

Organizational Health Audit for Mobilization Effectiveness

Paper #14 — Missionary Mobilization Research Project

Missio Nexus | Mark Harris, Researcher | 2025–2026

Research Base: Structured interviews with 18+ mission organizations • 2025 Launch Survey (2,400+ respondents)

Introduction: The Prerequisite Nobody Talks About

Every mission organization wants effective mobilization. Organizations invest in mobilizer training, refine their discovery conversation approach, optimize their websites, and study generational patterns. Yet a consistent finding from interviews with mobilization leaders across 18+ organizations points to a prerequisite that rarely appears in mobilization training materials: organizational health.

The pattern is striking in its consistency. When mobilizers discuss what enables or hinders their effectiveness, they return repeatedly to factors that have nothing to do with mobilization techniques—team dynamics on the field, leadership transparency, the quality of member care, the clarity of theological vision. One mobilizer put it memorably:

"Mobilization flows out of organizational health. And it stops at the door of your agency's dysfunction."

— Mobilization leader, major sending organization

This is not merely a rhetorical observation. It describes a mechanism. Candidates—especially those from Generation Z—evaluate the whole organization before committing. They look under the hood. They ask about leadership succession. They inquire about member care. They research what current field workers say. When they encounter dysfunction, even excellent mobilizers cannot overcome that perception.

This paper provides a framework for mission organizations to assess their health comprehensively as it relates to mobilization effectiveness. It draws from qualitative research with mobilization leaders representing diverse organizational sizes, theological traditions, and field contexts. The goal is not to provide a scoring system or ranking but to equip leadership teams with honest questions they might not be asking—and with the conviction that organizational health is not a peripheral concern but a mobilization imperative.

The research also carries a biblical dimension worth naming at the outset. The local church—and by extension the parachurch organizations that serve the church's mission—exists to glorify God and advance his kingdom through Jesus Christ. An organization's health is not merely a competitive advantage; it is a matter of faithful stewardship. Healthy organizations honor God, serve candidates well, and send missionaries who endure. Unhealthy organizations harm the people who trust them and diminish the witness they were formed to amplify.

Part One: Why Organizational Health Matters for Mobilization

The Mechanism: How Health Affects Mobilization

Understanding why organizational health matters requires understanding the mechanism through which it operates. Organizational health affects mobilization through at least four distinct pathways.

First, health shapes the candidate's experience of the organization from first contact forward. Every touchpoint—the website, the mobilizer's manner, the clarity of next steps, the promptness of follow-up—communicates organizational health or dysfunction. Candidates read these signals, often unconsciously, and make assessments that affect their willingness to proceed.

Second, health determines the quality of the environment candidates will join. Candidates are not merely joining an organization; they are joining field teams, leadership structures, and organizational cultures that will shape their effectiveness and resilience for years. When those teams are healthy, candidates thrive. When they are dysfunctional, even strong missionaries struggle.

Third, health determines whether mobilizers can speak honestly about the organization. Dysfunctional organizations create impossible situations for mobilizers: they must either recruit dishonestly—presenting a false image that candidates will eventually discover—or they must recruit with appropriate honesty that surfaces problems the organization is not addressing. Neither serves candidates well. Healthy organizations free mobilizers to be authentic, which builds trust more effectively than any recruitment technique.

Fourth, health is increasingly visible to candidates before they ever make contact. Online reviews, social media, conversations with former missionaries, and field worker accounts circulate in candidate communities. Organizations cannot control this information flow; they can only determine whether what candidates discover aligns with what mobilizers present.

The Gen Z Amplification

While organizational health has always mattered, the rise of Generation Z as the primary candidate pool has amplified its significance considerably. Research consistently shows that Gen Z evaluates organizational health more comprehensively and more early than previous generations.

"Gen Z doesn't have the loyalty to a sending agency that previous generations have. They're going to find a team they want to join and align with, and they're going to find a way to get there with whatever organization is going to support them."

