Users: Users who characterize their career as HR/Recruiting, post jobs as part of their responsibilities at work, plan on making between 2 and 50 hires in the next 6 months, have used Indeed.com in the last 6 months to post an open role at their company, and run background checks as part of their recruiting/hiring process.

Goal: Understand if event pages are still effective at communicating the basics of a job for the wider variety of industries Hiring Events has added to their portfolio.

Method: Test 7 users, unmoderated on usertesting.com, addressing the following questions/concerns:

- Did the user see any value in Indeed Background Checks?
- Do they currently pay to perform background checks?
- Would the advertiser consider using Indeed in place of their existing vendor?
- How valuable is it for the advertiser to run background checks on candidates sourced from Indeed. What other sources do they use for candidates?

Responses from usertesting.com sessions

1. **Current role and responsibilities**

    a. 3 of the users were HR Managers
    b. 2 of the users were candidate sourcers at recruiting firms
2. **How many employees are at your current company?**

    a. Responses ranged from 100 - 300,000 (globally)
        i. 2 users were 100 - 300
        ii. 3 users were 5,000 - 7,000
        iii. 1 user was 10,000

          iv. 1 user was 300,000
3. **Around how many roles do you typically hire for in a given year?**
   a. Responses ranged from 3 - 75
      i. 3 users hired 10 or less per year
      ii. 3 users hired between 11 - 25 per year
      iii. 1 user hired between 70 - 75 per year
4. **Top 3 products or services that you use to source candidates for open roles today?**
   a. LinkedIn
   b. Indeed
   c. Glassdoor
   d. Others mentioned were:s
      i. Career Builder
      ii. CraigsList
      iii. ATS/Excel spreadsheet of past applies
      iv. recruiting at local colleges and universities
5. **What does it mean to sponsor a job?**
   a. 6/7 users understood that sponsoring a job meant you paid to have your job show up at the top of candidate search results.
6. **Do they see the BGC promo on the sponsor job page?**
   a. 5/7 users did see the background checks promo on the initial review of the sponsor page of the Dradis job posting funnel.
7. **Thoughts on the BGC promo on the sponsor job page?**
   a. 3 users felt it was a good deal if you were the right sized company with enough flexibility and high enough hiring needs
   b. 3 users liked the idea ([clip](#))
   c. 1 user would rather have the $60 credit to use towards sponsoring her job since she already has a vendor in place and very specific background check needs
8. **Are free background checks valuable to you and your company?**
   a. 5 users felt it would be valuable for them (although none of the 5 tested actually had the influence at their company to make that decision and would have to get approval) ([clip](#))
   b. 2 users felt it would not be valuable at all since they had specific background check needs that varied per role and they already had vendors in place that covered their needs.
9. **What do they expect happens after they post their job?**
   a. No one mentioned anything about being able to view background checks.
10. **Do they notice the BGC promo on the candidate view?**
    a. 5 users did not notice the background checks promo on the candidate detail page ([clip](#))
    b. 2 users noticed the background checks promo on the candidate detail page
11. **What are their thoughts on the BGC promo on the candidate's application?**
    a. 5/6 users reactions were not positive

    b. 1/6 liked the free emphasis, but seemed to misunderstand that they would have to pay to sponsor to get the free background checks promo

    c. 1 user's response was not audible and was discounted

12. **Would they sign up on the candidate detail view? Why or why not?**

    a. 6/7 users **would not** sign up on the candidate details page to sponsor their job and get background checks ([clip](#))

        i. Over all consensus seemed to be wrong time/wrong place for the promo. They have already started receiving candidates, so they don't feel the need to boost the job and the free background check is not a big enough incentive for them to pay for more candidates just to get it. Also it feels out of place to look at a candidate's application and choose to sponsor a job, they feel that should be done elsewhere.

13. **What kind of checks would they expect an Indeed background check to cover?**

    a. National Criminal Database ([clip](#))

    b. SSN Trace

14. **Why do they run BGC at their company?**

    a. 2 users cited "working with clients" as a reason

    b. 2 users (the ones who source for recruiting firms) cited "to confirm the candidate does not have a history of fraud"

    c. 1 user said simply because her company requires it ([clip](#))

    d. 1 user said their company does not want to hire people who have a consecutive history of crime.

    e. 1 user said it depends on the position (i.e. drivers they look for driving related infractions, people in charge of equipment they look for theft related infractions, etc)

15. **How many BGC would they expect to be able to run for a given job posting on Indeed?**

    a. 3 users expected to be able to run between 1 and 5 checks per sponsored job

    b. 1 user expected to be able to run between 15 - 20 checks per sponsored job

    c. 3 users expected to be able to run an unlimited amount

16. **How many BGC do they typically run for an open role they hire for?**

    a. 4 users typically only run one background check per open role.

