

# **New York City Local Law 144 “Bias Audit” for HireVue for Adaptability for All jobs**

## **Conducted by DCI Consulting Group (DCI)**

### **Analysis Information**

- Summary produced on: July 5, 2025
- Data analyzed were based on nationwide applicants who were assessed between June 1, 2024 to June 1, 2025
- The assessment assigns applicants to one of three tiers (i.e., Bottom Tier, Middle Tier, Top Tier), yielding 2 threshold comparisons for analysis (i.e., the threshold between Top/Middle Tier and Bottom Tier and the threshold between Top Tier and Middle/Bottom Tier)

### **Purpose**

The “bias audit” reported here is consistent with the use case wherein historical data from multiple employers using the same automated employment decision tool (AEDT) are used as the basis of the audit. This audit and report address the requirements of the New York City (NYC) Local Law 144 that regulates the use of AEDTs in accordance with the final rules published by the NYC Department of Consumer and Worker Protection (DCWP) on April 6, 2023.

### **About DCI Consulting Group (DCI)**

DCI is a human resources consulting firm headquartered in Washington, D.C. Since 2001, DCI has provided expert solutions to hundreds of organizations on complex issues, with particular emphasis on equal employment opportunity analytics, employee selection and assessment, independent third-party reviews, and litigation support work. DCI’s team of Industrial/Organizational Psychologists and Labor Economists are recognized for their applied experience in complex quantitative analytics, adverse impact measurement, pay equity, job analysis, validation research and job-relatedness evaluations, and routinely perform work in the context of affirmative action plans under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor’s Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs compliance evaluations, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission systemic investigations, and expert witness work on matters related to Title VII, Executive Order 11246, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

### **“Bias Audit” Analysis Methodology<sup>1</sup>**

The analyses conducted for this audit are based on data from multiple employers using the AEDT in one or more different implementations as part of their selection processes. Analyses were conducted separately for each employer’s implementation(s) (hereafter these individual, or de-aggregated, analyses will be referred to as “by implementation”) and then results were aggregated to provide the tables in this report (referred to as “aggregated”). Before describing the aggregation process, a foundational understanding of the methodology used for analysis (related to a singular implementation of the AEDT by an employer) is required. As noted in the Analysis Information above, the AEDT assigns an applicant to a tier based on their performance. NYC’s Local Law 144 and the rules published by the DCWP stipulate specific requirements for conducting the required analyses. Where the AEDT assigns applicants to tiers, an 'impact ratio' must be calculated for each demographic group for each threshold separating the tiers.<sup>2</sup> Note that NYC specifies this calculation to be the Focal Demographic Group selection rate divided by the Comparator Demographic Group selection rate. This analysis is conducted separately for each implementation of the AEDT in the dataset provided to DCI.

The law further specifies that the demographic groups need to be compared in three specific ways:

1. Gender comparison (i.e., Male, Female).
2. Race/ethnicity comparison (i.e., Hispanic or Latino, White, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, Native American or Alaska Native, Two or More Races).
3. An intersectional comparison that is the combination of gender and race/ethnicity (e.g., Hispanic or Latino Male, Hispanic or Latino Female, White Male, White Female).

The NYC law impact ratio has been defined by the DCWP's published rules and is calculated as:

$$\text{NYC Law Impact Ratio} = \frac{\text{selection rate of demographic (focal) group}}{\text{selection rate of most selected (comparator) demographic group}}$$

## Results Aggregation Methodology

For each AEDT implementation where sufficient data were available to analyze, the number of applicants, number of applicants selected, number of applicants not selected, selection rate, and impact ratio for each demographic group were calculated. These results were then aggregated to produce the tables in this report. To be able to aggregate results meaningfully across a range of implementations for the AEDT, there are a number of specific, nuanced issues that must be considered that are not required when conducting a bias audit in a singular implementation. These aggregation considerations and related decisions are as follows:

