

— WHITEPAPER · AI-NATIVE TA ADVISORY

AI training for talent acquisition teams.

Practical workflows, prompts and automation across the full recruitment lifecycle — delivered responsibly. Eight hours, six modules, five labs and four dedicated practice blocks built on your own live requisitions, plus a governance module that makes the capability defensible.

For TA specialists & senior TA specialists

8-hour instructor-led session

15 min read

Updated 2026

8 hrs

one instructor-led day — six modules, four practice blocks, five labs

3.5 hrs+

of that is hands-on practice, on your own live roles — not case studies

~18 hrs

per recruiter, per week — the realistic ceiling once workflows embed

High-risk

how the EU AI Act classifies AI used in employment decisions

01 • THE CASE

Why AI in recruiting, and why now.

Roughly **60% of a recruiter's week** goes to work that is repetitive and automatable — sourcing admin, screening, scheduling, note-taking, reporting. That figure is not an argument for fewer recruiters. It is an argument about where a scarce, expensive resource is currently being spent.

The shift underway is not "AI replaces recruiters". It is narrower and more uncomfortable: **recruiters who orchestrate AI outperform recruiters who don't** — on speed, on volume handled, and on the quality of the hiring-manager conversations they have time for. The gap between those two groups is widening inside the same team, on the same requisitions, at the same salary.

~60%

of a recruiter's week goes to repetitive, automatable work — sourcing admin, screening, scheduling, notes, reports.

10–20 hrs / week

realistically recoverable with disciplined AI workflows — reinvested in candidates and hiring managers.

High-risk

how the EU AI Act classifies AI used in employment decisions. Capability has to arrive with governance attached.

Zero theory for its own sake

Eight hours, six modules, and a practice block after every one. Nobody leaves a module having only watched it done.

The training is not about tools. Tools change every quarter.

It is about a repeatable prompt structure, a set of saved workflows, and the judgement to know which decisions never leave a human — three things that survive every vendor cycle.

Figures throughout this paper are directional planning estimates drawn from the programme. Every team builds its own baseline in the measurement module — a number you did not measure yourself is a number you cannot defend to a CFO.

Who it is for, and what they can do by 18:00.

Designed for **TA Specialists and Senior TA Specialists with two to seven years of experience** — recruiters who already know how to hire and now need to know how to orchestrate. It assumes no technical background and no prior AI use.

By the end of the day	What that means in practice
Prompt like a pro	Use a repeatable six-part prompt structure for any recruiting task, instead of chatting hopefully at a text box.
Source faster	Generate Boolean and X-ray strings, candidate personas and sourcing strategies — then iterate them against real results.
Screen smarter	Analyse CVs, compare candidates against the <i>same</i> agreed criteria, and draft shortlist memos that survive a hiring-manager challenge.
Communicate better	Personalised outreach, candidate updates and rejection notes at scale — in the recruiter's own voice, not the model's.
Run better interviews	Structured guides, behavioural questions and anchored scorecards in minutes rather than evenings.
Report like a leader	Pipeline analytics, dashboards and executive-ready hiring updates generated from the ATS export.

The session shape

Time	Block	What happens
09:00 · 45m	Module 1 · AI fundamentals	LLMs, prompts, limits — the 20% of theory you actually need
09:45 · 20m	Practice 1	Break a model on purpose: run the same prompt three times, force a hallucination, catch it
10:05 · 45m	Module 2 · Prompt engineering	The six-part recruiting prompt, plus live rewrites of the room's own prompts
10:50 · 30m	Practice 2	Rebuild one of your own real prompts through the six parts; swap with a colleague and critique
11:20 · 15m	Break	
11:35 · 80m	Module 3 · AI across the lifecycle	Stage by stage: pain points, AI plays, hours recovered, human checkpoints
12:55 · 20m	Practice 3	Map your own desk: where do your hours actually go, and which two stages do you fix first
13:15 · 45m	Lunch	
14:00 · 120m	Module 4 · Five hands-on labs	Five core workflows built on live requisitions — JDs, sourcing, screening, interview kits, reporting
16:00 · 45m	Module 5 · Tools & automation	The landscape, vendor evaluation, and no-code automation
16:45 · 30m	Practice 4	Vendor teardown role-play against the five criteria, then map one automation end to end
17:15 · 45m	Module 6 · Responsible AI + your 30-60-90	GDPR, EU AI Act, governance, adoption roadmap, KPIs and the seven-day homework

Nine hours elapsed, 09:00 to 18:00, of which eight are instruction and practice and one is breaks. **Three hours forty of that eight is hands-on** — the five labs plus a practice block closing every taught module.