— Mobilization director, international sending organization

This means Gen Z candidates are comparing organizations actively—not passively accepting the first organization that contacts them. Research from the 2025 Launch Survey found that 68% of Gen Z respondents had contact with a different organization

before the one they joined, compared to only 40% of Gen X respondents. Gen Z candidates shop. They research. They ask difficult questions.

One mobilizer described the phenomenon vividly: imagine visiting a church for the first time and finding a dated building, sparse attendance, outdated programming—despite warm greeters and genuine effort. You would not return, regardless of how kindly you were treated at the door. The same dynamic applies to mission organizations. If the organization itself appears stuck in a past decade, excellent mobilization cannot overcome that perception.

"If a Gen Zer comes in and sees that you're old and irrelevant, they're out. Regardless of what the mobilization department does and how well they are, if the rest of the agency can't adapt, it's going to be an uphill battle."

— Mobilization leader

Gen Z also evaluates organizational health through what organizations reveal about themselves—not just what they conceal. Organizations that practice appropriate vulnerability, acknowledging areas of struggle while demonstrating commitment to growth, build trust far more effectively than those that project images of perfection. Gen Z has grown up in a social media environment saturated with curated images; they have developed finely tuned authenticity detectors. Organizations that perform health without practicing it are quickly discerned.

What Candidates Actually Assess

When candidates evaluate organizational health, they are making assessments across multiple dimensions—often without explicit frameworks or checklists. Research suggests candidates attend to the following signals, consciously or unconsciously:

- How quickly and personally the organization responds to initial contact
- Whether mobilizers speak honestly about organizational strengths and weaknesses
- What current field workers say about their experience
- Whether field teams appear to function collaboratively or exist as isolated individuals
- Whether the organization's digital presence reflects current cultural engagement
- How the organization handles difficult questions about finances, member care, and field challenges
- Whether leadership appears stable and thoughtful in its direction
- How the organization treats candidates who are not a good fit

The 2025 Launch Survey data reinforces these patterns. Missionaries report wanting organizations that listened to their individual calling, were honest about challenges, provided thorough orientation, and offered genuine care—not just logistical support. The absence of these qualities left lasting impressions: "My organization needs some serious internal overhaul, especially in the areas of support raising training and coaching, pre-field and on-field training."

Part Two: The Organizational Health Assessment Framework

The following framework addresses ten dimensions of organizational health as they relate to mobilization effectiveness. For each dimension, assessment questions are provided to guide leadership team reflection. These questions are not designed to generate scores but to surface honest conversations that may otherwise be avoided.

Assessment Framework Overview

Dimension	Key Assessment Focus
1. Team Health & Field Dynamics	Quality of field team relationships, team-centric vs. solo models, conflict patterns
2. Transparency & Communication	Honesty with candidates, internal communication culture, willingness to acknowledge struggle
3. Decision-Making & Agility	How decisions get made, responsiveness to changing field realities, adaptability
4. Member Care Systems	Quality of ongoing support for field workers, pre-field and on-field care, burnout prevention
5. Leadership Health	Leadership stability, succession planning, staff trust in leadership direction
6. Financial Sustainability	Financial health, stewardship practices, ability to support missionaries adequately
7. Theological Clarity	Clarity of theological identity and missional focus, alignment across staff and field
8. Cultural Relevance	Contemporary engagement, digital presence, organizational adaptability to generational shifts
9. Diversity & Intercultural Competence	Staff diversity, intercultural humility, welcome of non-Western workers and approaches
10. Technology & Systems	Technology infrastructure supporting mobilization, CRM effectiveness, communication systems

Dimension 1: Team Health and Field Team Dynamics

Candidates are not joining an organization in the abstract—they are joining specific field teams. The health of those teams may be the single most consequential organizational factor affecting long-term missionary effectiveness and retention.

"We're moving more into a team-centric mindset. Team chemistry is just as important as organizational culture. We're looking at candidates to ensure they're going to line up with the culture and chemistry of our organization."

