LEADING HR | M1 Insight

Five Operating Priorities for Large Hourly Employers



5 Min Read | November 20, 2026

The Atlanta CHRO conversation points to a connected agenda: restore hiring yield, manage retention through local operations, prepare for state-level policy divergence, make AI accountable to the candidate experience, and give transformation work clear decision rights.

The November CHRO meeting covered a wide range of issues facing employers with large hourly workforces. A common thread runs through the conversation. Scale magnifies small failures process designs and execution. A weak pre-start handoff becomes thousands of no-shows. Inconsistent scheduling becomes recurring replacement demand. An unclear transformation mandate becomes another cross-functional program that consumes time without changing execution.

The implications reach beyond HR process design. They affect labor capacity, customer experience, regulatory exposure and the allocation of transformation investment. Five priorities stand out.

1) Recalibrate the hiring engine around yield

The conversation highlighted a sharp deterioration in funnel economics. One employer planned for a 20 percent first-day no-show rate and was experiencing more than 30 percent. Another needed nearly three times as many applicants in some markets to produce the same number of hires. Recruitment advertising also became more expensive in the run-up to the US elections as political spending competed for inventory.

Participants were responding with speed and automation. Seasonal applicants at one employer could receive an offer in minutes without an interview. Another organization had removed 21 days from a driver-hiring process and reduced the period from requisition to arrival for the next stage to roughly seven days. An AI agent was handling pre-start welcome calls at scale.

Those changes improve throughput. They do not resolve declining yield on their own. The more useful management view links media spend, applicant quality, completed starts and 90-day retention by source, location and shift. It also separates coordination from judgment. The same meeting included concern about AI interviewers even as participants saw value in using AI for basic qualification and pre-start communication.

Take action: Replace cost per hire as the headline measure with cost per completed start and cost per employee retained at 90 days. Segment the funnel by location, shift and source, and route pre-start exceptions to a human owner.

2) Manage retention through the local systems

Participants identified the first year as the decisive retention window, with early tenure and scheduling as the critical pressure points. Participants agreed that engaging and retaining in the first 90 days are critical. One leader described an organization that moved turnover from roughly 70 percent to 50 percent while introducing realistic job previews, clearer training, a deliberate first-day welcome and an owner with capacity to deliver it.

Scheduling emerged as a direct retention control. One employer tracked whether employees received their preferred hours and stopped locations from hiring when the figure fell below 75 percent. The participant reported a significant reduction in turnover, although the result was not quantified. The rule prevented managers from adding labor while current employees lacked the hours they needed.

AT A GLANCE

- Faster hiring processes are not offsetting weaker applicant yield and rising first-day no-shows.
- Early retention depends heavily on scheduling, onboarding quality, local leadership, and targeted development.
- State and local policy changes are increasing workforce complexity for geographically distributed employers.
- AI can improve recruiting and candidate experience, but requires transparency, human oversight, and evidence of outcomes.
- Transformation efforts need dedicated capacity, explicit decision rights, and accountable implementation ownership.

The discussion also emphasized field HR capacity, career paths and targeted education. The meeting included an HR model in which local HR roles coached area managers, supported employees directly and were elevated to the organizational level of an area manager. A healthcare employer concentrated education funding on nine hard-to-fill pathways, including a one-year surgical technician program, rather than distributing the benefit without regard to workforce need.

Take action: Run 30-, 90- and 365-day cohorts by location and manager. Add schedule match and first-shift completion to the operating review. Target education spending to roles where supply constraints, completion time and retention value justify the investment.

---

3) Build a state-level workforce policy map

The conversation anticipated limited federal movement during the next two years and greater activity at the state and local levels. The meeting presenter pointed to paid leave, pay transparency, scheduling, wage rules, labor policy and AI in employment as areas where a multistate patchwork could deepen. This was a policy forecast made immediately after the election, not a verified account of future legislation.

For large hourly employers, the strategic issue is cumulative exposure. A leave mandate, scheduling rule or pay-transparency requirement may be manageable in isolation. Across a distributed footprint, different effective dates, definitions and enforcement regimes can change labor costs, system requirements, manager training and location economics at the same time.

Take action: Maintain a state and local exposure map tied to workforce size, growth plans and franchise structure. Assign an operating response, system dependency and decision date to each material scenario. Current legal review remains necessary before relying on any meeting forecast.

4) Make candidate experience part of the AI business case

The conversation included an AI-interviewing case that reported lower bias, better quality of hire and an unexpected commercial benefit: candidates received a consumer offer, developmental feedback and access to career support, creating a more positive interaction regardless of the hiring outcome. Those are case or provider claims and were not independently verified in the reviewed transcript.

The case expands the business question. In consumer-facing companies, candidate experience can affect the brand and customer relationship as well as recruiting efficiency. The Atlanta discussion also supplied a counterweight. One participant had chosen not to use AI interviewers after a pilot and expressed concern about the practice, while supporting AI for pre-start welcome calls and basic screening. Transparency about why AI is being used was central to the discussion.

Take action: Classify each AI use case as coordination, recommendation or decision. Require clear candidate disclosure, a documented human-review path and measures for completion, drop-off, complaints, quality and adverse impact. Treat vendor claims as hypotheses until company data supports them.

---

5) Give transformation work decision rights and throughput

The conversation then moved from technology to execution. Participants described a transformation office that connected technology, marketing, digital and customer engagement, supported by an HR leader with change-management capability and a project leader who could maintain throughput. The discussion showed the practical constraint: a transformation office can coordinate work, but its influence depends on whether functions accept its decision rights.

The meeting also examined a two-day design sprint used to overhaul a major employee process. Roughly 40 leaders from HR, Finance, Technology and Operations worked from a defined problem, a process map and explicit company outcomes. The workshop accelerated alignment, but participants emphasized the need for a named owner afterward. Without one, the output could dissipate once leaders returned to their functions.

Take action: Before convening a sprint, define the executive sponsor, decision rights, problem statement, process baseline and outcome measures. Name the implementation owner before the session ends and review progress at 30, 60 and 90 days.

The integrated agenda

The conversation presents a coherent operating agenda for the CHRO. Hiring yield, schedule integrity, state policy, AI governance and transformation execution all become harder when ownership is diffuse and enterprise averages conceal local variance. The practical move is to make the operating unit visible: the location producing repeat requisitions, the state creating exposure, the AI use case affecting trust, and the transformation decision waiting for an owner.