PASTORAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW SURVEY SUMMARY

by

Heather A. Card, BBA, CPA, CMA

This survey was part of a thesis project submitted to
the Faculty of McMaster Divinity College
in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Theological Studies
April 2016

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS

One of the most challenging situations a pastor faces occurs when the pastor and the church board have significant disagreements or misunderstandings regarding how well things are going in the church. These disagreements and misunderstandings can lead to strained relationships, ineffective ministry, termination of employment, and—in the worst case—abandonment of vocation and call to ministry.

The issue of strained board-pastor relationships was a key issue that my colleagues and I dealt with during my tenure with the Canadian Council of Christian Charities (2004–2014).[1] My desire in conducting this research was to provide information about the pastoral performance review process within the Canadian evangelical context. Primary research was conducted through an online survey from June 16, 2015 to August 10, 2015. This survey inquired about the type of performance evaluation process used by church boards and pastors, if/how church board members used theological principles to inform their evaluation process, what theological principles participants felt should be used in the evaluation process, and what made the evaluation process a positive or negative experience.

Only 60 percent of pastors surveyed are satisfied or very satisfied with the pastoral review process. There is also another group (17 percent) that has a neutral opinion, which indicates they could become dissatisfied (or perhaps satisfied) based on the type of review process they experience in the future. These statistics indicate a significant potential for improvement in satisfaction levels.

---

[1] The Canadian Council of Christian Charities (www.cccc.org) serves over 3,200 member churches, denominational offices, and charities.

The survey research also supports the idea that church leadership would benefit from increased, intentional theological reflection with respect to the pastoral performance review process—only 55 percent of pastors agreed that their boards are well-equipped theologically to provide a performance review. In addition, a significant percentage of board members, 24 percent, were not sure or did not know how theological principles were incorporated into the pastoral performance review process.

When theological reflection does occur, it is most often focused on the *criteria* related to the specific duties and character qualities that the pastor should exhibit such as preaching, equipping lay leaders, providing pastoral care, and investing in their own spiritual growth. Much less emphasis is placed on the *relationality* of the review process, yet pastors and boards often referred to the importance of this area when speaking about their positive and negative experiences with the pastoral evaluation process. This suggests that an articulation, an understanding, and a practice of relational theological principles have the potential to provide significant benefit to both pastors and boards in the pastoral evaluation process.[2]

---

[2] Persons interested in reading my thesis project, *Trinitarian Principles for Church Boards and the Pastoral Review Process*, may request a copy by emailing heather.card@rogers.com. The project includes full survey results, the development of Trinitarian principles for the pastoral review process, and the mapping of theological principles to key points in the performance review process.

PASTORAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW SURVEY RESULTS

Primary research was conducted through an online survey from June 16, 2015 to August 10, 2015. The survey inquired about the type of performance evaluation process used by church boards and pastors, if/how church board members used theological principles to inform their evaluation process, what theological principles participants felt should be used in the evaluation process, and what made the evaluation process a positive or negative experience. The following summary interprets data collected and summarizes major themes from the survey. Survey results are also presented in Appendix 1.

Survey Target Audience

All survey participants represent a Canadian church within the evangelical faith community. Although there are different traditions for evaluating pastoral performance, this research focused on faith traditions that involve the local church board (rather than a centralized body) in the pastoral performance evaluation process.

The survey captured feedback from the perspectives of pastors and board members in order to identify whether there were any significant differences between the responses and what could be learned from each perspective. The focus of this study is on the evaluation experience of the pastor within the local church, which I define as the most senior-level pastoral position that reports directly to the church board. The study does not specifically investigate how the performance reviews of other church staff—such as youth pastor, worship leader, administrator—are conducted, even if the board provides a performance evaluation for them. Nor does it include evaluations of church staff conducted by the lead pastor.

It is also important to note that the titles ascribed to pastors and board members vary across different traditions. In this study, the title of "pastor" is used to represent a variety of different terminologies including minister, clergy, priest, etc. Similarly, this survey uses the term church board or church board member, which would encompass various roles such as deacons, council members, elders, overseers, wardens, and so on.

Sampling Plan

To qualify to complete the full questionnaire, individuals had to be eighteen years of age or older, currently serving as a pastor (e.g., priest, minister, clergy) who receives a performance review from the church board (e.g., board members, elders, deacons, overseers, wardens) at a church in Canada, or as a board member (e.g., elder, deacon, warden) who participates in the performance review process for the pastor (e.g., minister, clergy, priest) at a church in Canada.

Of the 417 unique individuals who logged into the survey, 377 answered one or more questions, which is a 90% response rate. Of those answering the survey, 290 qualified to complete the full survey. The study population consists of 185 pastors and 105 board members, which is adequate to draw statistically significant conclusions, including some segmentation.

Survey Results

The following section reviews the various categories of the survey demographics, geographic location, denominational affiliation, age, gender, church size, as well as analysis and interpretation of survey results. For each question, the most common responses are highlighted in tabular form. Where the result between one segmented

group is statistically different than another, this fact is also indicated in the table. The full survey results are presented in Appendix 1. From time to time anecdotal stories or quotes from the survey are shared to provide additional insight to the survey results.

Demographics

The majority of pastors and board members participating in the survey, 84 percent, were located in Ontario, British Columbia, and Alberta. Quebec was significantly under-represented because the survey was offered only in English and because the survey was not actively promoted in that province. Ontario and British Columbia were over-represented compared to their relative proportion of the total Canadian population, while the remaining provinces and territories were relatively consistent with the proportion of total population of these geographic areas as shown in Table 1.1.

