

Hiring, Interviewing & Employee Retention Tracker

A Practical Restaurant Manager's Workbook for Hiring People Who Care and Keeping
the Right Employees

COMPLETE PRACTICAL WORKBOOK

THOMAS BUTLER

Thomas Monroe Books

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 forms reproduced for internal use by the purchasing or authorized restaurant operation.

Important This workbook is educational management guidance, not legal, tax, medical, safety, or human-resources advice. Federal guidance is only a baseline. State, local, industry, union, contract, licensing, and company requirements may add or change obligations. Route uncertain or high-risk decisions to authorized HR counsel or qualified legal review.

Do not use this workbook as a personality test, diagnostic instrument, automated selection system, or substitute for individual review. Do not ask AI to make final decisions about hiring, discipline, pay, scheduling, accommodation, investigation, or termination. A manager remains responsible for job-related evidence, consistent process, policy, lawful review, and humane treatment.

Care in this workbook means observable responsibility toward guests, coworkers, cleanliness, safety, honesty, learning, and team impact. It does not mean familiarity, charisma, appearance, similarity to the interviewer, or a vague idea of “culture fit.”

How to Use This Workbook

This workbook builds manager judgment and guided practice. It does not replace the controlled GRV-HR system. Use the linked GRV-HR form named in each tool section for an official operating record. A manager or owner must make final hiring, discipline, pay, scheduling, accommodation, and termination decisions; AI may support preparation, never make those decisions.

- Start with a verified workforce need—not an empty slot alone.
- Use the same core questions and job-related criteria for comparable candidates.
- Write evidence before discussing preference.
- Make the job preview honest enough that a candidate can decline intelligently.
- Treat the first 90 days as part of hiring, not as somebody else's problem.
- Escalate accommodation, background, discrimination, retaliation, discipline, and separation questions through authorized channels.

The working cycle

Stage	Manager output	Control
Need	Verified role, coverage, budget, authority	GRV-HR01 / GRV-C
Standard	Position success profile and criteria	GRV-HR02
Evidence	Comparable interview notes and score	GRV-HR06 and approved scorecard
Decision	Reasoned approval and honest offer	GRV-HR controlled record
Start	Prepared first shift and training handoff	GRV-HR / GRV-T
Stay	Check-ins, coaching, concerns, pattern review	GRV-HR / GRV-M / GRV-IV

Contents

Part I: Face the Hiring Truth 2

- Chapter 1 The Cost of Desperation Hiring 3
- Chapter 2 Hire Care First 7
- Chapter 3 Experience Is Evidence but Not the Whole Answer 11
- Chapter 4 Stop Hiring from Memory 15

Part II: Build the Hiring Standard 19

- Chapter 5 Confirm the Real Staffing Need 20
- Chapter 6 Define the Real Job 24
- Chapter 7 Set Fair Selection Criteria 28
- Chapter 8 Tell the Truth in the Job Posting 32
- Chapter 9 Review Applications Consistently 36

Part III: Interview for Evidence 40

- Chapter 10 Prepare the Interview 41
- Chapter 11 Open with Respect and Clarity 45
- Chapter 12 Questions That Reveal Care 49
- Chapter 13 Questions That Reveal Reliability 53
- Chapter 14 Questions That Reveal Coachability 57
- Chapter 15 Questions That Reveal Honesty and Judgment 61
- Chapter 16 Give a Realistic Job Preview 65
- Chapter 17 Stay Inside Lawful and Ethical Boundaries 69
- Chapter 18 Check References and Background Information Carefully 73

Part IV: Make and Document the Decision 77

- Chapter 19 Score Evidence Before Discussing Preference 78
- Chapter 20 Use a Second Look When Evidence Is Thin 82
- Chapter 21 Remove Favoritism from the Decision 86
- Chapter 22 Make the Offer Honestly 90
- Chapter 23 Document the Hiring Decision 94

Part V: Protect the First 90 Days 98

- Chapter 24 Protect the Time Before Day One 99
- Chapter 25 Make the First Shift Match the Promise 103
- Chapter 26 Use 7 Day 14 Day 30 Day 60 Day and 90 Day Check Ins 107
- Chapter 27 Separate Fit Problems from Training Problems 111
- Chapter 28 Coach Early and Fairly 115

Part VI: Keep the Right Employees 119

- Chapter 29 Why Good Employees Stay 120
- Chapter 30 Use Stay Conversations Before Exit Interviews 124
- Chapter 31 Handle Concerns without Gossip or Retaliation 128

Part VII: Coach Problems and Learn from Loss 132

Chapter 32 Separate Coaching Corrective Action and Separation 133

Chapter 33 Learn from Every Departure 137

Chapter 34 Measure Turnover without Hiding the Story 141

Part VIII: Install and Hold the System 145

Chapter 35 Review Hiring and Retention Every Week 146

Chapter 36 Install the System in 30 or 60 Days 150

Introduction: Hiring Is an Operating Decision

A vacancy is loud. The costs created by a weak decision are quieter: a trainer pulled from position, overtime, missed cleaning, guest recovery, schedule swaps, manager attention, and the next resignation. Pressure explains why shortcuts happen. It does not make them safe.

This workbook replaces the loose sequence—post, talk, guess, hope—with a visible management cycle. The restaurant defines the need, tells the truth about the work, gathers comparable evidence, records the decision, supports the start, listens early, and learns from patterns. The signature principle is simple: Hire care first. Train skill second. The practice is more demanding: managers must translate care into job-related behavior and refuse to confuse it with charm.

Experience matters when it shows usable knowledge, safe habits, sound judgment, or faster learning. It is not a waiver from standards. A less experienced candidate may offer stronger evidence of preparation, responsibility, honest learning, and response to feedback. The decision is not “experience or care.” It is whether the evidence supports success in the real role and whether trainable gaps can be closed responsibly.

Promise Use this workbook to make hiring more structured, interviews more comparable, first-90-day support more deliberate, and retention decisions more honest. No system eliminates uncertainty; a good system makes the reasoning visible and correctable.

Part I

Face the Hiring Truth

Move the reader from vacancy panic and informal judgment to evidence, role clarity, and accountable ownership.

Part standard Replace urgency and instinct with a defined decision standard.

Chapter 1

The Cost of Desperation Hiring

Show how vacancy pressure shifts cost into training, service, morale, overtime, safety, and repeated turnover.

The manager's question What does a fast but weak hire really cost?

Why this chapter matters

In restaurant operations, pressure and judgment becomes unreliable when the decision lives only in memory or urgency. Replace urgency and instinct with a defined decision standard. The objective here is not extra paperwork; it is a decision another authorized leader can understand, test, and improve.

The practical test is whether the manager can explain what was known, what was missing, which job standard applied, who had authority, and what would verify the next step. For “The Cost of Desperation Hiring,” the written record should make those five points visible without exaggeration or labels.

Care-first lens

Notice whether urgency is driving the standard down. Protect the schedule by defining the gap before naming a person.

Manager warning

Do not let one uncovered shift become permission to hire someone the role evidence does not support.

Chapter 1 Field Guide 3

Use this sequence

Step	Working instruction
1. Name the decision	What does a fast but weak hire really cost?
2. Separate facts	List direct observations, records, and candidate or employee statements. Do not mix inference into the fact column.
3. Apply the standard	Show how vacancy pressure shifts cost into training, service, morale, overtime, safety, and repeated turnover.
4. Identify missing evidence	Ask only job-related follow-up questions or use an approved verification step.
5. Choose the next step	Record the owner, authority, due date, communication, and verification method.
6. Review the result	Decide whether the process worked, needs correction, or requires escalation.

Evidence quality

Strong evidence	Weak substitute
Specific behavior, setting, action, result, and learning	A label such as “hard worker” or “bad attitude”
Comparable job-related response or approved work sample	Confidence, charm, familiarity, or personal similarity
Record that can be checked and put in context	Rumor, social-media assumption, or unexplained gap
Acknowledged miss plus concrete correction	Perfect-sounding answer with no detail

Applied Scenario: The Friday Night Vacancy

A manager wants to hire the first available applicant without a role-success profile.

Your decision

WHAT FACTS ARE PRESENT?

WHAT ARE YOU ASSUMING?

WHICH JOB-RELATED STANDARD APPLIES?

WHAT EVIDENCE IS MISSING?

WHAT IS THE FAIREST AUTHORIZED NEXT STEP?

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

Answer guidance A defensible response slows the decision long enough to apply the written standard from Chapter 1. It distinguishes evidence from preference, asks only relevant follow-up questions, documents the reasoning, and escalates anything outside the manager's authority. A weak response fills gaps with confidence, urgency, reputation, or punishment.

Chapter 1 Action Record 3

Complete this page for one real decision involving “The Cost of Desperation Hiring.” Use initials or an approved case identifier when privacy requires it.

Field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role or case ID	
Decision owner	
Date opened	
Required decision date	
Applicable policy / tool	
Authorized reviewer	

DECISION TO MAKE

VERIFIED FACTS

MISSING EVIDENCE AND APPROVED WAY TO OBTAIN IT

STANDARD APPLIED

NEXT ACTION, OWNER, DEADLINE, AND VERIFICATION

WHAT THIS CASE TEACHES THE SYSTEM

Manager sign-off: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Chapter 2

Hire Care First

Define care as observable job-related behavior and establish the book's signature principle.

The manager's question What does "care" mean in a fair hiring process?

Why this chapter matters

In restaurant operations, pressure and judgment becomes unreliable when the decision lives only in memory or urgency. Replace urgency and instinct with a defined decision standard. The objective here is not extra paperwork; it is a decision another authorized leader can understand, test, and improve.

The practical test is whether the manager can explain what was known, what was missing, which job standard applied, who had authority, and what would verify the next step. For "Hire Care First," the written record should make those five points visible without exaggeration or labels.

Care-first lens

Look for a pattern of taking responsibility for guests, coworkers, standards, and mistakes.

Manager warning

Do not confuse warmth, charm, or familiarity with dependable care.

Chapter 2 Field Guide 7

Use this sequence

Step	Working instruction
1. Name the decision	What does “care” mean in a fair hiring process?
2. Separate facts	List direct observations, records, and candidate or employee statements. Do not mix inference into the fact column.
3. Apply the standard	Define care as observable job-related behavior and establish the book’s signature principle.
4. Identify missing evidence	Ask only job-related follow-up questions or use an approved verification step.
5. Choose the next step	Record the owner, authority, due date, communication, and verification method.
6. Review the result	Decide whether the process worked, needs correction, or requires escalation.

Evidence quality

Strong evidence	Weak substitute
Specific behavior, setting, action, result, and learning	A label such as “hard worker” or “bad attitude”
Comparable job-related response or approved work sample	Confidence, charm, familiarity, or personal similarity
Record that can be checked and put in context	Rumor, social-media assumption, or unexplained gap
Acknowledged miss plus concrete correction	Perfect-sounding answer with no detail

Applied Scenario: The Experienced Candidate

Strong experience is paired with blame, disrespect, or resistance to standards.

Your decision

WHAT FACTS ARE PRESENT?

WHAT ARE YOU ASSUMING?

WHICH JOB-RELATED STANDARD APPLIES?

WHAT EVIDENCE IS MISSING?

WHAT IS THE FAIREST AUTHORIZED NEXT STEP?

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

Answer guidance A defensible response slows the decision long enough to apply the written standard from Chapter 2. It distinguishes evidence from preference, asks only relevant follow-up questions, documents the reasoning, and escalates anything outside the manager's authority. A weak response fills gaps with confidence, urgency, reputation, or punishment.

Chapter 2 Action Record 7

Complete this page for one real decision involving “Hire Care First.” Use initials or an approved case identifier when privacy requires it.

Field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role or case ID	
Decision owner	
Date opened	
Required decision date	
Applicable policy / tool	
Authorized reviewer	

DECISION TO MAKE

VERIFIED FACTS

MISSING EVIDENCE AND APPROVED WAY TO OBTAIN IT

STANDARD APPLIED

NEXT ACTION, OWNER, DEADLINE, AND VERIFICATION

WHAT THIS CASE TEACHES THE SYSTEM

Manager sign-off: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Chapter 3

Experience Is Evidence but Not the Whole Answer

Separate useful experience from reliability, learning, standards, and team impact.

The manager's question When should experience matter, and when does it mislead?

Why this chapter matters

In restaurant operations, pressure and judgment becomes unreliable when the decision lives only in memory or urgency. Replace urgency and instinct with a defined decision standard. The objective here is not extra paperwork; it is a decision another authorized leader can understand, test, and improve.

The practical test is whether the manager can explain what was known, what was missing, which job standard applied, who had authority, and what would verify the next step. For “Experience Is Evidence but Not the Whole Answer,” the written record should make those five points visible without exaggeration or labels.

Care-first lens

Use past work to ask better follow-up questions about actions, results, and learning.

Manager warning

Do not treat a recognizable employer or years served as proof of present capability.

Chapter 3 Field Guide 11

Use this sequence

Step	Working instruction
1. Name the decision	When should experience matter, and when does it mislead?
2. Separate facts	List direct observations, records, and candidate or employee statements. Do not mix inference into the fact column.
3. Apply the standard	Separate useful experience from reliability, learning, standards, and team impact.
4. Identify missing evidence	Ask only job-related follow-up questions or use an approved verification step.
5. Choose the next step	Record the owner, authority, due date, communication, and verification method.
6. Review the result	Decide whether the process worked, needs correction, or requires escalation.

Evidence quality

Strong evidence	Weak substitute
Specific behavior, setting, action, result, and learning	A label such as “hard worker” or “bad attitude”
Comparable job-related response or approved work sample	Confidence, charm, familiarity, or personal similarity
Record that can be checked and put in context	Rumor, social-media assumption, or unexplained gap
Acknowledged miss plus concrete correction	Perfect-sounding answer with no detail

Applied Scenario: The Quiet Candidate

A reserved candidate provides strong evidence but does not perform socially like the manager expects.

Your decision

WHAT FACTS ARE PRESENT?

WHAT ARE YOU ASSUMING?

WHICH JOB-RELATED STANDARD APPLIES?

WHAT EVIDENCE IS MISSING?

WHAT IS THE FAIREST AUTHORIZED NEXT STEP?

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

Answer guidance A defensible response slows the decision long enough to apply the written standard from Chapter 3. It distinguishes evidence from preference, asks only relevant follow-up questions, documents the reasoning, and escalates anything outside the manager's authority. A weak response fills gaps with confidence, urgency, reputation, or punishment.

Chapter 3 Action Record 11

Complete this page for one real decision involving "Experience Is Evidence but Not the Whole Answer." Use initials or an approved case identifier when privacy requires it.

Field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role or case ID	
Decision owner	
Date opened	
Required decision date	
Applicable policy / tool	
Authorized reviewer	

DECISION TO MAKE

VERIFIED FACTS

MISSING EVIDENCE AND APPROVED WAY TO OBTAIN IT

STANDARD APPLIED

NEXT ACTION, OWNER, DEADLINE, AND VERIFICATION

WHAT THIS CASE TEACHES THE SYSTEM

Manager sign-off: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Chapter 4

Stop Hiring from Memory

Establish structure, ownership, records, comparable questions, and decision accountability.

The manager's question Why do informal interviews produce inconsistent decisions?

Why this chapter matters

In restaurant operations, pressure and judgment becomes unreliable when the decision lives only in memory or urgency. Replace urgency and instinct with a defined decision standard. The objective here is not extra paperwork; it is a decision another authorized leader can understand, test, and improve.

The practical test is whether the manager can explain what was known, what was missing, which job standard applied, who had authority, and what would verify the next step. For “Stop Hiring from Memory,” the written record should make those five points visible without exaggeration or labels.

Care-first lens

Write down the job standard and the evidence before discussing an applicant.

Manager warning

Do not allow the loudest recollection to replace a comparable record.

Chapter 4 Field Guide 15

Use this sequence

Step	Working instruction
1. Name the decision	Why do informal interviews produce inconsistent decisions?
2. Separate facts	List direct observations, records, and candidate or employee statements. Do not mix inference into the fact column.
3. Apply the standard	Establish structure, ownership, records, comparable questions, and decision accountability.
4. Identify missing evidence	Ask only job-related follow-up questions or use an approved verification step.
5. Choose the next step	Record the owner, authority, due date, communication, and verification method.
6. Review the result	Decide whether the process worked, needs correction, or requires escalation.

Evidence quality

Strong evidence	Weak substitute
Specific behavior, setting, action, result, and learning	A label such as “hard worker” or “bad attitude”
Comparable job-related response or approved work sample	Confidence, charm, familiarity, or personal similarity
Record that can be checked and put in context	Rumor, social-media assumption, or unexplained gap
Acknowledged miss plus concrete correction	Perfect-sounding answer with no detail

Applied Scenario: The Employee Referral

A respected employee recommends a friend and the manager wants to skip the normal process.

Your decision

WHAT FACTS ARE PRESENT?

WHAT ARE YOU ASSUMING?

WHICH JOB-RELATED STANDARD APPLIES?

WHAT EVIDENCE IS MISSING?

WHAT IS THE FAIREST AUTHORIZED NEXT STEP?

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

Answer guidance A defensible response slows the decision long enough to apply the written standard from Chapter 4. It distinguishes evidence from preference, asks only relevant follow-up questions, documents the reasoning, and escalates anything outside the manager's authority. A weak response fills gaps with confidence, urgency, reputation, or punishment.

Chapter 4 Action Record 15

Complete this page for one real decision involving "Stop Hiring from Memory." Use initials or an approved case identifier when privacy requires it.

Field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role or case ID	
Decision owner	
Date opened	
Required decision date	
Applicable policy / tool	
Authorized reviewer	

DECISION TO MAKE

VERIFIED FACTS

MISSING EVIDENCE AND APPROVED WAY TO OBTAIN IT

STANDARD APPLIED

NEXT ACTION, OWNER, DEADLINE, AND VERIFICATION

WHAT THIS CASE TEACHES THE SYSTEM

Manager sign-off: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Part II

Build the Hiring Standard

Define the need, the role, the success evidence, the process, and the boundaries before recruiting.

Part standard Write the job-related standard before evaluating a person.

Chapter 5

Confirm the Real Staffing Need

Require evidence of volume, coverage, skill mix, availability, turnover, and budget before opening a position.

The manager's question Do we need another person, different coverage, or better deployment?

Why this chapter matters

In restaurant operations, role and process design becomes unreliable when the decision lives only in memory or urgency. Write the job-related standard before evaluating a person. The objective here is not extra paperwork; it is a decision another authorized leader can understand, test, and improve.

