

A Free Resource for Churches provided by:



Is your church ready for the challenges that are coming? Are you enjoying a secure present and looking forward to an even greater future?

This booklet is provided by the BGCM Congregational Health Team as a tool to help your church prepare for a brighter and more effective future in the service of the Kingdom of God.

It may be used by a Church Council, a Church staff, or any group of church leaders as a way of evaluating the congregation's ability to think strategically.

The booklet addresses 10 areas of church life and offers two contrasting approaches in each of the 10 areas. There is a one-to-ten scale on which to evaluate each area.

There are 100 questions to challenge a group's or an individual's processing and evaluation of the church. These questions may lead to helpful discussion and provide valuable insights into moving the church forward.

DOES YOUR CHURCH THINK STRATEGICALLY?

Churches desperately need to be intentional about their futures. One of the great reasons for the decline and failure of many well-established, traditional churches in America is their failure to think into the future. The pace of change is such that while churches are struggling to be “relevant” (i.e. in touch with their current reality), they need to be more than relevant. They need to be strategic (i.e. thinking about realities yet to come).

Like the chess master who is able to imagine, not just his opponent’s likely response to his next move, but his response to his opponent’s response, etc., etc. Indeed, it is said that many masters can accurately imagine 10 or 12 moves ahead. Sometimes they can play an entire game in their heads. That is the skill that I refer to in this paper as “strategic thinking.”

This ability goes beyond strategic planning. Many churches make good use of various consultants, resources and processes to do strategic planning. But with or without those organized strategic planning efforts, churches need leaders who are able to think strategically. And what a great grace gift God has given the church! He has placed within the fellowship some persons who hold the potential to lead out in strategic thinking. It is a part of the spiritual giftedness that makes the church a body that is able to function and flourish and accomplish its mission.

Several church growth and church health “experts” have predicted the demise of a large majority of existing main-line churches within a generation. Indeed, when looking at the present membership of many of these churches, one often finds an average age in the 60s. If those churches do not begin to reach younger adults and shift that average age downward, it is reasonable to assume no viable future for those congregations.

Churches are facing a crossroad – actually more of a “T” intersection. Going straight ahead and doing “business as usual” is not a reasonable option. There is a forced decision at the “T.” Go left or go right. Heads or tails. True or false. This paper is an effort to describe various areas of church life where these forced choices are upon us. No more time to delay. No more denial of the necessity of making important decisions about the future.

The decision arenas in which strategic thinking will be played out that will be discussed here are:

- Church **Motivation**: Maintenance or Mission
- Church **Methodology**: Reactive or Proactive
- Church **Structures**: Bureaucratic or Mission-driven
- Church **Leadership**: Traditional or Visionary
- Church at **Worship**: Tired or Enthused
- Church **Administration**: Hierarchical or Decentralized
- Church **Resource Stewardship**: Institutional or Missional
- Church **Ministry Operation**: Programmatic or Project-based
- Church **Self Image**: Fuzzy/Fragmented or Defined/Positive
- Church **Human Resources**: Clergy-driven or Laity-based

Each of these is discussed below, followed by some questions to help church leaders assess this area of church life in their own congregation. An evaluation scale allows leaders to score their church in each area.

Motivation: Maintenance or Mission

Motivation is the fuel that drives the engine. Motivation is that which energizes a church. For too long, many churches have been driven by a desire to maintain what they have. When churches plateau and begin to see decline, they shift into survival mode. The motivating principle becomes, “Join our church and help us survive.”

The “maintaining” church becomes self-serving, apathetic toward the larger community and resistant to change. Its energies are consumed in committee meetings, record keeping and internal administration. The highest aim in the mind of leaders is to fill the offices, have the meetings, and keep the machinery running. While no church would admit to being in maintenance mode, the objective observer can readily see the signs: no new ideas, no new ministries, no new groups being formed, no risks being taken.

Because maintenance is such a poor motivator, the lack of energy in a maintaining church is noticeable. It is hard for people to get excited about “plowing the same furrow” over and over. I once heard someone comment about a certain church leader, “He has 20 years of experience in that role.” Another person in the group said, “No, he has one year of experience repeated 20 times.” It becomes difficult for most people to be highly motivated when they are expected to do the same thing over and over, year after year. The energy level wanes.

