

Juliana de Moor

Public profile snapshot

<https://www.linkedin.com/in/julianavanlaanen>

Retrieved 2026-10-22T12:54:13.044Z · 7 public posts · Profile: Bright Data · Posts: Bright Data

Profile presentation grade

100/100 · Grade A+ · 45% coverage · Partial grade. Rubric profile-2026.09.1.

A transparent presentation checklist, not a LinkedIn ranking, talent assessment or prediction of reach.
Grade thresholds: A+ 90, A 80, B 65, C 50, D 35, F below 35.

Score = earned points ÷ assessed points × 100. Coverage is assessed weight out of 100. Unavailable and masked data are excluded. Scores with different coverage are not directly comparable.

Truncated text earns only checks already demonstrated in the visible excerpt; the unseen remainder is not marked wrong. Text rules measure structure, not factual accuracy, writing quality or every language equally.

Photo and banner grades cover image availability, decoding and shape only. Face framing, lighting, expression, visual style and authenticity require a human review. No appearance, identity or personality judgments are made.

An education entry is evidence of profile context, not verified credentials. School prestige, age, degree level and background do not affect the score.

Profile picture: A+ · 100/100 · 15/15 points assessable

Profile image supplied: 5/5 points

The source supplied an image URL.

Action: Choose a current, recognizable photo. Preview the circular crop at comment size and leave space around your head.

Image decodes and fits its display shape: 10/10 points

Returned image: 200 × 200px. Dimensions and decoding were measured on the returned image, which may be a resized LinkedIn thumbnail. Original resolution, face framing, lighting and professional suitability were not assessed automatically.

Action: Use a square original, check sharpness at full size, and preview the circular crop. A small provider thumbnail does not prove your original upload is low resolution.

Cover & visual identity: A+ · 100/100 · 10/10 points assessable

Cover image supplied: 5/5 points

The source supplied an image URL.

Action: Use a simple cover that says who you help and what you do. Keep important text clear of the profile-photo overlay.

Image decodes and fits its display shape: 5/5 points

Returned image: 800 × 199px. Dimensions and decoding were measured on the returned image, which may be a resized LinkedIn thumbnail. Original resolution, face framing, lighting and professional suitability were not assessed automatically.

Action: Preview your cover on desktop and mobile. Start with a 1584 × 396 canvas and keep the message readable without tiny text.

Name & identity: A+ · 100/100 · 10/10 points assessable

Readable display name: 5/5 points

Source text: "Juliana de Moor"

Action: Use the name people know you by, consistently across your profile and other professional channels. Single names and all writing systems are supported.

Name field stays focused on identity: 5/5 points

Source text: "Juliana de Moor"

Action: Move URLs, contact details and sales calls to action into About or Contact info. Keep your actual name unchanged.

Headline & positioning: Not assessed · —/100 · 0/15 points assessable

Headline supplied: Unknown

Not returned in readable form by the source.

Action: State your role or specialty in the headline, using terms your intended reader understands.

Enough context to explain your work: Unknown

Not returned in readable form by the source.

Action: Use this structure: [role or specialty] · Helping [audience] achieve [outcome]. Replace every bracket with a truthful detail.

Headline is concise enough to scan: Unknown

Not returned in readable form by the source.

Action: Keep the headline focused on one main promise. Move your longer story into About.

About & descriptions: A+ · 100/100 · 5/20 points assessable

Readable introduction: 5/5 points

Truncated source excerpt: "Hey! I'm Juliana [U+1F44B] Director of Recruiting at Better Career, where we focus on helping..."

Action: Lead with who you help, the problem you solve and the work you do today.

An introduction with supporting detail: Unknown

Truncated source excerpt: "Hey! I'm Juliana [U+1F44B] Director of Recruiting at Better Career, where we focus on helping..."

Action: Add a specific example of your work, your approach, and the kinds of opportunities you welcome. Length is a structure check, not a quality guarantee.

Easy-to-scan paragraph structure: Unknown

Truncated source excerpt: "Hey! I'm Juliana [U+1F44B] Director of Recruiting at Better Career, where we focus on helping..."

