



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:

- 12-15 points:** Critical - Immediate intervention required
- 7-11 points:** Concerning - Significant improvements needed
- 3-6 points:** Healthy - Optimization opportunities exist
- 0-2 points:** 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.

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.

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.

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](#)