



ERECRUIT 6 MONTH REVIEW

Human Resources

Release: v3.0

Date: June 2013

Author: Eddie Procter, HR Resourcing Manager

Document Location: H:\human-resources\OD\resourcing\erecruit\6 month review.2

Contents

1.0	Background	3
2.0	Review process	3
3.0	Analysis of outcomes of review	4
3.1	Recruiter user feedback	4
3.2	HR user feedback	4
3.3	Candidate feedback	5
3.4	Resourcing Manager feedback	6
3.5	Analysis of use of eRecruit workflow for a sample of jobs	7
3.6	Overview of key review findings	7
4.0	Recommendations for action and development	9
	Option 1: Limited functionality	10
	Option 2: Streamlining and improving	10
	Option 3: Increasing functionality	11
	Other general recommendations	12

Appendices

Appendix 1: Recruiting Users BOS survey results

Appendix 2: Additional comments from Recruiter users

Appendix 3: HR Users BOS survey results

Appendix 4: Additional comments from HR users

Appendix 5: Candidate quality survey results

Appendix 6: Additional comments from candidates

Appendix 7: Analysis of the use of eRecruit workflow for a sample of jobs

Appendix 8: eRecruit issues and action log

1.0 Background

eRecruit went live on 26th September 2012 and a formal 6 month review was scheduled in order to review how the system has bedded in and to identify priorities for action and development moving forward.

Headline developments since go live:

- 770 jobs and 12400 candidates have been processed by the system.
- At least one Local System Administrator (LSA) set up in each HR Team. LSA Group (LSAG) meets monthly and established as main two-way communications network for HR users. LSA's have access to set-up users in their areas and to the BORIS Archive of job descriptions and applications.
- On-going discussion with Lumesse on improved job-based workflow for a future release, based on our feedback that the workflow is currently too candidate-based.
- Two new releases with system enhancements based on client suggestions, enabling changes to UoB configuration eg amalgamation of the two on line questionnaires for support jobs into a single form, automatic creation of an individual PDF candidate pack for each candidate when they submit their application.
- Lumesse have taken up our request for UoB and our configuration of the system to be included in testing prior to future new releases; so that we can help to identify bugs and issues before go live.
- A number of suggested system enhancements put forward, and 'voting' for other client suggestions, for future new releases through the Lumesse Client Portal.
- Lumesse currently setting up automatic feed for jobs to be sent to www.jobs.ac.uk.
- 88 incident/ query cases raised through Lumesse Client Portal and successfully resolved; 3 currently open.
- Regular user training in Staff Development course diary; follow-up sessions for HR Teams with TMP on external advertising process and mop-up training for new HR starters.
- The University has joined the HE User Group for Talentlink/ I-Grasp (its predecessor system) – first meeting in Glasgow forthcoming.

2.0 Review process

This review included the following activity:

- BOS on-line surveys of recruiting managers/ administrators and HR users (see sections 3.1 and 3.2 below)
- An e-recruit sample survey of candidates (see section 3.3 below)
- Feedback from the Resourcing Manager, in consultation with other stakeholders
- A follow-up session with the LSAG
- A focus group session with a group of managers
- An analysis of the use of eRecruit workflow for a sample of jobs

It is also noted that the recommendations of this report will need to be considered alongside Jackie Noorden's concurrent report into recruitment activity across the Operational HR Teams and the recent Mazars internal audit report into recruitment and reward.

3.0 Analysis of outcomes of review

The review, as expected, has provided a mixed picture of feedback from users. Ranging from the positive to the emphatically negative (and mostly somewhere in-between), there are a number of patterns that can be discerned and are helpful in informing how we should move forward. These have been used to help identify the options and recommendations in section 4.0 below.

3.1 Recruiting managers/ administrators feedback

27 responses were received to the BOS on line survey (sent to a PIMS list of 101 recruitment contacts, therefore a 27% response rate), of which 37% were administrators and 48% recruiting managers.

Whilst the responses are not exactly effusive (and the response rate was fairly low), generally there is more positive than negative feedback. For instance, 52% have generally found the system easy to use, 59% agree or strongly agree that they are clear as to how they should use the system, and 56% agree or strongly agree that inputting the outcomes of shortlisting and interviews has been straight-forward. Overall, 63% feel that eRecruit has been a positive change for the University.

The vast majority of respondents (89%) agreed or strongly agreed that they were generally satisfied with the level of service received from HR when recruiting staff.

79% of those who used the on line guidance found it to be useful, although 48% had not referred to it when using the system.

Detailed information on the BOS recruiter survey feedback can be found at Appendix 1, with individual comments at Appendix 2.

3.2 HR user feedback

21 responses were received to the BOS in line survey (sent to all 40 staff in the HR Operations Teams, therefore a 52.5% response rate).

Given that recruitment, and the use of eRecruit, is very central to the HR Operational Teams activity, the response rate was a little disappointing. However, the responses that were received do clearly indicate that there is work to be done to further develop eRecruit and ensure that it is used to its full potential and effectiveness by HR Teams.

