

Dual Lens Lightweight Diagnostic

Participant Learning Guide and Workbook

Public Self-Paced Learning Package
Controlled Draft — Version 0.3

This workbook is the central learner companion for the public Dual Lens course. Use it alongside the narrated lessons, Google Site module pages, the HR onboarding demonstration, and responsible practice with the Lightweight Diagnostic GPT. The book Before You Improve the Service is a recommended reference, not a prerequisite.

Participant	Course start date	Completion date

Document Control

Field	Value
Document ID	DL-LW-TRN-02
Title	Participant Learning Guide and Workbook
Package	Dual Lens Lightweight Diagnostic — Public Self-Paced Learning Package
Version	0.2 — Controlled Draft
Audience	Public learners; no USM prerequisite
Related documents	DL-LW-TRN-00 v0.2, DL-LW-TRN-01 v0.2, DL-LW-TRN-03, DL-LW-TRN-04, DL-LW-TRN-05, DL-LW-TRN-06, DL-LW-TRN-08, DL-LW-TRN-09, DL-LW-TRN-10, Before You Improve the Service (recommended reference), public Lightweight GPT
Completion status	Course completion only; not Full Diagnostic facilitator qualification
Revision summary	Aligned to canonical Module 0–10 structure; workbook-centered Google delivery; book references made optional; module checks moved online; final quiz reframed as a non-certifying online knowledge check; completion tracking simplified; Appendix D added with illustrative example answers to workbook exercises.

Use of this workbook

Digital use: the editable Word version can be typed into directly. If the course offers a Google Docs master, make your own copy before entering responses. The printable PDF is intended for handwriting or annotation. Your personal workbook is not collected by the course.

- Keep this workbook open while you work through each course module. Use the recommended book references when you want additional depth.
- Use this workbook in whichever format works best for you: print/PDF, editable Word, or your own Google Docs copy.
- Use generalized or fictional information for exercises unless you are authorized to use actual organizational information.
- Keep the completed workbook as your personal learning record. Routine workbook responses are not submitted or reviewed.
- Do not treat workbook answers or GPT output as formal diagnostic findings.

Important boundary

Completion of this workbook does not authorize the learner to conduct a Full Dual Lens Management Diagnostic, issue formal findings, assign maturity levels, deploy the controlled Full GPT, or represent themselves as a qualified Full Diagnostic facilitator.

Course Map and Progress Record

The Google Site is the course navigation layer. Each module page directs you to the corresponding narrated lesson, workbook activity, optional reference material, and online knowledge check. Module numbering in this workbook matches the canonical Module 0–10 course sequence.

Module	Focus	Recommended reference / supporting material	Target time	Complete
0	Welcome and responsible use	Course site orientation	15 min	☐
1	Before you improve the service	Before You Improve the Service: Preface; Chapters 1–2 (optional depth)	30–40 min	☐
2	Establishing the service boundary	Workbook boundary lesson; DL-LW-TRN-10	35–45 min	☐
3	The Value Lens	Before You Improve the Service: Chapter 3 (optional depth)	40–50 min	☐
4	Capability / Control Integrity	Before You Improve the Service: Chapter 4 (optional depth)	40–50 min	☐
5	Keeping the lenses separate	Before You Improve the Service: Chapters 5–6 (optional depth)	30–40 min	☐
6	Evidence for Lightweight	Workbook evidence lesson	35–45 min	☐
7	Using the Lightweight GPT	DL-LW-TRN-06 GPT Practice Guide	50–70 min	☐
8	HR onboarding demonstration	DL-LW-TRN-05 HR Onboarding Demonstration Guide	40–55 min	☐
9	Lightweight or Full?	Course escalation lesson; DL-LW-TRN-10	25–35 min	☐
10	USM and responsible next steps	Before You Improve the Service: Chapters 7, 9–10 and Closing Note (optional depth)	25–35 min	☐
Final	Applied exercise and quiz	Final applied exercise; online final knowledge check	40–60 min	☐

Personal learning goals

What do you hope to understand or do better after completing this course?

What recurring service situation might you use for practice?

Module 0 — Welcome and Responsible Use

Learning objectives

- Explain what the public Lightweight Diagnostic is intended to do.
- Recognize what the course does not authorize.
- Use fictional, generalized, or appropriately authorized information.
- Understand the relationship among the course site, narrated lessons, workbook, scenario, recommended reference book, and GPT.

Core lesson

The Lightweight Diagnostic is an orientation and discovery aid. It helps improve the starting conversation by examining one bounded recurring service relationship through two independent perspectives: Value Posture and Capability / Control Integrity. Its outputs are tentative and evidence-limited.

The GPT supports thinking. It does not become an accountable assessor, auditor, certifier, decision-maker, or substitute for professional judgment.

Responsible-use checklist

- ☐ I will avoid entering confidential, personal, regulated, or proprietary information unless I have authority and an appropriate environment.
- ☐ I will define one service relationship before interpreting results.
- ☐ I will treat outputs as tentative orientation, not formal findings.
- ☐ I will keep Value and Control Integrity separate.
- ☐ I will not create a composite score or maturity level.
- ☐ I will state limitations and missing evidence.
- ☐ I will seek qualified help when the matter is consequential, contested, sensitive, or requires defensible findings.

In your own words, what is the difference between orientation and formal diagnosis?

Module 0 online knowledge check

Return to the course site for the short formative knowledge check for this module. It is for feedback and reinforcement; no workbook submission is required.

Module 1 — Before You Improve the Service

Recommended reference: Preface and Chapters 1–2 of Before You Improve the Service.

Learning objectives

- Recognize solution-first language.
- Explain the value of a diagnostic pause.
- Reframe an assumed solution as a question about a recurring service relationship.
- Distinguish symptoms, interpretations, and evidence.

Key concepts

Concept	Working definition
Solution-first thinking	Beginning with a tool, method, framework, reorganization, or prescribed fix before establishing the problem.
Diagnostic pause	A deliberate step to clarify the service, evidence, value orientation, and management control before choosing an improvement response.
Recurring service situation	A situation that repeatedly triggers coordinated work intended to reach a useful completion for a customer or customer group.
Symptom	An observed effect or complaint that may have multiple possible causes.
Evidence	A concrete example, record, observation, decision, or behavior relevant to the bounded service relationship.

Exercise 1.1 — Find the embedded prescription

Statement	What is already being assumed?	What should be examined first?
We need a better ticketing tool.		
HR needs a stronger onboarding process.		
Managers need more accountability.		
The problem is poor communication.		
We need to become customer-centric.		

