

Fictional demonstration

A founder monthly recruiting review

I'd use this review to make three decisions: unblock the backend assessment, narrow the design brief and set interview capacity for developer relations. The founder should leave with owners and due points for those decisions. A count of candidates alone would not explain why the searches are slowing down.

The assumed review

This fictional developer tools company is reviewing three open roles. The snapshot below uses made-up aggregate counts and stage ages. It contains no candidate identities and reports no achieved result. The review period is an illustrative 30-day month; the stage counts are the people still active at its end.

Role	Screen	Assessment	Final	Offer	Active
Staff backend engineer	5	3	2	1	11
Product designer	4	2	1	0	7
Developer relations engineer	6	1	0	0	7
Total	15	6	3	1	25

These are current stage balances, not counts of people moving through each stage. They cannot be used to calculate conversion or offer acceptance. For that, I would need distinct stage events, outcomes and a defined group of candidates.

Where decisions are waiting

Role	Active records over five calendar days in their current stage	Oldest unresolved item
Staff backend engineer	4 of 11	Assessment feedback waiting 12 days.
Product designer	2 of 7	Role scope question open 9 days.
Developer relations engineer	1 of 7	Screening decision waiting 7 days.

Seven of twenty-five active records cross the example review flag, or 28%. Five calendar days is a discussion trigger here, not a universal hiring standard. The stage clock starts at the latest stage-entry timestamp and includes weekends.

Example decisions from the review

Backend assessment ownership

Assumed finding: two interviewers disagree about whether the exercise tests service design or coding speed. The engineering lead should name the intended evidence and reconcile the existing feedback. The recruiting owner should then update the waiting candidates. Due point: within two working days of the review.

Example decision entry: engineering lead owns assessment criteria; founder owns any change to the seniority or budget. The advisor records the unresolved evidence and checks completion at the next weekly review. A new exercise should not be added to candidates already in the process without explaining the need.

Design scope

Assumed finding: the founder wants both product design and brand production in one role, while the hiring lead needs someone to improve a technical onboarding flow. Agree on the primary outcome and decide how the remaining work will be covered. Due point: before another assessment is scheduled.

Example decision entry: founder approves product onboarding as the primary scope. Hiring lead revises the brief and assessment. Recruiter checks whether existing candidates were evaluated against a different expectation. No rejection decision follows from this aggregate review.

Developer relations interview capacity

Assumed finding: six people are in screening, but the technical interviewer has one slot next week. Reserve capacity before adding more screening calls. The recruiting owner should identify which records have enough evidence to progress and tell the others when to expect an update.

Example decision entry: engineering lead provides two interview slots or proposes a later search start. Founder chooses the priority if the slots compete with backend interviews. Due point: before the next screening batch.

What I would ask before changing the plan

Check that stage timestamps are reliable, candidates have not already withdrawn and the counts exclude closed records. A delayed feedback entry and a delayed interview are different problems. The next action should reflect which one occurred.

Operating agreement after the review

Decision or action	Accountable owner	Evidence of completion
Resolve assessment disagreement	Engineering lead	Written criteria and reconciled feedback on the waiting records.
Approve the narrower design scope	Founder	Updated role outcome and agreement on who covers brand work.
Reserve technical interview capacity	Engineering lead	Available slots communicated to the recruiting owner.
Update waiting candidates	Recruiting owner	Next step or revised timing recorded for each affected person.
Review open decisions weekly	Founder	Decision list shows an owner, due point and current status.

Example agenda for the next monthly review

Start with changes in business priorities and approved roles. Check the decisions carried forward, then review active stage balances, aged records and interview capacity. Finish with choices that need the founder. Keep the supporting data available so the meeting can focus on the reasons for delay.

Measures worth carrying forward

Use a consistent stage-entry definition and report aged records with their denominator. Separately track candidate withdrawals, offer decisions and elapsed time for a defined group. Include the number of records behind any rate. This snapshot is too small and incomplete to establish a market benchmark.

Retainer scope

In a scoped advisory retainer, I could prepare the review, challenge unclear priorities and maintain the decision list. The company remains responsible for candidate decisions and interview execution. ATS cleanup, scheduling or active recruiting would be separately agreed work.

Next step

Confirm the role owners and data definitions before the first review. Bring the open decision list alongside the pipeline so the founder can see what needs their judgment.