

The Steep Cost of “Bad Hires” – Avoiding Hiring Mistakes

Today it is well accepted that hiring mistakes cost organizations real money. Some experts estimate the cost of a bad hire can be 3 to 5 times the original salary. Avoiding hiring mistakes simply makes sense. But doing so is not always easy. Recruiters, whenever internal or external, need to take a number of steps that go beyond simply resume review and interviewing of candidates to make this happen.

A candidate’s actual performance on-the-job results from two kinds of “fit”. The first has to do with the fit between a candidate’s capability - the result of the person’s skills and experience - and the performance requirements of the job. The second has to do with the fit between the candidate’s personality and the culture of the organization. The important thing to remember about culture is that it is a living thing that exists only in the actual behavior of the people in the organization. It is the “walk” that happens each and every day, in the internal conscious and unconscious, internal and external reality of the people in the organization as they interact with one another in the context of the organization. Assessing cultural fit requires techniques that assess this. These techniques collect and average the subjective, predictive impressions of people in the organization about candidates.

The two kinds of “fit” interact. The following schematic illustrates this. The fit between the performance requirements of the position and a candidate’s capability have been placed on the vertical axis. The large number of degree of fit possibilities on this scale has been simplified to four - Low, Medium, High, and Exceeds. The last two cover the situations in which a candidate has more skill and experience than needed to handle the performance requirements of the job.

The fit between a candidate’s personality and the organization’s culture is shown on the horizontal axis. Degree of fit on this axis has simplified to three levels - Low, Medium, and High.

This leads to twelve possible hiring result scenarios. Nine of these, the ones in the lower part of the schematic, occur as part of most organization’s normal hiring process. The remaining three, the ones at the top of the schematic, occur when recruiters and hiring managers deliberately over-hire on the performance fit.

Fit between the Capability of the Candidate And the Technical Performance Requirements of the Job	EXCEEDS			
	HIGH			
	MEDIUM			
	LOW			
		LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
	Fit between Personality of the Candidate And the Culture of the Organization			

Over Hiring For Performance

Recruiters and hiring managers sometimes hire people who are clearly over-qualified for the day-to-day performance requirements of the job. Individuals who are dramatically over qualified are usually the issue. Their past earning levels are high enough to remove them from consideration.

EXCEEDS	BAD HIRE: IMMEDIATE DISCONNECT BETWEEN HIRED PERSON AND OTHERS – TERMINATE EMPLOYMENT	SOME CONNECTION BETWEEN HIRED PERSON AND OTHERS, BUT INDIVIDUAL WILL BE FRUSTRATED BY PERFORMANCE DEMANDS OF JOB	GOOD CONNECTION BETWEEN HIRED PERSON AND OTHERS – BUT LONG TERM TROUBLE UNLESS JOB CONTENT UPGRADED
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
	CULTURE FIT		

“Somewhat” over qualified individuals are whose personal capability exceeds the job performance requirements, but whose career and earning history still makes them “potential” candidates. . Recruiters and hiring managers often believe that “some over qualification” is a bit of a safety value. They will often hire such people when they believe that the work group the individual will join is under some degree of performance pressure.

Unless the organization is capable of dealing quickly with the frustration such hired people feel once they are one the job, such hires inevitably become problematic ones. The depth of the future problem with such hires is a function of the fit between the over qualified individual’s personality and the culture of the work group.

Over hiring on performance only makes sense when the organization is growing dramatically. In such organizations, managers can rapidly upgrade job content, creating appropriate fit between the person’s capability and performance requirements of the job. If the culture is strongly oriented to promoting on the basis of merit, such individuals can also quickly be moved into more demanding positions.

This coping tactic works best when there is a high degree of fit between the candidate’s personality and the culture. If there is not, job content upgrading or promotion at best delay the onset of the problems associated with the type of problematic hire. Sometimes, the problem is solved when the hired individual simply leaves, often shortly after taking the job. The organization simply experiences the cost of finding another person.

More serious impacts occur when the hired person stays and starts to express personal frustration to co-workers. As a result, co-workers may distance themselves from that individual, resulting in decreased productivity and bad feelings in the work group. Alternatively, the frustration being expressed by the hired person may lead co-workers to develop negative perceptions about the organization. Once again, productivity suffers.

