

**A Brief History
and Evaluation
of the WELS
Outreach Worker
Program**

**by Bob Hein
and Jeff Schone**

Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary Library
11831 N. Seminary Drive. 65W
Mequon, Wisconsin

The ideas and impetus for this paper resulted directly from the writers' involvement in the planning and production of Mission Seminar 1987 at Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary. The general theme under which this Seminar organized was this:

Share the Word that Burns in the Heart

The fourth session of this Seminar focussed attention on sharing the word that 'burns in the heart of the congregation.' How do congregations outfit themselves for evangelism and mission work? Are there ways they can structure themselves constitutionally? Is Christ's Great Commission the driving force in the whole of congregational life and activity? Do the organizations within the congregation reflect and incorporate this mission purpose? What efforts do congregations make in fulfilling their stated purpose of existence within their own communities? It was during discussion of this last point that our Synod's Mass Media Ministry and Evangelism Outreach Teams were mentioned as possible topics for inclusion in the Mission Seminar program.

The individual administrating the Outreach Team program, Pastor Harold Hagedorn, served as an advisory member of the Mission Seminar planning committee. When the topic of Outreach Teams came up, he mentioned that his Home Missions office was interested in data concerning the outreach teams and their effectiveness and impact. Jokingly, someone commented that this might make an interesting paper for Senior Church History. So our paper topic was born.

The questions which we began our study with were these:

1. Do the Outreach Team efforts succeed in equipping the

congregations to which they are sent for on-going personal and community evangelism work and does that work happen?

2. Do the individuals who have served on the outreach teams continue to make use of their specialized training, skills and experience in the congregations they belong to throughout the Synod?

3. Can the Mass Media Ministry alone, without the assistance of outreach teams, meet the same or similar goals?

To answer these questions we decided to send out questionnaires to three separate groups of people. First, we developed a questionnaire specifically to gauge the attitudes and opinions of the men and women who served on the outreach teams. Second, we developed a questionnaire to inquire about the general effectiveness of the Mass Media Ministry and Outreach Team program. We sent this questionnaire to the pastors of congregations who participated in these two programs--to those congregations which utilized a Mass Media program only and to those congregations which took part in a Mass Media/Outreach Team program. [Copies of these questionnaires are included in the appendix of this paper.] It was hoped that the respondents would be more open and frank with a pair of seminary students than with their "bosses" at the Home Missions office.

Few people could or would want to deny that there is a growing 'evangelism' awareness and emphasis in our Synod today. This is not to say that sharing the gospel of Jesus Christ has never been a concern in the past. Certainly the growth and expansion of the Synod, both internally and externally, evidence the truth that our fathers were interested and active in kingdom work. Maybe it would be more accurate to say that congregational evangelism is more than an assumption today, it is specific and visible, i.e., talked about,

programmed, planned, budgeted, etc. The Mass Media programs begun in the '80s, the establishment of a Synodical office specifically for evangelism, new innovations in regard to technique, presentation, and strategies [cf. RSVP, 'God's Great Exchange', canvassing, 'farming', etc.] speak to this point.

It would be easy to claim that the Outreach Team program is just another result of such a renewed spirit of evangelism. Without a doubt, *Zeitgeist* was a factor in the establishment of this program. But, a realistic and pragmatic look at the inauguration of the Outreach Team program suggests that other factors played important roles. The impetus for this program seems to have been an over-supply of pastor and teacher candidates, or in other words, a dramatic shrinkage in the number of positions to which candidates for the preaching and teaching ministry could be called. The original administrator of the Outreach Team program, then Ass. Secretary for Home Missions Larry Zwieg comments in his report to the Home Mission Board, "It is important to remember that the program began as an effort to use people power the Lord has given the Synod--*people power that would otherwise have gone unused.* (Zwieg, section 4.1)

With this in mind, it is not difficult to understand that the Outreach Team program was not well planned and organized at its inception. Actually, the decision to begin the program might almost be described as 'spur of the moment.' Pastor Zwieg's 1985 report on the Outreach Team program indicates that the concept was not even seriously discussed until 3 or 4 days before the Seminary's Assignment Day in May of 1983. At that time two seminarians were called by the Mission Board and it was not until sometime later that

the decision was made to use DMLC graduates to staff the teams. Pastor Zwieg states that he had one month during the summer of 1983 in which to detail and outline the scope, responsibilities, schedules, guidelines, orientation, etc. of the entire program.

The first Outreach Team was staffed not by pastoral candidates, but by vicars. Apparently there was "an abundance of vicar candidates" (Zwieg, section 2.1.04) in 1983 which precipitated this decision. Later on when the decision was made to utilize unassigned teacher candidates as well, the composition of the individual outreach team was set at 2 men, 2 women, and 1 vicar.

While the organization and planning of the Outreach Team program may not have been completely worked out at the beginning, the goals of the program were more easily defined. Obviously, one goal was to utilize, productively, a good number of workers who might otherwise have been left standing idle in the marketplace. Another practical goal was to provide congregations (primarily mission congregations) with large numbers of mission prospects in a fairly short period of time. A somewhat more qualitative goal was to increase the congregation's recognition in its community. One goal particularly vital to the success of the program was to effectively train and motivate members of individual congregations for continuing mission/evangelism work. It was already known in regard to the Mass Media program that congregational follow up calls were of the utmost importance. A final goal, which may or may not have been recognized at the program's start, was to establish a pool of trained and experienced evangelists within the Synod who would become valuable assets to congregations scattered across the country.

Some of these goals have been met very admirably. Since the Fall of 1983 thirty-five workers have been called, trained, utilized and subsequently 'sent back' to individual congregations within the Synod. A total of 67 congregations have been assisted in their community outreach efforts by the teams. Literally thousands of homes have been visited by team members, and what is more important, hundreds of people have been presented with the truths of law and gospel. Certainly, congregational recognition has increased to varying degrees as a result of the Mass Media/Outreach Team efforts. There is little doubt that the Outreach program has been successful when looked at in this light.

Part of this success or effectiveness can be traced to the continuing efforts to refine the Outreach program. Changes were made in staffing, training and scheduling that seemed to improve the outreach work. In the second year of the program [1984/85] the two vicars were replaced by pastoral candidates. Some concern was expressed that the vicars on the outreach team might not receive as 'well-rounded' a year of training as the others in their class. Moreover, in the spring of 1984 there were a sufficient number of vicar calls while there continued to be a shortage of pastoral positions. Using the 'abundance' of pastoral candidates made good practical sense. But at the same time, men who had finished their pastoral training, including a vicar year, probably set to their outreach work with a little more confidence and purpose.

Training of outreach workers has improved over the years. In 1983 the newly called outreach workers received 4 days of 'classroom' training with no accompanying 'street' training. For people who were

going to be out on the streets for an entire year, this proved impractical. The next year, therefore, the outreach training was stretched to ten days and did include 'on the street' experience (practice?) in conjunction with Atonement Lutheran Church in Milwaukee. This type of training is still provided for outreach workers.

In 1986 a change in administration came, when Pastor Zwieg accepted a call to a mission congregation in Houston, Texas. Pastor Harold Hagedorn was called to replace him as the Associate Secretary for Home Missions. Pastor Hagedorn brought with him new and fresh approaches to the people and problems of the outreach teams. It is in the area of administration that much refinement was needed and actually accomplished. One notes an increasing efficiency in scheduling and better communication between the workers and the administrators. One thing that should not be overlooked is the increasing number and quality of the tools/materials team members can utilize in their efforts to train congregation members for evangelism work.

One of the most visible changes in the Outreach Team program occurred in 1986. At that time budget constraints forced the Mission Board to cut back to one 5-member team instead of two. In rough figures it costs \$6,000/month to fund a 5-member team. For the 1986/87 year, the budget was set at \$81,500. Outreach Team work, like other organized mission work, is not inexpensive. In 1987 budget problems continue to squeeze synodical programs and the future of the Outreach Teams is questioned.

In the appendix to this paper the compiled results of the three questionnaires are provided. However, we also would like to offer our brief analysis and encapsulation of these results. One of the questions we wanted answers to was this: how successful have the Outreach Teams been in equipping the congregations they served for on-going personal and community evangelism work?

The Outreach Teams, themselves, received high ratings from the congregations they served. Comments such as "very effective," "they were the inspiration," "they do a tremendous amount of work in a short time," and "they give it their best shot" were representative. A few pastors even commented that the possibility of burnout resulting from the nomadic Team lifestyle was very real. Some Team members agreed that living out of a suitcase for a whole year can become wearing.

The majority of the Team members felt they benefited the congregations they served in three specific areas. (1) They provided the congregations with a supply of mission prospects. (2) They significantly raised the mission awareness of the congregation. (3) They were able to train members to make evangelism calls. One Team member writes: "Most people commented positively on the effect the team had in the congregation. They felt that if we could do it, so could they." The Team members displayed a positive attitude toward mission work and in some cases their own enthusiasm rubbed off on the congregation.

Training congregation members to make evangelism calls is

certainly one of the great benefits supplied by the Outreach Team. The local pastor can lead a class on evangelism, but the five team members are able to take five local members along with them to let them see firsthand how an evangelism call is made. Personal, on the job training is a big plus in the Outreach Team's column. One Team member writes that, "during the second half of our campaign, we began training members of the congregations to canvass and to follow up. This is mission work. That should have been the congregation's biggest benefit." Another writes, "Our program gets people involved in a fairly non-threatening way. They really get excited when they see the results."

But were the Teams successful in equipping the congregations for on-going personal and community evangelism work? It's hard to answer this question definitively.

In some cases, 'Yes.' We received 26 questionnaires from congregations using Outreach Teams. They were asked to check those areas where long term effects of the outreach campaign may be noticeable within their congregation. Thirteen checked 'sensitivity to visitors.' One pastor commented, "Before the effort there was little awareness. The TCW (Outreach Team) effort got the ball rolling, and it is finally having impact on the congregation three years later. Some are becoming mission minded and are working to become evangelists." Fifteen congregations reported subsequent evangelism efforts including: continuing follow up of prospects, more canvassing, further mailings, Visitor Sundays, Friendship Evangelism courses, and Newcomer visits and packet development.

In some cases, 'No.' Often the Outreach Team had little effect

upon the congregation's ongoing evangelism efforts. Only seven of the twenty-six congregations felt the campaign stimulated their members to carry on 'friendship evangelism.' Only ten congregations reported further use of the mails or of media. Only seven congregations reported an increased outreach budget. Only 6 reported an increased concern for the lost in the community. When you consider that these twenty-six congregations are small mission churches, churches who live or die by evangelism efforts, it doesn't appear that the Mass Media campaign with Outreach assistance had tremendous impact.

Several reasons might be cited for this. Often the congregations were not properly prepared for the campaign and subsequently did not become involved in the evangelism work. The Team members were asked to characterize the congregations' role in and support of their outreach work [a general overview of their year-long experience was requested.] Four said they worked independently from the congregation. Twenty said that food and shelter was basically the extent of the congregations' support of their work. Only eleven felt that the congregations played an integral role in their work. Yet commonly this support was severely lacking. Read these comments from Team members:

--"For the most part we had good congregational help for the first weekend of canvassing, but then we were on our own."

--"Congregational involvement was minimal at best."

--"At most of the places, the people rarely played an integral role....Most places did send people out to canvass, but not much in following up."

--"The intent of the program was to train congregations in canvassing and witnessing; due to small sizes and lack of interest this often was not accomplished."

--"For the most part, many congregations felt we were there to do all the work. My biggest question was: After the Team is gone, who will continue this work?"