The practical test is whether the manager can explain what was known, what was missing, which job standard applied, who had authority, and what would verify the next step. For "Confirm the Real Staffing Need," the written record should make those five points visible without exaggeration or labels.

Care-first lens

Test whether the need is a true headcount gap, a coverage problem, or a training and deployment problem.

Manager warning

Do not open a requisition before the schedule and workload explain why it is needed.

Chapter 5 Field Guide 20

Use this sequence

Step	Working instruction
1. Name the decision	Do we need another person, different coverage, or better deployment?
2. Separate facts	List direct observations, records, and candidate or employee statements. Do not mix inference into the fact column.
3. Apply the standard	Require evidence of volume, coverage, skill mix, availability, turnover, and budget before opening a position.
4. Identify missing evidence	Ask only job-related follow-up questions or use an approved verification step.
5. Choose the next step	Record the owner, authority, due date, communication, and verification method.
6. Review the result	Decide whether the process worked, needs correction, or requires escalation.

Evidence quality

Strong evidence	Weak substitute
Specific behavior, setting, action, result, and learning	A label such as "hard worker" or "bad attitude"
Comparable job-related response or approved work sample	Confidence, charm, familiarity, or personal similarity
Record that can be checked and put in context	Rumor, social-media assumption, or unexplained gap
Acknowledged miss plus concrete correction	Perfect-sounding answer with no detail

Applied Scenario: The Schedule Mismatch

The candidate is capable, but the available hours do not match the restaurant's verified need.

Your decision

WHAT FACTS ARE PRESENT?

WHAT ARE YOU ASSUMING?

WHICH JOB-RELATED STANDARD APPLIES?

WHAT EVIDENCE IS MISSING?

WHAT IS THE FAIREST AUTHORIZED NEXT STEP?

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

Answer guidance A defensible response slows the decision long enough to apply the written standard from Chapter 5. It distinguishes evidence from preference, asks only relevant follow-up questions, documents the reasoning, and escalates anything outside the manager's authority. A weak response fills gaps with confidence, urgency, reputation, or punishment.

Chapter 5 Action Record 20

Complete this page for one real decision involving "Confirm the Real Staffing Need." Use initials or an approved case identifier when privacy requires it.

Field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role or case ID	
Decision owner	
Date opened	
Required decision date	
Applicable policy / tool	
Authorized reviewer	

DECISION TO MAKE

VERIFIED FACTS

MISSING EVIDENCE AND APPROVED WAY TO OBTAIN IT

STANDARD APPLIED

NEXT ACTION, OWNER, DEADLINE, AND VERIFICATION

WHAT THIS CASE TEACHES THE SYSTEM

Manager sign-off: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Chapter 6

Define the Real Job

Build a position success profile from actual duties, conditions, schedule, physical demands, standards, and training reality.

The manager's question What must the person actually be able and willing to do?

Why this chapter matters

In restaurant operations, role and process design becomes unreliable when the decision lives only in memory or urgency. Write the job-related standard before evaluating a person. The objective here is not extra paperwork; it is a decision another authorized leader can understand, test, and improve.

The practical test is whether the manager can explain what was known, what was missing, which job standard applied, who had authority, and what would verify the next step. For "Define the Real Job," the written record should make those five points visible without exaggeration or labels.

Care-first lens

Name the actual conditions, key tasks, pace, and standards of the job as it is worked.

Manager warning

Do not sell a simplified role and then judge a new employee against hidden expectations.

Chapter 6 Field Guide 24

Use this sequence

Step	Working instruction
1. Name the decision	What must the person actually be able and willing to do?
2. Separate facts	List direct observations, records, and candidate or employee statements. Do not mix inference into the fact column.
3. Apply the standard	Build a position success profile from actual duties, conditions, schedule, physical demands, standards, and training reality.
4. Identify missing evidence	Ask only job-related follow-up questions or use an approved verification step.
5. Choose the next step	Record the owner, authority, due date, communication, and verification method.
6. Review the result	Decide whether the process worked, needs correction, or requires escalation.

Evidence quality

Strong evidence	Weak substitute
Specific behavior, setting, action, result, and learning	A label such as "hard worker" or "bad attitude"
Comparable job-related response or approved work sample	Confidence, charm, familiarity, or personal similarity
Record that can be checked and put in context	Rumor, social-media assumption, or unexplained gap
Acknowledged miss plus concrete correction	Perfect-sounding answer with no detail

Applied Scenario: The Perfect Interview

Answers sound polished but contain few concrete examples or verifiable detail.

Your decision

WHAT FACTS ARE PRESENT?

WHAT ARE YOU ASSUMING?

WHICH JOB-RELATED STANDARD APPLIES?

WHAT EVIDENCE IS MISSING?

WHAT IS THE FAIREST AUTHORIZED NEXT STEP?

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

Answer guidance A defensible response slows the decision long enough to apply the written standard from Chapter 6. It distinguishes evidence from preference, asks only relevant follow-up questions, documents the reasoning, and escalates anything outside the manager's authority. A weak response fills gaps with confidence, urgency, reputation, or punishment.

Chapter 6 Action Record 24

Complete this page for one real decision involving "Define the Real Job." Use initials or an approved case identifier when privacy requires it.

Field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role or case ID	
Decision owner	
Date opened	
Required decision date	
Applicable policy / tool	
Authorized reviewer	

DECISION TO MAKE

VERIFIED FACTS

MISSING EVIDENCE AND APPROVED WAY TO OBTAIN IT

STANDARD APPLIED

NEXT ACTION, OWNER, DEADLINE, AND VERIFICATION

WHAT THIS CASE TEACHES THE SYSTEM

Manager sign-off: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Chapter 7

Set Fair Selection Criteria

Separate required, preferred, trainable, and irrelevant criteria.

The manager's question Which standards are necessary and consistently defensible?

Why this chapter matters

In restaurant operations, role and process design becomes unreliable when the decision lives only in memory or urgency. Write the job-related standard before evaluating a person. The objective here is not extra paperwork; it is a decision another authorized leader can understand, test, and improve.

The practical test is whether the manager can explain what was known, what was missing, which job standard applied, who had authority, and what would verify the next step. For "Set Fair Selection Criteria," the written record should make those five points visible without exaggeration or labels.

Care-first lens

Choose observable job-related criteria before reviewing candidates.

Manager warning

Do not add or change criteria after a preferred candidate appears.

Chapter 7 Field Guide 28

Use this sequence

Step	Working instruction
1. Name the decision	Which standards are necessary and consistently defensible?
2. Separate facts	List direct observations, records, and candidate or employee statements. Do not mix inference into the fact column.
3. Apply the standard	Separate required, preferred, trainable, and irrelevant criteria.
4. Identify missing evidence	Ask only job-related follow-up questions or use an approved verification step.
5. Choose the next step	Record the owner, authority, due date, communication, and verification method.
6. Review the result	Decide whether the process worked, needs correction, or requires escalation.

Evidence quality

Strong evidence	Weak substitute
Specific behavior, setting, action, result, and learning	A label such as "hard worker" or "bad attitude"
Comparable job-related response or approved work sample	Confidence, charm, familiarity, or personal similarity
Record that can be checked and put in context	Rumor, social-media assumption, or unexplained gap
Acknowledged miss plus concrete correction	Perfect-sounding answer with no detail

Applied Scenario: The Second Chance

A candidate owns a prior failure and explains specific correction and learning.

Your decision

WHAT FACTS ARE PRESENT?

WHAT ARE YOU ASSUMING?

WHICH JOB-RELATED STANDARD APPLIES?

WHAT EVIDENCE IS MISSING?

WHAT IS THE FAIREST AUTHORIZED NEXT STEP?

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

Answer guidance A defensible response slows the decision long enough to apply the written standard from Chapter 7. It distinguishes evidence from preference, asks only relevant follow-up questions, documents the reasoning, and escalates anything outside the manager's authority. A weak response fills gaps with confidence, urgency, reputation, or punishment.

Chapter 7 Action Record 28

Complete this page for one real decision involving "Set Fair Selection Criteria." Use initials or an approved case identifier when privacy requires it.

Field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role or case ID	
Decision owner	
Date opened	
Required decision date	
Applicable policy / tool	
Authorized reviewer	

DECISION TO MAKE

VERIFIED FACTS

MISSING EVIDENCE AND APPROVED WAY TO OBTAIN IT

STANDARD APPLIED

NEXT ACTION, OWNER, DEADLINE, AND VERIFICATION

WHAT THIS CASE TEACHES THE SYSTEM

Manager sign-off: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Chapter 8

Tell the Truth in the Job Posting

Write a realistic invitation that does not hide workload, schedule, expectations, pay process, or working conditions.

The manager's question How do we attract the right applicants without overselling the job?

Why this chapter matters

In restaurant operations, role and process design becomes unreliable when the decision lives only in memory or urgency. Write the job-related standard before evaluating a person. The objective here is not extra paperwork; it is a decision another authorized leader can understand, test, and improve.

The practical test is whether the manager can explain what was known, what was missing, which job standard applied, who had authority, and what would verify the next step. For “Tell the Truth in the Job Posting,” the written record should make those five points visible without exaggeration or labels.

Care-first lens

Describe the schedule, physical requirements, pay process, and working conditions honestly.

Manager warning

Do not use vague promises to solve a recruiting shortage.

Chapter 8 Field Guide 32

Use this sequence

Step	Working instruction
1. Name the decision	How do we attract the right applicants without overselling the job?
2. Separate facts	List direct observations, records, and candidate or employee statements. Do not mix inference into the fact column.
3. Apply the standard	Write a realistic invitation that does not hide workload, schedule, expectations, pay process, or working conditions.
4. Identify missing evidence	Ask only job-related follow-up questions or use an approved verification step.
5. Choose the next step	Record the owner, authority, due date, communication, and verification method.
6. Review the result	Decide whether the process worked, needs correction, or requires escalation.

Evidence quality

Strong evidence	Weak substitute
Specific behavior, setting, action, result, and learning	A label such as “hard worker” or “bad attitude”
Comparable job-related response or approved work sample	Confidence, charm, familiarity, or personal similarity
Record that can be checked and put in context	Rumor, social-media assumption, or unexplained gap
Acknowledged miss plus concrete correction	Perfect-sounding answer with no detail

Applied Scenario: The Background Concern

Information appears that may be inaccurate, irrelevant, outdated, or legally restricted.

Your decision

WHAT FACTS ARE PRESENT?

WHAT ARE YOU ASSUMING?

WHICH JOB-RELATED STANDARD APPLIES?

WHAT EVIDENCE IS MISSING?

WHAT IS THE FAIREST AUTHORIZED NEXT STEP?

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

Answer guidance A defensible response slows the decision long enough to apply the written standard from Chapter 8. It distinguishes evidence from preference, asks only relevant follow-up questions, documents the reasoning, and escalates anything outside the manager's authority. A weak response fills gaps with confidence, urgency, reputation, or punishment.

Chapter 8 Action Record 32

Complete this page for one real decision involving "Tell the Truth in the Job Posting." Use initials or an approved case identifier when privacy requires it.

Field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role or case ID	
Decision owner	
Date opened	
Required decision date	
Applicable policy / tool	
Authorized reviewer	

DECISION TO MAKE

VERIFIED FACTS

MISSING EVIDENCE AND APPROVED WAY TO OBTAIN IT

STANDARD APPLIED

NEXT ACTION, OWNER, DEADLINE, AND VERIFICATION

WHAT THIS CASE TEACHES THE SYSTEM

Manager sign-off: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Chapter 9

Review Applications Consistently

Use the same job-related screening standard and document unresolved questions.

The manager's question How do we decide who receives an interview?

Why this chapter matters

In restaurant operations, role and process design becomes unreliable when the decision lives only in memory or urgency. Write the job-related standard before evaluating a person. The objective here is not extra paperwork; it is a decision another authorized leader can understand, test, and improve.

The practical test is whether the manager can explain what was known, what was missing, which job standard applied, who had authority, and what would verify the next step. For “Review Applications Consistently,” the written record should make those five points visible without exaggeration or labels.

Care-first lens

Use the same initial review standard for every applicant to the same role.

Manager warning

Do not advance or reject someone on a name, photo, gap, or hunch without job-related evidence.

Chapter 9 Field Guide 36

Use this sequence

Step	Working instruction
1. Name the decision	How do we decide who receives an interview?
2. Separate facts	List direct observations, records, and candidate or employee statements. Do not mix inference into the fact column.
3. Apply the standard	Use the same job-related screening standard and document unresolved questions.
4. Identify missing evidence	Ask only job-related follow-up questions or use an approved verification step.
5. Choose the next step	Record the owner, authority, due date, communication, and verification method.
6. Review the result	Decide whether the process worked, needs correction, or requires escalation.

Evidence quality

Strong evidence	Weak substitute
Specific behavior, setting, action, result, and learning	A label such as “hard worker” or “bad attitude”
Comparable job-related response or approved work sample	Confidence, charm, familiarity, or personal similarity
Record that can be checked and put in context	Rumor, social-media assumption, or unexplained gap
Acknowledged miss plus concrete correction	Perfect-sounding answer with no detail

Applied Scenario: The First Week Silence

A new hire says everything is fine while training records show missed practice and unclear expectations.

Your decision

WHAT FACTS ARE PRESENT?

WHAT ARE YOU ASSUMING?

WHICH JOB-RELATED STANDARD APPLIES?

WHAT EVIDENCE IS MISSING?

WHAT IS THE FAIREST AUTHORIZED NEXT STEP?

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

Answer guidance A defensible response slows the decision long enough to apply the written standard from Chapter 9. It distinguishes evidence from preference, asks only relevant follow-up questions, documents the reasoning, and escalates anything outside the manager's authority. A weak response fills gaps with confidence, urgency, reputation, or punishment.

Chapter 9 Action Record 36

Complete this page for one real decision involving "Review Applications Consistently." Use initials or an approved case identifier when privacy requires it.

Field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role or case ID	
Decision owner	
Date opened	
Required decision date	
Applicable policy / tool	
Authorized reviewer	

DECISION TO MAKE

VERIFIED FACTS

MISSING EVIDENCE AND APPROVED WAY TO OBTAIN IT

STANDARD APPLIED

NEXT ACTION, OWNER, DEADLINE, AND VERIFICATION

WHAT THIS CASE TEACHES THE SYSTEM

Manager sign-off: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Part III

Interview for Evidence

Teach one structured, respectful interview process that looks for job-related evidence of care, reliability, coachability, honesty, and judgment.

Part standard Ask comparable questions, probe for facts, and record evidence without diagnosing personality.

Chapter 10

Prepare the Interview

Set the interviewer, questions, scoring anchors, time, privacy, accommodations route, and evidence standard.

The manager's question What must be ready before the candidate arrives?

Why this chapter matters

In restaurant operations, interview evidence becomes unreliable when the decision lives only in memory or urgency. Ask comparable questions, probe for facts, and record evidence without diagnosing personality. The objective here is not extra paperwork; it is a decision another authorized leader can understand, test, and improve.

The practical test is whether the manager can explain what was known, what was missing, which job standard applied, who had authority, and what would verify the next step. For "Prepare the Interview," the written record should make those five points visible without exaggeration or labels.

Care-first lens

Prepare role-specific questions, an evidence sheet, and a realistic interview order.

Manager warning

Do not improvise the process differently for people you already know or prefer.

Chapter 10 Field Guide 41

Use this sequence

Step	Working instruction
1. Name the decision	What must be ready before the candidate arrives?
2. Separate facts	List direct observations, records, and candidate or employee statements. Do not mix inference into the fact column.
3. Apply the standard	Set the interviewer, questions, scoring anchors, time, privacy, accommodations route, and evidence standard.
4. Identify missing evidence	Ask only job-related follow-up questions or use an approved verification step.
5. Choose the next step	Record the owner, authority, due date, communication, and verification method.
6. Review the result	Decide whether the process worked, needs correction, or requires escalation.

Evidence quality

Strong evidence	Weak substitute
Specific behavior, setting, action, result, and learning	A label such as "hard worker" or "bad attitude"
Comparable job-related response or approved work sample	Confidence, charm, familiarity, or personal similarity
Record that can be checked and put in context	Rumor, social-media assumption, or unexplained gap
Acknowledged miss plus concrete correction	Perfect-sounding answer with no detail

Applied Scenario: The Trainer Problem

The new hire is blamed for slow progress, but the assigned trainer changes the standard each shift.

Your decision

WHAT FACTS ARE PRESENT?

WHAT ARE YOU ASSUMING?

WHICH JOB-RELATED STANDARD APPLIES?

WHAT EVIDENCE IS MISSING?

WHAT IS THE FAIREST AUTHORIZED NEXT STEP?

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

Answer guidance A defensible response slows the decision long enough to apply the written standard from Chapter 10. It distinguishes evidence from preference, asks only relevant follow-up questions, documents the reasoning, and escalates anything outside the manager's authority. A weak response fills gaps with confidence, urgency, reputation, or punishment.

Chapter 10 Action Record 41

Complete this page for one real decision involving "Prepare the Interview." Use initials or an approved case identifier when privacy requires it.

Field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role or case ID	
Decision owner	
Date opened	
Required decision date	
Applicable policy / tool	
Authorized reviewer	

DECISION TO MAKE

VERIFIED FACTS

MISSING EVIDENCE AND APPROVED WAY TO OBTAIN IT

STANDARD APPLIED

NEXT ACTION, OWNER, DEADLINE, AND VERIFICATION

WHAT THIS CASE TEACHES THE SYSTEM

Manager sign-off: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Chapter 11

Open with Respect and Clarity

Explain the process, reduce avoidable anxiety, and establish an honest two-way conversation.

The manager's question How should a professional restaurant interview begin?

Why this chapter matters

In restaurant operations, interview evidence becomes unreliable when the decision lives only in memory or urgency. Ask comparable questions, probe for facts, and record evidence without diagnosing personality. The objective here is not extra paperwork; it is a decision another authorized leader can understand, test, and improve.

The practical test is whether the manager can explain what was known, what was missing, which job standard applied, who had authority, and what would verify the next step. For “Open with Respect and Clarity,” the written record should make those five points visible without exaggeration or labels.

Care-first lens

Explain the role, the interview purpose, and the next step so the candidate can respond fairly.

Manager warning

Do not create pressure or confusion to see whether someone can guess what you want.

Chapter 11 Field Guide 45

Use this sequence

Step	Working instruction
1. Name the decision	How should a professional restaurant interview begin?
2. Separate facts	List direct observations, records, and candidate or employee statements. Do not mix inference into the fact column.
3. Apply the standard	Explain the process, reduce avoidable anxiety, and establish an honest two-way conversation.
4. Identify missing evidence	Ask only job-related follow-up questions or use an approved verification step.
5. Choose the next step	Record the owner, authority, due date, communication, and verification method.
6. Review the result	Decide whether the process worked, needs correction, or requires escalation.