Hiring High Performance Fit Individuals

When the individual capability to job performance required fit is high, the degree of culture fit makes the difference between great hires and problematic ones. Low alignment between the person's personality and the culture means that the individual will not enjoy working in this organization. If the job is that of an individual contributor, who has little to no interaction with other co-workers, this may not matter. But there are few such jobs. Productivity normally depends on people working with one another. If the interaction goes smoothly, aligning well with the living culture of the organization, everyone involved will feel comfortable with the interaction. There will be no negative impact on productivity. If there is some level of discomfort, some disconnect between the hired person and the others in the organization in their day-to-day interaction, productivity will be negatively impacted.

HIGH	HIRED PERSON CAN DO JOB, BUT WILL NOT "ENJOY" WORKING WITH OTHERS – WORKS FOR ISOLATED INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTORS ONLY	HIRED PERSON WILL DO JOB, BUT IN THE LONGER RUN, COULD BE GROWING DISCONNECT BETWEEN PERSON AND CO-WORKERS	GREAT FIT ON BOTH PERFORMANCE AND CULTURE
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
	CULTURE FIT		

When the performance fit is high, and the culture fit is medium, this may not be an immediate problem. The hired person could be reasonably productive for a long period of time (months to years). Outside factors could impact the work group in this time period, leading to adaptive changes in the day to day culture that align the person and the others in the work group. The personality of the hired person could be such that there is a positive impact on the work group day to day behavior. As a result, underlying initial cultural fit dynamic could disappear, or never be an issue.

In fact, organizations sometimes hire individuals who they hope will produce desired changes in the culture. They are explicitly depending upon these dynamics. There needs to be some level of fit between the personality of the hired person and the current culture. Without it, the potential of early disconnect is so high that the new person cannot have a positive impact on co-workers. Effective change agents and executives have this ability. They know how to behave in ways which demonstrate that they are "somewhat aligned with the current culture". This allows them to develop an initial level of rapport with others in the organization. When this reaches a level sufficient to start the cultural change moving forward, they start to introduce the factors that produce change in

the culture. Based on their first successes, they progressively introduce more and more cultural change.

Six Types of Problematic Hires and their Potential Consequences

The remaining six possibilities are all problematic. The color in each cells below conveys two things. First, darker colors indicate the degree of negative impact on productivity. Secondly, darker colors indicate the degree of difficulty that organizations experience in dealing with these bad” hires.

PERFORMANCE FIT	MEDIUM	POOR FIT WITH COWORKERS AND LESS THAN REQUIRED PERFORMANCE – EASIER TO “LET GO”	HIRED PERSON WILL NOT PERFORM AS REQUIRED, AND THERE WILL BE GROWING DISCONNECT BETWEEN PERSON AND CO-WORKERS	HIRED PERSON WILL BE LIKED AND FIT IN WITH OTHERS BUT NOT PERFORM AS REQUIRED: DIFFICULT TO “LET GO”
	LOW	DO NOT HIRE: IF HIRED, END EMPLOYMENT ASAP	BAD HIRE, BUT SOME DEGREE OF CONNECTION BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL AND COWORKERS COULD MAKE IT MORE DIFFICULT TO HANDLE	BAD HIRE: POOR PERFORMANCE BUT CULTURE FIT BETWEEN PERSON AND CO-WORKERS MAKES IT DIFFICULT TO DEAL STRAIGHT FORWARDLY
		LOW	MEDIUM CULTURE FIT	HIGH

Medium and Low performance fit is usually apparent in the first weeks and months that a hired individual is in the job. When culture fit is low, organizations normally have little difficulty handling these cases. Properly written probation period clauses in offer letters allow most organizations to simply terminate the individual. The organization merely incurs a rehiring cost. Financial pressures may lead hiring managers not to take this step. This inevitably ends up costing more in lost productivity and other indirect costs than the cost of a better re-hire.

When culture fit is medium, things get more complicated. The medium or low level of performance on the part of the hired individual gets “clouded” by the fact the individual is getting along on some level with co-workers (including the hiring manager). People have a natural reluctance to take what they perceive as negative with regard to a person with whom they are getting along. As a result, the probation period often concludes with no action. Once the probation period is over, dealing with the performance issues becomes more complicated and difficult.

This dynamic is much stronger when there is a high degree of fit between the personality of the hired individual and the culture of the organization. The person “fits in” even though the person’s performance may not be what is required.

