INDIVIDUAL AND ORGANISATIONAL READINESS

Vega FutureReady

A documented design for considering personal readiness together with the organisational conditions that enable it. The current form is in redevelopment.

IN REDEVELOPMENT

Are the person and the organisation equipped to make change useful?

Consider both sides of readiness

The documented 90-item design pairs nine individual capabilities with nine organisational properties. Examples include cognitive flexibility with learning systems, digital fluency with digital infrastructure, and ethical orientation with governance.

Describe domains and dimensions

The individual side groups capabilities into adaptive intelligence, human-centric fluency and enterprise innovation. Parallel organisational domains describe the context in which those capabilities are used.

Compare corresponding responses

The documented method rescales responses and summarises dimension and domain levels. Its alignment calculation reflects the size of the gap between paired scores. Similarity of level is not evidence that either side is strong.

Redevelop before wider use

The source paper states that the instrument is not currently offered commercially. It records the design and evidence gaps as a basis for a shorter, revised form. Institutions should not plan a deployment on the documented form.

METHOD FIRST. INTERPRETATION AND EVIDENCE LIMITS ON PAGE 2.

READING THE RESULT

What the evidence supports

Alignment is not readiness

Two low scores can be close together and therefore appear aligned. That does not establish a healthy organisation or a ready individual. The source paper identifies level-qualified interpretation as a required correction.

Read self-report in its context

Both sides are largely reported by the respondent. Someone's judgement of an organisation's psychological safety may itself be affected by that safety. Independent perspectives and contextual evidence are needed.

Do not overread a difference score

An alignment measure inherits uncertainty from both inputs. A small gap should not be treated as a precise organisational diagnosis, particularly where the underlying short scales have limited reliability.

Evidence limits

The source paper reports weak internal consistency across the dimensions, no normative comparison group, no established validity or stability evidence, and substantial abandonment of the long form. Its headline alignment calculation also risks presenting mutual weakness as a positive result.

Appropriate use

This explainer is a record of the design and redevelopment direction, not an invitation to purchase or deploy the current form. It should not be relied on for an individual or workforce decision in its present state.

A practical next step

The documented programme is to shorten and improve the scales, qualify alignment by actual levels, test independent observer agreement, and establish repeat-measurement and outcome evidence before making stronger claims.

Source: Vega FutureReady methodology white paper, 11 September 2026. This concise adaptation preserves the source's evidence limitations. It is not a fresh validation study or a change to an assessment release. Product availability and programme direction should be confirmed before a deployment.