

**ITEM P.103
ACTION ITEM**

<i>FOR GAC EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S OFFICE USE ONLY</i>					
	A. Evangelism		D. Vocation		G. PC(USA), A Corporation
	B. Justice		E. Stewardship		H. Executive Committee
	C. Discipleship		F. Audit		I. Personnel Committee
X	P. Plenary				

Subject: Mission Initiative: Joining Hearts and Hands Final Narrative Report

Recommendation: That the General Assembly Council receive the final narrative report for the Mission Initiative: Joining Hearts and Hands campaign (as attached) and forward it to the 219th General Assembly (2010) as an information item.

Background:

The 214th General Assembly (2002) directed the General Assembly Council “to implement the Mission Initiative and report on its progress” to future General Assembly meetings. Progress reports have been submitted to the General Assembly in 2003, 2004, 2006, and 2008. The campaign’s pledge period came to a close at the end of the 218th General Assembly (2008). This final report documents the campaign’s background, challenges, successes, and lessons, upon the conclusion of the campaign pledge period.

Gifts in fulfillment of pledges to the campaign will be received through December 31, 2012. Financial reports will be issued quarterly through the PC(USA) website throughout this period, and a final financial report will be submitted to the 221st General Assembly (2014).

Financial Implications: None

**Mission Initiative: Joining Hearts and Hands
Final Narrative Report
September 2008**



Executive Summary:

The Mission Initiative: Joining Hearts and Hands campaign began as a five-year campaign to raise \$40 million for church growth and international mission personnel. The campaign faced a variety of challenges from its very beginning in 2002, which limited its ability to raise pledges to meet the campaign goals.

Despite the challenges, the campaign had a number of successes, including the focused effort of its final year, which brought in \$10 million in pledges, raising the total amount pledged through the campaign to over \$30 million.

The journey of the past six years, with its challenges and successes, has provided the church with the valuable opportunity to learn lessons from the campaign.

This report seeks to document the challenges, successes, and lessons, so that future efforts might be strengthened.

Outline

- I. Background
 - A. Purpose
 - B. Origins
 - C. Feasibility study
 - D. Initial GAC approval
 - E. Case statement
 - F. GA approval
- II. Campaign Challenges
 - A. Mission personnel as focus of campaign
 - B. Nature of the campaign
 - C. Dearth of major gift prospects
 - D. Campaign leadership
- III. Successes of the Campaign
 - A. Mobilization around a theme
 - B. Funds development capacity at the General Assembly level
 - C. Over 31 mission personnel fully funded and deployed
 - D. Presbyteries and congregations have connected with General Assembly mission
 - E. More than \$30 million in pledges despite the challenges
 - F. Leadership within the Steering Committee
 - G. Generosity of individuals

- H. Presbytery campaign
- I. Congregational campaigns over \$1 million
- J. New Church Development efforts
- K. Administrative cost of campaign
- IV. Lessons Learned
 - A. Donors seek involvement in the mission they fund
 - B. Campaigns must hit the ground running
 - C. Applying criteria from the feasibility study
 - D. A comprehensive plan for fund-raising
 - E. Much of the mission work of Presbyterian is “off the radar”
 - F. Perception of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) “brand” of mission
 - G. The time required to cultivate a gift
 - H. Pastors and congregations are central
 - I. Accountability and collaboration
- V. Next Steps

Background

Purpose

The strategic vision of the Mission Initiative: Joining Hearts and Hands (MIJHH) was to raise \$40 million in pledges during a five year campaign for the funding of church growth and international mission support.

Origins

The Mission Initiative originated with actions taken by General Assemblies between 1996 and 1999 to call attention to the need for additional strength in two key areas -new-church development/redevelopment in the United States and mission support overseas. The 1998 GA approved an overture calling for the investment of \$80 million.

In August 2001, GAC staff, after consulting throughout the church, and with area experts, identified a need for about \$200 million, between 2003 and 2010, to impact the pressing needs of the church and to offset the loss of revenue from spendable endowments, but felt that this level of giving was not feasible in the next few years. A first phase targeting nearly \$40 million was proposed for the years 2003-2006. Based on the results of Phase I, it was hoped that additional phases would follow, eventually realizing the total challenge of the growth needed in this mission work.

In the original report, several campaign parameters were proposed, based on the collection of General Assembly comments that gave rise to the campaign, including:

- The funding plan would include, but not be limited to, endowments.
- Costs related to implementing the funding plan should be paid from the proceeds of the campaign.
- “Up-front” money would be needed to cover initial planning and start-up costs. (The GAC set aside \$1 million for this purpose.)

Communications & Funds Development - ITEM P.103

- A national campaign, similar to previous efforts, was not anticipated. Instead, this creative funding plan would include a number of targeted components that would be tested during the feasibility study.
- In order to facilitate responses from donors, six Extra Commitment Opportunity accounts were created to cover three specific areas of mission in each of the two causes.
- A decade-long period for interpretation, cultivation, and solicitation will be developed as part of a creative new mission funding effort.
- Intentional efforts will be made to encourage presbyteries that will be conducting campaigns for their own needs to include these causes and to assist those presbyteries with funds development counsel, inasmuch as such shared efforts may provide resources for these causes in their own regions.

Feasibility study

A feasibility study was commissioned from the consulting firm of Marts & Lundy, in order to determine if the proposed campaign was realistic for the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) at this time in the life of the church.

Ninety individuals were identified as potential and desirable participants in the feasibility study and 74 individuals were subsequently interviewed. Based on the research, it was determined that the campaign should be styled as a capital campaign and focus on major prospective donors, individual and corporate (with pledges of \$25,000 or more, per gift), rather than be directed to the church at large. Marts & Lundy found that “a campaign might be feasible for the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) in the near future, but only if some significant moves are made to articulate the value of the denomination and to work in concert with local churches involving the members in those pews.”

Other criteria included:

- “The key leadership of the GAC, Worldwide Ministries Division (WMD), and National Ministries Division (NMD) must commit a significant amount of their time to this funding effort over the five-year period.” (‘a significant amount of time’ was defined by ‘as much as 30%’)
- “New and creative partnerships with governing bodies and congregations must be developed.”
- “Adequate staffing and a budget approaching \$5 million for this five-year effort must be identified. Expert funds development counsel must be retained.”
- “List of 1,000 major gift prospects for research and cultivation must be identified, and a campaign committee comprised of key denominational leaders and major gift prospects must be established.” (‘major gift prospects’ were defined as those who might contribute \$25,000 or more)

The majority of respondents said, “2003 could be the right time for a campaign, as long as the next 12 months was spent in preparation for the effort.” Marts & Lundy drew the conclusion that “taking that position and attending to a longer view and to the fundamental mission of your organization, it may happen that in the next 12-18 months the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) could move into a capital campaign. In fact, such a campaign might be used as a tool to leverage a reorientation to (a renewal of) the true mission of the church. This is certainly the direction in which the interviewees seemed to be leading.”

