



DATAEXPOSE

Clean data. Clear next actions.

CANDIDATE DATA QUALITY

Candidate Data Quality Snapshot

A fixed-scope review showing where duplicate, incomplete, conflicting and stale candidate records may need attention before a wider clean-up.

Synthetic sample data

This document illustrates the shape of the deliverable. It is not a client case study, measured result or claim about a real recruitment database.

1,000	74	138	91
Synthetic records reviewed	Potential duplicate pairs	Incomplete records	Stale status exceptions

WHAT THE SNAPSHOT ANSWERS

1. Where are the likely duplicates? Candidate pairs are identified using agreed identifiers and similarity rules. They are not merged automatically.	2. Which records cannot support the workflow? Required operational fields are tested for blanks, inconsistent formats and conflicting values.
3. What needs a person to decide? Uncertain matches and policy-dependent exceptions are separated into a review queue.	4. What should be fixed first? Issues are grouped into safe standardisation, human review and system-rule changes.

Illustrative scope: one agreed export, one data dictionary, one findings review and one sample corrected output. Exact field rules and record limits are confirmed before work begins.

Where the sample dataset needs attention

Counts below are synthetic. In a real Snapshot, each finding links to the affected record IDs, the rule used and the proposed next action.

Finding	Sample count	Why it matters	Proposed handling
Potential duplicates	74 pairs	History may be split across multiple profiles.	Human review required before any merge.
Missing availability date	63 records	Consultants cannot rely on a current availability view.	Confirm through the agency's agreed update process.
Conflicting status	28 records	CRM status and recent update do not agree.	Show both sources and route to an owner.
Inconsistent location	47 records	Search and reporting use several formats for the same place.	Standardise only with an approved mapping.
Stale activity	91 records	The record has no agreed recent activity signal.	Review retention and contact rules before action.

SEVERITY AND CERTAINTY ARE DIFFERENT

Safe to standardise Formatting rules that the agency has explicitly approved, such as whitespace or agreed location labels.
Potential match Records that share some identifiers but still need a person to confirm whether they represent the same candidate.
Policy decision Retention, eligibility, compliance and candidate-contact questions stay with authorised agency staff.

A review queue with source context

The corrected output is not a silent overwrite. Each proposed change keeps the source value, rule, uncertainty and required owner visible.

Record	Finding	Source values	Prepared output	Next action
RC-201	Potential duplicate	Mobiles end 4471 / 4471; surnames differ by one character.	Pair flagged. No merge applied.	Consultant confirms identity.
RC-203	Availability conflict	CRM: 03 Sep; form: 14 Oct.	Both dates retained with source links.	Consultant confirms current date.
RC-214	Missing location	Postcode supplied; town blank.	Town prepared from agreed postcode reference.	Review before CRM update.
RC-226	Status conflict	CRM: active; note: unavailable until December.	Exception only. Status unchanged.	Record owner decides.
RC-241	Stale activity	Last agreed activity signal: 19 months ago.	Added to policy-review queue.	Authorised staff apply retention policy.

Human review required

Data quality preparation does not decide whether two people are the same, whether a candidate is suitable or eligible, whether right-to-work requirements are met, or whether a record should be retained or deleted. Those decisions remain with authorised agency staff.

No names, email addresses, telephone numbers or real candidate data appear in this sample.

Fix the rules before fixing every row

The Snapshot separates work that can be standardised safely from cases that need an accountable person. A larger implementation is proposed only when the scope and review process are clear.

Priority	Action	Owner	Acceptance check
1	Confirm the candidate identifier and duplicate-review rules.	Agency operations	Known matches and non-matches behave as expected.
2	Agree required fields and approved format mappings.	Agency operations	Blank, invalid and conflicting values stay distinguishable.
3	Prepare a correction file and separate exception queue.	Data Expose	Every proposed change traces to a source and rule.
4	Review ambiguous matches, statuses and retention cases.	Named agency reviewers	A person records each decision before update.
5	Apply the agreed import or controlled update method.	Agreed technical owner	Totals reconcile and exceptions remain visible.

Candidate Data Quality Snapshot

£750 fixed price

One agreed anonymised export, findings summary, exception list, clean-up plan, small sample corrected output and findings review. The £750 is credited against a later implementation Sprint when both parties agree that a Sprint is appropriate.

Not included: an ATS replacement, live-system updates, candidate scoring or ranking, hiring decisions, right-to-work or compliance confirmation, data retention decisions, or a full implementation project.

Before work starts: the agency confirms the fields, record limit, lawful data-sharing method, responsible reviewer, deletion/return arrangements and the rules that may be applied automatically.