



# Screening Quality Audit

Is Your Resume Screening Costing You Great Candidates?

---

## How to Use This Audit

This 15-point diagnostic helps you identify exactly where your screening process is breaking down—and what it's costing you in lost productivity, hiring manager trust, and qualified candidates.

**Answer each question honestly.**  
**Each "yes" = 1 point.**

## Scoring Guide:

- |                      |   |
|----------------------|---|
| <b>12-15 points:</b> | Critical - Immediate intervention required      |
| <b>7-11 points:</b>  | Concerning - Significant improvements needed    |
| <b>3-6 points:</b>   | Healthy - Optimization opportunities exist      |
| <b>0-2 points:</b>   | Strong foundation - Minor refinements available |

**PART 1**

## Recruiter Efficiency & Process Health

### **Do your recruiters spend 20+ hours per role on initial resume screening alone?**

*Context: Research from Eddy shows the average recruiter spends 23 hours just on initial screening for a single hire. If this is your reality, your team is compensating for broken tools.*

### **Are more than 50% of applications from job boards completely unqualified?**

*Context: If half your applicant pool is noise, you're dealing with a signal-to-noise problem. Keyword-based screening creates false positives and false negatives.*

### **Do you rely on manual review because your ATS consistently misses qualified candidates?**

*Context: When recruiters become human filters for ATS failures, they're building workarounds for a fundamentally broken system.*

### **Has time-to-fill increased despite getting more applications?**

*Context: More applications should mean faster fills. If time-to-fill is climbing while volume rises, your screening is the bottleneck.*

### **Do you re-screen the same pool multiple times because initial shortlists don't work out?**

*Context: Circular screening signals that your filtering criteria aren't identifying actual capability.*

#### Notes:

**PART 2**

## Quality & Hiring Manager Alignment

### **Do hiring managers reject more than 30% of candidates you send?**

*Context: Harvard's "Hidden Workers" study found 88% of employers lose qualified candidates due to screening configuration issues.*

### **Have hiring managers started demanding increasingly specific credentials?**

*Context: When hiring managers don't trust screening, they respond by narrowing requirements. This creates a vicious cycle.*

### **Do your best-performing hires often lack the "ideal candidate" profile?**

*Context: If your top performers don't match your screening criteria, your criteria are measuring the wrong things.*

### **Have hiring managers escalated screening quality concerns to leadership?**

*Context: When screening failures become political, you're losing institutional trust in the recruiting function.*

### **Can't articulate why certain candidates were screened out vs. screened in?**

*Context: If you can't explain decisions beyond "they didn't have the keyword," your process isn't defensible.*

#### Notes:

**PART 3****Hidden Costs & Strategic Impact****Lost qualified candidates to competitors because screening took too long?**

*Context: Speed matters. But if speeding up means more false negatives, you're trading one problem for another.*

**Rely primarily on keyword matching to identify qualified candidates?**

*Context: Keyword matching is fast but blind. It favors resume optimization over actual job capability.*

**Has your team discussed that screening might contribute to diversity challenges?**

*Context: Keyword-based screening systematically filters out non-traditional candidates who have the skills but not the pedigree.*

**Measure screening success primarily by time-to-fill rather than quality of hire?**

*Context: Time-to-fill measures speed. Quality of hire measures value. High performers deliver 400% more productivity.*

**Haven't calculated what bad hires are actually costing you?**

*Context: 74% of employers admit hiring the wrong person. Each bad hire costs 30% of first-year earnings—plus morale, recruiter time, and trust.*

**Notes:**

# Your Score \_\_\_\_\_ /15

## What Your Score Means

### 12-15 points: CRITICAL

Your screening process is actively damaging recruitment outcomes.

### 7-11 points: CONCERNING

Significant gaps exist.

### 3-6 points: HEALTHY

You're performing better than most.

### 0-2 points: STRONG FOUNDATION

Your screening is solid.

#### Immediate actions:

1. Calculate actual screening hours for highest-volume roles
2. Audit ATS configuration for false negatives
3. Track shortlist-to-offer conversion rates.

#### Priority actions:

1. Benchmark against best-in-class (30% better performance)
2. Identify your biggest leak
3. Run pilot tests with skills-based screening.

#### Optimization focus:

1. Document what's working
2. Expand quality measurement
3. Scale successes across teams.

#### Refinements:

1. Automate what works
2. Measure capabilities traditional screening misses
3. Share your playbook.

## Want personalized recommendations?

CLARA helps mid-market companies move beyond keyword matching to identify candidates with critical thinking, learning agility, and potential to become top performers—even without the “perfect” pedigree.

### Schedule a 30-minute demo to see how CLARA can:

- Reduce screening time by 50%+ without sacrificing quality
- Identify qualified candidates your ATS currently filters out
- Improve hiring manager satisfaction with shortlist quality
- Measure what actually predicts performance

[Book A Demo](#)