Marts & Lundy proposed a five year total time horizon for the Phase I of the campaign. Their report, presented in December 2001, proposed twelve or more months to prepare for the campaign, a public kick-off in spring 2003, followed by four years focused on raising the dollars needed for the goal.

The feasibility study concluded with the voice of prospective donors: "Give us something that's worth working for and we can make it happen with God's help."

Initial GAC approval

The General Assembly Council (GAC) gave initial provisional support for the campaign in February 2002, describing the effort as:

"a funds development campaign to support international mission personnel and church growth, particularly racial-ethnic church growth. The campaign will target major donors (individuals and congregations) that have an interest in mission personnel and church growth. Phase 1 of the Mission Initiative Campaign will raise \$40 million over the next five years."

Final approval by the GAC was made contingent upon the following:

- Completion of the case statement including specific examples of the mission
- Recruitment of the campaign committee including a campaign committee chairperson
- GAC participation in the identification of potential donors
- Pledges to the campaign by at least 90% of members of GAC
- Presentation of a staffing plan for the administration of the campaign

Case statement

In June 2002, the five contingencies for the approval of MIJHH were addressed by the GAC. The completed case statement addressed the two goals of the campaign:

- Church Growth – According to the case statement, "Without new funds, we will not be able to reverse the trend of annual net losses in our denomination's membership, nor will we be in a position to meet the opportunities to grow churches in areas of increased racial-ethnic and immigrant populations. In the last 40 years, no new endowments for new church development and redevelopment have been established. While primary responsibility for church development resides with the presbyteries, the national church has the responsibility to ensure that vital church-wide resources are developed and shared throughout the whole nation." Therefore the campaign proposed:
 - Grants to Presbyteries.
 - New church development grants for new opportunities, especially in racial-ethnic, immigrant, and Gen-X new church developments -- \$8.1 million
 - Church redevelopment grants for existing congregations -- \$2.5 million
 - Racial-ethnic and immigrant fellowships -- \$359,000
 - Grants for specialized ministries such as day care centers, youth outreach programs, and parish nurses -- \$800,000

Communications & Funds Development - ITEM P.103

- Loans to Congregations.
 - Loans to new and existing churches to support property acquisition and building construction and expansion for racial-ethnic, new immigrant and Anglo congregations. The loans would also help congregations upgrade their technological capabilities to assist in worship -- \$6.5 million.
- International Mission Personnel
 - Support for Current Mission Personnel. At the time, the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) supported over 600 mission workers in the field. A significant portion of the campaign was designed to sustain this level and replace lost funding from the Bicentennial Fund campaign -- "Without new funds, we will no longer be able to support our current level of international mission personnel" -- \$9.4 million
 - New Mission Personnel. The GAC, in consultation with partner churches, mission personnel, and staff, also identified needs for new mission personnel, in categories such as: regional experts, replacement personnel, international volunteers, frontier workers, health consultants, and many others -- \$11.5 million

GA approval

The GAC adopted the recommendation and sent it to the General Assembly for approval. The 214th General Assembly (2002) reviewed the GAC recommendation and approved it, launching MIJHH as a five year, \$40 million funds development effort for international mission personnel and church growth, with an additional provision:

“that the proceeds from this campaign be considered over and above the budget and not be used to weaken the church’s commitment to missions from its unrestricted budget.”

The GA directed the GAC to “implement the Mission Initiative and report on its progress” to future General Assembly meetings.

Campaign Challenges

Mission personnel as a focus of campaign

The change added by the 214th General Assembly (2002) was very significant. As interpreted by the General Assembly Council, the provision specified that no Mission Initiative gifts could be allocated in support of existing mission personnel, since existing personnel were already within the budget. The General Assembly Council had been clear that it could not sustain the current number of mission personnel without additional funds, and had designated 25% of the total campaign for support of current mission personnel, but the revisions to the case statement on the floor of the Assembly made this impossible.

To meet the requirement that the Mission Initiative not diminish the level of undesignated mission budget support for mission personnel, the GAC determined a percentage of the budget, based on the previous year, that would be representative of the church’s commitment to mission from the unrestricted budget, and made that percentage constant over the life of the campaign.

But as each year passed, the level of restricted funds available for mission personnel support decreased, and they could not be replaced by new gifts to the Mission Initiative.

The General Assembly was aware of the funding needs for current mission personnel, and had approved an additional funds development effort to meet those needs: The General Assembly Council was directed to “communicate to the particular churches of the denomination an extra commitment opportunity (ECO) to support a ‘faith factor’ increase in the 2003 budget of sufficient size to permit continuity in the recruiting, placement, and support of worldwide missionaries.”

With this effort, two simultaneous funds development campaigns were launched:

- The Mission Initiative, in part, for new mission personnel, in addition to the mission budget, and
- The “Faith Factor” extra commitment opportunity to increase the 2003 budget to permit continuity of existing number of mission personnel.

With two funds development efforts underway, at times competition between a priority for existing personnel and a priority for new personnel developed and prevented the degree of collaboration that was necessary to make either effort successful. Therefore, ironically, during the course of the campaign designed to increase the number of mission personnel, the number actually decreased.

The campaign would face this issue again when new mission personnel, appointed through gifts to the Mission Initiative, reached the end of their first three-year term of service. At this point, they were no longer considered new mission personnel, and therefore could not remain in the field funded by the Mission Initiative, and funds were also not available within the mission budget to keep them in place.

Nature of the campaign

The campaign also faltered initially due to confusion over the nature of the campaign. It was originally designed as a major gifts campaign, similar to a capital campaign, with specifically targeted appeals to individual donors who could make significant pledges.

Campaigns of this nature generally begin with a quiet phase, with advance gifts from several substantial donors, then once the campaign has passed a tipping point, a public phase finishes off the pledges, using the advance gifts as leverage. According to a story in the Presbyterian Outlook, at the first meeting of the Steering Committee, the campaign director said that the first step should be a strong effort to attract major gifts. The first gift, he said, must be at least \$5 million, the next two in the range of \$2.5 million, the next five at least \$1 million each. The textbook says you stop there, "you stay in this room until you've found those eight gifts," to give the big-hitters a chance up front to start off the campaign with real momentum.

But, this first meeting of the Steering Committee was in November of 2002, several months after the campaign had been approved by the General Assembly. The approval process for the Mission Initiative had required pledges from at least 90% of General Assembly Council members. This round of GAC pledges became the “quiet phase” of the campaign.

Upon approval by the General Assembly, two additional motions were approved from the floor of the Assembly, launching the campaign with two supplemental funding efforts:

- a motion to take up an offering for missions at close of the assembly. Baskets were placed at the back of the assembly hall at the close of the assembly to receive cash donations and pledge cards. (This offering, from a GA audience of about 2,500 participants, totaled just over \$17,000.)
- a motion, in the wake of approving a move to biennial assemblies, encouraging “presbyteries, synods, exhibitors, and affiliated groups to apply the savings realized from biennial assemblies to the Mission Initiative,” and pledging as individual commissioners to “to celebrate the hope in our Lord Jesus Christ by interpreting and advocating for the Mission Initiative” in their presbyteries.