Exercise 1.2 — Diagnostic pause

Choose one statement above. Rewrite it as a neutral diagnostic question.

What recurring service situation might sit behind the statement?

What evidence would help distinguish symptoms from causes?

Module 1 online knowledge check

Return to the course site for the short formative knowledge check for this module. It is for feedback and reinforcement; no workbook submission is required.

Module 2 — Establishing the Service Boundary

Learning objectives

- Define a service through customer, provider, trigger, useful completion, seams, scope, and exclusions.
- Recognize boundaries that are too broad, too narrow, or solution-defined.
- Draft a usable boundary statement for the Lightweight GPT.

Boundary worksheet

Boundary element	Working notes
Customer or customer group	
Provider	
Recurring situation or need	
Trigger	
Useful completion	
Core contributors	
Important seams and dependencies	
Included scope	
Explicit exclusions	

Boundary statement template

For [customer or customer group], [provider] responds to [recurring trigger or need] by coordinating [essential service work] until [useful completion], within [scope], excluding [explicit exclusions].

Draft your boundary statement.

Exercise 2.1 — Improve vague boundaries

Vague concern	Candidate bounded service relationship
Our help desk is not working.	
New employees are frustrated.	
Finance and procurement do not communicate.	
The transformation is failing.	

Boundary quality test

- ☐ The customer is explicit.
- ☐ The provider is explicit.
- ☐ The trigger is recurring and observable.
- ☐ Useful completion is understandable to the customer.
- ☐ Important cross-functional seams are visible.
- ☐ Scope is neither enterprise-wide nor artificially narrow.

- ☐ Exclusions are explicit.
- ☐ The boundary is not defined by a tool, department, framework, or proposed solution.

Module 2 online knowledge check

Return to the course site for the short formative knowledge check for this module. It is for feedback and reinforcement; no workbook submission is required.

Module 3 — The Value Lens

Recommended reference: Chapter 3.

Learning objectives

- Describe the five Value Postures without treating them as maturity levels.
- Use the five dimensions to organize evidence.
- Separate observed posture from intended or target posture.
- State a tentative Value snapshot with appropriate confidence.

Value Postures reference

Posture	Primary orientation	Typical question
Technology-driven	Technology assets, platforms, and technical performance	Is the technology operating as intended?
System-driven	Internal systems, procedures, compliance, and consistency	Are the defined systems and procedures being followed?
Service-driven	Reliable end-to-end service delivery	Is the service being delivered consistently?
Customer-driven	Customer experience, outcomes, and learning	Are customers achieving the intended useful result?
Business-driven	Enterprise purpose, strategic contribution, and tradeoffs	How does the service contribute to business value and choices?

Value dimensions worksheet

Dimension	Questions to consider	Evidence notes
Governance & Control	What receives attention, decisions, funding, and escalation?	
Performance & Learning	What is measured, reviewed, learned, and changed?	
Accountability Boundaries	Where does accountability begin and end?	
Behavior & Culture	What behavior is rewarded, tolerated, or discouraged?	
Business–Service Integration	How are service choices connected to customer and business outcomes?	

Exercise 3.1 — Classify the evidence

Evidence example	Most relevant dimension	Possible posture signal
Leadership reviews server uptime every week, but not customer completion.		
Customer complaints are analyzed and operating routines are changed.		
A service owner is accountable only for work inside one department.		
Teams are rewarded for local efficiency even when service outcomes suffer.		
Investment decisions explicitly compare service outcomes with business priorities.		

Observed versus intended

What posture does your example service appear to demonstrate today? Cite examples.

What posture does the organization say it wants? What evidence supports that intention?

Where is the strongest tension between observed and intended posture?

Module 3 online knowledge check

Return to the course site for the short formative knowledge check for this module. It is for feedback and reinforcement; no workbook submission is required.

Module 4 — Capability / Control Integrity

Recommended reference: Chapter 4.

Learning objectives

- Describe the five Control Integrity domains.
- Recognize structural control issues hidden behind process, tool, or communication symptoms.
- Avoid interpreting documents, titles, tools, or certifications as proof of control.
- Describe tentative domain signals without formal staging.

Control Integrity domains

Domain	What it examines	Diagnostic questions
Structural Control Authority	Whether legitimate authority exists to coordinate and enforce service decisions across boundaries.	Who can decide? Who can require action? What happens when priorities conflict?
Process Coherence	Whether recurring routines connect end to end rather than operating as isolated departmental procedures.	Do routines connect? Are exceptions handled coherently?
Role & Ownership Clarity	Whether accountability, ownership, contribution, and decision rights are clear.	Who owns completion? Who owns exceptions and learning?
System Visibility	Whether the organization can see service status, outcomes, risk, failure, and learning across the boundary.	Can leaders see end-to-end performance and consequences?
Structural Stability	Whether control survives personnel changes, demand shifts, exceptions, and organizational change.	Does the service depend on heroes or workarounds?

Exercise 4.1 — Identify the domain

Example	Primary domain	What makes this structural?
A service owner may convene meetings but cannot require another department to act.		

Every team has a procedure, but the procedures do not connect.		
Managers disagree over who owns exceptions.		
Leadership sees activity volumes but not failed customer outcomes.		
The service works only when one experienced employee intervenes.		

Control Integrity evidence notes

Structural Control Authority: What examples support or weaken confidence?

Process Coherence: What examples support or weaken confidence?

Role & Ownership Clarity: What examples support or weaken confidence?

System Visibility: What examples support or weaken confidence?

Structural Stability: What examples support or weaken confidence?

Module 4 online knowledge check

Return to the course site for the short formative knowledge check for this module. It is for feedback and reinforcement; no workbook submission is required.

Module 5 — Keeping the Lenses Separate

Recommended reference: Chapters 5–6.

Learning objectives

- Explain why one lens cannot be inferred from the other.
- Interpret common combinations without ranking them.
- Avoid averaging, composite scoring, or maturity language.
- Describe diagnostic tension and target direction.

Four illustrative conditions

Value signals	Control signals	Possible interpretation
Stronger	Stronger	The service may be meaningfully directed and reliably managed.
Stronger	Weaker	The organization may understand desired value but struggle to deliver it reliably.
Weaker	Stronger	The service may be tightly controlled but insufficiently connected to meaningful value.
Weaker	Weaker	Both direction and management control may need clarification.

