

NEXORA

CHANGE READINESS ASSESSMENT

Nexora Consulting Group (L3)

Assessment Stage	Pre-Change
Report Date	XX June 2026
Total Respondents	100 respondents (99% response rate — 100 of 101 invited)
Employees	91 (91% of total)
Managers	9 (9% of total)
Teams in Scope	Product Engineering, Innovation & Technology, Client Success, Sales & Revenue, Strategy & Partnerships, Commercial & Growth, Data Science, Digital Experience
Hierarchy Levels	Business → Division → Team

CONFIDENTIAL — FOR AUTHORISED RECIPIENTS ONLY

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
Executive Summary	3
Overall Readiness Verdict	3
Key Scores at a Glance.....	3
Readiness Quadrant.....	4
Summary of Key Findings.....	4
Adoption Readiness	5
Dimension Breakdown — Adoption.....	5
Sponsorship Credibility	6
Dimension Breakdown — Sponsorship.....	6
Manager Overview.....	7
Manager Load	7
Load Band Distribution.....	7
Sponsorship Analysis	7
Sponsorship Sub-Score Overview.....	7
Sponsorship Chain Matrix.....	7
Sponsorship Dimension Detail.....	8
Load Band × Chain State	8
Team-Level Breakdown	9
Adoption Alerts.....	10
Next Steps & Recommended Support.....	11

Executive Summary

This report presents the results of the Change Readiness Assessment conducted for Nexora Consulting Group (L3). The assessment was completed by 100 respondents across Product Engineering, Innovation & Technology, Client Success, Sales & Revenue, Strategy & Partnerships, Commercial & Growth, Data Science and Digital Experience. The findings below reflect the pre-change baseline and should be read as diagnostic intelligence ahead of programme launch, not as a verdict on the organisation's capability.

Overall Readiness Verdict

NOT CLEARED FOR LAUNCH

This organisation has the motivation to change. It does not yet have the sponsorship conditions to sustain it.

Quadrant:

HIGH RISK

Key Scores at a Glance

Adoption Readiness

27.9 / 40

LOW (threshold: 28/40)

Sponsorship Credibility

27.6 / 40

LOW (threshold: 28/40)

The Adoption Readiness score of 27.9/40 indicates that the employee and manager population is, broadly, in a fragile state ahead of this change. Scores below the 28-point threshold reflect gaps in self-reported competence, capacity, or confidence in prior change delivery.

The Sponsorship Credibility score of 27.6/40 falls below the 28-point threshold. Employees and managers do not currently experience senior leaders as visibly modelling the change, communicating with sufficient honesty about its challenges, or creating the psychological safety needed to raise concerns.

Readiness Quadrant

The quadrant classification combines both scores to produce a single strategic position.

	LOW Sponsorship	HIGH Sponsorship
HIGH Adoption	Motivated but Lost <i>Org ready; leaders won't carry it</i>	Optimal <i>Proceed. Conditions are strong.</i>
LOW Adoption	► High Risk <i>Significant redesign required.</i>	Capable but Wary <i>Leaders credible; org not ready.</i>

Summary of Key Findings

- Adoption Readiness is 27.9/40 (LOW).
- Sponsorship Credibility is 27.6/40 (LOW).
- 22% of managers are in the failed sponsorship chain state.
- 1 priority alert identified for intervention sequencing.

Executive Overview

Nexora Consulting Group enters this change in a fragile state. Adoption Readiness and Sponsorship Credibility both fall below the readiness threshold, placing the organisation in the High Risk quadrant. Employees have some motivation to change, but senior sponsorship is not yet credible enough to sustain it, and 22% of managers are operating in a failed sponsorship chain. Launching without addressing these conditions first is likely to accelerate resistance rather than reduce it.

Adoption Readiness

The Adoption Readiness score measures the degree to which employees and managers feel equipped, supported, and capable of absorbing meaningful change.

Adoption Readiness Score

27.9 / 40

LOW (threshold: 28/40)

Dimension Breakdown — Adoption

Adoption Readiness is composed of four dimensions, each scored on a 2–10 scale (the sum of two questions per dimension), normalised here to a 1.0–5.0 average for comparability.

