

Independent Practitioner Review
Re Culture™ Human Experience Framework
Reviewer: Muqqadas Mazhar
Talent Acquisition and Recruitment Perspective

I approached the Re Culture™ Human Experience Framework through my practical experience in Talent Acquisition & Recruitment, alongside my recent dissertation exploring perceptions of AI-enabled decision support and its relationship with managerial decision-making effectiveness.

This perspective has led me to consider not only whether organizational decisions are efficient and evidence-informed, but also how they are experienced by the people affected. Recruitment is particularly important because it is often a person's first direct experience of an organization's culture, communication, standards, and use of power.

Within the scope of my dissertation research, AI-enabled decision support was viewed positively in relation to decision quality, speed, and confidence, while trust in AI-generated outputs appeared comparatively weaker. Although the research was not recruitment-specific, it provides a relevant lens for considering the responsible use of AI in talent decisions.

This review is offered independently and focuses on the relationship between recruitment, candidate experience, organizational judgement, and AI-supported decision-making.

Question 1: The First Human Encounter

The principles are relevant across the full recruitment journey: sourcing, screening, interviewing, selection, rejection, and communication after the decision. A candidate's experience of an organization begins before employment. The process communicates what the organization values, how it treats people, and whether its stated culture is reflected in practice.

For me, clarity, fairness, dignity, and responsiveness should be visible throughout the process, not only in the final hiring decision. Candidates may accept an unsuccessful outcome when the process has been transparent, timely, and respectful. In contrast, unexplained delays, unclear criteria, impersonal communication, or a lack of closure can leave a negative and lasting impression.

The principle of placing human experience before management interpretation is especially relevant in recruitment. CVs, screening criteria, assessments, and interview evidence are essential for consistent and efficient decisions. However, they can unintentionally reduce a person to the information immediately available within a profile or system.

I would encourage Re Culture™ to provide practical recruitment examples. Dignity could be expressed through accurate job information, clear timelines, respectful interviews, accessible processes, consistent criteria, and appropriate communication with unsuccessful candidates.

I reflect that recruitment should not be viewed only as a process for identifying the right candidate. It is also an early test of whether an institution's values are genuinely experienced in practice.

Question 2: The Person Beyond the Profile

I truly agree that a person should not be treated solely as a CV, score, category, prompt, or a system output. Structured screening tools can support efficiency, consistency, and evidence-informed decision-making. However, they cannot always capture transferable capability, potential, personal context, or the full meaning of a candidate's career journey.

A CV may demonstrate qualifications and experience but may not completely explain a career gap, a change of sector, relocation, caring responsibilities, or growth of transferable skills outside a conventional job title. This does not mean that organizations should remove standards or make decisions based on sympathy. Rather, a fair process should distinguish between essential role requirements and information that requires thoughtful professional interpretation.

“Consistency and humanity should not be treated as opposites.” Structured criteria can support fairness, while professional judgement can help in interpreting what available information does not completely explain.

For example, consider a candidate with a significant career gap. A rigid screening process may interpret this as lower suitability, while an unstructured human review may overreact because of sympathy, familiarity, or assumptions. A stronger process would retain the essential role criteria, consider whether the gap is relevant to current job performance, give the candidate an appropriate opportunity to provide context, and document the reason for the final decision.

This approach supports legitimate business requirements while reducing the risk that people are excluded simply because their experience does not fit a narrow or standardized profile.

Question: 3. Context Without Inconsistency

The framework makes a crucial distinction: context should enhance the quality of judgement, not remove accountability. In Talent decisions, context may help decision-makers interpret capability, conduct, intention, constraints, and temporary circumstances.

However, it can also become a source of inconsistency if it is not considered through a clear process.

Subjectively or bias may come through personal assumptions, familiarity with a candidate, cultural similarity, stereotypes, or different interpretations of common circumstances. Without a defined approach, two recruiters or hiring managers may respond differently to the same information.

I would recommend distinguishing between the following:

1. **Core criteria:** Clear, role-relevant requirements that should be applied consistently.
2. **Contextual considerations:** Relevant factors that may inform interpretation but should not automatically override essential criteria.
3. **Documented judgement:** A record of when context materially influenced a decision, why it was relevant, and who made the final judgement.

This avoids two unhelpful extremes:

- Rigid processes that ignore relevant human context.
- Highly discretionary processes that allow inconsistency to be presented as empathy.