In either case, dealing with the performance problem is no longer straightforward. The hiring manager or the co-workers may make an effort to “train” the person, formally or informally. Sometimes this works, often it does not. The manager will use the organization’s performance management to put the person on notice about their lack of performance. Often, this means dealing with this over several performance appraisal cycles. The feelings produced by this are not pleasant for either the manager or the person. The individual may leave, often to the relief of the manager and the co-workers. Sometimes, managers find it “easier” to avoid these unpleasant feelings and move the person to another part of the organization, through transfer or promotion. It solves the immediate work group’s problem, but usually recreates the issue somewhere else in the organization. In fact, it can extend it to impact more people when the movement mechanism is promotion.

Hire appropriately – but how given the resistance to change

Good hires mean that both performance fit and culture fit are high. How do recruiters and hiring managers need to behave in order to do this?

First, recruiters and hiring managers must accept three things.

The first is that they must separate the assessment of candidates into two clear parts. The assessment of a person’s capability to job performance fit must be cleanly split from the assessment of a person’s personality to culture fit.

The second is that the three most used hiring techniques:

- key word based resume ranking,
- recruiter and hiring manager personal review of highly ranked resumes,
- and face-to-face interviewing

are not effective predictors of either on-the-job performance or of culture fit.

The reasons for this are clear and at least well understood by job search researchers, if not by all recruiting professionals and hiring managers.

More and more, resumes today are structured to take advantage of Internet job board key word search algorithms. Often, they are written by professional resume writers, who are fully aware of how to “lace” resume text with the key words that will result in a resume being highly ranked by such algorithms. As a

result, especially in a world where recruiters receive hundreds of resumes in response to a job advertisement, the algorithms used by job boards are not as effective as top ranking the best candidates as they once were

For year, well structured research has clearly shown that there is a low relationship between candidates' interview behavior and their eventual performance on-the-job. Candidates may have far better "interview skills" than they have on-the-job skills.

Most recruiters and hiring managers still depend upon one-on-one interviews as their prime candidate evaluation technique. Despite decades of formal training in recruiter skills such as behavioral interviewing, research continues to show that recruiters' and hiring managers' interview based ranking of candidates is a poor predictor of actual performance-the-job performance.

The fact that organizations continue to rely upon interviewing as our prime assessment technique is probably the result of human evolution. As human beings, we have evolved to be instant evaluators of others, based on our first total impression of the other person, nonverbal and verbal. [Sandy Pentland](#) of MIT has led a sophisticated research program which clearly demonstrates this. His book "[Honest Signals](#)" makes fascinating reading.

Many recruiters tell tales of how their efforts to take these findings into account are undermined by the reluctance of hiring managers to move beyond their intuitive belief that they are effective hirers. Attempts to use candidate behavior assessment and group / final candidate meeting techniques are often dismissed by hiring managers. When appropriately done, both of these techniques are much more effective predictors of performance fit and cultural fit than recruiter/hiring manager interviews.

Since they see themselves, not the HR professionals, as having the ultimate responsibility for on-the-job performance, hiring managers will often undermine the efforts of HR professionals to improve the hiring process. "I don't have the time": and "Just get me the resumes, and I will know who I want to see" are the two most common responses that hiring managers make to HR suggestions to use more effective candidate assessment techniques. Prepared interview outlines, short presentations by final candidates to potential co-workers, working problem solving sessions with potential co-workers, review of past "work" submitted by candidates – e.g. candidate portfolios, multiple peer interviews, systematic use of rating forms are all techniques that work.

Often such techniques are used by "excellent organizations". They become "lionized" by the trade press, show up in conference presentations, and well publicized on the Internet. South West Airlines' well publicized use of structured candidate group interviews for cabin crew and Google's use of multiple peer interviews for professional staff are two such examples.

But this has little impact on the opinions of the majority of hiring managers in many organizations. They know that they are “excellent” interviewers. Their opinions override the reality of data. Unless there is explicit direction from the highest levels of the organization they will fall back on what they know to work. As Sandy Pentland has convincingly shown, it does work, in social situations, when immediate assessment of possibility of safe interaction with a newly met stranger in the next 5 to 90 minutes, is what is needed. But that is not the same thing as predicting future on-the-job performance for a number of months and years based on a 60 to 90 minute face to face interview.

The Better Way, Even if it is Not the Most Commonly Adopted Way

Resume and face-to-face interviews continue to have a place in hiring. But they must be used differently if organizations desire to consistently avoid the 11 problematic hiring scenarios.

All of these better ways require that the recruiting process assess current candidate work place, not interview, behavior in order to predict on-the-job performance and culture fit. There are many ways of doing so. A complete description of the techniques, and the best way of employing them, is the appropriate topic of books. The following hiring story is intended to be illustrative of some of them.