- Data were analyzed separately per implementation because the context around using the AEDT, the jobs for which they were used, the normative samples, and the composition of the specific applicant pools vary and cannot be assumed to be equivalent, nor can they be collapsed across implementations.
- Within an aggregation group, a single, consistent comparator group must be identified for all implementations of the AEDT to be able to produce interpretable aggregate impact ratios.
- Two factors are balanced when determining the aggregation comparator group: 1) selection rate and 2) statistical coverage. The comparator has the highest selection rate amongst those demographic groups with sufficient statistical coverage across implementations.<sup>3</sup>
- For all viable implementations analyzed in the aggregation group, aggregated values are calculated using recommended professional practices.<sup>4, 5</sup>

## Results Tables

Aggregated results are presented in tables, each of which provides an indication of the demographic group (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, or both), the aggregated number of applicants that comprise the demographic group, the aggregated selection rate for the demographic group, and the aggregated NYC law impact ratio. In each analysis table, the comparator group is identified. Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.

Finally, as specified by NYC for this law, each table contains a footnote specifying the number of applicants from the viable implementations analyzed for an aggregation group for whom demographic information is unavailable. Each page containing report tables also provides additional notes for the reader to bear in mind when viewing the results.

<sup>1</sup> A number of the requirements specific to NYC Local Law 144 are not aligned to contemporary adverse impact analysis practices (e.g., Morris and Dunleavy, Adverse impact analysis: Understanding data, statistics, and risk, 2017). However, these analyses were conducted as stipulated by NYC for the sole purpose of meeting the specific requirements of Local Law 144.

<sup>2</sup> Due to this balancing of factors, there may be some instances where aggregated impact ratios reported in a table will exceed 1.0.

<sup>3</sup> Selection rates and impact ratios calculated for the tables in this report are based on the thresholds between tiers. This may or may not reflect employer-specific operational use of the AEDT with respect to making selection process decisions.

<sup>4</sup> Sufficient data for a demographic group to be analyzed for an implementation requires that group comprise at least two-percent of the sample, and that there be at least three applicants above the threshold and three applicants below the threshold in the demographic group.

<sup>5</sup> When aggregating the number of applicants, results from each implementation in the aggregation group are summed; when aggregating the selection rate, results from each implementation are averaged; when aggregating the impact ratio, results from each implementation analysis must first be converted to a natural logarithm, averaged, and then exponentiated to yield the average ratio value.

## HireVue Aggregate “Bias Audit” Analysis for Adaptability for All jobs

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for Gender

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Male	12,335	0.67	Comparator Group		12,381	0.36	Comparator Group
Female	8,514	0.66	0.99		8,547	0.35	0.96

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 758 applicants with unknown or missing gender information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 760 applicants with unknown or missing gender information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Hispanic or Latino	4,340	0.63	0.95		4,354	0.37	1.09
White	5,789	0.60	0.87		5,806	0.31	0.84
Black or African American	3,957	0.67	0.99		3,978	0.35	0.94
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Asian	5,384	0.67	Comparator Group		5,414	0.39	Comparator Group
Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Two or More Races	850	0.63	0.96		874	0.37	1.10

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 1,067 applicants with unknown or missing race information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 1,120 applicants with unknown or missing race information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.

## HireVue Aggregate “Bias Audit” Analysis for Adaptability for All jobs

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for the Combination of Gender and Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Male Hispanic or Latino	1,375	0.63	0.88		2,466	0.40	1.24
Male White	3,164	0.59	0.77		3,458	0.26	0.89
Male Black or African American	1,184	0.69	0.93		2,158	0.29	1.02
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Male Asian	3,249	0.68	0.90		3,357	0.39	Comparator Group
Male Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Male Two or More Races	195	0.66	0.80		343	0.45	1.39
Female Hispanic or Latino	1,604	0.67	0.89		1,868	0.36	1.14
Female White	2,213	0.63	0.83		2,222	0.32	0.78
Female Black or African American	1,328	0.67	0.90		1,639	0.33	1.07
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Female Asian	1,936	0.73	Comparator Group		1,944	0.39	0.98
Female Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Female Two or More Races	219	0.58	0.89		219	0.29	1.25

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 1,151 applicants with unknown or missing gender and race information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 1,325 applicants with unknown or missing gender and race information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.