From the start, therefore, the campaign, originally designed as a “major gifts” effort, was evolving into a mass appeal for contributions. The mass audience approach differed sharply from a targeted campaign for special gifts, but the Assembly approval process, and the genuine excitement of commissioners toward addressing these heartfelt needs for the church, created confusion around the proper way to carry out the campaign. After the Assembly, presbyteries and congregations also followed suit and took up collections for the Mission Initiative, but without the campaign discipline that would be required to cultivate special gifts from major donors.

Members of the Steering Committee wanted to tap into the passion for mission that they saw at the General Assembly and in members of congregations. In the article from the first Steering Committee meeting, published by the Presbyterian Outlook, one of the steering committee members is paraphrased as saying, “The denomination needs to find a way to capture that populist energy, to make sure it's not seen as a campaign for ‘just a bunch of fat cats.’”

This tension between the original direction of the campaign, in line with the feasibility study, and a broader appeal which tapped existing passions within congregations and middle governing bodies continued throughout the campaign – in part driven by the lack of a major gift donor database, and in part by the developing sense of energy within governing bodies. At times significant effort was focused on individuals, and at other times the best prospects were governing bodies who had demonstrated a strong vision for mission that would qualify as a Mission Initiative cause, and a desire to raise funds to implement that vision.

The campaign was also challenged by its implementation as a one-time funding effort. Efforts such as capital campaigns are generally conducted for one-time expenses that will advance the organization’s capacity to serve. In the case of the Mission Initiative, the campaign’s causes were ongoing ministries, not one-time expenses. The case statement had clearly stated that the effort was necessary in order to offset the final disbursements from several spendable endowments. One-time funding would not be sufficient to continue these ministries into the future, instead they would need replacement funding every year into the future that the ministry continued. A donor might make a five-year pledge, which would enable mission personnel to go into the field for a three year term, but at the end of the term, there was no mechanism for funding that would continue the ministry beyond its initial term. A capital campaign model may not have been the best way to create renewable resources for funding these causes.

Dearth of major gift prospects

In 2002, the General Assembly Council was not equipped as a funds development organization. The denomination's mission agency typically spent most of its efforts properly managing funds, and allocating those funds in the pursuit of mission, but was not equipped to launch a donor-specific funds development appeal.

One of the original criteria for successfully launching the campaign was GAC identification of potential donors. The feasibility study indicated that the campaign would require the identification of 1,000 "major gift prospects" (capable of making gifts of \$100,000 or more). At this level, the campaign would need fewer than 400 gifts to meet the goal.

While the GAC had a record of considerable success in the promotion of special offerings, directed mission giving, and extra commitment opportunities, most of these efforts have focused on promoting through, and providing resources for, congregations and presbyteries. The GAC had not cultivated individual donors, and in 2002 did not have the names of 1,000 "major gift prospects" as required by the feasibility study.

In its statement to the General Assembly, the GAC had committed to "participate in the identification of potential donors," and the GAC fulfilled this commitment, but the numbers were very small. The first campaign director was quoted in a November 2002 article saying, 'To raise \$40 million will take 10,000 qualified prospects, and the Mission Initiative team so far has identified only 100 to 200...adding that there is no "master list" of the denomination's 2.5 million Presbyterians.'

Fortuitously, the campaign director reported growing interest in the campaign, in the weeks leading up to the May 2003 meeting of the Steering Committee, on the part of presbyteries. He reported that one executive presbyter had even chased him down in an airport to request a meeting to discuss a potential future partnership in the campaign.

The interest of presbyteries and congregations had not been anticipated in the planning to this point, but the opportunities were welcomed. At a later meeting of the Steering Committee, the director would report that there were relatively few individuals, known to campaign staff – 20 or fewer, rather than the anticipated 200 -- who had the capacity to make major gifts.

But during the first year of the effort, the campaign was not yet ready to abandon the original design. In May of 2003, the Steering Committee heard a presentation from outside funds development counsel regarding the principles of fundraising as it applied to the campaign:

- In successful fundraising efforts, 10% of donors provide 90% of the funds
- Lead gifts provide 25% or more of the total campaign goal
- Lead gifts are important because your chances of taking less time with the overall campaign increases with lead major gifts in the beginning
- If you "stretch the timetable," negative aspects can occur within the campaign – people get tired, people wander away, costs skyrocket.
- It takes less money to raise major gifts than it does to raise gifts broadly. For that reason, we need to look at individuals within presbyteries who can give up to the \$10 million mark.
- All campaigns are volunteer driven – people give to people.

Communications & Funds Development - ITEM P.103

- People are needed from around the Steering Committee table both to give major gifts and to provide names of others that are able.
- It is important to keep the campaign in a very tight timeframe – approximately 48 months.
- ‘Lead donors’ will give in the \$5 to \$10 million range

Questions regarding the dual nature of the campaign were openly discussed by the Steering Committee, at this meeting. The meeting notes contain the direct question, “Are we pushing over to the presbyteries and away from individuals?” along with two responses:

- We currently have very limited major donor prospects and time is critical
- Work with presbyteries must never be a way of getting around the major donor but a way to find major donors. We can assume at this time that pastors are not going to rush to bring their major donors to the table and that the timeline with presbyteries is very different from that of individuals.

The notes conclude with an observation about presbytery campaigns: “Fundraising is a volunteer driven process. The staff in Louisville should be positioned to support and assist volunteers. As we move toward the presbytery model, in some cases, we need to ensure that there is a campaign manager positioned in each presbytery who will ‘take home the project every night.’”

By the next month, June of 2003, the Steering Committee realized that to be successful in reaching the goal, it would have to develop funds through presbytery efforts. The Steering Committee made two decisions:

- “The campaign will continue to focus on major donors and will include a limited number of presbyteries who will be major donors.”
- “...money that is kept in presbyteries for the same purposes as the Mission Initiative will be counted as part of the total.”

The evolution continued, and by 2004, the campaign director was quoted as saying, ““I don't want anyone to think this is just a 'major gifts campaign.' We're doing a campaign, and right now we're in a deliberate phase of nurturing larger gifts to propel us forward, but by 2007 we'll certainly want every Presbyterian involved.” One of the campaign chairs said, ““We're still focused on major donors, but frankly, the response from presbyteries has been overwhelming.” Two presbyteries had launched multi-million dollar campaigns. Two others had approved MIJHH-related campaigns were conducting feasibility studies to determine the amounts they intend to raise.

The campaign was therefore challenged by multiple forces driving the implementation:

- the strength of the feasibility study and the campaign’s weakness with respect to a list of prospective donors, and
- the latent energy within presbyteries and congregations for the purposes of the campaign matched against the limited ability of staff to support a large number of campaigns.

