

STAGE 6 — INTEGRATED CASE DRILLS

PURPOSE

These drills prepare the trainee for certification-level practice.

Unlike earlier stages, the trainee is not told which framework applies.

Each case may involve:

commitment design;

calibration;

ordinary non-follow-through;

avoidance;

competing priorities;

overwhelm;

perfectionism;

discouragement;

changing goal value;

longitudinal patterns;

unsuccessful intervention outcome;

accountability intensity;

client dependence;

relational strain;

Accountabili-Buddy judgment;

or no meaningful problem at all.

The trainee must determine what matters.

The purpose is not to demonstrate knowledge of every Accountabili-Buddy concept in every case.

The purpose is to identify the smallest amount of information and intervention necessary to make the next professional decision well.

For each case, answer:

What is known?

What remains unknown?

What, if anything, requires formulation?

What is the next Accountabili-Buddy decision?

What would change that decision?

Unless otherwise stated, do not assume facts that are not provided.

DRILL SET 1 — RAPID CASE TRIAGE

Client Goal:

Maintain three weekly workouts.

History:

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

Current week:**Client:**

"My child was sick Saturday and I stayed home."

What is known?**What requires intervention, if anything?****Next decision:****Client Goal:**

Complete certification.

Commitment:

Five study sessions weekly.

Calendar shows three realistic study periods.

Six-week results:

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

What is the primary issue?**Next decision:****Client Goal:**

Grow business.

Commitment:

Contact three prospects weekly.

Six-week results:

0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1.

Client completes bookkeeping and website work every week.

What is established?

What remains unknown?

Next decision:

Client Goal:

Submit book proposal.

Commitment:

"Make progress on proposal."

Client:

"I worked on it a lot."

What is the first issue?

Next decision:

Client Goal:

Maintain weekly budgeting.

History:

Six months stable.

Client independently initiates every week.

Weekly accountability remains unchanged.

What process question should now be asked?

Next decision:

Client says:

"I am completely overwhelmed."

No calendar, commitment history, or workload data has been reviewed.

What is known?

What remains unknown?

Next decision:

Client misses one important deadline because the airline cancels their return flight.

What should Accountabili-Buddy avoid?

Next decision:

Client has missed the same important deadline five times.

Each week:

"Next week."

What should Accountabili-Buddy avoid?

Next decision:

DRILL SET 2 — IS THE COMMITMENT THE PROBLEM?

Goal:

Get a new job.

Commitment:

"Get an interview by Friday."

Result:

No interview.

Client submitted five qualified applications.

What is wrong?

What should Accountabili-Buddy NOT formulate from this result?

Next decision:

Goal:

Write a book.

Commitment:

"Write for exactly three hours Tuesday."

Client completes the planned chapter in 90 minutes.

Did the client fail?

Why?

What should be reviewed?

Goal:

Lose weight.

Commitment:

"Lose two pounds this week."

What is the commitment-design issue?

Write a more controllable commitment:

Goal:

Build business.

Commitment:

“Do more marketing.”

What information is missing?

Rewrite:

Goal:

Complete certification.

Commitment:

Four study sessions.

Available capacity:

Four.

Result:

Two.

Should commitment design be assumed to be the primary problem?

YES / NO

What should happen next?

DRILL SET 3 — NOTHING MAY BE WRONG

Client chooses baseline three workouts.

Stretch target five.

Result:

Three.

Client says:

"I only did three."

What should Accountabili-Buddy say?

Client has completed the same maintenance behavior for 16 weeks.

Client:

"Should we change something?"

Is change required?

Why?

Client has one unproductive workday after months of stable performance.

Should Accountabili-Buddy create a new intervention?

Why?

Client's commitment is three applications.

Result:

Three.

Client reports the week felt difficult.

Does difficulty itself mean the commitment was poorly calibrated?

What additional information would matter?

Client independently chooses a realistic commitment and completes it.

