

# **Guest Service, Complaints & Recovery Workbook**

**A Practical Restaurant Manager's Workbook for Guest Experience, Complaint Tracking, and Service Recovery**

---

**COMPLETE PRACTICAL WORKBOOK**

**THOMAS BUTLER**

Thomas Monroe Books

The Restaurant Manager's Toolkit

# Copyright, Use, and Important Limits

Copyright © 2026 Thomas Butler. Published by Thomas Monroe Books. First workbook edition, September 2026. All rights reserved except for blank guided-practice pages reproduced for internal use by the purchasing or authorized restaurant operation.

## IMPORTANT

This workbook is educational restaurant-management guidance. It is not legal, medical, food-safety, insurance, emergency-response, privacy, or platform-policy advice. Restaurants must adapt the material to current federal, state, local, company, insurance, health-code, alcohol, accessibility, platform, and other applicable requirements. High-risk concerns must be routed through the restaurant's approved emergency, safety, ownership, HR, insurance, or legal channels as appropriate.

The workbook teaches manager judgment and guided practice. The Gravity Guest Relationship & Retention System (GRV-R) remains the controlled operating system for permanent tool IDs, official forms, ownership, access, retention, review cadence, and restaurant records. Do not create a second competing set of GRV-R IDs from this workbook.

Protect guest and employee privacy. Record only facts needed for service, recovery, follow-up, safety, or management action. Do not collect payment-card numbers, passwords, government identification numbers, medical diagnoses, rumors, or unrelated personal information in workbook practice pages.

# How to Use This Workbook

Use the chapter that matches the current pressure, complete the guided practice, then move permanent operating evidence into the controlled GRV-R record named in the chapter or forms directory. The book is designed to strengthen judgment; it does not replace the operating system.

- Start with the guest's actual impact and the verified operating facts.
- Correct what can be corrected immediately without guessing or promising outside authority.
- Escalate safety, conduct, legal, financial, privacy, or reputation risks through approved channels.
- Document material cases, ownership, follow-up, and system correction.
- Review material complaints daily and patterns weekly.
- Use Truth → Cost → System to decide whether a new control is actually needed.

## The working cycle

| Stage    | Manager output                                | Controlled support |
|----------|-----------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Hear     | Guest impact and concern understood           | GRV-R07            |
| Classify | Category, severity, and escalation path       | GRV-R07 / GRV-R08  |
| Recover  | Operational correction and authorized remedy  | GRV-R09 / GRV-R10  |
| Follow   | Named owner, deadline, attempts, closure      | GRV-R11            |
| Learn    | Repeat theme and verified likely cause        | GRV-R12            |
| Correct  | Action owner, evidence, verification, closure | GRV-R30 / GRV-IV   |
| Review   | Weekly decisions and next priorities          | GRV-R28            |

# Gravity Product Relationship

| Gravity product                             | Unique job in this workbook                                                                               |
|---------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Quiet Gravity                               | Human standard: dignity, restraint, honesty, fairness, and calm use of authority.                         |
| The Owner's Chair                           | Authority standard: owner/GM responsibility, decision rights, and consequences of unclear leadership.     |
| Systems of Service                          | Operating context: flow, preparation, communication, pressure, recovery, and consistent guest experience. |
| Employee Training & SOP Tracker             | Trains the service and recovery standards employees are expected to perform.                              |
| Restaurant SOP & Station Operations Builder | Builds and controls the procedures that complaints may reveal need repair.                                |
| Gravity Restaurant SOP Library              | Provides customizable guest complaint, recovery, safety, and special-situation procedures.                |
| GRV-R Guest Relationship & Retention        | Controls permanent guest-recovery records, ownership, cadence, and retention evidence.                    |
| GRV-IV                                      | Verifies installed corrective actions and closes the loop after the process changes.                      |

## BOUNDARY

This workbook owns recovery judgment and guided practice. It does not become a second SOP library, a CRM database, a legal manual, a reputation-marketing system, or a replacement for controlled GRV-R records.

# Contents

|                                                              |    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Part 1: Face the Guest Experience Truth .....                | 9  |
| Chapter 1 Guest Experience Is a System .....                 | 10 |
| Chapter 2 The True Cost of a Bad Guest Experience .....      | 14 |
| Chapter 3 A Complaint Is a Signal, Not a Verdict .....       | 18 |
| Chapter 4 Failure, Preference, Policy, or Expectation? ..... | 22 |
| Part 2: Build the Recovery Standard .....                    | 26 |
| Chapter 5 Standards Must Exist Before Recovery .....         | 27 |
| Chapter 6 Complaint Categories That Lead to Action .....     | 31 |
| Chapter 7 Severity and Escalation .....                      | 35 |
| Chapter 8 Listen Without Defending .....                     | 39 |
| Chapter 9 Acknowledge the Impact .....                       | 43 |
| Part 3: Recover in Real Time .....                           | 47 |
| Chapter 10 The Manager Table Visit .....                     | 48 |
| Chapter 11 Recovery Authority Before the Rush .....          | 52 |
| Chapter 12 Proportionate Recovery .....                      | 56 |
| Chapter 13 Wrong Order and Missing Item Recovery .....       | 60 |

## Contents — continued

|                                                                               |     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Chapter 14 Delay, Pacing, and Expectation Failure .....                       | 64  |
| Chapter 15 Food Quality and Product Concerns .....                            | 68  |
| Chapter 16 Allergy and Immediate Safety Concerns .....                        | 72  |
| Chapter 17 Illness, Injury, Foreign Object, and Other High-Risk Reports ..... | 76  |
| Chapter 18 Conduct, Harassment, Threats, and Disruptive Behavior .....        | 80  |
| Chapter 19 Payment, Billing, Comp, and Refund Disputes .....                  | 84  |
| Chapter 20 When the First Recovery Does Not Work .....                        | 88  |
| Part 4: Turn Complaints into Evidence .....                                   | 92  |
| Chapter 21 Document Facts Without Writing a Story .....                       | 93  |
| Chapter 22 Follow-Up Is Part of the Recovery .....                            | 97  |
| Chapter 23 Online Reviews: Public Response, Private Recovery .....            | 101 |
| Chapter 24 Compliments and Positive Signals .....                             | 105 |
| Chapter 25 Pattern Analysis: Close the Cause, Not Only the Case .....         | 109 |
| Part 5: Read the Whole Guest Signal .....                                     | 113 |
| Chapter 26 Review Requests and Honest Reputation .....                        | 114 |
| Chapter 27 Guest Return and Relationship Repair .....                         | 118 |

## Contents — continued

|                                                                   |     |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Chapter 28 Guest Preferences, Recognition, and Privacy .....      | 122 |
| Chapter 29 What the Guest Did Not Say .....                       | 126 |
| Part 6: Coach the Cause and Correct the System .....              | 130 |
| Chapter 30 Coach the Cause, Not the Person .....                  | 131 |
| Chapter 31 Correct the System, Then Verify .....                  | 135 |
| Chapter 32 Recognition, Accountability, and Fairness .....        | 139 |
| Part 7: Manage Guest Experience as a Control .....                | 143 |
| Chapter 33 The Weekly Guest Experience Review .....               | 144 |
| Chapter 34 Measure What Helps a Decision .....                    | 148 |
| Chapter 35 Truth → Cost → System: The Recovery Control Loop ..... | 152 |
| Manager Judgment Lab: 20 Recovery Scenarios .....                 | 156 |
| 30-Day Guest Complaint Recovery Improvement Plan .....            | 177 |
| Controlled GRV-R Cross-Reference Directory .....                  | 181 |
| Operational Glossary .....                                        | 183 |
| Final Manager Readiness Assessment .....                          | 187 |

# The Gravity Guest Recovery Standard

## CENTRAL STANDARD

Recovery is complete only when the guest impact is addressed as far as reasonably possible, promised follow-up is owned, and material evidence is converted into a better management decision or verified operating correction.

A complaint should never be used as an excuse to ignore facts, and facts should never be used as an excuse to ignore the guest. Gravity requires both.

## Truth → Cost → System

| Step   | Question                                                  | Manager evidence                                                                                              |
|--------|-----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Truth  | What actually happened to the guest and in the operation? | Guest report, direct observation, ticket/POS timing, product, service sequence, policy, witnesses, records.   |
| Cost   | What did this truth cost or risk?                         | Guest trust, time, product, labor, rework, table flow, recovery dollars, team confidence, safety, reputation. |
| System | What repeatable control addresses the verified cause?     | Standard, authority, handoff, training, tool, staffing rule, escalation, corrective action, verification.     |

Do not add paperwork because a complaint feels serious. Add or repair a control only when the evidence shows a repeatable problem that requires a repeatable response.

PART 1

# FACE THE GUEST EXPERIENCE TRUTH

---

Separate emotion from evidence. A complaint is a real guest experience to address, but it is also operating information. The manager's job is to protect the guest, protect the team from guesswork, and find the condition that allowed the miss.

## CHAPTER 1

# Guest Experience Is a System

Show why guest experience is produced by connected operating conditions rather than personality alone.

## The operating truth

The guest experiences the restaurant as one operation. They do not separate the host stand, server, bar, kitchen, expo, dish, manager, payment process, and facility into different departments.

## What the restaurant pays when this is missed

When leaders treat each complaint as an isolated person problem, the same handoff or capacity failure survives and the restaurant pays through remakes, comps, slower tables, distrust, negative reviews, and employee frustration.

**MANAGER TEST**

Can you explain the guest impact, the verified operating facts, the authority used, and what must happen next without blaming a person you have not yet heard from?

# Chapter 1 Field Guide

## Use these rules on a real shift

1. Map the full guest path before assigning blame.
2. Ask where the first preventable miss occurred, not only where the guest finally complained.
3. Separate the person who discovered the failure from the condition that created it.
4. Use direct observation, tickets, timing, and records to test the story.
5. Fix the weakest handoff that is producing repeat consequences.

## Questions before you close the case

- What did the guest experience, in plain language?
- What can we verify now, and what remains reported but unverified?
- What recovery authority applies?
- What promise or follow-up exists after the guest leaves?
- Is this isolated, or does another case show the same failure condition?

### CONTROLLED RECORD CONNECTION

GRV-R07 Guest Feedback & Concern Record; GRV-R28 Weekly Guest Relationship Review. Use the current approved version. This workbook page is guided practice, not the permanent restaurant record.

# Applied Scenario: The Table That Waited Everywhere

A party was greeted late, drinks were slow, one entrée arrived after the others, and payment took too long. The server receives the complaint, but no single event explains the guest's frustration.

## Your decision

WHAT IS THE GUEST IMPACT?

---

WHAT FACTS ARE VERIFIED?

---

WHAT REMAINS UNKNOWN OR ONLY REPORTED?

---

WHAT AUTHORITY OR ESCALATION APPLIES?

---

WHAT IS THE SMALLEST USEFUL NEXT ACTION?

---

WHO OWNS FOLLOW-UP, BY WHEN, AND HOW WILL IT BE VERIFIED?

---

# Chapter 1 Action Record

Complete this guided-practice page for one real or representative decision involving “Guest Experience Is a System.” Use an approved case identifier rather than unnecessary personal information.

**CASE / SHIFT / DATE**

---

**GUEST IMPACT IN NEUTRAL LANGUAGE**

---

---

**VERIFIED OPERATING FACTS**

---

---

**IMMEDIATE RECOVERY OR CORRECTION**

---

---

**LIKELY CAUSE TO TEST — NOT ASSUME**

---

---

**NEXT OWNER / DUE DATE / VERIFICATION EVIDENCE**

---

---

## CHAPTER 2

## The True Cost of a Bad Guest Experience

Make managers calculate the operating and relationship cost instead of treating recovery only as the value of a comp.

**TRUTH FIRST**

The visible recovery cost may be a replacement item or discount. The larger cost can include rework, labor time, delayed table turns, manager attention, lost repeat visits, review exposure, and team confidence.

### The hidden cost

If the restaurant measures only comps, leaders may celebrate low recovery spending while guests simply stop returning or employees hide problems to avoid a manager reaction.

### A practical distinction

For “The True Cost of a Bad Guest Experience,” the guest-facing decision and the management decision are related but not identical. Address the immediate impact first, then preserve enough evidence to determine whether a standard, handoff, authority limit, training step, or other operating condition needs repair.

## Chapter 2 Field Guide

### Use these rules on a real shift

6. Record direct recovery cost when known.
7. Record operational consequences such as remake time, manager minutes, and delayed service.
8. Distinguish an isolated expensive recovery from a cheap failure that repeats every night.
9. Review lost trust as a risk, not as a number you can always know precisely.
10. Spend recovery resources where they repair impact and reveal the cause.

### Questions before you close the case

- What did the guest experience, in plain language?
- What can we verify now, and what remains reported but unverified?
- What recovery authority applies?
- What promise or follow-up exists after the guest leaves?
- Is this isolated, or does another case show the same failure condition?

#### CONTROLLED RECORD CONNECTION

GRV-R07 Guest Feedback & Concern Record; GRV-R28 Weekly Guest Relationship Review. Use the current approved version. This workbook page is guided practice, not the permanent restaurant record.

# Applied Scenario: The Free Dessert That Was Not Cheap

A manager comps a dessert after a delayed entrée and marks the problem solved. The kitchen repeats the same ticket-delay pattern on three more tables that week.

## Your decision

WHAT IS THE GUEST IMPACT?

---

WHAT FACTS ARE VERIFIED?

---

WHAT REMAINS UNKNOWN OR ONLY REPORTED?

---

WHAT AUTHORITY OR ESCALATION APPLIES?

---

WHAT IS THE SMALLEST USEFUL NEXT ACTION?

---

WHO OWNS FOLLOW-UP, BY WHEN, AND HOW WILL IT BE VERIFIED?

---

## Chapter 2 Action Record

Complete this guided-practice page for one real or representative decision involving “The True Cost of a Bad Guest Experience.” Use an approved case identifier rather than unnecessary personal information.

**CASE / SHIFT / DATE**

---

**GUEST IMPACT IN NEUTRAL LANGUAGE**

---

---

**VERIFIED OPERATING FACTS**

---

---

**IMMEDIATE RECOVERY OR CORRECTION**

---

---

**LIKELY CAUSE TO TEST — NOT ASSUME**

---

---

**NEXT OWNER / DUE DATE / VERIFICATION EVIDENCE**

---

---

## CHAPTER 3

## A Complaint Is a Signal, Not a Verdict

Teach managers to respect the complaint without assuming every statement is complete or every requested remedy is appropriate.

### Start with this distinction

A complaint is evidence that the guest experienced a problem or mismatch. It is not automatically proof of cause, intent, employee misconduct, or the correct financial remedy.

**COST OF GETTING IT WRONG**

Managers who argue with every complaint destroy trust. Managers who accept every claim without checking facts create unfairness, uncontrolled discounting, and weak learning.

### What calm management looks like

In “A Complaint Is a Signal, Not a Verdict,” calm management means moving at two speeds: act promptly on what is clear, and remain disciplined about what still needs verification. The guest should see ownership while the manager avoids inventing a cause or promise just to end the conversation.

## Chapter 3 Field Guide

### Use these rules on a real shift

11. Listen first; verify second.
12. Record what the guest reports separately from what the restaurant can independently confirm.
13. Never require certainty before showing respect.
14. Do not make an employee guilty simply because a guest is angry.
15. Choose recovery from impact, facts, policy, and authority—not volume of emotion.

### Questions before you close the case

- What did the guest experience, in plain language?
- What can we verify now, and what remains reported but unverified?
- What recovery authority applies?
- What promise or follow-up exists after the guest leaves?
- Is this isolated, or does another case show the same failure condition?