Table 1.1
Geographic Location of Participating Churches

	Survey	Population[1]
Ontario	55%	39%
British Columbia	18%	13%
Alberta	11%	12%
Saskatchewan	7%	3%
Manitoba	4%	4%
Nova Scotia	2%	3%
New Brunswick	1%	2%
Quebec	1%	23%
Newfoundland & Labrador	0%	2%
Prince Edward Island	0%	less than 1%
Northwest Territories	0%	less than 1%
Nunavut	0%	less than 1%
Yukon	0%	less than 1%

Urban churches made up 66 percent of the total survey population; however, it is interesting to note that significantly fewer pastors were responding from an urban context (57 percent) compared to board members (80 percent). Participating churches represented a wide spectrum of church sizes from small churches of less than 100 people (32 percent) to medium-sized churches with 250 – 499 people (34 percent) to large churches with 500 people or greater (34 percent) in relatively equal proportion. The participants of the survey, both pastors and board members, were predominantly male (86 percent) between the ages of forty and sixty-nine (82 percent). Appendix 1 (questions five and six) provides the age and gender breakdown of the survey population. Finally, the majority of survey participants reported that they provide their pastor with a performance evaluation annually (57 percent), every two years (16 percent), or every three to five years (10 percent).

---

[1]Statistics Canada, Population by year, by province, and territory (Proportion), for the year 2015. Online: http://www.statcan.gc.ca/tables-tableaux/sum-som/l01/cst01/demo02d-eng.htm Date last modified 2015-09-29.

A variety of denominational affiliations were represented in the survey; however, Baptist (24 percent), Free Methodist (18 percent), and Mennonite (16 percent) traditions were the most common. A listing of participating denominations as a percentage of the total survey population is shown in Appendix 1 question three. During the promotion of the survey to various denominations, it became apparent that some denominations have placed a strong emphasis on improving the performance review process of the pastor within the context of promoting a healthy church culture. I note that two groups in particular, the Free Methodist Church in Canada and the Mennonite Church of Eastern Canada, have provided significant denominational support to their churches in this area. Responses from these two groups comprise approximately 34 percent of the total survey population. As a result, this may represent a positive survey bias in the results compared to the general population.

Analysis and Interpretation of Survey Results

In this section, I analyze the remaining questions of the survey and provide a brief interpretation of the results. I highlight any statistically significant differences, particularly between pastors and board members responses, whenever possible. Supporting information for the analysis that follows is available in Appendix 1.

Methods Used to Train Board Members in the Pastoral Performance Review Process

In this question participants were asked to describe how their church board learned to do pastoral performance evaluations. The survey results are shown in Table 1.2.

Both pastors and board members indicated that denominational resources,

training, or facilitation and the board's previous business or management experience are the most common sources for church boards to learn how to do pastoral performance evaluations. Information contained in the church policy manual was also a key resource. In addition, approximately 10 percent of pastors said that they initiated the pastoral review process with the board themselves because a system of evaluation did not exist. These responses demonstrate that church boards rely heavily on the resources of their denominations and that the pastor provides a key linkage point for resource transfer and, in some cases, initiation and facilitation of the performance review process. The survey responses indicate that the general business and management experiences of board members have the potential to significantly influence—whether positively or negatively—the performance review process.

Table 1.2
How Did Your Board Learn to Do Pastoral Performance Evaluation?

Method	Pastor Response	Board Member Response
Denominational resources/training/facilitation*	54%	35%
Previous business or management experience*	32%	50%
Church policy manual	19%	24%
Read books and articles	8%	14%
Facilitated by the Lead Pastor*	10%	1%
Developed in-house	3%	2%
Consultant or outside source	3%	1%
Not sure	12%	17%

Respondents were encouraged to select all methods that applied to their context; therefore, the total percentage adds up to more than 100%.

*Indicates that differences between the responses of pastors and board members were statistically significant.

Criteria Used to Determine How Well the Pastor is Performing

In this question, respondents were asked to describe the criteria that the board uses to determine how well the pastor is performing. The responses generally fell into two categories: those who described the method used to conduct the performance review and those who highlighted specific criteria used in the actual evaluation. Quite surprisingly, 24 percent of board members indicated that they did not know what criteria was being used to evaluate the pastor, even though they indicated in the screening questions that they were part of the team responsible for conducting the performance review of the pastor. These results are shown in Table 1.3.

The most common *methods* mentioned for conducting the performance review were collecting broader input from congregation and staff, conducting a survey, or using a 360 performance review tool. The term 360 performance review refers to the practice of collecting feedback from multiple perspectives to give a more complete view of job performance. The most common *criteria* used to evaluate the pastor involved using the job description of the pastor (30 percent) and considering how well mission, vision, or goals were being achieved (21 percent).

There were also a significant number of participants who placed a strong emphasis on preaching and teaching (15 percent); leadership and administration (14 percent); pastoral care activities such as counselling and visitation (11 percent); and character and spirituality (11 percent). Although perhaps not a typical criteria for evaluating performance, the notion of pastoral self-care was mentioned relatively infrequently (3 percent) by the survey group compared to other criteria, even though there is a strong connection between the health of the pastor and how well the pastor is

able to carry out his or her role. Similarly there was scant reference (2 percent) to the nature and quality of relationship between the pastor and the board as a consideration in the evaluation process.