What should Accountabili-Buddy avoid doing?

Why?

DRILL SET 4 — EVENT, PATTERN, OR HISTORY?

Client misses Monday workout once.

What should be concluded?

Client misses Monday workout three consecutive weeks.

What changes?

Client misses Monday workout six consecutive weeks.

What changes now?

Client had a Monday-miss pattern last year.

Current history:

12 consecutive Monday workouts completed.

One current miss occurs.

How should history affect interpretation?

Same client now misses four consecutive Mondays.

How should old history be used now?

DRILL SET 5 — WHAT IS ACTUALLY REPEATING?

Results:

2 of 4 weekly for six weeks.

What is definitely repeating?

What is not definitely known?

Client gives a different explanation every week.

Result remains 2 of 4.

What is stable?

What is unstable?

Client repeatedly completes routine tasks but postpones one high-stakes task.

What pattern is stronger than the overall completion number?

Client repeatedly misses all commitments during weeks involving overnight travel.

What repeated condition is relevant?

What should still be tested?

DRILL SET 6 — CLIENT EXPLANATION IS DATA, NOT VERDICT

Client:

“I didn’t do it because I’m lazy.”

What should Accountabili-Buddy do with this explanation?

Write a response:

Client:

“I forgot.”

Client-owned cue records show the client acknowledged the cue before the scheduled task.

What changes?

Client:

"I had no time."

Calendar shows three available periods used for optional tasks.

What should Accountabili-Buddy say?

Client:

"I don't care about this anymore."

What should happen before another ordinary execution commitment?

DRILL SET 7 — CALIBRATION OR SOMETHING ELSE?

Target:

Five.

Capacity:

Three.

Result:

Three.

Formulation:

Target recalibrated to three.

Result:

One for four consecutive weeks.

What explanation is now weaker?

What becomes necessary?

Of three realistic opportunities, client completes two.

The missed one is consistently public-facing.

What becomes relevant?

Client has capacity for five.

Completes five but only by sleeping four hours nightly.

Is five automatically well calibrated?

Why?

DRILL SET 8 — SYSTEM-LEVEL OR TASK-LEVEL?

Client has nine active goals and misses broadly.

What level of problem should be checked first?

Load reduced to three goals.

Two immediately stabilize.

One remains stalled.

What changes?

Client is broadly overloaded but also cannot perform one technical step.

Identify:

System-level issue:

Task-level issue:

Which should be addressed first if the technical step is required before the task can proceed?

Why?

DRILL SET 9 — CAUSE, CONSEQUENCE, OR BOTH?

Client repeatedly misses commitments and then becomes discouraged.

Initial role of discouragement:

Later, discouragement causes client to stop attempting difficult tasks.

Current role:

Client repeatedly overchecks work.

Backlog develops.

Client becomes overwhelmed.

What appears upstream?

What appears downstream?

Why does this distinction affect intervention?

DRILL SET 10 — MASKING

Client has eight active goals.

Almost nothing progresses.

After reducing to two, one progresses and one remains stalled.

What did intervention reveal?

Client's target is reduced from six to three.

Client continues completing one.

What was probably not the whole explanation?

Client receives needed technical training.

Task remains unattempted.

What becomes newly visible?

**Why should Accountabili-Buddy not say:
“So the original problem wasn’t real”?**

DRILL SET 11 — INTERVENTION HISTORY

Client-owned calendar cue is unsuccessful.

Earlier client-owned calendar cue is unsuccessful.

Alarm is unsuccessful.

Client acknowledges noticing all three cues.

What explanation weakens?

What should Accountabili-Buddy NOT do next?

Task moved from Friday to Monday.

Completion becomes stable for six weeks.

What does this support?

What does it not prove?

Why must intervention history remain in the case record?

DRILL SET 12 — UNSUCCESSFUL INTERVENTION, NEXT DECISION

Hypothesis:

Client needs stronger client-owned cues.

