



accountabili-buddy

— CLARITY. COMMITMENT. FOLLOW THROUGH. —



TRAINING
MODULES

STAGE 3 — WORKBOOK 3B COMMITMENT CALIBRATION AND ADJUSTMENT

PURPOSE

Workbook 3A focused on designing commitments that are clear, controllable, meaningful, realistic, owned, and reviewable.

Workbook 3B addresses what happens after those commitments begin producing evidence.

A commitment that was reasonable when established may later prove too large, too small, poorly timed, unsustainable, or mismatched to changed circumstances.

Conversely, a commitment should not be changed merely because it was missed once.

Professional calibration requires the Accountabili-Buddy to use:

prior performance;

actual available capacity;

current circumstances;

the client's goal;

sustainability;

commitment history;

and the quality of the execution process

to determine whether the commitment should:

remain unchanged;

increase;

decrease;

change form;

change timing;

become temporary;

become a minimum;
return to a prior baseline;
pause;
or close.

The governing question is not:

“Did the client succeed?”

It is:

“What does the evidence tell us about whether this remains the right commitment?”

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

By the end of this workbook, the trainee should be able to:

calibrate commitments using prior performance rather than aspiration alone;
distinguish an isolated miss from evidence of poor calibration;
distinguish an ambitious commitment from an unrealistic one;
recognize chronic overcommitment;
recognize protective undercommitment;
distinguish strategic reduction from avoidance-based reduction;
distinguish temporary capacity changes from structural capacity changes;
use partial completion as calibration evidence;
determine when repeated recommitment has stopped being useful;
distinguish non-completion of the commitment from problems in the execution plan;
identify when a successful result was achieved through an unsustainable process;
determine when progression is appropriate;
determine when maintenance is preferable to progression;
determine when reduced accountability may be appropriate;
distinguish baseline commitments, minimum commitments, and stretch targets;
use intervention results to recalibrate future commitments;
preserve client ownership while making evidence-based recommendations.

CORE CONCEPT REVIEW

CALIBRATION IS AN EVIDENCE PROBLEM

A commitment should not be based solely on:

what the client wishes they could do;
what they think they “should” do;
the maximum they have ever done;
what another person can do;
what sounds ambitious;
or what feels safe enough to guarantee success.

Calibration asks:

What level of commitment is supported by the evidence available now?

PRIOR PERFORMANCE MATTERS

Example:

Weekly target: six study sessions.

Actual results:

Week 1: 2 Week 2: 3 Week 3: 2 Week 4: 3 Week 5: 2

Week 6 should not be designed as though the previous five weeks did not occur.

This does not automatically mean:

“The new commitment must be two or three.”

It does mean:

“Six now requires an explanation.”

ONE WEEK RARELY ESTABLISHES A NEW BASELINE

Client normally completes four workouts.

One unusual week produces one.

Do not automatically conclude:

“Four is unrealistic.”

Ask whether the conditions changed temporarily or structurally.

REPEATED PERFORMANCE CHANGES THE EVIDENCE

Repeatedly completing two against a commitment of six is not the same as missing six once.

At some point, the mismatch itself becomes relevant.

SUCCESS DOES NOT AUTOMATICALLY JUSTIFY INCREASE

Completion can mean:

the commitment was appropriately calibrated;

the commitment was easy;

the client used exceptional effort;

conditions were unusually favorable;

the system is stabilizing;

the target may now be ready to increase.

The result alone does not decide which.

A MISS DOES NOT AUTOMATICALLY JUSTIFY REDUCTION

A commitment may be missed because of:

avoidance;

unusual disruption;

poor planning;
competing priorities;
perfectionism;
loss of interest;
simple non-follow-through.

Reducing the commitment only makes sense if reducing it addresses the demonstrated problem.

CALIBRATION SHOULD CONSIDER SUSTAINABILITY

A client may technically complete five sessions by:

sleeping four hours;
abandoning other important obligations;
repeatedly working through exhaustion;
relying on an emergency sprint every week.

The outcome succeeded.

The commitment may still be poorly calibrated.

TEMPORARY AND STRUCTURAL CHANGES ARE DIFFERENT

A temporary disruption may justify temporary adjustment.