Evidence quality

Strong evidence	Weak substitute
Specific behavior, setting, action, result, and learning	A label such as “hard worker” or “bad attitude”
Comparable job-related response or approved work sample	Confidence, charm, familiarity, or personal similarity
Record that can be checked and put in context	Rumor, social-media assumption, or unexplained gap
Acknowledged miss plus concrete correction	Perfect-sounding answer with no detail

Applied Scenario: The Reliable Employee at Risk

A dependable employee is quietly considering leaving because of scheduling and manager behavior.

Your decision

WHAT FACTS ARE PRESENT?

WHAT ARE YOU ASSUMING?

WHICH JOB-RELATED STANDARD APPLIES?

WHAT EVIDENCE IS MISSING?

WHAT IS THE FAIREST AUTHORIZED NEXT STEP?

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

Answer guidance A defensible response slows the decision long enough to apply the written standard from Chapter 11. It distinguishes evidence from preference, asks only relevant follow-up questions, documents the reasoning, and escalates anything outside the manager's authority. A weak response fills gaps with confidence, urgency, reputation, or punishment.

Chapter 11 Action Record 45

Complete this page for one real decision involving "Open with Respect and Clarity." Use initials or an approved case identifier when privacy requires it.

Field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role or case ID	
Decision owner	
Date opened	
Required decision date	
Applicable policy / tool	
Authorized reviewer	

DECISION TO MAKE

VERIFIED FACTS

MISSING EVIDENCE AND APPROVED WAY TO OBTAIN IT

STANDARD APPLIED

NEXT ACTION, OWNER, DEADLINE, AND VERIFICATION

WHAT THIS CASE TEACHES THE SYSTEM

Manager sign-off: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Chapter 12

Questions That Reveal Care

Use past-behavior and scenario questions tied to guests, coworkers, cleanliness, safety, and follow-through.

The manager's question What evidence shows that a candidate notices and responds to impact?

Why this chapter matters

In restaurant operations, interview evidence becomes unreliable when the decision lives only in memory or urgency. Ask comparable questions, probe for facts, and record evidence without diagnosing personality. The objective here is not extra paperwork; it is a decision another authorized leader can understand, test, and improve.

The practical test is whether the manager can explain what was known, what was missing, which job standard applied, who had authority, and what would verify the next step. For “Questions That Reveal Care,” the written record should make those five points visible without exaggeration or labels.

Care-first lens

Ask for concrete examples of protecting a guest, coworker, product, safety practice, or standard.

Manager warning

Do not accept a general claim of caring without a situation, action, and result.

Chapter 12 Field Guide 49

Use this sequence

Step	Working instruction
1. Name the decision	What evidence shows that a candidate notices and responds to impact?
2. Separate facts	List direct observations, records, and candidate or employee statements. Do not mix inference into the fact column.
3. Apply the standard	Use past-behavior and scenario questions tied to guests, coworkers, cleanliness, safety, and follow-through.
4. Identify missing evidence	Ask only job-related follow-up questions or use an approved verification step.
5. Choose the next step	Record the owner, authority, due date, communication, and verification method.
6. Review the result	Decide whether the process worked, needs correction, or requires escalation.

Evidence quality

Strong evidence	Weak substitute
Specific behavior, setting, action, result, and learning	A label such as “hard worker” or “bad attitude”
Comparable job-related response or approved work sample	Confidence, charm, familiarity, or personal similarity
Record that can be checked and put in context	Rumor, social-media assumption, or unexplained gap
Acknowledged miss plus concrete correction	Perfect-sounding answer with no detail

Applied Scenario: The Exit Pattern

Three recent employees cite different immediate reasons but share one operational condition.

Your decision

WHAT FACTS ARE PRESENT?

WHAT ARE YOU ASSUMING?

WHICH JOB-RELATED STANDARD APPLIES?

WHAT EVIDENCE IS MISSING?

WHAT IS THE FAIREST AUTHORIZED NEXT STEP?

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

Answer guidance A defensible response slows the decision long enough to apply the written standard from Chapter 12. It distinguishes evidence from preference, asks only relevant follow-up questions, documents the reasoning, and escalates anything outside the manager's authority. A weak response fills gaps with confidence, urgency, reputation, or punishment.

Chapter 12 Action Record 49

Complete this page for one real decision involving "Questions That Reveal Care." Use initials or an approved case identifier when privacy requires it.

Field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role or case ID	
Decision owner	
Date opened	
Required decision date	
Applicable policy / tool	
Authorized reviewer	

DECISION TO MAKE

VERIFIED FACTS

MISSING EVIDENCE AND APPROVED WAY TO OBTAIN IT

STANDARD APPLIED

NEXT ACTION, OWNER, DEADLINE, AND VERIFICATION

WHAT THIS CASE TEACHES THE SYSTEM

Manager sign-off: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Chapter 13

Questions That Reveal Reliability

Examine commitments, attendance reasoning, preparation, communication, and recovery after a miss.

The manager's question What evidence suggests the person can be counted on?

Why this chapter matters

In restaurant operations, interview evidence becomes unreliable when the decision lives only in memory or urgency. Ask comparable questions, probe for facts, and record evidence without diagnosing personality. The objective here is not extra paperwork; it is a decision another authorized leader can understand, test, and improve.

The practical test is whether the manager can explain what was known, what was missing, which job standard applied, who had authority, and what would verify the next step. For "Questions That Reveal Reliability," the written record should make those five points visible without exaggeration or labels.

Care-first lens

Ask how the candidate planned, communicated, and recovered when attendance or commitments were at risk.

Manager warning

Do not treat confidence about reliability as evidence of reliability.

Chapter 13 Field Guide 53

Use this sequence

Step	Working instruction
1. Name the decision	What evidence suggests the person can be counted on?
2. Separate facts	List direct observations, records, and candidate or employee statements. Do not mix inference into the fact column.
3. Apply the standard	Examine commitments, attendance reasoning, preparation, communication, and recovery after a miss.
4. Identify missing evidence	Ask only job-related follow-up questions or use an approved verification step.
5. Choose the next step	Record the owner, authority, due date, communication, and verification method.
6. Review the result	Decide whether the process worked, needs correction, or requires escalation.

Evidence quality

Strong evidence	Weak substitute
Specific behavior, setting, action, result, and learning	A label such as “hard worker” or “bad attitude”
Comparable job-related response or approved work sample	Confidence, charm, familiarity, or personal similarity
Record that can be checked and put in context	Rumor, social-media assumption, or unexplained gap
Acknowledged miss plus concrete correction	Perfect-sounding answer with no detail

Applied Scenario: The Favorite Candidate

One interviewer says the candidate “felt right” while the scorecard evidence is weaker.

Your decision

WHAT FACTS ARE PRESENT?

WHAT ARE YOU ASSUMING?

WHICH JOB-RELATED STANDARD APPLIES?

WHAT EVIDENCE IS MISSING?

WHAT IS THE FAIREST AUTHORIZED NEXT STEP?

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

Answer guidance A defensible response slows the decision long enough to apply the written standard from Chapter 13. It distinguishes evidence from preference, asks only relevant follow-up questions, documents the reasoning, and escalates anything outside the manager’s authority. A weak response fills gaps with confidence, urgency, reputation, or punishment.

Chapter 13 Action Record 53

Complete this page for one real decision involving "Questions That Reveal Reliability." Use initials or an approved case identifier when privacy requires it.

Field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role or case ID	
Decision owner	
Date opened	
Required decision date	
Applicable policy / tool	
Authorized reviewer	

DECISION TO MAKE

VERIFIED FACTS

MISSING EVIDENCE AND APPROVED WAY TO OBTAIN IT

STANDARD APPLIED

NEXT ACTION, OWNER, DEADLINE, AND VERIFICATION

WHAT THIS CASE TEACHES THE SYSTEM

Manager sign-off: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Chapter 14

Questions That Reveal Coachability

Examine feedback, learning, correction, questions, practice, and response to standards.

The manager's question How does the candidate react when they do not know or get something wrong?

Why this chapter matters

In restaurant operations, interview evidence becomes unreliable when the decision lives only in memory or urgency. Ask comparable questions, probe for facts, and record evidence without diagnosing personality. The objective here is not extra paperwork; it is a decision another authorized leader can understand, test, and improve.

The practical test is whether the manager can explain what was known, what was missing, which job standard applied, who had authority, and what would verify the next step. For “Questions That Reveal Coachability,” the written record should make those five points visible without exaggeration or labels.

Care-first lens

Ask for a real correction, how it was received, and what changed afterward.

Manager warning

Do not mistake agreement in the interview for willingness to improve at work.

Chapter 14 Field Guide 57

Use this sequence

Step	Working instruction
1. Name the decision	How does the candidate react when they do not know or get something wrong?
2. Separate facts	List direct observations, records, and candidate or employee statements. Do not mix inference into the fact column.
3. Apply the standard	Examine feedback, learning, correction, questions, practice, and response to standards.
4. Identify missing evidence	Ask only job-related follow-up questions or use an approved verification step.
5. Choose the next step	Record the owner, authority, due date, communication, and verification method.
6. Review the result	Decide whether the process worked, needs correction, or requires escalation.

Evidence quality

Strong evidence	Weak substitute
Specific behavior, setting, action, result, and learning	A label such as “hard worker” or “bad attitude”
Comparable job-related response or approved work sample	Confidence, charm, familiarity, or personal similarity
Record that can be checked and put in context	Rumor, social-media assumption, or unexplained gap
Acknowledged miss plus concrete correction	Perfect-sounding answer with no detail

Applied Scenario: The Concern about Retaliation

An employee reports a problem but fears reduced hours or worse assignments.

Your decision

WHAT FACTS ARE PRESENT?

WHAT ARE YOU ASSUMING?

WHICH JOB-RELATED STANDARD APPLIES?

WHAT EVIDENCE IS MISSING?

WHAT IS THE FAIREST AUTHORIZED NEXT STEP?

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

Answer guidance A defensible response slows the decision long enough to apply the written standard from Chapter 14. It distinguishes evidence from preference, asks only relevant follow-up questions, documents the reasoning, and escalates anything outside the manager's authority. A weak response fills gaps with confidence, urgency, reputation, or punishment.

Chapter 14 Action Record 57

Complete this page for one real decision involving "Questions That Reveal Coachability." Use initials or an approved case identifier when privacy requires it.

Field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role or case ID	
Decision owner	
Date opened	
Required decision date	
Applicable policy / tool	
Authorized reviewer	

DECISION TO MAKE

VERIFIED FACTS

MISSING EVIDENCE AND APPROVED WAY TO OBTAIN IT

STANDARD APPLIED

NEXT ACTION, OWNER, DEADLINE, AND VERIFICATION

WHAT THIS CASE TEACHES THE SYSTEM

Manager sign-off: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Chapter 15

Questions That Reveal Honesty and Judgment

Explore ownership, difficult choices, mistakes, pressure, and speaking up without demanding rehearsed perfection.

The manager's question Will the person tell the truth and use judgment under pressure?

Why this chapter matters

In restaurant operations, interview evidence becomes unreliable when the decision lives only in memory or urgency. Ask comparable questions, probe for facts, and record evidence without diagnosing personality. The objective here is not extra paperwork; it is a decision another authorized leader can understand, test, and improve.

The practical test is whether the manager can explain what was known, what was missing, which job standard applied, who had authority, and what would verify the next step. For "Questions That Reveal Honesty and Judgment," the written record should make those five points visible without exaggeration or labels.

Care-first lens

Ask how the candidate handled an error, conflict, or choice with competing responsibilities.

Manager warning

Do not reward an answer that protects image while avoiding responsibility.

Chapter 15 Field Guide 61

Use this sequence

Step	Working instruction
1. Name the decision	Will the person tell the truth and use judgment under pressure?
2. Separate facts	List direct observations, records, and candidate or employee statements. Do not mix inference into the fact column.
3. Apply the standard	Explore ownership, difficult choices, mistakes, pressure, and speaking up without demanding rehearsed perfection.
4. Identify missing evidence	Ask only job-related follow-up questions or use an approved verification step.
5. Choose the next step	Record the owner, authority, due date, communication, and verification method.
6. Review the result	Decide whether the process worked, needs correction, or requires escalation.

Evidence quality

Strong evidence	Weak substitute
Specific behavior, setting, action, result, and learning	A label such as “hard worker” or “bad attitude”
Comparable job-related response or approved work sample	Confidence, charm, familiarity, or personal similarity
Record that can be checked and put in context	Rumor, social-media assumption, or unexplained gap
Acknowledged miss plus concrete correction	Perfect-sounding answer with no detail

Applied Scenario: The Good Person in the Wrong Role

The employee demonstrates care and effort but may not match the role's actual conditions or schedule.

Your decision

WHAT FACTS ARE PRESENT?

WHAT ARE YOU ASSUMING?

WHICH JOB-RELATED STANDARD APPLIES?

WHAT EVIDENCE IS MISSING?

WHAT IS THE FAIREST AUTHORIZED NEXT STEP?

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

Answer guidance A defensible response slows the decision long enough to apply the written standard from Chapter 15. It distinguishes evidence from preference, asks only relevant follow-up questions, documents the reasoning, and escalates anything outside the manager's authority. A weak response fills gaps with confidence, urgency, reputation, or punishment.

Chapter 15 Action Record 61

Complete this page for one real decision involving "Questions That Reveal Honesty and Judgment." Use initials or an approved case identifier when privacy requires it.

Field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role or case ID	
Decision owner	
Date opened	
Required decision date	
Applicable policy / tool	
Authorized reviewer	

DECISION TO MAKE

VERIFIED FACTS

MISSING EVIDENCE AND APPROVED WAY TO OBTAIN IT

STANDARD APPLIED

NEXT ACTION, OWNER, DEADLINE, AND VERIFICATION

WHAT THIS CASE TEACHES THE SYSTEM

Manager sign-off: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Chapter 16

Give a Realistic Job Preview

Let the candidate evaluate the restaurant, schedule, pace, expectations, and support before accepting.

The manager's question Does the candidate understand what they are joining?

Why this chapter matters

In restaurant operations, interview evidence becomes unreliable when the decision lives only in memory or urgency. Ask comparable questions, probe for facts, and record evidence without diagnosing personality. The objective here is not extra paperwork; it is a decision another authorized leader can understand, test, and improve.

The practical test is whether the manager can explain what was known, what was missing, which job standard applied, who had authority, and what would verify the next step. For "Give a Realistic Job Preview," the written record should make those five points visible without exaggeration or labels.

Care-first lens

Show the pace, standards, schedule realities, and difficult parts before the offer.

Manager warning

Do not postpone the hard truth until the first shift.

Chapter 16 Field Guide 65

Use this sequence

Step	Working instruction
1. Name the decision	Does the candidate understand what they are joining?
2. Separate facts	List direct observations, records, and candidate or employee statements. Do not mix inference into the fact column.
3. Apply the standard	Let the candidate evaluate the restaurant, schedule, pace, expectations, and support before accepting.
4. Identify missing evidence	Ask only job-related follow-up questions or use an approved verification step.
5. Choose the next step	Record the owner, authority, due date, communication, and verification method.
6. Review the result	Decide whether the process worked, needs correction, or requires escalation.

Evidence quality

Strong evidence	Weak substitute
Specific behavior, setting, action, result, and learning	A label such as “hard worker” or “bad attitude”
Comparable job-related response or approved work sample	Confidence, charm, familiarity, or personal similarity
Record that can be checked and put in context	Rumor, social-media assumption, or unexplained gap
Acknowledged miss plus concrete correction	Perfect-sounding answer with no detail

Applied Scenario: The Manager Who Skips Check Ins

New-hire meetings are marked complete without meaningful notes or follow-through.

Your decision

WHAT FACTS ARE PRESENT?

WHAT ARE YOU ASSUMING?

WHICH JOB-RELATED STANDARD APPLIES?

WHAT EVIDENCE IS MISSING?

WHAT IS THE FAIREST AUTHORIZED NEXT STEP?

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

Answer guidance A defensible response slows the decision long enough to apply the written standard from Chapter 16. It distinguishes evidence from preference, asks only relevant follow-up questions, documents the reasoning, and escalates anything outside the manager's authority. A weak response fills gaps with confidence, urgency, reputation, or punishment.

Chapter 16 Action Record 65

Complete this page for one real decision involving “Give a Realistic Job Preview.” Use initials or an approved case identifier when privacy requires it.

Field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role or case ID	
Decision owner	
Date opened	
Required decision date	
Applicable policy / tool	
Authorized reviewer	

DECISION TO MAKE

VERIFIED FACTS

MISSING EVIDENCE AND APPROVED WAY TO OBTAIN IT

STANDARD APPLIED

NEXT ACTION, OWNER, DEADLINE, AND VERIFICATION

WHAT THIS CASE TEACHES THE SYSTEM

Manager sign-off: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Chapter 17

Stay Inside Lawful and Ethical Boundaries

Teach prohibited shortcuts, job-related questioning, consistency, privacy, accommodations routing, and escalation.

The manager's question Which questions and decision methods create unnecessary risk or unfairness?

Why this chapter matters

Hiring discipline begins before the interview. Use only job-related standards, apply them consistently, protect applicant information, and route legal questions to the person authorized to handle them. A candidate can be evaluated on documented ability to perform the stated role, availability when it is genuinely required, and observable work-related evidence. They must not be evaluated through assumptions about a protected characteristic, medical condition, family situation, accent, appearance, or personal similarity to the interviewer.

Federal guardrails to apply

Federal equal-employment rules prohibit discrimination and retaliation in recruiting, advertising, applications, hiring, terms of employment, and training. Keep questions focused on the job and its essential requirements. Do not ask pre-offer disability or medical questions. Route a request for an accommodation promptly for authorized review. If a consumer-reporting company provides a background report, use the required notice, written permission, and applicable Fair Credit Reporting Act process before relying on it.

Local authority still matters

This workbook is not legal or HR advice. State, local, company, union, licensing, and industry requirements may add duties or stricter rules. When a question involves an accommodation, protected leave, wage and hour, background information, immigration documentation, safety certification, harassment, retaliation, or a possible legal claim, stop and route it to the owner, HR, qualified counsel, or the designated compliance authority.

Care-first lens

Use job-related questions, consistent standards, and prompt escalation for protected or regulated issues.

Manager warning

Do not let operational urgency turn a legal or accommodation question into a manager guess.