Why the day is eight hours and not six. A six-hour version fits, and it produces recruiters who have watched the workflows rather than run them. The two additional hours buy a practice block after every module, so nobody leaves having only seen it done — which is the difference between a team that is enthusiastic on Friday and a team still using the workflows in week six.

● 03 · FUNDAMENTALS

The minimum viable theory.

Enough to use the tools well and to hold your own in a vendor meeting. No more than that.

What actually happens when you send a prompt

STEP 1

You send text

Instructions, context and examples — everything the model can see. Nothing outside the prompt exists to it.

STEP 2

The model predicts tokens

It generates the most probable next words from patterns learned in training. It is not looking anything up.

STEP 3

You get a draft, not a verdict

Fluent, fast, often excellent — but not a database and not a decision-maker.

Three numbers that matter

Tokens

Chunks of text of roughly four characters. Models read and price by token — a CV is about 800–1,500 tokens.

Context window

The model's working memory for one conversation. Everything you paste must fit, and it forgets nothing inside the window and knows nothing outside it.

Temperature

Outputs vary run to run. Same prompt, slightly different answer — by design, and precisely why review matters.

And one habit

Treat the first output as draft one. Refinement — "shorter, more senior tone, add a risks section" — is where the quality actually comes from.

The eight terms you need in a vendor meeting

Term	What it means, in recruiting terms
LLM	A large language model — GPT, Claude, Gemini. The engine behind generative text tools.
Generative AI	AI that creates new content — text, images, structured data — rather than only classifying.
Embeddings	Text converted to numbers so machines can measure similarity. Powers semantic CV-to-job matching.
RAG	Retrieval-Augmented Generation: the model answers using <i>your</i> documents — ATS notes, JDs — which sharply reduces invention.
AI agent	AI that plans and executes multi-step tasks with tools (search, email, ATS) rather than returning single answers.
MCP	Model Context Protocol — an open standard letting AI assistants connect safely to your systems.
Reasoning model	Models that work step by step before answering. Better for comparison, scoring and analysis.
Hallucination	Confident, fluent, wrong. The model fills gaps with plausible fiction — the single risk to manage hardest.

Where these systems fail — and the habits that keep you safe

<div>Failure modes to expect<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Invented facts — employers, degrees, statistics, salary data, "sources"• Outdated knowledge — training data has a cutoff; market data may be stale• Instruction drift — long tasks lose constraints set early in the prompt• Bias reproduction — models mirror biased patterns in training data <i>and in your inputs</i>• Sycophancy — it agrees with your framing unless you ask for counter-arguments</div>	<div>Your safety habits<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Verify every fact you will act on — names, numbers, claims, links• Ground the model: paste the real JD, the real CV, the real data. Don't let it guess• Ask for uncertainty explicitly — "flag anything you're not sure about"• Never let AI make the hiring decision. It drafts, you decide• No personal candidate data in unapproved tools</div>
--	--

The six-part recruiting prompt.

One structure, memorised once, reused for every recruiting task. It is the single highest-leverage thing in the programme, and it needs no tool beyond the assistant the team already has.

Part	What goes in it
1 • Role	"You are a senior technical recruiter in iGaming..." — sets expertise and tone.
2 • Context	Company, team, role, market, constraints. Paste the real JD, the intake notes, the CV.
3 • Task	One clear verb: draft, compare, extract, rank, summarise, generate.
4 • Format	Table, bullets, email, JSON, scorecard — with length limits.
5 • Constraints	Tone, language, what to exclude, compliance rules, "flag uncertainty".
6 • Examples	One good example beats three paragraphs of instruction.

The same task, two prompts

Weak

"Write a LinkedIn message to a Java developer."