— HR director, international sending agency

Organizations with healthy field teams have formalized practices for introducing candidates to those teams before formal application. As one leader noted: "I think it's crazy to ask a team to accept a new team member without them having first invited them. If other agencies aren't doing that, you're setting up a team conflict." ABWE has made survey trips—or virtual team meetings when travel is impractical—a standard part of their process for exactly this reason.

Assessment questions for team health include: What do your field teams say about their experience working together? How do you handle conflict between field workers? How do candidates learn about the teams they will join? What percentage of field attrition is related to team dysfunction versus individual factors?

Dimension 2: Transparency and Communication Culture

The research is consistent on this point: candidates—especially Gen Z—trust organizations that communicate honestly about both strengths and weaknesses more than those that project images of perfection. Organizations practicing organizational humility build trust faster and lose candidates to disillusionment less often.

One mobilizer described the principle operationally: "We have a secure library that gives candidates access to our policies, our procedures, the information they would need to know. Being very upfront. Let them under the hood. Let them really get to know us. There's a level of trust built when we're open and honest—here's our good stuff and here's our hard stuff, here's where we're growing."

Another mobilizer described the internal value driving this transparency: "We have a core value of ministry through weakness. Acknowledging there are things our company doesn't do great, but volunteering that we're not perfect—we're all in need of grace. Modeling some of that in conversation goes a long way in helping people feel safe with us."

"People will forget what you say, they'll forget what you do, but they'll always remember how you made them feel."

— Mobilization leader, evangelical sending organization

Assessment questions for transparency include: How do your mobilizers describe your organization's weaknesses in initial conversations? What would candidates discover about your organization through independent research that differs from what you present? How does leadership communicate difficult news internally?

Dimension 3: Decision-Making Processes and Organizational Agility

Organizations that move slowly, struggle to adapt to new field realities, or make decisions through opaque processes communicate dysfunction to candidates who are evaluating whether to entrust their lives to organizational systems. Gen Z in particular asks about growth trajectories: what does the future look like? What is the organization's direction? How does it make decisions about new approaches?

Organizational agility also affects mobilizers' ability to respond to emerging opportunities. Organizations that require extensive internal approval for modest adaptations—new communication channels, adjusted processes, innovative partnership models—constrain mobilization effectiveness and frustrate talented staff.

Assessment questions for decision-making include: How long does it take your organization to make and implement meaningful process changes? Who has authority to adapt mobilization approaches to new candidate patterns? How are field workers' observations translated into organizational learning?

Dimension 4: Member Care Systems and Missionary Support

Member care may be the dimension candidates attend to most carefully—and the one organizations most frequently underinvest in. The 2025 Launch Survey data revealed consistent patterns in what missionaries wish had been different: "Better member care systems on the field, not just pre-field." "Once I moved, the coaching stopped. It would have been nice for it to continue." "More regular check-ins during preparation phases and early field service."

Survey Finding

When missionaries were asked what organizations could do better, member care failures ranked among the top responses—specifically the absence of ongoing coaching after initial deployment, inadequate on-field support systems, and insufficient attention to mental health and burnout prevention.

Gen Z candidates explicitly ask about member care during initial mobilization conversations. One mobilization director noted: "They're asking about mental health support, counseling. They want to know they're going to be cared for. They've even asked about what the off-ramp looks like if they burn out. Previous generations maybe weren't asking those questions. We need to be prepared to answer them."

Organizations with robust member care systems demonstrate health in ways candidates find compelling. Organizations without them face a growing problem: candidates who investigate carefully will find the gap between promotional materials and field reality.

Assessment questions for member care include: What specific structures exist for supporting missionaries in their first year on field? How does member care differ for missionaries in high-stress contexts? What percentage of field attrition could be attributed to inadequate member care? How does your organization address missionary burnout?