Janine, the senior recruiter in HR at Widget Corporation, has been approached by Maxwell, a lead engineer in Widgets product design group to do a recruitment for two new design engineers. Maxwell has asked Janine to get him some relevant resumes. He has told her that he will know the right candidates when he sees 20 or so resumes. He will then select 2 or 3 people to interview. Based on that, he will know the “right one” to hire.

Janine gently but persistently informs him that that is not how hiring is done at Widget. She gives him an outline of the steps normally used. Janine informs him that Maxine Bridot, Widget’s CEO, has made a 15 minute video presentation on how hiring mistakes hurt Widget’s competitive ability in the market place. She gives him the CD and asks him to view it as soon as possible.

Janine knows that Maxine will stress that it is responsibility of the Widget recruiter to avoid and to rectify hiring mistakes. She also knows that Maxine will clarify that this is not the same thing as being responsible for post probation on-the-job performance, which is the manager’s responsibility.

Janine realizes that her work as a recruiter involves much more than simply interviewing candidates. Her recruiting case load, and the training she has received, reflects this reality. Her personal performance appraisal metrics mean

that a single hiring mistake for which she was recruiter which is not rectified within the probation period will mean the loss of her annual performance bonus.

To give her the authority she needs to be able to address such mistakes, any newly hired individual is not transferred to the hiring manager's authority until the end of the probation period. This is normally 70 working days after the person's start date. Before that date, Janine has full performance review authority over the individual. She can initiate the dismissal of the individual even if the hiring manager objects. Although she has this authority, she also knows that a regular pattern doing so will not be viewed with a great deal of gladness by her own boss.

Widget's Recruiting Process for Professional Staff

1. Janine pulls and reviews the existing job description. If one not exists, she will interview Maxwell, the manager involved about the job, and prepare a short recruiting profile (This will eventually be the basis for a full job description, but other people in HR are responsible for this.). If one does exist, Janine will review it with Maxwell to make sure that it is relevant to the positions for which they are recruiting. She makes notes on any updates or changes that are important, and attaches them to the job description. That way they will become part of the input for the next recruitment, or scheduled job description update.
2. On the basis of this work, Janine prepares 5 to 7 metrics (concrete observable measures), that will be used to evaluate performance in the job in the first 3 months and in the first year. Often this means just making the metrics in the job description specific to each position for which she is recruiting. They will be shown to the final short listed candidates, as part of a briefing later in the process. She sends them to Maxwell to get his sign off on them. If he has problems, he will update them and send them back to Janine.
3. While this is happening, Janine places a preliminary job advertisement on the two "internet" job boards that Widget uses for engineering type positions. One is a large board like Workopolis or Monster. The second is the job board on the local chapter of the professional engineering society.
4. Janine summarizes all of this into a set of 10 or so key words that will be used to rank the resumes that come in on both Internet job boards.
5. Janine monitors and receives the most highly ranked resumes from each job board. She will read the top 50 or so to pick out a relevant set of 12. She will meet with Maxwell to review them to make sure that they are pulling the right kind of candidates. If not, she will update the job advertisements and the key word lists based on what they have learned.

6. Janine instructs Wilhelm, her recruiting coordinator in HR, to contact the top 12 to 15 candidates and schedule a 15 minute Skype or telephone interview. She prepares three “What would you do in this situation” short cases to use in these interviews. She modifies Widget’s “Preliminary Candidate Ranking Form to reflect any particularities needed for this recruitment.
7. Janine conducts the Skype or telephone interviews. She tries to get this done as quickly as possible. She completes the Preliminary Candidate Rating Sheet for each candidate. She sorts her results into “Possible” and “No Way” groups. At this stage, given that she is recruiting for two positions, she is trying to get at least 8 long listed candidates who are willing to take the next stage.
8. Janine meets with Maxwell to review her impressions, the resumes and Preliminary Ranking Sheets for the long listed candidates she has identified to date. At this point, her objective is to make sure that Maxwell is comfortable with the people she is finding. It also keeps him up-to-date on the search progress.
9. Janine now plans a 1 hour interview outline. She recognizes that at least 1/3 of each interview will be spent on selling / informing the candidates about the job and Widget. She has asked each long list candidate to bring some sample of the design work that they have done in the past that is relevant to this position. They have received an email from her recruiting coordinator describing what Widget is looking for, and providing a guarantee of confidentiality. Janine knows that she is not technically equipped to evaluate this work. She will be more interested in how each candidate behaves in presenting it to her, and what steps they take to illustrate their abilities, while preserving the identity of the firm for which they worked. The ability to do confidential work that is of interest to Widget’s competitors is a big part of these jobs.

