

Fictional demonstration

Auditing a distributed recruiting workflow

I'd make application ownership and stage history reliable before adding more automation. In this example, the team cannot consistently tell who owes the next action or when a record entered its current stage. A new dashboard would carry those gaps into another view.

The assumed audit

This fictional infrastructure software company has a distributed team of 22 people and four open roles. The audit sample contains 25 application records, including 13 active and 12 closed applications. All observations and counts are invented demonstration inputs. They are not actual client findings or achieved improvements.

Sample observation	Decision implication
4 of 13 active applications have no accountable recruiting owner.	Assign ownership before introducing overdue-action reminders.
7 of 25 application histories lack a stage-entry event.	Some stage ages cannot be calculated reliably. Keep those ages unknown.
4 of 12 closed applications have no recorded closure reason.	Outcome reporting cannot distinguish the missing reasons without a review.
2 potential duplicate pairs were found across the 25 records.	Review identity and role context before combining anything.

These issue counts may overlap. They should not be added together to estimate affected people. An application is a person linked to one role; the same person may have more than one legitimate application.

What I would examine

Review the role definitions, stage configuration, a limited export and a walkthrough with the recruiting owner. Check example event histories against the visible records. Interviewer feedback and candidate messages should be inspected only where they are needed to explain a workflow issue.

First decision

Agree on the proposed stages and the owner of each transition. Preserve the original export and test changes on sample records before changing the live workflow. The audit recommendation does not authorize a data migration or candidate communication.

Proposed active stages

Stage	Entry evidence	Accountable owner
New	Application is linked to a valid role and has a recruiting owner.	Recruiting owner
Screen	A screening conversation or review has been agreed.	Recruiting owner
Assessment	The assessment purpose and interviewer are confirmed.	Hiring lead
Decision	Required evidence is collected, or a named gap is awaiting a decision.	Hiring lead
Offer	An approved offer decision has been recorded.	Hiring lead with the offer approver

Hired and closed are terminal outcomes in this example, rather than active stages. Closed records need a reason such as withdrawal, rejection or role closure. A missing reason stays unknown until someone checks it; it should not default to rejection.

Minimum record rules

Record area	Required example fields
Application	Stable application ID, person reference, role ID, recruiting owner and active or terminal status.
Stage event	Application ID, previous stage, new stage, event timestamp and person making the change.
Next action	Action, accountable owner and agreed due point.
Closure	Outcome, reason, decision owner and timestamp where known.

Store event timestamps in UTC and display local time when people need it for coordination. Record the timestamp source. Do not invent historical stage dates to make a report complete.

Completed fictional correction entry

Application A014 is active in Assessment with no owner and no recorded stage-entry event. Proposed correction: assign the current recruiting owner after confirmation, retain Assessment and mark stage age unknown. Add a current audit note describing the gap. Do not manufacture a backdated event.

The owner assignment is a proposed action on a fictional record. It has not been applied to any live system.

Validation before a live change

Test record or event	Expected behavior
One person applies for two different roles.	Keep both applications linked to the same person. Do not merge the role histories.
A record moves from Screen to Assessment.	Write one event, preserve the previous history and set the next owner.
A historical stage-entry timestamp is missing.	Show unknown age and a data-quality flag. Do not treat it as zero days.
An application is closed without a reason.	Ask for a reason or explicit unknown value; preserve who made the decision.
A stage change is repeated accidentally.	Check for a duplicate event before writing another transition or triggering a message.

Implementation order

First, the recruiting owner confirms stage meanings and reviews the missing owners. Next, the system administrator tests event capture and closure rules on a small copy of the data. Only after the tests pass should the team consider reminders and reporting. Any automatic candidate message needs a separate review of recipients and triggers.

How to judge whether the changes helped

Recheck a defined sample using the same rules. Report active applications with an owner, transitions with a valid event and closed applications with a known reason, each with its denominator. Track unknown values separately. A cleaner record does not by itself prove that hiring became faster.

Scope and next step

I could deliver the audit findings, proposed stage map and validation plan. Implementation, historical data repair, integrations and ongoing recruiting would be separately agreed work. Start by confirming access to a limited export and naming the person who can approve the workflow.