

Understanding Consistency Dimensions

Deep Dive Modules · Professional Practice

CONTENTS

- Part 1 · Overview
- Part 2 · The Foundation: Why Consistency Is the Currency of Trust in Treatment Settings
- Part 3 · Differential Treatment: When the Same Rules Apply Differently to Different People
- Part 4 · Situational Inconsistency: When Pressure Becomes Permission to Abandon Standards
- Part 5 · The Invisible Dimensions: Mood, Communication, Drift, and the Erosion of Trust
- Part 6 · Closing the Consistency Gap: From Awareness to Organizational Integrity
- Part 7 · Organizational Consistency Assessment — 56 Items
- Part 8 · Exercise 1: The Consistency Mirror — Personal Patterns
- Part 9 · Exercise 2: Differential Treatment Case Analysis
- Part 10 · Exercise 3: Pressure Points — Situational Consistency Mapping
- Part 11 · Exercise 4: Leadership Weather Report — Mood & Enforcement
- Part 12 · Exercise 5: Communication Equity Audit
- Part 13 · Exercise 6: Policy Drift Detective — Then vs. Now
- Part 14 · Exercise 7: Exception Inventory & Standards Health Check
- Part 15 · Exercise 8: Consistency Repair Plan — From Diagnosis to Action

Part 1 · Overview

Understanding Consistency Dimensions

Seven Dimensions That Build or Break Organizational Trust

A Clinical Staff Intensive on Equitable Standards, Transparent Enforcement & Organizational Integrity

The Recovery Files — Clinical Staff Development Series

Inconsistent

Standards shift, trust erodes

→

Consistent

Standards hold, trust grows

Reading Sections

The Foundation: Why Consistency Is the Currency of Trust in Treatment Settings

Differential Treatment: When the Same Rules Apply Differently to Different People

Situational Inconsistency: When Pressure Becomes Permission to Abandon Standards

The Invisible Dimensions: Mood, Communication, Drift, and the Erosion of Trust

Closing the Consistency Gap: From Awareness to Organizational Integrity

Self-Assessment

Worksheets & Exercises

Exercise 3: Pressure Points — Situational Consistency Mapping

Exercise 8: Consistency Repair Plan — From Diagnosis to Action

Part 2 · The Foundation: Why Consistency Is the Currency of Trust in Treatment Settings

The Foundation: Why Consistency Is the Currency of Trust in Treatment Settings

In substance use disorder treatment, consistency is not a management luxury — it is a clinical necessity. The people who walk through our doors have spent years, sometimes decades, navigating environments where the rules changed without warning, where what was acceptable yesterday became punishable today, where the people in authority were unpredictable, unreliable, and governed by mood rather than principle. Inconsistency is not unfamiliar to them. It is the water they have been swimming in.

And when they arrive in treatment and discover that the organization tasked with teaching them a new way of living operates with the same inconsistency they experienced in active addiction — different rules for different people, standards that shift based on who is watching, consequences that depend on the day rather than the behavior — we have failed them before the clinical work even begins.

Consistency in treatment settings operates on multiple levels simultaneously. There is clinical consistency — the reliable application of therapeutic frameworks, treatment protocols, and evidence-based practices across clients and clinicians. There is operational consistency — the fair and predictable application of organizational policies, procedures, and expectations to all staff. And there is relational consistency — the degree to which the humans within the organization can be counted on to behave predictably, communicate clearly, and treat one another with the same standards they espouse in their mission statements.

When any of these dimensions of consistency breaks down, the damage is not abstract. It is concrete and measurable. Clients who experience inconsistent treatment application lose faith in the process. Staff who experience inconsistent standards application lose trust in the organization. Teams that operate under unpredictable leadership develop survival strategies rather than growth strategies — they learn to navigate the leader rather than master the work. And the mission statement that promised integrity, compassion, and excellence becomes decorative rather than operational.

The challenge is that consistency is genuinely difficult. Treatment settings are complex, dynamic environments where no two clinical situations are identical, where staff come with different backgrounds, strengths, and development needs, and where external pressures — from funders, accreditors, families, and the marketplace — create constant demands for adaptation. The question is not whether flexibility is needed. It is. The question is whether the flexibility is deliberate, principled, and transparent — or whether it is reactive, biased, and hidden behind the illusion of consistency that fools no one.

This intensive examines seven distinct dimensions of consistency — seven ways that organizations can claim consistency while practicing the opposite. Each dimension represents a different mechanism through which trust is eroded, fairness is undermined, and the gap between

what organizations say and what they actually do grows wider. Understanding these dimensions is the first step toward closing that gap.

Because here is the uncomfortable truth that this intensive will return to again and again: we cannot teach our clients to live with integrity if our organizations do not model it. We cannot ask our clients to be honest about their behavior if we are not honest about ours. And we cannot expect our staff to maintain high standards if those standards are applied inconsistently, enforced selectively, and communicated haphazardly. Consistency begins at the top. It flows through every level of the organization. And its absence — no matter how well concealed — is always, eventually, visible to everyone.

Reflection Questions

1. When you read the phrase "consistency is the currency of trust," what is your immediate reaction? Does your organization have a surplus or a deficit of this currency? What evidence supports your answer?

Reflect honestly...

2. Think about the three levels of consistency described — clinical, operational, and relational. In which dimension is your organization strongest? In which is it weakest? What is the impact of the weakest dimension on the other two?

Reflect honestly...

3. Have you observed clients reacting to organizational inconsistency — picking up on different rules for different people, standards that shift, or unpredictable leadership? What did that look like? How did it affect their treatment engagement?

Reflect honestly...

4. Reflect on the statement: "We cannot teach our clients to live with integrity if our organizations do not model it." Where does your organization model integrity well? Where does the gap between stated values and actual practice become visible?

Reflect honestly...

5. On a scale of 1 to 10, how consistent would you rate your organization's application of its own standards? If your staff were asked anonymously, what score do you think they would give? What accounts for any gap between those two numbers?

Reflect honestly...

Part 3 · Differential Treatment: When the Same Rules Apply Differently to Different People

Differential Treatment: When the Same Rules Apply Differently to Different People

Differential treatment is perhaps the most visible and most damaging form of organizational inconsistency. It occurs when the same standards, policies, or expectations are applied differently to different people based on factors that have nothing to do with the standard itself — personal relationships, performance history, organizational tenure, subjective preferences, or simple favoritism. And in treatment organizations, where the entire therapeutic enterprise rests on the principle that people deserve fair, equitable, and respectful treatment, differential treatment among staff is not just an HR problem. It is a clinical credibility problem.

