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The goal of this study was to extract lessons about leader development from the history of Campus Outreach that will help churches and para-church organizations and expressions become more effective. This project will analyze the forty year history of Campus Outreach, a campus ministry started under the direction of the local church.

The history of Campus Outreach was analyzed in order to understand the ministry context. A unique feature of the Campus Outreach movement from its inception is the development of missional leaders as the aim of the organization. Additionally, the present organizational challenges for developing missional leaders was analyzed and recommendations was offered.

To gain the insights to make helpful recommendations, a theological review was made to analyze guiding principles the church of Jesus Christ has employed in developing missional leaders. Through reflecting on the historical ministry context and analyzing the theological insights, a Campus Outreach missional theology was presented.

Taking this missional theological summary, two surveys were used to identify the present effective practices as well as the deficiencies. The staff survey, both the written questionnaire and personal interviews, sought to engage present executive level Campus Outreach leaders and any staff who served for over ten years with the organization. An additional survey of over 1,750 alumni was also used to assess the health and effectiveness of leader development and to gain needed feedback.

Recommendations for future health and effectiveness for the movement was offered to local churches, campus ministries and other missional organizations. This project commends to missional leaders and organizations the importance of aligning the aims of leader development with the organizations structures and practices.
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PART ONE

MINISTRY CONTEXT
INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this project is to extract lessons about leader development from the forty-year history of Campus Outreach that will help churches and para-church organizations and expressions become more effective in the future. This project will analyze the forty year history of Campus Outreach, a campus ministry started under the direction of the local church.

What are the ingredients that shaped the formation and expression of the organization known as Campus Outreach? Forty years ago, in 1978, a new church-based campus ministry was birthed in Birmingham, Alabama through Briarwood Presbyterian Church (PCA). Intentional campus ministry among university students had been taking place for nearly one hundred years through groups like the Student Volunteer Movement and in the last eighty years through groups like InterVarsity Christian Fellowship, Campus Crusade for Christ (CRU), and the Navigators. This new work began without a name but sought to reflect the vision and passion of the New Testament church through intentional evangelism, life-on-life discipleship of individuals, and strategic investment in worldwide missions. Each of the national campus ministries listed above tends to reflect a unique set of gifts and strategic emphases that sets them apart. In the 1980s, these campus ministries (also including Fellowship of Christian Athletes, Young Life, and Youth for Christ) were almost all parachurch ministries. Dr. Jerry White defines a parachurch organization as “any Christian organization that is not officially recognized as a church” or “any ministry
that comes alongside of the church but does not come under its authority.”¹ This new movement sought to reflect the evangelistic zeal of movements like Campus Crusade and Fellowship of Christian Athletes, focused discipleship and character development training found in the Navigators, and emphasis on worldwide missions similar to the emphasis of InterVarsity Christian Fellowship. What began as a student-led ministry at Samford University, a small private Christian school in Birmingham, Alabama, which at time was informally named Discipleship, began to spread to other small campuses in Alabama through relational networking and personal disciple making. Two students, Tom Caradine and Curtis Tanner, approached Dr. Frank Barker, pastor of Briarwood Church, and asked him and his wife to help them reach their classmates with the gospel of Jesus Christ. While a majority of Samford University students claimed to have a personal relationship with Jesus Christ, like a majority of people throughout the country at that time, there was a large number of students who appeared more indifferent rather than passionate about prioritizing their relationship with Christ. These students sparked a prayer and evangelistic movement that saw many students turn from apathy to zeal in pursuing and prioritizing their relationship with Christ. These new disciples began to become involved with the local church and began to be guided in their growth in Christ.

Campus Outreach, by virtue of being guided by this local church, put great emphasis on theological development, church membership, and leadership development while continuing to emphasize evangelism, personal disciple making, and missions.

The theological emphasis was expressed through teaching students how to build their lives on the authority of God’s word, believing its inspiration and adequacy. Students were also taught about the sovereignty of God in life and in salvation, which helped to stabilize these young disciples (many new converts with no spiritual heritage) in a changing and challenging environment of the college campus. Engagement in the local church modeled the call on all followers of Jesus to be servants and to seek not only guidance in the worship of Jesus Christ but also encouragement in serving others in the body of Christ.

So what made this movement unique? Was it the relationship with a local church? Was its emphasis on evangelism and discipleship? Was it the emphasis on theological development? Was it an emphasis on world missions? While all of these factors contributed to the identity of Campus Outreach, what made this ministry unique was its stated organizational objective to build the movement around the unique focus of leader development. While it is true that other ministries emphasized the importance of leader development, Campus Outreach built a complete organization around both the purpose and process of leader development. This meant that the outcome by which the original organizers used to determine their success and failure is a component (leader development) that most people use as a part of a process to produce an outcome. Campus Outreach set out from the beginning as its stated mission to be an organization that existed for one purpose— to develop kingdom leaders. As far as I know, there are few organizations that have ever said that they exist totally for the purpose of fulfilling an important process in an overall agreed upon mission. Making “leader development” the aim of the organization is like saying that the goal of driving is roads or that the
purpose of eating is food. Roads and foods are generally accepted as means to an end, but not a destination. Is leader development a mission? When Campus Outreach declared that their organization came into existence to produce certain kinds of leaders, the impact brought both focus and energy. The organizational purpose was narrow, and the measuring stick was narrow—“Where are the leaders?” There were very few plans made for expansion but there was often the question of determining who were the key people that were being invested in. Strategic expansion was never driven by wanting to reach a certain number of campuses or have a presence in a certain number of states or nations because the operative strategic question was always just one when it came to planning: “Would this decision contribute to the building of more laborers or not?” I will define a “laborer” later in this paper, but the driving imperative that shaped the vision and mission of Campus Outreach was one thing: more laborers.

While ministry growth was an important value, the whole organization was built around one central paradigm—being a movement that developed kingdom leaders. In fact, every evolution of organizational development and every expansion initiative was driven by one driving force- the expansion of platforms and contexts to develop leaders.

What would organizational development look like if leader development were made as the primary mission of that organization? Is that objective big enough and clear enough to sustain a movement beyond the initial leadership generation? What impact does a stated mission have on leader development, organizational development and movement development?
The purpose of this project is to extract lessons about leader development from the forty-year history of Campus Outreach that will help churches and para-church organizations and expressions become more effective in the future. Not only will Campus Outreach’s past be explored and analyzed, but the present challenges for developing leaders among emerging generational changes will also be analyzed and recommendations for mission, leader development, organizational development, and movement development will be offered.

In order to gain insights and make recommendations, detailing the institutional history and summarizing lessons learned and best practices being used globally will be required. This paper will not only look at ways that Campus Outreach’s original mission has shaped the movement, it will also make recommendations how to increase the staying power of Campus Outreach’s key leaders and effectiveness of its current movement.

In part 1, this paper will explore the Campus Outreach history. Chapter 1 will look at how a stated mission shaped every aim and action and produced an organization like Campus Outreach. Chapter 2 will explore in depth what Campus Outreach has meant by leader development and how this philosophy, development of people and its processes have shaped the Campus Outreach context and impact.

In part 2, “Theological Review,” both theological directives and mission shaped by theology will be explored. In chapter 3, the literature review will seek to identify guiding paradigms for Campus Outreach’s mission, its commitment to leader development, and its approach to operationalizing its mission. Chapter 4 will
summarize how these theological paradigms should shape the culture, content, context of Campus Outreach.

In part 3, “Ministry Strategy,” the past will be explored, including an extensive survey from past key leaders and the majority of present leaders within the movement. Current practices will be analyzed. Chapter 5 will look at how Campus Outreach has attempted to operationalize the vision and values and identify pitfalls through the culture that has been created. Chapter 5 will discuss movement development and address the changes recommended to remain a strategic leader development movement. Current challenges which changes have caused mission drift or a shadow mission to emerge will also be identified. A Summary and Conclusions section will offer recommendations to the local church, future campus ministries and other kingdom-minded organizations in regard to the impact of leader development on mission success.
CHAPTER 1:
DEFINING THE MISSION DEFINES EVERYTHING

The Power of a Model

Reverend Frank Barker has served as a pastor at Briarwood Presbyterian Church for over fifty years. As founding pastor and now pastor emeritus, he has seen the church grow to over 6,000 members and send out hundreds of pastors, ministry workers, and missionaries around the world.\textsuperscript{1} The ministry was built on personal evangelism and personal converts, and this beginning of Briarwood shaped the beginnings of Campus Outreach as well. When people meet Barker, they are not overly impressed with how he carries himself or even how he presents himself.\textsuperscript{2} As a former Navy fighter pilot and electrical engineer, Barker seems less interested in conversation and more interested in production. He is an unassuming and humble servant of Christ. One thing many people are struck by as they get to know him, hear about his life and watch him serve Christ is that he is focused on the task of making disciples.\textsuperscript{3} Those close to him describe his

\textsuperscript{1} “Barker, Jr., Frank,” Briarwood Presbyterian Church, PCA, accessed October 6, 2018, briarwood.org/resources/staff-directory/frank-barker-jr/.

\textsuperscript{2} Kent Bailey, interview with author, August 12, 2018.

\textsuperscript{3} Ibid.
prayer life and his commitments to evangelism and the Great Commission (to reach all nations), being faithful in the study and teaching of God’s word, equipping future leaders through teaching seminary, developing leaders through giving opportunities and providing direction, building relationships across racial lines as a reconciler, and faithfully serving one local church in a suburb of Birmingham, Alabama as evidence of his vision for making disciples.

As the key influencer in establishing the ministry of Campus Outreach, Barker’s vision and character have contributed to the shaping of the movement. This is also true for shaping the leadership of Briarwood Presbyterian Church, the founding church of Campus Outreach. These qualities that are so evident in Barker’s life and leadership became the guiding values of the Campus Outreach movement. Tom Caradine and Curtis Tanner regularly had Barker speaking and providing training to the staff in the areas of prayer and the power of the Holy Spirit, evangelism and the Great Commission (to reach all nations), study and teaching of God’s word along with personal disciple-making, the importance of solid theological training, building relationships across racial lines as a redemptive reconciler, faithfully serving under the leadership of a local church, and leader development through giving opportunities and providing direction. If someone asked Barker how he discipled others or how he developed leaders, he usually had very little specifics to say other than it was important to follow the model of the Lord Jesus while he developed disciples. He would often reference the book *The Master Plan of

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{4} Ibid.}
\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{5} Ibid.}
Evangelism by Robert Coleman, and Coleman and others came in from time to time to teach and train in the areas of personal disciple-making. While Barker’s life was pass-onable, his vocabulary and training style was much more organic.

The Law of the Life and Life-on-Life (Lk 6:40)6

Jesus said, “A disciple when fully trained, will be like his teacher.”7 In Campus Outreach circles this phrase began to be known as “the law of the life.”8 Jesus did not say a student when fully trained would be like his curriculum. He also did not say that a student when fully trained would be like his experiences. The reason Jesus said a disciple, when fully trained, would be like his teacher is because the law of the life is more profound and powerful than our intentions and aspirations for teaching. Campus Outreach staff took this to be the key transformative strategy to producing multipliers. This was not just passing on diagrams and techniques, but a belief that passing on the heart of discipleship (vision and values) could only be done with a few and among those engaged in multiplication ministry. This is how the phrases “philosophy of ministry” and “philosophy of training” emerged as guides for how Campus Outreach lived out its calling.9

---

6 All Scripture quoted is from the New International Version unless otherwise noted.
7 Brian Lewis, interview with author, August 12, 2018.
8 Ibid.
9 Ibid.
What Is Being Built?

How would a powerful model, shaped by the biblical example of Christ translate into a movement? The following diagram illustrates the need to clarify why an organization exists (results) in order to shape the activities in the workplace (process) and direct the investment of disciplined effort (manpower) and the use of money and creativity (resources). Without clarifying the outcome (results), it is likely that energy and resources will be wasted. Additionally, motivation will be negatively affected if those employed in the organization are unclear of the results or if the results are difficult to quantify. The more precise the intent of the organization, the greater the likelihood that the processes that are established and the motivation of the contributors will be maximized.

Assume that the purpose of this organization pictured in the diagram was to produce shoes. Before building out the process of shoemaking and before hiring and fund raising, it would be important to determine who would wear these shoes, what purchasers would be willing to pay in order to own these shoes, and how many people would be interested in owning a pair of these shoes. Once these results are determined, a more precise process can be determined.

Figure 1. Purpose and Process of an Organization
Mission Statement to Guide the Mission

Campus Outreach leaders determined that their calling was to produce laborers. They also concluded that a mission statement was needed to promote clarity and precision for this emerging movement. The original vision statement adopted was “building laborers on the campus for the lost world.” This vision statement identified the mission (building laborers), the audience (on the college campus), and the effect or vision (laborers sent from the campus to the lost world). The vision statement in itself assumes that when one builds a laborer, one will also build the internal locus needed for the vision to be accomplished. In 1999, the phrase “glorifying God” was added to the front of the vision statement to ensure that the motivation of everything was done for God’s glory. This statement has continued to be the mission statement of all Campus Outreach franchises.

How does leader development become a ministry and a movement? In the early stages, there was very little emphasis on ministry and movement development. Each campus ministry was focused on developing kingdom leaders, and staff were hired to develop them as kingdom leaders who could lead others with a vision of multiplication in mind. Over the years, the movement sought to more effectively reproduce the original vision. This pushed the leadership to attempt to formulate both organizational structures and metrics in order to produce more and better kingdom leaders. What was the result? The leadership did broaden its mission to also include the development of ministries and movements. This also will be explored in the next chapter.

---


11 Ibid.
Multiplication of Leaders as a Growth Strategy

Most organizational leaders define Campus Outreach’s philosophy of ministry as multiplication. Multiplication of the vision means that disciple-makers are called to focus efforts in a particular concentrated segment of all the body of Christ is called to be and do. Campus Outreach’s calling is categorized as an apostolic (outreach) arm of the church of the Lord Jesus Christ. In referring to apostolic ministry in contrast to pastoral ministry, this does not refer to apostolic miraculous gifts or new prophecy but simply the aspect of kingdom-building that involves the spread of Christianity beyond its presently defined borders. As an apostolic movement, Campus Outreach believes that multiplication aims to focus evangelism among the lost rather than just gathering Christians into a group. The most explosive approach to evangelism is multiplication that focuses on teaching disciples to grow in Christ and to equip these disciples to help others experience Christ. This vision on the campus of multiplying disciples extends to life beyond college, with the desire that graduates would leave the campus motivated and equipped to lead missional lives of kingdom influence in both vocational missions service and in the workplace.12

These simple expressions—internally (abiding in Christ in relationship) and externally in mission (evangelism, discipleship, leader development)—became the blueprint guiding principles for building disciples. It was not long before connections were being made on campuses outside of Birmingham and students were hungering for help in how to become disciple-makers. What began as an outreach to students on

12 Kent Bailey, interview with author, August 12, 2018.
Campuses in one southeastern city (Birmingham, Alabama) quickly became an outreach ministry at private and public colleges throughout the state of Alabama. Campuses were chosen that did not have other National Christian Ministries (Campus Crusade for Christ, Navigators or Intervarsity) present. In addition to weekly discipleship groups and ongoing campus evangelism strategies, conferences, retreats, and summer programs were developed in order to help fulfill the goals of the ministry. The pace of growth was rapid, and within the first decade, staff were ministering on campuses in the neighboring state of Georgia.

Language to Codify and Incarnate Values in Leader Development

The evolution of training language became an important part of leader development and spiritual formation in the early days of Campus Outreach. Sometimes formal training language was adapted for the purpose of explaining and equipping young leaders in gospel ministry. “Pass-on-ability” became a word that sought to summarize the training philosophy of Campus Outreach. Barker had this outlook in how he taught and how he lived. He developed a unique way to present the gospel that explained the importance of repentance and faith in conjunction with God’s character of holiness and love. This became known as “the Longer Presentation” and was the foundation of early evangelism training at Briarwood Church. When I was serving as an intern one summer, Barker invited me to attend his evangelism class and he took me on as one of his trainees. He encouraged me to memorize the Longer Presentation, and we met with

---


twenty others who discussed the theological concepts and prayed for opportunities to share the gospel. After the meeting, he took me to three different homes, and we shared the gospel using the outlines he had developed. Pass-on-ability soon became a part of all the training of Campus Outreach.

Most language was developed to describe the process of developing and nurturing a kingdom leader. Evangelism, Establishing, Equipping, and Exporting emerged as key processes for the training needed to develop a Multiplying Disciple. Evangelism involved the process of praying for unbelievers, building redemptive relationships with them, and exposing them to the word of God to understand the gospel of Jesus Christ. Establishing involved helping a new believer understand what Christ had done for them and to learn to walk with God through the means of grace. Equipping focused on developing the character, convictions and competencies of a follower of Christ as well as learning the skills to evangelism, establish and equip other believers. Exporting focused on helping college students transition from the campus ministry to the workplace or the mission field. The description title “Multiplying Disciple” was used on a continuum as an end product following the end goal of a Growing Disciple in the discipleship process. Leadership training centered on equipping leaders to develop skills and competencies in each of these areas of training.

The power of this paradigm often took shape by asking the question “Where are your disciples?” A person involved with Campus Outreach would be expected to disciple others even if they were very young spiritually. Shortly after I professed faith in Christ, I met with Tom Caradine and Curtis Tanner for four weeks during the summer to be established in my walk with Christ. I received some basic material from the Scriptures on
assurance of salvation, the lordship of Christ, how to have a devotional life, and the importance of the Great Commission. Following those four weeks together, I was given the little booklet by Dawson Trotman entitled *Born to Reproduce*. After reading this booklet that recommends multiplication rather than addition as the biblical strategy for growing the church, I was challenged to start my own discipleship group and multiply disciples to reach the world for Christ.

Shortly after coming on staff with Campus Outreach (I was the third male staff person hired), I recall staff meetings where charts were drawn up to determine who were the key men and key women on the campus. These students were considered committed to the vision of multiplication and wanted to be trained to become Multiplying Disciples.

**Franchising as an Expression of Leader Development**

By 1985 there were twenty-five people on full-time staff, and the relational nature of the ministry began to lose its intensity. Up until that time, developing leaders primarily focused on developing student leaders for each campus ministry. As graduates showed interest in joining the vision to multiply kingdom leaders, the need for developing the staff emerged as a major component of the leader development strategy. It was clear that if the principles that were being taught for “life on life” discipleship were to be reproduced, these principles would need to be applied to leading and developing the staff as well.

Curtis Tanner, the director, had made a strong commitment to shepherd and supervise each staff person, but there was very little personal engagement once the staff grew past ten people. Each campus had a campus director, who developed the ministries

---

15 Ibid.
and led the staff and key students, but each lacked personal guidance for these directors. Curtis suggested to the board that area directors be commissioned to supervise two to three campuses and to give direct leadership to a staff team of eight to ten. This kept the ministry relationally intensive and also allowed these emerging areas to hold their own retreats and training opportunities. This was no small adjustment. Curtis regularly used to say that the way to make a small ministry become big was to discover the secrets to how to keep a big ministry small. The concept here was that quantity of influence grows out of the quality of intense involvement and relationships. The area director structure was the first step in ensuring that Campus Outreach teams would remain small and their leaders would know the staff and be involved in the decision-making and leadership of the whole organization. The goal was to keep the regional teams small enough to make sure that accountability and involvement, along with support and guidance, would be the typical experience for every Campus Outreach staff person. The result was that deep relational commitments were forged, the ownership of the mission was spread beyond the founders to the staff, and quality life-on-life ministry was taking place.