Whilst 100% of respondents have made use of the user guidance, a slight majority (52%) have not found eRecruit easy to use. The majority strongly agree or agree that they and

their HR colleagues are clear as to how eRecruit should be used in the recruitment process (71%) and feel they have adapted well to it (74 %).

When it comes to the use of eRecruit during the different stages of the recruitment process the picture is mixed. The majority are generally using the full functionality of the system for the URP (67%) and advertising (76%) processes. However, this falls steeply for the long/short-listing (33%), interview (19%), reference (24%) and offer initiation (29%) stages. The comments make clear that some of the negative responses to these statements is due to the fact that the current UoB configuration of the system is not making full use of the potential functionality eg for on-line short-listing and setting up interviews.

71% did not feel that managers and other users in their area were generally comfortable with using eRecruit; a figure which is somewhat at odds with the feedback from recruiters in section 3.1 above. The follow-up discussion with the LSAG indicated that there was a mixed picture with managers and recruitment contacts in some areas engaging more effectively than others.

In summary, only 38% felt that eRecruit had so far been a positive development for the University; again something of a contrast with the response from recruiters on this point. The survey comments and LSAG discussion highlighted that there was a feeling that further improvements needed to be made to the system functionality and configuration for the benefits of the system to be more fully realised.

Detailed information on the BOS HR user survey feedback can be found at Appendix 3, with individual comments at Appendix 4.

3.3 Candidate feedback

On line questionnaires were sent to a sample of candidates from across different job types and both successful and unsuccessful candidates. 30 responses were received (therefore a 61.2% response rate).

The responses were very positive with only 3 candidates having any negative feedback (mostly focussed on the interview process, as outlined in the comments at Appendix 6).

100% of the candidates agree or strongly agree that job information is easy to find, the on line application process is straight-forward to use and the functionality of the jobs web pages is useful. The vast majority received timely and useful communications (96.7%) and appropriate responses to any questions that they had on the job and the process (93.3%). 96.7% felt the interview and other selection processes were carried out in a professional manner.

Detailed information on the on line survey feedback can be found at Appendix 5, with individual comments at Appendix 6.

3.4 Resourcing Manager feedback

Implementing a system for a process such as recruitment that operates across the whole University is quite a challenging undertaking, and I would highlight three particular elements underlying this:

1. The dispersed model of Faculty/ Divisional HR Teams undertaking recruitment activity (ie rather than a centralised unit). This model makes complete sense in terms of recruitment activity being located close to managers and joined-up with other HR processes. However, implementing a consistent approach to using a new system across these seven teams is not an easy task.
2. Even post-SPR, there is quite a high instance of different structures and working cultures across the Faculties and Divisions, which makes it difficult to identify an approach that best engages with and meets the needs of recruiting managers; the spectrum including relatively compliant support function line managers, Pl's and academics who do not consider themselves to be 'managers' and administrators carrying out recruitment tasks on behalf of or in support of academics and managers (sometimes with a degree of ambiguity or resistance to involvement in 'HR work').
3. A, surprisingly high, minority of the University's staff currently lack the confidence and experience to fully utilise on-line workflow systems, even though this is clearly the direction of travel for processes across the organisation.

In more general terms, and particularly looking at some of the comments in Appendix 4, the review has enabled some colleagues to express their wider frustrations regarding workloads and the, still evolving, post-SPR structures and ways of working. eRecruit is perhaps a convenient target, but also in a wider sense an example of the change management challenges faced with new ways of working; specifically with adopting a workflow system approach to processes, something that will of course be even more to the fore when the new integrated finance-HR-payroll system is implemented.

When looking at the comments from HR users it is noticeable that the tone of some is sometimes more negative than the day-to-day interaction, feedback and communication through LSAG and with users generally. And some of the comments about manager's interaction with the system are more negative than the picture that the actual feedback from managers in section 3.1 above, and more widely, suggests. There are also a number of comments relating to bugs and issues (which all new systems experience) that have since been resolved.

Of course, this is not to say that there are not genuine problems and developments that need to be addressed in order to ensure that eRecruit is used as effectively as possible; and I have been careful to ensure that these are fully addressed in the recommendations made in this report.

3.5 Analysis of the use of eRecruit workflow for a sample of jobs

A small but representative sample of 30 jobs was selected from across the different HR Teams and job types to look at how the eRecruit workflow was being used. The results of this analysis are at Appendix 7.

This analysis was carried out as a desk based exercise and the specific circumstances of the individual jobs were not followed up in detail; the analysis also does not cover every element of the recruitment process. However, it does give a broad indication of the level of consistency of use of the system workflow and the areas where the workflow is being used less or inconsistently.

The results of this analysis generally mirror the survey results from HR users. All of the sample jobs had been initiated (ie creation of the basic job details), approved and posted as expected (although, due to the current lack of workflow recording of posting to external media – see recommendation 10 below – this element has not been commented on). URP matching had taken place for the vast majority of the jobs (only 3 had no evidence of a check being carried out).

