



The Strategic Alignment Diagnostic

A 4Ms diagnostic for direction, resources, evidence, and commitments.

What it is: A 20-statement diagnostic that evaluates alignment across Mission, Money, Metrics, and Map.

When to use it: At the start of a planning cycle, when stepping into a new role, when something feels off but you cannot yet name it, or as part of an annual strategic review.

How to use it: Complete the diagnostic individually first. Then compare the four lens averages, the unknown-response counts, and the evidence behind the ratings. Differences between responses reveal assumptions worth investigating.

Be honest. A score that reflects where you are is more useful than a score that reflects where you wish you were.

RATING SCALE

0	1	2	3	4	5
Not enough visibility to assess	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral or inconsistent	Agree	Strongly agree

IMPORTANT

A 0 is a visibility signal, not a performance score. Do not include 0 responses in the lens average. Count and investigate them separately. Calculate each lens average using only ratings from 1 to 5. The diagnostic provides evidence; it does not automatically select the Highest-Leverage Gap.

Mission

Select one rating for each statement, then add concise evidence or a contradiction.

MISSION		Direction and fit					
STATEMENT		0	1	2	3	4	5
1. Our Strategic Foundation, including our purpose, mission statement, vision, and Unique Value Propositions, is clear, current, and specific enough to guide choices.							
2. Our current strategic priorities clearly connect to that foundation and define what matters now.							
3. People at different levels can explain the priorities, why they matter, and how their work contributes.							
4. Leaders use Mission to evaluate fit, resolve competing requests, and explain what we will not pursue.							
5. Strategic direction is reinforced consistently through leadership decisions, communications, and operating conversations.							
Mission average:	0 responses:	Evidence or contradiction:					

Money

Select one rating for each statement, then add concise evidence or a contradiction.

MONEY		Resources and trade-offs					
STATEMENT		0	1	2	3	4	5
1. Our budget, people, time, technology, capacity, and leadership attention reflect our stated priorities.							
2. Before committing to new work, we make the full resource requirement and opportunity cost visible.							
3. We intentionally balance resources across growth, savings, and investment rather than treating every initiative the same.							
4. When capacity is constrained, leaders make and communicate explicit trade-offs rather than adding work invisibly.							
5. We revisit and reallocate resources when evidence or conditions change, and we update the affected commitments.							
Money average:	0 responses:	Evidence or contradiction:					



Metrics

Select one rating for each statement, then add concise evidence or a contradiction.

METRICS		Evidence and learning					
STATEMENT		0	1	2	3	4	5
1. Each Strategic Objective and active initiative has a meaningful outcome Metric, baseline, target, timing, and owner.							
2. Our full set of Metrics balances leading and lagging evidence and reveals consequences across resources, customers or stakeholders, internal performance, and learning or capability.							
3. The Metrics that matter are visible and reviewed at a cadence appropriate to the decisions they should guide.							
4. When a Metric moves, someone knows what decision, investigation, or adjustment should follow.							
5. We use Metrics to test assumptions, learn, and adapt, not simply to report activity or defend past performance.							
Metrics average:	0 responses:	Evidence or contradiction:					

Map

Select one rating for each statement, then add concise evidence or a contradiction.

MAP		Commitments and sequence					
STATEMENT		0	1	2	3	4	5
1. We maintain one prioritized Map of active commitments, sequence, timing, and what is not happening now.							
2. Every active initiative has a named owner, committed resources, a defined Metric, and a clear place on the Map.							
3. Dependencies and capacity constraints are visible enough to make the sequence credible.							
4. New requests negotiate with existing commitments before entering the Map; work that is not ready is explicitly On the Runway, In the Hangar, or Grounded.							
5. Governance rhythms, decision rights, communication, and adoption keep commitments current and understandable to the people carrying them.							
Map average:	0 responses:	Evidence or contradiction:					

Read the 4Ms Pattern

The scores begin the conversation. They do not choose the intervention for you.

MISSION	MONEY	METRICS	MAP
Average:	Average:	Average:	Average:
0 responses:	0 responses:	0 responses:	0 responses:

OPTIONAL OVERALL AVERAGE:

TOTAL 0 RESPONSES:

HOW TO READ EACH LENS

4.0-5.0	Strong evidence of alignment. Identify what should be protected and verify that the strength holds beyond the leadership room.
3.0-3.9	Alignment is present but inconsistent. Examine where interpretations, evidence, or operating choices diverge.
2.0-2.9	A material gap is affecting the system. Investigate the evidence, consequences, and connections to the other Ms.
1.0-1.9	This lens is not reliably guiding decisions or work. Leadership attention is required, but the score alone does not determine the first intervention.
0	Visibility gap. Determine whether the issue is access to information, unclear ownership, inconsistent communication, or a genuinely unresolved decision.

FROM SCORE TO HIGHEST-LEVERAGE GAP

1. Which strength should we protect as we make changes?
2. Where do our stated intentions and operating evidence disagree?
3. Which gap appears to be causing or intensifying problems in more than one M?
4. Which gap, if addressed, would create the most useful downstream movement?
5. Which consequential gap is close enough to leadership's influence that we can act now?

PROVISIONAL GAP STATEMENT

Because [current condition], [important consequence] is occurring. The Highest-Leverage Gap may be [strategy, capacity, prioritization, or execution] because resolving it could [connected effect]. We will test this conclusion against [baseline evidence] before carrying it into commitment-building.