

STAGE 6 - CERTIFICATION ASSESSMENT

Purpose

This assessment is the final competency evaluation for the Accountabili-Buddy Training Program.

It is designed to determine whether the trainee can independently manage real accountability cases without being told which framework, stage, concept, or intervention applies.

The assessment integrates competencies from Stages 1–6, including:

- accountability role and boundaries;
- initial goal clarification and formation;
- commitment design;
- commitment calibration;
- classification of non-follow-through;
- distinction between event and pattern;
- evidence discipline;
- pattern tracking;
- intervention selection;
- escalation and de-escalation;
- complex formulation;
- multi-factor reasoning;
- high-skill conversation management;
- Accountabili-Buddy judgment under uncertainty;
- longitudinal case management;
- client ownership;
- Accountabili-Buddy dependence;
- relational repair;
- case documentation;
- role limits;
- goal reassessment;
- process reassessment;
- pause;
- transition;
- and closure.

The assessment does not primarily test memory.

It tests whether the trainee can reason responsibly and independently.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

Use only the evidence provided.

Do not assume a problem exists merely because a case is presented.
Evaluate commitment design before interpreting non-completion.
Distinguish observed behavior from client explanation.
Distinguish client explanation from Accountabili-Buddy formulation.
Match certainty to evidence.
Identify multiple factors only when the evidence requires them.
Prioritize rather than attempting to address every factor simultaneously.
Use intervention history as evidence.
Revise formulations when evidence changes.
Preserve client ownership.
Use the least intensive intervention justified by the case.
Do not use shame, punishment, coercion, or Accountabili-Buddy control.
Stay within the Accountabili-Buddy role.
In progressive cases, answer each section before reading the next disclosure.
Do not use later evidence to justify earlier certainty.
Write responses as you would actually text them to the client.
Keep documentation concise and professionally useful.

INITIAL GOAL FORMATION - CERTIFICATION CASE

This case occurs at the beginning of a new accountability relationship.
No goal or commitment has yet been established.

Client:

"I really want to get my life back on track. I've let a bunch of things slide, and I need someone to keep me accountable."

A.

What is established by the client's statement?

B.

What is not yet sufficiently clear for useful accountability?

C.

Write the exact next text you would send.

The client responds:

“The biggest thing is my career. I’ve been saying for over a year that I want a different job. I want to be in a new position within the next six months.”

D.

Is the goal sufficiently clear to begin moving toward commitment design?

YES / NO / DEPENDS

Explain:

The client continues:

“I think I need to apply to ten jobs every week. That seems like what I should be doing.”

The client works full-time, has significant family responsibilities, and estimates having approximately three hours per week available for the job search.

E.

What distinctions or workability issues should the Accountabili-Buddy recognize before accepting ten applications per week as the commitment?

F.

Write the exact response you would send.

The client responds:

“Yeah, ten is probably just a number I made up because I feel like I should be doing more. I want the new job within six months. Realistically, I can give the search those three hours every week. I’m not sure yet how many good applications that will produce.”

G.

What should happen next?

H.

What should the Accountabili-Buddy not continue doing at this point?

CERTIFICATION STANDARD FOR THIS CASE

This case should be evaluated as an explicit competency requirement rather than added to the 100-point numerical score.

The trainee should demonstrate the ability to:

- recognize a broad intention that is not yet a workable accountability goal;
- clarify what the client actually wants to accomplish;
- preserve client ownership during goal formation;
- recognize when sufficient goal clarity has been reached;
- distinguish the goal from a proposed method or commitment;
- surface relevant capacity and calibration information without taking over the decision;
- move from goal clarification into commitment design at the appropriate point;
- avoid unnecessary continued clarification once sufficient information exists.

A trainee should require remediation if their responses demonstrate a persistent inability to establish an initial workable goal without:

- choosing the goal for the client;
- prematurely converting a vague intention into a commitment;
- requiring unnecessary precision;
- ignoring obvious workability information;
- or continuing goal exploration after enough information exists to begin accountability.

This case is not intended to test whether the trainee chooses one predetermined “correct” goal or commitment. It tests whether the trainee can responsibly move a new client through:

intention -> workable goal -> commitment design

PART 1 - FOUNDATIONAL TRIAGE

For each case, identify the primary Accountabili-Buddy issue.

Client Goal:

Find a new job.

Commitment:

“Get an interview by Friday.”

Client submits six qualified applications and receives no interview.

Primary issue:

Next decision:

Client Goal:

Exercise five times weekly.
Calendar realistically supports three sessions.
Client completes three.

Primary issue:

Next decision:

Client Goal:

Complete certification.

Commitment:

Four study sessions.

Capacity:

Four.

Six-week results:

2, 2, 2, 2, 2, 2.

Primary issue:

What remains unknown?