Question 4. AI-Enabled Decision Support

AI can support candidate search, CV screening, ranking, communication, scheduling, and recommendation. It may enhance speed and help organizations handle high application volumes. However, an AI generated output should not become an unquestioned decision about a person.

My dissertation supports the view that Artificial Intelligence can add value as decision support, while trust in its results should not be assumed. For talent decisions, I believe the following safeguards are crucial:

- **Clear purpose:** AI should be used only for a defined, legitimate, and role-relevant purpose.
- **Meaningful human review:** Significant recommendations should be handled by an appropriately responsible professional before action is taken.
- **Explainability:** Organizations should be able to explain how AI materially influenced a decision.

- **Bias monitoring:** Organizations should assess whether the system creates unfair disadvantage or inconsistent outcomes for specific candidate groups.
- **Human override:** Recruiters/hiring managers should be able to challenge an AI recommendation with a clear rationale.
- **Candidate transparency & Data protection:** Candidates should receive appropriate information when AI materially supports assessments or communication, and their information should be handled securely only for legitimate purposes.

A human reviewer should be able to question the output, seek additional evidence, recognize limitations, and take authority for the final decision. AI may support judgement, but should not obscure how or why a decision was made.

Question: 5. Recruitment to Experience Continuity

Recruitment should be understood as the beginning of employee experience, rather than as a separate HR activity. The expectations created during recruitment about the role, culture, leadership, development, working conditions, and communication style should remain reasonably consistent with the experience after joining.

Trust can be damaged when an organization showcases one reality during recruitment but delivers another after employment begins. For instance, an organization may describe a culture of support, learning, respect, and openness during interviews but provide unclear expectations, inconsistent management, limited feedback, or inadequate onboarding once the person joins.

I truly believe the following should be carried from recruitment into daily employment:

- **Clarity:** The role, responsibilities, performance expectations, working arrangements, and growth opportunities should reflect what was communicated during recruitment.
- **Respectful communication:** The quality of interaction experienced by candidates should continue through onboarding, management, and feedback.
- **Leadership consistency:** Values presented during recruitment should be seen in how managers listen, explain decisions, correct mistakes, recognize contribution, and use authority.

- **Feedback & voice:** New employees should have safe opportunities to raise concerns when their experience does not align with what was promised.

Recruitment can therefore be viewed as the first stage of the employee experience, while onboarding is an early test of whether human commitments are sustained in practice.

Question 6. Areas for Further Development

Overall, I find the framework thoughtful and relevant. It focuses on human experience, dignity, context, leadership, capability, and meaningful measurements, giving a strong human-centered foundation.

My main observation is that several principles are conceptually strong, but operationally broad. Their practical value will depend on whether organizations can translate them into observable behaviors, decision processes, responsibilities, safeguards, and mechanisms for challenges.

I would encourage Re Culture™ to provide further guidance on:

- How each principle should translate into everyday organizational and people decisions.
- What practical behaviors demonstrate dignity, fairness, context-sensitive judgement, and meaningful leadership.
- Who is accountable for applying, monitoring, and maintaining each principle?
- How can candidates and employees question decisions that appear inconsistent with the framework?
- How organizations should respond when principles conflict, such as context versus consistency, or individual circumstances versus legitimate organizational requirements.
- What qualitative and quantitative evidence could demonstrate whether the framework is improving lived human experience.

The principle of “Measurement with Meaning” is particularly important. Metrics can indicate patterns, but they do not fully explain human experience. Practical guidance on combining data with candidate and employee voice, contextual proof, and consequences of decisions would strengthen the wider framework.

My Overall Reflection:

The Re Culture™ Human Experience Framework offers a valuable basis for considering how organizations make decisions about people. Its relevance is particularly strong in recruitment, where institutional values are first tested through communication, criteria, process design, the use of technology, and the treatment of candidates.

In my view, the framework's future value will depend on its ability to move from meaningful principles to practical application. Recruitment decision checklists, candidate experience standards, AI governance safeguards, leadership behaviors, and examples of difficult trade-offs could help institutions apply the framework consistently.

A framework becomes most credible not only when it states that people matter, but when it helps organizations make fairer, clearer, and more responsible decisions in complex situations. The Re Culture™ framework has the potential to make a useful contribution to that aim.