



KINGDOM VANGUARD

Leadership Health.

Fifty statements across ten dimensions, answered by the leader, the leadership team and the congregation. What each mode is allowed to say about whom, and what this instrument refuses to be used for, are stated before the first question.

The Church Health Index measures an organisation. *This one measures a person.*

That single difference changes what the tool is capable of doing to someone, and it is the reason this instrument carries guardrails the other does not. A church can survive a badly-run congregational survey. A pastor can be ended by a badly-run leadership one.

So the design question here was never how to measure leadership more finely. It was how to make an honest reading possible without handing anyone a weapon.

If a church is looking for evidence to remove a leader, this instrument must not be the route.

We will say so plainly when it is asked for in that spirit, and decline. That is not a disclaimer written by a lawyer — it is a refusal enforced in the design: there is no free-text field anywhere in this instrument, the minimum group sizes are enforced in code rather than in guidance, and a suppressed group carries no scores at all rather than scores marked unreliable.

Most of what it finds is structural

Load, isolation, unclear accountability, a leader who has nobody able to challenge them. These are the commonest findings, and they are properties of how a church is arranged rather than defects in a person's character. Structural problems are also the ones that respond to design — which is why a low reading is a starting point for work rather than a conclusion about someone.

It is deliberately continuous with the other instrument

Same five-point scale, same treatment of “not enough information”, same 0–100 dimension mathematics, same six bands. A church that has taken the Church Health Index already knows how to read this one, and the two can be laid side by side without translation.

Four things this instrument is *not*

These are printed on the instrument itself, in the report, and in the terms of engagement. Not in small print, and not once.

This is not an appraisal.

It must not be used in a performance review, a disciplinary process, a dismissal, or as evidence in any dispute. Beyond the ethical problem, doing so after inviting anonymous participation will end honest answering in this church permanently.

This is not a safeguarding process.

If there is a concern about someone's conduct or safety, it belongs with your denomination's safeguarding officer today, not in a five-point scale. There is deliberately nowhere in this instrument to write it down.

This is not a diagnosis.

Low scores on Emotional Maturity and Care describe how leadership is experienced, not a clinical state. Nothing here is licensed mental-health assessment, and where that is what is needed we refer rather than improvise.

A low score is not a verdict on a person.

It is a reading of how leadership is currently experienced by the people asked. Most of what this instrument surfaces is structural — load, isolation, unclear accountability — and structural problems are the ones that respond to design.

RUNNING IT WITHOUT DOING HARM

- **Say what it is for before you send it**, and say what will happen to the results. An assessment about a named leader, introduced without explanation, produces either defensive answers or vengeful ones. Both are useless.
- **Decide who sees the report before anyone answers**, and tell them. Changing that afterwards is the single most damaging thing a church can do with this instrument.
- **Do not collect names**, and do not ask people to hand forms back to the person being rated.
- **Honour the minimums**. Below 4 team members or 8 congregational respondents there is no group score, and there is no version of the report that quietly shows one anyway.

Two of them rate the leader. *One rates the leadership.*

Mode	Who answers	Who is rated	Minimum
Self	The senior leader, about themselves.	The senior leader	1
Leadership team	Elders, staff and anyone sharing formal leadership responsibility.	The senior leader	4
Congregation	Members and regular participants.	The leadership as a body	8

Self and team rate the same person, so that comparison is like-for-like and it is the one the report leans on. The congregation rates the leadership as a body, for two reasons. Asking a member to score one named person on integrity is an invitation to settle scores. And most members have no visibility of an individual leader's accountability arrangements, delegation, or whether they rest — so a score would be measuring impression rather than observation.

Every comparison involving the congregation is therefore printed with that caveat attached, every time, rather than left for the reader to remember at the moment it matters least.

All three modes answer all fifty

Unlike the Church Health Index, there are no mode-only items here. A member's read on whether leaders keep confidences is as valid as the leader's own, and is often the more useful of the two. What changes between modes is the wording, not the question.

Why the team minimum is 4

Three elders could work out who said what about the senior leader in an afternoon. In a small team that is not a privacy inconvenience — it is the end of anyone in that church answering honestly ever again. Below the minimum the answers are held, and reported only if more of the team completes it.