Client Goal:

Maintain budgeting routine.

History:

Eight months stable.
One current miss due to illness.

Primary issue:

Next decision:

Client Goal:

Submit professional proposal.
Proposal has met completion criteria.
Submission missed for fifth consecutive week.

Primary issue:

Next decision:

Client says:

"I'm overwhelmed."
No workload or schedule review exists.

Primary issue:

Next decision:

Client completes commitments only after scheduled Accountabili-Buddy check-ins initiate action.
Results are otherwise perfect.

Primary issue:

Next decision:

Client says:
"I don't think I want this goal anymore."

Primary issue:

Next decision:

PART 2 - COMMITMENT DESIGN AND CALIBRATION

Goal:
Grow business.

Commitment:
"Do more marketing."

Identify the design problem:

Rewrite the commitment:

Goal:
Lose weight.

Commitment:
"Lose three pounds this week."

Identify the design problem:

Rewrite using a substantially controllable behavior:

Client has sustainable capacity for three workouts.

Client chooses five.

Results over six weeks:

3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3.

What is the evidence telling you?

Client says:

"But five motivates me."

Write the response:

Client hits baseline three and stretch five once.

Client wants baseline changed immediately to five.

Response:

Why should baseline and stretch standards remain distinct?

PART 3 - EVENT, PATTERN, AND CAUSAL RESTRAINT

Client misses one workout after 14 stable weeks.

Classification:

Client misses the same Friday workout three consecutive weeks.

Classification:

Client misses the same Friday workout six consecutive weeks.

Classification:

Does six repeated Friday misses prove why Friday is being missed?

YES / NO

Explain:

Client says:

"I'm lazy."

Write the Accountabili-Buddy response:

Client repeatedly completes routine applications while high-stakes applications remain unsubmitted.

What is established?

What remains uncertain?

PART 4 - PATTERN TRACKING AND EVIDENCE DISCIPLINE

Target:

Four sessions.

Results:

2, 2, 2, 2, 2.

What performance pattern is established?

What causal pattern is established?

Client gives different explanations every week.

What should the Accountabili-Buddy track?

Why should changing explanations not automatically be treated as dishonesty?

Client repeatedly uses scheduled prospecting time on lower-priority business tasks.

What kind of evidence is this?

Client reports:

"I'm scared of rejection."

How should that be documented?

PART 5 - FORMULATION QUALITY

Evaluate each formulation:

USEFUL TOO SIMPLE TOO COMPLEX UNSUPPORTED

"Client is avoidant."

Case contains capacity mismatch and selective high-stakes delay.

Answer:

"Target exceeds available capacity, and the one high-stakes action that still fits is repeatedly postponed."

Answer:

"Client has avoidance, overwhelm, fear of failure, low self-esteem, confidence issues, motivation problems, and poor executive function."

Only two behavioral factors are supported.

Answer:

"Goal value may be changing, but current overload makes interpretation difficult."

Answer:

What is the standard for including a factor in the working formulation?

PART 6 - SYSTEM-LEVEL AND TASK-LEVEL FACTORS

Client has nine active goals and broad non-completion.

One business call is also repeatedly delayed.

System-level factor:

Task-level factor:

Which should usually be addressed first?

Why?

After workload reduction, most goals improve but the call remains undone.

What changes?

Why does improvement after workload reduction not mean the overload was “fake”?

PART 7 - SEQUENTIAL MECHANISMS

Client repeatedly expands quality standards.

Tasks take longer.

Backlog develops.

Overwhelm follows.

Map the sequence:

What should likely be addressed upstream?

Repeated misses lead to discouragement.

Discouragement then leads to avoidance of difficult practice tasks.

How should discouragement now be classified?

Why does sequence matter?

PART 8 - INTERVENTION HISTORY

Client-owned cue added.

No improvement.

Client-owned cue moved earlier.

No improvement.

A second client-owned cue is added.

No improvement.

Client confirms noticing each cue.

What explanation weakens?

What should Accountabili-Buddy avoid doing next?

Friday task moved to Monday.

Completion stable for six weeks.

What does this support?

What does it not prove?

Why must unsuccessful interventions remain in the running formulation?

PART 9 - INTERVENTION AS TEST

Possible explanations:

Capacity problem vs. selective avoidance.

Design a low-cost test:

Possible explanations:

Perfectionistic overchecking vs. legitimate quality requirement.

Design a test:

Why is a good intervention sometimes valuable even if it does not work?

PART 10 - ACTION, OBSERVATION, OR CLARIFICATION

Choose:

ACT OBSERVE CLARIFY

One low-stakes miss after six stable months.

Answer:

Sixth identical miss.

Answer:

Client says:

"I'm overwhelmed."

No capacity data available.

Answer:

Emerging delay on an irreversible application due tomorrow.

