

Recruiting Hub Homepage User Testing Report

Consolidated findings from ten sessions

Yuhan Hu · August 2026

A synthesis of the homepage study. It leads with how participants reacted to the design and what should change, then covers how they work today as supporting context. Sections 01 to 16 cover the nine participants in scope, meaning the individual contributors the homepage is designed for. Section 17 records the coordinator manager session separately.

Participants are identified by role rather than by name throughout. Where two people share a role, the session number distinguishes them.

9 participants in scope 3 out of scope, section 17 5 organisations 7 widgets tested
9 of 9 drove the prototype

PART ONE · THE DESIGN

1. Summary
2. Who took part
3. Widget by widget
4. Names and definitions to settle
5. Customization, and finding the entry point
6. Reminders: automatic beats manual
7. Notification preferences
8. Widgets people asked for
9. Where the evidence conflicts
10. Recommendations

PART TWO · HOW PEOPLE WORK TODAY

11. Where participants actually work today
12. Five of nine built a tracker outside the product
13. What participants think this page is for
14. Two problems bigger than the homepage

PART THREE · APPENDICES

15. Follow-ups owed to participants
16. Method limitations

17. Out of scope: the coordinator manager session

01

Summary

The design tested well. Participants understood almost every widget, five praised the visual design without being asked, and Events, the one widget every single person kept, drew the strongest reactions in the study. The work ahead is concentrated in three places rather than spread across the design: a handful of names, one entry point, and how much of the job the page covers.

What is working

- **Events is the only widget all nine participants kept,** and it drew the strongest positive reactions anywhere in the study. Four said unprompted that it restores something they miss, and paging backwards through dates was the single most enthusiastic moment across the ten sessions.
- **Comprehension was high.** Only three of the seven widgets produced a genuine misread, and two of those trace to the name rather than the layout, which makes them cheap to fix.
- **Notification preferences was the smoothest task in the study.** Seven of nine found it unaided, most on the first attempt, and three separately described the overflow menu as where they would naturally look.
- **The pinned talent pool card produced the strongest single reaction of any widget.** It carries the exact two numbers the research lead reports to hiring managers, and her verdict was "nothing manual involved in that".
- **Customization works once people reach it.** Everyone who found the entry point used it comfortably, and reordering and trade-offs went smoothly.
- **Pinning is the right model.** Four participants said they would rather pin things themselves than have the system guess, which supports the design's emphasis on pinned over recent.
- **Both requests with more than one voice behind them are already in the design.** Events filters moved onto the page, and pre-brief, interview loop and debrief are now separated. The filters change went in mid-study, and the two sessions that followed confirmed it.

What to change

- **Four names need work, and one needs a definition first.** "Recent active jobs" was not understood by two participants. "Pipeline lists" misled one for several minutes. "Customize" reads as an appearance setting. "At risk" means different things to coordinators, recruiters and sourcers, and the design side cannot define it either, so that one needs an owner before it needs copy.
- **The customization entry point is hard to find.** Five of eight participants with usable data did not reach it unaided. One of them explained the cause himself, which makes this the cheapest high-value fix in the report.
- **Reminders need to be generated, not written.** Six participants described reminders they want the system to raise from state it already holds. A manual reminder asks them to already know the thing they came to find out.
- **Every role wants something the seven widgets do not cover,** and each of those requests outranked an existing widget for the person who raised it. Offers, pending requests and panel feedback status have the strongest evidence.

What that means for the design

- **Three participants already work on today's homepage, and nothing they use goes away.** The Recruiting Pipeline page carries on in the new Recruiting Hub, so cancelling an event, opening a loop's full schedule and reaching the "my requests" queue all stay available there. What these three asked for is to do those things from the homepage instead of navigating to the pipeline page. That is a scoping question rather than a gap: should the homepage support action, or only orientation? Section 13 sets out the choice.
- **A single default set will not work.** The differences between roles are different objects, not different orderings. Senior industry recruiters want Offers, coordinators want Requests, campus recruiters want worklists.
- **Two problems raised by participants are larger than this page:** the visibility and ownership model, and integration with candidate email.

WHAT THIS STUDY DID NOT TEST

The plan was built to answer one question: are the five role presets right? It called for a before-and-after comparison. Each participant would first use the default layout with all seven widgets, then switch to the preset for their role. Two observations were to be recorded, and neither can be reconstructed afterwards:

- **At minute 15, before seeing their preset,** each participant names their top three widgets in order. Those three get compared against what the preset puts in the main section. A match confirms the preset, and confirms it strongly: the participant had not seen the preset, so nobody could have steered the answer.
- **After switching to the preset, which switched-off widgets do they add back?** A widget nobody adds back is a safe cut. One that most people add back means the preset got it wrong. One they say they want but fail to add back points at the configurator rather than the content.

Neither appears in the session records, and the sessions read as single walkthroughs rather than a comparison. So this report can tell you how people understood the design, where they struggled and what they asked for. It cannot tell you whether the role presets are correct. That needs a fresh round. Section 16 lists the other limitations.

02

Who took part

The middle column gives the label used for each participant throughout this report. Session numbers stay attached to the two campus recruiters and the two non-executive coordinators, because role alone does not separate them.

The nine participants in scope. All nine drove the prototype themselves.

Session	Label used in this report	Full role Organisation	Scale and working context
01	The sourcing recruiter	Sourcing RecruiterAudible	UX hiring at L5 and L6. Covers the middle of the funnel only.
02	The principal recruiter	Principal Recruiter, RVP viewFGBS	7.5 years at Amazon. Lives in three tabs: offers, disposition, interview loop. Cares about the hiring team, not the top of the funnel.
03	The coordinator (session 03)	Recruiting CoordinatorAudible	Heaviest user of the current homepage in the set. Confirmation SLA is 72 hours.
04	The campus recruiter (session 04)	Campus Hire RecruiterAUTA	Extreme volume. 70 new reqs in a day, 700 in the working scenario, 3,000-plus historically. Sends assessments 1,000 at a time from worklists.
05	The executive coordinator	Lead Executive RC and RC ManagerGSR	Executive scheduling and logistics. Sends applications through talent pools. Only participant with both coordinator and management duties.
06	The research lead	Research Lead, sourcer sideGSR	Low volume, high value. 8 to 9 pools at full load. Started as a coordinator, so reads the page with two sets of eyes.
07	The strategic recruiter	Principal Strategic Recruiter, designGSR	Executive and design hiring. Sits on the interview panel herself, so she is both recruiter and interviewer.
08	The coordinator (session 08)	Recruiting CoordinatorAADA and MEA	Schedules more in-person loops than the other coordinators. Swaps an unconfirmed bar raiser every 24 hours until one accepts.
09	The campus recruiter (session 09)	Campus RecruiterAUTA	Has done both industry and campus recruiting, so he can name the difference precisely. Works in a shared working group on each req.

SCOPE

A tenth session ran with three coordinator managers. It is not counted in any number in sections 01 to 16, for two reasons: the participants manage coordinators rather than doing the work the homepage is designed around, and they did not operate the prototype, so the session produced no behavioural data. Two of the three said managers should not set coordinator defaults. Their input is recorded in full in [section 17](#).