The most common form of differential treatment in SUD settings is the "high performer pass." A clinician who produces strong outcomes, carries a heavy caseload, or has a long tenure with the organization may receive dramatically different treatment for identical violations compared to a newer, less established, or less personally connected colleague. The high performer submits documentation late — it is overlooked or quietly addressed. The newer clinician submits documentation late — it becomes a formal performance conversation. The high performer misses a team meeting — leadership understands they were "busy with clients." The newer clinician misses the same meeting — it is noted as a pattern of disengagement. The behavior is identical. The response is not. And everyone on the team can see it.

The damage of this pattern extends far beyond the individuals directly involved. When staff observe differential treatment, they learn several lessons simultaneously: Standards are not real — they are suggestions that apply to some people and not others. Relationships matter more than performance — protection comes from connection to leadership, not from competence. Speaking up is risky — if the protected person is confronted, the organization will defend them, not you. And fairness is a value the organization claims but does not practice — which means other claimed values are suspect as well.

In treatment settings, this dynamic is particularly corrosive because it mirrors the very dysfunction many clients experienced in their families of origin and in active addiction. The family where one child could do no wrong and another could do no right. The relationship where the rules changed depending on the other person's mood or favoritism. The using environment where access and consequences depended on status rather than behavior. When treatment staff observe the same patterns in their professional environment, the implicit message is devastating: this organization operates exactly like the dysfunctional systems we claim to help people escape.

The equity challenge embedded in differential treatment is genuine and must be acknowledged. Not all situations are identical even when the behaviors are similar. Context matters. A clinician going through a personal crisis may genuinely need temporary flexibility. A new employee may need more guidance rather than more punishment. The challenge is distinguishing between appropriate individualization — treating different situations with thoughtful attention to context — and inappropriate favoritism — treating different people differently because of who they are

rather than what is happening.

The distinction requires transparency: Can the leader explain the rationale for the differential treatment in a way that would be perceived as fair by a neutral observer? If the answer is no, it is not individualization. It is favoritism.

Leaders who are committed to equitable treatment must develop the discipline to ask themselves a single question every time they respond to a standards issue: "Would I respond exactly the same way if this were a different person?" If the honest answer is no, the next question must be: "Why not? And is that 'why' defensible?"

Reflection Questions

1. Can you identify a specific example of differential treatment in your organization — where the same behavior received markedly different responses based on who performed it? What was the behavior, who were the individuals, and what were the different consequences?

Reflect honestly...

2. Have you been the beneficiary of differential treatment — receiving more lenient standards application because of your tenure, relationships, or performance? How did you rationalize it at the time? How do you see it now?

Reflect honestly...

3. How does your organization distinguish between appropriate individualization (thoughtful attention to context) and inappropriate favoritism (different rules for different people)? Is there a clear, documented framework — or is it left to individual supervisor judgment?

Reflect honestly...

4. If every standards decision your organization made in the past six months were reviewed by an outside observer for equity and consistency, what patterns would emerge? Would the observer conclude that standards are applied fairly?

Reflect honestly...

5. What is the impact of differential treatment on team morale, trust, and clinical quality in your setting? How does it affect the staff who observe it — not just those directly involved?

Reflect honestly...

Part 4 · Situational Inconsistency: When Pressure Becomes Permission to Abandon Standards

Situational Inconsistency: When Pressure Becomes Permission to Abandon Standards

Every organization faces situations where maintaining standards becomes difficult — during crisis periods, staffing shortages, funding transitions, accreditation reviews, or simply during the inevitable busy seasons that characterize treatment work. The question is not whether pressure will come. It always does. The question is whether the organization has a principled, transparent framework for how standards are maintained under pressure — or whether pressure simply becomes permission to abandon whatever is inconvenient.

Situational inconsistency is insidious precisely because it often feels reasonable in the moment. When the census is high and the team is short-staffed, it seems practical to relax documentation timelines. When an accreditation visit is approaching, it seems sensible to prioritize certain metrics while temporarily deprioritizing others. When a high-profile referral source makes a request that conflicts with standard protocol, it seems strategic to accommodate them. Each individual exception feels justified by the circumstances. But the accumulated effect of situational exceptions is the gradual dismantling of the standards themselves.

In SUD treatment settings, situational inconsistency creates a particularly dangerous dynamic because of what it teaches both staff and clients about the relationship between pressure and principles. When clients observe that the organization's rules become flexible under pressure — "We enforce the phone policy except during this week because we're short-staffed" or "Group attendance is mandatory except when we don't have enough counselors to run all the groups" — they learn that rules are conditional, not principled. This lesson directly undermines the therapeutic work of helping clients develop internal consistency and principled behavior regardless of external circumstances.

For staff, situational inconsistency creates what might be called "standards fatigue." When clinicians experience repeated cycles of standards enforcement followed by standards abandonment followed by re-enforcement — often without clear communication about what changed and why — they stop taking any standard seriously because they have learned that every standard is temporary.

The most damaging version of this pattern is what happens after the pressure subsides: standards that were relaxed during the crisis are supposed to return to full enforcement, but they rarely do. The temporary exception becomes the permanent new normal, and the organization has drifted from its intended standard without ever making a conscious decision to change it.

The solution is not rigidity. Treatment organizations genuinely need adaptability. But adaptability must be structured, not reactive. This means identifying in advance which standards are non-negotiable regardless of circumstances — clinical safety standards, ethical boundaries, client rights protections — and which standards have built-in flexibility protocols that specify how, when, and by whom exceptions can be authorized. It means communicating clearly when a

temporary adaptation is being made, why it is being made, and when it will end. And it means reviewing, after every pressure period, whether standards have drifted and deliberately deciding whether to restore the original standard or formally adopt the adapted one.

The organizational discipline required for this level of intentionality is significant. But the alternative — reactive, unplanned, poorly communicated situational inconsistency — costs more in the long run. It costs trust, credibility, staff morale, and ultimately clinical quality.