Action: Break About into short paragraphs: current focus, relevant proof, then how to connect.

A clear next step: Unknown

Truncated source excerpt: "Hey! I'm Juliana [U+1F44B] Director of Recruiting at Better Career, where we focus on helping..."

Action: End with one relevant next step, such as who should message you and what to include. This automated check recognizes English phrases and links; review other languages manually.

Experience & proof: Not assessed · —/100 · 0/15 points assessable

Professional experience identified: Unknown

No readable entries were returned. We cannot conclude this section is empty.

Action: List relevant roles with an accurate title and organization. Connect them to the work you want to do next.

Experience includes useful descriptions: Unknown

Not returned in readable form by the source.

Action: For each relevant role, explain your responsibility, a concrete contribution, and an outcome you can substantiate. Do not invent numbers. Masked source descriptions need manual review.

Education & learning: Not assessed · —/100 · 0/10 points assessable

Education or learning entry identified: Unknown

No readable entries were returned. We cannot conclude this section is empty.

Action: Add relevant education or structured learning you want to share. Name the institution or course accurately; formal degrees are not required for a strong professional story.

Learning context is described: Unknown

Not returned in readable form by the source.

Action: Describe your subject, course or qualification and one relevant project or skill. Use the full qualification name where helpful. We assess clarity, never institution prestige or degree level.

Location & context: A+ · 100/100 · 5/5 points assessable

Readable location: 5/5 points

Source text: "Napa"

Action: Use an accurate city or region if you want it visible. Do not add a home address. Omitted provider data is not penalized.

Executive summary

Juliana de Moor's audit covers 7 public posts, including 7 with both reaction and comment counts. The measured median is 28 interactions. Careers & leadership is the most represented detected theme (6/7; themes can overlap). Start with a concrete follow-up to an existing subject, then test the opening and reply invitation across a consistent four-week sample.

Measured performance

Followers: 6,087. Posts: 7. Fully measured: 7.

Engagement by current followers: 0.61%. Average reactions: 31.7. Median reactions: 27.

Average comments: 5.1. Comments per 100 reactions: 16.2.

Observed cadence: 1.8 posts/week. Sample window: 23 days.

Strengths, watch points and context

STRENGTH: A usable personal baseline

7 of 7 posts have both public counts. Their median is 28 interactions. Compare future experiments with your own sample rather than an unrelated peer score.

Evidence: post 1, post 2, post 3, post 4, post 5, post 6, post 7. Full text and links are in Source posts.

STRENGTH: A concrete post to learn from

"Two SE offers accepted this month! Senior SE in NYC: first interview to offer in 13 days. THIRTEEN. SE in SF: first inte" has 69 visible interactions. That is 2.5× the sample median. Its topic and opening are candidates for a follow-up experiment; this does not identify why it performed.

Evidence: post 7. Full text and links are in Source posts.

CONTEXT: Conversation is observable; quality is not

4 of 7 posts contain a question. Measured posts generated 16.2 comments per 100 reactions. Counts can include the author's replies and do not measure lead quality or sentiment.

Evidence: post 2, post 3, post 4, post 5. Full text and links are in Source posts.

CONTEXT: Understand the gaps in this sample

The median gap between sampled dates is 3.5 days; the longest is 7 days (6 intervals). Missing posts can exaggerate gaps, so this is not a complete publishing calendar.

Evidence: post 7, post 6, post 5, post 4, post 3, post 2, post 1. Full text and links are in Source posts.

Performance and publishing rhythm

Median visible interactions: 41 for the earliest 3 measured posts and 28 for the latest 3. The middle post is excluded to keep group sizes equal. This compares selected posts of different ages, not account growth.

Typical measured interactions: 28. Highest: 69.

Median gap 3.5 days; longest 7 days across 6 intervals.

2026-09-28T15:30:07.681Z: 66 reactions + 3 comments = 69 interactions.

2026-10-01T14:00:07.887Z: 33 reactions + 8 comments = 41 interactions.