ON YOUR DATA

Completed online, this assessment sends us nothing. The questions and the scoring run in your own browser; your answers and your report exist only on your device. There is no submit step, because there is nowhere for it to submit to. On an instrument that asks a leader whether anyone would tell them if they were crossing a line, that is not a feature — it is the precondition for a true answer.

Three movements, *and an order between them*

Five of the ten belong to Restore. When leadership is the subject, the things that must be well before anything can be rebuilt outnumber the things worth rebuilding.

■	Integrity & Trust	restore	Whether what is said matches what is done, and whether people believe it will. Everything else in this instrument rests on this dimension; a leader who scores low here cannot be helped by better systems.
■	Communication & Clarity	restore	Whether people understand decisions, hear difficult news early, and know what is expected of them. This is the dimension where self and team most often diverge.
■	Accountability	restore	Whether the leader is answerable to someone with real authority to challenge them, and whether correction is received. Spiritual authority used to deflect questions is the specific failure this measures.
■	Emotional Maturity & Care	restore	Steadiness under pressure, capacity to hear criticism without withdrawing or retaliating, and whether the leader notices people who are struggling. Includes whether they rest.
■	Conflict	restore	Whether disagreement is possible without relational cost, whether difficult conversations are held directly, and whether old conflicts were actually resolved rather than outlived.
■	Delegation & Shared Load	recalibrate	Whether authority is given rather than tasks handed out, whether delegated work stays delegated, and whether the church functions when the leader is away.
■	Decision-Making & Alignment	recalibrate	Whether decisions get made, whether the process is understood, and whether the team is pulling in one direction. Includes whether decisions are revisited when the evidence changes.
■	Developing Others	recalibrate	Whether specific named people are being developed, whether opportunities are given away, and whether people have grown under this leadership rather than merely served under it.
■	Succession & Multiplication	recalibrate	Whether anyone is being prepared to do this job, whether succession is discussed openly, and whether the leader has released people to lead elsewhere.
■	Spiritual Leadership	revitalize	Whether the leader's own walk with Christ is evident, whether prayer precedes decisions, and whether people are led toward Christ rather than toward the leader's vision.

The same question, *asked of the right person*

Six of the fifty, shown in all three phrasings. Note that the congregational wording is always plural: no congregational item in this instrument, in any language, refers to one individual leader, and a test asserts it.

Integrity & Trust	SELF	I am the same person in private as in front of the church.
	TEAM	Our senior leader is the same person in private as in front of the church.
	CONG.	Our leaders are the same people in private as in front of the church.
Accountability	SELF	I am answerable to people who have real authority to challenge me.
	TEAM	Our senior leader is answerable to people who have real authority to challenge them.
	CONG.	Our leaders are answerable to people who have real authority to challenge them.
Emotional Maturity & Care	SELF	I take genuine rest, and it is not the first thing I give up.
	TEAM	Our senior leader takes genuine rest, and it is not the first thing they give up.
	CONG.	Our leaders take genuine rest, and it is not the first thing they give up.
Delegation & Shared Load	SELF	This church functions well when I am away.
	TEAM	This church functions well when our senior leader is away.
	CONG.	This church functions well when our leaders are away.
Developing Others	SELF	I give away opportunities that would have raised my own profile.
	TEAM	Our senior leader gives away opportunities that would have raised their own profile.
	CONG.	Our leaders give away opportunities that would have raised their own profile.
Spiritual Leadership	SELF	I lead people toward Christ rather than toward my vision for this church.
	TEAM	Our senior leader leads people toward Christ rather than toward their vision for this church.
	CONG.	Our leaders lead us toward Christ rather than toward their vision for this church.

The pages that follow print the fifty in the **leadership-team** phrasing, which is the form most often completed on paper. The self and congregational forms carry the same fifty items in their own wording.

Answer for the leadership as it *is*, not as you hope it will be

Do not answer this form to protect someone, and do not answer it to settle something. Where you genuinely do not know — and on several of these you will not — mark **NA**. It is excluded from scoring entirely and never counts against anyone.