These are interpretive conditions, not grades, quadrants of maturity, or an overall score.

Exercise 5.1 — Describe without ranking

Mini-scenario	Your one-sentence interpretation
Customer outcomes are well understood, but no one can enforce cross-department decisions.	
The service is stable and measurable, but measures focus only on internal efficiency.	
Leaders articulate strategic outcomes and routines consistently adapt based on evidence.	
The service boundary is unclear and most work depends on informal coordination.	

Prohibited shortcuts

- ☐ I understand that I must not: Average the lenses.
- ☐ I understand that I must not: Convert the result into a 1–5 maturity level.
- ☐ I understand that I must not: Assume Business-driven is always the correct target.
- ☐ I understand that I must not: Assume strong control proves strong value orientation.
- ☐ I understand that I must not: Assume weak control means every practice is immature.
- ☐ I understand that I must not: Use a quadrant as a ranking or certification.

Why does lens independence matter?

Module 5 online knowledge check

Return to the course site for the short formative knowledge check for this module. It is for feedback and reinforcement; no workbook submission is required.

Module 6 — Evidence for a Lightweight Diagnostic

Learning objectives

- Distinguish examples from opinions and intentions.
- Assemble a balanced Lightweight evidence set.
- Recognize contradictions and missing evidence.
- State confidence and limitations without claiming Full evidence sufficiency.

Useful evidence categories

Category	Examples
Normal recurring work	How the service usually begins, moves, and reaches completion.
Customer impact	Delayed, incomplete, confusing, risky, or successful outcomes.
Cross-boundary work	Handoffs, dependencies, shared decisions, and competing priorities.
Authority and enforcement	Who decides, escalates, resolves conflict, and requires action.
Exceptions and recovery	How failures, unusual cases, and urgent work are handled.
Visibility and learning	What is measured, reviewed, understood, and changed.

Evidence classification exercise

Statement	Classification	Reason
Everyone knows onboarding is broken.		
In four of the last ten hires, equipment arrived after the start date.		
The policy says managers must submit requests five days early.		
The HR director believes a new platform will solve the problem.		
A manager bypassed the standard route to obtain urgent access.		
No customer outcome measures were provided.		

Lightweight evidence register — reference template

The table below shows the type of evidence record **you may use later when working with a fuller practice scenario** or your own generalized service example. You are not expected to complete it from the six statements above.

ID	Date / period	Concrete example	Source type	Lens / domain relevance	Confidence
E1					
E2					
E3					
E4					
E5					
E6					
E7					
E8					

Contradiction and gap log — reference template

Use this later to record conflicting evidence and important information that is still missing.

ID	Contradiction or missing evidence	Why it matters	Next question
C1			

C2			
G1			
G2			

Module 6 online knowledge check

Return to the course site for the short formative knowledge check for this module. It is for feedback and reinforcement; no workbook submission is required.

Module 7 — Using the Lightweight GPT

Learning objectives

- Prepare a bounded, privacy-conscious input.
- Use examples rather than conclusions.
- Review GPT output against the architecture and guardrails.
- Identify when to revise, challenge, or disregard output.

Practice workflow

1. Protect information and generalize names.
2. Describe the recurring concern neutrally.
3. Establish the service boundary.
4. Provide several concrete examples.
5. Review the Value snapshot independently.
6. Review Control Integrity signals independently.
7. Review synthesis, tensions, confidence, and gaps.
8. Use the result to ask better questions—not to force a solution.

Input preparation worksheet

Prompt element	Prepared input
Recurring concern	
Customer / customer group	
Provider	
Trigger	
Useful completion	
Scope and exclusions	
Examples supplied	
Information generalized or removed	

GPT output review checklist

- ☐ The service boundary is explicit.
- ☐ Value and Control Integrity are presented separately.
- ☐ The Value language is tentative and evidence-linked.
- ☐ Observed and intended posture are distinguished.
- ☐ No formal Capability stage is assigned.
- ☐ No numerical or composite score is created.
- ☐ Contradictions and missing evidence are visible.
- ☐ Confidence and limitations are stated.
- ☐ The output avoids audit, certification, or maturity claims.
- ☐ Recommendations are proportionate and do not presume a framework or tool.

Output challenge worksheet

Output statement	Evidence supporting it	Concern / overstatement	Revised wording

--	--	--	--

NOTE: When you begin GPT practice, use the evidence register and contradiction/gap log introduced in Module 6 to organize your examples.

What did the GPT help you see?

Where did you need to challenge or qualify the output?

What additional evidence would most improve confidence?

Module 8 — HR Employee Onboarding Demonstration

Recommended reference: Chapter 8 and the public HR onboarding scenario material.

Scenario boundary

Element	Scenario interpretation
Customer	New employee, with hiring manager and organization as important stakeholders.
Provider	The coordinated onboarding service involving HR, hiring management, IT, facilities, payroll, security, compliance, and others.
Trigger	A hiring decision or accepted offer initiates recurring preparation and coordination.
Useful completion	The employee can begin productively, safely, compliantly, and with essential access, equipment, payroll, orientation, and support in place.
Important seams	HR–manager, HR–IT, facilities/security, payroll, compliance, and local location dependencies.

Evidence analysis

Scenario example	Value relevance	Control relevance	Questions raised
Equipment arrives after the employee starts.			
Payroll correction requires manual escalation.			
Managers prepare inconsistently.			
Location information is confusing or incomplete.			
Compliance training is not visible end to end.			
Informal workarounds rescue urgent cases.			

NOTE: When you begin GPT practice, you can use the evidence register and contradiction/gap log introduced in Module 6 to organize your examples.

Your provisional interpretation

What tentative Value Posture signals appear strongest? Cite at least three examples.

Which Control Integrity domains appear weakest or uncertain? Cite examples.

Identify one example relevant to both lenses, and explain why it must be interpreted separately.

What evidence is missing?

What limited next steps are justified?

When might Full be warranted here?

- ☐ Material compliance or safety exposure exists.
- ☐ Employee retention or productivity impact is significant.
- ☐ Departments dispute ownership or authority.
- ☐ Leadership needs defensible findings for major investment or restructuring.
- ☐ The evidence is extensive, contradictory, or politically sensitive.
- ☐ The service needs recursive examination at nested boundaries.

Module 9 — Lightweight or Full?

Learning objectives

- Recognize appropriate Lightweight uses.
- Recognize conditions requiring stronger evidence governance and professional facilitation.
- Explain the difference between a better starting conversation and defensible findings.