She prepares 3 to 5 “What would you do in this situation” short cases that deal with typical interpersonal and group work environments in which Widget’s design engineers will encounter. She emails them to Maxwell to give him a chance to comment.

Finally, she modifies the two template rating sheets that will be used in the rating of candidates throughout this search. The first is “How will do you think this person will perform on the job”. It covers the capability to performance fit, and asks people to make rating that make predictions about this based on their interaction with a candidate. The second is “How will do think this person will fit into our culture at Widget”. It covers the personality to culture fit. Both ask individuals to make subjective

judgments, in the form of predictive ratings, based on their interaction to date, with candidates.

10. Wilhelm, Janine's recruiting coordinator, arranges face-to-face interviews with the top 8 to 10 still active candidates. Janine tries to get them done as quickly as possible. Since she is recruiting for two positions, she and her recruiting coordinator have some leeway in this. Once they have 3 strong final candidates for the first position, they can start to deal with the final candidates for the second. In the meantime, resumes are still coming in. If there is a particularly strong one, Janine will ask the recruiting coordinator to fit in a Skype/telephone interview. Based on this, the person may be added to the long list, since experience has shown that there is a good chance that people will drop out of the long list pool based on events in their job search.

At the end of each interview, Janine completes two rating sheets. They will form part of the data pool that is eventually used to assess candidates.

11. As she finds the time, Janine works on her briefing notes for "peer" and manager involvement with the final candidates. She has asked Maxwell to identify these folks for her.
12. She knows that this will be a crucial meeting in which she educates them about Widget's recruiting process and their part in it. She will explain the two rating forms to them. She will show them an example of how their ratings are summarized into way that pushes their personal identity into the background. She will explain that the pattern and the spread of the ratings on each factor will be most important element in assessing the final candidates. She will stress that these are to be filled out independently, shortly (within 3 working hours) of each meeting with each final candidate.

She will to explain that there will be two cycles of this process, one for each position. She will have to stress that at this point in the search it will be very important for them to flex to the candidate's schedule, even though it may mean disrupting their own.

Finally, she will give each person a copy of Maxine Bridot's video presentation on the importance of recruiting effectively to Widget. She hopes that knowing that the CEO stresses this will help deal with the inevitable upset that people feel when their work schedules are impacted by recruiting needs.

13. Janine meets with Maxwell to get through her first round of long list interview results, and review her ranking of the first set of candidates. Based on her ratings and interview comments, he accepts two of three first position short list recommendations, but wants to go with the person

that Janine has ranked fourth rather than third. Based on this person's resume, he thinks that the person will be technically qualified. Janine makes the change, putting the person she had ranked third into the long list pool for the second position for now.

Once she and Maxwell are done, they immediately move onto the meeting with the group of co-workers who will participate in the final candidate meetings. Janine briefs them as she has planned. She concludes by giving them name, telephone number and email address of her recruiting coordinator, who will be sending them all the forms and resumes they need, as well as doing the scheduling.

14. Wilhelm, Janine's recruiting coordinator contacts the three 1st position short list candidates and arranges for them to come in to meet with co-worker/manager group. She sends each of them a set of preparation instructions. At the same time, she sets up a Skype/telephone appointment for each person with Janine which will happen 2 to 3 days before their meeting with this group. In this meeting, Janine will brief each person on what to expect and how to get ready.
15. At the same time, Wilhelm is making sure that each of the coworkers and managers will be available for these meetings. It has all been made easier by tentatively penciling in several times in the next week or so when these meetings could happen.
16. Janine starts on the long list interview for the second position. At the same time, she holds her Skype/telephone meetings with the 1st position short list candidates. Her briefings with them cover the following.
 - Prepare a short briefing on presentation on "what I would do in this situation" for 2 scenarios that they have been sent by email. In each case, cover both how they would deal with the technical challenges, and the way they would work with peers and others to get the work done.
 - Expect to make this pitch to hiring manager and 3 to 5 future working peers in a face to face meeting.
 - Expect to answer their questions afterwards.
 - Entire meeting will last 45 to 90 minutes, depending on level of activity during meeting, and length of pitch.
17. Janine facilitates the face-to-face meetings between with top three 1st position "still active" candidates. She manages the structure and process, but stays out of the discussions, acting as an observer when they are

going on. When the meeting is over, Wilhelm, her recruiting coordinator, picks up the candidate. Janine stays with the group. She asks them to fill out their rating forms before they leave. As well, she invites them to send her emails with their impressions and comments on each candidate. She makes sure that they know that they can do this by phoning her if they prefer. As they fill out their forms, she once again completes a set of her own. Janine knows that Wilhelm will also fill out the “How will do think this person will fit into our culture at Widget”, based the impression has of each final candidate, as soon as he has escorted the person out of the building.