General consensus placed most responsibility for the program's success on the local pastor. If he promoted evangelism efforts by word and example, his sheep followed. If the pastor showed little interest, his congregation followed suit. If the latter was the case, the Outreach Team's fine efforts could go for naught. One Team member writes, "I feel that all of the attitudes of the congregations were initiated and sustained by the pastor. He was the person most responsible for each congregation's contribution toward our outreach goal."

Many pastors of the congregations using Outreach Teams felt the campaign would have been more successful if they had had more time to motivate and equip the members for involvement. One pastor writes, "Because it was all so quickly thrust upon us, we hardly had time to organize, let alone motivate any congregational enthusiasm for it. For some, it kind of irritated with an implication that our congregation hadn't been doing much."

Another pastor who said the Team was very effective, felt they could have been even more effective if only his congregation had been better prepared. He writes, "You see, the Alaska Outreach thing was sort of a last-minute decision, and us ^(S, 4) pastors were left in the dark about lots of the preparation ideas until it was nearly too late. Am I laying the blame for the 'success' on someone else? You bet! With all the niceties aside, I am glad Larry Zwieg is somewhere else but at 2929. Seriously, the Team did a super job, but the ill-prepared and uninformed congregation they had to work with didn't complement them very much." Incidentally, a congregation was 'usually' informed 6??? months in advance of the Team's arrival.

The pastor quoted above criticized the Home Mission Board Executives to some degree. We asked the Team members to assess the HMB's involvement in their work. Eight of twenty-four said the Board was very helpful, but ten felt they could have received more training and fifteen said they could have received more support. Their comments:

--"I am quite critical of the Mission Board....We felt like we were always receiving last minute consideration. We really could have enjoyed our first months more, had we been trained longer and been given a set itinerary. This is possible and actually beneficial to the program if the congregations know well ahead of time they will be getting a Team. We felt like we were 'thrown to the wolves' and had to figure everything out on our own."

--"We only received 4 days of training and after that we were put on the road."

--"Due to certain personalities in the home office, it was hard for some of the Outreach workers to work alongside the Board. The current situation may be different."

--"As a pastor I need to qualify this. I had adequate training. The teachers lacked miserably in the area of previous training, and received only a quick introduction to the methods."

Many of these problems occurred because the program was initiated on such short notice. As the program developed, the organization, training, and support of the Mission Board and its executives seemed to improve. A later Team member writes, "Always felt as if we could call and talk. Problems were taken care of, etc. Lots of Christian caring displayed." Another writes, "The Board has been extremely helpful all year, and they do their best to make sure this program gets its best shot to be a success."

To help gauge the Team members' assessment of the Outreach program, we asked them to evaluate the following statement: *The work of the Outreach Team could be done as well, and more economically, by sending a "Mission Counselor" to train and equip the congregation to*

do the work itself. The majority disagreed with the idea. However, one member wrote, "The motivation and time is not going to exist, no matter how good the Mission counselor could be. The mission churches are too small to adequately handle the program effectively." Another felt the big advantage of the Outreach Team is offering congregational members the opportunity to just come along on a visit and listen. Still another added, "Most people will not jump at the chance to knock on a stranger's door to talk about religion. They need people to go out with them and show it's not so bad. The Outreach Team could do this more effectively because they are more like lay people--ordinary Christians without a fancy title. People listen to and trust other lay people more easily. It's like 'If he can do it, so can I.'" Those Team members who favored the idea pointed out that it would save quite a bit of money. Some also felt that the congregations would get more directly involved, since they were getting trained to do the work and no one else would be available to get out on the streets for them.

Based on the data we collected we do not feel that the Outreach Teams were highly successful in equipping the majority of congregations they served for on-going personal and community evangelism work. Some notable exceptions are apparent. However, in many cases, when the Team left, the outreach efforts quickly diminished in quality and quantity. One pastor summed up our assessment well when he wrote "The Outreach Teams didn't really help that much, because there was no follow up after the campaign. The congregation has to be well-organized for follow-up, and if they are, they can do the whole thing themselves. The problem is not in

getting prospects, but in following up on them."

Another goal of the Outreach Program is to establish a pool of trained and experienced evangelists within the Synod who would conceivably be valuable assets to congregations scattered across the country. In the four years since this program began, has this goal been achieved? We asked the Team members how their year of outreach work influenced their attitude of ministry and supplied several possible answers. In the 24 questionnaires returned to us, eight people stated they continue to make calls in their present congregations; four continue to train outreach workers; six consider themselves a strong mission voice in their present congregation; five consider themselves a valuable asset in the Lord's kingdom; four said they remain active 'friendship evangelists' in their present community; finally, eight stated that none of the above categories truly represented their situations. These results were, at least to us, surprisingly low. [It should be noted, however, that some of the respondents are present Team members, others are teachers, and others "don't like to brag."]

One might think that Outreach Team pastors automatically turn into excited and enthusiastic mission congregation pastors because of their experience. Perhaps this isn't always the case. One Team member wrote, "I am a New Mode pastor, so I'm still doing the same thing [that I did during my year of outreach work.] It is hanging out a little at this point. It is very intense work. I would suggest that in the future, no New Modes should be filled by a pastor who just got done with Outreach Team work. Let the guy incorporate these skills into an established church." Another Outreach Team

) pastor writes that "the parish ministry is a very nice place to be."

The year of outreach work has proved to be a blessing for the Team members. Almost every one responded positively about their experience. One Team member wrote, "I never realized how difficult this call could be until I did it. Neither did I realize how rewarding it could be. If I ever run into a situation at our church for outreach, I will participate." Another wrote, "My outreach work influenced how I view evangelism. I love it. I enjoy talking to people as much as I can." Still another wrote, "I am presently a member of our Evangelism Committee, and I am in charge of the Canvass/Witness/Training part of it all....We are in the process of training 4 to 5 new people to make calls." In one exceptional case we received this comment: "My year of outreach was a direct cause of my receiving a call as Minister of Evangelism, where I was able to set up an evangelism system, make thousands of calls (mostly follow up), and train dozens of people to proclaim the gospel. Communicating the gospel to people has greatly strengthened my faith to the point of seeking the preaching ministry. I will be entering Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary in the Fall of '87."

Certainly our WELS congregations have been blessed by the work of these former team members. Yet, we feel it would be overstating the case to say that the Outreach Program has supplied our congregations with an elite corps of highly specialized evangelists. Objectively, the program has been only partially successful in placing highly trained and experienced evangelists (the Team members over the years) in congregations throughout the Synod. In some instances former Team members continue to be active evangelists in

) their home congregations. There are the success stories about the teacher who was moved to study for the preaching ministry and the girl who happened to join one of the congregations she served as a Team member and simply picked up where she left off and the teacher who speaks to groups about her Outreach experience. But the dream of highly trained ranks of evangelists sweeping through the Synod's congregations remains just that--a dream yet to be realized. Perhaps it is not a dream that needs to be realized through special programs. One Team member expressed this thought: "I feel that I am not a special asset in the Lord's kingdom. I am just like any other lay person, trying to bring others to church."

We initially hoped to assess the effectiveness of the Outreach Teams by comparing Mass Media Campaigns which used Outreach Team assistance with Mass Media campaigns conducted solely by congregational members. Could the congregations achieve the same or similar results without using Outreach Teams? To be fair, we point out that the congregations holding Mass Media campaigns on their own, are much larger churches, generally, and have more people and resources with which to work. We received fifteen questionnaire responses from congregations which did not utilize Outreach Team help in their campaigns. The majority of these congregations are located in the Twin Cities area. The results of are very positive [cf. Appendix #5.]

These congregations were able to achieve outstanding results without using outside help. The positive identity of the congregation in the community improved in every case. In addition, the members' image of their own church also improved. We asked the

question: Do you feel that this campaign stimulated your members to carry out 'friendship evangelism?' Eleven 'yes' and five 'no' answers were received. Compare that with the congregations using Outreach Teams, where out of twenty-six responses, seven marked 'yes' and nineteen marked 'no.' Why such a surprising difference?

Some congregations viewed the Outreach Team as a group of people hired to do evangelism work for them. People with this attitude didn't get actively involved in the evangelism program. They also weren't stimulated to carry out friendship evangelism. On the other hand, congregations without Outreach Teams had to become directly involved in the program. It was their own project--no one was administering and effecting it for them. Perhaps this encouraged some to carry out more friendship evangelism. We received many favorable comments about people inviting their friends and neighbors to church, as a result of the Mass Media campaign.

One advantage of congregation members doing the work themselves is that they continue to be at that particular church to welcome the guests and prospects and to make extended follow up calls. The Outreach Teams, on the other hand, can only stay in one place for about a month. They aren't able to nurture the prospects along, and greet them after church each Sunday. After a prospect becomes comfortable with a Team member, suddenly that Team member has to leave! The one familiar face known to the prospect is gone and he is once again a complete stranger.

What, you might ask, after all of this history and information, is our summation? What is our final evaluation? If we held the

future of the Outreach Teams in our hands what would we decide?

Well, fortunately those responsibilities have been left to far more mature and knowledgeable men. We don't have to decide *anything*, yet it is in the scope of this paper to conclude *something*.

After carefully reviewing the data we collected we feel that the ideal is to allow the local congregation to carry out its own outreach program. This would benefit the members. They are able (perhaps more apt) to become directly involved in the work and this can only serve to exercise and strengthen faith, which in turn encourages greater works of service. This would also benefit the prospects. The same people who initially visit them and follow up on them will be there to nurture them along and be a continuing source of Christian care and concern. Perhaps one might argue that small mission churches need help in massing lists of prospects. But we would then ask, what good are 2000 prospects if there is insufficient manpower to follow up and nurture them along?

Do we sound negative? We don't mean to be! We do not wish to say that the Teams were not successful, given their constraints. Prospects were found, people were trained and motivated for mission work, community recognition for WELS congregations was increased, and people chained by sin were told about the freedom and life that is theirs in Jesus. In many cases, mission work was done that would not have been done otherwise; people were found who might otherwise have remained lost. It is impossible to put a price on a soul--whether that price is measured in terms of dollars or time or effort. In this light, it is very easy to applaud the work and rejoice in the outcome of the WELS Outreach Worker Program.

APPENDICES

#1 Outreach Team Questionnaire

#2 Congregational Questionnaire

#3 Results from the Outreach Team Questionnaire

#4 Results from Congregational Questionnaire--Outreach assisted Mass
Media Campaigns

#5 Results from Congregational Questionnaire--Mass Media Campaigns

Special mention must be made of the "Outreach Worker Program Report" prepared by Pastor Larry Zwieg in September of 1985 for the General Board for Home Missions of the WELS. This report was used as primary source material.

Appendix

1

Dear fellow workers,

We need your help for the Seminary's annual Mission Seminar (held this school year on Jan. 28 & 29). Our Home Mission theme is: SHARE THE WORD THAT BURNS IN THE HEART! This theme is based on Jeremiah 20:9, "But if I say, 'I will not mention him or speak anymore in his name,' his word is in my heart like a burning fire, shut up in my bones. I am weary of holding it in; indeed, I cannot."

Our session of the Seminar deals specifically with the word that burns in the heart of the congregation. We are looking for ways to motivate and equip the members of our congregations for evangelism. Our particular assignment is to investigate the work of the Outreach teams of recent years. In addition, we intend to use the information we collect for our senior Church History paper. We would appreciate your help by answering the questions below. Of course, no names will be used, so please be perfectly candid. Because of our Mission Seminar deadlines, we need this information within a few weeks. Thanks in advance for your kind cooperation.

