



COMPLETE INTERPRETATION REPORT

Organizational Readiness Diagnostic

Evidence maturity, cross-domain interpretation, and a practical 90-day improvement sequence

61%

OVERALL EVIDENCE MATURITY

Documented

73 of 120 points across ten domains

This publication demonstrates the scope, narrative depth, and operating emphasis of a completed readiness report.

<https://carescollaborative.org/readiness-check>

** Illustrative response set: this document demonstrates the Complete Interpretation Report and does not describe a real organization or client.*

How to use this report

How the score, evidence tests, priorities, and 90-day sequence fit together.

- Begin with the executive view to understand the overall pattern and the first three priorities.
- Use the evidence profile to see how the forty responses produce the domain and overall scores.
- Read each domain narrative with its evidence tests, owner role, next action, and definition of done.
- Use the cross-domain synthesis to test relationships that individual domain scores cannot show.
- Move from interpretation to execution with the ninety-day sequence, evidence register, and board brief.

The response scale

Level	Label	What it means in this report
0	Not in place	The control is not in place or cannot be demonstrated.
1	Informal	The work occurs informally and depends on particular people.
2	Documented	A written method exists, but evidence of consistent operation is incomplete.
3	Evidenced	The organization can demonstrate that the control is operated and reviewed.

A SCORE IS A STARTING POINT

The useful question is not whether a percentage looks high. It is whether someone can produce current evidence, operate the method without its usual owner, and show that a control still matches practice.

Executive interpretation

61% overall · Documented · 73 of 120 points

The organization appears better documented than it is independently verifiable.

This response set produces 73 of 120 points, or 61 percent, in the Documented band. Twenty-four of the forty controls are reported as documented, but only five are reported as evidenced. That distribution suggests that a substantial written apparatus may exist while routine operation, independent retrieval, and periodic testing remain less mature. The score is not a comparison with other organizations. It is a compact description of the selected responses and a prompt to inspect the records behind them.

The strongest reported foundation is Organizational Design & Documentation at 92 percent, followed by Workforce & HR and Quality & Outcomes at 75 percent. Those strengths matter because named owners, usable playbooks, training records, and an operating quality-assurance method can support improvement elsewhere. The weaker pattern is concentrated in Compliance & Evidence and Risk, Insurance & Continuity, both at 42 percent, with Leadership & Succession and Systems & Information Flow at 50 percent. The resulting hypothesis is not that the organization lacks effort or policies. It is that critical evidence and decision authority may become difficult to locate or operate when the usual owner is absent, a deadline arrives, or normal systems are interrupted.

The sequence therefore begins with the one high-consequence response reported as not in place: a maintained requirement-to-evidence map. Once the organization knows which obligations and records are critical, it can test whether continuity arrangements preserve access to them and whether delegated leadership can make the required decisions. Compliance, risk, and leadership are the first three weighted priorities. Finance, technology, and information flow should be sampled alongside that work because their records are part of the same evidence chain, while stronger domains should be monitored for drift rather than rebuilt.

The immediate sequence

1. Create the route from each critical requirement to its current evidence - Compliance & Evidence has the largest weighted gap and contains the only high-consequence control reported as not in place. Without a maintained map, a complete record may still be unavailable when requested, and later continuity testing would not know which evidence paths matter most.
2. Turn continuity knowledge into a usable operating file - Risk, Insurance & Continuity has the second-largest weighted gap. Its underwriting preparation is reported as documented, but coverage mapping, board risk review, and continuity planning remain informal. The organization should establish how critical evidence, systems, facilities, and decision authority remain available during disruption.
3. Make delegated leadership operable before it is needed - Leadership & Succession ranks third after consequence weighting. Supervision and board-executive authority are reported as documented, while emergency succession and manager preparation remain informal. Continuity will still fail if alternates are named but lack authority, practice, or access.

EVIDENCE PROFILE

What the response pattern shows

Horizontal bars, percentages, and labels all show the same maturity result; color is supplementary.

Domain	Evidence profile	Score	Band
Governance & Board		67%	Documented
Compliance & Evidence		42%	Person-dependent
Finance & Fiscal Stewardship		58%	Documented
Workforce & HR		75%	Evidenced
Leadership & Succession		50%	Documented
Technology & Data Security		58%	Documented
Systems & Information Flow		50%	Documented
Quality & Outcomes		75%	Evidenced
Risk, Insurance & Continuity		42%	Person-dependent
Organizational Design & Documentation		92%	Evidenced

Distribution of the forty responses

1	10	24	5
Not in place	Informal	Documented	Evidenced

REQUIREMENT-TO-EVIDENCE MAPPING IS REPORTED AS NOT IN PLACE

In this response set, no maintained map connects each applicable requirement to the current record that demonstrates it, its owner, and its location. This single response is surfaced independently of the overall score because the rest of the organization’s documentation cannot substitute for a missing route from obligation to proof.

Methodology and limitations

What was calculated, what was interpreted, and what still has to be verified.

Forty self-reported controls are grouped into ten domains with four controls per domain.

Domain score. Round the sum of a domain's four response values divided by 12, multiplied by 100. Overall score. Round the sum of all forty response values divided by 120, multiplied by 100.

SCORE BANDS

0-24 Undocumented · 25-49 Person-dependent · 50-74 Documented · 75-100 Evidenced

Priority order. For each domain, multiply the unearned points, 12 minus domain points, by the fixed consequence weight. Sort from the largest weighted gap to the smallest; if values tie, place the higher consequence weight first.

Fixed consequence weights: Governance & Board 1.2, Compliance & Evidence 1.4, Finance & Fiscal Stewardship 1.4, Workforce & HR 1.2, Leadership & Succession 1.2, Technology & Data Security 1.3, Systems & Information Flow 1, Quality & Outcomes 1, Risk, Insurance & Continuity 1.3, Organizational Design & Documentation 1.

Weighted priority order: Compliance & Evidence → Risk, Insurance & Continuity → Leadership & Succession → Finance & Fiscal Stewardship → Technology & Data Security → Systems & Information Flow → Governance & Board → Workforce & HR → Quality & Outcomes → Organizational Design & Documentation.

A control with defined high-consequence language is reported separately when its selected level is zero. It is not hidden by a stronger domain or overall score.

Interpretive rules

- Use each score to select the next evidence test; the underlying controls provide the decision context.
- Interpret stronger domains as operating methods to reuse, not as reasons to transfer accountability.
- Sequence the mechanisms that connect obligations, records, authority, and continuity before expanding the work.
- Pair each priority with a named owner, an authorized alternate, completion evidence, and a retest date.
- Record what each test confirms, contradicts, or leaves unresolved so the next decision rests on current evidence.