Decision guide

Question	Lightweight more likely	Full more likely
Purpose	Orientation, education, discovery	Defensible professional findings
Evidence	Modest, illustrative, early-stage	Extensive, controlled, contradictory, or sensitive
Consequences	Low to moderate; supports discussion	High; informs major decisions, risk, investment, or restructuring
Boundary	Can be established with limited clarification	Contested, recursive, multi-provider, or politically disputed
Facilitation	User can responsibly explore	Independent professional challenge and evidence governance required
Output	Tentative snapshot and questions	Traceable findings, controlled synthesis, limitations, and report

Escalation decision worksheet

Indicator	Present?	Evidence / explanation
High strategic, financial, regulatory, safety, or reputational consequence		
Material disagreement about the service boundary or problem		
Multiple organizations, suppliers, or authority structures involved		
Formal findings or assurance expected		
Evidence is large, contradictory, sensitive, or politically contested		
Major investment, restructuring, or sourcing decision depends on the result		

Based on the worksheet, is Lightweight sufficient for your practice situation? Explain.

Module 9 online knowledge check

Return to the course site for the short formative knowledge check for this module. It is for feedback and reinforcement; no workbook submission is required.

Module 10 — Dual Lens, USM, and Responsible Next Steps

Recommended reference: Chapters 7, 9–10, and Closing Note.

Learning objectives

- Explain that Dual Lens is independently developed and compatible with—but not official—USM.
- Recognize frameworks, practices, and tools as possible evidence or later responses, not predetermined answers.
- Select proportionate next steps.
- Preserve the language and boundaries of the method.

Relationship statements

Statement	Correct?	Notes
Dual Lens is an official SURVUZ Foundation assessment.		
Dual Lens may reveal structural conditions for which USM concepts are relevant.		
A framework certification determines the Value Posture.		
A tool may provide evidence but does not establish Control Integrity.		
The diagnostic should be used to sell a predetermined solution.		
The Lightweight result may identify questions for further investigation.		

Proportionate next-step menu

- ☐ Clarify the service boundary.
- ☐ Collect better customer-impact evidence.
- ☐ Clarify authority and ownership.
- ☐ Connect existing routines across seams.
- ☐ Improve end-to-end visibility.
- ☐ Test whether workarounds are masking structural weakness.
- ☐ Run another bounded Lightweight exploration.
- ☐ Seek a qualified Full Diagnostic facilitator.
- ☐ Only after diagnosis, consider appropriate methods, practices, technology, or organizational changes.

Which next steps are justified by your evidence—and which would be premature?

Final reflection

What problem does Dual Lens help solve?

Why must the lenses remain separate?

What is the most important limitation of Lightweight use?

When would you seek qualified facilitation?

Final Applied Exercise

Instructions

Use a supplied public practice scenario or a fictional/generalized recurring service situation. Do not submit sensitive information. Complete the following steps before taking the final quiz.

9. Define the service boundary.
10. Identify at least six useful evidence examples.
11. Run the public Lightweight GPT.
12. Review the output against the guardrail checklist.
13. Write a bounded interpretation that distinguishes what the evidence suggests from what it does not establish.
14. Decide whether Lightweight is sufficient or whether Full facilitation may be warranted.

A. Service boundary

Element	Your response
Customer / customer group	
Provider	
Trigger	
Useful completion	
Important seams	
Scope	
Exclusions	

B. Evidence set

ID	Example	Category	Relevance
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			

C. Output review

- ☐ Boundary remained stable.
- ☐ Value and Control Integrity remained independent.
- ☐ Output was tentative and evidence-linked.
- ☐ No formal stage, maturity level, or composite score was used.
- ☐ Limitations and contradictions were stated.
- ☐ Next steps were proportionate.

D. Applied reflection (250–400 words)

What the result suggests:

What it does not establish:

What evidence remains missing:

What should happen next:

Final Online Knowledge Check

After completing the online knowledge check, return to the course site and submit the separate Completion Form. That submission records that you finished the public course; it does not confer certification or Full Diagnostic facilitator status.

Return to the course site and complete the final online knowledge check. It is a learning check, not a certification examination. Review any missed concepts and retake it if useful. Your workbook answers do not need to be submitted.

Personal Action Plan

One concept I will apply immediately:

One service boundary I will clarify:

One evidence habit I will improve:

One guardrail I must consciously protect:

One question I still need to explore:

Completion checklist

- ☐ Modules 0–10 worked through using the course site and workbook.
- ☐ Recommended references consulted as useful (optional).
- ☐ Formative online knowledge checks used as useful for reinforcement.
- ☐ At least one Lightweight GPT practice completed.
- ☐ HR onboarding demonstration reviewed or completed.
- ☐ Final applied exercise completed in the workbook.
- ☐ Final online knowledge check completed.
- ☐ Course completion form submitted and course boundaries understood.

Participant name	Signature / acknowledgment	Date

Appendix A — Quick Reference: Lightweight Guardrails

- Use one bounded recurring service relationship.
- Treat outputs as tentative orientation, not formal findings.
- Keep Value Posture and Control Integrity independent.
- Do not average the lenses or create a composite score.
- Do not assign formal cumulative Capability stages.
- Do not treat Value Postures as universal maturity levels.
- Distinguish observed posture from intended or target posture.
- Use concrete examples rather than unsupported opinions.
- Retain contradictions and state missing evidence.
- Do not infer control from documents, titles, tools, or certifications alone.
- Protect confidential, personal, regulated, and proprietary information.
- Do not use the output as an audit, certification, personnel rating, vendor score, or disguised sales tool.
- Escalate consequential, contested, sensitive, or assurance-dependent matters to qualified Full facilitation.

Appendix B — Quick Reference: Two Lenses

Lens	Question	Public Lightweight output
Value Posture	How does the organization understand, govern, behave toward, and learn from the value the service is meant to provide?	Tentative posture signals across five dimensions.
Capability / Control Integrity	Can the management system reliably coordinate the service across authority, routines, roles, visibility, boundaries, and change?	Tentative domain signals without formal cumulative staging.

