



Justification of the Thirty-Two Invariant SSC1 Core Quality Indicators

AMS SJ11

First Edition, September 2026

**Methodological justification of the thirty-two invariant Core Quality
Indicators established by the Support Service Quality Standard —
Core (SSC1)**

SUPPORT SERVICE QUALITY INITIATIVE

Foreword

SSC1 establishes eight invariant Core Quality Factors and thirty-two invariant Core Quality Indicators for determining the Quality State of defined Support Service Quality Objects. The companion Factors Justification explains why eight principal dimensions must remain separately visible. This paper moves one level deeper and examines why each Indicator is needed to make its Factor sufficiently observable and determinable.

The central question is not whether an Indicator sounds useful. It is whether the Indicator performs a necessary and distinguishable determination function at the Core level, remains meaningful across support-service contexts, and cannot be removed without materially weakening the Factor.

Context Guides provide the context-specific Outcome Criteria and Evidence through which the same invariant Indicators are interpreted. The Indicator layer therefore remains common while the expected conditions and evidence requirements may differ materially among support services.

Table of Contents

Foreword	2
Table of Contents	2
1. Introduction	6
1.1 Purpose of This Paper	6
1.2 Relationship to SSC1	6
1.3 Relationship to the Factors Justification	6
1.4 Scope and Limitations	6
1.5 Central Research Question	6
2. From Core Quality Factors to Core Quality Indicators	6
2.1 Role of a Core Quality Factor	6
2.2 Role of a Core Quality Indicator	6
2.3 Why a Factor Alone Is Not Sufficient	6
2.4 Indicator, Outcome Criterion, and Evidence	6
2.5 Invariance and Context Specificity	6
3. The Indicator Completeness Problem	7
3.1 Necessity at the Indicator Layer	7
3.2 Stable but Open Architecture	7
3.3 Avoiding Context-Specific Inflation	7
3.4 Avoiding Redundant Indicators	7
4. Method for Justifying an Invariant Core Quality Indicator	7
4.1 Necessity Test	7
4.2 Removal Test	7
4.3 Distinguishability Test	7
4.4 Evidence and Determinability Test	7

4.5 Context-Invariance Test.....	7
4.6 Criterion Boundary Test.....	7
5. Factor-by-Factor Justification of the Thirty-Two Indicators.....	7
5.1 Factor 1 — Protection from Foreseeable Harm	7
5.1.1 Indicator 1.1 — Identification of Foreseeable Harm Conditions	8
5.1.2 Indicator 1.2 — Role-Appropriate Control or Mitigation of Identified Harm Conditions	8
5.1.3 Indicator 1.3 — Prevention of Avoidable Harm Within the Support Service Boundary	8
5.1.4 Indicator 1.4 — Maintenance of Protective Conditions During Support	8
5.1.5 Factor 1 Indicator-Set Conclusion	8
5.2 Factor 2 — Support Effectiveness in Function Realization.....	9
5.2.1 Indicator 2.1 — Alignment of Support Work with Applicable Intended Function(s).....	9
5.2.2 Indicator 2.2 — Effective Contribution to Applicable Intended Result(s).....	9
5.2.3 Indicator 2.3 — Maintenance of Support Effectiveness Over the Service Period	9
5.2.4 Indicator 2.4 — Adaptation of Support Work When Conditions Affect Function Realization.....	9
5.2.5 Factor 2 Indicator-Set Conclusion	10
5.3 Factor 3 — Functional Participation and Appropriate Support Balance.....	10
5.3.1 Indicator 3.1 — Identification of Functions, Activities, or Participation Requiring Support	10
5.3.2 Indicator 3.2 — Support Level and Form Matched to Ability, Need, and Context	10
5.3.3 Indicator 3.3 — Adjustment of Support Level and Method Over Time	10
5.3.4 Indicator 3.4 — Avoidance of Unnecessary Substitution, Over-Support, or Under-Support	10
5.3.5 Factor 3 Indicator-Set Conclusion	11
5.4 Factor 4 — Respect for Personhood, Role, Dignity, and Autonomy	11
5.4.1 Indicator 4.1 — Respect for Dignity, Privacy, and Personal Integrity	11
5.4.2 Indicator 4.2 — Respect for Choice, Consent, Preferences, Rights, and Autonomy	11
5.4.3 Indicator 4.3 — Respect for Applicable Personal, Social, Community, Household, Student, Worker, or Other Role	11
5.4.4 Indicator 4.4 — Absence of Coercive, Demeaning, Infantilizing, Stigmatizing, or Unnecessarily Intrusive Practice.....	11
5.4.5 Factor 4 Indicator-Set Conclusion	12
5.5 Factor 5 — Recognition and Response to Material Change.....	12
5.5.1 Indicator 5.1 — Identification of Material Change Relevant to Support.....	12
5.5.2 Indicator 5.2 — Role-Appropriate Judgment Regarding the Significance of Material Change...	12
5.5.3 Indicator 5.3 — Timely Role-Appropriate Response to Material Change.....	12
5.5.4 Indicator 5.4 — Appropriate Communication and Follow-Through After Material Change	12
5.5.5 Factor 5 Indicator-Set Conclusion	13
5.6 Factor 6 — Support Integration with Service Conditions and Interfaces	13