How would the personal development of leaders and the personal ownership be maintained as the ministry grew? All the staff at this point considered themselves founders and part of the first generation establishing this new movement. How would a first-generation mentality be perpetuated as longevity and expansion issues emerged?

The concept of franchising was applied to the Campus Outreach movement. At the time, businesses like Howard Johnson’s and Macdonald’s became some of the most
visible franchises that surfaced after World War II.\textsuperscript{16} The concept of franchising involved allowing localized ownership to be helped by a national brand that brought expertise and resources, including marketing and strategy for an agreed on financial fee. National or global franchise standards were to be met by each local store. Participation in the network franchise was required to maintain the franchise brand and services.

Campus Outreach built their idea of franchising around the biblical concept of servant leadership. This meant that the purpose of the global brand was not to extract as much benefit as possible out of the local expressions but to invest as much resourcing as possible in each brand through empowering and resourcing each particular franchised expression. Local churches in other regions were encouraged to become hubs for Campus Outreach and to provide the spiritual oversight and regional resourcing for new Campus Outreach teams. The network sought to train and prepare leaders and teams to pioneer new movements and to launch these trained teams to new geographic regions beyond the present Campus Outreach footprint.

In the early stages of growth with Campus Outreach, Birmingham, Alabama and Carrollton, Georgia emerged as shaping contexts for leader development. Birmingham was the place where the ministry was founded at Samford University and the ministry at Samford was the shaping influence for expansion to campuses throughout the state of Alabama. Most of the campus ministries in Alabama were started through relational networks of Christian college students seeking to go deeper in their faith while in college.

Campus Outreach emphasized discipleship and missions and attracted many students to live for Christ while attending college. Many students came to faith in Christ, but the emphasis initially was one taking disciples of Christ deeper in their faith.

West Georgia College was the first college that hosted a Campus Outreach ministry outside the state of Alabama. Though the campus was less than 30 minutes from the Alabama line, the students in the late 1980s were very different from the students in Alabama. Many of the West Georgia students were from Atlanta, Georgia, and the growth of business in the area had brought many companies to the South. These families had grown up outside of cities where spiritual heritage and family were synonymous, and many students were interested to investigating Christianity but were unexposed to the gospel message. In Carrollton, the ministry shifted to begin to emphasize the skills and competencies needed in evangelism since so many of the students were not professing Christians. The ministry in Carrollton became as effective a training ground to launch kingdom leaders off the campus as Birmingham and the small towns of Alabama had proved to be, but it added a more focused emphasis on evangelism among unbelievers.

After four years in Carrollton, there was a significant number of soon-to-be graduates who wanted to expand the vision of Campus Outreach to other campuses in Georgia. Through relational networks in Georgia, First Presbyterian Church of Augusta began to show interest in replicating the ministry of Briarwood Presbyterian Church. First Presbyterian Church was a 200-year-old church that had a historic involvement with medical students since the church and school were founded next door to one another. Students from Augusta became involved with Campus Outreach, and the church leadership became interested in expanding their outreach to college students in
southeastern Georgia and in South Carolina. This was an unusual concept since most churches only thought about outreach locally as ministry and outreach beyond their city as missions. Briarwood and First Presbyterian Church bought into the vision of investing in ministry to college students on campuses where students attended, even if those students would never join their church. This mission approach to ministry was radical in the 1980s and set a model for churches to commit to invest in mission even if this did not bring direct benefit back to the local church. There is little doubt that Briarwood’s model was very important, but First Presbyterian Church, as the first church to receive a franchise, was vital in the expansion of a vision based on leader development.

This franchising concept took off and not only attracted pioneering kingdom leaders but also caught the attention of reformed local churches that desired to be a regional influence in campus ministry. At the time, many local churches began to feel that they were not asked to partner in the way they desired with campus ministries, many of which were organized as parachurch structures, and these churches wanted to have more of a direct involvement in shaping and influencing college students. By 1999 (twenty years later), Campus Outreach teams had spread to sixteen regions in the United States and four countries internationally.17 Each regional team was under the authority and supervision of a local church and led by a key leader and a team of staff that were trained and equipped in another region and sent to pioneer a new work. Now, forty years later, Campus Outreach has over 850 full-time staff serving on over eighty campuses from San Diego, California, to Washington, DC, as well as in fourteen countries.18

---

17 “By the Numbers,” Campus Outreach Global Newsletter, Fall 2013.

18 “About Us,” Campus Outreach, accessed October 5, 2018, coatlanta.org/about.
are ministering on campuses in Minnesota under the leadership of Bethlehem Baptist Church and in Dallas, Texas, under the Village Church. Internationally, there is a growing indigenous staff movement in places like Thailand, Brazil, Australia, South African, New Zealand, and the Philippines.

Over the forty years of Campus Outreach’s existence, there have been thousands of staff and students who have been helped by the ministry. Many Campus Outreach staff, after flourishing and happy experiences working in the ministry, have left to become leaders in their local church at the pastoral and the lay level. Many regional directors have gone on to pastor churches, become missionaries, serve in international agencies, and be faithful leaders in all types of professions. As the ministry grew beyond one denomination (PCA) and one geographic location (the southeastern United States) and outside one country, the ministry faced challenges of contextualization and adaptation to emerging generations and trends. In recent days, a new challenge has emerged: a turnover trend among key leaders the last ten years has been increasing, shortening the stay of each key leader within the organization. The issue of health, effectiveness, and longevity among key leaders, known as regional directors, has become the single most challenging factor to the sustainability of the Campus Outreach movement for another forty years and beyond. Issues such as the health of the organization, reasons for staff departures and external cultural factors need to be examined to understand the reasons for an increase in transition among the key leadership.
More about Franchising

In 1999, there were seven stateside franchises and three international franchises. Each franchise operated as an independent entity under the authority and supervision of a specific local church. All international teams initially operated under the authority of Briarwood Presbyterian Church.

Most organizations grow by a linear process that involves several steps. First, organizations must identify a problem found in a particular target group and offer a suitable solution to that problem. In industry, this could be described as a product. Second, the organization must build a process that will address the problem by providing the product. Often this is called building a model. Next, it must produce and promote this product and this process as a viable solution to the problem to the target group.\(^{19}\)

Figure 2. Typical organizational growth strategy

Campus Outreach had set no collective organizational goals and had not even defined its internal values when it began to expand. A mission statement that everyone agreed was the guiding focus, and the process of leader development was generally

\(^{19}\) Ibid.
agreed on and embraced. Beyond these minimal standards, however, the only quality control element of the mission was a yearly franchise directors’ gathering. Often most of the discussion centered on who should attend and what qualified as a franchise, but the spirit of the four-day meetings usually centered on talking about the vision, catching up on the challenges each region was facing, and praying for one another. The yearly directors’ gatherings also created an awkward interaction between the stateside franchise directors and the international directors since so many of the challenges and landscapes they faced were different. Below are some of the paradigms that were agreed upon, which provided direction for assessment and strategy. It was generally agreed that in order to fulfill the mission statement, the method of building laborers involved reaching, building, equipping, and mobilizing college students. These words were utilized to clarify what evangelism, establishing, equipping, and exporting meant and how they were fleshed out.

![Figure 3. Methodology for reaching students](image)

Expansion was always a major part of the annual directors’ meetings discussions. The expansion strategy reflected the commitment to grow the organization organically by

---

20 Brian Lewis, interview with author, August 12, 2018.
building more quality kingdom leaders. Growing organically was not specifically defined, but most regional directors would agree that this meant that a team had to multiply before it expanded. This meant that a leader must first be built into not only a stable person of character but also a person who had been effective in personal evangelism and disciple-making. Beyond inner stability, this person needed to be effective at building a small staff team into a ministry team that desired to reproduce the vision. The diagram below illustrates the process.

The Campus Outreach Growth Strategy

Figure 4. Two flow charts showing campus outreach growth strategies

With such a loose organizational structure and a methodology that was undeveloped and undefined, the explanation for the rapid growth of the ministry must be found elsewhere. National Collegiate Ministries from around the country were traveling to visit Campus Outreach leaders to understand what secrets they had for such qualitative and quantitative growth. Apart from the blessing of God and the fact that the campuses in

---
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the southeastern United States were ripe for gospel harvest, the internal steering compass for the organization was not only its vision but also the value it placed on leader development.

What were the results of this “leader development” paradigm on the ministry and culture of Campus Outreach? Unprecedented growth took place and misunderstanding, hurt feelings and fall out also resulted. In chapter 2 the health factors that emerged from this emphasis will be explored and the weaknesses and difficulties that emerged will also be addressed.
CHAPTER 2:
LEADER DEVELOPMENT AS MISSION

Dr. J. Edwin Orr chronicles the dynamics of Student Religious Movements in the book “Campus Aflame.” Orr points out that in the United States and in England that most Universities were established as Christian preparation for the ministry. The word University explains the Christian quest to find unity in the diversity seen and expressed throughout all walks of life and disciplines. In the early 1800s a spirit of revival began to break out on colleges throughout the United States and in Europe. Later in that century, the Student Volunteer Movement formalized the recruiting of students for missionary service to countries that did not have a Christian presence or a Christian witness. These student-led movements created not only spiritual awakenings and revivals but also movements of interest to reach the unreached with the gospel of Christ. Groups formed like Inter-varsity Christian Fellowship and the YMCA (Young Men’s Christian Association) and the YWCA (Young Women’s Christian Association.)

Mentors and Models

After World War II, campus ministries began to be present on the Western U.S. coasts that focused on evangelism, discipleship and missions. Campus Crusade for Christ

and the Navigators, along with the Fellowship of Christian Athletes, Young Life and Youth for Christ emerged as ministries focused on reaching college students for Christ, growing these students as disciples of Christ and mobilizing these students for missions. Campus Outreach was influenced heavily by Campus Crusade for Christ and by the Navigators Ministry, as these organizations had placed staff in Birmingham, Alabama in the 1970’s and were helping Briarwood Presbyterian Church grow their church ministry of evangelism and discipleship. These para-church leaders were members of the local church and many served as formal church leaders that helped guide the outreach. With the exposure to these national and international ministries, the birth of this new campus ministry was influenced and aided by the gracious investment of more established campus ministries. Campus Outreach gleaned much from these organizations about leader development.

Campus Context

When Briarwood Church decided to reach students on the campus, the large campuses were mostly avoided since Campus Crusade and the Navigators were primarily focused on these campuses. Small campuses (usually less than 10,000 students) rarely had any evangelical witness and proved to be a great training ground for kingdom disciples. This was often discussed as a distinctive of Campus Outreach: targeting of small campuses. Other distinctives also highlighted were partnership with the local church and the importance of theology and not just practical living as part of the discipleship curriculum.

Targeting small campuses did play a part in aiding Campus Outreach with its mission of leader development. Small campuses offered easier access to students with
more opportunities to participate in the various activities that the students were involved with. Staff built relationships with the college administration and integrated into the life of the campus as mentors who were seeking to enhance the student experience. Since most students who attended these campuses lived close to the campus, students were able to introduce their families and friends back home to others involved in the campus ministry. Relational networking was enhanced by this kind of proximity. It does make practical sense that the more exposure you have with those you are investing in, and the more environments you are able to be involved with them in, the greater impact you will be able to have on shaping the lifestyle of those you are seeking to disciple. In the early 80’s and 90’s, no student had a personal cell phone and there was very little to distract them from the world where they found their feet walking. This context of presence and proximity allowed for daily and often multiple touches with students that promoted personal care and personal knowledge of issues students were facing.

Grids Versus Curriculum

Campus Outreach’s most utilized curriculum tool was “The Blue Book.” This Bible study tool helped students begin to look up verses and think through how to interpret the Bible and apply those truths to their daily lives. The Blue Book took 8-10 weeks to work through the basic material and allowed new believers an opportunity to develop a template for what it takes to be a growing disciple. The Blue Book was built from the diagram developed by Dawson Trotman entitled “The Wheel Diagram.” (see below.)

The Wheel Diagram pictures the strength of the Christian Life as flowing from the inward connection to Christ and what He has done for the Christian. Abiding in Christ is enhanced through the means of grace (Prayer, the Word, Fellowship and Witnessing). The outward expression of discipleship is displayed in obedience to Christ.

Figure 5. Wheel diagram depicting Christian discipleship

While some other tools emerged for helping new believers learn to orient their lives around Christ, most of the emphasis was on grids and not curriculum. Grids were outlines or paradigms that helped leaders understand basic concepts that were biblically based. Most discipleship and leader development with Campus Outreach utilized these basic grids while maintaining the Bible as the primary curriculum emphasis.

Studying the Bible was always seen as the central activity of a disciple and the essential training focus of the leader. Many of the staff began to use the books of Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians for deeper understanding of “Establishing” issues and the Gospels, Acts, 1 and 2 Timothy and 1 Thessalonians as guidance for ministry. Some studies and outlines were created, but most of the time the emphasis was on discovering principles to shape ministry attitudes and actions.

Dr. Alan Hadidian wrote a book entitled “Successful Discipling.” Later the book was published under the title “Discipleship- Helping Other Christians Grow.” This book provided a definition of discipleship that became a guideline for training leaders in understanding the process of training others. Hadidian defines discipleship in 3 phases: 1.

Many Campus Outreach staff adopted a version of Hadidian’s successful discipleship and used this sentence to guide the process of discipleship:

Discipling others is a relational process in which a Christian with a life worth modeling commits himself for an extended period of time to an individual(s) who has been evangelized; the purpose being to establish them in growth to maturity, to equip them to reproduce themselves into a third spiritual generation, and to export them to the world.\(^{25}\)

These components became the guidelines to personal discipleship:

1. Relational process
2. A life worth modeling
3. Committed to a few individuals for an extended period of time
4. These individuals have been evangelized
5. The purpose is to establish them in growth to maturity
6. And equip them to reproduce themselves into a third spiritual generation
7. And to export them to the world.

This is an example of the way grids and outlines provided direction for training.

Pass-on-Ability


\(^{25}\) Ibid.
Multiplying leaders requires something to be passed on to followers. The greater the clarity as to what is being passed on the greater the replication of both the attitudes and actions that are sought to be transferred. In Campus Outreach circles a phrase was often used, “More is caught than taught.” This phrase depicts a reality that teaching is not a linear data transfer but involves multiple factors and phases in learning. Jesus Christ called his followers disciples because those that follow Christ are called to be learners. Leaders will seek to cause others to learn by their motives and methods. Other books that had a shaping influence on discipleship methods include *The Lost Art of Disciplemaking* and *Be the Leader You Were Meant to Be* by Leroy Eims, and *Disciples Are Made, Not Born* by Walt Hendrickson.

Within the first decade, Campus Outreach wrestled with standardizing curriculum, but the leadership concluded that for the ownership of each emerging team and for the application of each emerging context it was better to focus of principles of leader development rather than producing curriculum. The factors listed above: mentors and models, context, curriculum all played into shaping pass-on-ability. The staff eventually committed to three components for leader development: philosophy, people development and process.

**Components of Leader Development**

John Milton Gregory was the first president of the University of Illinois.²⁶ He was a pioneer in public education and was effective at blending liberal arts curriculum with industrial and agriculture curriculum. Additionally, he was particularly concerned about
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properly educating women. In 1886 he wrote the book called *The 7 Laws of Teaching*, which dealt with principles that have shaped the way teachers approached their calling for a century. When Howard Hendricks wrote the book *Teaching to Change Lives*, he used Gregory’s seven laws and applied them to discipleship. The third law is called “the Law of Activity.”  

Gregory states the third law this way: “Knowledge cannot be passed like a material substance from one mind to another, for thoughts are not objects which may be held and handled…Ideas must be rethought; experience must be re-experienced.”

### Philosophy of Training

The Campus Outreach approach to training shapes how teaching, discipleship, and ministry took place in a relational context. Howard Hendricks calls this “the Law of Activity.” Campus Outreach leaders believed that a person’s understanding of training philosophy would profoundly shape their approach to ministry. Leadership training philosophy is more shaping than the materials one uses or the content one teaches. Leadership philosophy is also more important than developing gifts or skills in training. Philosophy shapes not only what is to be done and how it is done: “The way you teach teaches more than what you teach.” This phrase began to circle through Campus Outreach staff discussions as staff read books like those already mentioned along with

---

27 Ibid.

28 Ibid.


30 Brian Lewis, interview with author, August 12, 2018.
Teaching to Change Lives by Hendricks and the classic work from Robert E. Coleman, The Master Plan of Evangelism. Jesus’ philosophy reflected a training style that implies that demonstration is more important than dissemination of information.\textsuperscript{31} That is what is meant by training philosophy. A brief analysis of the chapter headings of Coleman’s book provides insight into the training philosophy. The headings are selection, association, consecration, impartation, demonstration, delegation, supervision, and reproduction.\textsuperscript{32}

Several observations stand out from observing Coleman’s summary of Jesus’s way in discipleship. Coleman states that Jesus’s “objective was clear.”\textsuperscript{33} Content is very important and the communicator (coach) has significant effect on the learning process, but the context we create for learning is possibly the most powerful component in transformative teaching (discipling).\textsuperscript{34} Additionally, Jesus created catalytic learning situations (either capturing a moment or creating one) to enhance their understanding. In The Master Plan of Evangelism chapters listed above, Coleman provides a hint to Jesus’ philosophy of training.\textsuperscript{35} This parallels Paul’s explanation of personal discipleship in 1 Thes 2:8: “We were well pleased to impart to you, not only the gospel of God, but also our very lives, as you have become very dear to us.” Translating the philosophy of

\textsuperscript{31} Frank G. Tunstall and Robert E. Coleman, The Master Plan of Evangelism (Franklin Springs, GA: Advocate Press, 1990), 68.

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid., 7.

\textsuperscript{33} Ibid., 17.

\textsuperscript{34} Brian Lewis, interview with author, August 12, 2018.

