



Clarity.

Accountability.

Trust.



Leadership Alignment Diagnostic

A structured assessment for senior leaders navigating communication, accountability, trust, and priority governance before misalignment impacts execution at scale.

| | |
|--|--|
| Communication Clarity across leadership layers | Accountability Consistency under pressure |
| Trust Reinforced through behavior | Priority Governance Structured decision discipline |

Hidden Misalignment

In enterprise environments, leadership alignment rarely breaks from lack of effort. The root cause is usually the slow erosion of the structural conditions that make alignment possible in the first place.

It breaks when **communication loses clarity, accountability becomes inconsistent, and trust erodes under pressure**. These patterns are often subtle at first. It could be a misinterpreted directive here, an unresolved tension there, but they compound quickly during periods of innovation, integration, and rapid change. By the time misalignment is visible in performance data, the organizational cost is already significant.

Leaders at the VP level and above are uniquely positioned to either arrest or accelerate these dynamics. Decisions made by leadership regarding the communication of priorities, enforcement of accountability, and demonstration of trust ripples through every layer of organizational execution.

- ❑ This assessment is designed to surface early indicators of misalignment before they impact execution at scale. It is not a judgment. It is a navigation tool.

Answer each statement based on what is *consistently experienced* across your leadership environment not what is intended, aspired to, or occasionally achieved. Honest reflection here is the highest-value investment you can make in your organization's execution capacity.

Instructions

How to Use This Diagnostic

For each statement in the four sections that follow, select the response that most accurately reflects your organization's consistent, day-to-day reality.

- | | |
|---|------------------------|
| 1 | Yes |
| | Consistently present |
| 2 | Sometimes |
| | Present but unreliable |
| 3 | No |
| | Consistently absent |

A Critical Note on Honest Reflection

The diagnostic value of this assessment depends entirely on the candor of your responses. It is a common instinct for senior leaders to answer based on intent what the organization is working toward, what was communicated in the last all-hands, or what the operating model is designed to produce.

Resist that instinct. Answer based on what teams *actually experience* on a consistent basis. If a behavior shows up only when conditions are favorable, or only in certain functions, it does not qualify as a "Yes."

The gap between intent and consistent execution is precisely where misalignment lives. Surfacing that gap clearly and without defensiveness is the first act of disciplined leadership.

- There are no right answers here, only accurate ones. The insights generated are only as valuable as the honesty invested in answering.

Section 1 — Communication Discipline

ASSESSMENT · 7 STATEMENTS

Communication discipline is the foundation of leadership alignment. When priorities, trade-offs, and decisions are communicated with consistency and clarity across all leadership layers, execution follows. When they are not, ambiguity fills the gap and teams default to their own interpretations, often misaligned with enterprise intent.

For each statement below, reflect on whether this behavior is present **consistently** across your leadership environment not occasionally, not in isolated functions, but as a reliable operating norm.

Priority Translation

Executive priorities are translated clearly and consistently across leadership layers.

Shift Communication

When priorities shift, implications and trade-offs are explicitly communicated not just the change itself.

Ambiguity Reduction

Cross-functional communication reduces ambiguity rather than increasing it.

Delivery Clarity

Teams understand how shifting priorities affect commitments and delivery expectations.

Conflict Resolution

Conflicting viewpoints are surfaced and resolved at the appropriate level of leadership.

Strategic Consistency

Strategic direction is interpreted consistently across functions not fragmented by function or leader.

Pressure Discipline

Communication remains structured and disciplined even under organizational pressure.

Section 2 — Accountability Consistency

ASSESSMENT · 7 STATEMENTS

Accountability is not a cultural value; it is an operational discipline. It is visible in how decisions are owned, how underperformance is addressed, and how commitments are honored when conditions change. Inconsistent accountability is one of the most corrosive forces in enterprise execution, because it creates an unspoken double standard that leaders at every level can detect, even when it is never named.

Assess each statement against what is *consistently applied* across all functions and leadership levels, not just in high-visibility situations or with particular leaders.

1 Decision Rights Clarity

Decision rights are clearly defined and consistently applied. They are not renegotiated situation by situation.

2 Ownership Reassignment

Ownership is explicitly reassigned when priorities shift and not left ambiguous by default.