    b. 1 user runs 2 - 3 per open role

    c. 2 users responses were inaudible

17. **At what stage in the interview/hiring process do they run BGC?**

    a. 3 before interview (both sources did manual google searches before interview process)

    b. 3 after interview but before offer

    c. 1 after offer has been extended

18. **With Indeed's offer of free BGC, would they change when they run background checks? Why or why not?**

    a. 5/7 would not change stage they did background check at

    b. 2/7 would do it earlier as part of the screening process (these were both the sourcers. I suspect they do not have a good understanding of local and federal

laws since they are not using a form background check provider as part of their background check process. They are just doing manual google searches on candidates before passing them to the companies who will take the candidates through a formal interview process)

19. **Do they have an existing BGC vendor?**
    a. 5/7 did already have a background checks vendor in place
    b. 2/7 did not (these were the two people who worked as sources for recruiting firms)

20. **If they have a vendor, what kind of checks do they run?**
    a. 2 users said Criminal History (city, county, state, federal)
    b. 2 users said Education Verification ([clip](#))
    c. 2 users said Credit Check (both were instances for finance related roles)
    d. 2 users said SSN Trace
    e. 1 user said Sex Offender
    f. 1 user does Drug Screens
    g. 2 users were not sure/ did not realize there were different types of checks ([clip](#))
    h. 2 users (the sources at recruiting firms) were N/A

21. **What red flags from a BGC would result in a candidate not moving forward in their hiring process?**
    a. Red flags depended on the role. 4/7 of the respondents were willing to review any flags on a background check an decide if it was an infraction that would impact the particular role they were considering the candidate for. ([clip user #3](#), [clip user #7](#))

22. **How long does it take to run background checks on a candidate?**
    a. 4 users said 3 days or less
    b. 3 users said 1 - 2 weeks

23. **What is more important for their company? Speed or cost to run the BGC?**

    a. 5 users cited cost as being more important. Mostly due to high volume hiring needs
    b. 2 users cited speed

24. **Would they consider using Indeed if Indeed offered comparable price and services to their current vendor?**

    a. 4 users said they would not replace their current vendor with Indeed because they were not confident Indeed could meet their unique needs, they source candidates from other places and would still need to run background checks on those people if they made it through the interview process, and they saw that the offer was limited time and were not confident they would be able to continue to use it.
    b. 3 users said they would but would have to get approval from their managers (2 of these users were the recruiting firm sources who did not have a vendor in place already). The 1 user who was an in-house hiring manager liked the idea of having everything in one place instead of having a separate service from

everything else he does with recruiting and hiring - he also seemed to hire for high volume, blue collar jobs (construction/contractor maybe?).

25. **Would they consider using Indeed in addition to their current vendor?**

    a. 2 users said no because their current vendor already sufficiently meets their needs
    b. 2 users said yes citing that they could at least use it as an additional resource or a way to cut costs with their current vendor if the candidate happened to come from their Indeed pipeline.

Additional Insights

1. On average users with vendors expected to be able to run more background checks on Indeed than they would normally run for an open role. Reason seemed to be a concern for scenarios when a candidate reneged on an offer.
2. Sourcers for recruiting firms do not seem like the type of user we want to target. Both of these user types don't use a formal background check vendor but instead do manual searches online to look at candidate's social profiles and any additional public information they can find for free before passing the candidate on to the company they sourced them for.
    a. May want to consider targeting a user with a smaller HR department who hires multiple people for the same open role. (i.e. Pink or Blue collar jobs)
3. There is a happy hiring medium we are looking for. If a person is only making 1 - 2 hires for a role per year, the background checks offer will not be a good incentive for them because it will be less expensive for them to pay the $60.00 one time when they need to run the background check than for them to pay possibly more than $60 to sponsor the job and get way more candidates than they need. Also for people who are recruiting for a very high volume per year across different role types >~50, they already have a vendor in place and a system, plus multiple sources for their candidates. Getting background checks only through Indeed for Indeed candidates is not a cost or time savings for them.
4. Employers who run formal background checks are accustomed to reviewing red flags.
5. All of the interviewed users who are posting jobs on Indeed (the ones who will see the promo) do not actually have the deciding power to necessarily spend the sponsorship dollars or decide to switch vendors.
6. We are not well positioned for employers with unique background check needs like the user who worked for an alcohol purveyor or the user who hired for a multitude of white collar roles like finance that require credit checks and education verification (particularly education verification for non-US diplomas).
7. Employers who know they have a longer turn around time (i.e. 1 week or more) start running background checks before or during the final interview.
8. Seeing a promo to sponsor jobs on the application for a candidate (Candidate Details page) is confusing and out of place for users review applications. At this point they just want to review the applications and determine if the candidates who have applied are a

good fit or not. They don't want to sponsor the job and get more candidates, nor do they care about running background checks.

Recommended Improvements

- Remove the promo from the candidate details page - let's find a better time and place to retarget users with background checks.
- Take a harder look at the types of employers we're promo'ing in the job posting funnel. We might want to narrow it down to employers who have smaller HR departments and are hiring multiple people for the same open role. (Amazon warehouse workers, contractor companies, construction companies, nursing, teaching, etc)