

LUV LIBRARY OF PERSPECTIVE

BECOMING SERIES • TITLE 014

Non-Compliant—or Not Yet Understood?

Perspective Discussion Guide

Stability • Clarity • Identity • Plan • Action

The purpose of this conversation is not to reach immediate agreement or develop an action plan. It is an invitation to explore the Perspective itself.

Experience → Reflection → Discovery → Ownership

How to Use This Guide

For the Person Holding the Conversation

This is a reflective dialogue, not a training, presentation, case review, or implementation session. Choose the section that best fits the group. You do not need to ask every question.

- Invite discovery rather than persuasion.
- Allow disagreement, uncertainty, and silence.
- Ask for meaning before asking for solutions.
- Distinguish what was observed from what has been assumed.
- Protect the dignity of the person receiving services and the professionals involved.

Do not rush toward consensus, an action plan, or a new procedure.

Select the questions that best fit the people, time available, and direction of the conversation. A facilitator may use only three or four questions from the selected audience section.

Return to the central question as the conversation deepens:

Is the person non-compliant—or not yet understood?

The meaning of that question may change as different roles, responsibilities, and experiences are heard.

The conversation has been worthwhile when participants leave more curious about what may be underneath the behavior they see—not merely with a new way to label it.

The LUV Learning Process

Experience → Reflection → Discovery → Ownership

Choose Your Conversation

Conversation	Designed For
Leadership	Executives, directors, board members, and senior leaders
Managers and Supervisors	Those translating organizational direction into everyday work
Frontline Professionals	Professionals working directly with people, families, and communities

Conversation	Designed For
Whole Organization	Leadership, management, administration, support roles, and frontline teams together
Community Perspective	People, families, youth, community members, partners, funders, contract holders, and others affected by the work

1. Before the Discussion

Welcome to this reflection on Non-Compliant—or Not Yet Understood?

The purpose of this conversation is not to determine whether professionals were right or wrong, excuse unsafe decisions, eliminate accountability, or suggest that every requirement should be negotiable.

It is an invitation to examine what happens when visible behavior becomes the entire explanation for why someone did not follow through.

In the Perspective, a mother experiencing homelessness repeatedly refuses the shelter being offered to her. She will not bring her children into the agency building. Even after the dangers are explained and child welfare warns that her children could be removed, her answer remains no.

From the professionals' position, the situation is urgent. The family is sleeping outside. Shelter is available. The children's safety must be considered. The mother's continued refusal may appear resistant, uncooperative, or non-compliant.

What has not yet become visible is what the shelter requires.

Because of his age, her teenage son cannot remain with his mother and sister. He would have to stay separately in a youth homeless facility.

The mother is not choosing between safety and danger.

She is choosing between dangers.

The professionals are trying to protect the children from the immediate risks of homelessness. The mother is trying to protect her family from another separation.

Everyone is responding to safety, but they do not mean the same thing by it.

LUV conversations invite discovery rather than persuasion. Participants are not expected to arrive at the same interpretation or conclusion. Different roles may hold different responsibilities, information, authority, and proximity to the person's experience.

As you enter the discussion, resist the urge to decide too quickly what the professionals should have done or what the mother should have chosen.

First, consider what each person could see from where they stood—and what had not yet become visible.

The word non-compliant may accurately describe that someone did not do what was expected.

It does not necessarily explain why.

This Perspective invites us to explore what changes when we:

Listen beyond the behavior.

Understand what may be underneath it.

Venture beyond the first explanation.

It also invites us to consider whether Action is being expected before enough Stability, Clarity, Identity, or connection to a realistic Plan is present.

The purpose is not to replace one assumption with another. It is to create enough understanding and mutual dignity for a more truthful conversation to begin.

2. Shared Discussion Questions

Use with any audience before moving into the audience-specific conversation.

First Response

What stood out to you most in this Perspective?

What part felt immediately true or familiar?

Was there anything you resisted, questioned, or disagreed with?

What idea are you still thinking about?

What did the Perspective cause you to notice that you may not have noticed before?

Observation and Interpretation

What did the professionals directly observe, and what meaning may have been assigned to those observations?

When does a description such as non-compliant become an explanation?