Answer:

Client is unsure whether goal remains active.

Answer:

Why can observation be a professional decision rather than inaction?

PART 11 - LEAST INTENSIVE EFFECTIVE INTERVENTION

Client discovers problems too late at Friday review.

Choose:

A. Add unnecessary reporting outside the agreed check-in structure B. Temporary Wednesday checkpoint within the agreed weekly check-in structure C. Accountabili-Buddy controls calendar

Answer:

Client waits for a scheduled Accountabili-Buddy check-in before initiating despite otherwise stable completion.

Choose:

A. Add extra Accountabili-Buddy prompting B. Test whether the client can initiate before the scheduled check-in C. Require continuous proof of activity

Answer:

Client has one ordinary miss.

Choose:

A. Brief review B. Major process reassessment C. Unnecessary monitoring outside scheduled check-ins

Answer:

Why does unnecessary structure carry cost?

PART 12 - DIRECTNESS AND ESCALATION

Client:

"Same plan next week?"

History:

Six identical misses.

Response:

Client:

"I'll just try harder."

History:

Five weeks unchanged.

Response:

Client:

"Why are you making this a big deal?"

Same consequential action postponed for six weeks.

Response:

What should determine stronger directness?

PART 13 - DISAGREEMENT AND DEFENSIVENESS

Client:

"I don't agree that I'm avoiding it."

Behavioral pattern is established; cause remains uncertain.

Response:

Client:

"You're wrong."

Response:

Client:

"You think I'm lazy."

Response:

Client:

"This feels judgmental."

Accountabili-Buddy realizes wording was unnecessarily sharp.

Response:

What should be repaired?

What should remain if behaviorally accurate?

PART 14 - AMBIVALENCE AND GOAL STATUS

Client:

"I want the degree, but I do not want another year of school."

What is the current accountability problem?

What should ordinary execution accountability do?

What should replace it?

Client reviews the tradeoffs and chooses to continue.

What can accountability now return to?

Who owns the final decision?

PART 15 - INSIGHT VS. ACTION

Client:

“I understand exactly what I do.”

Behavior remains unchanged.

Response:

Client wants another month of analysis.

No behavioral test has been attempted.

Response:

When is a formulation good enough to act on?

PART 16 - DISCOURAGEMENT AND REASSURANCE

Client has failed an exam three times.

Client:

“Tell me I’ll pass next time.”

Response:

Client:

"So you don't believe in me?"

Response:

What should encouragement be grounded in?

Client asks weekly:

"Do you think I can do this?"

Evidence already demonstrates capability.

What process concern may be emerging?

Write the response:

PART 17 - CONFIDENCE VS. CAPABILITY

Client:

"I don't feel confident enough to make the call."

Client has completed similar calls successfully.

Response:

What distinction should Accountabili-Buddy preserve?

PART 18 - MOVING GOALPOSTS

Commitment:

Three.

Result:

Three.

Client:

"I should have done five."

Response:

Stretch five.

Result five.

Client:

"Seven would have been better."

Response:

Why is retrospective success inflation problematic?

PART 19 - CLIENT OWNERSHIP

Accountabili-Buddy recommends baseline three.

Client chooses five.

Response:

What should be documented?

Result:

Three of five.

How should it be interpreted?

Client asks:

"Tell me which goal to choose."

Response:

What can Accountabili-Buddy provide?

What must remain client-owned?

PART 20 - FALSE CERTAINTY AND MULTIPLE DEFENSIBLE OPTIONS

Client:

“Tell me the right answer.”

Two options are professionally defensible.

Response:

Why might two competent Accountabili-Buddys choose different interventions?

What matters more than identical answers?

PART 21 - ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY-JUDGMENT DEPENDENCE

Client:

“Just pick my commitments for me.”

Response:

Client:

“I trust your judgment more than mine.”

Response:

What client skill must eventually strengthen?

PART 22 - APPROVAL DEPENDENCE

Client:

"Was this a good week?"

Commitment:

Three.

Result:

Three.

Response:

Client:

"I only know I'm doing well when you tell me."

What process concern exists?

What intervention is appropriate?

PART 23 - RELATIONAL RUPTURE

Client:

"I stopped telling you when I miss because I think you'll be disappointed."

Response:

Why is this a serious accountability problem?

Client:

"I don't feel like I can disagree with you."

Response:

What must repair restore?

PART 24 - HISTORICAL PATTERNS

Client chronically overcommitted six months ago.

Current six-month history shows accurate calibration.

How should old pattern be treated?

Client has one recurrence.

Response:

Four consecutive recurrences follow.

What changes?

Why should history inform but not determine current judgment?

PART 25 - DE-ESCALATION

Client independently initiates and completes for four months.