Dimension 5: Leadership Health and Succession Planning

Leadership health cascades through every organizational dimension. Organizations with healthy, stable, trustworthy leadership create environments where mobilizers can work with confidence, field workers can serve with focus, and candidates can commit with reasonable assurance of continuity. Organizations with leadership dysfunction—whether relationally, theologically, or strategically—experience ripple effects across all of these areas.

"Candidates should look under the hood and better understand not only the health of the organization but the health of the leadership—and what succession planning looks like. Those would be the questions I'd be asking if I were joining a new organization."

— HR director, international sending organization

Succession planning deserves particular attention. Organizations where leadership continuity depends on a single individual—and where no thoughtful succession plan exists—carry organizational risk that sophisticated candidates increasingly recognize. Gen Z candidates who expect to commit decades to an organization reasonably want to understand its long-term viability.

Assessment questions for leadership include: How would your organization's mobilization effectiveness change if key leaders left tomorrow? What succession planning exists for critical leadership roles? How do mobilizers describe organizational leadership to candidates? What percentage of staff express confidence in the organization's direction?

Dimension 6: Financial Sustainability and Stewardship

Financial health affects mobilization in multiple ways. Organizations struggling financially may cut mobilization staff, reduce conference presence, or struggle to maintain systems that enable effective candidate engagement. More directly, financial dysfunction communicates organizational instability to candidates making long-term commitments.

Organizations also navigate the gap between what they communicate about financial requirements and what missionaries actually experience. Survey data consistently shows that missionaries felt inadequately prepared for the financial challenges of field service—particularly the length of support-raising timelines and the adequacy of support once on the field. Honest financial communication is itself a dimension of organizational health.

Assessment questions for financial health include: Is your current financial model sustainable over the next decade? What percentage of your missionaries would say their support level allows them to focus on ministry without financial distraction? How honestly do you communicate financial realities to candidates in early conversations?

Dimension 7: Theological Clarity and Missional Focus

Organizations with clear, shared theological identity—from leadership through mobilizers to field workers—present a coherent picture to candidates. Those with internal theological confusion, competing missional philosophies, or unresolved tensions between home office and field culture create environments where both candidates and missionaries struggle to understand what they are joining.

This does not mean organizational theology must be rigid or without nuance. It means that the theological convictions driving organizational strategy should be clear enough that mobilizers can articulate them, field workers embody them, and candidates understand what they are committing to. Theological clarity is not theological narrowness; it is theological honesty.

Assessment questions for theological clarity include: Could your mobilizers clearly articulate your organization's theological convictions in a twenty-minute conversation? Where do you observe tension between stated organizational theology and actual field practice? How do you navigate theological questions from candidates without overpromising or misrepresenting your organization's commitments?

Dimension 8: Cultural Relevance and Contextual Awareness

Cultural relevance operates at two levels: the organization's ability to engage contemporary candidates effectively, and the organization's field presence in increasingly complex and changing global contexts. Both matter for mobilization.

At the candidate-engagement level, organizations that appear stuck in previous decades face challenges that excellent mobilizers cannot fully overcome. Outdated websites, irrelevant social media presence, communication styles that feel institutional rather than relational, promotional materials that do not reflect the diversity of contemporary mission—all communicate that the organization is not engaging the present moment effectively.

At the field level, organizations need to demonstrate ongoing contextual awareness: of Business as Mission opportunities, of digital platforms for gospel engagement, of shifting political environments affecting field access, of evolving language learning methodologies. Candidates are considering decades of service; they reasonably want to know whether the organization they are joining can navigate a changing world.

Assessment questions for cultural relevance include: When did you last comprehensively review your digital presence from the perspective of a first-time candidate visitor? How does your organization stay current on emerging field methodologies? Where do you observe your organizational culture resisting necessary adaptation?

Dimension 9: Diversity and Intercultural Competence

Gen Z is the most diverse generation in American history. They are accustomed to living and working alongside people of different backgrounds; they expect organizational environments to reflect that reality. Mission organizations that present as monocultural—in staff composition, in leadership, in field approaches—face growing disadvantage in reaching diverse candidates.