5.6.1 Indicator 6.1 — Compatibility of Support Work with Material Service Conditions	13
5.6.2 Indicator 6.2 — Effective Functioning Across Relevant Service Interfaces.....	13
5.6.3 Indicator 6.3 — Support of Required Context Participation and Interaction.....	13
5.6.4 Indicator 6.4 — Avoidance of Support-Created Context or Interface Disruption.....	14
5.6.5 Factor 6 Indicator-Set Conclusion	14
5.7 Factor 7 — Continuity, Accuracy, and Protection of Support-Relevant Information	14
5.7.1 Indicator 7.1 — Accuracy, Currency, and Relevance of Information Used to Guide Support....	14
5.7.2 Indicator 7.2 — Appropriate Transfer of Support-Relevant Information Across Workers, Periods, Arrangements, and Interfaces	14
5.7.3 Indicator 7.3 — Continuity of Support Logic and Direction Across Material Changes	14
5.7.4 Indicator 7.4 — Protection from Information Loss, Distortion, Misuse, or Inappropriate Disclosure.....	15
5.7.5 Factor 7 Indicator-Set Conclusion	15
5.8 Factor 8 — Practice and Judgment Within Functional Scope.....	15
5.8.1 Indicator 8.1 — Practice Within Authorized Support Role and Functional Scope	15
5.8.2 Indicator 8.2 — Appropriate Judgment Within Functional Scope.....	15
5.8.3 Indicator 8.3 — Avoidance of Unauthorized or Reserved Practice	15
5.8.4 Indicator 8.4 — Appropriate Assistance Seeking, Escalation, Referral, or Transfer of Responsibility	16
5.8.5 Factor 8 Indicator-Set Conclusion	16
6. Horizontal Analysis Across the Eight Factors.....	16
6.1 Recurring Determination Functions	16
6.2 Indicators Serving More Than One Function	16
6.3 Cross-Factor Overlap.....	16
6.4 Apparent Gaps.....	16
6.5 Context-Specific Need Versus Core Gap	17
7. Cross-Context Testing of the Indicator Structure	17
7.1 Personal Care Aide Applications	17
7.2 Vocational Rehabilitation Job Coaching Applications	17
7.3 Why Different Criteria Do Not Require Different Indicators.....	17
7.4 Continuing Test Through Additional Context Guides.....	17
8. Why the Present Indicator Set Is Stable but Open	17
8.1 Present Necessity	17
8.2 No Claim of Permanent Closure	17
8.3 Conditions for Addition.....	17
8.4 Conditions for Merger or Removal	17

8.5 Controlled Revision	18
9. Conclusions	18
Reference Use.....	18
Copyright and Use Notice.....	18

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of This Paper

This paper justifies the thirty-two invariant SSC1 Core Quality Indicators distributed among the eight invariant Core Quality Factors.

1.2 Relationship to SSC1

SSC1 is the normative source. This Resource does not replace, modify, or independently redefine the Core; it explains the methodological basis for the established Indicator structure.

1.3 Relationship to the Factors Justification

The Factor justification asks what principal dimensions must remain visible. This paper asks what must remain observable and determinable within each of those dimensions.

1.4 Scope and Limitations

The analysis concerns Core-level necessity, distinguishability, invariance, and determinability. It does not establish context-specific expected results or evidence thresholds.

1.5 Central Research Question

For each Indicator: what determination capability does it provide, what becomes materially weaker if it is removed, and does it remain meaningful across materially different support-service contexts?

2. From Core Quality Factors to Core Quality Indicators

2.1 Role of a Core Quality Factor

A Factor identifies a principal dimension of Function Realization that must remain visible in Quality State determination.

2.2 Role of a Core Quality Indicator

An Indicator identifies a more specific aspect of that Factor that should be examined so Evidence can support a finding.

2.3 Why a Factor Alone Is Not Sufficient

A broad Factor title does not by itself reveal all distinct conditions needed for responsible interpretation. Indicators provide the stable Core-level determination structure.

2.4 Indicator, Outcome Criterion, and Evidence

The Indicator identifies what is examined. A Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criterion states the expected condition or result. Evidence supports a finding about that criterion. These layers should not be collapsed.

2.5 Invariance and Context Specificity

An invariant Indicator remains meaningful across contexts; its criteria, examples, Failure Modes, and Evidence may change with the Quality Object and Reference Layer.

3. The Indicator Completeness Problem

3.1 Necessity at the Indicator Layer

The primary test is whether removal of an Indicator materially weakens determination of its Factor.

3.2 Stable but Open Architecture

The present thirty-two Indicators form a stable Core structure, but the number is not treated as permanently closed if future Evidence demonstrates a recurring Core-level gap.

