

Execution Clarity Diagnostic™

Powered by the Via Clara Execution Drift Model™

A structured self-assessment for CEOs, COOs, and Directors to identify where execution is drifting away from strategic intent — and where to focus first.

01 Priority Drift™

02 Decision Drift™

03 Accountability Drift™

04 Flow Drift™

05 Information Drift™

06 Alignment Drift™

07 Capacity Drift™

Complimentary assessment · 35 questions · 15–20 minutes

© 2026 Via Clara · viaclara.co.nz · All frameworks and trademarks reserved

How to use the Execution Clarity Diagnostic™

Most organisations do not fail because of poor strategy. They fail because execution drifts away from strategic intent over time — quietly, incrementally, and often without anyone realising until the gap between plan and reality becomes impossible to ignore.

The Execution Clarity Diagnostic identifies where drift is occurring across seven structural signals. It gives you a precise picture of where to focus — before drift compounds into something more expensive to fix.

Who should complete this

This diagnostic is designed for CEOs, COOs, and Directors who are responsible for operational delivery or transformation outcomes. It can be completed individually in 15–20 minutes, or facilitated as a leadership team exercise (allow 60–90 minutes with discussion). Where multiple leaders complete it independently, comparing scores across the team often reveals the most important insights.

How to score

Rate each of the 35 statements from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). Score based on how the organisation **actually operates** — not how it is designed to operate or how you would like it to. Honest scoring produces useful results. Generous scoring does not.

Rating	Meaning
5	Strongly Agree — this is consistently true across the organisation
4	Agree — this is mostly true, with occasional exceptions
3	Neutral — this is sometimes true, but not reliably
2	Disagree — this is rarely true in practice
1	Strongly Disagree — this does not reflect how we operate

Interpreting your results

At the end of each section, add your five ratings to produce a section score out of 25. Add all seven section scores for your total out of 175. Section scores below 15 indicate a signal that warrants immediate attention. Use the outcome framework on the final page to interpret your total score and identify your priority intervention areas.

A note on honesty

The most common mistake in self-assessment is scoring how things should work rather than how they actually work. If in doubt, score lower. A score of 3 means “sometimes” — not “we have a policy for this.” The diagnostic is only useful if it reflects reality.

Priority Drift™

SCORE (1=STRONGLY DISAGREE, 5=STRONGLY AGREE)

Q1	Our strategic priorities are understood consistently across all leadership teams — not just at the top.	1	2	3	4	5
Q2	Teams can clearly explain how their day-to-day work contributes to organisational objectives.	1	2	3	4	5
Q3	Success measures are defined and agreed for all major initiatives before execution begins.	1	2	3	4	5
Q4	Competing priorities rarely create confusion or force teams to make trade-offs without guidance.	1	2	3	4	5
Q5	Strategic objectives remain stable long enough for teams to execute effectively against them.	1	2	3	4	5

Priority Drift™ Section Score (add your five ratings): ___ / 25

LOW SCORE SIGNAL — PRIORITY DRIFT™

A low score here typically presents as teams that are busy but misaligned — where effort is high but directed at different targets. You will often see strategic initiatives restarted or reprioritised frequently, and leaders who cannot agree on what the organisation is actually focused on right now.

Decision Drift™

SCORE (1=STRONGLY DISAGREE, 5=STRONGLY AGREE)

Q1	Decisions that should be made at the team level are not being escalated unnecessarily.	1	2	3	4	5
Q2	When a decision is needed, it is made within an expected timeframe — not left pending.	1	2	3	4	5
Q3	Approval processes support execution speed rather than creating bottlenecks.	1	2	3	4	5
Q4	Critical issues are identified and resolved quickly, without waiting for the next scheduled meeting.	1	2	3	4	5
Q5	Governance forums consistently produce clear decisions and assigned actions — not just discussion.	1	2	3	4	5

Decision Drift™ Section Score (add your five ratings): ___ / 25

LOW SCORE SIGNAL — DECISION DRIFT™

A low score here typically presents as slow approvals, decisions being relitigated after they have been made, or leadership teams that meet frequently but produce few clear outcomes. You will often see the same issues appearing repeatedly in steering committees without resolution, and teams waiting for sign-off before they can move.