The alternative to maintenance church life is the church with a clear and powerful sense of mission. That mission and its priorities are reflected in everything the church does. Meeting agendas are infused with the mission. Budget priorities are set by the mission. Church leaders spend significant amounts of their time and energy in actions directly related to the mission.

It is not sufficient to have a carefully-crafted, well-worded mission statement. That is helpful, but the question is: “How many people know, understand and are inspired by the mission statement?” The mission statement needs to be simple, to the point and free of theological jargon. It should express the real “heart” and “passion” of the church.

Questions to Ponder:

1. What new projects or ministries did your church start last year?
2. What first-time events are scheduled on this year’s calendar?
3. How recently has your church written, reviewed or revised its mission statement?
4. How many church leaders could state or paraphrase your mission statement?
5. How often do leaders make reference to the mission statement?
6. How much leadership time is spent in activities directly related to the mission?
7. What new ideas are currently under consideration for quick implementation?
8. What risky ventures has the church undertaken in the past year?
9. How is your budget and its priorities different from last year’s budget?
10. How many of your regular committee/team/council meetings would be considered “routine” rather than “energetic?”

Indicate on the scale below how you would rate your church in Motivation:

Maintenance 1-----5-----10 Mission

Methods: Reactive or Proactive

Congregations can fall into habits of behavior and decision-making that are reactive – constantly having to react to crises. The reactive church is like a firehouse. Firefighters wait until an alarm sounds; then they react by rushing to the scene to extinguish the fire. The proactive church is like a farm. The success of the farmer may be influenced by forces beyond his control – rain, sunshine, etc. – but the farmer acts in faith. He prepares the soil, plants the seed, cultivates the crop, and trusts in a good outcome. Farmers take initiative and do everything within their power to make good things happen.

Reactive churches place themselves at the mercy of outside influences. Their customary lack of direction makes the sudden crisis that arises seem invigorating, and they swing into action to “put out fires.” But they never set the agenda. Their approach empowers “children playing with matches,” rather than mature church leaders who could lead toward positive ministry.

Proactive methodology operates on the cutting edge of creativity and discovery. It offers the ongoing excitement of learning and exploring. Being productively proactive means following the guidance of the Holy Spirit in vision casting, planning for success and coordinating efforts within the church. It is not just taking action, but doing so with wisdom and purpose.

Questions to Ponder:

1. Does your church tend to swing between times of relative idleness and being behind and overwhelmed with work?
2. Has the church done comprehensive strategic planning in the past three years?
3. Does the church have an annual theme or emphasis each year?
4. Is the church often caught by surprise by negative developments in the church or community?
5. To what extent is the church programming the same as it was 20 years ago?
6. Do you have up-to-date demographic data on your church community?
7. Can you think of two ministries your church is doing that other churches around you are not?
8. Does the church have an educational philosophy and plan that helps determine the selection of curriculum resources?
9. Is there expectation that the church will be better and stronger two years from now than it is today?
10. Does the church feel that it is the victim of unfortunate circumstances? (e.g. location, community change, financial shortage, etc.)

Indicate on the scale below how you would rate your church on Methods:

Reactive

Proactive

1-----5-----10

Structure: Bureaucratic or Mission-driven

Many main-line American churches had their founding and/or their years of greatest growth in the heady years following the Second World War. The GIs came home victorious, got jobs or pursued education, got married, had children and bought homes. The baby boom sounded. In those years of industrial progress and corporate development, Americans learned patterns of building bureaucratic structures. They built corporations, governmental structures, non-profit causes, churches and denominations. All of these took shape in a new world that loved and understood bureaucracy.

Churches organized to get all the work done. When new tasks appeared to need to be done, new committees were formed. When rules appeared to have loopholes, more rules were written and more red tape was developed. Layer upon layer of decision-making process was invented.

A mission-driven structure sees itself as existing only to accomplish the mission. It maintains a very humble attitude about itself as an organization, seeing its reason for being as doing the mission. This structure does not worry about its own survival; it concerns itself with fulfilling its purpose.

In a bureaucracy, the most valued positions are those of power and influence in decision-making. In a mission-driven structure, the most valued persons are those who are out doing the work of fulfilling the mission. Leaders are honored for setting an example of ministry commitment and leading the way into the mission field. In a bureaucracy people strive to be CEO; in a mission-driven church people strive to be missionaries.