2026-10-05T14:00:02.887Z: 18 reactions + 9 comments = 27 interactions.

2026-10-07T15:36:08.316Z: 17 reactions + 0 comments = 17 interactions.

2026-10-14T16:00:04.124Z: 46 reactions + 9 comments = 55 interactions.

2026-10-19T14:35:03.290Z: 15 reactions + 6 comments = 21 interactions.

2026-10-21T15:00:16.404Z: 27 reactions + 1 comments = 28 interactions.

UTC publishing days — descriptive, not recommended times:

Mon UTC: 3 posts / 3 measured; median 27, average 39 interactions.

Evidence: post 7, post 5, post 2. Full text and links are in Source posts.

Wed UTC: 3 posts / 3 measured; median 28, average 33.3 interactions.

Evidence: post 4, post 3, post 1. Full text and links are in Source posts.

Thu UTC: 1 posts / 1 measured; median 41, average 41 interactions.

Evidence: post 6. Full text and links are in Source posts.

Older posts have had more time to accumulate interactions. Different publication-day groups have different sample sizes and topics.

Content pillars and format performance

Overlapping English keyword themes, not semantic certainty:

Careers & leadership: 6 posts / 6 measured; median 27.5, average 36.2 interactions.

Evidence: post 1, post 2, post 3, post 4, post 5, post 7. Full text and links are in Source posts.

Business & entrepreneurship: 2 posts / 2 measured; median 38, average 38 interactions.

Evidence: post 2, post 3. Full text and links are in Source posts.

AI & building products: 1 posts / 1 measured; median 27, average 27 interactions.

Evidence: post 5. Full text and links are in Source posts.

Learning & practice: 1 posts / 1 measured; median 27, average 27 interactions.

Evidence: post 5. Full text and links are in Source posts.

Marketing & audience: 1 posts / 1 measured; median 41, average 41 interactions.

Evidence: post 6. Full text and links are in Source posts.

Source-reported formats; unknown is not text-only:

image: 5 posts / 5 measured; median 28, average 35.2 interactions.

Evidence: post 1, post 2, post 4, post 6, post 7. Full text and links are in Source posts.

text: 2 posts / 2 measured; median 41, average 41 interactions.

Evidence: post 3, post 5. Full text and links are in Source posts.

Small or unequal groups cannot establish a winning format.

Hooks and writing structure

One of the worst things a recruiter can do is introduce a hiring manager to a candidate they could never actually hire. Imagine you're hiring a Solutions Engineer, and I introduce you to someone who checks all the boxes. You love everything about them, but there's one problem: they're expecting \$220K, and your budget is \$160K. You make an offer anyway, hoping they'll be excited enough about the opportunity to compromise. They decline, and now every candidate I introduce to you gets compared to someone who was never within your budget. This is one of the reasons I spend so much time understanding what candidates actually want before introducing them to clients. I want to know their salary expectations, career goals, preferred working environment, and whether they'd seriously consider the opportunity if an offer came through. I also want to understand where the hiring manager has flexibility and where they don't, because there's very little value in creating excitement around a candidate when the expectations on both sides don't align. The problem is that the other candidates aren't going to put their job searches on hold while the hiring manager figures this out. They're interviewing with other companies, and some will inevitably receive offers. I've always felt that a good recruiter should help hiring managers understand what's realistically available within their budget, rather than set expectations they can't meet.

Hook: Number-led; 229 words; 1 paragraphs; final CTA not detected; question not detected.

Hashtags: None detected. Mentions: None detected.