One sampling fact shapes everything that follows. The manager session established that **Audible runs a separate coordinator system with its own process**, which reclassifies the session 03 coordinator and the executive coordinator as non-representative of mainstream coordinators. That leaves the session 08 coordinator as the only mainstream sample. Separately, **the two campus recruiters agree on one thing and diverge on another**, which is set out in section 09.

03

Widget by widget

Comprehension was high. Only three widgets produced a genuine misread, and two of those trace to naming rather than design. The table records what participants understood, what they valued, and where the evidence is thin.

Findings per widget. Counts refer to the nine participants in scope.

Widget	Comprehension	Value	Main finding
Events of the day	ONE MISREAD	HIGHEST	Kept by 9 of 9 and the strongest positive in the study. The session 03 coordinator initially read the whole screen as one event with several time slots. Two participants say the day-by-day form is not the cut they need.
Reminders today	UNDERSTOOD	ADOPTION RISK	Kept by 8 of 9, but four participants signalled they would not open it. Value depends entirely on the reminders being generated rather than written. Section 06.
Pinned jobs	UNDERSTOOD	SOLID	Preferred over the Recent equivalent by four participants who would rather pin than let the system guess. The session 09 campus recruiter pins pooling reqs rather than hiring reqs.
Recent active jobs	NAME FAILED	WEAKEST	Two participants could not say what it meant. Switched off or ignored by five. The one participant who wanted more from it wanted every associated req, not a longer list of five.
Pinned talent pools	UNDERSTOOD	SPLITS BY ROLE	Strongest single positive of any widget, from the research lead, because the card carries the exact two numbers she reports to hiring managers. Coordinators and campus switch it off. The executive coordinator is the exception, because she sends applications through pools.

Widget	Comprehension	Value	Main finding
Pinned pipeline lists	NAME MISLED	SPLITS BY ROLE	Core to campus, where it is the worklist. The session 04 campus recruiter read "pipeline" as a top-down funnel and lost several minutes. Three roles each asked for a different stage breakdown on the same card.
Recent active pipeline lists	BOUNDARY UNCLEAR	WEAK	The strategic recruiter thought it duplicated Reminders and needed several rounds to separate them. Same naming problem as Recent active jobs.

Events earned the praise, but the daily cut is not universal

Events restored something people missed. Four participants said so without prompting, in almost the same words, and the ability to page backwards through dates was the single most enthusiastic reaction in the study.

"This to me is probably the absolute most useful. This is what I feel is missing from the dashboard today that used to exist where you could just go date by date."

Principal recruiter, FGBS · session 02

Two participants nonetheless said the daily cut is the wrong shape, and their reasons do not overlap:

- **The research lead wants a candidate cut, not a day cut.** She named the reason herself: paging by day is a scheduler's view, and she is not a scheduler. She wants to know where her thirty phone-screen candidates stand.
- **The session 04 campus recruiter wants a cross-day slice** because of volume. Her example is the ten people who interviewed last week, are past SLA, and still have no debrief.

Neither argues against Events. They argue that Events is necessary and not sufficient. Keeping it and adding a cross-day view satisfies both groups; replacing the daily view would break the finding with the strongest support in the study. A third objection, from a coordinator manager who wanted a queue of work not yet scheduled, is recorded in [section 17](#).

Requested changes to Events, and what the design did with them

Five changes were asked for, and the working rule has been to act once more than one person raises the same thing. Both requests that cleared that bar are now in the design. The remaining three were each raised once.

Requested changes to Events, with how many participants raised each one and where the design currently stands.

Request	Raised by	In the design	Detail
Surface the filters on the page	Fourthree asked, one noticed it missing	DONE	Asked for by the sourcing recruiter, the principal recruiter and the session 03 coordinator, and noticed as missing by the executive coordinator without any prompt. Implemented mid-study.
Separate pre-brief and debrief from interview loop	Twoplus one manager	DONE	The sourcing recruiter and the session 04 campus recruiter. Separated in the new design. A manager independently reported that her coordinators filter pre-brief out and then fail to schedule it, which is worth checking as a current defect in its own right. See section 17 .
Cancel an event from the homepage	One	NOT CHANGED	The executive coordinator says this is mandatory for coordinators, and that today's homepage already provides it: "right now we do have it on the home page." It stays available on the Recruiting Pipeline page, so the request is to surface it on the homepage as well, not to restore it.
Open a loop's full schedule without clicking into it	One	NOT CHANGED	The session 03 coordinator's top ask, and a feature she uses today on the RPM page, which continues in the new Recruiting Hub. She reports coordinators are "obsessed with the drop down" because clicking into a loop means waiting for it to load. The request is to bring it onto the homepage too.
Acknowledge a known non-acceptance	One	NOT CHANGED	The principal recruiter's case is a debrief where someone has already said they cannot attend and everyone agrees. Her own wording for the control was "acknowledge, no further action needed". A genuinely new request, so the single-source rule applies cleanly.

THE FILTERS CHANGE HAS ALREADY VALIDATED

Moving the Events filters out of the flyout and onto the page is the one design change made during this study, and the two sessions that followed confirmed it. The research lead called the option valuable even at her own low volume, and the strategic recruiter said the filters matched her role. Treat this as settled and keep it.

WHY THE SINGLE-SOURCE RULE HOLDS HERE

None of the three unchanged items is a loss. The Recruiting Pipeline page continues in the new Recruiting Hub, so all three remain available there. Each request is about doing the thing from the homepage instead of navigating to the pipeline page, which makes them convenience requests, and one voice is reasonable grounds to wait. The open question is not whether to restore anything. It is how much action the homepage should support at all, which [section 13](#) sets out.

Warning lead time has no consensus yet

NOT CHANGED Nothing to act on yet, and that is the correct outcome for now. Three participants gave three different answers, and each is defensible from their own service level agreement. The sourcing recruiter wants two business days, on the grounds that two days is enough to act and more is noise. The session 03 coordinator accepts a full week, because her confirmation SLA is 72 hours. The principal recruiter wants no lead time rule at all: show the warning on any day that is not fully accepted, and clear it when it resolves. This needs a decision per SLA rather than a single global number.

Job card content requests

Requested additions to the job card, with who asked and how strong the case is.

Request	Asked by	Evidence	Reason given
Position ID	Principal recruiter	STRONG, N=1	Without a position ID attached, the role cannot be filled. Hiring managers discuss reqs by position ID.
Hiring req or pooling req chip	Principal recruiter, campus recruiter (session 04)	TWO	Fast classification. Present in the design, absent from the prototype at the time.
Recruiter alias	Sourcing recruiter, coordinator (session 03)	TWO	Both cover reqs that are not their own. The coordinator recognises a job by whose it is.
Sourcer alias	Sourcing recruiter wants it, session 03 coordinator does not	SPLITS	Splits on whether the person sources. This is the intended role split working as expected.
Opened date instead of last modified	Principal recruiter	STRONG, N=1	Open date drives time to fill. Last modified only reflects edits and reposting. She also wants to sort by it to find the most aging role.
Link to the req's sourcing pool	Strategic recruiter	STRONG, N=1	Reaching the pool she works from takes five clicks today. It was her only answer when asked what was missing.