"Gen Z is the most diverse generation in history, and they are very used to doing life with people who are different from them. They are looking at organizations through that lens—this is something ideal that I hope to be part of. If we don't have representation from any more than one group of people, we are not doing a service to representing the kingdom of God."

— Mobilization leader, evangelical sending agency

Intercultural competence extends beyond representation to organizational practice. It includes how organizations welcome and support non-Western missionaries, how they navigate cross-cultural conflict within field teams, how they develop and empower minority leaders, and how they approach missions in ways that honor rather than override indigenous expressions of the church.

Assessment questions for diversity include: What does your leadership team look like relative to the diversity of your candidate pool? How does your organization specifically support non-Western or ethnic minority missionaries who face structural challenges the traditional model does not address? What training exists for intercultural humility across your staff?

Dimension 10: Technology and Systems Functionality

While technology is the most tactical of the ten dimensions, dysfunctional systems create real mobilization problems. Organizations without effective CRM platforms lose candidates who fall through the cracks. Organizations without automated notification systems for new inquiries miss the critical response-time window. Organizations without communication infrastructure for maintaining long-runway candidate engagement experience preventable attrition.

Technology also signals organizational investment in mobilization effectiveness. Candidates who experience seamless, responsive communication—where no detail is forgotten, where follow-up arrives as promised, where relevant content appears consistently—conclude that they are dealing with an organization that takes mobilization seriously. Those who experience disorganized communication conclude the opposite.

Assessment questions for technology include: What percentage of inquiries receive a response within 24 hours? Can your organization identify every candidate in your pipeline and the status of their progress? What systems exist to maintain engagement with candidates across 1-3 year preparation timelines?

Part Three: Conducting the Organizational Health Audit

Principles for Effective Self-Assessment

Organizational self-assessment is inherently challenging. The same dynamics that produce dysfunction—defensiveness, avoidance, interpersonal friction, power imbalances—also make honest assessment difficult. Several principles from the research can increase the likelihood that an assessment process yields genuine insight rather than institutional self-congratulation.

First, multiple constituencies must be heard. Leadership teams assessing their own organizations have blind spots that other stakeholders can correct. Effective audits gather input from mobilizers, field missionaries, recently returned missionaries, candidates who chose not to proceed, and—where possible—candidates who joined other organizations. The 2025 Launch Survey data, representing 2,400+ respondents, provides a valuable external benchmark for what missionaries across organizations report about organizational effectiveness.

Second, the assessment should be anonymous enough to surface honest answers. Staff who fear reprisal for honest assessments will not provide them. Anonymous survey instruments, conducted by external parties or through structures that genuinely protect anonymity, yield more accurate data than open-ended discussions where power dynamics shape responses.

Third, the process should be led by people with authority to act on findings. Assessments that produce reports filed away without action demoralize staff and erode trust in future assessment efforts. Organizations benefit from establishing in advance how findings will be used and what decision-making authority the process carries.

Gathering Input from Multiple Constituencies

A comprehensive organizational health audit for mobilization effectiveness should gather input from at least four groups:

- Mobilization staff: What organizational factors most help or hinder your effectiveness with candidates? Where do you find yourself making apologies or explanations for organizational dysfunction?
- Active field missionaries: How would you describe the organizational health of your agency to a prospective candidate? What do you wish you had known before joining?
- Recent candidates (joiners and non-joiners): What factors most influenced your evaluation of this organization? What questions did you ask that received evasive or inadequate answers?
- Home office staff: Where do you observe organizational practices that would concern you if you were considering joining? What systemic issues are widely acknowledged but not addressed?

The goal is triangulation—comparing perspectives across constituencies to identify patterns that transcend any single viewpoint. When mobilizers, field missionaries, and candidates independently identify the same organizational weaknesses, that pattern carries weight that any single source cannot.