Table 1.3 Criteria Used to Determine How Well Pastor is Performing

	Total Response	Pastor Response	Board Member Response
Method			
Broader input from congregation, staff*	21%	26%	13%
Survey, 360 evaluation	16%	19%	11%
Subjective	9%	11%	6%
Appreciative Inquiry*	2%	3%	0%
Criteria			
Job Description*	30%	36%	18%
Goals, Mission, Vision	21%	19%	25%
Preaching & Teaching	15%	15%	15%
Leadership & Administration	14%	14%	14%
Pastoral Care (counselling, visitation)	11%	11%	13%
Character, Spirituality	11%	12%	9%
Major responsibilities	6%	6%	5%
Staff & Volunteer Management	6%	6%	6%
Outreach or Community Focus	5%	4%	8%
Communication	4%	4%	4%
Self-care, Family*	3%	5%	0%
Relationship with Board	2%	1%	4%
Don't Know*	12%	6%	24%

*Indicates that differences between the responses of pastors and board members were statistically significant.

Type of Process Used for Pastoral Evaluation

In this open-ended question, respondents provided more detail on how the pastoral performance evaluation process was carried out. The results are summarized in Table 1.4. In looking at the responses to this question, it is important to highlight that

respondents did not generally provide a step-by-step summary of their evaluation process, but rather they seemed to highlight the key steps or criteria that characterized their process.

A significant proportion of those surveyed (41 percent) said that a common method for obtaining information was the use of surveys, questionnaires, or similar forms that solicited feedback. While survey tools are efficient methods of collecting data, they do have drawbacks because they are predominantly one-way communication vehicles. People write comments, but unless they identify themselves in the survey, it is difficult to clarify survey responses or understand the context from which a particular response was given. If some type of review of the collected data is not performed prior to providing the responses to the pastor, the results could be particularly negative and damaging.

Nearly one-third of respondents indicated that feedback was solicited from a group that was broader than the board. Obtaining feedback from a variety of sources allows the board to understand how things are going in areas where they might not be particularly involved. It also provides direct input from people other than the pastor and a check on whether information the board receives has been filtered by the pastor—either positively or negatively. Twenty-two percent of survey participants included a self-evaluation component in the review process, which was completed by the pastor. This type of feedback is valuable, because it allows the pastor to be involved in the process and it helps to better understand where there may be a disconnect between the pastor's view of performance compared to that of board members, lay leaders, and members of the congregation. These overall results are likely positively influenced by

the significant participation by both the Free Methodist Church of Canada and the

Mennonite Church of Eastern Canada, which both actively promote a breadth of

involvement for the pastoral performance evaluation process.

Forty-five percent of participants in the survey indicated that they used some

type of debriefing process where results from the feedback are discussed with the pastor.

The most common scenario involved a meeting with the board chair (32 percent) or the

board as a whole (14 percent). These types of meetings provide the opportunity for

greater understanding of the feedback. Five percent of respondents indicated that the

pastor is given the opportunity to respond to the feedback at the conclusion of the

process. Although this was not mentioned as frequently as the overall process of

debriefing, it is important in terms of providing a platform for the pastor to

communicate whether there were any significant concerns about the issues raised. It

provides the opportunity for dialogue together as pastor and board.

As with the previous question, there were a significant number, 8 percent, of

both pastors and board members who did not know what method was used in the

evaluation process. In the case of board responses, this may suggest that only a subset of

the board is involved in the process, perhaps resulting in a lack of understanding on the

part of the entire board.

Finally, only 4 percent of those surveyed mentioned the idea that the

performance review process is one where the board and pastor collaborate together. Two

board members from the survey provide examples of what this collaboration looks like.

One participant said, "It is a mutual process with each role bringing their perspective

using the accountability statements as a basis for discussion."[2] Another participant

added, "Our pastors are transparently included in how the process will look and

proceed."[3]

Table 1.4 Type of Process Used for Performance Evaluation of Pastor

	Total Response	Pastor Response	Board Member Response
Method			
Survey, questionnaire, forms	41%	45%	33%
Criteria – job description, goals	30%	30%	29%
Verbal, informal conversation	15%	14%	16%
Appreciative Inquiry	4%	5%	3%
Interview	2%	2%	1%
Process			
Debrief pastor–meet with board chair	32%	33%	30%
Feedback – includes board, subset of board	31%	31%	31%
Feedback—congregation, lay leadership	31%	34%	25%
Feedback – includes pastoral self-evaluation	22%	23%	21%
Feedback – written summary for pastor	17%	17%	18%
Debrief pastor–meet with board	14%	15%	11%
Denominational involvement/reporting*	12%	8%	20%
Feedback – pastor responds	5%	4%	6%
Pastor and board collaboration	4%	4%	4%
Don't know	8%	6%	11%

Respondents were encouraged to select all methods or criteria that applied to their context.

*Indicates that differences between the responses of pastors and board members were statistically significant.

---

[2] Anecdote from survey participant.
[3] Anecdote from survey participant.

Is the Board Well-Equipped Theologically to Provide a Pastoral Performance Review?

