

# Kashi Research Memo

## Remediation Outcomes and Human Recovery

Project-use memo tailored to the current Kashi materials

Prepared: 21 April 2026 | Purpose: convert the remediation-outcome lens into product, pilot, and deck decisions

Primary question	How should Kashi measure whether it actually improves outcomes for people, not just whether the analytics were used or a few visible meeting signals moved?
Why this matters	Without remediation outcomes, Kashi risks looking like a smart thermometer: it detects patterns, but cannot show whether handling improved, correction happened earlier, or the affected person and team actually recovered.
Internal anchors	Kashi - Progress & Project Overview (2026-04-21); Transparency That Drives Institutional Accountability concept note.
Output of this memo	A Kashi-specific remediation-outcome framework, proposed KPI stack, pilot implications, and paste-ready wording.

### Executive conclusion

The research does not support treating Kashi's success as a mix of dashboard views, report generation, and narrower interruption metrics alone. Those are adoption and signal-movement indicators. They matter, but they do not answer the harder question: did the product improve the way the institution handled the concern, and did the affected person and team actually recover?

The strongest project-usable upgrade is to add a fourth and fifth outcome layer on top of the current Kashi model: remediation quality and human recovery. This means measuring whether escalation quality improved, whether manager correction happened earlier, whether the targeted person recovered contribution and speaking safety, whether the team regained healthier participation patterns, and whether the concern resolved without recurrence, forced silence, or avoidable exit.

That shift matters because current Kashi materials already track platform use, behavior change, organizational responsiveness, and strategic value. The remediation-outcome lens keeps the same governance posture but makes the success test stricter: not only did Kashi surface the pattern, but did it improve what happened next?

# 1. What the current Kashi metric model already does well - and where it stops

The current Kashi concept stack is already better than most adjacent products because it does not pretend that usage is the same as benefit. The concept note's success framework covers platform use, behavior change, organizational responsiveness, and strategic value. The progress deck also frames Kashi as governance infrastructure rather than as a classifier or generic meeting-productivity tool. That is the right direction: it pushes measurement toward traceable pattern visibility and bounded intervention rather than moral theater.

But there is still a missing layer. The current success logic can tell you whether Kashi was opened, whether certain visible asymmetry indicators moved, and whether triage happened earlier. It does not yet tell you whether the product was good for the person under pressure or for the team's functioning afterward. That gap is exactly where an analytics product becomes a governance-intervention product - or fails to.

## Current Kashi metric layers versus the missing remediation layer

Layer	What it already captures	What it still misses
Adoption	Dashboard views, mirror review, report generation, repeated use	Whether use translated into better handling or safer contribution afterward
Behavior movement	Interruption concentration, speaking-share gaps, directionality, ignored-turn patterns	Whether visible improvement reflected real correction rather than metric-gaming or displacement
Organizational responsiveness	Earlier triage, faster review, escalation support	Whether the process felt fair, understandable, and actually resolved the issue
Strategic value	Earlier visibility before attrition, leave, or formal cases spike	Whether targeted people recovered contribution, stayed, and avoided silent withdrawal or unresolved recurrence

## 2. What the external research actually says

### 2.1 Resolution quality matters, not just whether a complaint or escalation exists

The literature is hard on superficial success measures. In the workplace-conflict and bullying-handling literature, the existence of a complaint route or the formal completion of a procedure does not mean the problem was handled well. A 2021 study of real-life bullying complaints emphasized organizational justice - especially procedural, interpersonal, and informational justice - as central to complainant dissatisfaction and to decisions to escalate externally. CIPD's 2024 conflict findings point the same way from the employee side: only 36% of employees who experienced conflict said it had been fully resolved.

For Kashi, the implication is direct: report generated is a weak metric. A better question is whether the concern was handled in a way the reporting person experienced as timely, understandable, serious, and fair. That makes escalation quality an outcome domain in its own right, not just a process statistic.

## **2.2 Earlier manager handling is a substantive intervention lever**

Research on workplace conflict resolution keeps returning to the same point: problems are often allowed to harden because line managers lack confidence and avoid early handling. Acas notes that managers who lack confidence tend to avoid conflict and rely on rigid procedure instead of seeking mutually beneficial solutions; the intervention goal is to improve conflict confidence so managers can handle issues earlier and more informally where appropriate.

