

Hybrid Alignment Audit

A fast diagnostic for the silo hiding inside your own team.

Hybrid teams rarely fracture along department lines. They fracture along a much quieter line: who happened to be in the room. Since 2020, hybrid and fully remote employees have experienced roughly double the decline in knowing what's expected of them, compared with on-site employees doing the same kind of work (Gallup). Use this audit to find out if your team is already living that gap.

- ☐ **1. Decisions get explained differently depending on who's in the room.**
When a decision is announced, in-office employees pick up extra context through hallway follow-up conversations that never reach remote teammates.
- ☐ **2. Meetings default to whoever's in the room speaking first.**
In hybrid meetings, in-person attendees carry most of the conversation while remote attendees wait for a pause that rarely comes.
- ☐ **3. Your top priorities live in someone's head, not in writing.**
If priorities are reinforced mainly through in-person conversation instead of a written source of truth, remote employees are working from a thinner version of the picture.
- ☐ **4. Career-relevant visibility depends on physical presence.**
Recognition, stretch assignments, and informal advancement conversations happen disproportionately for the employees who are physically visible.
- ☐ **5. No one owns keeping remote and in-office informed equally.**
There's no standing habit, log, or recap responsible for distributing context evenly. Information equity is accidental, not designed.



What it looks like:

Remote employees ask clarifying questions weeks later that in-office employees already had answered informally.



What it looks like:

A meeting recap shows two or three in-office voices carrying most of the discussion, with remote attendees speaking only when directly addressed.



What it looks like:

Ask a remote employee and an in-office employee to name this week's top priority separately, and get two different answers.



What it looks like:

The people getting pulled into ad hoc strategic conversations are consistently the same in-office few, regardless of who's actually doing the work.



What it looks like:

When someone asks whether everyone got the update, the honest answer is that the people who were in the room did.

How many did you check?

0-1 checked

Strong information parity.

Your team is largely working from the same picture regardless of location.

2-3 checked

Early divide.

Context is starting to depend on physical presence. Worth a direct look this month.

4-5 checked

Two teams, one name.

The location-based information gap is likely already shaping who's aligned, who's guessing, and who eventually leaves.

This checklist covers one signal. It's one of five that determine whether a team is genuinely aligned or quietly misaligned: domain 5 of 5, the Leadership Consistency domain of the Team Alignment Risk Scan.