Reflection Questions

1. Think about the last time your organization relaxed a standard due to external pressure. What was the pressure? What standard was relaxed? Was the relaxation formally communicated with a clear end date — or did it just happen informally?

Reflect honestly...

2. Have any "temporary" exceptions to standards in your organization become permanent changes? Which ones? Did the organization consciously decide to change the standard, or did it simply drift?

Reflect honestly...

3. Which standards in your organization are genuinely non-negotiable regardless of circumstances? Is that list clear, documented, and understood by all staff — or would different people give different answers?

Reflect honestly...

4. How does your organization communicate to staff when standards are being temporarily adapted? Is the communication proactive, clear, and transparent — or do staff learn about changes by observing what leadership does rather than what they say?

Reflect honestly...

5. What process does your organization use after a pressure period to assess whether standards need to be formally restored? If no process exists, what has been the accumulated cost of that absence?

Reflect honestly...

Part 5 · The Invisible Dimensions: Mood, Communication, Drift, and the Erosion of Trust

The Invisible Dimensions: Mood, Communication, Drift, and the Erosion of Trust

Some forms of inconsistency are dramatic and visible — the blatant favoritism, the public double standard, the obvious policy reversal. But the dimensions of inconsistency that cause the most cumulative damage are often the ones that operate below the surface: the mood-dependent enforcement that staff navigate without ever naming, the communication inequities that create invisible advantages for some and invisible disadvantages for others, the slow temporal drift that erodes standards so gradually that no one can identify exactly when or how they changed, and the transparency gaps that allow inconsistency to persist unchallenged because there is no mechanism for acknowledging it.

Leadership mood and availability variations represent one of the most underexamined sources of inconsistency in treatment organizations. Leaders are human beings who experience varying levels of energy, patience, stress, and emotional capacity. On a good day, a supervisor might respond to a clinician's documentation lapse with a patient coaching conversation. On a bad day, the same lapse by the same clinician might trigger a sharp correction or formal documentation. The behavior is identical. The context is identical. The only variable is the internal state of the leader.

And staff learn this variation quickly. They develop sophisticated, unspoken systems for reading leadership mood — monitoring tone, body language, office door position, email response speed — and adjusting their own behavior accordingly. They time their requests for when the supervisor seems approachable. They avoid raising concerns on days when the supervisor seems stressed. They learn to manage the leader rather than engage with the work. This is not leadership. It is emotional weather that staff must forecast and navigate.

Communication inconsistencies create a form of organizational inequity that is rarely discussed but deeply consequential. When some staff members receive detailed, timely, specific feedback about standards expectations while others receive little or none, the result is an information gap that directly affects performance and vulnerability. The clinician who receives regular coaching conversations understands expectations, has opportunities to course-correct, and develops competence through guided practice. The clinician who receives minimal feedback operates in a vacuum — unaware of gaps until they become formal performance issues. And when those two clinicians are later evaluated against the same standards, the comparison is inherently unfair because they did not receive equivalent access to the information, coaching, and support necessary to meet those standards.

Temporal inconsistency — the slow drift of standards over time — is perhaps the most difficult dimension to identify because it happens gradually. A standard that was firmly enforced two years ago begins to be enforced less rigorously. Small exceptions accumulate. New staff members, who were not present when the standard was clear, adopt the current relaxed practice as their baseline. Eventually, the original standard exists in the policy manual but not in daily

practice, and the gap between the two creates confusion, frustration, and vulnerability for staff who may not realize they are operating outside the official standard. Policy drift is the organizational equivalent of a slow leak — by the time you notice the damage, the foundation has been compromised.

Transparency and accountability gaps tie all of these dimensions together. When enforcement decisions are made without clear reasoning, when there is no mechanism for questioning perceived inconsistencies, and when leadership is reluctant to acknowledge or examine its own patterns, inconsistency becomes self-perpetuating. Staff who cannot name the inconsistency cannot advocate for its correction. Leaders who are not confronted with their patterns cannot change them. And the organization exists in a state of quiet dysfunction that everyone can feel but no one can address — because addressing it would require the very transparency and accountability that the dysfunction has eliminated.

Reflection Questions

1. Have you ever adjusted your behavior based on your supervisor's mood — timing a request or conversation for when they seemed more receptive? What does that adaptive behavior tell you about the consistency of your organizational environment?

Reflect honestly...

2. Think about the feedback and coaching you receive compared to what your colleagues receive. Is it equivalent in frequency, specificity, and quality? If not, what is the impact of that inequity on performance and morale?

Reflect honestly...

3. Can you identify a specific standard in your organization that has drifted from its original form? What was the standard originally? What is the actual practice now? How did the drift happen — through deliberate decision or accumulated erosion?

Reflect honestly...

4. If you raised a concern about inconsistency in your organization, how would it be received? Is there a safe, consequential mechanism for identifying and addressing inconsistency — or does raising the concern carry risk?

Reflect honestly...

5. Which of the "invisible dimensions" — mood variability, communication inequity, temporal drift, or transparency gaps — is most active in your organization? What evidence leads you to that conclusion?

Reflect honestly...

Part 6 · Closing the Consistency Gap: From Awareness to Organizational Integrity

Closing the Consistency Gap: From Awareness to Organizational Integrity

Identifying inconsistency is the diagnosis. Closing the consistency gap is the treatment plan. And like any good treatment plan, it must be specific, measurable, realistic, and supported by genuine organizational commitment — not just aspirational language in a leadership meeting.

The first principle of consistency repair is honest assessment. Organizations cannot fix what they will not name. This requires creating mechanisms for identifying inconsistency that go beyond individual perception — systematic reviews of enforcement patterns, anonymous staff surveys about perceived fairness, exit interview analysis that examines whether consistency concerns contributed to departure, and leadership self-assessment processes that hold supervisors accountable for equitable treatment. The data will be uncomfortable. That discomfort is the price of improvement.

The second principle is structural consistency. Human beings are inconsistent by nature — our moods vary, our attention wanders, our biases operate beneath our awareness. Organizational consistency cannot depend on individual leaders being consistently fair at all times. It requires structures, processes, and systems that maintain consistency even when individual humans are having bad days. This means clear, documented standards with specific behavioral expectations rather than vague aspirational language. It means decision frameworks that guide enforcement responses, reducing the range of individual discretion and ensuring that similar situations receive similar treatment regardless of who is making the decision. It means regular calibration meetings where supervisors compare their enforcement patterns, identify discrepancies, and align their approaches. And it means documentation practices that create a reviewable record of how standards are applied across individuals, situations, and time periods.