That matters because Kashi already wants to create earlier visibility for correction before complaints, attrition, burnout, or leave become the only visible signals. If the product surfaces patterns earlier but manager correction still happens late - or not at all - the system has not yet proved governance value.

## **2.3 Target recovery matters because harm often suppresses voice before it creates a formal case**

The psychological-safety and speaking-up literature reinforces a second point: recovery cannot be reduced to the absence of formal escalation. The 2020 systematic review of interventions to improve psychological safety, speaking up, and voice found mixed results overall and explicitly argued that longitudinal, multifaceted interventions and more objective outcome measures are needed. In adjacent bullying research, targets often move toward silence, withdrawal, or neglect rather than cleanly toward voice. A 2023 study of workplace bullying and Exit-Voice-Loyalty-Neglect responses found neglect to be a significant coping response, and showed that perceived organizational tolerance changes whether people move toward voice, exit, or neglect.

That is exactly the danger for Kashi if it uses naive success metrics. A concern may appear to de-escalate simply because the targeted person stopped speaking, disengaged, or gave up on the process. So the product needs a target-recovery layer: did the person re-enter contribution, ask questions again, get answered again, and stop showing chilling-pattern collapse?

## **2.4 Retention and work-function recovery are part of the human outcome story**

A stronger human-outcome frame also needs to include whether the affected person can remain and function. The 2025 systematic review and meta-analysis on workplace bullying and turnover intentions found that bullying is associated with increased intention to leave, including in prospective studies. That does not mean every case of repeated meeting asymmetry leads to resignation. It means that unresolved patterns are part of a credible attrition-risk chain.

For Kashi, this suggests a practical rule: success is not merely that the dashboard quieted down or that the case never became formal. A stronger success test asks whether the previously targeted person remained, recovered contribution, and avoided sliding into a still-employed-but-functionally-withdrawn state.

## **2.5 Effective anti-bullying interventions are multi-level and longitudinal**

The intervention evidence also argues against feature-level triumphalism. The current Kashi materials already cite a recent scoping-review finding that effective workplace-bullying interventions are typically multifaceted, multi-level, organization-owned, champion-led, and longer in duration. That is consistent with the broader intervention and psychosocial-safety literature: single dashboards or single training interventions do not reliably change deep organizational patterns by themselves.

So Kashi should not define success as detector worked or mirror was opened. The better story is: Kashi supplies earlier and more structured visibility inside a broader governance-and-remediation system, and its

success depends on whether that system then handled the concern better and changed downstream outcomes.

### 3. What this means for Kashi specifically

The research result is not that Kashi needs a moral or wellness rewrite. It needs an outcome-model upgrade. Kashi is already strongest when it presents itself as governance infrastructure with structural interaction signals, review-worthy events, role-bounded visibility, and explicit refusals around content, affect, and HR decision use. The remediation-outcome lens extends that same posture into measurement.

The project-use formula is simple:

**signal detection -> better handling -> earlier correction -> target recovery -> team recovery -> lower severe downstream harm**

If Kashi cannot measure the right-hand side of that chain, it remains vulnerable to the criticism that it built a more elegant analytics layer without proving human benefit.

#### 3.1 The strongest upgrade: add remediation outcomes and human recovery as explicit success layers

The current Kashi model should therefore be extended from four layers to six:

- Adoption - did people actually use the system?
- Behavior movement - did visible asymmetry indicators change?
- Organizational responsiveness - did triage, review, and attention happen earlier?
- Remediation quality - was the concern handled better, more fairly, and with less procedural breakdown?
- Human recovery - did the affected person and team recover contribution, speaking safety, and stability?
- Strategic value - did the organization reduce late-stage blow-ups, avoidable exits, or other severe downstream consequences?