In the following questions, check all of the following statements which you feel apply. Circle the 'X' if it applied to the majority of the congregations you worked in.

1. Characterize the congregations' role in and support of your outreach work: (a general overview of your year-long experience)

- We worked independently from the congregations
 Supplying food and shelter was basically the extent of the congregations' support of our work
 The congregations played an integral role in our work

COMMENT AND EXPLAIN

2. In your opinion, in what way did you benefit the congregations you worked with:

- We provided the congregation with a supply of Mission prospects
 We significantly raised the mission consciousness of the congregation
 We significantly raised the self-image of the congregation
 We trained members to make evangelism calls
 We saw evidence of an increase in friendship evangelism

COMMENT AND EXPLAIN

How would ^{you} evaluate the Home Mission Board's involvement in your work?

- The Board was very helpful in our work
 We could have received more training

Appendix

2

Dear Pastor,

We need your help for the Seminary's annual Mission Seminar (which will be held this school year on Jan. 28 & 29). Our Home Mission theme is: SHARE THE WORD THAT BURNS IN THE HEART! This theme is based on Jeremiah 20:9, "But if I say, 'I will not mention him or speak anymore in his name,' his Word is in my heart like a burning fire, shut up in my bones. I am weary of holding it in; indeed, I cannot."

Our session of the Seminar deals specifically with the word that burns in the heart of the congregation. We are looking for ways to motivate and equip the members of our congregations for evangelism. Our particular assignment is to investigate the work of the Mass Media Outreach campaigns of recent years. In addition, we intend to use the information we collect for our Senior Church History paper. We would appreciate your help by answering the questions below. Of course, no names will be used, so please be perfectly candid. Because of our Mission Seminar deadlines, we need this information within a few weeks. Thanks in advance for your kind cooperation.

Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability. If statistics are unavailable, please estimate and comment (but indicate that you are estimating).

Part I

1. What media vehicles did you use? _____
2. How many homes did you hope to reach? _____
3. Evaluate the positive identity of your congregation in the community BEFORE and AFTER the campaign on a scale of 0 -10, ten being the highest rating. BEFORE _____ AFTER _____
What are the reasons for this evaluation?

Part II

1. Evaluate your members' image of their church BEFORE and AFTER the media assisted campaign on a scale of 0 - 10. BEFORE _____ AFTER _____
What are the reasons for this evaluation?

2. Do you feel that this campaign stimulated your members to carry out 'friendship evangelism.' Yes _____ No _____
Relate any evidence of such friendship witnessing you observed as a result of this campaign.

4. How many follow-up calls were made during the campaign? _____
5. How many members made follow-up calls during the campaign? _____
6. How many of that number are still active evangelists in the congregation (if some have transferred out of your congregation, please indicate this)? _____
7. How many members have been trained for evangelism since the campaign? _____

Part VI

1. How many people visited the church or inquired about the church as a direct or indirect result of the outreach campaign? _____
2. How many people began an adult instruction class as a direct or indirect result of the campaign? _____
3. With how many prospects did your congregation have at least one opportunity to explain sin and grace? _____
4. How many people have become members of your congregation as a direct or indirect result of your outreach campaign?

Part VII

1. If you had an Outreach Team assist your campaign, comment on its effectiveness AND offer suggestions for improvement.

2. What suggestions would you offer to another congregation beginning a mass media campaign?

Many thanks for your time, your help and your interest! Please return this survey form BY JANUARY 1, 1987!!! Send it to:

Mr. Robert Hein
Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary
6717 W. Wartburg Circle
Mequon, WI 53092

The Lord's continued blessing in your work. Have a blessed holiday!

Bob Hein & Jeff Schone

Appendix

3

Hein

TEAM MEMBER QUESTIONNAIRE

In the following questions, check all of the following statements which you feel apply. Circle the 'X' if it applied to the majority of the congregations you worked in.

1. Characterize the congregations' role in and support of your outreach work: (a general overview of your year-long experience)

- 4 We worked independently from the congregations
- 20 (9) Supplying food and shelter was basically the extent of the congregations' support of our work
- 11 (3) The congregations played an integral role in our work

*not much love
participation
with congregation*

COMMENTS

1. When we arrived in a new town the very first thing we did was have a survey training meeting. We wanted as many helpers as we could get to reach the 5000 homes. We then took the volunteers out with us on the survey. We also trained for the follow-up calls. Less people were usually interested, but one or two came along. Most congregations also had to fold and stuff all the materials before we got there. 5000 door bags were also to be hung. This was usually done before we got there if we warned them!

2. For the most part we had good congregational help for the first weekend of canvassing but then we were on our own.

3. Each congregation has supported in their own way.

*congregational
support critical to
success!*

4. When the congregation did work along with us and after us, the more success was evident.

5. Congregational involvement was minimal at best. There usually were 1 or 2 couples that really did the bulk of the work. Pastoral support was critical to the success of the program.

*Pastor is
most important
factor!*

6. At most of the places, the people rarely played an integral part. the pastor's support and involvement were critical! Most places did send people out to help canvass but not much in following-up.

7. The intent of the program was to train congregations in canvassing and witnessing. ;due to small sizes and lack of interest this often was not accomplished.

8. The original plan called for the [congregations] to take an active part in the effort. However, no formal means to implement the plan existed until '85-'86. We spent the year experimenting on how to involve the [congregations] more. Hopefully it has improved.

9. For the most part, many congregations felt we (team) were there to do all the work. My biggest question was: after the team is gone, who will continue this work?

10. There were some notable individuals who helped us with the work

but the team by and large did the footwork by themselves.

11. Food and shelter was basically the extent of the support we received.....In nearly all congregations, there were a number of people who helped out on the initial canvass.....the congregation tended to not be too much help [with follow-up]. Part of the problem was that we trained them. You can't expect someone to go out and make calls after one or two hour-long training sessions.

12. the congregations have been very supportive of our work--al of them helped out to a degree with survey work etc. However, sometimes work schedules, distances from church, hindered individuals who wanted to help. Other individuals were "hyped" about the program but didn't contribute their time.

13. It really depended on the area we were working in. We usually got at least one or two people to go out with us from the congregation. More than once we had around 7-10 people helping out. There were some congregations, however, where we did most or all of the work.

14. Members in Kansas City did help survey the area quite extensively, but I feel the pastors of the congregations we have been at could have done more, for he is the main member of the congregation.

15. For the majority of congregations we were the whole evangelism thrust. After we would leave the congregation most of the calls we had left for prospects turned out to be the pastor's responsibility. I feel that all of the attitudes of the congregation were initiated and sustained by the pastor. He was the person most responsible for each different congregation's contribution toward our outreach goal.

16. Some of the congregations were so small, they didn't have anyone available to help, but they were eager to please with food and shelter.

*small church
can't do too
much*

17. The extent to which the congregation got involved in actual canvassing varied from congregation to congregation.

18. Some regulars would help and once in a while we might hit an extra-evangelistic congregation. Overall a day or two of help and shelter was it.

19. Pastors did very little work in majority of the congregations. Some of the people in the congregations did some work but only a few people.

20. Even food and shelter was phased out in some areas where we had apartments and requisitioned our food bills to synod. that situation wasn't all bad from our standpoint, but I think the congregation missed a great opportunity to understand our position (we generally only saw them at church.)

22. There were only 4 churches that didn't help us with canvassing or

follow-ups. Otherwise there was always at least one person that helped us.

24. It isn't easy to evaluate the role of a particular congregation after we leave because members of congregations support us in different ways. Each congregation has a different concept of what their role of support is. One congregation firmly believed that they would serve us best by 'getting out of our way,' supplying our housing arrangements, and being friendly to us (at least to my eyes.) Another was just the opposite in that it felt obligated to make as many calls as the team. Communication between the HMB and the pastor is the key to the congregations understanding their role.

2. In your opinion, in what way did you benefit the congregations you worked with:

- A 21 (11) We provided the congregation with a supply of Mission prospects *if no follow-up, what use is it?*
- B 21 (7) We significantly raised the mission consciousness of the congregation *big + pastor*
- 7 (4) We significantly raised the self-image of the congregation
- yet* 21 (5) We trained members to make evangelism calls *personal attention, take along with*
- not* 6 (2) We saw evidence of an increase in friendship evangelism *big + show by example*
- not follow-up*

COMMENTS:

- 1 1. Most people commented positively on the effect the team had in the congregation. They felt that if we could "do it" so could they....We really encouraged members to come with us--just to listen--even if they didn't want to make a call themselves. They usually jumped in and helped.....In Penryn, CA people were really into friendship evangelism. The family I stayed with was urged by our materials to share even more with their next door neighbors. These neighbors were confirmed a few months ago and are now members of Hope, Penryn.
- B 2. While we provided the congregations with mission prospects and had training sessions, I felt that when we left everything would be left up to the pastor to make follow-up calls.
- 3. It's hard to say if there was any "significant" change, but the initiation or renewal of change is there.
- 4. With very few exceptions, the congregations were very effected by the outreach program.
- 5. Many times our calls raised the image of the congregation in the neighborhood among the other churches.
- B 6. During the 2nd half of our campaign, we began training members of the congregations to canvass and to follow-up. This is mission work. that should have been the congregations' biggest benefit.
- 7. If the congregation was willing to work with the team, these goals would have been accomplished.

9. People became more mission conscious but were more comfortable if someone did the work for them.

10. Since we spent only 3-4 weeks in each congregation it is difficult to evaluate the benefits to the congregations.

12. Hard to tell.

13. I had to check #1 as the most important because that was, what I think, the main thrust of our work. In 1 congregation we were able to dig up approximately 900 suspects or prospects. We did hold training sessions everywhere we went and we tried as much as possible to get the interested members out with us when we made calls. This did have an effect on congregational attitude.

14. We made the congregations aware of the many unchurched in surrounding neighborhoods.

15. All except for choice 4 were very apparent in the congregations we worked for...Most of the congregations felt alone and on their own. This feeling was also shared by most of the pastors. When they dealt with us on a one to one basis they realized that the "synod" was not anything big wig but more or less people like themselves.

16....made the congregations aware of the need for mission work.

③ 17. The program gets people involved in mission work in a fairly non-threatening way. They really get excited when they see the results.

19. [We benefited congregations in these areas} but some congregations became discouraged not seeing immediate results. Also, they did not see the pastor of their congregation doing the work so they didn't.

② 20. This was a major disappointment as we felt that we had training and experience to share with the congregations and we realized that once we left, the evangelism program of that congregation would probably die out.

22. We always supplied the mission cong. with a good many prospects and also trained its members for canvass and follow-up calls. Without a doubt, after the outreach program was completed in an area, the people sure knew where the WELS church was near them. advertising was very effective.

24. Your first and second answers are certainly the most immediate benefits that the program offers the congregation and we do will not to sell those benefits short on importance. I can also say that in many if not most of the programs you are going to see a few prospects already take steps toward membership by the end of the six to eight week program. That helps the congregation with its self-image. When you hear radio ads and see highway billboards with your church's name on it, it makes you conscious of the fact that people do watch you.

Training members for evangelism calls is done on an individual basis, but two to five people in a congregation of 70 is not a bad percentage of people doing evangelism calls. Compare it to the average you might find in a congregation of 500 to 1000.

3. How would you evaluate the Home Mission Board's involvement in your work?:

8 (3) The Board was very helpful in our work

(10) We could have received more training

15 (3) We could have received more support

*need more training + support!
Situation better as program develops
and Larry Jewell left.*

1. I am quite critical of the Mission Board. it is nothing that is personal. Putting the lives of 10 people and all those travel plans on the shoulders of a person who already has too many other responsibilities spelled disaster! We felt like we were always receiving some last minute consideration. We really could have enjoyed our first months more, had we been trained longer and given a set itinerary. this is possible and actually beneficial to the programs if the congregations know well ahead of time they will be getting a team. We felt that we were "thrown to the wolves" and had to figure everything out on our own.