#### CONTROLLED RECORD CONNECTION

GRV-R07 Guest Feedback & Concern Record; GRV-R28 Weekly Guest Relationship Review. Use the current approved version. This workbook page is guided practice, not the permanent restaurant record.

## Applied Scenario: Two Different Stories

A guest says the server ignored the table for twenty minutes. POS timing and a manager observation show the server checked twice, but a drink request was missed during a shift change.

### Your decision

WHAT IS THE GUEST IMPACT?

---

WHAT FACTS ARE VERIFIED?

---

WHAT REMAINS UNKNOWN OR ONLY REPORTED?

---

WHAT AUTHORITY OR ESCALATION APPLIES?

---

WHAT IS THE SMALLEST USEFUL NEXT ACTION?

---

WHO OWNS FOLLOW-UP, BY WHEN, AND HOW WILL IT BE VERIFIED?

---

## Chapter 3 Action Record

Complete this guided-practice page for one real or representative decision involving “A Complaint Is a Signal, Not a Verdict.” Use an approved case identifier rather than unnecessary personal information.

**CASE / SHIFT / DATE**

---

**GUEST IMPACT IN NEUTRAL LANGUAGE**

---

---

**VERIFIED OPERATING FACTS**

---

---

**IMMEDIATE RECOVERY OR CORRECTION**

---

---

**LIKELY CAUSE TO TEST — NOT ASSUME**

---

---

**NEXT OWNER / DUE DATE / VERIFICATION EVIDENCE**

---

---

## CHAPTER 4

## Failure, Preference, Policy, or Expectation?

Give managers a simple classification that changes the recovery path.

**THE TRUTH**

Not every unhappy moment is the same. A restaurant may fail its own standard, a guest may prefer something different, a policy may create friction, or expectations may never have been clarified.

### Why this matters operationally

If managers label every disappointment a service failure, standards become meaningless. If they label every complaint a preference, the operation learns nothing.

### Do not confuse activity with control

Closing a conversation does not prove “Failure, Preference, Policy, or Expectation?” is controlled. The manager should be able to show what changed, who owns the next step, and what evidence on a comparable shift would demonstrate that the same avoidable failure is less likely to return.

## Chapter 4 Field Guide

### Use these rules on a real shift

16. Failure: the restaurant missed an approved standard.
17. Preference: the restaurant met the standard but the guest wanted a different option.
18. Policy conflict: a rule or authority boundary created the dispute.
19. Expectation gap: the restaurant did not clearly communicate timing, product, price, or limitation.
20. Mixed case: more than one category can be true; record the primary operating cause.

### Questions before you close the case

- What did the guest experience, in plain language?
- What can we verify now, and what remains reported but unverified?
- What recovery authority applies?
- What promise or follow-up exists after the guest leaves?
- Is this isolated, or does another case show the same failure condition?

#### CONTROLLED RECORD CONNECTION

GRV-R07 Guest Feedback & Concern Record; GRV-R28 Weekly Guest Relationship Review. Use the current approved version. This workbook page is guided practice, not the permanent restaurant record.

## Applied Scenario: The Well-Done Steak

A guest orders medium steak, receives medium, and later says they expected no pink. The food is prepared to the stated order, but the ordering conversation did not clarify the guest's expectation.

### Your decision

WHAT IS THE GUEST IMPACT?

---

WHAT FACTS ARE VERIFIED?

---

WHAT REMAINS UNKNOWN OR ONLY REPORTED?

---

WHAT AUTHORITY OR ESCALATION APPLIES?

---

WHAT IS THE SMALLEST USEFUL NEXT ACTION?

---

WHO OWNS FOLLOW-UP, BY WHEN, AND HOW WILL IT BE VERIFIED?

---

## Chapter 4 Action Record

Complete this guided-practice page for one real or representative decision involving “Failure, Preference, Policy, or Expectation?”. Use an approved case identifier rather than unnecessary personal information.

**CASE / SHIFT / DATE**

---

**GUEST IMPACT IN NEUTRAL LANGUAGE**

---

---

**VERIFIED OPERATING FACTS**

---

---

**IMMEDIATE RECOVERY OR CORRECTION**

---

---

**LIKELY CAUSE TO TEST — NOT ASSUME**

---

---

**NEXT OWNER / DUE DATE / VERIFICATION EVIDENCE**

---

---

PART 2

# BUILD THE RECOVERY STANDARD

---

Recovery becomes fair only when expectations, authority, escalation, and documentation exist before the problem arrives. This part converts hospitality instincts into a usable decision system.

## CHAPTER 5

## Standards Must Exist Before Recovery

Connect service recovery to clear service standards and prevent managers from improvising what “good service” means after the complaint.

### The operating truth

You cannot reliably recover a standard that was never defined. Managers need clear expectations for greeting, order accuracy, pacing, communication, product quality, table maintenance, payment, and escalation.

### What the restaurant pays when this is missed

When standards are vague, one manager calls a ten-minute wait acceptable and another calls it a crisis. Employees learn personalities instead of the operation.

**MANAGER TEST**

Can you explain the guest impact, the verified operating facts, the authority used, and what must happen next without blaming a person you have not yet heard from?

## Chapter 5 Field Guide

### Use these rules on a real shift

21. Define the standard in observable language.
22. Set timing targets only where the restaurant can support and verify them.
23. Train exceptions: what to do when the target cannot be met.
24. Tell guests the truth early when service will differ from normal.
25. Review standards after evidence shows they are unrealistic or incomplete.

### Questions before you close the case

- What did the guest experience, in plain language?
- What can we verify now, and what remains reported but unverified?
- What recovery authority applies?
- What promise or follow-up exists after the guest leaves?
- Is this isolated, or does another case show the same failure condition?

#### CONTROLLED RECORD CONNECTION

GRV-R07 Guest Feedback & Concern Record; GRV-R28 Weekly Guest Relationship Review. Use the current approved version. This workbook page is guided practice, not the permanent restaurant record.

## Applied Scenario: The Ten-Minute Debate

Two managers disagree about whether a ten-minute wait for first drinks is a failure. Neither can point to an approved service standard.

### Your decision

WHAT IS THE GUEST IMPACT?

---

WHAT FACTS ARE VERIFIED?

---

WHAT REMAINS UNKNOWN OR ONLY REPORTED?

---

WHAT AUTHORITY OR ESCALATION APPLIES?

---

WHAT IS THE SMALLEST USEFUL NEXT ACTION?

---

WHO OWNS FOLLOW-UP, BY WHEN, AND HOW WILL IT BE VERIFIED?

---

## Chapter 5 Action Record

Complete this guided-practice page for one real or representative decision involving “Standards Must Exist Before Recovery.” Use an approved case identifier rather than unnecessary personal information.

**CASE / SHIFT / DATE**

---

**GUEST IMPACT IN NEUTRAL LANGUAGE**

---

---

**VERIFIED OPERATING FACTS**

---

---

**IMMEDIATE RECOVERY OR CORRECTION**

---

---

**LIKELY CAUSE TO TEST — NOT ASSUME**

---

---

**NEXT OWNER / DUE DATE / VERIFICATION EVIDENCE**

---

---

## CHAPTER 6

## Complaint Categories That Lead to Action

Build a category system that supports pattern review without burying managers in labels.

**TRUTH FIRST**

Categories are useful only when they change a decision. A small set of consistent categories makes patterns visible across shifts and managers.

### The hidden cost

If every manager invents a different label, the restaurant cannot tell whether it has one repeated problem or twenty unrelated ones.

### A practical distinction

For “Complaint Categories That Lead to Action,” the guest-facing decision and the management decision are related but not identical. Address the immediate impact first, then preserve enough evidence to determine whether a standard, handoff, authority limit, training step, or other operating condition needs repair.

## Chapter 6 Field Guide

### Use these rules on a real shift

26. Use categories such as service, speed, order accuracy, food quality, facility, payment, policy/expectation, conduct, and safety.
27. Allow one primary category and limited secondary tags.
28. Do not create a new category for every menu item or employee.
29. Tag the failure point as well as the guest-facing symptom when known.
30. Review category definitions quarterly and retire labels nobody uses.

### Questions before you close the case

- What did the guest experience, in plain language?
- What can we verify now, and what remains reported but unverified?
- What recovery authority applies?
- What promise or follow-up exists after the guest leaves?
- Is this isolated, or does another case show the same failure condition?

#### CONTROLLED RECORD CONNECTION

GRV-R07 Guest Feedback & Concern Record; GRV-R28 Weekly Guest Relationship Review. Use the current approved version. This workbook page is guided practice, not the permanent restaurant record.

## Applied Scenario: Five Names for the Same Problem

One manager calls an issue “slow food,” another “kitchen,” another “ticket time,” another “server delay,” and another “bad service.” The weekly report shows no pattern.

### Your decision

WHAT IS THE GUEST IMPACT?

---

WHAT FACTS ARE VERIFIED?

---

WHAT REMAINS UNKNOWN OR ONLY REPORTED?

---

WHAT AUTHORITY OR ESCALATION APPLIES?

---

WHAT IS THE SMALLEST USEFUL NEXT ACTION?

---

WHO OWNS FOLLOW-UP, BY WHEN, AND HOW WILL IT BE VERIFIED?

---

## Chapter 6 Action Record

Complete this guided-practice page for one real or representative decision involving “Complaint Categories That Lead to Action.” Use an approved case identifier rather than unnecessary personal information.

**CASE / SHIFT / DATE**

---

**GUEST IMPACT IN NEUTRAL LANGUAGE**

---

---

**VERIFIED OPERATING FACTS**

---

---

**IMMEDIATE RECOVERY OR CORRECTION**

---

---

**LIKELY CAUSE TO TEST — NOT ASSUME**

---

---

**NEXT OWNER / DUE DATE / VERIFICATION EVIDENCE**

---

---

## CHAPTER 7

## Severity and Escalation

Give managers a consistent way to distinguish ordinary inconvenience from material failure and high-risk concerns.

### Start with this distinction

The response should increase with impact, uncertainty, and risk. A missed side item is not managed the same way as an allergy concern, injury report, discrimination allegation, threat, or significant financial dispute.

**COST OF GETTING IT WRONG**

Without severity levels, managers either overreact to small misses or underreact to serious ones. Both consume trust and create risk.

### What calm management looks like

In “Severity and Escalation,” calm management means moving at two speeds: act promptly on what is clear, and remain disciplined about what still needs verification. The guest should see ownership while the manager avoids inventing a cause or promise just to end the conversation.

## Chapter 7 Field Guide

### Use these rules on a real shift

31. Level 1: isolated inconvenience with limited impact.
32. Level 2: material failure, repeated miss, significant delay, or meaningful loss of confidence.
33. Level 3: safety, injury, discrimination, threatening conduct, severe financial exposure, or material reputation risk.
34. High-risk issues move to authorized leadership immediately.
35. Severity guides escalation and documentation; it does not determine guilt.

### Questions before you close the case

- What did the guest experience, in plain language?
- What can we verify now, and what remains reported but unverified?
- What recovery authority applies?
- What promise or follow-up exists after the guest leaves?
- Is this isolated, or does another case show the same failure condition?

#### CONTROLLED RECORD CONNECTION

GRV-R08 Service Recovery Decision Matrix; GRV-R07. Use the current approved version. This workbook page is guided practice, not the permanent restaurant record.

# Applied Scenario: The Complaint That Changes Category

A guest begins by complaining about a long wait, then reports that the meal may contain an allergen they disclosed. The manager must stop treating the case as a timing issue.

## Your decision

WHAT IS THE GUEST IMPACT?

---

WHAT FACTS ARE VERIFIED?

---

WHAT REMAINS UNKNOWN OR ONLY REPORTED?

---

WHAT AUTHORITY OR ESCALATION APPLIES?

---

WHAT IS THE SMALLEST USEFUL NEXT ACTION?

---

WHO OWNS FOLLOW-UP, BY WHEN, AND HOW WILL IT BE VERIFIED?

---

## Chapter 7 Action Record

Complete this guided-practice page for one real or representative decision involving “Severity and Escalation.”  
Use an approved case identifier rather than unnecessary personal information.

**CASE / SHIFT / DATE**

---

**GUEST IMPACT IN NEUTRAL LANGUAGE**

---

---

**VERIFIED OPERATING FACTS**

---

---

**IMMEDIATE RECOVERY OR CORRECTION**

---

---

**LIKELY CAUSE TO TEST — NOT ASSUME**

---

---

**NEXT OWNER / DUE DATE / VERIFICATION EVIDENCE**

---

---

## CHAPTER 8

## Listen Without Defending

Train the first moments of the conversation so managers can gather information without making the guest fight to be heard.

**THE TRUTH**

Defensive listening is still arguing. The manager may remain silent while mentally preparing a rebuttal, interrupting facts, or protecting the team before understanding the impact.

### Why this matters operationally

A defensive opening makes every later recovery harder. It also reduces information quality because the guest starts proving the case instead of explaining it.

### Do not confuse activity with control

Closing a conversation does not prove “Listen Without Defending” is controlled. The manager should be able to show what changed, who owns the next step, and what evidence on a comparable shift would demonstrate that the same avoidable failure is less likely to return.

## Chapter 8 Field Guide

### Use these rules on a real shift

36. Let the guest finish the first account.
37. Use short clarifying questions instead of cross-examination.
38. Restate the concern and impact in neutral words.
39. Do not blame another employee or department in front of the guest.
40. Separate acknowledgment from admitting an unverified cause.

### Questions before you close the case

- What did the guest experience, in plain language?
- What can we verify now, and what remains reported but unverified?
- What recovery authority applies?
- What promise or follow-up exists after the guest leaves?
- Is this isolated, or does another case show the same failure condition?

#### CONTROLLED RECORD CONNECTION

GRV-R07; GRV-R09 Guest Recovery Authorization Guide. Use the current approved version. This workbook page is guided practice, not the permanent restaurant record.

# Applied Scenario: The Manager Who Explains Too Soon

Before the guest finishes describing a late meal, the manager explains that the kitchen is short-staffed. The explanation is accurate but makes the guest feel dismissed.

## Your decision

WHAT IS THE GUEST IMPACT?

---

WHAT FACTS ARE VERIFIED?

---

WHAT REMAINS UNKNOWN OR ONLY REPORTED?

---

WHAT AUTHORITY OR ESCALATION APPLIES?

---

WHAT IS THE SMALLEST USEFUL NEXT ACTION?

---

WHO OWNS FOLLOW-UP, BY WHEN, AND HOW WILL IT BE VERIFIED?

---

## Chapter 8 Action Record

Complete this guided-practice page for one real or representative decision involving “Listen Without Defending.”  
Use an approved case identifier rather than unnecessary personal information.

**CASE / SHIFT / DATE**

---

**GUEST IMPACT IN NEUTRAL LANGUAGE**

---

---

**VERIFIED OPERATING FACTS**

---

---

**IMMEDIATE RECOVERY OR CORRECTION**

---

---

**LIKELY CAUSE TO TEST — NOT ASSUME**

---

---

**NEXT OWNER / DUE DATE / VERIFICATION EVIDENCE**

---

---

## CHAPTER 9

## Acknowledge the Impact

Teach language that recognizes what happened to the guest without making unsupported promises or legal conclusions.

### The operating truth

Guests often need to know that the restaurant understands the effect of the failure: lost time, disrupted meal flow, embarrassment, uncertainty, or disappointment.

### What the restaurant pays when this is missed

A generic “sorry about that” can sound procedural. An overconfident apology that states an unverified cause can create a different problem.

**MANAGER TEST**

Can you explain the guest impact, the verified operating facts, the authority used, and what must happen next without blaming a person you have not yet heard from?

