

Avalon Partner

Social Media Audit

An independent restaurant
South Coast Massachusetts

Observation date: September 4, 2026

Redacted public copy. Business name, location detail, handles, exact figures and source links removed.

Prepared by Joshua Amado, Founder, Avalon Partner. AvalonPartner.com

At a glance

Five weighted categories and three named liability findings. Anything under half of its available points is marked LOW and printed in deep red. The label is there so the page still works printed in black and white.

Category	Score	Bar	Status	One line
Presence and Coverage	8.0 / 20	■■■■■■■■■■.....	LOW	Two channels live and linked. Three absent where the audience is demonstrably already there.
Consistency and Cadence	4.0 / 20	■■■■.....	LOW	Three listings publish opening hours for a day the restaurant is closed.
Content Quality	10.0 / 20	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■	OK	The content is good. It is published in a format search engines and screen readers cannot read.
Engagement and Community	10.7 / 20	■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■■	OK	Several hundred reviews, repeated local press, and no visible reply to any of it.
Discoverability and Conversion	9.0 / 20	■■■■■■■■■■.....	LOW	Ranks on page one for four customer searches and offers no way to book, order or buy from any page.

Liability findings, scored separately

Finding	Score	What was observed
L1. Accessibility	1 / 5	Every menu is published as a picture. No dish and no price on the site is readable by a screen reader or by the search engine.
L2. Dormant and stale published content	1 / 5	A seasonal promotion with no year on it is live and indexed on September 4. Two copyright lines, six years and two company names apart, sit in the same footer.
L3. Unclaimed and duplicate listings	0 / 5	A place database publishes the address as closed. Two review platforms both state the listing is unclaimed. A dead scraper subdomain ranks for the brand.

The headline: the content and the reputation are strong. The information a customer actually reads before deciding to come is wrong in several places at once.

Grade and industry position

F

42 out of 100

Below 60. Effectively invisible in the places customers check, or publishing information that is wrong.

Ranked third of seven comparable independent restaurants reviewed in this city, approximately the 57th percentile of that set, and above the median of it.

Percentile is measured against the comparison set described in the appendix, not against all businesses nationally. The comparison set is scored on a two component instrument. Your grade of 42 is scored on a sixteen component instrument. The two numbers measure different things and are never mixed.

Read the grade and the rank together

A grade of F and a rank above the median of your own market are not a contradiction. The grade measures you against what good looks like. The rank measures you against the restaurants down the road. Both are true: you are doing better than most of your neighbours, and the whole category is leaving a great deal on the table. Of the seven restaurants in this comparison set, not one has claimed and answered its listing on the main review platform. Not one publishes its prices as readable text on its own site. Whoever fixes that first takes the category.

Executive summary

This restaurant has a genuinely differentiated room, several hundred public reviews averaging above four, repeat coverage from local radio and the local paper, and an endorsement from the state tourism account. The demand is real and it is documented.

What is costing it sits between that demand and the customer. Three separate listings publish opening hours for a day of the week the restaurant is closed. The listing where it is ranked in the top fifteen restaurants in its city is wrong on all seven days. A major place database publishes the address as closed, and that database feeds phone maps and in-car navigation.

None of that is visible from inside the restaurant, and none of it produces a complaint. It produces a customer who drives over on the wrong night and does not try again.

The rest follows the same shape. The menus are published as images, so neither a search engine nor a screen reader can read a single dish or price. A navigation link for the venue's most distinctive offering opens an unrelated page. A seasonal promotion from the spring is still live in September. An online ordering page exists that the website never links to.

Not one of these is a rebuild. Every one is a correction.

- Working well: reputation volume, repeat local press, and a room nobody else in the city can copy.
- Costing you: listings that publish opening hours for a day you are closed, and menus no search engine can read.
- Quick win: claim the main review platform, correct Monday, and reply to the review left this summer.

If they only fix one thing this month, they fix the wrong day on the three listings that publish it.

