

A weekly review checklist that ends with a clear next action

A weekly review meeting is useful when it changes what someone will check or do next. Reading the loudest complaint aloud is not enough. This checklist helps a restaurant team define the review window, separate duplicate records from different guest experiences, check reply approvals and carry operational work into the next handover. It is a suggested manual routine, not a claim about a software feature or a promise of better ratings. Adapt it to your staffing and existing business procedures.

Prepare a comparable review set

Write down the locations, Google review date window and collection date before discussing themes. Decide whether the set includes all available reviews in that window or a selected sample. If it is a sample, describe how you selected it and avoid presenting its counts as totals for the location. Keep the same inclusion rule when comparing periods.

Remove duplicate copies of the same review record before counting. A guest mentioning several issues in a single review is still one review, although it can contribute to several theme counts. Separate an edited review from a new visit when the available record lets you do so. If you cannot tell, record the uncertainty rather than silently treating both entries as independent experiences.

Record: [locations], [review dates], [collection date], [all available reviews or sampling rule].

Record the number of included review records after duplicate removal.

Keep excluded records and the reason for exclusion in an approved private note when appropriate.

Remove reviewer names and unnecessary personal details from meeting materials.

Check what the counts actually mean

Use a small, consistent set of themes the team can explain, such as wait, food temperature and order accuracy. Read the reviews behind a theme before assigning work. A keyword can be praise, a complaint, a comparison or a negation. Keep ambiguous cases separate until a person checks the context.

Label the denominator whenever you show a share. "Reviews mentioning a wait complaint divided by all included reviews" answers a different question from "wait complaints divided by negative reviews." Do not combine those measures in one trend. Counts can overlap across themes, so their sum can exceed the number of reviews. Avoid ranking locations from tiny or differently collected samples.

Check the text behind the leading themes.

Note mixed, unclear or excluded mentions.

Write the denominator beside any calculated share.

Keep individual locations visible instead of letting a group total hide missing data.

Review the response queue

Separate reviews awaiting a draft, drafts awaiting owner approval and replies already posted. Confirm that the approved wording matches what was posted. Read any promise of a callback, investigation or remedy and check who owns it. An approved reply is not evidence that a promised private follow-up occurred.

A weekly review checklist that ends with a clear next action

Handle allergy, food-safety and other sensitive concerns through existing escalation procedures. Do not copy medical details or private order information into a group summary. Where a draft needs facts from a location, give that request a specific owner rather than leaving a vague note that the team should investigate.

Pending draft: [review reference and assigned person].

Pending owner approval: [draft reference and approver].

Promised private contact: [responsible person and agreed due time].

Sensitive case: [approved private record reference and responsible manager].

Choose an observable next action

For a recurring concern, distinguish what guests reported from what the team has observed. Choose a check that can narrow the uncertainty. A food-temperature complaint might call for observing holding and handoff against the business's established procedures. A wait complaint might require watching where the queue stops. Do not assume the cause from the wording of a review alone.

Record a named owner, an action and an agreed due time. Describe what the reviewer of that action should be able to inspect, such as an observation note or an updated handover procedure. Use records the business is permitted to keep. Do not photograph or share guests, payment information or private details just to demonstrate activity.

Concern to check: [specific theme and location].

What we know: [review evidence and confirmed observations].

What remains uncertain: [question to answer].

Next action, owner and due time: [locally agreed details].

Review of completed action: [responsible manager and appropriate record].

Close the meeting with an honest handover

Read the next actions back to their owners. Note blocked work, missing information and who will help remove the blocker. Keep "action completed" separate from "guest concern no longer appearing." A quiet week can reflect low review volume or a changed collection window, not a solved problem.

At the next review, compare like with like and record limits before drawing conclusions. Do not attribute a rating movement, sales result or change in complaint counts to a single action without evidence that supports that claim. The immediate output of this checklist is a clearer set of decisions and responsibilities, not a performance promise.

Carry forward unfinished commitments with a named owner.

Check completed actions against their stated scope.

Record changes to the sample or collection method.

Keep a short decision log: what changed, why, and what to check next.

Source: <https://www.repliohq.com/resources/weekly-review-checklist>