Dimension	Section	Avg Score	Status
1A — Competence & Capability	Adoption	3.4 / 5.0	Manageable but worth monitoring
1B — Change Track Record	Adoption	3.5 / 5.0	Above threshold
1C — Change Load / Capacity	Adoption	3.5 / 5.0	Above threshold
1D — Manager as Enabler	Adoption	3.5 / 5.0	Above threshold

Adoption Readiness

Adoption Readiness sits just below the threshold at 27.9/40, with Competence & Capability (1A) as the only dimension requiring active attention at 3.4/5.0. The remaining three dimensions (Change Track Record, Change Load, and Manager as Enabler) all sit above threshold. This is not a workforce in crisis; it is a workforce that lacks confidence in its own capability to absorb this change. That is a targeted problem with a targeted fix.

Sponsorship Credibility

The Sponsorship Credibility score measures the degree to which employees and managers experience senior leadership as visibly modelling change, communicating with honesty, walking the talk, and creating the psychological safety needed to raise concerns.

Sponsorship Credibility Score

27.6 / 40

LOW (threshold: 28/40)

Dimension Breakdown – Sponsorship

Dimension	Section	Avg Score	Status
2A – Visible Sponsorship	Sponsorship	3.4 / 5.0	Manageable but worth monitoring
2B – Walk the Talk	Sponsorship	3.3 / 5.0	Manageable but worth monitoring
2C – Honest Communication	Sponsorship	3.5 / 5.0	Above threshold
2D – Psychological Safety	Sponsorship	3.5 / 5.0	Above threshold

Sponsorship Credibility

Sponsorship Credibility sits at 27.6/40; the lowest of the two primary scores and the more urgent problem. Visible Sponsorship (2A) and Walk the Talk (2B) are both below threshold at 3.4 and 3.3 respectively, indicating that employees do not experience senior leaders as visibly committed to this change or as modelling the behaviours they are asking others to adopt. Honest Communication and Psychological Safety are holding, but they cannot compensate for leaders who are not yet seen to be leading.

Manager Overview

Manager Load

Manager Load is derived from four survey questions assessing whether managers have the bandwidth, personal sustainability, and equipped capacity to lead their teams through change. It is a risk signal: a high proportion of managers in the At Capacity or Overloaded bands indicates that launching without structural support will amplify organisational risk.

Load Band Distribution

78% Sustainable Genuine surplus capacity. Can function as active change sponsor.	11% Stretched Managing, but at risk under additional change load.	11% At Capacity Requires structured support and executive air cover.	0% Overloaded Risk amplifier. Do not launch without addressing load first.
--	---	--	--

Manager Load

The load distribution indicates where manager support is required before programme launch.

Sponsorship Analysis

This analysis disaggregates the Sponsorship Credibility score into two constructs with distinct intervention owners: what managers are receiving from senior leadership above, and whether managers have the conditions to sponsor their own teams below.

Sponsorship Sub-Score Overview

Sponsorship Received 14.9 / 20 HIGH (threshold: 14/20)	Sponsorship Capacity 15.6 / 20 HIGH (threshold: 14/20)
---	---

Sponsorship Chain Matrix

The matrix below shows the distribution of managers across four chain states, derived by crossing Received and Capacity scores against the 14/20 threshold.

	LOW Received	HIGH Received
HIGH Capacity	0% Breaking at Manager Level	67% Chain Functioning
LOW Capacity	22% Sponsorship Failed at Both Levels	11% Managers Resilient, Under-Supported

Sponsorship Dimension Detail

Dimension	Section	Avg Score	Status
1A — Enabling Team Competence	Received	3.3 / 5.0	Manageable but worth monitoring
1B — Team Change Track Record	Received	3.8 / 5.0	Above threshold
1C — Change Saturation	Received	4.1 / 5.0	Above threshold
1D — Upward Enablement	Received	3.7 / 5.0	Above threshold
2A — Senior Sponsorship Visibility	Capacity	3.5 / 5.0	Above threshold
2B — Strategic Alignment	Capacity	3.9 / 5.0	Above threshold
2C — Implementation Autonomy	Capacity	3.7 / 5.0	Above threshold
2D — Manager Wellbeing	Capacity	4.1 / 5.0	Above threshold

Load Band × Chain State

The cross-analysis below identifies the highest-risk sub-groups by combining each manager's load band with their chain state.

