**Measuring time to productivity (“good enough to be effective independently)**

We all want our hires to hit the ground running and time-to-productivity is the metric that tracks this. But like time-to-hire or time-to-start, it’s a recruiting metric that means little without context.

It has three drivers:

* The experience and aptitude of the candidate (recruiting’s responsibility)
* The onboarding/training program (training’s responsibility)
* And on-the-job mentoring and support (the hiring manager’s responsibility)

All three have to be synchronized for new hire performance to be optimized. This requires teamwork and shared responsibility that happens to be somewhat rare. See more at: <http://www.staffing.org/library_ViewArticle.asp?ArticleID=593#sthash.0yaHHw6j.dpuf>

**Samples of how organizations measure time to productivity:**

**We follow up** with both the employee and manager at various stages - starting with a series of 3 emails and phone calls over the initial onboarding stages. The emails provide information for each new stage - inviting the employee to 'now set objectives', 'to attend or complete a specific training', 'to complete an onboarding checklist and online feedback', a reminder for the managers to have a performance discussion with the employee, a reminder for the HR manager to check in with the employee and manager and so on. This provides us with opportunities to check in with both the manager and employee (via phone, in person and via email/survey etc) to understand their level and speed to competency. It also allows us to pinpoint any issues or problems before the employee goes beyond the probationary period (6 months) and to make adjustments along the way.

**We manage this** for our new hire training program, but the measurement is specific to a role. We don't have a single measure that works across all jobs and functions. There is a group in the firm that manages role definition and implementation, and we work with them to identify an already-collected metric that relates to productivity of a specific role. Using an already-collected metric gave two benefits: 1) credibility with the managers and 2) a baseline that we could compare large populations with. I would also say that we didn't get data that had high confidence until we had at least 100 people in a role who were at least 6 months after their training completion date. That time duration might be shorter if the average project period for the role was shorter - say something that could be measured daily rather than weekly.

**Our firm has developed** a survey tool that is designed to measure the new hire experience. It is a survey tool that is confidential and is automatically deployed to new hires at the 2 week, 3 month and 6 month time period. The reports give HR and senior manager a very clear picture on how quickly new hires are become productive.