Limitations

- Response levels are self-reported. Validate them by inspecting current records, observing practice, and asking an independent authorized person to repeat key tasks.
- Scores compress four control levels into a domain percentage. Review the underlying responses and any high-consequence flag before deciding what to do.
- Cross-domain narratives are working hypotheses. Confirm or reject them with the evidence tests and record what the tests demonstrate.
- Requirements vary by jurisdiction, license, contract, and service. Confirm applicability and action with the appropriate authoritative source or qualified adviser.

The interpretation is generated from the fixed response levels and versioned instrument shown in this report.

Governance & Board

FOUR REPORTED CONTROL LEVELS

2 Documented • 2 Documented • 2 Documented • 2 Documented

67%
Documented

Interpretation

All four governance controls in this response set are reported as Documented, producing 8 of 12 points and a 67 percent domain score. That is a meaningful foundation: the selected levels suggest that the organization may have written expectations for decision records, annual conflict-of-interest administration, committee operation, and interested-party transactions. None of the four controls is reported as Evidenced, however. The result therefore describes the presence of written apparatus without demonstrating that the apparatus is used consistently or that a later reader could reconstruct what occurred.

The practical test is whether the board record carries the reasoning and safeguards, not only the outcome. A motion and vote may show that a decision occurred while leaving unanswered what information the board considered, whether a disclosure was made, who recused, and how the remaining directors reached the decision. Committee charters and calendars have similar limits if minutes, work products, and reports do not show that the assigned cycle operated. The interpretation should remain a hypothesis until a sample of recent records is inspected.

Governance evidence connects directly to leadership authority, fiscal oversight, compliance findings, and the risk register. If those functions produce information that never reaches an agenda or durable record, the board cannot show how it exercised oversight. Conversely, a disciplined board record can establish ownership and follow-up across the weaker domains. The next step is not to rewrite every policy. It is to sample recent decisions and annual cycles, identify what a person who was not present could not reconstruct, and repair the recording and follow-up method before the next meeting.

REPORTED STRENGTH

The selected responses indicate a written baseline across all four governance controls, so improvement can begin with operation and evidence rather than first-time policy drafting.

HYPOTHESIS OR EXPOSURE TO TEST

Board and committee practices may occur as intended while the durable record remains too thin to demonstrate deliberation, disclosure, recusal, follow-up, or completion of the annual cycle.

How this domain interacts

- Leadership & Succession, Finance & Fiscal Stewardship, Risk, Insurance & Continuity, Compliance & Evidence: Governance is the oversight surface for executive authority, financial variance, risk treatment, and corrective action. Evidence from those domains becomes governable only when it is presented, questioned, decided, assigned, and recorded.

Evidence to test now

- Select two material decisions from recent board cycles and ask a reader who was not present to reconstruct the alternatives, disclosed interests, recusals, rationale, vote, owner, and follow-up from the record alone.
- Reconcile the current director, officer, staff, and contractor roster against the most recent annual conflict-of-interest declarations and the completion report presented to the board.
- For one standing committee, trace its charter and annual calendar to meeting records, work products, board reports, and completed follow-up.

Next action	Accountable role	Definition of done
Run a bounded governance-record sample and add a standard decision-and-follow-up section to minutes and committee reports for any information that could not be reconstructed.	Board secretary with the governance committee chair	A dated sample covers at least two board decisions, the annual conflict-of-interest cycle, and one committee cycle; each exception has an owner and due date, and the revised record standard is used at the next meeting.

Protect from drift: Quarterly, sample one board decision and one committee deliverable; annually, reconcile conflict disclosures to the current roster and record the completion rate in the minutes. [Open the linked CARES tool](#)

Compliance & Evidence

FOUR REPORTED CONTROL LEVELS
0 Not in place • 1 Informal • 2 Documented • 2 Documented

42%
Person-dependent

Interpretation

Compliance & Evidence scores 5 of 12 points, or 42 percent, in this response set. Review preparation and corrective action are reported as Documented, which suggests that the organization may already have methods for assembling material and responding to findings. Policy version control remains Informal, and the requirement-to-evidence map is reported as Not in place. That zero is the report’s only high-consequence flag. It is surfaced separately because a strong overall score cannot compensate for an absent route from a specific obligation to the current record that demonstrates it.

The pattern may create a misleading form of readiness. Staff can prepare successfully when experienced people know which contract clause, policy version, training record, fiscal schedule, or service file a reviewer will request. The same process becomes fragile when a usual owner is unavailable, requirements change, records move, or several reviews overlap. A documented review checklist can organize production without answering whether the underlying inventory of obligations is complete. Likewise, a corrective-action protocol can close an identified finding without detecting requirements that never entered the review scope.

This domain depends on nearly every other domain for evidence. Finance supplies allocation and award records; workforce supplies qualification and training files; technology preserves access and recovery; quality defines outcome and review records; governance receives significant findings. The first improvement should therefore be a bounded map, not an attempt to catalog everything at once. Select the obligations with the greatest operational consequence, identify the authoritative source and exact evidence, name an owner and alternate, record location and freshness rule, and then test retrieval without the usual owner. The resulting exceptions reveal whether the next repair belongs to documentation, access, training, or process operation.

REPORTED STRENGTH

The selected responses indicate that review preparation and corrective action already have written methods that can provide structure for the missing requirement inventory and retrieval test.

HYPOTHESIS OR EXPOSURE TO TEST

Compliance knowledge may be concentrated in experienced staff, allowing normal reviews to succeed while leaving the organization unable to show that every applicable requirement is known, current, assigned, and connected to evidence.

How this domain interacts

- Finance & Fiscal Stewardship, Workforce & HR, Technology & Data Security, Quality & Outcomes, Governance & Board: Compliance does not create most of its own evidence. It depends on operating domains to produce reliable records and on governance to receive significant exceptions, so a missing evidence map can hide otherwise capable work.

Evidence to test now

- Select ten high-consequence obligations across licensing, accreditation, contracts, and funding; map each one to its authoritative source, exact proof, location, owner, alternate, review date, and retention rule.
- Ask a person outside the normal workflow to retrieve a sample using only the map, and record every question, access barrier, stale version, and missing artifact.
- Choose one previously closed finding and verify the root-cause record, completed corrective action, later effectiveness check, and evidence that recurrence was considered.

Next action	Accountable role	Definition of done
Build and independently test the first bounded requirement-to-evidence map, beginning with obligations whose failure could interrupt service, funding, licensure, or contractual performance.	Compliance lead with one executive sponsor and evidence owners from each operating function	The selected obligations have approved map rows, named primary and alternate owners, current evidence locations, freshness and retention rules, and a dated blind-retrieval result with corrective actions assigned.