Appendix C — Key Terms

Term	Working meaning
Service boundary	The explicitly bounded customer-provider relationship, recurring trigger, useful completion, seams, scope, and exclusions being examined.
Value Posture	A descriptive orientation showing how the organization relates service activity to value.
Control Integrity	The structural ability of the management system to coordinate recurring service work reliably.
Evidence	Concrete examples, records, observations, decisions, and behaviors relevant to the boundary.
Contradiction	Evidence that points in different directions and should remain visible rather than being prematurely resolved.
Lightweight Diagnostic	A public, evidence-limited orientation that produces tentative signals and better questions.
Full Diagnostic	A professionally facilitated, evidence-governed engagement producing controlled, traceable findings.
Useful completion	The condition in which the recurring service situation has achieved the intended useful result for the customer.

Appendix D — Illustrative Example Answers

These are illustrative learning responses, not an answer key. In open-ended exercises, more than one response may be reasonable when it is grounded in the stated service boundary and available evidence. The examples below demonstrate the expected discipline: avoid unsupported certainty, keep Value Posture and Control Integrity independent, and state limitations where the evidence is incomplete.

For exercises that ask learners to use a situation of their own, the examples below use a fictional employee onboarding service so that the answers remain coherent across modules.

Personal learning goals

Example goal: I want to become better at pausing before recommending a tool or process change, defining the service boundary clearly, and distinguishing a value-direction problem from a management-control problem.

Example practice situation: Employee onboarding from accepted offer through initial work readiness.

Module 0 — Welcome and Responsible Use

In your own words, what is the difference between orientation and formal diagnosis?

Example answer: Orientation helps identify tentative patterns, evidence gaps, and better questions using limited information. Formal diagnosis requires controlled evidence, accountable professional facilitation, traceable findings, and stronger review before conclusions are used for consequential decisions.

Module 1 — Before You Improve the Service

Exercise 1.1 — Find the embedded prescription

Statement	What is already being assumed?	What should be examined first?
We need a better ticketing tool.	The current tool is assumed to be the main cause of poor results.	The recurring service situation, the customer outcome being missed, and evidence showing where work actually breaks down.
HR needs a stronger onboarding process.	The problem is assumed to be an HR-owned process weakness.	The end-to-end onboarding service, its customer, useful completion, cross-functional seams, and recurring examples of failure or success.
Managers need more accountability.	A lack of individual accountability is assumed to be the cause.	Where decision rights and ownership actually sit, what managers can enforce, and what happens when priorities conflict across boundaries.
The problem is poor communication.	Communication is assumed to be the root cause rather than a symptom.	Specific recurring handoffs, missing information, unclear ownership, visibility gaps, and examples showing when communication breaks down.
We need to become customer-centric.	Customer-driven behavior is assumed to be the correct target without defining the service or contribution expected.	The service purpose, customer useful completion, current observed Value Posture, intended posture, and evidence of the gap.

Exercise 1.2 — Diagnostic pause

Example neutral diagnostic question: What conditions in the employee onboarding service are contributing to inconsistent first-day readiness, and what does the available evidence show about value orientation and management control?

Recurring service situation: Preparing a newly hired employee from accepted offer through initial work readiness.

Evidence that would help distinguish symptoms from causes: several successful and unsuccessful onboarding cases; start-date readiness data; examples of cross-functional handoffs; escalation and exception records; employee and manager feedback; evidence of who can require action across HR, IT, Facilities, Payroll, Security, and hiring management.

Module 2 — Establishing the Service Boundary**Boundary worksheet — example**

Boundary element	Example working notes
Customer or customer group	New employees, with hiring managers as important co-recipients of a successful outcome.
Provider	The organization acting through HR, hiring management, IT, Facilities, Payroll, Security/Compliance, and learning contributors.
Recurring situation or need	A person has accepted an offer and must be prepared to begin useful work.
Trigger	Accepted offer and authorization for the hire to proceed.
Useful completion	The employee can begin useful work with required access, equipment, pay arrangements, orientation, manager readiness, and mandatory obligations addressed.
Core contributors	HR, hiring manager, IT, Facilities, Payroll, Security/Compliance, Learning.
Important seams and dependencies	HR–manager, HR–IT, manager–IT, HR–Payroll, HR–Facilities, central functions–local site.
Included scope	Accepted offer through an agreed initial readiness checkpoint, such as the first working week.
Explicit exclusions	Recruitment before offer acceptance, long-term development, later performance management, and unrelated employee lifecycle administration.

Example boundary statement: For newly hired employees and their hiring managers, the organization coordinates the recurring work required to prepare, equip, authorize, orient, and welcome each employee from accepted offer through an agreed point of initial work readiness, across the required contributors and seams, excluding recruitment before offer acceptance and longer-term employee development.

Exercise 2.1 — Improve vague boundaries

Vague concern	Candidate bounded service relationship
Our help desk is not working.	For employees needing operational support, the provider receives a support need and coordinates diagnosis and restoration until the employee can resume the required work, excluding project work and unrelated technology changes.
New employees are frustrated.	For newly hired employees, the organization coordinates onboarding from accepted offer through

	initial work readiness, including required access, equipment, pay, orientation, and manager preparation.
Finance and procurement do not communicate.	For an internal requester needing an approved purchase, Finance and Procurement coordinate the request from validated need through authorized order and a clear financial commitment, including required approvals and handoffs.
The transformation is failing.	Too broad as stated. Choose one recurring service relationship materially affected by the transformation, identify its customer, trigger, useful completion, seams, and scope, and examine that boundary instead of “the transformation” as a whole.

Module 3 — The Value Lens

Value dimensions worksheet — example evidence notes

Dimension	Example evidence notes
Governance & Control	Leadership attention is focused mainly on technical uptime and internal operating measures. Escalations are triggered more often by technical failures than by failure to achieve customer useful completion. Funding favors infrastructure reliability over end-to-end service improvement.
Performance & Learning	Teams measure activity, availability, response time, and internal task completion. Customer outcomes are reviewed inconsistently. Complaints sometimes lead to local changes, but end-to-end learning is not yet systematic.
Accountability Boundaries	Accountability is strongest within individual functions. Service owners may coordinate but have limited authority across departmental boundaries. End-to-end accountability for the customer outcome is unclear.
Behavior & Culture	Teams are rewarded for local targets and efficiency. Cross-boundary recovery often depends on personal initiative rather than an expected service-wide behavior.
Business–Service Integration	Some decisions consider customer impact, but priorities are still largely driven by technical or operational needs. Stronger evidence would show explicit trade-offs among service outcomes, customer needs, risk, cost, and business priorities.

Exercise 3.1 — Classify the evidence

Evidence example	Most relevant dimension	Possible posture signal
Leadership reviews server uptime every week, but not customer completion.	Governance & Control	Technology-driven signal: technical performance receives more governing attention than useful completion.