3.3 Avoiding Context-Specific Inflation

A recurring need in one Context Guide does not automatically justify a new Core Indicator. The need must represent a distinct Core-level determination function across contexts.

3.4 Avoiding Redundant Indicators

Two Indicators may interact or use related Evidence without being redundant. Redundancy exists when one adds no materially distinct determination capability.

4. Method for Justifying an Invariant Core Quality Indicator

4.1 Necessity Test

Does the Indicator make a condition visible that is necessary for responsible interpretation of the Factor?

4.2 Removal Test

What becomes materially less observable or determinable if the Indicator is removed?

4.3 Distinguishability Test

Can the Indicator be distinguished from the other Indicators under the same Factor and from neighboring Factors?

4.4 Evidence and Determinability Test

Can Evidence be related to the Indicator in a way that supports an Evidence-Supported Finding rather than merely a descriptive statement?

4.5 Context-Invariance Test

Does the Indicator remain meaningful when the specific service, population, setting, role, technology, and Intended Result change?

4.6 Criterion Boundary Test

Is the wording sufficiently general to remain a Core Indicator rather than becoming a context-specific expected condition?

5. Factor-by-Factor Justification of the Thirty-Two Indicators

5.1 Factor 1 — Protection from Foreseeable Harm

Support services can expose a person to foreseeable physical, psychological, environmental, social, or situational harm when hazards are not recognized or protective conditions are not maintained. This

dimension must remain separately visible because successful completion of an activity or achievement of an intended result does not establish acceptable quality if preventable harm occurred or remained uncontrolled.

5.1.1 Indicator 1.1 — Identification of Foreseeable Harm Conditions

Determination function. A protective determination cannot begin unless foreseeable harm conditions are identified.

Removal test. Without this Indicator, later mitigation can be assessed only after a hazard is already known, leaving the recognition function itself unexamined.

Context-invariance and criterion boundary. Context Guides may specify the relevant hazards; the Core Indicator remains the invariant question of whether foreseeable harm conditions were identified.

Distinguishability. The Indicator should be interpreted together with the other Indicators under this Factor, but it preserves a separate question and should not be treated as interchangeable with them.

5.1.2 Indicator 1.2 — Role-Appropriate Control or Mitigation of Identified Harm Conditions

Determination function. Recognition alone is insufficient. The service must apply controls or mitigation that are appropriate to the Support Role and actual conditions.

Removal test. Removal would permit a positive Factor interpretation where hazards were recognized but no appropriate protective action followed.

Context-invariance and criterion boundary. Specific controls vary by context and belong in Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criteria.

Distinguishability. The Indicator should be interpreted together with the other Indicators under this Factor, but it preserves a separate question and should not be treated as interchangeable with them.

5.1.3 Indicator 1.3 — Prevention of Avoidable Harm Within the Support Service Boundary

Determination function. This Indicator tests the resulting protective performance: whether avoidable harm attributable to the bounded support service is prevented.

Removal test. Without it, the Core could verify recognition and attempted mitigation without examining whether preventable harm remained.

Context-invariance and criterion boundary. It does not demand zero risk; it asks whether avoidable harm within the defined boundary is prevented to the extent supported by the Applicable Basis.

Distinguishability. The Indicator should be interpreted together with the other Indicators under this Factor, but it preserves a separate question and should not be treated as interchangeable with them.

5.1.4 Indicator 1.4 — Maintenance of Protective Conditions During Support

Determination function. Protective conditions may degrade during a visit, shift, interaction, or longer Service Period. Their maintenance is therefore distinct from initial recognition and control.

Removal test. Removal would create a temporal gap between initial protection and the continuing condition of support.

Context-invariance and criterion boundary. What constitutes a protective condition is context-specific; the need to maintain it is invariant.

Distinguishability. The Indicator should be interpreted together with the other Indicators under this Factor, but it preserves a separate question and should not be treated as interchangeable with them.

5.1.5 Factor 1 Indicator-Set Conclusion

The four Indicators collectively make Factor 1 — Protection from Foreseeable Harm sufficiently observable at the present Core methodological resolution. None should be removed merely because its

Evidence may overlap with another Indicator; the relevant issue is whether the determination function remains distinct.

5.2 Factor 2 — Support Effectiveness in Function Realization

Support Work is not justified merely because it occurred. It must be aligned with the applicable Support Intended Function(s), contribute effectively to the applicable Support Intended Result(s), remain effective over the relevant Service Period, and adapt when conditions affect Function Realization. This is the direct effectiveness dimension of the support itself.

5.2.1 Indicator 2.1 — Alignment of Support Work with Applicable Intended Function(s)

Determination function. Support Work must address the function the service is actually required or intended to help realize.

Removal test. Without alignment, competent activity can still be irrelevant or misdirected.

Context-invariance and criterion boundary. The applicable Intended Function(s) vary by Quality Object; the alignment question does not.