Protect from drift: Review the map when a requirement, contract, system, owner, or record location changes; sample retrieval quarterly and report unresolved high-consequence exceptions to leadership and the board. [Open the linked CARES tool](#)

Finance & Fiscal Stewardship

FOUR REPORTED CONTROL LEVELS
1 Informal • 2 Documented • 2 Documented • 2 Documented

58%
Documented

Interpretation

Finance & Fiscal Stewardship scores 7 of 12 points, or 58 percent. Budget logic, the board financial pack, and grant or contract tracking are reported as Documented. Cost allocation is reported as Informal. The profile suggests that regular financial management may be supported by written routines while one of the most explanation-intensive methods still depends on individual knowledge. That distinction matters because a reasonable allocation cannot be defended from memory after the period closes; the basis, source data, calculation, approval, and consistent application must be traceable in the contemporaneous record.

The three documented controls also require evidence testing. A budget tied to program volume and rate logic is more useful when a variance can be traced back to the operating assumptions that changed. A board pack becomes an oversight control when it is timely, reconciled, understood, and connected to recorded decisions. An award inventory becomes reliable when deadlines, allowability rules, matching, drawdowns, and closeout tasks are current and an alternate can operate them. Those selected levels direct the next step: sample the operating records before treating documentation as proof.

Finance is closely linked to compliance, governance, quality, and systems. The requirement-to-evidence map should identify fiscal obligations and their source records. Program volume and outcome definitions should reconcile with the numbers used in budgets and reports. The board record should show how material variance and contract exposure were considered. The immediate action is a trace-through rather than a policy rewrite: select one allocation period, one material variance, and one active award, then move from reported number to source record, documented rule, approval, and board or management use. Any break in that chain becomes a specific repair with an owner.

REPORTED STRENGTH

The selected responses suggest that budgeting, board reporting, and award administration have written structures that can anchor a focused evidence trace.

HYPOTHESIS OR EXPOSURE TO TEST

Cost-allocation logic may be reasonable but concentrated in a preparer's knowledge, while other documented finance routines may not yet have been independently traced from source through decision use.

How this domain interacts

- Compliance & Evidence, Governance & Board, Quality & Outcomes, Systems & Information Flow: Fiscal evidence demonstrates contract and funder requirements, informs board decisions, and depends on consistent program definitions and source data. Breaks elsewhere can therefore appear first as unexplained financial variance.

Evidence to test now

- Trace one month of a shared cost from source transaction through the allocation base, calculation, review, posting, and supporting record using only the written method.
- Choose one material budget variance and reconcile it to the documented volume or rate assumption, management explanation, corrective action, and board record.
- Sample one active award from obligation and reporting calendar through allowability support, drawdown or billing, submitted report, and approaching closeout tasks.

Next action	Accountable role	Definition of done
Write the current cost-allocation methodology as it is actually operated, then run a source-to-report trace on one period and resolve every step that requires verbal explanation.	Chief financial officer or finance lead with program and grant owners	A reviewer can reproduce the selected allocation from current written instructions and retained source data, reconcile it to the ledger, and identify documented approval without asking the original preparer to explain an unwritten step.

Protect from drift: Revalidate allocation bases at least annually and when programs or awards change; sample one variance and one award quarterly, and record material explanations and decisions in the board financial record. [Open the linked CARES tool](#)

Workforce & HR

FOUR REPORTED CONTROL LEVELS

2 Documented • 2 Documented • 3 Evidenced • 2 Documented

75%
Evidenced

Interpretation

Workforce & HR scores 9 of 12 points, or 75 percent, placing the domain in the Evidenced band. Per-employee training completion is reported as Evidenced. Position requirements, the pre-access onboarding gate, and separation procedures are reported as Documented. This is one of the stronger domains and provides a concrete model for the rest of the organization: an expectation becomes more dependable when it is attached to an individual, a due date, an authoritative record, and a retrieval method that does not require assembling proof after a request arrives.

The band should not be read as a conclusion that every workforce control is effective. Three of the four selected levels stop at Documented. The highest residual exposure sits at workforce boundaries, where timing matters. A position description can be current without demonstrating that a person met every applicable qualification before assignment. An onboarding checklist can exist without proving that records, systems, or client access remained blocked until required clearances and training were complete. A separation checklist can be written without showing that accounts, devices, keys, and records were closed on the required day. A small record sample is needed to distinguish those possibilities.

Workforce evidence interacts directly with compliance requirements and technology access. It also supports quality by showing who was qualified, trained, and supervised when a service or review occurred. The strongest reported control-the training record-can supply a repeatable design pattern for other evidence: defined population, required item, due date, completion status, exception, owner, and periodic reconciliation. The next action is to test a bounded sample across hiring, access, training, and separation, including exceptions and role changes. The aim is not a perfect personnel file score; it is a reliable gate that prevents work or access from beginning or continuing before the required evidence exists.

REPORTED STRENGTH

Per-employee training evidence is reported as retrievable, giving the organization an existing record model that may be reusable for qualifications, clearances, access, and separation.

HYPOTHESIS OR EXPOSURE TO TEST

The written onboarding and separation processes may not consistently demonstrate the exact time at which eligibility was confirmed, access was granted, or access was removed.

How this domain interacts

- Compliance & Evidence, Technology & Data Security, Quality & Outcomes, Leadership & Succession: Workforce records demonstrate qualification and training obligations, trigger technology access changes, support quality review, and reveal whether managers operate supervision and personnel responsibilities consistently.

Evidence to test now

- Sample recent hires and role changes; compare required qualifications, clearances, and training with the dated approval and the first date of system, record, or client access.
- Retrieve completion evidence for one required course across the full in-scope employee population and reconcile missing, late, waived, or expired records.
- Sample recent separations and compare the effective time with account disablement, device and key return, record reassignment, and documented exception handling.

Next action	Accountable role	Definition of done
Run one joined sample across the HR roster, training record, and access system so onboarding, role-change, and separation evidence can be evaluated on the same timeline.	Human resources lead with technology administration and the relevant supervisors	The sample population reconciles across systems; every exception identifies whether the cause is policy, workflow, access, recordkeeping, or supervision; corrective actions have owners, due dates, and a retest date.

Protect from drift: Reconcile the employee roster to required training and active system access on a fixed cadence, and sample onboarding and separation timestamps whenever roles, systems, or requirements change. [Open the linked CARES tool](#)

Leadership & Succession

FOUR REPORTED CONTROL LEVELS
1 Informal • 1 Informal • 2 Documented • 2 Documented

50%
Documented

Interpretation

Leadership & Succession scores 6 of 12 points, or 50 percent. Supervision cadence and the division of authority between board and executive are reported as Documented. Emergency succession and manager preparation remain Informal. The profile suggests that ordinary leadership may have written boundaries and routines while the organization’s capacity to transfer those responsibilities is still concentrated in particular people. That is a different problem from having no organization chart. A named alternate is not yet a usable succession method unless the alternate understands the mandate, has access to the necessary records and systems, and has practiced the decisions the role must make.

The response pattern raises two connected hypotheses. First, an unexpected executive absence may require the board to define authority while operational deadlines continue, creating delay or overlap if immediate and interim decisions are not distinguished. Second, managers may carry supervision, documentation, budget, and personnel responsibilities through experience rather than a common preparation method. Documented supervision can therefore coexist with uneven judgment or escalation. Neither hypothesis should be treated as fact until an absence exercise and a sample of management records are reviewed.