Chapter 17 Field Guide 69

Use this sequence

Step	Working instruction
1. Name the decision	Which questions and decision methods create unnecessary risk or unfairness?
2. Separate facts	List direct observations, records, and candidate or employee statements. Do not mix inference into the fact column.
3. Apply the standard	Teach prohibited shortcuts, job-related questioning, consistency, privacy, accommodations routing, and escalation.
4. Identify missing evidence	Ask only job-related follow-up questions or use an approved verification step.
5. Choose the next step	Record the owner, authority, due date, communication, and verification method.
6. Review the result	Decide whether the process worked, needs correction, or requires escalation.

Evidence quality

Strong evidence	Weak substitute
Specific behavior, setting, action, result, and learning	A label such as "hard worker" or "bad attitude"
Comparable job-related response or approved work sample	Confidence, charm, familiarity, or personal similarity
Record that can be checked and put in context	Rumor, social-media assumption, or unexplained gap
Acknowledged miss plus concrete correction	Perfect-sounding answer with no detail

Applied Scenario: The Friday Night Vacancy

A manager wants to hire the first available applicant without a role-success profile.

Your decision

WHAT FACTS ARE PRESENT?

WHAT ARE YOU ASSUMING?

WHICH JOB-RELATED STANDARD APPLIES?

WHAT EVIDENCE IS MISSING?

WHAT IS THE FAIREST AUTHORIZED NEXT STEP?

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

Answer guidance A defensible response slows the decision long enough to apply the written standard from Chapter 17. It distinguishes evidence from preference, asks only relevant follow-up questions, documents the reasoning, and escalates anything outside the manager's authority. A weak response fills gaps with confidence, urgency, reputation, or punishment.

Chapter 17 Action Record 69

Complete this page for one real decision involving "Stay Inside Lawful and Ethical Boundaries." Use initials or an approved case identifier when privacy requires it.

Field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role or case ID	
Decision owner	
Date opened	
Required decision date	
Applicable policy / tool	
Authorized reviewer	

DECISION TO MAKE

VERIFIED FACTS

MISSING EVIDENCE AND APPROVED WAY TO OBTAIN IT

STANDARD APPLIED

NEXT ACTION, OWNER, DEADLINE, AND VERIFICATION

WHAT THIS CASE TEACHES THE SYSTEM

Manager sign-off: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Chapter 18

Check References and Background Information Carefully

Use authorization, relevance, consistency, documentation, and qualified review.

The manager's question How do we verify information without turning suspicion into proof?

Why this chapter matters

In restaurant operations, interview evidence becomes unreliable when the decision lives only in memory or urgency. Ask comparable questions, probe for facts, and record evidence without diagnosing personality. The objective here is not extra paperwork; it is a decision another authorized leader can understand, test, and improve.

The practical test is whether the manager can explain what was known, what was missing, which job standard applied, who had authority, and what would verify the next step. For “Check References and Background Information Carefully,” the written record should make those five points visible without exaggeration or labels.

Care-first lens

Use an approved, consistent process and connect information to legitimate job requirements.

Manager warning

Do not make a background result or informal reference a shortcut around fair, authorized review.

Chapter 18 Field Guide 73

Use this sequence

Step	Working instruction
1. Name the decision	How do we verify information without turning suspicion into proof?
2. Separate facts	List direct observations, records, and candidate or employee statements. Do not mix inference into the fact column.
3. Apply the standard	Use authorization, relevance, consistency, documentation, and qualified review.
4. Identify missing evidence	Ask only job-related follow-up questions or use an approved verification step.
5. Choose the next step	Record the owner, authority, due date, communication, and verification method.
6. Review the result	Decide whether the process worked, needs correction, or requires escalation.

Evidence quality

Strong evidence	Weak substitute
Specific behavior, setting, action, result, and learning	A label such as “hard worker” or “bad attitude”
Comparable job-related response or approved work sample	Confidence, charm, familiarity, or personal similarity
Record that can be checked and put in context	Rumor, social-media assumption, or unexplained gap
Acknowledged miss plus concrete correction	Perfect-sounding answer with no detail

Applied Scenario: The Experienced Candidate

Strong experience is paired with blame, disrespect, or resistance to standards.

Your decision

WHAT FACTS ARE PRESENT?

WHAT ARE YOU ASSUMING?

WHICH JOB-RELATED STANDARD APPLIES?

WHAT EVIDENCE IS MISSING?

WHAT IS THE FAIREST AUTHORIZED NEXT STEP?

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

Answer guidance A defensible response slows the decision long enough to apply the written standard from Chapter 18. It distinguishes evidence from preference, asks only relevant follow-up questions, documents the reasoning, and escalates anything outside the manager's authority. A weak response fills gaps with confidence, urgency, reputation, or punishment.

Chapter 18 Action Record 73

Complete this page for one real decision involving "Check References and Background Information Carefully." Use initials or an approved case identifier when privacy requires it.

Field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role or case ID	
Decision owner	
Date opened	
Required decision date	
Applicable policy / tool	
Authorized reviewer	

DECISION TO MAKE

VERIFIED FACTS

MISSING EVIDENCE AND APPROVED WAY TO OBTAIN IT

STANDARD APPLIED

NEXT ACTION, OWNER, DEADLINE, AND VERIFICATION

WHAT THIS CASE TEACHES THE SYSTEM

Manager sign-off: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Part IV

Make and Document the Decision

Compare evidence consistently, test concerns fairly, communicate decisions, and preserve an auditable record.

Part standard Separate evidence from preference and preserve accountable human judgment.

Chapter 19

Score Evidence Before Discussing Preference

Require independent scoring against anchored criteria before group discussion.

The manager's question What did the candidate actually demonstrate?

Why this chapter matters

In restaurant operations, selection and records becomes unreliable when the decision lives only in memory or urgency. Separate evidence from preference and preserve accountable human judgment. The objective here is not extra paperwork; it is a decision another authorized leader can understand, test, and improve.

The practical test is whether the manager can explain what was known, what was missing, which job standard applied, who had authority, and what would verify the next step. For “Score Evidence Before Discussing Preference,” the written record should make those five points visible without exaggeration or labels.

Care-first lens

Record evidence independently before the team discusses who it likes best.

Manager warning

Do not let group discussion rewrite a weak record into a strong one.

Chapter 19 Field Guide 78

Use this sequence

Step	Working instruction
1. Name the decision	What did the candidate actually demonstrate?
2. Separate facts	List direct observations, records, and candidate or employee statements. Do not mix inference into the fact column.
3. Apply the standard	Require independent scoring against anchored criteria before group discussion.
4. Identify missing evidence	Ask only job-related follow-up questions or use an approved verification step.
5. Choose the next step	Record the owner, authority, due date, communication, and verification method.
6. Review the result	Decide whether the process worked, needs correction, or requires escalation.

Evidence quality

Strong evidence	Weak substitute
Specific behavior, setting, action, result, and learning	A label such as “hard worker” or “bad attitude”
Comparable job-related response or approved work sample	Confidence, charm, familiarity, or personal similarity
Record that can be checked and put in context	Rumor, social-media assumption, or unexplained gap
Acknowledged miss plus concrete correction	Perfect-sounding answer with no detail

Applied Scenario: The Quiet Candidate

A reserved candidate provides strong evidence but does not perform socially like the manager expects.

Your decision

WHAT FACTS ARE PRESENT?

WHAT ARE YOU ASSUMING?

WHICH JOB-RELATED STANDARD APPLIES?

WHAT EVIDENCE IS MISSING?

WHAT IS THE FAIREST AUTHORIZED NEXT STEP?

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

Answer guidance A defensible response slows the decision long enough to apply the written standard from Chapter 19. It distinguishes evidence from preference, asks only relevant follow-up questions, documents the reasoning, and escalates anything outside the manager's authority. A weak response fills gaps with confidence, urgency, reputation, or punishment.

Chapter 19 Action Record 78

Complete this page for one real decision involving “Score Evidence Before Discussing Preference.” Use initials or an approved case identifier when privacy requires it.

Field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role or case ID	
Decision owner	
Date opened	
Required decision date	
Applicable policy / tool	
Authorized reviewer	

DECISION TO MAKE

VERIFIED FACTS

MISSING EVIDENCE AND APPROVED WAY TO OBTAIN IT

STANDARD APPLIED

NEXT ACTION, OWNER, DEADLINE, AND VERIFICATION

WHAT THIS CASE TEACHES THE SYSTEM

Manager sign-off: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Chapter 20

Use a Second Look When Evidence Is Thin

Use a second interview, lawful work sample, or clarified reference rather than filling gaps with assumptions.

The manager's question What should we do when the answer is still uncertain?

Why this chapter matters

In restaurant operations, selection and records becomes unreliable when the decision lives only in memory or urgency. Separate evidence from preference and preserve accountable human judgment. The objective here is not extra paperwork; it is a decision another authorized leader can understand, test, and improve.

The practical test is whether the manager can explain what was known, what was missing, which job standard applied, who had authority, and what would verify the next step. For “Use a Second Look When Evidence Is Thin,” the written record should make those five points visible without exaggeration or labels.

Care-first lens

Identify the exact missing evidence and use one fair, approved way to obtain it.

Manager warning

Do not fill evidence gaps with assumptions or extend the process only for favorites.

Chapter 20 Field Guide 82

Use this sequence

Step	Working instruction
1. Name the decision	What should we do when the answer is still uncertain?
2. Separate facts	List direct observations, records, and candidate or employee statements. Do not mix inference into the fact column.
3. Apply the standard	Use a second interview, lawful work sample, or clarified reference rather than filling gaps with assumptions.
4. Identify missing evidence	Ask only job-related follow-up questions or use an approved verification step.
5. Choose the next step	Record the owner, authority, due date, communication, and verification method.
6. Review the result	Decide whether the process worked, needs correction, or requires escalation.

Evidence quality

Strong evidence	Weak substitute
Specific behavior, setting, action, result, and learning	A label such as “hard worker” or “bad attitude”
Comparable job-related response or approved work sample	Confidence, charm, familiarity, or personal similarity
Record that can be checked and put in context	Rumor, social-media assumption, or unexplained gap
Acknowledged miss plus concrete correction	Perfect-sounding answer with no detail

Applied Scenario: The Employee Referral

A respected employee recommends a friend and the manager wants to skip the normal process.

Your decision

WHAT FACTS ARE PRESENT?

WHAT ARE YOU ASSUMING?

WHICH JOB-RELATED STANDARD APPLIES?

WHAT EVIDENCE IS MISSING?

WHAT IS THE FAIREST AUTHORIZED NEXT STEP?

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

Answer guidance A defensible response slows the decision long enough to apply the written standard from Chapter 20. It distinguishes evidence from preference, asks only relevant follow-up questions, documents the reasoning, and escalates anything outside the manager's authority. A weak response fills gaps with confidence, urgency, reputation, or punishment.

Chapter 20 Action Record 82

Complete this page for one real decision involving “Use a Second Look When Evidence Is Thin.” Use initials or an approved case identifier when privacy requires it.

Field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role or case ID	
Decision owner	
Date opened	
Required decision date	
Applicable policy / tool	
Authorized reviewer	

DECISION TO MAKE

VERIFIED FACTS

MISSING EVIDENCE AND APPROVED WAY TO OBTAIN IT

STANDARD APPLIED

NEXT ACTION, OWNER, DEADLINE, AND VERIFICATION

WHAT THIS CASE TEACHES THE SYSTEM

Manager sign-off: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Chapter 21

Remove Favoritism from the Decision

Expose affinity, urgency, halo effects, reputation, and manager pressure as risks to evidence.

The manager's question Are we choosing the strongest evidence or the most familiar person?

Why this chapter matters

In restaurant operations, selection and records becomes unreliable when the decision lives only in memory or urgency. Separate evidence from preference and preserve accountable human judgment. The objective here is not extra paperwork; it is a decision another authorized leader can understand, test, and improve.

The practical test is whether the manager can explain what was known, what was missing, which job standard applied, who had authority, and what would verify the next step. For "Remove Favoritism from the Decision," the written record should make those five points visible without exaggeration or labels.

Care-first lens

Compare each candidate to the same role standard and record the reason for the choice.

Manager warning

Do not give referrals, friends, or familiar applicants an unrecorded advantage.

Chapter 21 Field Guide 86

Use this sequence

Step	Working instruction
1. Name the decision	Are we choosing the strongest evidence or the most familiar person?
2. Separate facts	List direct observations, records, and candidate or employee statements. Do not mix inference into the fact column.
3. Apply the standard	Expose affinity, urgency, halo effects, reputation, and manager pressure as risks to evidence.
4. Identify missing evidence	Ask only job-related follow-up questions or use an approved verification step.
5. Choose the next step	Record the owner, authority, due date, communication, and verification method.
6. Review the result	Decide whether the process worked, needs correction, or requires escalation.

Evidence quality

Strong evidence	Weak substitute
Specific behavior, setting, action, result, and learning	A label such as “hard worker” or “bad attitude”
Comparable job-related response or approved work sample	Confidence, charm, familiarity, or personal similarity
Record that can be checked and put in context	Rumor, social-media assumption, or unexplained gap
Acknowledged miss plus concrete correction	Perfect-sounding answer with no detail

Applied Scenario: The Schedule Mismatch

The candidate is capable, but the available hours do not match the restaurant's verified need.

Your decision

WHAT FACTS ARE PRESENT?

WHAT ARE YOU ASSUMING?

WHICH JOB-RELATED STANDARD APPLIES?

WHAT EVIDENCE IS MISSING?

WHAT IS THE FAIREST AUTHORIZED NEXT STEP?

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

Answer guidance A defensible response slows the decision long enough to apply the written standard from Chapter 21. It distinguishes evidence from preference, asks only relevant follow-up questions, documents the reasoning, and escalates anything outside the manager's authority. A weak response fills gaps with confidence, urgency, reputation, or punishment.

Chapter 21 Action Record 86

Complete this page for one real decision involving “Remove Favoritism from the Decision.” Use initials or an approved case identifier when privacy requires it.

Field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role or case ID	
Decision owner	
Date opened	
Required decision date	
Applicable policy / tool	
Authorized reviewer	

DECISION TO MAKE

VERIFIED FACTS

MISSING EVIDENCE AND APPROVED WAY TO OBTAIN IT

STANDARD APPLIED

NEXT ACTION, OWNER, DEADLINE, AND VERIFICATION

WHAT THIS CASE TEACHES THE SYSTEM

Manager sign-off: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Chapter 22

Make the Offer Honestly

Confirm role, pay, scheduling expectations, conditions, start process, and who will support the employee.

The manager's question What must be clear before the candidate says yes?

Why this chapter matters

In restaurant operations, selection and records becomes unreliable when the decision lives only in memory or urgency. Separate evidence from preference and preserve accountable human judgment. The objective here is not extra paperwork; it is a decision another authorized leader can understand, test, and improve.

The practical test is whether the manager can explain what was known, what was missing, which job standard applied, who had authority, and what would verify the next step. For “Make the Offer Honestly,” the written record should make those five points visible without exaggeration or labels.

Care-first lens

Confirm the actual role, schedule, pay process, conditions, and next steps before the candidate accepts.

Manager warning

Do not make promises a manager cannot authorize or keep.

Chapter 22 Field Guide 90

Use this sequence

Step	Working instruction
1. Name the decision	What must be clear before the candidate says yes?
2. Separate facts	List direct observations, records, and candidate or employee statements. Do not mix inference into the fact column.
3. Apply the standard	Confirm role, pay, scheduling expectations, conditions, start process, and who will support the employee.
4. Identify missing evidence	Ask only job-related follow-up questions or use an approved verification step.
5. Choose the next step	Record the owner, authority, due date, communication, and verification method.
6. Review the result	Decide whether the process worked, needs correction, or requires escalation.

Evidence quality

Strong evidence	Weak substitute
Specific behavior, setting, action, result, and learning	A label such as “hard worker” or “bad attitude”
Comparable job-related response or approved work sample	Confidence, charm, familiarity, or personal similarity
Record that can be checked and put in context	Rumor, social-media assumption, or unexplained gap
Acknowledged miss plus concrete correction	Perfect-sounding answer with no detail

Applied Scenario: The Perfect Interview

Answers sound polished but contain few concrete examples or verifiable detail.

Your decision

WHAT FACTS ARE PRESENT?

WHAT ARE YOU ASSUMING?

WHICH JOB-RELATED STANDARD APPLIES?

WHAT EVIDENCE IS MISSING?

WHAT IS THE FAIREST AUTHORIZED NEXT STEP?

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

Answer guidance A defensible response slows the decision long enough to apply the written standard from Chapter 22. It distinguishes evidence from preference, asks only relevant follow-up questions, documents the reasoning, and escalates anything outside the manager's authority. A weak response fills gaps with confidence, urgency, reputation, or punishment.

Chapter 22 Action Record 90

Complete this page for one real decision involving "Make the Offer Honestly." Use initials or an approved case identifier when privacy requires it.

Field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role or case ID	
Decision owner	
Date opened	
Required decision date	
Applicable policy / tool	
Authorized reviewer	

DECISION TO MAKE

VERIFIED FACTS

MISSING EVIDENCE AND APPROVED WAY TO OBTAIN IT

STANDARD APPLIED

NEXT ACTION, OWNER, DEADLINE, AND VERIFICATION

WHAT THIS CASE TEACHES THE SYSTEM

Manager sign-off: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Chapter 23

Document the Hiring Decision

Record the criteria, evidence, decision, approvals, conditions, and retained records.

The manager's question Could another authorized leader understand why this decision was made?

Why this chapter matters

In restaurant operations, selection and records becomes unreliable when the decision lives only in memory or urgency. Separate evidence from preference and preserve accountable human judgment. The objective here is not extra paperwork; it is a decision another authorized leader can understand, test, and improve.

The practical test is whether the manager can explain what was known, what was missing, which job standard applied, who had authority, and what would verify the next step. For “Document the Hiring Decision,” the written record should make those five points visible without exaggeration or labels.

Care-first lens

Create a concise record of criteria, evidence, authority, decision, and next step.

Manager warning

Do not write labels that cannot be supported by facts or may create unnecessary risk.

Chapter 23 Field Guide 94

Use this sequence

Step	Working instruction
1. Name the decision	Could another authorized leader understand why this decision was made?
2. Separate facts	List direct observations, records, and candidate or employee statements. Do not mix inference into the fact column.
3. Apply the standard	Record the criteria, evidence, decision, approvals, conditions, and retained records.
4. Identify missing evidence	Ask only job-related follow-up questions or use an approved verification step.
5. Choose the next step	Record the owner, authority, due date, communication, and verification method.
6. Review the result	Decide whether the process worked, needs correction, or requires escalation.