What can be lost when a label becomes the starting point for every later interaction?

How might the same behavior carry different meanings depending on what the person is trying to protect?

What helps us remain curious when repeated lack of follow-through has already created frustration?

How can we test an interpretation without replacing it with a different assumption?

Safety, Choice, and What May Be at Risk

What did safety mean to the professionals in the Experience? What did it mean to the mother?

What changes when a person is choosing between dangers rather than between a safe and unsafe option?

How do we recognize the cost of an option even when the requirement or available resource cannot change?

What might someone be protecting, preserving, understanding, or surviving when they say no?

When might a person's refusal itself be a form of Action?

How can professionals hold legitimate safety responsibilities while remaining open to meanings they cannot yet see?

Stability · Clarity · Identity · Plan · Action

Which conditions beneath Action are easiest for organizations to see? Which are easiest to overlook?

How might instability affect a person's ability to consider an otherwise reasonable next step?

What is the difference between providing information and creating enough Clarity for someone to use it?

How might Identity, family roles, values, or relationships shape what a person can agree to?

What makes a Plan professionally sound but impossible for the person to carry?

What changes when we ask which condition has not yet been understood before concluding that someone is unwilling?

Listen · Understand · Venture

What does it mean to listen beyond the behavior without promising that every option can change?

What questions invite meaning rather than defend the option already offered?

Whose perspective could deepen understanding of what the person is experiencing?

What might professionals need in order to venture beyond a conclusion that has already hardened?

How do authority and unequal power affect what a person feels safe enough to explain?

How would the conversation change if understanding—not immediate agreement—were the first goal?

A. Leadership Perspective

For executives, directors, board members, and senior organizational leaders.

Purpose

To explore how organizational language, policy, resources, authority, and performance expectations shape whether behavior becomes a conclusion—or an invitation to understand more.

Discussion Questions

What language does our organization use when people do not complete an expected Action, and what assumptions does that language carry?

Do our performance measures show only whether Action occurred, or also whether the conditions for meaningful participation were present?

How might policies or limited service options place staff in the position of repeatedly offering something the person cannot realistically accept?

What routes allow frontline understanding to reach leaders who can examine policy, resources, or system design?

How do leaders protect legitimate accountability while preventing labels from becoming organizational explanations?

What would help the organization recognize when the needed option does not exist—without placing responsibility for that gap on the person being served?

Question to Sit With

Are we measuring unwillingness—or the result of conditions our organization has not yet learned to see?

B. Managers and Supervisors Perspective

For those responsible for supervision, coordination, implementation, and translating organizational expectations into everyday work.

Purpose

To explore how supervision can hold responsibility, staff frustration, professional judgment, and curiosity at the same time.

Discussion Questions

What happens in supervision when a person repeatedly misses appointments, declines services, or does not follow through?

How can supervisors help staff distinguish what they observed from what they believe the behavior means?

What support do professionals need when they understand the person's concern but lack the authority or resources to offer another option?

How might workload, productivity expectations, or urgency narrow the space available for listening and discovery?

How can a supervisor honor staff frustration without allowing frustration to harden into a judgment about the person?

What process allows new understanding from direct practice to be documented, communicated, and considered beyond supervision?

Question to Sit With

Does supervision make room to discover what is underneath the behavior—or primarily focus on moving the person to the next required Action?

C. Frontline Professionals Perspective

For professionals working directly with individuals, youth, families, and communities.

Purpose

To explore how professionals can remain curious about meaning while carrying real responsibilities, limits, and safety obligations.

Discussion Questions

What do you notice first when someone refuses an option, becomes angry, stops responding, or does not follow through?

What question might help reveal what the person believes is at risk?

How can you acknowledge the cost of an option without suggesting that you can change a requirement or resource that you cannot change?

When might repeating the same information more firmly deepen the person's belief that they have not been heard?

How can documentation distinguish the person's stated reason from the professional's interpretation of their behavior?

What helps you remain present without rescuing, persuading, or taking ownership of a decision that must belong to the person?

Question to Sit With

What might become visible if I ask what the person is trying to protect before I ask again for the next step?