Questions to Ponder:

1. How recently has your church decreased its number of committees, teams or working groups?
2. Are the church's most energetic groups administrative in nature or missional?
3. If your church suddenly had a windfall of \$500,000, how would the money be used?
4. Is your church organized about like every other church of your denominational heritage?
5. What parallels are there between your mission statement and your organizational structure?
6. Do you have difficulty each year finding enough people to fill all the positions called for in the church's organizational chart?
7. What does your church do best? Is that a missional task?
8. What has your church sacrificed of its own comfort or convenience in order to serve beyond itself?
9. Does the church have strategies for ministering to specific people needs?
10. Does the church have a strong and growing body of volunteers?

Indicate on the scale below how you would rate your church on Structure:

Bureaucratic Mission-driven
1-----5-----10

Leadership: Traditional or Visionary

Some churches value and call out leaders, both clergy and laity, who conform to the patterns of the past. They want to preserve the past, and one way to do that is to honor the stereotypical models of leadership.

Having been reared in the country, I recall the deep ruts that often developed in the dirt roads between our farm and town. The more people drove in the ruts, the deeper they became. And the deeper they became, the harder it was to break out of the ruts and drive on the higher ground.

There are people in many churches that are tired of driving in the ruts and “dragging bottom.” But they run up against a strong majority, very often, of persons who slavishly defend the old ways. These tradition-bound leaders fail to see the newer and exciting possibilities of trying new approaches and preparing for new opportunities.

Visionary leaders do not ignore or depreciate their heritage and traditions. But they also appreciate Jesus’ admonition that new wine cannot be held successfully in old wineskins. They let the past suggest what the future might look like, but they do not let the past limit the dreams for the future. Visionary leaders are not afraid to risk. They try things that may fail. Sometimes they are highly creative people, but other times they are just highly motivated realists who recognize when things are not working. Their zeal for the Kingdom compels them to search for new and better ways of ministry.

Questions to Ponder:

1. Has there been any major change in the philosophy or approach to ministry of your church in the past ten years?
2. Do people in the church sometimes suggest ideas that seem “weird” or “radical?”
3. Are there people who question why things are done the way they are?
4. Are there new leaders coming into ministry roles in the church each year?
5. Do church leaders talk more about the glories of the past or the challenges of the future?
6. Are there some “dreamers” in the leadership of the church?
7. Has the church recently attempted something risky that failed?
8. Does the church have a good spread of generations in the membership? Ethnic groups?
9. Is the church making good use of electronic technology? Good website? Interactive applications?
10. Would people say that church leaders are “change agents?”

Indicate on the scale below how you would rate your church on Leadership:

Traditional

Visionary

1-----5-----10

Worship in the Church: Tired or Enthused

Worship is a primary function of the church. It is not unrelated to mission; it is the corporate experience that affirms mission, prepares people spiritually to be on mission, calls people to mission, and thanks God when mission is accomplished. Worship can enliven the church, or it can bore people. It can inspire, or it can discourage.

Most who have been involved in debates about worship in the church over the past 20 years have come to recognize that the worn terms of traditional, blended and contemporary fail to address the real issue about worship. Style is not the crux of the matter. Whatever style of worship is used can be ineffective, just as all styles can be effective in the right context and done with sufficient quality.

A more helpful way to evaluate worship is in terms of its energy, its passion, its inspiration. Thus the terms “tired” and “enthused” come into the discussion. I have seen contemporary worship that was trite and tired; I have seen traditional worship that was energetic and lively.

Regardless of church architecture and traditional worship style, the world we seek to evangelize has changed. It has become a visual world with internet news driving print newspapers out of business. People are not only comfortable with hearing a message from an image on a screen, indeed, it has been shown that some younger generations are more comfortable and trusting with an image of pixels than with a live human in front of them.

Churches that ignore the communication potential of visual image do so at their own loss. In fact, the use of visual messages to enhance worship takes the church back to its roots when religious art and stained glass symbols helped deliver the message to illiterate seekers. Some sociologists suggest that much of American culture has become “functionally illiterate” because of the choices people are making to take in information through sounds and images rather than printed words.

Another question about worship in current culture relates to music. Most worship leaders will want to acknowledge and make appropriate use of the great classical music of Christianity. Hymns written by Martin Luther and John Wesley still communicate powerfully. But what about the God who stopped inspiring composers at the end of the 19th Century? Why did he do that?