2. We only received 4 days of training and after that we were put on the road.

3. I don't know what else they could really do...more than adequate.

4. As the year progressed the team got more attention and was taken more seriously by the Board. At year's end...things were quite satisfactory.

5. Larry Zwieg was so un-organized he didn't tell his secretaries where the teams were. Frequently his secretaries called me to find out while Larry was on a fishing trip. Our comments and suggestions were taken, but never acted on. Then periodically during the year he'd ask the same questions, get the same answers, and forget to act....I never met a DMB chairman.

6. I don't think they knew enough about what we were to do. The scheduling was terrible. They could have helped more by listening to us.

7. Due to certain personalities in the home office it was hard for some of the Outreach workers to work along side of the Board. The current situation may be different.

8. As a pastor, I need to qualify this. I had adequate training. The teachers lacked miserably in the area of previous training and received only a quick introduction to the methods. We asked the Board to look into a mid-year review for them. This might help reinforce the training they received. Time limits also forced the members of the Board to not be able to witness us first hand and give any evaluation. Both were needed.

Teachers lacked

9) Things seemed to be quite unorganized many times. That, however, is quite trivial. We often needed spiritual support and we didn't receive it. We did our own devotions, etc. I' referring to listening to our problems and then helping us to reach a conclusion based on Scripture.

10. The only comment I have is that Larry Zwieng had charge of this program in my time. Need I say more?

11. Generally helpful....could have used a few more days of training initially, but on the job training is the bestgenerally supportive

12. Always felt as if we could call and talk. Problems were taken care of, etc. Lots of Christian caring displayed. [smile face drawn here] *later 4/91* *Hagador*

13. Helpful as far as training....biggest concern was scheduling, some difficulties there....I also thought it would be nice if we received some progress reports on our congregations that we had already worked.

14. The best training is on hands experience, classroom training is theory, out on the street is reality.

15. This is a hard subject for me to answer. Our team was first to go out. We were as you could say the guinea pigs of the outreach game. All of these were problems but they all got worked out.

17) We were well prepared for our work, but many times the congregations we were working for could have been better informed and better prepared.

18. Harry H. was very good. Since he was new we didn't expect much input from him, but he was supportive. Kelm also. We needed to hear more from synod though. Contact was usually one way.

19. the training was too long and once we were gone it was a numbers game. The BHM seemed to not be interested in us, but in the results. We were not encouraged if things did not go well.

20. We often had questions about our position (hours to work, 'special situations' etc.) and were usually left in the hands of the local pastor who occasionally did not agree with what we were taught by GBHM.

22. Sometimes there was a lack of communication which made us feel left out of the whole process. The team needs to know what's going on at all times.

24. The Board has been extremely helpful all year and they do their best to make sure that this program gets its best shot to be a success.

1 usual routine
2 pastor do new mode, not well
3 new, young leaders
4 Long time a good group of team experts not redwired
5 a. adult evangelism

4. How has your outreach work influenced your attitude of ministry?

- 8 (2) I continue to make calls in my present congregation
- 4 I continue to train outreach workers in my present congregation
- 6 (1) I am a strong mission or outreach voice in my present congregation
- 5 I consider myself a valuable special asset in the Lord's kingdom
- 4 I am an active 'friendship' evangelist in my present community
- 8 (2) None of the above is truly accurate in my case [some respondents are present team members]

Not real high numbers
some still in program, some humble, some 1st year teachers

1. I am actually almost ashamed I am not involved in evangelism. Yet, I have given two "chats" on the team last year. both groups were interested. Most groups I've spoken to in the past were unaware such a program existed! I am also relieved to not be swamped by things my first year teaching!

2. In my community, it is such a small one, that everyone knows everyone else and everyone has their own religious preference.

3. Since I'm still on the team I am not yet doing work with my home congregation, but I hope I will be. Personally, Outreach work has been a great blessing and strengthening to my spiritual life!

4. I have made several presentations to local congregations dealing with the Synod's Outreach Program.

5. The parish ministry is a very nice place to be. *Pastors not always happy for him cost*

6. I never realized how difficult that call could be until I did it. Neither did I realize how rewarding it could be. If I ever run into a situation at our church or outreaching, I will participate.

7. It's hard to brag!! We carry on the Lord's work and leave the success to the Holy Spirit.

8. [My outreach work] influenced how I view evangelism. I love it. I enjoy talking to people as much as I can.

9. I feel it is the responsibility of pastors to follow-up on prospects.

10. My experience has made it easier for me to make calls and to know what to do when I get there.

11. I am a New Mode pastor, so I'm still doing the same thing. It is hanging out a little at this point. It is very intense work. I would suggest that in the future, no New Modes should be filled by a pastor who just got done with Outreach team work. Let the guy incorporate these skills into an establishe church. Give him a New Mode call down the road, but not right away.

12. I am presently a member of our Evangelism Committee and I am in charge of the Canvass/Witness/Training part of it all. We held a canvass this past summer and covered around 900 homes in the area.

We are still in the process of doing follow-up calls with a calling group of about 5 at the present time. We are also in the process of training 4-5 new people to make calls. I believe I am one voice for outreach in my congregation.

14. I have not been home yet, and I feel that I am not a special asset in the Lord's kingdom, I am just like any other lay person, just trying to bring others to church.

15. I have not received a call for this year of service for the Synod. I know it is a very hard road that many may follow with me, but I also feel that the experience I have gone through and the churched and un-churched people I have met I will never forget nor do I want to. This experience will stay with me the rest of my life. I hope the Lord blesses each Sem graduate with such an experience.

16. My outreach work helped me to be more outgoing and unafraid to talk to people. That was good when I had to talk to parents of my school children. Reno didn't have any evangelism program. The church I now attend has limited evangelism and I am a part of that.

17. Our congregation does a little canvassing and I have helped with this work. I now understand a lot better what it is like to be unchurched and to come to a strange church so it's easier for me to help them feel at ease and fit in.

19. I push for evangelism but I often feel burnt out and can also get a negative attitude toward outreach.

20. My year of outreach was a direct cause of my receiving a call of "Minister of Evangelism" where I was able to set up an evangelism system, make thousands of calls (mostly follow-up), and train dozens of people to proclaim the gospel. Communicating the gospel to people greatly strengthened my own faith to the point of seeking the preaching ministry. I will be entering WLS in the Fall of '87). I do not make calls in my present situations as the pastors here feel it would "overburden" me, since I already work with the youth group and attend school.

21. I'm not really sure what you mean, but being a woman, I feel that even if I had a desire to make calls, I don't feel that I would get much support for such work here. I enjoyed speaking to people about my Savior, but it was very difficult and I have not done any canvassing or evangelism calls since my year was completed.

22. My husband and I have joined Ascension in Plymouth--one of the churches our team worked with in April. I have been making follow up calls once again here and I can't believe the number of people who remembered me after 6 months. It was a neat feeling.

5. Evaluate this statement:

The work of the Outreach Team could be done as well and more economically by sending a "Mission Counselor" to train and

7 agree 12 - disagree 4 neither

1

*Don't get 2. Can also be done, one or two being
to callin of the "people"
mission team, but it's important to have that agency*

*But the 4. concept gets much more into the work
6 more money
7 permit with calls no clergy follow-up*
equip the congregation to do the work itself.

*5 people can talk
5 people along on a call*

1) This is a good idea--provided the congregation is willing to do all the work---SOLO. It was a big help to offer to just let them "come along" to listen. But if the Mission Counselor had lots of small meetings maybe in several homes, people could get lots of practice with each other.

*G
small mission
should needs help*

2. I feel the Outreach Team is a necessary tool because it is my opinion that you can train a congregation, but the members are hesitant to do it.

B Counselor would love to stay there, not just 1 meeting

3) It would certainly be more economical, but I don't feel it would be as effective. Most congregational members haven't taken the initiative to organize or do the work without a team's influence and initiative.

B

4) No. the motivation and time is not going to exist, no matter how good the Mission Counselor could be. The mission churches are too small to adequately handle the program effectively.

B

5) My thoughts exactly 2 years ago and today.

6. As I think back, the congregation that helped out the most got the most out of it. it should be the people of the congregation doing the calling--that's what outreach is.

G

7) for the long-range results, I would say you're correct. If you want immediate prospects, the team can cover many homes in a short time.

8. No. First the mission counselor's job is to help the pastor as a person not the congregation. Second, the missions where this has gone, rarely had any evangelism work going, so the people were scared.

B

9) I think that is a superb idea! In that way the congregations are getting trained to do the work themselves.

G

10. first of all, I think the BHM overstepped its bounds because it went ahead with the program before seeking Synod approval. However, to the point, I feel the Outreach Team would be more effective because it supplies people who can do the work and go out with .

B

11. I agree 90%.

G

12. A mission counselor would perhaps "force" churches to do the evangelism themselves, but many of them don't have much manpower plus I think one mission counselor my find working alone quite draining emotionally; maybe they'd get closer to congregation members but I don't know.

*B
Base money*

13. If the Mission Counselor is able to stay at a congregation for 2-3 months, I believe he could. Economically I am sure it would save

G

some money. I believe that you can't just rush a congregation into making calls. The counselor would first have to get a good base of people to start making calls. By a good base, I mean a least 5/6 people to help start the work (preparing materials, mailings, etc....one person can't do that all by himself.)

B (14) I would agree with the statement, because members of the congregation are permanent and therefore could continue to call on a person. The one mission congregation in Omaha had some members who really thought evangelism important and went out on calls without training. Plus they were evangelists when they were on their jobs and throughout the day. G

G (15) Very false. There are too many congregations that need training and emotional support for one man to handle. Besides by sending a team those four people can be in four different places at once for up to a full month. Training is not enough. A day by day working side by side is the only way. These people trained in outreach will be dedicated evangelists for the rest of their lives. B

16. I think it's good to have a special group come in to do outreach work. It helps to get some enthusiasm in the congregation for mission work. The congregation should be able to do the work themselves so it can be a continuous program rather than a 3 week spurt of evangelism. In that way a Mission Counselor would be very beneficial. B

17. I don't agree. Most people will not jump at the chance to knock on strangers doors to talk about religion. They need people to go out with them and show them its not so bad. The outreach team could do this more effectively because they are more like lay people--ordinary Christians without a fancy title. People listne to and trust other lay people more easily. It's like, "If he can do it, so can I." B

G (18) In a few places where people are eager and can motivate themselves. Some places need help. Pastor can't do it alone. B

19. I disagree because if we wouldn't have done the work I don't think it would have been done. The pastor didn't seem to want to do it. B

G* (20) You would be asking one man to do the work of 5. Naturally the results would be minimized accordingly. He could certainly present strategies and techniques; where the real training takes place, he would only be able to take one person at a time to the door, where an outreach team would be training 5 at a time. B

21. I think the most economical thing to do would be to drill into the Pastors and Teachers the importance of the work, first, then maybe a mission counselor would do some good. I feel that the entire subject is ignored too much because it's usually thankless work.

22. That might work better because if the congregation didn't do

anything, nothing would get done. However, that's bad for the program itself. I think the congs. need to be more informed well before they even take on the program. It would help if the congregation had already been trained somewhat before the team arrives.

24. The suggestion of a mission counselor has merit. But consider this: next year there will be five "mission counselors" going into five different WELS congregations.