\textsuperscript{35} Tunstall and Coleman, The Master Plan of Evangelism, 14.
ministry and training into a strategy required trial and error and focused attention on principles to create paradigms that people could replicate. A diagram emerged that was used to facilitate an understanding of training that put the development of the leader in the center of all ministry activity. Each developmental component was defined:

Maximizing Leader Development

The Coach  The leader who is training the emerging leader in the context of life-on-life ministry by providing a compelling and involved model

The Content  Vision, knowledge, character and skills to be a disciple, leader, and multiplier

The Context  Discipling and leader development take place in the context of a ministry of evangelism; team building that is modeled by the trainer

The Catalysts  The movement (each campus and campuses in the area) along with key partnerships like church partnerships and like-minded ministry partners contributes to accelerating the exposure opportunities

---

Figure 6. Key components of leadership development

People Development

---
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A Key mentor in the early stages of Campus Outreach was a Bible Teacher named Dan DeHaan. Dan was leading Metro Bible Study, which had thousands of college age and young singles attending in the Atlanta area. Dan was a scholarly theologian who sought to make the lofty intellectual theological thoughts of A.W. Tozer and J.I. Packer accessible for college students seeking to grow in Christ. Dan DeHaan spoke regularly at retreats and conferences for Campus Outreach. His ministry placed an emphasis on two particular things that helped keep Campus Outreach from simply being a production oriented ministry based on what was done for Christ as a disciple. DeHaan joined Frank Barker in emphasizing the ministry of the Holy Spirit and abiding in Christ as the aim of maturity in Christ. DeHaan went on to emphasize an experiential approach to Christian living that set knowing God as the highest aim of the Christian. Many would call this an emphasis on quietism. While quietism has unbiblical expressions (the phrase Let Go and Let God is often associated with quietism), DeHaan emphasized knowing God and depending on God by placing the development of your spiritual being as more important than your Christian activity. This along with Curtis Tanner’s emphasis of taking the time to develop a strong personal relationship with Christ helped keep Campus Outreach for an overemphasizing activism. Character development, confronting and confessing sin though submitting to personal accountability and prioritizing extended times of pray and bible study marked the early years of the ministry.

People development requires more than just learning the grids and being committed to make sacrifices so other people could grow spiritually. This is seen in the
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epistle letters written to the early church in cities where the pagan culture was still having a greater influence on shaping the Christian community than the teaching of the apostles or the model of the Church leaders. Paul, among others, points out the lack of character being displayed and points out principles that were not being applied to specific moral and cultural situations in those cities. People development moved beyond emphasizing communion with God and began to address issues of character. Another category emerged in the pastoral epistles of I & II Timothy and Titus, emphasizing the character and practices of spiritual leaders in the church. This emphasis gradually emerged with Campus Outreach, extending people development to both the being (who you are) issues and the doing (what you practice).

While this was an emphasis among student ministry and staff development, Campus Outreach received significant criticism through the years as a ministry that over-emphasized doing over being. People were viewed and measured by their ability to contribute to the goal of developing more laborers, and the lack of emphasis on gifts led to many involved feeling undervalued because of their lack of productivity. There were plenty of examples of people feeling like their value was dependent on their commitment to the mission of Campus Outreach. This problem seemed to always follow the movement.

Common language emerged as the emphasis on developing leaders from the inside-out became the focus of the movement. Needless to say, there were plenty of failures, but the desire of the leadership was to develop people, and this kind of development from a biblical perspective started with inward development. Over time,
leadership language emerged with an emphasis on people development and not simply on productivity and contribution. These four areas are listed below with brief explanations:

1. Communion—grows out of connection with God from vision, knowledge and intimacy.

2. Character—grows Confidence (Gospel Identity), Knowledge (Contrition/Conviction) and Intimacy (Compassion for others).

3. Competence—grows through learning skills in the five areas of ministry deployment: evangelism, discipleship, teaching, counseling and administration.

4. Capacity—grows first in the context of team development and life management and includes leadership training, guidance and gifts development

(The diagram below is a picture of a complete approach to people development.)

![Figure 7. Wholistic approach to leader and people development](image-url)
The Process of Building a Leader

By the 1970s nominalism had been creeping into the church and was impacting the next generation.\(^{38}\) Children and youth saw the forms of Christian religious practice but seemed unengaged or unmoved by the vision of Christianity. Many students claimed to have had conversion experiences in their youth, but conversations on campus indicated that the idea of Jesus being Lord and authority in their lives and the mission of the kingdom of God being their ambition was rarely the case.\(^{39}\) The 1970s were also considered part of the youth cultural revolution in the United States.\(^{40}\) The Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s and the protest against the draft and the Vietnam War in the 1970s created a sense of unrest among emerging adults.\(^{41}\) Additionally, social norms were changing and sexual experimentation, racial blending of friendships, experimentation with drugs, and excessive use of alcohol became the experiences of many college students.\(^{42}\) College had once been a place where students discovered and prepared for their careers. More and more students were going off to college with the expectation and desire to experience new freedom and fulfillment. Much of this new freedom and fulfillment was thought to be experienced apart from family and religious morals.


\(^{39}\) Brian Lewis, interview with author, August 12, 2018.
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Christian college ministries like Campus Crusade for Christ, Youth for Christ, Fellowship of Christian Athletes, the Navigators, and Intervarsity Christian Fellowship had been engaging college students for decades and presenting the claims of Christ. Some ministries focused on gathering Christians and helping them to reach their lost friends with the gospel. Other ministries focused on going deeper in Bible study or taking missions seriously. Campus Outreach wanted to change the world by raising up a certain kind of difference maker that they called a laborer. In Mt 9:36-38, Jesus told his disciples, “The harvest is plentiful, but the laborers are few. Pray to the Lord of the harvest to send out laborers into his harvest.” With this focus to build laborers, Campus Outreach emphasized that people who had missional ambitions shaping their lifestyles would become people who would undertake ambitious missional objectives. In Campus Outreach circles, a missionally-ambitious person was a laborer. The term laborer became a guiding goal for the discipleship and leader development process of Campus Outreach. In order to teach and train students to reflect these values, a training curriculum was put in place to instill them, explaining what to teach and emphasize (see Appendix A).

The mission statement defined the ministry of Campus Outreach. A philosophy of ministry (multiplication and a philosophy of training [life-on-life]) was generally accepted and was the plumb line to evaluate if each region was being true to the mission and vision of Campus Outreach. It took nearly twenty years before the values of the movement were formally identified. There also was a commitment to highlight the importance of relationships as a key element to promoting both effectiveness and health throughout the movement, so the term “vital relationships” was added as part of the sketched-out summary of the vision and values. There was resistance to formalizing any
metrics or program expectations, but the key leaders did agree that describing the general components that make up Campus Outreach’s distinct vehicle (unique organizational expressions) would be helpful to promote quality growth.\textsuperscript{43} In 2000, Campus Outreach hosted a gathering with all regional churches represented (all pastors and board chairmen were invited to join the regional directors annual meeting), and a set of visions, values, vital relationships, and vehicle descriptions was presented.\textsuperscript{44} There was formal agreement that provided enough direction to be clear but also allowed for each region to be customized by the influence and values of each local church and board that was involved with Campus Outreach. The international directors also thought that this skeleton provided clarity but was not too confining for the international partnerships. In each location, both stateside and overseas, the goal was to have each church hold each team accountable to the implementation of the philosophy and strategy (see Appendix B).

A Systems Approach to Leader Development

This diagram emphasizes that the leader, his or her team, and those being ministered to in a particular context all shape and influence development. Development is not linear or static, and growth and development and deterioration are all happening in the system.

\textsuperscript{43} Brian Lewis, interview with author, August 12, 2018.

\textsuperscript{44} Kent Bailey, interview with author, August 12, 2018.
Figure 8. The impact of the leader, the team and the movement on development.

Personal Approach to Development

The training chart below reflects the need for a personalized approach to leader development. A leader must adjust his or her style of leadership and must adjust to the stages of leadership of each member since individuals will be at different levels of understanding and ownership. When a leader refuses to adjust the style, pace and expectations of development, individuals feel dragged along and depersonalized. The diagram depicts the importance of personalizing the leadership approach to each person who is involved and avoiding the generic approach for everyone. A generic approach usually leads to some feeling that they are not meeting expectations, and it can also lead to others feeling overwhelmed when they compare themselves to other team members. A personalized approach enhances understanding and ownership of each individual involved. Also note that autocratic leadership (telling) and responsive leadership (facilitating) should be present but should not be the main style of development being employed.
Developing a Leadership Pipeline as Part of the Process

In 2000, leadership consultant Ram Charan popularized the phrase “leadership pipeline” in his book *The Leadership Pipeline: How to Build a Leadership Powered Company*. This concept summarized what Campus Outreach had attempted to do starting twenty years earlier by creating integrated job descriptions for campus staff, campus directors, area directors, and franchise directors. Each leadership role required a greater amount of knowledge, skills, and experiences that built on shepherding (internal development and guidance) of staff and supervision (external missional responsibility).
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Campus staff were being guided and developed by campus directors, who were being guided and developed by area directors, who were being guided and directed by franchise directors. Additionally, each of these staff members functioned in teams that included members with different gifts and needs, which added both complimentary perspectives and additional complexities to challenge the leaders to grow and continue to learn. Over time, the area directors began to meet together and seek to determine what principles and practices needed to be standardized and passed on. Individual staff members were encouraged to set Personal Development Plans that would guide them and hold them accountable to growing internally and externally.

What resulted was the attraction of entrepreneurial leaders who were drawn to take risks and create a new expression of kingdom leadership development using the college campus as the launching pad. There was an additional emphasis on world missions that pushed these young disciples to pray for the world and for those who did not have the gospel as readily accessible as those in the southeastern United States. The movement momentum and growth were very rapid.

Soon the emphasis slightly shifted from growing kingdom leaders to growing movements. A kingdom leader was expected to lead a group of students to faith in Christ, to develop the students as disciples and leaders, and to deploy many of those won to faith in Christ inside the rapidly growing ministry movement of Campus Outreach.

There was rapid organizational growth and deployment of leaders, but such an intense rate of growth was difficult to sustain and replicate. While no one in leadership would admit that a shift took place toward an over-emphasis on doing (organizational deployment) and away from being (leader development), the net effect in talking to
alumni and to former staff has indicated that this was the case.\textsuperscript{46} This emphasis on the organizational vision took precedence over the fostering of personal vision and the promoting of kingdom vision. Since the movement was started among young people in their early twenties, this emphasis on production began to show signs of problems in sustaining the pace and the quality of the expansion. Additionally, personal maturity issues, personal gifts, and character stability were not factored into the growth plan for the movement. The expansion emphasis also did not take into account the challenges of marriage and family development that added other challenging dimensions to both leader development and movement deployment.

The leadership pipeline approach helped Campus Outreach clarify developmental training and expectations for young emerging leaders. The pipeline approach helped identify the necessary skills and competencies for leaders carrying out various assignments and also created camaraderie and shared experiences and insights across regional lines. There have been many benefits, but this pipeline also created frustrations that appeared more like a ladder than a progression for development. Some leaders were either scared off early anticipating the organizational expectations or were envious when others within the organization received new assignments. While anyone can fall prey to comparison, envy and jealousy, the pipeline structure emerged as an effective development tool for leadership within Campus Outreach.

Development and deployment of women leaders has lagged behind the development of male leaders. This doesn’t mean women were not valued or depended

\textsuperscript{46} Ibid.
upon for leadership within Campus Outreach. In recent years more attention has been given to the development of women leaders. In chapter 4, “Organizational Development,” some of the efforts being made will be mentioned.

Why has women’s leader development lagged behind the emphasis among the men? The theology of the churches leading Campus Outreach take a complimentary approach to women in leadership. Additionally, as married women began to focus on leadership in the home as children were born, this took away stable women’s leadership. Single women staff were committed but most left staff when they were married. The lack of attention to gifts also limited women to only a few roles within the Campus Outreach pipeline. However, there are some encouraging steps being made recently.

Feedback and Assessment

Campus Outreach staff members were always expected to report on what goals they were working on, the progress made on those goals and the plans ahead for new goals for the future. Usually a weekly, monthly and quarterly rhythm of reporting and feedback emerged with documented submitted by each staff person about the progress made toward agreed on goals. In chapter 4, the process of formal assessment is discussed, explaining its benefit and the need for it to continue.

Mentoring beyond the Movement

The growth of the networks of Campus Outreach has enhanced the process of leader development by providing multiple leaders who do similar jobs and who have developed expertise in their contributions. Staff who lead resourcing tasks like mobilizing graduates, managing finances and communication need expertise from both Campus
Outreach staff and those in their particular field. As mentoring was important in the early stages of Campus Outreach, it has emerged as a major part of a person’s development.

Sometimes members of the local boards or counselors can be mentors, as those with expertise in specific areas can be called upon to speak into a specific staff situation. Developing a mentorship network is an important component of a leader’s personal development. The book by Paul Stanley and Bobby Clinton *Connecting* emphasizes the need to develop a mentoring constellation of upward, downward, inward and outward mentors. (See diagram below)

![Diagram of the Mentoring Constellation](image)

**Figure 10. The importance of mentors for a leader’s development**
PART TWO

THEOLOGICAL REFLECTION
PART TWO:
THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

This section will address the theological basis for many of the questions that birthed Campus Outreach as a movement and many of the questions the movement faces. For a movement to be able to direct itself within the parameters of God’s call, defining its mission and being able to show alignment with the movement mission and the mission of God is imperative. *The Missional Church* is an analysis of the drift from mission among Christians in modern times in Western civilization and shows how the mission of Christ is and must be central to what it means to belong to Christ. Ralph Winter’s *Two Strategies of God’s Redemptive Mission* presents the evidence and experience of the early church to focus on both pastoral needs of care and apostolic goals of mission advance. Chapter 4 will analyze theological paradigms to shape the Campus Outreach missional theology.

Campus Outreach has defined its movement as a movement built upon and dependent on leader development. What are the philosophical, people development and process directives for a movement built on leader development? What does distinctive Christian leader development look like? This question of philosophy will be examined by
reflecting on Robert Clinton’s book *The Making of a Leader*. The next question is: How does leader development align with the biblical idea of people development? Richard Lovelace’s book *Dynamics of the Spiritual Life* will be a helpful resource for addressing this question. The last question in this discussion of leader development will look at *Revolution and Leadership* by Reggie McNeal to understand how to most effectively build a process to deliver quality leader development.

    Now that a movement has a clear philosophy and process to carry out that mission, how does the mission operationalize all that it does to create a culture that can be sustained? J. R. Woodward’s work *Creating a Missional Culture* is helpful to understand how to operationalize a leader development throughout an organization. Alan Hirsch and Tim Catchim’s *The Permanent Revolution* helps address the issue of missional sustainability by addressing current challenges and thinking beyond what the present structure and set of leaders are facing.
CHAPTER 3:  
LITERATURE REVIEW

Defining Your Mission:

*Missional Church, edited by Darrell Guder*

Every church of Jesus Christ has a mission. This does not mean that every church leader is clear on what the mission is or that the mission is coherently articulated. Mission has been explained as those activities that build and expand the church, but the definition must also align with God’s mission for the church. This paper will examine these theological arguments and apply this to the present context of university ministry in Western churches.

In *Missional Church: A Vision for the Sending of the Church in North America*, Darrell L. Guder emphasizes that the decline of Western Christendom’s spiritual influence has been the result of being unclear about the nature of the mission of the church.¹ Guder argues that church history can provide insight to show where progress has
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been made or how efforts have failed to reflect God’s intended design. It is true that the North American church has maintained its presence in the culture, but the loss of influence is due in large part to its loss of “mission” at its total program and form of identity. This has led the church toward activity but not always beneficial productivity. Mission is best understood by aligning the church with God’s nature and original plan.

Everything Is Mission; Nothing Is Mission

*Missional Church* presents a strong case that the church in the West has not understood its nature and mission. Guder points out that too often mission is “merely one among the various programs of the church” and is not seen as “the fundamental, the essential, the centering understanding of the church’s purpose and action.” Guder believes that the New Testament church properly understood its purpose in terms of missional calling. He states, “the purpose of the apostolic church is: to found missional communities to continue the witness that had brought them into being.” Guder points out that the apostolic mission shaped the church. He goes on to argue that the challenge for many years is that churches have been unaware that they have a problem.  
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in *Transforming Mission* writes, “The Church is always in a state of crisis and its greatest shortcoming is that it is only occasionally aware of it; this crisis helps deliver people from delusion to encounter the possibility of truly being the church.”

Church leaders must discern what went wrong and what they need to do to address these problems.

Alignment, Misalignment, and Realignment

First, when the church of Jesus Christ lacks alignment with God’s nature, it leads to an eccentric, or man-centered, mission. Guder points out that the nature of the church’s mission flows from God’s nature, which he calls a “theocentric mission.”

When ecclesiology and methodology do not grow out of a correct theological understanding of God and his nature, this leads to a human-centered expression of mission. The theology of the *missio Dei* defines the church within the framework of the doctrine of the triune God. Guder points out that the trinity has a reciprocal relationship in fulfilling the mission of the church. This reciprocal relationship is called *perichoreresis.* The mission of the church is to extend God’s mission in the world and not simply to be a self-justifying end.

Second, God’s model for missions is best seen and displayed on earth through the incarnation of Jesus Christ. A misalignment of the church of Jesus Christ with God’s model leads to syncretistic mission. Hebrews 1:3a (NASB) says that Jesus Christ is “the
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radiance of his glory and the exact representation of his nature.” Jesus Christ is the Word made flesh to dwell among his creation, and he was sent to reveal God’s nature and mission. As God in human flesh, Jesus sought to reveal that he was sent by God to “seek and save the lost” (Lk 15:10). After the resurrection Jesus appeared to his disciples and said, “As the Father has sent me into the world, so I am sending you” (Jn 20:21). Guder emphasizes that mission is the “apostolic nature” of the church that is the breaking in of the kingdom of God bringing God’s reign into human reality. Guder and the team involved in their research and writing project go on to point out that the church’s dynamic witness grew from the sense of being called to be a countercultural expression in the world. The “community of the word” is shaped around God’s “living hope” established by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. This hope points to God’s future reign and rule that will abolish death and evil as God establishes a new heaven and new earth. The incarnation of Jesus led the church to engage in apostolic witness to advance of the kingdom of God on the earth. Without seeing this as its model, the church will be led to syncretism and seek to use its earthly human powers to build influence for the institution. The church is called to bless the world with the spirit of the suffering servant, who comes “not to be served but to serve and to give his life as a ransom for many” (Mk 10:45).
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Third, when the church of Jesus Christ thinks that it does not need constant realignment with God’s nature, model, and plan, the expression of mission is anemic. Discipleship is the call to living under the lordship of Jesus Christ in a way that engages the culture around believers. This is not a one-time event, and it is not a “cheap grace” experience as Dietrich Bonhoeffer describes it. Missional Church points out that the ecclesiologies of institutional maintenance are not adequate to the task of world evangelization. In this sense, the church has sought to connect and relate to a world outside of its doors, but all too often this is an accommodation to popular culture rather than a robust discipleship that seeks to transform culture. Guder references the writings of Bishop Lesslie Newbigin, who helped the North American church see that its engagement of culture was either as antagonistic opponents or as absent separatists. Where the church has been unclear in its discipleship that teaches followers “to observe all that I have commanded you,” this has led to an anemic expression of mission (Mt 28:19). Engagement has been more about bringing consumerism and self-actualization of the culture into the church rather than freeing the culture from its destructive idols by living under Christ’s lordship. Discipleship is a lifestyle of repentance and faith that requires a constant realignment of believers’ purposes to God’s purposes and obedience that demonstrates faith in him. Missional Church points out that this is a pattern for personal discipleship but that the church often plateaus in its institutional discipleship and ceases to continually realign its heart with God’s heart in synergy for the mission.
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17 Guder, “The Church as Missional Community,” 121.
Defining Your Mission in Practice:

Two Structures of God’s Redemptive Mission by Ralph Winter

Ralph Winter, founder of the U.S. Center for World Missions at Fuller Theological Seminary, wrote a paper on the structure and advance of the kingdom mission of the gospel in the world. Winter points out that Christian apostles created centralized synagogue-like structures in the Jewish world and sought to embrace the decentralized parish connection of the Roman world. The emergence of the monastic expressions was not an attempt to “flee the world,” but a commitment to advancing the Christian movement in new cultures by enculturation of the gospel beyond familiar cultural soil. Winter believes that the medieval period formalized the two-fold ecclesial structure of the diocese or parish, which he refers to as the modalities, and the monastery and the missionary bands started by orders which he calls sodalities. Winter points out how Paul’s missionary band established parish churches in cities and nourished, equipped, and kept these churches directed by providing leadership, strategic presence, letter writing, and instruction. Winter asserts that not only has the church of Jesus Christ always expressed itself in dual structures and dual functions but also that this has been true in all ages. He refers to the nineteenth and twentieth century expressions of mission

20 Ibid., 125.
21 Ibid., 121-139.
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agencies and parachurch organizations as a continuation of the original design of the church for inward strengthening and care (the pastoral arm) and outward extension of the message and influence of the gospel (the apostolic arm). The word *apostle* usually refers to the original twelve plus the apostle Paul, who were chosen to advance the mission of Christ in a special, unrepeatable way. The word is also used in the book of Acts to refer to missionaries and those who are sent to advance the message and ministry of Christ. Ephesians 4 lists the functional leadership gifts of the church, which could be explained as having both apostolic and pastoral expressions. A movement focused on apostolic influence practices evangelism, centers on leader development and emphasizes missions. Pastoral influence focuses on shepherding and caring for people, practicing the sacramental duties of the faith, helping members of the body of Christ identify their spiritual gifts, and cultivating service in the community of faith and among neighbors. Pastors tend to have a primary focus on nurturing and caring for those in the faith community while evangelists focus on engaging those outside the faith community.

