>		
	Total	31 100%	31 100%	61 100%		
10	Frequently	26 84%	21 68%	51 82%		
	Occasionally	5 16%	10 32%	9 15%		
	<u>Not very often</u>	<u>0 0%</u>	<u>0 0%</u>	<u>2 3%</u>		
	Total	31 100%	31 100%	62 100%		
11	Most of the time	21 68%	14 45%	34 55%		
	Some of the time	9 29%	14 45%	19 31%		
	<u>Very little supervision</u>	<u>1 3%</u>	<u>3 10%</u>	<u>9 15%</u>		
	Total	31 100%	31 100%	62 100%		
12	Most of the time	18 58%	15 48%	46 75%		
	Some of the time	13 42%	13 42%	14 23%		
	<u>Very little authority</u>	<u>0 0%</u>	<u>3 10%</u>	<u>1 2%</u>		
	Total	31 100%	31 100%	61 100%		
13	Recruited	2 6%	2 6%	12 19%		
	Volunteered	6 19%	5 16%	10 16%		
	Both	23 74%	23 74%	39 63%		
	<u>Neither</u>	<u>0 0%</u>	<u>1 3%</u>	<u>1 2%</u>		
	Total	31 100%	31 100%	62 100%		

14	Very effective	27	87%	26	79%	47	76%
	Somewhat effective	4	13%	7	21%	15	24%
	<u>Not effective</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>
	Total	31	200%	33	200%	62	200%
15	Yes	2	6%	1	3%	1	2%
	No	29	91%	31	97%	61	98%
	<u>Not sure</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>
	Total	32	100%	32	100%	62	100%
16	Long range planning	15	12%	17	12%	21	8%
	Site selection	8	6%	11	8%	33	13%
	Contract negotiations	15	12%	17	12%	33	13%
	Architectural design	22	17%	25	18%	40	16%
	Furnishing & equipment	22	17%	20	14%	36	14%
	Interim location	3	2%	2	1%	5	2%
	Moving & storage	5	4%	6	4%	16	6%
	Fund raising	16	12%	12	9%	22	9%
	Long term financing	12	9%	15	11%	20	8%
	Communications	7	5%	7	5%	19	8%
	<u>Other</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3%</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>3%</u>
	Total	129	100%	139	100%	253	100%
17	Yes	6	19%	9	27%	15	25%
	No	24	77%	21	64%	43	72%
	<u>Not sure</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>9%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3%</u>
	Total	31	100%	33	100%	60	100%
18	Positive effect	23	74%	23	72%	45	75%
	Negative effect	4	13%	2	6%	8	13%
	<u>No effect</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>13%</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>22%</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>12%</u>
	Total	31	100%	32	100%	60	100%
19	Reduced the time	23	74%	23	72%	33	56%
	Increased the time	0	0%	1	3%	6	10%
	<u>No noticeable affect</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>26%</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>25%</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>34%</u>
	Total	31	100%	32	100%	59	100%
20	Reduced the time	21	68%	22	69%	31	53%
	Increased the time	0	0%	0	0%	2	3%
	<u>No noticeable affect</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>32%</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>31%</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>44%</u>
	Total	31	100%	32	100%	59	100%
21	Increased stress	23	77%	26	81%	38	64%
	Decreased stress	0	0%	0	0%	3	5%
	<u>No change in stress</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>23%</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>19%</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>31%</u>
	Total	30	100%	32	100%	59	100%

22	Yes	23	74%	26	84%	51	86%
	No	3	10%	1	3%	1	2%
	<u>Not sure</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>16%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>13%</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>12%</u>
	Total	31	100%	31	100%	59	100%
23	Greater harmony	26	84%	25	93%	47	80%
	Less harmony	3	10%	0	0%	2	3%
	<u>No affect upon harmony</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>6%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>7%</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>17%</u>
	Total	31	100%	27	100%	59	100%
24	Yes	27	87%	28	88%	54	92%
	No	1	3%	0	0%	1	2%
	<u>Not sure</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>10%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>13%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>7%</u>
	Total	31	100%	32	100%	59	100%
25	Yes	28	90%	26	81%	55	93%
	No	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	<u>Not sure</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>10%</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>19%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>7%</u>
	Total	31	100%	32	100%	59	100%