A permanent schedule change may justify a new baseline.

Do not treat both the same.

PART 1 — MAINTAIN, INCREASE, DECREASE, OR INVESTIGATE?

Choose:

A. Maintain B. Increase C. Decrease D. Investigate before changing

Client has completed three workouts weekly for eight consecutive weeks.

Three supports the goal and still requires deliberate effort.

Answer:

Client has completed three easily for eight weeks and the goal now requires progressive training.

Answer:

Client has completed two of six sessions for five consecutive weeks.

Answer:

Client misses one week because of influenza after months of consistency.

Answer:

Client completes all five sessions but repeatedly loses significant sleep doing so.

Answer:

Client asks to reduce four workouts to one after a single miss.

Answer:

Client completes one of five for six weeks despite having only two available windows.

Answer:

Client completes five easily for two months but does not want to increase because five is the intended maintenance level.

Answer:

PART 2 — WHAT DOES PRIOR PERFORMANCE TELL US?

For each history, identify what can reasonably be concluded.

Target: 4

Results:

4, 4, 4, 3, 4, 4

What does the history suggest?

Target: 6

Results:

2, 2, 3, 2, 2, 3

What does the history suggest?

Target: 3

Results:

3, 3, 3, 3, 3

What does the history establish?

What does it not establish?

Target: 5

Results:

5, 5, 1

What additional information is needed?

Target: 2

Results:

2, 2, 2, 2, 2

Client previously demonstrated capacity for five.

What should be examined?

PART 3 — ONE WEEK OR PATTERN?

Choose:

A. Treat primarily as isolated evidence B. Pattern-level review justified C. More history needed

One miss after 12 successful weeks.

Answer:

Five consecutive weeks below the same target.

Answer:

Two poor weeks after a permanent work-schedule change.

Answer:

One unusually successful week at twice the historical output.

Answer:

Eight weeks of stable completion at the same level.

Answer:

Three misses at the same point of execution.

Answer:

First-ever attempt at a new behavior.

Answer:

PART 4 — CHRONIC OVERCOMMITMENT

For each scenario, identify whether chronic overcommitment is supported.

Client repeatedly commits to seven study sessions and completes two or three.

Supported / Not supported / Uncertain

Why?

Client commits to five workouts, completes five for eight weeks, then has one poor week.

Supported / Not supported / Uncertain

Why?

Client commits to 10,000 words every weekend and consistently produces 2,000–3,000 despite serious effort.

Supported / Not supported / Uncertain

Why?

Client commits to three calls and repeatedly avoids them despite ample time.

Supported / Not supported / Uncertain

Why?

Why should avoidance not be misclassified as overcommitment?

PART 5 — UNDERCOMMITMENT

Undercommitment occurs when the commitment is substantially below what the client can reasonably support and below what meaningful progress requires.

Client historically completes four workouts.

New commitment:

One.

No disruption exists.

What should be examined?

Client says:

"I want to commit to one application because then I know I will succeed."

What concern arises?

Client has a major debt-reduction goal but commits to reviewing finances for five minutes once per month.

What calibration concern exists?

Client is returning after a major health-related interruption and chooses a deliberately small re-entry commitment that is consistent with any applicable professional guidance.

Is this necessarily undercommitment?

Why?

What distinguishes strategic reduction from protective undercommitment?

PART 6 — BASELINE, MINIMUM, OR STRETCH?

Identify:

A. Baseline commitment B. Minimum commitment C. Stretch target

"Three workouts is what I am accountable for."

Answer:

"Even during travel, I will do at least one."

Answer:

"If the week goes well, I would like five."

Answer:

Why should these three levels not be conflated?

Create an example using a writing goal.

Baseline:

Minimum:

Stretch:

PART 7 — TEMPORARY VS. STRUCTURAL CAPACITY CHANGE

Choose:

A. Temporary adjustment likely B. Structural recalibration likely C. Insufficient evidence

Client has a two-week family emergency.

Answer:

Client permanently changes from part-time to full-time employment.

Answer:

Client has one demanding travel week.

Answer:

Client becomes primary caregiver indefinitely.

Answer:

Client says:

"I have been tired lately."

No other information.

