

The Sovereign Safety Self-Assessment

Measure what happened - not what was promised.

Created by Rob Pompa, LCSW | The Sovereign Source™

Use this after a meeting, group cycle, incident, training, or program review. For every item, answer from the last time it actually happened - not from your policy, intention, or preferred response.

This assessment is not a certification or safety score. Do not average away a serious failure. A single zero involving retaliation, coercion, threatened safety, preventable privacy harm, or abandonment after activation requires attention even when other ratings are high.

Educational resource only. This does not replace legal advice, crisis procedures, mandated-reporting obligations, clinical judgment, or setting-specific policy.

No evidence / harm occurred	Rare or reactive	Usually practiced	Reliable and observable

Who should complete it?

Whenever possible, compare responses from participants, facilitators, and people with less formal power. Differences between their ratings are evidence, not noise.

Assessment context

Space or program:		Date reviewed:	
Reviewer role:		Event or time period:	
What happened that prompted this review?			

Evidence review

1. Belonging does not require concealment.	0	1	2	3	Evidence / last example
When someone revealed a stigmatized identity, history, need, or way of surviving, their standing in the space did not decrease.	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Clinical or group language was not used to reduce a whole person to a diagnosis, behavior, or problem.	☐	☐	☐	☐	

2. Experience is not put on trial.	0	1	2	3	Evidence / last example
People could describe their own experience without being shamed, interrogated, or debated out of it.	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Claims about another person were examined without erasing the speaker or treating sincerity as proof.	☐	☐	☐	☐	

3. Consent remains active.	0	1	2	3	Evidence / last example
When someone said no, passed, paused, or changed their mind, the choice was accepted without pressure or penalty.	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Silence, hesitation, compliance, or fear of authority was not treated as consent.	☐	☐	☐	☐	

4. Vulnerability is invited - not extracted.	0	1	2	3	Evidence / last example
Declining to disclose did not reduce a person's credibility, standing, or belonging.	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Disclosure, forgiveness, reconciliation, or emotional exposure was not treated as proof of readiness or commitment.	☐	☐	☐	☐	

5. Agency remains with the person.	0	1	2	3	Evidence / last example
People had meaningful influence over pace, direction, and decisions whenever influence was genuinely available.	☐	☐	☐	☐	
The space clearly named what participants could shape and what had already been decided.	☐	☐	☐	☐	

Evidence review - continued

6. Power is acknowledged.	0	1	2	3	Evidence / last example
When someone named a power difference, it was examined rather than minimized or smoothed over.	☐	☐	☐	☐	
People with greater authority accepted greater responsibility for the impact of their decisions and reactions.	☐	☐	☐	☐	

7. Safety is relational.	0	1	2	3	Evidence / last example
When one participant targeted, exposed, threatened, degraded, or dominated another, someone intervened promptly.	☐	☐	☐	☐	
The space had a known process for raising concerns, reviewing conduct, and responding proportionately.	☐	☐	☐	☐	

8. Accountability preserves dignity.	0	1	2	3	Evidence / last example
When harm occurred, the response sought acknowledgment, responsibility, changed behavior, and appropriate boundaries.	☐	☐	☐	☐	
Interruption, separation, or removal was handled without unnecessary humiliation or public punishment.	☐	☐	☐	☐	

9. Privacy is practiced.	0	1	2	3	Evidence / last example
Participants knew the limits of confidentiality before disclosure, including who could receive information and why.	☐	☐	☐	☐	
When privacy was breached or information had to be shared, the response was transparent and accountable.	☐	☐	☐	☐	

10. No opening without a return.	0	1	2	3	Evidence / last example
After emotionally difficult material was opened, time remained for grounding, orientation, questions, and transition.	☐	☐	☐	☐	
People left knowing what support, choices, and next steps remained available.	☐	☐	☐	☐	

Interpretation and action

Do not total these ratings into a claim that the space is safe. Read them as a pattern. Look first for zeros, then for gaps between participant and facilitator ratings, then for principles that fail repeatedly under pressure.

Immediate attention

Any 0 involving coercion, retaliation, threatened safety, preventable privacy harm, or abandonment after activation?	Yes ☐ No ☐
Was the person most affected included in deciding what happens next, where possible?	Yes ☐ No ☐
Is there a safe feedback route that does not run through the person the concern is about?	Yes ☐ No ☐

What the evidence says

Strongest observable practice:
Most important gap:
Whose experience differs from the dominant account?
What happened the last time safety became inconvenient?

One accountable next step

Specific change:		Owner:	
Evidence that will show improvement:			
Review date:		How participants will be informed:	

The Standard is a tool for accountability - not a badge of innocence.