Number of Action Teams Used by Churches Responding to Question 16

16*	0	1	3%	2	6%	4	6%
	1	1	3%	1	3%	3	5%
	2	1	3%	5	16%	3	5%
	3	6	20%	3	9%	14	22%
	4	7	23%	7	22%	12	19%
	5	8	27%	5	16%	10	16%
	6	3	10%	5	16%	10	16%
	7	3	10%	4	13%	2	3%
	8	0	0%	0	0%	5	8%
	9	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	10	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2%</u>
	Total	30	100%	32	100%	64	100%

PASTOR'S AGE TALLY

	<u>21-35</u>		<u>36-50</u>		<u>51-65</u>		<u>Above 65</u>	
5 Yes	18	78%	59	83%	25	93%	3	75%
No	5	22%	8	11%	1	4%	1	25%
<u>Uncertain</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>6%</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>
Total	23	100%	71	100%	27	100%	4	100%
6 Most of the time	18	82%	57	80%	16	62%	3	75%
Some of the time	3	14%	11	15%	8	31%	0	0%
<u>Very little consideration</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>8%</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>25%</u>
Total	22	100%	71	100%	26	100%	4	100%
7 Written job description	4	20%	16	20%	2	7%	0	0%
Verbal job description	13	65%	52	66%	24	86%	1	25%
<u>No job description</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>15%</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>14%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>7%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>75%</u>
Total	20	100%	79	100%	28	100%	4	100%
8 Most of the time	1	5%	8	11%	5	19%	0	0%
Some of the time	6	27%	26	37%	12	44%	1	33%
<u>Very little training</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>68%</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>52%</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>37%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>67%</u>
Total	22	100%	71	100%	27	100%	3	100%
9 Most of the time	10	45%	33	46%	12	44%	1	25%
Some of the time	5	23%	17	24%	6	22%	1	25%
<u>No "chain of command"</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>32%</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>30%</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>33%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>50%</u>
Total	22	100%	71	100%	27	100%	4	100%
10 Frequently	18	82%	58	82%	19	83%	2	50%
Occasionally	4	18%	12	17%	4	17%	1	25%
<u>Not very often</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>25%</u>
Total	22	100%	71	100%	23	100%	4	100%
11 Most of the time	13	65%	39	56%	14	54%	0	0%
Some of the time	6	30%	24	34%	9	35%	2	50%
<u>Very little supervision</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>10%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>12%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>50%</u>
Total	20	100%	70	100%	26	100%	4	100%
12 Most of the time	12	55%	48	68%	14	52%	3	100%
Some of the time	9	41%	22	31%	11	41%	0	0%
<u>Very little authority</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>7%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>
Total	22	100%	71	100%	27	100%	3	100%
13 Recruited	4	18%	10	14%	0	0%	1	25%
Volunteered	6	27%	11	15%	7	23%	1	25%
Both	11	50%	49	69%	23	77%	2	50%
<u>Neither</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>5%</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>
Total	22	100%	71	100%	30	100%	4	100%
14 Very effective	16	73%	56	79%	22	81%	4	100%
Somewhat effective	6	27%	15	21%	5	19%	0	0%
<u>Not effective</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>
Total	22	200%	71	200%	27	200%	4	200%