Three client-owned cue interventions are unsuccessful.

Next decision:

Hypothesis:

Target is too high.

Target reduced.

Completion immediately stabilizes.

Next decision:

Hypothesis:

Late-week scheduling causes non-completion.

Task moved early.

No improvement.

Next decision:

Why is repeating a unsuccessful intervention without new evidence poor practice?

DRILL SET 13 — HOW MUCH CERTAINTY?

One high-stakes task postponed once.

Appropriate confidence level:

Same category postponed four times.

Routine tasks completed.

Appropriate confidence level:

Client also repeatedly reports fear of rejection.

What changes?

Client asks:

"So you KNOW I'm avoiding rejection?"

Write response:

DRILL SET 14 — DO WE NEED MORE INFORMATION?

Two plausible causes.

Both support moving task to Monday for two weeks.

Do you need more analysis first?

Why?

Two plausible causes.

One would require commitment reduction.

The other would require a task-specific intervention.

Do you need more information?

Why?

Goal status is uncertain.

Would knowing whether client still values goal change the next decision?

Client tells Accountabili-Buddy their favorite productivity app.

Would this information change the decision?

Why?

DRILL SET 15 — ACT, OBSERVE, OR CLARIFY?

One low-stakes miss after six stable months.

Decision:

Second similar miss.

Cause unclear.

Decision:

Sixth identical miss.

Decision:

Major deadline in three days.

Emerging delay pattern threatens ability to recover.

Decision:

Client says:

"I'm overwhelmed."

No workload review exists.

Decision:

DRILL SET 16 — LEAST INTENSIVE EFFECTIVE RESPONSE

Problems are discovered too late at Friday review.

Choose:

A. Repeated unscheduled reporting B. Temporary Wednesday checkpoint C. Accountabili-Buddy manages calendar

Answer:

Client waits for the scheduled Accountabili-Buddy check-in before initiating.

Choose:

A. Add unscheduled Accountabili-Buddy contacts B. Test client initiation before the next scheduled check-in C. Add daily Accountabili-Buddy calls

Answer:

Client has one ordinary miss.

Choose:

A. Pattern-level confrontation B. Brief review C. Accountability overhaul

Answer:

Why does minimum effective structure matter?

DRILL SET 17 — CONSEQUENCE CHANGES THRESHOLD

One miss of optional maintenance task.

Likely action:

One emerging delay on irreversible application due tomorrow.

Likely action:

Why can the evidence be similar but the decision different?

DRILL SET 18 — CLIENT DISAGREES

Accountabili-Buddy:

"The high-stakes tasks are being postponed."

Client:

"I disagree that it's avoidance."

Response:

Client:

"You're wrong."

Evidence remains clear about behavior but not cause.

Response:

What does Accountabili-Buddy need agreement on?

What do they NOT necessarily need agreement on?

DRILL SET 19 — CLIENT BECOMES DEFENSIVE

Client:

“You’re calling me lazy.”
Accountabili-Buddy did not.

Response:

Client:

“This feels judgmental.”
Accountabili-Buddy realizes wording was sharp.

Response:

What should be repaired?

What should remain?

DRILL SET 20 — CLIENT IS AMBIVALENT

Client:

“I want the promotion but not the responsibilities.”

What kind of problem is this currently?

Should Accountabili-Buddy make another execution commitment immediately?

Why?

What accountability target might replace execution temporarily?

DRILL SET 21 — GOAL STATUS

Client:

"I don't care about this anymore."

Next decision:

Client:

"I still want it, but I don't know if the cost is worth it."

Next decision:

Client repeatedly misses and changes goals every time execution becomes difficult.

What should be reviewed?

DRILL SET 22 — INSIGHT WITHOUT ACTION

Client:

"I know exactly what I do."

Behavior unchanged for six weeks.

What should Accountabili-Buddy shift toward?

Client wants another month of analysis.

No behavioral tests attempted.

What should Accountabili-Buddy consider?