- 1. Better Organizational Communication
- 2. Volunteering - pull down it
- 3. Better plan out

4. Congregation more prepared / Pastor better advised

6. Any suggestions for improving the outreach program?

2. Give them more and better training.

- 1. volunteers
- 2. more training + communication
- 3. better prepared congregations

3. When contacting the pastors who will be working with the team at their congregations, they should be encouraged to be examples of evangelists for their members sake.

4. More communication and planning between the outreach workers and the GBHM. (letters, phone, visits)

5. Base the team in a major city for 3-6 months and work with 3-6 different congregations. Rent apartments for them. Let them use own vehicles and do away with "pro-rated" pay. Pay them code.

7. More communication with Mission Board.....localized teams used on a temporary basis 1/2 to 1/3 a year.

8. 1. Use teachers and pastors who want to do the work. 2. Give them an honest chance to back out, if they can explain why they feel it is not for them.

10. Make it a three month summer program.

11. Make assignments from a list of 'volunteers' at DMLC and WLS.

12. Make sure enough short vacations are scheduled otherwise the work can seem hard in the psychological sense and have last day in a city be a light odds and ends work day. Without some of these things burn out is very real.

13. Inform the congregations beforehand exactly what is expected of them.

14. Time to recreate.

16. Less expense for the congregations involved.

20. Much more communication between GBHM and the local congregation. Several times the congregation wasn't ready for us when we arrived. Nor did they understand their responsibilities toward the program or us. One congregation did not even want us and was directly opposed to our being there.

21. I'm not sure what has been done in the last 3 years, but having been from the very first group, I feel maybe it should be on a volunteer basis for only those interested, secondly I found that our supervisor was not any better trained than we were--more training is a must! especially for the teams.

22. Don't let anyone tell you that it's not worthwhile.

Appendix

4

Alein

Congregations
With Teams

26 returned

*Missions
Club to Dept*

Part I

1. What media vehicles did you use? _____

Direct Mailings, Newspaper, Radio, Door Hangers in all cases.
Some also used billboards and TV.

2. How many homes did you hope to reach? _____

- | | | | |
|-------------------|---------------------|---------------|----------|
| 1. Pt. Washington | 8. 5000 | 16. 4000 | 23. x |
| 2. 3000 | 9. 50,000 | 17. 5000 | 24. 3000 |
| 3. 5000 mailed | 10. 3667 | 18. 3-4000 | 25. 5000 |
| 3000 door | 11. 6000 | 19. 5000 | 26. 7000 |
| 4. 5000 | 12. 10,000 | 20. x | |
| 5. 5000 | 13. @2500 in person | 21. 5000 mail | |
| 6. 3500 | 14. 5000 | 100,000TV | |
| 7. 5000 | 15. x | 22. 7000 | |

3. Evaluate the positive identity of your congregation in the community BEFORE and AFTER the campaign on a scale of 0 -10, ten being the highest rating. BEFORE _____ AFTER _____
What are the reasons for this evaluation?

	<u>B</u>	<u>A</u>		<u>B</u>	<u>A</u>		<u>B</u>	<u>A</u>
1.	3	4	8.	0	2metro	14.	5	7
2.	7	8		0	9neigh.	15.	x	x
3.	0	5	9.	1	3	16.	2	8
4.	5	8	10.	0	0	17.	1	3
5.	1	1	11.	1	4=6	18.	3	5
6.	5	5	12.	1	5	19.	2	3
7.	2/3	6	13.	0	3	20.	x	x

*improved
slightly*

1. Not having our building at that point made it difficult to build positive community awareness of our congregation. Yet we had already canvassed Pt. Wash. twice before the TAS program when the TCW teams came to town. We really didn't make much of a greater impact with the TCW.
2. Our approach wasn't pushy. The gospel is positive.
3. We started our congregation with a mass media campaign. This is not typical. There was almost no previous advertising in a non-Lutheran area.
4. The congregation had a neutral identity before the campaign. Everybody knew it was the new church on 13th Ave. But not too many knew anything about it. After the campaign I would guess the image improved somewhat in the minds of some people.
5. Houston is a huge city. The campaign we ran may have been big time stuff for the WELS, but in this metropolis market it was a drop in the bucket.

6. I have no way to objectively answer this question. I don't know if the campaign had an effect on the community. Yes, it did on some of the people we came in contact with, but as for impact on the community, I don't know the answer.
7. Media was well done, not high pressured. Canvass-survey format was non-threatening, and zeroed in on the concerns of most people.
8. The metro community is difficult to reach-minimal response to radio, TV, newspaper. The neighborhood was reached by door-to-door personal contact, which I believe is the most effective way for recognition.
9. We started as an exploratory 2 years ago. We did some preliminary work before our media work.
10. The people, by and large, recognize no church that does not have a large house of worship that is readily identifiable. The radio was of little value due to odd times the commercials played. No one reads the local paper. The billboards were not and could not be seen by anyone in this city. We were part of an area mass media push.
11. improved community awareness
12. Still seem to run into people who don't know we're in the Rogue Valley. The WELS is an unknown in Southern Oregon and many who do know us say we're too strict.
13. By and large people don't give a crap about church here in Alaska. Not that many listen to radio and read the paper. When they did run across our ads not that many people sat back and said to themselves, "Wow, I wish I could hook up with that church body!" That just didn't happen. And I asked a lot of people too! Of those who heard and saw our ads, few even remembered anything about them. My opinion, as you will find out below, is that Mass Media was a total waste of Lutheran Brotherhood's money. Really. Glad we didn't foot the bill!
16. Before we were relatively unknown. After we were very well known and we were well received-at least by the Christian community. One Presb. said, "At last the Christian Church is reaching out. Not just the Mormans."
17. We weren't by any means a household name after the Mass Media campaign, but we were better known at least.
18. This is most difficult. The media blitz does not create an awareness for perhaps 30-60 days, but then this quickly fades. We are continuing a "low key" advertising program in the newspaper only.
19. We had no advert. prior to this effort. Could not afford to continue ad campaign. However, had many compliments from "churched" people I met.

21. We were virtually unknown before the mass media campaign. Afterwards much of the city had at least heard our name.
 Note: the mass media is not as effective as one might think.

22. Lutherans in the South are still thought to be Catholic. Some Lutherans are Catholic.

25. I felt the campaign gave us little identity in the community. At the time we were a group of 25 people meeting in a grade school cafeteria in a metro area of 400,000. Being realistic, there was very little to identify us by.

Part II

1. Evaluate your members' image of their church BEFORE and AFTER the media assisted campaign on a scale of 0 -10. BEFORE ___ AFTER ___
 What are the reasons for this evaluation?

①
 improved
 image

	B	A		B	A		B	A
1.	x	x	8.	3	8	15.	x	x
2.	7	8	9.	8	8	16.	8	8
3.	x	x	10.	5	5	17.	8	9
4.	5	5	11.	2	8	18.	x	x
5.	8	9	12.	8	10	19.	4	6
6.	x	x	13.	10	10	20.	x	x
7.	6	8	14.	5	6	21.	2	4

very high
 image of church
 members' church

problems
 not used to

①. Because it was all so quickly thrust upon us, we hardly had time to organize, let alone motivate any congregational enthusiasm for it. For some, it knid of irritated with an implication that our congregation hadn't been doing anything.

2. Convinced we are truly concerned about sharing the faith.

4. I don't think it affected most of them. Although some were impressed with the radio spot ads.

no change

5. I think there was a short-term improvement in our self-image, which was followed by disappointment that all our effort and expense produced so little in the way of tangivle results.

7. Their own awarenss of actively doing Jesus' work and their excitement when a prospect was uncovered.

8. The psychology factor of group identification, "That's my church on TV" The congregational members were individually involved etc. in their church. The members saw results from their effort.

10. Members made it a point not to get too involved or too interested.

11. Sharing faith builds faith.

12. Our members are for the most part dedicated Christian people who come to church for the right reasons. I think they see our church as a caring church and the mass media reaffirmed that.

13. Although spiritual growth among the members of the congregation was evident, especially on the part of those who helped survey and hang doorhangers, this whole thing didn't make that much difference. Part of that could be my fault for not getting the people keyed up for big-time evangelism. But hey, these people are evangelists - only not in the big-time mass media-type ways that many in other parts of the nation are. Honestly, I think the campaign did little if any good in this way.
14. The program raised members' self-image, but not extremely so. People felt good about it.
15. The media campaign did little to enhance the image of our church among members. They already had a good image and retained it.
17. Just the fact that the Gospel was being brought to them on a regular basis had already given them a positive self-image. This positive outlook increased when they saw the Synod's willingness to subsidize and assist with a media campaign.
18. I really don't think the media blitz had much of an effect on our present members. Some of our people were not particularly pleased with this form of "merchandizing" the church. (especially the billboards.)
19. They were impressed with the materials our Synod has produced and with the TCW team. We began with a special "rally" service which received compliments.
21. Our members were quite positive before the media blitz. I think they were expecting more immediate results from it, thus a 4 instead of a higher rating.
22. It was high in both cases. Mission people are unique in that respect.
25. Before little was known by our exploratory group other than "they"-the WELS had closed down this explor. once, and "they"-the WELS had decided to give Baton Rouge a 2nd chance. After most people were impressed with the quality materials we received for use in our campaign.

2. Do you feel that this campaign stimulated your members to carry out 'friendship evangelism.' Yes No
Relate any evidence of such friendship witnessing you observed as a result of this campaign. (Totals: 7-YES 19-NO)

YES: 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 11, 22

NO: 1, 4, 5, 6, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26

2. One of the prospects invited a friend who in turn invited parents, resulting in 5 adult confirmations. One family invited their couple they babysit for plus involved a relative in our church in a neighboring city.

lean
influence?
no

less the
without
teams

3. One confirmand brought a close friend and she completed instruction and joined a few months later.
5. From my perspective, Mass Media did not have much impact either way on the friendship witnessing that our people have always been doing.
7. When some of the canvassers returned for follow-up calls, there was a helpfulness in their going-not a drudge.
8. Subsequently, the Mater's Plan was initiated with good response. Presently, our high priority prospects are coming from new members bringing their unchurched family members or neighbors.
12. Most of them still aren't into inviting people or bringing them the first time.
13. "Most people come into contact with a church through their friends." You'll hear that a lot, and it's 100% true! Although I can't dig up one recollection about a member of mine giving a polished Law and Gospel presentation to a friend, I can cite daily examples from many people who plant the seed of curiosity and interest until their friends ask me after church if they can take Adult Info class. Spit and polished evangelism? Maybe not. Souls getting pointed to heaven? You bet!!!
15. No! Our members carried out "friendship evangelism" before the campaign. The 1st adult class I had after we started the congregation had 10 members. 8 were friends of members.
18. Probably, but have no specific evidence of this to recount.
21. There seemed to be no connection between the media work and incentives to friendship evangelism.
22. Bringing people to church, knowledge of our church to friends.

Part III

How did the outreach campaign affect the mission awareness within your congregation?

Check those areas where long-term effects of the outreach campaign may be noticeable:

13 _____ sensitivity to visitors 6,7,8,9,12,13,14,16,18,19,22,25,26

COMMENT:

6. Before the effort there was little awareness. The TCW effort got the ball rolling and it is finally having impact on the congregation 3 years later. Some are becoming mission-minded and are working to become evangelists.