Only 55 percent of pastors responding to this survey agreed that their board was well-equipped theologically to provide their performance review. Although this statistic is concerning, it is not surprising, since theological training is provided primarily to pastors and not necessarily to board members. As such, it represents an opportunity for future development. Pastors at churches with more than 250 people attending had the highest level of agreement with this statement at 62 percent, while pastors in churches of less than 250 people reported approximately 50 percent agreement. Although these results are not statistically different, it is likely that within a larger congregation there will be more people who have some theological background available to serve on boards simply because there is a larger pool of people to draw from. In contrast to the pastors' opinion, 71 percent of board members agreed that their board was well-equipped theologically to provide a pastoral performance review. This represents a significant perception gap (See Table 1.5).

Table 1.5 My Board is Well-Equipped Theologically to Provide a Performance Review

	Total Response	Pastor Response	Board Member Response
NET Agree*	61%	55%	71%
NET Disagree*	23%	29%	10%
Strongly disagree	6%	7%	3%
Disagree*	17%	23%	7%
Neither agree or disagree	17%	16%	18%
Agree	43%	40%	51%
Strongly Agree	17%	15%	21%

*Indicates that differences between the responses of pastors and board members were statistically significant.

When survey participants were asked why they thought their board was well-equipped theologically to provide a performance review, the most common responses were: the board members are mature believers (14 percent); the board members are well-grounded in biblical and theological principles (14 percent); the board members have formal or informal theological training (10 percent and 5 percent respectively); and the board members possess a good understanding of the role of the pastor (7 percent). Despite the fact that 47 percent said that their denomination provided resources and training or that the denomination facilitated the pastoral performance evaluation process, only 4 percent of respondents mentioned that board members were well-equipped because of the theological resources from their denomination.

Those who disagreed with the statement had similar responses, but on the negative end of the spectrum: they feel that board members are not well-equipped because they do not have theological expertise (7 percent), they do not understand the theological foundation of the work of the pastor (6 percent), or there is no specific theological training in the area of pastoral performance reviews (4 percent). Notably, 12 percent of board members said they did not know why they chose their response in this question.

What Theological Principles Should be Used in the Pastoral Performance Review Process?

When responding to this question, many respondents focused on the *criteria* used to evaluate the pastor as opposed to the actual *process* of the evaluation. Pastors gave particular emphasis (40 percent) to the importance of scripture-based, Christ-like leadership attributes of the pastor, while only 26 percent of board members selected this

option. Faithful, theologically-sound preaching and an emphasis on church mission and vision were each noted as important principles by one in five people. The full set of results is shown in Table 1.6.

Table 1.6 What Theological Principles Should be Used in the Pastoral Evaluation Process?

Criteria	Total Response	Pastor Response	Board Response
Scripture-based, Christ-like character*	35%	40%	26%
Preaching theologically sound	21%	22%	18%
Encompasses mission, vision	18%	20%	13%
Equipping the church*	14%	18%	5%
Recognize pastoral gifting*	8%	11%	1%
Pastoral care	8%	7%	8%
Pastor's spiritual health, spiritual disciplines	7%	7%	7%
Spirit-led	6%	6%	7%
Don't know*	11%	5%	24%
Process			
Speak the truth in love	10%	9%	11%
Encourage, build up pastor	6%	5%	7%
Relationality of review process	5%	4%	7%

*Indicates that differences between the responses of pastors and board members were statistically significant.

Those who did make reference to the *process* most often mentioned speaking the truth in love (10 percent), encouraging the pastor (6 percent), and the relationality of the review process itself (5 percent). The idea of unity among the participants was mentioned infrequently.

From these results we can conclude two important observations. First, when asked to describe the theological principles involved in the evaluation process both pastors and boards focused more on the evaluation criteria than the actual process of the evaluation (how the evaluation is conducted). Second, a remarkable number of board

members, 24 percent, said they did not know what theological principles should be used in the process. It is reasonable to conclude that pastors and boards would benefit greatly by engaging in further reflection and conversation about theological principles that should form the foundation for this important process.

How Has Your Board Incorporated Theological Principles into the Evaluation Process?

Survey participants were also asked to provide examples of how the church board had incorporated theological principles into the pastoral evaluation process. Nearly one-fifth of all respondents were either "not sure" or "did not know" how the board incorporated theological principles into the pastoral evaluation process. A further 28 percent of pastors (compared with 10 percent of board members) said that their board had either not incorporated theological principles into the performance review process or had not intentionally incorporated them. One pastor's response highlights some of the frustration about the lack of theological integration into board practices. He said, "We come from a church that often brags about its biblical base, yet so much decision making is done with a strong reticence to look at Scripture, and [the board] bases most of its understanding and practice based on either past experience or personal feelings about something."[4] Another pastor described the board's evaluation process as "rather whimsical and selective."[5]

The survey data from this question reinforces the notion that a significant proportion of boards do not place a priority on reflecting theologically about their own practices. In light of the fact that 50 percent of boards learned to conduct pastoral

---

[4] Anecdote from survey participant.
[5] Anecdote from survey participant.

performance reviews from their own business or management experience, there appears to be significant disconnect between the secular and church context. In cases where the denomination provides a strong support role, board members might be inclined to assume that the theological work has already been done.[6]

The most common way boards incorporate theological principles into the performance evaluation process is by connecting the pastoral duties outlines in the job description to Scripture (20 percent). Common biblical passages referenced by survey participants included the practices of spiritual leadership outlined in 1Timothy chapter four, the character traits of elders from Titus chapter one and Galatians chapter five, and the exhortation for pastors to be shepherds of their flocks in 1 Peter chapter five.