1	2	3	4	5	NA
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral / unsure	Agree	Strongly agree	Not enough information

RESTORE Integrity & Trust

1	Our senior leader tells people the truth even when it costs them something.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
2	Our senior leader does what they said they would do.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
3	Our senior leader keeps confidences, including when it would be useful not to.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
4	Our senior leader admits mistakes openly rather than explaining them away.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
5	Our senior leader is the same person in private as in front of the church.	1	2	3	4	5	NA

Add the scores you gave, divide by the number you answered, multiply by 20.

Dimension score _____ / 100

RESTORE Communication & Clarity

6	Our senior leader explains decisions so that people understand the reasoning, not only the outcome.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
7	Our senior leader communicates difficult news early rather than letting people discover it.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
8	People who work with our senior leader know what is expected of them.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
9	Our senior leader listens properly before deciding, not afterwards.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
10	Our senior leader says the same thing to different groups of people.	1	2	3	4	5	NA

Add the scores you gave, divide by the number you answered, multiply by 20.

Dimension score _____ / 100

RESTORE Accountability

11	Our senior leader is answerable to people who have real authority to challenge them.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
12	Our senior leader receives correction without becoming defensive.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
13	Our senior leader's decisions and the church's finances are open to appropriate scrutiny.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
14	Our senior leader does not use spiritual authority to avoid legitimate questions.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
15	If our senior leader were crossing a line, someone here would tell them.	1	2	3	4	5	NA

Add the scores you gave, divide by the number you answered, multiply by 20.

Dimension score _____ / 100

RESTORE Emotional Maturity & Care

16	Our senior leader stays steady under pressure.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
17	Our senior leader does not make their mood other people's problem.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
18	Our senior leader notices when someone here is struggling.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
19	Our senior leader can hear criticism without withdrawing from the person or retaliating.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
20	Our senior leader takes genuine rest, and it is not the first thing they give up.	1	2	3	4	5	NA

Add the scores you gave, divide by the number you answered, multiply by 20. Dimension score _____ / 100

RESTORE Conflict

21	Our senior leader addresses conflict directly rather than hoping it resolves itself.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
22	Our senior leader delivers difficult messages themselves rather than sending someone else.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
23	People can disagree with our senior leader without it costing them the relationship.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
24	Past conflicts here were actually resolved, not simply outlived.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
25	Our senior leader hears both sides before forming a view.	1	2	3	4	5	NA

Add the scores you gave, divide by the number you answered, multiply by 20. Dimension score _____ / 100

RECALIBRATE

Delegation & Shared Load

26	Our senior leader gives people real authority, not only tasks.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
27	Once our senior leader has delegated something, they leave it delegated.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
28	This church functions well when our senior leader is away.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
29	Our senior leader can let someone do a task differently from how they would do it.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
30	The weight of this church is shared rather than carried by one person.	1	2	3	4	5	NA

Add the scores you gave, divide by the number you answered, multiply by 20.

Dimension score _____ / 100

RECALIBRATE

Decision-Making & Alignment

31	Decisions here get made rather than deferred.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
32	People understand how decisions are made here.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
33	Our leadership team pulls in the same direction.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
34	Our senior leader will revisit a decision when the evidence changes.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
35	The direction of this church is clear enough for people to act on.	1	2	3	4	5	NA

Add the scores you gave, divide by the number you answered, multiply by 20.

Dimension score _____ / 100

RECALIBRATE

Developing Others

36	Our senior leader is actively developing specific people they could name.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
37	Our senior leader gives away opportunities that would have raised their own profile.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
38	People have grown under our senior leader, not only served under them.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
39	When our senior leader corrects someone, they come away more capable rather than smaller.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
40	Our senior leader names other people's work publicly.	1	2	3	4	5	NA

Add the scores you gave, divide by the number you answered, multiply by 20.

Dimension score _____ / 100

RECALIBRATE

Succession & Multiplication

41	Someone is being prepared to do what our senior leader does.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
42	This church would come through our senior leader's departure well.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
43	Our senior leader talks about their own succession openly rather than avoiding it.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
44	Our senior leader has released people to lead elsewhere, including when it cost us.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
45	Our senior leader is not trying to make themselves necessary.	1	2	3	4	5	NA

Add the scores you gave, divide by the number you answered, multiply by 20.

