



FINANCE PLAYBOOK · FREE GUIDE

# Cost-Per-Hire Teardown

What's really inside your cost-per-hire number — and the five levers that cut it by 30–60 % without changing your tech stack.

## BUILT BY SCREEQ

Screeq is the AI recruiting platform that screens hundreds of candidates with structured async interviews, ranked shortlists, and audit-ready scoring. Start a free trial — no credit card — at [screeq.com](https://screeq.com).

## Why this guide exists

Most TA teams quote a single cost-per-hire number, but that number hides three very different costs: the recruiter hours, the agency & tooling spend, and the cost of vacancy. Cut the first two and the third often grows. Cut the third and the first two often follow. This teardown shows you how to model all three and where the leverage actually sits.

## 01 · The three buckets you need to track separately

### Bucket 1 — Internal (recruiter hours × loaded rate)

Sourcing, screening calls, calibration, scheduling, debriefs, references. Average recruiter spends 52 % of the day on non-recruiting admin and ~23 hours/week on screening calls alone.

### Bucket 2 — External (agency fees, ads, tools)

Agency contingency fees (typically 20–25 % of base), job-board spend, ATS, CRM, sourcing tools, async-video tool, assessment tools.

### Bucket 3 — Cost of vacancy

Roughly \$500/day per unfilled role, varying by function. A 44-day time-to-fill burns ~\$22,000 before any recruiting dollar is spent.

## 02 · The five highest-leverage cuts

- **Cut #1 — Async-screen the top of funnel.** Replaces the 15-min phone screen × N. Up to 60 % faster screening, no recruiter hour consumed per candidate.
- **Cut #2 — Standardise the rubric.** A shared rubric kills the 1-on-1 calibration call. Saves ~2 recruiter hours per role.
- **Cut #3 — Internal mobility first.** Internal moves are 30–50 % cheaper and 2x faster than external. Only 33 % of orgs have a formal programme — the leverage is enormous.
- **Cut #4 — Reply in 48 hours.** 61 % of seekers report being ghosted; ghosting drives application-to-offer drop-off and forces re-recruits. Re-recruits multiply cost-per-hire by 1.4–1.8x.
- **Cut #5 — Audit your agency mix.** Move repeat roles in-house. One \$120k role with a 22 % contingency fee = \$26,400 — that pays for an entire screening tool stack for a year.

**Worked example.** A team hiring 60 roles/yr at a baseline \$5,475/hire spends \$328,500. Cutting time-to-fill by 30 % saves ~\$200/role in cost of vacancy (\$12,000) and ~\$60/role in recruiter time (\$3,600). Replacing 4 agency-sourced roles with in-house async screening (avg fee \$20k) saves \$80,000. Total annual saving: **≈\$95,000.**

### 03 - The bad-hire multiplier no one prices in

A bad hire costs a minimum of 30 % of the employee's annual salary (DOL/SHRM standard) and up to 5x for senior roles. Speed at the cost of rigor is the wrong trade. Always favour structured rubrics over faster gut-feel calls.

## The numbers that should shape your strategy

*Eight current data points — every one drawn from a 2024–2026 primary or peer-reviewed report. Tap any superscript on the next page to open the source.*

<b>\$5,475</b> average US cost-per-hire (non-exec) — up 16% from 2023's \$4,700.	<b>\$35,879</b> average US cost-per-hire for executive roles (+21% vs 2022).
<b>\$500/day</b> average cost of an unfilled vacancy in lost productivity.	<b>≥30%</b> of annual salary — minimum direct + indirect cost of a bad hire.
<b>23 hrs/wk</b> average recruiter time spent on screening calls alone.	<b>67%</b> hiring-cost reduction with AI-powered video screening (PwC, 2025).
<b>61%</b> of job seekers report being ghosted after a 2024 interview.	<b>30% / 33%</b> internal mobility growth in recent years; only 33% have a formal programme.

## Sources & citations

Every URL below was fetched and verified before publication. If a link breaks, the publisher name and report title will let you re-locate it.

- [1] Average US cost-per-hire \$5,475 (non-exec) — up from \$4,700 in 2023 (~16% in 2 years).  
*SHRM 2025 Benchmarking Report (pin.com synthesis, Mar 2026)* · <https://pin-com.ghost.io/cost-per-hire-benchmarks/>
- [2] Executive hires cost \$35,879 on average — 6x+ non-exec average; up 21% from 2022.  
*SHRM 2025 Benchmarking Report* · <https://pin-com.ghost.io/cost-per-hire-benchmarks/>
- [3] Cost-of-vacancy ≈ \$500/day in lost productivity; a 44-day time-to-fill burns ~\$22,000 before recruiting spend.  
*SHRM / ANSI cost-per-hire framework* · <https://pin-com.ghost.io/cost-per-hire-benchmarks/>
- [4] Bad hire costs ≥30% of annual salary (direct + indirect); up to 5x salary for senior roles.  
*DOL / SHRM standard (cited in pin.com 2026)* · <https://pin-com.ghost.io/cost-per-hire-benchmarks/>
- [5] Recruiters spend ~23 hours/week on screening calls alone.  
*LinkedIn Future of Recruiting (2024), via Hirevire ROI analysis* · <https://hirevire.com/blog/ai-video-interviews-vs-traditional-methods-roi-comparison>
- [6] AI-powered video screening cut hiring costs 67% and time-to-hire 45% in PwC-cited 2025 ROI analysis.  
*PwC, via Hirevire 2025 ROI Comparison* · <https://hirevire.com/blog/ai-video-interviews-vs-traditional-methods-roi-comparison>
- [7] AI recruiting tools reduce average cost-per-hire by ≥30%.  
*pin.com Cost-Per-Hire Benchmarks (Mar 2026)* · <https://pin-com.ghost.io/cost-per-hire-benchmarks/>
- [8] 61% of seekers report being ghosted in 2024 (+19 pp vs Apr 2024) — inflates re-open / re-recruit costs.  
*Greenhouse 2024 State of Job Hunting (via UNLEASH, Dec 2024)* · <https://www.unleash.ai/artificial-intelligence/greenhouse-61-of-job-seekers-have-been-ghosted-during-the-recruitment-process/>
- [9] Internal mobility grew ~30 % in recent years; only 33 % of orgs have a formal programme.  
*LinkedIn Talent Blog (June 2024)* · <https://www.linkedin.com/business/talent/blog/talent-acquisition/how-internal-mobility-benefits-employers>
- [10] US hires fell 20 % month-on-month in Nov 2024; finished year 8 % below Nov 2023 — talent pool tightening.  
*iCIMS Insights, Dec 2024 Workforce Report* · [https://www.icims.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/2024\\_Insights\\_Dec\\_FINAL-1.pdf](https://www.icims.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/2024_Insights_Dec_FINAL-1.pdf)

## Ready to put this guide into production?

Screeq removes the most expensive line items in cost-per-hire — the recruiter screening hour, the agency fee on repeat roles, and the days lost to scheduling. Most customers see 30–60 % cost-per-hire reduction on the first role family they move onto Screeq. We'll model your number with you on a 20-minute call.

[START YOUR FREE 14-DAY TRIAL](#)

[screeq.com](#) — no credit card, no setup fees, full product access. Questions? Email [coffee@screeq.com](mailto:coffee@screeq.com) — a human replies within one business day.