You don't see many people in jobs longer than a year and a half anymore. Especially on the startup side. And to be fair there can be good reasons for that. A candidate might have three roles in three years and on paper, that looks like they're job-hopping. But when you actually talk to them, you find out: - The first company had an acquisition - The second was supposed to sell but didn't, and they had layoffs - The third ran into financial trouble None of that means the person isn't looking for something stable. In fact, a lot of the candidates I talk to are actively seeking stability but they're just coming out of situations that were beyond their control. For AEs, there's another layer to this, especially when they've been selling something with a longer sales cycle. Someone might leave before they've had enough time for the deals they were working to actually close, which can make their performance a little harder to judge from a resume alone. That's where you have to look beyond tenure and ask better questions: What pipeline did they build? How were they performing against the expectations for that stage of their ramp? What deals were they

working? And, most importantly, why did they leave? I think hiring managers sometimes look at a resume and make a quick judgment about a candidate's tenure without understanding the full story. And candidates...if you've moved around, you need to be ready to explain why in a way that makes sense. Because the context ALWAYS matters.

Hook: Question; 258 words; 1 paragraphs; final CTA detected; question detected.

Hashtags: None detected. Mentions: None detected.

The difference between a good SE and a great SE usually comes down to one thing: They tie everything back to value. A good SE can run a standard demo and answer questions. But the SEs who really stand out spend less time showing how much they know and more time understanding what the customer actually cares about. When I debrief with hiring managers after demo rounds, this is the most common reason a strong candidate doesn't get the offer. And it usually starts well before the demo. If a prospect says they need better reporting, a great SE won't just add the reporting dashboard to their demo checklist. They'll want to know what's wrong with the current reporting, who it affects, and why fixing it matters to the business. So when they finally show that dashboard, it's built around the VP who spends six hours a week pulling numbers by hand. That's also why value isn't one-size-fits-all. Even on the same call, different people want different answers. The technical buyer wants to know how it works. The business leader wants to know what changes for them. The strongest SEs can speak to both without losing either. And it's why feature dumping is such a missed opportunity. You can show someone 25 impressive features, but if only three address the problems they came to solve, you've spent most of the demo on the wrong things. For the SE leaders here, what's one thing you notice during a demo that immediately tells you, "This person really knows what they're doing"?

Hook: Question; 259 words; 1 paragraphs; final CTA detected; question detected.

Hashtags: None detected. Mentions: None detected.

He had less than 60 days to find a job. If he didn't, he'd have to pack up his family and leave the US. This was right after Covid, and I had just started my career in recruiting. Finding a job was difficult for almost everyone at the time and for candidates on visas, the pressure was on another level. I was working at a large agency with plenty of openings, so I started reaching out to account managers across the company, trying to find a client who might be open to sponsorship. A lot of the initial answers were no. And I remember pushing back with a simple question: "Have you actually asked them?" A lot of the time, we were assuming the answer would be no because of how difficult the market was, without actually putting the question to the client. Sponsorship added another layer of complexity to an already difficult hiring process, so it was easy to assume a client probably wouldn't go for it. But this candidate didn't have the luxury of us assuming. So I kept asking account managers to go back to their clients and actually have the conversation. Eventually, we found an opportunity. He went through several rounds of interviews and got the job. I still remember how grateful he was. He had built a life in the US with his family, and this job meant they could keep that life. Years later, that experience is still the clearest answer I have for why I love this work.

Hook: Question; 255 words; 1 paragraphs; final CTA detected; question detected.

Hashtags: None detected. Mentions: None detected.

Our last 21 hires went from submission to signed offer in a median of 20 days. The goal now is to make

that even faster, and AI is a big part of how we're doing it. It isn't removing the human touch. We still run every screen ourselves and talk to every candidate and hiring manager directly. What it's changed is how fast we learn. Every piece of hiring manager feedback, whether it comes through Slack, email or a sync call, goes into a living scorecard for that role. If a hiring manager tells us a candidate's technical depth wasn't there, the scorecard updates, and the next candidate gets asked the question that would have caught it. So we're asking better questions every week and spotting fit (and misfit) before a candidate ever reaches the hiring manager's calendar. The number we care about most is sub-to-start: how many candidates a client has to interview to make one hire. Every candidate we take out of that number is hours back on a hiring manager's week. That's the whole goal: save our clients as much time as possible. How is your team using AI in hiring right now?

Hook: Question; 196 words; 1 paragraphs; final CTA detected; question detected.