15	Yes	0	0%	3	4%	1	4%	0	0%	154
	No	22	100%	68	94%	26	96%	4	100%	
	<u>Not sure</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	
	Total	22	100%	72	100%	27	100%	4	100%	
16	Long range planning	6	8%	31	11%	13	12%	1	6%	
	Site selection	8	10%	24	8%	8	7%	0	0%	
	Contract negotiations	10	13%	36	12%	14	13%	3	17%	
	Architectural design	17	21%	49	17%	18	16%	4	22%	
	Furnishing & equipment	14	18%	42	14%	20	18%	2	11%	
	Interim location	2	3%	6	2%	1	1%	1	6%	
	Moving & storage	4	5%	15	5%	6	5%	1	6%	
	Fund raising	7	9%	30	10%	12	11%	1	6%	
	Long term financing	7	9%	31	11%	9	8%	3	17%	
	Communications	3	4%	17	6%	8	7%	1	6%	
	<u>Other</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3%</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>4%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2%</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>6%</u>	
	Total	80	100%	292	100%	111	100%	18	100%	
17	Yes	4	17%	18	25%	4	17%	1	25%	
	No	19	83%	50	68%	18	78%	3	75%	
	<u>Not sure</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>7%</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	
	Total	23	100%	73	100%	23	100%	4	100%	
18	Positive effect	19	83%	57	78%	17	68%	3	75%	
	Negative effect	2	9%	7	10%	3	12%	1	25%	
	<u>No effect</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>9%</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>12%</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>20%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	
	Total	23	100%	73	100%	25	100%	4	100%	
19	Reduced the time	10	56%	47	66%	13	54%	2	50%	
	Increased the time	2	11%	3	4%	2	8%	0	0%	
	<u>No noticeable affect</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>33%</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>30%</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>38%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>50%</u>	
	Total	18	100%	71	100%	24	100%	4	100%	
20	Reduced the time	14	61%	42	59%	14	58%	2	50%	
	Increased the time	1	4%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	
	<u>No noticeable affect</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>35%</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>39%</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>42%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>50%</u>	
	Total	23	100%	71	100%	24	100%	4	100%	
21	Increased stress	16	70%	53	75%	15	63%	2	50%	
	Decreased stress	1	4%	1	1%	1	4%	0	0%	
	<u>No change in stress</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>26%</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>24%</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>33%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>50%</u>	
	Total	23	100%	71	100%	24	100%	4	100%	
22	Yes	16	70%	59	84%	20	87%	4	80%	
	No	3	13%	2	3%	1	4%	0	0%	
	<u>Not sure</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>17%</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>13%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>9%</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>20%</u>	
	Total	23	100%	70	100%	23	100%	5	100%	
23	Greater harmony	19	83%	56	79%	18	75%	3	75%	
	Less harmony	1	4%	6	8%	2	8%	0	0%	
	<u>No affect upon harmony</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>13%</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>13%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>17%</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>25%</u>	
	Total	23	100%	71	100%	24	100%	4	100%	

24 Yes	21	91%	64	90%	21	88%	3	75%	155
No	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	
<u>Not sure</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4%</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>10%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>13%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	
Total	23	100%	71	100%	24	100%	4	100%	
25 Yes	22	96%	63	89%	20	83%	4	100%	
No	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	
<u>Not sure</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>4%</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>11%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>17%</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0%</u>	
Total	23	100%	71	100%	24	100%	4	100%	

Number of Action Teams Used by Churches Responding to Question 16

16*	0	0	0%	5	8%	0	0%	1	20%
	1	1	5%	4	6%	1	4%	0	0%
	2	3	14%	4	6%	2	8%	1	20%
	3	5	24%	4	6%	7	27%	2	40%
	4	7	33%	16	25%	4	15%	0	0%
	5	4	19%	15	23%	5	19%	0	0%
	6	0	0%	7	11%	5	19%	0	0%
	7	1	5%	9	14%	2	8%	0	0%
	8	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%
	9	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	10	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	Total	21	100%	65	100%	26	100%	5	100%

APPENDIX E

RELOCATION MINISTRY TEAMS

The Relocation Committee has been organized into the following ministry teams which will work on specifically directed tasks.

1. INTERIM WORSHIP MINISTRY TEAM – Leader:

- 1) Determine the needs and requirements for interim worship and interim office space
- 2) Find and lease suitable space for both
- 3) Oversee weekly set-up and clean-up of worship facilities as needed

2. MOVING/STORAGE MINISTRY TEAM – Leader:

- 1) Work with department heads to determine items to be stored
- 2) Obtain appropriate storage facilities
- 3) Transfer utilities, phone service, etc. to interim and new building facilities
- 4) Oversee packing and moving of items to storage and new facility

3. PLANS DEVELOPMENT/CONSTRUCTION MINISTRY TEAM – Leader:

- 1) Work with the architect to develop the full set of plans and drawings
- 2) Assist in church meetings to discuss the same
- 3) Proceed to ground breaking and through first phase construction
- 4) Continue to handle lease requests at Northcrest property

4. FURNISHINGS/EQUIPMENT MINISTRY TEAM – Leader:

- 1) Assess the furnishing and equipment needs and purchase timing
- 2) Review different products and meet with various selected vendors and suppliers
- 3) Obtain written bids for large expense items as directed
- 4) Negotiate the best price based on value
- 5) Recommend purchase(s) to the Relocation Committee (then to Church Board)