Write response:

DRILL SET 23 — REASSURANCE-SEEKING

Client:

“Do you think I can do this?”

First difficult week.

Response:

Client asks same question weekly despite demonstrated capability.

What process issue may emerge?

Response:

DRILL SET 24 — APPROVAL DEPENDENCE

Client:

“Was this a good week?”

Commitment three.

Result three.

Response:

Client:

“I don’t know whether I did well until you tell me.”

What should Accountabili-Buddy develop?

Why is Accountabili-Buddy approval a poor performance metric?

DRILL SET 25 — ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY-JUDGMENT DEPENDENCE

Client:

“Pick my commitment.”

Response:

Client:

“I trust you more than myself.”

What should Accountabili-Buddy do?

Why is successful completion not enough if client judgment is weakening?

DRILL SET 26 — CLIENT CHOOSES AGAINST RECOMMENDATION

Accountabili-Buddy recommends baseline three.

Client chooses five.

What should Accountabili-Buddy do?

What should Accountabili-Buddy not do?

Result:

Three of five.

How should result be used?

DRILL SET 27 — TWO DEFENSIBLE ANSWERS

Client independently completes for eight weeks.

Accountabili-Buddy A recommends reduced check-in frequency now.

Accountabili-Buddy B recommends four more weeks before reduction.

Can both be competent?

Why?

What would make one recommendation clearly weaker?

DRILL SET 28 — FALSE PRECISION

Accountabili-Buddy says:

"We must wait exactly 9.5 weeks before reducing accountability."

No standard supports this.

What is wrong?

Rewrite:

DRILL SET 29 — ACTION BIAS

Accountabili-Buddy changes intervention every week despite stable success.

What error may exist?

Corrective question:

DRILL SET 30 — CONFIRMATION BIAS

Accountabili-Buddy believes client is avoidant.

Every miss confirms avoidance.

Every success is ignored.

What error exists?

What should Accountabili-Buddy actively seek?

DRILL SET 31 — RECENCY BIAS

Six months stable.

One bad week.

Accountabili-Buddy declares system broken.

What error exists?

Better reasoning:

DRILL SET 32 — HISTORY DOMINANCE

Client used to wait for scheduled Accountabili-Buddy check-ins before initiating.

Current six-month evidence shows independent initiation.

Accountabili-Buddy refuses to reduce check-in frequency.

What error exists?

Better question:

DRILL SET 33 — OUTCOME BIAS

Poorly reasoned intervention succeeds once.

Was judgment necessarily good?

Well-reasoned intervention is unsuccessful once.

Was judgment necessarily bad?

What should judgment quality be based on?

DRILL SET 34 — ACCOUNTABILI-BUDDY ROLE LIMITS

Client cannot perform required technical task because they do not know how.

Should Accountabili-Buddy increase accountability?

What should happen first?

Client asks Accountabili-Buddy for legal interpretation.

What should Accountabili-Buddy do?

What accountability role can remain?

DRILL SET 35 — ACCOUNTABILITY IS NOT THE SOLUTION TO EVERYTHING

Client has zero time for commitment due to temporary 80-hour workweek.

Accountabili-Buddy increases check-in frequency.

What is wrong?

Client has not decided whether to relocate.

Accountabili-Buddy assigns packing tasks.

What is wrong?

Client lacks a required skill.

Accountabili-Buddy threatens stronger consequences.

What is wrong?

DRILL SET 36 — CASE NOTE JUDGMENT

Goal:

Job search.

Commitment:

Three applications.

Result:

Two.

History:

High-stakes application postponed third consecutive week.

Capacity supports three.

Client reports rejection anxiety.

Write:

Facts:

Pattern:

Working formulation:

Uncertainty:

Next decision:

Goal:

Workout maintenance.

Commitment:

Three.

Result:

Three.

History:

12 weeks stable with independent initiation.

