90-Day Development Plan

COMPLETED PARTICIPANT RECORD

Completed Example: Post-360 Development Cycle

Fictional participant. Sanitized sample data.

PARTICIPANT PROFILE

This record covers one senior leader through a full development cycle, from 360 debrief to six-month reassessment.

Participant	Alina Marchetti (fictional)
Role	Vice President, Field Operations
Organization	Meridian Retail Group (fictional)
Time in role	14 months
Prior role	Senior Director, Regional Operations (3 years)
Scope	9 direct reports, 4 regions, 112 locations
Manager	Chief Operating Officer
Development coach	Internal, Leadership Development
360 fielded	Jan 8 to Jan 19
Debrief held	Feb 1
Plan window	Feb 5 to May 3
Reassessment	Aug 5 to Aug 16
Rater panel	1 manager, 5 peers, 9 direct reports
Response rate	15 of 15 (100%)

Reporting rule applied: peer and direct-report results are reported in aggregate only. No rater group with fewer than 3 respondents is broken out. Verbatim comments are paraphrased before they reach the participant.

SCORING METHOD

Each dimension contains 3 behavioral questions. Each question is scored 1 to 4. Maximum score per dimension is 12.

Score	Label	Rater instruction
1	Negative Impact	The behavior is absent or works against the outcome
2	Mixed Impact	The behavior appears inconsistently, or only under favorable conditions
3	Positive Impact	The behavior is reliable and produces the intended effect
4	Outstanding Impact	The behavior is reliable, visible to others, and raises the standard around it

- **Others average** is the mean of all non-self responses, weighted by respondent rather than by group.
- **Gap** is self score minus others average. A gap greater than +1.0 is flagged for discussion at debrief.

90-Day Development Plan

COMPLETED PARTICIPANT RECORD

INITIAL 360 SUMMARY (BASELINE, JANUARY)

All scores are out of 12. The two flagged dimensions became the priorities for the 90-day plan.

Dimension	Self	Mgr	Peers (5)	Reports (9)	Others Avg	Gap	Flag
Psychological Safety	10.7	10.0	9.8	9.4	**9.6**	+1.1	Monitor
Meaningful Work	10.5	10.4	10.4	10.0	**10.2**	+0.3	
Dependability	11.0	10.6	10.4	9.8	**10.1**	+0.9	Priority 2
Structure & Clarity	10.0	9.0	9.4	8.4	**8.8**	+1.2	Priority 1
Impact	10.8	11.0	10.6	10.2	**10.4**	+0.4	
Core Values	11.3	11.2	11.2	11.0	**11.1**	+0.2	Strength

Three lowest-scoring items (item level, 1 to 4 scale)

Item	Group	Score	Detail
"I know what is expected of me and how my work will be judged"	Direct reports	2.2	6 of 9 rated 3 or 4 (67%)
"Priorities stay stable long enough to finish them"	Direct reports	2.5	3 raters cited mid-cycle redirection
"Commitments made to my function are closed out visibly"	Peers	2.6	Closure is assumed, not confirmed

Qualitative themes (paraphrased)

- Direction is sound and the reasoning behind decisions is usually explained. What is missing is the written version of it.
- Direct reports report re-deriving their own priorities each week rather than confirming them.
- Peers describe work that gets done but arrives without notice, so they build their own tracking to cover the gap.

STRENGTH TO BUILD ON

Core Values, others average 11.1. Highest scoring dimension, smallest gap at +0.2.

Raters across all three groups describe consistency between what she says in the room and what she does afterward. Manager and peer comments both note that her decision rationale does not change depending on the audience.

Why this matters for the plan:

- Credibility is already established, so new clarity practices will be read as a real change rather than as process for its own sake.
- She can name the problem out loud to her team without losing standing. The plan opens with her saying what the 360 showed.
- Both development priorities are execution habits, not trust repairs. Trust is not the constraint here, and the plan should not spend time treating it as one.

