

SERVICE AUDIT & DEBRIEF PACK

Reusable service-quality audits, manager debrief, and system-survivability controls.

INCLUDED TOOLS

- Planning Quality Audit
- Service-System Audit
- Manager Debrief Protocol
- Service-System Survivability Audit

Use with the current approved book for context and implementation guidance. Print or replenish only the tools the restaurant will actually use. Physical Fulfillment remains optional; digital access and self-printing remain available.

Planning Quality Audit

Score the planning process against evidence from several comparable shifts. One strong or difficult night is not enough to establish a pattern. Use the audit to improve decisions, not to create a grade that hides weak follow-through.

AUDIT QUESTION	EVIDENCE OF CONTROL
Was the forecast useful?	Volume, timing, channel, and complexity were expressed as a range and connected to decisions.
Were constraints identified early?	The likely controlling station and material product, equipment, space, or skill limits were named.
Did staffing represent usable capacity?	Assignments considered proficiency, relief, breaks, training load, and time of arrival—not headcount alone.
Was readiness verified honestly?	Consequential conditions were observed; exceptions had immediate controls, owners, and due points.
Did the team receive the plan?	Employees could state the unusual conditions, relevant priorities, decision path, and ownership.
Were triggers operational?	Signals were observable, authority was clear, responses were proportionate, and reviews occurred.
Did leadership compare plan to actual?	The manager used checkpoints and revised the plan before strain became visible failure.
Did the shift close the learning loop?	Plan-versus-actual differences, causes, carryover, and one reusable lesson were recorded.
Did the next shift benefit?	The incoming manager acknowledged the handoff and completed or escalated open items.

Service-System Audit

Use this audit to find where service loses control across boundaries. Observe an actual shift. Ask for evidence. Avoid rating a system only by whether a familiar manager can personally rescue it.

SYSTEM	QUESTIONS FOR LEADERSHIP
Guest promise	Is the promised experience specific enough to guide tradeoffs in pace, personalization, access, and recovery?
Demand and flow	Where does work enter, where does it queue, and which releases create preventable waves?
Roles and handoffs	Does each consequential handoff have a sender, receiver, required information, and confirmation?
Stations	Can each station state readiness, current capacity, limiting condition, and escalation path?
Information	Does material truth reach the person able to act before it becomes a guest-facing failure?
Standards	Are standards observable, teachable, verified, and still relevant to the risk or promise they protect?
Leadership	Does manager presence increase clarity and capacity, or does it introduce interruption and emotional pressure?
Recovery	Can the team recognize, own, communicate, correct, document, and learn from service failure?
Memory	Do records change future decisions, or are recurring issues repeatedly documented without closure?

Manager Debrief Protocol

1. Reconstruct

What happened? Use times, counts, records, and specific conditions before interpreting cause.

2. Compare

Where did actual demand, capacity, readiness, or timing materially differ from the plan?

3. Explain

Which contributing causes were within the operating system, and which were outside reasonable control?

4. Evaluate

Which planned controls worked, which trigger came too late, and which response created unintended pressure elsewhere?

5. Decide

What one or two changes should affect the next comparable shift, standard, training, or controlled tool?

6. Assign

Who owns each open item, what is the next action, when is it due, and how will completion be verified?

7. Transfer

What must the next manager know before assuming responsibility, and where is the authoritative record?

Keep the debrief brief enough to complete while evidence is fresh. If the event involves safety, legal exposure, harassment, violence, intoxication, injury, cash loss, protected information, or another high-consequence matter, follow the applicable reporting and escalation requirement rather than relying on this general protocol.

Service-System Survivability Audit

A mature service system should survive the temporary loss of a key person and remain understandable through leadership change. Use this audit to locate where the restaurant is still protected by individual memory rather than organizational capability.

FUNCTION	SURVIVABILITY EVIDENCE
Host / reservation control	More than one qualified person can manage waits, reservation waves, table states, accessibility needs, and manager escalation using current standards.
Expo / service coordination	Qualified backups understand ticket flow, quality verification, allergy/modifier controls, runner release, pacing authority, and the current communication path.
Bar controls	Coverage exists for service-well production, responsible alcohol requirements, cash/POS, product security, and closing/handoff.
Kitchen station leadership	Backups understand recipes, capacity limits, critical equipment, product controls, pacing, and escalation rather than only cooking technique.
Dish / ware flow	The system does not depend on one person knowing chemical, temperature, routing, priority-ware, machine, and landing-space practices.
Opening	Another qualified manager can establish the starting condition, read carryover, verify critical readiness, and control exceptions.
Closing	Another qualified manager can protect people, product, property, cash/POS, records, security, and next-shift readiness.
Guest recovery	Recovery authority and boundaries are taught; promises survive shift changes; serious matters escalate to the right level.
Cash / POS exception control	More than one authorized leader understands reconciliation, void/refund rules, outage procedure, documentation, and escalation.

FUNCTION	SURVIVABILITY EVIDENCE
Allergy / safety communication	The process is documented, trained, verified, and not dependent on one experienced server, cook, or manager.
Manager handoff	Current operating truth is carried by the manager log and defined handoff, not by private text threads or one person's memory.
System/version control	The team can identify current authoritative forms, SOPs, training, and standards; obsolete copies are retired or clearly archived.

RATE THE DEPENDENCE

For each function, classify it as person-dependent, developing, or transferable. Person-dependent means one person carries essential knowledge or authority with no reliable backup. Developing means written standards and backup exist but unusual conditions still collapse back to the original expert. Transferable means another qualified person can perform, decide, escalate, and hand off using current evidence.

Choose the highest-consequence person-dependent function and build one layer of redundancy: train a backup, clarify decision rights, repair the documentation, centralize the record, or verify that a second person can actually perform the work under realistic conditions.