5. COMMUNICATION/PRESENTATION MINISTRY TEAM – Leader:

- 1) Develop regular communication plans and links with the congregation
- 2) Develop all presentations and ceremonies (ground breaking, etc.) with pastoral staff
- 3) Oversee implementation of all communication and presentation meetings

6. SALES CONTRACT COMPLETION MINISTRY TEAM – Leader:

- 1) Continue to work with the realtor
- 2) Follow contract for sale through to closing
- 3) Oversee all details as needed to completion

7. DAY CARE DEVELOPMENT MINISTRY TEAM – Leader:

- 1) Develop day care performa
- 2) Provide day care construction requirements to the construction team
- 3) Handle all business details of development up to and including opening

8. FINANCING MINISTRY TEAM (Work with Finance Committee) – Leader:

- 1) Plan and implement the capitol fund-raising project
- 2) Review different long-term financing strategies
- 3) Obtain long-term financing and oversee administration of the same

The actual Relocation Committee will consist of the leaders of each ministry team and 2-4 members at large. Each leader will schedule meetings, have minutes taken, and report the teams progress to the committee at regular intervals.

Please see the attached sign-up sheet to get involved.

Personal Reminder: I signed up for _____ Ministry Team.

RELOCATION MINISTRY TEAMS

Name: _____

Phone: _____

I will be willing to work on the following Relocation Ministry Team:

#1 Choice: _____

#2 Choice: _____

#3 Choice: _____

Please fill out this form, tear off, and turn this portion into the church office. Keep the detached part.

God's going to build His church!

APPENDIX F
INTERIM WORSHIP ACTION REPORT AT
ATLANTA FIRST CHURCH OF THE NAZARENE

C

ATLANTA FIRST CHURCH OF THE NAZARENE
INTERIM WORSHIP ACTION ITEMS
STATUS AS OF May 7, 1997

ITEM NO.	ACTION ITEM DESCRIPTION	DATE NEEDED	TO BE COMPLETED BY	DATE COMPLETED
1	Sign Lease			
2	Pay First Month Lease			
3	Establish Date for Move			
4	Notify Congregation-Move Date			
5	Coordinate Last Service Actions			
6	Coordinate First Service Actions			
7	Complete Construction Actions			
8	Obtain Occupancy Permit			
9	Notify Water Company			
10	Notify Gas Company			
11	Notify Ga. Power Company			
12	Install New Telephone System			
13	Disconnect Old Phones			
14	Change Yellow Page Ad			
15	Change Phone Answer Message			
16	Notify Old Post Office			
17	Obtain New Postage Permit			
18	Obtain New Post Office Box			
19	Mail Map & Letter to Church			
20	Notify Georgia District Office			
21	Notify Nazarene Headquarters			
22	Notify Atlanta Naz. Churches			
23	Post Sign at Old Church			
24	Remove Signs at Old Church			
25	Mail Literature in Neighborhood			
26	Notify Merchants in Shop Center			
27	Install Overhead Sign - New Loc.			
28	Install Door Signs - New Location			
29	Distribute New Keys			
30	Install Computers			
31	Coordinate Physical Move			
32	Notify Vendors			
33	Establish New Bank Account			
34	Assign Classrooms			
35	Make Classroom Signs			
36	Order New Stationery			
37	Transfer Insurance			
38	Publish Marta Bus Route Info.			
39				
40				

All dates are based upon lease signing date of May 15, effective June 1, occupancy July 1, 1997.

