



accountabili-buddy

— CLARITY. COMMITMENT. FOLLOW THROUGH. —



TRAINING
MODULES

WORKBOOK 6B — INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY JUDGMENT

PURPOSE

Workbook 6A focused on integrated case formulation:

What is happening?

What does the evidence support?

What factors matter now?

Workbook 6B focuses on the next level of competence:

What should the Accountabili-Buddy do when there is no obvious right answer?

At advanced practice level, the Accountabili-Buddy will frequently face situations where:

more than one intervention is defensible;

available evidence is incomplete;

client preference conflicts with Accountabili-Buddy recommendation;

the most conservative option and the most ambitious option are both reasonable;

an intervention could help but could also create dependence;

the Accountabili-Buddy must decide whether to intervene or continue observing;

accountability could appropriately become more intensive or less intensive;

the goal may be changing but not clearly abandoned;

previous patterns are relevant but may no longer be active;

or the Accountabili-Buddy must decide whether the accountability relationship itself is still useful.

Competent practice does not require perfect prediction.

It requires defensible judgment.

The Accountabili-Buddy should be able to explain:

What decision am I making?
What evidence supports it?
What alternatives did I consider?
What risk exists if I am wrong?
Can the decision be tested or reversed?
What belongs to me as Accountabili-Buddy judgment?
What remains the client's decision?
What evidence will determine what happens next?

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

By the end of Workbook 6B, the trainee should be able to:

make professional decisions under uncertainty;
distinguish situations requiring action from situations requiring observation;
identify when more information would materially change the decision;
avoid unnecessary information gathering;
select among several defensible interventions;
use reversibility when choosing interventions;
weigh intervention cost against likely benefit;
identify the least intensive intervention sufficient for the current evidence;
know when stronger intervention is justified despite uncertainty;
distinguish Accountabili-Buddy recommendation from client decision;
respond professionally when the client chooses against recommendation;
recognize legitimate disagreement between competent Accountabili-Buddies;
avoid false precision;
avoid defensive over-documentation;
recognize when prior success should change current intervention intensity;
recognize when history should influence but not determine judgment;
decide when to maintain, recalibrate, escalate, de-escalate, pause, restructure, or close;
recognize when accountability is no longer the correct problem-solving tool;
identify the limits of the Accountabili-Buddy role;
and make certification-level decisions that can be clearly defended from evidence.

CORE PRINCIPLE 1 — PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENT IS NOT GUESSING

A professional judgment may contain uncertainty.

It should not be arbitrary.

Example:

Client has missed the same commitment twice.

Cause remains unclear.

Possible Accountabili-Buddy decisions:

continue one more week and observe;

add a focused follow-up question;

run a small scheduling experiment.

More than one may be reasonable.

A defensible judgment explains why the chosen option fits the current evidence.

CORE PRINCIPLE 2 — NOT EVERY DECISION HAS ONE CORRECT ANSWER

At earlier training levels, some questions have relatively clear answers.

Example:

A target requires six available periods.

Only three exist.

The target is overcalibrated.

At advanced levels, decisions may be genuinely close.

Example:

Client independently completes a behavior for eight weeks after previously relying heavily on three scheduled check-ins per week.

Should check-ins move from two per week to one now or after four more weeks?

Either could be defensible depending on:

stability;

consequence of relapse;

client confidence;

other process indicators;

and whether reduced intensity can be easily reversed.

The Accountabili-Buddy should not manufacture certainty where professional judgment legitimately permits alternatives.

CORE PRINCIPLE 3 — ASK WHETHER MORE INFORMATION WOULD CHANGE THE DECISION

Information gathering has value only when it could materially affect what the Accountabili-Buddy does.

Weak:

"Let's keep analyzing."

Better:

"What do we still need to know before choosing between these two options?"

If the same intervention is appropriate under both plausible explanations, additional analysis may not be necessary.

CORE PRINCIPLE 4 — FAVOR REVERSIBLE EXPERIMENTS WHEN UNCERTAINTY IS HIGH

When evidence is incomplete and risk is low, a temporary experiment may be better than a permanent structural change.

Example:

Possible need:

More frequent check-ins.

Instead of:

"From now on we'll meet twice weekly."

Try:

"For the next three weeks, let's temporarily increase from one scheduled check-in to two by adding a Wednesday check-in, then review whether it changes completion."