Write:**Current formulation:****Process issue:****Next decision:**

DRILL SET 37 — WHAT WOULD CHANGE YOUR MIND?

Current decision:

Maintain baseline three.

What would justify increase?**Current decision:**

Reduce check-in frequency.

What would justify restoring structure?**Current formulation:**

Broad overload primary.

What evidence would weaken that?**Why should revision criteria be explicit?**

DRILL SET 38 — FULL RAPID CASE A

Client Goal:

Write a book.

Target:

Five sessions.

Capacity:

Three.

Result:

Two.

Client spends half of every session editing old work.

Identify:

Commitment issue:

Additional factor:

First decision:

Second decision:

What should be tested?

DRILL SET 39 — FULL RAPID CASE B

Client Goal:

Grow business.

Six active business commitments exceed capacity.

Prospecting remains zero.

Accounting and website work complete.

Client:

"I'm overwhelmed."

First formulation:

First intervention:

After load reduction prospecting remains zero.

Revised formulation:

Next intervention:

DRILL SET 40 — FULL RAPID CASE C

Client Goal:

Certification.

Target five.

Capacity three.

Two exam failures.

Client still values goal.

Client feels incapable.

Identify:

Calibration issue:

Emotional/maintaining factor:

First decision:

What should not be promised?

What should be monitored?

DRILL SET 41 — FULL RAPID CASE D

Client Goal:

- Publish course.
- Original requirements complete.
- Client adds content repeatedly.
- Overload develops.
- Scope reduced.
- Overload resolves.
- Publication still delayed.
- Client worries about buyer judgment.

Map:

Initial factor:

Remaining factor:

Next intervention:

What remains uncertain?

DRILL SET 42 — FULL RAPID CASE E

Client Goal:

Three study sessions.

Completion stable.

Accountabili-Buddy currently provides 3 scheduled check-ins per week.

Client waits for scheduled check-ins before initiating.

What is successful?

What is not yet successful?

Next decision:

What result would support de-escalation?

DRILL SET 43 — FULL RAPID CASE F

Client Goal:

Complete degree.

Client:

"I want the degree but cannot stand another year."

Current problem type:

What should pause?

What should replace it?

Who owns the final decision?

DRILL SET 44 — FULL RAPID CASE G

Client has missed same commitment for six weeks.

Accountabili-Buddy and client have discussed cause extensively.

Three interventions have been unsuccessful.

Client:

"Maybe we should talk more about why."

What should Accountabili-Buddy recognize?

Next decision:

Write response:

DRILL SET 45 — FULL RAPID CASE H

Client completes independently for four months.

Still asks Accountabili-Buddy to approve each commitment.

What is positive?

What process issue remains?

Next intervention:

DRILL SET 46 — FULL RAPID CASE I

Client historically overcommitted.

Six months stable.

Client proposes temporary modest increase for a time-limited project.

What should Accountabili-Buddy consider?

What should history do?

What should history NOT do?

DRILL SET 47 — FULL RAPID CASE J

Client has one bad week after long success.

Client says:

“I knew I would fail again.”

What should Accountabili-Buddy correct?

What should be observed?

Write response:

DRILL SET 48 — FULL RAPID CASE K

Client asks Accountabili-Buddy:

“Tell me if I should pause certification and take this business opportunity.”

What can Accountabili-Buddy do?

What can Accountabili-Buddy not do?

What commitment might be appropriate?

DRILL SET 49 — FULL RAPID CASE L

Client has no active goal.

Accountability meetings continue because:

"I like talking to you."

What professional question arises?

What options should be considered?

DRILL SET 50 — FINAL INTEGRATED CASE DRILL

Client Goals:

Grow consulting business.

Complete certification.

Maintain fitness.

Initial commitments:

Prospecting — 5

Study — 5

Fitness — 3

Available capacity:

Prospecting — 3

Study — 3

Fitness — 3

Four-week history:

Prospecting: 1, 1, 2, 1

Study: 2, 2, 2, 2

Fitness: 3, 3, 3, 3

Client:

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

What are the most important facts?

