

Coach to Performance

MANAGER COACHING QUALITY RUBRIC · 2020 DISTRICT PILOT

Completed scored example from a fictional coaching observation. The structure reflects the district-level Coach to Performance initiative led by the District Manager in 2020.

PROGRAM CONTEXT

ROLE	COHORT	BASELINE	POST-PROGRAM
District Manager	15 Store Managers	20 of 37 met standard · 54%	40 of 46 met standard · 87%

Formal performance-related corrective actions also declined from 25 to 19 across matched six-month periods, a 24% reduction. The program did not treat that decline as proof that coaching caused every avoided corrective action; it was used as a supporting operating indicator alongside observed coaching quality.

HOW THE RUBRIC WORKS

A coaching conversation met the quality standard only when the manager demonstrated the core behaviors below. The rubric was used during live observation, role-play, and follow-up review. Scores were based on what the manager actually did, not what they intended to do.

1 · MISSED	2 · DEVELOPING	3 · EFFECTIVE	4 · STRONG
Behavior absent or counterproductive	Partially present; inconsistent or vague	Clear, usable, and repeatable	Specific, evidence-based, and builds employee ownership

QUALITY STANDARD

21 of 28 points or higher, with no score of 1 on diagnosis, evidence, behavior change, or follow-up. A high total could not compensate for a critical miss in the core coaching sequence.

MANAGER COACHING-QUALITY RUBRIC

#	Criterion	What good looks like	Common miss
1	Defines the performance gap	States the expected result and the current result in specific, neutral terms.	Vague concern or personality judgment.
2	Diagnoses skill / will / environment	Tests whether the cause is capability, motivation/accountability, or the work conditions.	Assumes poor attitude or lack of effort.
3	Uses observable evidence	Grounds the conversation in examples, data, or direct observation.	Relies on hearsay, impression, or labels.
4	Asks before prescribing	Uses questions to understand the employee perspective before offering a fix.	Manager explains the solution immediately.
5	Agrees on one behavior change	Converts the issue into a specific next behavior the employee can demonstrate.	Ends with “do better,” “communicate more,” or multiple competing asks.
6	Establishes a follow-up point	Defines when and how progress will be reviewed.	No date, owner, or evidence source.
7	Closes the loop	Returns to the commitment, reviews evidence, and records whether the behavior changed.	Conversation disappears after the initial coaching.

Observed Coaching Example

STORE MANAGER · COMPLETED SCORECARD

COACHING SITUATION

Store Manager	Marcus Reed
Employee	Taylor Nguyen, Assistant Store Leader
Store	Store 1842 · fictional
Observed by	District Manager / Coach
Issue window	Three weeks before coaching
Follow-up	Three weeks after coaching

The Store Manager believed the ASM had an accountability problem because priority operational tasks were repeatedly being missed. Over the prior three weeks, 7 of 18 tracked priority tasks were late or incomplete, and end-of-shift handoffs averaged five missed items per week.

During the observed coaching conversation, Marcus did not move directly to corrective action. He used the Coach to Performance sequence to test whether the issue was skill, will, or environment.

CONVERSATION EXCERPT

MANAGER

“I want to start with the pattern, not an assumption. Seven of the 18 priority tasks we tracked over the last three weeks were late or incomplete. Walk me through what happens when priorities change during your shift.”

EMPLOYEE

“I usually start with the opening list, but I get new asks during the day. I do the new thing because it sounds urgent, but I’m not always sure whether the old thing is still expected.”

MANAGER

“So the issue may not be that you are ignoring the work. We may be changing the order without resetting the list. When I add something, what would make it clear whether it replaces a priority or sits behind it?”

EMPLOYEE

“If we had the top three written down and changed it when something moved, I’d know what actually dropped.”

AGREED BEHAVIOR CHANGE

- Manager posts the three shift priorities at opening, with one named owner for each.
- When a new request becomes more important, the manager explicitly states which existing priority it replaces.
- ASM closes the shift with a five-minute handoff noting completed, moved, and open items.
- Both review the task-completion rate and handoff misses after three weeks.

Scored Rubric & Coach Review

OBSERVED EXAMPLE · FOLLOW-UP EVIDENCE

COMPLETED SCORED RUBRIC

#	Criterion	Score	Observer evidence
1	Defines the performance gap	4	Opened with 7 of 18 missed tasks over a defined three-week window; no character judgment.
2	Diagnoses skill / will / environment	4	Tested the workflow before assuming accountability. Correctly identified an environment/clarity issue.
3	Uses observable evidence	4	Used tracked tasks and handoff misses, then validated with the employee's description of the shift.
4	Asks before prescribing	4	Asked the employee to reconstruct the work sequence; employee input materially changed the intervention.
5	Agrees on one behavior change	3	Behavior was specific, but the solution contained three linked practices rather than one single behavior.
6	Establishes a follow-up point	4	Three-week review date, two measures, and named evidence source were agreed in the conversation.
7	Closes the loop	4	At follow-up, manager reviewed the same measures, documented the result, and retained the process instead of escalating.
FINAL SCORE 27 / 28 · MEETS COACHING-QUALITY STANDARD. No critical criterion scored below 3.			

COACH INTERPRETATION

- Gap and evidence were specific enough to keep the conversation neutral.
- The manager tested the diagnosis instead of assuming motivation or accountability.
- Employee input changed the intervention and surfaced a manager-created clarity problem.
- Criterion 5 scored 3 rather than 4 because three linked practices were introduced at once; the stronger version would isolate the minimum behavior first.

FOLLOW-UP EVIDENCE

Measure	Baseline	3-week follow-up	Change
On-time priority-task completion	61% (11 of 18)	91% (20 of 22)	+30 pts
Missed handoff items	5 / week	1 / week	-80%
Formal corrective action	Pending consideration	Not initiated	Avoided escalation

FACILITATOR / COACH FEEDBACK

DISTRICT MANAGER NOTE

“The strongest part was the diagnosis. You entered with an accountability hypothesis and let the evidence disprove it. Next time, make the employee own more of the behavior-change language: ‘What is the smallest change we could make that would tell us whether we fixed the right problem?’”

Program Impact Snapshot

COACH TO PERFORMANCE · DISTRICT PILOT TO REGIONAL PRACTICE

NEXT ACTION

- Marcus self-scores his next two coaching conversations before district review.
- Next observation focuses on criterion 5: one behavior change before adding process.
- Skill / will / environment diagnosis is required before any new performance corrective action.

PROGRAM-LEVEL MEASUREMENT

The scored example above shows how the quality standard was applied at the individual-conversation level. Across the 15-manager district cohort, the same rubric was used before and after the intervention:

COACHING QUALITY	CORRECTIVE ACTIONS	COHORT
20 / 37 → 40 / 46 54% → 87%	25 → 19 Matched 6-month periods	15 Store Managers 2019 District Pilot

WHAT CHANGED IN MANAGER BEHAVIOR

- Managers were expected to diagnose the cause before deciding whether the answer was teaching, accountability, or a change to the work environment.
- Observed coaching quality became the primary measure; completion alone was no longer treated as evidence that coaching was effective.
- The skill / will / environment diagnostic and rubric were later adopted as a regional standard for performance coaching.

MEASUREMENT DESIGN

- Baseline: 37 observed coaching conversations scored with the same rubric before the intervention.
- Post-program: 46 observed conversations scored against the same standard after practice and reinforcement.
- Corrective actions were compared across matched six-month periods as a supporting operating indicator.

INTERPRETATION

The program measured coaching behavior directly. The corrective-action decline was monitored as a supporting operating outcome, not treated as a standalone causal claim.