	Chain Functioning	Breaking at Manager Level	Managers Resilient, Under-Supported	Sponsorship Failed at Both Levels
Sustainable	5	0	1	1
Stretched	1	0	0	0
At Capacity	0	0	0	1
Overloaded	0	0	0	0

Sponsorship Chain Analysis

The chain matrix and cross-analysis identify where in the sponsorship architecture intervention is most urgent.

Team-Level Breakdown

The table below disaggregates the org-wide scores into a per-team view. Compare each team's Adoption and Sponsorship against the readiness threshold (28/40) and the org averages above to identify outliers requiring tailored intervention sequencing.

Team	Responses	Adoption	Sponsorship	Quadrant	Manager Load
Client Success	16 (15 staff · 1 mgr.)	27.9 / 40 (LOW)	31.6 / 40 (HIGH)	Capable but Wary	Sustainable
Commercial & Growth	1 (0 staff · 1 mgr.)	27 / 40 (LOW)	26 / 40 (LOW)	High Risk	Sustainable
Data Science	16 (15 staff · 1 mgr.)	34.5 / 40 (HIGH)	20 / 40 (LOW)	Motivated but Lost	Sustainable
Digital Experience	16 (15 staff · 1 mgr.)	20.4 / 40 (LOW)	27.9 / 40 (LOW)	High Risk	Sustainable
Innovation & Technology	1 (0 staff · 1 mgr.)	28 / 40 (HIGH)	28 / 40 (HIGH)	Optimal	Stretched
Product Engineering	17 (16 staff · 1 mgr.)	31.2 / 40 (HIGH)	30.7 / 40 (HIGH)	Optimal	Sustainable
Sales & Revenue	16 (15 staff · 1 mgr.)	19.3 / 40 (LOW)	20.3 / 40 (LOW)	High Risk	At Capacity
Strategy & Partnerships	16 (15 staff · 1 mgr.)	33.6 / 40 (HIGH)	34.6 / 40 (HIGH)	Optimal	Sustainable

Teams with fewer than 5 respondents should be interpreted with caution; small samples are sensitive to individual perspectives. Manager Load is shown only for teams whose lead manager completed the assessment.

Team-Level Breakdown

3 of 8 teams fall below the readiness threshold on both Adoption and Sponsorship (notably Commercial & Growth); 4 are below on Adoption and 4 on Sponsorship overall. Sequence enablement against this list rather than treating the org as uniform.

Adoption Alerts

The following alerts were generated automatically based on scoring thresholds built into the assessment instrument. They are listed in priority order and represent the system's assessment of the most operationally significant findings requiring action before launch.

THRESHOLD — SPONSORSHIP BELOW READINESS THRESHOLD
Sponsorship is 27.6/40 (threshold 28).

SAMPLE

Next Steps & Recommended Support

The findings in this report point to a clear and sequenced set of interventions. The Outlier Group partners with organisations to design and deliver the specific interventions this assessment points to. The recommendations below reflect the priority sequence indicated by the data.

01 PRIORITY

Sponsorship Architecture Review

- Senior Leadership Sponsorship Diagnostic: half-day facilitated session with programme sponsors.
- Sponsorship Behaviour Design: co-create visible sponsorship commitments for the programme lifecycle.
- Sponsorship Pulse run a lightweight sponsorship check every 4 weeks.

02 PRIORITY

Manager Enablement Programme

- Manager Readiness Bootcamp: targeted practical change-leadership session for manager cohort.
- Peer Learning Circles: monthly manager forums for live challenge-solving and safe escalation.
- Executive Air Cover Protocol: define manager decision rights and escalation boundaries.

03 PRIORITY

Change Portfolio Review

- Change Portfolio Mapping: inventory all active initiatives and identify overlap.
- Load Reduction Planning: remove or sequence initiatives to reduce delivery conflict.
- Launch Sequencing Workshop: agree explicit stop/start criteria pre-launch.

04 PRIORITY

Mid-Change Assessment

- Mid-Change Survey: redeploy the same instrument 4-8 weeks post-launch.
- Delta Analysis Report: compare pre vs mid movements across scores and risk states.
- Intervention Re-prioritisation: re-order support actions based on live movement.

This report is confidential and prepared exclusively for Nexora Consulting Group (L3). The methodology, frameworks, and scoring logic are proprietary to The Outlier Group.