The third principle is transparency and communication. Every standards decision should be explainable. This does not mean that every decision must be explained to every person — confidentiality and professional boundaries must be maintained. But it means that if asked, a leader should be able to articulate the reasoning behind their enforcement response in a way that a neutral observer would find principled and defensible. When standards are adapted — temporarily or permanently — the adaptation should be communicated clearly, with rationale and timeline. When inconsistency is identified, it should be acknowledged rather than defended. The willingness to say "You're right — I handled that differently than I should have, and here's what I'll do differently" is not weakness. It is the most powerful demonstration of organizational integrity available to any leader.

The fourth principle is accountability at all levels. Consistency cannot flow only downward. If staff are held accountable for meeting clinical standards, supervisors must be held accountable for equitable enforcement. If clinicians are evaluated on documentation timeliness, leaders must be evaluated on coaching quality and retention outcomes. If the organization claims consistency as a value, it must measure that value with the same rigor it applies to billable hours, census, and

regulatory compliance. What gets measured gets managed. What gets ignored gets worse.

The fifth principle is continuous improvement rather than perfection. No organization will achieve perfect consistency. The goal is not to eliminate all variability — some variability is appropriate and necessary. The goal is to develop organizational awareness, structures, and practices that identify unintentional inconsistency quickly, address it transparently, and continuously improve the alignment between stated standards and actual practice. This is a perpetual process, not a one-time initiative. It requires the same ongoing attention, review, and adjustment that we apply to clinical programming.

Because organizational consistency is not a separate concern from clinical quality. It is the infrastructure upon which clinical quality depends. In substance use disorder treatment, we ask our clients to do the hardest thing a human being can do: change. We ask them to examine their patterns, acknowledge their inconsistencies, commit to new behaviors, and sustain those behaviors even when it is difficult, uncomfortable, and imperfect. We owe them — and our staff — organizations that are willing to do the same.

Reflection Questions

1. Of the five principles described — honest assessment, structural consistency, transparency, accountability, and continuous improvement — which does your organization practice most effectively? Which is the most significant gap?

Reflect honestly...

2. What structures or systems currently exist in your organization to maintain consistency beyond individual judgment? What additional structures would make the biggest difference?

Reflect honestly...

3. How comfortable is your organization's leadership with acknowledging inconsistency when it is identified? Is the typical response curiosity and correction — or defensiveness and justification?

Reflect honestly...

4. If your organization measured consistency with the same rigor it measures census, revenue, or regulatory compliance, what would the data show? What would change if that data were visible to all levels of the organization?

Reflect honestly...

5. Write a one-paragraph description of what organizational consistency would look like in your setting if it were fully realized — not perfect, but genuinely committed. What is the distance between that description and your current reality? What is the first step toward closing that gap?

Reflect honestly...

Part 7 · Organizational Consistency Assessment — 56 Items

Organizational Consistency Assessment

56 Items Across 7 Consistency Dimensions

How to Use This Assessment

Rate each statement on a scale of 1 (Not at all true) to 5 (Very much true). Answer based on your direct experience and honest observation — not what leadership says happens, but what you have actually witnessed. Higher scores across all categories indicate greater organizational inconsistency. This is a diagnostic tool for organizational health, not a judgment of individuals.

1. High-performing clinicians in our organization receive more lenient treatment for identical policy violations than average performers

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

2. Personal favorites or long-standing staff members are held to different standards than newer employees for the same behaviors

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

3. New employees are treated more harshly during their probationary period than established team members would be for identical issues

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

4. The consequences for identical behaviors — late documentation, missed meetings, policy deviations — vary significantly based on who commits them

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

5. Informal hierarchies exist in our organization that override the formal standards that are supposed to apply equally to everyone

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

6. I have observed situations where who the person is mattered more than what they did when determining the organizational response

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

7. Staff members have expressed or privately acknowledged that standards are not applied equally across the team

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

8. Leadership would have difficulty defending, with specific examples, that standards are applied consistently across all staff

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

1. Standards that are enforced during normal operations are routinely ignored during busy periods, audits, or high-stress situations

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

2. Different enforcement patterns exist during different projects, funding cycles, or accreditation timelines without clear rationale

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

3. External pressures — from referral sources, families, or funders — cause selective abandonment of standards that are otherwise enforced

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

4. Similar clinical situations receive markedly different organizational responses depending on timing, workload, or current priorities

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

5. Temporary relaxations of standards during crisis periods have become permanent changes without deliberate organizational decision-making

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

6. Staff are unclear about which standards are flexible under what circumstances and which standards are non-negotiable regardless of conditions

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

7. I have observed identical situations handled completely differently based on the day, the context, or who was on shift

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

8. Our organization lacks clear written criteria for when and how standards can be temporarily adapted versus when they must be maintained

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

1. Standards enforcement in our organization varies noticeably based on the supervisor's mood, energy level, or personal stress

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

2. Violations that would trigger a conversation on a "good day" are ignored on days when leadership is busy, distracted, or overwhelmed

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

3. Different supervisors or leaders within the same organization apply the same standards in markedly different ways

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

4. The timing of enforcement seems driven more by the leader's schedule or emotional state than by the severity or urgency of the violation

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

5. Personal relationships between supervisors and specific staff members visibly influence how standards are applied to those individuals

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

6. Staff have learned to "read the room" — timing their requests, disclosures, or conversations based on the supervisor's perceived mood

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

7. I have noticed that my own enforcement consistency varies based on how I am feeling on a given day

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

8. Our organization has no systems or structures designed to maintain consistency despite the natural variability of human mood and availability

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

1. Some staff members receive detailed, specific, constructive feedback while others receive little or no feedback at all

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

2. The formality level of performance conversations varies significantly depending on who the staff member is rather than the nature of the concern

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

3. Similar performance issues are addressed quickly with some staff members but allowed to persist for weeks or months with others

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

4. Different levels of explanation, context, and rationale are provided to different staff members when communicating standards expectations

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

5. Documentation and follow-up for performance conversations is inconsistent — thorough for some staff, nonexistent for others

