

# Quick-Start Implementation Kit

## KIT 3: ENTERPRISE OPTIMIZATION

For VP/Director of TA at Organizations with Existing Infrastructure That Is Underperforming | 500+ Employees

### What This Kit Is For

This kit is for organizations that already have a recruiting function, an ATS, a team of recruiters, and metrics. And yet hiring is still unpredictable, mis-hires happen at a rate that should be embarrassing, and the TA team is exhausted. This kit does not teach you how to build a function. It teaches you how to diagnose why the one you have is broken - and then what to fix first.

*Defining principle: diagnose before you redesign. Most enterprise TA failures are structural failures being managed by hardworking people doing the wrong things at heroic effort.*

### PROOF OF CONCEPT: THIS MODEL IN PRACTICE

*A a single-source global manufacturing and total energy solutions company implemented this model and produced the following results across a two-year period:*

|                              |  |                                      |                                      |   |
|------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| <b>\$2M+</b><br>OPEX Savings | <b>18 days</b><br>Average Time to Fill | <b>100%</b><br>Offer Acceptance Rate | <b>350+</b><br>Total Hires Completed | <b>\$1M+</b><br>Year 1 Annualized Savings |
|------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|

The model began as a cost problem - agency spend exceeding \$350,000+ annually with volume projected to multiply 2-3x. It became the infrastructure that hired a CEO, three Presidents, a VP of Finance, and a CHRO. The same VP of Talent who built the cost case that justified the investment went on to recruit the full executive architecture of a scaling global company. The parent company preparing for public markets subsequently adopted the RCoE framework for executive recruiting across its business groups - institutional validation that the model scales beyond a single implementation.

*In the first 90 days: 5 salaried positions filled at 15-day average TTF and 100% offer acceptance rate - within the window required to justify the cost of the Talent Strategy Advisor role. The ATS was activated from unused shelfware to functioning infrastructure. SOPs were established. Hiring Manager training was built as a self-serve video module. The business case was proven before the full model was complete.*

## SECTION 1: DIAGNOSTIC TRIGGER LIST

These 8 signals indicate that your infrastructure is the problem. Count how many apply to your organization right now.

| # | Symptom You Can See | What It Actually Means | Blueprint Section That Fixes It |
|---|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|
|---|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|

|   |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|--|
| 1 | <b>Strong recruiters keep leaving or burning out</b>                      | They are doing coordinator work because the system has no operational support layer. The role design is broken, not the people.   | Section B: Organizational design and role boundary clarity           |
| 2 | <b>Hiring managers consistently bypass the process</b>                    | The process adds friction without perceived value. Either intake takes too long or the TSA has no authority to enforce consequences.  | Section A + B: TSA authority design and governance structure         |
| 3 | <b>Metrics dashboards exist but no one uses them</b>                      | Metrics are tracking activity, not outcomes. Or the data is known to be unreliable. Leaders stop trusting dashboards when the numbers do not match their experience.          | Section D: Rebuild KPI architecture with data integrity controls     |
| 4 | <b>Agency spend keeps rising despite internal capacity</b>                | Internal sourcing cannot compete on speed. Your workflow has too much friction or decision rights are so unclear that business units escalate to agencies to bypass the RCoE. | Section C + B: Workflow velocity and cycle time reduction            |
| 5 | <b>Time-to-fill varies wildly across similar roles</b>                    | Process is being applied selectively. Variance this wide is a governance failure, not a recruiter performance failure.  | Section B + C: Decision rights clarity and workflow gate enforcement |
| 6 | <b>Offer acceptance rate is declining</b>                                 | Compensation governance is broken, candidate experience has degraded, or the market has moved and your intelligence has not.  | Section A + C: Market intelligence and offer governance redesign     |
| 7 | <b>The same type of hire keeps failing at 6-12 months</b>                 | Your intake and assessment process is not predicting success. Post-hire feedback is not feeding back into the search process.   | Section A + D: Role architecture standards and QoH feedback loop     |
| 8 | <b>Leadership views TA as a service function, not a strategic partner</b> | TA is reporting on activity metrics instead of business outcomes. The framing creates the perception.   | Section D + E: Executive dashboard redesign and TSA briefing format  |

### Scoring Your Organization

**1-2 symptoms:** Isolated execution gaps. Run the 60-day assessment window before concluding the problem is structural.

**3-4 symptoms:** Structural problem in at least one Blueprint section. Prioritize diagnosis of Sections A and B before investing further in systems or metrics.