Evidence quality

Strong evidence	Weak substitute
Specific behavior, setting, action, result, and learning	A label such as “hard worker” or “bad attitude”
Comparable job-related response or approved work sample	Confidence, charm, familiarity, or personal similarity
Record that can be checked and put in context	Rumor, social-media assumption, or unexplained gap
Acknowledged miss plus concrete correction	Perfect-sounding answer with no detail

Applied Scenario: The Second Chance

A candidate owns a prior failure and explains specific correction and learning.

Your decision

WHAT FACTS ARE PRESENT?

WHAT ARE YOU ASSUMING?

WHICH JOB-RELATED STANDARD APPLIES?

WHAT EVIDENCE IS MISSING?

WHAT IS THE FAIREST AUTHORIZED NEXT STEP?

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

Answer guidance A defensible response slows the decision long enough to apply the written standard from Chapter 23. It distinguishes evidence from preference, asks only relevant follow-up questions, documents the reasoning, and escalates anything outside the manager's authority. A weak response fills gaps with confidence, urgency, reputation, or punishment.

Chapter 23 Action Record 94

Complete this page for one real decision involving “Document the Hiring Decision.” Use initials or an approved case identifier when privacy requires it.

Field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role or case ID	
Decision owner	
Date opened	
Required decision date	
Applicable policy / tool	
Authorized reviewer	

DECISION TO MAKE

VERIFIED FACTS

MISSING EVIDENCE AND APPROVED WAY TO OBTAIN IT

STANDARD APPLIED

NEXT ACTION, OWNER, DEADLINE, AND VERIFICATION

WHAT THIS CASE TEACHES THE SYSTEM

Manager sign-off: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Part V

Protect the First 90 Days

Connect selection to preboarding, training, support, check-ins, early correction, and verified role readiness.

Part standard Test clarity, training, opportunity, tools, schedule, and conduct before assigning blame.

Chapter 24

Protect the Time Before Day One

Control communication, documents, schedule, uniform, trainer, arrival, and avoidable uncertainty.

The manager's question What causes good candidates to disappear before their first shift?

Why this chapter matters

In restaurant operations, first-90-day support becomes unreliable when the decision lives only in memory or urgency. Test clarity, training, opportunity, tools, schedule, and conduct before assigning blame. The objective here is not extra paperwork; it is a decision another authorized leader can understand, test, and improve.

The practical test is whether the manager can explain what was known, what was missing, which job standard applied, who had authority, and what would verify the next step. For "Protect the Time Before Day One," the written record should make those five points visible without exaggeration or labels.

Care-first lens

Make sure the new employee receives confirmed details, required paperwork, and a prepared first-day contact.

Manager warning

Do not let silence after acceptance create a preventable no-show.

Chapter 24 Field Guide 99

Use this sequence

Step	Working instruction
1. Name the decision	What causes good candidates to disappear before their first shift?
2. Separate facts	List direct observations, records, and candidate or employee statements. Do not mix inference into the fact column.
3. Apply the standard	Control communication, documents, schedule, uniform, trainer, arrival, and avoidable uncertainty.
4. Identify missing evidence	Ask only job-related follow-up questions or use an approved verification step.
5. Choose the next step	Record the owner, authority, due date, communication, and verification method.
6. Review the result	Decide whether the process worked, needs correction, or requires escalation.

Evidence quality

Strong evidence	Weak substitute
Specific behavior, setting, action, result, and learning	A label such as “hard worker” or “bad attitude”
Comparable job-related response or approved work sample	Confidence, charm, familiarity, or personal similarity
Record that can be checked and put in context	Rumor, social-media assumption, or unexplained gap
Acknowledged miss plus concrete correction	Perfect-sounding answer with no detail

Applied Scenario: The Background Concern

Information appears that may be inaccurate, irrelevant, outdated, or legally restricted.

Your decision

WHAT FACTS ARE PRESENT?

WHAT ARE YOU ASSUMING?

WHICH JOB-RELATED STANDARD APPLIES?

WHAT EVIDENCE IS MISSING?

WHAT IS THE FAIREST AUTHORIZED NEXT STEP?

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

Answer guidance A defensible response slows the decision long enough to apply the written standard from Chapter 24. It distinguishes evidence from preference, asks only relevant follow-up questions, documents the reasoning, and escalates anything outside the manager's authority. A weak response fills gaps with confidence, urgency, reputation, or punishment.

Chapter 24 Action Record 99

Complete this page for one real decision involving “Protect the Time Before Day One.” Use initials or an approved case identifier when privacy requires it.

Field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role or case ID	
Decision owner	
Date opened	
Required decision date	
Applicable policy / tool	
Authorized reviewer	

DECISION TO MAKE

VERIFIED FACTS

MISSING EVIDENCE AND APPROVED WAY TO OBTAIN IT

STANDARD APPLIED

NEXT ACTION, OWNER, DEADLINE, AND VERIFICATION

WHAT THIS CASE TEACHES THE SYSTEM

Manager sign-off: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Chapter 25

Make the First Shift Match the Promise

Connect welcome, job reality, safety, standards, training, and manager attention.

The manager's question Does the first shift confirm or contradict the interview?

Why this chapter matters

In restaurant operations, first-90-day support becomes unreliable when the decision lives only in memory or urgency. Test clarity, training, opportunity, tools, schedule, and conduct before assigning blame. The objective here is not extra paperwork; it is a decision another authorized leader can understand, test, and improve.

The practical test is whether the manager can explain what was known, what was missing, which job standard applied, who had authority, and what would verify the next step. For “Make the First Shift Match the Promise,” the written record should make those five points visible without exaggeration or labels.

Care-first lens

Assign an informed trainer, a clear start point, and enough structure to make the first shift useful.

Manager warning

Do not treat orientation as complete because the employee was handed paperwork.

Chapter 25 Field Guide 103

Use this sequence

Step	Working instruction
1. Name the decision	Does the first shift confirm or contradict the interview?
2. Separate facts	List direct observations, records, and candidate or employee statements. Do not mix inference into the fact column.
3. Apply the standard	Connect welcome, job reality, safety, standards, training, and manager attention.
4. Identify missing evidence	Ask only job-related follow-up questions or use an approved verification step.
5. Choose the next step	Record the owner, authority, due date, communication, and verification method.
6. Review the result	Decide whether the process worked, needs correction, or requires escalation.

Evidence quality

Strong evidence	Weak substitute
Specific behavior, setting, action, result, and learning	A label such as “hard worker” or “bad attitude”
Comparable job-related response or approved work sample	Confidence, charm, familiarity, or personal similarity
Record that can be checked and put in context	Rumor, social-media assumption, or unexplained gap
Acknowledged miss plus concrete correction	Perfect-sounding answer with no detail

Applied Scenario: The First Week Silence

A new hire says everything is fine while training records show missed practice and unclear expectations.

Your decision

WHAT FACTS ARE PRESENT?

WHAT ARE YOU ASSUMING?

WHICH JOB-RELATED STANDARD APPLIES?

WHAT EVIDENCE IS MISSING?

WHAT IS THE FAIREST AUTHORIZED NEXT STEP?

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

Answer guidance A defensible response slows the decision long enough to apply the written standard from Chapter 25. It distinguishes evidence from preference, asks only relevant follow-up questions, documents the reasoning, and escalates anything outside the manager's authority. A weak response fills gaps with confidence, urgency, reputation, or punishment.

Chapter 25 Action Record 103

Complete this page for one real decision involving “Make the First Shift Match the Promise.” Use initials or an approved case identifier when privacy requires it.

Field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role or case ID	
Decision owner	
Date opened	
Required decision date	
Applicable policy / tool	
Authorized reviewer	

DECISION TO MAKE

VERIFIED FACTS

MISSING EVIDENCE AND APPROVED WAY TO OBTAIN IT

STANDARD APPLIED

NEXT ACTION, OWNER, DEADLINE, AND VERIFICATION

WHAT THIS CASE TEACHES THE SYSTEM

Manager sign-off: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Chapter 26

Use 7 Day 14 Day 30 Day 60 Day and 90 Day Check Ins

Create a listening and verification rhythm that catches preventable loss early.

The manager's question What should managers learn before silence becomes resignation?

Why this chapter matters

In restaurant operations, first-90-day support becomes unreliable when the decision lives only in memory or urgency. Test clarity, training, opportunity, tools, schedule, and conduct before assigning blame. The objective here is not extra paperwork; it is a decision another authorized leader can understand, test, and improve.

The practical test is whether the manager can explain what was known, what was missing, which job standard applied, who had authority, and what would verify the next step. For “Use 7 Day 14 Day 30 Day 60 Day and 90 Day Check Ins,” the written record should make those five points visible without exaggeration or labels.

Care-first lens

Use scheduled conversations to surface confusion, support needs, evidence of progress, and retention risk.

Manager warning

Do not wait for a performance problem or resignation to ask how the job is going.

Chapter 26 Field Guide 107

Use this sequence

Step	Working instruction
1. Name the decision	What should managers learn before silence becomes resignation?
2. Separate facts	List direct observations, records, and candidate or employee statements. Do not mix inference into the fact column.
3. Apply the standard	Create a listening and verification rhythm that catches preventable loss early.
4. Identify missing evidence	Ask only job-related follow-up questions or use an approved verification step.
5. Choose the next step	Record the owner, authority, due date, communication, and verification method.
6. Review the result	Decide whether the process worked, needs correction, or requires escalation.

Evidence quality

Strong evidence	Weak substitute
Specific behavior, setting, action, result, and learning	A label such as “hard worker” or “bad attitude”
Comparable job-related response or approved work sample	Confidence, charm, familiarity, or personal similarity
Record that can be checked and put in context	Rumor, social-media assumption, or unexplained gap
Acknowledged miss plus concrete correction	Perfect-sounding answer with no detail

Applied Scenario: The Trainer Problem

The new hire is blamed for slow progress, but the assigned trainer changes the standard each shift.

Your decision

WHAT FACTS ARE PRESENT?

WHAT ARE YOU ASSUMING?

WHICH JOB-RELATED STANDARD APPLIES?

WHAT EVIDENCE IS MISSING?

WHAT IS THE FAIREST AUTHORIZED NEXT STEP?

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

Answer guidance A defensible response slows the decision long enough to apply the written standard from Chapter 26. It distinguishes evidence from preference, asks only relevant follow-up questions, documents the reasoning, and escalates anything outside the manager's authority. A weak response fills gaps with confidence, urgency, reputation, or punishment.

Chapter 26 Action Record 107

Complete this page for one real decision involving “Use 7 Day 14 Day 30 Day 60 Day and 90 Day Check Ins.” Use initials or an approved case identifier when privacy requires it.

Field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role or case ID	
Decision owner	
Date opened	
Required decision date	
Applicable policy / tool	
Authorized reviewer	

DECISION TO MAKE

VERIFIED FACTS

MISSING EVIDENCE AND APPROVED WAY TO OBTAIN IT

STANDARD APPLIED

NEXT ACTION, OWNER, DEADLINE, AND VERIFICATION

WHAT THIS CASE TEACHES THE SYSTEM

Manager sign-off: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Chapter 27

Separate Fit Problems from Training Problems

Determine whether the issue is clarity, opportunity, skill, support, conduct, schedule, or role mismatch.

The manager's question Is the employee failing, or is the system failing the employee?

Why this chapter matters

In restaurant operations, first-90-day support becomes unreliable when the decision lives only in memory or urgency. Test clarity, training, opportunity, tools, schedule, and conduct before assigning blame. The objective here is not extra paperwork; it is a decision another authorized leader can understand, test, and improve.

The practical test is whether the manager can explain what was known, what was missing, which job standard applied, who had authority, and what would verify the next step. For “Separate Fit Problems from Training Problems,” the written record should make those five points visible without exaggeration or labels.

Care-first lens

Test whether expectations, tools, practice, supervision, or role conditions caused the miss before judging fit.

Manager warning

Do not call someone a poor fit when the restaurant did not provide a fair learning path.

Chapter 27 Field Guide 111

Use this sequence

Step	Working instruction
1. Name the decision	Is the employee failing, or is the system failing the employee?
2. Separate facts	List direct observations, records, and candidate or employee statements. Do not mix inference into the fact column.
3. Apply the standard	Determine whether the issue is clarity, opportunity, skill, support, conduct, schedule, or role mismatch.
4. Identify missing evidence	Ask only job-related follow-up questions or use an approved verification step.
5. Choose the next step	Record the owner, authority, due date, communication, and verification method.
6. Review the result	Decide whether the process worked, needs correction, or requires escalation.

Evidence quality

Strong evidence	Weak substitute
Specific behavior, setting, action, result, and learning	A label such as “hard worker” or “bad attitude”
Comparable job-related response or approved work sample	Confidence, charm, familiarity, or personal similarity
Record that can be checked and put in context	Rumor, social-media assumption, or unexplained gap
Acknowledged miss plus concrete correction	Perfect-sounding answer with no detail

Applied Scenario: The Reliable Employee at Risk

A dependable employee is quietly considering leaving because of scheduling and manager behavior.

Your decision

WHAT FACTS ARE PRESENT?

WHAT ARE YOU ASSUMING?

WHICH JOB-RELATED STANDARD APPLIES?

WHAT EVIDENCE IS MISSING?

WHAT IS THE FAIREST AUTHORIZED NEXT STEP?

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

Answer guidance A defensible response slows the decision long enough to apply the written standard from Chapter 27. It distinguishes evidence from preference, asks only relevant follow-up questions, documents the reasoning, and escalates anything outside the manager's authority. A weak response fills gaps with confidence, urgency, reputation, or punishment.

Chapter 27 Action Record 111

Complete this page for one real decision involving "Separate Fit Problems from Training Problems." Use initials or an approved case identifier when privacy requires it.

Field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role or case ID	
Decision owner	
Date opened	
Required decision date	
Applicable policy / tool	
Authorized reviewer	

DECISION TO MAKE

VERIFIED FACTS

MISSING EVIDENCE AND APPROVED WAY TO OBTAIN IT

STANDARD APPLIED

NEXT ACTION, OWNER, DEADLINE, AND VERIFICATION

WHAT THIS CASE TEACHES THE SYSTEM

Manager sign-off: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Chapter 28

Coach Early and Fairly

Use facts, expectations, support, practice, deadlines, verification, and documented follow-through.

The manager's question How can a manager correct a problem before it hardens?

Why this chapter matters

In restaurant operations, first-90-day support becomes unreliable when the decision lives only in memory or urgency. Test clarity, training, opportunity, tools, schedule, and conduct before assigning blame. The objective here is not extra paperwork; it is a decision another authorized leader can understand, test, and improve.

The practical test is whether the manager can explain what was known, what was missing, which job standard applied, who had authority, and what would verify the next step. For “Coach Early and Fairly,” the written record should make those five points visible without exaggeration or labels.

Care-first lens

Name the observed gap, the expected standard, the support offered, and the follow-up date.

Manager warning

Do not coach through vague warnings, public embarrassment, or changing expectations.

Chapter 28 Field Guide 115

Use this sequence

Step	Working instruction
1. Name the decision	How can a manager correct a problem before it hardens?
2. Separate facts	List direct observations, records, and candidate or employee statements. Do not mix inference into the fact column.
3. Apply the standard	Use facts, expectations, support, practice, deadlines, verification, and documented follow-through.
4. Identify missing evidence	Ask only job-related follow-up questions or use an approved verification step.
5. Choose the next step	Record the owner, authority, due date, communication, and verification method.
6. Review the result	Decide whether the process worked, needs correction, or requires escalation.

Evidence quality

Strong evidence	Weak substitute
Specific behavior, setting, action, result, and learning	A label such as “hard worker” or “bad attitude”
Comparable job-related response or approved work sample	Confidence, charm, familiarity, or personal similarity
Record that can be checked and put in context	Rumor, social-media assumption, or unexplained gap
Acknowledged miss plus concrete correction	Perfect-sounding answer with no detail

Applied Scenario: The Exit Pattern

Three recent employees cite different immediate reasons but share one operational condition.

Your decision

WHAT FACTS ARE PRESENT?

WHAT ARE YOU ASSUMING?

WHICH JOB-RELATED STANDARD APPLIES?

WHAT EVIDENCE IS MISSING?

WHAT IS THE FAIREST AUTHORIZED NEXT STEP?

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

Answer guidance A defensible response slows the decision long enough to apply the written standard from Chapter 28. It distinguishes evidence from preference, asks only relevant follow-up questions, documents the reasoning, and escalates anything outside the manager's authority. A weak response fills gaps with confidence, urgency, reputation, or punishment.

Chapter 28 Action Record 115

Complete this page for one real decision involving “Coach Early and Fairly.” Use initials or an approved case identifier when privacy requires it.

Field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role or case ID	
Decision owner	
Date opened	
Required decision date	
Applicable policy / tool	
Authorized reviewer	

DECISION TO MAKE

VERIFIED FACTS

MISSING EVIDENCE AND APPROVED WAY TO OBTAIN IT

STANDARD APPLIED

NEXT ACTION, OWNER, DEADLINE, AND VERIFICATION

WHAT THIS CASE TEACHES THE SYSTEM

Manager sign-off: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Part VI

Keep the Right Employees

Show managers how fairness, scheduling, recognition, workload, growth, trust, and leadership behavior influence retention.

Part standard Address controllable working conditions without promising that every departure can or should be prevented.

Chapter 29

Why Good Employees Stay

Examine fairness, competent leadership, workable schedules, tools, staffing, safety, respect, growth, recognition, and trust.

The manager's question What does the restaurant control about retention?

Why this chapter matters

In restaurant operations, retention and trust becomes unreliable when the decision lives only in memory or urgency. Address controllable working conditions without promising that every departure can or should be prevented. The objective here is not extra paperwork; it is a decision another authorized leader can understand, test, and improve.

The practical test is whether the manager can explain what was known, what was missing, which job standard applied, who had authority, and what would verify the next step. For “Why Good Employees Stay,” the written record should make those five points visible without exaggeration or labels.

Care-first lens

Look for conditions managers control: respect, clarity, fair treatment, learning, recognition, and workable leadership.

Manager warning

Do not reduce retention to pay alone or assume good employees will tolerate preventable disorder.

Chapter 29 Field Guide 120

Use this sequence

Step	Working instruction
1. Name the decision	What does the restaurant control about retention?
2. Separate facts	List direct observations, records, and candidate or employee statements. Do not mix inference into the fact column.
3. Apply the standard	Examine fairness, competent leadership, workable schedules, tools, staffing, safety, respect, growth, recognition, and trust.
4. Identify missing evidence	Ask only job-related follow-up questions or use an approved verification step.
5. Choose the next step	Record the owner, authority, due date, communication, and verification method.
6. Review the result	Decide whether the process worked, needs correction, or requires escalation.