#### 3.2 Weak success proxies Kashi should stop treating as sufficient

Weak proxy	Why it is weak	Stronger alternative
Dashboard views	Shows interest or compliance, not benefit	Tie use to whether review quality or correction speed changed
Report generation count	Tells you a report existed, not whether it helped	Measure escalation completeness, response time, fairness, and recurrence
Fewer interruptions alone	Can be cosmetic or displaced into other behaviors	Check target recovery, unanswered-question rate, ignored-turn patterns, and recurrence
Fewer formal complaints	May reflect silence, resignation, or low trust in the process	Check whether concerns resolved fairly and whether affected people recovered or exited
Case closed	Administrative closure is not human resolution	Require reduced pattern persistence plus no major

## 4. Proposed remediation-outcome framework for Kashi

Below is the project-usable version of the metric stack. The point is not to measure everything on day one. The point is to stop collapsing people-impact into adoption or cosmetic signal movement.

### 4.1 Escalation quality

What to ask: when Kashi contributed to a concern being raised or structured, did the escalation become more usable, more contextualized, and easier to act on without forcing the employee to reconstruct everything manually?

- Median time from first persistent-risk signal to first substantive human review
- Median time from employee report generation to first meaningful response
- Proportion of escalations judged to contain adequate timeline, context, and traceability
- Post-process fairness rating from the reporting person
- Re-open rate of cases marked resolved within 90 or 180 days

### 4.2 Earlier manager correction

What to ask: did manager-facing visibility create earlier correction rather than late formal procedure or passive avoidance?

- Median days from first thresholded pattern to manager-facing corrective feedback
- Median days from manager feedback to first observable improvement in comparable meetings
- Share of manager cases showing improvement before any formal grievance or heavy investigation path
- Relapse rate at 30, 90, and 180 days after apparent correction
- Share of manager cases where no measurable improvement followed the self-correction window

### 4.3 Targeted-person recovery

What to ask: did the person who seemed to be under repeated pressure recover the ability to contribute, ask, challenge, and stay present without defensive collapse?

- Recovery of speaking share toward their own within-type baseline
- Recovery of answered-question rate
- Reduction in ignored-turn, takeover, or appropriation patterns directed toward that person
- Reduction in chilling-delta after trigger events
- Short pulse items such as: I felt able to contribute; I felt heard; I understood what action was taken

### 4.4 Team participation recovery

What to ask: did the team's conversational regime improve, or did the problem simply become less visible?

- Narrowing of participation inequality without flattening legitimate role structure
- Improvement in reciprocal response patterns and reduction in selective non-response

- Reduction in concentrated one-way directive density toward particular people or subgroups
- Team-level speaking-up or psychological-safety pulse where feasible
- Bystander-support or intervention indicators in later product phases

#### 4.5 Resolution quality

A concern should not count as resolved merely because it never became formal or because the employee stopped raising it. For Kashi, a stronger operational definition of resolution is:

- the concerning pattern materially reduced,
- the affected person's participation or contribution partially or fully recovered,
- there was no serious recurrence in the follow-up window,
- the reporting person rated the handling as understandable and fair, and
- the outcome did not amount to silence, neglect, or distress-driven exit masquerading as closure.

#### 4.6 Retention and work-function recovery

This is where the human and buyer stories finally meet. The question is not only whether the individual stayed employed, but whether they stayed while recovering normal contribution rather than remaining physically present but functionally withdrawn.

- 6- and 12-month retention of previously affected people or cohorts
- Distress-driven transfer rate or team-change rate
- Contribution-recovery trajectories for previously suppressed contributors
- Aggregate sickness-absence or leave patterns in affected teams over longer windows
- Silent-withdrawal proxies, using within-person contribution collapse over time

## 5. What should not count as success for Kashi

This section matters because weak metrics are seductive, especially in early pilots.

- A lower complaint count by itself. A fall in formal cases can mean fear, exhaustion, neglect, or no faith in the process - not genuine resolution.
- A quieter dashboard by itself. Visible signals can move because behavior was displaced, normalized, or made less detectable.
- A case-closure label by itself. Administrative completion is not the same thing as fair handling or human recovery.
- Manager acknowledgment by itself. Reading or acknowledging mirror feedback is not evidence of correction.
- Employee silence after intervention. In this problem space, silence is often an ambiguous or bad outcome, not a reassuring one.