Identifying Strengths and Areas for Growth

Effective audits identify organizational strengths as carefully as weaknesses. Organizations need to know what they do well—both to protect those practices from inadvertent erosion and to build on genuine assets in their mobilization approach. Strengths identified by multiple constituencies are more credible than self-assessments; hearing field missionaries describe what the organization does well carries more weight than leadership describing its own effectiveness.

Areas for growth should be categorized by urgency and tractability. Some organizational weaknesses are urgent—they are actively costing candidates and missionaries now—and require immediate attention. Others are significant but addressable over time. Still others may reflect genuine tradeoffs rather than pure dysfunction: an organization with a narrow theological focus may lose some candidates to that narrowness while gaining others who find that clarity compelling. Not every organizational limitation represents a problem to be solved.

Prioritizing Improvements and Creating Action Plans

The ten dimensions assessed in this framework are not equally tractable. Technology systems can often be improved relatively quickly with appropriate investment. Leadership succession planning may require years of intentional development. Member care systems require both structural investment and cultural change. Organizations benefit from realistic prioritization that acknowledges these differences.

A Prioritization Framework

Consider organizing improvement priorities into three categories: (1) Quick wins—changes that address significant problems and can be implemented within six months; (2) Medium-term investments—structural changes requiring 6-18 months of sustained effort; (3) Long-term cultural shifts—changes to organizational culture, values, and practices that require multi-year commitment and leadership modeling.

Action plans should include specific commitments, responsible parties, timelines, and mechanisms for accountability. The most common failure mode for organizational improvement efforts is the absence of accountability structures that keep improvement on the agenda when other urgencies press. Organizations that build assessment and accountability into their regular rhythms—annual reviews with external input, quarterly progress assessments against specific goals—are more likely to sustain improvement than those that treat the audit as a one-time event.

Part Four: Patterns from the Field

Organizations That Improved Health and Saw Mobilization Impact

Multiple organizations in the research demonstrated the connection between organizational health improvement and mobilization effectiveness. While organizational confidentiality prevents direct attribution, several patterns emerged consistently.

Organizations that formalized previously informal practices—survey trips, structured handoffs from mobilization to member care, response-time standards, systematic candidate tracking—reported improved conversion rates and reduced candidate attrition. The common thread: making implicit practices explicit created accountability and consistency that informal approaches could not sustain.

"ABWE changed their standard from 'people weren't being contacted' to '8-hour response on most days, 48 hours maximum.' They consistently hear: 'You're one reason we wanted to proceed with ABWE—you actually responded right away.'"

— Research summary from organizational interview

Organizations that moved toward greater transparency with candidates—sharing organizational struggles alongside strengths in initial conversations—reported faster trust development and better candidate quality. Candidates who chose to proceed after receiving honest assessments proved more resilient when field realities matched organizational transparency rather than contradicting organizational promotion.

Organizations that invested in field team health—moving from models where missionaries were assigned to teams toward models where teams participated in welcoming new members—reported lower first-term attrition. As one field leader described: "We used to assign people to teams. Teams didn't like it, new missionaries didn't like it, and we saw conflict. Now the team invites the candidate. That changes everything."

Organizations that addressed member care gaps—particularly by extending active coaching and support through the early field years rather than front-loading support during candidacy—reported improved long-term retention. The investment required to sustain member care through the difficult first years proved less costly than recruiting and training replacement missionaries.

What Healthy Organizations Communicate to Candidates

Healthy organizations communicate health through multiple channels simultaneously. The speed and warmth of response to initial contact. The mobilizer's willingness to acknowledge organizational weaknesses. The quality and authenticity of field worker testimonials. The clarity and honesty of financial conversations. The robustness of the member care description. The thoughtfulness of leadership in articulating organizational direction.

No single element is decisive. Candidates experience an overall impression that accumulates across touchpoints. Organizations that invest in health across dimensions create cumulative impressions of trustworthiness that individual mobilization techniques cannot manufacture. This is why organizational health is not ultimately a mobilization strategy—it is the prerequisite that makes mobilization strategies work.