Evidence quality

Strong evidence	Weak substitute
Specific behavior, setting, action, result, and learning	A label such as “hard worker” or “bad attitude”
Comparable job-related response or approved work sample	Confidence, charm, familiarity, or personal similarity
Record that can be checked and put in context	Rumor, social-media assumption, or unexplained gap
Acknowledged miss plus concrete correction	Perfect-sounding answer with no detail

Applied Scenario: The Favorite Candidate

One interviewer says the candidate “felt right” while the scorecard evidence is weaker.

Your decision

WHAT FACTS ARE PRESENT?

WHAT ARE YOU ASSUMING?

WHICH JOB-RELATED STANDARD APPLIES?

WHAT EVIDENCE IS MISSING?

WHAT IS THE FAIREST AUTHORIZED NEXT STEP?

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

Answer guidance A defensible response slows the decision long enough to apply the written standard from Chapter 29. It distinguishes evidence from preference, asks only relevant follow-up questions, documents the reasoning, and escalates anything outside the manager’s authority. A weak response fills gaps with confidence, urgency, reputation, or punishment.

Chapter 29 Action Record 120

Complete this page for one real decision involving “Why Good Employees Stay.” Use initials or an approved case identifier when privacy requires it.

Field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role or case ID	
Decision owner	
Date opened	
Required decision date	
Applicable policy / tool	
Authorized reviewer	

DECISION TO MAKE

VERIFIED FACTS

MISSING EVIDENCE AND APPROVED WAY TO OBTAIN IT

STANDARD APPLIED

NEXT ACTION, OWNER, DEADLINE, AND VERIFICATION

WHAT THIS CASE TEACHES THE SYSTEM

Manager sign-off: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Chapter 30

Use Stay Conversations Before Exit Interviews

Ask useful questions while the restaurant can still act.

The manager's question What would make this employee's work more sustainable and successful?

Why this chapter matters

In restaurant operations, retention and trust becomes unreliable when the decision lives only in memory or urgency. Address controllable working conditions without promising that every departure can or should be prevented. The objective here is not extra paperwork; it is a decision another authorized leader can understand, test, and improve.

The practical test is whether the manager can explain what was known, what was missing, which job standard applied, who had authority, and what would verify the next step. For “Use Stay Conversations Before Exit Interviews,” the written record should make those five points visible without exaggeration or labels.

Care-first lens

Ask current employees what helps, what makes work harder, and what would cause them to leave.

Manager warning

Do not promise changes you will not own, track, or communicate back on.

Chapter 30 Field Guide 124

Use this sequence

Step	Working instruction
1. Name the decision	What would make this employee's work more sustainable and successful?
2. Separate facts	List direct observations, records, and candidate or employee statements. Do not mix inference into the fact column.
3. Apply the standard	Ask useful questions while the restaurant can still act.
4. Identify missing evidence	Ask only job-related follow-up questions or use an approved verification step.
5. Choose the next step	Record the owner, authority, due date, communication, and verification method.
6. Review the result	Decide whether the process worked, needs correction, or requires escalation.

Evidence quality

Strong evidence	Weak substitute
Specific behavior, setting, action, result, and learning	A label such as "hard worker" or "bad attitude"
Comparable job-related response or approved work sample	Confidence, charm, familiarity, or personal similarity
Record that can be checked and put in context	Rumor, social-media assumption, or unexplained gap
Acknowledged miss plus concrete correction	Perfect-sounding answer with no detail

Applied Scenario: The Concern about Retaliation

An employee reports a problem but fears reduced hours or worse assignments.

Your decision

WHAT FACTS ARE PRESENT?

WHAT ARE YOU ASSUMING?

WHICH JOB-RELATED STANDARD APPLIES?

WHAT EVIDENCE IS MISSING?

WHAT IS THE FAIREST AUTHORIZED NEXT STEP?

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

Answer guidance A defensible response slows the decision long enough to apply the written standard from Chapter 30. It distinguishes evidence from preference, asks only relevant follow-up questions, documents the reasoning, and escalates anything outside the manager's authority. A weak response fills gaps with confidence, urgency, reputation, or punishment.

Chapter 30 Action Record 124

Complete this page for one real decision involving “Use Stay Conversations Before Exit Interviews.” Use initials or an approved case identifier when privacy requires it.

Field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role or case ID	
Decision owner	
Date opened	
Required decision date	
Applicable policy / tool	
Authorized reviewer	

DECISION TO MAKE

VERIFIED FACTS

MISSING EVIDENCE AND APPROVED WAY TO OBTAIN IT

STANDARD APPLIED

NEXT ACTION, OWNER, DEADLINE, AND VERIFICATION

WHAT THIS CASE TEACHES THE SYSTEM

Manager sign-off: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Chapter 31

Handle Concerns without Gossip or Retaliation

Provide safe routing, documented listening, impartial review, confidentiality limits, and protection against retaliation.

The manager's question Where can employees take concerns, and what happens next?

Why this chapter matters

In restaurant operations, retention and trust becomes unreliable when the decision lives only in memory or urgency. Address controllable working conditions without promising that every departure can or should be prevented. The objective here is not extra paperwork; it is a decision another authorized leader can understand, test, and improve.

The practical test is whether the manager can explain what was known, what was missing, which job standard applied, who had authority, and what would verify the next step. For “Handle Concerns without Gossip or Retaliation,” the written record should make those five points visible without exaggeration or labels.

Care-first lens

Receive concerns privately, document the facts, protect against retaliation, and route them correctly.

Manager warning

Do not investigate through rumors or discuss a concern with people who do not need to know.

Chapter 31 Field Guide 128

Use this sequence

Step	Working instruction
1. Name the decision	Where can employees take concerns, and what happens next?
2. Separate facts	List direct observations, records, and candidate or employee statements. Do not mix inference into the fact column.
3. Apply the standard	Provide safe routing, documented listening, impartial review, confidentiality limits, and protection against retaliation.
4. Identify missing evidence	Ask only job-related follow-up questions or use an approved verification step.
5. Choose the next step	Record the owner, authority, due date, communication, and verification method.
6. Review the result	Decide whether the process worked, needs correction, or requires escalation.

Evidence quality

Strong evidence	Weak substitute
Specific behavior, setting, action, result, and learning	A label such as “hard worker” or “bad attitude”
Comparable job-related response or approved work sample	Confidence, charm, familiarity, or personal similarity
Record that can be checked and put in context	Rumor, social-media assumption, or unexplained gap
Acknowledged miss plus concrete correction	Perfect-sounding answer with no detail

Applied Scenario: The Good Person in the Wrong Role

The employee demonstrates care and effort but may not match the role's actual conditions or schedule.

Your decision

WHAT FACTS ARE PRESENT?

WHAT ARE YOU ASSUMING?

WHICH JOB-RELATED STANDARD APPLIES?

WHAT EVIDENCE IS MISSING?

WHAT IS THE FAIREST AUTHORIZED NEXT STEP?

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

Answer guidance A defensible response slows the decision long enough to apply the written standard from Chapter 31. It distinguishes evidence from preference, asks only relevant follow-up questions, documents the reasoning, and escalates anything outside the manager's authority. A weak response fills gaps with confidence, urgency, reputation, or punishment.

Chapter 31 Action Record 128

Complete this page for one real decision involving "Handle Concerns without Gossip or Retaliation." Use initials or an approved case identifier when privacy requires it.

Field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role or case ID	
Decision owner	
Date opened	
Required decision date	
Applicable policy / tool	
Authorized reviewer	

DECISION TO MAKE

VERIFIED FACTS

MISSING EVIDENCE AND APPROVED WAY TO OBTAIN IT

STANDARD APPLIED

NEXT ACTION, OWNER, DEADLINE, AND VERIFICATION

WHAT THIS CASE TEACHES THE SYSTEM

Manager sign-off: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Part VII

Coach Problems and Learn from Loss

Separate coaching, policy, corrective action, resignation, termination, and organizational learning.

Part standard Keep facts, policy, privacy, authority, consistency, and employee voice in the same review.

Chapter 32

Separate Coaching Corrective Action and Separation

Clarify purpose, authority, evidence, policy, consistency, escalation, and documentation.

The manager's question Which process actually applies to the current problem?

Why this chapter matters

In restaurant operations, fair response and learning becomes unreliable when the decision lives only in memory or urgency. Keep facts, policy, privacy, authority, consistency, and employee voice in the same review. The objective here is not extra paperwork; it is a decision another authorized leader can understand, test, and improve.

The practical test is whether the manager can explain what was known, what was missing, which job standard applied, who had authority, and what would verify the next step. For “Separate Coaching Corrective Action and Separation,” the written record should make those five points visible without exaggeration or labels.

Care-first lens

Choose the response that matches the evidence, policy, seriousness, prior support, and authorized process.

Manager warning

Do not pre-decide the outcome before the facts and required review are complete.

Chapter 32 Field Guide 133

Use this sequence

Step	Working instruction
1. Name the decision	Which process actually applies to the current problem?
2. Separate facts	List direct observations, records, and candidate or employee statements. Do not mix inference into the fact column.
3. Apply the standard	Clarify purpose, authority, evidence, policy, consistency, escalation, and documentation.
4. Identify missing evidence	Ask only job-related follow-up questions or use an approved verification step.
5. Choose the next step	Record the owner, authority, due date, communication, and verification method.
6. Review the result	Decide whether the process worked, needs correction, or requires escalation.

Evidence quality

Strong evidence	Weak substitute
Specific behavior, setting, action, result, and learning	A label such as “hard worker” or “bad attitude”
Comparable job-related response or approved work sample	Confidence, charm, familiarity, or personal similarity
Record that can be checked and put in context	Rumor, social-media assumption, or unexplained gap
Acknowledged miss plus concrete correction	Perfect-sounding answer with no detail

Applied Scenario: The Manager Who Skips Check Ins

New-hire meetings are marked complete without meaningful notes or follow-through.

Your decision

WHAT FACTS ARE PRESENT?

WHAT ARE YOU ASSUMING?

WHICH JOB-RELATED STANDARD APPLIES?

WHAT EVIDENCE IS MISSING?

WHAT IS THE FAIREST AUTHORIZED NEXT STEP?

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

Answer guidance A defensible response slows the decision long enough to apply the written standard from Chapter 32. It distinguishes evidence from preference, asks only relevant follow-up questions, documents the reasoning, and escalates anything outside the manager's authority. A weak response fills gaps with confidence, urgency, reputation, or punishment.

Chapter 32 Action Record 133

Complete this page for one real decision involving "Separate Coaching Corrective Action and Separation." Use initials or an approved case identifier when privacy requires it.

Field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role or case ID	
Decision owner	
Date opened	
Required decision date	
Applicable policy / tool	
Authorized reviewer	

DECISION TO MAKE

VERIFIED FACTS

MISSING EVIDENCE AND APPROVED WAY TO OBTAIN IT

STANDARD APPLIED

NEXT ACTION, OWNER, DEADLINE, AND VERIFICATION

WHAT THIS CASE TEACHES THE SYSTEM

Manager sign-off: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Chapter 33

Learn from Every Departure

Use respectful exit information without treating one account as the whole truth.

The manager's question What can the organization learn without arguing with the person leaving?

Why this chapter matters

In restaurant operations, fair response and learning becomes unreliable when the decision lives only in memory or urgency. Keep facts, policy, privacy, authority, consistency, and employee voice in the same review. The objective here is not extra paperwork; it is a decision another authorized leader can understand, test, and improve.

The practical test is whether the manager can explain what was known, what was missing, which job standard applied, who had authority, and what would verify the next step. For “Learn from Every Departure,” the written record should make those five points visible without exaggeration or labels.

Care-first lens

Capture what the departure reveals about the job, supervision, training, schedule, or system.

Manager warning

Do not use an exit conversation to defend the restaurant or pressure the person to soften the truth.

Chapter 33 Field Guide 137

Use this sequence

Step	Working instruction
1. Name the decision	What can the organization learn without arguing with the person leaving?
2. Separate facts	List direct observations, records, and candidate or employee statements. Do not mix inference into the fact column.
3. Apply the standard	Use respectful exit information without treating one account as the whole truth.
4. Identify missing evidence	Ask only job-related follow-up questions or use an approved verification step.
5. Choose the next step	Record the owner, authority, due date, communication, and verification method.
6. Review the result	Decide whether the process worked, needs correction, or requires escalation.

Evidence quality

Strong evidence	Weak substitute
Specific behavior, setting, action, result, and learning	A label such as “hard worker” or “bad attitude”
Comparable job-related response or approved work sample	Confidence, charm, familiarity, or personal similarity
Record that can be checked and put in context	Rumor, social-media assumption, or unexplained gap
Acknowledged miss plus concrete correction	Perfect-sounding answer with no detail

Applied Scenario: The Friday Night Vacancy

A manager wants to hire the first available applicant without a role-success profile.

Your decision

WHAT FACTS ARE PRESENT?

WHAT ARE YOU ASSUMING?

WHICH JOB-RELATED STANDARD APPLIES?

WHAT EVIDENCE IS MISSING?

WHAT IS THE FAIREST AUTHORIZED NEXT STEP?

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

Answer guidance A defensible response slows the decision long enough to apply the written standard from Chapter 33. It distinguishes evidence from preference, asks only relevant follow-up questions, documents the reasoning, and escalates anything outside the manager's authority. A weak response fills gaps with confidence, urgency, reputation, or punishment.

Chapter 33 Action Record 137

Complete this page for one real decision involving “Learn from Every Departure.” Use initials or an approved case identifier when privacy requires it.

Field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role or case ID	
Decision owner	
Date opened	
Required decision date	
Applicable policy / tool	
Authorized reviewer	

DECISION TO MAKE

VERIFIED FACTS

MISSING EVIDENCE AND APPROVED WAY TO OBTAIN IT

STANDARD APPLIED

NEXT ACTION, OWNER, DEADLINE, AND VERIFICATION

WHAT THIS CASE TEACHES THE SYSTEM

Manager sign-off: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Chapter 34

Measure Turnover without Hiding the Story

Track early turnover, regrettable loss, vacancy days, source quality, first-90-day retention, and pattern evidence.

The manager's question Which numbers reveal a fixable operating problem?

Why this chapter matters

In restaurant operations, fair response and learning becomes unreliable when the decision lives only in memory or urgency. Keep facts, policy, privacy, authority, consistency, and employee voice in the same review. The objective here is not extra paperwork; it is a decision another authorized leader can understand, test, and improve.

The practical test is whether the manager can explain what was known, what was missing, which job standard applied, who had authority, and what would verify the next step. For “Measure Turnover without Hiding the Story,” the written record should make those five points visible without exaggeration or labels.

Care-first lens

Track departures by role, timing, reason pattern, and operating condition so leadership can see the cause.

Manager warning

Do not celebrate a lower number if the record hides transfers, short-tenure loss, or avoidable patterns.

Chapter 34 Field Guide 141

Use this sequence

Step	Working instruction
1. Name the decision	Which numbers reveal a fixable operating problem?
2. Separate facts	List direct observations, records, and candidate or employee statements. Do not mix inference into the fact column.
3. Apply the standard	Track early turnover, regrettable loss, vacancy days, source quality, first-90-day retention, and pattern evidence.
4. Identify missing evidence	Ask only job-related follow-up questions or use an approved verification step.
5. Choose the next step	Record the owner, authority, due date, communication, and verification method.
6. Review the result	Decide whether the process worked, needs correction, or requires escalation.

Evidence quality

Strong evidence	Weak substitute
Specific behavior, setting, action, result, and learning	A label such as "hard worker" or "bad attitude"
Comparable job-related response or approved work sample	Confidence, charm, familiarity, or personal similarity
Record that can be checked and put in context	Rumor, social-media assumption, or unexplained gap
Acknowledged miss plus concrete correction	Perfect-sounding answer with no detail

Applied Scenario: The Experienced Candidate

Strong experience is paired with blame, disrespect, or resistance to standards.

Your decision

WHAT FACTS ARE PRESENT?

WHAT ARE YOU ASSUMING?

WHICH JOB-RELATED STANDARD APPLIES?

WHAT EVIDENCE IS MISSING?

WHAT IS THE FAIREST AUTHORIZED NEXT STEP?

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

Answer guidance A defensible response slows the decision long enough to apply the written standard from Chapter 34. It distinguishes evidence from preference, asks only relevant follow-up questions, documents the reasoning, and escalates anything outside the manager's authority. A weak response fills gaps with confidence, urgency, reputation, or punishment.

Chapter 34 Action Record 141

Complete this page for one real decision involving “Measure Turnover without Hiding the Story.” Use initials or an approved case identifier when privacy requires it.

Field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role or case ID	
Decision owner	
Date opened	
Required decision date	
Applicable policy / tool	
Authorized reviewer	

DECISION TO MAKE

VERIFIED FACTS

MISSING EVIDENCE AND APPROVED WAY TO OBTAIN IT

STANDARD APPLIED

NEXT ACTION, OWNER, DEADLINE, AND VERIFICATION

WHAT THIS CASE TEACHES THE SYSTEM

Manager sign-off: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Part VIII

Install and Hold the System

Use measures, review rhythms, manager sign-off, 30-day or 60-day installation, and controlled forms to make the process repeatable.

Part standard Use a small tool set, a named owner, weekly evidence, correction, and a decision gate.

Chapter 35

Review Hiring and Retention Every Week

Create a short management rhythm for vacancies, candidates, starts, check-ins, risks, ownership, and deadlines.

The manager's question What must leaders review before another week passes?

Why this chapter matters

In restaurant operations, installation and sustainment becomes unreliable when the decision lives only in memory or urgency. Use a small tool set, a named owner, weekly evidence, correction, and a decision gate. The objective here is not extra paperwork; it is a decision another authorized leader can understand, test, and improve.

The practical test is whether the manager can explain what was known, what was missing, which job standard applied, who had authority, and what would verify the next step. For “Review Hiring and Retention Every Week,” the written record should make those five points visible without exaggeration or labels.

Care-first lens

Review pipeline, open roles, early-tenure risk, concerns, coaching, and ownership in one short meeting.

Manager warning

Do not turn the weekly review into a status ritual without decisions, owners, and verification.

Chapter 35 Field Guide 146

Use this sequence

Step	Working instruction
1. Name the decision	What must leaders review before another week passes?
2. Separate facts	List direct observations, records, and candidate or employee statements. Do not mix inference into the fact column.
3. Apply the standard	Create a short management rhythm for vacancies, candidates, starts, check-ins, risks, ownership, and deadlines.
4. Identify missing evidence	Ask only job-related follow-up questions or use an approved verification step.
5. Choose the next step	Record the owner, authority, due date, communication, and verification method.
6. Review the result	Decide whether the process worked, needs correction, or requires escalation.