Distinguishability. The Indicator should be interpreted together with the other Indicators under this Factor, but it preserves a separate question and should not be treated as interchangeable with them.

5.2.2 Indicator 2.2 — Effective Contribution to Applicable Intended Result(s)

Determination function. Alignment of purpose is not enough; Evidence must support that the work contributes to the applicable Intended Result(s).

Removal test. Removal would allow intention or procedural completion to substitute for functional effectiveness.

Context-invariance and criterion boundary. The Indicator does not assume sole causation by Support Work; contribution is evaluated within the declared boundaries and interfaces.

Distinguishability. The Indicator should be interpreted together with the other Indicators under this Factor, but it preserves a separate question and should not be treated as interchangeable with them.

5.2.3 Indicator 2.3 — Maintenance of Support Effectiveness Over the Service Period

Determination function. A favorable isolated episode may not represent the quality of a longer Service Period.

Removal test. Without this Indicator, unstable or intermittent effectiveness could be hidden by selected successful moments.

Context-invariance and criterion boundary. The required duration and stability are determined by the declared Service Period and Applicable Basis.

Distinguishability. The Indicator should be interpreted together with the other Indicators under this Factor, but it preserves a separate question and should not be treated as interchangeable with them.

5.2.4 Indicator 2.4 — Adaptation of Support Work When Conditions Affect Function Realization

Determination function. Function Realization can weaken when needs, abilities, settings, technology, routines, or other conditions change.

Removal test. Removal would leave the Factor static even when effectiveness depends on adaptation.

Context-invariance and criterion boundary. The Indicator concerns adaptation of Support Work; broader recognition and response to change remains separately visible under Factor 5.

Distinguishability. The Indicator should be interpreted together with the other Indicators under this Factor, but it preserves a separate question and should not be treated as interchangeable with them.

5.2.5 Factor 2 Indicator-Set Conclusion

The four Indicators collectively make Factor 2 — Support Effectiveness in Function Realization sufficiently observable at the present Core methodological resolution. None should be removed merely because its Evidence may overlap with another Indicator; the relevant issue is whether the determination function remains distinct.

5.3 Factor 3 — Functional Participation and Appropriate Support Balance

Support-service quality depends not only on whether help is available but on whether its level and form are appropriately matched to the person's abilities, needs, and context. Too little support may leave required functions unrealized; too much may unnecessarily substitute for the person, reduce participation, or create dependency.

5.3.1 Indicator 3.1 — Identification of Functions, Activities, or Participation Requiring Support

Determination function. Appropriate support balance requires first knowing which functions, activities, or forms of participation actually require support.

Removal test. Without this Indicator, support level can be judged without a defensible functional basis.

Context-invariance and criterion boundary. The relevant functions and activities are context-specific.

Distinguishability. The Indicator should be interpreted together with the other Indicators under this Factor, but it preserves a separate question and should not be treated as interchangeable with them.

5.3.2 Indicator 3.2 — Support Level and Form Matched to Ability, Need, and Context

Determination function. The amount and form of support must correspond to actual ability, need, and context.

Removal test. Removal would obscure mismatch even where the service eventually achieves a result.

Context-invariance and criterion boundary. This Indicator applies both to insufficient and excessive assistance.

Distinguishability. The Indicator should be interpreted together with the other Indicators under this Factor, but it preserves a separate question and should not be treated as interchangeable with them.

5.3.3 Indicator 3.3 — Adjustment of Support Level and Method Over Time

Determination function. Support needs and abilities may change over time; the support level and method must therefore remain adjustable.

Removal test. Without this Indicator, an initially appropriate support arrangement could remain unchallenged after it becomes inappropriate.

Context-invariance and criterion boundary. The timing and method of adjustment depend on context and Evidence.

Distinguishability. The Indicator should be interpreted together with the other Indicators under this Factor, but it preserves a separate question and should not be treated as interchangeable with them.

5.3.4 Indicator 3.4 — Avoidance of Unnecessary Substitution, Over-Support, or Under-Support

Determination function. Support quality can fail through unnecessary substitution, excessive assistance, or insufficient assistance.

Removal test. Removal would weaken the Factor's balancing function and could bias interpretation toward simply providing more support.

Context-invariance and criterion boundary. Context Guides determine what counts as unnecessary substitution, over-support, or under-support.

Distinguishability. The Indicator should be interpreted together with the other Indicators under this Factor, but it preserves a separate question and should not be treated as interchangeable with them.

5.3.5 Factor 3 Indicator-Set Conclusion

The four Indicators collectively make Factor 3 — Functional Participation and Appropriate Support Balance sufficiently observable at the present Core methodological resolution. None should be removed merely because its Evidence may overlap with another Indicator; the relevant issue is whether the determination function remains distinct.

5.4 Factor 4 — Respect for Personhood, Role, Dignity, and Autonomy

A support service acts in direct relation to a person and therefore can realize instrumental results while still degrading dignity, privacy, autonomy, consent, rights, or the person's applicable role. These conditions are not reducible to safety or effectiveness and must remain separately determinable.