Conclusion: Health as Faithful Stewardship

The mission of God to the nations is not served by dysfunction. Organizations that exist to mobilize and send missionaries for the glory of God through Jesus Christ bear responsibility not only for their stated mission but for the manner in which they pursue it—for the health of the teams they build, the honesty of the communication they practice, the quality of the care they provide, and the faithfulness of the stewardship they exercise.

The research is clear that candidates increasingly see through organizational presentations to organizational realities. This is not primarily a marketing challenge; it is an integrity challenge. Organizations that practice health—not merely perform it—will find that mobilization effectiveness follows. Organizations that attempt to substitute mobilization excellence for organizational health will find themselves increasingly frustrated as candidates with more choices and better research tools look beneath the surface of their presentations.

The ten dimensions presented in this framework do not represent a comprehensive theory of organizational health. They represent the dimensions that surfaced most consistently as affecting mobilization effectiveness across eighteen-plus organizations and thousands of missionary respondents. Other dimensions matter for other purposes. But organizations that honestly assess and address these ten areas will find themselves better positioned to mobilize the missionary workforce the Great Commission requires.

The invitation this paper extends is not to anxiety but to honest examination. Psalm 139 captures the spirit of the enterprise: "Search me, O God, and know my heart; try me and know my anxious thoughts; and see if there be any grievous way in me, and lead me in

the way everlasting." Organizations that invite that kind of honest examination—from their Lord, from their constituents, and from their own leadership—are the organizations best positioned to serve the kingdom they exist to advance.

Discussion Questions for Leadership Teams

The following questions are designed for use by organizational leadership teams, boards, or mobilization staff in honest assessment conversations. They are not designed to produce scores but to surface genuine reflection.

1. **Team Health:** If you asked your current field missionaries to rate the health of their teams on a scale of one to ten, what do you think the average would be? What specific situations confirm your estimate?
2. **Transparency Test:** What are the three most significant organizational weaknesses a well-researched candidate would discover? Do your mobilizers proactively raise these in initial conversations? If not, why not?
3. **Member Care Gap:** Compare the support you provide to candidates during the mobilization process with the support you provide to missionaries in their first year on field. Where are the gaps? What would closing those gaps require?
4. **Leadership Succession:** If your top three leaders left tomorrow, what would happen to your organization's mobilization effectiveness? What succession planning exists to address this?
5. **Candidate Experience:** When did you last have a comprehensive conversation with candidates who chose not to proceed with your organization? What reasons did they give? What does that tell you?
6. **Gen Z Perception:** How would a thoughtful Gen Z candidate evaluate your organization's digital presence, staff diversity, and organizational relevance? What would they find compelling? What would concern them?
7. **Financial Honesty:** At what point in your mobilization process do candidates learn the full financial picture? What is the dropout rate at that point? What does that suggest about timing and framing?
8. **Theological Clarity:** Could your mobilizers clearly and consistently articulate your organization's theological identity and missional focus in a twenty-minute conversation? How do you know?
9. **Accountability Structures:** What organizational health improvement efforts have you undertaken in the past three years? What accountability structures ensured follow-through? What were the results?
10. **Faithful Stewardship:** In what ways does your organization's current health reflect faithfulness to the mission God has entrusted to you? Where does honest assessment suggest that greater faithfulness is needed?

About This Research

This paper is part of the Missionary Mobilization Research Project conducted for Missio Nexus, drawing on structured qualitative interviews with mobilization leaders from 18+ mission organizations including ABWE, Action International, AIM, Avant, Compel Global, East-West, FIM, Globe International, IMB, Launch Global, MAF, Mesa Global, Pioneers, Send International, Serge, and others. Interview subjects are not individually identified to protect the candor of their contributions. Findings are also informed by the 2025 Gospel Mobilization Launch Survey representing 2,400+ respondents. This paper reports research findings and does not constitute recommendations or evaluations of specific organizations.