## Chapter 9 Field Guide

### Use these rules on a real shift

41. Name the observed or reported impact.
42. Keep the acknowledgment specific and proportionate.
43. Avoid scripted exaggeration.
44. Do not promise compensation before authority and facts are clear.
45. Move from acknowledgment to a concrete next step quickly.

### Questions before you close the case

- What did the guest experience, in plain language?
- What can we verify now, and what remains reported but unverified?
- What recovery authority applies?
- What promise or follow-up exists after the guest leaves?
- Is this isolated, or does another case show the same failure condition?

#### CONTROLLED RECORD CONNECTION

GRV-R07; GRV-R09 Guest Recovery Authorization Guide. Use the current approved version. This workbook page is guided practice, not the permanent restaurant record.

## Applied Scenario: The Birthday Course

A birthday table waits while one entrée is remade. The issue is not only food quality; the group's shared meal and celebration timing were disrupted.

### Your decision

WHAT IS THE GUEST IMPACT?

---

WHAT FACTS ARE VERIFIED?

---

WHAT REMAINS UNKNOWN OR ONLY REPORTED?

---

WHAT AUTHORITY OR ESCALATION APPLIES?

---

WHAT IS THE SMALLEST USEFUL NEXT ACTION?

---

WHO OWNS FOLLOW-UP, BY WHEN, AND HOW WILL IT BE VERIFIED?

---

## Chapter 9 Action Record

Complete this guided-practice page for one real or representative decision involving “Acknowledge the Impact.”  
Use an approved case identifier rather than unnecessary personal information.

**CASE / SHIFT / DATE**

---

**GUEST IMPACT IN NEUTRAL LANGUAGE**

---

---

**VERIFIED OPERATING FACTS**

---

---

**IMMEDIATE RECOVERY OR CORRECTION**

---

---

**LIKELY CAUSE TO TEST — NOT ASSUME**

---

---

**NEXT OWNER / DUE DATE / VERIFICATION EVIDENCE**

---

---

PART 3

# RECOVER IN REAL TIME

---

A manager rarely receives a complaint in ideal conditions. These chapters address the common failures that arrive while the restaurant is busy and judgment is under pressure.

## CHAPTER 10

## The Manager Table Visit

Turn the table visit into a purposeful diagnostic and recovery step rather than a ceremonial “everything okay?”

**TRUTH FIRST**

A manager table visit is valuable when it confirms the guest's experience, verifies a recovery, or detects a problem early. A vague visit can create false reassurance.

### The hidden cost

Managers who visit only after a complaint arrive late. Managers who visit every table with no purpose can spend time without learning anything.

### A practical distinction

For “The Manager Table Visit,” the guest-facing decision and the management decision are related but not identical. Address the immediate impact first, then preserve enough evidence to determine whether a standard, handoff, authority limit, training step, or other operating condition needs repair.

## Chapter 10 Field Guide

### Use these rules on a real shift

46. Know why you are approaching the table.
47. Use open questions when you need information and specific questions when verifying a known recovery.
48. Observe the table as well as the answer.
49. Do not make the server stand beside the table while the guest criticizes them.
50. Close with the next action and return when you said you would.

### Questions before you close the case

- What did the guest experience, in plain language?
- What can we verify now, and what remains reported but unverified?
- What recovery authority applies?
- What promise or follow-up exists after the guest leaves?
- Is this isolated, or does another case show the same failure condition?

#### CONTROLLED RECORD CONNECTION

GRV-R08; GRV-R09; GRV-R10 Recovery Action Record. Use the current approved version. This workbook page is guided practice, not the permanent restaurant record.

## Applied Scenario: Everything Is Fine—Until Checkout

A manager asks a rushed “Everything good?” The guest says yes, then tells the cashier the meal was slow and the server disappeared.

### Your decision

WHAT IS THE GUEST IMPACT?

---

WHAT FACTS ARE VERIFIED?

---

WHAT REMAINS UNKNOWN OR ONLY REPORTED?

---

WHAT AUTHORITY OR ESCALATION APPLIES?

---

WHAT IS THE SMALLEST USEFUL NEXT ACTION?

---

WHO OWNS FOLLOW-UP, BY WHEN, AND HOW WILL IT BE VERIFIED?

---

## Chapter 10 Action Record

Complete this guided-practice page for one real or representative decision involving “The Manager Table Visit.”  
Use an approved case identifier rather than unnecessary personal information.

**CASE / SHIFT / DATE**

---

**GUEST IMPACT IN NEUTRAL LANGUAGE**

---

---

**VERIFIED OPERATING FACTS**

---

---

**IMMEDIATE RECOVERY OR CORRECTION**

---

---

**LIKELY CAUSE TO TEST — NOT ASSUME**

---

---

**NEXT OWNER / DUE DATE / VERIFICATION EVIDENCE**

---

---

## CHAPTER 11

## Recovery Authority Before the Rush

Define what employees, shift leaders, and managers may correct so the team can act quickly without uncontrolled discounting.

### Start with this distinction

Recovery authority must be established before the guest is upset. The team should know what can be corrected immediately, what needs a manager, and what requires owner or specialist review.

**COST OF GETTING IT WRONG**

Unclear authority creates two expensive outcomes: employees promise too much, or nobody acts while waiting for permission.

### What calm management looks like

In “Recovery Authority Before the Rush,” calm management means moving at two speeds: act promptly on what is clear, and remain disciplined about what still needs verification. The guest should see ownership while the manager avoids inventing a cause or promise just to end the conversation.

# Chapter 11 Field Guide

## Use these rules on a real shift

51. Separate operational correction from financial compensation.
52. Define who may replace, discount, comp, refund, credit, or make a future offer.
53. Set maximum values and escalation points by role.
54. Require case documentation for material financial recovery.
55. Review authority when abuse, delay, or repeated escalation appears.

## Questions before you close the case

- What did the guest experience, in plain language?
- What can we verify now, and what remains reported but unverified?
- What recovery authority applies?
- What promise or follow-up exists after the guest leaves?
- Is this isolated, or does another case show the same failure condition?

### CONTROLLED RECORD CONNECTION

GRV-R08; GRV-R09; GRV-R10 Recovery Action Record. Use the current approved version. This workbook page is guided practice, not the permanent restaurant record.

# Applied Scenario: The Server Who Promised a Full Refund

A server tells a guest the entire check will be refunded before a manager hears the concern. The manager's actual authority is lower than the promise.

## Your decision

WHAT IS THE GUEST IMPACT?

---

WHAT FACTS ARE VERIFIED?

---

WHAT REMAINS UNKNOWN OR ONLY REPORTED?

---

WHAT AUTHORITY OR ESCALATION APPLIES?

---

WHAT IS THE SMALLEST USEFUL NEXT ACTION?

---

WHO OWNS FOLLOW-UP, BY WHEN, AND HOW WILL IT BE VERIFIED?

---

## Chapter 11 Action Record

Complete this guided-practice page for one real or representative decision involving “Recovery Authority Before the Rush.” Use an approved case identifier rather than unnecessary personal information.

**CASE / SHIFT / DATE**

---

**GUEST IMPACT IN NEUTRAL LANGUAGE**

---

---

**VERIFIED OPERATING FACTS**

---

---

**IMMEDIATE RECOVERY OR CORRECTION**

---

---

**LIKELY CAUSE TO TEST — NOT ASSUME**

---

---

**NEXT OWNER / DUE DATE / VERIFICATION EVIDENCE**

---

---

## CHAPTER 12

## Proportionate Recovery

Prevent both under-recovery and automatic over-recovery by tying the response to verified impact and what can actually be repaired.

**THE TRUTH**

A recovery should address the guest's real impact. More money is not always better recovery, and less money is not always disciplined management.

### Why this matters operationally

Automatic comping teaches the team that discounting is the solution. Refusing reasonable recovery to protect a number can cost the relationship and create a larger public problem.

### Do not confuse activity with control

Closing a conversation does not prove "Proportionate Recovery" is controlled. The manager should be able to show what changed, who owns the next step, and what evidence on a comparable shift would demonstrate that the same avoidable failure is less likely to return.

## Chapter 12 Field Guide

### Use these rules on a real shift

56. Correct the operational failure first when possible.
57. Match financial recovery to impact, stage of meal, and restaurant authority.
58. Consider time and disruption, not only item price.
59. Explain the resolution clearly so the guest knows what changed.
60. Document the reason and approval for material recovery.

### Questions before you close the case

- What did the guest experience, in plain language?
- What can we verify now, and what remains reported but unverified?
- What recovery authority applies?
- What promise or follow-up exists after the guest leaves?
- Is this isolated, or does another case show the same failure condition?

#### CONTROLLED RECORD CONNECTION

GRV-R08; GRV-R09; GRV-R10 Recovery Action Record. Use the current approved version. This workbook page is guided practice, not the permanent restaurant record.

# Applied Scenario: Two Meals, Same Mistake, Different Impact

The same entrée error happens at lunch to a solo guest with time to spare and at dinner to a guest who must leave for a show. Equal item value does not mean equal impact.

## Your decision

WHAT IS THE GUEST IMPACT?

---

WHAT FACTS ARE VERIFIED?

---

WHAT REMAINS UNKNOWN OR ONLY REPORTED?

---

WHAT AUTHORITY OR ESCALATION APPLIES?

---

WHAT IS THE SMALLEST USEFUL NEXT ACTION?

---

WHO OWNS FOLLOW-UP, BY WHEN, AND HOW WILL IT BE VERIFIED?

---

## Chapter 12 Action Record

Complete this guided-practice page for one real or representative decision involving “Proportionate Recovery.”  
Use an approved case identifier rather than unnecessary personal information.

**CASE / SHIFT / DATE**

---

**GUEST IMPACT IN NEUTRAL LANGUAGE**

---

---

**VERIFIED OPERATING FACTS**

---

---

**IMMEDIATE RECOVERY OR CORRECTION**

---

---

**LIKELY CAUSE TO TEST — NOT ASSUME**

---

---

**NEXT OWNER / DUE DATE / VERIFICATION EVIDENCE**

---

---

## CHAPTER 13

## Wrong Order and Missing Item Recovery

Build a repeatable response to one of the most common service failures and locate the handoff where accuracy broke.

### The operating truth

Wrong orders are guest problems and process signals. The failure may begin with listening, POS entry, modifier use, ticket routing, production, expo, runner handoff, or seat delivery.

### What the restaurant pays when this is missed

If the restaurant only remakes the item, it pays the recovery cost without learning whether the same failure point is still active.

**MANAGER TEST**

Can you explain the guest impact, the verified operating facts, the authority used, and what must happen next without blaming a person you have not yet heard from?

## Chapter 13 Field Guide

### Use these rules on a real shift

61. Confirm what the guest actually requested.
62. Compare the guest statement, POS entry, kitchen ticket, and delivered item when useful.
63. Prioritize the correction and communicate realistic timing.
64. Protect allergy and safety details during the remake.
65. Record the failure point when it can be established.

### Questions before you close the case

- What did the guest experience, in plain language?
- What can we verify now, and what remains reported but unverified?
- What recovery authority applies?
- What promise or follow-up exists after the guest leaves?
- Is this isolated, or does another case show the same failure condition?

#### CONTROLLED RECORD CONNECTION

GRV-R07; GRV-R10; applicable SOP Library procedure. Use the current approved version. This workbook page is guided practice, not the permanent restaurant record.

## Applied Scenario: The Modifier That Disappeared

The guest asked for no cheese. The server entered the modifier correctly, but the expo handoff missed it. A remake solves the plate; only the review solves the process.

### Your decision

WHAT IS THE GUEST IMPACT?

---

WHAT FACTS ARE VERIFIED?

---

WHAT REMAINS UNKNOWN OR ONLY REPORTED?

---

WHAT AUTHORITY OR ESCALATION APPLIES?

---

WHAT IS THE SMALLEST USEFUL NEXT ACTION?

---

WHO OWNS FOLLOW-UP, BY WHEN, AND HOW WILL IT BE VERIFIED?

---

## Chapter 13 Action Record

Complete this guided-practice page for one real or representative decision involving “Wrong Order and Missing Item Recovery.” Use an approved case identifier rather than unnecessary personal information.

**CASE / SHIFT / DATE**

---

**GUEST IMPACT IN NEUTRAL LANGUAGE**

---

---

**VERIFIED OPERATING FACTS**

---

---

**IMMEDIATE RECOVERY OR CORRECTION**

---

---

**LIKELY CAUSE TO TEST — NOT ASSUME**

---

---

**NEXT OWNER / DUE DATE / VERIFICATION EVIDENCE**

---

---

## CHAPTER 14

## Delay, Pacing, and Expectation Failure

Teach managers to distinguish actual delay, poor communication, and sequencing failures and to recover before frustration compounds.

**TRUTH FIRST**

Guests experience waiting differently when they know what is happening and when the rest of the table is moving together. Delay becomes more damaging when it is unexplained or repeatedly re-promised.

### The hidden cost

False time promises create a second failure on top of the first. Silence makes guests assume nobody owns the problem.

### A practical distinction

For “Delay, Pacing, and Expectation Failure,” the guest-facing decision and the management decision are related but not identical. Address the immediate impact first, then preserve enough evidence to determine whether a standard, handoff, authority limit, training step, or other operating condition needs repair.

## Chapter 14 Field Guide

### Use these rules on a real shift

- 66. Verify actual timing before giving an estimate.
- 67. Do not promise a completion time the kitchen or bar has not confirmed.
- 68. Update the guest before they must ask again.
- 69. Protect meal sequence when one course or seat is delayed.
- 70. Record repeated delay causes by station, shift, or handoff.

### Questions before you close the case

- What did the guest experience, in plain language?
- What can we verify now, and what remains reported but unverified?
- What recovery authority applies?
- What promise or follow-up exists after the guest leaves?
- Is this isolated, or does another case show the same failure condition?

#### CONTROLLED RECORD CONNECTION

GRV-R07; GRV-R10; applicable SOP Library procedure. Use the current approved version. This workbook page is guided practice, not the permanent restaurant record.

## Applied Scenario: Five More Minutes—Three Times

A manager tells a guest “five more minutes” three times because no one checks the actual kitchen position. The guest becomes angrier about the promises than the original delay.

### Your decision

WHAT IS THE GUEST IMPACT?

---

WHAT FACTS ARE VERIFIED?

---

WHAT REMAINS UNKNOWN OR ONLY REPORTED?

---

WHAT AUTHORITY OR ESCALATION APPLIES?

---

WHAT IS THE SMALLEST USEFUL NEXT ACTION?

---

WHO OWNS FOLLOW-UP, BY WHEN, AND HOW WILL IT BE VERIFIED?

---

## Chapter 14 Action Record

Complete this guided-practice page for one real or representative decision involving “Delay, Pacing, and Expectation Failure.” Use an approved case identifier rather than unnecessary personal information.

**CASE / SHIFT / DATE**

---

**GUEST IMPACT IN NEUTRAL LANGUAGE**

---

---

**VERIFIED OPERATING FACTS**

---

---

**IMMEDIATE RECOVERY OR CORRECTION**

---

---

**LIKELY CAUSE TO TEST — NOT ASSUME**

---

---

**NEXT OWNER / DUE DATE / VERIFICATION EVIDENCE**

---

---

## CHAPTER 15

## Food Quality and Product Concerns

Manage quality complaints without pressuring the guest to accept a product they do not trust.

### Start with this distinction

Food quality can involve doneness, temperature, freshness, recipe execution, portion, presentation, or a mismatch between product and expectation. Safety allegations require a different escalation path.