- Generic, template-smelling output
- No role, market or candidate specifics
- Sounds like every other AI InMail that candidate received this week

Strong

"You are a senior iGaming recruiter. Context: hiring a Backend Java Engineer (Vert.x, high-throughput betting platform) in Sofia, hybrid, budget X. Candidate: 6 yrs at a payments scale-up, posts about performance tuning. Task: 90-word LinkedIn message. Format: hook referencing his content, one concrete challenge of the role, soft CTA. Constraints: no buzzwords, no 'rockstar', British English. Example of my voice: [paste past InMail]."

The second prompt is longer to write once and then reusable forever as a template. That is the whole economic argument for prompt structure: the effort is front-loaded and the output compounds.

05 • LIFECYCLE

Eight intervention points, four human gates.

AI compresses every stage of the lifecycle. Judgement stays human at four gates: **shortlist decisions, interview evaluation, offer decisions, and any message that shapes a candidate's experience.**

Stage	The AI play	Time recovered	Human checkpoint
Intake & job descriptions	Generate intake question sets; transcribe the intake call and extract must-haves, nice-to-haves, red flags and sell points; draft the JD from real intake data in your template; produce the LinkedIn and internal-mobility variants from the same source.	2–3 hrs per role	Hiring-manager sign-off on requirements before sourcing starts
Talent mapping & sourcing	Boolean with full synonym trees, iterated live ("too narrow, relax titles"); X-ray strings for LinkedIn, GitHub, conference sites; candidate personas; target-company lists as a research starting point.	3–4 hrs per week	Recruiter validates result quality before outreach; company lists verified against live data
CV screening & comparison	Extract a structured profile per CV; compare candidates against the same agreed criteria in a side-by-side matrix with evidence quotes; draft shortlist memos; generate phone-screen guides personalised to each CV.	4–5 hrs per week	Recruiter makes every advance/reject decision — AI output is decision support only
Outreach & communication	Messages drafted from the candidate's actual profile in your voice; three-touch sequences each with a different angle; warm, specific rejection notes; status and interview-prep emails from pipeline data.	2–3 hrs per week	Every message read and personalised before send — you sign it, you own it
Interviews	Structured guides per competency with follow-up probes; behavioural and technical question banks mapped to the scorecard; AI notetakers with consent; draft debrief summaries aggregating scorecards.	1.5–2 hrs per role	Interviewers score independently before seeing AI summaries; consent required for recording
Offers, reporting & post-hire	Offer summary and business justification from comp data and interview evidence; weekly pipeline updates per hiring manager from the ATS export; executive dashboards; silver-medalist nurture sequences.	2–3 hrs per week	Numbers reconciled against the ATS before anything reaches an executive

The realistic ceiling is around 18 hours per recruiter per week — and it arrives in months, not days, once workflows are genuinely embedded rather than demonstrated. The point of recovering it is not to run leaner. It is to reinvest it in what AI cannot do: hiring-manager trust, candidate relationships, and closing.

Five workflows, built on your own live roles.

The two-hour lab block is the largest of the day's five practice sessions, and it is not a demo. Participants bring live requisitions and real materials, and leave with working assets. Every lab ends the same way: *save your prompt*.

The anatomy of a repeatable workflow

Goal → Inputs → Prompt → Tool → Review → Ship & save. One outcome and one owner; real materials rather than invented ones; the six-part structure saved as a template; a tool appropriate to the data sensitivity; a human checking facts, tone and fairness; and then the prompt filed in the team library.

Lab	Participants bring	They leave with
1 · Job description in 15 minutes	A live req with intake notes, their JD template, and one JD they consider excellent	A ship-ready JD, its LinkedIn variant, and a saved jd-draft-v1 template
2 · Sourcing strategy + Boolean, 20 min	A hard-to-fill live role and access to LinkedIn to test strings	A tested Boolean and X-ray set, a persona doc, and a target-company hypothesis list
3 · CV screen & shortlist memo, 20 min	Three sanitised CVs (names, photos, age, address removed) and the agreed screening criteria	A defensible comparison matrix, a shortlist memo, and the screening prompt saved
4 · Interview kit, 20 min	The finalised JD from Lab 1 and their rating scale	A structured guide, anchored scorecard and one-page interviewer cheat sheet
5 · Weekly reporting, 15 min	A sanitised pipeline export and one past weekly update they wrote by hand	Friday's reporting done, a reusable template, and two hours back every week

A workflow run once is a trick. A workflow saved, named and shared in the team library is an asset.