# **New York City Local Law 144 “Bias Audit” for HireVue for Communication for All jobs**

## **Conducted by DCI Consulting Group (DCI)**

### **Analysis Information**

- Summary produced on: July 5, 2025
- Data analyzed were based on nationwide applicants who were assessed between June 1, 2024 to June 1, 2025
- The assessment assigns applicants to one of three tiers (i.e., Bottom Tier, Middle Tier, Top Tier), yielding 2 threshold comparisons for analysis (i.e., the threshold between Top/Middle Tier and Bottom Tier and the threshold between Top Tier and Middle/Bottom Tier)

### **Purpose**

The “bias audit” reported here is consistent with the use case wherein historical data from multiple employers using the same automated employment decision tool (AEDT) are used as the basis of the audit. This audit and report address the requirements of the New York City (NYC) Local Law 144 that regulates the use of AEDTs in accordance with the final rules published by the NYC Department of Consumer and Worker Protection (DCWP) on April 6, 2023.

### **About DCI Consulting Group (DCI)**

DCI is a human resources consulting firm headquartered in Washington, D.C. Since 2001, DCI has provided expert solutions to hundreds of organizations on complex issues, with particular emphasis on equal employment opportunity analytics, employee selection and assessment, independent third-party reviews, and litigation support work. DCI’s team of Industrial/Organizational Psychologists and Labor Economists are recognized for their applied experience in complex quantitative analytics, adverse impact measurement, pay equity, job analysis, validation research and job-relatedness evaluations, and routinely perform work in the context of affirmative action plans under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor’s Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs compliance evaluations, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission systemic investigations, and expert witness work on matters related to Title VII, Executive Order 11246, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

### **“Bias Audit” Analysis Methodology<sup>1</sup>**

The analyses conducted for this audit are based on data from multiple employers using the AEDT in one or more different implementations as part of their selection processes. Analyses were conducted separately for each employer’s implementation(s) (hereafter these individual, or de-aggregated, analyses will be referred to as “by implementation”) and then results were aggregated to provide the tables in this report (referred to as “aggregated”). Before describing the aggregation process, a foundational understanding of the methodology used for analysis (related to a singular implementation of the AEDT by an employer) is required. As noted in the Analysis Information above, the AEDT assigns an applicant to a tier based on their performance. NYC’s Local Law 144 and the rules published by the DCWP stipulate specific requirements for conducting the required analyses. Where the AEDT assigns applicants to tiers, an 'impact ratio' must be calculated for each demographic group for each threshold separating the tiers.<sup>2</sup> Note that NYC specifies this calculation to be the Focal Demographic Group selection rate divided by the Comparator Demographic Group selection rate. This analysis is conducted separately for each implementation of the AEDT in the dataset provided to DCI.

The law further specifies that the demographic groups need to be compared in three specific ways:

1. Gender comparison (i.e., Male, Female).
2. Race/ethnicity comparison (i.e., Hispanic or Latino, White, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, Native American or Alaska Native, Two or More Races).
3. An intersectional comparison that is the combination of gender and race/ethnicity (e.g., Hispanic or Latino Male, Hispanic or Latino Female, White Male, White Female).