**COST OF GETTING IT WRONG**

Arguing taste with the guest wastes time. Throwing away a questioned item before review can also destroy useful evidence of a recurring process problem.

### What calm management looks like

In “Food Quality and Product Concerns,” calm management means moving at two speeds: act promptly on what is clear, and remain disciplined about what still needs verification. The guest should see ownership while the manager avoids inventing a cause or promise just to end the conversation.

## Chapter 15 Field Guide

### Use these rules on a real shift

71. Identify the exact item and stated concern.
72. Separate quality preference from safety allegation.
73. Remove or preserve the item according to policy.
74. Offer an approved replacement or alternative without pressure.
75. Tag recurring temperature, doneness, freshness, recipe, or equipment patterns.

### Questions before you close the case

- What did the guest experience, in plain language?
- What can we verify now, and what remains reported but unverified?
- What recovery authority applies?
- What promise or follow-up exists after the guest leaves?
- Is this isolated, or does another case show the same failure condition?

#### CONTROLLED RECORD CONNECTION

GRV-R07; GRV-R10; applicable SOP Library procedure. Use the current approved version. This workbook page is guided practice, not the permanent restaurant record.

# Applied Scenario: The Soup That Keeps Coming Back

Three guests across two shifts describe the same soup as lukewarm. Each bowl is replaced, but nobody checks hot-holding practice or equipment.

## Your decision

WHAT IS THE GUEST IMPACT?

---

WHAT FACTS ARE VERIFIED?

---

WHAT REMAINS UNKNOWN OR ONLY REPORTED?

---

WHAT AUTHORITY OR ESCALATION APPLIES?

---

WHAT IS THE SMALLEST USEFUL NEXT ACTION?

---

WHO OWNS FOLLOW-UP, BY WHEN, AND HOW WILL IT BE VERIFIED?

---

## Chapter 15 Action Record

Complete this guided-practice page for one real or representative decision involving “Food Quality and Product Concerns.” Use an approved case identifier rather than unnecessary personal information.

**CASE / SHIFT / DATE**

---

**GUEST IMPACT IN NEUTRAL LANGUAGE**

---

---

**VERIFIED OPERATING FACTS**

---

---

**IMMEDIATE RECOVERY OR CORRECTION**

---

---

**LIKELY CAUSE TO TEST — NOT ASSUME**

---

---

**NEXT OWNER / DUE DATE / VERIFICATION EVIDENCE**

---

---

## CHAPTER 16

## Allergy and Immediate Safety Concerns

Make immediate safety the priority and prevent ordinary recovery steps from delaying escalation.

**THE TRUTH**

When a guest reports an allergy concern or symptoms, the issue is no longer an ordinary service complaint. The team must follow the restaurant's current allergy and emergency procedures.

### Why this matters operationally

Trying to settle compensation, debate ingredients, or diagnose the guest before protecting safety can create serious harm and confusion.

### Do not confuse activity with control

Closing a conversation does not prove "Allergy and Immediate Safety Concerns" is controlled. The manager should be able to show what changed, who owns the next step, and what evidence on a comparable shift would demonstrate that the same avoidable failure is less likely to return.

## Chapter 16 Field Guide

### Use these rules on a real shift

76. Stop service of the questioned item.
77. Notify the manager and designated kitchen leader immediately.
78. Use approved ingredient/allergen resources; do not guess.
79. Contact emergency services when the restaurant's emergency procedure requires it or the guest reports an emergency.
80. Preserve objective records and route follow-up through authorized leadership.

### Questions before you close the case

- What did the guest experience, in plain language?
- What can we verify now, and what remains reported but unverified?
- What recovery authority applies?
- What promise or follow-up exists after the guest leaves?
- Is this isolated, or does another case show the same failure condition?

#### CONTROLLED RECORD CONNECTION

GRV-R07; GRV-R10; applicable emergency/safety/conduct/payment procedure. Use the current approved version. This workbook page is guided practice, not the permanent restaurant record.

## Applied Scenario: The Complaint That Cannot Wait

A guest who initially says “this tastes wrong” then reports an allergy concern. The manager must move from hospitality recovery to the approved safety response immediately.

### Your decision

WHAT IS THE GUEST IMPACT?

---

WHAT FACTS ARE VERIFIED?

---

WHAT REMAINS UNKNOWN OR ONLY REPORTED?

---

WHAT AUTHORITY OR ESCALATION APPLIES?

---

WHAT IS THE SMALLEST USEFUL NEXT ACTION?

---

WHO OWNS FOLLOW-UP, BY WHEN, AND HOW WILL IT BE VERIFIED?

---

## Chapter 16 Action Record

Complete this guided-practice page for one real or representative decision involving “Allergy and Immediate Safety Concerns.” Use an approved case identifier rather than unnecessary personal information.

**CASE / SHIFT / DATE**

---

**GUEST IMPACT IN NEUTRAL LANGUAGE**

---

---

**VERIFIED OPERATING FACTS**

---

---

**IMMEDIATE RECOVERY OR CORRECTION**

---

---

**LIKELY CAUSE TO TEST — NOT ASSUME**

---

---

**NEXT OWNER / DUE DATE / VERIFICATION EVIDENCE**

---

---

## CHAPTER 17

# Illness, Injury, Foreign Object, and Other High-Risk Reports

Provide a disciplined first response when facts, safety, insurance, or legal exposure may matter.

## The operating truth

High-risk reports require calm, objective documentation and authorized escalation. The manager's job is not to diagnose, investigate beyond authority, or decide liability at the table.

## What the restaurant pays when this is missed

Speculation, destroyed evidence, merged witness stories, public discussion, and unsupported promises can make an already difficult event harder to manage.

**MANAGER TEST**

Can you explain the guest impact, the verified operating facts, the authority used, and what must happen next without blaming a person you have not yet heard from?

## Chapter 17 Field Guide

### Use these rules on a real shift

81. Protect immediate safety first.
82. Preserve relevant item, check, ticket, scene, and records when policy requires.
83. Record what was observed separately from what was reported.
84. Keep witnesses separate when statements are required.
85. Route the matter promptly to approved ownership, safety, insurance, HR, or legal channels as applicable.

### Questions before you close the case

- What did the guest experience, in plain language?
- What can we verify now, and what remains reported but unverified?
- What recovery authority applies?
- What promise or follow-up exists after the guest leaves?
- Is this isolated, or does another case show the same failure condition?

#### CONTROLLED RECORD CONNECTION

GRV-R07; GRV-R10; applicable emergency/safety/conduct/payment procedure. Use the current approved version. This workbook page is guided practice, not the permanent restaurant record.

## Applied Scenario: The Object on the Plate

A guest reports a foreign object in food. An employee wants to throw the plate away and remake it immediately. The manager must preserve safety and evidence while still caring for the guest.

### Your decision

WHAT IS THE GUEST IMPACT?

---

WHAT FACTS ARE VERIFIED?

---

WHAT REMAINS UNKNOWN OR ONLY REPORTED?

---

WHAT AUTHORITY OR ESCALATION APPLIES?

---

WHAT IS THE SMALLEST USEFUL NEXT ACTION?

---

WHO OWNS FOLLOW-UP, BY WHEN, AND HOW WILL IT BE VERIFIED?

---

## Chapter 17 Action Record

Complete this guided-practice page for one real or representative decision involving “Illness, Injury, Foreign Object, and Other High-Risk Reports.” Use an approved case identifier rather than unnecessary personal information.

**CASE / SHIFT / DATE**

---

**GUEST IMPACT IN NEUTRAL LANGUAGE**

---

---

**VERIFIED OPERATING FACTS**

---

---

**IMMEDIATE RECOVERY OR CORRECTION**

---

---

**LIKELY CAUSE TO TEST — NOT ASSUME**

---

---

**NEXT OWNER / DUE DATE / VERIFICATION EVIDENCE**

---

---

## CHAPTER 18

# Conduct, Harassment, Threats, and Disruptive Behavior

Clarify when guest recovery stops being the only priority because employee or guest safety and conduct rules must control the response.

**TRUTH FIRST**

Hospitality does not require employees to tolerate threats, harassment, discrimination, violence, or unsafe conduct. A guest complaint can be valid while the guest's behavior still crosses a boundary.

## The hidden cost

Managers who excuse abuse in the name of service damage employees and culture. Managers who escalate ordinary frustration as a threat can inflame the situation.

## A practical distinction

For "Conduct, Harassment, Threats, and Disruptive Behavior," the guest-facing decision and the management decision are related but not identical. Address the immediate impact first, then preserve enough evidence to determine whether a standard, handoff, authority limit, training step, or other operating condition needs repair.

## Chapter 18 Field Guide

### Use these rules on a real shift

86. Separate the underlying service issue from the conduct issue.
87. Protect employees and guests from immediate danger.
88. Use the restaurant's conduct, security, and emergency procedures.
89. Set a clear behavioral boundary without retaliatory language.
90. Document material conduct incidents objectively and route them appropriately.

### Questions before you close the case

- What did the guest experience, in plain language?
- What can we verify now, and what remains reported but unverified?
- What recovery authority applies?
- What promise or follow-up exists after the guest leaves?
- Is this isolated, or does another case show the same failure condition?

#### CONTROLLED RECORD CONNECTION

GRV-R07; GRV-R10; applicable emergency/safety/conduct/payment procedure. Use the current approved version. This workbook page is guided practice, not the permanent restaurant record.

# Applied Scenario: The Valid Complaint and the Unacceptable Threat

A guest has a legitimate complaint about a delayed meal but begins threatening the server. The manager must address both truths at the same time.

## Your decision

WHAT IS THE GUEST IMPACT?

---

WHAT FACTS ARE VERIFIED?

---

WHAT REMAINS UNKNOWN OR ONLY REPORTED?

---

WHAT AUTHORITY OR ESCALATION APPLIES?

---

WHAT IS THE SMALLEST USEFUL NEXT ACTION?

---

WHO OWNS FOLLOW-UP, BY WHEN, AND HOW WILL IT BE VERIFIED?

---

## Chapter 18 Action Record

Complete this guided-practice page for one real or representative decision involving “Conduct, Harassment, Threats, and Disruptive Behavior.” Use an approved case identifier rather than unnecessary personal information.

**CASE / SHIFT / DATE**

---

**GUEST IMPACT IN NEUTRAL LANGUAGE**

---

---

**VERIFIED OPERATING FACTS**

---

---

**IMMEDIATE RECOVERY OR CORRECTION**

---

---

**LIKELY CAUSE TO TEST — NOT ASSUME**

---

---

**NEXT OWNER / DUE DATE / VERIFICATION EVIDENCE**

---

---

## CHAPTER 19

## Payment, Billing, Comp, and Refund Disputes

Give managers a controlled response when the complaint involves money, authorization, payment processing, or prior promises.

### Start with this distinction

Financial complaints often combine service impact with system records. The manager needs the check, payment record, discount/comp authority, and prior promises before deciding the remedy.

**COST OF GETTING IT WRONG**

Improvised refunds, duplicate adjustments, vague future credits, and unsupported promises create accounting problems and guest distrust.

### What calm management looks like

In “Payment, Billing, Comp, and Refund Disputes,” calm management means moving at two speeds: act promptly on what is clear, and remain disciplined about what still needs verification. The guest should see ownership while the manager avoids inventing a cause or promise just to end the conversation.

## Chapter 19 Field Guide

### Use these rules on a real shift

91. Verify the check and transaction facts.
92. Separate a service recovery from a payment-processing correction.
93. Use approved reason codes and authorization.
94. Document refunds, credits, comps, and future offers clearly.
95. Give the guest a realistic completion timeline for any delayed financial correction.

### Questions before you close the case

- What did the guest experience, in plain language?
- What can we verify now, and what remains reported but unverified?
- What recovery authority applies?
- What promise or follow-up exists after the guest leaves?
- Is this isolated, or does another case show the same failure condition?

#### CONTROLLED RECORD CONNECTION

GRV-R07; GRV-R10; applicable emergency/safety/conduct/payment procedure. Use the current approved version. This workbook page is guided practice, not the permanent restaurant record.

## Applied Scenario: The Refund That Already Happened

A guest calls saying a promised refund never arrived. The POS shows a void, not a completed refund. The manager must verify the financial path instead of assuming the guest or employee is wrong.

### Your decision

WHAT IS THE GUEST IMPACT?

---

WHAT FACTS ARE VERIFIED?

---

WHAT REMAINS UNKNOWN OR ONLY REPORTED?

---

WHAT AUTHORITY OR ESCALATION APPLIES?

---

WHAT IS THE SMALLEST USEFUL NEXT ACTION?

---

WHO OWNS FOLLOW-UP, BY WHEN, AND HOW WILL IT BE VERIFIED?

---

## Chapter 19 Action Record

Complete this guided-practice page for one real or representative decision involving “Payment, Billing, Comp, and Refund Disputes.” Use an approved case identifier rather than unnecessary personal information.

**CASE / SHIFT / DATE**

---

**GUEST IMPACT IN NEUTRAL LANGUAGE**

---

---

**VERIFIED OPERATING FACTS**

---

---

**IMMEDIATE RECOVERY OR CORRECTION**

---

---

**LIKELY CAUSE TO TEST — NOT ASSUME**

---

---

**NEXT OWNER / DUE DATE / VERIFICATION EVIDENCE**

---

---

## CHAPTER 20

## When the First Recovery Does Not Work

Teach managers how to continue without escalating emotionally or throwing larger offers at an unresolved cause.

**THE TRUTH**

A guest can reject a reasonable first solution because the impact is larger than the manager understood, because trust is already low, or because the requested remedy is outside authority.

### Why this matters operationally

Managers who take rejection personally begin arguing. Managers who keep increasing compensation without diagnosis lose control and still may not repair trust.

### Do not confuse activity with control

Closing a conversation does not prove “When the First Recovery Does Not Work” is controlled. The manager should be able to show what changed, who owns the next step, and what evidence on a comparable shift would demonstrate that the same avoidable failure is less likely to return.

## Chapter 20 Field Guide

### Use these rules on a real shift

96. Ask what remains unresolved.
97. Reconfirm the impact and the guest's desired outcome.
98. Explain authority boundaries plainly.
99. Escalate when the requested outcome exceeds authority or the risk level changes.
100. Know when the restaurant has made its final authorized offer and the conversation must be closed respectfully.

### Questions before you close the case

- What did the guest experience, in plain language?
- What can we verify now, and what remains reported but unverified?
- What recovery authority applies?
- What promise or follow-up exists after the guest leaves?
- Is this isolated, or does another case show the same failure condition?

#### CONTROLLED RECORD CONNECTION

GRV-R11 Recovery Follow-Up Tracker; GRV-R24 Online Review Response & Escalation Log. Use the current approved version. This workbook page is guided practice, not the permanent restaurant record.

# Applied Scenario: The Guest Who Does Not Want a Comp

A manager offers to remove an entrée. The guest says money is not the issue; they are upset that nobody told them their child's meal would arrive fifteen minutes later.

## Your decision

WHAT IS THE GUEST IMPACT?

---

WHAT FACTS ARE VERIFIED?

---

WHAT REMAINS UNKNOWN OR ONLY REPORTED?

---

WHAT AUTHORITY OR ESCALATION APPLIES?

---

WHAT IS THE SMALLEST USEFUL NEXT ACTION?

---

WHO OWNS FOLLOW-UP, BY WHEN, AND HOW WILL IT BE VERIFIED?

---

## Chapter 20 Action Record

Complete this guided-practice page for one real or representative decision involving “When the First Recovery Does Not Work.” Use an approved case identifier rather than unnecessary personal information.

