Structured Empathy Framework **Maturity Model** www.structuredempathy.net	Level 1 Absent	Level 2 Emerging	Level 3 Intentional	Level 4 Embedded	Level 5 Strategic Capability
Strategy How is the need for a psychologically safe culture seen as part of organisational strategy.	Not part of organisational strategy	Individual leaders recognise the need and incorporate elements into local strategies, but efforts are ad-hoc. Some teams experiment, but there is no organisation-wide structure or repeatability	The organisational strategy incorporates it as a target, with structured methods for delivery. It is referenced in formal strategy messaging and associated initiatives.	Forms a foundation of organisational strategy. It shapes decision-making, conflict resolution, leadership behaviours, and delivery rhythms.	A strategic differentiator; the organisation continuously improves the framework, shares learning openly. Insights feed back into the framework to mature it further.
Leadership and Management Behaviours How well the leaders in the organisation understand, model, reenforce, and are accountable for ensuring psychological safety.	Leadership behaviours vary widely. Psychological safety depends on individual leaders.	Senior leaders demonstrate intent, and some model empathetic behaviours, although may be inconsistent.	All leaders are trained and measured for how psychologically safe their team/organisation feels. Clear expectations and escalation paths exist. Leaders begin to model and reinforce more consistently.	Leaders consistently demonstrate the behaviours required to support psychological safety.	Leaders actively coach, steward, and develop empathy as a capability.
Operational Culture and Rhythms How organisational processes, rituals, and behavioural norms embed psychological safety into the way the organisation operates — including meetings, decision-making, governance, and how people behave under pressure or in conflict.	Psychological safety is not reflected in the way the business operates. Meetings, rituals, and decision-making processes do not support or protect it.	Use of psychological safety practices is inconsistent, appearing in some meetings or conflict situations but not reliably across the organisation.	Key processes, rituals, and meeting norms are designed to assure and protect psychological safety. People experience more consistent behaviours.	Processes and behavioural norms are embedded and integrated into governance, decision-making, and operational rhythms. Psychological safety is reliably maintained, even under pressure.	Leadership drives accountability for consistently following these rhythms. The operating system is continuously improved, and psychological safety becomes a cultural expectation and source of learning.
Organisation and People How the organisation builds and reinforces the behaviours, skills, and experiences that underpin psychological safety — including how leaders and staff are held accountable, how empathy and compassion are taught and developed, and how people experience psychological safety in their day-to-day work.	There is no formal training, no accountability, and no systemic support for empathy or psychological safety. Staff describe an unsafe and unpredictable environment.	Basic, untailored training exists. Individual leaders encourage accountability informally. Staff experience pockets of psychological safety around certain leaders or teams.	Structured training and learning pathways exist for all staff. Clear expectations and escalation paths are defined. Staff describe psychological safety within and across multiple teams.	Training, coaching, and assessment are regular and consistent. Accountability is integrated into performance and governance. Staff describe high levels of trust, constructive challenge, and reliable psychological safety.	Empathy, compassion, and psychological safety skills form a core organisational capability. Accountability is fair, trusted, and culturally reinforcing. Staff describe psychological safety as a strategic asset that strengthens performance and resilience.
Enablement How the organisation equips people with the tools, shared language, and practical supports needed to create psychologically safe environment consistently — including in difficult situations such as conflict, challenge, or high-pressure delivery.	Tools are found externally and used inconsistently by individuals. There is no shared vernacular and no common understanding of empathy, compassion, or psychological safety. People lack the practical supports needed to create psychological safety especially in difficult situations	Tools are used widely but inconsistently. The organisation recognises key terms and has basic awareness of the concepts. Some leaders attempt to ensure psychological safety in challenging moments, but practice is uneven and unsupported.	Tools are integrated into business-as-usual processes. Shared definitions are consistently used and understood. Conflict processes incorporate psychological safety, and people have clearer guidance on how to apply behave and operate in difficult situations.	Tools are consistently used across the organisation. Shared language becomes part of communication norms. Lived experiences show psychological safety is maintained even in difficult or high-pressure situations, supported by reliable tools and practices.	Tools are actively improved and contributed back into the community. Shared vernacular is consistent organisation-wide. Conflict becomes a source of learning, and insights refine the framework. Psychological safety is confidently nurtured in all contexts, including the most challenging.
Execution and impact How psychological safety is enacted, experienced, evidenced, and used to drive continuous improvement and organisational outcomes.	There is no structured way to enact or evidence psychological safety. The organisation relies on anecdote, intuition, or individual leader perception. Staff describe an unsafe or unpredictable environment, and there is no evidence-based understanding of impact on people or delivery.	The organisation conducts basic or local surveys that touch on aspects of psychological safety, but behaviours and responses are inconsistent and not tied to decision-making. Some teams gather informal feedback, but there is no systematic analysis or follow-through. Staff experience pockets of psychological safety around certain leaders or teams, with limited impact on broader outcomes.	The organisation runs regular, organisation-wide surveys and collects other basic indicators of psychological safety. Data is reviewed and discussed, and early feedback loops begin to influence behaviours and team practices. Staff describe psychological safety within and across multiple teams, though experiences and impacts still vary.	Psychological safety is consistently enacted and evidenced across the organisation. Measurement is reliable and integrated into feedback loops. Indicators inform governance, decision-making, and leadership behaviours. Lived experiences confirm that psychological safety is maintained even during conflict or change. Staff describe high trust, constructive challenge, and positive impacts on delivery.	The organisation uses data-driven insights and lived experience to continuously improve practices. Psychological safety metrics are reviewed at board level and treated as strategic indicators. Feedback loops are rapid, trusted, and culturally embedded. Psychological safety is recognised as a strategic asset that accelerates innovation, resilience, and delivery.