04

Names and definitions to settle

Four labels came up repeatedly, and they are among the cheapest things in this report to improve. Three are copy changes. The fourth needs a decision about what the underlying status means before any wording will help.

"Recent active jobs"

Two participants could not parse it, and the session 03 coordinator identified the mechanism: the label contradicts itself. "Recent" suggests history, "active" suggests current. The principal recruiter went further and offered a replacement that describes the intent she assumed.

"I would somehow retitle that recent active job. To me, I don't know what that means."

Principal recruiter, FGBS · session 02

Her suggestion was "new activity requiring action". Before choosing any name, the underlying definition needs settling, because the session 03 coordinator's follow-up question exposed that it is unclear: are these jobs still being scheduled, or jobs that have closed? A different answer produces a different name. She is owed a reply on this.

"Pipeline lists"

The session 04 campus recruiter lost several minutes to this. Two problems compounded. The object is a worklist, and renaming it "pipeline" led her to expect a hiring req funnel. Separately, the prototype showed all five stages on every card, when a worklist should show only the stages it contains. The second was a prototype shortcut rather than a design decision, and it must be fixed before the next session or it will manufacture the same misread again. Her suggested names were personal views, personalized lists, or customized views.

"At risk" and "on track"

This is the most serious definition problem, because nobody owns the answer. Three participants raised it and each surfaced a different layer:

- **The session 03 coordinator reads "at risk" as interview declines**, meaning a loop she cannot confirm. Pipeline health does not enter her mind. Two coordinators and one recruiter would therefore read the same pill as two different objects.
- **The principal recruiter asks who sets it** and whether she should trust it.
- **The research lead says a single formula cannot work for GSR**, which runs its own search health index on different rules, and where practices differ again between principal engineering, science and executive recruiting. Her phrase was that this may be a can of worms.

The research lead also proposed the cleanest solution: let the recruiter set the status. Her reasoning is concrete. With only three or four top matches, one candidate accepting an internal promotion flips a req from healthy to unhealthy, and no automatic formula keeps pace with that. The design side confirmed during session 03 that it does not know the definition either, so this needs a product owner before it needs a tooltip.

"Customize"

Covered in the next section, because the naming problem and the discovery problem are the same problem.

05

Customization, and finding the entry point

The feature itself landed. Every participant who reached it understood it and used it without difficulty, and two praised it before any task was set. The work is in getting people to it.

How each participant reached the customization entry point.

Participant	Discovery	Detail
Coordinator session 03	IMMEDIATE	Found it at once. Reordering and trade-offs went smoothly.
Executive coordinator	IMMEDIATE	Praised it before any task was set.
Research lead	IMMEDIATE	Saw it right away, assumed she should wait before selecting it.
Sourcing recruiter	DELAYED	Searched the page for a while. "It was right in front of me and I didn't notice it."
Principal recruiter	DELAYED	"Just took me a minute."
Campus recruiter session 09	DELAYED	Selected Remove first, assuming that was the route, then found the banner.
Campus recruiter session 04	ONLY WHEN ASKED	Went looking only after the task was set. Found it without difficulty once looking.
Strategic recruiter	NEEDED EXPLAINING	Removed a widget, then asked "How do I add it back?" and needed the route explained.
Coordinator session 08	UNUSABLE	The moderator raised it first. Excluded from the count.

Three of eight found it immediately, and the other five got there with varying amounts of searching. The session 09 campus recruiter explained the cause himself, unprompted, which makes this the most actionable finding in the report: it points at a specific fix rather than a general concern.

"I think configure rather than customize because customize for me feels more aesthetic wise, especially because it has this little cute clip art next to it that I'm just like, oh, this is how I make it look pretty, not how I make it more functional."

Campus recruiter, AUTA · session 09

Two forces point the same wrong way. The word suggests appearance, and the illustration beside it reinforces that reading. Renaming the control to "Configure" and moving or replacing the illustration costs very little and has a stated mechanism behind it.

THIS DATA DOES NOT DESCRIBE WHAT SHIPS

The prototype offered only the sidebar banner, and at the top of the sidebar. The current design adds a persistent "Configure homepage" button in the page header and moves the banner to the bottom of the sidebar, below the fold on most screens. So these results describe an easier condition than the one that ships for the banner, and say nothing at all about the header button. Five of eight failing to find the banner in the easier position is still a strong argument, but the two-entry-point question in the plan remains unanswered.

Three further problems inside the configurator

- **Moving a widget between the main section and the sidebar has no visible affordance.** The research lead and the strategic recruiter hit this in consecutive sessions, in the same way, and both recognised the drag handle only once it was pointed out. Two consecutive identical failures is enough evidence. Fix it rather than test it again.
- **Removing a widget offers no way back.** The strategic recruiter removed one and had no route to restore it. An undo on remove, or an entry point left in the empty slot, would close this.
- **Collapse reads as delete.** The strategic recruiter's reaction was "Did I accidentally remove something?" The session 09 campus recruiter, by contrast, discovered collapse on his own and understood it. The control works; its result needs to look different from removal.

RELATED, OUT OF SCOPE

A manager who watched a previous homepage revision land badly named the most specific risk anyone raised for this project: that customization addresses which things are available to look at, when what her team cares about is how those things are presented. See [section 17](#).

06

Reminders: automatic beats manual

Reminders was kept by eight of nine participants, yet four separately signalled they would not use it. Both facts are true, and the resolution is in what the reminders contain.

The adoption risk

- **The sourcing recruiter has never used the existing reminders feature once**, and the reason is exposure rather than need. The entry point is not in her line of sight.
- **The principal recruiter works off her calendar** and will not open another tab to see a second list.
- **The session 04 campus recruiter judges she will not use it herself**, though she expects industry recruiters will.
- **The session 09 campus recruiter asked the sharpest version of the question:** is this a fourth thing he has to open each morning, alongside email, Slack and Quip?

What would change that

Six participants described reminders they want the system to generate from state it already holds. None asked for a better place to write their own notes. The strategic recruiter drew the line most clearly.

"I wouldn't want that to be a manual reminder because then that's pointless because I'd have to go [get] all the information anyways."

Strategic recruiter, GSR · session 07

A manual reminder asks her to already know the thing she came to find out. The generated cases participants named:

Reminders participants want generated from existing system state.

Case	Asked by	Trigger that already exists
Loop feedback overdue against the two-day rule	Sourcing recruiter	The 2-and-5 promise. Her single largest pain point.
Panel feedback not yet submitted before a debrief	Strategic recruiter	Submission status per interviewer. She needs to ping the whole loop.
Her own feedback due, with the debrief date	Strategic recruiter	Requires the system to know she holds an interview slot. See below.
Bar raiser unconfirmed past 24 hours	Coordinator (session 08)	The product already sends an automatic email at 24 hours. She proposed reusing that trigger.
Defect-prevention items: compensation, references, confidential flag	Strategic recruiter	Team deadlines. She tracks these in Quip today and offered to send the full list.
Candidate replies awaiting a response	Research lead, coordinator (session 08)	The C3 activity feed already surfaces "this person replied three days ago".
Final confirmation not yet sent	Coordinator (session 08)	She currently looks a week ahead and sets her own reminders.