**5-6 symptoms:** Multiple structural failures compounding each other. Full Phase 1 assessment required. Do not add headcount or technology until root cause is mapped.

**7-8 symptoms:** Your infrastructure is producing predictable failure regardless of who is in the recruiter seats. A full redesign is required. Read Section E of the full Blueprint before taking any implementation action.

### WHAT YOU CAN SHOW THE BUSINESS IN 60 DAYS

*Proof points you can produce before the structural work is complete*

#### **Audit your last 50 ATS records for intake completion rate - today, before anything else**

This is the fastest diagnostic available. Pull it, calculate the percentage of searches that launched with a completed intake, and present the number to your CHRO. Below 80% is a governance failure on paper. That number creates the mandate for everything else.

#### **Identify your highest bypass executive and schedule a recalibration session within 30 days**

You already know who it is. You have known for months. The bypass has normalized because there has been no structured consequence. One documented recalibration session - anchored in data from their last three searches - signals to the entire organization that the new governance has teeth.

#### **Retire one vanity metric from your executive dashboard this quarter and replace it with a business outcome metric**

Replace 'reqs closed' with 90-day quality-of-hire rating. Replace 'candidates submitted' with candidate quality ratio. One swap. Present it in your next leadership review and explain what the new metric tells you that the old one did not. This repositions TA as a strategic function in a single meeting.

#### **Calculate annualized agency spend and present it as a margin metric, not a recruiting metric**

Agency spend is not a talent acquisition cost. It is a process failure cost. Present it to your CFO as: this is what we spend annually because our internal process cannot compete on speed. That framing turns a budget line into a business case.

#### **Run a mis-hire count for the past 12 months and calculate replacement cost**

Every exit within 12 months of hire is a mis-hire for this exercise. Count them, multiply by 1.5x salary as conservative replacement cost estimate, and sum the total. That number is the cost of your current assessment process. Present it without commentary. The number speaks.

---

## SECTION 2: LEGACY SYSTEM AUDIT FRAMEWORK

The 60-day mandatory assessment window. Do not skip this. Organizations that redesign without diagnosing spend 18 months building the wrong solution at full cost.

Enforce a 60-day assessment window before any systems investment or structural change. Every enterprise TA failure that gets worse after a redesign skipped this gate.

### Audit Domain 1: Process Integrity

| Audit Question  | What You Are Looking For  |
|---|---|
| What percentage of your last 50 searches launched with a completed intake document before sourcing started? | Below 80%: Your intake governance is aspirational, not operational.                                     |
| Pull 10 random searches. Can you locate written interview feedback from every interviewer?                  | Missing in more than 3 searches: structured assessment exists on paper only.                            |
| How many searches in the past 12 months required mid-search role redefinition?                              | Above 20%: Intake governance is failing. You are letting searches start before the role is defined.     |
| What is your current offer acceptance rate and how has it trended over 4 quarters?                          | Declining trend: Something in the experience, compensation, or process is signaling risk to candidates. |
| What percentage of searches have all required ATS data fields completed at each stage gate?                 | Below 85% at any gate: Your ATS is a documentation tool, not a governance tool.                         |

## Audit Domain 2: Governance Integrity

| Audit Question   | What You Are Looking For  |
|--|---|
| How many hires in the past 12 months bypassed standard intake because a senior leader called the search 'urgent' or 'strategic'? | More than 10%: Your exception process has become your primary process.                                    |
| When the TSA or Director pushes back on a role definition or comp range, what happens? Does the pushback hold?                   | If they consistently get overridden: Your TSA has advisory standing with no enforcement authority.        |
| Which business units have the highest rate of searches launched without RCoE involvement?  | Concentration in one or two units: You have a political problem, not a process problem.                   |
| When an offer is extended outside approved comp range, what is the documented consequence?                                       | No documented consequence: Compensation governance does not exist.  |
| How many times in the past 12 months did a mis-hire trigger a documented root cause analysis?                                    | Zero or near-zero: Your system cannot learn from failure. You will repeat the same mistakes at full cost. |