**CASE / SHIFT / DATE**

---

**GUEST IMPACT IN NEUTRAL LANGUAGE**

---

---

**VERIFIED OPERATING FACTS**

---

---

**IMMEDIATE RECOVERY OR CORRECTION**

---

---

**LIKELY CAUSE TO TEST — NOT ASSUME**

---

---

**NEXT OWNER / DUE DATE / VERIFICATION EVIDENCE**

---

---

PART 4

# TURN COMPLAINTS INTO EVIDENCE

---

The guest conversation is only the first half of recovery. The second half is documenting facts, assigning ownership, following through, and converting repeated problems into evidence.

## CHAPTER 21

## Document Facts Without Writing a Story

Improve complaint records so later reviewers can distinguish evidence, guest report, manager decision, and follow-up.

### The operating truth

Good documentation is factual enough to support learning and restrained enough to protect dignity and privacy. A complaint record is not a diary or a place to prove who was right.

### What the restaurant pays when this is missed

Loaded language, speculation, missing times, missing owners, and copied rumors make the record less useful and can create unnecessary risk.

**MANAGER TEST**

Can you explain the guest impact, the verified operating facts, the authority used, and what must happen next without blaming a person you have not yet heard from?

## Chapter 21 Field Guide

### Use these rules on a real shift

101. Use date, time, table/check/case identifiers, category, impact, and action.
102. Label guest-reported information as reported when not independently verified.
103. Record exact recovery and approval level.
104. Record owner and due date for follow-up.
105. Exclude unrelated personal information and emotional commentary.

### Questions before you close the case

- What did the guest experience, in plain language?
- What can we verify now, and what remains reported but unverified?
- What recovery authority applies?
- What promise or follow-up exists after the guest leaves?
- Is this isolated, or does another case show the same failure condition?

#### CONTROLLED RECORD CONNECTION

GRV-R11 Recovery Follow-Up Tracker; GRV-R24 Online Review Response & Escalation Log. Use the current approved version. This workbook page is guided practice, not the permanent restaurant record.

## Applied Scenario: The Record That Blames Everyone

A manager writes, "Guest was impossible and server was careless." A later reviewer cannot tell what happened, what standard failed, or what was verified.

### Your decision

WHAT IS THE GUEST IMPACT?

---

WHAT FACTS ARE VERIFIED?

---

WHAT REMAINS UNKNOWN OR ONLY REPORTED?

---

WHAT AUTHORITY OR ESCALATION APPLIES?

---

WHAT IS THE SMALLEST USEFUL NEXT ACTION?

---

WHO OWNS FOLLOW-UP, BY WHEN, AND HOW WILL IT BE VERIFIED?

---

## Chapter 21 Action Record

Complete this guided-practice page for one real or representative decision involving “Document Facts Without Writing a Story.” Use an approved case identifier rather than unnecessary personal information.

**CASE / SHIFT / DATE**

---

**GUEST IMPACT IN NEUTRAL LANGUAGE**

---

---

**VERIFIED OPERATING FACTS**

---

---

**IMMEDIATE RECOVERY OR CORRECTION**

---

---

**LIKELY CAUSE TO TEST — NOT ASSUME**

---

---

**NEXT OWNER / DUE DATE / VERIFICATION EVIDENCE**

---

---

## CHAPTER 22

## Follow-Up Is Part of the Recovery

Make promised follow-up an owned task rather than a courteous sentence that disappears after the shift.

**TRUTH FIRST**

A promise to call, email, refund, verify, replace, or investigate creates a new obligation. The case is not closed because the guest left the building.

### The hidden cost

Missed follow-up creates a second betrayal: the restaurant not only failed once, it failed on the recovery promise.

### A practical distinction

For “Follow-Up Is Part of the Recovery,” the guest-facing decision and the management decision are related but not identical. Address the immediate impact first, then preserve enough evidence to determine whether a standard, handoff, authority limit, training step, or other operating condition needs repair.

## Chapter 22 Field Guide

### Use these rules on a real shift

106. Assign one named owner.
107. Set a deadline and preferred contact channel when appropriate.
108. Record attempts and outcomes.
109. Close the guest commitment and the internal corrective action separately.
110. Verify return or response only when the restaurant has a legitimate reason and permission to track it.

### Questions before you close the case

- What did the guest experience, in plain language?
- What can we verify now, and what remains reported but unverified?
- What recovery authority applies?
- What promise or follow-up exists after the guest leaves?
- Is this isolated, or does another case show the same failure condition?

#### CONTROLLED RECORD CONNECTION

GRV-R11 Recovery Follow-Up Tracker; GRV-R24 Online Review Response & Escalation Log. Use the current approved version. This workbook page is guided practice, not the permanent restaurant record.

## Applied Scenario: The Call Nobody Made

Two managers each assume the other will call a guest about a serious service problem. Three days later the guest posts that nobody followed up.

### Your decision

WHAT IS THE GUEST IMPACT?

---

WHAT FACTS ARE VERIFIED?

---

WHAT REMAINS UNKNOWN OR ONLY REPORTED?

---

WHAT AUTHORITY OR ESCALATION APPLIES?

---

WHAT IS THE SMALLEST USEFUL NEXT ACTION?

---

WHO OWNS FOLLOW-UP, BY WHEN, AND HOW WILL IT BE VERIFIED?

---

## Chapter 22 Action Record

Complete this guided-practice page for one real or representative decision involving “Follow-Up Is Part of the Recovery.” Use an approved case identifier rather than unnecessary personal information.

**CASE / SHIFT / DATE**

---

**GUEST IMPACT IN NEUTRAL LANGUAGE**

---

---

**VERIFIED OPERATING FACTS**

---

---

**IMMEDIATE RECOVERY OR CORRECTION**

---

---

**LIKELY CAUSE TO TEST — NOT ASSUME**

---

---

**NEXT OWNER / DUE DATE / VERIFICATION EVIDENCE**

---

---

## CHAPTER 23

## Online Reviews: Public Response, Private Recovery

Help managers respond to reviews without arguing publicly, exposing private information, or treating reputation as more important than the underlying failure.

### Start with this distinction

A public response is visible hospitality. It should acknowledge, remain calm, and route detailed recovery to an appropriate private channel. The internal operation still needs a case and pattern review.

**COST OF GETTING IT WRONG**

A clever public reply cannot repair a repeated operating failure. Defensive replies often amplify the issue and make future guests question the restaurant's judgment.

### What calm management looks like

In “Online Reviews: Public Response, Private Recovery,” calm management means moving at two speeds: act promptly on what is clear, and remain disciplined about what still needs verification. The guest should see ownership while the manager avoids inventing a cause or promise just to end the conversation.

## Chapter 23 Field Guide

### Use these rules on a real shift

111. Respond according to current platform and company rules.
112. Keep public responses brief, factual, and respectful.
113. Do not expose guest history, order details, or employee information unnecessarily.
114. Create an internal recovery case for material concerns.
115. Tag themes from reviews alongside direct complaints.

### Questions before you close the case

- What did the guest experience, in plain language?
- What can we verify now, and what remains reported but unverified?
- What recovery authority applies?
- What promise or follow-up exists after the guest leaves?
- Is this isolated, or does another case show the same failure condition?

#### CONTROLLED RECORD CONNECTION

GRV-R12 Repeat Concern Pattern Log; GRV-R28; GRV-R30 Corrective Action Log. Use the current approved version. This workbook page is guided practice, not the permanent restaurant record.

## Applied Scenario: The Review the Team Wants to Win

A guest posts a harsh review with one inaccurate detail but a valid complaint about slow service. The manager wants to correct the guest publicly line by line.

### Your decision

WHAT IS THE GUEST IMPACT?

---

WHAT FACTS ARE VERIFIED?

---

WHAT REMAINS UNKNOWN OR ONLY REPORTED?

---

WHAT AUTHORITY OR ESCALATION APPLIES?

---

WHAT IS THE SMALLEST USEFUL NEXT ACTION?

---

WHO OWNS FOLLOW-UP, BY WHEN, AND HOW WILL IT BE VERIFIED?

---

## Chapter 23 Action Record

Complete this guided-practice page for one real or representative decision involving “Online Reviews: Public Response, Private Recovery.” Use an approved case identifier rather than unnecessary personal information.

**CASE / SHIFT / DATE**

---

**GUEST IMPACT IN NEUTRAL LANGUAGE**

---

---

**VERIFIED OPERATING FACTS**

---

---

**IMMEDIATE RECOVERY OR CORRECTION**

---

---

**LIKELY CAUSE TO TEST — NOT ASSUME**

---

---

**NEXT OWNER / DUE DATE / VERIFICATION EVIDENCE**

---

---

## CHAPTER 24

## Compliments and Positive Signals

Use positive feedback as evidence of standards that should be reinforced rather than treating compliments only as morale moments.

**THE TRUTH**

Compliments show what guests notice when the system works: anticipation, warmth, timing, recovery, teamwork, accuracy, and personal attention. Positive signals can be studied without turning service into a contest for praise.

### Why this matters operationally

If managers track only failures, employees experience feedback as punishment and the restaurant misses evidence of what should be repeated.

### Do not confuse activity with control

Closing a conversation does not prove “Compliments and Positive Signals” is controlled. The manager should be able to show what changed, who owns the next step, and what evidence on a comparable shift would demonstrate that the same avoidable failure is less likely to return.

## Chapter 24 Field Guide

### Use these rules on a real shift

116. Record specific behavior behind the compliment when possible.
117. Recognize the employee without exaggerating or creating favoritism.
118. Ask what conditions made the strong service possible.
119. Share repeatable behavior in pre-shift or training.
120. Do not pressure guests for public praise or reviews.

### Questions before you close the case

- What did the guest experience, in plain language?
- What can we verify now, and what remains reported but unverified?
- What recovery authority applies?
- What promise or follow-up exists after the guest leaves?
- Is this isolated, or does another case show the same failure condition?

#### CONTROLLED RECORD CONNECTION

GRV-R12 Repeat Concern Pattern Log; GRV-R28; GRV-R30 Corrective Action Log. Use the current approved version. This workbook page is guided practice, not the permanent restaurant record.

## Applied Scenario: The Compliment with a Lesson

A guest praises a server for noticing they were in a hurry and coordinating the meal. The manager can reinforce the observation and communication behavior, not just say “good job.”

### Your decision

WHAT IS THE GUEST IMPACT?

---

WHAT FACTS ARE VERIFIED?

---

WHAT REMAINS UNKNOWN OR ONLY REPORTED?

---

WHAT AUTHORITY OR ESCALATION APPLIES?

---

WHAT IS THE SMALLEST USEFUL NEXT ACTION?

---

WHO OWNS FOLLOW-UP, BY WHEN, AND HOW WILL IT BE VERIFIED?

---

## Chapter 24 Action Record

Complete this guided-practice page for one real or representative decision involving “Compliments and Positive Signals.” Use an approved case identifier rather than unnecessary personal information.

**CASE / SHIFT / DATE**

---

**GUEST IMPACT IN NEUTRAL LANGUAGE**

---

---

**VERIFIED OPERATING FACTS**

---

---

**IMMEDIATE RECOVERY OR CORRECTION**

---

---

**LIKELY CAUSE TO TEST — NOT ASSUME**

---

---

**NEXT OWNER / DUE DATE / VERIFICATION EVIDENCE**

---

---

## CHAPTER 25

## Pattern Analysis: Close the Cause, Not Only the Case

Move from individual complaint closure to repeated-cause correction.

### The operating truth

One complaint may be noise or an isolated miss. Repeated complaints with similar timing, station, product, handoff, or leadership conditions are a pattern until evidence shows otherwise.

### What the restaurant pays when this is missed

Restaurants can spend money recovering the same failure for months because every case is closed individually and never compared.

**MANAGER TEST**

Can you explain the guest impact, the verified operating facts, the authority used, and what must happen next without blaming a person you have not yet heard from?

## Chapter 25 Field Guide

### Use these rules on a real shift

121. Review material complaints daily and patterns weekly.
122. Group comparable cases using stable categories.
123. Look for shift, station, product, role, time, volume, and handoff patterns.
124. Test the likely cause before coaching or redesign.
125. Assign one corrective action with owner, due date, and verification.

### Questions before you close the case

- What did the guest experience, in plain language?
- What can we verify now, and what remains reported but unverified?
- What recovery authority applies?
- What promise or follow-up exists after the guest leaves?
- Is this isolated, or does another case show the same failure condition?

#### CONTROLLED RECORD CONNECTION

GRV-R12 Repeat Concern Pattern Log; GRV-R28; GRV-R30 Corrective Action Log. Use the current approved version. This workbook page is guided practice, not the permanent restaurant record.

# Applied Scenario: Three Different Complaints, One Handoff

Guests complain about missing sauces, wrong sides, and incomplete takeout bags. The categories differ, but all failures occur at final handoff.

## Your decision

WHAT IS THE GUEST IMPACT?

---

WHAT FACTS ARE VERIFIED?

---

WHAT REMAINS UNKNOWN OR ONLY REPORTED?

---

WHAT AUTHORITY OR ESCALATION APPLIES?

---

WHAT IS THE SMALLEST USEFUL NEXT ACTION?

---

WHO OWNS FOLLOW-UP, BY WHEN, AND HOW WILL IT BE VERIFIED?

---

## Chapter 25 Action Record

Complete this guided-practice page for one real or representative decision involving “Pattern Analysis: Close the Cause, Not Only the Case.” Use an approved case identifier rather than unnecessary personal information.

**CASE / SHIFT / DATE**

---

**GUEST IMPACT IN NEUTRAL LANGUAGE**

---

---

**VERIFIED OPERATING FACTS**

---

---

**IMMEDIATE RECOVERY OR CORRECTION**

---

---

**LIKELY CAUSE TO TEST — NOT ASSUME**

---

---

**NEXT OWNER / DUE DATE / VERIFICATION EVIDENCE**

---

---

PART 5

# READ THE WHOLE GUEST SIGNAL

---

Direct complaints are only one source of truth. Reviews, compliments, return behavior, and recurring themes show where the operation is building trust and where it is spending it.

## CHAPTER 26

## Review Requests and Honest Reputation

Protect the integrity of feedback collection and keep review practices from becoming manipulation.

**TRUTH FIRST**

The goal of review requests is honest feedback from real guests, not filtering for people likely to praise the restaurant.

### The hidden cost

Selective requests, incentives tied to positive reviews, or employee pressure may violate platform rules and distort the evidence managers need.

### A practical distinction

For “Review Requests and Honest Reputation,” the guest-facing decision and the management decision are related but not identical. Address the immediate impact first, then preserve enough evidence to determine whether a standard, handoff, authority limit, training step, or other operating condition needs repair.

## Chapter 26 Field Guide

### Use these rules on a real shift

126. Use a neutral, approved rule for asking guests.
127. Do not gate requests based on expected sentiment.
128. Do not condition incentives on positive ratings.
129. Follow current platform requirements.
130. Treat review volume and rating as context, not as a substitute for direct operating evidence.

### Questions before you close the case

- What did the guest experience, in plain language?
- What can we verify now, and what remains reported but unverified?
- What recovery authority applies?
- What promise or follow-up exists after the guest leaves?
- Is this isolated, or does another case show the same failure condition?

#### CONTROLLED RECORD CONNECTION

GRV-R12 Repeat Concern Pattern Log; GRV-R28; GRV-R30 Corrective Action Log. Use the current approved version. This workbook page is guided practice, not the permanent restaurant record.

## Applied Scenario: The “Happy Guests Only” Shortcut

A manager tells servers to ask only visibly happy tables for reviews. The rating may improve while the restaurant becomes less informed about recurring misses.

### Your decision

WHAT IS THE GUEST IMPACT?

---

WHAT FACTS ARE VERIFIED?