What client conclusion is unsupported?

What should be addressed first?

What should be tracked separately?

Commitments are recalibrated to:

Prospecting — 3

Study — 3

Fitness — 3

Three-week history:

Prospecting: 1, 1, 1

Study: 3, 3, 3

Fitness: 3, 3, 3

What did recalibration resolve?

What did it not resolve?

Working formulation now:

Client:

"I spend prospecting time on the website because I don't want people saying no."

What is now strongly supported?

What wording should Accountabili-Buddy still avoid?

Client agrees to begin outreach before website work.

They initiate, but spend excessive time rewriting each message.

Result:

One prospect contact.

What new factor appears?

How should formulation change?

A reasonable message standard is defined.

No further rewriting after standard is met.

Next four weeks:

3, 3, 3, 3.

What does this support?

What does it not prove?

Three months later:

All commitments stable.

Client asks Accountabili-Buddy every week:

"Am I doing well?"

What new process concern appears?

What should Accountabili-Buddy do?

Client begins asking Accountabili-Buddy to choose every weekly commitment.

What process concern is stronger now?

What intervention follows?

Client begins selecting own commitments.

Six weeks stable.

What positive development exists?

What should happen to Accountabili-Buddy involvement?

Check-ins reduce from 3 to 2 per week.

Six weeks stable.

What options are now defensible?

Client chooses 1 scheduled check-in per week.

Two months stable.

A major business opportunity appears.

Client proposes:

large increase in prospecting;

content within documented available capacity;

website relaunch;

certification restart;

new fitness target.

What historical issue becomes relevant?

Should Accountabili-Buddy immediately declare relapse?

Why?

Calendar review shows total commitments clearly exceed capacity.

What is now supported?

What should Accountabili-Buddy recommend?

Client:

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

What should Accountabili-Buddy acknowledge?

What should still be protected?

Client designs a four-week sprint within documented available hours.

Certification remains paused.

Fitness is temporarily maintenance only.

Is this defensible?

Why?

What should be monitored?

Four weeks later:

Business target achieved.

Sleep and fitness minimum remained stable.

Client wants to continue sprint indefinitely.

What should Accountabili-Buddy avoid?

What should happen?

Client returns to normal baseline after review.

Months later:

All goals stable.

Client:

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

What evidence supports this?

What should Accountabili-Buddy review before transition?

What process options are defensible?

Write response:

FINAL INTEGRATION REVIEW

Where was commitment design/calibration the first issue?

Where did a task-specific factor remain after calibration?

Where did a second task-specific factor appear only after intervention?

Where did accountability-process dependence emerge?

Where did Accountabili-Buddy involvement appropriately decrease?

Where did historical evidence appropriately become relevant again?

Where would history have become controlling if misused?

Where was temporary escalation defensible?

Where was de-escalation defensible?

Where did client preference matter?

Where could client preference not erase capacity evidence?

Where did Accountabili-Buddy recommendation remain separate from client choice?

Where did an intervention function as a diagnostic test?

Where was uncertainty appropriately preserved?

Where could action proceed without full causal certainty?

What would have happened if Accountabili-Buddy treated:

“I’m bad at follow-through”

as the permanent formulation?

What is the smallest final formulation of the entire case?

STAGE 6 INTEGRATED CASE DRILLS — COMPETENCY CHECK

Can I recognize when the commitment itself is defective?

YES / NOT YET

Can I avoid explaining non-follow-through before checking calibration?

YES / NOT YET

Can I recognize when nothing meaningful needs intervention?

YES / NOT YET

Can I distinguish one event from an established pattern?

YES / NOT YET

Can I use history without allowing it to determine the current case automatically?

YES / NOT YET

Can I distinguish behavior from explanation?

YES / NOT YET

Can I distinguish a client explanation from supported evidence?