3 Underperformance Response

Underperformance is addressed directly and in a timely manner, not managed around or deferred.

4 Commitment Follow-Through

Leaders follow through on commitments without requiring repeated escalation or reminders.

5 Uniform Standards

Accountability expectations are applied uniformly across all functions and not selectively enforced.

6 Trade-Off Acknowledgment

When new priorities are introduced, trade-offs are explicitly acknowledged and absorbed structurally.

7 Early Escalation

Escalation occurs early enough to prevent downstream disruption rather than as a last resort.

Section 3 — Trust Under Pressure

ASSESSMENT · 7 STATEMENTS

Trust is the operating system of high-performing leadership teams. It determines whether leaders share real information or manage perceptions, whether teams raise risks or suppress them, and whether alignment decisions reflect enterprise interest or functional self-preservation. Trust is also the element most sensitive to pressure. It reveals itself precisely when conditions are difficult.

The statements below are designed to assess whether trust in your leadership environment is **structural and behavioral**, or whether it is conditional on favorable circumstances.

Enterprise-First Orientation

Leaders consistently act in the best interest of the enterprise and not primarily in the interest of their function or team.

Psychological Safety

Teams can raise concerns, risks, or dissenting views without hesitation or fear of political consequence.

Decision Transparency

Decisions are made transparently and explained not driven by informal back-channel alignment.

Cross-Functional Resilience

Cross-functional trust holds when priorities conflict. It does not fracture under competitive pressure.

Feedback Quality

Feedback is direct, timely, and constructive. It is not withheld, softened beyond utility, or delivered indirectly.

Resolution Over Ambiguity

Alignment discussions resolve issues rather than prolong ambiguity through deferred or performative agreement.

Behavioral Reinforcement

Trust is actively reinforced through consistent, visible leadership behavior during periods of change.

Section 4 — Priority Governance

ASSESSMENT · 7 STATEMENTS

Priority governance is the discipline of managing not just what gets added to the agenda, but what gets removed, who owns the decision, and how the organization absorbs the change. Without structured governance, urgency becomes the default operating mode, and reactive decision-making displaces strategic intent. This section examines whether your organization has the structural discipline to govern priority changes rather than simply react to them.



Ownership on Urgency

Urgent priorities trigger clear ownership and decision alignment. They do not diffuse action without accountability.



Explicit Trade-Offs

New priorities include explicit de-prioritization as to what stops, what slows, and who absorbs the impact.



Pre-Communication Alignment

Executive alignment occurs before broad communication of changes not after confusion has already spread.



Delivery Impact Clarity

Teams understand how priority shifts impact delivery expectations and can adjust commitments accordingly.



Dependency Reassessment

Cross-functional dependencies are actively reassessed when priorities change not discovered later as friction.



Governance Under Urgency

Urgency does not bypass governance discipline, speed and structure are not treated as mutually exclusive.



Signal vs. Noise

Leadership consistently distinguishes true strategic priority shifts from reactive noise or short-cycle pressure.

Scoring Your Results

Once you have responded to all 28 statements across the four sections, use the framework below to interpret the pattern of your responses. The scoring is designed to surface directional insight. It is not a precise metric, and its value lies in what the pattern reveals about organizational alignment health.

1 - Mostly Yes


Alignment is stable under pressure. Leadership disciplines are operating consistently and the organization has the structural foundation to execute through change. Monitor for early drift signals as conditions evolve.

2 - Mixed (Yes / Sometimes)

Early signs of drift may be emerging. Inconsistencies in one or more domains suggest the alignment infrastructure is under stress. Structured intervention now is significantly more efficient than remediation later.

3 - Mostly Sometimes / No

Execution risk is increasing due to misalignment. The organization is likely experiencing friction, repeated escalation cycles, and cross-functional tension. Immediate structured alignment work is the highest-leverage intervention available.

-  Pay particular attention to which sections drive your mixed or negative responses. Misalignment concentrated in one domain such as Trust or Priority Governance points to a specific structural intervention, not an organization-wide overhaul.