Answer:

Why does the distinction matter?

PART 8 — TEMPORARY REDUCTION

Client normally studies four times weekly.

During a two-week relocation, only one session realistically fits.

What might the commitment become?

What should be established about the reduction?

Why should the temporary commitment not automatically become the new baseline?

What should happen when the disruption ends?

PART 9 — STRUCTURAL RECALIBRATION

Client previously exercised five times weekly.

New permanent work schedule leaves three practical periods.

What should happen?

Client says:

"But five is what I used to be able to do."

Write the response:

Why is historical capacity relevant but not decisive?

PART 10 — PARTIAL COMPLETION AS DATA

Target:

Five.

Result:

Three.

What is known?

What is not known?

Results over six weeks:

3, 3, 2, 3, 3, 2 against a target of five.

What becomes relevant?

Client says:

"I keep getting three, so three must be my limit."

Is that established?

Why?

What other explanations could produce repeated three-of-five performance?

PART 11 — REPEATED RECOMMITMENT

Week 1:

Five planned, two completed.

Client:

"Five again."

Reasonable?

Why?

Week 5:

Five planned for five consecutive weeks.

Results:

2, 2, 3, 2, 2.

Client:

"Five again."

What is different now?

What question should be asked before another identical recommitment?

Why can repeated recommitment look like persistence while actually preventing learning?

PART 12 — WHAT IS CHANGING?

For each repeated miss, identify what should change before repeating the same commitment.

Problem:

No protected time.

Change:

Problem:

Target exceeds available capacity.

Change:

Problem:

Client avoids one specific component.

Change:

Problem:

Client does not know how to perform the task.

Change:

Problem:
Goal no longer matters.

Change:

Problem:
Nothing identifiable; first isolated miss.

Change:

PART 13 — SUCCESS DOES NOT AUTOMATICALLY MEAN INCREASE

Client completes three workouts for the first time.

Should the next target automatically be four?

Why?

Client completes three for eight weeks and says it still requires substantial effort.

Should the target increase?

What should determine the answer?

Client completes three easily and wants progressive fitness improvement.

What becomes reasonable?

Client completes all sessions during one unusually light week.

Why should that week be interpreted cautiously?

PART 14 — WHEN PROGRESSION IS APPROPRIATE

Identify whether progression is supported.

Stable completion over eight weeks, target now easy, goal requires increased challenge.

Supported / Not supported / Uncertain

One successful week.

Supported / Not supported / Uncertain

Stable completion but the current level is intentionally the maintenance goal.

Supported / Not supported / Uncertain

Client wants to increase because they feel guilty that current success seems “too easy.”

Supported / Not supported / Uncertain

Client has substantial unused capacity and current commitment produces little meaningful progress.

Supported / Not supported / Uncertain

PART 15 — MAINTENANCE IS A VALID DECISION

Why can maintaining the same commitment be professionally appropriate after repeated success?

Give three reasons maintenance may be preferable to progression.

Why should “more” not automatically be treated as “better”?

PART 16 — SUCCESSFUL OUTCOME, UNSUSTAINABLE PROCESS

Client completes five study sessions by sleeping four hours nightly.

Was the commitment completed?

Was the process necessarily sustainable?

What should the next conversation examine?

Client completes a weekly writing target through one 12-hour Sunday sprint every week.

What questions should be asked?

Client completes all business commitments only by neglecting another stated top priority.

What calibration issue may exist?

Why should completion and sustainability be evaluated separately?

PART 17 — CAPACITY VS. WILLINGNESS

Client has time for four sessions but only wants to protect two periods.

Is four necessarily realistic?

Explain:

What is the difference between theoretical capacity and committed capacity?

Why should the Accountabili-Buddy not define capacity solely by empty calendar space?

PART 18 — CLIENT SAYS “I COULD IF I REALLY TRIED”

Client consistently completes three.

Client:

“I could do six if I really pushed myself.”

What should the Accountabili-Buddy examine?

Why is theoretical maximum performance a weak baseline?

What evidence better supports a sustainable commitment?

PART 19 — CLIENT SAYS “I SHOULD BE ABLE TO”

Client:

“I should be able to exercise every day.”

Actual sustainable history:

Three times weekly.