It improves with every refinement, and it onboards the next recruiter for free.

Six categories, and how to evaluate any vendor in twenty minutes.

Category	Representative options	What it is for
General assistants	Claude, ChatGPT, Gemini, Copilot	Drafting, analysis, comparison — the daily workhorse
Research & sourcing	Perplexity, Deep Research, SeekOut, hireEZ, Juicebox	Market intelligence and people search
Interview intelligence	Metaview, BrightHire, Otter, Fireflies	Transcription, summaries, coaching — consent required
ATS/CRM native AI	Ashby, Greenhouse, Lever, Recruit CRM, LinkedIn Recruiter	Matching and drafting inside the system of record
Automation platforms	Zapier, Make, n8n, Lindy	Connecting ATS, email, calendar and Slack into workflows
Content & decks	Gamma, Canva AI, Notion AI, NotebookLM	Employer branding, documents, knowledge bases

Master one general assistant deeply before adding point solutions. Around 70% of the value in this programme needs nothing else — and a team that buys three tools before mastering one usually ends up using none of them well.

The vendor conversation

- 01

Data & compliance
Where is data processed and stored? Is our data used for model training? Is a DPA available? Is the GDPR and EU AI Act posture documented?
- 02

Real capability
Demo on OUR data, not their demo data. What breaks at our volume? Which claimed features are generally available versus roadmap?
- 03

Integration
Native ATS/CRM connection or manual export? API or MCP access? Who maintains it when the ATS updates?
- 04

Bias & auditability
Is there bias-testing evidence? Can we audit why it scored or ranked a candidate? Is human override built in?

05

ROI & exit

Price per recruiter against hours saved. Pilot terms. What happens to our data if we leave?

● 08 · AUTOMATION

From single prompts to hands-free workflows.

The pattern is always the same four steps, and the third one is not optional:

Trigger → AI step → Human gate → Actions. A new application lands in the ATS; the model extracts the profile, scores it against criteria and drafts a screen summary; the recruiter reviews it in Slack and approves or adjusts with one click; the ATS updates, the hiring manager is notified and the candidate email is queued.

Three starter automations — build in this order, because it is also the value order

FIRST**Interview scheduling**

Calendar link, reminder and prep-email sequence. Pure admin, zero judgement — automate it fully and never think about it again.

SECOND**Weekly reporting**

ATS export → AI summary → a draft waiting in your inbox every Friday at 08:00, for review before sending.

THIRD**Application triage**

Extraction and criteria pre-screen, then a recruiter approval gate, then ATS and notifications. **Never auto-reject.**

● 09 · RESPONSIBLE AI

Capability without governance is a liability.

GDPR — data protection

- Candidate data is personal data: lawful basis, minimisation and retention limits apply to AI use too
- No candidate personal data in unapproved consumer AI tools — anonymise before prompting
- Art. 22: candidates have rights around solely automated decisions. A human must meaningfully review rejections
- Transparency: be able to explain how AI was used in the process if asked

EU AI Act — employment AI is high-risk

- AI for recruitment, screening, evaluation and selection sits in the high-risk category
- Obligations flowing to deployers: human oversight, monitoring, transparency to affected people, staff AI literacy
- Manipulative and social-scoring uses are banned outright; emotion recognition in the workplace is prohibited
- Vendor due diligence is your obligation too — ask for their conformity documentation

Six golden rules for the whole team

Rule	In practice
Human decides, always	AI drafts, structures and suggests. Advance, reject and offer are human decisions only.
Anonymise before you paste	Strip names, photos, age and contact details from CVs before any prompt.
Approved tools only	Sensitive data stays in tools with a DPA and a no-training guarantee.
Audit for bias	Spot-check AI shortlists against human ones; challenge prestige-signal drift.
Verify, then send	Every fact checked and every message read before it leaves under your name.
Log and share	Save prompts to the library; note where AI assisted in the process.