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

6. Staff who ask questions or seek clarification about standards receive more support than staff who do not, creating an information equity gap

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

7. New or less connected staff members are disadvantageded because they lack the informal channels through which standards information flows

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

8. Our organization does not systematically ensure that all staff receive equivalent access to feedback, coaching, and standards communication

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

1. Exceptions to organizational standards have become so frequent that they are no longer truly exceptional — they are routine

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

2. The criteria for when exceptions are appropriate versus when standards must be maintained are unclear or undocumented

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

3. Different staff members receive different treatment regarding exceptions — some have access to flexibility that others do not

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

4. Exceptions are granted based on personal requests, relationships, or advocacy rather than consistent, objective criteria

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

5. The frequency of exceptions to specific standards suggests those standards need to be formally revised rather than continually bypassed

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

6. Our organization does not systematically review whether frequent exceptions indicate that a standard is unrealistic or needs updating

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

7. Staff have learned that standards are "negotiable" and adjust their compliance accordingly, knowing enforcement is inconsistent

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

8. Well-intentioned flexibility in applying standards has eroded the standards themselves to the point where they carry little meaningful weight

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

1. Standards that were once consistently enforced have gradually eroded over time without any deliberate organizational decision to change them

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

2. New informal interpretations of standards have emerged through practice without official policies being updated to reflect the change

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

3. Enforcement patterns from six months ago differ noticeably from current patterns without clear communication about what changed and why

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

4. Historical precedents established under previous leadership have been abandoned without explanation or formal policy revision

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

5. Small, accumulated compromises to standards over time have created a significant gap between official policy and actual practice

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

6. Staff who have been in the organization for different lengths of time operate under effectively different standards based on what was enforced when they were onboarded

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

7. Our organization rarely conducts systematic reviews to identify where policy drift has occurred and whether it should be formalized or corrected

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

8. If a new employee read the official policy manual and compared it to actual daily practice, they would find significant discrepancies

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

1. Enforcement decisions are frequently made without clear explanation of the reasoning behind them

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

2. There are no meaningful processes for staff to question or appeal perceived inconsistencies in standards application

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

3. The criteria used to make enforcement decisions are unclear, undocumented, or appear arbitrary to staff

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

4. Leadership is reluctant to acknowledge inconsistencies when they are identified, becoming defensive rather than curious

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

5. Our organization lacks systematic review processes that examine enforcement patterns for bias, inconsistency, or drift

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

6. Staff perceive enforcement decisions as unfair but have no avenue to raise those concerns without risk

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

7. Even when enforcement decisions are fair, the lack of transparency creates the perception of unfairness that damages trust

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

8. Accountability for consistent standards application flows downward to staff but not upward to leadership — leaders are not held to the same transparency standards they require of clinicians

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Not at all · Very much

1. Looking at your scores across all seven dimensions, which dimension of inconsistency is most active in your organization? Which scored lowest? What does the overall pattern reveal?

Synthesize your assessment...

2. Are multiple dimensions elevated simultaneously? If so, how do they interact — does inconsistency in one area create or worsen inconsistency in others?

Synthesize your assessment...

3. Which dimension surprised you most — either because it scored higher or lower than you expected? What does that surprise tell you about your prior awareness?

Synthesize your assessment...

4. If you shared these results with your leadership, how would they respond? Would they be curious, defensive, dismissive, or motivated? What does that predicted response tell you about the organization?

Synthesize your assessment...

5. Based on this assessment, what are the three most urgent consistency gaps your organization needs to address? For each, identify one specific, actionable step that could begin closing the gap.

Synthesize your assessment...

Scoring guide

Reset all progress? This cannot be undone.

Higher scores indicate greater inconsistency in that dimension. Scores above 60% suggest significant organizational inconsistency that is likely visible to staff and possibly to clients. Scores above 75% indicate a critical consistency gap that is almost certainly undermining trust, morale, and clinical quality. The profile shape matters as much as individual scores — multiple elevated dimensions compound each other's damage.

Part 8 • Exercise 1: The Consistency Mirror — Personal Patterns

The Consistency Mirror

Examining Your Own Patterns Before Examining Anyone Else's

Start With Yourself

Before examining organizational inconsistency, this exercise asks you to examine your own. Every person — regardless of role — contributes to or undermines consistency through their daily decisions, responses, and patterns. Honest self-examination is the foundation of any credible organizational critique.

1. Do you apply the same standards to yourself that you expect of others? Where are you most likely to give yourself an exception that you would not give a colleague or supervisee?

Be honest with yourself...

2. Think about your last five interactions with different staff members about the same topic (documentation, attendance, clinical standards). Was your tone, specificity, and follow-through identical across all five? If not, what varied and why?

Be honest with yourself...

3. Have you ever enforced a standard with one person while overlooking the same violation by another? What determined the difference — the behavior, the person, or your mood?

Be honest with yourself...

4. How does your own emotional state affect your consistency? On your worst days, what standards are you most likely to either over-enforce (because you are frustrated) or under-enforce (because you are exhausted)?

Be honest with yourself...

5. Do you communicate standards expectations with the same clarity, frequency, and specificity to every person on your team — or do some people get more coaching and information than others?

Be honest with yourself...

6. When have you been inconsistent and known it in the moment? What prevented you from correcting it? What would it have cost to be consistent?

Be honest with yourself...

1. Based on your honest self-assessment, which dimension of consistency is your personal weakness — differential treatment, situational flexibility, mood-driven variability, communication inequity, or exception-making? What evidence supports your answer?

Identify your patterns...

2. What triggers your inconsistency? Identify the specific conditions — internal (mood, stress, fatigue) or external (workload, pressure, conflict) — under which you are most likely to deviate from consistent practice.

Identify your patterns...

3. Who benefits from your inconsistency? Who is disadvantaged by it? Are there specific individuals or types of individuals who consistently receive better or worse treatment from you? Identify your patterns...

4. Write a commitment statement: "The dimension of consistency I most need to improve is _____. The specific behavior I commit to changing is _____. The structure or support I need to maintain this change is _____."

Identify your patterns...

Part 9 • Exercise 2: Differential Treatment Case Analysis

Differential Treatment Case Analysis

Examining How Identical Behaviors Receive Different Responses

The Equity Test

For each scenario below, answer honestly based on what would ACTUALLY happen in your organization — not what should happen, not what the policy says, but what your direct observation tells you would occur. The gap between 'should' and 'would' is the measure of your organization's differential treatment problem.