## Audit Domain 3: Talent Strategy Gap

| Audit Question   | What You Are Looking For  |
|--|---|
| Can your TSA, right now, cite the current market comp range for your three hardest-to-fill role types with a source? | No or 'we check when we need it': You have no standing intelligence function.               |
| How were your last 10 success profiles created - by the hiring manager alone or co-designed with                     | Manager-created only: Your success profiles are job descriptions with different formatting. |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| RCoE against documented outcomes?   |   |
| When a search fails, is there a documented diagnosis of what went wrong?  | No documentation: You cannot distinguish between a market problem, a process problem, and a structural problem. |
| In the past 12 months, has the TSA provided a proactive briefing on a market condition leadership was not yet aware of? | No: Your TSA is reactive. They wait for searches to start. They are a senior recruiter with a different title.  |

## SECTION 3: GOVERNANCE REDESIGN CHECKLIST

Governance is the first redesign priority - not systems, not headcount, not technology. Fix governance first. Everything else runs on top of it.

| Decision Point                              | How Most Enterprises Handle It (Reality)                                  | How It Must Work for Governance to Hold  |
|---|---|--|
| <b>Role approval and headcount release</b>  | Finance and BU leader, often without RCoE involvement                     | Finance releases headcount; RCoE validates role scope, level, and comp range before sourcing launches. Both gates required.      |
| <b>Success profile definition</b>           | Hiring manager alone - copy-paste from the last JD                        | TSA co-designs success profile using documented outcomes and behavioral indicators. Hiring manager approves, does not author.    |
| <b>Compensation range setting</b>           | HR comp team using internal bands not updated to reflect market           | TSA validates market range using current external data before the role is posted. Internal bands are a floor, not a ceiling.     |
| <b>Candidate advancement to offer stage</b> | Hiring manager verbal decision, recruiter follows up                      | Documented in ATS with reference to scorecard ratings. TSA reviews for pattern flags before offer is extended.                   |
| <b>Offer design and approval</b>            | Recruiter drafts, hiring manager approves, HR reviews for band compliance | TSA confirms market alignment. Any exception above approved range requires documented executive approval with rationale on file. |
| <b>Search closure after failed attempt</b>  | Recruiter and hiring manager restart informally                           | TSA conducts documented post-mortem before relaunch. Relaunch strategy changes based on diagnosis.                               |
| <b>Agency engagement authorization</b>      | BU leader calls their preferred agency directly                           | All agency engagements require RCoE approval with documented rationale and cost comparison to                                    |

|                             |  |   |
|-----------------------------|--|---|
|                             |  | internal execution.   |
| <b>Mis-hire attribution</b> | Not attributed - hire is managed out and next search launches the same way | TSA conducts root cause attribution within 30 days of exit. Findings fed back into intake and assessment process. |

## Building TSA Authority When You Do Not Have It Yet

Most TA leaders reading this do not walk in with enforcement authority pre-granted. They walk in with a mandate to improve hiring and have to earn the standing to enforce governance. This is not a structural failure - it is the normal starting condition. The path from advisory to authoritative runs through demonstrated financial impact, not through org chart redesign.

### Step 1: Build the Cost Case First (Days 1-30)

Before you push back on a single search, before you challenge a single comp range, build the financial model. What is current agency spend? What is average vacancy cost per open role? What is the estimated annual cost of your current mis-hire rate? This work takes two to three weeks and produces a single document: the cost of the current state, quantified. That document is what earns you the executive conversation. It is not an HR argument - it is a margin argument. A global manufacturing company used exactly this approach: the VP of Talent built the agency spend model, overlaid turnover data from agency hires, and projected forward cost. That financial case created the mandate. Everything else followed from it.

### Step 2: Win One Visible Search (Days 30-90)

Identify the highest-visibility open role in the organization. Offer to own it personally with the new model. Run a complete intake, build a proper success profile, enforce structured feedback, and close it fast with a strong hire at 100% offer acceptance. Five salaried positions filled at 15-day average TTF and 100% offer acceptance within 90 days - that proof point was sufficient to justify the full TSA role cost and shift the conversation from 'should we do this' to 'how do we scale this.' One well-executed search in a visible role is worth six months of process documentation.