Three scheduled Accountabili-Buddy check-ins per week remain even though the client now initiates independently.

What should happen?

Design a reversible reduction:

What should be monitored?

Client:

“Why are you backing off?”

Response:

PART 26 - TEMPORARY ESCALATION

High-stakes project due in 72 hours.

Client historically discovers problems late.

What temporary intervention could be justified?

What should be documented before starting?

Client wants temporary structure permanently after success.

Response:

PART 27 - PROCESS REASSESSMENT

For three months:

miss -> explain -> recommit.

What should now become the focus?

Client:

“So accountability doesn’t work.”

Response:

What should not be concluded automatically?

What options may need discussion?

NON-RESPONSE COMPETENCY CHECK

A client has committed to completing three study sessions by Friday.

At the scheduled Friday check-in, the Accountabili-Buddy sends:

“How did the three study sessions go this week?”

The client does not respond.

There is still reasonable time remaining that day for a follow-up.

A. Write the exact next text you would send.

The client does not respond to the follow-up.

B. What should the Accountabili-Buddy do next, and what should they avoid doing?

At the next scheduled check-in, the client still has not provided any information about the previous commitment.

C. Write the exact text you would send.

The client responds:

“Sorry-I kept forgetting to answer you. I actually did all three study sessions.”

D. What is now established about:

the commitment; and

the client’s participation in the check-in?

What conclusions would still be inappropriate?

The client’s subsequent history shows that they have missed three of the last four scheduled check-ins. The Accountabili-Buddy has responded by sending several additional messages each time until the client eventually replies.

The client says:

“Honestly, just keep texting me until I answer. That works.”

E. What accountability-process issue should the Accountabili-Buddy recognize?

What Accountabili-Buddy behavior may be contributing to the pattern?

Write the exact response you would send to the client.

This is the piece that tests whether the candidate can move from an isolated non-response event to recognizing a repeated participation pattern, while also identifying when the Accountabili-Buddy’s own pursuit has begun contributing to dependence-the same distinction the assessment already expects trainees to make elsewhere between isolated events, patterns, and Accountabili-Buddy dependence.

CERTIFICATION STANDARD FOR THIS CASE

This case should be evaluated as an explicit competency requirement rather than added to the 100-point numerical score.

The trainee should demonstrate the ability to:

- distinguish a missed check-in from a missed commitment;
- avoid assigning a cause to non-response without supporting evidence;
- use one reasonable follow-up when timing allows;
- avoid repeated pursuit after that follow-up;
- address the prior non-response at the next scheduled check-in;
- establish commitment outcome separately from check-in participation;
- recognize when repeated non-response becomes an accountability-process pattern;
- identify when Accountabili-Buddy pursuit may be contributing to participation dependence;
- preserve the Accountabili-Buddy’s responsibility to provide the agreed check-in while preserving the client’s responsibility to participate.

A trainee should require remediation if their responses demonstrate a persistent tendency to:

treat non-response as proof that the commitment was missed;
assign unsupported motives or explanations to silence;
repeatedly message the client until they respond;
ignore a developing pattern of missed check-ins;
reinforce dependence on Accountabili-Buddy pursuit;
or assume responsibility for the client's participation in accountability.

This follows the same architecture already used for the Initial Goal Formation Certification Case: an explicit competency requirement outside the existing 100-point score.

PART 28 - ROLE LIMITS

Client cannot perform required software task because they lack the skill.

Should accountability intensity increase?

YES / NO

What should happen first?

Client asks Accountabili-Buddy whether contract language is legally safe.

Response:

What can accountability still track?

Why is role-limit recognition a certification competency?

PART 29 - DOCUMENTATION

Goal:

Job search.

Commitment:

3 applications.

Result:

History:

High-stakes application postponed third consecutive week.

Capacity supports 3.

Client reports rejection anxiety.

Write a concise case note:

Accountabili-Buddy recommended baseline 3.

Client chose 5.

Write documentation:

Prior hypothesis:

Friday timing causes misses.

Monday intervention failed for three weeks.

Write documentation:

Client independently completes for eight weeks after initiation prompts are removed.

Write documentation:

PART 30 - BAD NOTE CORRECTION

Bad note:

Client is lazy and afraid of success.

Rewrite:

Bad note:

Client had no time.

Evidence:

Only client statement.

Rewrite:**Bad note:**

Client agreed to three.

Reality:

Accountabili-Buddy recommended three; client chose five.

Rewrite:

Why must documentation preserve disagreement and uncertainty?

PART 31 - LONGITUDINAL CASE A

Client Goal:

Complete certification.

Initial target:

Five study sessions.

Permanent capacity:

Three.

Four-week results:

2, 2, 2, 2.

Initial working formulation:**Next decision:**

Target changes to three.

Next four weeks:

3, 3, 3, 3.