Winter makes the point that these two structures exist as part of God’s design for qualitative growth (parish or modalities) and quantitative growth (apostolic or sodalities). If these two structures are not shaping and influencing the church or Christian movements, the mission and maturity of the church will languish. Winter points

---

24 Ibid., 131-133.


26 Ibid., 127
out that whenever these structures were acknowledged, affirmed, and empowered, the kingdom mission of Christ in the world has advanced with power.  

Leader Development as Philosophy:

The Making of a Leader by Robert Clinton

The book The Making of a Leader grew out of research and studying biblical, historical, and contemporary spiritual leaders to learn about how leaders are formed and developed. Clinton and other researchers have now studied hundreds of spiritual leaders, looking into the process God uses to shape the soul of a leader. A major emphasis is that God builds leaders from the inside out. The importance of deepening one’s spiritual being is more of an indicator of ministry effectiveness and longevity than even matching gifts to assignments or matching interests to calling. Clinton concludes that there are five phases that God takes every spiritual leader through to shape and use them in service. Much of this shaping takes place when God is working in the leader by preparation, long before the leader can see clearly the positioning direction God has in mind. These five phases are as follows:

Phase I—Sovereign Foundations: God is developing the leader by laying foundations in his life. Lesson to learn: respond positively and take advantage of what God has done.

Phase II—Inner-Life Growth: God is drawing the leader into a personal, intimate relationship. The leader learns the importance of prayer, the word, and hearing God. Leadership potential is identified, and God uses testing experiences to develop character.

27 Ibid.
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Phase III—Ministry Maturing: Now the leader begins reaching out to others. He is using his spiritual gifts and being trained in order to be more effective. Many of these lessons zero in on relationships with other people or inadequacies in his own life.

Note: Ministry activity or fruitfulness is not the primarily focus of phases 1-3. God is working primarily in the leader, not through him/her. This can be a source of frustration if this is not recognized.

Phase IV—Life-Maturing: The leader has identified and is using his spiritual gifts in a ministry that is confirming and satisfying. He is gaining a sense of priority with his investments, and learning what to do and not do to advance his calling. A mature fruitfulness is the result. Isolation, crisis, and conflict take on new meaning as the leader is learning that “ministry flows out of being.” Deeper communion with God develops and learning to trust God becomes personal and continuous, not just intermittent or external.

Phase V—God moves the leader into a role that matches his gift-mix and experience so that ministry is maximized. Many leaders do not experience convergence due to their lack of personal development. At times an organization may hinder a leader by keeping him limited in a position. Some reasons are providential, which may be hard to understand. The major task in this phase is the guidance of the leader into a role and place where he can have maximum effectiveness.30

Clinton states that effective leaders will recognize development as a primary function of the selection of leaders and will see that to be effective, they must perceive their ministries in terms of a lifetime perspective.31 These perspectives will not only guide the effective leader in his or her own development and perspective but will also bring these realities to bear on the context of the leadership they create and the ways they emphasize growth and development as essential to effectiveness. This bias toward development will require leaders to help those they lead to develop a leadership

30 Ibid., 37-38.

philosophy. A leadership philosophy provides answers to the following questions: what God is doing in the world through the advancement of Christ’s kingdom (biblical dynamics), what the leaders’ understanding is of God’s calling on their lives (personal gifts), what the leaders’ understanding is of themselves, and what God is doing in their lives and relationships (situational dynamics).32

Additionally, this will lead to an emphasis on the development of a leader’s inner life in growing his or her communion (contrition, compassion, confidence) that comes from being shaped by God’s character and heart in the gospel. Effective leaders will also be part of a mentoring cluster to guide and influence other leaders.33

How Leaders Learn

*The Making of a Leader* emphasizes the importance of not just formal training in competencies but also relational learning and perspective.34 This requires that leaders receive feedback and are helped in developing a dynamic leader environment among the teams they seek to develop and lead. Discernment of spiritual gifts and team development are also essential for helping leaders learn.

Finishing Well

In the revised and updated version of *The Making of a Leader*, Clinton includes six characteristics of finishing well, six barriers to finishing well, and five enhancements

32 Ibid., 158.
33 Ibid., 214-215.
34 Ibid., 19, 211.
to the life of the one who finishes well. These papers were published in Clinton’s Biblical Leadership Commentary. 35

Table 3. Keys to Leaders Finishing Well36 by Robert Clinton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of Finishing Well</th>
<th>Barriers to Finishing Well</th>
<th>Enhancements to Those Who Finish Well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Maintain a personal, vibrant relationship with God</td>
<td>1. Finances, their use and abuse</td>
<td>1. Perspective, view present ministry with lifetime perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Manifest Christ-like character, displaying the fruit of the Holy Spirit</td>
<td>3. Pride leads to downfall</td>
<td>3. Disciplines in all areas, staying strong to serve others (mind, body, soul)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Truth is lived out. Convictions and promises are seen to be real.</td>
<td>4. Sex, illicit relationships</td>
<td>4. Learning posture, humility and hunger to grow and give</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. They leave behind ultimate contributions.</td>
<td>5. Family, critical issues not sufficiently addressed</td>
<td>5. Mentors, relational empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. They walk with a sense of destiny and see some of it fulfilled.</td>
<td>6. Plateauing, minister out of competence but not dependence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Leader Development and People Development:**

*Dynamics of the Spiritual Life, by Dr. Richard Lovelace*

Dr. Richard Lovelace writes in *Dynamics of the Spiritual Life* that God’s plan for believers is continuous renewal through growing the gospel’s influence to bring about


36 Ibid., 199-215
saving faith and hopeful renewal. This book functioned as a helpful microscope to analyze the condition of a person’s spiritual state/heart at a dynamic or present moment.

It seems to me that when people fall, it is important to understand not only why they have fallen but also how to keep from falling in the future. This outline of the theology (preconditions), beliefs (primary elements), and lifestyle (secondary elements) provides insight into people’s experiences with God and a description of what inside-out living (IOL) requires (I also will be referring to the IOL paradigm as heart work).

The inner life with God is mystical, subjective, and experiential, making it difficult to describe. Jesus said, “The words I give you are spirit and life” (Jn 6:63b).

When explaining the spiritual life to a Jewish religious leader named Nicodemus, Jesus said, “The wind blows wherever it pleases. You hear its sound, but you cannot tell where it comes from or where it is going. So it is with everyone born of the Spirit” (Jn 3:8). The question that arises from this passage is whether the spiritual life can be objectified. Jesus did indicate that when the Spirit of God was sent to every believer, he would “guide you into all the truth. He will not speak on his own; he will speak only what he hears, and will tell you what is yet to come” (Jn 16:13).

Richard Lovelace’s Spiritual Life renewal outline provides “a map” and “a compass” to engage with spiritual leaders in regard to the condition of their spiritual lives: a map to identify places where their hearts have drifted from “the simplicity and purity of devotion to Christ” and a compass to guide their hearts back to a God-centered
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37 Richard R. Lovelace, Dynamics of Spiritual Life: An Evangelical Theology of Renewal (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1979), 72-74.
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life that denies self, takes up their cross daily and follows Christ (2 Cor 11:3, Lk 9:23). The call of leaders is to experience the spiritual life God supplies, while also seeking to understand it and explain it to others so that they too can experience an intimate relationship with God. Lovelace speaks in the outline of the book of preconditions and primary elements. This is very helpful language as it provides insight not only into the elements of the gospel’s renewal but also into how learning the truths of the gospel’s work done for believers brings about transformative change in them. Lovelace has studied the Scriptures, church history, and historic revivals to explain renewal. Gospel renewal is spiritual formation, an attempt to provide an umbrella of understanding for how God is at work in the life of a believer to change him or her into God’s likeness. In that sense, the term discipleship could be exchanged synonymously with the phrase spiritual formation, as the goals are the same. Recently, the term discipleship has been understood as a program or materials that someone studies. Spiritual formation emphasizes the holistic process of life transformation. As Lovelace states, renewal takes place when there is alignment in one’s theology (preconditions), beliefs (primary elements), and lifestyle (secondary elements).

I found Lovelace’s study of spiritual renewal particularly helpful in understanding why leaders plateau in their internal change. As Clinton speaks of ministering out of competence rather than dependence, Lovelace points out that if both the primary and secondary elements are not evaluated, a leader’s heart will drift and be conformed to

[39 Ibid., 75.]
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cultural idols rather than gospel love.\textsuperscript{41} \textit{The Making of a Leader} focuses on the environment and dynamics that God takes every leader through to form spiritual and leadership development. Lovelace’s \textit{Dynamics of the Spiritual Life} highlights the theology, beliefs, and lifestyle necessary to be formed into Christ-like reflections.

**Leader Development as Process:**

\textit{Revolution and Leadership, by Reggie McNeal}

In \textit{Revolution and Leadership}, Reggie McNeal points out that the New Testament developed and deployed apostolic leaders because this was the vision.\textsuperscript{42} The early church was a small movement in the pagan and secular cultures, and the gospel implications led the leaders to shape a movement that would engage the ideas of the marketplace, the political structures, the family and community, and the personhood issues in order to reshape the culture. McNeal points out that this requires thoughtfulness in the visionary, missional, empowerment, and team orientation of a movement.\textsuperscript{43} The visionary element is cultivated and personalized when the movement (leadership) and in the community (lifestyle) are engaged. The missional aspect of a movement regularly evaluates where God is at work in the church and where God is at work in the world. This is a dynamic process not built on forms and systems but on organic growth. Finally, the movement must have an empowering element. As the ministry grows, the number of leadership assignments must increase.

\textsuperscript{41} Ibid., 74.


\textsuperscript{43} Ibid., 81-87.
In Acts 6, 8, 11, and 13, church leaders promoted ownership and equipping as key ingredients to growing the movement. The church must release the ministry from being bottlenecked in the hands of a few professionals. Additionally, the aspect of partnership which McNeal calls clusters allows for learning communities to be established without creating authoritative hierarchy and bureaucratic control. These clusters of learning provide encouragement, feedback, focused learning, and outlets for leaders to move beyond their day-to-day relationships and tasks to engage with other learners. Apostolic leaders practice and reproduce a leadership that is plural in its essence and expression. Effective leaders build teams around themselves and teach others to build teams.

McNeal summarizes the essential key resources that effective apostolic leaders need. Prayer is the first; decisions made in an atmosphere of prayer will produce dependence upon the Holy Spirit. Prayerfulness will shape the spiritual engagement of others and set a tone of kingdom dynamics. Leaders need a staff and leadership team to support their work. This team must be insightful and self-aware, fostering lay leadership so that the work can extend beyond the hired staff. Lay ministry partners carry out the kingdom initiatives by helping people discover their callings, gifts, and talents. They are free to serve as missionaries in the world. Leaders need more time to develop ministry than they do to enact it. Increasing the impact of movements through key people is the

44 Ibid., 48.
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best use of the leader’s time. This requires an ability to catalyze leadership influence through other leaders. Finally, no leader can operate without money, facilities, and technology. Money should be invested in people, facilities, and services that advance the mission strategically. Affordability, flexibility, accessibility, and expandability must be factors to consider when investing in facilities and technology.

**Shaping Organizational Culture Based on Leader Development:**

*Creating a Missional Culture, by J.R. Woodward*

Alan Roxburgh writes, “Missional Leadership is about cultivating an environment that innovates and releases the missional imagination present in God’s people."^48^ Woodward suggests that there are five types of environments that are necessary to create a missional culture. He also points out that Newbigin writes, “If the church is to be effective in advocating and achieving a new social order in the nation, it must itself be a new social order.”^49^ The idea is that as people are being transformed and changed, the church becomes a transformed community and an influence in the broader culture. Woodward’s premise is that if any of these influences are not present in the church, the church will not be formational in shaping culture.

It is important for a church to be a learning environment. Teachers cultivate learning environments where God’s people immerse themselves in God’s narrative and engage in sacred assemblies and future-oriented living. God’s intention for all of creation is eternal worship of himself. Churches must be formational in engaging people with

---
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environments that teach God’s people how to love him with all their heart, soul, mind, and strength.

The church should also be a healing environment. Pastors help God’s people embody the ministry of reconciliation and cultivate a life-giving spirituality in God’s new family. Soul healing must not only be a high priority but also must be modeled and experienced at every level of the gospel community. Confession and peacemaking must be regular practices and liturgies.

Evangelists model, involve, and invite people to bless their neighbors and be redemptive agents in their vocation. Their ministry should create a welcoming environment for those coming into the church. These storytellers show hospitality and humility in loving and caring for others in Christ’s name and patiently guiding seekers through the Scriptures to understand and embrace God’s redemptive pursuit of humanity.

The church must also be a liberating environment. Prophets help congregations cultivate practices of communing with God, being present with God through prayerful solitude, silence, and fasting, and the practice of the Lord’s Supper. Connecting with the liberating God creates a liberating environment from personal and social sins by forming spirit-transforming communities.

Finally, a church should be a thriving environment. Apostles call people to join God in the redemption of all things by developing a strong discipleship ethos. This includes the practices of Sabbath and making disciples by helping people live out their primary calling to follow Christ through their gifts and vocation.\footnote{Ibid., 186-196.}
Woodward’s ideas about culture match up with what Andy Crouch, who in *Culture Making*, writes that Christians have the best and most lasting ideas and they should be creating flourishing communities. All too often, Christians are guilty of condemning, critiquing, copying, and consuming culture rather than creating something different and better. He connects the creation narrative and the gospel narrative of redemption and renewal to inspire us to take steps to be creators and not simply consumers. Gaining a deeper understanding of grace helps followers of Christ discover the motivation needed to inspire new and life-giving expressions to our world.

Polycentric Leadership

The central paradigm of leadership in the scriptures is servanthood. The central characteristic required is humility. The example in Scripture has always been a multiple-voiced, multiple-gifted team of leaders shaping and guiding the people of God. J. R. Woodward points out some examples of this type of team approach to leadership. Scripture consistently shows the Trinitarian nature of mission and leadership. “The Trinity is a loving community of persons, each fully sharing all the divine attributes. This mutual embodiment means they share in each other’s work. The Son and the Spirit join the Father in creation; the Father and the Spirit join the Son in redemption; and the Father and the Son join the Spirit in sanctification, which doesn’t preclude there being primary actions of each person.”

---
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Various books and sections of Scripture demonstrate specific leadership. The book of Revelation demonstrates God’s eternal leadership in heaven as well as the leadership of his people. With God at the center, the Hebrew tribes and the Christian apostles collaboratively lead the congregation in community (Rev 4:9-11). In the gospels, Jesus did not call one person to be a senior (solo) shepherd and others to assist. While it is implicit that Peter, James, and John had greater access to Jesus and greater leadership responsibility, the context of leading leans toward pluralistic and collaborative expressions and not hierarchical or singular.

Additional key sources of examples of church leadership are found in the epistles and the book of Acts. Galatians 2:9 indicates that the church in Jerusalem was led by Peter, James, and John. Paul refers to them as pillars. It is clear that they were all significant contributors, with James probably the designated leader (Acts 15). In 1 Peter 5:1-3, Peter addresses the multiple elders. The word he uses is overseer, and it is clear he assumes each church would have multiple overseers:

To the elders among you, I appeal as a fellow elder and a witness of Christ’s sufferings who also will share in the glory to be revealed: Be shepherds of God’s flock that is under your care, watching over them—not because you must, but because you are willing, as God wants you to be; not pursuing dishonest gain, but eager to serve; not lording it over those entrusted to you, but being examples to the flock. And when the Chief Shepherd appears, you will receive the crown of glory that will never fade away. In the same way, you who are younger, submit yourselves to your elders.

Paul addresses the letter to the Philippians jointly with Timothy (1:1). Additionally, Paul addresses the overseers: “Paul and Timothy, servants of Christ Jesus, To all God’s holy people in Christ Jesus at Philippi, together with the overseers and deacons.” There were clearly multiple teaching elders leading and serving in Antioch (Acts 13:1-2).
Additionally, when the Holy Spirit commissioned apostolic leaders to start new churches, the instruction is for Barnabas and Saul to go together:

Now in the church at Antioch there were prophets and teachers: Barnabas, Simeon called Niger, Lucius of Cyrene, Manaen (who had been brought up with Herod the tetrarch) and Saul. While they were worshiping the Lord and fasting, the Holy Spirit said, “Set apart for me Barnabas and Saul for the work to which I have called them.

The stories in Acts 13-28 show that Paul always traveled with a team of pastors (Barnabas, Timothy, Titus, Luke, John Mark and others). Paul left Titus in Crete and instructed him to develop poly-centered leadership team(s): “The reason I left you in Crete was that you might put in order what was left unfinished and appoint elders in every town, as I directed you” (Titus 1:5). Even after Paul and Barnabas separated due to a sharp disagreement, both took other pastors along with them. Barnabas took John Mark and Paul took Silas:

Some time later Paul said to Barnabas, “Let us go back and visit the believers in all the towns where we preached the word of the Lord and see how they are doing.” Barnabas wanted to take John, also called Mark, with them, but Paul did not think it wise to take him, because he had deserted them in Pamphylia and had not continued with them in the work. They had such a sharp disagreement that they parted company. Barnabas took Mark and sailed for Cyprus, but Paul chose Silas and left, commended by the believers to the grace of the Lord. He went through Syria and Cilicia, strengthening the churches (Acts 15:36-41).

