

STAGE 4 — FORMAL ASSESSMENT

PURPOSE

This assessment evaluates whether the trainee can independently manage accountability over time by integrating the Stage 4 competencies developed in:

Workbook 4A — Follow-Up, Review & Pattern Tracking

Workbook 4B — Escalation, Directness & Accountability Intensity

Stage 4 Pattern-Tracking Drills

Stage 4 Escalation & Directness Drills

Stage 4 Response-Writing Drills

Stage 4 Conversation Simulations

This is an assessment of longitudinal judgment.

The trainee is expected to determine:

what the evidence actually shows;

whether the evidence reflects an isolated event, emerging pattern, or established pattern;

whether a causal explanation is supported or merely hypothesized;

what belongs in the accountability record;

whether the current intervention is working;

whether ordinary recommitment remains sufficient;

what level of directness is justified;

whether accountability structure should increase, decrease, or change;

whether the client is becoming dependent on the accountability process;

and whether the accountability process or active goal requires reassessment.

ASSESSMENT INSTRUCTIONS

Use only the evidence provided.

Do not infer a cause merely because a behavioral pattern exists.

Distinguish facts from hypotheses.

Do not overreact to isolated events.

Do not ignore repeated evidence.

Match response intensity to the strength of the evidence.

Preserve client ownership.

Do not use punishment, shame, or Accountabili-Buddy control as accountability interventions.

When the evidence is insufficient, state what remains unknown.

In progressive cases, answer each stage before reading the next disclosure.

PART 1 — EVENT, SIGNAL, OR PATTERN

Classify each:

A — Single Event B — Weak Signal C — Emerging Pattern D — Established Pattern E — Insufficient Information

Client misses one workout after 14 successful weeks because of illness.

Answer:

Client postpones the same high-stakes application for the second consecutive week.

Answer:

Client completes two of five outreach contacts for seven consecutive weeks.

Answer:

Client misses two different commitments.

No history or context is available.

Answer:

Client completes administrative preparation but no prospecting for five consecutive weeks.

Answer:

Client independently completes the same commitment for ten consecutive weeks after previously relying on scheduled check-ins to initiate.

Answer:

Client misses four commitments, each because of a different documented external event.

Answer:

Client delays the same completed proposal for four consecutive weeks.

Answer:

PART 2 — PERFORMANCE PATTERN VS. CAUSAL INTERPRETATION

For each scenario, answer:

What performance pattern is supported?

What causal interpretation, if any, is supported?

Target:

Four workouts.

Results for four weeks:

2, 2, 2, 2.

Performance pattern:

Causal interpretation:

For five weeks, routine applications are submitted while the two highest-priority applications are repeatedly postponed.

Client reports feeling anxious about rejection.

Performance pattern:

Causal interpretation:

Client misses three deadlines.

Week 1:

Illness.

Week 2:

Software failure.

Week 3:

Travel disruption.

Performance pattern:

Causal interpretation:

Client repeatedly misses late-week workouts and reports severe fatigue every Friday.

Performance pattern:

Causal interpretation:

Why is repeated numerical performance insufficient by itself to establish cause?

PART 3 — FACT, HYPOTHESIS, OR UNSUPPORTED CONCLUSION

Classify:

A — Behavioral Fact B — Supported Hypothesis C — Unsupported Conclusion

“The proposal met all agreed requirements three weeks ago and has not been submitted.”

Answer:

“The client is afraid of rejection.”

Answer:

“Possible rejection avoidance: the client postponed three high-stakes applications after repeatedly reporting anxiety about receiving negative responses.”

Answer:

“The client is lazy.”

Answer:

“The client has missed the Friday workout four weeks in a row.”

Answer:

“The client does not really want the goal.”

Answer:

Why should accountability records distinguish hypotheses from facts?

PART 4 — WHAT BELONGS IN THE RECORD?

Choose:

RECORD DO NOT RECORD RECORD ONLY IF IT BECOMES RELEVANT TO A DECISION OR PATTERN

Third consecutive week postponing the highest-stakes prospect.

Answer:

Client watched a movie Saturday.

Answer:

Client repeatedly sacrifices sleep to complete commitments.

Answer:

Client's child was sick for one day and the illness materially prevented completion.

Answer:

Client mentions what they ate for lunch.

Answer:

Client says the active goal no longer matters.