If you look through most hymnals, the vast majority of the composers and lyricists have been dead for many years. Check it out. How much music can you find in your hymnal that was written by anyone born since 1945? It became stylish, with the rise of contemporary worship, for classically trained church musicians to look down their noses and make snide remarks about that “seven-eleven” music (seven words repeated eleven times). But that attitude seems to be based on an assumption that there is no worthwhile current Christian music out there. The fact is, there is shallow and repetitive contemporary music, just as there is shallow and repetitive traditional hymnology. The task is for church worship leaders to put forth the effort to find the good current music to mix with the good classical music.

The issue is whether the worship experience provided is well planned and well executed to provide an experience that is engaging and inspiring. The skillful use of meditation, quiet times, crescendos and excitement can create worship that points people to a God who models all of those. He created the still waters of a slow-moving river and the white water of rapids. He uses the hushed sound of a gentle breeze and the powerful rush of a tornado. What we can say about God is that he is never boring; would that we could say that about worship.

Questions to Ponder:

1. Does your church regularly utilize the arts in worship? Drama? Dance? Visual images? Symbolism?
2. Does your worship flow smoothly from element to element in the worship experience?
3. Does your worship show careful, detailed planning and coordination of all elements?
4. What engaging words would people use to describe a worship experience at your church? Inspiring? Exciting? Interesting? Unpredictable?
5. Does your church have a mix of music composed before 1980 and music composed since 1980?
6. Does your church make good and appropriate use of video resources to enhance worship?
7. Is your church worship determined by what your members like or what your community residents would like?
8. Is your worship service “guest friendly?” (Understandable to outsiders who drop in and who may not have church experience)
9. Is it clear in the flow of your worship why each element is present? (Offering, promotional announcements, prayers, scriptures, etc.)
10. Would you dare inquire of your listeners the degree to which they found a worship experience boring and why?

Indicate on the scale below how you would rate your church in Worship:

Tired Enthusied
1-----5-----10

Church Administration: Hierarchical or Decentralized

Who steers the church as it makes its way down the highway? How are important decisions made? How does a good idea make its way from the grassroots to achieve sufficient approval to be enacted? Churches with congregational polity claim to be “bottom up” rather than “top down” in the way direction is provided for the church. But the bureaucratic tendencies discussed earlier tend to gravitate toward hierarchical rather than decentralized decision making.

The decentralized power structure is “permission giving.” Church leaders have a choice about how to respond to new ideas. Some will have a tendency to make their first answer to an “off-the-wall” proposal a quick “no!” Others will be more inclined to leave the door open and encourage entrepreneurial enterprise. Rather than withholding permission or discouraging new ideas, these leaders value research and the possibility of new discoveries in ministry.

Decentralizing means the structures are simplified and layers of decision-making are reduced. Rather than having to take an idea from one committee to another working its way “up” through the levels of organization, a good idea (or maybe even one that turns out to be not so good) can be given quick permission to move ahead.

Years ago, while serving as the Director of an Association of Churches in the Washington, DC area, the news had been filled with reports of desperate needs as winter approached in one of the Eastern European countries. A layman in one of the churches had been touched by the need. He

was the owner/operator of a private air cargo company. He volunteered the use of one of his jumbo cargo jets to take relief supplies. His fuel supplier had agreed to donate the fuel for the flight, and some of his employees had volunteered to make up a flight crew. He had also secured donated relief goods – food, clothing, medicine, etc. All he lacked was the permission from the foreign government to make the flight and a local aid organization within the country to receive and distribute the aid.

I called a large international mission organization to ask their help in letting this aid be delivered. They immediately informed me of the difficulties, the levels of approval they would have to secure, and all of the reasons why it would take months and months to make it happen. I called another small, under-funded international aid group. When I asked the leader there about the red tape, he said, “The red tape with us is no longer that the width of my desk.” He expressed appreciation for the generosity of the donors, went to work on the arrangements, and the aid was delivered and distributed within three weeks.

Church leaders who think strategically reduce red tape, eliminating it where possible. They take a “permission giving” approach to new ideas, and they encourage entrepreneurial lay ministry in and through the church.