This is training guidance, not legal advice. Involve Legal or your DPO when defining the organisation's AI policy — and note that the AI Act's high-risk obligations have their own timetable, which is worth confirming as it stands when you plan.

10 · ADOPTION

The 30–60–90 roadmap.

Training that ends at 18:00 with no roadmap produces enthusiasm and no change. The last block of the day is the plan each participant leaves with.

DAYS 1–30

Personal wins

Master the six-part prompt on daily tasks. Run Labs 1, 2 and 5 on live roles. Start a personal prompt library. Baseline your time — where do the hours actually go now?

DAYS 31–60

Team habits

Shared prompt library with a naming convention. A team tool policy: approved tools and the anonymisation rule. First automation live — scheduling or reporting. A weekly fifteen-minute "prompt of the week" ritual.

DAYS 61–90

Scale & prove

Full lifecycle coverage on two or three pilot roles. Measure against the baseline: hours, time-to-fill, hiring-manager satisfaction. Governance checklist signed off with HR and Legal. Present results and the expansion case to leadership.

11 • MEASUREMENT

Measure it, or it didn't happen.

Dimension	What to track
Efficiency	Hours saved per recruiter per week against baseline · time-to-shortlist and time-to-fill · admin share of the week
Quality	Submit-to-interview and interview-to-offer conversion · quality of hire at 90 days · shortlist diversity against the pre-AI baseline
Experience	Candidate NPS and response sentiment · outreach reply rate · hiring-manager satisfaction with updates and kits
Adoption & safety	Percentage of recruiters active weekly with AI workflows · prompt library size and reuse rate · governance checklist compliance, incidents = 0

Two of these matter more than the rest for the business case. **Hours saved** is what finance will ask for, and it is only credible if the baseline was measured before the training. **Shortlist diversity against the pre-AI baseline** is what protects you: it is the number that shows, with evidence, that the efficiency gain did not quietly cost you fairness.

What participants take home

01 AI is a drafting and analysis engine

Judgement, decisions and relationships stay yours.

02 The six-part prompt plus your real materials beats any tool you can buy

Structure outperforms subscriptions.

03 Workflows saved to a shared library compound

One-off prompts evaporate.

04 Human review gates and anonymisation keep you fast AND compliant

They are not in tension.

05 Start with reporting and JDs this week

Measure against your baseline from day one.

The seven-day homework is deliberately small: run one lab workflow on a live role end to end, save three prompts to the team library, log an hours-saved estimate for the week, and bring one failure or surprise to the follow-up session. The failures are the most valuable material in the follow-up.

12 · DELIVERY

How Dreamwork delivers this.

This programme is part of Dreamwork's **AI-Native TA Advisory** practice. It is delivered by a practitioner rather than a trainer — talent acquisition led for a 10,000-employee multinational across four markets, a €30M staffing P&L, a 1,400-person greenfield build inside twelve months, and a sustained 38-day time-to-hire at multi-country scale.

That matters for a specific reason. A trainer teaches the tool; a practitioner knows which of these workflows survives contact with a real hiring manager on a contested requisition, and which ones quietly get abandoned in week three.

Format	Shape	Best for
The core session	8 hours, in person or remote, up to 12 participants	A TA team that needs capability fast, with working assets built by their own hands by 18:00
Session + 30-day follow-up	Core day plus a 90-minute review at day 30	Teams that want the adoption curve supported past the enthusiasm phase — where most training dies
Full advisory engagement	Process audit, AI workflow design, tool selection, governance	Functions rebuilding how they hire, not just how they prompt

Every version includes the governance module. Capability without it is a liability we are not willing to hand a client — and in a high-risk regulatory category, it is the part that a board will eventually ask about.

"AI won't replace recruiters. Recruiters who use AI will replace recruiters who don't."

The training exists to put your team on the right side of that sentence — with the governance to make it defensible.

● BEGIN THE ASCENT

Bring the programme to your team.

Forty-five confidential minutes on where your recruiters actually lose hours, what your governance position looks like today, and whether a session, a follow-up or a full advisory engagement is the right shape. You leave with a view either way.

✓Delivered by a practitioner

✓Governance module included

✓Assets built on your live roles

✓Response within one business day