Hashtags: None detected. Mentions: None detected.

I didn't talk for ten days. No phone. No writing. No communication of any kind. Just silence, and my own mind, for ten days straight. It was a Vipassana meditation retreat in Indonesia. You wake up at 4am, meditate for ten hours a day, eat twice, sleep, and then get up and do it all over again. It was one of the hardest things I've done, and also one of the most life changing. After the 10 days, I had a level of focus I didn't know was possible. Work felt different. Even reading emails and having conversations felt different, and it's all because my brain had been so overstimulated for so long that I'd forgotten what it was like to think clearly. What surprised me most was who else was there. A lot of them were managers and executives whose bosses had actually encouraged them to go, because people came back sharper, calmer and more productive. I'm not saying everyone needs to do a Vipassana retreat. But I do think we underestimate how much noise we carry around, and we keep adding to it with more tools, more content and more things to do. Ten days of nothing did more for my focus than any productivity hack I've tried.

Hook: Number-led; 210 words; 1 paragraphs; final CTA not detected; question not detected.

Hashtags: None detected. Mentions: None detected.

Two SE offers accepted this month! Senior SE in NYC: first interview to offer in 13 days. THIRTEEN. SE in SF: first interview to offer in 22 days. NYC and SF are two of the harder markets to close SE searches in right now. Both moved fast for the same reason: candidates responded quickly, clients decided quickly. Shout out to our candidates, clients & team. Pastry + coffee to celebrate [U+1F937][U+2640][U+FE0F]

Hook: Number-led; 69 words; 1 paragraphs; final CTA not detected; question not detected.

Hashtags: None detected. Mentions: None detected.

Hook uses the first nonempty line. Paragraphs use blank-line breaks. Final CTA uses the last content line, ignoring tag-only lines, with question or action-phrase detection. Text rules can miss meaning and linked mentions.

Hashtag patterns

Up to 20 most-used tags. Each post is counted once per tag. Tags travel with topics and formats; their isolated effect cannot be measured.

Prioritized action plan

1. Develop a specific follow-up

Observation: The sample includes "Two SE offers accepted this month! Senior SE in NYC: first interview to offer in 13 days. THIRTEEN. ". Its visible interaction total is 69.

Action: Build a follow-up to "Two SE offers accepted this month! Senior SE in NYC: first interview to offer in 13 days. THIRTEEN. ". Add a concrete example, a decision you made and one lesson. Keep the format similar so topic development is the main experiment.

Potential impact: Test repeatable interest in an existing subject. Effort: Medium.

Metric to watch: Reactions and comments after the same seven-day window; compare with the baseline median

Evidence: post 7. Full text and links are in Source posts.

2. Test a sharper opening

Observation: Median text length is 229 words with 1 paragraphs. 0 of 7 openings are classified as statements.

Action: For the next post related to "Two SE offers accepted this month! Senior SE in NYC: first interview to offer in 13 days. THIRTEEN. ", open with a specific problem and a concrete outcome you can substantiate. Move context into the second paragraph. Avoid invented results or curiosity gaps that the post does not resolve.

Potential impact: Improve clarity; any engagement effect remains to be tested. Effort: Low.

Metric to watch: Median interactions across at least three comparable posts per opening approach

Evidence: post 1, post 2, post 3. Full text and links are in Source posts.

3. Make the reply invitation concrete

Observation: 4 of 7 final content lines contain a detected question or action phrase; 4 posts contain a question anywhere. These are text rules, not semantic judgments.

Action: End one upcoming post with a focused trade-off question connected to careers & leadership. Ask readers to share a decision and why. Read replies before deciding whether the discussion was useful.

Potential impact: Test whether a clearer invitation supports useful discussion. Effort: Low.

Metric to watch: Public comments per post and manual review of reply relevance

Evidence: post 2, post 3, post 4, post 5. Full text and links are in Source posts.

4. Choose a sustainable publishing experiment

Observation: 7 dated posts span 23 days. Observed cadence is 1.8 posts per week.