APPENDIX G
MASTER LIST OF SITES CONSIDERED
AND
REPORT TO THE RELOCATION COMMITTEE
AND THE CHURCH BOARD

MASTER LIST OF LOCATIONS TO BE CHECKED
Interim Location Ministry Team

<u>No.</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>CONTACT</u>	<u>SQ FT</u>
Churches:				
1	Zion Full Gospel	I-285/ Peachtree Ind.	Bishop	
2	Atl. North 7th Day Adv.	Chamblee Dunwoody Rd.	770-3xx-xxxx	
3	Chamblee 7th Day Adv.	Old Town Chamblee		
4	Doraville 7th Day Adv.	Buford Highway		
5	Belvedere 7th Day Adv.	Memorial Drive	404-2xx-xxxx	
6	St. Mtn. 7th Day Adv.	Silver Hill Rd. Stone Mountain	770-9xx-xxxx	
7	Presby. Church	Rockbridge @ St Mtn Lithonia	Realtor	
8	Closed Church of God	Hairston Rd / Mainstreet Park		
9	Old Chamblee First Bapt	Old Town Chamblee		
10	Decatur Church of Christ		Realtor	
11	Holy Cross Catholic Church	Chamblee Tucker Rd.		
12	Embry Hills Methodist	Henderson Mill Rd.		
13	Atlanta First New Owners	Share space - Sunday Afternoon		
Schools:				
14	Henderson Mill Elem School	Henderson Mill Rd.	770-9xx-xxxx	
15	Henderson Middle School	Henderson Mill Rd.	770-9xx-xxxx	
16	Tucker High School	Tucker	770-9xx-xxxx	
17	Atlanta Christian School	Gwinnett County		
18	Mercer University	Flowers Road	770-9xx-xxxx	
19	Pleasantdale Elem School	Across Norcross Rd from property	770-9xx-xxxx	
20	St. Mtn. Christian School	Stone Mountain	770-4xx-xxxx	
21	Nesbitt Elem School	Gwinnett County		
22	Rockbridge Elem School	Gwinnett County		
Office/Warehouse Buildings:				
23	Sale or Lease	I-85 @ Pleasantdale	770-9xx-xxxx	
24	Monarch Realty	Tucker Industrial Road	404-6xx-xxxx	
25	Patillo Company	Mtn. Industrial	770-9xx-xxxx	24,000
26	LaVista Association	Mtn. Industrial	404-4xx-xxxx	38,000
27	"For Lease" Sign	4747 Gxxxxxx Rd.	770-4xx-xxxx	
28	Patillo Company	2156 Fxxxxxxx	770-9xx-xxxx	16,400
29	Patillo Company	2189 Fxxxxxxx	770-9xx-xxxx	19,200
30	"For Lease" Sign	Mt Ind @ Hugh Howell	770-8xx-xxxx	35,000
31	Office/Warehouse Building	Hugh Howell	404-2xx-xxxx	25,000
32	Monarch Realty	Royal Office Park	404-6xx-xxxx	10,000
33	Monarch Realty	Royal Office Park	404-6xx-xxxx	19,000
34	Snapfinger Woods Office Pk	Panola Rd @ I-20	770-4xx-xxxx	10,774
35	Office/Warehouse	Chamblee Marta Station		
36	"Available" Sign	I-85/I-285	404-9xx-xxxx	23,000
37	Oakcliff Industrial Park	3163 Oxxxxxxx Ind.	404-4xx-xxxx	
38	Oakcliff Industrial Park	Northcrest 85 Office Park	404-2xx-xxxx	
39	Oakcliff Industrial Park	3482-C Oxxxxxxx	770-6xx-xxxx	
40	Oakcliff Industrial Park	3400-3406 Oxxxxxxx	404-8xx-xxxx	12,000
41	Oakcliff Industrial Park	Adam Properties	404-2xx-xxxx	18,000

