3330 The Corrective Action Framework

People Book · https://kb.jeffreysummers.com/docs/3330-the-corrective-action-framework/

What the Conversation Actually Is

Honesty is an act of respect. Avoiding it is an act of self-protection dressed up as kindness.

The operator who will not have the performance conversation — who lets the underperformer slide another week, another period, another quarter — is not being compassionate. They are prioritizing their own comfort over the cast member's growth, over the team's performance, and over the Guest experience everyone in the building is responsible for producing. The avoided conversation did not spare anyone. It delayed the reckoning and added interest to the bill.

Every avoided conversation has a cost. It does not show up on the P&L as a line item. There is no column for conversations the operator did not have. But it shows up everywhere else — in the cast member who never improved because no one told them the truth, in the team that adjusted their own standard downward to match the one being tolerated, in the Guest experience that eroded one dropped standard at a time while the operator wondered what was going wrong.

The corrective action conversation is not punishment. It is the most respectful thing the operator can offer the person sitting across from them: an honest accounting of where they stand, what the standard is, and what it will take to close the gap. Done right, it is a development act. Done wrong — delivered with contempt, with condescension, with the intent to wound rather than improve — it is something else entirely.

Direct without respect is just rude. Honest without care is just cruel. The distinction matters because the goal of this conversation is never to relieve the operator's frustration. The goal is the cast member's growth. When that is genuinely the goal, the conversation changes everything. When it is not, it changes nothing — and usually makes things worse.

Corrective action is not punishment. It is the structured conversation that closes the gap between the standard and what is actually happening — and it fails almost every time it is used in a restaurant because operators treat it as one or the other: either they avoid it entirely until the situation is past saving, or they reach for it as a weapon when they are frustrated.

Neither works.

There are two kinds of underperforming cast members, and they require completely different responses. The first knows what the standard is, has the ability to meet it, and is choosing not to. That is a values problem. The conversation is short: here is the standard, here is what you are doing, here is what happens if it continues. No coaching. No exploration. A decision point.

The second does not know the standard clearly, or knows it but lacks the skill or the support to meet it. That is a systems or development problem. The conversation is longer: here is what I am seeing, here is what the standard is, here is where the gap is, here is what I am going to do to help you close it, and here is when we will check back in. Applying corrective action to this person without the support step is not accountability — it is blame.

Before you write anyone up, answer two questions. First: does this person know exactly what the standard is? Not roughly. Exactly. Second: have they been given the tools, the training, and the environment to meet it? If either answer is no, the corrective action starts with you, not them.

There is a specific sequence that works — and most operators who struggle with accountability skip the first step entirely. Before you correct, build. Name something specific and real that the person does well. Then share a time you made the same mistake they are making now. Then correct the behavior. That sequence — build, relate, correct — is not softness. It is the difference between a cast member who fixes the problem and a cast member who fixes the problem and then quits. You need both outcomes.

The framework in sequence:

Step 1 — Define the gap. State specifically what the standard is and specifically what is happening instead. Not "your attitude has been an issue." What behavior, in what situation, on what shift.

Step 2 — Understand the cause. Is this a will problem or a skill problem? The answer changes everything that follows.

Step 3 — Set the expectation. State clearly what meeting the standard looks like going forward. Not approximately. Exactly.

Step 4 — Name the support. What are you going to do to help them get there? What resources, coaching, or changes to the environment are you committing to?

Step 5 — Set the timeline. When will you check back in? What does improvement look like by that date?

Step 6 — Document. Not to build a legal case. To create a shared record of what was agreed, what was committed, and what will be evaluated. The documentation protects both of you.

Before you hold your kitchen manager accountable for Guest complaints, ask whether you have given them a system that allows them to actually fix the problem. When your cast is constantly apologizing to Guests for broken things you control — the POS that crashes, the understaffed line, the protocol that requires three approvals before a comp — that is not a service problem. That is an operator problem. The fastest way to raise your cast's accountability is to remove the obstacles you put in front of them. Fix the equipment, staff the line, simplify the protocol. Then hold the standard.

If the gap does not close after a genuine, supported correction cycle, you are no longer in a development conversation. You are in a values conversation — and values conversations end one way.