Reversibility supports learning without prematurely locking the process into one structure.

CORE PRINCIPLE 5 — USE THE LEAST INTENSIVE EFFECTIVE INTERVENTION

More accountability is not automatically better accountability.

The Accountabili-Buddy should ask:

What is the minimum additional structure justified by the evidence?

If one temporary checkpoint is sufficient, do not add daily reporting.

If one direct conversation is sufficient, do not create a new monitoring system.

If stable independence exists, do not preserve intensive accountability merely because it once helped.

CORE PRINCIPLE 6 — HIGH CONSEQUENCE MAY JUSTIFY EARLIER INTERVENTION

Evidence strength is not the only factor.

Consequence matters.

Example:

A minor maintenance commitment is missed once.

Observation may be sufficient.

A major application deadline is approaching and an emerging delay pattern could make recovery impossible.

Earlier intervention may be justified even before the pattern is fully established.

Professional proportionality considers:

probability;

consequence;

reversibility;

and timing.

CORE PRINCIPLE 7 — LOW-COST EXPERIMENTS REQUIRE LESS CERTAINTY

Example:

Hypothesis:

Friday timing may be contributing to non-completion.

Changing one task to Monday for two weeks is:

low cost;

reversible;

easy to evaluate.

The Accountabili-Buddy does not need high causal certainty before testing it.

Contrast:

Advising the client to abandon a major goal requires a much higher decision threshold—and ultimately remains the client's decision.

CORE PRINCIPLE 8 — ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY RECOMMENDATION IS NOT ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY AUTHORITY

The Accountabili-Buddy may say:

"Based on the last eight weeks, I recommend reducing the baseline to three."

The client may say:

"I understand. I'm choosing five."

Both can remain true:

The Accountabili-Buddy maintains the recommendation.

The client owns the decision.

Advanced judgment requires the Accountabili-Buddy to tolerate that distinction.

CORE PRINCIPLE 9 — CLIENT PREFERENCE MATTERS, BUT DOES NOT ERASE EVIDENCE

Client:

"I prefer three check-ins every week."

Evidence:

Client now initiates independently and the additional check-ins appear to be reinforcing reliance on external accountability.

The Accountabili-Buddy should not simply say:

"Whatever you prefer."

Nor should they say:

"You aren't allowed to choose that."

Instead:

"We can take your preference seriously and still examine whether that structure is helping the skill we're trying to build."

CORE PRINCIPLE 10 — HISTORY MODIFIES JUDGMENT

History should affect decision thresholds.

Example:

Client misses one workout.

History A:

Six months stable.

History B:

Previous six-week collapse began with the same behavior.

The same present event may justify different degrees of attention.

History informs judgment.

It does not determine it automatically.

CORE PRINCIPLE 11 — INTERVENE ON CURRENT EVIDENCE, NOT FEAR OF FUTURE NON-FOLLOW-THROUGH

Weak Accountabili-Buddy reasoning:

“They used to depend heavily on Accountabili-Buddy check-ins, so I’d better never reduce them.”

or:

“They used to overcommit, so I’d better stop them from increasing anything.”

This treats historical risk as current certainty.

Advanced practice distinguishes:

risk awareness

from

preemptive control.

CORE PRINCIPLE 12 — SOMETIMES THE CORRECT DECISION IS TO WAIT

Observation can be an active professional decision.

Appropriate observation may occur when:

evidence is weak;

consequences are low;

the current structure remains reasonable;

additional data is likely to clarify the case;

and premature intervention could distort interpretation.

“Wait” should mean:

observe deliberately

not

ignore.

CORE PRINCIPLE 13 — SOMETIMES WAITING IS THE ERROR

Observation becomes weak when:

a strong pattern already exists;

repeated intervention failure is being ignored;

delay will make recovery impossible;
the client repeatedly requests the same ineffective recommitment;
relational damage is occurring;
or the accountability process itself has clearly become dysfunctional.
Advanced practice requires knowing the difference between patience and passivity.

CORE PRINCIPLE 14 — THE NEXT DECISION SHOULD BE EVALUABLE

Whenever possible, define what would make the Accountabili-Buddy:

maintain;
intensify;
reduce;
reverse;
or replace the intervention.

Example:

Decision:

Reduce scheduled check-ins from three to two per week for two weeks.

Evaluation:

If completion remains stable remove final reminder.
If initiation collapses review what dependence remains.
The decision produces a future decision rule.