What distinction matters?

Write the response:

Why can “should” distort calibration?

PART 20 — THE MAXIMUM IS NOT THE BASELINE

Client once wrote 8,000 words during a deadline weekend.

Normal weekly output:

2,500.

Client wants 8,000 as the new weekly commitment.

What problem exists?

What should the Accountabili-Buddy use instead?

When might unusually high performance legitimately inform progression?

PART 21 — THE AVERAGE IS NOT AUTOMATICALLY THE COMMITMENT

Client averages three workouts.

Does that mean three must be the next commitment?

Why?

What other evidence should be considered?

PART 22 — CALIBRATION AND GOAL IMPORTANCE

Two goals are equally feasible.

One is substantially more important.

Should importance influence commitment allocation?

Explain:

Does a highly important goal justify an impossible commitment?

Why?

Does a low-priority goal need the same accountability intensity as a primary goal?

Why?

PART 23 — CALIBRATION AND COMPETING GOALS

Client has:

fitness goal;

business goal;

certification goal.

Available discretionary time:

Six hours weekly.

Desired commitments require:

Fitness: 4 hours Business: 5 hours Certification: 4 hours

What is the structural problem?

Why can each commitment appear individually realistic while the total set is unrealistic?

What should happen?

PART 24 — CALIBRATION ACROSS THE WHOLE SYSTEM

Why should each commitment not be calibrated in isolation?

What information should the Accountabili-Buddy consider across all active goals?

PART 25 — STEP-DOWN AFTER STABILITY

Client has completed a routine independently for four months with minimal Accountabili-Buddy input.

What question should be considered?

Why might reducing accountability frequency be appropriate?

What evidence would suggest the current accountability intensity is still useful?

PART 26 — DEPENDENCE ON ACCOUNTABILITY

Client completes commitments reliably when Accountability-Buddy check-ins are active but follow-through drops substantially when accountability is reduced.

Is the commitment itself necessarily poorly calibrated?

Why?

What should be evaluated separately?

Why can increasing accountability intensity distort apparent success?

PART 27 — RECOVERY AFTER A LAPSE

Client has been inactive for two months after a major disruption.

Should the old baseline automatically resume immediately?

Why?

What may be more appropriate?

How should the re-entry commitment be reviewed?

PART 28 — STRATEGIC RE-ENTRY VS. PERMANENT SHRINKAGE

Client formerly studied four times weekly.

After a six-week disruption, commits to one session for the first week back.

Assessment:

After eight weeks, client is still using one session despite ample capacity and desire for faster progress.

What should be examined?

Why should temporary recovery commitments have review points?

PART 29 — CALIBRATING NEW BEHAVIORS

Client has no performance history.

How should the first commitment be selected?

Why should the first commitment sometimes be treated partly as a test?

What should happen after the first two or three weeks?

PART 30 — CALIBRATING KNOWN BEHAVIORS

Client has six months of stable performance data.

How should that affect calibration?

Why should strong historical evidence generally reduce reliance on guesswork?

PART 31 — WHEN THE CLIENT WANTS A STRETCH GOAL

Client baseline:

Three.

Stretch:

Five.

What is the accountable result if client completes four?

Should four be described as:

Baseline non-completion? Baseline success plus stretch progress? Full stretch completion?

Answer:

Why does precise language matter?

PART 32 — WHEN THE CLIENT USES STRETCH AS A HIDDEN REQUIREMENT

Client says:

“Three is technically the commitment, but if I do not hit five, I will feel like I failed.”

What issue exists?

What should the Accountabili-Buddy clarify before the week begins?

Write the response:

PART 33 — WHEN A MINIMUM BECOMES THE DEFAULT

Baseline:

Three.

Minimum for difficult weeks:

One.

Client completes one every week for six weeks despite normal conditions.

What should happen?

What questions should be asked?

Why can a protective minimum become a form of undercommitment?

PART 34 — COMMITMENT ADJUSTMENT AND AVOIDANCE

Client repeatedly avoids sales calls.

Client proposes reducing four calls to one.

What must be established before calling this recalibration?

If four genuinely exceeds capacity but one is chosen mainly because it feels emotionally safe, what may be the better target?