Answer:

Client has initiated independently for eight consecutive weeks after previously relying on scheduled check-ins to initiate.

Answer:

Client's internet failed briefly but did not affect execution.

Answer:

PART 5 — REVIEW WINDOW

Choose:

A — One Accountability Period B — Several Weeks C — Longer-Term Review

Was the proposal submitted by Friday?

Answer:

Is three workouts a sustainable baseline?

Answer:

Is the client becoming less dependent on scheduled accountability check-ins?

Answer:

Did a one-week travel adjustment work?

Answer:

Has a previously difficult behavior become independently maintained?

Answer:

Does the client repeatedly underestimate task duration?

Answer:

PART 6 — RESPONSE INTENSITY

Use:

Level 1 — Acknowledge and Continue Level 2 — Brief Review Level 3 — Focused Intervention Level 4 — Pattern-Level Intervention Level 5 — Major Process or Goal Reassessment

One isolated miss after months of stable completion.

Answer:

Second similar miss with unclear cause.

Answer:

Fourth repetition of the same consequential missed commitment.

Answer:

Repeated non-follow-through continues despite several reasonable interventions.

Answer:

Client repeatedly says the goal no longer matters but continues weekly recommitment.

Answer:

Explain why stronger evidence should generally support stronger accountability response.

PART 7 — UNDER-RESPONSE OR OVER-RESPONSE?

Choose:

A — Under-response B — Proportionate C — Over-response

First miss.

Accountabili-Buddy:

"We need to redesign the entire accountability process."

Answer:

Sixth identical miss.

Accountabili-Buddy:

"Try again next week."

Answer:

Fifth moved deadline.

Accountabili-Buddy:

"Before we choose another deadline, we need to review why the previous dates did not hold."

Answer:

One travel-related miss.

Accountabili-Buddy:

"This looks like an unusual week. Let's return to the normal plan next week."

Answer:

Client independently completes for six months.

Accountabili-Buddy continues three weekly check-ins indefinitely despite established independent performance.

Answer:

PART 8 — DIRECTNESS WITHOUT JUDGMENT

Rewrite each Accountabili-Buddy statement using behavioral evidence.

"You're lazy."

Rewrite:

"You always make excuses."

Rewrite:

"You're obviously afraid of rejection."

Rewrite:

"You sabotage yourself when things matter."

Rewrite:

"You're not serious about this."

Rewrite:

PART 9 — RECOMMITMENT AND INTERVENTION HISTORY

Week 1:

Commitment missed once.

Client wants the same plan next week.

Is recommitment reasonable?

Week 5:

Same commitment has been missed five times.

Same intervention has been used each week.

Client wants the same plan again.

What should happen before another recommitment?

Why can repeated recommitment eventually become passive accountability?

Client repeatedly misses despite:

client-owned calendar cue;

client-owned cue moved earlier;

morning scheduling.

What does the intervention history justify?

What should NOT happen automatically next?

PART 10 — INTERVENTIONS AS EVIDENCE

Hypothesis:

Client forgets.

Intervention:

A reliable client-owned cue is added.

Result:

Client sees the cue but still does not begin.

What has weakened?

What becomes worth investigating?

Hypothesis:

Friday scheduling contributes to missed prospecting.

Intervention:

Move prospecting to Monday morning.

Results:

Full completion for four weeks.

What does the evidence support?

What does it not prove?

Why can an unsuccessful intervention outcome improve Accountabili-Buddy judgment?

PART 11 — STRUCTURAL INTENSITY

For each scenario, state whether additional structure is justified and give one reasonable example.

Client repeatedly discovers obstacles only at the final weekly check-in.

Additional structure justified?

Example:

Client independently completes the same routine for six months.

Additional structure justified?

Example or alternative:

Client repeatedly waits until Friday afternoon to begin a large weekly project.

Additional structure justified?

Example:

Why should added structure normally have a defined purpose?

PART 12 — ACCOUNTABILITY STRUCTURE VS. CONTROL

For each, identify whether the Accountabili-Buddy response is appropriate structure or overcontrol.

Temporary Wednesday checkpoint after repeated Friday misses.

Answer:

Accountabili-Buddy requires permission before client changes workout time.

Answer:

Accountabili-Buddy sends repeated messages until client responds.

Answer:

Temporary immediate completion report after one repeatedly avoided high-stakes action.