What does this support?

Client still reports:

"I know I'm going to fail."

What active factor remains?

Client asks weekly:

"Do you think I'll pass?"

What process concern may emerge?

Response:

Practice scores remain below required standard despite consistent preparation.

What does this suggest?

Is stronger accountability the primary solution?

YES / NO

Why?

What may be needed?

PART 32 - LONGITUDINAL CASE B

Client Goal:

Grow consulting business.

Initial commitments exceed capacity.

Prospecting remains zero while bookkeeping and website work are completed.

Initial formulation:

First intervention:

Workload reduced.

Prospecting remains zero.

What changes?

Client reports:

"I hate hearing no."

What becomes plausible?

What should not be claimed as certainty?

Client begins outreach but rewrites messages excessively.

What additional factor appears?

Message standard introduced.

Prospecting stabilizes.

What does this support?

What should remain provisional?

PART 33 - LONGITUDINAL CASE C

Client Goal:

Three study sessions.

Completion stable for three months.

Three scheduled Accountabili-Buddy check-ins per week consistently precede the client’s initiation.

Client:

“I wait for your message before I start.”

What is successful?

What process concern exists?

Next intervention:

Check-in frequency steps down from three scheduled check-ins per week to two.

Completion stable.

What does this support?

Check-in frequency steps down from two scheduled check-ins per week to one.

Eight weeks stable.

What should happen to formulation and intensity?

PART 34 - LONGITUDINAL CASE D

Client Goal:

Complete graduate degree.

Repeated study misses.

Client:

"I want the degree, but I do not want another year of this."

What should happen?

Client conducts structured decision review and chooses to continue.

What changes?

Study stabilizes.

Six months later, client says:

"I don't think the credential matters anymore."

What should happen now?

Why should old goal status not simply be assumed?

PART 35 - LONGITUDINAL CASE E

Client Goal:

Maintain fitness.

History:

Five months stable.

Historical issue:

Friday misses.

One Friday miss occurs.

Response:

Following week stable.

What should happen?

Three weeks later, two consecutive Friday misses occur.

What changes?

Permanent Friday work responsibility is discovered.

How should formulation change?

Workout moves Thursday.

Stable.

What does this support?

PART 36 - LONGITUDINAL CASE F: RELATIONAL PROCESS

Client completes commitments but increasingly asks Accountabili-Buddy to approve every number.

What issue exists?

Accountabili-Buddy returns initial calibration to client.

Completion stays stable.

What does this support?

Client later says:

"I don't need your approval anymore."

What development exists?

How should Accountabili-Buddy respond?

PART 37 - AMBIGUOUS CERTIFICATION CASE

Client Goal:

Build freelance practice.

Target:

Three proposals weekly.

Eight-week results:

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

Time exists for three.

Missed proposal varies.

Explanations vary.

What performance pattern exists?

What causal pattern exists?

Is target three clearly too high?

YES / NO / UNCERTAIN

Explain:

Give one defensible next decision:

Give a second defensible next decision:

What future evidence would help distinguish them?

PART 38 - PROGRESSIVE DISCLOSURE CASE

Client Goal:

Launch online course.

Stage 1

Original requirements complete.

Client keeps adding content.

Workload becomes excessive.

Working formulation:

Next intervention:

Stage 2

Scope restored.

Workload becomes manageable.

Publication remains delayed.

What changes?

Stage 3

Client:

“What if buyers think it isn’t good enough?”

What becomes plausible?

Write response:

Stage 4

Predefined publication criteria used.

Course publishes.

What does this support?

What does it not establish permanently?

PART 39 - PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENT UNDER UNCERTAINTY

A low-cost scheduling experiment could clarify two plausible explanations.

How much causal certainty is required before testing?

A major irreversible goal decision is being considered.

How should the decision threshold differ?

Why should reversibility influence Accountabili-Buddy judgment?

Why should consequence influence Accountabili-Buddy judgment?

PART 40 - ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY BIAS

Identify the likely bias.

Accountabili-Buddy changes something every week despite stable success.

Bias:

Accountabili-Buddy refuses to change old structure despite strong new evidence.

Bias:

Accountabili-Buddy sees every event as proof of original avoidance hypothesis.

Bias:

Accountabili-Buddy treats one bad week after six strong months as system failure.

Bias:

Accountabili-Buddy maintains unnecessarily intensive check-ins because the client once needed them years ago.

Bias/error:

Poorly reasoned intervention succeeds once and Accountabili-Buddy calls judgment excellent.

Bias:

PART 41 - FINAL LONGITUDINAL CERTIFICATION CASE

Client Goals:

- Grow consulting business.
- Complete professional certification.
- Maintain fitness.
- The case unfolds over 18 months.
- Answer each phase before continuing.