In the majority of cases long and short-listing outcomes had been recorded correctly, although in some cases not yet for the long or short-listed candidates or the unsuccessful candidates had been rejected at the pre-screening stage (not a significant problem but incorrect in process terms). Unsuccessful candidates are generally being informed of the outcome, though in some cases, particularly early on, not and this task (a recruiter responsibility) is often carried out by HR. The recording of interview outcomes has been used less consistently and there was little evidence of the system templates being utilised for communications with candidates and the panel; notification of unsuccessful interview candidates was generally by the manager off-line (though this is not 'outside process', no evidence of HR following up with email confirmation from the system).

Use and recording of the reference check and offer checklist was patchy. Where the job had moved to the offer stage, in most cases the initiating the offer process and then change in status to 'hired' had been actioned. Most of the jobs that had proceeded through the whole workflow had been 'closed', but the Faculty of Arts and Engineering HR Teams have all of their jobs remaining as status 'Open'.

3.6 Overview of key review findings

(i) 3.6.1 Positives and benefits

The transition from Boris to eRecruit was relatively smooth and all vacancies and applications since go live have been processed through the new system. eRecruit has proved capable of handling a large volume of vacancies and applicants without any negative impact on processing speed and has only experienced a few short instances of system downtime.

A number of tangible process and service benefits can be identified, including:

-
- Effective and comprehensive data transfer integration with PIMS, with the majority of the job requisition fields automatically pre-populated.
 - HR Teams able to take full responsibility for job details and workflow in the system, including posting jobs directly without having to send to a central point.
 - Unlimited number of recruiting managers, panel members and administrators able to access full job and application details.
 - A much improved experience for candidates. The new candidate functionality and application process has proved to be easy to navigate around, efficient and has received very good feedback. In addition, unsuccessful candidates at the short-listing stage (ie the majority of applicants) who previously were not informed of the outcome are now updated at the click of a button with minimum administrative effort.
 - Transition to 100% on-line applications and the ending of default printing of all applications by HR. In some cases HR are printing applications and other candidate documentation for managers, and local printing is also often fairly common. However, the principle has been established that this is an on-line system, with the option to print if required, rather than the other way round.
 - Streamlined central URP to replace the previous unsatisfactory model of different Faculty-based redeployment processes; both as a mechanism for matching at risk staff with jobs and also avoiding an in-built delay in the recruitment process where there are no potential matching URP candidates.
 - Reporting and management information directly from eRecruit (BORIS did not have reporting functionality).

The above process changes have enabled the reduction in the central Resourcing Team from 5.78 fte to 3.09 fte, with some of this resource able to be redeployed across the Operational HR Teams.

In addition, the system support and maintenance framework for eRecruit is much more robust than for BORIS, which had a high dependency of knowledge and technical expertise on just two individuals:

- The two Global System Administrators (GSA's) in HR have a good understanding of the UoB configuration of the system and, within the limits of the Lumesse controlled system-architecture, have considerable autonomy in maintaining workflow and content.
- Lumesse have a well-established support structure that has generally proved to be responsive and helpful.

-
- In addition, the internal support structure has bedded-in well, with queries and problems filtered through the designated Local System Administrators in each HR Team to the HR Systems Team/ Resourcing Manager.

(ii) 3.6.2 Negatives and challenges

There are some parts of the eRecruit functionality that the majority of HR users are not using as they work through the recruitment process, relying on sending emails and tracking progress off-line. As a consequence, eRecruit is generally not yet being fully used as an on-line workflow tool, one of the major advantages of an e-recruitment system. This is due to a combination of factors, including areas of workflow and functionality that have had problems or have proved cumbersome to use, a relative lack of confidence and experience of using workflow systems amongst the HR Teams and the high volume of recruitment activity that most of the teams have had to contend with during the first few months of the new system being live.

Although it is clear that the level of engagement of recruiting managers and administrators in Faculties and Divisions with eRecruit is mixed, there is limited appetite or resource capability for HR Teams to take on the responsibilities currently allocated to recruiters (albeit that in some cases this is happening already).

A good relationship has been established with both The Guardian and Lumesse,; however, the account management role of The Guardian has yet to prove its full value and it is unclear as to what real benefits this arrangement has for the University. Discussions with The Guardian/ Lumesse regarding the main functionality issue that would most help to move the acceptance and full effectiveness of the system forward - improved job-based workflow – have not yet led to any definitive changes in this area.

Certain elements of system functionality that in theory would improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the recruitment process have not yet been used because, in their current format, it is difficult to see either how they can be implemented effectively within the University's configuration or what added value they would provide. For example, automatic pre-screening of candidates, use of the communications centre to set up interview slots and on-line short-listing. However, it is important that these potential benefits are not lost and that they remain in clear sight for future stage development.

4.0 Recommendations for action and development

Although eRecruit has become established in its first 6 months of use, and helped to realize a number of benefits, it is clear that there is more progress to be made to ensure that an on-line workflow approach becomes fully embedded in the recruitment process and that users, particularly in HR, become more accepting of the system.

The recommendations below are grouped around three options which entail different approaches to moving eRecruit forward; mapping out three alternative directions of travel. The recommendations under each option are not necessarily mutually exclusive and in reality a combination from the different options may be implemented. A number of more general recommendations are also listed.