90-Day Development Plan

COMPLETED PARTICIPANT RECORD

DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIES

Priority 1: Structure & Clarity, specifically role clarity for direct reports

Baseline	Others average 8.8 / 12. Direct-report clarity item at 67% rating 3 or 4
Why selected	Lowest dimension, largest self-other gap, and the group closest to the work scores it lowest
90-day target	Direct-report clarity pulse at 85% or higher
Six-month target	Others average 10.0 or higher

Priority 2: Dependability, specifically visible closure of cross-functional commitments

Baseline	Others average 10.1 / 12. Tracked commitments closed visibly: 64% (16 of 25)
Why selected	The dimension score is adequate. One behavior inside it is not, and it is the one peers depend on
90-day target	85% or more of tracked commitments closed visibly
Six-month target	Others average 10.5 or higher

Explicitly out of scope this cycle: the Psychological Safety gap of +1.1. It is real and it is logged, but working three priorities at once produces three partial results. It carries to the next cycle.

OBSERVABLE BEHAVIOR COMMITMENTS

Each commitment is written so that a third party can tell whether it happened without asking the participant.

#	Commitment	Cadence	Evidence source	Measure
C1	Write a one-page role scorecard for each direct report: outcomes owned, decision rights held, and the criteria their work is judged against. Review it live with each person.	Once, by Day 30	Signed scorecard on file	9 of 9 complete
C2	Open each weekly 1:1 with the direct report stating their top three priorities. She confirms or corrects in the meeting, not afterward.	Weekly	1:1 notes	Restatement in 80% or more of logged 1:1s
C3	Any priority change is issued in writing within 24 hours and names what is being dropped to make room.	As it occurs	Change note thread	100% of changes documented
C4	Every cross-functional commitment is entered in a shared commitment log at the moment it is made: owner, deliverable, date.	At the moment made	Commitment log	100% entry
C5	Closure is posted in the same thread where the commitment was made, on or before the date. If the date will slip, a revised date is posted before the original passes.	Per commitment	Commitment log and thread	85% or more closed visibly
C6	Monthly written recap to peer function leads: what closed, what slipped, what changed.	Monthly	Sent email	3 of 3 sent

90-Day Development Plan

COMPLETED PARTICIPANT RECORD

SANDBOX VR

30-DAY CHECKPOINT (MARCH 6)

Status: At Risk

#	Evidence reviewed	Status
C1	5 of 9 scorecards written, 4 reviewed live	Behind
C2	Priority restatement in 6 of 9 logged 1:1s (67%)	Below threshold
C3	3 priority changes occurred, 2 documented	Below threshold
C4	11 commitments logged, 2 known commitments missing	Partial
C5	6 of 11 closed visibly (55%)	Below threshold
C6	Month 1 recap sent Mar 4	Met

- **What is working:** the scorecard conversations that did happen produced immediate correction. Two direct reports were carrying work neither of them believed they owned.
- **What is not:** the four missing scorecards belong to the two regions in the middle of a structure change. She deferred those on the reasoning that the roles might move.
- **Adjustment agreed:** write the scorecards against the current role, dated, marked provisional. A provisional scorecard beats an absent one, and the deferral was becoming the pattern the 360 already flagged.
- **Coach note:** the failure mode here is not effort. It is that clarity work gets postponed precisely when conditions are unclear, which is when it matters most. Named directly in session.
- **Next action by Mar 20:** remaining 4 scorecards written and reviewed. Commitment log entry moves to the point of the conversation rather than end of day.