Paul opens his letter to the Thessalonians with Silas and Timothy as also writers and perceived equals and shared leaders: “Paul, Silas and Timothy, To the church of the Thessalonians in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ: Grace and peace to you” (1 Thes 1:1). Acts 18 illustrates that Paul was regularly developing and promoting new pastoral leaders. Apollos came to Ephesus and was brilliantly gifted and passionate but needed direction and equipping. Priscilla and Aquilla, those who Paul brought from
Corinth, trained and equipped this young and gifted leader. Woodward summarizes this way:

The picture given throughout Acts and the Epistles is that the under-shepherds live together as a communal example, priests ministering to fellow priests, not lording it over others but recognizing the need to care for, encourage and exhort those entrusted to them by the chief Shepherd, Jesus Christ. As they follow Christ and share the Word by the power of the Spirit, the people of God respond to the work of the Holy Spirit in their lives, and more leaders are raised up to equip others. As this happens the current leaders appoint new leaders in every church, based on the Spirit’s work (character, knowledge, and skill development) in their lives, so that they might exercise their gifts for the common good. As a result, the entire people of God contribute to the building up of the body of Christ and expanding the kingdom.54

Creating an Equipping Ethos

Woodward poses an important question for church leaders to consider: “What would the church look like,” he asks, “if everyone in the church used their God-given gifts to equip the rest of the church in such a way that the entire church became more like Jesus? And if the whole church looked more like Jesus, how much more would our neighborhoods and cities look like heaven?”55 For a church to multiply ministry, it must be developing coaches that have the skills and knowledge to pass them on to others. This is the skill of equipping. Woodward points out that an “equipper ethos” must be cultivated by helping leaders not only serve in formal leadership but also to expand the influence of the church in the community.56 Woodward references Joseph Myers’ work, *The Search to Belong*, identifying the four kinds of spaces people live in.57 He points out
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that each congregation must be wise in determining how to pursue making disciples in each of these spaces.\textsuperscript{58}

Public space allows a community to share a common experience in a larger space.\textsuperscript{59} This space becomes missional if it reshapes people to inhabit God’s story in their everyday lives. In social space, people select community in order to go deeper and to belong.\textsuperscript{60} The Bible talks about households that refer to the mid-sized prime building block of the church. In personal space, people connect through private relationships.\textsuperscript{61} Personal space includes the eight to twelve people a person feels close to, with whom the person spends much time, such as Jesus with the twelve disciples. Finally, in intimate space, people share experiences, feelings, and thoughts. Intimate relationships are those where people are known and not rejected or feel ashamed.

A strong discipleship culture seeks to make disciples in each of these spaces.\textsuperscript{62} Myers points out that today’s emerging generation longs for intimate space along with personal space.\textsuperscript{63} Baby boomers have often been willing to accept public and social space as adequate contexts for being known. Myers defines belonging as “identifying with
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another entity.”64 He points out that leadership insight is required to spot, develop, and commission equippers in each of these spaces.65

**Leader Development and Movement Sustainability:**

*The Permanent Revolution*, by Alan Hirsch and Tim Catchim

Alan Hirsch, Mike Breen and Tim Catchim, writing *The Permanent Revolution*, emphasize that the apostolic imagination and practice of the church of Jesus Christ has been largely lost in the twenty-first century.66 Their theological framework is built around the explanation of the work of the church in the epistle to the Ephesians, particularly focused on Ephesians 4:1-16. They call these specific offices and gifts of the church the “synergies of difference.”67 The authors make the point that after the Reformation, in Protestant circles, an overemphasis on pastoring and teaching replaced the important roles and functions of apostles, prophets, and evangelists.68 The book defines these leadership functions this way:

**APOSTLES** extend the gospel. As the “sent ones,” they ensure that the faith is transmitted from one context to another and from one generation to the next. They are always thinking about the future, bridging barriers, establishing the church in new contexts, developing leaders, networking trans-locally. Yes, if you focus solely on initiating new ideas and rapid expansion, you can leave people and organizations wounded. The shepherding and teaching functions are needed to ensure people are cared for rather than simply used.
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PROPHETS know God's will. They are particularly attuned to God and his truth for today. They bring correction and challenge the dominant assumptions we inherit from the culture. They insist that the community obey what God has commanded. They question the status quo. Without the other types of leaders in place, prophets can become belligerent activists or, paradoxically, disengage from the imperfection of reality and become other-worldly.

EVANGELISTS recruit. These infectious communicators of the gospel message recruit others to the cause. They call for a personal response to God's redemption in Christ, and also draw believers to engage the wider mission, growing the church. Evangelists can be so focused on reaching those outside the church that maturing and strengthening those inside are neglected.

SHEPHERDS nurture and protect. Caregivers of the community, they focus on the protection and spiritual maturity of God's flock, cultivating a loving and spiritually mature network of relationships, making and developing disciples. Shepherds can value stability to the detriment of the mission. They may also foster an unhealthy dependence between the church and themselves.

TEACHERS understand and explain. Communicators of God's truth and wisdom, they help others remain biblically grounded to better discern God's will, guiding others toward wisdom, helping the community remain faithful to Christ's word, and constructing a transferable doctrine. Without the input of the other functions, teachers can fall into dogmatism or dry intellectualism. They may fail to see the personal or missional aspects of the church's ministry.69

The church in the West has lost its sense of mission, and while emphasis was given to send missionaries, the apostolic nature of the church in North America and Europe ceased. It was not surprising that as the local church began to decline in the 1970s and 1980s, the average person lost any sense of need for God in his or her daily life.70 Since Christianity was not making a personal difference in the daily life of an individual, it was rare that an individual would invite a friend who was not a believer to consider the claims of Jesus Christ. Churches became less outreach-oriented and more focused on
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keeping their denominational group committed to their specific beliefs and practices. Apostolic movements were often raised up outside of the local church and were focused on expanding the kingdom through evangelism, discipleship, and social action. These were the characteristics of the early church.

Hirsch, Breen, and Catchim point out that sociologists like Rodney Starks note that when revival and the spread of Christianity accelerated through church movements, (like the spread of early Methodism, the Moravian movements, early Pentecostalism, or the underground church growth movement in China), the characteristics of apostolic enthusiasm always existed in the understanding and expression of every member of that group. It was not that a small or separate sect of the group focused on outreach, mission, and taking the gospel to others, but it was understood to be part of the DNA of the very group itself.

Hirsch, Breen, and Catchim call an apostolic movement that is built for spontaneous expansion a movement built with “apostolic architecture.” The book explores the idea of sodalities and modalities as a helpful framework for understanding how movements that grow movements expand. They reference Ralph Winter’s work and his explanation for how the church has always grown throughout the centuries by emphasizing both the modalic and sodalic expressions of the nature of the church. A modality is a structured fellowship where there is no distinction of sex or age. A sodality is a structured fellowship in which membership involves a second decision beyond
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modalic membership. Often either age or sex or marital statues limits a sodality. This was explored earlier in the review of an article written by Winter. Hirsch, Breen, and Catchim point out that all expanding movements keep both of these realities vital and active and find life and health from organizing this way. The authors expand on this by talking about all apostolic movements being shaped and guided by four principles:

**Self-Organizing**—the ability for a movement to contain, channel and mobilize resources, move toward greater complexity if needed to advance its self-stated mission and purpose. Experimentation becomes the norm, taking people and place seriously and applying realities and truth to each new identity approached.

**Self-Generating**—each community is responsible for its own survival and for extending its own influence. This follows a natural leadership, reproducing disciples, leaders, churches and movements.

**Self-Sustaining**—this involves keeping the focus on the mission of the movement and not building a movement inordinately dependent on external organization, funding, or control. If this happens within a church or an apostolic movement, eventually this will lead to the loss of lay involvement, loss of focus on evangelism and outreach, and loss of devotion to the mission and the vision of the movement.

**Self-Reflective**—Apostolic movements must build into their systems self-regulation that generates tools to analyze, reflect, learn, and adapt without having recourse to some central system that regulates what is, and is not, permitted. Guided by a love for God, the presence of the indwelling Holy Spirit, and a deep commitment to the scriptures, God’s people are able to make the right choices, and God’s leaders are able to help the movement grow its people to maturity. Without a system of self-reflection built into the movement to identify bureaucracy and centralization, a policy and procedure driven approach to leadership will dominate, and creativity will decrease, and control will increase. Missiologists have this self-reflective ability to be self-theologizing.74

This involves recognizing that the process of institutionalism moves a church or a movement from:

**Routine to Routinization**—The early church was an organic movement that eventually began to define and encode its leadership with defining beliefs,

74 Ibid., 229-238.
building structures, and scripted messaging to ensure its pass-on-ability. Unchecked, routinization easily drifts into institutionalism and seeks control and stability more than growth and innovation.

**Vocation to Manuscript**—As movements struggle to preserve their unique message, they generate manuscripts. Written literature can only capture some of the dynamics for why and how things grew and took hold in people’s lives. These ideas are separated from the charisma and calling that generated the ideas, and instead of pointing to greater realities, they often point to the importance of the institution and not the calling and vocation that the institution came into being to incarnate and accomplish.

**Pneumatocracy to Bureaucracy**—The Holy Spirit led the early church onward, and the energy, legitimizing, and catalyzing came internally from the confirmation of the Spirit and not from structure or positional authority. The early church was a people under the empowerment, rule, and guidance of the Spirit of God. This uncontrollable aspect of the New Testament ministry seems to fly in the face of movements seeking to perpetuate and sustain their influence. All too often the institutional solution moves toward structure and structure in order to control.

**Orthodoxy Replaces Orthopraxy**—The substituting of impersonal apostolic doctrine for the active and living ministry of the apostolic person accelerates a movement toward institutionalism. The intent was good, to keep people out of error and from being misled by doctrine. This explains the growth in formal academic seminary training and the requirement of ordination to ensure that right teaching would be perpetuated. The reality is that a greater emphasis on study and scrutinizing leaders has not kept churches or movements from error. The greater problem is the loss of emphasis on living the doctrine and creating learning environments that foster hunger for truth discovery.

Institutionalism moves from the **Generative Leadership Forms** of Message-to-Mission to the **Operative Leadership Forms** of Maintenance-to-Machine-to-Monument-to-Museum. The authors recommend keeping organizations focused on Generative Forms and away from drifting to Operative Forms by following their advice.75

---

75 Ibid., 255-269.
MISSIONAL THEOLOGY

With all their imperfections, which were both numerous and great, these humble fishermen of Galilee had, at the very onset of their career, one grand distinguishing virtue, which is the certain forerunner of ultimate high attainment. They were animated by a devotion to Jesus and to the divine kingdom, which made them capable of any sacrifice. One charge only can be brought against those men, and it can be brought with truth and without doing their memory harm. They were enthusiasts. Their hearts were fired, and as an unbelieving world might say, their heads were turned by a dream of a divine kingdom to be set up in Israel, with Jesus of Nazareth for the king. That dream possessed them, and imperiously ruled over their minds and shaped their destinies.

*Training of the Twelve*, A.B. Bruce

**Missional Culture and Its Impact on Leader Development**

Missional culture is necessary to operationalize missional philosophy and process. Without giving attention to culture, it is possible to have plans and teaching and even programs but miss the important requirement of translating the ideas of the organization into an organic movement shaping force. In 2014, Merriam-Webster announced that *culture* was the word of the year. The word speaks of an idea that an ideal way of life might express itself in regular habits and activities that lead not only to health but also growth and fulfillment and sustainability. The present project is exploring what is necessary for staying power, health, effectiveness, and longevity in the mission of
Campus Outreach. This would be to the end that a movement would flourish and continue to expand its effectiveness in fulfilling its mission.

In analyzing the literature review (chapter 3) and applying these theological insights to the mission of the church broadly and to the historic evolution of the calling of Campus Outreach, Ten Missional Theological Principles have emerged to guide the effectiveness and sustainability of Campus Outreach.

I. The Campus Outreach Mission

1. Campus Outreach is called to a narrow and focused kingdom mission of

building laborers on the college campus.

Guder points out that the apostolic mission must shape the church in the book of Acts and in the first few centuries.¹ This means that an expression like Campus Outreach could find itself aligned with the ministries of a local church that are focused on the central mission of reaching the lost, nurturing the immature, and equipping leaders. Local churches and the church broadly may find that this mission as one that overemphasizes certain functions of the body of Christ and neglects other functions. For example, outreach may, at times, be viewed as competing with other leadership priorities like caring for children or serving the poor. Additionally, some churches may find that the narrow focus of Campus Outreach overemphasizes activism and does not cultivate an appreciation for the wholistic call of the church in the world.

2. The Campus Outreach mission requires a narrow set of experiences, gifts and values in the areas of evangelism, discipleship and leader development.

¹ Guder, “The Church as Missional Community,” 117.
“Narrow” may sound restrictive or limited, but it can also mean focused and specific. Campus Outreach is not attempting to do everything required of the church of Jesus Christ in the world. In fact, the health and vitality of Campus Outreach is dependent on its relationship with the local church since Campus Outreach operates under the authority and supervision of local churches in regions around the world. Winter points out that the Jewish world, the Roman world, the early church, the church in the middle ages, and the emerging parachurch movements in the early twentieth century all have one thing in common: they were deployed in dual structures and functions. Organizations tend to move toward institutional survival, and it is often the challenge of leadership to focus resources on expansion and future leadership influence. Campus Outreach is almost purely a dream or idea of future spiritual kingdom leadership emerging from relationships invested into the lives of college students. This is a very difficult product for local churches to invest in since the fruit of their investment may or may not been realized in the present or near future. The visionary resources needed to sustain ministry to college students requires constant attention.

3. Campus Outreach, as an expression of the local church, provides a church with a direct missional investment into the emerging generation of a culture’s future leaders and must be fully integrated and resourced by the local church that has authority for the movement.

Campus Outreach strengthens the mission of the local church by empowering the staff and the movement to focus on those outside the visible church. When a Campus

---

Outreach region narrowly focuses on its mission and is not supported, understood, resourced, or strengthened by a vibrant local church complimentary ministry, the Campus Outreach expression can be shallow, narrow and struggling to sustain a quality depth and stability. Winter implies that the church has not grown without apostolic expressions, and these apostolic expressions do not flourish or are not sustainable without healthy local congregations investing, guiding and strengthening the work.

4. Campus Outreach, by virtue of its focus on college students and expansion, will constantly remain youthful, experience cycles of transition, and require ongoing experienced leadership to provide guidance.

Growing organizations multiply, and often multiplication means that opportunities and problems are multiplied. Robert Clinton points out that developing a spiritual leader is not a microwavable miracle but takes time in stages. This means that leaders grow from the inside out over time and not simply by learning skills and understanding strategies. As Campus Outreach has grown, new staff have been hired, more youth have emerged, and more guidance has been needed. This means that the campus ministries, local movements, and regional networks will always face youthful challenges and will always need mature, wise, and experienced leaders to guide these youthful movements. The college campus is also rapidly changing. Often the target sought to be influenced is changing faster than the movement and the leaders seeking to influence the campus. Regions that are connected and resourced by local churches will be

---

better suited to adapt to changes and face the growing challenges of ministry to emerging leaders.

II. Campus Outreach and Leader Development

5. *The Campus Outreach staff responsibilities are designed to develop and deploy staff in leader growth and effectiveness and to be increasingly deployed in their personal and unique sense of calling.*

Requiring a staff person to be a growing spiritual person in order to effectively fulfill his or her job responsibilities is very difficult. Staff must be encouraged to give attention to practices that cultivate spiritual health internally. An overemphasis on activity will eventually lead to shallow spiritual influence. Jesus talked about the importance of abiding in the vine since spiritual effectiveness is organic and not mechanical or engineered. Leaders can emphasize the cultivation of the inner life as a priority, can pray together, can give time on the job for prayer and personal growth, can required sabbath rest and time away from ministry, and can give feedback that is about heart and character and not simply about productivity and performance. For a Campus Outreach staff person this includes direction and feedback for personal growth in the following ways: (a) Heart—Passion for God and His work and for people; (b) Head—Maturity of character: words and life reflecting Christ-likeness; (c) Hand—Skills in evangelism, establishing, equipping, and leadership; and (d) Height—gift mix of relational, communication, and leadership.

Additionally, each staff person is encouraged to develop in leadership growth in order to be effective in the organization by growing in the following ways: (a) Depth of life; (b) Vision, philosophy of ministry, mission, and values; (c) Campus ministry skills
(micro and macro, planning and leading); (d) Theology (personal Bible study/ Bible knowledge/theology); and (e) Leadership (relationship, communication, directional, team building). Each staff person will be encouraged to implement a plan for development along with the area-wide and ministry-wide plans for staff development. Richard Lovelace outlines a map and a compass to engage spiritual leaders with the importance of a cultivated spirituality that is theological, heart-felt, and personal.4

6. Campus Outreach staff should be encouraged to discover, develop and be deployed in their gifts and in their personal and unique sense of calling.

Robert Clinton emphasizes that a person develops and grows inwardly while also developing in ministry-maturing and life-maturing issues. Leader development for Campus Outreach, historically, has not always considered the life-maturing issues, or personal development issues that play a role in leader development. This will be explored in the next chapter when surveys are analyzed, but in recent years young leaders are finding it difficult to embrace challenging job responsibilities because the lack of personal stability makes it difficult to make contributions while thriving in personal life issues.

Campus Outreach also has been slow to embracing the benefit of organizing around gifts. The emphasis on commitment to the mission and the development of skills and expertise has taken the greatest emphasis in the area of development. The leadership has hesitated from assuming that young leaders could know and function in their gifts without multiple experiences and opportunities to develop basic competencies. This

4 Lovelace, Dynamics of Spiritual Life, 72-74.
slowness to identify, cultivate, and capitalize on gifts has cost Campus Outreach, as leaders have moved because they have not found outlets within the organization to find utilize their specific gifts. There are signs that this is changing in some regions.

Professional development has also been an important part of Campus Outreach staff development. Most development has been informal and lacked recognizable credentialing capacity. Emerging generations desire recognizable credentials for their learning and experiences. Unfortunately, accredited seminary study has not been interwoven into the lifestyle and responsibilities of Campus Outreach staff, and this aspect of professional development has been underutilized. Also, the opportunities for women have not been offered with the same access and priority as the opportunities for men. This is changing in some regions, but emphasis is still needed in the area of women’s leader development.

7. All staff will receive personal shepherding, supervision, regular feedback and annual assessment to contribute to greater self-awareness and effectiveness. Staff will be encouraged to cultivate internal and external mentors.

J. R. Woodward observes that the Trinitarian nature of God should shape the multiple-influence approach to growth and ministry. Just as God himself is unified and diverse, the church must reflect this diversity. In Campus Outreach, individual staff all serve on a team with a leader who is accountable to someone else. Additionally, team members are in position to offer feedback and provide insight for the leader’s development. A structure is in place for formal assessment and feedback to be offered.

---

5 Woodward, Creating a Missional Culture, 68.
Encouraging staff to cultivate others who could serve as internal (within the organization and local context) and external mentors beyond the organization ensures proper exposure and stimulation. The vision for this type of input is that all staff persons have significant people assigned to them to speak into their lives and that the staff persons also have significant people of their choosing speaking into their lives. This keeps the emphasis on development of the staff persons and not simply on advancement of the organization’s goals and priorities.