Questions to Ponder:

1. How much time do church leaders spend doing ministry as opposed to doing administrative tasks?
2. Are ministry accomplishments often highlighted in public gatherings?
3. Are new ideas welcomed or seen as threatening?
4. Does the church keep an active list, constantly updated, of ministries and ministry opportunities?
5. Would you say your church is driven more by the laity or the clergy?
6. Does the church provide opportunities for feedback and evaluation of ministries by members?
7. How long since the church had a “town meeting” or “listening session” to get feedback from members?
8. What new ministry began last year that came from an idea proposed by laity?
9. How long does it take for a good idea to become a functioning ministry in your church?
10. How often does someone exercise “veto” power over an emerging idea?

Indicate on the scale below how you would rate your church in Administration:

Hierarchical Decentralized
1-----5-----10

Resource Stewardship: Institutional or Mission-driven

Churches tend to let their budgets “grow like topsy” over the years. Expense lines are added, causes are funded, and last year’s budget is used as a template for this year’s budget. Little attention is given to how budget priorities may have shifted or need to be shifted.

Fixed expenses in the church budget increase by necessity. The cost of utilities, health insurance and other necessary things goes up, and the budget adjusts accordingly. When reductions or freezes are needed, those tend to be applied to discretionary expenses such as salaries, missions and program expenses. This evolution of the budget over the years, then, tends to get out of touch with the real priorities intended by the congregation.

Financial commitments to “institutions” such as denominational entities and missionary organizations are seldom revisited or reevaluated. This results in patterns of giving that tend to favor institutions over “causes.”

We know that the giving of lay persons is motivated more by the support of causes than the funding of institutions. So, we sometimes let our budgets reflect more of the giving channels people are less likely to want to support, and less of the cause-based giving that would inspire enthusiasm and passion. All budget lines, especially the larger ones, should periodically be evaluated in terms of the degree to which they line up with the church’s mission.

Questions to Ponder:

1. Has the church’s discretionary spending (e.g. missions, salaries, program support) kept up with its fixed expenses?
2. Has the church recently created a “zero-based” budget or started with a blank page to create a budget that matches the mission?
3. Is the organization of the budget consistent with the church mission? Are the headings or divisions of the budget easily matched to missional priorities?
4. If your budget had to be cut by 10%, what area of expense would most people prefer to reduce?
5. Does the church enthusiastically promote special offerings and cause-related giving? (e.g. hunger relief, disaster relief, etc.)
6. Does the church have an active strategic plan that influences the annual budget process?
7. Is the church income presently adequate to meet expenses?
8. Is the average member aware of the mission causes and projects supported by the church?
9. How recently has the church discontinued support for a particular budget item?
10. What is the balance of money invested in “local” ministries within your own community as compared to extended ministries at the national and international levels? Is this the right balance?

Indicate on the scale below how you would rate your church in the Stewardship of Resources:

Institutional Mission-driven
1-----5-----10

Church Ministry Operation: Programmatic or Project-based

A large majority of what most churches do is based on certain church programs which continue year after year. Programs like Sunday School, Discipleship Training, and a host of others. The only real task when the church does calendar planning is to get a copy of next year's calendar and copy last year's programs into next year's dates. A few dates will be adjusted for when holidays fall or because of leap year, but the template seldom changes.

Many churches fail to set their calendars and make their plans based on anticipated ministries and missions, but rather they repeat the same programs done the year before, and in some cases the previous 50 or 60 years. Perennial programs tend to develop loyal, but sometimes small, groups who support them, so it becomes painful to drastically change or discontinue programs.

New projects are risky; sometimes they work and sometimes they don't. New projects require creativity and courage. But the rewards of finding projects that catch the interest and inspire the passion of more people make the effort worth the risk.

Questions to Ponder:

1. How many first-time projects or events did your church have last year?
2. How many first-time projects or events are scheduled for this year?
3. Has attendance at your ongoing, perennial programs been increasing or decreasing in recent years?
4. Does your church have an up-to-date data base of the specialized skills, ministry interests and/or spiritual gifts of your members?
5. Does your church have a way to continuously monitor changing needs in the community?
6. Does the church ask members to evaluate the effectiveness of ongoing programs?
7. What event in your church seemed to be most effective last year?
8. How much does your church calendar vary from year to year?
9. What mechanisms are in place to get honest feedback about the church activities from members?
10. Are most church events aimed at "everyone" or directed toward specific constituencies?

Indicate on the scale below how you would rate your church in Ministry Operation?