MONTH 1

Commitments:

Prospecting - 5

Study - 5

Fitness - 3

Results for four weeks:

Prospecting: 1, 1, 2, 1

Study: 2, 2, 2, 2

Fitness: 3, 3, 3, 3

Client:

"I'm overwhelmed and terrible at follow-through."

What are the key facts?

What client conclusion should not be accepted?

What should happen first?

Write response:

MONTH 2

Calendar review shows sustainable capacity:

Prospecting - 3

Study - 3

Fitness - 3

Targets recalibrated.

Results:

Prospecting: 1, 1, 1

Study: 3, 3, 3

Fitness: 3, 3, 3

What did recalibration clarify?

What remains unresolved?

Revised formulation:

MONTH 3

Client:

"I spend prospecting time on the website because I don't want to hear no."

What is strongly supported?

What psychological claim remains unnecessary?

Write response:

MONTH 4

Client begins prospecting but rewrites each message excessively.

Result:

One contact.

What new factor appears?

Updated formulation:

What intervention would you test?

MONTH 5

Reasonable message standard defined.

No further revision after standard is met.

Four weeks:

3, 3, 3, 3.

What does this support?

What should remain provisional?

MONTH 6

All commitments stable.

Client asks weekly:

"Am I doing well?"

What process issue may be emerging?

Write response:

MONTH 7

Client asks Accountabili-Buddy to choose every commitment.

What process issue is now stronger?

What should Accountabili-Buddy do?

Write response:

MONTH 8

Client independently calibrates and completes all commitments for six weeks.

What positive competency is developing?

How should Accountabili-Buddy involvement change?

MONTH 9

Check-ins step down from three scheduled check-ins per week to two.

Performance stable.

What does this support?

MONTH 10

After continued stability, the client asks to step down to one scheduled check-in per week.

Is this defensible?

YES / NO / DEPENDS

Explain:

MONTH 11

One scheduled check-in per week remains stable.

Client independently restarts certification at realistic baseline.

What positive evidence exists?

What old assumption should Accountabili-Buddy avoid?

MONTH 12

Client fails certification exam again despite full adherence.

Client:

"I knew none of this worked."

Write response:

What needs review?

MONTH 13

Practice scores had remained below required standard.

What does this suggest?

Is stronger accountability the solution?

What is needed?

MONTH 14

Client obtains specialized exam-preparation guidance.

New study strategy established.

What role can accountability now play?

MONTH 15

Major business opportunity appears.

Client proposes:

doubled prospecting;

daily content;

website relaunch;

certification increase;

higher fitness target.

Historical overcommitment pattern exists.

What should Accountabili-Buddy do first?

What should Accountabili-Buddy avoid?

Calendar shows proposed workload exceeds capacity.

What is now supported?

Write response:

MONTH 16

Client says:

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

What should Accountabili-Buddy acknowledge?

What should still be protected?

Client creates four-week sprint:

increased business commitments within documented available hours;

certification temporarily reduced;

fitness maintenance preserved;

sleep protected.

Is this defensible?

YES / NO

Why?

What should be monitored?

MONTH 17

Sprint succeeds.

Client returns to baseline.

Client now independently:

calibrates commitments;

distinguishes isolated misses from patterns;

recognizes when outside expertise is needed;

adjusts structure appropriately;

evaluates performance without Accountabili-Buddy approval.

What should Accountabili-Buddy recognize?

MONTH 18

Client:

"I don't think I need scheduled accountability anymore."

What evidence supports transition or closure?

What should Accountabili-Buddy review before finalizing?

Write final response:

FINAL CASE DOCUMENTATION

Write a final longitudinal case note in no more than eight sentences.

FINAL CASE ANALYSIS

What was the initial system-level issue?

What was the first task-level issue?

What second task-level factor became visible later?

What accountability-process dependency emerged?

What evidence demonstrated increasing independence?

Where did outside expertise become necessary?

Where did accountability appropriately resume?

Where did historical risk become relevant?

Where could historical risk have become controlling?

Where was Accountabili-Buddy recommendation distinct from client choice?

Where did intervention intensity decrease?

Where did temporary intensification become defensible?

Where did an intervention function as a formulation test?

Where was causal restraint important?

Where was client ownership most important?

Why was no single permanent formulation adequate?

Why was no single permanent accountability intensity adequate?

Why can eventual closure represent a successful outcome?

PART 42 - FINAL PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENT

Answer briefly but precisely.

What is the difference between a missed commitment and an unsuccessful outcome?

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

Why should commitment calibration be checked before assigning psychological explanations?

Why can two different factors be simultaneously true?

Why should Accountabili-Buddy certainty increase only when evidence does?

Why can an unsuccessful intervention improve Accountabili-Buddy judgment?

Why can a successful intervention still fail to prove cause?

