

Are you closing the right capability gaps?

A self-assessment for CHROs, People & Culture Directors and L&D leaders who want to know whether their capability investment is going to the right places.

WHAT'S INSIDE

- **6 dimensions of Capability Architecture**
 - Strategy alignment to organisational integration
- **12 Diagnostic Questions**
 - Scored against real-world best practice benchmarks
- **Gap Analysis Framework**
 - Know where to invest first and why
- **Prioritised Action Guide**
 - Three actions based on your highest-risk gaps

5,500+

Workforce roles baselined

\$3M+

Average hiring costs saved

91%

Self-assessment completion rate

+14%Employee Engagement Uplift
(Average Engagement)

THE PROBLEM

Most organisations are developing people against the **wrong definition of good.**

Somewhere between strategy and day-to-day execution, things stop connecting. Training programs run but nothing changes. L&D budgets grow but the CFO can't see the return. Capability audits produce data but nobody acts on it.

The framework problem

Without a capability framework built from your strategy, you're developing people against a generic definition of "good" — or worse, no definition at all. The result: investment in the wrong skills, for the wrong roles, at the wrong level.

The measurement problem

Most organisations identify capability gaps through manager feedback and annual performance reviews. That's opinion collection, not gap analysis. Real workforce intelligence combines self-assessment, manager validation, and risk-based prioritisation.

The execution problem

Even when frameworks and data exist, they rarely connect to how people actually learn and develop. Course catalogues fill gaps in theory. Curated pathways with measurable proficiency milestones close them in practice.

THE SIX DIMENSIONS

High-performing Capability Architecture operates across six interconnected dimensions.

A gap in any one of them limits the effectiveness of the others. This self-assessment scores your organisation against each dimension so you can see where the system is strong — and where it's costing you.

01 Strategy Alignment

Is your framework built from where your business is going — or where it's been?

02 Gap Measurement

Do you have validated data on where capability gaps sit — by team, role and individual?

03 Investment Decisions

Is your L&D budget directed by evidence — or by seniority and habit?

04 Learning Effectiveness

Can you prove your development activity is closing gaps, not just filling calendars?

05 Future Readiness

Is your workforce building the AI and digital capabilities your strategy will need in 18 months?

06 Organisational Alignment

Is capability architecture embedded in exec conversations, hiring, performance and succession?

For each question, circle or tick the statement that most accurately describes your organisation right now — not where you aspire to be.

01 STRATEGY ALIGNMENT

Q1. How closely does your capability framework reflect your organisation's 12–18 month strategy?

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> No formal framework exists 0pts | <input type="checkbox"/> Framework is generic or several years old 1pt | <input type="checkbox"/> Framework references strategy but not recently validated 2pts | <input type="checkbox"/> Co-designed from current strategy, reviewed annually 3pts |
|---|---|---|---|

Q2. How confident are you that critical roles have clearly defined, organisation-specific capability profiles?

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Generic job descriptions only, no capability mapping 0 pts | <input type="checkbox"/> Some role profiles exist but inconsistent across the org 1 pt | <input type="checkbox"/> Most critical roles profiled but not connected to a framework 2 pts | <input type="checkbox"/> All critical roles have validated, proficiency-levelled profiles 3 pts |
|--|---|---|--|

02 GAP MEASUREMENT

Q1. How do you currently identify capability gaps across your workforce?

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Manager intuition and performance reviews 0pts | <input type="checkbox"/> Annual surveys without systematic follow-through 1pt | <input type="checkbox"/> Structured capability reviews in parts of the business 2pts | <input type="checkbox"/> Validated assessments with manager-confirmed proficiency scoring 3 pts |
|--|--|---|--|

Q2. Can you identify — by team, function and individual — where your most critical gaps sit?

| | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> No — a general sense only, with no data 0 pts | <input type="checkbox"/> Broad organisational-level visibility only 1 pt | <input type="checkbox"/> Function-level data but no team or individual view 2 pts | <input type="checkbox"/> Heat map data at org, team and individual level with risk ratings 3 pts |
|---|---|--|---|

03 INVESTMENT DECISIONS

Q1. How do you decide where to invest your L&D budget each year?