The NYC law impact ratio has been defined by the DCWP's published rules and is calculated as:

$$\text{NYC Law Impact Ratio} = \frac{\text{selection rate of demographic (focal) group}}{\text{selection rate of most selected (comparator) demographic group}}$$

## Results Aggregation Methodology

For each AEDT implementation where sufficient data were available to analyze, the number of applicants, number of applicants selected, number of applicants not selected, selection rate, and impact ratio for each demographic group were calculated. These results were then aggregated to produce the tables in this report. To be able to aggregate results meaningfully across a range of implementations for the AEDT, there are a number of specific, nuanced issues that must be considered that are not required when conducting a bias audit in a singular implementation. These aggregation considerations and related decisions are as follows:

- Data were analyzed separately per implementation because the context around using the AEDT, the jobs for which they were used, the normative samples, and the composition of the specific applicant pools vary and cannot be assumed to be equivalent, nor can they be collapsed across implementations.
- Within an aggregation group, a single, consistent comparator group must be identified for all implementations of the AEDT to be able to produce interpretable aggregate impact ratios.
- Two factors are balanced when determining the aggregation comparator group: 1) selection rate and 2) statistical coverage. The comparator has the highest selection rate amongst those demographic groups with sufficient statistical coverage across implementations.<sup>3</sup>
- For all viable implementations analyzed in the aggregation group, aggregated values are calculated using recommended professional practices.<sup>4, 5</sup>

## Results Tables

Aggregated results are presented in tables, each of which provides an indication of the demographic group (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, or both), the aggregated number of applicants that comprise the demographic group, the aggregated selection rate for the demographic group, and the aggregated NYC law impact ratio. In each analysis table, the comparator group is identified. Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.

Finally, as specified by NYC for this law, each table contains a footnote specifying the number of applicants from the viable implementations analyzed for an aggregation group for whom demographic information is unavailable. Each page containing report tables also provides additional notes for the reader to bear in mind when viewing the results.

<sup>1</sup> A number of the requirements specific to NYC Local Law 144 are not aligned to contemporary adverse impact analysis practices (e.g., Morris and Dunleavy, Adverse impact analysis: Understanding data, statistics, and risk, 2017). However, these analyses were conducted as stipulated by NYC for the sole purpose of meeting the specific requirements of Local Law 144.

<sup>2</sup> Due to this balancing of factors, there may be some instances where aggregated impact ratios reported in a table will exceed 1.0.

<sup>3</sup> Selection rates and impact ratios calculated for the tables in this report are based on the thresholds between tiers. This may or may not reflect employer-specific operational use of the AEDT with respect to making selection process decisions.

<sup>4</sup> Sufficient data for a demographic group to be analyzed for an implementation requires that group comprise at least two-percent of the sample, and that there be at least three applicants above the threshold and three applicants below the threshold in the demographic group.

<sup>5</sup> When aggregating the number of applicants, results from each implementation in the aggregation group are summed; when aggregating the selection rate, results from each implementation are averaged; when aggregating the impact ratio, results from each implementation analysis must first be converted to a natural logarithm, averaged, and then exponentiated to yield the average ratio value.

## HireVue Aggregate “Bias Audit” Analysis for Communication for All jobs

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for Gender

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Male	23,434	0.70	0.99		23,533	0.38	0.98
Female	13,326	0.71	Comparator Group		13,385	0.40	Comparator Group

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 1,783 applicants with unknown or missing gender information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 1,791 applicants with unknown or missing gender information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Hispanic or Latino	6,270	0.59	0.92		6,334	0.31	0.92
White	12,311	0.64	0.94		12,397	0.31	0.77
Black or African American	7,696	0.70	Comparator Group		7,736	0.37	0.90
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Asian	7,892	0.68	0.95		7,954	0.44	Comparator Group
Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Two or More Races	1,295	0.70	1.09		1,319	0.39	1.11

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 2,353 applicants with unknown or missing race information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 2,413 applicants with unknown or missing race information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.

## HireVue Aggregate “Bias Audit” Analysis for Communication for All jobs

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for the Combination of Gender and Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Male Hispanic or Latino	2,065	0.67	1.13		2,135	0.41	1.12
Male White	4,975	0.70	0.99		4,975	0.29	0.71
Male Black or African American	2,557	0.73	1.04		2,595	0.35	0.87
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Male Asian	4,822	0.76	1.04		4,840	0.45	0.96
Male Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Male Two or More Races	195	0.82	0.90		218	0.54	0.92
Female Hispanic or Latino	2,214	0.63	1.02		2,260	0.33	0.84
Female White	3,732	0.69	0.97		3,752	0.35	0.79
Female Black or African American	2,442	0.72	1.07		2,524	0.41	1.01
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Female Asian	2,670	0.72	Comparator Group		2,694	0.44	Comparator Group
Female Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Female Two or More Races	219	0.72	1.22		219	0.32	0.97

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 2,008 applicants with unknown or missing gender and race information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 2,020 applicants with unknown or missing gender and race information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.