CORE PRINCIPLE 15 — ROLE LIMITS ARE PART OF ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY JUDGMENT

Not every problem revealed in accountability belongs within the Accountabili-Buddy role.

The Accountabili-Buddy should know when the issue requires:

different expertise;
practical assistance outside accountability;
professional care beyond the accountability role;
or a different service altogether.

The Accountabili-Buddy can still help clarify:

What is the next accountability-relevant action?

But should not pretend that accountability itself resolves every problem.

PART 1 — ACTION OR OBSERVATION?

Choose:

ACT NOW OBSERVE MORE INFORMATION NEEDED

Client misses one maintenance commitment after six stable months.

No meaningful consequence.

Answer:

Client postpones the same high-stakes application for the third week and the deadline expires in five days.

Answer:

Client reports:

"I'm overwhelmed."

No information exists about workload, capacity, or recent performance.

Answer:

Client has missed the same commitment six times.

Answer:

Client independently completes for eight weeks after check-in frequency was reduced.

Answer:

Why can observation be an active intervention decision?

PART 2 — WOULD MORE INFORMATION CHANGE THE DECISION?

Choose:

YES NO UNCERTAIN

Two explanations remain plausible.

Both support the same low-cost scheduling experiment.

Do you need more causal information before testing?

Answer:

Client is deciding whether to close a major long-term goal.

Important information about remaining cost and requirements is unknown.

Would more information matter?

Answer:

Client repeatedly misses a commitment that is clearly impossible given current capacity.

Do you need to determine whether perfectionism is also present before recalibrating?

Answer:

Client reports being discouraged.

You do not know whether the goal still matters.

Would that information affect the next decision?

Answer:

What is the test for whether additional information is useful?

PART 3 — REVERSIBLE OR HIGH-COMMITMENT DECISION?

Classify:

REVERSIBLE EXPERIMENT HIGHER-COMMITMENT DECISION

Move one weekly session from Friday to Monday for two weeks.

Answer:

Pause a major professional goal indefinitely.

Answer:

Reduce scheduled check-ins from three to two per week for two weeks.

Answer:

End the accountability relationship.

Answer:

Add one temporary midweek checkpoint.

Answer:

Why should decision threshold generally rise as reversibility decreases?

PART 4 — LEAST INTENSIVE EFFECTIVE INTERVENTION

Choose the most proportionate response.

Client repeatedly discovers problems too late in weekly review.

A. Daily hourly reporting B. One temporary midweek checkpoint C. Accountabili-Buddy takes over planning

Answer:

Client has one unexplained miss after 12 stable weeks.

A. Major process reassessment B. Brief review and continue C. Daily reminders

Answer:

Client repeatedly waits for one reminder before beginning.

A. Add five more reminders B. Test removal or delay of that reminder C. Require proof of completion every hour

Answer:

Why is additional structure not neutral?

PART 5 — CONSEQUENCE CHANGES THE DECISION THRESHOLD

Client misses one low-stakes maintenance task.

No pattern.

Likely response:

Client shows the same early delay behavior on a once-a-year application due tomorrow.

Likely response:

Why might similar evidence justify different intervention intensity?

PART 6 — CLIENT CHOOSES AGAINST RECOMMENDATION

Evidence supports baseline three.

Accountabili-Buddy recommends three.

Client chooses five.

What should Accountabili-Buddy do?

What should Accountabili-Buddy record?

What should Accountabili-Buddy not do?

Following week:
Three of five completed.

How should this result be used?

PART 7 — CLIENT PREFERENCE VS. PROCESS EVIDENCE

Client prefers three scheduled check-ins per week.
Evidence suggests that frequency is no longer necessary.

What should Accountabili-Buddy do?

Client prefers weekly check-ins.
Behavior has been fully independent for six months.

Is preference alone enough to preserve current structure indefinitely?

YES / NO
Why?

Client dislikes a temporary checkpoint that appears useful.
Should client preference be ignored?

YES / NO

Explain:

PART 8 — TWO DEFENSIBLE OPTIONS

Client has independently completed for eight weeks.

Option A:

Reduce weekly check-in frequency now.

Option B:

Maintain for four additional weeks before reduction.

Could both be professionally defensible?

YES / NO

What should determine the choice?

Why should certification-level assessment sometimes accept multiple answers?