### Step 3: Make the TSA Value Visible in Executive Language (Days 60-90)

Once you have a proof point, translate it into the language your CEO or CFO uses: cost per hire, vacancy cost recovered, agency spend eliminated, offer decline risk reduced. Present it in a 10-minute briefing - not a slide deck, not an HR report. A number, a comparison, and a projection. When leadership begins associating the TSA function with financial outcomes rather than process compliance, the authority question begins to answer itself. You do not need to demand the authority. You build it through demonstrated impact until the authority is offered.

### Step 4: Use the First Pushback as the Authority Test (Month 3-4)

At some point a hiring manager will push back on your intake requirement or your comp range guidance. This is the moment that defines whether the TSA function has real authority or advisory theater. Do not avoid the confrontation - frame it. Present your position in writing, with

data, through the CHRO or CEO. One documented escalation that lands in your favor, where leadership backs the TSA position over the hiring manager's preference, signals to every other hiring manager in the organization that the governance model is real. That signal is worth more than any charter document.

### Step 5: Document and Publish Every Win (Ongoing)

Quality-of-hire at 90 days. Offer acceptance rates. Time-to-fill trends. Agency spend reduction quarter over quarter. Every data point that validates the TSA function's impact gets documented and delivered to leadership in a standing intelligence briefing. Authority compounds with evidence. The function that consistently surfaces accurate market intelligence, predicts search risk before it materializes, and produces measurable hiring improvement does not have to argue for its authority. The results make the argument.

## SECTION 5: FULL METRICS ARCHITECTURE SUMMARY

Most enterprise TA functions have too many metrics and too little intelligence. The architecture below reorients your metrics around outcomes, not activity.

### Vanity Metrics to Retire - With Replacements

| Retire This                               | Why It Creates False Confidence   | Replace It With  |
|---|---|--|
| <b>Reqs closed per quarter</b>            | High closure rates can mean fast bad hires or lowered standards. Without QoH correlation it measures velocity, not value.                   | QoH rating at 90 days, correlated back to intake quality score for that search         |
| <b>Candidates submitted per recruiter</b> | Rewards sourcers who spray and pray. Penalizes recruiters who are selective. No relationship to hiring quality.                             | Candidate quality ratio: % of submitted candidates who advance to interview            |
| <b>Time-to-fill as a single average</b>   | Averaging across all roles is meaningless. A 35-day average obscures that Director+ searches take 60 days and ops roles should close in 20. | Stage-disaggregated cycle time by role tier with bottleneck attribution by stage owner |
| <b>Interviews conducted</b>               | Volume has no relationship to decision quality. More interviews can mean better assessment or a broken process that cannot decide.          | Interview-to-offer ratio by role type tracked against QoH outcomes                     |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <b>Careers page traffic / job views</b> | Traffic without conversion is brand awareness, not pipeline health.  | Application-to-screen and screen-to-interview conversion rates as pipeline quality signals |
| <b>Cost per hire in isolation</b>       | Reducing CPH by lowering assessment rigor produces cheaper hires that fail faster. Mis-hire costs are 3-5x salary. | Total cost of hire: CPH plus vacancy cost plus mis-hire risk weighted by QoH data          |

## SECTION 6: EXECUTIVE STAKEHOLDER ALIGNMENT PROTOCOL

Enterprise TA transformations do not fail because the process design was wrong. They fail because leadership behavior did not change. Executive alignment is a behavioral calibration exercise, not a communication exercise.

| Dimension                           | Aligned Executive Behavior   | Misaligned Executive Behavior   |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| <b>Decision discipline</b>          | Completes intake before announcing a search. References success profile in debrief. Asks for TSA market assessment before setting timeline expectations. | Tells the team they need someone 'like the last person, but better.'<br>Skips intake because they already know what they want.      |
| <b>Process respect</b>              | Attends calibration sessions. Submits structured feedback within SLA. Escalates concerns through defined governance channel.                             | Provides verbal feedback only. Approves candidates based on gut feel. Calls the recruiter after hours to push for faster decisions. |
| <b>TSA authority recognition</b>    | References TSA advisory in hiring discussions. Defers to TSA market intelligence when their expectation conflicts with external data.                    | Thanks the TSA for their input and then does the opposite. Makes verbal commitments to candidates before TSA validates feasibility. |
| <b>Business-consequence framing</b> | Talks about vacancy cost, mis-hire risk, and market timing. Views recruiting as a strategic constraint, not a service to be demanded.                    | Characterizes all openings as critical and urgent. Views recruiting as a function that should deliver candidates when requested.    |