Programmatic

Project-based

1-----5-----10

Church Self-View: Fuzzy/Fragmented or Defined/Positive

We all know that the search for self identity is a major sociological task for humans. That search for self intensifies during the adolescent and young adult years, but it is a life-long process. Churches had a fairly clear and comfortable sense of self during the 50s and 60s. Those were the “good old days” for most mainline churches and denominations in America. Churches had defined places in the community, and virtually everyone, even secular, unchurched people showed respect, or at least tolerance, for the church.

Now we live in a world that is described with words like, “Post-Christian” and “Post-Denominational.” No longer does the local school district give deference to the Wednesday evening schedules of the churches. New rules and policies have been established about when and where prayer is appropriate in public schools and at other governmental, tax-supported activities. The church does not enjoy the favored status it once did.

So, if the church is not the institution at the heart of community life it perceived itself to be 50 years ago, who are we? If we are not the representatives of a powerful majority in the community, are we nothing? Are we powerless and hopeless? Is it possible for the church to exercise its influence for good without having governmental blessing and assistance? Can Christianity hold its own in a diverse society where Christians may be a minority group?

Of course, we can! The Church of the Lord Jesus Christ grew from a tiny movement hidden in a remote outpost of the Roman Empire. It had to cope with a situation that was not government-neutral toward its existence; it had outright governmental and societal animosity, persecution and the threat of annihilation. But read the response of the Early Church. They met to worship and praise God as if they were on top of the world. They loved each other, and they loved the community – even the community that persecuted them. They were not confused about who they were and what mission they had been called to achieve.

Churches in our day must find a clearer and more empowering sense of self. This task of self defining is essential to a strategically effective future. It is not a matter of “branding” or “marketing” ourselves to the world. It is about who and what we believe ourselves to be; how we see ourselves as followers of the living Christ. And that self image needs to get beyond the complaining and self pity about how the world doesn’t understand or appreciate us.

Questions to Ponder:

1. Do the people in your immediate community know your church exists?
2. What positive activity is your church known for in the community?
3. What negative perceptions of church in general do people in the community associate with your church?
4. Are your members “proud” to let people know they are associated with your church?
5. Do most of your members have a clear sense of the core values of your church?
6. Would most members be able to state the church’s mission statement?
7. Does local news media seek comment from your church leaders when local or national religious issues are in the news?
8. Are younger adults willing to accept positions of responsibility in the church when asked?
9. Can members name ministries of the church that they are “proud of?”
10. Are there upcoming events or activities planned for the church that people are excited about?

Indicate on the scale below how you would rate your church in its Self-View:

Fuzzy/Fragmented Defined/Positive
1-----5-----10

Human Resource Values: Clergy-Dominated or Laity-Driven

Current changes in the national and global economy and the reality of the Post-Christian era mentioned earlier, are forcing churches to reexamine their use of human resources. There was a time when many churches were funded sufficiently to “hire” people to lead most of the important ministries. This resulted in heavy dependence on professional clergy. But current limitations are shifting personnel decisions toward a more practical and a more biblical leadership approach.

Full-time clergy are being replaced on many church staffs by part-time employees. In some cases they may be theologically trained and ordained, but in many places they are gifted and committed lay persons who have heard a call from God and from the church. Many bring decades of church experience as lay leaders, and most bring outstanding gifts and skills from secular work experience.

The other new development is the increased utilization of volunteers. Where the church earlier went from volunteers doing much church work to hiring more and more clergy, now we are seeing the reversal of that approach. Things formerly entrusted to paid clergy are being assumed by lesser paid and unpaid laity. This empowerment of the laity means that the future of the church will be directed more from the pew and less from the pulpit.

Questions to Ponder:

1. Does your church have more full-time clergy staff than it did 10 years ago?
2. Do you sense that the role of the laity is growing in your church?
3. Would you say that the clergy or the laity in your church are more in touch with the feelings of the congregation?
4. On matters of financial decision-making in the church, would primary leadership come from clergy or laity?
5. If you listed the ten most “spiritually mature” people in your church, how many would be clergy; how many laity?
6. Do you have formerly paid staff roles now filled by volunteers?
7. Do you have formerly full-time staff roles now filled by part-time employees?
8. When new ideas emerge for creative ministries in your church, do they usually come from clergy or laity?
9. Are the most progressive people in your church clergy or laity?
10. Has anyone from your church gone on an extended missions ministry (six months or longer) outside your area with support from the church in the past year?

Indicate on the scale below how you would rate your church in Human Resource Utilization:

Clergy-Dominated Laity-
Driven 10
1-----5-----10