7. The atmosphere of welcome has always been there.

10. A problem-always has been.

- 12.They are pretty good at saying hi to a stranger.
- 13.Yes, this was a benefit. However, visitor welcoming and warmness to guests is something that, I found, needs to be reasserted and retaught constantly throughout the year.
- 18.Our people have been sensitive in this areas, but this no doubt did increase awareness of the visitor.
- 19.Much more friendly
- 20.Possibly oversensitive, but our congregation definitely learned to be friendly to the visitors we had come through our doors.

10 further use of mail or media 2,5,7,10,12,17,18,21,22,25

COMMENT:

- 2.Over 300 pieces mailed monthly to prospects.
- 5.We had a regular ongoing proram of newspaper advertising before Mass Media ever came along. In effect, Mass Media interrupted what we were already doing. It was noce to have someone else pay for all that advertising, but then after Mass Media was over it took about 6 months to get back to our own program of regular ads. And experience has shown that we get more and better response to a low-key ongoing approach rather than one big splash.
- 7.Bulk mail, door hangers and ads are part of our regular canvass efforts.
- 10.The mass media campaign heightened the members belief that evangelism is puuting a couple things in a lot of people's mailboxes.
- 12.We are still using direct mailing.
- 13.Believe me, for us this mass mail and media was a complete waste of money. Glad it wasn't all mine is all I can say. Personal contact is what matters, not this "softening them up" by mail.
- 14.We've done more.
- 17/We are regular users of the mass mailing approach.
- 18.We are mailing our special letters to newcomers in our immediate sector of the city welcoming them to our neighborhood and seeking to make contacts with them.
- 19.Wish it had. However, financial difficulties make this impossible.
- 21.We eventually got a bulk mailing permit and used it for mailing.
- 24.(Overall)Result was rather negative. Congregation as a whole was turned off to the approach due to the lack of success.

7 increased outreach budgeting 2,7,10,14,16,18,22

COMMENT:

7. Not newly increased, but consistently significant

10. The budget has been no problem for evangelism, but it seems that's more of a "take the dollars and do it and leave me alone" approach to evangelism.

13. What increased is our enthusiasm to personally evangelize. I purposely cut our outreach budget down because I am still convinced that personal (call it friendship) evangelism is much more effective.

16. Only so much money is available. We use low cost evangelism like door bags and print own materials.

18. Have increased this 100% but it was quite low before. Still working on this.

6 Greater planning for outreach 8,9,12,18,19,22

COMMENT:

2. Canvassed homes where no one was home during Outreach of 85.

10. A problem-no desire-always has been

12. We are working on canvassing certain areas.

13. To be coming. Nothing as mega-bucks as that outreach campaign though!

16. I'm not sure this was a result of outreach efforts or not. I think I learned it from Joel Gerlach at a Seminar.

18. Now have an "Evangelism Coordinator" (layman) working full-time with pastor and are developing more complete plans.

19. There has been some. Though in a recent voters meeting it mainly centered around the pastor getting "out more."

22. Still a long way from excellent planning.

6 increased concern for the lost in your community 6,9,13,17,18,22

COMMENT:

10. None-see no change

12. Not really

13. Always present. Still is.

16. If we're not concerned about the lost, who are we concerned about?

*after team left,
Kings went back to
normal*

*not much
seen effort*

Don

17. The Mass Media program emphasized that we were not simply to be the last bastion of orthodoxy, but an evangelizing, outward looking body obedient to the Great Commission.

18. This is hard to evaluate, but we feel it is growing.

15 subsequent evangelism efforts: (please specify) 2,3,8,9,10,
12,13,14,16,17,18,19,21,22,24.

positive

2. Follow-up of prospects continues.

3. Nearly all our members have been won from the community. We started as exploratory and the congregation is as a result very aware of all the above areas. They know what it is like to be new to the group and they try to make others feel at home.

7. Attempt 1 major canvass a year. Different emphasis: 1. Bible Study, 2. Sunday School.

8. Monthly mailings, "Day-Away" ministry oriented to young families in community, lay visitation of new people.

9. a. Visitor's Days every 6 months. b. "Agape" meetings once a month to promote friendship evangelism. c. Evangelism Weekend by District Evangelism Committee.

10. it fostered (by use of TCW teams) an increase in "if someone else is doing it, I'm all for it."

12. Follow-up has been our basic thrust this year. Have about 50 homes that we still go back to periodically and extend invitations.

14. Targeted mass mailings, Fair booth, church prome, free water, and brochures. Bible classes by correspondence course. Future-Friendship evangelism.

16. Again we were canvassing before the campaign. The campaign was just another evangelism effort.

17. Canvassing, Mass mailing, Friendship Evangelism "The Master's Plan, Newcomer's packets

18. Develop special plans (short and long range) for Community outreach. Planning on showing Marriage Enrichment Series of tapes during Jan. and Feb. 1987 and invite the public to join us using PSA.

19. A mass mailing was sent out, finances follow-up issues. A new format newsletter was favorable received, finances pending.

21. We learned what works and what doesn't. We became more realistic in how much to do at once. We learned the cost of various media.

22. Easter mailings, Newcomer visits and packet development, more newspaper advertising.

24. Canvasses, surveys, newcomer welcomes, Friendship Evangelism Seminar, Witness teams support group.

Part IV

1. How many prospects were discovered in the campaign? _____

- | | | | |
|-----------|-----------------------|----------|---------|
| 1. x | 8. 300 | 15. 31 | 22. 100 |
| 2. 300 | 9. 219 | 16. 300 | 23. x |
| 3. 40 | 10. 4 of 250 suspects | 17. 176 | 24. 120 |
| 4. x | 11. x | 18. @10 | 25. @55 |
| 5. 5 est. | 12. 150 | 19. @200 | 26. @50 |
| 6. 87 | 13. @150 | 20. x | |
| 7. 250 | 14. 25 to 50 | 21. @120 | |

2. How many of those prospects are still, in some way, on your congregation's nurturing list (occasional mailing or visitation)?

- | | | | |
|-----------|---------|----------------------|--------|
| 1. x | 8. 200 | 15. 3 | 21. 0 |
| 2. 300 | 9. 100 | 16. 12 | 22. 3 |
| 3. 75 | 10. 2 | 17. 2 | 23. x |
| 4. x | 11. x | 18. 2 | 24. 0 |
| 5. 1 or 2 | 12. 50 | 19. 110 family units | 25. 12 |
| 6. 2 | 13. @40 | 20. x | 26. 20 |
| 7. 5 | 14. 5 | | |

3. On average, how many follow-up calls did your congregation make on a prospect before placing the name in the "inactive file"?

- | | | | |
|-----------|------------|------------|-------|
| 1. x | 8. 5 to 10 | 15. 2 | 22. 4 |
| 2. ? | 9. ? | 16. 12 | 23. x |
| 3. ? | 10. 1 to 2 | 17. 2 | 24. x |
| 4. x | 11. x | 18. 2 to 3 | 25. 3 |
| 5. 1 or 2 | 12. 6 | 19. 2 | 26. x |
| 6. 3 | 13. 4 to 5 | 20. x | |
| 7. 3 | 14. 3 to 4 | 21. 1 or 2 | |

4. How many prospects were referred to you by the people you contacted through the campaign? _____

- | | | | |
|--------|---------|---------|-------|
| 1. x | 8. few | 15. 0 | 22. 0 |
| 2. 2 | 9. 1 | 16. 4 | 23. x |
| 3. @10 | 10. 0 | 17. 0 | 24. x |
| 4. x | 11. x | 18. @30 | 25. 0 |
| 5. 0 | 12. 2 | 19. 0 | 26. x |
| 6. x | 13. @40 | 20. x | |
| 7. 0 | 14. x | 21. 0 | |

Part V

1. How many members were trained for follow-up calls during or just prior to the campaign?_

1. x	8. 10	15. 0	22. 6
2. 4	9. 6	16. 10	23. x
3. N/A	10. 0	17. 0	24. 10
4. x	11. x	18. 2	25. 3
5. 0	12. 10	19. 4	26. x
6. 0	13. 3	20. x	
7. 0	14. 6	21. 0	

less than without
 14-0
 7 - several

2. Who was responsible for training these callers? _____

- | | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| 2. Outreach Team | 14. Team and pastor |
| 5. Pastor | 16. Team and pastor |
| 6. TCW team-but didn't work out | 17. I was. Being one of the earliest attempts at Mass Media and TCW style outreach, we were ill-prepared to do it well. |
| 7. Pastor | 18. Pastor |
| 8. Pastor and evang. director | 19. Pastor and Stadler tapes |
| 9. Pastor | 21. pastor |
| 10. Pastor | 22. Pastor |
| 12. Pastor + Pastor John Kuske | 24. TCW Team |
| 13. Outreach Team+Pastor | 25. Myself+Pastor |
| | 26. Pastor |

7 said Team raised them

3. What method was used to train them? (be specific please)

2. Pamphlet "Are you getting the most out of life?"

5. Our training sessions concentrated on how to take surveys. We showed the Dick Stadler videotape as part of the training program. We also had a training day one Saturday at the parsonage where we practiced surveying each other before going out to take surveys in the community.

*didn't take
 her along*

7. TAS, Great Exchange

8. T.A.S. initially, The Master's Plan later

9. S.A. District Evangelism Bible Studies, group meetings with pastor's own materials.

10. a. Demonstration use of Mass Media follow-up materials. b. Attempted to take people with to give them an idea of how to talk to people about Jesus.

12. We practiced on each other. Before they went out on their own, they went with someone else who had experience, and listened to a couple of presentations.

13. A little TAS, a little Great Exchange. Most of the training was not used because the follow-up was done mostly by Kenyon and myself. In fact, of the prospects gained I still have

regular contact in some way or another with many of them, although they have not joined my church.

14. Taking prospects through printed materials including "We'd like you to know the Great Exchange."
16. God's Great Exchange
18. God's Great Exchange
19. TAS/ Though some was abbreviated and adapted.
21. TCW tape by Pastor Stadler.
22. "Soldiers of the Cross"
25. Four weekly meetings at which we went through "The Great Exchange and hi-lights of TAS."
26. Used brochure-Great Exchange.

4. How many follow-up calls were made during the campaign?

1. x	2. 500est	3. 200est	4. 200-300
5. 220	6. 245	7. 431	8. 150
9. 120	10. 350	11. NA	12. 150
13. zillions	14. 250?	15. 0	16. 900
17. 400	18. 50 to 60	19. 145est	20. x
21. 100est	22. 500?	23. x	24. 0
25. 450	26. 180est.		

5. How many members made follow-up calls during the campaign?

1. x	2. 4 to 5	3. NA	4. 1
5. 0	6. 3	7. 4	8. 10
9. 6	10. 3	11. 0	12. 3
13. 0	14. 7	15. 0	16. 6
17. 0	18. 2	19. 2	20. x
21. 0	22. 6	23. x	24. 0
25. 3	26. 3		

6. How many of that number are still active evangelists in the congregation (if some have transferred out of your congregation, please indicate this)?

1. x	2. 0	3. NA	4. 0
5. x	6. 2	7. 2 (2 trans)	8. 4
9. 6	10. 3	11. 0	12. 3
13. x	14. 4	15. 0	16. 4
17. 0	18. 1	19. 0	20. 2
21. 0	22. 6	23. x	24. 0
25. 0	26. 2		

not good

7. How many members have been trained for evangelism since the campaign?

1. x	2. 0	3. 10	4. 0
5. 6	6. x	7. 2	8. 0
9. 3	10. 0	11. 0	12. 0
13. x	14. 0	15. 4	16. 3
17. 19 frndshp	18. 1	19. 0	20. 1
21. 11	22. 25	23. x	24. 2
25. 0	26. 3		

Good

PART VI

1. How many people visited the church or inquired about the church as a direct or indirect result of the outreach campaign?