Action: Choose two slots per week for the four-week experiment below, or reduce the schedule if your capacity is lower. Keep the slots consistent and log every published post. Two slots are a planning choice, not a LinkedIn benchmark.

Potential impact: Create comparable records and a manageable learning loop. Effort: Medium.

Metric to watch: Planned versus published posts, time spent, and median interactions at seven days

Evidence: post 7, post 6, post 5, post 4, post 3, post 2, post 1. Full text and links are in Source posts.

5. Use tags and mentions with a purpose

Observation: 0 of 7 posts contain hashtags and 0 contain visible @mentions. LinkedIn may return linked mentions as plain text, so detection can undercount.

Action: Use relevant topic labels only when they clarify the subject. Mention people only when they contributed or are directly relevant. Test a consistent tagging approach on comparable posts; do not attribute performance changes to tags alone.

Potential impact: Keep context and attribution useful. Effort: Low.

Metric to watch: Median interactions for tagged/untagged samples, with sample sizes and topic differences

6. Test presentation without changing the subject

Observation: image: 5 posts (5 measured); text: 2 posts (2 measured).

Action: Turn one idea related to “Two SE offers accepted this month! Senior SE in NYC: first interview to offer in 13 days. THIRTEEN.” into a concise checklist or document post. Keep a similar topic and ask the same type of question. Label this a new format experiment, not a proven winning format.

Potential impact: Learn whether a different presentation helps explain the same idea. Effort: Medium.

Metric to watch: Public interactions at the same post age; at least three posts in each format before comparison

Evidence: post 1, post 2, post 3, post 4, post 5, post 6, post 7. Full text and links are in Source posts.

Basic content ideas

1. The next chapter

Follow up on “Two SE offers accepted this month! Senior SE in NYC: first interview to offer in 13 days. THIRTEEN.”: what changed since publishing, what stayed difficult, and the next step. Only include outcomes you can verify.

Evidence: post 7. Full text and links are in Source posts.

2. Show the process

Break the work behind “Two SE offers accepted this month! Senior SE in NYC: first interview to offer in 13 days. THIRTEEN.” into three decisions. Add an example or screenshot you have permission to share.

Evidence: post 7. Full text and links are in Source posts.

3. A useful trade-off

Describe two approaches to careers & leadership, explain your constraint, and ask which constraint readers face.

Evidence: post 1, post 2, post 3, post 4, post 5, post 7. Full text and links are in Source posts.

Basic writing outline

Open with one specific point. Show your reasoning with a supported example. End with a focused question.

Peer comparison, private AI strategy, extensive schedules and downloadable writing skills are coming with Profilyst Pro. They are not included in this public report.

Source posts

POST 1

https://www.linkedin.com/posts/julianavanlaanen_one-of-the-worst-things-a-recruiter-can-do-activity-7518687608827334656-72RL

Published: 2026-10-21T15:00:16.404Z. Reactions: 27. Comments: 1. Format: image.

One of the worst things a recruiter can do is introduce a hiring manager to a candidate they could never actually hire. Imagine you're hiring a Solutions Engineer, and I introduce you to someone who checks all the boxes. You love everything about them, but there's one problem: they're expecting \$220K, and your budget is \$160K. You make an offer anyway, hoping they'll be excited enough about the opportunity to compromise. They decline, and now every candidate I introduce to you gets compared to someone who was never within your budget. This is one of the reasons I spend so much time understanding what candidates actually want before introducing them to clients. I want to know their salary expectations, career goals, preferred working environment, and whether they'd seriously consider the opportunity if an offer came through. I also want to understand where the hiring manager has flexibility and where they don't, because there's very little value in creating excitement around a candidate when the expectations on both sides don't align. The problem is that the other candidates aren't going to put their job searches on hold while the hiring manager figures this out. They're interviewing with other companies, and some will inevitably receive offers. I've always felt that a good recruiter should help hiring managers understand what's realistically available within their budget, rather than set expectations they can't meet.