Campaign leadership

The campaign began in June 2002, and was designed to run for five years. Early reports suggested that it might not need the entire five year period to raise the number of pledges needed,

but the switch to biennial General Assemblies disrupted the flow of the campaign, and therefore it was extended through the close of the 218th General Assembly (2008). In total the campaign comprised six years, rather than five.

Through the six years of the campaign, the campaign experienced the leadership of four different directors, in addition to being without a director for eight months.

- June 2002 – January 2003 – no director
- January 2003 – July 2003 – director #1
- July 2003 – September 2003 – no director
- September 2003 – February 2004 – interim director
- February 2004 – October 2006 – director #2 (after serving as interim director)
- October 2006 – July 2007 – acting director
- July 2007 – June 2008 – interim director #2

During this same period, there were two GAC executive directors, and the two other senior positions which were to spend 30% of their time on the campaign were eliminated in a GAC restructure four years into the campaign. The evangelism office, central to the denomination's leadership efforts for new church development and transformation, was also in the midst of transition throughout the campaign period.

Changes in GAC staff leadership contributed to the development of weak case statements describing the specific ministries that could be launched through the major gifts.

Leadership transitions within the national campaign staff also affected the presbytery-level campaigns. One presbytery reported that over the course of their unsuccessful campaign, five different campaign consultants from the national staff worked with the presbytery – each with a different funds development philosophy or focus, and none had previous experience with a presbytery-level campaign.

Relationship-building is central to a funds development campaign, particularly one focused on major gifts. The lack of long-term continuity in leadership therefore presented challenges for donor development.

The strong final months of the campaign can be significantly attributed to competent and effective leadership by the campaign director who was experienced, good on process and follow-through, and relational. He was able to enlist a number of fund-raisers, from within staff and part-time contractors, which leveraged and expanded the capacity of the campaign effort and the campaign leadership.

Successes of the Campaign

Mobilization around a theme

When the Mission Initiative began it was a concept to raise funds for mission by cultivating major gifts from donors toward two primary causes: church growth and international mission personnel. Even with such attractive causes, the Steering Committee and staff felt that to be

successful, the campaign would need to have a more identifiable “brand” in order to capture the imagination of Presbyterians.

Taglines for the campaign were discussed at the first Steering Committee meeting, and at the next meeting in early 2003, the promotional identity for the campaign was approved. “The Mission Initiative” became “The Mission Initiative: Joining Hearts and Hands” with a tagline line of “A Campaign to Renew the Church for Mission.”

In the years since early 2003, no effort in national church life could have been more successful than a ‘campaign to renew the church for mission.’ While not all of the transformation can be directly linked to the Mission Initiative, the church has been renewed for mission in many ways during this period:

- Dallas consultation – Presbyterians gathered in Dallas, TX, January 16-18, 2008, in response to an invitation from the Moderator of the General Assembly and the vote of commissioners to the 217th General Assembly (2006), to discuss the current state of international mission in the evolving context of denominational mission outreaches and the future of the worldwide mission work of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) for the 21st century.

Participants in the consultation came together to outline a covenant of agreement to live and serve together and a commitment to work cooperatively. The participants also pledged to celebrate diverse Presbyterian approaches to mission, to share responsibility for education and preparation of all Presbyterians for mission, and to seek and support more mission personnel. Each of the 64 consultation participants signed the document titled, “An Invitation to Expanding Partnership in God’s Mission” and agreed to take the document back to other mission-related organizations and seek their approval.

Since the consultation, earlier this year, the “Invitation” has been endorsed by over 100 other Presbyterians and the:

- 218th General Assembly (2008) of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)
- Association of Presbyterians for Cross-Cultural Mission
- Association of Presbyterian Mission Pastors (APMP)
- Bel Air Presbyterian Church
- Council on Witness to Society and World of New York Presbytery
- First Presbyterian Church, Audubon, Iowa
- General Assembly Council
- Ghana Mission Network
- Giddings-Lovejoy Joining Hands Coordinating Team
- Grace Presbytery
- Israel/Palestine Mission Network
- Living Waters for the World
- Medical Benevolence Foundation
- New Wilmington Mission Conference
- Outreach Foundation of the Presbyterian Church
- Presbyterian Frontier Fellowship
- Presbyterian Global Fellowship
- Presbyterian Peace Fellowship

Communications & Funds Development - ITEM P.103

- Presbyterian Women Churchwide Coordinating Team
- Presbyterian Women of the Synod of Alaska/Northwest Coordinating Team
- Presbyterian Women Synod of the Sun Coordinating Team
- Presbyterians for Renewal
- Presbytery of Central Washington
- Tres Rios Presbytery
- Tres Rios Presbytery Presbyterian Women Coordinating Team
- Witherspoon Society
- World Mission Initiative

The Dallas consultation caps a renewal of interest in mission in recent years, and a remarkable display of unity around one of the central callings of the Christian life.

- World Mission '07: A Celebration of Grace -- About 700 Presbyterians attended this world mission conference in Louisville in October 2007. They heard insights about the future of world mission, gained new resources for mission participation, shared their thoughts on mission engagement and listened to inspirational speakers. The event was described in the church press as one aspect of “twin events that mark the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)’s most concerted effort to enlist support for the denomination’s global mission in decades.”
- Mission Challenge '07 – Following the World Mission '07 event, 48 PC(USA) mission workers began a month-long period of intensive itineration visiting 144 of the PC(USA)’s 173 presbyteries. The itinerating mission personnel told their story of international mission, and asked congregations in these presbyteries to select at least one mission worker and build a relationship with him or her through prayer, correspondence and financial support. They also will challenge presbyteries to seek 100 percent participation by all of their congregations in support of at least one PC(USA) mission worker.

As a result of the itineration visits and a direct mail campaign to persons who have previously expressed an interest in PC(USA) mission, over \$1.5 million has been raised in support of international mission personnel.

- Missional identity increasingly a focus of church life – Over the last decade, the phrase “missional church” has taken on a life of its own within North American contexts. While there is not a universal agreement on what it means, Alan J. Roxburgh, in his article “The Missional Church” written in 2004, finds these traits, which have had a part in renewing the church:
 - “Western society as a mission field”
 - “Mission as *missio dei*”
 - “Missional church is about the nature and purpose of the church”
 - The church as a ‘contrast society’

The Mission Initiative is not directly responsible for any of these efforts, but within the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) we give thanks to God for the campaign’s part in renewing the church for mission, and pray that this renewal continues.

Funds development capacity at the General Assembly level

Communications & Funds Development - ITEM P.103

When the campaign started, most GA level activities were focused as funds management, or funds distribution; but few areas had an expertise in funds development. An increasing number of Presbyterians had moved toward donating directly to mission causes through the denomination, (based largely on the success of disaster relief efforts and extra commitment opportunities), but the General Assembly itself had not developed a competency at nurturing those donors.