60-DAY CHECKPOINT (APRIL 3)

Status: On Track

#	Evidence reviewed	Status
C1	9 of 9 scorecards complete and reviewed	Met
C2	Restatement in 11 of 13 logged 1:1s (85%)	Met
C3	4 priority changes, 4 documented, all named the tradeoff	Met
C4	19 commitments logged, no known gaps	Met
C5	15 of 19 closed visibly (79%)	Approaching
C6	Month 2 recap sent Apr 1	Met

- **Interim measure:** a five-question pulse to the 9 direct reports returned 78% rating the clarity item 3 or 4, up from 67% at baseline.
- **What is working:** the written priority-change note has had a second-order effect. Two changes were withdrawn once she had to write down what would be dropped.
- **What is not:** closure still lags on commitments made verbally in large meetings rather than in threads. Those are the ones that do not get logged in the moment.
- **Adjustment agreed:** in any meeting with more than six people, she closes with a verbal readback of what she has committed to and logs it before leaving the room.
- **Coach note:** the practices are holding without prompting. Support shifts from weekly to biweekly.

90-Day Development Plan

COMPLETED PARTICIPANT RECORD

SANDBOX VR

90-DAY REVIEW (MAY 3)

Status: Complete. Practices sustained without coach prompting.

#	Final measure	Result	Standard met
C1	Scorecards complete and reviewed	9 of 9	Yes
C2	Priority restatement in logged 1:1s	88%	Yes
C3	Priority changes documented within 24 hours	7 of 7	Yes
C4	Commitments logged at point of agreement	27 of 27	Yes
C5	Commitments closed visibly	24 of 27 (89%)	Yes
C6	Monthly peer recaps sent	3 of 3	Yes

Direct-report clarity pulse: 84% rating 3 or 4, up from 67% at baseline.

Manager assessment (COO, recorded at review)

- Escalations arriving at the COO level from Field Operations dropped noticeably. The ones that arrive now come with a stated decision the VP already made.
- Two peer function leads raised the recap emails unprompted as the reason they stopped duplicating tracking.
- Open question carried forward: whether the clarity practices survive the next structure change without a coach attached to them.

Sustainment plan

- Scorecards reviewed at each quarter start and whenever a role changes. Owner: participant.
- Commitment log continues. Closure rate is reported in her own monthly business review, not to the coach.
- Coaching support ends. Next contact is the six-month reassessment.

90-Day Development Plan

COMPLETED PARTICIPANT RECORD

SANDBOX VR

SIX-MONTH REASSESSMENT EXCERPT (FIELDED AUG 5 TO AUG 16)

Same instrument, same rater panel composition. 15 of 15 responded.

Dimension movement, others average

Dimension	Baseline	Six months	Change	Plan target
Structure & Clarity	8.8	**10.5**	+1.7	Yes
Dependability	10.1	**10.9**	+0.8	Yes
Psychological Safety	9.6	10.1	+0.5	No
Meaningful Work	10.2	10.3	+0.1	No
Impact	10.4	10.6	+0.2	No
Core Values	11.1	11.1	0.0	No

Rater-group detail, priority dimensions only

Dimension	Group	Baseline	Six months	Change
Structure & Clarity	Manager	9.0	10.7	+1.7
	Peers	9.4	10.9	+1.5
	Direct reports	8.4	10.3	+1.9
Dependability	Manager	10.6	11.0	+0.4
	Peers	10.4	11.0	+0.6
	Direct reports	9.8	10.8	+1.0

Behavioral measures

Measure	Baseline	Six months	Change
Direct reports rating the clarity item 3 or 4	67% (6 of 9)	**89%** (8 of 9)	+22 pts
Cross-functional commitments closed visibly	64% (16 of 25)	**93%** (28 of 30)	+29 pts

Self-other gap

Dimension	Baseline gap	Six-month gap
Structure & Clarity	+1.2 (self 10.0)	-0.2 (self 10.3)
Dependability	+0.9 (self 11.0)	+0.1 (self 11.0)

The gap closed because others moved, not because she scored herself lower. Self-rating on Structure & Clarity rose slightly and now sits marginally below where her raters place her.

Qualitative themes at six months (paraphrased)

- Direct reports describe knowing what they own without checking, including through a regional structure change in month five.
- Peers report they stopped building shadow trackers for Field Operations commitments.
- One direct report continues to rate clarity at 2. The comment cites decision rights on vendor issues specifically, not priorities.