PART 9 — FALSE PRECISION

Accountabili-Buddy says:

“Exactly 9.5 weeks of stable completion are required before decreasing reminders.”

No evidence or program standard supports that number.

What is wrong?

Accountabili-Buddy says:

“Given eight stable weeks and independent initiation, I think we have enough evidence to test less support.”

What is stronger about this?

PART 10 — HISTORICAL RISK

Client previously overcommitted chronically.

Current six-month history shows accurate calibration.

Client proposes a modest increase.

What should Accountabili-Buddy do?

Weak response:

"No, because you always overcommit."

Why is this weak?

What role should the old pattern play?

PART 11 — RECURRENCE AND THRESHOLDS

Old pattern returns once after four stable months.

Recommended judgment:

Same pattern returns three consecutive times.

Recommended judgment:

Same pattern returns six consecutive times.

Recommended judgment:

What changes across these cases?

PART 12 — PATIENCE OR PASSIVITY?

Classify:

APPROPRIATE PATIENCE PASSIVITY

Accountabili-Buddy observes one more week after a weak signal with low consequence.

Answer:

Accountabili-Buddy says:

"Let's see what happens"

after six identical misses.

Answer:

Accountabili-Buddy gathers one missing piece of information that will determine whether the goal remains active.

Answer:

Accountabili-Buddy keeps gathering explanations after four ineffective interventions and no process change.

Answer:

What distinguishes patience from passivity?

PART 13 — WHEN TO ESCALATE DESPITE UNCERTAINTY

Cause remains uncertain.

Pattern is established and materially harming the goal.

Can stronger intervention still be justified?

YES / NO

Why?

Give an example of intervention that does not require certainty about cause.

PART 14 — WHEN NOT TO ESCALATE

Client has one miss.

Accountabili-Buddy feels strongly that it "might become a problem."

Should intensity increase substantially?

Why?

What evidence should Accountabili-Buddy seek before stronger escalation?

PART 15 — MAINTAIN AS ACTIVE JUDGMENT

Client baseline three.

Results:

3, 3, 3, 3, 3.

Goal:

Maintenance.

Client says:

“Should we increase?”

Is increase required?

YES / NO

Why?

What evidence could justify maintaining?

Why can Accountabili-Buddies become biased toward changing something?

PART 16 — WHEN TO RECALIBRATE

Target five.

Eight-week results:

2, 3, 2, 3, 2, 3, 2, 3.

Capacity evidence supports three.

Decision:

Client insists five remains aspirationally important.

How can baseline and aspiration be separated?

PART 17 — WHEN TO REDUCE INTENSITY

Client independently initiates and completes for four months.

Current accountability:

Three scheduled check-ins per week.

Decision:

What reduction would be reasonable to test first?

Why?

What should be monitored?

PART 18 — WHEN TO MAINTAIN INTENSITY

Client has just achieved stability for two weeks after a severe repeated pattern.

Should intensity automatically reduce immediately?

Why?

What additional evidence might justify reduction?

PART 19 — PROCESS EXPERIMENT

Client may no longer need scheduled accountability.

Design a reversible experiment:

Define success:

Define reversal criteria:

PART 20 — CLIENT REJECTS STEP-DOWN

Client says:

"I want weekly accountability forever."

What should Accountabili-Buddy investigate?

What should Accountabili-Buddy recommend if evidence supports greater independence?

What remains client-owned?

PART 21 — CLIENT REQUESTS MORE INTENSITY

Client:

"Text me every day."

What should Accountabili-Buddy ask first?

When could a temporary increase be reasonable?

When might it be counterproductive?

PART 22 — ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY UNCERTAINTY

Accountabili-Buddy thinks:

"I'm not sure whether this is avoidance or poor scheduling."

What should Accountabili-Buddy ask?

If both explanations support the same Monday scheduling experiment, what should happen?

If they imply radically different interventions, what should happen?

PART 23 — DECISION RISK

For each intervention assess:

LOW / MODERATE / HIGH consequence if wrong.

Move one study session one day earlier for two weeks.

Answer:

Recommend that the client consider closing a business.

Answer:

Reduce scheduled check-ins from three to two per week experimentally.

Answer:

Pause all accountability indefinitely.

Answer:

Why should risk affect decision threshold?

PART 24 — ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY RECOMMENDATION STRENGTH

Write one recommendation at each confidence level.

Low confidence:

Moderate confidence:

High confidence:

Why should language reflect confidence?

