3665 Rung 3 Operator 2

People Book · https://kb.jeffreysummers.com/docs/3665-rung-3-operator-2/

The voice: "I can't afford to step out of the building."

Both kitchen manager and front lead in place. Two domain leads, both running their verbs. The operator is still in the building daily. The leadership layer exists. The operator has not stepped out of it.

[Money] is real but no longer the loudest constraint. If it is still the loudest, the rung was not earned — it was reached for.

[Time] should finally open up at this rung. In practice the Rung 3 operator is usually still working in the business — covering shifts, jumping on the line, running expo — because they have not done the work to let the leadership layer actually lead.

[Trust] determines whether this rung holds. With two leads in place, the [Competence] question and the [Ego] question are running in parallel, twice over.

[Systems] becomes the spine. Without them, every disagreement between leads becomes a power struggle instead of a conversation against a shared standard.

The Cover-Shift Problem is Rung 3's most common failure mode. The operator covers when a lead is off. It looks like filling in. Underneath it is three failures. The operator's version of the role is worse than the lead's — the lead's verb has developed past the operator's last hands-on knowledge of it. Even if the operator is capable, they run it their way — staff sees the deviation and the lead comes back to "well, the operator did it this way yesterday." Worst: the operator voices opinions about how the lead runs it in front of the cast. Whatever is said becomes ammunition the staff carries back. The lead now leads under the operator's shadow instead of under the operator's authority.

The cover-shift problem is the single fastest way to break the leadership layer the operator just built.

The Golden Rule runs here. When the operator covers a shift and runs it differently, staff does not see "the operator filling in" — they see "the person who signs the checks doing it the way they

prefer." The informal version is worse: staff understands without anyone saying it that the operator's preference is the real standard and the lead's is the negotiable one. The leadership layer becomes ceremonial.

The structural answer: the systems are the business's, not the operator's, not the leads'. The operator is the first one bound by them, not the only one exempt. When the operator covers, they run the system the same way the lead runs it.

[The Consultative Methodology for Leadership] activates here. Decisions in each lead's domain are made with the lead, not over them. Giving up responsibility at this rung is not abdication. It is strength. The operator who refuses to consult and runs every decision through their own preference is the one who is actually weak.

The leadership layer is the only real team in the building — three people, wins and losses bound at the outcome. No individual leg wins while another loses. The operator does not carve themselves out as exempt. When the operation has a bad week, "the kitchen manager needs to fix BOH" is naming a leg, not a team.

The [Future State] question at this rung: what will success look like when I am no longer in the building daily and the leadership layer is running it without me overriding?

Honest read: "I can't afford to step out" is rarely [Money] at this rung. The constraint is almost always [Trust], [Ego], or the failure to make the systems the business's instead of the operator's. "I can't afford to step out" is almost always "I have not built the operation that lets me step out — and that is on me, not on the leads."