Option 1: Limited functionality

Simplify the configuration of eRecruit and use at a more basic level only, perhaps with less input required from managers; then focus on consistency of use of the system.

Recommendation 1: Consider replacing the URP matching process (some HR user feedback that this process is cumbersome) with posting jobs to a URP jobs page for URP candidates to apply. This may not be technically possible and it would build in an automatic delay for all jobs.

Recommendation 2: Recruiting users often do not follow the current process of initiating the mass emails to unsuccessful candidates when they record short-listing outcomes and it is left to HR to do this. Therefore make this action a HR responsibility.

Recommendation 3: Take out offer checklist stage of selection processes. HR user feedback is that this has limited added value and is often not used.

Recommendation 4: Decide on protocol for updating system where actions carried out locally by recruiting managers or administrators e.g. inviting interview candidates, taking up references ([issues and actions log, number 43](#)).

Option 2: Streamlining and improving

Streamlining and improving the existing functionality and configuration, particularly addressing any relatively quick wins; then focus on ensuring that both HR and recruiter users are utilising the system to the full and consistently.

Recommendation 5: Consider taking out the approval process altogether (on the basis that approval is outside of the system and this is therefore a redundant stage) ([issues and actions log, number 73](#)). The implication would be that emails sent from the approval suite of email templates (which includes all non-candidate templates) would not be recorded (though currently only date/ sender/ recipient is recorded); templates held here have also been the source of the 'illegal tag' problem. Progress on Recommendation 21 will be needed to find a better solution to these templates issues.

Recommendation 6: Identify the optimum usefulness of the Tasks and Messages functionality, both the Workspace Apps and in Comms Centre, and email notifications to users ([issues and actions log, numbers 9 and 47](#)).

Recommendation 7: Implement the use of the more detailed indicators of current job status now in the list of values for job status (eg advertising, short-listing, interview) to enable users to more clearly identify where a job is in the process ([issues and actions log, number 71](#)).

Recommendation 8: Implement the procedure to copy to Notepad, in order to 'clean' coding before pasting external wording into templates, to resolve the illegal tag problem with some email templates and encourage HR Teams to use the system templates rather than sending most emails via Gmail. However, ideally progress on Recommendation 21 will be needed, as job-based (ie rather than candidate-based) e-mail templates that are affected by this problem are not retained in eRecruit when sent ([issues and actions log, number 10](#)).

Recommendation 9: Revisit 'duplications' in data input at requisition, posting and offer stages and strip out any that are non-essential ([issues and actions log, number 35](#)).

Recommendation 10: Implement using 'posting notes' in the Postings section of the Job Details to record external media used for each job and audit trail of contact with TMP ([issues and actions log, number 28](#)) and sending posting confirmation emails to contacts via the Postings section ([issues and actions log, number 85](#)).

Recommendation 11: Continue to push for further improvements to PDF candidate pack eg alpha surname order and ensuring that double-sided printing separates out candidates ([issues and actions log, number 9](#)).

Recommendation 12: Recruiting managers to record successful candidates at long-list and short-list stages en masse (proceed candidates) rather than actioning for each individual candidate ie same process as mass reject for unsuccessful candidates (would need to identify how reserve candidates actioned) ([issues and actions log, number 66](#)).

Recommendation 13: Seek further advice from Lumesse on notification to HR users when the interview feedback form is completed by the recruiter ([issues and actions log, number 9](#)). However, the need for this will be dependent on outcome of recommendation 21 below.

Recommendation 14: Review the options provided for informing unsuccessful candidates of the interview outcome ([issues and actions log, number 31](#)).

Recommendation 15: Review process for obtaining information from eRecruit to go into the offer of employment and finalise work with IS to enable transfer of successful candidate data from eRecruit to PIMS ([issues and actions log, number 31](#)).

Option 3: Increasing functionality

Exploring additional functionality not yet utilised in the UoB configuration eg on line short-listing, filtering candidates, setting up interviews through the communications centre; focus on increasing the positive benefits of the system to users.

Recommendation 16: Reconsider the benefits of using the Communications Centre functionality to set up and communicate details of interviews ([issues and actions log, number 64](#)).

Recommendation 17: Revisit the scope for using routing rules functionality for automatic pre-screening for jobs with high response levels ([issues and actions log, number 42](#)).

Recommendation 18: Discuss implementation of candidate pools for high volume, high turn-over roles with relevant HRM's and managers ([issues and actions log, number 23](#)).

Recommendation 19: Test and implement the new functionality to enable multiple panel member on-line short-listing available since new release 12.2 ([issues and actions log, number 37](#)).

Recommendation 20: Use sourcing channels, LinkedIn profiles and other social media functionality in line with social media recruitment strategy being developed with TMP/ Marketing and Communications ([issues and actions log, numbers 27 and 79](#)).

Other general recommendations

Recommendation 21: To work with The Guardian and Lumesse to ensure maximum value from the account management role of The Guardian; this to include a proactive role in the HE User Group.

