

Fictional demonstration

A recruiting team coaching and development plan

I'd coach the two recruiters differently in this example. One needs more precise assessment notes; the other needs help keeping candidates informed while juggling requests. I'd first check whether the hiring team has made its expectations clear. A recruiting problem can involve both individual practice and the way the team works.

The assumed review

This fictional software company has two recruiters and four active searches. A sponsor asks for a four-week development plan. Records R1 and R2 identify invented recruiter examples, not real employees. The record reviews, counts, conversations and proposed changes are fictional. This is a coaching demonstration, not an actual performance assessment.

Evidence reviewed	R1 example	R2 example
20 screening notes per recruiter	11 name the agreed role evidence; 9 rely on general impressions.	17 name role evidence; 3 leave an essential question open.
20 promised candidate updates	18 recorded by the promised time.	14 recorded by the promised time.
Work allocation	Two priority searches; assessment bar changed midweek.	Two searches plus six ad hoc requests with no priority owner.

These are manual review counts from a small invented sample. Eleven of twenty is 55%; seventeen of twenty is 85%. They identify records to examine, not a validated rating of either person. Check the definitions, opportunity to do the work and missing records before drawing a conclusion.

Choose a specific practice goal

For R1: connect each screening recommendation to the agreed role evidence and name what remains unknown. For R2: keep one visible next-update commitment for each active candidate and escalate conflicting requests. The hiring lead must also stop changing the bar without recalibrating the recruiter.

Completed example feedback conversation

I would begin with a record the recruiter can examine: "In nine of these twenty notes, I could not see which role requirement supported the recommendation. Let us take one together. What did you hear, and what would you still need to establish?" The aim is to improve the work, not defend a general label about the person.

Turn a vague note into useful evidence

Draft note on fictional record E07	Revised note after practice
Strong communicator and good infrastructure background. Recommend moving forward.	Described diagnosing a service outage and comparing rollback with a forward fix. Own decision authority and responsibility after the incident remain unclear. Recommend one focused question on those points before an overall assessment.

The revised note is a worked demonstration. It does not establish that E07 is qualified or available. The useful change is that the hiring lead can see the evidence, its limit and the proposed follow-up.

Four weeks of practice

Week	Practice and support	Review evidence
1	Agree on screening evidence and the update rule. Review two records together.	Each recruiter explains the rule in their own words and applies it to one example.
2	R1 drafts five notes; R2 maintains update commitments on five active records.	Review the underlying records, not just a completion count.
3	Recruiters apply the same practice to a second search. Sponsor resolves conflicting requests.	Check whether the practice transfers and which obstacles need a team decision.
4	Review a fresh sample and agree on the next development priority.	Compare like-for-like records and record continuing gaps without claiming a causal result.

These weeks describe a proposed coaching cycle. No before-and-after improvement is claimed. Keep a record of what changed in the brief or workload so a later comparison does not attribute every change to coaching.

An operating agreement that supports the coaching

Responsibility	Owner	Example agreement
Assessment criteria	Hiring lead	Confirm the role evidence before screens; explain and record later changes.
Search priorities	Founder sponsor	Name two priority searches per recruiter in this scenario; explicitly displace work when adding an urgent request.
Candidate updates	Recruiter	Record the next promised update and flag a risk before that commitment passes.
Coaching review	Recruiting leader	One 30-minute conversation each week using actual work examples and one practice goal.
Capacity conflicts	Sponsor and recruiting leader	Resolve competing deadlines instead of asking the recruiter to promise all of them.

Completed example follow up entry

C14. R2 has six extra requests without an agreed order. The sponsor will name the two that matter this week and defer the rest. R2 will add a next-update commitment to the five reviewed active records. The leader will check the entries at the next coaching conversation. Status: proposed action in a fictional scenario, not a report of completed work.

What I would keep out of the review

Use work evidence and the agreed role responsibilities. Do not infer motivation, capability or a personal characteristic from one missed update or an incomplete note. A real employment decision would need the employer's process, appropriate context and evidence beyond this demonstration.

How this fits fractional support

I could help a founder or recruiting lead establish the review, give specific feedback and identify operating obstacles. The company owns management and employment decisions. The engagement should agree on the people supported, meeting time, access to work examples and the limits of recruiting execution.

Next step

Choose one recurring work problem and a small set of records to review. Agree on the practice goal and the team support it needs before adding another metric.