This structural weakness for funds development significantly impacted the early success of the Mission Initiative. There was no capacity for coordinated donor relations or cultivation, and therefore the GAC did not have information on donor prospects.

One of the first efforts of the campaign, within staff in Louisville, was to increase usage of donor management software. On a small-scale basis, software had been in use since the late 1990's, but it was not widely used. Over the course of the campaign, the difficult challenge of bringing together the various databases of contacts who were interested in the ministries of the General Assembly was addressed.

Today, that donor management software is at the core of the General Assembly Council's accounting and contact management infrastructure. The software creates a capacity for improved communication with donors and interested others, and allows GAC staff to customize appeals based on the constituent's demonstrated interests. Unlike the situation in 2002, an infrastructure for funds development, as well as staffing to resource that information, is now in place.

The infrastructure was tested most extensively with the overwhelming response of Presbyterians and others to the needs created by 2005 Hurricanes Katrina, Wilma, and Rita, and the Indonesian tsunami of 2004, as over \$38 million in donations from almost 30,000 donors was received. Of these 30,000 donors, 18,000 had not previously made a gift to General Assembly mission.

The benefits of this infrastructure may also be seen in the increased success as the campaign continued. Once the infrastructure was built, donors received better information, solicitation, and acknowledgement.

As the campaign started, the GAC executive director repeatedly referred to the campaign as "phase one" of a fundamental shift in the way PC(USA) mission is funded. "We've been passive, waiting for folks to give," he said. "We need to learn to be more interactive and proactive. This campaign will help us learn, while we raise money for two specific parts of our work." Part of the success of the Mission Initiative has been the learning of these lessons.

Thirty-four mission personnel fully funded and deployed

The campaign has generated pledges and gifts that have enabled 34 individuals to be appointed into new international mission service positions, including several that will be deployed in January 2009:

- Stacy and Bob Bronkema (Russia) – to serve with the Moscow Protestant Chaplaincy, an international faith community composed primarily of students and refugees from the developing world.

Communications & Funds Development - ITEM P.103

- David Dierksen (Mexico) – to serve as Puentes de Cristo US Coordinator for Presbyterian Border Ministries in Mexico.
- Carol Dolezal-Ng (Lebanon) – to serve as development associate for interpretation and support with the Near East School of Theology (NEST).
- Brett and Shelly Faucett (India, Thailand, and China) – to serve as regional consultants for HIV/AIDS in Asia
- Gwenda and John Fletcher (Democratic Republic of Congo)– to serve in education with the Presbyterian Church of Kinshasa and as a physician with the Presbyterian Community of the Congo)
- Jacob Goad (Peru) – to serve as coordinator for receiving PC(USA) mission teams and delegations in Peru.
- Shirley Hill (Cameroon) – to serve as registered nurse, pastor, and chaplain, providing training and support to the public health (HIV/AIDS) program of the Presbyterian Church of Cameroon.
- Jane Holslag (Lithuania) – to serve as a professor of theology and English at the LCC International University (formerly Lithuania Christian College).
- Tracey King (Nicaragua) – to serve as regional liaison for Central America, creating better communication between the Worldwide Ministries Division, mission personnel, partner churches, and PC(USA) congregations interested in ministry in Central America.
- Matt Middleton (Palestine/Israel) – to serve as a music teacher in Bethlehem, Palestinian territory currently occupied by the state of Israel. He was chair of music at Dar Al-Kalima College and music coordinator for Lutheran ministries in Bethlehem. Matt also directed Bethlehem Star Music, a joint program of the Evangelical Lutheran Christmas Church and International Center of Bethlehem, which has five ensembles: band, chamber ensemble, choristers, chorus, and handbells.
- Shannon O'Donnell (Palestine/Israel) – to serve as Assistant to the Director for the Sabeel Liberation Theology Center in Jerusalem.
- Ingrid Reneau (Sudan) –to serve as an educator in Sudan, and to help the Sudanese, who have lived through such unimaginable horrors, know the peace and love of Christ.
- Bill Richter (Mexico and Texas) – to serve as U.S. coordinator of the bi-national ministry, Puentes de Cristo helping PC(USA) delegations and mission teams be engaged in meaningful ministry along the U.S./Mexico border.
- Doug and Liz Searles (Poland) – to serve as consultants and evangelists working with church leaders in church growth, small group development, music ministry, and teacher training in English as a second language, all in order to assist church renewal and growth in the Evangelical-Reformed Church in Poland in the post-communist environment.
- Vicki Smith (Jamaica) – to serve as educator in music and art with children ages 3 to 12 at Iona Preparatory School in Tower Isle, Jamaica.
- Scott and Melanie Smith (India) – to serve with the Emmanuel Hospital Association (EHA). Scott is helping the EHA take a community-organizing approach to community health work, and Melanie is office manager for a "struggling but growing" fair trade company.
- Stacey Steck (Costa Rica) – to serve as Associate for Development and Congregational Growth with the Costa Rican Presbyterian Church
- Marcia Towers (Guatemala) – to serve as site coordinator for the Young Adult Volunteer Program, placing young adult volunteers in Guatemalan church communities. She also works with the Central American Evangelical Center for Pastoral Studies.

Communications & Funds Development - ITEM P.103

- Bruce and Lora Whearty (Ethiopia) – to serve in an outreach program of the Ethiopian Evangelical Church Mekane Yesus teaching English as well as mentoring and training teachers.

An additional nine mission workers were deployed in the fields of education, evangelism, and health in four countries which are not listed here due to security concerns.

Presbyteries and congregations have connected with General Assembly mission

As campaign staff visited with prospects (presbyteries, congregations, and members), it often formed a first encounter for those prospects with representatives of General Assembly mission. Time after time, visit reports revealed that the prospective donors had no awareness of the range of mission being engaged by the General Assembly.

In addition, the visits opened lines of communication between General Assembly offices and many congregations actively engaged in other mission, where previously there had been a disconnect. Campaign staff had no awareness of the range of mission being engaged by presbyteries and congregations as well.

The fruit of these visits will be borne out over the years to come. In some cases, the prospect was already committed to causes for the near term, but indicated a willingness to consider General Assembly mission options in the future. The value of the campaign cannot be stated solely in the number of pledges that came in during the six year life of the campaign. Future gifts will not be counted in the Mission Initiative totals, but the inspiration for the gift will have come from the initial cultivation of the donor that occurred during the campaign.

More than \$30 million in pledges despite the challenges

Despite the campaign's uneven start, and the lack of a database of prospective donors, the Mission Initiative raised more than \$30 million in pledges, including:

Mission Personnel

GAC Administered	\$4.7 million
Presbytery Administered	\$0.02 million
Congregation Administered	\$1.0 million

Church Growth

GAC Administered	\$0.1 million
Presbytery Administered	\$16.2 million
Congregation Administered	4.0 million

Unrestricted/Undesignated

GAC Administered	\$3.2 million
------------------	---------------

A complete report will be available at the September 2008 General Assembly Council meeting.