The research lead drew a useful distinction the design does not yet make. Reminders are actions due today. A C3 nudge is something slipping. Both belong on the page, but they are different objects and she treats them differently.

A DEPENDENCY THAT BLOCKS TWO HIGH-SEVERITY FINDINGS

Executive recruiters sit on interview panels, so the strategic recruiter is both recruiter and interviewer on the same loop. Her top two pain points both assume the system knows that. If it does not record that a recruiter holds an interview slot, the reminder cannot be generated at all. This needs confirming with the product team before either item is scoped.

Two participants want this to be an agent, not a widget

The executive coordinator wants a combined to-do list for the day, assembled for her rather than by her, and reacted well to hearing that a "top three things needing you" concept is planned. The session 09 campus recruiter goes further: an agent that talks to Quip and delivers a report at 8 AM, covering high-priority flags and the day-over-day change in applications on his pinned jobs. His reasoning is worth noting, because it reframes the personalisation problem. He would move the burden of "everyone wants something different" off the product team and onto each person's own agent configuration.

07

Notification preferences

This was the smoothest task in the study and needs the least work. Seven of nine participants found notification preferences in the widget's overflow menu, most on the first attempt. The session 04 campus recruiter took two steps, opening Create reminder first. The sourcing recruiter, the principal recruiter and the session 03 coordinator all described the overflow menu as where they would naturally look.

Two clear preferences emerged. **A daily summary beats per-event notification** for the sourcing recruiter, the session 03 coordinator and the executive coordinator, who do not want to be interrupted each time. **Slack matters more than email** for several participants, and for specific reasons rather than taste. The session 04 campus recruiter is in neither Hire nor Outlook consistently, but Slack is always open. The sourcing recruiter contacts interviewers on Slack rather than email. The session 08 coordinator and the executive coordinator both singled out the Slack option approvingly. Keeping both channels on by default is well supported.

GAP IN THE RECORD

The plan called for a comprehension check on the fourth notification option, a seventeen-word concatenation of the middle two, and asked whether participants finish reading it. The session records do not report this for any participant. Whether the wording works is still unknown, and it is the option most likely to be misread. Add it to the next round.

08

Widgets people asked for

These are the gaps participants named themselves, and the list is a useful signal in its own right: people engaged with the design enough to tell us what they would add. Every item here was ranked above at least one existing widget by the person who asked for it.

Requested widgets, with evidence strength and the work they would replace.

Requested widget	Asked by	Evidence	What it replaces or unblocks
Offers	Principal recruiter	STRONG, N=1	Her most-used tab and her first answer on what is missing. Needs draft, pending approval, extended and accepted, a toggle between internal and external, and expiration dates.
Pending requests	Coordinator (session 03), executive coordinator, coordinator (session 08)	THREE	Requests and scheduled events sit on two separate pages today, which the executive coordinator names as her top pain point. Both coordinators reach requests by going into pipeline, which still works in the new Recruiting Hub, so this is a request for a homepage entry point rather than a missing capability. The session 08 coordinator added the one concrete field anyone offered: how long each request has been idle.
Req-level pipeline table	Campus recruiter (session 04)	N=1, NOT CONFIRMED	Replaces the Excel pivot table she maintains. She listed the fields herself: job ID, manager, assessment, resume review, confirmed loop or pending interview, pending debrief, outcome. The session 09 campus recruiter did not raise it, so this is not yet a campus trait.
Panel feedback status	Strategic recruiter	STRONG, N=1	Removes the need to check each interviewer before a debrief. Blocked on whether the system knows a recruiter holds an interview slot.

Requested widget	Asked by	Evidence	What it replaces or unblocks
Loops with an unconfirmed bar raiser	Coordinator (session 08)	STRONG, N=1	Replaces her personal checklist. Three swap rounds over three days is typical per loop. She proposed wiring it to the existing 24-hour email trigger, which makes it cheap.
Candidate communications	Coordinator (session 08)	N=1	Final confirmations due, plus candidate emails needing a reply. Overlaps with item B in section 14.
Disposition	Principal recruiter	N=1, PLUS ASSENT	One of her three permanent tabs. She wants to filter to items sitting with her and to see the whole team. The executive coordinator agreed it would help others.

One structural request recurs across roles and belongs here. The pinned pipeline card was asked to break down by stage by three participants who each wanted a different breakdown: the research lead wants recruiter screen, tech screen and loop, because that is what she presents to hiring managers. The executive coordinator wants requests and scheduled. The session 04 campus recruiter wants the finer fields from her req-level table. One card, three requested cuts, which makes this a configurability question rather than a default question. A manager added a fourth cut, in [section 17](#).

09

Where the evidence conflicts

Three conflicts remain inside scope. In each case the resolution depends on separating behaviour from inference, and self-driven reactions from prompted agreement.

Does higher volume need higher information density?

The session 04 campus recruiter makes the case forcefully, and it is the sharpest critique in the study. Against it: the principal recruiter worries about a crowded screen, and the research lead said the page already looks busy on a 13-inch laptop. Critically, **the session 09 campus recruiter, the second sample in the same organisation, did not raise density at all**, focusing instead on ownership and cross-system integration.

Resolution: density is a single sample and must not be generalised to campus. What the two campus participants do agree on, and what can be treated as a finding, is that campus tracking happens outside the product because the product is built for industry recruiting.

"Hire continues to cater towards industry recruiters that are 1 to 1 with minimal volume... they have less than 10 wrecks that they need to fill. I had to oversee over 3000 requisitions."

Campus recruiter, AUTA · session 04

Do coordinators want pinned jobs?

The session 03 coordinator and the executive coordinator both switched it off. The session 08 coordinator kept it, and gave a specific reason: sometimes a single job carries a large batch of loops. She also schedules more in-person loops than the others, which may or may not be the mechanism.

Resolution: unresolved, and it now matters more than it looks, because the two who switched it off are both from the coordinator system identified as non-representative. Ask the next coordinator directly rather than assuming coordinators do not need it.

Will Events be confused with the RPM view coordinators already use?

This matters because both surfaces coexist. The Recruiting Pipeline page continues in the new Recruiting Hub, so coordinators will move between it and the new Events widget, and the two look alike. The session 03 coordinator misread the whole Events screen as a single loop's time slots, and named the cause herself: it resembles the RPM loop detail she reads every day. The executive coordinator, asked about it, said she could tell the difference and did not think people would be confused. Same role, opposite answers, and the second was a stated opinion after hearing that others had struggled, which makes it the weaker of the two.

Resolution: test it cold rather than asking. Show the screen without explanation and ask how many events are on it. A related boundary problem appeared in three sessions: the session 03 coordinator inside Events, the executive coordinator between events and requests, and the strategic recruiter between events, reminders and recent active pipeline lists. Three sessions failing on the same cluster of concepts suggests the fix is not copy. It may need "what is happening today" and "what I need to do" to sit at different visual levels rather than as peer widgets.