<u>No.</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>CONTACT</u>	<u>SQ FT</u>	163
Retail Space:					
42	Embry Hills Hardware	Chamblee Tucker Rd.	770-4xx-xxxx	10,000	
43	Embry Hills Pharmacy	Chamblee Tucker Rd.	770-4xx-xxxx	6,000	
44	Textile Outlet	Chamblee Tucker Rd.	770-7xx-xxxx	15,000	
45	Kroger Store (closed)	Near Target @ Hwy 29			
46	Retail Space	Near Target @ Hwy 29	770-9xx-xxxx		
47	Former Winn Dixie	Rockbridge @ Stone Mountain Ind	770-9xx-xxxx	52,500	
48	Closed Drug Emporium	Memorial Drive	770-4xx-xxxx	24,000	
49	Closed Michaels	Memorial Drive	770-4xx-xxxx	17,500	
50	Shopping Center	Montreal Road	770-5xx-xxxx	7,000	
Office Buildings:					
51	Northlake Quadrangle	Northlake Parkway	770-9xx-xxxx		
52	Office Building	Henderson Mill Road	404-8xx-xxxx		
53	Old Decatur Federal Bldg.	Henderson Mill Road	404-3xx-xxxx		
54	Koger Center	Chamblee Tucker @ I-85	770-4xx-xxxx		
55	Regent Center	Mercer University Drive	770-4xx-xxxx		
56	C/T Professional Center	Embry Hills Shopping Center	770-4xx-xxxx		
57	Int Mag Services of Atlanta	Chamblee Tucker @ I-85	770-9xx-xxxx		
58	"Space for Lease" Sign	Old Chamblee Tucker Road	770-4xx-xxxx		
59	Park Ridge 85	Chamblee Tucker @ I-85	770-4xx-xxxx		
60	Office Building	Pleasantdale Rd near I-85	404-8xx-xxxx		
61	Executive Suites	Northlake Area	404-2xx-xxxx		
Closed Bank Buildings:					
62	Closed Bank Building	Henderson Mill Road			
63	Closed Bank Building	Chamblee Tucker Road			
64	Former Bank Building	Winters Chapel @ PIB	770-9xx-xxxx	28,615	
Misc. Businesses:					
65	Closed Restaurant	Embry Hills (Bik Beach)			
66	Closed Conley Buick	Lawrenceville Hwy/I-285	770-3xx-xxxx	30,000	
67	Baranco Pontiac	Covington Hwy/I-285			
68	Ramada Inn - Northlake	Conference Rooms	770-9xx-xxxx		
69	Holiday Inn - Northlake	Conference Rooms	770-9xx-xxxx		
70	Day's Inn - Northlake	Conference Rooms	770-9xx-xxxx		
71	Former Presidential Hotel	I-85/I-285	770-4xx-xxxx		
72	Baptist Conference Center	Mercer University			
73	Closed Movie Theater	Memorial Drive near Rays Road	770-6xx-xxxx		
74	Closed Movie Theater	6xx Memorial Drive	770-4xx-xxxx	13,000	
75	Closed Book Factory	1xx Montreal Road	770-2xx-xxxx	50,000	
76	Metal Building 84 x 275	To be moved to the property	770-7xx-xxxx	23,500	

REPORT TO RELOCATION COMMITTEE AND CHURCH BOARD
Interim Worship Ministry Team
March 10, 1997

The team has canvassed a large portion of DeKalb County for possible locations for interim worship during the time Atlanta First will be in a construction phase. Criteria for selection was:

1. Total space of 10,000 to 15,000 sq. ft., to allow for worship, Sunday School and office space.
2. Parking for at least 100 cars.
3. Air Conditioning and Heating.
4. Availability during at least one night during the week, plus Sunday all day.
5. Reasonable access from interstates.
6. Safe surroundings.

Approximately 75 locations and properties have been considered, including 13 churches, 9 schools, 19 office/warehouse buildings, 9 retail spaces, 14 office buildings, and 12 other buildings. Various problems were encountered in each one, including lack of air conditioning, lack of parking, excessive costs and lack of sufficient space. In addition, many of the facilities considered, especially the churches and schools, were already being used by various church groups. One Seventh-day Adventist church had 5 different groups sharing their space.

Without giving up our separate Sunday School space, or going to Sunday night only for both worship and Sunday School, there appears to be only one reasonable option – rent retail space and customize it to fit our needs.

Two retail spaces have been located that can be leased on a “short-term” basis (most retail space is only available for 5 or more years). One of these spaces is at Chamblee Tucker Road and Pleasantdale Road (at Norcross Tucker Road) – Pittsburgh Plaza. It is 15,000 sq. ft., but the building is not in a good condition, and it has no downstairs bathrooms. It will cost \$75,000 per year. The other area is the Embury Hills Shopping Center at Chamblee Tucker Road and Northcrest Road. It was formerly a hardware store, but Home Depot put them out of business a year or two ago. It will cost \$78,000 per year, including 1,000 sq. ft. of office space nearby. The hardware space is only 10,000 sq. ft., but it is in reasonably good condition. The main drawback is that there are only two “single” restrooms. The owner has agreed to put in new heating and air conditioning.

To “carve up” the space into sanctuary and classrooms will cost about \$20,000, if we do the work. That includes carpet throughout, with installation included, plus metal studs (12 ft. ceilings), sheetrock and doors. Contacts have already been made for all of these, and firm prices secured (except for the doors and hardware).