In terms of applying theological reflection to the actual process of pastoral performance evaluation, 14 percent of survey participants provided examples of how this is done within their context. For example, they approach the process in a loving way designed to build up and encourage the pastor; they deal with difficult situations in a direct, yet mercy- and grace-filled way; and they consider that the entire congregation shares the responsibility for how well the church is doing. One pastor summarizes the concept of shared responsibility well. He said:

> I believe that there is an understanding that we all share in the ministry of the church—it is not all mine to do—so the evaluations have always had a sense of—in light of our shared mission as a congregation—how is our pastor doing in regards to the specific tasks he does as we together follow Jesus and live out our identity as the church? As well there is not an expectation that I have all the gifts. [They] support what I have, work on areas of weakness, and invite others to step into my areas of weakness. Finally there is a sense of that we all are accountable to God for our actions—not in shaming or finger pointing way—but in the spirit of mutually building each other up.[7]

---

[6] Anecdote from survey participant.

[7] Anecdote from survey participant.

Satisfaction with the Performance Evaluation Process

One in five of those surveyed are either dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the pastoral

performance evaluation process at their church. There is also another large group (17

percent) that has a neutral opinion, which indicates they could become dissatisfied (or

even satisfied) based on the type of review process they experience in the future. It is

also interesting to note that although 62 percent identify themselves in the satisfaction

category, only one-third of those are *very* satisfied. The complete list of responses for

this question is shown in Table 1.7. Clearly, these results indicate that there is more

work that can be done to improve the pastoral evaluation process in the Canadian

evangelical church context.

Table 1.7 How satisfied are you with the performance evaluation process at your church?

	Total	Pastors	Board
Very dissatisfied	6%	6%	4%
Dissatisfied	14%	14%	15%
Neither dissatisfied or satisfied	17%	18%	15%
Satisfied	42%	40%	46%
Very satisfied	20%	20%	19%
Prefer not to say	2%	1%	2%
NET satisfied	62%	60%	64%
NET dissatisfied	20%	21%	19%

What Makes the Evaluation Process Positive or Negative?

The final survey questions asked participants to speak from their own experiences and

provide responses about what made the pastoral performance evaluation experience

process positive and what made it negative. A summary of the most frequent responses

is shown in Table 1.8 and Table 1.9.

Both pastors and boards reported that the most important attribute was that the

process was constructive, encouraging and affirming while identifying areas for growth

or improvement. Further, both groups noted the importance of focusing on the shared

ministry of the church and providing the opportunity for collaborative, interactive

dialogue with the pastor. One pastor expressed how important this idea of shared

ministry was to him. He said, "[The performance evaluation process] is collaborative. If

they [the board] simply sat in a room and evaluated my performance with no

opportunity for me to share with them what I believe I have accomplished, I would find

that very difficult."[8]

Table 1.8 What Makes the Evaluation Process Positive?

Constructive, notes areas for growth, improvement	26%
Encouraging, affirming	21%
Identify areas for improvement	18%
Focus on shared ministry	16%
Collaborative, interactive, dialogue with pastor	16%
Positive motivation (love, respect, trust, grace)	14%
Identifies strengths	11%
Feedback is honest	10%
Encourage/identify growth areas	8%
Evaluation is well-intentioned, fair, balanced	8%
Feedback is regular, timely	8%
Evaluation criteria is clear	7%
Open, transparent	6%
Good relationships between leadership and pastors	5%
Clear process, process followed	5%

---

[8] Anecdote from survey participant.

In terms of what makes the performance review process negative, many respondents provided examples related to the *process* of the review versus the *criteria* used to evaluate the pastor. Nearly one in five respondents said that a poorly executed, unprofessional, or cumbersome review process would make the experience a negative one for them. There was also a considerable number (11 percent) of participants who mentioned that a system that supports complainers and those with personal agendas would also result in a negative experience. Focusing on weakness, failing to approach the process positively with love, and allowing issues to build up were also among the issues commonly cited by both parties.

Table 1.9 What Makes the Evaluation Process Negative?

Review process poorly executed	18%
Supports complainers with personal agendas	11%
Focus on weakness without recognizing gifting	9%
Failure to understand pastor role and ministry context	8%
Failure to approach process positively	7%
Avoiding issues, allowing things to build up	6%
Pastor not open to feedback, lack of self-awareness	5%
Evaluation not based on job description, agreed upon goals	5%
Anonymous feedback	5%
Broad characterization without specifics	4%
No recognition of joint responsibility for results	4%
No opportunity for dialogue	3%
Review takes too long; time-consuming	3%
Feedback not clear	3%
Don't know	4%
Nothing	9%

There were several categories where the responses of pastors were significantly different than board members. Twelve percent of pastors noted that the failure to understand their ministry role and context made the evaluation process negative for them. In

addition, 7 percent of pastors and 5 percent of board members noted that a failure to agree upon goals for the evaluation and a failure to recognize joint responsibility for the results contributed to a negative process. Eleven percent of board members stated that a lack of self-awareness on the part of the pastor or failure to be open to growth and feedback was something that made the evaluation process negative for them.