A CONFLICT THAT SCOPE RESOLVES

Three coordinators reacted strongly and positively to the day-by-day Events view after operating it themselves. The only opposing view came from a coordinator manager, who judged that a daily overview does not help a coordinator. With that session out of scope, the coordinators' behavioural evidence stands unopposed. Her separate point, that the queue of work not yet scheduled is missing, does not conflict with anything and is worth keeping. Both are in [section 17](#).

Recommendations

DECIDE THIS FIRST

Settle whether the homepage is for orienting or for acting, before adding more widgets.

Participants described the page as a glance surface: somewhere to see the day and get their bearings, then act elsewhere. Several of their requests point the other way, asking to act without leaving the homepage:

- Cancel an event, rather than opening the Recruiting Pipeline page.
- Open a loop's full schedule in place, rather than clicking into the loop and waiting.
- See pending requests, rather than navigating into pipeline.

Both are defensible designs, and nothing is broken either way, since all three actions remain available on the Recruiting Pipeline page. But the choice settles a whole class of requests at once. Left open, each one gets argued on its own merits and the page drifts. Evidence in sections 03, 08 and 13.

If each role gets four default widgets

Four is a defensible number. No participant's self-built set exceeded five, and most settled at three or four. Three presets cover all nine participants, which is the right granularity given the sample: no role here has enough data to justify a preset of its own. Coordinator managers are excluded, since no current widget serves that role.

Three presets, four widgets each, derived from what participants selected themselves. Events sits at the top of the main section and Reminders at the top of the sidebar in every preset, matching the shipped convention.

Preset who it covers	Shared three	The fourth what makes it a preset	Evidence
Recruiters and sourcers sourcing, full lifecycle and specialty · n=4	Events, Reminders, Pinned jobs	Pinned talent pools Highest-value widget for the two GSR specialty recruiters.	MIXED ON THE FOURTH
Campus AUTA · n=2	Events, Reminders, Pinned jobs	Pinned pipeline lists The worklist. Both campus participants said this is where they work.	STRONGEST OF THE THREE
Recruiting coordinators RC · n=3	Events, Reminders, Pinned jobs	Open No widget in the current seven earns it. See below.	SOLID ON THE THREE

The finding underneath the table

Three of the four slots are the same in every preset. Events, Reminders and Pinned jobs hold across all nine participants. Only the fourth carries the difference: pools for recruiters and sourcers, worklists for campus, and nothing that exists yet for coordinators.

That is a smaller personalisation problem than the seven-widget matrix suggests, and it changes what a preset costs. Building one is a single decision rather than four, and getting the fourth slot wrong costs one widget rather than a layout. It also means the shared three carry most of the weight, so they are worth being sure about.

The three are not equally solid, and the difference matters if they are going to be held constant:

- **Events is safe.** All nine participants kept it, the only widget with no dissent anywhere in the study.
- **Reminders is nearly safe.** Eight of nine kept it. The exception is the highest-volume campus recruiter, who reads it as an industry-recruiter feature, so expect one group of campus users to switch it off.
- **Pinned jobs is the weakest of the three.** Coordinators split two to one and the highest-volume campus recruiter did not select it. It holds its place on the reasoning that a requisition someone pinned themselves should never need hunting for, not on consensus.

Two cells to decide before this ships

POOLS FOR FULL-LIFECYCLE RECRUITERS IS A BET, NOT A FINDING

Grouping sourcing, full-lifecycle and specialty recruiters together works for the shared three. The fourth is where they diverge. Both GSR specialty recruiters rank talent pools highest, which carries the cell. But the one full-lifecycle recruiter in this round switched pools off, and her top ask was Offers. The sourcing recruiter did not select pools either, saying she does not use them now but would later.

So the cell rests on two of four participants. It is still a reasonable call, because prior work supports it: the shipped default turns pools on for this group on the Apr finding that full-lifecycle recruiters touch every part of the funnel including sourcing. Record it as a bet on that earlier study against this round's single contrary data point, not as something these sessions established. If a full-lifecycle recruiter switches pools off in the next round, that is a result, not noise.

THE COORDINATOR FOURTH SLOT HAS NO GOOD CANDIDATE

Coordinators are the only group where four slots cannot be filled from the current seven widgets. All three removed both pipeline widgets, two of three removed Recent active jobs, and talent pools split one to two: the executive coordinator ranked it first because she sends applications through pools, and the other two did not want it. Meanwhile all three asked for pending requests, which does not exist yet.

Recommendation: ship three and hold the fourth for Pending requests. Padding the slot with something two of three participants removed is worse than leaving it out, because a widget nobody wants still costs attention and still has to be switched off by hand. If the slot has to be filled now, pinned talent pools is the only defensible choice, and only for coordinators who send applications through pools.

SAMPLING CAVEAT

Two of the three coordinators work in Audible or GSR, which the manager session identified as running separate coordinator processes. So the coordinator preset is built mostly on non-mainstream samples, and mainstream coordinator evidence rests on one participant. Section 16 covers this.

Tier 1. Fix before the next session. No external dependency.

1. **Rename "Customize" to "Configure", and move or replace the illustration beside it.** Five of eight participants missed the entry point, and the session 09 campus recruiter supplied the causal explanation. Cost is close to zero.
2. **Give the cross-column move a visible affordance.** The research lead and the strategic recruiter failed identically in consecutive sessions. Enough evidence, no more testing needed.
3. **Add an undo to Remove, or leave an entry point in the empty slot.** The strategic recruiter had no route back.
4. **Make a collapsed widget look clearly different from a removed one.** The strategic recruiter read collapse as accidental deletion.
5. **Show only the stages a worklist actually contains** on pinned pipeline cards. The current all-five display is a prototype shortcut that manufactured the session 04 misread.
6. **Check the layout at 13 inches, around 1366 pixels wide.** The research lead reported the page feels crowded there and said most recruiters use that size. Record every future participant's screen size, since only one is on file.
7. **Repair the mock data.** Lorem ipsum reminder bodies, five identical jobs, identical event times running backwards, and duplicate talent pools make the prioritisation tasks unanswerable. A participant cannot rank five identical jobs, so the data blocked the ranking task this round.

Tier 2. Needs a product decision.

1. **Decide which coordinator actions the homepage should carry.** Cancelling an event, opening a loop's schedule in place and reaching pending requests all work on the Recruiting Pipeline page today, so none is urgent. Each was asked for once, so the evidence is thin individually. Taken together they describe a coordinator who wants to act without leaving the homepage, which is the scoping question above.
2. **Define "at risk" and "on track", or let recruiters set the status.** Three participants, three different readings, and no owner on the design side. Decide separately whether GSR follows its own rules or sits outside the feature.
3. **Settle what "Recent active jobs" contains, then rename it.** Still being scheduled or already closed produces different names. "New activity requiring action", from the principal recruiter, is one candidate. The session 03 coordinator is owed the answer.
4. **Confirm that Events can show only the viewer's own activity.** If it cannot, the widget is unusable for campus working groups. This is blocking, not cosmetic.
5. **Check whether pre-brief being filtered out is causing missed scheduling.** The design now separates pre-brief, interview loop and debrief, so the request itself is closed. What remains is the manager's report that her coordinators filter pre-brief out and then never schedule it, which sounds like a current defect rather than a design question.