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, Sharon Lavonda. "A Model of Equipping Laity of a Local Church for Evangelism in a New Community." D.MIN. diss., Drew University, 1995.
- Ardrey, Kenneth Dale. "Crossroads Church of the Nazarene: A Strategy for Church Growth." D.MIN. diss., Fuller Theological Seminary, 1990.
- Benis, Warren and Burt Nanus. Leaders: The Strategies for Taking Charge. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1985.
- Briner, Bob. The Management Methods of Jesus: Ancient Wisdom for Modern Business. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, Inc., 1996.
- Bustle, Louie E. Keys for Church Growth. Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press, 1990.
- Carnahan, Roy E. Creative Pastoral Management. Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press of Kansas City, 1976.
- Conn, Harvie M., editor. Planting and Growing Urban Churches: From Dream to Reality. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1997.
- Covey, Stephen. Principle-Centered Leadership. New York: Summit Books, 1991.
- Daft, Richard L and Richard M. Steers. Organizations: A Micro/Macro Approach. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1986.
- Dale, Robert D. Leading Edge: Leadership Strategies from the New Testament. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1996.
- _____. Sharing Ministry With Volunteer Leaders. Nashville: Convention Press, 1986.

Drucker, Peter F. Managing the Nonprofit Organization. New York: Harper Collins, Publishers, 1990.

Dudley, Carl S. Basic Steps Toward Community Ministry. New York: The Alban Institute, 1991.

Easum, William M. Sacred Cows Make Gourmet Burgers: Ministry Anytime, Anywhere, by Anyone. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1995.

Gangel, Kenneth O. Feeding and Leading: A Practical Handbook on Administration in Churches and Christian Organizations. Wheaton, IL: Victor Books, 1989.

Hemphill, Ken. The Official Rule Book for the New Church Game. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1990.

Hendrix, Olan. Management for Christian Leaders. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1990.

Henricksen, Walter A. Laymen, Look Up! God Has a Place for You. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1983.

Heusser, D. B. Helping Church Workers Succeed: The Enlistment and Support of Volunteers. Valley Forge, PA: Judson Press, 1980.

Jones, Bruce W. Ministerial Leadership In a Managerial World. Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House Publishers, 1988.

Lewis, Larry L. The Church Planter's Handbook. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1992.

Lindgren, Alvin J. Foundations for Purposeful Church Administration. New York: Abingdon Press, 1965.

Lindgren, Alvin J. and Norman Shawchuck. Let My People Go: Empowering Laity For Ministry. Nashville: Abingdon, 1980.

Logan, Robert E. Beyond Church Growth: Action Plans for Developing a Dynamic Church. Old Tappan, NJ: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1989.

Luecke, David S. New Designs for Church Leadership. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1990.

- McCokey, Dale D. MBO for Nonprofit Organizations. New York: AMACOM, 1975.
- McCormick, Gwenn E. Planning and Building Church Facilities. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1992.
- McKenna, David L. Power to Follow; Grace to Lead. Dallas: Word Publishing, 1989.
- Madringer, Charles Brent. "Churches in Transition: The Issues and Proposed Strategy for Post Road Christian Church." Fuller Theological Seminary, 1989.
- Malcony, H. Newton. Living with Paradox: Religious Leadership And the Genius of Double Vision. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998.
- Malphus, Aubrey. Planting Growing Churches for the Twenty-first Century: A Comprehensive Guide for New Churches and Those Desiring Renewal. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1992.
- Manual/1997-2001 Church of the Nazarene. Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1997.
- Maxwell, John C. Developing the Leaders Around You: How to Help Others Reach Their Potential. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1995.
- Miller, C. John. Outgrowing the Ingrown Church. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1986.
- Miller, Herb. Leadership Is the Key: Unlocking Your Effectiveness in Ministry. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1997.
- Morsch, Gary and Eddy Hall. Ministry: It's Not Just for Ministers. Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press of Kansas City, 1993.
- Nelson, Alan E., editor, The New Thing: Cutting-Edge Ideas for 21st Century Ministry from Progressive Leaders in the Wesleyan Heritage. Scottsdale, AZ: The Southwest Center for Leadership, 1998.
- Nuechterlein, Anne Marie. Improving Your Multiple Staff Ministry: How to Work Together More Effectively. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989.

Ogden, Greg. The New Reformation: Returning Ministry to the People of God. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1990.

Parrott, Leslie. Building Today's Church. Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press of Kansas City, 1971.