1. x	2. 30	3. 20est	4. 10
5. 2	6. 3	7. 4	8. 140
9. 25	10. 4	11. 100est	12. 7 families
13. 80	14. 25	15. 0	16. 30
17. 5	18. 10-12	19. 10	20. x
21. 3 fam.	22. 25	23. x	24. 5
25. 20est	26. 20est		

2. How many people began an adult instruction class as a direct or indirect result of the campaign?

1. x	2. 29	3. 10	4. 7
5. 0	6. 1	7. 5	8. 30
9. 20	10. 2	11. 16	12. 5
13. 16-18	14. 0	15. 0	16. 3
17. 2	18. 10	19. 2	20. x
21. 2 fam	22. 4	23. x	24. 5
25. 2	26. 4		

3. With how many prospects did your congregation have at least one opportunity to explain sin and grace?

1. x	2. 500est	3. 40	4. 100
5. 14	6. 25-30	7. 431	8. 150
9. 80	10. 50-100	11. 500	12. 150
13. 1000est	14. 75	15. 31	16. 300est
17. 400	18. 20	19. 40est	20. x
21. 100	22. 350?	23. x	24. ?
25. 50est	26. 30		

great!

4. How many people have become members of your congregation as a direct or indirect result of your outreach campaign?

1. x	2. 24	3. 12	4. 5
5. 0	6. x	7. 4	8. 8
9. 5	10. 2	11. 25	12. 3 communicants
13. 10	14. 1 maybe	15. 0	16. 14 bap 3 adul con
17. 1	18. 2 (2 more?)	19. 1 fam	20. x
21. 1 fam	22. 4	23. x	24. 3
25. 0	26. 0		

good

*1 Team got help visiting a little down road
2 off the team, all old
3 not much work*

PART VII

1. If you had an outreach team assist your campaign, comment on its effectiveness AND offer suggestions for improvement?

1. x (letter available)

2. ~~very effective~~---more follow-up by outreach team would have helped.

3. ~~They were the inspiration.~~ Next time I would do those homes in high turn areas and catch everyone possible, but not overdue it. Instead of 300 homes maybe 1500 to 2000.

4. They do a tremendous amount of work in a short period of time. but when they leave, the work failed. first, their prospects came to know them---when they left, and the pastor (me) showed up at their door---it was another stranger. second, the team is needed to follow-up on its own work, several months later. I think the Outreach team to be effective needs to stay longer in one place and return to a place where they had worked.

They were capable and conscientious. They were hampered by poor weather. They were pretty well burned-out on TCW lifestyle. But they gave it their best shot anyway. TCW pastor was not here long enough to really accomplish much with his follow-up calls.

6. Too many houses covered. Survey work should stress quality, not quantity. TCW team was too prone to give up on "prospects."

7. One of the 1st TCW efforts used. Hood record keeping--standardized-- is *essential*.

8. ~~Effective in motivation and inspiration~~ to congregational laity; the zeal and energy of youth was a factor for above improvement--no comment

9. There were far greater gains for the invisible church than our visible church.

10. TCW did its job well. It was the first year and most approached it as a job. The team here could have used something to help keep their spirits up.

11. ~~Very effective~~--left home pastor with too many to follow up in a reasonable amount of time--suggest another pastor or two follow-up the team about 2 months after they leave

12. For the most part the team worked hard. The 4 weeks they were here we saw no visitors in church. The week they left we saw 2 new families in church. Canvass work never seems to bear much fruit as far as numbers are concerned, but the identity in the area is a plus. More billboard coverage in the area might be an improvement. Lots cheaper than radio spots, too.

13. Very effective, although they would have been much more effective if we had prepared better. You see, the Alaska Outreach things was sorta a last-minute decision and us pastors were left in the dark about lots of the preparation ideas until it was nearly too late. Am I laying blame for the lack of success on someone else? You bet! With all niceties aside, I am glad Larry Zwieg is somewhere else but at 2929. Seriously, the team did a super job, but the ill-prepared and uninformed congregation they had to work with didn't compliment them very much.

14. The team did the work they were called to do. Suggestion: Determine who is the boss--BHM or local pastor.

15. From what I could see, the team did their work but it seems there was very poor preparation for the campaign and in fact I believe the congregation viewed the team as a group of people hired to do the work of evangelism in their place rather than with them.

16. I was a bit disappointed. None of them really wanted to be in outreach. They had to be pushed to work. They gave up too easily and rated all prospects as poor. For the money spent, we should have and could have done better.

17. They were still getting used to being far from the Midwest and living out of a suitcase when they were here. Under the circumstances, they did well. If it is not already being done, I

would suggest that they ask the members of the outreach team, prior to calling them, whether the idea of being on an outreach team appeals to them. I don't think it appeals to everyone. Further, I don't think every Christian has the spirit's gift to be an evangelist, though there are ways in which each of us can be responsive to the Great Commission.

18. The Outreach team ~~did a fine job~~. The prospect list, however, was "overly optimistic" when careful follow-up ensued. They really needed more time and we needed more trained workers to follow-up their contacts.

19. Well-trained. However, follow-up effectiveness would have been vastly improved for me if they had gotten the NAMES, even a last name off of a mailbox. Of about 500 cards they filled out I only had about 35-45 with names. It was very hard getting access to a current city directory and very time consuming work months later when I was able to return to work.

20. (letter attached)

21. A TCW team and a vicar helped. Weaknesses: unable to do effective follow-up since they spent only 3-4 weeks in our area. The method of follow-up was somewhat awkward it seemed--not sure why, it seemed to rushed.

22. Much better preparation. 3 1/2 years ago we were given only 6 weeks to prepare campaign due to unreasonable time frame. We were one of the first to use the program. Also immediately after campaign a nearby pastor took a call and serving the vacancy meant problems following up here and there.

24. ~~Outreach team really didn't help that much because there was no follow-up after the campaign.~~ The congo has to be well organized for follow up and if they are they can do the whole thing themselves. Problem is not getting prospects but following up on them.

*Key
card*

25. ?

26. Would suggest that TCW be used for follow-up and leave initial canvass to individual congregation. TCW did canvass a good number of homes while here.

2. What suggestions would you offer to another congregation beginning a mass media campaign?

1. letter attached

2. Follow up is most important or forget.

3. Put your prospects in categories--hot, cold, in-between. Go for

the hot ones and put others on the back burner. Your time is limited. Set up an adult class and do everything possible to get them in it.

4. Don't consider such a campaign to be the one activity that will increase the size of the congregation in any vast degree. Evangelism is hard and never ending work. One campaign, ran a few weeks, if not continued by the pastor and congregation is wasted effort.

5. Ask yourself if its really the best possible use of all that time, energy, and money. [cf attached letter for extended comments]

6. Stress quality of calls, instead of quantity. Bite off a smaller chunk and work it well rather than try to reach many houses. Billboards are of limited value in a large metropolitan are. Make your survey "religious opinion" orientated--not "church affiliation" orientated.

7. Make sure evangelists are trained and ready first.

8. Planning is the key--best when done by one individual, probably pastor.

9. Train members well beforehand. Be well-organized for follow-up.

10. I wouldn't. I feel this was a strange situation (the first "area" MMM) and an unusual (hopefully) congregational setting.

11. Be ready to work!

12. Have plenty of people willing to help out. You need lots of legs to hang doorhangers on 5000 doors before the door to door work begins. Have members trained for follow-ups.

13. Don't. The "necessity" for a mass media campaign simply reveals a lack of personal evangelism on the part of those who desire it. If all the members of one of our 50 member mission congregations contacted 10 friends and nurtured them to come to church through personal witnessing and invitation, no flashy campaign would be necessary. Those are people who would stay, too, because the connection in the congregation is there through their friends. Thank God for those who have been snatched from hell through such a campaign, but more woulda been in other less expensive ways.

14. Don't do a MMM campaign until you learn about and promote friendship evangelism in cong. Better this than visitors meeting an unfriendly church. [see attached letter for more detailed comments.]

15. A year's worth of preparation and training in the congregation. Believe the congregation has to ? the program and be active in it besides just providing housing, money, etc. They need to do the work.

16. don't look at the MMM as a miracle worker. It helps with exposure. Also don't let them make you advertize where it's not appropriate for your area. We, as part of an area campaign, were forced to be part of an advertizing campaign on a rock and roll station in Anchorage. We are 60 miles from Anchorage living in a country living type of town where very few people listen to rock. We were forced to advertize in the Anchorage papers, when very few people read those papers. Be sure to do it all locally.

17. Do a lot of preparation beforehand. We did a lot, but we should have done much more. Time constraints and the distance our members lived from church made it difficult for us to prepare adequately. Perhaps such a campaign was "biting off more than we could chew," but I'd like a shot at doing it again sometime now that I know what to expect.

18. Give careful consideration to your particular local situation in your home community. Be sure that you have enough people who are willing and able to train for the follow up work. This is most critical to make these follow ups ASAP before the contacts have time to "cool off" or move away, etc.

19. Begin long ahead of the scheduled event (we were told about 1 1/2 months before the team arrived that we would have such an effort) in preparing up the people for evangelism. Begin officially with a special service, welcoming team, tec. Then have a special service when the team leaves which emphasizes that while the team is leaving the work is only beginning, that evangelism is a long-term working with people.

20. [see attached letter]

21. 1. Wait until a friendship evangelism program has been taught to most of congregation and is in motion. 2. Get a "farming" type of outreach established first. Use this instead of canvassing if you can't do both farming and canvass. 3. Have a well planned system and plan for follow up. (see addition comments in attached letter)

22. Prepare a year in advance. Synodical office should be better prepared to give information which I know is happening now.

25. Plan ahead minimum of 6 months in advance. We were "chosen" to have a MMM and had 2 months to get ready for it. consequently we had poor follow up and little after effect. Also draw out a detailed plan for keeping an on-going evangelism plan going. Also I wouldn't suggest this MMM for areas where we have only 1 exploratory mission. The cost is too great and unless things are much different elsewhere the effects are too minimal to justify using this tool in such areas. Use mass media in areas where there are two, three or more congregations. the whole campaign is not necessary for the 'loners'.

26. Outline the whole program on paper before beginning. Include all the details.

Appendix

5

9lein

Results From Mass Media Congregations

Not Using Outreach Teams

③

15 Returned

Anne Morgan
Larry Dubb

Part I

1. What media vehicles did you use? _____
Magazines-3; Radio-11; TV-3; Billboards-9; Newspaper-11;
Mailings-12; Door to Door Hangings-8; Bumper Stickers-1;
Sunday Bulletin-1.
2. How many homes did you hope to reach? _____
3500-7000-4000 to 5000-3300-2500-5300-X-4000-Twin Cities-2000-
1400-4000-4500-7000-1900. (Results always recorded in order, 1-15)
3. Evaluate the positive identity of your congregation in the
community BEFORE and AFTER the campaign on a scale of 0 -10, ten
being the highest rating. BEFORE _____ AFTER _____
What are the reasons for this evaluation? *12/38* *3.2 increase*
BEFORE-5-2-X-0-3-4-X-5-X-7-2-3 to 4-3-X-3
AFTER -6-8-X-5-8-7-X-7-X-9-5-4 to 5-7-X-8 (Improvement in every case!)
Number: 1.2.3.4.5.6.7.8.9...
Comments:
1. We received only a few favorable comments after the campaign.
2. nothing.
3. Very little data is available to asses impact realistically.
4. No history of evangelism at this congregation. Any activity
which called for our people to meet their neighbors is "positive".
5. Many people drive by the church-but never look at the name or
forget the name.
6. Since we have been here 119 years, there is community identi-
fication. Greatest improvement due to community aware of us
more, and realizing "our doors are open", and they are invited
and welcomed to be part of us.
7. X
8. The community looked upon us a closed church, a cold church, not
too interested in welcoming new folks. I think the perception
that the community now has of our church has improved.
9. We have internal troubles which may have negated some or much
of the outreach.
10. The church was we~~l~~-known. Community is small to begin with.
Better name recognition and what church body we were affiliated
with after campaign.
11. The congregation has kept a low profile. Since we did not try
to reach the whole community, we are still not well known.
However during the canvass we received positive comments, such
as, "It is nice to know your church is doing something in the
community."
12. Our areas is very mobile and transient. There is a need for
an on-going media identity. Our canvass and survey techniques
have given positive feedback.
13. We were unknown before-this has helped to make us visible.
14. I can't see much of a change before and after.
15. Because we are located on the far west of town, many have viewed
us a "country" church; we do not have a high visibility rating
with city traffic.

rt II

4. Evaluate your members' image of their church BEFORE and AFTER the media assisted campaign on a scale of 0-10. BEFORE ___ AFTER ___
What are the reasons for this evaluation?