5.4.1 Indicator 4.1 — Respect for Dignity, Privacy, and Personal Integrity

Determination function. Dignity, privacy, and personal integrity are conditions of the service itself, not optional consequences of effectiveness.

Removal test. Without this Indicator, intrusive or degrading support could be masked by successful task completion.

Context-invariance and criterion boundary. Specific privacy and integrity requirements may come from the Applicable Basis and Reference Layer.

Distinguishability. The Indicator should be interpreted together with the other Indicators under this Factor, but it preserves a separate question and should not be treated as interchangeable with them.

5.4.2 Indicator 4.2 — Respect for Choice, Consent, Preferences, Rights, and Autonomy

Determination function. Support must remain compatible with applicable choice, consent, preferences, rights, and autonomy.

Removal test. Removal would leave person-directed decision conditions insufficiently visible.

Context-invariance and criterion boundary. Limits or competing requirements must be handled transparently through the Applicable Basis rather than assumed away.

Distinguishability. The Indicator should be interpreted together with the other Indicators under this Factor, but it preserves a separate question and should not be treated as interchangeable with them.

5.4.3 Indicator 4.3 — Respect for Applicable Personal, Social, Community, Household, Student, Worker, or Other Role

Determination function. People receive support while occupying real personal, household, community, student, worker, and other roles. Support should not unnecessarily displace or distort those roles.

Removal test. Without this Indicator, respect could be reduced to interpersonal courtesy while role integrity disappears.

Context-invariance and criterion boundary. The applicable role varies by context; the need to examine it is invariant.

Distinguishability. The Indicator should be interpreted together with the other Indicators under this Factor, but it preserves a separate question and should not be treated as interchangeable with them.

5.4.4 Indicator 4.4 — Absence of Coercive, Demeaning, Infantilizing, Stigmatizing, or Unnecessarily Intrusive Practice

Determination function. Certain practices can directly negate personhood and autonomy even when other indicators appear favorable.

Removal test. Removal would make coercive, demeaning, infantilizing, stigmatizing, or unnecessarily intrusive practice less directly determinable.

Context-invariance and criterion boundary. Context and Applicable Basis determine what conduct falls within these categories.

Distinguishability. The Indicator should be interpreted together with the other Indicators under this Factor, but it preserves a separate question and should not be treated as interchangeable with them.

5.4.5 Factor 4 Indicator-Set Conclusion

The four Indicators collectively make Factor 4 — Respect for Personhood, Role, Dignity, and Autonomy sufficiently observable at the present Core methodological resolution. None should be removed merely because its Evidence may overlap with another Indicator; the relevant issue is whether the determination function remains distinct.

5.5 Factor 5 — Recognition and Response to Material Change

Support services operate over time and under changing human, environmental, organizational, and functional conditions. Quality therefore depends on the ability to identify material change, judge its significance within role, respond in time, communicate appropriately, and follow through.

5.5.1 Indicator 5.1 — Identification of Material Change Relevant to Support

Determination function. Dynamic quality begins with identifying changes that are material to support.

Removal test. Without this Indicator, response can be judged only after someone else has identified the change.

Context-invariance and criterion boundary. Material change may involve deterioration, improvement, new conditions, or altered requirements; it is not limited to risk.

Distinguishability. The Indicator should be interpreted together with the other Indicators under this Factor, but it preserves a separate question and should not be treated as interchangeable with them.

5.5.2 Indicator 5.2 — Role-Appropriate Judgment Regarding the Significance of Material Change

Determination function. Observed change must be interpreted for significance within the Support Role.

Removal test. Removal would collapse observation and judgment, obscuring whether a change was noticed but misunderstood.

Context-invariance and criterion boundary. The judgment remains bounded by Functional Scope.

Distinguishability. The Indicator should be interpreted together with the other Indicators under this Factor, but it preserves a separate question and should not be treated as interchangeable with them.

5.5.3 Indicator 5.3 — Timely Role-Appropriate Response to Material Change

Determination function. A correct judgment can still fail if the response is delayed or inappropriate to role.

Removal test. Without this Indicator, timeliness and action would not be separately determinable.

Context-invariance and criterion boundary. The required response is context-specific and may include adjustment, protective action, or other role-appropriate steps.

Distinguishability. The Indicator should be interpreted together with the other Indicators under this Factor, but it preserves a separate question and should not be treated as interchangeable with them.

5.5.4 Indicator 5.4 — Appropriate Communication and Follow-Through After Material Change

Determination function. Material change often crosses people, shifts, organizations, or professional boundaries and therefore requires communication and follow-through.

Removal test. Removal would allow one-time notification to substitute for completed response where follow-through is material.

Context-invariance and criterion boundary. This Indicator concerns response continuity; Factor 7 separately addresses the integrity of support-relevant information.