Evidence quality

Strong evidence	Weak substitute
Specific behavior, setting, action, result, and learning	A label such as “hard worker” or “bad attitude”
Comparable job-related response or approved work sample	Confidence, charm, familiarity, or personal similarity
Record that can be checked and put in context	Rumor, social-media assumption, or unexplained gap
Acknowledged miss plus concrete correction	Perfect-sounding answer with no detail

Applied Scenario: The Quiet Candidate

A reserved candidate provides strong evidence but does not perform socially like the manager expects.

Your decision

WHAT FACTS ARE PRESENT?

WHAT ARE YOU ASSUMING?

WHICH JOB-RELATED STANDARD APPLIES?

WHAT EVIDENCE IS MISSING?

WHAT IS THE FAIREST AUTHORIZED NEXT STEP?

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

Answer guidance A defensible response slows the decision long enough to apply the written standard from Chapter 35. It distinguishes evidence from preference, asks only relevant follow-up questions, documents the reasoning, and escalates anything outside the manager's authority. A weak response fills gaps with confidence, urgency, reputation, or punishment.

Chapter 35 Action Record 146

Complete this page for one real decision involving “Review Hiring and Retention Every Week.” Use initials or an approved case identifier when privacy requires it.

Field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role or case ID	
Decision owner	
Date opened	
Required decision date	
Applicable policy / tool	
Authorized reviewer	

DECISION TO MAKE

VERIFIED FACTS

MISSING EVIDENCE AND APPROVED WAY TO OBTAIN IT

STANDARD APPLIED

NEXT ACTION, OWNER, DEADLINE, AND VERIFICATION

WHAT THIS CASE TEACHES THE SYSTEM

Manager sign-off: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Chapter 36

Install the System in 30 or 60 Days

Begin with one problem, one owner, three to five tools, evidence, training, review, correction, and a final decision gate.

The manager's question How do we make this process hold after launch?

Why this chapter matters

In restaurant operations, installation and sustainment becomes unreliable when the decision lives only in memory or urgency. Use a small tool set, a named owner, weekly evidence, correction, and a decision gate. The objective here is not extra paperwork; it is a decision another authorized leader can understand, test, and improve.

The practical test is whether the manager can explain what was known, what was missing, which job standard applied, who had authority, and what would verify the next step. For "Install the System in 30 or 60 Days," the written record should make those five points visible without exaggeration or labels.

Care-first lens

Install the smallest workable routine first, then expand only after it is being used and verified.

Manager warning

Do not call the system installed because forms were distributed or a meeting was held.

Chapter 36 Field Guide 150

Use this sequence

Step	Working instruction
1. Name the decision	How do we make this process hold after launch?
2. Separate facts	List direct observations, records, and candidate or employee statements. Do not mix inference into the fact column.
3. Apply the standard	Begin with one problem, one owner, three to five tools, evidence, training, review, correction, and a final decision gate.
4. Identify missing evidence	Ask only job-related follow-up questions or use an approved verification step.
5. Choose the next step	Record the owner, authority, due date, communication, and verification method.
6. Review the result	Decide whether the process worked, needs correction, or requires escalation.

Evidence quality

Strong evidence	Weak substitute
Specific behavior, setting, action, result, and learning	A label such as “hard worker” or “bad attitude”
Comparable job-related response or approved work sample	Confidence, charm, familiarity, or personal similarity
Record that can be checked and put in context	Rumor, social-media assumption, or unexplained gap
Acknowledged miss plus concrete correction	Perfect-sounding answer with no detail

Applied Scenario: The Employee Referral

A respected employee recommends a friend and the manager wants to skip the normal process.

Your decision

WHAT FACTS ARE PRESENT?

WHAT ARE YOU ASSUMING?

WHICH JOB-RELATED STANDARD APPLIES?

WHAT EVIDENCE IS MISSING?

WHAT IS THE FAIREST AUTHORIZED NEXT STEP?

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

Answer guidance A defensible response slows the decision long enough to apply the written standard from Chapter 36. It distinguishes evidence from preference, asks only relevant follow-up questions, documents the reasoning, and escalates anything outside the manager's authority. A weak response fills gaps with confidence, urgency, reputation, or punishment.

Chapter 36 Action Record 150

Complete this page for one real decision involving “Install the System in 30 or 60 Days.” Use initials or an approved case identifier when privacy requires it.

Field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role or case ID	
Decision owner	
Date opened	
Required decision date	
Applicable policy / tool	
Authorized reviewer	

DECISION TO MAKE

VERIFIED FACTS

MISSING EVIDENCE AND APPROVED WAY TO OBTAIN IT

STANDARD APPLIED

NEXT ACTION, OWNER, DEADLINE, AND VERIFICATION

WHAT THIS CASE TEACHES THE SYSTEM

Manager sign-off: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: _____

Forms Directory

These are workbook practice templates and cross-references. Where a GRV-HR ID is shown, use the current controlled GRV-HR form for live records. Where an ID is not shown, verify the current forms register rather than inventing or reusing an ID.

Workbook tool	Use point	Control
Staffing Need and Role Request	Before recruiting	Use existing GRV-HR01.
Position Success Profile	Before recruiting	Use existing GRV-HR02.
Job Posting Truth Check	Before posting	Map to current GRV-HR register.
Applicant Screening Worksheet	Application review	Map to current GRV-HR register.
Structured Interview Guide	Interview	Use existing GRV-HR06.
Care Evidence Question Bank	Interview	Workbook teaching tool; cross-reference GRV-HR06.
Candidate Evidence Scorecard	Selection	Map to current GRV-HR register.
Realistic Job Preview Checklist	Interview or second look	Map to current GRV-HR register.
Reference and Verification Record	Pre-offer or authorized stage	Map to current GRV-HR register.
Hiring Decision Record	Selection	Map to current GRV-HR register.
Preboarding Readiness Checklist	Before Day One	Map to current GRV-HR register.
First Week Fit and Support Check	First week	Use existing GRV-HR12.
New Hire Check In Record	Days 7 14 30 60 and 90	Map to current GRV-HR register.
Early Retention Risk Review	First 90 days	Map to current GRV-HR register.
New Hire Coaching Record	As needed	Map to current GRV-HR register.
Stay Conversation Guide	Quarterly or at risk	Map to current GRV-HR register.
Employee Concern Intake	As needed	Map to current GRV-HR register.
Corrective Action Review Checklist	Before corrective action	Use existing GRV-HR23.
Exit Conversation Record	At separation	Map to current GRV-HR register.
Turnover Pattern Analysis	Monthly and quarterly	Use existing GRV-HR tool title; verify exact ID.
Weekly Hiring and Retention Review	Weekly	Map to current GRV-HR register.
30 Day or 60 Day Installation Tracker	During rollout	Connect to GRV-IV; do not duplicate installation IDs.

Guided Practice Tool 1: Staffing Need and Role Request

Confirm demand, coverage, skill, availability, wage authorization, owner, and deadline.

Use point Before recruiting	
ID control Use existing GRV-HR01.	
Control question	Working entry
What decision does this support?	
Who is authorized to complete it?	
Which evidence belongs here?	
Which policy or controlled tool applies?	
When is review due?	
How will completion be verified?	

MANAGER NOTES

Prepared by: _____ Date: _____ Reviewed by: _____

Staffing Need and Role Request: Guided Practice Copy |

Controlled operating record: GRV-HR01 Staffing Need & Role Request

Record field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role / employee / case ID	
Date and time	
Manager / owner	
Relevant standard	
Source or record checked	

VERIFIED FACTS AND DIRECT STATEMENTS

ANALYSIS: FACTS VERSUS ASSUMPTIONS

ACTION, RESPONSIBLE OWNER, AND DUE DATE

EMPLOYEE OR CANDIDATE COMMUNICATION

VERIFICATION RESULT AND FOLLOW-UP DATE

Signature: _____ Review date: _____ Status: ☐ Open ☐ Verified ☐ Escalated

Guided Practice Tool 2: Position Success Profile

Define duties, conditions, nonnegotiable standards, trainable skills, schedule, and success evidence.

Use point Before recruiting	
ID control Use existing GRV-HR02.	
Control question	Working entry
What decision does this support?	
Who is authorized to complete it?	
Which evidence belongs here?	
Which policy or controlled tool applies?	
When is review due?	
How will completion be verified?	

MANAGER NOTES

Prepared by: _____ Date: _____ Reviewed by: _____

Position Success Profile: Guided Practice Copy | Controlled operating record: GRV-HR02 Position Success Profile

Record field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role / employee / case ID	
Date and time	
Manager / owner	
Relevant standard	
Source or record checked	

VERIFIED FACTS AND DIRECT STATEMENTS

ANALYSIS: FACTS VERSUS ASSUMPTIONS

ACTION, RESPONSIBLE OWNER, AND DUE DATE

EMPLOYEE OR CANDIDATE COMMUNICATION

VERIFICATION RESULT AND FOLLOW-UP DATE

Signature: _____ Review date: _____ Status: ☐ Open ☐ Verified ☐ Escalated

Guided Practice Tool 3: Job Posting Truth Check

Verify accurate role, schedule, conditions, requirements, access, and claims.

Use point Before posting	
ID control Map to current GRV-HR register.	
Control question	Working entry
What decision does this support?	
Who is authorized to complete it?	
Which evidence belongs here?	
Which policy or controlled tool applies?	
When is review due?	
How will completion be verified?	

MANAGER NOTES

Prepared by: _____ Date: _____ Reviewed by: _____

Job Posting Truth Check: Guided Practice Copy | Controlled operating record: GRV-HR05 Applicant Communication Standard

Record field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role / employee / case ID	
Date and time	
Manager / owner	
Relevant standard	
Source or record checked	

VERIFIED FACTS AND DIRECT STATEMENTS

ANALYSIS: FACTS VERSUS ASSUMPTIONS

ACTION, RESPONSIBLE OWNER, AND DUE DATE

EMPLOYEE OR CANDIDATE COMMUNICATION

VERIFICATION RESULT AND FOLLOW-UP DATE

Signature: _____ Review date: _____ Status: ☐ Open ☐ Verified ☐ Escalated

Guided Practice Tool 4: Applicant Screening Worksheet

Apply the same required and preferred criteria to each applicant.

Use point Application review	
ID control Map to current GRV-HR register.	
Control question	Working entry
What decision does this support?	
Who is authorized to complete it?	
Which evidence belongs here?	
Which policy or controlled tool applies?	
When is review due?	
How will completion be verified?	

MANAGER NOTES

Prepared by: _____ Date: _____ Reviewed by: _____

Applicant Screening Worksheet: Guided Practice Copy |

Controlled operating record: GRV-HR03 Hiring Priority & Pipeline Tracker; GRV-HR07 Work Availability & Scheduling Fit Check

Record field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role / employee / case ID	
Date and time	
Manager / owner	
Relevant standard	
Source or record checked	

VERIFIED FACTS AND DIRECT STATEMENTS

ANALYSIS: FACTS VERSUS ASSUMPTIONS

ACTION, RESPONSIBLE OWNER, AND DUE DATE

EMPLOYEE OR CANDIDATE COMMUNICATION

VERIFICATION RESULT AND FOLLOW-UP DATE

Signature: _____ Review date: _____ Status: ☐ Open ☐ Verified ☐ Escalated

Guided Practice Tool 5: Structured Interview Guide

Provide consistent core questions, probes, notes, and lawful boundaries.

Use point Interview	
ID control Use existing GRV-HR06.	
Control question	Working entry
What decision does this support?	
Who is authorized to complete it?	
Which evidence belongs here?	
Which policy or controlled tool applies?	
When is review due?	
How will completion be verified?	

MANAGER NOTES

Prepared by: _____ Date: _____ Reviewed by: _____

Structured Interview Guide: Guided Practice Copy | Controlled operating record: GRV-HR06 Structured Interview Guide

Record field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role / employee / case ID	
Date and time	
Manager / owner	
Relevant standard	
Source or record checked	

VERIFIED FACTS AND DIRECT STATEMENTS

ANALYSIS: FACTS VERSUS ASSUMPTIONS

ACTION, RESPONSIBLE OWNER, AND DUE DATE

EMPLOYEE OR CANDIDATE COMMUNICATION

VERIFICATION RESULT AND FOLLOW-UP DATE

Signature: _____ Review date: _____ Status: ☐ Open ☐ Verified ☐ Escalated

Guided Practice Tool 6: Care Evidence Question Bank

Evaluate job-related evidence involving guests, coworkers, cleanliness, safety, honesty, and follow-through.

Use point Interview	
ID control Workbook teaching tool; cross-reference GRV-HR06.	
Control question	Working entry
What decision does this support?	
Who is authorized to complete it?	
Which evidence belongs here?	
Which policy or controlled tool applies?	
When is review due?	
How will completion be verified?	

MANAGER NOTES

Prepared by: _____ Date: _____ Reviewed by: _____

Care Evidence Question Bank: Guided Practice Copy |

Controlled operating record: GRV-HR08 Restaurant Values & Team-Fit Evidence Page

Record field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role / employee / case ID	
Date and time	
Manager / owner	
Relevant standard	
Source or record checked	

VERIFIED FACTS AND DIRECT STATEMENTS

ANALYSIS: FACTS VERSUS ASSUMPTIONS

ACTION, RESPONSIBLE OWNER, AND DUE DATE

EMPLOYEE OR CANDIDATE COMMUNICATION

VERIFICATION RESULT AND FOLLOW-UP DATE

Signature: _____ Review date: _____ Status: ☐ Open ☐ Verified ☐ Escalated

Guided Practice Tool 7: Candidate Evidence Scorecard

Use anchored criteria and evidence notes before preference discussion.

Use point Selection	
ID control Map to current GRV-HR register.	
Control question	Working entry
What decision does this support?	
Who is authorized to complete it?	
Which evidence belongs here?	
Which policy or controlled tool applies?	
When is review due?	
How will completion be verified?	

MANAGER NOTES

Prepared by: _____ Date: _____ Reviewed by: _____

Candidate Evidence Scorecard: Guided Practice Copy |

Controlled operating record: GRV-HR10 Selection Decision & Offer Approval

Record field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role / employee / case ID	
Date and time	
Manager / owner	
Relevant standard	
Source or record checked	

VERIFIED FACTS AND DIRECT STATEMENTS

ANALYSIS: FACTS VERSUS ASSUMPTIONS

ACTION, RESPONSIBLE OWNER, AND DUE DATE

EMPLOYEE OR CANDIDATE COMMUNICATION

VERIFICATION RESULT AND FOLLOW-UP DATE

Signature: _____ Review date: _____ Status: ☐ Open ☐ Verified ☐ Escalated

Guided Practice Tool 8: Realistic Job Preview Checklist

Confirm the candidate understands schedule, pace, duties, environment, expectations, and support.

Use point Interview or second look	
ID control Map to current GRV-HR register.	
Control question	Working entry
What decision does this support?	
Who is authorized to complete it?	
Which evidence belongs here?	
Which policy or controlled tool applies?	
When is review due?	
How will completion be verified?	

MANAGER NOTES

Prepared by: _____ Date: _____ Reviewed by: _____

Realistic Job Preview Checklist: Guided Practice Copy |

Controlled operating record: GRV-HR02 Position Success Profile

Record field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role / employee / case ID	
Date and time	
Manager / owner	
Relevant standard	
Source or record checked	

VERIFIED FACTS AND DIRECT STATEMENTS

ANALYSIS: FACTS VERSUS ASSUMPTIONS

ACTION, RESPONSIBLE OWNER, AND DUE DATE

EMPLOYEE OR CANDIDATE COMMUNICATION

VERIFICATION RESULT AND FOLLOW-UP DATE

Signature: _____ Review date: _____ Status: ☐ Open ☐ Verified ☐ Escalated

Guided Practice Tool 9: Reference and Verification Record

Record authorization, source, job-related questions, responses, inconsistencies, and review.

Use point Pre-offer or authorized stage	
ID control Map to current GRV-HR register.	
Control question	Working entry
What decision does this support?	
Who is authorized to complete it?	
Which evidence belongs here?	
Which policy or controlled tool applies?	
When is review due?	
How will completion be verified?	

MANAGER NOTES

Prepared by: _____ Date: _____ Reviewed by: _____

Reference and Verification Record: Guided Practice Copy |

Controlled operating record: GRV-HR09 Reference / Prior

Experience Review Record

Record field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role / employee / case ID	
Date and time	
Manager / owner	
Relevant standard	
Source or record checked	

VERIFIED FACTS AND DIRECT STATEMENTS

ANALYSIS: FACTS VERSUS ASSUMPTIONS

ACTION, RESPONSIBLE OWNER, AND DUE DATE

EMPLOYEE OR CANDIDATE COMMUNICATION

VERIFICATION RESULT AND FOLLOW-UP DATE

Signature: _____ Review date: _____ Status: ☐ Open ☐ Verified ☐ Escalated

Guided Practice Tool 10: Hiring Decision Record

Record criteria, evidence, decision, approval, conditions, communication, and retention requirement.

Use point Selection	
ID control Map to current GRV-HR register.	
Control question	Working entry
What decision does this support?	
Who is authorized to complete it?	
Which evidence belongs here?	
Which policy or controlled tool applies?	
When is review due?	
How will completion be verified?	

MANAGER NOTES

Prepared by: _____ Date: _____ Reviewed by: _____

Hiring Decision Record: Guided Practice Copy | Controlled operating record: GRV-HR10 Selection Decision & Offer Approval

Record field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role / employee / case ID	
Date and time	
Manager / owner	
Relevant standard	
Source or record checked	

VERIFIED FACTS AND DIRECT STATEMENTS

ANALYSIS: FACTS VERSUS ASSUMPTIONS

ACTION, RESPONSIBLE OWNER, AND DUE DATE

EMPLOYEE OR CANDIDATE COMMUNICATION

VERIFICATION RESULT AND FOLLOW-UP DATE

Signature: _____ Review date: _____ Status: ☐ Open ☐ Verified ☐ Escalated

Guided Practice Tool 11: Preboarding Readiness Checklist

Verify paperwork route, schedule, trainer, uniform, access, arrival, and communication.

Use point Before Day One	
ID control Map to current GRV-HR register.	
Control question	Working entry
What decision does this support?	
Who is authorized to complete it?	
Which evidence belongs here?	
Which policy or controlled tool applies?	
When is review due?	
How will completion be verified?	