PART 25 — “I RECOMMEND” VS. “YOU HAVE TO”

Rewrite:

“You have to reduce this to three.”

Rewrite:

“You need to quit this goal.”

Rewrite:

“You cannot keep doing it your way.”

PART 26 — CLIENT MAKES A DECISION ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY DISLIKES

Client reviews evidence and chooses a defensible option Accountabili-Buddy personally would not choose.

What should happen?

What should Accountabili-Buddy separate?

PART 27 — PROFESSIONAL PREFERENCE VS. PERSONAL PREFERENCE

Accountabili-Buddy prefers morning exercise.

Client consistently succeeds at evening exercise.

Should Accountabili-Buddy recommend mornings because they personally prefer them?

YES / NO

Why?

What makes a recommendation professionally relevant?

PART 28 — COMPETING PRIORITIES

Client has two goals.

Both matter.

Capacity supports only one at full intensity.

What should Accountabili-Buddy do?

What should Accountabili-Buddy not do?

What accountability commitment could follow before execution?

PART 29 — AMBIGUOUS GOAL STATUS

Client says:

“I think I still want it, but I’m not sure.”

Should Accountabili-Buddy:

A. Assume goal remains fully active B. Close goal C. Shift temporarily to goal-status clarification

Answer:

What evidence might clarify?

PART 30 — WHEN ACCOUNTABILITY IS THE WRONG TOOL

Client's next action requires technical expertise they do not have.

Is stronger accountability the primary solution?

YES / NO

What is needed first?

Client does not know whether a legal action is permissible.

Should Accountabili-Buddy interpret the law?

YES / NO

What can accountability still address?

Why is recognizing role limits an advanced competency?

PART 31 — ACCOUNTABILITY AFTER EXTERNAL HELP

Client obtains needed technical assistance.

Task is now feasible.

What role can accountability resume?

PART 32 — DO NOT SUBSTITUTE ACCOUNTABILITY FOR SKILL

Client repeatedly cannot complete the task because they do not know how to perform the required software function.

Accountabili-Buddy adds reminders.

What is wrong?

What should happen instead?

PART 33 — DO NOT SUBSTITUTE ACCOUNTABILITY FOR DECISION

Client does not know whether they want to relocate for a job.

Accountabili-Buddy creates daily packing commitments.

What is wrong?

What should accountability focus on first?

PART 34 — DO NOT SUBSTITUTE ACCOUNTABILITY FOR CAPACITY

Client works 80 hours weekly temporarily and cannot realistically maintain five additional goals.

Accountabili-Buddy adds more check-ins.

What is wrong?

What should happen?

PART 35 — ROLE LIMITS + NEXT ACTION

A problem lies outside accountability role.

Does Accountabili-Buddy simply say:

“Not my job”?

YES / NO

What can they still do?

PART 36 — DOCUMENTING JUDGMENT

For each decision, write:

Decision Evidence Uncertainty Review trigger

Decision:

Reduce reminders.

Evidence:

Uncertainty:

Review trigger:

Decision:

Maintain baseline.

Evidence:

Uncertainty:

Review trigger:

Decision:

Run temporary midweek checkpoint.

Evidence:

Uncertainty:

Review trigger:

PART 37 — DEFENSIBLE ALTERNATIVES

Case:

Client has eight weeks stable independent completion.

Option A:

Reduce check-in frequency now.

Defensible reasoning:

Option B:

Maintain current frequency another four weeks.

Defensible reasoning:

What would make one option clearly weaker?

PART 38 — WHEN TWO ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDIES DISAGREE

Accountabili-Buddy A favors a two-week experiment.

Accountabili-Buddy B favors four weeks of observation.

Both cite current evidence.

Can both be competent?

YES / NO

Why?

What matters more than identical decisions?

PART 39 — JUSTIFY THE DECISION

For each, write a one-sentence professional rationale.

Recalibrate from five to three.

Add one temporary checkpoint.

Reduce scheduled check-ins from three to two per week.

Maintain current structure.

Shift to goal review.

Recommend process pause.

PART 40 — WHAT WOULD CHANGE YOUR MIND?

Current decision:

Maintain three-session baseline.

What evidence would justify increase?

Current decision:

Reduce accountability intensity.

What evidence would justify restoring some structure?

Current formulation:

Capacity appears primary.

What evidence would make you revise?