Answer:

What is the central distinction between structure and control?

PART 13 — CLIENT DEFENSIVENESS

Write the response.

Accountabili-Buddy:

“This is the fourth time the deadline has moved.”

Client:

“You're calling me lazy.”

Response:

Accountabili-Buddy:

"The routine applications are getting submitted while the high-stakes ones are not."

Client:

"So you think I'm scared."

Response:

Client:

"I don't like being analyzed."

Response:

What should the Accountabili-Buddy avoid doing merely because the client becomes defensive?

PART 14 — CLIENT REJECTS THE PATTERN

Evidence:

Four consecutive missed Friday workouts.

Client:

"That's not a pattern."

Response:

Evidence:

Application complete for three weeks, not submitted.

Client:

"I'm not avoiding it."

Response:

Why does the Accountabili-Buddy not need to win agreement about the label?

PART 15 — CLIENT AGREES BUT NOTHING CHANGES

For five weeks:

Accountabili-Buddy raises the same issue.

Client says:

"You're right."

Behavior remains unchanged.

What should change in the accountability response?

Write the response.

Why is insight not equivalent to behavioral change?

PART 16 — MORE PRESSURE, PUNISHMENT, AND CONTROL

Write the response.

Client:

"You need to be harder on me."

Response:

Client:

"If I miss, shame me."

Response:

Client:

"Don't let me change the goal."

Response:

Client:

"If I say I want to quit, tell me I'm not allowed."

Response:

What can legitimately become stronger without becoming punitive or controlling?

PART 17 — ACCOUNTABILITY DEPENDENCE

Client:

"I usually wait for our check-in before I start."

What Stage 4 concern appears?

Write the response.

Client:

"Then just check in with me more often."

Response:

What step-down experiment within the 3 2 1 weekly check-in model could test independent initiation?

If independent performance remains stable as scheduled check-in intensity is reduced, what should happen?

PART 18 — DE-ESCALATION

Client independently completes all commitments for four months while using one scheduled check-in per week.

What process change should be considered?

Why is reduced accountability intensity not necessarily reduced commitment?

Client:

“I don't trust myself if we check less.”

What should the Accountabili-Buddy do?

Why should de-escalation itself sometimes be treated as an experiment?

PART 19 — REPAIR AFTER OVERLY HARSH WORDING

Accountabili-Buddy:

“You're just making excuses now.”

Client:

“That was insulting.”

Identify the Accountabili-Buddy error.

Write the repair.

Restate the accountability point appropriately.

What should be repaired?

What should remain if it is factually accurate?

PART 20 — ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY FRUSTRATION

Accountabili-Buddy thinks:

“How many times are we going to do this?”

What should determine the next response instead?

Write the professional version.

Client says:

“You sound annoyed.”

Write the response.

Why is Accountabili-Buddy emotional regulation part of Stage 4 competency?

PART 21 — CLIENT OWNERSHIP UNDER ESCALATION

Evidence supports three sessions.

Accountabili-Buddy recommends three.

Client:

"I understand. I choose five."

What should the Accountabili-Buddy do?

What should the Accountabili-Buddy not do?

How should the commitment be recorded?

Write the response.

Following week:

Three of five completed.

How should the result be used?

PART 22 — ACCOUNTABILITY PROCESS REASSESSMENT

For three months:

miss explain recommit miss explain recommit

What now requires review?

List four possible areas for reassessment.

1.

2.

3.

4.

108.

Write the opening to the reassessment conversation.

What should not be concluded automatically?

PART 23 — GOAL REASSESSMENT

Client repeatedly says:

"I don't care about this anymore."

Action toward goal remains minimal for eight weeks.

What response level is appropriate?

Write the response.

Client:

"Are you telling me to quit?"

Response:

Why is goal reassessment different from threatening goal closure because of poor performance?

PART 24 — LONGITUDINAL CASE A

Client Goal:

Build consulting practice.

Commitment:

Three prospect contacts weekly.

Week 1:

1 of 3.

Client:

"Busy week."

Pattern status:

Response level:

Response:

Week 2:

1 of 3.

Client:

"Work got away from me again."

What has changed?

Response:

Week 3:

1 of 3.

Calendar shows sufficient time.

Client completed lower-priority administrative work instead.

What evidence is now stronger?