What you are already doing right

This section is never skipped and it is never padded. Everything below is something specific that was observed, with the evidence attached.

A reputation base that is large, current and still growing.

Local media keeps coming back, and it uses the business's own photographs.

The state tourism account has recommended it.

Nothing structural is blocking improvement. The technical foundation is clean.

People already make content about it for free.

Details removed from the public copy.

Five things you can fix this week, for free, whether or not you ever work with us

Ranked by impact, highest first. Every one costs nothing, takes under an hour, and needs no tool, no subscription and no outside help.

1. Correct the wrong day on every listing that publishes it.

Three listings currently tell customers the restaurant is open on a day it is closed.

2. Claim the review listings that say they are unclaimed, and reply to the newest review.

Claiming is free and it is the only way to correct the hours those platforms publish.

3. Get the place database that says closed corrected.

That data flows into phone maps and in-car navigation.

4. Repoint the navigation link that opens the wrong page.

It sits on every page of the site and it is the most distinctive item in the menu bar.

5. Unpublish the expired seasonal page.

It is live in September and it competes in search with a real page that has the same title.

The three liability findings

These are scored separately and do not enter the weighted total. They are usually the fastest and cheapest things to fix in the whole report.

L1. Accessibility | score 1 / 5

Detail removed from the public copy.

L2. Dormant and stale published content | score 1 / 5

Detail removed from the public copy.

L3. Unclaimed and duplicate listings | score 0 / 5

Detail removed from the public copy.

Where you sit locally

Six independently owned full service restaurants in the same city, plus you. Every one is scored on the same two components, because those are the only two that can be verified from outside for every business in a set. Comparables are anonymised: their owners did not ask to be measured. Nothing here is a judgement about anyone's food, staff or business. It is social media execution only.

Rank	Business	City	Score	The larger social platform	Reviews
1=	Comparable A	same city	69.1	3	4
1=	THIS BUSINESS (you)	same city	69.1	3	4
1=	Comparable B	same city	69.1	3	4
4=	Comparable C	same city	60.0	3	3
4=	Comparable D	same city	60.0	3	3
6	Comparable E	same city	50.9	3	2
7	Comparable F	same city	49.1	2	3

What the table actually says

You are tied at the top and the top is flat. Six of the seven scored identically on the larger social platform, because from outside a login all that can be verified is that a page exists. The whole table is decided by reviews, and that is where you are genuinely ahead.

Three facts about this set are worth more than the ranking. Not one of the seven has claimed and answered its listing on the review platform we could read. Not one publishes its prices as readable text on its own website. And in ten customer searches run for this city, position one was never held by a local independent restaurant. It went to an aggregator seven times, a chain twice, and the city government once.

That is not a warning. It is the opening.

The 30, 60, 90 day plan

Effort: Low is under an hour, Medium is one to five hours, High is over five hours or ongoing weekly time. Who: Owner means you can do it with no training and no tools. Manager means it needs sustained production or strategy. Every item in the first thirty days is marked Owner, because every one of them genuinely is.

The plan is specific to the business audited and is not reproduced in the public copy. The shape of it is: thirty days of corrections that the owner can make alone and for nothing, sixty days of building a content and reply routine, ninety days of owning the searches the category is currently handing to aggregators.

What we would do, and what it costs

This is a business with a strong room, a strong reputation and repeat local press. It does not have a marketing problem. It has a plumbing problem.

The gap between what it has earned and what a customer can find is made almost entirely of corrections.

If you would rather have the plan executed than recommended, that is what Avalon does. Social media management runs \$1,500 to \$5,000 a month depending on scope and channel count. Standalone audits and one time cleanups run \$500 to \$1,500. This audit was free and it stays free either way.

Joshua Amado, Founder, Avalon Partner. AvalonPartner.com. joshua.amado@avalonpartner.com. Fall River, MA.

This audit was free, it is complete, and nothing in it is held back. If you take the five free fixes, never reply, and get more customers because of it, that is a good outcome as far as we are concerned.