

The Leadership Development Program Self-Audit Scorecard

Is your program producing leaders — or just activity?

Lead magnet draft. Gated download: name, email, company. Derived from the diagnostic tools in Leading With Impact by William C. Rawe, Ph.D. Final version should be designed as a branded PDF with the Rawe Leadership Solutions logo, site URL, and book mention on every page.

How to Use This Scorecard

Most leadership development programs are evaluated by the wrong evidence: enrollment numbers, completion rates, satisfaction surveys. Those measure *activity*. This scorecard measures whether your program is designed to produce *impact* — and where it is quietly at risk of producing neither.

Score each statement honestly from **1 to 5**:

1 = Not true of us · **2** = Rarely true · **3** = Partially true · **4** = Mostly true · **5** = Consistently true

Twenty statements. Ten minutes. Be honest — an inflated score helps no one, and the gaps you're tempted to round up are usually the ones costing you the most.

Section 1: Purpose & Strategy (Why does your program exist?)

1. We can state our program's primary purpose in a single sentence, and senior leadership would state the same one.

Score: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

2. Our program's objectives are specific, measurable, and explicitly connected to business outcomes (retention, succession readiness, performance) rather than to attendance or completion.

Score: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

3. We have identified the roles most critical to executing our 3–5 year strategy, and our program is deliberately building leaders for those roles.

Score: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

4. For our most critical leadership roles, we have at least two named successors ready within 24 months.

Score: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Section subtotal: _____ / **20**

Section 2: Policies & Access (Who gets developed, and how is it governed?)

5. Leadership development in our organization is available beyond a small executive tier — emerging and frontline leaders have a genuine path into it.

Score: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

6. Participants are selected through transparent criteria, not informal sponsorship or whoever's manager speaks up.

Score: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

7. Our program has a named executive sponsor and a governance structure that would survive the departure of the person currently running it.

Score: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

8. The program has a protected budget that is treated as a strategic investment, not a discretionary line item cut in difficult quarters.

Score: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Section subtotal: _____ / 20

Section 3: Practices & Design (Does the experience actually change how people lead?)

9. Development is individualized — participants work on their specific gaps through development plans, not identical content delivered to everyone.

Score: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

10. The program includes substantial experiential learning (real work, stretch assignments, applied projects) — not primarily classroom or e-learning content.

Score: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

11. Every participant has access to coaching or mentoring as part of the program, with structured reflection built in.

Score: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

12. Our program develops leaders' capacity to handle complexity, ambiguity, and difficult conversations — not just functional or technical skills.

Score: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

13. Development continues after the formal program ends, with planned touchpoints over the following years — it doesn't conclude at the graduation ceremony.

Score: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Section subtotal: _____ / 25

Section 4: Culture & Leadership Modeling (Will it stick?)

14. Senior leaders participate in development themselves — visibly — rather than only sponsoring it for others.

Score: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

15. The behaviors our program teaches are actually rewarded in our performance reviews and promotion decisions.

Score: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

16. Psychological safety in our organization is high enough that participants give and receive honest feedback in development settings.

Score: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

17. Graduates of past programs report that the experience changed how they actually lead — not just their vocabulary.

Score: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Section subtotal: _____ / 20

Section 5: Measurement (How would you know?)

18. We measure beyond satisfaction surveys — we assess whether participants learned, whether their behavior changed on the job, and whether results followed.

Score: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

19. We can connect our program to at least one hard organizational metric (turnover, internal promotion rate, engagement, succession coverage) and show its trend.

Score: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

20. Program data goes to decision-makers who act on it — the program is redesigned based on evidence, not on tradition or anniversary.

Score: ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Section subtotal: _____ / 15

Your Score: _____ / 100

85–100 • Built to Last. Your program reflects what the research says serious leadership development requires. Your opportunity is at the margins: deepening individualization, strengthening post-program development, and pressure-testing governance against leadership transitions.

65–84 • Strong Foundation, Structural Gaps. Your program is real, but specific weaknesses — most often in measurement, governance, or senior-leader participation — are limiting its impact and quietly threatening its longevity. Look at your two lowest-scoring sections: that's where your program is most at risk.

45–64 • Producing Activity, Not Impact. Your organization is investing in development, but the design isn't built to change how people lead or to prove that it has. Programs in this range are the most common — and the most vulnerable to budget cuts, because they can't demonstrate their value when challenged.

Below 45 • The Appearance of Development. Your program exists on paper and in calendars, but little in its design connects it to business outcomes, behavior change, or sustainability. The honest news: this is a design problem, and design problems have solutions. The encouraging news: organizations starting here often see the fastest, most visible gains.

One pattern to watch regardless of total score: a low Section 4. Strong design with weak cultural conditions is how programs collapse after their champions leave — measurable results can evaporate within two years when the leadership around a program never truly changes. (I have watched it happen. It's the founding story of my practice.)

What to Do With Your Results

Your three lowest-scoring statements are your redesign priorities — and the research is clear that three is the right number. If you're tempted to fix ten things, you haven't narrowed enough.

If you'd like a second set of eyes on what you found, that is precisely what the **Leadership Development Program Audit & Redesign** engagement does: an evidence-based external assessment of your program across these same dimensions, with a prioritized roadmap and the governance plan to make it last.

Schedule a discovery call: [RaweLeadership.com](https://raweleadership.com)

Go deeper: This scorecard is adapted from the diagnostic tools in *Leading With Impact: Reimagining Leadership Development for a Modern World* by William C. Rawe, Ph.D.

© 2026 Rawe Leadership Solutions. This scorecard may be shared freely within your organization with attribution. William C. Rawe, Ph.D., is an Industrial-Organizational Psychologist (SHRM-SCP) whose doctoral research examined the policies, practices, and purposes of leadership development programs.