---

WHAT REMAINS UNKNOWN OR ONLY REPORTED?

---

WHAT AUTHORITY OR ESCALATION APPLIES?

---

WHAT IS THE SMALLEST USEFUL NEXT ACTION?

---

WHO OWNS FOLLOW-UP, BY WHEN, AND HOW WILL IT BE VERIFIED?

---

## Chapter 26 Action Record

Complete this guided-practice page for one real or representative decision involving “Review Requests and Honest Reputation.” Use an approved case identifier rather than unnecessary personal information.

**CASE / SHIFT / DATE**

---

**GUEST IMPACT IN NEUTRAL LANGUAGE**

---

---

**VERIFIED OPERATING FACTS**

---

---

**IMMEDIATE RECOVERY OR CORRECTION**

---

---

**LIKELY CAUSE TO TEST — NOT ASSUME**

---

---

**NEXT OWNER / DUE DATE / VERIFICATION EVIDENCE**

---

---

## CHAPTER 27

## Guest Return and Relationship Repair

Distinguish a completed transaction from restored confidence.

### Start with this distinction

A recovery may resolve the immediate bill and still leave the relationship damaged. When the restaurant has legitimate, permissioned follow-up, return behavior can provide evidence of whether confidence was restored.

**COST OF GETTING IT WRONG**

Chasing every guest after every complaint can feel intrusive. Never contacting guests after significant failures can leave important promises unresolved.

### What calm management looks like

In “Guest Return and Relationship Repair,” calm management means moving at two speeds: act promptly on what is clear, and remain disciplined about what still needs verification. The guest should see ownership while the manager avoids inventing a cause or promise just to end the conversation.

## Chapter 27 Field Guide

### Use these rules on a real shift

131. Use follow-up only when appropriate and permitted.
132. Connect return verification to the original case when the system supports it.
133. Do not claim that a return proves full satisfaction.
134. Review the next experience for repeated failure.
135. Close internal actions even when the guest never responds.

### Questions before you close the case

- What did the guest experience, in plain language?
- What can we verify now, and what remains reported but unverified?
- What recovery authority applies?
- What promise or follow-up exists after the guest leaves?
- Is this isolated, or does another case show the same failure condition?

#### **CONTROLLED RECORD CONNECTION**

GRV-R12; GRV-R30; GRV-IV verification. Use the current approved version. This workbook page is guided practice, not the permanent restaurant record.

## Applied Scenario: They Came Back Once

A recovered guest returns but experiences the same slow bar service. The return itself is not success if the underlying pattern survived.

### Your decision

WHAT IS THE GUEST IMPACT?

---

WHAT FACTS ARE VERIFIED?

---

WHAT REMAINS UNKNOWN OR ONLY REPORTED?

---

WHAT AUTHORITY OR ESCALATION APPLIES?

---

WHAT IS THE SMALLEST USEFUL NEXT ACTION?

---

WHO OWNS FOLLOW-UP, BY WHEN, AND HOW WILL IT BE VERIFIED?

---

## Chapter 27 Action Record

Complete this guided-practice page for one real or representative decision involving “Guest Return and Relationship Repair.” Use an approved case identifier rather than unnecessary personal information.

**CASE / SHIFT / DATE**

---

**GUEST IMPACT IN NEUTRAL LANGUAGE**

---

---

**VERIFIED OPERATING FACTS**

---

---

**IMMEDIATE RECOVERY OR CORRECTION**

---

---

**LIKELY CAUSE TO TEST — NOT ASSUME**

---

---

**NEXT OWNER / DUE DATE / VERIFICATION EVIDENCE**

---

---

## CHAPTER 28

## Guest Preferences, Recognition, and Privacy

Keep helpful guest knowledge useful without allowing recovery records to become intrusive profiles.

**THE TRUTH**

Information should exist because it helps the restaurant serve, recognize, recover, or follow up appropriately. A complaint is not permission to collect unrelated personal information.

### Why this matters operationally

Over-collection creates privacy risk and can make recognition feel unsettling instead of hospitable.

### Do not confuse activity with control

Closing a conversation does not prove “Guest Preferences, Recognition, and Privacy” is controlled. The manager should be able to show what changed, who owns the next step, and what evidence on a comparable shift would demonstrate that the same avoidable failure is less likely to return.

## Chapter 28 Field Guide

### Use these rules on a real shift

136. Collect only information with a legitimate operating purpose.
137. Use permission and suppression controls for outreach.
138. Do not expose prior complaints or private details in front of others.
139. Reverify safety-critical information at the point of service.
140. Remove or retire information according to restaurant policy and applicable requirements.

### Questions before you close the case

- What did the guest experience, in plain language?
- What can we verify now, and what remains reported but unverified?
- What recovery authority applies?
- What promise or follow-up exists after the guest leaves?
- Is this isolated, or does another case show the same failure condition?

#### CONTROLLED RECORD CONNECTION

GRV-R12; GRV-R30; GRV-IV verification. Use the current approved version. This workbook page is guided practice, not the permanent restaurant record.

## Applied Scenario: The Regular Guest Note

A manager adds personal details to a guest profile because they might be useful later. None of the details are needed to serve the guest and the guest never expected them to be stored.

### Your decision

WHAT IS THE GUEST IMPACT?

---

WHAT FACTS ARE VERIFIED?

---

WHAT REMAINS UNKNOWN OR ONLY REPORTED?

---

WHAT AUTHORITY OR ESCALATION APPLIES?

---

WHAT IS THE SMALLEST USEFUL NEXT ACTION?

---

WHO OWNS FOLLOW-UP, BY WHEN, AND HOW WILL IT BE VERIFIED?

---

## Chapter 28 Action Record

Complete this guided-practice page for one real or representative decision involving “Guest Preferences, Recognition, and Privacy.” Use an approved case identifier rather than unnecessary personal information.

**CASE / SHIFT / DATE**

---

**GUEST IMPACT IN NEUTRAL LANGUAGE**

---

---

**VERIFIED OPERATING FACTS**

---

---

**IMMEDIATE RECOVERY OR CORRECTION**

---

---

**LIKELY CAUSE TO TEST — NOT ASSUME**

---

---

**NEXT OWNER / DUE DATE / VERIFICATION EVIDENCE**

---

---

## CHAPTER 29

## What the Guest Did Not Say

Teach leaders to use observation and operational evidence without pretending to know hidden motives.

### The operating truth

A quiet guest can be satisfied, disappointed, distracted, or simply private. Managers should observe service signals but avoid psychological guesses.

### What the restaurant pays when this is missed

When leaders assume emotion from body language alone, they can overreact, stereotype, or miss the actual operating facts.

**MANAGER TEST**

Can you explain the guest impact, the verified operating facts, the authority used, and what must happen next without blaming a person you have not yet heard from?

## Chapter 29 Field Guide

### Use these rules on a real shift

141. Use observable cues as prompts to check, not conclusions.
142. Ask respectful questions when a check-in is appropriate.
143. Use timing, table condition, unfinished needs, and service sequence as evidence.
144. Avoid labels such as difficult, entitled, or dishonest in operating records.
145. Let the guest's stated concern guide recovery while the operation verifies its own standards.

### Questions before you close the case

- What did the guest experience, in plain language?
- What can we verify now, and what remains reported but unverified?
- What recovery authority applies?
- What promise or follow-up exists after the guest leaves?
- Is this isolated, or does another case show the same failure condition?

#### CONTROLLED RECORD CONNECTION

GRV-R28 Weekly Guest Relationship Review; GRV-R29 Monthly Guest Retention Scorecard. Use the current approved version. This workbook page is guided practice, not the permanent restaurant record.

## Applied Scenario: The Silent Table

A table says little and declines dessert. The server assumes they are unhappy. The manager reviews the service sequence before deciding whether there is a problem to recover.

### Your decision

WHAT IS THE GUEST IMPACT?

---

WHAT FACTS ARE VERIFIED?

---

WHAT REMAINS UNKNOWN OR ONLY REPORTED?

---

WHAT AUTHORITY OR ESCALATION APPLIES?

---

WHAT IS THE SMALLEST USEFUL NEXT ACTION?

---

WHO OWNS FOLLOW-UP, BY WHEN, AND HOW WILL IT BE VERIFIED?

---

## Chapter 29 Action Record

Complete this guided-practice page for one real or representative decision involving “What the Guest Did Not Say.” Use an approved case identifier rather than unnecessary personal information.

**CASE / SHIFT / DATE**

---

**GUEST IMPACT IN NEUTRAL LANGUAGE**

---

---

**VERIFIED OPERATING FACTS**

---

---

**IMMEDIATE RECOVERY OR CORRECTION**

---

---

**LIKELY CAUSE TO TEST — NOT ASSUME**

---

---

**NEXT OWNER / DUE DATE / VERIFICATION EVIDENCE**

---

---

PART 6

# COACH THE CAUSE AND CORRECT THE SYSTEM

---

A complaint should not automatically become employee blame. Managers need to distinguish a knowledge gap, a standard gap, a capacity failure, a handoff failure, a leadership miss, and willful disregard.

## CHAPTER 30

## Coach the Cause, Not the Person

Help managers use complaint evidence for fair coaching instead of public blame or automatic discipline.

**TRUTH FIRST**

The same guest outcome can come from different causes: knowledge, skill, unclear standard, capacity, communication, equipment, leadership, or deliberate disregard. Coaching should match the cause.

### The hidden cost

Blaming the closest employee may feel decisive while leaving the real condition untouched. It also teaches employees to hide complaints.

### A practical distinction

For “Coach the Cause, Not the Person,” the guest-facing decision and the management decision are related but not identical. Address the immediate impact first, then preserve enough evidence to determine whether a standard, handoff, authority limit, training step, or other operating condition needs repair.

## Chapter 30 Field Guide

### Use these rules on a real shift

146. Coach privately and from verified behavior.
147. Explain the standard and observed gap.
148. Ask what the employee saw and what blocked the correct action.
149. Distinguish training from accountability.
150. Reobserve after coaching before declaring the problem fixed.

### Questions before you close the case

- What did the guest experience, in plain language?
- What can we verify now, and what remains reported but unverified?
- What recovery authority applies?
- What promise or follow-up exists after the guest leaves?
- Is this isolated, or does another case show the same failure condition?

#### CONTROLLED RECORD CONNECTION

GRV-R28; GRV-R30; GRV-IV verification. Use the current approved version. This workbook page is guided practice, not the permanent restaurant record.

## Applied Scenario: The Server Who Could Not Win

A server is coached for slow drinks, but the service bar was backed up and no manager communicated the delay. The guest impact is real; the coaching target is wrong.

### Your decision

WHAT IS THE GUEST IMPACT?

---

WHAT FACTS ARE VERIFIED?

---

WHAT REMAINS UNKNOWN OR ONLY REPORTED?

---

WHAT AUTHORITY OR ESCALATION APPLIES?

---

WHAT IS THE SMALLEST USEFUL NEXT ACTION?

---

WHO OWNS FOLLOW-UP, BY WHEN, AND HOW WILL IT BE VERIFIED?

---

## Chapter 30 Action Record

Complete this guided-practice page for one real or representative decision involving “Coach the Cause, Not the Person.” Use an approved case identifier rather than unnecessary personal information.

**CASE / SHIFT / DATE**

---

**GUEST IMPACT IN NEUTRAL LANGUAGE**

---

---

**VERIFIED OPERATING FACTS**

---

---

**IMMEDIATE RECOVERY OR CORRECTION**

---

---

**LIKELY CAUSE TO TEST — NOT ASSUME**

---

---

**NEXT OWNER / DUE DATE / VERIFICATION EVIDENCE**

---

---

## CHAPTER 31

## Correct the System, Then Verify

Turn pattern findings into a small controlled change with evidence rather than a broad memo that nobody tests.

### Start with this distinction

A corrective action is complete only when an owner, due date, change, evidence, verification, and closure decision exist.

**COST OF GETTING IT WRONG**

Restaurants often announce “we need to communicate better” without changing a handoff, tool, staffing rule, or verification method. The problem returns because nothing operational changed.

### What calm management looks like

In “Correct the System, Then Verify,” calm management means moving at two speeds: act promptly on what is clear, and remain disciplined about what still needs verification. The guest should see ownership while the manager avoids inventing a cause or promise just to end the conversation.

## Chapter 31 Field Guide

### Use these rules on a real shift

151. Name the specific failure condition.
152. Choose the smallest useful change.
153. Assign one owner and due date.
154. Train affected roles and run the change on representative shifts.
155. Verify whether recurrence or performance changed before standardizing.

### Questions before you close the case

- What did the guest experience, in plain language?
- What can we verify now, and what remains reported but unverified?
- What recovery authority applies?
- What promise or follow-up exists after the guest leaves?
- Is this isolated, or does another case show the same failure condition?

#### CONTROLLED RECORD CONNECTION

GRV-R28; GRV-R30; GRV-IV verification. Use the current approved version. This workbook page is guided practice, not the permanent restaurant record.

## Applied Scenario: The New Expo Check

Repeated missing sides lead to a final-check change at expo. The team must test whether the check catches errors without creating a new bottleneck.

### Your decision

WHAT IS THE GUEST IMPACT?

---

WHAT FACTS ARE VERIFIED?

---

WHAT REMAINS UNKNOWN OR ONLY REPORTED?

---

WHAT AUTHORITY OR ESCALATION APPLIES?

---

WHAT IS THE SMALLEST USEFUL NEXT ACTION?

---

WHO OWNS FOLLOW-UP, BY WHEN, AND HOW WILL IT BE VERIFIED?

---

## Chapter 31 Action Record

Complete this guided-practice page for one real or representative decision involving “Correct the System, Then Verify.” Use an approved case identifier rather than unnecessary personal information.

**CASE / SHIFT / DATE**

---

**GUEST IMPACT IN NEUTRAL LANGUAGE**

---

---

**VERIFIED OPERATING FACTS**

---

---

**IMMEDIATE RECOVERY OR CORRECTION**

---

---

**LIKELY CAUSE TO TEST — NOT ASSUME**

---

---

**NEXT OWNER / DUE DATE / VERIFICATION EVIDENCE**

---

---

## CHAPTER 32

## Recognition, Accountability, and Fairness

Balance recognition of strong recoveries with consistent accountability for preventable failures.

**THE TRUTH**

Strong recovery work should be recognized because it teaches the team what good judgment looks like. Accountability should remain evidence-based and proportionate.

### Why this matters operationally

If managers praise favorites for ordinary service and punish others for system failures, the complaint process becomes another source of favoritism.

### Do not confuse activity with control

Closing a conversation does not prove “Recognition, Accountability, and Fairness” is controlled. The manager should be able to show what changed, who owns the next step, and what evidence on a comparable shift would demonstrate that the same avoidable failure is less likely to return.

## Chapter 32 Field Guide

### Use these rules on a real shift

156. Recognize observable actions, not personalities.
157. Use the same standard across comparable roles.
158. Do not turn a guest complaint into public humiliation.
159. Separate one mistake from a repeated coached pattern.
160. Document material accountability through the proper employee-relations process, not the guest file.

### Questions before you close the case

- What did the guest experience, in plain language?
- What can we verify now, and what remains reported but unverified?
- What recovery authority applies?
- What promise or follow-up exists after the guest leaves?
- Is this isolated, or does another case show the same failure condition?

#### CONTROLLED RECORD CONNECTION

GRV-R28; GRV-R30; GRV-IV verification. Use the current approved version. This workbook page is guided practice, not the permanent restaurant record.

## Applied Scenario: Two Employees, Same Miss

Two servers make the same order-entry error on different shifts. One is a manager favorite. The recovery system must not become a back door for inconsistent discipline.