# **New York City Local Law 144 “Bias Audit” for HireVue for Dependability for All jobs**

## **Conducted by DCI Consulting Group (DCI)**

### **Analysis Information**

- Summary produced on: July 5, 2025
- Data analyzed were based on nationwide applicants who were assessed between June 1, 2024 to June 1, 2025
- The assessment assigns applicants to one of three tiers (i.e., Bottom Tier, Middle Tier, Top Tier), yielding 2 threshold comparisons for analysis (i.e., the threshold between Top/Middle Tier and Bottom Tier and the threshold between Top Tier and Middle/Bottom Tier)

### **Purpose**

The “bias audit” reported here is consistent with the use case wherein historical data from multiple employers using the same automated employment decision tool (AEDT) are used as the basis of the audit. This audit and report address the requirements of the New York City (NYC) Local Law 144 that regulates the use of AEDTs in accordance with the final rules published by the NYC Department of Consumer and Worker Protection (DCWP) on April 6, 2023.

### **About DCI Consulting Group (DCI)**

DCI is a human resources consulting firm headquartered in Washington, D.C. Since 2001, DCI has provided expert solutions to hundreds of organizations on complex issues, with particular emphasis on equal employment opportunity analytics, employee selection and assessment, independent third-party reviews, and litigation support work. DCI’s team of Industrial/Organizational Psychologists and Labor Economists are recognized for their applied experience in complex quantitative analytics, adverse impact measurement, pay equity, job analysis, validation research and job-relatedness evaluations, and routinely perform work in the context of affirmative action plans under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor’s Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs compliance evaluations, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission systemic investigations, and expert witness work on matters related to Title VII, Executive Order 11246, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

### **“Bias Audit” Analysis Methodology<sup>1</sup>**

The analyses conducted for this audit are based on data from multiple employers using the AEDT in one or more different implementations as part of their selection processes. Analyses were conducted separately for each employer’s implementation(s) (hereafter these individual, or de-aggregated, analyses will be referred to as “by implementation”) and then results were aggregated to provide the tables in this report (referred to as “aggregated”). Before describing the aggregation process, a foundational understanding of the methodology used for analysis (related to a singular implementation of the AEDT by an employer) is required. As noted in the Analysis Information above, the AEDT assigns an applicant to a tier based on their performance. NYC’s Local Law 144 and the rules published by the DCWP stipulate specific requirements for conducting the required analyses. Where the AEDT assigns applicants to tiers, an 'impact ratio' must be calculated for each demographic group for each threshold separating the tiers.<sup>2</sup> Note that NYC specifies this calculation to be the Focal Demographic Group selection rate divided by the Comparator Demographic Group selection rate. This analysis is conducted separately for each implementation of the AEDT in the dataset provided to DCI.

The law further specifies that the demographic groups need to be compared in three specific ways:

1. Gender comparison (i.e., Male, Female).
2. Race/ethnicity comparison (i.e., Hispanic or Latino, White, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, Native American or Alaska Native, Two or More Races).
3. An intersectional comparison that is the combination of gender and race/ethnicity (e.g., Hispanic or Latino Male, Hispanic or Latino Female, White Male, White Female).