Distinguishability. The Indicator should be interpreted together with the other Indicators under this Factor, but it preserves a separate question and should not be treated as interchangeable with them.

5.5.5 Factor 5 Indicator-Set Conclusion

The four Indicators collectively make Factor 5 — Recognition and Response to Material Change sufficiently observable at the present Core methodological resolution. None should be removed merely because its Evidence may overlap with another Indicator; the relevant issue is whether the determination function remains distinct.

5.6 Factor 6 — Support Integration with Service Conditions and Interfaces

Support is realized within actual service conditions and across interfaces among people, organizations, environments, equipment, information, routines, and responsibilities. Even competent individual actions may fail when they are incompatible with those conditions or poorly integrated across interfaces.

5.6.1 Indicator 6.1 — Compatibility of Support Work with Material Service Conditions

Determination function. Support Work must be compatible with the physical, organizational, environmental, technological, social, or other material conditions in which it is realized.

Removal test. Without this Indicator, service conditions would remain descriptive background rather than part of quality determination.

Context-invariance and criterion boundary. Which conditions are material is established by the Quality Object, Context Guide, and Reference Layer.

Distinguishability. The Indicator should be interpreted together with the other Indicators under this Factor, but it preserves a separate question and should not be treated as interchangeable with them.

5.6.2 Indicator 6.2 — Effective Functioning Across Relevant Service Interfaces

Determination function. Support frequently crosses interfaces among workers, family, supervisors, providers, systems, equipment, organizations, or settings.

Removal test. Removal would obscure failures that arise specifically at interfaces rather than within one actor or activity.

Context-invariance and criterion boundary. Relevant interfaces vary by context but the need to examine their functioning is invariant.

Distinguishability. The Indicator should be interpreted together with the other Indicators under this Factor, but it preserves a separate question and should not be treated as interchangeable with them.

5.6.3 Indicator 6.3 — Support of Required Context Participation and Interaction

Determination function. Many support services exist to enable participation or interaction in an actual context rather than to replace it.

Removal test. Without this Indicator, support could technically complete activities while unnecessarily isolating or displacing the person from required participation.

Context-invariance and criterion boundary. The form of participation or interaction is context-specific.

Distinguishability. The Indicator should be interpreted together with the other Indicators under this Factor, but it preserves a separate question and should not be treated as interchangeable with them.

5.6.4 Indicator 6.4 — Avoidance of Support-Created Context or Interface Disruption

Determination function. The support itself can create barriers, workflow disruption, contamination, isolation, conflict, or other interface problems.

Removal test. Removal would focus only on external conditions and miss adverse conditions created by the manner of support.

Context-invariance and criterion boundary. Specific disruptions belong in Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criteria.

Distinguishability. The Indicator should be interpreted together with the other Indicators under this Factor, but it preserves a separate question and should not be treated as interchangeable with them.

5.6.5 Factor 6 Indicator-Set Conclusion

The four Indicators collectively make Factor 6 — Support Integration with Service Conditions and Interfaces sufficiently observable at the present Core methodological resolution. None should be removed merely because its Evidence may overlap with another Indicator; the relevant issue is whether the determination function remains distinct.

5.7 Factor 7 — Continuity, Accuracy, and Protection of Support-Relevant Information

Support Work depends on information that is accurate, current, relevant, transferred appropriately, coherent across changes, and protected against loss, distortion, misuse, or inappropriate disclosure. Information is therefore part of Function Realization rather than merely administrative documentation.

5.7.1 Indicator 7.1 — Accuracy, Currency, and Relevance of Information Used to Guide Support

Determination function. Information used to guide support must be accurate, current, and relevant at the time it is used.

Removal test. Without this Indicator, historically accurate but outdated or irrelevant information could satisfy the information Factor.

Context-invariance and criterion boundary. The required information set varies by service and Applicable Basis.

Distinguishability. The Indicator should be interpreted together with the other Indicators under this Factor, but it preserves a separate question and should not be treated as interchangeable with them.

5.7.2 Indicator 7.2 — Appropriate Transfer of Support-Relevant Information Across Workers, Periods, Arrangements, and Interfaces

Determination function. Support-relevant information must move appropriately across workers, periods, arrangements, and interfaces when continuity requires it.

Removal test. Removal would leave handoffs and transfers insufficiently visible.

Context-invariance and criterion boundary. Transfer must also respect privacy, authorization, and minimum-necessary principles where applicable.

Distinguishability. The Indicator should be interpreted together with the other Indicators under this Factor, but it preserves a separate question and should not be treated as interchangeable with them.

5.7.3 Indicator 7.3 — Continuity of Support Logic and Direction Across Material Changes

Determination function. Continuity requires preservation not only of data but of the support logic and direction needed to act coherently through material changes.

Removal test. Without this Indicator, information could be transferred accurately while the meaning needed to guide support is lost.

Context-invariance and criterion boundary. The relevant direction may come from the person, plan, employer, professional, organization, or other applicable source.