POST 2

https://www.linkedin.com/posts/julianavanlaanen_you-dont-see-many-people-in-jobs-longer-activity-7517956486631895041--Jq3

Published: 2026-10-19T14:35:03.290Z. Reactions: 15. Comments: 6. Format: image.

You don't see many people in jobs longer than a year and a half anymore. Especially on the startup side. And to be fair there can be good reasons for that. A candidate might have three roles in three years and on paper, that looks like they're job-hopping. But when you actually talk to them, you find out: - The first company had an acquisition - The second was supposed to sell but didn't, and they had layoffs - The third ran into financial trouble None of that means the person isn't looking for something stable. In fact, a lot of the candidates I talk to are actively seeking stability but they're just coming out of situations that were beyond their control. For AEs, there's another layer to this, especially when they've been selling something with a longer sales cycle. Someone might leave before they've had enough time for the deals they were working to actually close, which can make their performance a little harder to judge from a resume alone. That's where you have to look beyond tenure and ask better questions: What pipeline did they build? How

were they performing against the expectations for that stage of their ramp? What deals were they working? And, most importantly, why did they leave? I think hiring managers sometimes look at a resume and make a quick judgment about a candidate's tenure without understanding the full story. And candidates...if you've moved around, you need to be ready to explain why in a way that makes sense. Because the context ALWAYS matters.

POST 3

https://www.linkedin.com/posts/julianavanlaanen_the-difference-between-a-good-se-and-a-great-activity-7516165941756387328-5RAY

Published: 2026-10-14T16:00:04.124Z. Reactions: 46. Comments: 9. Format: text.

The difference between a good SE and a great SE usually comes down to one thing: They tie everything back to value. A good SE can run a standard demo and answer questions. But the SEs who really stand out spend less time showing how much they know and more time understanding what the customer actually cares about. When I debrief with hiring managers after demo rounds, this is the most common reason a strong candidate doesn't get the offer. And it usually starts well before the demo. If a prospect says they need better reporting, a great SE won't just add the reporting dashboard to their demo checklist. They'll want to know what's wrong with the current reporting, who it affects, and why fixing it matters to the business. So when they finally show that dashboard, it's built around the VP who spends six hours a week pulling numbers by hand. That's also why value isn't one-size-fits-all. Even on the same call, different people want different answers. The technical buyer wants to know how it works. The business leader wants to know what changes for them. The strongest SEs can speak to both without losing either. And it's why feature dumping is such a missed opportunity. You can show someone 25 impressive features, but if only three address the problems they came to solve, you've spent most of the demo on the wrong things. For the SE leaders here, what's one thing you notice during a demo that immediately tells you, "This person really knows what they're doing"?

POST 4

https://www.linkedin.com/posts/julianavanlaanen_he-had-less-than-60-days-to-find-a-job-if-activity-7513623204482015233-g7G4

Published: 2026-10-07T15:36:08.316Z. Reactions: 17. Comments: 0. Format: image.

He had less than 60 days to find a job. If he didn't, he'd have to pack up his family and leave the US. This was right after Covid, and I had just started my career in recruiting. Finding a job was difficult for almost everyone at the time and for candidates on visas, the pressure was on another level. I was working at a large agency with plenty of openings, so I started reaching out to account managers across the company, trying to find a client who might be open to sponsorship. A lot of the initial answers were no. And I remember pushing back with a simple question: "Have you actually asked them?" A lot of the time, we were assuming the answer would be no because of how difficult the market was, without actually putting the question to the client. Sponsorship added another layer of complexity to an already difficult hiring process, so it was easy to assume a client probably wouldn't go for it. But this candidate didn't have the luxury of us assuming. So I kept asking account managers to go back to their clients and actually have the conversation. Eventually, we found an opportunity. He went through several rounds of interviews and got the job. I still remember how grateful he was. He had built a life in the US with his family, and this job meant they could keep that life. Years later, that experience is still the clearest answer I have for why I love

this work.

POST 5

https://www.linkedin.com/posts/julianavanlaanen_our-last-21-hires-went-from-submission-to-activity-7512874246788919298-qcot

Published: 2026-10-05T14:00:02.887Z. Reactions: 18. Comments: 9. Format: text.