APPENDIX 1: SURVEY RESULTS

	Qualifies	Pastor	Board Member
	A	B	C
Question 1: Where is your church located?			
	290	185	105
Ontario	55%	53%	59%
British Columbia	18%	17%	21%
Alberta	11%	14%	7%
Saskatchewan	7%	8%	6%
Manitoba	4%	5%	3%
Nova Scotia	2%	2%	1%
New Brunswick	1%	1%	2%
Quebec	1%	1%	2%
Newfoundland and Labrador	0%	0%	0%
Prince Edward Island	0%	0%	0%
Northwest Territories	0%	0%	0%
Nunavut	0%	0%	0%
Yukon	0%	0%	0%
Prefer not to say	0%	0%	0%
Outside of Canada	0%	0%	0%

APPENDIX 1: SURVEY RESULTS CONT'D

	Qualifies	Pastor	Board Member
	A	B	C
Question 2 -- Is your church located in an urban or rural setting?			
N	287	183	104
Urban	66%	57%	80% **B**
Rural	34%	43% **C**	20%
Prefer not to say	0%	0%	0%
Question 3 -- What is the denominational affiliation of your church?			
N	289	184	105
Baptist	24%	16%	37% **B**
Free Methodist	18%	17%	18%
Mennonite	16%	20% **C**	10%
Pentecostal	8%	8%	8%
Christian & Missionary Alliance	8%	10% **C**	4%
Christian Reformed	4%	4%	4%
Mennonite Brethren	5%	5%	6%
Associated Gospel	2%	2%	2%
Evangelical Missionary Church	2%	2%	1%
Church of the Nazarene	1%	2% **C**	0%
Brethren in Christ	1%	1%	0%
Lutheran	1%	1%	3%
Foursquare Gospel	0%	0%	1%
Other (please specify):	7%	9%	4%
No denominational affiliation	2%	2%	3%
Prefer not to say	1%	1%	1%

When a letter is shown, it indicates that the results are statistically different than the column indicated. (E.g., letter B indicates the results are statistically different than those in column B)

APPENDIX 1: SURVEY RESULTS CONT'D

	Qualifies	Pastor	Board Member
	A	B	C
Question 4a -- Are you the pastor who receives a performance evaluation from the church board?			
N	290	185	105
Yes	64%	100% **C**	0%
No	36%	0%	100% **B**
Question 4b -- Are you a church board member who participates in the evaluation of the pastor?			
N	105	.	105
Yes	100%	.	100%
No	0%	.	0%
Question 5 -- What is your age?			
N	287	183	104
18-29	2%	2%	2%
30-39	11%	13%	7%
40-49	26%	30%	20%
50-59	34%	39% **C**	27%
60-69	22%	16%	32% **B**
70 and older	5%	1%	13% **B**
Prefer not to say	0%	0%	0%

When a letter is shown, it indicates that the results are statistically different than the column indicated. (E.g., letter B indicates the results are statistically different than those in column B)

APPENDIX 1: SURVEY RESULTS CONT'D

	Qualifies	Pastor	Board Member
	A	B	C
Question 6 -- What is your gender?			
N	289	185	104
Male	86%	88%	82%
Female	14%	12%	18%
Prefer not to say	0%	0%	0%

	Qualifies	Pastor	Board Member
Question 7 -- What is the size of your church congregation (members and non-members)?			
N	288	184	104
Under 100 people	32%	33%	30%
100 to 249 people	34%	35%	32%
250 to 499 people	22%	22%	22%
500 to 999 people	9%	8%	12%
1,000 to 2,999 people	3%	2%	5%
3,000 people or more	0%	0%	0%
Prefer not to say	0%	0%	0%
I'm not sure	0%	1%	0%

APPENDIX 1: SURVEY RESULTS CONT'D

	Qualifies	Pastor	Board Member
	A	B	C
Question 8 -- How often does your board provide the pastor with an evaluation of how well they are doing in their role? / How often does your church board provide you with an evaluation of how well you are doing as a pastor?			
N	283	180	103
Every 3 to 5 years	10%	14% **C**	4%
Every two years	16%	17%	13%
Annually	57%	49%	71% **B**
Twice a year	1%	1%	1%
Quarterly	0%	0%	1%
Monthly	1%	2%	0%
Never	0%	0%	0%
Other (please specify):	15%	17%	11%

When a letter is shown, it indicates that the results are statistically different than the column indicated. (E.g., letter B indicates the results are statistically different than those in column B)

APPENDIX 1: SURVEY RESULTS CONT'D

	Qualifies A	Pastor B	Board Member C
Question 9 -- How did your board learn to do pastoral performance evaluation?			
They used their own business or management experience	38%	32%	50% **B**
My denomination provided resources/training	34%	38% **C**	27%
They followed a process set out in our church policy manual	21%	19%	24%
My denomination facilitated this process	13%	16% **C**	8%
They read books and articles	10%	8%	14%
Other - Lead Pastor/Senior Pastor facilitated, resourced, or lead process	6%	10% **C**	1%
They received human resource training	3%	2%	6%
Other - developed in-house	3%	3%	2%
Other - consultant or outside source	3%	3%	1%
Other - Other congregations	1%	1%	1%
Other - Spiritual - Listening to God	1%	1%	1%
Other (please specify)	6%	8% **C**	2%
I'm not sure	14%	12%	17%
Prefer not to say	0%	0%	0%

When a letter is shown, it indicates that the results are statistically different than the column indicated. (E.g., letter B indicates the results are statistically different than those in column B)