Distinguishability. The Indicator should be interpreted together with the other Indicators under this Factor, but it preserves a separate question and should not be treated as interchangeable with them.

5.7.4 Indicator 7.4 — Protection from Information Loss, Distortion, Misuse, or Inappropriate Disclosure

Determination function. Information quality includes protection against loss, distortion, misuse, and inappropriate disclosure.

Removal test. Removal would treat protection only as an external compliance issue rather than part of support-service Function Realization.

Context-invariance and criterion boundary. Specific confidentiality, security, and retention requirements arise from the Applicable Basis and Reference Layer.

Distinguishability. The Indicator should be interpreted together with the other Indicators under this Factor, but it preserves a separate question and should not be treated as interchangeable with them.

5.7.5 Factor 7 Indicator-Set Conclusion

The four Indicators collectively make Factor 7 — Continuity, Accuracy, and Protection of Support-Relevant Information sufficiently observable at the present Core methodological resolution. None should be removed merely because its Evidence may overlap with another Indicator; the relevant issue is whether the determination function remains distinct.

5.8 Factor 8 — Practice and Judgment Within Functional Scope

Support services are performed through roles with defined authority, competence expectations, and limits. Quality requires appropriate judgment within Functional Scope and appropriate assistance seeking, escalation, referral, or transfer when a matter exceeds that scope.

5.8.1 Indicator 8.1 — Practice Within Authorized Support Role and Functional Scope

Determination function. Support Work must remain within the authorized Support Role and Functional Scope.

Removal test. Without this Indicator, role boundaries would be assumed rather than directly examined.

Context-invariance and criterion boundary. The scope itself is established externally through the applicable occupational, legal, organizational, contractual, or person-directed basis.

Distinguishability. The Indicator should be interpreted together with the other Indicators under this Factor, but it preserves a separate question and should not be treated as interchangeable with them.

5.8.2 Indicator 8.2 — Appropriate Judgment Within Functional Scope

Determination function. Being within scope does not by itself establish good judgment. Choices made within authorized boundaries must also be appropriate to conditions.

Removal test. Removal would collapse authorization and judgment into one question.

Context-invariance and criterion boundary. Evidence should distinguish lack of authority from poor judgment within authority.

Distinguishability. The Indicator should be interpreted together with the other Indicators under this Factor, but it preserves a separate question and should not be treated as interchangeable with them.

5.8.3 Indicator 8.3 — Avoidance of Unauthorized or Reserved Practice

Determination function. Some functions are reserved to another role, profession, employer authority, regulator, or decision-maker.

Removal test. Without this Indicator, the Core could overlook unauthorized assumption of reserved practice even when no immediate harm is shown.

Context-invariance and criterion boundary. What is reserved is context- and jurisdiction-specific; the prohibition on unauthorized assumption is invariant.

Distinguishability. The Indicator should be interpreted together with the other Indicators under this Factor, but it preserves a separate question and should not be treated as interchangeable with them.

5.8.4 Indicator 8.4 — Appropriate Assistance Seeking, Escalation, Referral, or Transfer of Responsibility

Determination function. Quality includes recognizing when responsibility should not remain with the current Support Role and obtaining appropriate assistance or transfer.

Removal test. Removal would leave the Core without a positive determination function for appropriate response to scope limits.

Context-invariance and criterion boundary. Escalation, referral, or transfer does not itself prove quality; appropriateness and follow-through remain evidence questions.

Distinguishability. The Indicator should be interpreted together with the other Indicators under this Factor, but it preserves a separate question and should not be treated as interchangeable with them.

5.8.5 Factor 8 Indicator-Set Conclusion

The four Indicators collectively make Factor 8 — Practice and Judgment Within Functional Scope sufficiently observable at the present Core methodological resolution. None should be removed merely because its Evidence may overlap with another Indicator; the relevant issue is whether the determination function remains distinct.

6. Horizontal Analysis Across the Eight Factors

6.1 Recurring Determination Functions

Across the Core, Indicators commonly perform recognition, condition/state, response, continuity, boundary/interface, and role-control functions. These recurring functions are useful for horizontal testing but do not constitute an additional normative classification layer.

6.2 Indicators Serving More Than One Function

An Indicator may contribute to more than one analytical purpose. For example, information transfer can influence continuity and safety, while material-change response can affect effectiveness and protection. Multi-function relevance does not make the Indicator redundant.

6.3 Cross-Factor Overlap

Evidence may support findings under more than one Factor. The Core should preserve the Factor and Indicator distinctions when the underlying determination questions differ.

6.4 Apparent Gaps

A candidate gap should be recorded only when a necessary condition repeatedly cannot be represented by existing Indicators without forced interpretation or inappropriate dependence on context-specific criteria.

6.5 Context-Specific Need Versus Core Gap

A need is context-specific when it identifies the expected condition, threshold, procedure, hazard, interaction, or result for a particular service. It becomes a Core-gap candidate only when the missing determination function remains necessary across materially different contexts.