Customer complaints are analyzed and operating routines are changed.	Performance & Learning	Customer-driven signal: customer experience is being used as input to learning and operating change.
A service owner is accountable only for work inside one department.	Accountability Boundaries	System-driven or Service-driven tension: service language may exist, but accountability still stops at a functional boundary.
Teams are rewarded for local efficiency even when service outcomes suffer.	Behavior & Culture	System-driven signal: local optimization and internal efficiency dominate the end-to-end service outcome.
Investment decisions explicitly compare service outcomes with business priorities.	Business–Service Integration	Business-driven signal: service choices are explicitly connected to enterprise priorities and trade-offs.

Observed versus intended — example

Observed posture: The onboarding service appears primarily Service-driven, because people talk about readiness and end-to-end delivery, but governance and measures are still heavily functional and activity-based.

Intended posture: Leadership says it wants a more Customer-driven service in which employee and manager experience, readiness, and learning shape decisions.

Strongest tension: The organization describes onboarding in customer/service terms, but ownership, measures, funding, and behavior still emphasize local functional completion. This makes the intended customer orientation stronger than the governing evidence supports.

Module 4 — Capability / Control Integrity

Exercise 4.1 — Identify the domain

Example	Primary domain	What makes this structural?
A service owner may convene meetings but cannot require another department to act.	Structural Control Authority	The issue is whether legitimate cross-boundary decision and enforcement authority exists, not whether meetings occur.
Every team has a procedure, but the procedures do not connect.	Process Coherence	Local routines exist, but the recurring service is not managed as one connected flow across seams.
Managers disagree over who owns exceptions.	Role & Ownership Clarity	Responsibility and decision ownership are unclear at exactly the points where unusual work requires coordinated action.
Leadership sees activity volumes but not failed customer outcomes.	System Visibility	The organization can see local activity but lacks end-to-end visibility of service status, impact, and outcome.
The service works only when one experienced employee intervenes.	Structural Stability	Reliable completion depends on a person or workaround rather than a control structure that survives normal variation and personnel changes.

Control Integrity evidence notes — example

Structural Control Authority: Supporting signal — HR can coordinate onboarding meetings. Weakening signal — HR cannot require IT or hiring managers to reprioritize work when start-date readiness is at risk.

Process Coherence: Supporting signal — each function has documented routines. Weakening signal — exceptions and changing start dates are handled differently by each function and there is no common end-to-end route.

Role & Ownership Clarity: Supporting signal — local task owners are usually known. Weakening signal — HR and hiring managers disagree about who owns overall readiness and exception resolution.

System Visibility: Supporting signal — request and ticket volumes are visible. Weakening signal — leadership cannot see end-to-end readiness, waiting state, recurring failure, or employee impact.

Structural Stability: Supporting signal — many routine hires complete successfully. Weakening signal — urgent or complex cases depend on experienced coordinators and personal contacts.

Module 5 — Keeping the Lenses Separate**Exercise 5.1 — Describe without ranking**

Mini-scenario	Illustrative one-sentence interpretation
Customer outcomes are well understood, but no one can enforce cross-department decisions.	The service shows stronger outside-in value understanding than the management system can reliably support across departmental boundaries.
The service is stable and measurable, but measures focus only on internal efficiency.	Control may be relatively disciplined, while the value orientation remains internally focused and may not reflect customer useful completion.
Leaders articulate strategic outcomes and routines consistently adapt based on evidence.	The evidence suggests a stronger value orientation supported by learning and control, but the two lenses should still be evaluated independently before synthesis.
The service boundary is unclear and most work depends on informal coordination.	The boundary is insufficient for a responsible Value interpretation, while the reliance on informal coordination is a tentative Control Integrity concern that requires better evidence.

Why lens independence matters — example answer: Strong value intent cannot compensate for weak management control, and strong control cannot prove that the service is directed toward the right value. Keeping the lenses separate preserves the diagnostic tension and prevents an overall score from hiding what leadership actually needs to understand.

Module 6 — Evidence for a Lightweight Diagnostic**Evidence classification exercise**

Statement	Classification	Reason
Everyone knows onboarding is broken.	Unsupported claim / opinion	It summarizes a belief but provides no concrete example, frequency, source, or observable condition.
In four of the last ten hires, equipment arrived after the start date.	Concrete example / quantitative evidence	It identifies a defined sample and a recurring outcome relevant to useful completion.
The policy says managers must submit requests five days early.	Documented design / context	It shows intended procedure, but not whether managers comply or whether five days is sufficient.

The HR director believes a new platform will solve the problem.	Opinion / proposed solution	It is an interpretation and prescription, not evidence that the platform is the cause or cure.
A manager bypassed the standard route to obtain urgent access.	Concrete exception example	It is observable behavior that may signal process-coherence, authority, or stability issues, although one case does not establish prevalence.
No customer outcome measures were provided.	Missing evidence / evidence gap	The absence limits confidence about useful completion and Value orientation; it is not proof that outcomes are never measured.

Lightweight evidence register — sample entries

ID	Date / period	Concrete example	Source type	Lens / domain relevance	Confidence
E1	Last 10 hires	Equipment arrived after start date in 4 cases.	Operational sample	Value: useful completion; Control: Process Coherence / Visibility	Moderate; sample is small but concrete.
E2	Recent case	Manager bypassed standard route to obtain urgent access.	Case example	Control: Process Coherence / Structural Stability	Low–moderate; one case.
E3	Current	Leadership receives task/ticket counts but no end-to-end readiness measure.	Reporting review	Value: Performance & Learning; Control: System Visibility	Moderate if report set is complete.
E4	Current	HR and managers disagree about who owns start-date readiness.	Interview statements	Value: Accountability Boundaries; Control: Role & Ownership Clarity	Moderate; requires corroboration.
E5	Recent hires	Employees report friendly help but inconsistent readiness.	Feedback comments	Value: customer experience; Control: Structural Stability	Low–moderate; prevalence unknown.
E6	Current	Each function has a procedure, but no common exception path is visible.	Document review	Control: Process Coherence	Moderate for design; weak proof of actual behavior.