### III. Organizational Culture and Sustainability

8. The leadership pipeline is a defined organization structure that assigns responsibilities based on gifts and experiences to develop and deploy leaders strategically. This is the organic leader development delivery system and requires significant investment, planning, and clarity to maintain health for each staff person and the movement.

College students have been competing their whole lives to get into schools, to be accepted into programs, or to gain emotional and relational affirmation among family and peers. The leadership pipeline and its campus ministry equivalent may seem like competitive ladders of success to climb and conquer in order to validate one’s own leadership importance. Campus Outreach has used the leadership pipeline to create a more specific “equipping ethos.” These leadership assignments allow for a more focused training context and a greater ability to assess effectiveness. For example, one region has hosted campus director training for several years. Campus director job descriptions have

---

6 Ibid., 86.
evolved through the years with similar responsibilities and assignments transcending teams and geography. As mentioned above, the leadership pipeline has not developed as rapidly among men. This will be addressed in the next chapter.

Most leadership pipelines among regions include a regional director, a group of area directors that oversee six to twelve campus staff members and are responsible for the catalytic events and extended training of staff and students. There are usually two to five campus directors in each area that lead the staff on each campus and have supervision responsibilities for a staff and student leadership team. Administrative staff or resource staff teams function in most regions with a few or many specialized staff to serve in specific administrative roles.

9. Teams are essential to the success and flourishing of each staff member and each movement. Teams offer a context to maximize personal growth and ministry effectiveness.

All Campus Outreach staff serve on teams and minister as a team. A team is built in part of the organizational culture. Reggie McNeal emphasizes that teams only flourish when they are structured properly, resourced properly, and led properly.\(^7\) Through the years, the Campus Outreach ministry has evolved to include greater dynamics and influence within a ministry team, moving away from the autocratic leader-directed environment that characterized early Campus Outreach teams. As these teams have evolved, the greater participation and contribution by each member has allowed for

\(^7\) McNeal, *Revolution and Leadership*, 90-91.
greater health and effectiveness. All too often, apostolic leaders are more directive and less accommodating. This has led to the stifling of team and individual development.

Teams will continue to have greater and greater importance in the effectiveness of the Campus Outreach ministry vision. Specialization and expertise are needed in every ministry area, but this actually allows for teams to be resourced in more effective and diverse ways.

10. Separate from the regional leadership, the movement-wide leadership, called networks, is committed to the development of the movement as a whole and to cultivate an environment that leads to greater effectiveness and sustainability. These movements must function in concert with the mission and ministry of the local churches that lead them.

One of the beautiful realities of Campus Outreach is the attention to grassroots local impact. This keeps the movements responsive and aware to the changing culture that each team and region is seeking to influence. It is also important that an overall coordinating and collaboration expression helps the Campus Outreach network know and maintain effectiveness outside of local areas. This overarching influence is made up of network directors who serve staff throughout the United States and around the world. The network directors team seeks to provide coordinated and visionary leadership for the Campus Outreach movement as a whole. Reggie McNeal says that movements must be concerned about the compelling kingdom vision in addition to the organic lifestyle of the community.\(^8\)

\(^8\) Ibid., 28.
In recent years, the rapid growth of the movements into changing geographies nationally and internationally and the diversity of the churches now leading these movements have caused greater stress on the Campus Outreach movement leadership to function as a service agency in concert with local churches. This dual leadership structure has at times competed for authority and also at times has left gaps due to assumption and misunderstanding of the specific roles of these leadership entities.

Summary of Missional Theology and the Campus Outreach Movement

The Campus Outreach calling in the kingdom, its approach to focused leader development to advance the goals of the mission, and its distinct culture provide a tremendous opportunity for kingdom impact. It is also true that the narrowness that Campus Outreach has sought in its focus has created significant challenges through the years. As the target audience has become more diverse and complex (college students), and the context has become more oppositional (university dynamics, parental expectations, etc.), enacting the ministry strategies of Campus Outreach have become more challenging.

In part 3: “Ministry Strategy,” an analysis of the current movement mission and strategy and an analysis of the target audience and context will be done to offer recommendations for greater development of the movement and ongoing sustainability for the future. The ten Missional and Theological Principles summarized in this chapter will provide standards for evaluating the feedback and information gathered from hundreds of sources, including current and former staff, church leaders, and alumni.
PART THREE

MINISTRY STRATEGY
CHAPTER 5:

MOVEMENT DEVELOPMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY

In *The Church and the Parachurch*, Jerry White emphasizes that while the local church is primarily generalist in its ministry, the para-local church societies have historically been narrowly specialist.\(^9\) Christian organizations spread in the 1950s with a narrow focus on kingdom contribution. These specializations included personal evangelism, church planting, mass evangelism, broadcasting, theological education, medicine, relief, literature distribution, aviation, camping, counseling, orphanages, translation and a host of others. In the early 2000s, Campus Outreach seemed clear on its focus but began to seek to improve its effectiveness by becoming more defined in stating organizational expectations. The movement leaders described its vision and values and asked for agreement with particular expressions or delivery systems that should be reflected in the many emerging diverse movements. (See Appendix B.) This was an attempt to provide clarity and to assist in replication of the vision as the ministry expanded to new cities and regions in the United States and continued to expand to
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countries outside the United States. The shift was subtle but was an attempt to provide help in increasing the quality of each movement by clarifying expressions, delivery systems, and expectations. The narrow call of Campus Outreach seemed clear, and the need to be driven by organic health also seemed to be agreed on and accepted by the leadership. Yet this subtle shift to standardize and formalize the training in the movement began to push the organization toward organizational development as a way to ensure health and fruitfulness. There was always a loose affiliation among regions and leaders that held the same vision and values, but there were no formal expectations for what the mechanisms or metrics would be for participation in the Campus Outreach movement. In the late 1990s there began to be greater emphasis on standardizing and agreeing on what delivery systems would look like. Additionally, the experienced leaders in the movement began to formalize communication and coordination of training and began to describe what effective leadership was needed to increase the health of each movement. Campus Outreach was on its way to centralizing expectations and leadership strategies.

Campus Outreach, at its inception, was not the only organization to emphasize organic grassroots leadership as the primary expression of its organizational movement but was one of a few that sought to do this in connection with local churches. Youth With a Mission (YWAM) was an organization that was driven by grassroots leadership and intentionally sought to stay grassroots-led. At times, this meant that a YWAM city movement could look significantly different than other city movements and usually took on the personality and gifts of the local leader.\(^{10}\) Decentralization as a primary movement

\(^{10}\) Interview with Paul Stanley, former vice president of the Navigators and senior advisor of YWAM, November 23, 2017.
emphasis also kept the funding expectations on the local movements rather than the overall organizational leaders. What is fascinating about the shift in the Campus Outreach leadership approach in the late 1990s and early 2000s is that as most parachurch organizations were moving toward a greater organic, team-based approach to leadership, Campus Outreach was seeking to clarify expectations, metrics, and results. Most Christian organizations took on the autocratic military and business models of leadership that emerged in the church in the 1950s and beyond. In the 1990s most businesses began to shift toward a more participatory style of leadership and away from bureaucratic and autocratic approaches.\textsuperscript{11} Steve Addison points out that, for Christian organizations, this was not an evolution of leadership in God’s kingdom, but a return to the model Jesus put in place and the early church replicated. Addison points out that Jesus gathered learners, connected them with others, trained them to be leaders, and then unleashed them to multiply.\textsuperscript{12} As Campus Outreach began formalizing its leadership structure, the movement began to resist some of these shifts.

In 2018, some startling leadership transitions began to send a signal that Campus Outreach may have been in trouble in the areas of mission, leader development, and organizational culture. While the ministry that began in the southeastern United States had spread throughout the United States and into Europe, Africa, Asia, and South America, there was a growing complexity of challenges presented to each region. The


campus culture was changing, and these changes like generational skepticism, suspicion of organized religion, diversity of churches partnered with, differences in regional dynamics, variance in student values nationally and internationally, personally stability of students and young staff, and other factors have contributed to greater complexity and loss of effectiveness. Additionally, experienced leaders were leaving the organization. Only one leader remains with the organization from the early days of formative inception. There is no formal leadership pipeline in place to create expanded opportunities for younger maturing leaders and formal roles for older leaders. To date, twenty-eight franchise directors have transitioned out of the director position over the forty-year period. The director position within Campus Outreach is the critical leadership position to determine not only the health of the movement but also its growth. Another concern is the rapid exodus of key leaders who have served for over a decade. In the last five years, sixteen franchise leaders, with more than ten years’ experience, have transitioned off staff. One key leader felt that of the fourteen key leader transitions among regional directors, only four were positive transitions.\textsuperscript{13} Currently, 50 percent of present directors have been serving in their current role for less than five years.\textsuperscript{14} One in three directors are youthful, in their early thirties. Additionally, no region has developed any type of formal succession strategy. Only recently has any formal long-term ministry planning been encouraged in conjunction with local churches and boards.

The rapid staff transition has led the leadership to ask questions and seek answers

\textsuperscript{13} Kent Bailey, interview with author, May 4, 2019.

\textsuperscript{14} Kent Bailey, interview with author, August 12, 2018.
to provide more effective leadership. A movement-wide survey of current leaders with ten years’ experience was conducted, and input from staff who served as senior leaders but have now transitioned off-staff were consulted. The majority of responders were franchise directors, with less than 20 percent being senior leaders serving in a different capacity than regional director.

This chapter will analyze the effectiveness of the movement by comparing and analyzing the results of the staff survey and a 2008 survey of Campus Outreach alumni. The Avalaunch Group analyzed 1,750 surveys and made observations. These two surveys, along with personal interviews, will be analyzed to provide clarity on the effectiveness of the mission of Campus Outreach, the present health of its leader development, and the strengths and struggles of its organizational culture. Additionally, survey results from Campus Outreach leaders who served over the first twenty years will be compared to those who served with Campus Outreach over the last twenty years to identify whether there have been shifts in emphasis in mission, leader development, and organizational culture.

Here are the details about the staff survey done by Campus Outreach Augusta: All current and former Campus Outreach franchise directors and all senior staff who have served for over ten years with Campus Outreach were invited to participate in a leadership survey conducted by Campus Outreach Augusta from October 2018 – April 2019. Seventy-two of 130 current or former staff invited to provide feedback responded. Personal interviews were also conducted with individuals, but all comments are shared anonymously as the survey was conducted with anonymity in mind. Eighty-two percent of current franchise directors worldwide and 61 percent of all present and former directors
responded to the survey. Of those invited to take the survey, fifty-five percent responded.

Twenty-four percent of respondents were staff who served with Campus Outreach for ten years. Forty-five percent of respondents served on staff between eleven and twenty years. Thirty-one percent of respondents have served on staff for over twenty years.

The Campus Outreach Mission

Almost all of the participants in the Campus Outreach Senior Leaders Survey and Campus Outreach Alumni Survey agreed that the Campus Outreach mission has always been clear to both the leaders and participants of Campus Outreach. Less than one percent of the staff surveyed disagreed with this, and only 4 percent of alumni felt that the mission was unclear. One hundred percent of all senior leaders surveyed indicated that the mission of Campus Outreach is a compelling vision, and 96 percent of alumni agreed. Some of the written comments by staff stated that “the mission of Campus Outreach is clear, concise, powerful and biblical. Being a part of this movement made me feel that I was contributing to the most strategic work being done on the earth with a view of impacting the nations with the gospel.”\(^{15}\) Another staff member commented,

Campus Outreach’s mission is effective because it is paradoxically broad and God-honoring (Glorifying God) and narrow and personally helpful for individuals [leaders from the college campus]. The mission statement kept me on track when there was temptation to drift in my twenty years on staff. There are so many other good things that could be done, but working with this clear and focused mission has always felt worthwhile."\(^{16}\)

One former staff person stated that Campus Outreach was the strongest missional

\(^{15}\) Campus Outreach Senior Staff Survey, conducted by Campus Outreach Augusta August 1, 2018- April 30, 2019. Augusta, Georgia

\(^{16}\) Ibid.
organization that they had ever encountered.\textsuperscript{17}

In comparing the staff from the most recent twenty years with the staff involved with Campus Outreach in the first twenty years, there was little to no variance of opinion assessing the clarity and effectiveness of the Campus Outreach Mission. Almost all staff with Campus Outreach believe their mission was compelling, that they were effective in fulfilling that mission, and that they were helped significantly by the leadership and structure of the organization.

There was one contrast in the comparison of the missional emphasis feedback from those who served on staff the first twenty years with similar feedback from those who served the last twenty years. There seemed to be a shift from emphasis on the ministry of the Holy Spirit and being Spirit-led to what one responder called “cookie cutter ministry” that requires staff to improve techniques, programs, and performance to attract more students.\textsuperscript{18} There were a number of comments implying that there was a subtle shift from being to doing in the area of leadership and a shift from dependence upon the Holy Spirit to dependence on the perfecting of means.

Most of the survey feedback on strengthening the effectiveness of the mission centered on four areas: (1) utilizing the variety of gifts and passions of its leaders, (2) helping students and staff discern clarity in issues of vocational calling and personal direction, (3) helping staff families flourish while serving on staff and (4) effectively working in conjunction with the local churches that oversee and guide each Campus

\textsuperscript{17} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{18} Ibid.
Outreach franchise.


Campus Outreach as an organization tends to attract a certain type of gifted and passionate leader to its staff. The ministry practices focus on evangelism, personal discipleship, and leader development all done in the context of challenging college students to discover and invest their lives in a lifelong kingdom mission. Much of the feedback indicates that this has been an area of growth for Campus Outreach. In the early years, the expectation was that if a person was faithful and trained that he or she would be able to be effective as a staff person. Through the years, the feedback from those on staff and those leaving the staff was that the early twenties is a time to learn one’s gifts and passions. This means that it is unusual to see a significant number of alumni work on staff for three to five years and then move along to another place of contribution in the kingdom. However, in the early years, this was considered a failure or a loss of vision.

Most staff in the survey believe that the organization is growing in this area. It is interesting that staff from the last twenty years rated the effectiveness of the organization lower than did those from the first twenty years. One senior leader from this decade said,

The leadership is doing a better job with those coming out of college, but still need to grow in helping those in their mid-thirties find a clear contribution within the organization or to move on to a place of better fit. Many of my friends struggled after eight to ten years on staff and had difficulty transitioning to roles within the church or marketplace. I think the reason is that these staff only focused on the mission of Campus Outreach and were not helped in discovering and developing their own vision for their life.19

Another staff person said, “In my early years on staff each person recruited was

19 Ibid.
one dimensional and narrow. While this led to faithfulness in the short run, it created problems for these staff. Much has changed, but I think people were missed and were not utilized well in our regional work in Africa.”

A number of comments stated that the same attention given to married staff was not given to singles, in particular to women. Many felt that women staff were not afforded the same leadership tracks and opportunities that men were. Very few believed that Campus Outreach should be more egalitarian in its leadership structure but felt that complimentary leadership should include opportunities for women to contribute and develop on an equal basis with their male counterparts. The summary of the feedback is that the leadership must develop clear plans and strategies to encourage the intentional leader development of women.

2. The Mission and Helping Students Gain Clarity on Personal Calling.

In the Leadership Staff Survey and the Alumni Survey, helping students gain clarity on their personal calling is the most glaring deficiency of the organization in the area of mission. While an almost everyone of those surveyed believed that Campus Outreach has been clear and focused on a compelling mission, only slightly more than half of the staff surveyed believed that the organization is effective in helping students gain clarity on their personal calling. Two of three staff surveyed from the last twenty years believed that this lack is a deficiency for the organization. Of the alumni surveyed, 68 percent felt that most of the emphasis on personal calling was focused on those interested in full-time vocational ministry and in particular, in coming on staff with the
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20 Ibid.
organization. Additionally, a large majority felt that teaching about a Christ-centered marriage, investing in a Christian family and discipling children, and cultivating a biblical world and life view were all neglected. Alumni felt that discipleship and leadership training focused primarily on living effectively in the mission of Campus Outreach while on campus.

This feedback is not new to Campus Outreach as an organization and continues to verify what many regional directors are aware of. The mission of Campus Outreach is narrow and focused and is presented in such a compelling way that this emphasis may elevate the missional importance of the organization and deemphasize the broader kingdom calling and gifts discovery of other equally compelling callings. At times the staff has received feedback from third- and fourth-year students who find it difficult to juggle upper level classes and meeting the expectations of a leader on the campus. Some staff have even pressed the issue of lordship and faithfulness to God’s mission as a reason for neglecting their studies or choosing a less demanding major.

While some students look for easier ways to avoid college rigor, it is true that Campus Outreach staff need to be instructed and reminded of the importance of supporting students in exploring and preparing for various callings that God may have for those they disciple. All Campus Outreach staff are led by churches that believe in a worldview that does not elevate sacred duties above secular duties. All lawful vocations are opportunities for dignified expressions of God’s kingdom mission and need to be encouraged among students in college or explored by staff as they serve with Campus Outreach.

3. The Mission and Staff Family Experiences
Less than 20 percent of staff in the survey indicated that being on staff with a family is an excellent experience for both the family and the ministry. A large percentage believed that raising a family while on staff is very challenging and yet still worthwhile. A significant portion of staff believes that the lifestyle of Campus Outreach is not a healthy fit for families. Among staff from the most recent twenty years, the range of feedback seemed more extreme between having a great experience on staff with their family to having a very difficult experience. Among the written comments, the extremes represented included comments that being on staff was the best thing that could have happened for their family versus comments that it was the most difficult experience and that they wished they had not experienced it once they began to have children. The extreme feedback seems to indicate that this needs to be an area of intentional development for Campus Outreach leadership since the number of staff members staying longer than ten years has decreased in the most recent decade.

Why are more Campus Outreach staff leaving sooner is a very complex question that the survey does not directly address. Most leaders think the reason for this is multifaceted. In the early days, being on staff seemed like being part of a family where people stayed for many years. The ministry was in a pioneering stage, and staff felt that they were making a unique and new contribution in the kingdom work done by Campus Outreach. Now the ministry is so broad and operates in so many locations that the sheer multiplication of ministries also means that multiplication of transitions would follow. Additionally, some leaders in the survey commented that the emerging generation seems to have more options and seems interested in moving from option to option without making long-term commitments. This is not validated broadly by the survey, but it does
show up in some comments.

4. Effectively Working in and with the Local Churches That Guide Each Franchise

Campus Outreach’s unique mission includes its relationship with local churches, which embrace the organization as part of their missionary staff. The structure is also dependent on local churches for spiritual guidance, resourcing of the ministry, and broadening its impact by integrating fruit into the church. The goal is for this to be a symbiotic relationship that allows the church to have an outreach arm into the emerging next generation and allows the ministry, often led by young believers, to be strengthened by mature and wise leadership. When the relationship with the local church is not operating in optimal fashion, the ministry of Campus Outreach will lose focus and effectiveness in fulfilling its mission.

