Redeployment Economics

A worker between assignments isn't generating billings, and depending on your employment model, may still be generating cost. Redeployment rate, how quickly and how often you move a worker from one ending assignment into another, is one of the least-discussed levers in staffing economics precisely because it happens in the gaps between the numbers everyone already tracks.

Why the gap between assignments is expensive

Every day a worker sits between assignments is a day of lost billings on a resource you've already recruited, onboarded, and know is placeable, distinct from the cost of finding a brand-new candidate for a brand-new req. A high redeployment rate means fewer of those gap-days across your workforce; a low one means workers, and the GP they could be generating, sitting idle more often than they need to.

Quantifying what an improvement is worth

Redeployment Financial Impact takes your current and target redeployment rate and computes the GP difference directly, turning "we should get better at redeploying people" from a vague operational goal into a specific dollar figure. That figure is what justifies, or doesn't, investing in whatever would actually move the redeployment rate: a dedicated redeployment-focused role, better internal visibility into upcoming assignment end dates, or process changes that start the next-placement search before an assignment ends rather than after.

The alternative to redeploying: extending in place

Redeployment isn't the only lever against an ending assignment. Sometimes the better move is keeping the worker where they are. Contract Extension Value computes the contribution from extending an assignment directly, and optionally compares it against the expected value of ending the assignment and redeploying the worker elsewhere, accounting for the probability of successfully replacing that revenue, the sourcing cost of doing so, and the risk of a gap if the replacement doesn't happen immediately.

These two engines answer complementary questions, not competing ones: redeployment financial impact tells you what a better redeployment *process* across your whole workforce is worth, while contract extension value tells you, for one specific ending assignment, whether extension or replacement is the better call this time. Use the first to justify process investment, the second to make an individual decision when an assignment is actually ending.

What this looks like in practice

A disciplined redeployment process usually means tracking upcoming assignment end dates well before they arrive, and running the extension-vs-redeploy comparison for each one rather than defaulting to either extend automatically or let the assignment lapse and start sourcing cold. Over a full workforce, the aggregate effect of consistently making that comparison, rather than defaulting one way, is exactly what shows up as an improved redeployment rate in the financial-impact calculation.

Related

- Redeployment Financial Impact engine
- Contract Extension Value engine