Leadership is the bridge between the strong ownership reported in Organizational Design & Documentation and the weaker continuity reported in Risk, Insurance & Continuity. It also determines whether compliance exceptions, financial variance, workforce issues, and technology incidents reach the right decision-maker on time. The priority is to make authority transferable: define the first-day, first-week, and interim succession decisions; match alternates to access and information; and exercise representative management scenarios. The desired evidence is not merely an adopted plan. It is a record showing that another person used the plan, identified unclear authority or missing access, and that those gaps were repaired and scheduled for retest.

REPORTED STRENGTH

The selected responses suggest that supervision expectations and board-executive authority already have written baselines that can anchor a more specific succession and management-transfer method.

HYPOTHESIS OR EXPOSURE TO TEST

Normal leadership may work well while emergency authority, alternate access, and manager judgment remain dependent on a small number of experienced people.

How this domain interacts

- Organizational Design & Documentation, Risk, Insurance & Continuity, Governance & Board, Workforce & HR: Organizational ownership becomes continuity only when authority and access transfer; governance defines emergency mandate, risk planning identifies critical decisions, and workforce systems prepare and evidence manager capability.

Evidence to test now

- Run a first-day and first-week executive-absence tabletop; require the board and alternate leader to identify authority, notifications, system access, deadlines, and decisions from existing records.
- Sample supervision records across managers for cadence, agenda, follow-up, escalation, and consistent handling of comparable issues without reviewing protected content beyond what the test requires.
- Give an alternate manager one representative budget, personnel, and documentation scenario and record which steps require unwritten coaching or unavailable information.

Next action	Accountable role	Definition of done
Convert the informal emergency succession understanding into a board-adopted protocol and exercise it with the actual alternate roles, access pathways, and decision thresholds.	Board chair and executive director, with human resources support	The protocol distinguishes immediate, interim, and permanent-transition authority; names alternates by role; identifies access and communications; and has a dated exercise record with corrective actions and retest dates.

Protect from drift: Review the protocol after leadership, board, system, banking, contract, or contact changes and exercise at least one representative decision and access pathway on a recurring schedule. [Open the linked CARES tool](#)

Technology & Data Security

FOUR REPORTED CONTROL LEVELS
2 Documented • 2 Documented • 1 Informal • 2 Documented

58%
Documented

Interpretation

Technology & Data Security scores 7 of 12 points, or 58 percent. The system inventory, role-based access process, and incident-response plan are reported as Documented. Backup restoration remains Informal. This pattern is common in the sense that technical components can be configured and described without a complete operating record showing they work together under pressure. The score identifies the gap between a stated capability and a dated test that restores a defined record or service to a usable condition.

A restore test should be more specific than confirmation that a backup job completed. It should identify what was restored, from which recovery point, by whom, into what isolated location, how usability and permissions were checked, how long the work took, and which exceptions remain. Access control requires similar evidence. A role model and periodic review become dependable when the current workforce roster reconciles to active accounts, privileged roles, shared credentials, service accounts, and departures. An incident plan becomes operable when the named people can recognize the trigger, reach the call order, make time-sensitive decisions, preserve records, and communicate through an exercised path.

Technology underpins compliance evidence, information flow, workforce offboarding, and continuity. If critical records are mapped but cannot be recovered or accessed by an authorized alternate, the evidence chain still fails. If systems are restored without validating data and permissions, apparent recovery may create a second problem. The next action is a bounded recovery and access exercise using non-production or otherwise appropriately controlled data. Pair one restore test with one access recertification and one incident call-tree walk-through. Record assumptions, timing, failures, decisions, and corrective actions so the result can be evaluated without relying on the technician who performed it.

REPORTED STRENGTH
The selected responses indicate written inventories, access expectations, and incident roles, providing a defined starting point for testing rather than an unknown technology estate.

HYPOTHESIS OR EXPOSURE TO TEST
Recovery capability may be assumed from backup status rather than demonstrated through restoration, while access and incident procedures may depend on administrators who have not exercised them with alternates.

How this domain interacts

- Compliance & Evidence, Workforce & HR, Systems & Information Flow, Risk, Insurance & Continuity: Technology stores compliance evidence, receives workforce access changes, carries operational information flows, and supplies the recovery mechanisms that continuity planning assumes will be available.

Evidence to test now

- Restore one representative record set or service into an appropriately isolated environment and document source, recovery point, elapsed steps, validation, permissions, exceptions, and disposition.
- Reconcile current workers and role assignments against active accounts, privileged access, service accounts, and recent separations; document every exception and approval.
- Walk the incident plan with the people named in it and test call order, alternate communications, decision thresholds, evidence preservation, and escalation to qualified advisers where needed.

Next action	Accountable role	Definition of done
Schedule and document one bounded restore test, then use its findings to update the inventory, recovery instructions, access dependencies, and continuity file.	Technology administrator with the data owner and continuity lead	A dated record shows that the selected data or service was restored and validated, authorized access was confirmed, exceptions have owners and deadlines, and an alternate can locate and follow the revised procedure.

Protect from drift: Repeat recovery tests by risk-based schedule and after material system changes; reconcile access on a fixed cadence and update the incident call tree whenever roles or providers change. [Open the linked CARES tool](#)

Systems & Information Flow

FOUR REPORTED CONTROL LEVELS

1 Informal • 2 Documented • 1 Informal • 2 Documented

50%

Documented

Interpretation

Systems & Information Flow scores 6 of 12 points, or 50 percent. A current supervisory view and the relationship between growth and administrative effort are reported as Documented. Single entry of a person or family and production of a complete file without manual assembly remain Informal. The response profile suggests that parts of the operating model may be designed and understood while staff still bridge systems through repeated entry, local tracking, or knowledge of where missing records live. A score at this level does not identify a software purchase as the answer. It identifies an information path that should be observed before a solution is chosen.

The two informal controls may share a cause. When multiple systems each require their own version of a person, service, authorization, or outcome, a supervisor’s consolidated view can appear complete while depending on manual reconciliation. The same fragmentation becomes visible when a complete file is requested and staff must export, rename, match, and check material from several locations. Documentation may describe the intended flow without measuring rework, duplicate entry, exceptions, or retrieval dependence. A useful test follows one representative record from first entry through service, supervision, reporting, and final evidence production, noting every system and human handoff.

Information flow links technology, compliance, quality, finance, and organizational design. Technology identifies systems and administrators; compliance defines which records must be retained and produced; quality and finance rely on consistent definitions; organizational design names the owner of each handoff. The next action is a bounded workflow map, not a system replacement. Choose one high-volume or high-consequence workflow, identify the authoritative record for each data element, record who re-enters or reconciles it, and time a complete-file retrieval. The result should distinguish a process problem, an ownership problem, a configuration problem, and a genuine integration need.