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Senior requests, trends, or repeating the previous year 0pts | <input type="checkbox"/> Some HR BP input but no formal capability data driving decisions 1pt | <input type="checkbox"/> Capability data referenced but doesn't fully drive allocation 2pts | <input type="checkbox"/> Investment directly prioritised by gap severity and business risk 3 pts |
|--|--|--|---|

Q2. How systematically do you decide whether to build, buy or borrow capability?

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> No formal process — decisions made case by case 0 pts | <input type="checkbox"/> Options considered but no structured framework 1 pt | <input type="checkbox"/> Framework exists but not consistently applied 2 pts | <input type="checkbox"/> Data-informed Build / Buy / Borrow framework applied consistently 3 pts |
|---|---|---|---|

04 LEARNING EFFECTIVENESS

Q1. How would you describe your organisation's current approach to learning pathways?

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Course catalogue only — no structured pathways 0pts | <input type="checkbox"/> Some pathways exist but not connected to a capability framework 1pt | <input type="checkbox"/> Pathways exist and link to framework but aren't consistently used 2pts | <input type="checkbox"/> Curated, framework-connected pathways with proficiency milestones 3pts |
|---|---|--|--|

Q2. Can you demonstrate, with data, that your L&D investment is closing gaps—not just achieving completions?

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Track completions and satisfaction scores only 0 pts | <input type="checkbox"/> Some post-program assessment, not connected to the framework 1 pt | <input type="checkbox"/> Measure capability change pre/post for some programs 2 pts | <input type="checkbox"/> Track capability uplift against the framework and business outcomes 3 pts |
|--|---|--|---|

05 FUTURE READINESS

Q1. How prepared is your workforce for AI and digital capability demands over the next 18–24 months?

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Not formally assessed AI or digital capability 0pts | <input type="checkbox"/> Aware of the need but not built into framework or strategy 1pt | <input type="checkbox"/> AI and digital capability in the framework but not yet baselined 2pts | <input type="checkbox"/> AI literacy baselined, mapped and actively developed in critical roles 3pts |
|---|--|---|---|

Q2. How frequently do you review your framework against external skill trends and benchmarks?

| | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rarely or never 0 pts | <input type="checkbox"/> Every 2–3 years as part of a broader HR review 1 pt | <input type="checkbox"/> Annually, without formal external benchmarking 2 pts | <input type="checkbox"/> At least annually with external benchmarking and trend analysis 3 pts |
|---|---|--|---|

06 ORGANISATIONAL ALIGNMENT

Q1. How well does your executive team understand the link between capability gaps and business performance risk?

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> L&D is a cost centre — hard to make the business case 0pts | <input type="checkbox"/> Awareness exists but no formal connection to business outcomes 1pt | <input type="checkbox"/> Some executives see the link but it's not embedded in strategy 2pts | <input type="checkbox"/> Capability risk discussed at exec level with data and business case modelling 3pts |
|--|--|---|--|

Q2. How integrated is your capability framework with performance, hiring and succession planning?

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Each system operates independently — no common capability language 0 pts | <input type="checkbox"/> Some overlap but no formal integration 1 pt | <input type="checkbox"/> Framework referenced in some people systems but not all 2 pts | <input type="checkbox"/> Framework is the common language across all people systems 3 pts |
|--|---|---|--|

YOUR SCORE SUMMARY

| | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 01 Strategy Alignment / 6 | 02 Gap Measurement / 6 | 03 Investment Decisions / 6 |
| 04 Learning Effectiveness / 6 | 05 Future Readiness / 6 | 06 Organisational Alignment / 6 |

TOTAL SCORE: / 36

| | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| 0–12 Critical architecture gaps — requires immediate action | 13–22 Significant gaps — targeted investment required | 23–30 Strong Foundations - opportunity to close execution gaps | 31–36 High Performing Capability Architecture — maintain and evolve |
|---|---|--|---|

HOW TO READ YOUR RESULTS

Use your dimension scores to identify your highest-risk gaps.