APPENDIX 1: SURVEY RESULTS CONT'D

	Qualifies	Pastor	Board Member
	A	B	C
Question 10 -- Please describe the criteria that the board uses to determine how well the pastor is performing. / Please describe the criteria that the board uses to determine how well you are performing.			
N	240	160	80
Criteria - Job Description	30%	36% **C**	18%
Method - Broader Input (e.g., congregation, staff)	21%	26% **C**	13%
Criteria - Goals,Mission, Vision	21%	19%	25%
Method - Survey, 360 evaluation, or questions	16%	19%	11%
Criteria - Preaching & Teaching	15%	15%	15%
Criteria - Leadership & Administration	14%	14%	14%
Criteria - Pastoral Care (Counselling, visitation)	11%	11%	13%
Criteria - Character, Spirituality	11%	12%	9%
Method - Subjective	9%	11%	6%
Criteria - Major responsibilities	6%	6%	5%
Criteria - Staff & Volunteer Management	6%	6%	6%
Criteria - Outreach or Community Focus	5%	4%	8%
Criteria - Communication	4%	4%	4%
Criteria - Self-Care, Family	3%	5% **C**	0%
Method - Appreciative Inquiry	2%	3% **C**	0%
Criteria - Relationship with Board	2%	1%	4%
Other	25%	24%	29%
Don't know	12%	6%	24% **B**

When a letter is shown, it indicates that the results are statistically different than the column indicated. (E.g., letter B indicates the results are statistically different than those in column B)

APPENDIX 1: SURVEY RESULTS CONT'D

	Qualifies	Pastor	Board Member
	A	B	C
Question 11 -- Please describe the type of process used for [the/your] evaluation. (e.g., How is information provided? What criteria are used for [the/your] evaluation?).			
N	240	160	80
Method - Survey, questionnaire, forms	41%	45%	33%
Debrief with pastor provided in a meeting with board chair, committee or delegates of board	32%	33%	30%
Feedback - included board or subset of board	31%	31%	31%
Feedback - included congregation or lay leadership	31%	34%	25%
Criteria from job description, goals, set criteria	30%	30%	29%
Feedback - included self-evaluation by pastor.	22%	23%	21%
Written summary provided to pastor	17%	17%	18%
Method - Verbal, Informal conversation	15%	14%	16%
Debrief with pastor provided by the board	14%	15%	11%
Denominational involvement/reporting	12%	8%	20% **B**
Feedback - pastor responds or comments on evaluation	5%	4%	6%
Method - Pastor and Board collaborate on process together	4%	4%	4%
Method - Appreciative Inquiry	4%	5%	3%
Criteria based on character	3%	4%	1%
Method - Interview	2%	2%	1%
Don't know	8%	6%	11%

When a letter is shown, it indicates that the results are statistically different than the column indicated. (E.g., letter B indicates the results are statistically different than those in column B)

APPENDIX 1: SURVEY RESULTS CONT'D

	Qualifies	Pastor	Board Member
	A	B	C
Question 12 -- Please indicate how strongly you agree with the following statement: My board is well-equipped theologically to provide a performance evaluation of [the pastor's / my] ministry.			
N	251	164	87
NET Agree	61%	55%	71% **B**
NET Disagree	23%	29% **C**	10%
Strongly disagree	6%	7%	3%
Disagree	17%	23% **C**	7%
Neither agree nor disagree	17%	16%	18%
Agree	43%	40%	51%
Strongly agree	17%	15%	21%
Prefer not to say	0%	0%	0%

When a letter is shown, it indicates that the results are statistically different than the column indicated. (E.g., letter B indicates the results are statistically different than those in column B)

APPENDIX 1: SURVEY RESULTS CONT'D

	Qualifies	Pastor	Board Member
	A	B	C
Question 13 -- Why did you indicate that you/ your board is well-equipped theologically to provide a performance evaluation of the pastor's / your ministry?			
N	242	158	84
They are mature believers	14%	15%	13%
They are well-grounded in scriptures, biblical, theological principles	14%	16%	10%
They don't think about theology when conducting performance reviews	11%	13% **C**	6%
They have formal theological training	10%	9%	13%
They don't have theological expertise	7%	10% **C**	2%
They possess good understanding of the role of pastor	7%	8%	4%
They don't understand the theological foundations of the work of the pastor	6%	9% **C**	0%
They have informal theological training (books, pastor, experience)	5%	6%	5%
They have theological resources from denomination	4%	3%	5%
There is no specific theological training in this area	4%	3%	5%
They understand the mission of the church	3%	3%	5%
Experience varies or changes frequently	2%	3%	1%
Process is not rooted in theological principles (e.g., business approach)	2%	3% **C**	0%
Job description built on theological principles	1%	1%	0%
Board members selected because of their business expertise	0%	1%	0%
Other	30%	27%	35%
Don't know	6%	3%	12% **B**

When a letter is shown, it indicates that the results are statistically different than the column indicated. (E.g., letter B indicates the results are statistically different than those in column B)