REPORTED STRENGTH

The selected responses suggest that supervisors have a documented current view and that the organization has considered how administrative effort should behave as volume changes.

HYPOTHESIS OR EXPOSURE TO TEST

The current view and file-production process may depend on manual reconciliation and the knowledge of staff who understand how records correspond across systems.

How this domain interacts

- Technology & Data Security, Compliance & Evidence, Quality & Outcomes, Finance & Fiscal Stewardship, Organizational Design & Documentation: Information flow turns system records into compliance proof, outcome measures, and financial explanations; its handoffs require both technical administration and named operational ownership.

Evidence to test now

- Trace one representative person or case across intake, service, supervision, reporting, and closure; list every repeated entry, spreadsheet, manual reconciliation, and uncertain source of truth.
- Ask a staff member outside the usual workflow to produce a complete file and record elapsed steps, missing items, naming problems, permissions, duplicate records, and questions to the normal owner.
- Select one figure used in both an internal view and an external or board report; trace its definition, source, transformation, reconciliation, and approval in each destination.

Next action	Accountable role	Definition of done
Map one end-to-end information flow and declare an authoritative source for each critical data element before evaluating automation, integration, or replacement.	Operations lead with program, data, and technology owners	The selected workflow has an approved source-and-handoff map, duplicate entry and manual reconciliation are quantified for the sample, retrieval exceptions are assigned, and any technology recommendation names the specific control it would improve.

Protect from drift: Review the flow when a form, report, system, contract, or owner changes; repeat the file-production test and reconcile shared definitions on a recurring sample schedule. [Open the linked CARES tool](#)

Quality & Outcomes

FOUR REPORTED CONTROL LEVELS

2 Documented • 2 Documented • 3 Evidenced • 2 Documented

75%
Evidenced

Interpretation

Quality & Outcomes scores 9 of 12 points, or 75 percent, placing the domain in the Evidenced band. The quality-assurance sampling plan and rubric are reported as Evidenced. Outcome measurement, consistency of reported definitions, and reviewer calibration are reported as Documented. This is a strong operating base because a functioning sample-and-correct cycle can do more than identify isolated file errors: it can reveal whether a defined process is applied consistently, whether exceptions share a cause, and whether corrective action held when the work was sampled again.

The remaining distinction is between a documented measurement system and demonstrably consistent results. An indicator can have a written definition while different reports apply different populations, dates, exclusions, or calculation rules. A review rubric can be used regularly while two reviewers interpret its criteria differently. An outcomes framework can describe what should change without showing that source records, transformations, and reported figures reconcile. The selected levels do not mean those problems exist. They indicate that the organization should test definition, lineage, and calibration before treating the Evidenced band as proof of effectiveness or before comparing results across audiences.

Quality can become the improvement engine for the entire diagnostic. Its sampling method, review rubric, exception classification, corrective-action loop, and retest cadence can be adapted to governance records, compliance evidence, fiscal traces, access reviews, and continuity exercises. That transfer must preserve functional accountability: quality staff can help design a method without becoming the owner of another domain's control. The next action is to trace one important indicator from definition to source and every report in which it appears, then run a blind calibration using the same sample. The result should show whether differences arise from source data, calculation, interpretation, or reporting rather than collapsing them into a generic data-quality concern.

REPORTED STRENGTH

A sampling plan and rubric are reported as operating with evidence, giving the organization a tested improvement method that can be adapted carefully across domains.

HYPOTHESIS OR EXPOSURE TO TEST

Indicator definitions, report reconciliation, or reviewer judgment may still vary despite a strong quality-assurance cycle, creating different conclusions from the same underlying activity.

How this domain interacts

- Systems & Information Flow, Finance & Fiscal Stewardship, Compliance & Evidence, Governance & Board: Quality relies on authoritative information flows, must reconcile with fiscal and contractual reporting, produces compliance evidence, and gives governance a disciplined view of operating exceptions and outcomes.

Evidence to test now

- Select one material outcome indicator and trace its definition, population, source fields, exclusions, calculation, approval, and value across internal, board, and funder reports.
- Give the same de-identified or otherwise appropriately controlled sample to two qualified reviewers; compare ratings, reasons, rubric interpretation, and required calibration.
- Choose one prior quality finding and verify assigned cause, corrective action, closure evidence, later sample, and whether recurrence was evaluated.

Next action	Accountable role	Definition of done
Complete one indicator-lineage and reviewer-calibration exercise, then document any changes to definitions, sources, rubrics, training, or reconciliation.	Quality lead with the relevant program, data, and reporting owners	The indicator can be reproduced from its approved definition and source, values reconcile across selected reports, reviewer differences are documented and resolved through calibration, and exceptions have retest dates.

Protect from drift: Maintain a change-controlled data dictionary, recalibrate reviewers on a fixed cadence and after rubric changes, and repeat source-to-report traces for a rotating sample of material indicators. [Open the linked CARES tool](#)

Risk, Insurance & Continuity

FOUR REPORTED CONTROL LEVELS

2 Documented • 1 Informal • 1 Informal • 1 Informal

42%
Person-dependent

Interpretation

Risk, Insurance & Continuity scores 5 of 12 points, or 42 percent, making it the second weighted priority. Insurance-renewal preparation is reported as Documented. Contract-to-coverage mapping, the board risk-register cycle, and continuity planning remain Informal. This combination suggests that one recurring event may have a written preparation method while the broader view of exposures, oversight, and disruption still depends on people assembling what they know. The score does not establish that coverage is inadequate or that continuity would fail. Those questions require review of actual terms, exposures, operations, and advice from qualified professionals.

The three informal controls can reinforce one another. If contract insurance requirements are not maintained in a current map, the underwriting file may be complete without showing how every obligation was evaluated. If the board’s risk register is assembled through discussion rather than a durable cycle, decisions, owners, accepted exposures, and follow-up dates may be difficult to reconstruct. If continuity plans live in experienced people’s knowledge, an outage, facility loss, or key-person absence can remove the same people needed to interpret contracts, reach providers, authorize workarounds, and locate critical evidence.

Risk therefore connects compliance, governance, leadership, and technology. The requirement-to-evidence map identifies obligations and records worth protecting. Governance records decisions about treatment and acceptance. Succession establishes who can act, and technology testing establishes what can be recovered. The immediate action is a continuity file built around verified critical functions rather than a generic emergency binder. It should name minimum services, records, systems, external contacts, alternate roles, decision thresholds, manual workarounds, and recovery order. A tabletop should then force participants to use the file, expose missing assumptions, and assign corrective actions. Any interpretation of coverage should remain with the organization and its qualified insurance adviser.

REPORTED STRENGTH

The insurance-renewal process is reported as documented, providing an existing cycle and record set that can help anchor broader exposure mapping and continuity preparation.