YES / NOT YET

Can I recognize when a system-level factor masks a task-level factor?

YES / NOT YET

Can I identify sequential mechanisms?

YES / NOT YET

Can I distinguish cause from consequence?

YES / NOT YET

Can I recognize when a consequence becomes a maintaining factor?

YES / NOT YET

Can I use intervention history rather than intellectually restarting the case each week?

YES / NOT YET

Can I allow unsuccessful interventions to weaken a formulation?

YES / NOT YET

Can I allow successful interventions to strengthen a formulation without treating them as absolute proof?

YES / NOT YET

Can I match certainty to evidence?

YES / NOT YET

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

YES / NOT YET

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

YES / NOT YET

Can I choose between action, observation, and clarification?

YES / NOT YET

Can I use the least intensive intervention justified by the case?

YES / NOT YET

Can I account for consequence and timing?

YES / NOT YET

Can I manage disagreement without arguing?

YES / NOT YET

Can I respond to defensiveness without abandoning accurate evidence?

YES / NOT YET

Can I recognize genuine ambivalence?

YES / NOT YET

Can I shift from execution accountability to decision accountability?

YES / NOT YET

Can I recognize when insight has stopped producing useful change?

YES / NOT YET

Can I recognize reassurance dependence?

YES / NOT YET

Can I recognize Accountabili-Buddy-approval dependence?

YES / NOT YET

Can I recognize Accountabili-Buddy-judgment dependence?

YES / NOT YET

Can I preserve client ownership when the client chooses differently from my recommendation?

YES / NOT YET

Can I recognize when more than one Accountabili-Buddy decision is defensible?

YES / NOT YET

Can I avoid false precision?

YES / NOT YET

Can I recognize action bias, confirmation bias, recency bias, history dominance, and outcome bias?

YES / NOT YET

Can I recognize when accountability is not the primary solution?

YES / NOT YET

Can I remain within the Accountabili-Buddy role?

YES / NOT YET

Can I identify what evidence would change my decision?

YES / NOT YET

Can I document a concise working formulation without writing a narrative history?

YES / NOT YET

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

YES / NOT YET

Can I temporarily increase accountability without making it permanent?

YES / NOT YET

Can I recognize when scheduled accountability may have fulfilled its purpose?

YES / NOT YET

STAGE 6 INTEGRATED CASE DRILL STANDARD

At certification level, the trainee should no longer approach a case by asking:

“Which curriculum category is this?”

They should ask:

What is actually happening?

Then:

Is the commitment itself sound?

Does it fit demonstrated capacity?

Is this an event or a pattern?

What is repeating?

What does the evidence explain?

What remains unexplained?

What has already been tried?

What did those interventions teach us?

What decision is justified now?

How much intervention is actually necessary?

What remains the client’s decision?

What would change my mind?

And sometimes:

Is anything actually wrong?

A certification-level Accountabili-Buddy should be capable of leaving a successful process alone.

They should be capable of saying:

“One miss does not justify a new formulation.”

and:

“Six identical misses do not justify another unchanged recommitment.”

They should be capable of saying:

“The target was wrong.”

without interpreting that as client non-follow-through.

They should be capable of saying:

“The target is now realistic, and the remaining non-completion means we need to investigate something else.”

They should be capable of saying:

“I don’t know exactly why this happens yet, but we know enough to test a low-cost change.”

They should be capable of saying:

“The intervention was unsuccessful, so our explanation needs revision.”

They should be capable of saying:

“The scheduled check-in structure that helped earlier may now be carrying initiation the client is capable of developing independently.”

And ultimately:

“The evidence suggests you may no longer need scheduled accountability at the same frequency.”

The governing standard is:

Do not hunt for a category. Do not invent a problem. Do not cling to an explanation. Identify what the case requires now, make the smallest defensible decision, observe what happens, and update accordingly.

END OF STAGE 6 — INTEGRATED CASE DRILLS