Accountability Drift™

SCORE (1=STRONGLY DISAGREE, 5=STRONGLY AGREE)

Q1	Every major initiative has a single, clearly identified owner — not a committee or shared responsibility.	1	2	3	4	5
Q2	When something goes wrong, it is clear who is responsible — and that person is held accountable.	1	2	3	4	5
Q3	Cross-functional responsibilities are clearly defined and do not rely on informal relationships to function.	1	2	3	4	5
Q4	Accountability remains clear and intact during periods of change or restructuring.	1	2	3	4	5
Q5	When a process produces the wrong outcome, we can identify a specific owner without ambiguity.	1	2	3	4	5

Accountability Drift™ Section Score (add your five ratings): ___ / 25

LOW SCORE SIGNAL — ACCOUNTABILITY DRIFT™

A low score here typically presents as diffused ownership — where everyone is responsible and therefore no one is. You will often see outcomes that are poor but unattributable, cross-functional work that stalls at handover points, and change programs where accountability quietly dissolves as complexity increases.

Flow Drift™

SCORE (1=STRONGLY DISAGREE, 5=STRONGLY AGREE)

Q1	Core processes are consistently followed across teams, sites, and regions — not quietly worked around.	1	2	3	4	5
Q2	Handoffs between teams occur with minimal friction, delay, or information loss.	1	2	3	4	5
Q3	Rework and duplication are genuinely limited — not just managed around.	1	2	3	4	5
Q4	Cycle times are predictable and consistently met across the organisation.	1	2	3	4	5
Q5	Teams spend more time delivering value than managing complexity and exceptions.	1	2	3	4	5

Flow Drift™ Section Score (add your five ratings): ___ / 25

LOW SCORE SIGNAL — FLOW DRIFT™

A low score here typically presents as operational friction that has become normalised — workarounds that have become standard practice, handovers that routinely fail, and cycle times that vary significantly without a clear reason why. Teams often know exactly where the friction lives but feel unable to change it.

SCORE (1=STRONGLY DISAGREE, 5=STRONGLY AGREE)

Q1	Leadership has genuine confidence in the accuracy and timeliness of operational reporting.	1	2	3	4	5
Q2	Data is consistent across systems — the same question does not produce different answers.	1	2	3	4	5
Q3	Teams can access the information they need, when they need it, without significant manual effort.	1	2	3	4	5
Q4	When performance data shows a problem, it consistently produces a decision and a clear action — not just a discussion.	1	2	3	4	5
Q5	Manual workarounds for data aggregation and reporting are the exception, not the norm.	1	2	3	4	5

Information Drift™ Section Score (add your five ratings): ___ / 25

LOW SCORE SIGNAL — INFORMATION DRIFT™

A low score here typically presents as leadership making decisions based on data they do not fully trust, or spending significant time reconciling conflicting reports before they can act. You will often see manual spreadsheets sitting alongside formal systems, and reporting cycles that consume disproportionate team effort.

Alignment Drift™

SCORE (1=STRONGLY DISAGREE, 5=STRONGLY AGREE)

Q1	Leaders consistently reinforce agreed priorities and ways of working through their own behaviour — not just in communications.	1	2	3	4	5
Q2	New processes and systems are adopted effectively — teams use them as designed, not worked around.	1	2	3	4	5
Q3	Deviations from agreed processes are identified and addressed quickly, not left to compound.	1	2	3	4	5
Q4	Continuous improvement is genuinely embedded in daily operations — not just discussed in reviews.	1	2	3	4	5
Q5	Local practices across sites and regions remain aligned with organisational standards over time.	1	2	3	4	5

Alignment Drift™ Section Score (add your five ratings): ___ / 25

LOW SCORE SIGNAL — ALIGNMENT DRIFT™

A low score here typically presents as the gap between what was agreed and what actually happens. You will often see change programs that were implemented on paper but never truly adopted, local variations that have drifted significantly from the standard, and improvement initiatives that are launched but not sustained.