HYPOTHESIS OR EXPOSURE TO TEST

Risk knowledge may be distributed across experienced people rather than maintained in a board-reviewed register and executable continuity file with alternate authority and tested record access.

How this domain interacts

- Compliance & Evidence, Governance & Board, Leadership & Succession, Technology & Data Security: Compliance defines obligations, governance records risk decisions, leadership transfers authority, and technology preserves systems and evidence; continuity depends on all four operating together during disruption.

Evidence to test now

- Map a sample of material contract insurance requirements to the current policy terms and endorsements, documenting questions for review with the organization’s qualified insurance adviser.
- Trace one material risk from identification through current controls, residual gap, owner, decision, board review, action, and next review date.
- Run a thirty-day disruption tabletop for one critical service, requiring alternates to use the written call order, authority, record locations, system recovery information, and manual workarounds.

Next action	Accountable role	Definition of done
Build and exercise a continuity file for one critical service using verified obligations, records, systems, contacts, alternate roles, and decision authority.	Executive risk owner with operations, technology, and the board committee assigned risk oversight	The continuity file is current, accessible to authorized alternates, and used in a dated tabletop that records decisions, failures, owners, due dates, and a scheduled retest; coverage questions are routed to the qualified adviser.

Protect from drift: Review the risk register and continuity dependencies on a fixed board cycle and after material contract, coverage, leadership, facility, system, or service changes; repeat tabletop tests by planned schedule. [Open the linked CARES tool](#)

Organizational Design & Documentation

FOUR REPORTED CONTROL LEVELS

3 Evidenced • 3 Evidenced • 3 Evidenced • 2 Documented

92%
Evidenced

Interpretation

Organizational Design & Documentation scores 11 of 12 points, or 92 percent, and is the strongest reported domain. Named ownership, usable playbooks, and recurring decision paths are reported as Evidenced. Institutional knowledge is reported as Documented. This profile suggests that the organization may already have the architecture needed to improve weaker areas: work can be assigned to a person rather than a department, routine processes can be followed from written instructions, and recurring questions can move through defined decisions instead of being reinvented. Those are enabling controls, not merely administrative artifacts.

The remaining point matters because knowledge concentration can persist inside a well-documented organization. A playbook may cover normal steps while exceptions, relationships, credentials, judgment thresholds, and recovery knowledge remain concentrated in the people who wrote or regularly use it. An ownership map may show accountability without identifying an authorized alternate. A decision path may work during normal operations without showing what happens when the designated approver is unavailable. The selected levels should therefore be tested through transfer, not inferred from the quality of the documents alone.

This domain can provide the scaffold for every other priority. The requirement-to-evidence map needs a named owner and alternate for each row. Continuity and succession need playbooks and explicit decisions. Finance, workforce, technology, and quality all need recurring review cycles that survive staff change. The next action is to apply the ownership-and-playbook method to the first three priorities, then ask someone outside each normal workflow to operate a bounded task. Any explanation that is required but absent from the record should be treated as institutional knowledge to capture, a decision threshold to clarify, or training to complete. The objective is not more documentation; it is demonstrated transferability without making the documentation team the permanent owner of everyone else’s work.

REPORTED STRENGTH

Ownership, playbooks, and recurring decision paths are reported as evidenced, giving the organization a credible internal method for assigning and transferring remediation work.

HYPOTHESIS OR EXPOSURE TO TEST

Exception handling, alternate authority, access knowledge, or relationship context may still be concentrated in key people even when normal processes are well documented.

How this domain interacts

- Compliance & Evidence, Leadership & Succession, Risk, Insurance & Continuity, Finance & Fiscal Stewardship, Workforce & HR, Technology & Data Security, Systems & Information Flow, Quality & Outcomes, Governance & Board: Every domain depends on named ownership, operable instructions, and recurring decision paths. This strong reported foundation can accelerate remediation if functional accountability stays with the people who operate each control.

Evidence to test now

- Select one important process and ask an authorized person who does not normally perform it to complete a bounded cycle using only the playbook, decision path, and available access.
- For each critical owner, identify the alternate, exceptions known only to the owner, required relationships or credentials, and the longest absence the current documentation could support.
- Trace one recurring decision from trigger through criteria, authority, record, communication, follow-up, and escalation when the usual approver is unavailable.

Next action	Accountable role	Definition of done
Use the existing accountability and playbook method to assign Compliance, Risk, and Leadership remediation, then test one transfer in each priority without the usual owner coaching the operator.	Chief operating officer or equivalent organizational-design owner with each functional lead	The three priority workstreams have named owners and alternates, documented operating and decision paths, completed transfer tests, and an exception log showing what was added, trained, or reassigned.

Protect from drift: Review owners, alternates, playbooks, and recurring decision paths at least annually and after role or system changes; rotate transfer tests so evidence reflects current practice rather than original implementation. [Open the linked CARES tool](#)

Cross-domain synthesis

The report looks for operating relationships that a list of ten scores cannot show.

PATTERN 01

The written apparatus may be ahead of the operating evidence

The response profile contains twenty-four controls at Documented and only five at Evidenced. Governance, finance, technology, systems, and leadership all sit in the Documented band, yet their selected controls include few demonstrations that another person can retrieve a record, operate a process, or repeat a decision on demand. A policy library, board pack, system inventory, or supervision standard can be valuable without proving that the current practice follows it. The central question is therefore not whether documents exist, but whether the organization can show that the documented method is current, assigned, used, and independently retrievable.

EVIDENCE TESTS

- Select one current obligation and ask a staff member outside its normal workflow to retrieve the governing requirement, current procedure, and dated proof without coaching.
- Sample one documented control in governance, finance, technology, and leadership; compare the written method with the most recent operating record.
- Record every clarification, inaccessible location, stale version, and missing approval discovered during the sample, then assign corrective action.

PATTERN 02

Clear ownership may not yet equal transferable authority

Organizational Design & Documentation is the strongest reported domain, which suggests that functions, playbooks, and recurring decisions may already have visible owners. Leadership & Succession and Risk, Insurance & Continuity are materially weaker. Taken together, the responses raise a testable distinction: the organization may know who normally performs critical work without having established who can act, what authority transfers, and which records remain available when that person cannot. This is a handoff risk rather than an organization-chart problem. It can surface during an executive absence, insurance renewal, system outage, funder deadline, or urgent board decision.

EVIDENCE TESTS

- Choose one critical function and conduct a thirty-day-absence tabletop using only the written delegation, playbook, credentials process, and call tree.
- Ask the alternate role to locate the next deadline, make one permitted decision, and assemble the records needed to continue work; document every dependency on the usual owner.
- Confirm that the board's emergency authority and the executive team's operational authority agree rather than creating a gap or overlap.

Cross-domain synthesis, continued

The final pattern identifies the leverage point to test before adding more policy or software.