7. Cross-Context Testing of the Indicator Structure

7.1 Personal Care Aide Applications

PCA contexts can interpret the invariant Indicators through criteria concerning bodily safety, daily-life activities, hygiene, privacy, person-directed support, changing needs, information, and role limits without converting those subjects into separate universal Indicators.

7.2 Vocational Rehabilitation Job Coaching Applications

Job Coaching can interpret the same Indicators through criteria concerning job performance, support balance, worker role, workplace change, supervisor and coworker interfaces, employment-relevant information, and Functional Scope.

7.3 Why Different Criteria Do Not Require Different Indicators

Different expected conditions are exactly what Context-Specific Quality Outcome Criteria are designed to express. The Core Indicator remains stable when the underlying determination question is common.

7.4 Continuing Test Through Additional Context Guides

Future Context Guides should be used as applications and stress tests. Repeated forced mappings or recurring unrepresented determination functions should be documented as possible Core-revision Evidence.

8. Why the Present Indicator Set Is Stable but Open

8.1 Present Necessity

The removal tests support retaining all thirty-two Indicators at the present methodological resolution.

8.2 No Claim of Permanent Closure

The analysis does not claim that thirty-two is a permanently sufficient number independent of future Evidence.

8.3 Conditions for Addition

A new Indicator should require evidence of a recurring, distinguishable Core-level determination function that cannot be represented responsibly by the existing Indicator set and is not merely a context-specific criterion.

8.4 Conditions for Merger or Removal

Merger or removal should require evidence that the Indicator adds no materially distinct determination capability across contexts or that its function is fully and transparently represented elsewhere.

8.5 Controlled Revision

Any revision should preserve traceability to the affected Factors, Context Guides, Failure Modes, Evidence, and Quality State determination consequences.

9. Conclusions

The thirty-two SSC1 Core Quality Indicators are individually justified at the present methodological resolution because each preserves a necessary and distinguishable determination function within one of the eight invariant Core Quality Factors. Together they make the Factors sufficiently observable for Evidence-Supported Findings and Quality Factor Interpretation while leaving context-specific expected conditions to Context Guides and Outcome Criteria.

The final proposition is therefore: SSC1 should retain the present thirty-two invariant Core Quality Indicators unless future cross-context Evidence demonstrates a recurring Core-level gap, redundancy, or misallocation that materially affects responsible Support Service Quality State determination.

Reference Use

This justification is an explanatory AMSI Resource. SSC1 remains the normative source for the Indicator names and architecture. The SSC1 Factors Justification addresses the preceding level of methodological resolution. Context Guides and the applicable Reference Layer provide context-specific interpretation, Outcome Criteria, and Evidence requirements.

Copyright and Use Notice

Copyright © Support Service Quality Initiative (AMSI), 2026. All rights reserved.

This document, Justification of the Thirty-Two Invariant SSC1 Core Quality Indicators, is a methodological resource published by the Support Service Quality Initiative (AMSI) in support of SSC1.

This Resource may be used, reproduced, and distributed, in whole or in part, for informational and non-commercial purposes, provided that all reproductions include this Copyright and Use Notice and do not imply AMSI certification, approval, endorsement, accreditation, regulatory approval, professional acceptance, legal compliance, guaranteed capability or deliverability, or performance of a conformity assessment by AMSI.

Restrictions. No part of this Resource may be modified, adapted, abridged, translated, excerpted in a manner that alters meaning, or incorporated into another standard, specification, regulation, certification scheme, audit program, commercial product, training product, software tool, or conformity-assessment program without prior written permission from AMSI.

No endorsement; no certification. Use of terms, definitions, concepts, analytical methods, Factor or Indicator justifications, examples, or other content from this Resource does not imply AMSI certification, approval, endorsement, accreditation, regulatory approval, professional acceptance, legal compliance, or acceptance of any Support Service Quality State determination or Support Service Quality Claim.

Relationship to SSC1. This Resource explains methodological reasoning supporting SSC1. It is informative and does not replace, supersede, amend, or independently establish the normative provisions of SSC1, an AMSI Context Guide, or any applicable law, regulation, professional requirement, authorization, Reference Layer source, or occupational scope requirement.

Disclaimer of warranties. AMSI makes this Resource available on an “as is” basis, without warranty of any kind, express or implied, including without limitation warranties of merchantability, fitness for a particular purpose, completeness, accuracy, or suitability for any specific person, service, provider, program, jurisdiction, Support Service Quality Object, Support Service Quality State determination, or Support Service Quality Claim.

Limitation of liability. AMSI disclaims any liability for the use, interpretation, or application of this document, including any direct, indirect, incidental, special, exemplary, or consequential damages arising from reliance on it or from any Support Service Quality Claim Statement, decision, assessment, service operation, or action based on it.

Revisions. AMSI reserves the right to revise, amend, replace, or withdraw this document at any time. Users are responsible for ensuring that they are referencing the current edition.