## SECTION 7: ENTERPRISE SEQUENCING LOGIC

Enterprise redesigns fail in predictable ways when sequencing is wrong. The most common mistake: investing in systems and technology before governance and strategy are stable.

| Order | Workstream | Cannot Start Until... | Common Mistake |
|-------|------------|-----------------------|----------------|
|-------|------------|-----------------------|----------------|

|   |  |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|
| 1 | <b>Governance and decision rights</b>        | Audit is complete. Executive alignment confirmed in writing.                                  | Launching redesign without executive commitment and discovering 60 days in that the TSA has no authority.                                 |
| 2 | <b>Talent strategy layer</b>                 | Governance is documented and communicated.  | Investing in ATS governance before the strategy the ATS needs to support is defined.  |
| 3 | <b>Workflow and ATS gate configuration</b>   | TSA charter in place. Decision rights clear.  | Configuring ATS workflows to accommodate existing broken process instead of enforcing improved process.                                   |
| 4 | <b>Metrics dashboard and QoH collection</b>  | ATS data capture is reliable. Workflow gates are enforced.                                    | Building dashboards on unreliable ATS data and presenting them to leadership. One bad briefing destroys metric credibility for 12 months. |
| 5 | <b>Enablement and capability development</b> | Recruiters have clear role boundaries. Hiring managers have been briefed on new expectations. | Running enablement training before the process being taught is actually operational.  |

## SECTION 8: 90-DAY ACTIVATION CHECKLIST

Enterprise implementation starts with diagnosing, aligning, and resourcing. The first 90 days establish the foundation that determines whether everything after succeeds.

### DAYS 1-30: DIAGNOSE AND RESOURCE

- Complete Sections 1-2 of this kit. Score the Diagnostic Trigger List. Begin the 60-day Legacy System Audit across all three domains.
- Identify and assign dedicated implementation team. Confirm resource protection in writing. No part-time commitments.
- Secure IT partnership with confirmed capacity allocation and timeline for ATS configuration work.
- Conduct individual executive alignment assessments. Map which executives are aligned, which are misaligned.
- Confirm CHRO or CEO executive sponsorship with written commitment to timeline, resources, and governance enforcement authority.

### DAYS 30-60: ASSESS AND ALIGN

- Complete the full 60-day Legacy System Audit. Produce the Talent Strategy Deficiency Report, Gap Heat Map, and Top 3 Structural Risk Estimates.

- Present audit findings to CHRO and CEO framed in business-consequence language. Get explicit approval to proceed with the sequenced redesign.
- Brief all executives on what will change and what authority the TSA has. This communication comes from CHRO or CEO, not from TA.
- Identify the two or three highest-severity governance gaps. These become the first workstream in the redesign sequence.
- Begin TSA charter documentation. Define authority explicitly: what the TSA can halt, escalate, and what thresholds trigger leadership review.

## DAYS 60-90: GOVERN AND LAUNCH

- TSA charter executed and communicated. Authority documented, not assumed.
- Decision rights matrix drafted, reviewed by CHRO, and distributed to all hiring managers above Director level.
- ATS intake gate configured as a system control for at least the top 5 most common hire types.
- First executive stakeholder calibration sessions completed for highest-risk executives.
- Weekly pipeline review ritual launched. TSA facilitating. Decision-based agenda, not status update.
- QoH collection mechanism active for all searches launched since Day 1. ATS data integrity audit underway.
- Phase 1 Deficiency Report and redesign roadmap presented to leadership with Phase 2 commitment confirmed.

### Where to Go Next

**Section A:** Full TSA role architecture and Talent Strategy Engine for enterprise-scale advisory function

**Section B:** Complete organizational design models including global governance and failure mode analysis

**Section C:** Full workflow library, technology selection criteria, and OPEX impact calculation methodology

**Section D:** Predictive modeling, cohort analysis, and attribution complexity in lagging indicators

**Section E:** Full 5-phase roadmap including Phase 5 and continuous improvement protocol

**Section F:** Master integration guide covering cross-section patterns and value realization framework