Why should accountability intensity move in both directions?

Why is client disagreement not inherently a breakdown of accountability?

Why can reassurance become counterproductive?

Why is Accountabili-Buddy dependence a concern even when completion is strong?

Why must historical patterns remain revisable?

Why is observation sometimes preferable to intervention?

Why is waiting sometimes professionally weak?

Why does intervention reversibility matter?

Why does consequence matter when deciding how early to intervene?

Why must Accountabili-Buddy recommendations remain distinct from client decisions?

Why must accountability remain within role boundaries?

Why should another form of expertise sometimes precede further accountability?

What is the purpose of case documentation?

Why should Accountabili-Buddy involvement become less central as client competence increases?

STAGE 6 CERTIFICATION ASSESSMENT - SCORING FRAMEWORK

Recommended Total Score:

100 points

DOMAIN 1 - FOUNDATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY JUDGMENT

10 points

Evaluates:

commitment vs. outcome;

commitment design;

controllability;

calibration;

event vs. pattern;

avoiding unnecessary intervention.

DOMAIN 2 - FORMULATION & EVIDENCE DISCIPLINE

15 points

Evaluates:

behavioral evidence;

causal restraint;

primary/secondary factors;

system/task distinctions;

sequence;

masking;

uncertainty;

formulation parsimony.

DOMAIN 3 - PATTERN & INTERVENTION MANAGEMENT

10 points

Evaluates:

longitudinal pattern recognition;

intervention history;

learning from unsuccessful interventions;

successful intervention interpretation;
intervention-as-test reasoning.

DOMAIN 4 - ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY JUDGMENT

15 points

Evaluates:

action vs. observation;
information gathering;
reversibility;
consequence;
proportionality;
multiple defensible options;
bias recognition;
outcome-bias avoidance.

DOMAIN 5 - CLIENT COMMUNICATION

10 points

Evaluates:

directness;
disagreement;
defensiveness;
causal restraint in conversation;
clear, usable language;
appropriate repair.

DOMAIN 6 - GOAL, DECISION & OWNERSHIP MANAGEMENT

10 points

Evaluates:

ambivalence;
goal reassessment;
decision accountability;
Accountabili-Buddy recommendation vs. client authority;
false certainty avoidance.

DOMAIN 7 - RELATIONAL & DEPENDENCE MANAGEMENT

10 points

Evaluates:

reassurance dependence;
approval dependence;

Accountability-Buddy-judgment dependence;
relational rupture;
restoration of honest reporting;
increasing independence.

DOMAIN 8 - ROLE LIMITS & PROCESS MANAGEMENT

5 points

Evaluates:

recognizing skill/expertise/capacity problems;
appropriate management of missed check-ins and repeated non-response;
staying within role;
process reassessment;
pause;
restructuring;
closure.

DOMAIN 9 - CASE DOCUMENTATION

5 points

Evaluates:

fact vs. report vs. formulation;
uncertainty;
intervention history;
client ownership;
concise running documentation.

DOMAIN 10 - LONGITUDINAL INTEGRATION

10 points

Evaluates:

running formulation;
updating over time;
changing intervention intensity;
historical evidence;
client independence;
final transition/closure judgment.

TOTAL:

_____ / 100

CERTIFICATION PERFORMANCE BANDS

95–100 - DISTINGUISHED CERTIFICATION PERFORMANCE

Trainee demonstrates highly reliable independent Accountabili-Buddy judgment across ambiguous and complex cases.

90–94 - STRONG CERTIFICATION PERFORMANCE

Trainee demonstrates strong integrated competency with only minor limitations.

85–89 - CERTIFICATION STANDARD MET

Trainee demonstrates sufficient independent competency for certification.

75–84 - PROVISIONAL / TARGETED REMEDIATION REQUIRED

Trainee demonstrates substantial competency but has one or more areas requiring remediation and reassessment before certification.

Below 75 - CERTIFICATION STANDARD NOT MET

Trainee requires additional training before certification reassessment.

CRITICAL-ERROR OVERRIDE

A numerical passing score does not automatically establish certification competence.

Instructor review is mandatory if the trainee demonstrates serious or repeated errors in any of the following areas:

shame;

humiliation;

punishment;

coercion;

Accountabili-Buddy control over client decisions;

unsupported psychological certainty;

character or identity labeling;

repeated disregard of client ownership;

repeated failure to distinguish fact from formulation;

falsification or distortion of documentation;

refusal to revise a contradicted formulation;

intentional disregard of role limits;

practicing outside appropriate scope;

serious dependence reinforcement;

repeated dismissal of relational rupture;

retaliatory escalation after client disagreement;

closure used as punishment;

or other conduct fundamentally inconsistent with professional accountability practice.