18. Wilhelm summarizes rating sheets using codes (M = manager involved, C = coworkers, R1 & R2 = recruiter, S = recruiting coordinator) so that the summary sheets show the rating spreads. Janine reviews them, and meets with Maxwell. They jointly decide on the ranking of the three 1st round final candidates. Janine asks Maxwell if he wants to meet the top ranked individual personally again, or if he is ready to make an offer at this point. Maxwell indicates that since the people ranked 1 and 2 are so close that he would like to meet both if Janine has found no stronger candidates in her second round interviews. If so, after meeting them, he might be prepared to offer them both, and short circuit the second round search. Janine accepts this possibility, but indicates that she will continue the 2nd round long list interviews just in case. Maxwell agrees that this makes sense.

19. Wilhelm sets up the face to face meetings with Maxwell. Janine follows up with him by phone after he is done. He tells her that he wants to offer the individual ranked 1, but is less sure about the person ranked 2. He wants to go through the meetings with the top three second round candidates before making a final decision. Janine starts Wilhelm on setting up the meetings needed. In the meantime, she has phone conversations with the two candidates that Maxwell has met.

As part of the short list process, she has discussed salary with each of these folks. So she knows that the offer will be in the range expected by the person to whom Maxwell wants to make an offer. She tells him to expect the formal offer by courier first thing in the morning. She talks with the other person and does her best to put the person “on hold”. However, she senses disappointment, and tells the individual that she understands that he will have to consider other offers. She is not too concerned, since there are several other strong candidates in the 2nd round short list.

20. Janine receives a telephone call that the offer has been accepted. She calls Maxwell and informs him. Wilhelm contacts the person to start the on-boarding process.

21. Janine holds the first “on-boarding” briefing session with Maxwell. She talks about with him about who will act as peer “coach / mentor” weeks. She takes him through about “confidential” follow up rating sheets (How I think this person will perform on the job” evaluation rating sheet and “How I think this person will fit into our group” rating sheet). They identify who, in addition to Maxwell, will be asked to fill these out. At the same time, Janine informs Maxwell that the new hire will also be asked to complete a: “How I think “ version of them. They will be completed at the end of week 6 and week 10 of 12 week probation period. Janine will meet with Maxwell first, and then the new hire, to review how things are going when the summaries are available.
22. Wilhelm schedules the collection of these sheets for the end of week 7 and week 10. He summarizes them, gives them to Janine, and sets up the meetings with Maxwell and the new hire. After the meetings, Janine decides if the probation clause needs to be executed. If she decides yes, she informs Maxwell and takes the appropriate steps. If not, at the end of week 12, she start the process of confirming permanent employment, and transferring the new hire to Maxwell’s authority.
23. While all this is going on, Janine and Wilhelm repeat the steps that are needed to complete the hiring and the probation of the 2nd round design engineer hire.
24. As this recruitment winds down, Janine and Wilhelm move onto other recruiting assignments.

Widget’s recruiters are not just interviewers who pass candidates onto hiring managers. They are responsible for managing the entire “early performance” and culture fit assessment. They are accountable for acting on problematic hires, ensuring that they do not become full time employees. As such, they need a number of skills beyond just interviewing. They must facilitate the process. They must educate hiring managers and co-workers about their roles in the steps involved. They must be able to conduct data gathering interviews and translate the results into job descriptions and accurate, observable 3 month and 1 year performance metrics. They must be able to sell Widget and the job opportunity to candidates. They must be able to work with Internet job board staff to both post jobs and to understand their key word-based resume ranking algorithms.

Widget's recruiters know they have two key accountabilities:

- to hire people who can perform well and contribute to Widget’s culture;
- and

- to act on and minimize the impact of problematic hires, should they occur. Minimize the impact that such cases have on Widget's productivity, performance and competitiveness.

They are recruiters equipped with the skills and the job authority to deal with realities of 21st century hiring.