6. **Scope the three best-evidenced missing widgets:** Offers, Pending requests, and Panel feedback status. Requests has three independent sources and is also a route that exists today.
7. **Take the C3 and recruiter dispatch integration forward as one item.** Three independent requests.
8. **Establish whether the system knows a recruiter holds an interview slot.** Two of the strategic recruiter's high-severity items depend on it.

Recommendations arising from the manager session are kept separate, in [section 17](#). One of them carries production-incident evidence and is more severe than anything in the list above.

Where participants actually work today

This section and the three that follow are context for part one. They explain what the design is competing against, and why several requests in section 03 are really about capability that already exists.

READ THE DESTINATIONS CAREFULLY

The RPM page and the pipeline view are parts of today's homepage, not separate destinations. So when a participant says she works out of the RPM page, or goes straight to her pipeline, she is describing which view of the current homepage she uses, not leaving it. Earlier drafts of this analysis counted those statements as bypasses. They are not, and the corrected picture below changes what the new design is competing against.

The nine participants split three ways. Three already work on today's homepage, two are choosing a different part of Hire, and four are working outside the product.

Where each participant's work actually happens, and how they get there.

Participant	Where the work happens	Detail
Coordinator session 03	CURRENT HOMEPAGE	The RPM page is her main workspace. Her favourite feature there is the expand arrow that shows a full loop schedule without clicking in. Her "my requests" queue is reachable only by going into pipeline. Candidate-stage tracking is the one thing she keeps outside, in Asana.
Executive coordinator	CURRENT HOMEPAGE	Opens Hire for a daily check-in, then moves to the current coordinator work view, where "our requests" and scheduled events sit on two separate pages. She names that split as her top pain point.
Research lead	CURRENT HOMEPAGECONFIRM	Goes straight to her recruiting pipeline rather than the default landing view, and works out of the pool attached to a req. Her own wording separates the two, so this classification needs one check. See the note below.
Sourcing recruiter	ELSEWHERE IN HIRE	Bookmarks the jobs list, explicitly to avoid the main page, because she wants every req she owns in one view.
Principal recruiter	ELSEWHERE IN HIRE	Keeps three tabs open: offers, disposition, interview loop. Reminders live on her calendar instead.
Campus recruiter session 04	OUTSIDE THE PRODUCT	Opens recruiter dispatch, meaning email, then Outlook. Never the funnel. Req tracking sits in an Excel pivot table.
Campus recruiter session 09	OUTSIDE THE PRODUCT	Opens email, Slack and Quip. Hire is not among the first three things he opens. Candidate tracking sits in SharePoint.
Strategic recruiter	OUTSIDE THE PRODUCT	Goes to the homepage looking for what to do today, does not find it, then works from a Quip dashboard.
Coordinator session 08	OUTSIDE THE PRODUCT	Runs the day off her own checklist of loops and bar raiser swap times.

"When I open hire, I actually, I have it hyperlinked, so that in my bookmarks, instead of just going to the main page on hire, I go right to the jobs list, cause I like to see all my jobs."

Sourcing recruiter, Audible · session 01

"I'll open up hire and I immediately go to recruiter dispatch. Like, I don't go to my funnel, I go to my email."

Campus recruiter, AUTA · session 04

What this means: the homepage sits alongside a page these three already use

The new homepage does not take the Recruiting Pipeline page away. Both live in the new Recruiting Hub. So for the three participants already working there, nothing is lost, and they will see the new homepage regardless. The question their requests raise is narrower than it first appears: when they need to cancel an event, open a loop's schedule or check pending requests, should they do that on the homepage or navigate to the pipeline page? That is a scoping decision, not a gap to close.

Three requests in part one are all the same request underneath, which is easy to miss when they arrive in different sessions:

- **Cancelling an event.** Available on the pipeline page. The executive coordinator wants it on the homepage. Section 03.
- **Opening a full loop schedule without clicking in.** Available on the RPM page, and the session 03 coordinator's top ask for the homepage. Section 03.
- **Reaching "my requests".** Both coordinators get there through pipeline and want a homepage entry point. Section 08.

Individually each is a single voice. Together they describe a coordinator who wants to act from the homepage rather than treat it as a signpost, which is the scoping decision that opens [section 10](#).

One finding does change character because both surfaces coexist. The session 03 coordinator read the new Events list as a single loop's time slots, because it resembles the RPM loop detail she uses daily. Since the RPM page carries on, that resemblance is not a transition artefact that fades. It is a standing risk of two similar-looking surfaces in the same product. Section 09.

For the four participants working outside the product, the bar is different and much higher: the page has to displace an email client, a Quip dashboard, a SharePoint list or a personal checklist. No participant said it would.

ONE CLASSIFICATION TO CONFIRM

The research lead said "I almost never use the home page in hire. My home page is like straight to my recruiting pipeline." The first half distinguishes the homepage from the pipeline; the second half treats the pipeline as her landing point. Under the corrected reading she is skipping the default view rather than leaving the homepage, which is how she is classified above. Worth one message to her, because it decides whether the new homepage has to earn her attention or already has it.

Five of nine built a tracker outside the product

Participants were not asked about external tools. Five volunteered one, and two shared their screen to show it. These artefacts are effectively requirement documents: every column exists because the product does not supply it.

Trackers participants maintain outside the product, and the gap each one covers.

Participant	Tool	What it holds	Gap it covers
Coordinator session 03	Asana	Every candidate at every stage, kept by the whole coordinator team.	Pipeline tracking the team does not trust the product to hold.
Campus recruiter session 04	Excel pivot table	Which reqs are short of candidates, sortable.	No req-level view of stage counts across many reqs.
Strategic recruiter	Quip dashboard	Which candidates still need feedback, compensation, references, or a confidential flag.	No defect-prevention reminders. Each overdue item is a defect.
Coordinator session 08	Personal checklist	Each loop, plus the exact time she last swapped its bar raiser.	No list of loops with an unconfirmed bar raiser.
Campus recruiter session 09	SharePoint, formerly Quip	Campus candidate tracking.	Tracking built for industry recruiting does not fit campus.

"What I would have to do is take this into Excel. And then make a pivot. Which is already what I'm doing right now."

Campus recruiter, AUTA · session 04

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Collect these artefacts before anything else. The strategic recruiter promised her defect checklist. It is one step from a feature list, and cheaper to read than to rediscover through more sessions.

RELATED, OUT OF SCOPE

The manager session produced a sixth tracker, an Asana system operating at team scale, along with the clearest cost argument anyone made about this pattern. See [section 17](#).

What participants think this page is for

Two participants defined the page's role unprompted, and their definitions are more useful than any feature request because they set the ceiling on what success looks like.

"I wake up in the morning, I pull up hire, and I see like an overview of my day, all my reminders. It's like a daily little check-in... And then after I like check this out, then I go to what we currently use and I work out of that. And like this is like a nice to have, like, snapshot into my work."

Executive coordinator, GSR · session 05

"I got pulled into a fire. Let's go back here. Where was I at? Here's my pinned list, here's my pin jobs... let's do a mental reset after the fire and get back to the grind."