MANAGER NOTES

Prepared by: _____ Date: _____ Reviewed by: _____

Preboarding Readiness Checklist: Guided Practice Copy |

Controlled operating record: GRV-HR11 Preboarding Readiness Checklist

Record field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role / employee / case ID	
Date and time	
Manager / owner	
Relevant standard	
Source or record checked	

VERIFIED FACTS AND DIRECT STATEMENTS

ANALYSIS: FACTS VERSUS ASSUMPTIONS

ACTION, RESPONSIBLE OWNER, AND DUE DATE

EMPLOYEE OR CANDIDATE COMMUNICATION

VERIFICATION RESULT AND FOLLOW-UP DATE

Signature: _____ Review date: _____ Status: ☐ Open ☐ Verified ☐ Escalated

Guided Practice Tool 12: First Week Fit and Support Check

Ask what is clear, unclear, missing, harder than expected, and requiring support.

Use point First week	
ID control Use existing GRV-HR12.	
Control question	Working entry
What decision does this support?	
Who is authorized to complete it?	
Which evidence belongs here?	
Which policy or controlled tool applies?	
When is review due?	
How will completion be verified?	

MANAGER NOTES

Prepared by: _____ Date: _____ Reviewed by: _____

First Week Fit and Support Check: Guided Practice Copy |

Controlled operating record: GRV-HR12 First Week Fit & Support Check

Record field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role / employee / case ID	
Date and time	
Manager / owner	
Relevant standard	
Source or record checked	

VERIFIED FACTS AND DIRECT STATEMENTS

ANALYSIS: FACTS VERSUS ASSUMPTIONS

ACTION, RESPONSIBLE OWNER, AND DUE DATE

EMPLOYEE OR CANDIDATE COMMUNICATION

VERIFICATION RESULT AND FOLLOW-UP DATE

Signature: _____ Review date: _____ Status: ☐ Open ☐ Verified ☐ Escalated

Guided Practice Tool 13: New Hire Check In Record

Track support, training, fit, attendance communication, concerns, commitments, and follow-up.

Use point Days 7 14 30 60 and 90	
ID control Map to current GRV-HR register.	
Control question	Working entry
What decision does this support?	
Who is authorized to complete it?	
Which evidence belongs here?	
Which policy or controlled tool applies?	
When is review due?	
How will completion be verified?	

MANAGER NOTES

Prepared by: _____ Date: _____ Reviewed by: _____

New Hire Check In Record: Guided Practice Copy | Controlled operating record: GRV-HR13 30-Day Retention Conversation Guide; GRV-HR14 60-Day Retention & Development Check; GRV-HR15 90-Day Employment Fit Review

Record field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role / employee / case ID	
Date and time	
Manager / owner	
Relevant standard	
Source or record checked	

VERIFIED FACTS AND DIRECT STATEMENTS

ANALYSIS: FACTS VERSUS ASSUMPTIONS

ACTION, RESPONSIBLE OWNER, AND DUE DATE

EMPLOYEE OR CANDIDATE COMMUNICATION

VERIFICATION RESULT AND FOLLOW-UP DATE

Signature: _____ Review date: _____ Status: ☐ Open ☐ Verified ☐ Escalated

Guided Practice Tool 14: Early Retention Risk Review

Separate schedule, training, workload, team, manager, transportation, role, and conduct risks.

Use point First 90 days	
ID control Map to current GRV-HR register.	
Control question	Working entry
What decision does this support?	
Who is authorized to complete it?	
Which evidence belongs here?	
Which policy or controlled tool applies?	
When is review due?	
How will completion be verified?	

MANAGER NOTES

Prepared by: _____ Date: _____ Reviewed by: _____

Early Retention Risk Review: Guided Practice Copy |

Controlled operating record: GRV-HR27 Retention Risk Register

Record field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role / employee / case ID	
Date and time	
Manager / owner	
Relevant standard	
Source or record checked	

VERIFIED FACTS AND DIRECT STATEMENTS

ANALYSIS: FACTS VERSUS ASSUMPTIONS

ACTION, RESPONSIBLE OWNER, AND DUE DATE

EMPLOYEE OR CANDIDATE COMMUNICATION

VERIFICATION RESULT AND FOLLOW-UP DATE

Signature: _____ Review date: _____ Status: ☐ Open ☐ Verified ☐ Escalated

Guided Practice Tool 15: New Hire Coaching Record

Record facts, standard, employee perspective, support, action, deadline, and verification.

Use point As needed	
ID control Map to current GRV-HR register.	
Control question	Working entry
What decision does this support?	
Who is authorized to complete it?	
Which evidence belongs here?	
Which policy or controlled tool applies?	
When is review due?	
How will completion be verified?	

MANAGER NOTES

Prepared by: _____ Date: _____ Reviewed by: _____

New Hire Coaching Record: Guided Practice Copy | Controlled operating record: GRV-HR21 Coaching Route Decision; GRV-HR22 Performance Documentation Standard

Record field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role / employee / case ID	
Date and time	
Manager / owner	
Relevant standard	
Source or record checked	

VERIFIED FACTS AND DIRECT STATEMENTS

ANALYSIS: FACTS VERSUS ASSUMPTIONS

ACTION, RESPONSIBLE OWNER, AND DUE DATE

EMPLOYEE OR CANDIDATE COMMUNICATION

VERIFICATION RESULT AND FOLLOW-UP DATE

Signature: _____ Review date: _____ Status: ☐ Open ☐ Verified ☐ Escalated

Guided Practice Tool 16: Stay Conversation Guide

Identify controllable reasons to stay, pressure points, support, growth, and commitments.

Use point Quarterly or at risk	
ID control Map to current GRV-HR register.	
Control question	Working entry
What decision does this support?	
Who is authorized to complete it?	
Which evidence belongs here?	
Which policy or controlled tool applies?	
When is review due?	
How will completion be verified?	

MANAGER NOTES

Prepared by: _____ Date: _____ Reviewed by: _____

Stay Conversation Guide: Guided Practice Copy | Controlled operating record: GRV-HR13 30-Day Retention Conversation Guide

Record field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role / employee / case ID	
Date and time	
Manager / owner	
Relevant standard	
Source or record checked	

VERIFIED FACTS AND DIRECT STATEMENTS

ANALYSIS: FACTS VERSUS ASSUMPTIONS

ACTION, RESPONSIBLE OWNER, AND DUE DATE

EMPLOYEE OR CANDIDATE COMMUNICATION

VERIFICATION RESULT AND FOLLOW-UP DATE

Signature: _____ Review date: _____ Status: ☐ Open ☐ Verified ☐ Escalated

Guided Practice Tool 17: Employee Concern Intake

Provide a direct, factual route for concerns and protect against gossip, retaliation, and casual disclosure.

Use point As needed	
ID control Map to current GRV-HR register.	
Control question	Working entry
What decision does this support?	
Who is authorized to complete it?	
Which evidence belongs here?	
Which policy or controlled tool applies?	
When is review due?	
How will completion be verified?	

MANAGER NOTES

Prepared by: _____ Date: _____ Reviewed by: _____

Employee Concern Intake: Guided Practice Copy | Controlled operating record: GRV-HR16 Employee Concern Intake Record

Record field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role / employee / case ID	
Date and time	
Manager / owner	
Relevant standard	
Source or record checked	

VERIFIED FACTS AND DIRECT STATEMENTS

ANALYSIS: FACTS VERSUS ASSUMPTIONS

ACTION, RESPONSIBLE OWNER, AND DUE DATE

EMPLOYEE OR CANDIDATE COMMUNICATION

VERIFICATION RESULT AND FOLLOW-UP DATE

Signature: _____ Review date: _____ Status: ☐ Open ☐ Verified ☐ Escalated

Guided Practice Tool 18: Corrective Action Review Checklist

Verify facts, policy, consistency, prior guidance, authority, employee response, and review route.

Use point Before corrective action	
ID control Use existing GRV-HR23.	
Control question	Working entry
What decision does this support?	
Who is authorized to complete it?	
Which evidence belongs here?	
Which policy or controlled tool applies?	
When is review due?	
How will completion be verified?	

MANAGER NOTES

Prepared by: _____ Date: _____ Reviewed by: _____

Corrective Action Review Checklist: Guided Practice Copy |

Controlled operating record: GRV-HR23 Corrective-Action Review Checklist

Record field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role / employee / case ID	
Date and time	
Manager / owner	
Relevant standard	
Source or record checked	

VERIFIED FACTS AND DIRECT STATEMENTS

ANALYSIS: FACTS VERSUS ASSUMPTIONS

ACTION, RESPONSIBLE OWNER, AND DUE DATE

EMPLOYEE OR CANDIDATE COMMUNICATION

VERIFICATION RESULT AND FOLLOW-UP DATE

Signature: _____ Review date: _____ Status: ☐ Open ☐ Verified ☐ Escalated

Guided Practice Tool 19: Exit Conversation Record

Capture reason, employee perspective, operational lessons, property, access, and required routing.

Use point At separation	
ID control Map to current GRV-HR register.	
Control question	Working entry
What decision does this support?	
Who is authorized to complete it?	
Which evidence belongs here?	
Which policy or controlled tool applies?	
When is review due?	
How will completion be verified?	

MANAGER NOTES

Prepared by: _____ Date: _____ Reviewed by: _____

Exit Conversation Record: Guided Practice Copy | Controlled operating record: GRV-HR25 Separation / Exit Learning Record

Record field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role / employee / case ID	
Date and time	
Manager / owner	
Relevant standard	
Source or record checked	

VERIFIED FACTS AND DIRECT STATEMENTS

ANALYSIS: FACTS VERSUS ASSUMPTIONS

ACTION, RESPONSIBLE OWNER, AND DUE DATE

EMPLOYEE OR CANDIDATE COMMUNICATION

VERIFICATION RESULT AND FOLLOW-UP DATE

Signature: _____ Review date: _____ Status: ☐ Open ☐ Verified ☐ Escalated

Guided Practice Tool 20: Turnover Pattern Analysis

Analyze early loss, regrettable loss, source, role, manager, schedule, reason, and corrective action.

Use point Monthly and quarterly	
ID control Use existing GRV-HR tool title; verify exact ID.	
Control question	Working entry
What decision does this support?	
Who is authorized to complete it?	
Which evidence belongs here?	
Which policy or controlled tool applies?	
When is review due?	
How will completion be verified?	

MANAGER NOTES

Prepared by: _____ Date: _____ Reviewed by: _____

Turnover Pattern Analysis: Guided Practice Copy | Controlled operating record: GRV-HR26 Turnover Pattern Analysis

Record field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role / employee / case ID	
Date and time	
Manager / owner	
Relevant standard	
Source or record checked	

VERIFIED FACTS AND DIRECT STATEMENTS

ANALYSIS: FACTS VERSUS ASSUMPTIONS

ACTION, RESPONSIBLE OWNER, AND DUE DATE

EMPLOYEE OR CANDIDATE COMMUNICATION

VERIFICATION RESULT AND FOLLOW-UP DATE

Signature: _____ Review date: _____ Status: ☐ Open ☐ Verified ☐ Escalated

Guided Practice Tool 21: Weekly Hiring and Retention Review

Review openings, candidates, offers, starts, check-ins, risks, actions, owners, and deadlines.

Use point Weekly	
ID control Map to current GRV-HR register.	
Control question	Working entry
What decision does this support?	
Who is authorized to complete it?	
Which evidence belongs here?	
Which policy or controlled tool applies?	
When is review due?	
How will completion be verified?	

MANAGER NOTES

Prepared by: _____ Date: _____ Reviewed by: _____

Weekly Hiring and Retention Review: Guided Practice Copy |

Controlled operating record: GRV-HR29 Monthly Workforce Health Scorecard

Record field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role / employee / case ID	
Date and time	
Manager / owner	
Relevant standard	
Source or record checked	

VERIFIED FACTS AND DIRECT STATEMENTS

ANALYSIS: FACTS VERSUS ASSUMPTIONS

ACTION, RESPONSIBLE OWNER, AND DUE DATE

EMPLOYEE OR CANDIDATE COMMUNICATION

VERIFICATION RESULT AND FOLLOW-UP DATE

Signature: _____ Review date: _____ Status: ☐ Open ☐ Verified ☐ Escalated

Guided Practice Tool 22: 30 Day or 60 Day Installation Tracker

Track ownership, training, evidence, review, correction, adoption, and final decision.

Use point During rollout	
ID control Connect to GRV-IV; do not duplicate installation IDs.	
Control question	Working entry
What decision does this support?	
Who is authorized to complete it?	
Which evidence belongs here?	
Which policy or controlled tool applies?	
When is review due?	
How will completion be verified?	

MANAGER NOTES

Prepared by: _____ Date: _____ Reviewed by: _____

30 Day or 60 Day Installation Tracker: Guided Practice Copy |

Controlled operating record: GRV-HR30 90-Day Retention

Improvement Plan

Record field	Entry
Restaurant / location	
Role / employee / case ID	
Date and time	
Manager / owner	
Relevant standard	
Source or record checked	

VERIFIED FACTS AND DIRECT STATEMENTS

ANALYSIS: FACTS VERSUS ASSUMPTIONS

ACTION, RESPONSIBLE OWNER, AND DUE DATE

EMPLOYEE OR CANDIDATE COMMUNICATION

VERIFICATION RESULT AND FOLLOW-UP DATE

Signature: _____ Review date: _____ Status: ☐ Open ☐ Verified ☐ Escalated

30-Day Quick Start

Begin with one visible problem, one accountable owner, and three to five controlled tools. Do not launch all forms at once.

Week	Focus	Evidence
1	Verify workforce need and position success profile	Approved GRV-HR01 and GRV-HR02; owner named
2	Use one structured interview and evidence score	Comparable questions; notes; decision record
3	Protect one start and conduct the first support check	Trainer, schedule, access, GRV-HR12, issues routed
4	Review results and correct the process	Vacancies, starts, risks, actions, owner, due dates

THE ONE PROBLEM WE ARE SOLVING

OWNER AND WEEKLY REVIEW TIME

DAY-30 DECISION: ADOPT, CORRECT, EXPAND, OR PAUSE

Federal Compliance Verification Notes

Checked September 9, 2026. These sources establish federal starting points only. Verify the current page, current forms and instructions, and applicable state/local/company requirements before action.

Authority	Use	Official page
U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission	Prohibited Employment Policies/Practices and applicant guidance	https://www.eeoc.gov/prohibited-employment-policiespractices
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services	I-9 Central and current Form I-9 instructions	https://www.uscis.gov/i-9-central
Federal Trade Commission	Background checks and Fair Credit Reporting Act employer/consumer guidance	https://www.ftc.gov/legal-library/browse/statutes/fair-credit-reporting-act
U.S. Department of Labor, Wage and Hour Division	Restaurant and fast-food establishment fact sheets, including youth-employment limits	https://www.dol.gov/agencies/whd/fact-sheets/2-flsa-restaurants

- Use job-related, consistently applied criteria and preserve an accommodation route.
- Complete employment-eligibility verification only through the current authorized process and timing.
- For third-party consumer reports, obtain required authorization and follow pre-adverse and adverse-action procedures; route decisions through qualified review.
- Confirm age-based hours and hazardous-duty restrictions before assigning youth work.
- Never treat an arrest, rumor, protected characteristic, complaint, accommodation request, or other legally sensitive fact as automatic proof of job failure.

Plain-Language Glossary

Care. Observable responsibility toward guests, coworkers, cleanliness, safety, honesty, learning, and team impact.

Candidate evidence. Job-related facts from answers, records, approved work samples, or verification steps.

Coachability. A demonstrated ability to receive feedback, ask useful questions, practice, correct, and verify improvement.

Comparable question. A core question asked consistently of candidates for the same role.

Essential function. A fundamental duty of a position; confirm the authorized job description and accommodation process.

First 90 days. The early employment period in which selection, training, support, fit, and preventable risks should be reviewed deliberately.

Job related. Connected to duties, conditions, schedule, safety, conduct, or success evidence that the role genuinely requires.

Realistic job preview. A truthful description of the work, pace, schedule, conditions, standards, support, and tradeoffs.

Regrettable turnover. Loss of an employee the restaurant reasonably wanted and was able to retain.

Stay conversation. A structured conversation about what helps an employee stay, what creates pressure, and what the restaurant can responsibly change.

Structured interview. An interview using prepared job-related questions, consistent scoring anchors, notes, and accountable review.

Turnover rate. Separations during a defined period divided by an approved average-headcount measure; document the formula and period used.

Work sample. An authorized, accessible, job-related task used consistently and lawfully to gather evidence; confirm pay and policy requirements before use.

Workforce bench. A current view of internal employees who may be developed for greater responsibility, based on observable readiness and approved development needs rather than favoritism.

Preboarding. The work completed after acceptance and before the first shift to prepare the employee, manager, trainer, schedule, paperwork, and first-day contact.

Selection criterion. A pre-established, job-related standard used consistently to compare applicants for the same role.

Retaliation. Harmful treatment because someone raised a concern, requested a protected process, reported conduct, or participated in a review. Route any possible retaliation concern immediately.

Retention risk. A visible condition that could lead a capable employee to disengage or leave, such as unclear expectations, inconsistent treatment, inadequate support, or avoidable schedule pressure.

Protected characteristic. A personal characteristic protected by applicable law. It is not a selection criterion and must not be used to make employment decisions.

Corrective action. A formal response to a documented issue after required review. It is different from ordinary coaching and should follow company policy and authorized review.

Background report. Information supplied by an outside reporting company about an applicant or employee. Its use can trigger federal, state, and local requirements; use only the authorized process.

Applicant communication standard. The approved way the restaurant acknowledges, updates, schedules, declines, or closes applicant communication consistently and respectfully.

Accommodation. A change or adjustment considered through the employer's authorized process so a qualified applicant or employee can apply for or perform a job. Managers route requests; they do not decide them alone.

Final Manager Commitment

A fair hiring process is not slow by definition. It is prepared. A useful retention process is not sentimental. It is honest about working conditions, standards, support, and behavior. The manager's obligation is to make the next decision more visible than the last one.

THE SHORTCUT I WILL STOP

THE STANDARD I WILL WRITE BEFORE THE NEXT INTERVIEW

THE QUESTION I WILL ASK EVERY COMPARABLE CANDIDATE

THE FIRST-90-DAY CHECK-IN I WILL PROTECT

THE RETENTION PATTERN OUR LEADERSHIP TEAM WILL REVIEW WEEKLY

Signature principle Hire care first. Train skill second. Prove both through job-related evidence, capable training, fair follow-through, and accountable human judgment.

Manager: _____ Restaurant: _____ Date: _____