Recommendation 22: Continue discussions with The Guardian and Lumesse on the pressing need for improved job-based workflow for a future release, based on our feedback that the workflow is currently too candidate-based ([Issues and actions log, number 29, 40, 60, 62](#)).

Recommendation 23: Review other items in the eRecruit issues and future enhancements list not specifically addressed in these recommendations with the LSA Group and identify priorities for local configuration or action, adding to the ideas portal or further discussion with Lumesse.

Recommendation 24: Update user guidance and training to reflect changes and developments implemented from the recommendations in this report, and ensure that guidance content/ screen shots up to date.

Recommendation 25: Work with LSA Group to conduct a new round of training sessions for HR Teams (team based) focused on new developments and reinforcing functionality not currently used in full (informed by this report and sample analysis).

Recommendation 26: Further promote developments, guidance and user training to recruitment contacts (with recommendations from HR Teams to target those with particular training needs).

Recommendation 27: Put in place more links to eRecruit user guidance web pages from appropriate places on UoB/ HR web site (and investigate further scope for link to UoB guidance from eRecruit back office).

Recommendation 28: HR Teams to use the monthly recruitment activity report being developed to carry out regular data integrity checks to ensure that job records are up to date and any outstanding actions carried out.

Recommendation 29: Develop and promote enhanced regular recruitment activity reports ([Issues and actions log, number 32](#)).

Recommendation 30: Implement UoB branding to the eRecruit back office ([Issues and actions log, number 49](#)).

Appendix 1: Recruiting managers and administrators BOS survey results

Responses	27 of 101 recruitment contacts invited to respond (27%)
Role breakdown	Administrator 37% Recruiting manager 48% Selection panel member 15%
Location breakdown	Arts 7.4% Engineering 7.4% Medical and Veterinary Sciences 0% Medicine and Dentistry 18.5% Science 14.8% Social Sciences and Law 11.1% Support Services 40.7%

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I have found eRecruit generally easy to use		51.9%	37%	11.1%
I have referred to the on line guidance when using eRecruit	Yes: 51.9%		No: 48.1%	
If yes, I have found the on line guidance to be useful		78.6%	21.4%	
I am clear as to how I and my recruiting colleagues should use eRecruit during the recruitment and selection process	7.4%	51.9%	37%	3.7%
I have found the candidate information provided through eRecruit suitable for making selection decisions	3.7%	51.9%	29.6%	14.8%
I, or my colleagues, have found inputting outcomes of shortlisting and interviews onto eRecruit straightforward	7.4%	48.1%	33.3%	11.1%
I am generally satisfied with the level of service I receive from HR when recruiting new staff	11.1%	77.8%	11.1%	
I believe that the eRecruit system has been a positive change for the University	11.1%	51.9%	29.6%	7.4%

Appendix 2: Additional comments from recruiting managers and administrators

As both a recruiter and an applicant this system has not been as user-friendly as one might hope. As a recruiter it is difficult (or has been) to get one document for each candidate that flows naturally. There does not seem to be an easy way of getting an individual candidate's information into one document. As an applicant I had anticipated being able to re-use a number of key pages for multiple applications and this does not appear to happen.

Certainly not very intuitive and it is clunky to use. However, it is an improvement on previous arrangements and at least it is all held in one place. I believe the experience for applicants is much better than it was.

I am willing to use any on-line system to make a process simpler but e-Recruit is extremely non-intuitive. I find it so long winded to use that I rarely access it now. Instead I am sent a fluff link by HR, I shortlist against the document and submit the shortlist to HR who do the rest. The HR team in Science have been fantastic in the support they have provided but I really should be able to do it myself on e-Recruit if the system was more straightforward.

I have only had to access the information in order to print off details from applicants and not in the whole process so far - I can't 'agree' with a statement about an action I haven't used/experienced fully yet.

I put that it was a positive change just because it is better than what we had - it isn't easy to use and the guidance is not always helpful.

I run recruitment for the whole of SOCS. I think the change is fantastic. I hear lots of people complain that the job application system is difficult, however I've applied for jobs myself as a test and see no problem with that side of things. URP is a concern. People don't tend to remove themselves once they get a job within UOB. Also with URP, should a URP candidate apply for a job (once it's become an external advert), it doesn't get recognised as an applicant in the system and can be easily overlooked. It would be great if I could clearly see a URP closing date on jobs. There is often conflict over agreed closing dates and I need clarification. It would be great if HR closed jobs once positions are filled as it would appear that I have more 'open' jobs than the reality of the situation. I appreciate this is a 'lack of staff' situation but I don't feel the system is being used to its full potential. There's a problem in the 'reject at interview' stage. If I reject someone, I'll ask HR to formally notify the candidate (in the system) - however, HR don't get this message - so something needs to be done in the system to 'trigger' HR. I've found a work-around, however this isn't the point of the system. Job descriptions - when uploaded they appear to lose their formatting - this is concerning when it comes to essential/desirable criteria as this binds us legally - I think PDFs should be the only way of viewing things and then they can't be changed. Candidate packs - love them! Shortlisting is easier. I think this is an extremely clever system, am glad that all are learning at the same time, but feel there's so much more work this system can do and it would be great to see it. PS - Eddie Procter has been fantastic in the whole transition

my comments were a thank you to Jess Cain for her help and support which has been amazing

It is a shame that the e-recruiting process has some major areas that are not available within the system, which did appear to be within the pilot - including e authorisation, providing a filing system for jds.