APPENDIX 1: SURVEY RESULTS CONT'D

	Qualifies	Pastor	Board Member
	A	B	C
Question 14 -- In your opinion, what theological principles should be used in the pastoral evaluation process?			
N	224	148	76
Scripture-based, Christ-like leadership/character attributes (1 Tim 4, Titus, 1 Peter 5, Gal 5, Eph 4, Col 3:1-17)	35%	40% **C**	26%
Preaching is faithful, theologically, sound	21%	22%	18%
Encompasses church mission, vision, and health	18%	20%	13%
Equipping the church; all believers the body of Christ	14%	18% **C**	5%
Love - speaking truth in love, love one another	10%	9%	11%
Recognize pastoral giftings	8%	11% **C**	1%
Pastoral Care	8%	7%	8%
Pastor's spiritual health, spiritual disciplines	7%	7%	8%
Spirit-led	6%	6%	7%
Grace	6%	5%	8%
Encourage, build up pastor	6%	5%	7%
Accountability	6%	6%	5%
Relationality of Review process	5%	4%	7%
Character of Pastor	4%	4%	5%
Process	3%	1%	7%
Unity	3%	3%	3%
Outreach, community	3%	2%	4%
Other	44%	46%	41%
Don't know	11%	5%	24% **B**

When a letter is shown, it indicates that the results are statistically different than the column indicated. (E.g., letter B indicates the results are statistically different than those in column B)

APPENDIX 1: SURVEY RESULTS CONT'D

	Qualifies	Pastor	Board Member
	A	B	C
Question 15 -- Please give examples of how your board has taken theology and incorporated those principles into the pastoral evaluation process.			
N	211	143	68
This is not done or not done intentionally	22%	28% **C**	10%
Pastor's duties/job description connected to scripture or theological principles	20%	20%	21%
Theological evaluation of the process of evaluation - how it's done	14%	14%	15%
Pastor's personal character or spirituality	8%	8%	9%
Trinitarian Principles mutuality, common mission, unity	4%	5%	3%
Adhere to denominational theology	2%	3% **C**	0%
Self Care (Sabbath, family etc)	2%	3% **C**	0%
Other	21%	17%	28%
Not sure / Don't know	19%	17%	24%

When a letter is shown, it indicates that the results are statistically different than the column indicated. (E.g., letter B indicates the results are statistically different than those in column B)

APPENDIX 1: SURVEY RESULTS CONT'D

	Qualifies	Pastor	Board Member
	A	B	C
Question 16 -- How satisfied are you with the performance evaluation process at your church?			
N	235	154	81
NET Satisfied	62%	60%	64%
NET Dissatisfied	20%	21%	19%
Very dissatisfied	6%	6%	4%
Dissatisfied	14%	14%	15%
Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	17%	18%	15%
Satisfied	42%	40%	46%
Very satisfied	20%	20%	19%
Prefer not to say	2%	1%	2%

APPENDIX 1: SURVEY RESULTS CONT'D

	Qualifies	Pastor	Board Member
	A	B	C
Question 17 -- In your experience, what makes the evaluation process positive?			
N	226	148	78
Constructive, notes areas for growth or improvement	26%	26%	26%
Encouraging, affirming	21%	23%	17%
Identify areas for improvement	18%	20%	15%
Focus on shared ministry (setting goals for the church, evaluate the church as a whole, church mission, healthy church)	16%	17%	15%
Collaborative, interactive; dialogue and discussion by pastor and board	16%	16%	15%
Motivated by love, respect, trust, grace	14%	16%	10%
Identifies strengths	11%	11%	12%
Identify strengths	10%	10%	10%
Feedback is honest	10%	11%	8%
Encourage/Identify growth areas	8%	9%	8%
Evaluation is well-intentioned, fair balanced	8%	10%	5%
Regular, timely, ongoing feedback/communication	8%	8%	8%
Evaluation criteria clear	7%	7%	5%
Open, transparent	6%	5%	8%
Good relationships between leadership (evaluators) and pastor	5%	7% **C**	1%
Clear process; process followed	5%	4%	6%
Understand pastoral role and ministry context	3%	4%	1%
Completed prayerfully, thoughtfully, with biblical principles	2%	3% **C**	0%
Other	44%	45%	42%
Don't know	4%	1%	9% **B**

When a letter is shown, it indicates that the results are statistically different than the column indicated. (E.g., letter B indicates the results are statistically different than those in column B)

APPENDIX 1: SURVEY RESULTS CONT'D

	Qualifies	Pastor	Board Member
	A	B	C
Question 18 -- In your experience, what makes the evaluation process negative?			
N	290	185	105
Review process poorly executed, cumbersome	18%	17%	19%
Supports complainers, personal agendas	11%	14%	7%
Focuses on weaknesses; does not recognize giftings	9%	10%	7%
Fail to understand pastoral role and ministry context	8%	12% **C**	1%
Evaluators fail to approach process positively with love, respect, trust, and grace	7%	7%	7%
Avoiding issues; allowing things to build up	6%	5%	7%
Pastor not open to growth/feedback; lack of self-awareness	5%	3%	11% **B**
Evaluation not based on job description, agreed upon goals; unrealistic expectations	5%	7% **C**	1%
Anonymous feedback - difficult to respond	5%	6% **C**	1%
Broad characterization without specific examples	4%	5%	1%
No recognition of joint responsibility for "results"	4%	5% **C**	0%
No opportunity for clarification or dialogue	3%	4%	1%
Review takes too long; time-consuming	3%	3%	3%
Feedback not clear	3%	4%	1%
Poor follow-up	3%	3%	1%
Results are a "surprise"	3%	2%	4%
Hard to tell the truth	2%	1%	3%
Fails to evaluate important things	1%	1%	1%
When significant change is needed (pastoral, programming, approach) or poor performance	1%	1%	1%
Other	34%	32%	38%
Don't know	4%	3%	7%
Nothing	9%	11%	6%