Are you happy with your executive failure rate?

If yes, keep this page for later. If not: the rate is not bad luck and not a talent shortage. It is the predictable output of a toolkit that cannot tell a people problem from a system problem, and has not noticed that both questions changed. **Three misreads, two instruments, one page.**

THREE MISREADS

1. WHO and HOW look identical from the IC

When work drifts from thesis, the cause is the wrong executive or an operating model that would defeat any executive. Replace the exec to fix a system problem, or reorg to fix a people problem, and either mistake burns a year of the hold.

2. You are assessing for the last economy

Longer holds mean build beats buy, twice per seat. And work is now produced by people and AI together: diligence that does not read a team's capacity to restructure work around agents is underwriting it blind.

3. The comp chart is the honest org chart

Pay the talent seat like a cost center and it will behave like one. Funds serious about talent as value creation put it in the deal room and match operating carry to deal carry.

TWO INSTRUMENTS, ONE OWNER OF THE WHAT

YOURS, NOT OURS

WHAT

The value hypothesis: where this company is going and why it will be worth more there. We never set it. Both instruments score against it, which is what generic assessments structurally cannot do.

THE EXECUTIVE ASSESSMENT

WHO

Can this team carry this thesis? Intrinsics, outcome metrics, and how work flows through each leader's org, rolled into one score, tracked as bench density. Run pre-close and across the hold.

THE STRATEGY ALIGNMENT AUDIT

HOW

Is the day-to-day work moving toward the thesis? A five-dimension pulse plus a system map, costed monthly, every finding labeled by confidence. Run at day 60 to 90 and at every inflection.

When both are broken, the instruments sequence the fix: repair the system enough to see the person, then judge the person against the thesis. Run in the other order, you pay for a search you may not have needed.

THE FLAG WE PLANT

> Alignment is not consensus. It is a rate: how fast an organization reconciles the work people actually do to a WHAT that keeps changing. That rate is the leading indicator of the asset every fund wants and none can underwrite today: adaptive capacity. It shows in behaviors months before it shows in the numbers, which means it is measurable while it is still cheap to fix.

SIZING THE PROBLEM

Sanitized illustration from one directional audit: a 140-person company reporting drift in the often band (30 to 40 percent of effort) carries wasted payroll in the low hundreds of thousands of dollars per month. Ranges on purpose: the number's job is to size the problem against the cost of fixing it.

We present this system at fund partner meetings. Fifteen minutes of material, your questions after.

Thomas Igeme, Founder and Principal
thomas@tlpartners.biz | tlpartners.biz