Redeployment pool does not work optimally, not always clear and staff who are not interested in post but do not reply do not automatically 'drop off' and allow vacancy to go forward.

Some areas still to be set up of the Engineering Faculty, i.e. Templates for calling for interview.

System is generally easy to use and has improved tracking and processing of recruitment.

Redeployment pool does not work optimally, not always clear for staff joining and staff who are not interested in post but do not reply, do not automatically 'drop off' and allow vacancy to go forward. Staff are not automatically removed from URP when take up new post within UoB. The changes to the confirmation of appointment have made identifying staff with health issues and who need screening for hazardous work more difficult to identify. Job information not always updated by HR in timely manner so jobs appear to be in process when they have been filled.

We would like to be able to add more people to the pool of those who can view application forms, i.e. the whole recruitment panel. We would especially need outside-of-School panel members to be able to access application forms on-line. In the past, not being able to do this has caused delays.

Appendix 3: HR Users BOS survey results

Responses	21 of 40 HR staff invited to respond (52.5%)
Role breakdown	Administrator 42.9% Adviser 33.3% Officer 4.8% Manager 19%

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I have found eRecruit generally easy to use		47.6%	52.4%	
I generally make good use of the user guidance and other supporting information on the HR Intranet	14.3%	85.7%		
I am clear as to how I and my HR colleagues should use eRecruit during the recruitment and selection process	4.8%	66.7%	23.8%	4.8%
I feel that I, and colleagues in my HR Team, have adapted well to using eRecruit	9.5%	66.7%	23.8%	
I feel that my team are generally using the full functionality of eRecruit for the URP process	9.5%	57.1%	23.8%	9.5%
I feel that my team are generally using the full functionality of eRecruit for the advertising process	19%	57.1%	14.3%	9.5%
I feel that my team and recruiting managers are generally using the full functionality of eRecruit for the long/shortlisting process		33.3%	38.1%	28.6%
I feel that my team and recruiting managers are generally using the full functionality of eRecruit for the interview process		19%	38.1%	42.9%
I feel that my team and recruiting managers are generally using the full functionality of eRecruit for the reference process.	4.8%	19%	28.6%	47.6%
I feel that my team are generally using the full functionality of eRecruit for initiating the offer process	4.8%	23.8%	28.6%	42.9%
Recruiting managers and other users in my area have generally been comfortable with using eRecruit		28.6%	52.4%	19%
I believe that the eRecruit system has been a positive change for the University		38.1%	57.1%	4.8%

Appendix 4: Additional comments from HR users
General
It is difficult for me to say, as I had no experience of Boris. I do believe there are useful elements to eRecruit, but some of the processes seem like they are done for the sake of it at the moment, e.g. approving vacancies.
I do feel the intention was there for a good system but I feel the provider (LUMESSE) do not really have a grasp of what is required and there have been a number of technical issues. I also feel that erecruit was implemented in a shorter timescale than perhaps sensible. I would say however that the systems support we have received (from Dylan) in particular has been great.
I think we should be using an e-recruit system. I think an e-recruit system should however make life easier for us. This system does not currently do that.
Managers took a long time to embrace erecruit and took their frustrations out on the HR administrators which was not fair. Direction should have come from the top and Managers should have been told they had to use it and embrace it. One Manager told me that she preferred the old system as it was quicker and she felt more in control.
Potentially it could be helpful if it worked properly and was easier to use for all users. The training guide on the intranet is out of date - notifications of changes are not reflected in the guide.
Unfortunately due to frequent systems issues and feedback that the system is not user-friendly recruiting managers may attempt to engage with the system but may not get very far and then will not try the next time.
Unfortunately not it has been another proactis and this has reflected badly on HR and the University.
We have been proactive in trying to engage recruiting managers to use the system, and in some cases there have been successes. On the whole, the enthusiasm people have shown in using the system has been drained over a period of enduring countless errors, gaps in functionality, and ambiguity in system usage. I should emphasise again that my team's adapting to the system has been thanks to a greater effort on our part, rather than the ease of use or functionality of the system.
Where the eRecruit system has been working it has offered a lot of benefits and positive change, unfortunately there have been so many problems that it has not had the positive impact that it might otherwise have had. The issue with not being able to edit the emails that come out of the system (particularly the 'illegalTag' issue) has been the most crippling I feel.
Whilst at the moment I don't think it has been a positive change for the University I do think it could be if we develop and implement the functionality as intended and improve the workflow through the system.
Whilst I agree that eRecruit has been a positive change we have however experienced numerous issues with the system along the way.
Redeployment
Candidates that may have now left the university or have another job at the university still come up in the URP for weeks after.
I agree that we are using the full functionality for the URP process, but I believe this is the part of eRecruit where we have had the most problems. E.g. candidates we know are in the redeployment pool not matching, commonly because they do not have multiple profiles set up and not all candidates know this is an option, unless they are proactive and query it.