BEFORE 5-3-x-5-4-6-x-7-5-x-3-4 to 5-5-x-5
AFTER 7-10x-6-6-8-x-8-7-x-5-5 to 6-6-x-6
Number 1.2.3.4.5.6.7.8.9.....

11/23

improvement
but nothing drastic

Comments:

1. There were some positive and favorable responses. I don't think there was a big dramatic change in attitude.
2. x
3. I think our members felt good about P.R. aspects, however I don't know if the dollar amount would be well received as a justifiable expense.
4. x
5. Many are not that organization conscious. Why "Come to the WELS"? Why not "Come to Holy Trinity"?
6. Increased pride and awareness as they see their church in non-traditional settings-radio, Billboard.
7. x
8. This church is well over 100 years old. It has always been interested in supporting missions.-now, I think, it sees itself as a mission congregation-it's mission to reach the unchurched in the community. But we still have many unwilling missionaries.
9. x
10. unaffected for the most part
11. The congregation had not been growing. They seem to apologize rather than have a positive attitude. Now more and more members are gaining the vision, we have something to share and others even want it. Prior to 1986 there was no evangelism committee. Also only 1 adult confirmation in 5 years.
12. GO-86 required an organized effort of a large number of members. We made use of many more member' talents than ever before.
13. No drastic changes-Perhaps being in the public eye made them feel more positive about themselves.
14. Again I don't see much of a change...It was just one of many things done during the year.
15. Hard to answer; hopefully there was an increased awareness of identity and purpose.

5. Do you feel that this campaign stimulated your members to carry our 'friendship evangelism.' yes 11 no 5

YES-2-4-5-6-8-9-10-11-12-13-15
NO-1-3-7-11-12-14

very positive
friendship thru own company
Lila Myrtin

Relate any evidence of such friendship witnessing you observed as a result of this campaign.

1. x
2. Members invited friends and neighbors to take part in a BIC-not only in a search for new members, but so that people may know the Bible's message of peace and joy.
3. x
4. Members attending 15 week doctrinal course immediately have adopted non-members without being urged.
5. Greeting people before and after worship services is now done by all, most of the time. They are feeling more that it is expected of them to do so.

6. Members talking more with family and friends re: membership and instruction. Visitors comment on our friendly atmosphere.
8. Families have been encouraging and have brought friends or neighbors
- 7.x
9. More friendship to visitors,
10. More serious talk with unchurched friends and neighbors. No longer weather, but Christ and church attendance.
11. The thrust was not friendship evangelism. However one who refused to go door to door brought her neighbor who has now joined the church. The neighbor has brought her sister to me for the purpose of baptizing three children.
12. This is a difficult question to answer. On the one hand it brought many together to share and express their faith. On the other hand there was no major emphasis on friendship witnessing. I believe we have a natural inclination to be closed-minded toward others.
13. More guests in church-brought by members.
14. I feel it did make them more aware of responsibilities in this area.
15. ~~More of a concerted effort to welcome visitors; also seems to be more of a desire to invite friends, neighbors, etc.~~

Part III

How did the outreach campaign affect the mission awareness within your congregation?

Check those areas where long-term effects of the outreach campaign may be noticeable:

Good response

8 sensitivity to visitors

COMMENT:

6. We have cultivated this area without 'designated greeters'.
10. more friendly toward them-sought them out.
11. We have now started to have a greeters program.
12. We are conscious of visitors via greeters. Some of our members go out of their way to make visitors feel welcomed.

9 further use of mail or media

COMMENT:

6. Plans for another mailing in '87. Long range media plans on conference level.
9. more extended willingness.
10. seasonal mailings-Christmas and Easter.
11. planning of Lenten outreach program with newspaper.
12. We are making a greater effort to publicize activities of our church to the community.

7 increased outreach budgeting

COMMENT:

6. Too early to tell
9. Not yet-desired by more members-but at expense of Synod subscription.
10. For Mass-Media we had to budget \$2500. The Budget committee is budgeting the same amount for 1987. (I am thrilled.)
12. Our Evangelism budget for 1987 is \$2800. We have ways to spend more, but we have to be realistic in what we can accomplish.
14. I don't feel the major thrust of last Spring changed much in these areas.

8 greater planning for outreach

COMMENT:

1. Before the campaign the congregation was working on welcoming new members. The campaign assisted somewhat.
8. There was virtually none of the part of the congregation before.
9. Beginning
11. We are working on showing marriage films and inviting the community.
12. Our Evangelism Committee is giving initial planning to a 1988 canvass.

6 increased concern for the lost in your community

COMMENT:

9. Increasing
11. People are bringing me names for the pastor to contact.
12. This Fall we had a Sunday School Emphasis to "bring a friend" during October.

5 subsequent evangelism efforts: (please specify)

COMMENT:

2. On-going program. *not real high*
5. Follow-up on prospective children for Sun. School, and Christmas Program. Sunday school teachers contact with prospects.
8. Gathering names of newcomers and contacting them. Continued work with prospects.
9. Church Master Planning is in the works now.
10. a. VBS mailing, follow-up on unchurched families of VBS.
b. further mailings-re. above.
12. Evangelism Committee of 4-6 members. Reaching our visitors within 48 hours. Increase size of committee. Planning our 1988 Canvass.

Part IV

1. How many prospects were discovered in the campaign? _____
75-60-0-x-150-12--x-200-x-x-140-200+-140-100-x.
2. How many of those prospects are still, in some way, on your congregation's nurturing list (occasional mailing or visitation)? _____
50-35-0-x-75-x-125-x-7-40-10 to 12-135-50-x
3. On average, how many follow-up calls did your congregation make on a prospect before placing the name in the "inactive" file? _____
x-3-0-x-2 to 3-x-x-x-x-3-x-2-2-3-x.
4. How many prospects were referred to you by the people you contacted through the campaign? _____
0-x-0-x-x-x-x-x x-1 2-x-12-x-x

Part V

1. How many members were trained for follow-up calls during or just prior to the campaign? _____
6-25-0-x-8-25-x-18-x-37-8-10-12-25-x. *Good congregational involvement*

2. Who was responsible for training these callers? _____
Pastor alone-2-8-9-10-11-14+vicar.

Pastor and lay leaders 1-6-12-13.

Lay leaders

Area Meetings 5-13

can't talk on calls, though

3. What method was used to train them? (be specific please)

Answers:

1. Materials from mass-media-Are you getting the most out of life?
2. Great exchange plus Mass-Media follow up-telephone, friendship, etc.
5. Group lecture-one on one canvass call; one on one follow-up call.
6. Combination-"Kennedy"+"Friendship Survey" format.
7. Lecture and role-play.
9. TAS would have been used.
10. TAS+Great Exchange.
11. RSVP and The Great Exchange.
12. We conducted God's Great Exchange Classes in the Fall of 1985 and Winter-Spring '86 prior to the outreach effort.
13. lecture and one on one.
14. Detailed printed materials were present on approaching delinquents, inactive prospects. This included questions and answers to possible questions and objections.

4. How many follow-up calls were made during the campaign? _____
35-4000-0-60-350-1300-x-200-x01370-in progress-74-100-x-50 so far.

5. How many members made follow-up calls during the campaign? _____
4-20-0-10-6-23-x-10-0-9-8- 8 to 10- 12-25-3. *Just*

6. How many of that number are still active evangelists in the congregation (if some have transferred out of your congregation, please indicate this)? _____
1-8-0-x-6-17-x-3-4-9-4- 4 to 6-12-not complete-3.

7. How many members have been trained for evangelism since the campaign? 0 for all

Part VI

1. How many people visited the church or inquired about the church as a direct or indirect result of the outreach campaign? _____
4-10-x-x-20-75-x-40- 4 to 6-10 5 families- 4 to 5 families-35-50-1

2. How many people began an adult instruction class as a direct or indirect result of the campaign? _____
1-4-x-4-x-18-x-3-2-0-2-1-5-1-0. *Just*

3. With how many prospects did your congregation have at least one opportunity to explain sin and grace? _____
?-x-x-22-10 100--x-50-2-27-4-25-50-0-5.

4. How many people have become members of your congregation as a direct or indirect result of your outreach campaign? _____
0-3-x-x-x-6+will be more-x-8-?-0-1-x-1-0-0.

19 people

Part VII

1. concerning outreach team
 2. What suggestions would you offer to another congregation beginning a mass media campaign?
- COMMENTS:
1. Don't get into a situation where you have lots of canvassors + lots of names, and not enough time and people to do the follow-up work.
 2. More training for follow up: More realistic goals.
 3. We are advocates of regular pastoral visitation and follow up rather than the MASS media approach! I firmly believe that more consistent visitation and pastoral care reaches more in the long term than general outreach! We have done both enthusiastically- and over the past 20 years have found this formula to be effective while others produce little discernible fruit.
 4. a. Focus on Christ not "the WELS".
b. Set a realistic time schedule, 6-8 weeks is not enough.
c. Tailor evangelism materials for congregation's needs well in advance-6 months.
 5. Talk it through with every group or organization in the church, teenage and adult. Make sure to get an experienced evangelism trainer from the outside-congregations could exchange trainers. What another church has accomplished sparks enthusiasm and interest.
 6. Do it and quit worrying about the results.
 7. We did not conduct a Media Outreach campaign. It was cancelled when the neighboring church lost its pastor.
 8. Get people committed to make follow-up calls before beginning or promote it strongly as the campaign progresses. I was able to key the people up for the survey. Those people were burned out after the survey. Many concluded the work was finished then. Still working on it-just 3 of us out of a congregation of 600.
 10. consider cost, area to be covered, immediate followup within 2 weeks.
 11. Have it over 1 to 2 years to build up Evangelism team before going mass media. I found a lack of enthusiasm from the top, to encourage us and to keep us going...We need to hear of other's successes...Another side benefit is a concern within the congregation for the delinquents.
 12. I believe it would be helpful for a stronger emphasis of internal preparation of the congregation. If the work falls on just a handful of people, they can be overwhelmed and eventually run out of gas.
 13. Emphasis on Jesus Christ, not the WELS-realistic goals.
 15. Do plenty of spade work in planning and building up awareness and interest in the congregation. Make sure there is a committed nucleus to make follow-up; if there isn't, don't try to tackle the job.

**Congregations located in Minnesota, especially Twin Cities area. Also from California, and Nebraska.