## 6. Pilot and product implications

### 6.1 Pilot design

Kashi's early pilots should be designed to test both pattern detection and remediation outcomes. That means tracking not only whether a pattern was surfaced, but whether the case handling improved and whether the targeted person and team showed recovery in the following measurement window.

- Pair every flagged-pattern cohort with a follow-up window and explicit post-handling review point.
- Separate pattern surfaced from concern handled and from person or team recovered.
- Use recurrence tracking. If the same dyadic or manager-linked asymmetry comes back after a nominal intervention, that should count against the remediation score.
- Collect at least one worker-side fairness or clarity measure after handling, not only admin-side closure statistics.

### 6.2 Product and deck changes

- Add 'Remediation outcomes' as an explicit success-measures section in the concept note and deck.
- Treat 'human recovery' as a first-class outcome area, not as a soft appendix.
- Define a stricter resolution state than 'case closed' or 'escalation completed'.
- Show in the CEO or sponsor logic that Kashi is valuable because it shortens the period of unmanaged harm and improves the quality of institutional response - not merely because it detects more patterns.
- In later design, connect the victim-explainer page and evidence-vault logic to recovery pathways and outcome tracking, not only recognition.

## 7. Paste-ready wording for Kashi materials

The wording below is intentionally plain and reusable.

### **Remediation outcomes**

Kashi should not be evaluated only by dashboard use, report generation, or reductions in visible interaction asymmetry. Because workplace harm often suppresses voice, contribution, and trust before it becomes a formal case, the product must also be evaluated on whether escalation quality improves, manager correction happens earlier, targeted individuals recover contribution and speaking safety, teams regain healthier participation patterns, and concerns are resolved fairly without recurrence, forced silence, or avoidable exit.

## 8. Decision-ready synthesis

The serious version of Kashi is not: we detect bad dynamics. The serious version is: we help institutions surface repeated interaction asymmetries earlier and judge whether the handling that followed actually made things better for people.

That is the difference between analytics and governance intervention. If the product adopts that measurement discipline, it becomes much harder to dismiss as either generic employee analytics or moral performance theater.

## References

### Internal Kashi sources

- [K1] Kashi - Progress & Project Overview (2026-04-21). Internal project deck / progress-share PDF.
- [K2] Transparency That Drives Institutional Accountability. Internal meeting-governance concept note.

### External sources

- [E1] O'Donovan, R. & McAuliffe, E. (2020). A systematic review exploring the content and outcomes of interventions to improve psychological safety, speaking up and voice behaviour. BMC Health Services Research. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s12913-020-4931-2>
- [E2] Acas (2024). Line manager handling of discipline and grievance - a barrier to resolution? <https://www.acas.org.uk/line-manager-handling-of-discipline-and-grievance-a-barrier-to-resolution>
- [E3] CIPD (2024). Only around a third of employees feel the conflict they experienced at work has been fully resolved. <https://www.cipd.org/en/about/press-releases/third-employees-workplace-conflict-not-resolved/>
- [E4] Neall, A. M., Li, Y. & Tuckey, M. R. (2021). Organizational Justice and Workplace Bullying: Lessons Learned from Externally Referred Complaints and Investigations. Societies. <https://www.mdpi.com/2075-4698/11/4/143>
- [E5] Kaur, G., Kaur, P. & Kaur, K. (2023). Targets' Coping Responses to Workplace Bullying with Moderating Role of Perceived Organizational Tolerance. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. <https://www.mdpi.com/1660-4601/20/2/1083>
- [E6] Sun, S. et al. (2025). Workplace bullying and turnover intentions among workers: a systematic review and meta-analysis. BMC Public Health. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s12889-025-23339-2>
- [E7] Success factors for effective workplace bullying interventions (2026 summary of scoping-review findings referenced in current Kashi materials). Emerald / Personnel Review project coverage. <https://www.emerald.com/pr/article/doi/10.1108/PR-06-2025-0600/1336095/Success-factors-for-effective-workplace-bullying>

*Prepared as a project-use memo for Kashi. This is strategy and product-governance guidance, not formal legal advice.*