PATTERN 03

Existing quality and workforce disciplines can become the improvement engine

Workforce & HR and Quality & Outcomes are both reported in the Evidenced band, although neither is uniformly evidenced across all four controls. The quality-assurance sampling method and the per-employee training record are especially useful models: they turn a stated expectation into a defined population, a review method, a dated result, and a corrective-action loop. The organization can reuse that operating discipline rather than inventing a separate improvement system for every weaker domain. The hypothesis to test is whether the people who run those stronger controls can help design sampling, calibration, and evidence retention for compliance, risk, finance, and technology without becoming permanent owners of those functions.

EVIDENCE TESTS

- Compare the quality-assurance sampling record with one compliance or finance review and identify which fields, review cadence, and closure steps can be reused.
- Use the training-record retrieval method as a model for locating board, access-review, continuity, and corrective-action evidence by owner and date.
- Verify that support from stronger domains transfers a method and does not quietly transfer accountability away from the named functional owner.

INTEGRATED READING

The sequence therefore begins with the one high-consequence response reported as not in place: a maintained requirement-to-evidence map. Once the organization knows which obligations and records are critical, it can test whether continuity arrangements preserve access to them and whether delegated leadership can make the required decisions. Compliance, risk, and leadership are the first three weighted priorities. Finance, technology, and information flow should be sampled alongside that work because their records are part of the same evidence chain, while stronger domains should be monitored for drift rather than rebuilt.

Why sequence matters

A durable sequence repairs the evidence path first, assigns an operating owner, tests retrieval without the usual owner, and only then expands the control. That order makes progress observable and reduces the risk of mistaking new documentation for a working system.

ACTION SEQUENCE

Ranked priorities

Three bounded priorities, ordered by consequence and operating leverage rather than score alone.

01

COMPLIANCE & EVIDENCE

Create the route from each critical requirement to its current evidence

Compliance & Evidence has the largest weighted gap and contains the only high-consequence control reported as not in place. Without a maintained map, a complete record may still be unavailable when requested, and later continuity testing would not know which evidence paths matter most.

- Select the highest-consequence licensing, accreditation, contract, and funder obligations for an initial bounded inventory.
- For each obligation, name the authoritative source, required evidence, current location, owner, review date, and expected retrieval time.
- Ask someone outside the normal workflow to retrieve a sample and log every failure, stale record, and undocumented clarification.

Proof of progress: A reviewed requirement-to-evidence map exists for the selected obligations, every row has a named owner and review date, and an independent sample can be retrieved from the map without relying on the usual owner's memory.

02

RISK, INSURANCE & CONTINUITY

Turn continuity knowledge into a usable operating file

Risk, Insurance & Continuity has the second-largest weighted gap. Its underwriting preparation is reported as documented, but coverage mapping, board risk review, and continuity planning remain informal. The organization should establish how critical evidence, systems, facilities, and decision authority remain available during disruption.

- Define the minimum services, records, systems, contacts, and decisions that must continue through a thirty-day disruption.
- Create a continuity file with call order, alternate roles, decision thresholds, record locations, manual workarounds, and recovery sequence.
- Run one tabletop involving leadership, technology, workforce, and the board role named in the plan; record decisions and corrective actions.

Proof of progress: An alternate role can use the continuity file to locate critical records, explain the first operating decisions, and complete a tabletop with dated findings, owners, and retest dates.

03

LEADERSHIP & SUCCESSION

Make delegated leadership operable before it is needed

Leadership & Succession ranks third after consequence weighting. Supervision and board-executive authority are reported as documented, while emergency succession and manager preparation remain informal. Continuity will still fail if alternates are named but lack authority, practice, or access.

- Adopt an emergency succession protocol that distinguishes immediate, interim, and permanent-transition decisions.
- Match each alternate role to the authority, information, system access, and management routines needed on the first day of an absence.
- Exercise one supervision, budget, personnel, and board-communication decision with the alternate role and document coaching needs.

Proof of progress: The board-approved protocol, authority statement, access plan, and exercise record show that an alternate can assume the defined responsibilities without improvising the mandate.

90-day starting sequence

A practical first cycle for verification, construction, operation, and evidence of progress.

PHASE 1

1-30

Verify the evidence chain

Test the responses before expanding the improvement scope and establish which obligations and records require the strongest continuity protection.

- Build the first bounded requirement-to-evidence map.
- Run independent retrieval samples across compliance, finance, governance, and workforce records.
- Confirm each failure as a missing control, stale artifact, access problem, or training issue rather than treating all gaps alike.

COMPLETION EVIDENCE

- Approved map with owners and review dates
- Dated retrieval-test log
- Corrective actions assigned by cause and consequence

PHASE 2

31-60

Build continuity and delegated authority around what matters

Use the verified evidence chain to define which services, decisions, records, and systems must survive an owner's absence or operational disruption.

- Complete the continuity file and emergency succession protocol.
- Align alternate roles, decision limits, access, contact order, and manual workarounds.
- Review coverage mapping and the board risk register with the organization's qualified advisers where appropriate.

COMPLETION EVIDENCE

- Current continuity file
- Board-adopted emergency succession protocol
- Named alternates with confirmed access and authority

PHASE 3

61-90

Exercise, repair, and report

Demonstrate that the new apparatus works without its authors present and turn failed tests into owned corrective action.

- Run a combined absence-and-system-disruption tabletop using the actual documents and alternate roles.
- Repeat selected evidence retrieval, backup restore, and decision-handoff tests.
- Give the board a concise result showing what worked, what failed, who owns each repair, and when it will be retested.

COMPLETION EVIDENCE

- Exercise record and decision log
- Closed or assigned corrective-action register
- Board minutes recording review and the next test date

Evidence test register

The questions that convert the interpretation into observable tests and decisions.