### Your decision

WHAT IS THE GUEST IMPACT?

---

WHAT FACTS ARE VERIFIED?

---

WHAT REMAINS UNKNOWN OR ONLY REPORTED?

---

WHAT AUTHORITY OR ESCALATION APPLIES?

---

WHAT IS THE SMALLEST USEFUL NEXT ACTION?

---

WHO OWNS FOLLOW-UP, BY WHEN, AND HOW WILL IT BE VERIFIED?

---

## Chapter 32 Action Record

Complete this guided-practice page for one real or representative decision involving “Recognition, Accountability, and Fairness.” Use an approved case identifier rather than unnecessary personal information.

**CASE / SHIFT / DATE**

---

**GUEST IMPACT IN NEUTRAL LANGUAGE**

---

---

**VERIFIED OPERATING FACTS**

---

---

**IMMEDIATE RECOVERY OR CORRECTION**

---

---

**LIKELY CAUSE TO TEST — NOT ASSUME**

---

---

**NEXT OWNER / DUE DATE / VERIFICATION EVIDENCE**

---

---

PART 7

# MANAGE GUEST EXPERIENCE AS A CONTROL

---

The final step is a management rhythm: daily follow-up, weekly pattern review, defined measures, corrective-action ownership, and verified sustainment.

## CHAPTER 33

## The Weekly Guest Experience Review

Create the management rhythm that turns open cases, patterns, reviews, and corrective actions into decisions.

### The operating truth

The forms capture events. The weekly review makes the evidence manageable. It should be short enough to happen and specific enough to change the operation.

### What the restaurant pays when this is missed

Without a review rhythm, cases age, follow-up disappears, patterns remain invisible, and corrective actions have no owner.

**MANAGER TEST**

Can you explain the guest impact, the verified operating facts, the authority used, and what must happen next without blaming a person you have not yet heard from?

## Chapter 33 Field Guide

### Use these rules on a real shift

161. Review open material cases and overdue follow-up.
162. Review repeat concern themes and leading category.
163. Review material online reviews alongside direct feedback.
164. Review open corrective actions, owners, due dates, and evidence.
165. Name one or two priorities for the next week instead of launching ten fixes.

### Questions before you close the case

- What did the guest experience, in plain language?
- What can we verify now, and what remains reported but unverified?
- What recovery authority applies?
- What promise or follow-up exists after the guest leaves?
- Is this isolated, or does another case show the same failure condition?

#### CONTROLLED RECORD CONNECTION

GRV-R28; GRV-R30; GRV-IV verification. Use the current approved version. This workbook page is guided practice, not the permanent restaurant record.

## Applied Scenario: The Folder Full of Complaints

The restaurant has records, but nobody looks at them together. Managers believe documentation exists, so they assume the system is controlled.

### Your decision

WHAT IS THE GUEST IMPACT?

---

WHAT FACTS ARE VERIFIED?

---

WHAT REMAINS UNKNOWN OR ONLY REPORTED?

---

WHAT AUTHORITY OR ESCALATION APPLIES?

---

WHAT IS THE SMALLEST USEFUL NEXT ACTION?

---

WHO OWNS FOLLOW-UP, BY WHEN, AND HOW WILL IT BE VERIFIED?

---

## Chapter 33 Action Record

Complete this guided-practice page for one real or representative decision involving “The Weekly Guest Experience Review.” Use an approved case identifier rather than unnecessary personal information.

**CASE / SHIFT / DATE**

---

**GUEST IMPACT IN NEUTRAL LANGUAGE**

---

---

**VERIFIED OPERATING FACTS**

---

---

**IMMEDIATE RECOVERY OR CORRECTION**

---

---

**LIKELY CAUSE TO TEST — NOT ASSUME**

---

---

**NEXT OWNER / DUE DATE / VERIFICATION EVIDENCE**

---

---

## CHAPTER 34

## Measure What Helps a Decision

Define a small guest-experience dashboard whose numbers have definitions, sources, and management uses.

**TRUTH FIRST**

Metrics are management questions expressed as evidence. A number matters only when leaders know the time period, definition, source, and decision it should influence.

### The hidden cost

A dashboard can create false confidence when different managers count complaints differently or when the restaurant chases percentages without reading the cases.

### A practical distinction

For “Measure What Helps a Decision,” the guest-facing decision and the management decision are related but not identical. Address the immediate impact first, then preserve enough evidence to determine whether a standard, handoff, authority limit, training step, or other operating condition needs repair.

## Chapter 34 Field Guide

### Use these rules on a real shift

- 166. Complaint rate per 100 guests = material complaints ÷ guest count × 100.
- 167. First-contact resolution rate = material cases resolved in the initial interaction ÷ material cases × 100.
- 168. Follow-up completion rate = follow-ups completed by deadline ÷ follow-ups assigned × 100.
- 169. Average days to close = total days open for closed cases ÷ closed cases.
- 170. Track leading repeat themes and open corrective actions alongside percentages.

### Questions before you close the case

- What did the guest experience, in plain language?
- What can we verify now, and what remains reported but unverified?
- What recovery authority applies?
- What promise or follow-up exists after the guest leaves?
- Is this isolated, or does another case show the same failure condition?

#### CONTROLLED RECORD CONNECTION

GRV-R28; GRV-R30; GRV-IV verification. Use the current approved version. This workbook page is guided practice, not the permanent restaurant record.

# Applied Scenario: The Better Percentage with Worse Service

Complaint count falls after managers stop documenting minor material complaints consistently. The dashboard looks better while the information quality gets worse.

## Your decision

WHAT IS THE GUEST IMPACT?

---

WHAT FACTS ARE VERIFIED?

---

WHAT REMAINS UNKNOWN OR ONLY REPORTED?

---

WHAT AUTHORITY OR ESCALATION APPLIES?

---

WHAT IS THE SMALLEST USEFUL NEXT ACTION?

---

WHO OWNS FOLLOW-UP, BY WHEN, AND HOW WILL IT BE VERIFIED?

---

## Chapter 34 Action Record

Complete this guided-practice page for one real or representative decision involving “Measure What Helps a Decision.” Use an approved case identifier rather than unnecessary personal information.

**CASE / SHIFT / DATE**

---

**GUEST IMPACT IN NEUTRAL LANGUAGE**

---

---

**VERIFIED OPERATING FACTS**

---

---

**IMMEDIATE RECOVERY OR CORRECTION**

---

---

**LIKELY CAUSE TO TEST — NOT ASSUME**

---

---

**NEXT OWNER / DUE DATE / VERIFICATION EVIDENCE**

---

---

## CHAPTER 35

## Truth → Cost → System: The Recovery Control Loop

Close the workbook by linking individual guest truth to cost and then to the smallest useful operating system.

### Start with this distinction

The Gravity direction is simple: face what actually happened, understand what the restaurant and people are paying for it, then build or repair the system that prevents recurrence.

#### **COST OF GETTING IT WRONG**

The danger is stopping at one of the first two steps. Truth without action becomes frustration. Cost without truth becomes blame. System without truth becomes paperwork.

### What calm management looks like

In “Truth → Cost → System: The Recovery Control Loop,” calm management means moving at two speeds: act promptly on what is clear, and remain disciplined about what still needs verification. The guest should see ownership while the manager avoids inventing a cause or promise just to end the conversation.

## Chapter 35 Field Guide

### Use these rules on a real shift

- 171. Truth: establish the guest impact and verified operating facts.
- 172. Cost: identify the relationship, operational, financial, safety, or team consequence.
- 173. System: choose the smallest repeatable control that addresses the verified cause.
- 174. Verification: observe whether the control works on real shifts.
- 175. Sustainment: keep only controls that produce useful evidence and better decisions.

### Questions before you close the case

- What did the guest experience, in plain language?
- What can we verify now, and what remains reported but unverified?
- What recovery authority applies?
- What promise or follow-up exists after the guest leaves?
- Is this isolated, or does another case show the same failure condition?

#### CONTROLLED RECORD CONNECTION

GRV-R28; GRV-R30; GRV-IV verification. Use the current approved version. This workbook page is guided practice, not the permanent restaurant record.

# Applied Scenario: The Complaint That Became a Better Restaurant

A recurring delay problem is traced to a predictable handoff at shift change. The team changes the handoff standard, trains it, verifies it, and sees the complaint theme decline.

## Your decision

WHAT IS THE GUEST IMPACT?

---

WHAT FACTS ARE VERIFIED?

---

WHAT REMAINS UNKNOWN OR ONLY REPORTED?

---

WHAT AUTHORITY OR ESCALATION APPLIES?

---

WHAT IS THE SMALLEST USEFUL NEXT ACTION?

---

WHO OWNS FOLLOW-UP, BY WHEN, AND HOW WILL IT BE VERIFIED?

---

## Chapter 35 Action Record

Complete this guided-practice page for one real or representative decision involving “Truth → Cost → System: The Recovery Control Loop.” Use an approved case identifier rather than unnecessary personal information.

**CASE / SHIFT / DATE**

---

**GUEST IMPACT IN NEUTRAL LANGUAGE**

---

---

**VERIFIED OPERATING FACTS**

---

---

**IMMEDIATE RECOVERY OR CORRECTION**

---

---

**LIKELY CAUSE TO TEST — NOT ASSUME**

---

---

**NEXT OWNER / DUE DATE / VERIFICATION EVIDENCE**

---

---

# Manager Judgment Lab

## 20 Recovery Scenarios

Use these scenarios for manager development, pre-shift discussion, or readiness review. The goal is not to find a magic sentence. The goal is to show that the manager can protect dignity, verify facts, use authority correctly, and convert the event into an owned next step.

- State what you would do first.
- State what you would not promise yet.
- Name the controlled record or escalation path.
- Identify the likely system question after the guest is cared for.

# Scenario 1: The Cold Entrée at a Busy Table

One entrée is cold while the other five meals are correct and the table is halfway through dinner.

## Manager response map

### FIRST ACTION

---

---

### FACTS TO VERIFY

---

---

### AUTHORITY / ESCALATION

---

---

### GUEST-FACING RESPONSE

---

---

### INTERNAL SYSTEM QUESTION

---

---

### VERIFICATION EVIDENCE

---

---

## Scenario 2: The Missing Allergy Modifier

The POS ticket contains the allergy note, but the plate arrives without the expected manager verification.

### Manager response map

#### FIRST ACTION

---

---

#### FACTS TO VERIFY

---

---

#### AUTHORITY / ESCALATION

---

---

#### GUEST-FACING RESPONSE

---

---

#### INTERNAL SYSTEM QUESTION

---

---

#### VERIFICATION EVIDENCE

---

---

## Scenario 3: The Review Posted Before the Guest Leaves

A guest posts a one-star review from the table before asking for a manager.

### Manager response map

#### FIRST ACTION

---

---

#### FACTS TO VERIFY

---

---

#### AUTHORITY / ESCALATION

---

#### GUEST-FACING RESPONSE

---

---

#### INTERNAL SYSTEM QUESTION

---

---

#### VERIFICATION EVIDENCE

---

## Scenario 4: The Comp Request for a Preference

A guest dislikes a correctly prepared item but did not report a defect and asks for the full check to be removed.

### Manager response map

#### FIRST ACTION

---

---

#### FACTS TO VERIFY

---

---

#### AUTHORITY / ESCALATION

---

---

#### GUEST-FACING RESPONSE

---

---

#### INTERNAL SYSTEM QUESTION

---

---

#### VERIFICATION EVIDENCE

---

---

## Scenario 5: The Host Stand Promise

A host promises a 15-minute wait. Forty minutes later the party is still waiting and nobody updated them.

### Manager response map

#### FIRST ACTION

---

---

#### FACTS TO VERIFY

---

---

#### AUTHORITY / ESCALATION

---

---

#### GUEST-FACING RESPONSE

---

---

#### INTERNAL SYSTEM QUESTION

---

---

#### VERIFICATION EVIDENCE

---

---

## Scenario 6: The Bartender and the Lost Ticket

A server says the bartender lost the ticket. The bar shows a printer failure that affected several orders.

### Manager response map

#### FIRST ACTION

---

---

#### FACTS TO VERIFY

---

---

#### AUTHORITY / ESCALATION

---

---

#### GUEST-FACING RESPONSE

---

---

#### INTERNAL SYSTEM QUESTION

---

---

#### VERIFICATION EVIDENCE

---

---

## Scenario 7: The Guest Who Wants an Employee Fired

A guest demands that a server be terminated before the manager has reviewed the event.

### Manager response map

#### FIRST ACTION

---

---

#### FACTS TO VERIFY

---

---

#### AUTHORITY / ESCALATION

---

---

#### GUEST-FACING RESPONSE

---

---

#### INTERNAL SYSTEM QUESTION

---

---

#### VERIFICATION EVIDENCE

---

---

## Scenario 8: The Family Member Manager

An owner's relative is the manager on duty and minimizes a complaint involving a favored employee.

### Manager response map

#### FIRST ACTION

---

---

#### FACTS TO VERIFY

---

---

#### AUTHORITY / ESCALATION

---

---

#### GUEST-FACING RESPONSE

---

---

#### INTERNAL SYSTEM QUESTION

---

---

#### VERIFICATION EVIDENCE

---

---

## Scenario 9: The Refund Across Two Systems

A delivery-platform order and restaurant POS show different refund status.

### Manager response map

#### FIRST ACTION

---

---

#### FACTS TO VERIFY

---

---

#### AUTHORITY / ESCALATION

---

---

#### GUEST-FACING RESPONSE

---

---

#### INTERNAL SYSTEM QUESTION

---

---

#### VERIFICATION EVIDENCE

---

---

## Scenario 10: The Repeat Takeout Error

Three takeout orders in one week are missing condiments and utensils.

### Manager response map

#### FIRST ACTION

---

---

#### FACTS TO VERIFY

---

---

#### AUTHORITY / ESCALATION

---

#### GUEST-FACING RESPONSE

---

---

#### INTERNAL SYSTEM QUESTION

---

---

#### VERIFICATION EVIDENCE

---

## Scenario 11: The Unreachable Guest

A manager promised follow-up. Three attempts have received no response.

### Manager response map

#### FIRST ACTION

---

---

#### FACTS TO VERIFY

---

---

#### AUTHORITY / ESCALATION

---

#### GUEST-FACING RESPONSE

---

---

#### INTERNAL SYSTEM QUESTION

---

---

#### VERIFICATION EVIDENCE

---

## Scenario 12: The Positive Recovery Review

A guest posts that the meal failed but the manager handled it exceptionally well.

### Manager response map

#### FIRST ACTION

---

---

#### FACTS TO VERIFY

---

---

#### AUTHORITY / ESCALATION

---

#### GUEST-FACING RESPONSE

---

---

#### INTERNAL SYSTEM QUESTION

---

---

#### VERIFICATION EVIDENCE

---

## Scenario 13: The Threat After a Valid Complaint

A guest has a valid complaint but begins threatening an employee.

### Manager response map

#### FIRST ACTION

---

---

#### FACTS TO VERIFY

---

---

#### AUTHORITY / ESCALATION

---

---

#### GUEST-FACING RESPONSE

---

---

#### INTERNAL SYSTEM QUESTION

---

---

#### VERIFICATION EVIDENCE

---

---

## Scenario 14: The Wrong Table Was Comped

A manager selects the wrong check while attempting a recovery.

### Manager response map

#### FIRST ACTION

---

---

#### FACTS TO VERIFY

---

---

#### AUTHORITY / ESCALATION

---

#### GUEST-FACING RESPONSE

---

---

#### INTERNAL SYSTEM QUESTION

---

---

#### VERIFICATION EVIDENCE

---

## Scenario 15: The Server Hid the Complaint

An employee handled a complaint privately because they feared being blamed and never told management.