I agree that we are using the functionality - I would however add that the functionality is pretty rubbish!!
I don't like the matching process for URP candidates. I feel this is long-winded and we are potentially mis-matching candidates against jobs based on the limited information candidates are able to complete on their profile. One suggestion I have made and that needs further investigation is that we create a replica of the internal jobs pages that only redeployees can access. We can then post the job to this page in the same way we do for internal or external jobs and redeployees can use the job search alerts, that exists already , to receive notifications on a daily basis of any new job that matches the criteria. The benefits would be that recruiting managers would have visibility of when a job has been advertised to the URP.
It currently doesn't work to send details to through e-recruit to candidate so this is having to be carried out off line.
It is easier to email the potential matches off line
My team makes the best use possible of eRecruit, and the URP procedure in particular, but this is probably a better reflection of my team's commitment than the functionality of eRecruit. This is often 'despite eRecruit', rather than 'thanks to eRecruit'.
There have been problems with sending out the invitations to URP candidates recently and sending attachments, I find the system less intuitive when there are problems like this.
URP process is not currently working. Unable to send invitation email to candidates through eRecruit
We are still doing a lot of work arounds that are taking extra time. In particular having to use email out of the system to invite candidates to interview and request references.
Advertising
Adverts are still not going straight to Jobs.ac.uk so we have to advertise for additional time to take account of the delay in getting placed.
Although there have been problems with the templates periodically that make this very difficult
It is not being used properly by recruiters so it can't be used correctly by HR and many parts of it do not work properly.
Not able to send candidate packs through the system or use the interview or references functionality.
the link between eRecruit and TMP should be stronger. I feel sending a 'buggy' email from the system isn't the best approach.
Short-listing
I am afraid the majority of our Schools are not using erecruit for this purpose and as anticipated it is a task that comes down to my team. In the grand scheme of things I can see why the PIS (who are our main customer base) do not feel this is their role. At the outset the PI's were never really included as a user group and I feel this was slightly shortsighted in reality as they are disengaged with the system which is unfortunate as general on a resourcing level they engage well.
I have to question how fully functional eRecruit is for this purpose - there are gaps in the system (our managers are instructed, as per the eRecruit system, to carry out shortlisting offline) and instances where the system is not best suited/paced to capture data.
I would say we are growing in this area but it feel a long steep path

it doesn't work effectively
Managers don't seem to like e-recruit and where they can ask the administrators to do their inputting for them.
Most recruiting managers don't engage with using or updating the system and their vacancy even though guidance links are attached to all emails sent.
Mostly this is used well
Not all dept update on e-recruit
Not all Managers are happy to update e-recruit
Recruiters tend not to use it at all, or correctly on the rare occasions when they do. Recruiters, in general, completely by-pass it and still do everything by paper as previously. Recruiters complain that it is not user friendly, counter-intuitive and too complex to learn to use, especially when they recruit only occasionally. It is not time effective for them.
Sometimes this may not be used to its full capacity for grade J and above academic posts, but this is something we are working on with SEA's in the Schools.
We are still having difficulty in getting recruiters to fully use the system. Managers have experienced difficulties when trying to use the system as there have been delays in HR responding to them completing sections. Often we are not aware they have completed bits from their end as there are no notifications to make us aware of this.
Interviews
Again, problems have been encountered when going through the process for interview and inviting to interview, the system isn't intuitive and a process we used when we first had the system is not usable now and we have to send the invitations by email from eRecruit instead.
As above
as before
Ditto above. The email system in eRecruit isn't able to contact multiple people simultaneously for interview invites. This stage should either be discarded from the system to streamline the process, or functionality improved to make it better to use than a separate email client.
Due to the initial errors at the start with bad formatting of the e-mails going out and it not carrying across information, we stopped using this function. We are looking to start using this function again.
has proven to be embarrassingly unhelpful
Interviews are pretty much all arranged offline
It's not yet completely working as far as I am aware? Also even if the managers do enter the outcomes of the interviews on eRecruit properly then the system does not send the email it is supposed to to alert us to this. This has led to delays and some very poor service.
No all is done off-line as many features still do not work correctly.
Not all dept update on e-recruit
Not all functionality is available to use.
We are having to use workarounds for this at present as we cannot use the system to trigger emails to invite to interview.

Offer
A confirmation of appointment form is still used as I am concerned that if a manager uploads the details to eRecruit there isn't necessarily a notification to HR that an action is required.
Again, eRecruit does not inform us when the managers have entered the interview details. We are therefore having to resort to working outside the system to ensure we deliver a good service.
Again, this offers very little value at this stage. We input the data as we're told, but this is only duplication of information recorded elsewhere and at this stage this information doesn't go anywhere else.
Managers are inconsistently completing this section so we often resort to them emailing, speaking to us or getting instructions in writing re offers.
No as it does not actually do anything for the offer process. It is just used as an exercise to close the job, it has no other purpose.
Seems rather a pointless step at the moment.
The Schools still need to complete a confirmation of Appointment form and send that to us. they do update the system but we do not receive a automated email to let us know the information is there and ready for us to produce a contract.
To be honest if we receive an email confirming the appointment etc it is an additional task to complete the offer form from erecruit.