In the early years there were few churches leading Campus Outreach ministries, and these churches seemed to understand the great opportunity that a Campus Outreach team afforded them. These churches also saw the great focus that leadership of a Campus Outreach team required to ensure health and effectiveness. In the last twenty years, many churches have reached out to Campus Outreach looking for help in their outreach to the next generation without understanding the commitment required in investing in the staff and guiding the ministry. In the alumni survey, a large majority felt that the emphasizing local church involvement while in college was deficient. Most staff surveyed believe the ministry was helped by the church in its mission, but nearly one in four saw the relationship between the Campus Outreach organization and the local church as either difficult or unhelpful. The turnover among leadership in a local church and within a Campus Outreach franchise adds complexity because much of the fluidity that exists
among the organization and the overseeing church is a relational connection of trust and mutual understanding. As staff changes have taken place, the tension in the relationship has become strained, and motives are not only questioned, but effectiveness is decreased. One former franchise director confided to me that he felt the church only took on a Campus Outreach team because some other larger churches in the area were growing their outreach ministry and he felt that they were simply competing with other churches for influence among students. Several churches have asked Campus Outreach staff to transition because they have not seen the effectiveness of their investment. One pastor said that in the early years, students attended the worship services in larger numbers, but in the recent years the numbers have been falling. The pastor admitted that a large number of Campus Outreach alumni had joined the church after graduation and become part of the church leadership, but the pastor did not see continuing to invest in Campus Outreach as strategic. A utilitarian view by the church toward Campus Outreach or a utilitarian view of the church by Campus Outreach will not cultivate a sustainable partnership. In one overseas situation, a staff person surveyed said that it was detrimental that Campus Outreach staff started local churches while at the same time leading campus ministries. A number of staff thought that the relationship with the local church should offer more opportunities for counseling, mentoring, and coaching young staff and young families and more pathways for staff to cultivate healthy and balanced lifestyles while on staff. Some staff surveyed felt that the demands on staff were so intense that no time was left for greater partnership and involvement with the local church.

**Campus Outreach and Leader Development**

Campus Outreach has described a Christ-centered leader as a laborer. The vision
statement for the mission is a call to build laborers. Leader development has been central to the mission of Campus Outreach. All leaders ask how to reach more people, and the Campus Outreach philosophy of ministry rests on the assumption that the key to reach more leaders is to build more leaders. Campus Outreach historically has attracted leaders to the vision and mission of the organization and has sought to develop and deploy leaders in mission. Most of the survey feedback on strengthening leader development centered on four areas: (1) Balancing leader development and organizational results, (2) Maximizing the job assignments and feedback for growth as a leader, (3) Prioritizing professional development that benefits the staff person, (4) Allowing for adequate time for staff development, and (5) Helping staff transition well.

1. Balancing Leader Development and Organizational Results

The Campus Outreach staff survey indicates that eight of ten staff surveyed believe that Campus Outreach balances leader development and organizational results. This is interesting since a great deal of negative feedback that staff hear from students and former staff is that the organization focuses an inordinate amount of energy on results. In the specific comments given by staff in the survey, several mentioned that the organizational structure can lead staff to think that they are stronger leaders than they actually are. This overdependence on structure and form may increase effectiveness in the short run but may not lead to greater leader development. One staff person who had transitioned from the organization shared their opinion that not all Campus Outreach leaders would thrive in a workplace environment that was more demanding and results-oriented than the Campus Outreach environment.

Some staff surveyed indicated that in the last decade, the emphasis on metrics for
evangelism and discipleship has caused the organizational emphasis to shift from people
development to organizational effectiveness. In the late 1990s an emphasis on metrics
was implemented, which sought to evaluate the health of the evangelism, discipleship,
leader development, and mobilization of graduates beyond the campus. These metrics
applied percentages to evaluate the health of each movement. The reception of the use of
metrics to determine effectiveness was not welcomed with the same enthusiasm as was
the clarity gained from stating and re-stating the vision and values and strategic delivery
systems.

In the last twenty years, the overall movement began to subtly shift from building
one leader and investing in one campus to building movements. While this was a subtle
shift, it was effectively a move to evaluate outcomes and results as the most essential
measure rather than emphasizing health of leaders, relationships and delivery systems.
The leadership did not deny that ministry is an overflow of the heart and character, but by
elevating performance the movement leaders did begin to send the message that
production was at least equally as important. While the intent was to help each leader
provide greater objective analysis for his or her ministry, the effect was met with
resistance and identified a shift in the directional leadership of Campus Outreach. This is
something to investigate further and may contribute to the reason that a significant
number of young, key senior leaders have transitioned off staff. The organization should
investigate if staff are promoted simply because they get quality results or if they display
depth of character and faithfulness beyond the need for greater designated organizational
influence.

A surprising bit of feedback from the survey revealed that the longer a person was
with the organization and the greater the amount of responsibility, the less personal feedback they received. Obviously, the reasons are varied, but some felt that the more a staff person became responsible for other staff, the more the emphasis shifted from the person’s development as a leader to his or her effectiveness in developing others. One staff person mentioned that personal ministry must shrink to maintain quality development of key leaders and that development of key leaders only happens as the leader is growing. Another staff person mentioned that there must be a constant emphasis on the heart and issues related to the personal being of the leader so that the demands of doing not be allowed to shape the staff person’s development.

2. Maximizing the Job Assignments and Feedback Given for the Growth of Each Leader

Almost all (92 percent) of staff surveyed believe that the staff job assignments contribute to the growth of the leader. Personal comments indicated that some gaps could be addressed to maximize the growth of the leader in addition to gaining challenging job assignments. A number of staff commented that a more intentional delegation of assignments with development in mind could lead to greater leader growth. The tendency is for staff to be given challenging assignments with limited guidance or for staff to over-lead by only inviting younger staff to participate when implementation of decisions is needed. Staff need more involvement in decision-making. This nuanced leader development approach is pictured in Figure 9 and explained in chapter 1 under the heading “A Personal Approach to Development.” Some staff surveyed felt that their supervisor could help with their job effectiveness and personal development balance by meeting with them more regularly.
Campus Outreach attracts high relational leaders and high task-oriented leaders. As assignments increase, some staff mentioned that the gifting and design of the staff person needs to fit the design assignments. Often leaders are promoted because of longevity within the organization, and the gifts of a leader are not always matched with the assignment.

3. Prioritizing Professional Development That Benefits the Staff Person

Most staff believe that seminary training is available to them, and they feel encouraged. While this is helpful for staff who see themselves serving as future pastors in local churches, not as many have been encouraged to prioritize other forms of professional development. In the early years of being on staff with Campus Outreach, most staff saw themselves as missionaries to the college campus. Many of these were preparing to be missionaries overseas, and their professional development focused on preparation for missionary service. Some staff transitioned into or returned to work in business or community service. However, many found that while their leadership skills were sharp, their ability to contribute in the marketplace was less than those of equal age who had served in business longer. In the last twenty years, the number of Campus Outreach staff becoming pastors of local churches has become the highest trend.

Seminary training is being offered to staff for personal development, which is helpful to those seeking pastoral ministry preparation. Allowing for greater personalized training thus could mean that staff could be encouraged to dream and plan a clearer track for their lives in the future in order to invest in greater training while on staff. Currently, the cycle of organizational assessments for staff are offered after three years and after eight years. Most who have participated feel that the recommendations have been helpful. One person
suggested that additional accredited leader development, even opportunities online, could benefit the staff members in planning for their future, especially those who might leave vocational ministry.

So much of Campus Outreach health is built around the maturity and stability of the franchise leader. Some staff surveyed saw this as a weakness and a threat to the health of the organization. Others felt that the senior leader in their region was not getting the help or accountability needed, yet that leader was expected to provide an inordinate amount of wisdom and influence throughout the organization. One person surveyed mentioned that many of the early senior leaders had Type-A personalities, which caused them to focus intensely on results and lack patience with others to develop. Today’s emerging leaders need patience, participation, and multiple leadership influences beyond what the designated organizational franchise leader can provide.

Others responding to the survey mentioned that mentoring by older leaders was necessary to help staff develop. Local churches, financial partners and community leaders could also be sources for staff to connect with mentors who could help guide and enhance their development. Some staff surveyed mentioned that encouraging networking with those doing similar work in other organizations could also cultivate greater professional development. At different times within the history of Campus Outreach, networking with other mission agencies has been helpful to stimulate vision and development ideas for the organization. These comments offered by staff will be explored when Organizational Culture is discussed.

4. Allowing for Adequate Time for Staff Development
“Learning more must be emphasized over doing more.” This comment made by a staff person surveyed speaks to the need to create learning environments from staff experiences. Campus Outreach regions usually operate off of a ministry life cycle that follows the school year. This life cycle tends to emphasize outreach and evangelism in the fall, discipleship and depth in the winter and spring, and leader development in the summer. Campus Outreach Charleston, under the new leadership of Matt Reagan, is seeking to push beyond this narrow cycle and cultivate staff health, staff learning, and staff friendship as the core staff experience. This is more of a slow and steady approach toward growth, but the result has been that staff are motivated. The results in Charleston are beginning to show more broader impact as the leadership has taken an intentional approach to leader and team health and development.

Some regions have instituted policies for regular sabbaticals to ensure that rest, refreshment, and learning are built into the staff experience. All too often a senior leader explodes or implodes due to crushing personal or organizational circumstances and a sabbatical is recommended as a reactive fix to a problem. Regional leadership must look at ways to ensure that senior leaders are building in adequate time for spiritual rest and refreshment. Each region should apply these same principles in the life cycle of a staff person weekly, quarterly, and seasonally.

5. Helping Staff Transition Well

Very few resources are in place to help staff transition. Each regional board should work to put processes in place that assist staff who are transitioning. Often senior
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leaders are expected to help staff transition. The weight of current responsibility makes it difficult for staff to help others transition to places with which staff are often only peripherally familiar. The local church and the local board are excellent resources for transitioning staff. Additionally, adequate counseling for the family should be offered. Professional counseling and career counseling should be encouraged to help staff transition well. Many former staff speak of appreciation for what they learned from being on staff with Campus Outreach. Many also mention that they found themselves behind their peers now that they were competing in a workplace that required various skills and insights. Helping staff identify their potential future landing place and helping them build out a longer transition ramp could improve the effectiveness of the staff transition. One staff person mentioned that often staff transitions are abrupt because staff financial support sometimes comes to a crisis in ways that are poorly prepared for. Regional boards should investigate setting aside resources to help staff more effectively transition.

**Organizational Culture and Sustainability**

A mission implemented by leaders creates a process with certain outcomes. Organizational culture is a cultivated and ongoing process that leaders seek in order to fulfill the mission. Campus Outreach as an organization has philosophically operated as a loose, organic expression in order to promote maximum kingdom influence. The leadership theory has been built on decentralization, personalization, local contextualization, and diversification so that systems and structures would be shaped by organic leadership. Has this worked? Is Campus Outreach better off seeking to emphasize spirit and substance over systems and structure? The staff survey sought to gain insight and feedback in the following areas of organizational culture: (1) emphasis on
organizational calling compared to kingdom and personal calling, (2) organizational care provided to those who serve on staff, (3) organizational openness to being influenced by new or different approaches and by other organizations, and (4) effective oversight given to the organization by churches and boards.

1. Emphasis on Organizational Calling Compared to Kingdom and Personal Calling

One in four staff persons surveyed felt that Campus Outreach put too much emphasis on organizational calling and not enough emphasis on kingdom and personal calling. Staff surveyed from the time period of the last twenty years thought that this was still a problem, but an increasing number of staff believed that the current leadership was attempting to address this issue. Some staff commented that hiring twenty-two- to twenty-five-year-old staff can lead to unhealthy dependence on the organization. Often staff became aware of their unhealthy dependence on the organization when crises arose, which could lead to resentment. Some staff surveyed felt that the organization was doing a better job proactively by talking about this trend and encouraging staff to be more responsible for their own development. One region requires staff to map out a three-year Life Development Plan in addition to stating their Staff Development Goals. Each year a staff person is expected to update this plan so that the person is aware of his or her developmental needs and strategies to grow and develop toward fulfilling the personal vision. The cyclic assessment process being instituted by most regions encourages staff to take ownership for their own personal development in the area of calling. A staff person in one region in the Mid-Atlantic region of the United States mentioned that they worked for four different directors over the last twenty years and they did not feel their region did a good job on helping staff discern personal calling. This staff person did say that the last
five to seven years has been better and that they see improvement in this area throughout the movement.

This feedback corresponds to the alumni survey, in which a high percentage of alumni felt wounded if they did not sell out to Campus Outreach while in college or when they left staff. Alumni mentioned that they believed that if they did not financially support the ministry, they had little opportunity to influence or stay connected with the staff.

2. Organizational Care Provided to Those who Serve on Staff

The staff survey asked about perceived organizational commitment to staff health, help with assignments, support and resources provided for personal care, responsiveness and listening among the leadership, and structure for adequate financial compensation. Overall, most staff surveyed felt that more resources were given to help them be proficient in their job assignments than were available to encourage personal health. The significance of this feedback is difficult to discern, since those who are involved in people-helping spiritual work can only be helpful to others if they are growing in their own spiritual health and dependence upon God. It is also true that helping staff be effective in their skills and practices leads to personal flourishing. Since more than one-fourth of the staff surveyed mentioned that the organization needed to improve in the area of staff care, this response is noteworthy. More than 50 percent of the staff surveyed believed that Campus Outreach did a poor job of providing adequate resources for personal health. Eighty percent of those surveyed did believe that their supervisors listened to them, cared for them personally, valued their health more than their ministry production, and helped them address their unique needs. The results indicate that most
staff believed their supervisors cared about them but that they still lacked the care they needed. This seems to lead to the conclusion that Campus Outreach does not offer enough resources or does not cultivate lifestyles that are healthy so that staff may flourish. Some staff commented that Campus Outreach Boards and churches that lead the movements are not involved enough in the day to day challenges. These are both indicators that the organizational culture at present is not addressing the issues of staff care. One region that stood out was Campus Outreach Lexington. A number of staff surveyed from this region spoke of the integrated approach that the organization takes with the board and local church and the resources available in that region that contribute to care and staff health. Campus Outreach Lexington could be a model for other regions in the area of organizational care being offered to staff.

Several staff commented that the nature of the job (raising financial support, evangelism among a skeptical demographic, working with a population that increasingly lacks personal and environmental stability, and the high turnover in leadership) makes it difficult to provide adequate care resources for the staff. This is a valid observation but does not eliminate the need to work to increase the attention given to and the resources available for staff care.

3. Organizational Openness to Being Influenced by Other Organizations.

The perception among 80 percent of staff surveyed is that Campus Outreach does not intentionally seek advice from others. Best practices and standards are compared within the Campus Outreach movement, but staff perceive that organizational leaders are myopic and ingrown or do not think that outside influence could benefit the organization. While it is true that Campus Outreach takes a unique approach to its mission, the
comments seem to indicate that the staff surveyed believe that Campus Outreach should be more intentional about seeking advice from outside the organization. In the early years, the organization was perceived as arrogant and unwilling to listen to feedback as the pioneering movement sought to create a new expression of kingdom mission on the campus. Certain leaders were consulted, and organizations were sought out to speak into the work of Campus Outreach, but this was done in a limited fashion. Finding organizations with similar values or parallel interests can help Campus Outreach become better equipped, especially in the areas of human resources and staff development, which can contribute to greater staff health and longevity.

In recent years, Campus Outreach has attempted to partner with the Navigators and Student Mobilization and form international partnerships with The Acts 29 Network, MTW, and City-to-City Global Church Planting Network, among others. These partnerships have proven to be helpful and should encourage regions to be more proactive in cultivating partnerships for learning and for ministry.

4. Effective Oversight Given to the Organization by Churches and Boards

Campus Outreach, in the last two decades, has developed an internal support and guidance system to strengthen leaders, teams and regional movements. This system has been formalized in the last decade and is now organized under the heading of regional networks. There are presently five networks functioning with leaders throughout the United States and internationally. This network structure functions in addition to the supervisory and authoritative structures that are in place in each region under the local church. Local churches can supervise Campus Outreach regions through their church staff structure or can appoint lay leaders and staff to work together to provide oversight.
The staff that were surveyed expressed a strong appreciation for the local churches that lead Campus Outreach. Virtually all staff believe that Campus Outreach should remain under the authority of local churches.

It is true that many staff feel estranged from the church that is in authority over them due to proximity, size of staff teams or the business of the local church leaders in other areas of leadership. There is no agreed-upon structure that most staff believe will deliver the quality of connection and care needed for staff and organizational thriving. Many staff do believe that the present structures and connections with local church leadership are not providing adequate assistance for the staff and ministries to thrive. Recently, two regional churches decided to end relationships with Campus Outreach due to the perceived lack of fruitfulness of the ministry or lack of benefit to the church compared with the investment being made. These examples indicate that Campus Outreach/church relationships and structure should be revisited and new present agreements and understandings should be embraced. One network leader has suggested that Campus Outreach franchises and local churches should revisit their commitment and contribution to one another every ten years to make sure that current partnerships do not drift.

**Additional Feedback from the Staff Survey**

At the end of the survey, each staff person was asked what he or she would encourage Campus Outreach to never change and what he or she would encourage Campus Outreach to consider improving or changing. The following commitments were pervasive among the staff, encouraging Campus Outreach to continue in the following areas: (1) commitment to evangelize the lost, (2) commitment to disciple through life-on-
life relationships that build kingdom leaders, (3) commitment to maintain the word of God as central to discipleship and prayer as central to personal practices for all disciples, (4) commitment to intentional leader development, (5) expansion through multiplication of leaders, (6) commitment to the local church, and (6) commitment to the nations and sending laborers to the nations.

The feedback for areas Campus Outreach should consider changing or improving included the following: (1) seek to be more aligned with local churches, (2) find ways to utilize quality leaders even if their gifts do not fit narrowly within the leadership pipeline, (3) develop more wholistic personal care for each staff member, (4) more effectively develop and utilize the women staff members, (5) grow in effectiveness to reach diverse groups and minorities on the campus and on staff, (6) emphasize spirit-led ministry over self-determination, and (7) plan more specifically to encourage alumni to locate in cities near their campus experience to help alumni and staff stay connected relationally.

Survey Feedback for Consideration for Campus Outreach

Campus Outreach is an organization focused on missional leader development. In reflecting on its history and on the theological insights offered as well as the feedback received from staff and alumni, the following considerations are offered in two areas, mission and leader development and organizational culture.

Mission and Leader Development

The following recommendations are made to the Campus Outreach leadership to strengthen the effectiveness of the mission. While the mission has always included the
need for leader development, greater precision needs to be given in carrying out this priority.

1. The CO Ministries Need Greater Integration into
Local Church Life, Leadership and Community

Greater integration would involve greater accountability and involvement with local boards, church leadership, counseling services provided locally by the church, and general shepherding. Campus Outreach regions should seek to develop more wholistic systems to guide and support staff. Regional leadership should consider requiring local hub churches to embrace the people, process and product of the movement. The possibility of a reset of organizational understanding and commitments with each local church on a ten-year time horizon could be very helpful as local church and organizational leadership change. The network leaders and network services provided by Campus Outreach must coordinate their efforts with local church leaders, or this model will not be sustainable.