SCENARIO

Two clinicians submit their weekly progress notes three days late. Clinician A has been with the organization for five years and has strong relationships with leadership. Clinician B has been with the organization for eight months and recently raised concerns about workload in a team meeting.

1. What response would Clinician A most likely receive in your organization?

Describe what would actually happen...

2. What response would Clinician B most likely receive?

Describe what would actually happen...

3. If the responses would differ, what does that tell you about how standards are actually applied?

Describe what would actually happen...

SCENARIO

Two staff members miss the mandatory weekly staff meeting without prior notice. Staff Member A is a supervisor's close personal friend. Staff Member B is quiet, keeps to themselves, and has no personal relationship with leadership.

1. How would each absence most likely be interpreted by leadership?

Describe what would actually happen...

2. What assumptions would be made about the reason for each person's absence?

Describe what would actually happen...

3. How does personal relationship with leadership influence the benefit of the doubt?

Describe what would actually happen...

SCENARIO

Two clinicians receive similar client complaints about feeling "rushed" during sessions. Clinician A generates the most revenue and carries the highest caseload. Clinician B carries an average caseload and has been identified as someone who "needs improvement" in other areas.

1. How would each complaint likely be handled — investigated, discussed, or dismissed?

Describe what would actually happen...

2. Would the response focus on the complaint itself or be colored by the clinician's overall standing?

Describe what would actually happen...

3. What does the likely response difference reveal about how organizational value is assigned to different staff?

Describe what would actually happen...

1. Describe a specific instance of differential treatment you have directly observed in your organization. Same behavior, different people, different response. What happened?

Share your experience...

2. Have you ever been on the receiving end of differential treatment — either benefiting from it or being disadvantaged by it? What was the situation and how did it affect your trust in the organization?

Share your experience...

3. If you asked five different staff members whether standards are applied equally in your organization, what do you think they would say? Would their answers depend on their own position in the informal hierarchy?

Share your experience...

4. What is one specific change that could reduce differential treatment in your organization? Who has the power to implement it, and what is preventing them?

Share your experience...

Part 10 · Exercise 3: Pressure Points — Situational Consistency Mapping

Pressure Points Mapping

Identifying When and How Pressure Erodes Standards

Stress-Testing Your Standards

Every organization faces pressure. The question is whether your standards are designed to withstand pressure or whether they collapse under it. For each pressure type below, map how your organization's standards enforcement changes — what gets relaxed, what gets tightened, and what the accumulated effect of those changes has been over time.

When client numbers are high and staff are stretched thin, which standards get relaxed first? Documentation timelines? Group size limits? Supervision frequency? Individual session length? Which specific standards are most affected by this pressure? What changes about their enforcement?

Identify the affected standards...

Is the change communicated proactively to staff, or do they discover it by observing what leadership does? Is there a clear end date?

Evaluate the transparency...

Have any "temporary" adaptations during this type of pressure become permanent? What was the long-term impact?

Track the drift...

When accreditation visits or audits approach, which standards are suddenly enforced more rigorously? Which are deprioritized? Does the organization's behavior change more for external observers than for daily practice?

Which specific standards are most affected by this pressure? What changes about their enforcement?

Identify the affected standards...

Is the change communicated proactively to staff, or do they discover it by observing what leadership does? Is there a clear end date?

Evaluate the transparency...

Have any "temporary" adaptations during this type of pressure become permanent? What was the long-term impact?

Track the drift...

When referral sources, insurance companies, or funders make requests that conflict with standard practice, how does the organization respond? Are standards maintained, adapted, or abandoned?

Which specific standards are most affected by this pressure? What changes about their enforcement?

Identify the affected standards...

Is the change communicated proactively to staff, or do they discover it by observing what leadership does? Is there a clear end date?

Evaluate the transparency...

Have any "temporary" adaptations during this type of pressure become permanent? What was the long-term impact?

Track the drift...

During periods of leadership change, organizational restructuring, or internal conflict, how do standards enforcement patterns change? Do they tighten, loosen, or become unpredictable?

Which specific standards are most affected by this pressure? What changes about their enforcement?

Identify the affected standards...

Is the change communicated proactively to staff, or do they discover it by observing what leadership does? Is there a clear end date?

Evaluate the transparency...

Have any "temporary" adaptations during this type of pressure become permanent? What was the long-term impact?

Track the drift...

When a client crisis, adverse event, or critical incident occurs, how do standards enforcement patterns change across the organization? Does enforcement become reactive and punitive, or does it remain principled?

Which specific standards are most affected by this pressure? What changes about their enforcement?

Identify the affected standards...

Is the change communicated proactively to staff, or do they discover it by observing what leadership does? Is there a clear end date?

Evaluate the transparency...

Have any "temporary" adaptations during this type of pressure become permanent? What was the long-term impact?

Track the drift...

Are there predictable times of year when standards enforcement changes — end of fiscal year, holiday periods, summer staffing challenges? What happens during these predictable pressure points?

Which specific standards are most affected by this pressure? What changes about their enforcement?

Identify the affected standards...

Is the change communicated proactively to staff, or do they discover it by observing what leadership does? Is there a clear end date?

Evaluate the transparency...

Have any "temporary" adaptations during this type of pressure become permanent? What was the long-term impact?

Track the drift...

1. Looking across all six pressure types, which standards are most vulnerable to situational inconsistency? Are they the same standards every time, or does the pressure determine which standards flex?

Synthesize the pressure patterns...

2. Does your organization have a formal framework for distinguishing non-negotiable standards from standards that can be temporarily adapted? If not, what is the cost of that absence?

Synthesize the pressure patterns...

3. What would it look like for your organization to maintain core standards under pressure while transparently adapting non-essential ones? Write a brief "pressure protocol" describing how this could work.

Synthesize the pressure patterns...

Part 11 · Exercise 4: Leadership Weather Report — Mood & Enforcement

Leadership Weather Report

How Mood and Availability Drive Enforcement Patterns

Forecasting the Leader

Staff in organizations with mood-driven leadership develop sophisticated internal weather forecasting systems — reading tone, body language, email patterns, and office door position to predict what kind of enforcement day it will be. This exercise asks you to make those invisible patterns visible and examine their impact on organizational consistency.