Campus recruiter, AUTA · session 09

They describe the same thing in different words: a glance surface and a place to re-orient, not a workbench. The research lead is the one participant who assembled the parts into a full chain of work, and it is worth recording as the clearest mental model anyone produced: reminders are the to-do list, events are the calendar, and to act on either she goes to talent pools and jobs.

This is the scoping decision that runs through the whole report. A glance surface is achievable and would be welcomed, and it is a coherent choice given that the Recruiting Pipeline page continues to handle the doing. The cost of that choice is visible in two places. The three coordinators keep asking to act from the homepage rather than navigate, and the four participants working in email, Quip, SharePoint and a personal checklist will not be pulled back by a page that only shows them things. Deciding this before more widgets get designed is cheaper than deciding it one request at a time. A manager put a number on the same question from the opposite direction, in [section 17](#).

Two problems bigger than the homepage

Both arrived through homepage sessions but cannot be solved by a homepage.

A. Ownership and cross-visibility

The session 09 campus recruiter raised this from two directions in the same session. His campus team works as a group on shared reqs, so he wants to overlay a colleague's activity on his own view, and he asked how many layers he could stack. He also needs the default to be unambiguously his own activity, and he knows about delegation but finds it insufficient for this.

He frames the ownership half as a data model problem rather than a homepage problem, and he is right. If Events cannot reliably show only the viewer's own activity, the widget is not usable for campus at all. That is a blocking dependency, not a preference.

RELATED, OUT OF SCOPE

Two managers reached the same gap from the management direction, and reported that delegation is unusable at their scale. That evidence is in [section 17](#). If the visibility model becomes a workflow, the two sets of evidence belong together.

B. Candidate email and C3 integration

Three participants raised this independently, from different starting points. The session 04 campus recruiter opens recruiter dispatch before anything else and does a large share of her work there. The research lead finds the C3 activity feed genuinely useful and wants its nudges folded into Reminders. The session 08 coordinator wants a section listing candidate emails received today that need a reply. The session 09 campus recruiter adds a fourth variant by wanting Quip in the loop. This is a single coherent request with three independent sources, and it should go to the product team as one item.

Follow-ups owed to participants

Eight participants are owed something. These are easy to lose and each one is a small trust debt.

Outstanding follow-ups for the participants in scope. Manager follow-ups are listed in section 17.

Owed to	Commitment	Direction
Coordinator session 03	The product team's definition of "recent active job", and the logic behind "at risk".	Reply to her
Principal recruiter	Disposition attempt bubble does not appear. Flag to engineering and report the status of the default-view fix.	Reply to her
Campus recruiter session 04	Feasibility of C3 and recruiter dispatch integration. Also the timing of the req-level pipeline table, which she reacted to with clear frustration.	Reply to her
Executive coordinator	Tell her cancelling an event stays available on the Recruiting Pipeline page, and ask how often she would want to do it without leaving the homepage. That answer feeds the scoping decision in section 13.	Ask her
Research lead	Confirm whether the "recruiting pipeline" she lands on is a view of the current homepage or a separate pool view. This decides how she is classified in section 11. Also clarify whether the activity feed she named is Quip or QuickSight, and understand the scope of the GSR AI CRM pilot she is in.	Ask her
Strategic recruiter	Her defect checklist, which she promised to send. Chase if it has not arrived within a week. Also confirm in writing that prospects merge into the pipeline this year.	Awaiting her
Coordinator session 08	Ask the product team whether the existing 24-hour bar raiser email trigger can feed a homepage list.	Internal, then reply
Campus recruiter session 09	Pass his name to the designer working on the campus dashboard. He asked to see it.	Action owed

Two participants also offered help worth taking up. The research lead volunteered to recruit more GSR participants and said the organisation is investing heavily in this area. The session 04 campus recruiter offered introductions to two campus contacts.

WORTH CHECKING EARLY

Two independent signals point to a parallel customer relationship management project: the research lead is in a GSR pilot, and the strategic recruiter had heard about a new system from a different direction. The research lead also reported that her organisation is now treated as a primary customer for that product rather than an edge case. Understanding the scope of that work is cheaper now than after a collision.

Method limitations

These constrain what the findings above can carry. The first is the most consequential.

1. **The role presets were not tested.** The plan asked each participant to use the default layout first, then switch to their role preset. Two things were to be recorded: the top three widgets they name at minute 15, before seeing the preset, and which switched-off widgets they add back afterwards. Neither is in the session records, and no session shows the switch happening. Both had to be captured live, so neither can be recovered now. This report therefore covers comprehension, friction and requests, but not whether the presets are right.
2. **The prototype changed during the study.** Sessions 01 to 03 ran an earlier build. Filters were surfaced before session 06. Session 06 also had a component bug that displayed the old narrow Events style. Comparing those elements across sessions is unsafe.
3. **The header "Configure homepage" button was never built.** All discovery data describes the sidebar banner, and in the easier top-of-sidebar position rather than the bottom position the design specifies. The plan's two-entry-point question is unanswered.
4. **Mainstream coordinator evidence rests on one participant.** The Audible coordinator system was identified as separate only in the manager session, which retroactively reclassifies two of three coordinator samples as non-representative.
5. **The collapse question was not systematically asked.** The session 09 campus recruiter found collapse himself and the strategic recruiter misread it, but the planned question about collapsing versus removing does not appear answered across the set. Since collapse changes the cost of a wrong default, this gap affects the density argument in section 09.
6. **Screen size was recorded for one participant.** The research lead's 13-inch finding cannot be checked against anyone else, and earlier sessions cannot be reconstructed.
7. **Transcripts carried no speaker labels.** Attribution was inferred from content, and uncertain passages are flagged in the individual session files.
8. **Session 08 produced almost no friction data.** The coordinator volunteered that she had nothing negative to say. Her positive signals are discounted accordingly, and the customization discovery data from that session is excluded entirely, because the moderator raised it first.
9. **Session 04 contained a moderator error.** The moderator said worklists were going away, then corrected it to merged under pipeline. The participant's reactions during the misunderstanding remain valid as a measure of dependence, but statements she made based on it cannot be read as requirements.
10. **Several requests were raised by the moderator rather than the participant,** including the request and scheduled split on pinned pipeline cards, and disposition as a widget. These are marked as prompted agreement in the session files and carry less weight than self-generated requests.

11. **Two design elements could not be tested** because the prototype lacked them at the time: the position ID and the hiring or pooling requisition chip. Whether the extra density overloads the job card is still unknown.

17

Out of scope: the coordinator manager session

A tenth session ran with three coordinator managers, covering between them a large share of Amazon scheduling. It sits outside the scope of this study for two reasons, and it is recorded separately rather than folded into the findings above.

- **The participants are managers, not the individual contributors the homepage is designed around.** Two of the three said so themselves: managers should not set coordinator defaults, and a dedicated coordinator session is needed instead.
- **They did not operate the prototype.** The moderator presented and shared a screen, so the session produced no behavioural data on discoverability, comprehension or widget selection.