Interpretation

High-performing organizations do not achieve alignment by accident. They maintain it through structural disciplines that are consistently reinforced at the leadership level, especially when conditions are difficult and the pressure to shortcut is highest. The four pillars of sustained alignment are clear, and they directly mirror the sections of this diagnostic.



Clear Communication of Priorities and Trade-Offs

Priorities without trade-offs are aspirations, not decisions. High-performing leadership teams communicate both and do so consistently across every layer of the organization.



Consistent Accountability Across Leadership Layers

Accountability that is applied selectively to some leaders, in some situations is not accountability. It is politics. Consistency is the differentiator between cultures of ownership and cultures of avoidance.



Trust Reinforced Through Disciplined Leadership Behavior

Trust is not built through team offsites or stated values. It is built through the accumulation of consistent, transparent, enterprise-oriented behavior, especially during change and conflict.



Structured Governance During Priority Shifts

Organizations that govern priority shifts with structure: explicit trade-offs, pre-communication alignment, dependency reassessment execute change with significantly less friction and faster recovery.

If your responses are mixed, early signs of misalignment may already be present. These often surface as **repeated clarification cycles, cross-functional friction, shifting priorities without clear trade-offs,** and **inconsistent accountability across teams.** Left unaddressed, these signals compound into organizational drift often before it is visible in performance metrics. The gap between early signal and measurable impact is precisely the window where intervention is most effective and least costly.

A Moment of Transition

If any of the patterns surfaced in this diagnostic feel familiar: the repeated clarification cycles, the cross-functional friction that never fully resolves, the priorities that shift without clear trade-offs, the accountability that holds in some places but not others, **you are not alone.**

These are not indicators of leadership failure. They are indicators of organizational complexity operating at the edge of its current alignment infrastructure. Every enterprise at scale encounters them. The differentiating factor is not whether they appear. It is **how quickly and deliberately leadership responds** when they do.

The instinct is often to address misalignment through increased activity: more meetings, more dashboards, more communication cascades. But activity without structure amplifies noise, not alignment. The patterns that erode execution at scale are structural and they require structural responses.

The first step is not more activity. It is structured alignment.




What Structured Alignment Looks Like



Schedule a Confidential Executive Alignment Conversation

This diagnostic is a starting point – not a destination. The patterns it surfaces are addressable with the right structure, the right focus, and the right external perspective. If your responses revealed areas of concern, or if the act of answering these questions brought specific dynamics to mind, the most productive next step is a direct, confidential conversation.

An Executive Alignment Conversation is a structured, focused dialogue – not a sales engagement. It is designed to help you think through what the diagnostic revealed, identify where the highest-leverage alignment intervention would be in your specific context, and determine whether external support would accelerate or is even necessary for the work ahead.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
|  Confidential A private, senior-level conversation with no agenda beyond clarity and insight. |  Structured Focused on your specific diagnostic results and organizational context – not a generic framework. |  Action-Oriented Designed to produce a clear next step – whether that involves external support or not. |
|---|---|---|

Pamela Marion, Founder & Managing Partner, BigPaw CX

Pamela works with VP-level and C-suite leaders navigating the intersection of strategy, execution, and organizational alignment. Her work is grounded in the conviction that sustainable enterprise performance is built on structural leadership disciplines.

Pamela works with VP-level and C-suite leaders navigating the intersection of strategy, execution, and organizational alignment. Her work is grounded in the conviction that sustainable enterprise performance is built on structural leadership disciplines.



info@bigpawcx.com



610-203-2509



bigpawcx.com



[LinkedIn](#)



[YouTube](#)

Say It. Own It. Do It.

Clarity. Accountability. Trust.

These are not aspirational values. They are operational disciplines: observable, measurable, and reinforceable at every layer of leadership. Organizations that embed them structurally are the ones that execute with precision, adapt without fragmentation, and lead with the credibility that sustains performance through change.

| Say It | Own It | Do It |
|--|---|---|
| Communicate with clarity and consistency about priorities, trade-offs, and direction — at every level, in every condition. | Apply accountability with uniformity and directness to decisions, commitments, and outcomes without exception or exemption. | Reinforce trust through disciplined, transparent, enterprise-oriented behavior consistently, especially under pressure. |

The organizations that lead well are the ones where leadership alignment is simply how leadership works, not an initiative.