Contradiction and gap log — sample

ID	Contradiction or missing evidence	Why it matters	Next question
C1	Leadership says onboarding is end-to-end, but reporting is entirely functional.	Intent and observed governing behavior point in different directions.	What end-to-end outcome does leadership review and act on when readiness fails?
C2	Local procedures are documented, but urgent cases are frequently rescued through personal contacts.	Documented design may not match behavior under pressure.	How often are informal routes used and what conditions trigger them?
G1	No reliable measure of employee initial work readiness.	Limits Value and visibility interpretation.	How is useful completion currently recognized, if at all?
G2	No evidence showing who can require cross-functional action before a start date.	Limits Structural Control Authority interpretation.	Who has the legitimate authority to resolve competing priorities across contributors?

Module 7 — Using the Lightweight GPT**Input preparation worksheet — example**

Prompt element	Prepared input
Recurring concern	New employees are not consistently ready to perform useful work on their first day.
Customer / customer group	New employees; hiring managers are important co-recipients.
Provider	The organization acting through HR, hiring management, IT, Facilities, Payroll, Security/Compliance, and Learning.
Trigger	Accepted offer and authorization to hire.
Useful completion	The employee can begin useful work with essential access, equipment, pay arrangements, orientation, and mandatory obligations addressed.
Scope and exclusions	Accepted offer through initial readiness checkpoint; exclude recruitment, long-term development, and later performance management.
Examples supplied	Equipment delay; access mismatch; ownership disagreement; local-only measures; successful recovery through personal contacts; inconsistent manager preparation.
Information generalized or removed	Names, employee identifiers, exact locations, internal system names, confidential policy details, and personal information.

Output challenge worksheet — example

Output statement	Evidence supporting it	Concern / overstatement	Revised wording
"HR lacks control of onboarding."	HR cannot require some contributors to reprioritize work.	Assumes HR should own or control the whole service and overstates the available evidence.	"The examples do not show a clear end-to-end authority able to require

			timely action across all contributors.”
“The onboarding process is immature.”	Procedures do not always connect and workarounds occur.	Uses prohibited maturity language and collapses several Control domains.	“The evidence suggests tentative Process Coherence and Structural Stability concerns, with prevalence still uncertain.”
“A workflow platform should be implemented.”	Requests and status are fragmented.	Premature prescription; a tool cannot establish authority or ownership.	“Improved visibility may be worth exploring after authority, ownership, and service requirements are clarified.”

What did the GPT help you see? Example: It made the difference between local task completion and end-to-end useful completion more explicit and highlighted that the same onboarding example can provide different evidence for each lens.

Where did you need to challenge or qualify the output? Example: I challenged statements that implied HR should automatically own the service and wording that treated procedure documentation as proof of actual control.

What additional evidence would most improve confidence? Example: A representative set of successful and unsuccessful onboarding cases, end-to-end readiness measures, escalation examples, and evidence of actual cross-functional authority.

Module 8 — HR Employee Onboarding Demonstration

Evidence analysis — illustrative responses

Scenario example	Value relevance	Control relevance	Questions raised
Equipment arrives after the employee starts.	Useful completion and employee experience are missed.	May signal Process Coherence, Visibility, or authority problems across HR/manager/IT seams.	How often does this occur, why was the request late, and who can intervene before the start date?
Payroll correction requires manual escalation.	Late or incorrect pay affects the employee outcome and trust.	May signal exception-handling, Process Coherence, and Structural Stability issues.	Is manual escalation exceptional or routine, and who owns the recovery path?
Managers prepare inconsistently.	The service experience varies by manager and may weaken customer-oriented intent.	Role & Ownership Clarity and Structural Stability may be uncertain.	What preparation is expected, how is it triggered, and who can require it?
Location information is confusing or incomplete.	The employee may not reach useful completion smoothly.	May indicate System Visibility and cross-boundary Process Coherence weaknesses.	Where is authoritative location data maintained and how are changes propagated?
Compliance training is not visible end to end.	Compliance and readiness are part of the expected service outcome.	System Visibility and ownership of mandatory completion may be weak.	Who can see whether required training is complete before the

			employee performs regulated work?
Informal workarounds rescue urgent cases.	Customers may still achieve the outcome, masking the service weakness.	Strong signal for Structural Stability and possibly Process Coherence.	How often are workarounds needed and what happens when the experienced people are unavailable?

Tentative Value Posture signals: Service-driven signals appear strongest because the concern centers on readiness and end-to-end delivery. There are emerging Customer-driven signals where employee experience and useful work are discussed, but activity-based functional measures and inconsistent learning limit confidence.

Control Integrity domains that appear weakest or uncertain: Process Coherence, Role & Ownership Clarity, System Visibility, and Structural Stability. Structural Control Authority is also uncertain because the supplied examples do not show who can require cross-functional action when priorities conflict.

Example relevant to both lenses: Informal workarounds rescue urgent cases. Value interpretation: customers may still receive a usable outcome because individuals act beyond normal routines. Control interpretation: dependence on personal intervention may indicate weak Structural Stability. The example informs both lenses but does not justify collapsing them.

Missing evidence: prevalence of failures; successful comparison cases; who has cross-functional authority; end-to-end readiness measures; outcome data by employee group; how exceptions are handled; whether lessons from failures change the service.

Limited next steps: define a shared readiness outcome; review several successful and failed cases; clarify decision and escalation authority; compare local measures with a small set of end-to-end readiness and recovery measures; identify where workarounds are masking recurring structural weakness.

One reason Full may be warranted: leadership is considering a major technology or organizational investment and needs defensible findings based on traceable evidence rather than a Lightweight orientation.

Module 9 — Lightweight or Full?

Escalation decision worksheet — example using onboarding

Indicator	Present?	Evidence / explanation
High strategic, financial, regulatory, safety, or reputational consequence	Possibly	Late payroll and compliance readiness may create financial, regulatory, employee-retention, or reputational consequences; actual materiality needs evidence.
Material disagreement about the service boundary or problem	Yes	HR and hiring managers disagree about ownership, and leaders initially frame the problem as a workflow-tool issue.
Multiple organizations, suppliers, or authority structures involved	Yes	The service crosses HR, hiring management, IT, Facilities, Payroll, Security/Compliance, and possibly external providers.
Formal findings or assurance expected	Depends	If leadership only wants orientation, Lightweight may suffice. If it expects defensible findings for investment or

		governance decisions, Full is more appropriate.
Evidence is large, contradictory, sensitive, or politically contested	Possibly	Current examples are contradictory and ownership is disputed; a real engagement may also involve sensitive employee and compliance information.
Major investment, restructuring, or sourcing decision depends on the result	Possible / likely	A major workflow-platform or operating-model decision would increase the need for stronger evidence governance.