01	GOVERNANCE & BOARD Can a reader who was not present reconstruct a material board decision and its safeguards from the durable record? Evidence: Agenda material, minutes, disclosures and recusals, vote record, rationale, assigned follow-up, and later completion record Method: Select two recent material decisions and complete an independent record reconstruction without asking attendees to fill gaps from memory. Owner: Board secretary · Decision use: Determine whether the recording standard or meeting follow-up process needs revision.
02	COMPLIANCE & EVIDENCE, FINANCE & FISCAL STEWARDSHIP, WORKFORCE & HR, QUALITY & OUTCOMES Can each selected high-consequence obligation be traced to current evidence, ownership, location, and a freshness rule? Evidence: Authoritative requirement, requirement-to-evidence map row, current proof, owner and alternate, review date, and retrieval-test log Method: Map ten selected obligations and ask a person outside the normal workflow to retrieve a sample using only the approved map. Owner: Compliance lead · Decision use: Separate missing requirements from documentation, access, training, and operating failures before assigning remediation.
03	FINANCE & FISCAL STEWARDSHIP, COMPLIANCE & EVIDENCE, SYSTEMS & INFORMATION FLOW Can a reviewer reproduce one allocation and explain one material variance from retained records and the written method? Evidence: Source transaction, allocation base, calculation, approval, ledger entry, budget assumption, variance explanation, and reporting record Method: Complete a source-to-ledger trace for one period and a budget-to-operating-driver trace for one material variance. Owner: Finance lead · Decision use: Identify unwritten calculation, reconciliation, approval, or reporting steps that require correction.
04	WORKFORCE & HR, TECHNOLOGY & DATA SECURITY, COMPLIANCE & EVIDENCE Do qualification, training, access, and separation records agree on when a person became eligible and when access ended? Evidence: Roster, position requirements, clearance and training records, approval timestamps, system accounts, separation record, and exception approvals Method: Join a bounded sample of hires, role changes, and departures across HR, training, and access records and compare the timelines. Owner: Human resources lead · Decision use: Locate failures in the gate, system handoff, supervisor action, or recordkeeping rather than treating every exception as the same problem.
05	LEADERSHIP & SUCCESSION, GOVERNANCE & BOARD, ORGANIZATIONAL DESIGN & DOCUMENTATION, RISK, INSURANCE & CONTINUITY Can the alternate leader identify and exercise first-day authority without informal coaching from the usual role holder? Evidence: Succession protocol, authority statement, alternate assignment, access checklist, deadline inventory, scenario decisions, and exercise findings Method: Run a first-day and first-week absence tabletop with the board role and alternate leader named in the protocol. Owner: Board chair and executive director · Decision use: Clarify emergency authority, access, communication, and management preparation before an actual transition.

Evidence test register, continued

Each test names evidence, a method, an accountable role, and the decision it informs.

06	TECHNOLOGY & DATA SECURITY, RISK, INSURANCE & CONTINUITY, WORKFORCE & HR Can a defined record or service be restored to usable condition with correct authorized access? Evidence: Backup source, recovery point, test plan, isolated restore record, validation, permissions check, elapsed time and steps, exceptions, and corrective actions Method: Perform a bounded restore in an appropriately controlled environment and reconcile access for the selected data or service. Owner: Technology administrator and data owner · Decision use: Distinguish backup-job success from demonstrated recovery and prioritize changes to procedure, access, or architecture.
07	SYSTEMS & INFORMATION FLOW, TECHNOLOGY & DATA SECURITY, COMPLIANCE & EVIDENCE, QUALITY & OUTCOMES Can an authorized person outside the usual workflow produce a complete current file without manual reconstruction knowledge? Evidence: Source-and-handoff map, authoritative-system decisions, retrieval log, missing or duplicate items, permissions, and elapsed steps Method: Trace one representative record end to end, then conduct a blind complete-file retrieval using the documented information path. Owner: Operations lead · Decision use: Determine whether the repair is process, ownership, configuration, training, integration, or replacement.
08	QUALITY & OUTCOMES, SYSTEMS & INFORMATION FLOW, FINANCE & FISCAL STEWARDSHIP, GOVERNANCE & BOARD Does one important indicator retain the same definition and value from source through every selected report? Evidence: Approved definition, source fields, population and exclusions, calculation, reconciliation, report values, approvals, and change record Method: Reproduce the indicator from source and compare its use in internal, board, fiscal, and external reporting as applicable to the sample. Owner: Quality lead and data owner · Decision use: Identify whether a discrepancy arises from definition, source, calculation, timing, interpretation, or reporting.
09	RISK, INSURANCE & CONTINUITY, LEADERSHIP & SUCCESSION, TECHNOLOGY & DATA SECURITY, COMPLIANCE & EVIDENCE Can alternate roles sustain one critical service and its evidence through a thirty-day disruption? Evidence: Continuity file, critical-function inventory, call order, alternate authority, system and record locations, workaround, decision log, and findings Method: Run a combined key-person and system-disruption tabletop that requires participants to use the current file rather than describe what they would later create. Owner: Executive risk owner · Decision use: Prioritize missing authority, records, access, provider coordination, and manual workarounds before expanding the plan.
10	ORGANIZATIONAL DESIGN & DOCUMENTATION, COMPLIANCE & EVIDENCE, RISK, INSURANCE & CONTINUITY, LEADERSHIP & SUCCESSION Can an authorized alternate operate a bounded critical process from the playbook and decision path without its normal owner? Evidence: Ownership map, alternate assignment, playbook, decision thresholds, required access, completed output, exception log, and revisions Method: Choose one task in each of the first three priorities and run a transfer test with the normal owner observing but not coaching. Owner: Organizational-design owner and each functional lead · Decision use: Expose institutional knowledge and exception handling that remain outside otherwise strong documentation.

Board brief

A concise record for deliberation, assignment, and follow-through.

Summary for the record

This self-assessment scores 61 percent overall in the Documented band. The principal pattern is a gap between written apparatus and independently verifiable operation: twenty-four controls are reported as Documented, while five are reported as Evidenced. Organizational Design & Documentation, Workforce & HR, and Quality & Outcomes provide strengths that may support improvement. Compliance & Evidence and Risk, Insurance & Continuity are the weakest reported domains after consequence weighting, followed by Leadership & Succession.

The proposed ninety-day sequence is to map critical requirements to their evidence, build continuity and delegated authority around the verified evidence chain, and then exercise the apparatus without its normal owners. The board should treat the findings as hypotheses until the specified records and tests are reviewed. Its role is to approve the priority and authority structure, receive material exceptions, ensure owners and retest dates are assigned, and avoid displacing the immediate work with broader policy rewriting or technology procurement.

Decisions requested

1. Approve a bounded first phase focused on Compliance, Risk, and Leadership rather than attempting simultaneous remediation across all ten domains.
2. Assign an executive sponsor, functional owner, and authorized alternate for the requirement map, continuity file, and succession protocol.
3. Approve the first combined absence-and-system-disruption tabletop and require a dated corrective-action and retest record.
4. Set the cadence and threshold for reporting unresolved high-consequence exceptions to the board.
5. Defer broad policy replacement and major software procurement until evidence and workflow tests identify the specific control they would improve.

Questions for the board

- Which obligations or services would create the greatest consequence if their evidence or operating authority could not be produced tomorrow?
- What evidence supports each selected response level, and which responses still depend primarily on an owner's explanation?
- Who can act when the normal owner is unavailable, and where is that authority recorded?
- What did the most recent independent retrieval, restore, succession, or continuity test demonstrate?
- Which exceptions require advice from legal, accounting, insurance, tax, clinical, regulatory, or other qualified professionals?
- How will the board know that a corrective action changed the system rather than only repaired one record?
- Which stronger internal method can be reused without transferring accountability to the team that designed the method?
- What should deliberately wait until the first ninety-day evidence and continuity sequence has been tested?

USE THIS AS A RECORD, NOT A CONCLUSION

Minute what was assessed, what the board understood the principal exposure to be, what work it authorized, who owns the first evidence test, and when the result returns for review.

[Run the free CARES Organizational Readiness Diagnostic](#)