None of what follows should be read as validation or rejection of the homepage design. It is recorded in full because it is substantial, because one item carries production-incident evidence more severe than anything in sections 01 to 16, and because it defines a second audience that the current widget set does not serve at all.

The three participants in the manager session, labelled by the scope each covers.

Label	Role Scope	Main contribution
The GTA manager	Coordinator ManagerGTA	Team visibility, real-time reporting, SLA ownership, and the risk carried by the previous homepage revision.
The international manager	Coordinator ManagerInternational	The critique of the day-by-day Events view, and the missing queue of work not yet scheduled.
The NAMER manager	Coordinator ManagerNAMER	The Asana system, the confirmation-send gap, and the need to mirror a coordinator.

17.1 What they need that no current widget provides

A coordinator manager landing on the current widget set would find nothing addressed to their role. All seven widgets describe an individual's own work.

Manager needs, with the source and the work each would replace.

Need	Raised by	Detail
See the team's work in flight	GTA manager	Once work moves from the coordinator group to a named coordinator, management visibility ends.
Mirror a coordinator's view	NAMER manager	Needed both to investigate an escalation and to take over work in flight when someone goes on unplanned leave.
Per-person workload distribution	GTA manager, NAMER manager	Replaces the per-person, per-day view in their Asana system.
Upstream funnel counts	GTA manager	Applicant, candidate, resume review and assessment volumes, because they predict the phone screens about to reach her team.
Queue of work not yet scheduled	International manager	Requests submitted three, four and five days ago. In her judgement the only relevant cell on the current screen for a coordinator is the partial-acceptance warning.
Recurring reporting on unreliable panellists	All three	Interviewers and bar raisers who repeatedly decline or drop out. The business is already asking for this.

"I have no physical way to see the work that is being done on my team right now. That's what I want to see on my homepage."

Coordinator manager, GTA · session 10

The existing mechanism, delegation, is unusable at this scale: delegating across two hundred to eight hundred people would overwhelm Outlook. The managers state this affects every coordinator manager in the company without exception, and they emphasised the universality rather than the headcount. This is the same wall the session 09 campus recruiter reached from the individual side, in section 14.

17.2 Real-time reporting, with production evidence

This is the most severe item anywhere in the study, and the only one supported by incidents rather than opinion.

"We broke hire. We had 3 sev-2 tickets because we broke hire trying to get what hire can't give us."

Coordinator manager, GTA · session 10

Her team ran scripts against the product to extract data it does not expose, took it down, and has an open correction of error. She was explicit that without a supported route her team will keep doing it. The NAMER manager supplied the strongest single example of the underlying gap:

"We get about 600 on-sites a day... I would have to go through each part to find out if the RC sent that, instead of just running a report that said, hey, [candidate] has an interview tomorrow and nobody sent her a confirmation."

Coordinator manager, NAMER · session 10

The chain is: nobody can verify a confirmation went out, so candidates arrive uninformed, do not appear, interviewer time is wasted, and the team learns about it afterwards. All three said the demand extends beyond scheduling to the whole talent acquisition organisation, and the NAMER manager had a separate correction of error to present the same afternoon.

17.3 The tracker they built, and its cost

The managers run an Asana system at team scale: a daily tracker per coordinator, request intake from two sources, funnel stages with tasks beneath each, and a per-person workload view. It is the sixth external tracker in the study, alongside the five in section 12.

Two arguments came with it. The NAMER manager pointed out that her own Asana data is unreliable, because ticking a box does not prove the work happened, and coordinators are essentially transcribing what already exists in the product. The GTA manager put a number frame around the same waste.

"If they don't have to do this work, how many more schedules could they do?"

Coordinator manager, GTA · session 10

17.4 Their observations on the homepage design

These are opinions about a screen they watched rather than used, so they carry less weight than the behavioural evidence in sections 01 to 16. Two are worth keeping anyway.

- **The previous homepage revision made coordinators select more times to complete the same work.** The GTA manager watched that happen. She predicted her team would like customization, then added that what they actually care about is not which things are available to look at but how those things are presented. This is the most specific risk anyone named for this project.
- **Pre-brief, interview loop and debrief are three separate scheduling processes** and must be counted separately. This matched what two participants in scope asked for, and the design now separates them. The GTA manager also reports that her coordinators filter pre-brief out and then fail to schedule it, which still needs checking as a current defect.
- **The day-by-day Events view does not help a coordinator** in the international manager's judgement; she wants a week or a month of workload to prioritise against. Three coordinators who operated the view themselves reacted strongly the other way, so section 09 resolves this in the coordinators' favour. Her separate point about the missing queue stands on its own.

"The home screen only gives them 25% of the information they need in order to process their job effectively."

Coordinator manager, GTA · session 10

Read alongside section 13, this is not a contradiction. The participants in scope described the page as a glance surface and were content with that. The GTA manager is saying a glance surface is not enough for her team, and treating the shortfall as a cost.

17.5 SLA ownership

The GTA manager argues that scheduling leaders must set scheduling service level agreements, notes that different teams currently run different versions, and asked to be included in that decision. She also separated two things worth keeping separate: user testing is not the same activity as agreeing an SLA baseline.

17.6 Recommendations for a separate track

1. **Take real-time reporting and confirmation-send status to the product team with the incident evidence attached:** two to three severity-2 tickets, an open correction of error, and 600 on-sites a day with no way to verify a confirmation went out. Highest severity in the study.
2. **Open a visibility and permission workstream**, combining this evidence with the session 09 campus recruiter's ownership requirement in section 14. Delegation is already proven unworkable at scale.
3. **Decide whether coordinator managers are an audience for this homepage at all.** If they are, the widget set needs team-level objects that do not exist today. If they are not, say so, because three managers now expect an answer.
4. **Resolve who owns scheduling SLAs**, and include scheduling leadership in that decision.
5. **Check the pre-brief filtering defect** before treating it as a design request.

17.7 Follow-ups owed

- The promised list of experienced coordinators and managers, from the international and NAMER managers. Mainstream coordinator evidence currently rests on a single participant, so this list is worth chasing.
- The NAMER manager's Asana tracker, which she agreed to share.
- An answer on SLA ownership.
- The NAMER manager's roadmap visibility question, which needs routing to the leadership team.

17.8 Why this session cannot support design conclusions

- **No behavioural data.** Participants did not drive the prototype, so nothing about discoverability, comprehension or widget preference can be drawn from it.
- **Wrong audience by their own account.** Two of the three stated they were not the right people to answer coordinator questions, so their judgements about coordinator needs rank below the coordinators' own behaviour.
- **Least certain attribution in the study.** Three speakers with frequent overlap and no speaker labels in the transcript. Attribution between the three managers is the weakest in the set.
- **One finding from this session does carry into the main analysis.** The identification of Audible as a separate coordinator system is a factual claim about how teams are organised, not a design judgement, and it reclassifies two of the three coordinator samples. It is retained in section 16.

Sources: session files `research/session-01` through `research/session-10`, and `user-testing-plan.md` revision 3. Participant names appear in the session files; this report refers to roles only. Sections 01 to 16 count the nine participants in scope; section 17 covers the three in the manager session. Companion report: Default widget preferences by role, which covers the widget-level defaults in more detail.