### Manager response map

#### FIRST ACTION

---

---

#### FACTS TO VERIFY

---

---

#### AUTHORITY / ESCALATION

---

---

#### GUEST-FACING RESPONSE

---

---

#### INTERNAL SYSTEM QUESTION

---

---

#### VERIFICATION EVIDENCE

---

---

## Scenario 16: The Same Delay Every Friday

Friday ticket delays recur despite individual comps and apologies.

### Manager response map

#### FIRST ACTION

---

---

#### FACTS TO VERIFY

---

---

#### AUTHORITY / ESCALATION

---

---

#### GUEST-FACING RESPONSE

---

---

#### INTERNAL SYSTEM QUESTION

---

---

#### VERIFICATION EVIDENCE

---

---

## Scenario 17: The Complaint with No Case Record

A serious complaint appears in an online review, but the manager log contains no case.

### Manager response map

#### FIRST ACTION

---

---

#### FACTS TO VERIFY

---

---

#### AUTHORITY / ESCALATION

---

---

#### GUEST-FACING RESPONSE

---

---

#### INTERNAL SYSTEM QUESTION

---

---

#### VERIFICATION EVIDENCE

---

---

## Scenario 18: The Guest Wants a Call from the Owner

A guest refuses the GM's recovery and insists only the owner can resolve it.

### Manager response map

#### FIRST ACTION

---

---

#### FACTS TO VERIFY

---

---

#### AUTHORITY / ESCALATION

---

---

#### GUEST-FACING RESPONSE

---

---

#### INTERNAL SYSTEM QUESTION

---

---

#### VERIFICATION EVIDENCE

---

---

## Scenario 19: The Employee Was Not Trained

A complaint reveals the employee was assigned a task they had never been trained or verified to perform.

### Manager response map

#### FIRST ACTION

---

---

#### FACTS TO VERIFY

---

---

#### AUTHORITY / ESCALATION

---

---

#### GUEST-FACING RESPONSE

---

---

#### INTERNAL SYSTEM QUESTION

---

---

#### VERIFICATION EVIDENCE

---

---

## Scenario 20: The Fix Worked—Once

A new handoff check works on Monday but fails during Saturday volume.

### Manager response map

#### FIRST ACTION

---

---

#### FACTS TO VERIFY

---

---

#### AUTHORITY / ESCALATION

---

#### GUEST-FACING RESPONSE

---

---

#### INTERNAL SYSTEM QUESTION

---

---

#### VERIFICATION EVIDENCE

---

## 30-Day Guest Complaint Recovery Improvement Plan

Use this plan when complaint handling is inconsistent, follow-up is unreliable, or the same guest-experience failure keeps returning. Measure before coaching so the team does not confuse a belief with a baseline.

| Measure                                 | Baseline | Day-30 target | Actual |
|-----------------------------------------|----------|---------------|--------|
| Material complaints per 100 guests      |          |               |        |
| Average time to manager acknowledgment  |          |               |        |
| First-contact resolution rate           |          |               |        |
| Follow-up completion rate               |          |               |        |
| Leading repeat complaint theme          |          |               |        |
| Verified return/response after recovery |          |               |        |

### Recommended control boundaries

- Document every material complaint using the approved process.
- Assign follow-up whenever the cause or guest commitment remains open.
- Reduce the leading repeated complaint category rather than chasing every small category at once.
- Do not improve a metric by reducing documentation quality or discouraging complaints.

## 30-Day Action Calendar — Days 1–10

| Day | Phase   | Required action                                                                                    |
|-----|---------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1   | Measure | Review 30 days of complaints, comps, reviews, and manager notes.                                   |
| 2   | Measure | Classify service, food, accuracy, speed, facility, policy/expectation, conduct, and safety issues. |
| 3   | Measure | Measure response time, closure, follow-up, and repeated themes.                                    |
| 4   | Measure | Map employee and manager recovery authority.                                                       |
| 5   | Measure | Choose the leading repeat cause for deeper review.                                                 |
| 6   | Define  | Share baseline findings with managers; do not coach from assumptions.                              |
| 7   | Define  | Approve definitions, target, case owner, and review cadence.                                       |
| 8   | Define  | Publish the recovery sequence and escalation triggers.                                             |
| 9   | Train   | Train listening, acknowledgment, options, authority, and verification.                             |
| 10  | Train   | Role-play common high-emotion situations.                                                          |

## 30-Day Action Calendar — Days 11–20

| Day | Phase   | Required action                                                        |
|-----|---------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 11  | Pilot   | Launch or confirm one controlled concern record and ownership process. |
| 12  | Pilot   | Pilot manager follow-up on material concerns.                          |
| 13  | Pilot   | Observe without rescuing every difficulty.                             |
| 14  | Pilot   | Revise the standard only when evidence supports the change.            |
| 15  | Pilot   | Confirm affected employees received the training.                      |
| 16  | Execute | Review every material complaint daily.                                 |
| 17  | Execute | Coach defensive language and delayed escalation.                       |
| 18  | Execute | Correct the selected repeat cause operationally.                       |
| 19  | Execute | Verify promised follow-up occurs.                                      |
| 20  | Execute | Compare resolution and recurrence with baseline.                       |

## 30-Day Action Calendar — Days 21–30

| Day | Phase       | Required action                                               |
|-----|-------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| 21  | Review      | Hold a ten-minute mid-plan review with assigned owners.       |
| 22  | Review      | Document exceptions, causes, and corrective actions.          |
| 23  | Review      | Recheck the highest-risk handoff.                             |
| 24  | Stress-Test | Audit authority use, documentation quality, and privacy.      |
| 25  | Stress-Test | Review online and direct feedback together.                   |
| 26  | Stress-Test | Complete final complaint-pattern analysis.                    |
| 27  | Stress-Test | Recognize recoveries that protected dignity and learning.     |
| 28  | Verify/Hold | Lock weekly complaint review and corrective-action ownership. |
| 29  | Verify/Hold | Obtain employee feedback on usability.                        |
| 30  | Verify/Hold | Assign the ongoing report owner and next review date.         |

### Day-30 verification

- Was the baseline measured consistently?
- Was the standard trained and observed?
- Did the primary measure improve without hiding complaints?
- Were safety, hospitality, fairness, and privacy protected?
- Decision: Standardize / Extend controlled test / Redesign / Stop.

# Controlled GRV-R Cross-Reference Directory

These are controlled operating records from the Gravity Guest Relationship & Retention System. Use the current approved version; do not rename or reuse the IDs for workbook practice pages.

| ID      | Tool                               | Frequency          | Operating purpose                                                    |
|---------|------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| GRV-R07 | Guest Feedback & Concern Record    | At occurrence      | Facts, guest impact, response, owner, status.                        |
| GRV-R08 | Service Recovery Decision Matrix   | Quarterly review   | Severity, impact, response levels, authority.                        |
| GRV-R09 | Guest Recovery Authorization Guide | Quarterly review   | Role limits for correction, replacement, discount, comp, escalation. |
| GRV-R10 | Recovery Action Record             | At occurrence      | Operational correction, compensation, coaching, system action.       |
| GRV-R11 | Recovery Follow-Up Tracker         | Daily until closed | Commitments, attempts, guest response, closure.                      |
| GRV-R12 | Repeat Concern Pattern Log         | Weekly             | Recurring themes, evidence, likely source, correction.               |
| GRV-R13 | Visit & Engagement Log             | At visit/contact   | Permissioned engagement and follow-up history.                       |

## Workbook rule

Practice pages in this book may mirror the thinking sequence, but permanent restaurant evidence belongs in the controlled record. This prevents competing versions, duplicated IDs, and “which form is current?” confusion.

## Controlled GRV-R Cross-Reference Directory — continued

| ID      | Tool                                     | Frequency   | Operating purpose                                               |
|---------|------------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| GRV-R16 | Guest Return Verification Log            | At return   | Evidence of return and next-experience result.                  |
| GRV-R23 | Review Request Log                       | As approved | Neutral review requests under current policy/platform rules.    |
| GRV-R24 | Online Review Response & Escalation Log  | Daily       | Response, severity, owner, offline recovery, system action.     |
| GRV-R28 | Weekly Guest Relationship Review         | Weekly      | Recovery, patterns, reviews, open actions, next priorities.     |
| GRV-R29 | Monthly Guest Retention Scorecard        | Monthly     | Guest growth, return, recovery, reviews, relationship measures. |
| GRV-R30 | Guest Relationship Corrective Action Log | Weekly      | Owner, due date, evidence, verification, closure.               |

### Workbook rule

Practice pages in this book may mirror the thinking sequence, but permanent restaurant evidence belongs in the controlled record. This prevents competing versions, duplicated IDs, and “which form is current?” confusion.

# Operational Glossary

**Acknowledgment** — A clear statement that the manager understands the guest's reported experience or impact without claiming an unverified cause.

**Authority Limit** — The maximum action a role may take without additional approval, including discounts, comps, refunds, credits, or other commitments.

**Case ID** — The restaurant's approved identifier that links a material concern, recovery, follow-up, and corrective action without requiring unnecessary personal information.

**Complaint Category** — A stable label used to group comparable concerns, such as service, speed, accuracy, food quality, facility, payment, policy/expectation, conduct, or safety.

**Corrective Action** — A defined change with an owner, due date, evidence, verification, and closure decision intended to correct a verified operating cause.

**Escalation** — Moving a concern to a role with the authority, expertise, safety responsibility, or risk ownership required for the next decision.

**First-Contact Resolution** — A material concern that is satisfactorily resolved during the initial interaction without an open guest commitment requiring later recovery work.

## Operational Glossary — continued

**Follow-Up** — A promised or required action after the immediate interaction, with a named owner and deadline.

**Guest Impact** — The practical effect of the failure on the guest, such as lost time, disrupted meal sequence, uncertainty, incorrect product, financial error, or safety concern.

**Material Complaint** — A concern significant enough under the restaurant's standard to require manager review, documentation, follow-up, escalation, or pattern tracking.

**Manager Verification** — Documented confirmation that the required action or standard was actually completed or observed in real operation.

**Operational Correction** — The immediate action that fixes the service condition, such as remaking an item, correcting an order, reseating, cleaning, restoring equipment, or clarifying timing.

**Pattern** — Multiple comparable cases whose timing, category, station, product, handoff, role, or other evidence suggests a repeatable cause worth testing.

**Preference** — A guest desire that differs from the restaurant's normal product or service but does not by itself prove the restaurant missed its standard.

## Operational Glossary — continued

**Proportionate Recovery** — A response reasonably matched to verified impact, meal stage, authority, and what the restaurant can actually repair.

**Recovery** — The combined work of hearing the concern, correcting what can be corrected, acting within authority, documenting material evidence, and completing follow-up.

**Repeat Concern Theme** — A complaint pattern that appears often enough to require system review rather than another isolated apology.

**Reported Fact** — Information provided by a guest, employee, or witness that is recorded as a report until independently verified when verification is relevant.

**Return Verification** — Evidence, when legitimately and appropriately tracked, that a recovered guest returned and what happened on the next experience.

**Severity Level** — A consistent classification of impact and risk used to guide escalation, authority, and documentation.

**Service Failure** — A verified miss against an approved restaurant standard or reasonable committed expectation.

## Operational Glossary — continued

**System Correction** — A change to a standard, training method, handoff, tool, staffing rule, authority boundary, maintenance response, or verification process that addresses a verified repeatable cause.

**Training Verification** — Internal confirmation that an employee or manager can perform the required standard in practice. It is not an external certification or professional credential.

**Truth → Cost → System** — Gravity's governing sequence: establish what is true, understand what the restaurant or people are paying for it, then create or repair the smallest useful repeatable system.

**Verification Evidence** — Observable proof that the corrective action worked, such as reobservation, reduced recurrence, completed follow-up, accurate record, or representative-shift result.

**Weekly Guest Experience Review** — The recurring management review of open cases, overdue follow-up, repeat themes, reviews, corrective actions, and next priorities.

# Final Manager Readiness Assessment

This is an internal readiness review. It does not create an outside certification or professional credential. The purpose is to determine whether the manager can use the restaurant's approved guest-recovery system safely, fairly, and consistently.

| Readiness area                        | Not ready                | Developing               | Ready                    |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Listening and neutral fact gathering  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Complaint classification and severity | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Recovery authority and escalation     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Proportionate recovery judgment       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Safety/high-risk routing              | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Documentation quality                 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Follow-up ownership and closure       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Pattern analysis                      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Coaching and system correction        | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Weekly management review              | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

## REVIEWER EVIDENCE / COMMENTS

---



---



---



---

# Readiness Scenario Review

Reviewer: choose three scenarios from the Manager Judgment Lab. The manager should explain the first action, authority, evidence, escalation, guest communication, controlled record, and verification step without relying on a script.

## Scenario 1

SCENARIO NUMBER / TITLE

---

WHAT THE MANAGER DID WELL

---



---

WHAT REQUIRES COACHING OR RETRAINING

---



---

Result: ☐ Not Ready ☐ Retrain / Reobserve ☐ Ready for Current Assigned Authority

## Scenario 2

SCENARIO NUMBER / TITLE

---

WHAT THE MANAGER DID WELL

---



---

WHAT REQUIRES COACHING OR RETRAINING

---



---

Result: ☐ Not Ready ☐ Retrain / Reobserve ☐ Ready for Current Assigned Authority

## Scenario 3

SCENARIO NUMBER / TITLE

---

WHAT THE MANAGER DID WELL

---



---

WHAT REQUIRES COACHING OR RETRAINING

---



---

Result: ☐ Not Ready ☐ Retrain / Reobserve ☐ Ready for Current Assigned Authority

# Practical Shift Verification

Observe the manager on a representative shift or controlled role-play. Do not mark ready from discussion alone when the role requires real-time recovery judgment.

| Observed behavior                         | Evidence / notes |
|-------------------------------------------|------------------|
| Listens without defensiveness             |                  |
| Clarifies guest impact                    |                  |
| Verifies useful facts                     |                  |
| Uses correct authority                    |                  |
| Escalates high-risk issues promptly       |                  |
| Communicates realistic next steps         |                  |
| Documents material case correctly         |                  |
| Assigns and completes follow-up           |                  |
| Separates coaching from blame             |                  |
| Identifies system question after recovery |                  |

## REQUIRED FOLLOW-UP BEFORE READINESS DECISION

---



---

# Manager Readiness Verification Record

MANAGER NAME

---

ROLE / AUTHORITY LEVEL ASSESSED

---

REVIEWER

---

ASSESSMENT DATE

---

## Final internal readiness result

- ☐ NOT READY — additional instruction required before using this authority independently.
- ☐ RETRAIN / REOBSERVE — specific gap identified; manager must demonstrate the standard again.
- ☐ READY FOR CURRENT ASSIGNED AUTHORITY — manager demonstrated the required judgment and controls for the authority being assessed.

EVIDENCE SUPPORTING DECISION

---



---



---

NEXT REVIEW DATE / TRIGGER

---

Manager signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

# Closing Standard

## THE GRAVITY RECOVERY STANDARD

Protect the guest. Protect the team from guesswork. Face the operating truth. Own the promised follow-up. Correct the verified cause. Then return to the floor and verify that the restaurant is actually better.

A restaurant eventually pays for every truth its leaders do not face. Guest complaints are one of the clearest places that truth arrives. The goal is not to eliminate every complaint. The goal is to build leadership strong enough to hear the signal, recover with judgment, and prevent the same avoidable failure from becoming normal.

**THOMAS BUTLER**

Thomas Monroe Books • The Gravity Restaurant Leadership System