Is Lightweight sufficient? Example answer: Lightweight is sufficient for the initial discovery conversation and to identify the most important questions. It would not be sufficient if leadership intends to use the result to justify a major platform investment, restructure ownership, resolve politically contested authority, or make formal claims about the management system.

Module 10 — Dual Lens, USM, and Responsible Next Steps

Relationship statements — example answers

Statement	Correct?	Notes
Dual Lens is an official SURVUZ Foundation assessment.	No	Dual Lens is independently developed and compatible with USM; it is not official USM or SURVUZ Foundation material.
Dual Lens may reveal structural conditions for which USM concepts are relevant.	Yes	A diagnostic can expose authority, process-coherence, ownership, visibility, or stability issues for which USM may provide useful architecture in deeper follow-through.
A framework certification determines the Value Posture.	No	Certification may provide context, but Value Posture must be interpreted from evidence within the declared service boundary.
A tool may provide evidence but does not establish Control Integrity.	Yes	Tools can show workflow, records, and visibility, but enforceable authority and coherent behavior under pressure require broader evidence.
The diagnostic should be used to sell a predetermined solution.	No	The diagnostic pause exists specifically to avoid solution-first prescription.
The Lightweight result may identify questions for further investigation.	Yes	That is one of its primary purposes: orientation, discovery, and better questions rather than definitive findings.

Which next steps are justified — example: Clarify the service boundary and useful completion; collect better customer-impact examples; clarify cross-functional authority and ownership; improve end-to-end visibility; and test whether workarounds mask recurring structural weaknesses.

Which would be premature — example: Buying a new workflow platform, assigning a specific department as the service owner, restructuring teams, adopting a framework, or launching a multi-year transformation before the evidence supports those choices.

Final reflection — example answers

What problem does Dual Lens help solve? It helps prevent improvement work from jumping directly from symptoms to solutions by separating the direction of value from the management system's ability to coordinate and sustain the service.

Why must the lenses remain separate? Because strong value orientation does not prove strong control, and strong control does not prove that the service is oriented toward the right customer or business outcomes.

What is the most important limitation of Lightweight use? It uses limited evidence and produces tentative orientation rather than defensible formal findings.

When would you seek qualified facilitation? When the consequences are high, evidence is extensive or contested, the boundary is complex or recursive, authority is disputed, sensitive information is involved, or leadership expects formal defensible findings.

Final Applied Exercise — illustrative completed example

The workbook permits a supplied public scenario or a fictional/generalized situation. The example below reuses employee onboarding to demonstrate the form of a completed response; learners should complete the assigned or chosen scenario independently before consulting this appendix.

A. Service boundary

Element	Example response
Customer / customer group	New employees, with hiring managers as important co-recipients.
Provider	The organization acting through HR, hiring management, IT, Facilities, Payroll, Security/Compliance, and Learning.
Trigger	Accepted offer and authorization for the hire to proceed.
Useful completion	The employee can begin useful work with required access, equipment, pay, orientation, manager readiness, and mandatory obligations addressed.
Important seams	HR–manager, HR–IT, manager–IT, HR–Payroll, HR–Facilities, central–local site.
Scope	Accepted offer through initial readiness checkpoint.
Exclusions	Recruitment, long-term development, later performance management, and unrelated employee lifecycle work.

B. Evidence set

ID	Example	Category	Relevance
1	Four of the last ten hires received equipment after the start date.	Customer impact / recurring work	Value useful completion; Process Coherence / Visibility.
2	A manager bypassed the standard route to obtain urgent access.	Exception and recovery	Process Coherence / Structural Stability.
3	Leadership reviews ticket counts but not end-to-end readiness.	Visibility and learning	Value Performance & Learning; System Visibility.

4	HR and managers disagree about who owns readiness.	Authority / ownership	Value Accountability Boundaries; Role & Ownership Clarity.
5	Experienced coordinators routinely use personal contacts to rescue cases.	Exception and recovery	Structural Stability; possible service-value masking.
6	Employees praise helpful people but describe inconsistent readiness.	Customer impact	Value Posture; Structural Stability.
7	Each function has a documented procedure but no shared exception path.	Cross-boundary work	Process Coherence; documented design is not proof of behavior.
8	No common evidence shows who can require cross-functional action before a start date.	Missing authority evidence	Structural Control Authority; limits confidence.

C. Output review — example

- Boundary remained stable: Yes, after clarifying accepted offer through initial readiness.
- Value and Control Integrity remained independent: Yes; each was reviewed separately before synthesis.
- Output was tentative and evidence-linked: Yes, after revising two overstatements.
- No formal stage, maturity level, or composite score: Confirmed.
- Limitations and contradictions stated: Confirmed; prevalence and authority evidence remain incomplete.
- Next steps proportionate: Confirmed; no tool or framework was prescribed.

D. Applied reflection — example

What the result suggests: The service appears to be understood increasingly as an end-to-end readiness outcome, which supports a tentative Service-driven Value orientation with some Customer-driven intent. At the same time, the examples suggest uncertainty in cross-functional authority, ownership, connected routines, end-to-end visibility, and structural stability. Individual recovery behavior may be helping customers achieve useful completion while masking weaknesses in the management system.

What it does not establish: The exercise does not establish prevalence, causality, formal Capability stages, an organizational maturity level, or that any proposed workflow platform, framework, or ownership model is the correct solution. It also does not prove that all employee groups experience the same conditions.

What evidence remains missing: A representative sample of successful and unsuccessful onboarding cases; actual cross-functional decision and escalation authority; end-to-end readiness and recovery measures; disconfirming examples; outcome differences by employee group; and evidence showing whether failures produce structural learning.

What should happen next: Clarify useful completion and ownership/authority for start-date readiness, review a balanced sample of cases, improve end-to-end visibility, and test the frequency and causes of workaround dependence. If leadership requires defensible findings for a major investment or governance decision, seek qualified Full facilitation.

Personal Action Plan — illustrative answers

One concept I will apply immediately: Start improvement discussions by defining the recurring service situation and useful completion before discussing tools or frameworks.

One service boundary I will clarify: Employee onboarding from accepted offer through initial work readiness.

One evidence habit I will improve: Ask for concrete recurring examples and disconfirming evidence rather than relying on policy statements or stakeholder opinions.

One guardrail I must consciously protect: Never average Value Posture and Control Integrity or turn them into an overall maturity score.

One question I still need to explore: How can I tell when an apparent process issue is really an authority or service-boundary issue?