1. Describe a typical "good day" for your supervisor or the primary leader who enforces standards. What is their demeanor? How do they respond to issues? How accessible are they?

Map the weather patterns...

2. Now describe a typical "bad day." What changes about their tone, availability, patience, and enforcement approach? What specific standards are enforced differently?

Map the weather patterns...

3. What signals do you and your colleagues use to "read the room" and predict the leader's enforcement mood? Be specific — what behaviors, patterns, or cues do you monitor?

Map the weather patterns...

4. How do you personally adjust your behavior based on the leader's mood? Do you time conversations, delay disclosures, or modify your approach depending on the forecast?

Map the weather patterns...

5. If multiple supervisors or leaders enforce standards in your organization, how do their patterns differ? Do staff know which leader to approach for which types of issues based on predictable mood patterns?

Map the weather patterns...

6. What is the cumulative impact of mood-driven enforcement on your team's morale, trust, and willingness to engage honestly with leadership?

Map the weather patterns...

1. What structures or systems could your organization implement to reduce the impact of individual mood on standards enforcement? Think about frameworks, checklists, peer calibration, or delayed response protocols.

Design the structures...

2. If you are a supervisor, what personal practices could you develop to maintain enforcement consistency regardless of your internal state? What "pause protocol" could prevent mood-driven responses?

Design the structures...

3. What would it look like if your organization normalized the conversation about mood-driven enforcement — acknowledging it openly as a human limitation rather than pretending it doesn't exist?

Design the structures...

Part 12 · Exercise 5: Communication Equity Audit

Communication Equity Audit

Do All Staff Have Equal Access to Information, Feedback & Support?

The Information Gap

When feedback, coaching, and communication about standards are distributed unevenly, the result is an invisible information hierarchy that directly affects performance, vulnerability, and career outcomes. Staff who receive more communication have more opportunity to succeed. Staff who receive less are set up to fail. This audit examines whether your organization's communication practices are equitable.

INEQUITABLE PRACTICE

Some staff receive regular coaching while others receive feedback only during formal evaluations or performance problems

EQUITABLE PRACTICE

All staff receive equivalent frequency of feedback — scheduled, predictable, and proportionate to need

Which description more accurately reflects your organization's actual practice? Provide a specific example.

Evaluate honestly with a specific example...

INEQUITABLE PRACTICE

Some staff receive detailed, actionable feedback while others receive vague generalities like "keep up the good work" or "you need to improve"

EQUITABLE PRACTICE

All staff receive specific, behavioral, actionable feedback that enables genuine improvement

Which description more accurately reflects your organization's actual practice? Provide a specific example.

Evaluate honestly with a specific example...

INEQUITABLE PRACTICE

Issues with some staff are addressed immediately while identical issues with others are allowed to persist for weeks or months

EQUITABLE PRACTICE

Similar issues are addressed within similar timeframes regardless of who is involved

Which description more accurately reflects your organization's actual practice? Provide a specific example.

Evaluate honestly with a specific example...

INEQUITABLE PRACTICE

Similar conversations are informal and supportive with some staff but formal and documented with others

EQUITABLE PRACTICE

The formality level of performance conversations is determined by the issue, not the individual

Which description more accurately reflects your organization's actual practice? Provide a specific example.

Evaluate honestly with a specific example...

INEQUITABLE PRACTICE

Some staff receive thorough explanations of expectations while others are expected to "figure it out" or are given minimal context

EQUITABLE PRACTICE

All staff receive equivalent access to rationale, context, and explanation for standards and expectations

Which description more accurately reflects your organization's actual practice? Provide a specific example.

Evaluate honestly with a specific example...

INEQUITABLE PRACTICE

Conversations with some staff are thoroughly documented and followed up while others are undocumented and forgotten

EQUITABLE PRACTICE

Documentation and follow-up practices are consistent across all staff interactions

Which description more accurately reflects your organization's actual practice? Provide a specific example.

Evaluate honestly with a specific example...

1. Across all six dimensions, how equitable is your organization's communication practice? Where are the greatest gaps?

Summarize your findings...

2. Who benefits most from the current communication distribution? Who is most disadvantaged? Is there a pattern based on tenure, role, relationship with leadership, or other factors?

Summarize your findings...

3. What would it cost — in time, structure, and leadership effort — to make communication genuinely equitable? What is the cost of not doing so?

Summarize your findings...

4. Design a specific communication structure that would ensure equitable access to feedback across your team. Describe the frequency, format, and accountability mechanism.

Summarize your findings...

Part 13 · Exercise 6: Policy Drift Detective — Then vs. Now

Policy Drift Detective

Tracking Where Standards Have Silently Changed

Then vs. Now

Policy drift is the slow, unintentional erosion of standards through accumulated small compromises. No single moment caused the change. No deliberate decision was made. But the gap between the standard as written and the standard as practiced has grown to the point where they are effectively different policies. This exercise asks you to identify where drift has occurred and determine whether the organization should formalize the change or restore the original standard.

Identify five specific standards, policies, or practices in your organization that are currently enforced differently than they were originally intended or previously practiced. For each one, map the drift:

Standard #1

What is the standard/policy as officially written?

The official standard...

What is the standard as actually practiced today?

The actual practice...

How did the drift happen? Can you identify when, why, or through what series of small compromises the change occurred?

Trace the drift...

Should the organization formalize the current practice (make the drift official) or restore the original standard? Why?

Formalize or restore?

Standard #2

What is the standard/policy as officially written?

The official standard...

What is the standard as actually practiced today?

The actual practice...

How did the drift happen? Can you identify when, why, or through what series of small compromises the change occurred?

Trace the drift...

Should the organization formalize the current practice (make the drift official) or restore the original standard? Why?

Formalize or restore?

Standard #3

What is the standard/policy as officially written?

The official standard...

What is the standard as actually practiced today?

The actual practice...

How did the drift happen? Can you identify when, why, or through what series of small compromises the change occurred?

Trace the drift...

Should the organization formalize the current practice (make the drift official) or restore the original standard? Why?

Formalize or restore?

Standard #4

What is the standard/policy as officially written?

The official standard...

What is the standard as actually practiced today?

The actual practice...

How did the drift happen? Can you identify when, why, or through what series of small compromises the change occurred?

Trace the drift...