D. Whole Organization Perspective

For conversations that include leadership, management, administration, eligibility, intake, support roles, and frontline professionals.

Purpose

To explore how separate roles, requirements, and interpretations combine into one experience for the person being served.

Discussion Questions

Do different parts of our organization use words such as resistant, disengaged, and non-compliant in the same way?

Where might one role see a reasonable requirement while another sees its cumulative effect on the person?

Who can see the full number of requests, plans, deadlines, and consequences one person may be carrying?

How does understanding move across departments when no single role has the authority or information to see the whole situation?

What happens when an unavailable resource or inflexible policy is documented primarily as the person's refusal?

How might our organization create a more accurate picture of both the expected Action and the conditions surrounding it?

Question to Sit With

Can we understand a person's response if each part of the organization sees only its own request?

E. Community Perspective

For conversations with—or in preparation for engaging—people, families, youth, community members, partners, funders, contract holders, and others affected by the work.

Purpose

To explore what lived experience reveals about safety, choice, trust, power, and the meaning underneath visible behavior.

Discussion Questions

What might make it risky for a person or family to explain why they are refusing an option?

How do earlier experiences with agencies or public systems shape whether a person experiences a setting, service, or professional as safe?

What does the community understand about available choices that may not be visible in program descriptions or eligibility rules?

How can organizations invite lived experience without asking people to defend every decision they made during a crisis?

What allows community knowledge to influence how behavior is interpreted, documented, and discussed?

How can funders and contract holders make room for understanding when required outcomes emphasize visible Action?

Question to Sit With

What could the community help us understand that our policies, reports, and professional roles cannot reveal on their own?

3. After the Discussion

Do not rush to translate the conversation into an action plan, revise a policy, or create a new assessment. Allow participants to leave with questions, tensions, and emerging insight.

What idea are you still sitting with?

Did anything shift in how you understand non-compliance or resistance?

Where did you notice an interpretation that had been treated as an observation?

What did you hear from another role or perspective that you had not considered before?

Where did you notice yourself becoming defensive, curious, or surprised?

What question do you want to carry forward?

Whose perspective would deepen this conversation?

What would you like to understand more fully before deciding what this Perspective means for your work?

Participants may reflect silently, write privately, or share with the group. No one is required to leave with the same conclusion.

4. Guidance for the Person Holding the Conversation

Your role is not to teach the correct interpretation, determine why a particular person behaved as they did, or guide participants toward a predetermined answer.

- Invite rather than persuade.
- Protect dignity across roles and experiences.
- Allow disagreement.
- Separate observation from interpretation.
- Resist replacing one label with another.
- Ask for meaning before asking for solutions.
- Make room for silence.
- Notice whose perspective is missing.
- Acknowledge real limits, policies, and safety responsibilities.
- Let discovery belong to the participants.

When the Conversation Moves Too Quickly Toward Action

What do we need to understand more fully before deciding what to do?

Are we using the pathway to understand conditions—or to evaluate the person?

What interpretation is underneath that proposed solution?

Whose knowledge or experience have we not yet heard?

The conversation has been worthwhile when people leave more able to recognize what may not yet be visible—not merely when they leave with a list of tasks.

5. Continue the Conversation

Understanding grows when people can look beyond visible behavior, remain curious about meaning, and recognize the conditions surrounding Action.

This discussion is not intended to complete the work. It is an invitation to begin seeing non-compliance, resistance, engagement, safety, choice, and accountability more fully.

Consider continuing the conversation through another audience perspective, a related LUV Library title, or a deeper organizational dialogue.

Continue the Conversation with LUV

Every organization serves people whose decisions are shaped by experiences, responsibilities, relationships, fears, strengths, and possibilities that may not be immediately visible.

If this Perspective raised questions about how your organization understands non-compliance, resistance, engagement, and follow-through, we invite you to continue the conversation with LUV.

Together, we can explore how Stability • Clarity • Identity • Plan • Action might deepen understanding across leadership, supervision, direct practice, and community relationships.

We would be honored to spend time thinking alongside you.

No sales presentation. Just a conversation about the people you serve, what may be underneath the behavior you see, and the conditions that can support Action they genuinely own.

Schedule a Complimentary Conversation with LUV