_____. Motivating Volunteers in the Local Church. Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1993.

Rainer, Thom S. Eating the Elephant: Bite-Sized Steps to Achieve Long-Term Growth in Your Church. Nashville: Broadman and Holman Publishers, 1994.

Rainey, Robert H. Growing Church Leaders: New Skills for New Tasks. Decatur, GA: CTS Press, 1995.

Saari, Ronald W. "Leading a Church Through the Change of Relocation." D.MIN. diss., Bethel Theological Seminary, 1984.

Schaller, Lyle E. 44 Questions for Church Planters. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1991.

_____. Hey, That's Our Church. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1975.

_____. Strategies for Change. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1993.

Senter, Mark III. Recruiting Volunteers in the Church. Wheaton, IL: Victor Press, 1990.

Shawchuck, Norman and Roger Heuser. Managing the Congregation Building Effective Systems to Serve People. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1996.

Smith, Donald P. Empowering Ministry: Ways to Grow in Effectiveness. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996.

Smith, Fred. Learning to Lead: Bringing Out the Best in People. Waco, TX: Word Books, Publisher, 1986.

Smith, H. Paul and Ezra Earl Jones. The Church Building Process. Cincinnati, OH: United Methodist Development Fund, 1975.

- Smith, Roland A. Before You Build Your Church. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1979.
- Steinbron, Melvin J. The Lay Driven Church. Ventura, CA: Regal Books, 1997.
- Stevens, R. Paul. Liberating the Laity: Equipping All the Saints for Ministry. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1985.
- Sullivan, Bill M. Starting Strong New Churches. Kansas City: Nazarene Publishing House, 1997.
- Tennyson, Mack. Making Committees Work. Grand Rapids, Mich: Zondervan, 1992.
- Tillapaugh, Frank R. Unleashing the Church: Getting People Out Of the Fortress and into Ministry. Ventura, CA: Regal Books, 1982.
- Treston, Kevin. Creative Christian Leadership: Skills for More Effective Ministry. Mystic, CT: Twenty-Third Publications, 1995.
- Toler, Stan. The People Principle: Transforming Layperson's into Leaders. Kansas City: Beacon Hill Press of Kansas City, 1997.
- Towns, Elmer Leon. Getting a Church Started: A Theological and Practical Manual for Those Who Would Plant a Church. Lynchburg, VA: Elmer L. Towns, 1982.
- Wagner, C. Peter. Church Planting for a Greater Harvest: A Comprehensive Guide. Ventura, CA: Regal Books, 1990.
- Weems, Lovett H. Church Leadership: Vision, Team Culture, and Integrity. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1993.
- Westing, Harold J. Multiple Church Staff Handbook. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 1979.
- White, James F. and White, Susan J. Church Architecture: Building and Renovating for Christian Worship. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1988.
- Wilson, Robert Rawsthorne. "Training a Taskforce to Determine How to Raise Future Possibilities (Goals) of the Congregation." D.MIN. diss., Columbia Theological Seminary, 1985.

Wiseman, Neil B. Leadership: A Leadership Development
Strategy Manual for Church Growth. Kansas City: Beacon
Hill Press of Kansas City, 1979.

VITA

Truman D. Casey

PERSONAL

Born: March 22, 1946.

Married: Sharon R. Chalfant, June 10, 1967.

Children: Curtis Jay, born October 3, 1971.

Marcus Ray, born December 27, 1973.

Cherie Lynn, born July 15, 1977.

EDUCATIONAL

B.A., Olivet Nazarene University, 1964.

M.A.R., Liberty University, 1993.

MINISTERIAL

Ordination: September 9, 1972 by the Georgia District
of the Church of the Nazarene.

PROFESSIONAL

Pastor, Trinity Church of the Nazarene, Macon,
Georgia, 1970-1974.

Senior Pastor, Church of the Nazarene, East Point,
Georgia, 1974-1979.

Senior Pastor, Central Church of the Nazarene, Omaha,
Nebraska, 1979-1985.

Senior Pastor, First Church of the Nazarene, Dublin,
Georgia, 1985-1988.

Senior Pastor, First Church of the Nazarene, Atlanta,
Georgia, 1988-1999.

Senior Pastor, First Church of the Nazarene, Little
Rock, Arkansas, 1999-present.