Our last 21 hires went from submission to signed offer in a median of 20 days. The goal now is to make that even faster, and AI is a big part of how we're doing it. It isn't removing the human touch. We still run every screen ourselves and talk to every candidate and hiring manager directly. What it's changed is how fast we learn. Every piece of hiring manager feedback, whether it comes through Slack, email or a sync call, goes into a living scorecard for that role. If a hiring manager tells us a candidate's technical depth wasn't there, the scorecard updates, and the next candidate gets asked the question that would have caught it. So we're asking better questions every week and spotting fit (and misfit) before a candidate ever reaches the hiring manager's calendar. The number we care about most is sub-to-start: how many candidates a client has to interview to make one hire. Every candidate we take out of that number is hours back on a hiring manager's week. That's the whole goal: save our clients as much time as possible. How is your team using AI in hiring right now?

POST 6

https://www.linkedin.com/posts/julianavanlaanen_i-didnt-talk-for-ten-days-no-phone-no-activity-7511424716298170368-ak-I

Published: 2026-10-01T14:00:07.887Z. Reactions: 33. Comments: 8. Format: image.

I didn't talk for ten days. No phone. No writing. No communication of any kind. Just silence, and my own mind, for ten days straight. It was a Vipassana meditation retreat in Indonesia. You wake up at 4am, meditate for ten hours a day, eat twice, sleep, and then get up and do it all over again. It was one of the hardest things I've done, and also one of the most life changing. After the 10 days, I had a level of focus I didn't know was possible. Work felt different. Even reading emails and having conversations felt different, and it's all because my brain had been so overstimulated for so long that I'd forgotten what it was like to think clearly. What surprised me most was who else was there. A lot of them were managers and executives whose bosses had actually encouraged them to go, because people came back sharper, calmer and more productive. I'm not saying everyone needs to do a Vipassana retreat. But I do think we underestimate how much noise we carry around, and we keep adding to it with more tools, more content and more things to do. Ten days of nothing did more for my focus than any productivity hack I've tried.

POST 7

https://www.linkedin.com/posts/julianavanlaanen_two-se-offers-accepted-this-month-senior-activity-7510360201078763521-AfAR

Published: 2026-09-28T15:30:07.681Z. Reactions: 66. Comments: 3. Format: image.

Two SE offers accepted this month! Senior SE in NYC: first interview to offer in 13 days. THIRTEEN. SE in SF: first interview to offer in 22 days. NYC and SF are two of the harder markets to close SE searches in right now. Both moved fast for the same reason: candidates responded quickly, clients decided quickly. Shout out to our candidates, clients & team. Pastry + coffee to celebrate [U+1F937][U+2640][U+FE0F]

Saved audit comparison

This export represents one saved snapshot. No earlier comparable snapshot was selected.

Methodology and limits

Read 7 of up to 8 requested posts. Unreturned or unverifiable posts are not included in the analysis.

The source returned a shortened About section. Suggestions use only the visible excerpt.

Some profile sections were not returned by the source. They remain unknown, not confirmed missing from LinkedIn.

Selected URLs may omit recent or low-performing posts. This is a sample, not a complete feed.

Reaction and comment totals are snapshots. Older posts had more time to accumulate interactions.

Themes can overlap and use English keyword rules. Hooks, CTAs and mentions are text heuristics and may miss context or other languages.

Timing is UTC publishing history, not audience activity or an optimal posting time.

Recommendations and potential impact are hypotheses. No impressions, revenue, private demographics, peer percentile or causal attribution are available.

Engagement = average visible reactions plus comments / current followers × 100, requiring at least three measured posts. Missing values remain unavailable. Cadence uses the intervals between sampled dates. No uncalibrated score or private metric is inferred.

Independent public-data analysis. Not affiliated with LinkedIn or the profile owner. <https://profilyst.com/methodology>

Unsupported glyphs are preserved as Unicode code points [U+...]. Full original text is available in the online report.