2. People Development over Leader Development Must Become the Emphasis

This does not eliminate the need for skill specific competencies but requires both a strategic emphasis and exposure to greater wholistic development of the young staff. The difference is subtle, but an approach to development emphasizing wholistic people development will promote staff health and will provide guidance for readiness in hiring new staff. Some regions are seeking assessment from psychological and counseling experts to help determine if a potential staff person is prepared for an intense people-helping responsibility like the staff experience. Investing in staff as early as possible, like the application and interview process, will contribute to greater health and development.
Emphasis on personal identity and security and overall staff care must become a priority. The assumption that a person is internally stable cannot be assumed based on social skills or outward projections. Leaders must emphasize being over doing issues among the staff, analyze the pace of the ministry and allow for extended times of emotional and spiritual replenishment. The assessment mindset as part of integrating benchmark feedback with on-going year-to-year evaluations must be expanded to include the integration of this feedback with on-going annual evaluations. These adjustments will help leaders move beyond directional leadership to focus their attention on developmental leadership. The use of metrics and the emphasis on building movements should be deemphasized. A greater attention needs to be placed on staff health and healthy processes rather than outcomes and results.

3. Team-Based Leadership Must Grow.

The narrow pipeline structure that has traditionally been the CO leadership approach must be rethought and expanded. Teams should be built based on wisdom and maturity, gifts and experience. Historically, teams were built mostly on experience, which has led to weak or limited teams. Cultivating healthy teams will promote ownership, strengthen contributions of all, and develop greater fulfillment and diverse contributions. Following a tight pipeline structure for senior leadership could promote less mature and experienced leaders and limit access to a breadth of insight available from those serving throughout the organization. Character, maturity, and diversity of contribution should be considered in addition to leadership assignment.

4. Leadership Investment Must Be Synergistic and Dense,

Coming from the Churches, Networks, and Network Leaders
Network leaders should consider developing network systems that support and guide the staff and ministries in collaboration with local hub churches. This will require focused and collaborative leadership and cannot be sustained without it. Each leader will need layers of mentors, counselors, diverse opportunities, and multiple leadership contexts and exposure if each leader is to mature and expand.

5. Assisting Graduates in Transition from the Campus Must Continue to
   Grow as an Integrated Expression of the Campus Outreach Vision

Campus Outreach has received feedback for multiple decades that students who are intensely involved with staff on campus feel isolated and on their own once they graduate. The contrast of intense experiences with experiences of isolation create unnecessary trauma and undermine much of the goodwill and positive relational investment that staff have made in the lives of these students now transitioning. Regions should consider cultivating a mobilization presence in strategic key-cities where graduates may receive on-going mentoring. With the fragility of family and personal support systems, these graduates will need stable and familiar relationships and connections with people who know them and believe in them, or drifting will likely result.

Organizational Culture and Strategic Adjustments

The following recommendations are made to the Campus Outreach leadership to strengthen the alignment of organizational culture and strategic mission impact. While
the organization has always been intentional about cultivating an equipping environment, greater precision needs to be given in carrying out this priority.

1. Greater Equipping in Apologetics / Culture Issues

The college campus is becoming an increasingly complex place to develop missional kingdom leaders. Each staff person needs to love people genuinely, but each staff person has to relate to a complex number of life situations among today’s students. For the staff to continue to be winsome and disarming, developing trusted relationships, it is important that they are equipped with knowledge in the areas of cultural apologetics that address complex problems. For example, eating disorders, gender confusion, depression, estrangement from family, experimentation with drugs and abuse of alcohol, and social anxiety are all examples of complex individual problems that exist among college students. Investment in staff equipping in these areas is crucial to helping the campus ministries maintain trust and credibility in this increasingly hostile environment.

2. Women’s Leadership Emphasis Must Expand

Currently most regions lack any developmental pipeline for women in the area of leader development and have few places for women to serve in leadership other than on the campus or in the office. Complementarian leadership should be explored, and women’s gifts and development should be affirmed and deployed. Some regions have engaged this issue and looked for ways to not only encourage women’s leadership contributions but to also develop women’s leadership pathways. There are a greater number of women college students today than men, and the number will continue to grow. Women staff leaders need to be challenged to develop pathways and processes to more effectively develop women leaders. The theological parameters of the churches that
lead Campus Outreach are not barriers to the Campus Outreach leadership intentionally developing women leadership opportunities.

3. Implement a Plan to Engage Diversity and Minister to All Types of Students

The college campus has become more diverse and as the general population becomes more integrated, it is important that college ministries capitalize on these contexts that are fostering diverse interaction. While there are plenty of correctives and much healing that needs to still take place among the races, campus ministries on public campuses are a fertile environment for cultivating discipleship and community among diverse people. Modeling through hiring, resourcing and supporting staff, being intentional in programming, and being willing to rethink programs and processes are important to reach this critical leadership goal within our culture. Many minorities feel Campus Outreach has not made significant progress, and at times this discourages others from continuing to make the effort. The number of international students studying in the United States should has increased recently, and these students should be included in the campus strategy. Campus Outreach is making progress and has worked to make this a part of its organizational footprint. Intentional plans and goals are important to translate desires and aspirations into realities.

4. Develop an On-Going Professional Development Curriculum

Staff can benefit from organizing professional development tools to help guide them as they minister to all types of students facing all kinds of problems. Twenty-two-year-old staff persons will have had only limited personal experiences but could benefit from a professional development resource to guide them as they work with students in crisis. Personal care suggestions can be offered, and general counseling knowledge and
skills can be provided. While partnership with pastors, counselors, parents, and other resource professionals is important, each staff person needs to be regularly reminded of the complex nature of people helping and of the signs of strain that may surface in the lives of staff and students.

5. Continue to Look for Ways to Creatively Hire and Fund Minority Staff

Some regional churches might consider funding a minority staff person. Campus Outreach can look for ways that all staff can use their networks to help minority staff with limited connections reach full financial support. They can also engage with local churches to consider investing in this strategic initiative.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

It has been forty years since the inception of Campus Outreach. This ministry began as an outreach to college students by one local church. More than 150,000 students worldwide have been directly impacted by an engaged involvement with Campus Outreach. It is estimated that nearly 75,000 students have been through some type of formal spiritual leadership training through one of the mechanisms developed by Campus Outreach (see Appendix C).

In order to gain insights and make recommendations, this project has detailed the institutional history of Campus Outreach and has summarized lessons learned and best practices being used globally. This paper has sought to look at ways that Campus Outreach’s original mission has shaped the movement, but it also presents recommendations on how to increase the staying power of Campus Outreach’s key leaders and the effectiveness of its current movement into the future.

The beginning of the paper looked at how a stated mission shaped aims and actions and produced an organization like Campus Outreach. Next, the paper explored what Campus Outreach has meant by leader development and how this philosophy and its development of people and processes have shaped the context and impact of Campus Outreach. A through theological review provided interpretive lenses through which to view the efforts of mission, leader development, and organizational culture. Both theological directives and missional actions shaped by theology were analyzed. Ten guiding principles were summarized entitled “Missional Theology for Campus Outreach’s Mission,” its commitment to leader development and its approach to operationalizing its mission. In the Ministry Strategy section, the past was evaluated,
including an extensive survey of results reported from past key leaders and the majority of present leaders within the movement. An alumni survey was also analyzed. Current practices were reflected on, as this paper sought to discover the effectiveness of Campus Outreach in operationalizing its vision and values. Pitfalls and challenges were addressed, and considerations were offered. The hope is that not only Campus Outreach leaders but others working with similar age groups or movements might benefit from the lessons learned.

How will Campus Outreach interpret its own history and how will the organization adapt to reach the changing face of the college campus? How will the lessons learned from Campus Outreach benefit other organizations seeking to have a missional kingdom influence among young people in the generations to come? Below is a summary of the lessons learned and recommendations for how Campus Outreach and others focusing on emerging adults can be more effective in building kingdom leaders.

**Lessons Learned from Campus Outreach**

Missional Kingdom Leaders are the lifeblood of every church and every kingdom ministry. Missional Kingdom Leaders do not think about sacrifice and cost to self as much as they think about service and help to others. Missional Kingdom Leaders seem to see opportunities instead of obstacles. This type of unique leader doesn’t wait to be told what to do but shows up, meets needs, solve problems, builds bridges, and seems to have unending amounts of energy, zeal, creativity, and vision.

1. Where Does One Find Missional Kingdom Leaders?

Missional Kingdom Leaders are needed now more than ever in America’s churches as the surrounding culture is growing more and more suspicious of the
institutional church. The cultural climate is growing more and more difficult for the institutional church to have an equal voice among all the voices seeking to shape the souls of the next generation. Radical individualism, self-serving and exploitive capitalism, Marxism, identity politics, pleasure, and sensory living are among some of Christianity’s competing worldviews. How does the church infiltrate the culture with seeds of hope and agents of change? The church is dependent upon Missional Kingdom Leaders.

Where do churches and kingdom ministry find Missional Kingdom Leaders? Missional Kingdom Leaders embrace a missional lifestyle because they have seen others model, teach, and demonstrate missional mindsets and values. These missional mindsets and values are caught in the hearts of teachable followers, who have seen these values demonstrated by leaders whose lifestyles reflect the missional values of their Savior, the Lord Jesus.

2. How Are Missional Kingdom Leaders Developed?

Missional Kingdom Leaders cannot be mass-produced by institutions or even by perfecting processes. Missional Kingdom Leaders develop competencies and skills through a life-on-life process that requires personal engagement. When one Missional Kingdom Leader intentionally invests in another teachable younger leader, the process of demonstration, explanation, modeling, observing and coaching done under the watch of a Missional Kingdom Leader leads to the cultivation of other Missional Kingdom leaders. It does take one to make one. All too often the church of Jesus Christ has looked for short cuts, the efficiency of organizational processes, or the transference of information to replace the transference of life as a substitute for leader development. There is no
substitute for constant, personal, intentional, thoughtful, and patient leadership investment from one person to the next. The only way to ensure that younger leaders emerge with the lifestyle of a Missional Kingdom Leader is if Missional Kingdom Leaders take the time to invest their lives in others.

3. How Does Missional Kingdom Leadership Develop a Process That Avoids Superficiality?

When Missional Kingdom Leaders seek to model this type of transformational leadership, they must reflect the emphasis that the Lord Jesus and the apostles made while fulfilling their earthly ministry by emphasizing the soul-shaping practices of relationship. Relationship with God is fostered through prioritizing being over doing and valuing one’s soul over one’s service. Missional Kingdom Leaders understand that ministry is the work of the Holy Spirit accomplished through surrendered lives and that the gospel is advanced through pointing people to the truth of the revealed Word of God rather than the latest fads. Missional Kingdom Leaders live from the inside-out and learn dependence and faith rather than trusting in gifts and processes. In this way, Missional Kingdom Leadership is more about learning the ways of God than about learning skills and practices to perform.

4. What Is the Key to Sustaining the Influence of Missional Kingdom Leadership?

Individuals cannot sustain the movement of God. In fact, individuals will only pervert and distort the movement of God. Jesus established an eternal institution, the church, to continue his work on the earth. Jesus promised to build his church and said that the gates of Hell will not prevail against the advance and progress of the church. (Mt 16:18) The church of Jesus Christ has been given a promise that God himself (Father,
Son and Holy Spirit) will be faithful to the mission and to the maintenance of his church. Jesus also pointed out that sinfulness in the hearts of people will corrupt the corporate expression of his church.

The history of Campus Outreach has paralleled the emergence of the church of Jesus Christ in history. Jesus began his movement in a pioneer fashion by calling a few followers to commit to follow him and take on his vision and values. Next, Jesus commissioned his disciples to band together as partners and to recognize that success cannot be achieved without depending on one another. No one person possesses all the knowledge or wisdom or experience to advance the mission toward fruitfulness. Modern individualism in our day promotes ego but blinds ambitious leaders to seeing their need for others. Once leaders embrace partnership, it is important to position them as valuable and unique contributors in the mission. For many years, Campus Outreach ignored giftedness and focused primarily on faithfulness. This led to discouragement among staff and organization’s inability to properly utilize each staff member, and it has led to greater than necessary transition difficulties. While it is important to stay focused on the mission, teams of Campus Outreach staff are discovering the unique benefits of deploying staff in their areas of giftedness and fostering greater ownership and diversity among each leadership team. Lastly, Jesus emphasized a family that cares for each other and is focused on fostering relationships of health and conversation, not simply establishing groups to accomplish tasks or reach goals. Campus Outreach has evolved, seeing the need for pioneering, partnering, positioning, and pastoring. In almost a decade, these four emphases have evolved and emerged as important keys to developing and sustaining the missional kingdom leadership of Campus Outreach and other movements with similar
vision. Campus Outreach would be a one-legged stool if any of these four elements were missing. Regions that at times have emphasized two or three or neglected two or three may start well but have been unable to sustain kingdom influence. Other regions that lack one or more elements find the mission producing unbalanced leaders who are not be able to continue to be influential when facing diverse challenges. It takes all four of these elements to growth a healthy and sustainable movement that will produce missional kingdom leaders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pioneering</th>
<th>Partnering</th>
<th>Positioning</th>
<th>Pastoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on Faithfulness to the Vision &amp; Mission</td>
<td>Focus on Fruitfulness in the Mission</td>
<td>Focus on Fit and Contribution for the Mission</td>
<td>Focus on Fullness as the Vision &amp; Mission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11. Evolution of Campus Outreach Missional Kingdom Influence

“And seeing the multitudes, he felt compassion for them, for they will distressed and downcast like sheep without a shepherd. Then Jesus turned to his disciples and said, “the harvest is plentiful but the laborers are few, beseech the Lord of the harvest that he would send out workers into his harvest.” (Mt 9:36-38) May God give the ministry of Campus Outreach grace to fulfill its mission- *Glorifying God by building laborers on the campus for the lost world.*
APPENDIX A

A Christ-Centered Laborer

L – Lives in the security of God’s love
   Understands his position in Christ – Justification
   Is motivated and compelled by an understanding of God’s love for him

A – Aims for Christ-likeness in all things
   Fights in the Spirit to have the character of Christ in all things – Sanctification
   Does everything with a mindset of glorifying God – for this purpose

B – Builds life on the foundation of God’s Word
   Sees God’s Word as his authority and guide for all life (Great Commandment / Great Commission)
   Has a regular habit of personal Bible study and a firm understanding of essential biblical doctrines
   Has developed and lives by personal convictions (not borrowed convictions) rooted in God’s Word

O – Operates under the control of the Spirit
   Consistently lives under the control and power of the Spirit and bears the fruit of the Spirit
   Understands and is actively using his spiritual gifts in service to Christ

R – Relates properly to the body/local church
   Understands his responsibility to edify all members of the body – relates in holiness and humility
   Understands the biblical necessity of—and is committed to being an active member in—a God-centered, Bible-believing local church

E – Evangelizes as a lifestyle
   Understands that people (all people) need Jesus
   Has a mindset of evangelism—shares the gospel wherever he or she is

R – Reproduces third-generation disciples
   Is committed to investing in others and passing on the things which he or she has been taught
   Actively seeks to equip others for ministry through life-on-life discipleship

S – Steps out in radical faith
   Has a regular habit of private prayer and trusting God for his or her needs
   Hears from God and responds by stepping out in faith even if he or she doesn’t have all the answers

Training Disciples to be LABORERS*

L – Lives in the security of God’s love
• Position in Christ  
• God’s love for them  
• Gospel  
• Grace in justification, sanctification, glorification

**A – Aims for Christ-likeness in all things**
  • Know the character of Christ  
  • Character development—nature of confession/repentance  
  • We are image-bearers—to reflect God’s glory holistically

**B – Builds life on the foundation of God’s Word**
  • Word of God as their source for everything  
  • Decision making and priorities

**O – Operates under the control of the Spirit**
  • Laboring in God’s strength, not my strength  
  • Asking “Why do I do what I do?”  
  • Understanding personal gifts/design

**R – Relates properly to the body/local church**
  • Biblical fellowship – brother/brother, sister/sister, brother/sister  
  • Relating to the church and church members

**E – Evangelizes as a lifestyle**
  • Taking advantage of every opportunity  
  • Process of evangelism—prayer, relationship, method, using the Word, dialoging the over the gospel  
  • Fluent with a method—presentation and follow-up

**R – Reproduces third generation disciples**
  • Life-on-life—walking with them and modeling reproduction  
  • Vision for multiplication—model of Jesus  
  • Thinking for other’s development—discipleship index—being intentional

**S – Steps out in radical faith**
  • Risk-taking mentality  
  • Knowing and praying the promises of God

*Never assume motivation and heart. Communicate everything in light of these themes: glory of God, worship, Great Commandment, God’s love.*
APPENDIX B

Campus Outreach Ministry Strategy
(Adopted in 2000)

Vision

• Glorifying God by building laborers on the campus for the lost world

Values

• Compelled by the love of God (motive in ministry)

• Following hard after Christ (passion/obedience)

• The Word of God as central to discipleship (devotion/study and believing promises)

• Prayer (foundation for life and ministry through the Holy Spirit/trusting the Holy Spirit to build a movement)

• Developing leaders
  o Spiritual leadership (character of a leader/leading from the inside out)
  o Leadership: being responsive to GOD, taking initiative to people
  o Shepherding and supervision

• Growing through multiplication (reproduction)

• Reaching the lost (building disciples in the context of reaching the lost)

Vital Relationships

• Ministry flows out of vital relationship with God

• Team relationships are vital for unity and maximizing the development and contributions of each leader

• Church relationships are vital for pastoring, guiding and maintaining integration

• Partnership relationships with other regional leaders is key to strategic engagement
Vehicle

- Connection with a local church (authority/supervision of the church/board)
- Interdenominational profile on campus but only to franchise to theologically reformed churches
- Growth through regional hubs where all services were sought to be duplicated locally
- Catalytic growth opportunities (retreats, conferences, summer projects)
- Team (at every level/learning environments and relational communities)
- Connection with other CO ministries (partnerships regional and internationally)
### APPENDIX C

Timeline Growth of Campus Outreach Franchises

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRANCHISE</th>
<th>LAUNCH YEAR</th>
<th>HUB CHURCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Briarwood Presbyterian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>First Presbyterian Church, Augusta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khon Kaen, TH</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Covenant Church (Thailand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Christ Covenant Presbyterian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Second Presbyterian Church, Memphis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belo Horizonte, BR</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Comunidade Horizonte (Brazil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>East Cooper Baptist Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenville</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Mitchell Road Presbyterian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane, AU</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Christ Community Church (Australia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Perimeter Presbyterian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytona Beach</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Christ Community Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Christ Community Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johannesburg, SA</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Central Baptist Church (South Africa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Tates Creek Presbyterian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Bethlehem Baptist Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynchburg</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Rivermont Evangelical Presbyterian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Illinois</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Grace Presbyterian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raleigh</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>The Summit Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas-FW</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>The Village Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Capitol Hill Baptist Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>The Journey Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Northwest Presbyterian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Grace Bible Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Harbor Presbyterian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiang Mai, TH</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Covenant Church (Thailand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines, Manila</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Bread from Heaven (Manila)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England, Birmingham</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Redeemer Church</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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