For each dimension, mark your total (out of 6). Dimensions scoring 0–2 are high risk. Dimensions scoring 3–4 represent significant opportunities. Dimensions scoring 5–6 are your strengths — maintain them.

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| High risk (0–2) | Requires immediate attention. Capability investment is likely misdirected or absent. |
| Opportunity (3–4) | Foundations exist but gaps in execution are limiting ROI on capability spend. |
| Strong (5–6) | Operating above the benchmark. Focus on maintaining currency and external validation. |

PRIORITY ACTION GUIDE

Based on your highest-risk dimensions, prioritise the following actions.

01 Strategy Alignment Gap: Start with a Capability Framework Design engagement

If your framework is absent, generic, or disconnected from strategy, everything else is built on sand. MTG's Framework Design engagement co-designs a strategy-connected, proficiency-levelled capability framework — including AI and digital capability layers — from scratch. From

Ideal for: CHROs and L&D Leaders in scaling or restructuring organisations.

02 Gap Measurement Gap: Commission a Capability Review & Gap Analytics engagement

If you can't answer "where are our most critical gaps, and how severe are they?" — you need a full capability baseline. MTG combines self-assessment, manager validation, risk-based training needs analysis, and heat map dashboards. From \$25K · 6–8 weeks.

Ideal for: L&D leaders accountable for ROI they can't currently demonstrate.

03 Investment Decisions Gap: Implement a Build/Buy/Borrow decision framework

If L&D budget allocation is largely based on habit or seniority, you are almost certainly spending on the wrong gaps. MTG designs a data-informed workforce decision system that connects gap severity to Build, Buy, and Borrow choices — and gives the CFO the evidence

Ideal for: P&C Directors and L&D leaders navigating executive scrutiny of L&D spend.

04 Learning Effectiveness Gap: Redesign your learning architecture

If you track completions but not capability uplift, your L&D is invisible to the CFO. MTG's Learning Architecture engagement replaces catalogue-based learning with curated pathways, competency management systems, and pre/post measurement against the capability

Ideal for: L&D functions ready to shift from activity measurement to outcome measurement.

05 Future Readiness Gap: Baseline AI and digital capability now

94% of CEOs identify AI as their top in-demand skill. Only 35% have prepared their workforce for it. MTG conducts dedicated AI literacy and digital capability reviews using DigComp/SFIA-aligned assessment, then builds development pathways before the gap becomes a

Ideal for: Organisations entering AI-enabled workflow transformation in the next 12–18 months.

06 Organisational Alignment Gap: Build the executive capability business case

If capability architecture is siloed in HR, investment will always be undervalued. MTG works with senior teams to connect capability gap data to dollar-value business risk — attrition cost, missed strategic execution, productivity loss — and embed capability intelligence into board-level

Ideal for: People leaders seeking to shift L&D from cost centre to strategic investment.

See exactly where your capability gaps are.

Book a free 30-minute diagnostic call with a MTG consultant. We'll review your assessment results, benchmark your organisation, and give you a clear picture of where to invest first — with no obligation.

Confidential

Your results stay between you and your MTG consultant.

No sales pitch

One honest conversation about where you are and what would help.

30 minutes

Focused, structured, and immediately useful.

Results in 30 days

If we work together, you'll see measurable change fast.

50+

Organisations served

5,500+

Workforce roles baselined

\$3M+

Average hiring costs saved

+14%

Employee Engagement Uplift (Average Engagement)

MULTI-AWARD WINNING

Best Learning & Talent Development

Best eLearning Project

Best Custom / Bespoke Learning Model

Best Onboarding / Induction Program

Best Technical Skills Training

Australian Institute of Training and Development Finalist

TRUSTED BY

Westpac

Transport for NSW

Sydney Metro

Optus

Singtel

John Holland

Transgrid

Water NSW

ARTC

Systra

nbn co

Sanitarium

Moët Hennessy

Australian Institute of Company Directors

Piper Alderman

Network Rail Consulting

Vocus