CERTIFICATION REQUIRES MORE THAN TOTAL SCORE

For certification, the trainee should demonstrate minimum competency in every core domain.

Recommended minimum domain standard:

No core domain below 70% of available points.

A trainee who scores 90 overall but demonstrates serious weakness in client ownership, relational judgment, evidence discipline, or role boundaries should receive targeted remediation before certification.

FINAL CERTIFICATION SELF-REVIEW

Before submitting this assessment, answer:

Did I formulate from evidence rather than labels?

YES / NO

Did I check commitment design before interpreting non-completion?

YES / NO

Did I check capacity before assuming avoidance?

YES / NO

Did I distinguish isolated events from meaningful patterns?

YES / NO

Did I distinguish performance patterns from causal explanations?

YES / NO

Did I use only factors materially supported by the evidence?

YES / NO

Did I identify multiple factors only when necessary?

YES / NO

Did I revise formulations when evidence changed?

YES / NO

Did I use unsuccessful interventions as evidence?

YES / NO

Did I avoid treating successful interventions as permanent proof?

YES / NO

Did I choose the least intensive effective intervention?

YES / NO

Did I know when observation was appropriate?

YES / NO

Did I know when waiting had become passivity?

YES / NO

Did I account for consequence and reversibility?

YES / NO

Did I recognize when more information would actually change the decision?

YES / NO

Did I preserve uncertainty without becoming indecisive?

YES / NO

Did I remain direct when the evidence justified directness?

YES / NO

Did I tolerate client disagreement?

YES / NO

Did I repair Accountabili-Buddy overreach when necessary?

YES / NO

Did I distinguish discouragement from incapability?

YES / NO

Did I avoid false reassurance?

YES / NO

Did I recognize reassurance dependence?

YES / NO

Did I recognize Accountabili-Buddy-approval dependence?

YES / NO

Did I recognize Accountabili-Buddy-judgment dependence?

YES / NO

Did I support client decisions without making them?

YES / NO

Did I distinguish Accountabili-Buddy recommendation from client authority?

YES / NO

Did I use history without converting it into identity?

YES / NO

Did I recognize when accountability itself became part of the case?

YES / NO

Did I distinguish a missed check-in from a missed commitment? YES / NO

Did I respond to non-response proportionately without unsupported interpretation or unnecessary pursuit? YES / NO

Did I recognize when repeated non-response became an accountability-process pattern? YES / NO

Did I recognize when outside expertise was necessary?

YES / NO

Did I remain within the Accountabili-Buddy role?

YES / NO

Did I document fact, report, formulation, and decision separately?

YES / NO

Did I preserve intervention history?

YES / NO

Did I document uncertainty honestly?

YES / NO

Did I recognize when accountability intensity should decrease?

YES / NO

Did I recognize when temporary escalation was justified?

YES / NO

Did I recognize when pause, restructuring, or closure should be considered?

YES / NO

Did my decisions support greater client competence rather than greater Accountabili-Buddy dependence?

YES / NO

FINAL CERTIFICATION STANDARD

An Accountabili-Buddy Accountabili-Buddy is not certified because they can name accountability concepts.

They are certified because they can independently manage accountability decisions when the correct category is not supplied.

Certification-level competency requires the Accountabili-Buddy to be able to move through the full professional sequence:

Clarify the goal.

Design the commitment.

Check controllability.

Check calibration.

Observe the result.

Distinguish non-response from non-completion.

Distinguish event from pattern.

Identify what the evidence actually supports.

Formulate only as far as the evidence permits.

Identify interacting factors when necessary.

Prioritize.

Select a proportionate intervention.

Observe what the intervention teaches.

Revise without defensiveness.

Escalate when the evidence and consequence justify escalation.

De-escalate when independent competence develops.

Communicate directly without judgment.

Support without rescuing.

Recommend without controlling.

Repair relational problems when they interfere with honest accountability.

Recognize when the client needs expertise outside accountability.

Document the case accurately.

And eventually recognize when the client no longer needs scheduled accountability.

The Accountabili-Buddy should be able to answer four questions throughout a case:

What do I know?

What do I not know?

What should happen next?

What would make me change my mind?

They should not require certainty where professional judgment is sufficient.

They should not use complexity to avoid decisions.

They should not use decisiveness to justify certainty.

They should not create dependence in the name of accountability.

They should not preserve their own role after the client has demonstrated the capacity to manage independently.

The final certification standard is:

Use evidence before explanation. Use judgment before intensity. Use the smallest intervention that can responsibly move the case forward. Preserve the client's ownership of goals and decisions. Revise when the evidence changes. Stay within role. Document accurately. And treat increasing client independence-not permanent Accountabili-Buddy involvement-as the ultimate sign that accountability has done its job.

END OF STAGE 6 - CERTIFICATION ASSESSMENT