More than \$10 million in pledges and gifts were produced in the campaign's final quarter (April-June 2008), following a refocusing of campaign energy in the campaign's final year, which included:

- Adopting campaign parameters – providing reasonable definition for acceptable Mission Initiative contributions
- Creating a written plan for contacting the “top 200” congregations and the top presbyteries – defining a critical path for a comprehensive fund-raising strategy
- Implementing ‘user-friendly’ commitment forms (pledge and gift instruments) for churches, presbyteries, and individuals – eliminating much of the complication involved in record-keeping and determining donor intent
- New leadership and the recruitment of a staff team of six part-time experienced, relational, and process-oriented Presbyterian fundraising professionals who were assigned specific church and presbytery prospects – bringing the basic principles of effective fund-raising into play
- Enlisting, and getting the commitment of, an ad hoc Leadership Task Force of Steering Committee members to assume the responsibility for contacting selected “Top 200” churches where they had a personal relationship with the pastor to set the stage for Staff Team members to schedule visits and discuss participation in MI. Without this effort, the campaign would not have made the forward progress that it did over the final year. The Leadership Task Force was comprised of Joanna Adams, Tim Hart-Andersen, John Huffman, Dave Peterson, and Linda Valentine under the leadership of Tom Gillespie. Adams and Peterson also served as campaign co-chairs over the campaign’s final two years.

Additional gifts and pledges were signed by donors before the end of the campaign on June 30, 2008, but were not received in the campaign office until July or August. These gifts/pledges will be noted on future campaign reports.

The energy of the campaign’s final year provides a platform for continued successful funds development efforts. In many of these ‘top 200’ congregations, once the renewed set of contacts were explored there wasn’t enough time left in the campaign to cultivate the relationship and find the best way to link mission opportunities with mission interest, but the relationships will continue to develop within the Funds Development office.

Leadership within the Steering Committee

Early successes

When the campaign was launched in June of 2002, a Steering Committee had not yet been formed, but the two campaign co-chairs were in place, Bill Saul, of Long Beach, CA, and Lucimarian Roberts, of Biloxi, MS. The leadership provided by Roberts and Saul in the initial phases were central to the recruitment of the Steering Committee, the selection of campaign staffing, and the initial pledges that were secured. It was also under the leadership of Saul and Roberts that the campaign responded to the interest expressed in presbyteries and created the category of “presbytery administered” funds. Saul’s presbytery, Los Ranchos, was one of the campaign’s first large donors, pledging \$4.5 million.

Thomas Gillespie

Thomas Gillespie, a member of the General Assembly Council Executive Committee, became an outspoken advocate for the successful completion of the Mission Initiative late in 2006. The campaign had raised about \$26 million in pledges, but lacked the momentum to raise the final \$14 million that would be necessary to complete the effort. In addition, several of the pledges included in the \$26 million were overly optimistic estimates of what might be possible within several governing bodies.

Gillespie gave energy to the campaign, both through verbal support, and a willingness to assist the effort through all means possible. As a result, he was named honorary campaign chair, and rallied the Steering Committee through its final eighteen months of work with an extraordinary vigor.

The Steering Committee

Members of the Steering Committee agreed to serve a five year term on a committee that would seek to do a new thing: effectively raise a significant amount of funds for critical mission needs within a denomination that was finding its unity challenged at each step of the way. Through it all, they sought “to renew the church for mission.”

At the end of six years, the Steering Committee was thanked for its efforts and dismissed, with most of the church knowing little about the extent of the commitment that the members had given. Members of the Steering Committee led the way in early pledges, as 85% of its members made financial commitments to the campaign. Steering Committee members have described their work as one of the most difficult challenges in their careers of church service.

Through these challenges they were led by the unity of Christ’s mission. In February 2003, the committee released a statement regarding their common convictions for the unity of mission that would guide their efforts throughout the rest of the campaign:

“We, the members of the Steering Committee of the Mission Initiative: Joining Hearts and Hands, reaffirm our unequivocal and unanimous support of the goals for the PC(USA) \$40 million campaign: expanding global mission and developing churches. We represent a range of theological positions and differing perspectives on some matters that are divisive in the life of the church, including ordination issues and questions of biblical authority and interpretation. Yet, we remain united behind the Mission Initiative. We trust that God will work through the church to resolve these matters in God’s own time and way. In the meantime, we call all members of the PC(USA) to step forward and join us in fully supporting the Joining Hearts and Hands campaign. Together, by the grace of God, the church will be renewed for the mission of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.”

Those who have served as Steering Committee members:

- Joanna Adams, Atlanta, GA
- Judy Angleberger, Beaver PA
- Carol Adcock, Fort Worth, TX
- Fran Calderwood, Sterling KS
- Don Campbell, San Antonio TX
- Youngil Cho, Raleigh, NC
- Melva Costen, Atlanta, GA
- Erin Cox-Holmes, Yatesboro, PA
- Fred Denson, Webster, NY
- John Detterick, Rociado NM
- Jan DeVries, Tucson, AZ
- Winnie Drape, Manitowoc WI

Communications & Funds Development - ITEM P.103

- Chuck Ford, Huntington Beach, CA
- Thomas Gillespie, Princeton, NJ
- Tim Hart-Andersen, Minneapolis, MN
- Thomas Hood, St. Louis MO
- John Huffman, Newport Beach, CA
- Curtis Kearns, Louisville KY
- Charles Kim, Setauket NY
- Bob Langwig, Tucson AZ
- Robert Leech, Jeffersonville, IN
- Marian McClure, Louisville KY
- Manley Olson, St. Paul, MN
- Letty Owings, Edmonds WA
- David Peterson, Houston, TX
- Alvin Puryear, Williamsburg, VA
- Lucimarian Roberts, Biloxi, MS
- Bill Saul, Long Beach, CA
- Allison Seed, Lee's Summit, MO
- Linda Valentine, Louisville, KY
- Edmundo Vasquez, Pasadena, CA
- John Williams, Overland Park, KS

Generosity of individuals

Mary Lee Dayton of Minneapolis

In January of 2006, Mary Lee Dayton created a permanent endowment for the Presbyterian Theological Seminary of Cameroon, through a \$1 million gift. Dayton, and her congregation, Westminster Presbyterian Church in Minneapolis, had a special connection with Cameroon. Her father, the late Arnold Lowe, began his ministry there in 1912 as a Presbyterian missionary. At that time Cameroon was a German colony. When World War I broke out, Lowe was one of three missionaries who remained and courageously led an effort to protect thousands of Cameroonians from the warring Europeans. Later, he served as pastor of Westminster Church from 1941-1965. Dayton's gift created an endowment through the Presbyterian Foundation, and will provide support for the seminary in Cameroon for future generations.