Why can calibration and avoidance both be relevant?

PART 35 — COMMITMENT ADJUSTMENT AND PERFECTIONISM

Client repeatedly misses writing targets because each paragraph receives excessive revision.

Client proposes reducing word count.

What should be examined first?

Why may reducing word count fail?

What adjustment may fit better?

PART 36 — CLIENT WANTS TO INCREASE AFTER SUCCESS

Client:

“I completed all three, so I want six next week.”

What should the Accountabili-Buddy ask?

What evidence would support six?

What evidence would argue for maintaining three?

PART 37 — CLIENT WANTS TO REDUCE AFTER A MISS

Client:

"I only did one of four. Let's make the goal one."

What should happen before accepting the change?

What evidence would support reduction?

What evidence would argue for maintaining four?

PART 38 — CALIBRATION RESPONSE WRITING

Write the response.

History:

Target five.

Results:

2, 2, 3, 2, 2.

Client:

"Five again."

Your response:

History:

Target four.

Results:

4, 4, 4, 4, 1.

Current week involved an unusual emergency.

Client:

"I think four is too much."

Your response:**History:**

Three completed easily for eight weeks.

Client wants greater progress.

Your response:**History:**

Five completed only through repeated sleep deprivation.

Client:

"See? Five works."

Your response:**History:**

Client historically completes four.

Client proposes one because:

"I know I can complete one."

Your response:

PART 39 — CLIENT REJECTS CALIBRATION FEEDBACK

Evidence supports three.

Client chooses five.

Write the response:

Evidence supports maintaining three.
Client insists on lowering to one after a single miss.

Write the response:

Evidence supports increasing a trivially easy commitment.
Client wants to keep it because:
“I like getting a perfect score.”

Write the response:

PART 40 — CALIBRATION AS AN EXPERIMENT

Current uncertainty:
Three or four workouts may be sustainable.

How could the next two weeks generate evidence?

What should be tracked?

Why is experimentation preferable to arguing abstractly about what the client “should” be able to do?

PART 41 — INTEGRATED CASE: CHRONIC OVERCOMMITMENT

Client Goal:
Complete professional certification.

Commitment:
Six study sessions weekly.

Six-week history:
2, 3, 2, 3, 2, 2.

Client says:

"I am capable of six. I just need to become more disciplined."

What does the history establish?

What does it not establish?

What information should be gathered?

NEW INFORMATION

Client has three reliable study periods.

A fourth is occasionally possible.

Six requires giving up sleep or significant family time.

Current calibration assessment:

Write the response:

Client:

"I do not want to lower it because six is what serious people do."

What additional issue appears?

Write the response:

Client:

"Three is the real baseline. Four could be a stretch."

Does this structure fit the evidence?

Why?

PART 42 — INTEGRATED CASE: UNDERCOMMITMENT

Client Goal:

Find a new job within several months.

History:

Client has capacity to submit three to four qualified applications weekly.

Proposed commitment:

"One application every two weeks."

Client says:

"I know I can definitely hit that."

What calibration concern exists?

What information matters?

Write the response:

Client:

"I am choosing something tiny because I do not want another week where I miss."

What mechanism is clearer?

What should happen?

PART 43 — INTEGRATED CASE: TEMPORARY DISRUPTION

Client normally completes four exercise sessions weekly.

For the next three weeks, client will be caring for a family member after surgery.

Realistic capacity:

One or two sessions.

Should the baseline permanently change?

Why?

What commitment structure may fit?

What should happen at the end of three weeks?

PART 44 — INTEGRATED CASE: SUCCESSFUL BUT UNSUSTAINABLE

Client Goal:

Write a business plan.

Commitment:

Complete two major sections weekly.

Client succeeds for four weeks.

Method:

Works until 2–3 a.m. on Sunday each week after delaying all work until the final night.

Is the commitment being completed?

Is the process necessarily successful?

What different issues should be separated?

Write the response:

PART 45 — INTEGRATED CASE: PROGRESSION

Client Goal:

Improve cardiovascular fitness.

Commitment:

Three training sessions weekly.

History:

12 weeks completed consistently.