Capacity Drift™

SCORE (1=STRONGLY DISAGREE, 5=STRONGLY AGREE)

Q1	Senior leaders spend the majority of their time on strategic and high-value activity — not operational firefighting.	1	2	3	4	5
Q2	Teams are not significantly burdened by rework, duplication, or work that should have been done right the first time.	1	2	3	4	5
Q3	Meeting and reporting cycles consume an appropriate proportion of team time relative to the value they produce.	1	2	3	4	5
Q4	When priorities change, workload is actively adjusted — new demands do not simply get added to existing ones.	1	2	3	4	5
Q5	The organisation has genuine capacity to absorb and deliver change — transformation is not permanently competing with keeping the lights on.	1	2	3	4	5

Capacity Drift™ Section Score (add your five ratings): ___ / 25

LOW SCORE SIGNAL — CAPACITY DRIFT™

A low score here typically presents as firefighting that has displaced strategic work — where leadership attention is consumed at the wrong level and the organisation lacks the headroom to deliver change. Transformation programmes are permanently competing with keeping the lights on, and improvement efforts stall not from lack of intent but from lack of available capacity.

RESULTS

Scoring Summary

Transfer your seven section scores below, then add them to calculate your total. Use the outcome framework to interpret what your score means and identify your highest-priority intervention areas.

Drift Signal	Section Score (out of 25)
Priority Drift™	
Decision Drift™	
Accountability Drift™	
Flow Drift™	
Information Drift™	
Alignment Drift™	
Capacity Drift™	
TOTAL SCORE	__ / 175

Outcome Framework

Locate your total score in the framework below to understand what it signals and what level of response it typically requires.

140–175	Clear Execution™ Execution is strong. Focus on sustaining performance, catching early drift signals, and scaling what works as the organisation grows.
115–139	Early Drift™ Drift is emerging but has not yet compounded. This is the ideal moment to act — before structural friction becomes embedded and expensive to reverse.
80–114	Active Drift™ Execution is degrading. Structured intervention across multiple signals is needed before drift compounds further.
45–79	Fragmented Execution™ Execution has fragmented significantly. A full diagnostic engagement is recommended to map intervention priorities.
Below 45	Structural Realignment Required™ Fundamental structural change is required before execution can improve. Immediate structured engagement is recommended.

Section score thresholds

Section Score	Signal	Recommended Action
20–25	Strong	Monitor — maintain current practices
15–19	Watch	Review — identify specific friction points
10–14	Concern	Act — structured improvement needed
5–9	Critical	Urgent — prioritise this signal immediately

YOUR TOP PRIORITIES

Identifying where to focus first

Review your seven section scores. Your three lowest-scoring sections are your highest-leverage intervention points. Address these before investing in broader transformation activity — effort spent on high-scoring areas while low-scoring ones remain unaddressed will not produce lasting improvement.

My three priority drift signals

	Drift Signal	Section Score	Key Observation
Priority 1			
Priority 2			
Priority 3			

Key principle

Transformation efforts directed at symptoms rarely produce lasting results. The Execution Clarity Diagnostic is designed to surface structural causes — the underlying drift signals that are driving the outcomes you are experiencing. Addressing these signals directly, in priority order, produces faster and more durable improvement than broad-based change programs.

NEXT STEPS

What to do with your results

140–175 — Clear Execution™

Your execution architecture is strong. The focus should be on sustaining performance as the organisation grows and scaling the systems that are working.

115–139 — Early Drift™

Drift is emerging but has not yet compounded. This is the ideal moment to act — before structural friction becomes embedded and difficult to reverse.

Below 115 — Active Drift or below

Execution has drifted materially from strategic intent. A structured diagnostic engagement — typically 2–4 weeks — will give you a precise intervention plan and priority sequence.

Contact Via Clara

Email	contact@viaclara.co.nz
Phone	+64 27 802 4143
Book a call	viaclara.co.nz/contact
Website	viaclara.co.nz

© 2026 Via Clara. All frameworks, model names, and trademarks including Execution Clarity Diagnostic™, Execution Drift Model™, and the Seven Drift Signals™ are the intellectual property of Via Clara. This document is provided for organisational self-assessment purposes only.