Chuck Ford, Huntington Beach, CA

Chuck Ford, a lifelong Presbyterian, and member of the Mission Initiative Steering Committee, has been instrumental in starting 15 new and redeveloped congregations in southern California. His contributions to the campaign have been numerous and multi-faceted. In addition to his own pledges of over \$680,000, he has been active in the campaign of his congregation (St. Andrews Presbyterian Church in Newport Beach, CA), his presbytery (Los Ranchos), and other presbyteries.

Anonymous

In June of 2008, an anonymous donor, citing deep concerns for the health, education and well-being of the world's children, made a gift of \$510,456 to the Mission Initiative. The funds ensured that six new mission co-workers would be sent to serve in positions in the Democratic Republic of Congo, Poland, Pakistan, and Costa Rica.

Presbytery campaigns

Several presbyteries have been actively involved in campaigns to raise funds within the scope of the Mission Initiative, but none have been as active and energetic as the campaign of Los Ranchos Presbytery. In July of 2003, the presbytery announced that it had committed to raise \$4.5 million to extend its ministry at home and around the world. The presbytery worked with its congregations and sessions follow through on its pledge and will celebrate the accomplishment at its November 2008 meeting. Projects sponsored included:

- Chinese Presbyterian Church of Orange County
- Village Presbyterian Church of Ladera Ranch
- Mission workers in Thailand
- Mission workers in Pakistan.

Congregational campaigns over \$1 million

In addition to presbytery campaigns, several congregations have responded to the twin challenges of raising support for church growth and international mission personnel by engaging campaigns that have pledged over \$1 million each. The mission commitment of these congregations has been extraordinary:

- Memorial Drive, Houston, TX
- Grace First, Long Beach, CA
- Madison Avenue, New York City
- Fourth Presbyterian, Chicago
- St. Andrews, Newport Beach, CA

New Church Development efforts

Many new church developments have been nurtured through the support of the Mission Initiative campaign, including:

- Iglesia Fuente de Esperanza – a new church in Houston, which is attracting and serving primarily Mexican, Salvadoran, and Guatemalan immigrants who are new to the faith.
- Highlands – an exciting new church development in Paso Robles, California, which has moved in only a year and a half's time from one service of worship with an average attendance of 180 to three services with an average attendance of 550.
- Peace NCD – a missional church with an intentional, outward focus that is making a real difference in the community in Lakewood Ranch, Florida.
- Word of Life – a new church in Port Hueneme, California, an area characterized by extreme poverty and gang culture, which is comprised primarily of new Christians between the ages of twenty-three and forty-five, who had never been formally involved in a church before.

Administrative cost of campaign

Previous campaigns have often faced difficulty in covering the administrative cost of conducting the campaign. The Mission Initiative was set out in a different manner. The original staff-led study proposed that costs for the funding plan be paid from the proceeds of the campaign and estimated that an up-front investment would be required of the GAC.

The feasibility study was more specific about those estimates, calling for a budget of nearly \$5 million to implement the campaign over five years.

The General Assembly Council budgeted \$1 million for 2003 to cover the upfront costs of the campaign, ensuring that the campaign had the resources needed to launch the effort. In addition, the GAC covered campaign operating expenses for 2004 and half of 2005. At this point, the Mission Initiative campaign was charged with covering campaign expenses.

As of the end of June 2008, six years into the campaign, due to the careful stewardship of campaign resources, the total administrative cost has been \$4.3 million, easily under the initial estimate of nearly \$5 million for five years. At the same time, of the more than \$30 million in campaign pledges and gifts, only \$2 million has been allocated toward campaign expenses, since the GAC separately invested \$2.3 million into the campaign.

Lessons Learned:

Donors seek involvement in the mission they fund

The Mission Initiative campaign was designed to focus resources on two of the most commonly cited priorities for General Assembly mission: international mission personnel and church growth. A variety of giving opportunities were created so that donors could participate in the campaign through a number of options. Donor response to the variety of accounts taught the campaign a mixed set of lessons.

When Presbyterian churches are open to investing in PC(USA) mission projects, they are increasingly determined to know where the money is going, who the mission workers are, what the purpose of the mission is, and how they might have some interaction with the mission workers.

Donors are much less interested in giving undesignated funds to international mission, instead they want to share in the mission. Therefore they seek a direct connection and a meaningful relationship with a mission worker and with a part of the world that resonates with their congregation's own missional interests.

Each of the major pledges to the campaign were made in a region of the world where the donor, whether an individual, congregation, or presbytery, had previously existing relationships. It was that involvement in mission that inspired the donor to make an even greater gift.

The same lessons can be found in the church growth side of the campaign. A large majority of the funds committed to church growth as part of the campaign were committed to specific causes within the donor's congregation or presbytery.

Unrestricted pledges, for either primary cause of the campaign, were relatively rare, comprising less than only 10% of the total pledges committed.

The designation of a pledge, however, does not have to be tightly defined. As Mission Challenge '07, a related effort which during 2007 and 2008 raised over \$1 million for World Mission, demonstrated; when given an option, donors prefer some restriction on the gift, in order to gain involvement in the mission, but they do not want to micro-manage the causes they pledge to support.

Campaigns must hit the ground running

The feasibility study for the Mission Initiative called for a 12-18 month period of preparation prior to launching the campaign. However, once active consideration of a campaign began, the process gathered momentum and moved more quickly than the feasibility study had recommended, condensing the time allotted for preparation.

While the idea of a campaign, in response to Overture 98-47 had been circulating for several years, the sequence of events began to move quickly with the internal report (August 2001), the feasibility study (December 2001), GAC provisional approval (February 2002), and GAC final approval, along with GA approval, in June 2002.

Despite this ten month period, campaign preparations were not occurring, instead the focus was on demonstrating a commitment to meet the criteria that had been proposed for the campaign. When the campaign was launched in June 2002, a five month period passed before a Steering Committee was selected, and six months passed before there a campaign director was in place.

During this period, the original strategy for the campaign lost momentum, and a grassroots approach to raising funds stepped into the vacuum, with a \$17,000 offering at GA, several presbytery collections, and a general encouragement to apply savings from biennial assemblies toward the campaign. This made it impossible to fulfill the campaign strategy of having a "quiet phase" in which the bulk of the major pledges would be developed.

In addition, this timeline left little room for consultation with the GAC, middle governing bodies, or large congregations, apart from the feasibility study itself, prior to seeking approval for the campaign from the General Assembly.

Once campaign leadership was in place, several additional months of planning and preparation were needed to re-orient the campaign toward its purposes, to interpret the campaign, and to build relationships with the necessary partners across the church.

Future campaigns would benefit from additional consultation and planning with GAC elected leaders, presbyteries, and congregations; and a longer quiet phase before launching the campaign into a public process. Careful planning will be required to find a way to balance the General Assembly timelines for approval, while also allowing campaigns to hit the ground running – once launched, they don't have time to go back and invent the rules, they need to be equipped to begin working as soon as they are approved.