Appendix 5: Candidate quality survey results

Responses	30 of 49 candidates invited to respond (61.2%); 21 offered jobs, 9 unsuccessful candidates
-----------	--

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Information on the job was easy to find and useful	40%	60%		
The on line application process was straight-forward to use	40%	60%		
Being able to register to set-up a candidate homepage, return to an incomplete application and track the progress of my application are useful features	43.3%	56.7%		
I received timely and useful communications to keep me updated during the selection process	30%	66.7%	3.3%	
The interview and other selection processes that I took part in were carried out in a professional manner	50%	46.7%	3.3%	
I received appropriate responses to any questions that I had on the job and the process	43.3%	50%		6.7%

Appendix 6: Additional comments from candidates

As I am already a University employee, it would not have been appropriate to give a complete introduction to the company, as I already understand this hence the slightly lower mark in this area. Otherwise, the candidate application page was very easy to use and the option to save and return to my application was invaluable.

The on line system worked well but I had some difficulties accessing my candidate page details from some locations - not sure if it was a site issue or to do with the PC I was using?

The 'human' side of things worked extremely well!

Went for the early morning position as it would have worked better with my studies at Bristol but didn't get it even though the other candidate didn't voice a preference on the shift she wanted. I believe its because I am a student which brought up concerns in the interview which I believe was unfair. The staff I work alongside however are very nice and have made me very welcome.

In general the process was fine. I've held similar posts at several universities and the recruitment process was comparable (on the whole). There was an issue with the advertised salary. I can't remember the exact details, but I don't think a salary was listed on jobs.ac.uk, the salary on the University website was given as a range (about £30,000-35,000) but the person specification/further particulars stated one salary (about £30,000). I was concerned about taking a significant pay cut but the PI/HR offered me the same salary that I am on in my current job. (I am due to start at Bristol in a few days). Whenever I've been offered jobs in the past I usually go through HR to discuss salary, annual leave, start dates etc. but at Bristol I negotiated salary with the PI. I found this a little confusing and uncomfortable at first, but to be honest with you I felt this was simply because I

wasn't used to discussing such things directly. It's not necessarily a "bad" thing - it's just different.

I was grateful to receive a personal call to tell me that I was unsuccessful, but the promised letter / email giving me the contact details for feedback never arrived. I thought the amount of information on the interview process provided on the job application web site was really helpful. Very professional and friendly HR staff - who went the extra mile. So sorry not to be successful!

My experience was that I was interviewed by a team of people who barely understood what it was that they were interviewing me for. I have 15 years high grade professional experience in my work and I felt treated like a secretary. I felt that they had no idea of the quality and depth of my work, nor remotely understood the value I could have brought to the project. At the end of the interview I was told I would be informed of a decision within 24 hours. I did not receive ANY further communication after this point, not even an email to say I'd not got the job. The sheer arrogant unprofessionalism was shocking frankly. And the discourtesy to not even get a formal rejection email was worse. I am thoroughly disgusted.

The candidate homepage WOULD have been an excellent feature had the recruiting team actually bothered to use it. It has taken 2 months for that application page to finally give me an answer.

My experience of the recruitment process this times has been - pathetic, rude, inappropriate and unprofessional.

Very poor and unprofessional conduct on part of Faculty Manager and Head of School following interview process. I do not believe such an approach is befitting of a university such as Bristol, especially given the meeting that they initiated prior to the interview. Frankly, I am appalled.

Staggering of interviews throughout the day meant that some candidates would be going into interview / tests with a better understanding of the School and its planning/operations than others. Those that had lunch and tour (which included speaking to various members of staff from School) before interview and tests may have been better placed to answer some questions than those who had the interview / tests earlier. For example, I would have been better placed to answer the budget deficit scenario following the tour as I would have been aware of the restrictions on student numbers resulting from physical resources (buildings etc) and drive to increase income from CPD activities / events, conferences on campus etc.

Also, a lot of emphasis placed on academic knowledge of subject area and laboratory safety. The degree of involvement with the management of technical staff and knowledge of laboratory safety wasn't clearly stated in the job description/person specification. One question concerned the regulations relating to the use of human tissue and another asking about chemicals that could be used in the School laboratories. I could not answer these in any depth as this is not my area of expertise, my personal statement was transparent and honest in showing my skills and experience which are targeted towards general school administration and Management. Therefore by inviting me to interview, I would have expected there to have been more questions relating to how I would transfer my current skills to the role rather than asking questions and scenarios outside my area of knowledge (not to say that I don't have the ability to learn these new skills 'on the job').

I am still waiting for written feedback.

Appendix 7: Analysis of the use of eRecruit workflow for a sample of jobs (see separate Excel file)

Appendix 8: eRecruit issues and action log (see separate Excel file)