Why should advanced Accountabili-Buddies identify revision criteria in advance?

PART 41 — DECISION BIAS: ACTION BIAS

Accountabili-Buddy feels they must change something every week.

What bias may exist?

What corrective question should they ask?

PART 42 — DECISION BIAS: CONSERVATISM

Accountabili-Buddy refuses to alter a long-standing structure despite strong new evidence.

What bias may exist?

Corrective question:

PART 43 — DECISION BIAS: CONFIRMATION

Accountabili-Buddy believes client is avoidant.

Every new event is interpreted as avoidance.

What bias exists?

What should Accountabili-Buddy actively seek?

PART 44 — DECISION BIAS: RECENCY

Client has six months of success and one bad week.

Accountabili-Buddy immediately concludes the system failed.

What bias exists?

What evidence should be weighted?

PART 45 — DECISION BIAS: HISTORY DOMINANCE

Client once depended heavily on reminders.

Accountabili-Buddy refuses to reduce them years later despite independent performance.

What error exists?

Corrective question:

PART 46 — CLIENT PRESSURES ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY FOR CERTAINTY

Client:

"Just tell me what the right answer is."

Two defensible choices exist.

Response:

Client:

"But you're supposed to be the expert."

Response:

PART 47 — CLIENT PRESSURES ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY TO OWN THE OUTCOME

Client:

"If I do what you recommend and it fails, that's on you."

Response:

What boundary must remain clear?

PART 48 — ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY MAKES A REASONABLE DECISION THAT DOES NOT PRODUCE THE EXPECTED RESULT

Intervention was evidence-based and proportionate.

It does not work.

Does that prove Accountabili-Buddy judgment was incompetent?

YES / NO

Why?

What should happen next?

PART 49 — OUTCOME BIAS

A poorly reasoned intervention happens to succeed once.

Was the original judgment automatically good?

YES / NO

Why?

A well-reasoned intervention does not produce the expected result once.

Was the original judgment automatically bad?

YES / NO

Why?

What should judgment quality be evaluated by?

PART 50 — FINAL INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT CASE

Client Goals:

Grow consulting business.

Maintain fitness.

Complete certification.

History:

The client initially had overcalibrated business and study commitments.

These were corrected.

Study and fitness have been stable for three months.

Prospecting improved after addressing both avoidance of outreach and excessive message revision.

The client now selects appropriate weekly commitments independently.

One scheduled Accountabili-Buddy check-in per week remains in place.

Client says:

"I'm doing pretty well. I still like having you here every week."

What evidence supports reducing Accountabili-Buddy involvement?

What evidence might support maintaining some involvement?

Is one obvious correct decision available?

YES / NO

Explain:

Client and Accountabili-Buddy agree to a defined pause from scheduled accountability for six weeks, with clear criteria for resuming if needed.

Performance remains stable.

What does this support?

Client says:

"I think I may be ready to continue without scheduled accountability."

Is this defensible?

YES / NO / DEPENDS

What should Accountabili-Buddy consider?

They continue without scheduled accountability.

Two months remain stable.

A major business opportunity appears.

Client suddenly begins overcommitting:

five prospect meetings;

website relaunch;

daily content;

certification restart;

new fitness target.

Should Accountabili-Buddy assume the old overcommitment pattern is active again?

Why?

What should Accountabili-Buddy review immediately?

Calendar review shows the commitments clearly exceed capacity.

What is now supported?

How direct should the Accountabili-Buddy be?

Write the response:

Client says:

“This opportunity is different. I want to go all in.”

What should Accountabili-Buddy distinguish?

Can a temporary period of higher effort be legitimate?

YES / NO

What must still be established?

Client chooses a four-week temporary sprint with:
reduced fitness maintenance;
certification still paused;
business commitments increased but kept within documented available hours.

Is this potentially defensible?

YES / NO

Why?

What should be monitored?

After four weeks:
Business sprint succeeds.
Sleep remains stable.
Fitness minimum maintained.
Client wants to continue sprint indefinitely.

What new decision must be made?

What evidence supports continuation?

What evidence or risks argue for reassessment?

What could a reversible next decision look like?

Client ultimately returns to normal business baseline.

Several months later:

All goals stable.

Client says:

"I don't think I need scheduled accountability anymore. I'd rather come back if I hit a problem."

What evidence supports closure or transition out of scheduled accountability?

What should Accountabili-Buddy review before agreeing?

What would be inappropriate?

Write the response:

FINAL JUDGMENT REVIEW

Where did Accountabili-Buddy judgment require action?

Where did it require restraint?

Where was a reversible experiment appropriate?

Where did client preference matter?

Where could client preference not erase evidence?

Where did historical information appropriately alter attention?

Where would historical information have become controlling if misused?

Where did the Accountabili-Buddy recommend without owning the decision?

Where was de-escalation appropriate?

Where was temporary re-escalation appropriate?

Where did the accountability relationship itself become the decision subject?

Why was no single permanent accountability intensity correct throughout the case?

What made the Accountabili-Buddy's decisions defensible even when outcomes could not be guaranteed?

STAGE 6B INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY JUDGMENT SELF-REVIEW

Can I make a decision without pretending certainty?

Can I recognize when more information would materially change the decision?

Can I stop gathering information when it would not change the decision?

Can I select reversible experiments when uncertainty is high?

Can I use the least intensive effective intervention?

Can I consider consequence as well as evidence strength?

Can I intervene earlier when delay would create irreversible loss?

Can I choose observation intentionally?

Can I recognize when observation has become passivity?

Can I maintain a working intervention rather than changing something unnecessarily?

Can I distinguish Accountabili-Buddy recommendation from client authority?

Can I tolerate the client choosing against my recommendation?

Can I allow client preference to matter without letting it erase evidence?

Can I recognize when two different Accountabili-Buddy decisions are both defensible?

Can I avoid false precision?

Can I use history to modify judgment without letting history control it?

Can I respond proportionately to recurrence?

Can I identify in advance what would make me change my decision?

Can I identify action bias?

Can I identify excessive conservatism?

Can I identify confirmation bias?

Can I identify recency bias?

Can I avoid outcome bias?

Can I distinguish judgment quality from whether one intervention happened to succeed?

Can I recognize when the client needs another kind of expertise before accountability can proceed?

Can I stay within the Accountabili-Buddy role?

Can I document the rationale for a judgment without over-documenting?

Can I recommend strongly without controlling?

Can I reduce Accountabili-Buddy involvement when evidence supports independence?

Can I increase structure temporarily without making it permanent?

Can I recognize when scheduled accountability has fulfilled its purpose?

STAGE 6B ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY STANDARD

Independent Accountabili-Buddy judgment is not demonstrated by always selecting the intervention an instructor would have selected.

It is demonstrated by making decisions that can be defended from:

the evidence;

the current level of uncertainty;

the likely consequence of action or inaction;

the cost and reversibility of the intervention;

the client's stated goals and preferences;

the Accountabili-Buddy's role;

and

the information the intervention is expected to produce.

A mature Accountabili-Buddy can say:

"I don't know with certainty which mechanism is primary, but both possibilities support the same low-cost experiment, so I don't think we need more analysis before testing it."

They can say:

"I recommend three based on the last eight weeks. You can still choose five, and if you do, we'll record that accurately and use the result as new evidence."

They can say:

"One bad week after six strong months doesn't justify rebuilding the entire accountability system."

They can also say:

"We don't know the precise cause yet, but this is the sixth consecutive miss and the deadline is approaching. Waiting is no longer the most responsible option."

They can say:

"This structure worked when you needed it. The current evidence suggests you may no longer need the same amount."

And they can say:

"This part of the problem requires expertise beyond accountability. We can identify what you need to obtain and hold you accountable for taking that next step, but I should not pretend to provide expertise outside this role."

The advanced Accountabili-Buddy does not confuse decisiveness with certainty.

They do not confuse caution with delay.

They do not confuse support with control.

They do not confuse client preference with evidence.

They do not confuse intervention outcome with judgment quality.

And they do not preserve an accountability structure simply because it once worked.

The governing sequence is:

Assess the evidence Identify the decision Determine whether more information matters Consider consequence and reversibility Choose the least intensive defensible intervention Preserve client ownership Define what will be observed Revise when necessary

The governing standard is:

Make decisions that are proportionate, evidence-based, reversible when possible, explicit about uncertainty, and clear about ownership. Intervene when action is justified. Observe when observation is justified. Change course when evidence changes. And allow competent accountability to become less central as the client becomes more capable of managing the process independently.

END OF STAGE 6 — WORKBOOK 6B: INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY JUDGMENT