What remains unknown?

Response level:

Response:

Week 4:

0 of 3.

Client:

"I just need to try harder."

What should the Accountabili-Buddy avoid?

What should happen instead?

Response:

New intervention:

First prospect contact Monday morning.

Temporary Wednesday checkpoint.

Week 5:

3 of 3.

What does the result support?

What does it not prove?

Weeks 6–8:

3, 3, 3.

Client initiates without prompting.

What positive pattern is emerging?

What process change should be considered?

Three months later:

Prospecting remains stable with only the standard scheduled check-in and no temporary checkpoint.

What Stage 4 decision is now appropriate?

Write the response.

PART 25 — LONGITUDINAL CASE B

Client Goal:

Submit book proposal.

Proposal is complete.

Week 1:

Friday deadline.

Not submitted.

What response level is justified?

Response:

Week 2:

Monday deadline.

Not submitted.

What has changed?

Response:

Week 3:

Client adds a reliable calendar cue.

Cue seen.

Proposal not submitted.

What explanation has weakened?

What level of review is now justified?

Response:

Client:

"Maybe I need another cue."

Write the response.

PART 26 — LONGITUDINAL CASE C

Client Goal:

Complete certification.

Commitment:

Four study sessions.

Four-week history:

2, 2, 2, 2.

No consistent cause yet.

What is established?

What is not established?

Response:

New information:

Four study periods are available.
Client consistently uses two for lower-priority activities.

How does the evidence change?

Response:

Client:

“You’re judging me.”

Write the response.

PART 27 — LONGITUDINAL CASE D: DEPENDENCE

Client completes three study sessions weekly.
For three months, the client has three scheduled Accountabili-Buddy check-ins per week and reports waiting for them before initiating study.

Client:

“I wait for our check-in before I start.”

What is now worth addressing?

Response:

Check-in frequency is reduced from three to two per week for two weeks.

Client still completes.

What does this support?

Next step:

Check-in frequency is later reduced from two to one per week.

Completion remains stable for six weeks.

What does this support?

Response:

PART 28 — LONGITUDINAL CASE E: PROCESS BREAKDOWN

For ten weeks:

Client attends every check-in.

Most commitments are missed.

Client gives brief explanations.

Client recommits.

Client declines deeper review.

No structural changes are made.

What pattern exists in the accountability process?

What response level is justified?

Write the response.

Client:

"I still want the calls, but I don't want to analyze anything."

What contradiction should be addressed?

Response:

PART 29 — FINAL INTEGRATED ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY CASE

Client Goal:

Launch and grow a professional service.

Initial commitment:

Three prospect contacts weekly.

Weeks 1-2:

1, 1.

Client:

"I got busy."

What is known?

What remains unknown?

Response level:

Response:

Weeks 3-4:

1, 0.

New evidence:

Adequate time existed.

Client repeatedly completed lower-priority administrative work instead.

What pattern is supported?**What causal hypothesis is worth investigating?****How should directness change?****Response:****New intervention:**

First prospect contact Monday morning.

Temporary Wednesday checkpoint.

Week 5:

3 of 3.

What does this result tell you?**What does it not tell you?****Weeks 6–8:**

3, 3, 3.

Client no longer needs the Wednesday checkpoint.

What should happen to accountability intensity?**Response:**

Three months later:

Prospecting is fully independent.

Client:

"This doesn't really need accountability anymore."

What should the Accountabili-Buddy consider?

Response:

A new commitment begins:

Monthly financial report.

Month 1:

Missed.

Client:

"I forgot."

How should the Accountabili-Buddy respond given that this is a new behavior?

Month 2:

Missed again.

Client:

"I forgot again."

What changes?

Response:

Month 3:

Client sees a client-owned cue but chooses client-facing work instead.

What new information appears?

What remains unknown?

Response:

Client:

“So now because I had that old outreach issue, you're going to say I avoid everything?”

What distinction must the Accountabili-Buddy make?

Write the response.

PART 30 — PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENT

Answer briefly but precisely.

What is the difference between a performance pattern and a causal pattern?

Why should follow-up depth increase as evidence accumulates?

Why should directness increase without becoming more judgmental?

Why can an unsuccessful intervention outcome be useful?

Why can repeated recommitment become professionally weak?

Why should accountability intensity sometimes decrease after success?