Client reports:

sessions feel manageable;
recovery is good;
current plan no longer feels challenging;
client wants continued improvement.

Is progression reasonably supported?

Why?

What should the Accountabili-Buddy NOT do?

What should happen instead?

PART 46 — INTEGRATED CASE: MAINTENANCE

Client Goal:

Maintain regular exercise.

Commitment:

Three sessions weekly.

History:

Six months stable.

Client says:

“Three is exactly what I want long term. I am not trying to increase.”

Appropriate calibration decision:

Why?

What other question might now become relevant?

PART 47 — FULL CALIBRATION CASE

Client Goal:

Build a freelance business.

Initial Commitment:

Contact five prospects weekly.

Weeks 1–4:

1, 2, 1, 2.

Client says:

“Five is too much. I want one.”

What does the evidence suggest?**What remains uncertain?****Is one clearly the correct recalibration?****Why?****NEW INFORMATION**

Client has time for three quality contacts.

Five requires rushed, low-quality outreach.

What target now appears better supported?**NEW INFORMATION**

Client says:

“One feels safer because I know nobody can expect much from one.”

What secondary issue appears?**What structure might fit?****Write the response:**

Client chooses:

Baseline: three Stretch: five

Next three weeks:

3, 3, 4.

What does the evidence now suggest?

Should baseline automatically become four?

Why?

What question should guide the next adjustment?

PART 48 — CALIBRATION SELF-REVIEW

- Do I reduce commitments too quickly after misses?
- Do I maintain clearly mismatched targets too long?
- Do I confuse ambition with good calibration?
- Do I confuse ease with good calibration?
- Do I use one unusually successful week as a new baseline?
- Do I use one unusually poor week as evidence for permanent reduction?
- Do I examine sustainability?
- Do I distinguish temporary from structural capacity change?
- Do I recognize undercommitment?
- Do I distinguish strategic reduction from safety-seeking reduction?
- Do I separate baseline, minimum, and stretch?
- Do I use the whole set of active goals when evaluating capacity?
- Do I let “should” distort calibration?
- Do I recognize when maintenance is the correct decision?

Do I recognize when progression is genuinely supported?

Do I know when accountability intensity itself should decrease?

PART 49 — STAGE 3B COMPETENCY CHECK

I can use prior performance when calibrating commitments.

Yes / Not Yet

I can distinguish isolated misses from meaningful patterns.

Yes / Not Yet

I can identify chronic overcommitment.

Yes / Not Yet

I can identify protective undercommitment.

Yes / Not Yet

I can distinguish temporary reduction from structural recalibration.

Yes / Not Yet

I can interpret partial completion as evidence without treating it as a diagnosis.

Yes / Not Yet

I know when repeated recommitment requires reassessment.

Yes / Not Yet

I do not automatically increase after success.

Yes / Not Yet

I do not automatically reduce after a miss.

Yes / Not Yet

I can evaluate sustainability separately from completion.

Yes / Not Yet

I can distinguish baseline, minimum, and stretch targets.

Yes / Not Yet

I can determine when progression is supported.

Yes / Not Yet

I can determine when maintenance is appropriate.

Yes / Not Yet

I can recognize when accountability intensity may be reduced.

Yes / Not Yet

I can use short calibration experiments when evidence is uncertain.

Yes / Not Yet

I can provide strong calibration recommendations while preserving client ownership.

Yes / Not Yet

STAGE 3B CORE STANDARD

Commitment calibration requires the Accountabili-Buddy to answer four separate questions:

What does the client currently want to accomplish?

What level of action does the available evidence suggest the client can reasonably and sustainably support?

What does prior behavior tell us about that estimate?

Is the proposed commitment large enough to produce meaningful progress without being based primarily on aspiration, fear, or exceptional effort?

Good calibration is not the commitment with the highest completion rate.

It is not the most ambitious commitment.

It is not the least uncomfortable commitment.

It is the commitment best supported by the client’s goals, available capacity, historical evidence, current circumstances, and need for meaningful progress.

The governing principle is:

Use evidence to set the commitment—and continue using evidence to decide whether it should remain the commitment.

END OF STAGE 3 — WORKBOOK 3B: COMMITMENT CALIBRATION AND ADJUSTMENT