Should the organization formalize the current practice (make the drift official) or restore the original standard? Why?

Formalize or restore?

Standard #5

What is the standard/policy as officially written?

The official standard...

What is the standard as actually practiced today?

The actual practice...

How did the drift happen? Can you identify when, why, or through what series of small compromises the change occurred?

Trace the drift...

Should the organization formalize the current practice (make the drift official) or restore the original standard? Why?

Formalize or restore?

1. Looking across all five standards, what common factors drove the drift? Was it workload pressure, leadership change, gradual accommodation, or something else?

Analyze the drift...

2. If a new employee read the policy manual on day one and then observed actual practice on day two, how many discrepancies would they notice? What would that experience tell them about the organization's relationship with its own standards?

Analyze the drift...

3. What process could your organization implement to regularly audit for policy drift and make deliberate decisions about whether to formalize changes or restore original standards?

Analyze the drift...

Part 14 · Exercise 7: Exception Inventory & Standards Health Check

Exception Inventory & Standards Health Check

When Exceptions Become the Rule, the Rule No Longer Exists

The Exception Paradox

Exceptions to standards are sometimes necessary and appropriate. But when exceptions become routine, they reveal one of two things: either the standard is unrealistic and needs to be formally revised, or the organization lacks the discipline to maintain standards it has chosen to set. This exercise asks you to inventory the exceptions in your organization and determine what they reveal about standards health.

1. List the five standards or policies that are most frequently excepted in your organization. For each, estimate how often exceptions are granted (weekly? monthly? more often than enforcement?)

Inventory the exceptions...

2. For each of those five standards, who typically receives exceptions? Is there a pattern based on role, tenure, relationship with leadership, or other factors?

Inventory the exceptions...

3. What process exists for requesting an exception? Is it formal (written request, documented approval) or informal (conversation, assumption, unspoken understanding)?

Inventory the exceptions...

4. When an exception is granted, is it documented? Is there a review process? Does anyone track the cumulative frequency of exceptions to the same standard?

Inventory the exceptions...

5. For each frequently excepted standard, answer honestly: Does this standard need to be formally revised to match reality — or does the organization need to strengthen its commitment to enforcing it?

Inventory the exceptions...

1. Based on your exception inventory, how many of your organization's standards are genuinely "living" — consistently enforced, meaningfully maintained, and taken seriously by staff? How many are "decorative" — officially in place but routinely bypassed?

Diagnose standards health...

2. What is the cost of maintaining standards that are not enforced? Consider the impact on staff trust, organizational credibility, and the message sent to clients about the relationship between stated rules and actual practice.

Diagnose standards health...

3. Write a recommendation: Which standards should be formally revised to reflect actual practice? Which standards should be re-committed to with renewed enforcement? What criteria should guide the distinction?

Diagnose standards health...

4. Design an "exception protocol" for your organization — a clear, documented framework that specifies when exceptions are appropriate, who can authorize them, how they are documented, and how frequently excepted standards are reviewed for formal revision.

Diagnose standards health...

Part 15 · Exercise 8: Consistency Repair Plan — From Diagnosis to Action

Consistency Repair Plan

From Diagnosis to Action — Building the Organization Your Staff & Clients Deserve

The Final Step

This final exercise translates everything you have examined throughout this intensive into a concrete, actionable plan. Awareness without action is sophisticated avoidance. The seven dimensions of consistency you have explored are not abstract concepts — they are daily realities that affect real people. What you do with this awareness determines whether it was worth developing.

1. Write a one-paragraph honest diagnosis of your organization's consistency across all seven dimensions. Where is it strongest? Where is it most compromised? What is the overall impact on staff and clients?

Summarize your diagnosis...

2. Rank the seven dimensions from most problematic to least problematic in your organization. For the top three, identify the specific harm each is causing.

Summarize your diagnosis...

3. What is the connection between your organization's consistency problems and its staff turnover, client outcomes, and organizational culture? Are these connected or separate issues?

Summarize your diagnosis...

1. Identify one specific consistency improvement you can implement within the next 30 days without requiring anyone else's permission. What is it, and when will you start?

Plan your immediate actions...

2. Identify one consistency conversation you need to have with a colleague, supervisor, or leader. What will you say? What outcome are you seeking? What risk are you willing to accept?

Plan your immediate actions...

3. What data do you need to start collecting to make consistency visible and measurable? How will you begin collecting it?

Plan your immediate actions...

4. What personal consistency practice will you commit to — a daily or weekly behavior that models the consistency you want to see in the organization?

Plan your immediate actions...

1. What structural changes — decision frameworks, calibration meetings, audit processes, feedback structures — would most improve consistency in your organization? Prioritize three and describe implementation steps.

Cast the vision...

2. What training or development does leadership need to improve consistency? How would you propose it, and what resistance do you anticipate?

Cast the vision...

3. What accountability mechanisms would hold the organization to its consistency commitments? Who would be responsible for monitoring and reporting?

Cast the vision...

4. Describe the organization you want to be part of — one that genuinely practices the consistency it claims. What does a typical week look like in that organization? How are decisions made? How are people treated? How does it feel to work there?

Cast the vision...

A Final Word on Consistency & Clinical Integrity

In substance use disorder treatment, we ask clients to develop consistency in their recovery — consistent meeting attendance, consistent medication adherence, consistent honest communication, consistent healthy behavior even when it is difficult. We ask this because we know that consistency is the infrastructure of change. Without it, recovery is a series of disconnected events rather than a sustained trajectory toward health. The same is true for organizations. Consistency is the infrastructure of trust. Without it, policies are decorative, values are aspirational, and the gap between what we say and what we do becomes the defining feature of our organizational culture — visible to every staff member and, inevitably, to every client. Closing that gap is not a one-time effort. It is a daily practice — like recovery itself. It requires honest self-examination, willingness to be held accountable, courage to name what is not working, and persistent effort to align behavior with values. The seven dimensions you have explored in this intensive are not problems to be solved and forgotten. They are areas of ongoing organizational attention that require the same vigilance and commitment we ask of every person who walks through our treatment doors seeking change. Your staff are watching. Your clients are watching. And the integrity of your mission depends on what they see.

Write your personal closing commitment — a statement that captures what this intensive has revealed, what you are committed to changing, and how you will hold yourself accountable:
