

Pass-Sure C_THR81 Exam Training, Ensure to pass the C_THR81 Exam



Our C_THR81 study materials are designed carefully. We have taken all your worries into consideration. Also, we adopt the useful suggestions about our C_THR81 study materials from our customers. Now, our study materials are out of supply. Thousands of people will crowd into our website to choose the C_THR81 study materials. So people are different from the past. Learning has become popular among different age groups. Our C_THR81 Study Materials truly offer you the most useful knowledge. You can totally trust us. We are trying our best to meet your demands. Why not give our C_THR81 study materials a chance? Our products will live up to your expectations.

SAP C_THR81 Exam Syllabus Topics:

Section	Weight	Objectives
Topic 1: Data Models & Foundation Objects	25%	- Metadata Framework (MDF) & Generic Objects - Picklists, Business Rules & Event Derivation - Corporate, Succession & Country-Specific Data Models
Topic 2: Security & Workflows	15%	- Role-Based Permissions (RBP) - Notifications & Event Reasoning - Workflow Configuration & Approvals
Topic 3: Position Management	25%	- Position Hierarchy & Structure - Position Synchronization with Job Information - Mass Updates & Import/Export
Topic 4: Data Management & Integration	10%	- Import Tools & Data Migration - Company Structure Overview - Integration with other SuccessFactors Modules
Topic 5: Employee Central Core	25%	- Time & Attendance Integration - Global Assignment & Concurrent Employment - Person & Employment Information

>> C_THR81 Exam Training <<

Test SAP C_THR81 Objectives Pdf | C_THR81 Actual Exam Dumps

Have you been many years at your position but haven't got a promotion? Or are you a new comer in your company and eager to make yourself outstanding? Our C_THR81 exam materials can help you. After a few days' studying and practicing with our C_THR81 products you will easily pass the examination. God helps those who help themselves. If you choose our C_THR81 Study Materials, you will find God just by your side. The only thing you have to do is just to make your choice and study. Isn't it very easy? So know more about our C_THR81 study guide right now!

SAP Certified - SAP SuccessFactors Employee Central Core and Position Management (C_THR81_2605) Sample Questions (Q191-Q196):

NEW QUESTION # 191

A consultant is validating a position-blocking process before a quarterly planning review in a public cloud SAP SuccessFactors Employee Central and Position Management tenant. In the web-based UI, HR specialists can mark selected positions as blocked and save successfully. The blocked status is visible on the position record, but for a subset of those positions the expected restriction on downstream staffing preparation does not activate, and planners can still include them in preparation lists.

Older blocked positions behave correctly. The customer confirms the affected records belong to a newly introduced position usage type created for temporary project coverage and wants to keep that usage type because reporting depends on it. The consultant must restore expected lifecycle behavior without requiring planners to maintain a separate exclusion list.

What should the consultant investigate first?

Response:

- A. Recreate the affected positions under an older usage type so the existing blocked-position behavior applies immediately.
- **B. Review the dependency between the new position usage type and blocked-state enforcement, then correct the configuration controlling downstream staffing restrictions after save.**
- C. Give planners broader permissions so they can decide case by case whether blocked positions should remain selectable during preparation.
- D. Ask planners to maintain a manual list of blocked project-coverage positions and remove them from preparation lists before each planning cycle.

Answer: B

Explanation:

Feedback:

The blocking action itself succeeds and the blocked state is stored, so the primary lifecycle update is functioning. The defect appears in the next layer, where blocked positions should stop participating in downstream staffing preparation. Because only the newly introduced usage type is affected, the most likely root cause is a usage-type-specific configuration dependency controlling downstream enforcement after save.

NEW QUESTION # 192

A consultant is validating a position-based readiness process before a planning checkpoint in a public cloud SAP SuccessFactors Employee Central and Position Management tenant. In the web-based UI, HR specialists update selected positions to a ready-for-action state and save successfully. The new state is visible on the position records, but for positions in one newly introduced hierarchy branch the linked employee-side planning indicator does not update during follow-up validation.

Other branches behave correctly. The customer wants to preserve position-driven administration and avoid separate employee-side maintenance after each position update. The affected records all belong to a branch introduced during the latest configuration cycle, and the consultant must correct the issue without redesigning the broader readiness process.

What is the best first action?

Response:

- A. Recreate the affected positions under an older hierarchy branch so the downstream update behavior matches earlier records.
- B. Give planning users broader edit access to the employee planning field so they can repair missing updates directly after each position save.
- **C. Review the dependency between the new hierarchy branch and downstream planning-indicator propagation, then correct the configuration or binding controlling the linked employee update.**
- D. Ask HR specialists to update the employee planning indicator manually for the new branch until the checkpoint is completed.

Answer: C

Explanation:

Feedback:

The position update itself succeeds and the new readiness state is stored. The failure occurs only in the downstream employee-side update and only for the newly introduced branch. That indicates a second-order integration dependency between branch-specific setup and the propagation logic that updates the planning indicator. Correcting that dependency restores intended end-to-end behavior while preserving the position-driven operating model.

NEW QUESTION # 193

CHALLENGE 2 — Shared Banquet Position Context for Event Staffing A banquet assignment can be

saved, but manager-facing review later displays inconsistent resort context. The guest services director asks whether the team can proceed if HR coordination verifies banquet assignments outside the system. Which response best reflects the performance-versus-governance trade-off? Response:

- A. Narrow the validation set and verify representative banquet assignments in the system before relying on offline confirmation.
- B. Stop all housekeeping and banquet testing until every position record across all resorts is rebuilt.
- C. Open all banquet positions to resort operations managers temporarily so they can confirm assignments faster during validation.
- D. Proceed with offline HR verification because it preserves the remediation schedule and the assignment record saves successfully.

Answer: A

Explanation:

Feedback:

This option allows controlled progress while preserving system-based evidence for banquet assignment behavior. It recognizes schedule pressure but does not replace governed validation with offline confirmation.

NEW QUESTION # 194

CHALLENGE 4; Employee Change Workflow for Department Review Some employee change requests remain visible to HR shared services and do not reach the expected department reviewer. The same department manager can approve other employee changes in the same location.

What should be validated before changing the workflow configuration?

Response:

- A. Whether HR shared services can approve all employee changes centrally until the workflow behavior is reviewed later.
- B. Whether the notification wording explains that some requests may stay with HR shared services.
- C. Whether all employee change workflows should be routed to both HR and every department manager for testing.
- D. Whether the employee record context, department value, and manager responsibility assignment support reviewer determination for the affected request.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

The same manager can approve other changes, so the workflow configuration may not be universally wrong. The affected request should be traced through employee context, department value, and responsibility assignment before workflow rules are changed.

NEW QUESTION # 195

CHALLENGE 4; Employee Data Workflow for Compliance Review A tester suggests changing workflow routing so insurance employee changes always go directly to a compliance reviewer, regardless of employee and position context. This would reduce pending corporate HR items before the regulated review.

Why is this approach less appropriate?

Response:

- A. It is less appropriate because corporate HR must always approve insurance employee changes.
- B. It is less appropriate because compliance reviewers cannot approve any Employee Central workflow tasks.
- C. It prevents HR partners from updating branch employee records.
- D. It changes routing before confirming whether employee context and position assignment already determine the correct reviewer.

Answer: D

Explanation:

Feedback:

The scenario indicates routing works in some comparable contexts, so a universal workflow change may address the symptom without validating the source context. The consultant should confirm the dependency before changing workflow behavior.

• • • • •

Test C_THR81 Objectives Pdf: https://www.dumpsvalid.com/C_THR81-still-valid-exam.html

- [illegible]