Dimension score _____ / 100

46	Our senior leader's own walk with Christ is evident to the people closest to them.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
47	Our senior leader prays about decisions before making them, not after.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
48	Scripture shapes how our senior leader leads, not only what they preach.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
49	Our senior leader leads people toward Christ rather than toward their vision for this church.	1	2	3	4	5	NA
50	Our senior leader would still be following Christ if they were not leading anything.	1	2	3	4	5	NA

Add the scores you gave, divide by the number you answered, multiply by 20.

Dimension score _____ / 100

SCORING

A dimension score is the mean of the items answered, multiplied by twenty, expressed on 0–100. Fewer than 3 answered items reports insufficient data rather than a misleading number.

The overall score is the unweighted mean of the dimensions that could be scored. Insufficient data is left out — it does not count as zero.

A group reading pools every answer given by the group, then applies the same rules. It is never an average of individual overalls, which would let one person who answered three questions weigh as much as one who answered fifty.

Six bands, *and a rule that overrides them*

Flourishing	85–100	Strong across the board. The useful work is protecting what is working and preparing succession.
Healthy	70–84	Broadly healthy with identifiable weak points. Targeted work on the lowest dimensions pays off quickly.
Stable	55–69	Functioning, with real strain in specific areas. Left alone these compound over two to three years.
Vulnerable	40–54	Several dimensions under pressure at once. This is where outside help usually shortens the road considerably.
At Risk	25–39	Significant difficulty across most of the instrument. Stabilise care and accountability before restructuring anything.
Critical	0–24	Serious difficulty. This is not a verdict on a person's faithfulness or calling. It means the situation needs experienced help soon.

Perception gaps

A difference of 20 points or more on any dimension is reported. The wording is fixed and deliberately even-handed: it says the two sides are not working from the same picture, and notes that the side scoring higher is the side that cannot see the difference. It does not say who is right.

Only the leader-versus-team comparison is like-for-like. Gaps involving the congregation are reported with the caveat that they rated a different subject, and are printed after the like-for-like ones so they cannot be mistaken for the stronger evidence.

The precedence rule

Integrity & Trust below 55, or Accountability below 50 — on whichever group reads lower, not on the leader's own account of themselves — or **any like-for-like gap of 20 points or more**. Any one of the three makes the report lead with the leader's own care and accountability, ahead of anything strategic.

This report leads with the leader's own care and accountability. We do not recommend restructuring a leadership team, changing a role, or beginning any strategic work until these are addressed.

Two boundaries the rule holds deliberately. A **congregational reading** below a threshold does trigger it: a congregation reporting the leadership's integrity at 20 is a reading, not a gap. A **congregation-only gap** does not trigger it on its own, because the congregation rated a different subject and that difference is not, by itself, evidence about this leader.

What we can stand behind, *and what we cannot*

This is **version 0.1, a draft instrument**. It has not been academically validated, has not been reviewed by Nordic denominational leaders, and has not yet been completed by a church. Nothing here should be read as a claim that it has.

The thresholds are reasoned, not derived

55, 50 and 20 are judgements about where a reading stops being a weak point and starts being the thing that must be dealt with first. They are not derived from a dataset, because no European dataset exists that could derive them. We would rather publish the number and say how it was chosen than present a reasoned judgement as an empirical finding.

The Swedish awaits native review

All fifty items exist in Swedish in all three phrasings, machine-assisted and not yet reviewed by a native theological reader. Translation error in a measurement instrument does not announce itself — it appears as a dimension that scores oddly in one country. The Swedish forms carry a visible notice saying so.

What is defended by a test rather than by good intentions

- A suppressed team or congregational aggregate carries **no scores at all**, and cannot leak through a perception gap or through the precedence rule.
- No congregational item names or refers to one individual leader, in either language.
- A leader's strong self-assessment **cannot suppress the precedence rule** when the team disagrees. This failure existed in the Church Health Index, was found in review, and is now asserted against in both instruments.
- The thresholds read whichever group scores lower, and the report names whose reading it was.
- No gap text contains the words fault, blame, failing or dishonest.
- Insufficient data is never scored as zero.
- **No free-text field exists anywhere in the module**. If one is ever added, the test fails before the site ships.