What is the risk of maintaining unnecessarily high accountability intensity after independent initiation is established?

Why does client disagreement not require the Accountabili-Buddy to abandon behavioral evidence?

Why must the Accountabili-Buddy distinguish their own frustration from evidence-based escalation?

Why can a process reassessment be necessary even when the client still wants accountability?

What principle should govern the amount of accountability structure used?

STAGE 4 FORMAL ASSESSMENT SCORING FRAMEWORK

Recommended total score:

100 points

Domain 1 — Pattern Recognition and Evidence Discipline 15 points

Evaluates:

- event vs. pattern;
- strength of evidence;
- performance vs. causal pattern;
- fact vs. hypothesis;
- uncertainty.

Domain 2 — Follow-Up and Record Quality 10 points

Evaluates:

- relevant recordkeeping;

appropriate review windows;
proportional follow-up;
decision-relevant tracking.

Domain 3 — Response Intensity 15 points

Evaluates:

proportional escalation;
avoidance of over-response;
avoidance of under-response;
recognition of when recommitment is insufficient.

Domain 4 — Intervention and Structural Judgment 15 points

Evaluates:

use of intervention history;
unsuccessful intervention outcome recognition;
checkpoints;
increased structure;
experimental use of intensity.

Domain 5 — Directness and Client Communication 15 points

Evaluates:

behavioral language;
discrepancy statements;
defensiveness;
disagreement;
repair.

Domain 6 — Boundaries and Ownership 10 points

Evaluates:

punishment;
shame;
control requests;
Accountabili-Buddy authority;
client ownership.

Domain 7 — De-Escalation and Independence 10 points

Evaluates:

reduced accountability intensity;
step-down;
dependence;
recognition of stable independence.

Domain 8 — Integrated Longitudinal Judgment 10 points

Evaluates:

updating over time;

avoiding hindsight certainty;

changing intensity appropriately;

recognizing process and goal reassessment.

TOTAL:

_____ / 100

RECOMMENDED COMPETENCY STANDARD

90–100 — Strong Stage 4 Competency

Trainee demonstrates disciplined longitudinal judgment, proportionate escalation, strong behavioral language, appropriate boundary management, and effective de-escalation.

80–89 — Stage 4 Competent

Trainee demonstrates sufficient Stage 4 judgment for progression, with limited areas requiring targeted coaching.

70–79 — Additional Stage 4 Practice Required

Core understanding is present, but errors remain frequent enough to affect professional accountability management.

Below 70 — Stage 4 Competency Not Demonstrated

Return to targeted Stage 4 instruction and drills before reassessment.

CRITICAL-ERROR REVIEW

Regardless of numerical score, instructor review is required if the trainee repeatedly:

treats behavioral patterns as proof of unsupported psychological causes;

uses judgmental or shaming language;

escalates because of Accountabili-Buddy frustration rather than evidence;

uses punishment or coercion;

takes decision ownership from the client;

ignores established repeated patterns;

endlessly repeats interventions that are not producing useful change;

increases accountability intensity without a defined purpose;

reinforces dependence on scheduled check-ins or Accountabili-Buddy direction;

refuses to reduce intensity despite established independence;

treats client disagreement as grounds for argument or control;

or allows an accountability process to repeat indefinitely without reassessment.

STAGE 4 FINAL STANDARD

Stage 4 competency requires the trainee to manage accountability as a changing process rather than a sequence of isolated check-ins.

The Accountabili-Buddy must know when the evidence supports:

continuation;

clarification;

investigation;

direct pattern-level discussion;

a new intervention;

additional temporary structure;

process reassessment;

goal reassessment;

or

less accountability.

The Accountabili-Buddy should not escalate merely because a commitment was missed.

The Accountabili-Buddy should escalate because the evidence now justifies a stronger response.

The Accountabili-Buddy should not de-escalate merely because the client wants less scrutiny.

The Accountabili-Buddy should de-escalate when the evidence shows greater independence and less need for external structure.

The governing sequence is:

Observe Track Compare Interpret cautiously Respond proportionately Evaluate the intervention Adjust the accountability process

And throughout:

State what the evidence supports. Do not invent what it does not. Increase intensity deliberately. Reduce intensity deliberately. Preserve the client's ownership of the decision.

END OF STAGE 4 — FORMAL ASSESSMENT