In addition, the staff organization must be equipped with the ingredients for a successful campaign, before a campaign is launched:

- A donor base with meaningful relationships, based on prior giving history with some connection to GAC and GAC mission, must be developed.
- Qualified staff with time dedicated to fund-raising
- Volunteers with relationships to donors.

Applying criteria from the feasibility study

The feasibility study for any campaign is a very significant document, as it sets out under what conditions a proposed campaign might be successful. The Mission Initiative campaign was backed by two significant documents: the internal preliminary case study document, and the feasibility study. Each was carefully developed to elaborate on the style and substance of a campaign that could be successful within the mission life of the General Assembly from 2003 through 2007.

In many instances, the criteria are very clear about what should and should not be done within the campaign. In other areas, Steering Committee members report that they wished the document would also have discussed campaign strategies, necessary campaign leadership, and the campaign resources required to sustain such strategies.

A comprehensive plan for fund-raising

There was no comprehensive plan for fund-raising for the first five years of the campaign. This shortcoming resulted in most of what would be considered the "Top 200" churches and most of the higher budget presbyteries either not being contacted at all, or lacking any follow-up after a perfunctory initial contact. This scenario changed in September of 2007, the sixth year of the campaign, bringing energy and direction to the campaign, a surge of contacts within the last nine months, and more than \$10 million in pledges and gifts in the final quarter of the campaign. Unfortunately, the increased number of contacts came very late in the campaign, and found many prospects without sufficient reaction time to be able to make a commitment within the campaign period.

The success of future campaigns will be enhanced if a comprehensive plan is put into place at the beginning of the campaign, and then adjusted based on implementation results.

Much of the mission work of Presbyterians is “off the radar”

In the campaign’s final one-year push, the strategy was revised to approach the largest congregations in the PC(USA). Presbyterians and Presbyterian churches are very “mission-minded.” In the contacts that were made by staff team members, time and again it was revealed that there were significant “mission projects” and significant dollars devoted to projects that had no connection to the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) as a denomination. At first there was an attempt to document and record those initiatives, but this was not kept up because of the sheer volume. At least the very least, the \$30 million attributed to the Mission Initiative is matched by another \$30 million worth of church initiatives that are under the radar of the denomination. These funds sponsor and support mission workers overseas, support schools and hospitals, and collaborate with other organizations in a myriad of projects.

Perception of the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) “brand” of mission

Research done in 2005 indicated that a large majority of Presbyterians were either little informed or not informed about the range and scope of PC(USA) mission beyond their congregation. The study showed that this was also true of Presbyterian elders.

When individual prospects with the possible potential for major gifts were contacted, for the most part, they evidenced very little interest in the Mission Initiative campaign. Lack of sufficient interpretation and cultivation may have been a determining factor in these cases, but it also raises the larger question of how ‘brand’ awareness relates to mission funding.

For many donors, there is a lack of history for direct giving in support of the twin causes of the Mission Initiative: church growth and international mission personnel. Funding support for these causes has traditionally been provided within the context of support for the larger church (beyond the congregation), through gifts to the congregation. Therefore, the causes never had to provide specific promotional materials for funds development.

As patterns of mission, service, and funding have changed, the denomination has not kept pace. Organizations that can promote their ‘brand’ attributes have generally shown an ability to raise the necessary funds to implement their mission.

Future campaigns will need to develop stronger presentations for the denomination’s approach to its mission, and the unique attributes that it brings, so that prospective donors can better understand the strategic importance of funding this kind of work. Relying upon the traditional legacy of Presbyterian mission effectiveness alone will not be sufficient.

The time required to cultivate a gift

Presbyteries, for the most part, are the bodies that initiate and follow through on new church development projects. It takes years to move from the decision to start a new church, through the planning phases, and then to conduct the campaign, if it is feasible, to begin the new congregation.

One common scenario that the staff team encountered was presbytery planning for new church developments that was not yet sufficiently developed enough to have dollars counted toward the campaign total, and not enough campaign time remaining to wait for specific definition.

A second common scenario was new church development projects that were well down the road to completion and that could not be counted because there was no prior Mission Initiative contact. Earlier contact, as opposed to final year contact, could have brought more presbyteries into the campaign.

While five or six years is a significant period for a campaign, the timelines for potential donors can be even longer, particularly when the effort begins without an active ongoing process of donor cultivation. Future campaigns will need to take those longer timelines into account, or be based on existing relationships with potential donors.

Pastors and congregations are central

Pastors and congregations are central to Presbyterian funds development campaigns. While many Presbyterians are eager to participate in the mission and ministry of the denomination, they do so generally at the encouragement of those whom they most trust – their congregational colleagues and leaders. Each of the major gifts developed through this campaign occurred because of the encouragement of someone within their congregation or the encouragement of pastoral leadership. Future campaigns will need to draw upon the strength of the relationship between pastors, congregations, and the General Assembly.

Accountability and collaboration

The Mission Initiative was a new approach to funds development for mission within the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.). The campaign's integration, with existing mission programs as well as presbytery and congregational campaigns, required tight collaboration. When this collaboration was lacking, the campaign's progress suffered.

Similarly, in creating a new style of funds development, lines of accountability were not always clearly delineated. The campaign was initiated by the General Assembly Council, approved by the General Assembly, and overseen by the Steering Committee, with only brief clarifications as to ongoing roles:

- The General Assembly directed the GAC “to implement the Mission Initiative and report on its progress” to future General Assembly meetings.
- The campaign guidelines, proposed by the GAC and approved by the GA, describe the role of the Steering Committee: “Under the direction of the General Assembly Council, the Mission Initiative Steering Committee will provide leadership for the Mission Initiative Funds Development effort.”
- A few months into the campaign, the GAC executive director sought to clarify the roles of the GAC and the Steering Committee by saying, “(The Steering Committee is) to lead the campaign and set the policies, and the Council will determine the utilization of the funds.”

There is a point at which too many changes in the game plan, and the rules, and the players, and the way of keeping score becomes highly detrimental to presenting a clear and understandable invitation to participation; not to mention the effect on the morale of those responsible for carrying out the mandate.

Future campaigns would be wise to build in clear principles of accountability and collaboration, so that there is no confusion, and so that communication between stakeholders can flow more freely.

Next Steps

The pledge reception phase of the Mission Initiative campaign came to a close on June 28, 2008, but payments on those pledges will continue to be received through December 31, 2012. A final financial report will be submitted to the 220th General Assembly (2014). Until that time, the following activities will be undertaken:

- The GAC Director of Funds Development will create a collection system for outstanding pledges, and make quarterly reports via the website, regarding the fulfillment of pledges.
- World Mission will provide continuing feedback to donors regarding the projects for which pledges have been made.
- Presbyteries and congregations will be queried regarding the status of cash received toward pledges administered at the presbytery or congregation level.