The NYC law impact ratio has been defined by the DCWP's published rules and is calculated as:

$$\text{NYC Law Impact Ratio} = \frac{\text{selection rate of demographic (focal) group}}{\text{selection rate of most selected (comparator) demographic group}}$$

## Results Aggregation Methodology

For each AEDT implementation where sufficient data were available to analyze, the number of applicants, number of applicants selected, number of applicants not selected, selection rate, and impact ratio for each demographic group were calculated. These results were then aggregated to produce the tables in this report. To be able to aggregate results meaningfully across a range of implementations for the AEDT, there are a number of specific, nuanced issues that must be considered that are not required when conducting a bias audit in a singular implementation. These aggregation considerations and related decisions are as follows:

- Data were analyzed separately per implementation because the context around using the AEDT, the jobs for which they were used, the normative samples, and the composition of the specific applicant pools vary and cannot be assumed to be equivalent, nor can they be collapsed across implementations.
- Within an aggregation group, a single, consistent comparator group must be identified for all implementations of the AEDT to be able to produce interpretable aggregate impact ratios.
- Two factors are balanced when determining the aggregation comparator group: 1) selection rate and 2) statistical coverage. The comparator has the highest selection rate amongst those demographic groups with sufficient statistical coverage across implementations.<sup>3</sup>
- For all viable implementations analyzed in the aggregation group, aggregated values are calculated using recommended professional practices.<sup>4, 5</sup>

## Results Tables

Aggregated results are presented in tables, each of which provides an indication of the demographic group (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, or both), the aggregated number of applicants that comprise the demographic group, the aggregated selection rate for the demographic group, and the aggregated NYC law impact ratio. In each analysis table, the comparator group is identified. Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.

Finally, as specified by NYC for this law, each table contains a footnote specifying the number of applicants from the viable implementations analyzed for an aggregation group for whom demographic information is unavailable. Each page containing report tables also provides additional notes for the reader to bear in mind when viewing the results.

<sup>1</sup> A number of the requirements specific to NYC Local Law 144 are not aligned to contemporary adverse impact analysis practices (e.g., Morris and Dunleavy, Adverse impact analysis: Understanding data, statistics, and risk, 2017). However, these analyses were conducted as stipulated by NYC for the sole purpose of meeting the specific requirements of Local Law 144.

<sup>2</sup> Due to this balancing of factors, there may be some instances where aggregated impact ratios reported in a table will exceed 1.0.

<sup>3</sup> Selection rates and impact ratios calculated for the tables in this report are based on the thresholds between tiers. This may or may not reflect employer-specific operational use of the AEDT with respect to making selection process decisions.

<sup>4</sup> Sufficient data for a demographic group to be analyzed for an implementation requires that group comprise at least two-percent of the sample, and that there be at least three applicants above the threshold and three applicants below the threshold in the demographic group.

<sup>5</sup> When aggregating the number of applicants, results from each implementation in the aggregation group are summed; when aggregating the selection rate, results from each implementation are averaged; when aggregating the impact ratio, results from each implementation analysis must first be converted to a natural logarithm, averaged, and then exponentiated to yield the average ratio value.

## HireVue Aggregate “Bias Audit” Analysis for Dependability for All jobs

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for Gender

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Male	16,219	0.73	Comparator Group		16,199	0.39	Comparator Group
Female	5,044	0.72	0.99		5,037	0.38	0.98

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 770 applicants with unknown or missing gender information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 770 applicants with unknown or missing gender information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Hispanic or Latino	799	0.76	1.11		799	0.39	0.98
White	9,446	0.66	0.95		9,444	0.34	0.76
Black or African American	2,448	0.68	0.99		2,462	0.34	0.78
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Asian	7,013	0.69	Comparator Group		7,019	0.42	Comparator Group
Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Two or More Races	588	0.64	0.93		597	0.39	1.00

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 1,311 applicants with unknown or missing race information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 1,298 applicants with unknown or missing race information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.

## HireVue Aggregate “Bias Audit” Analysis for Dependability for All jobs

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for the Combination of Gender and Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Male Hispanic or Latino	523	0.80	0.97		537	0.43	1.08
Male White	4,681	0.74	0.94		4,688	0.40	0.87
Male Black or African American	1,617	0.72	0.91		1,625	0.40	0.85
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Male Asian	4,636	0.75	1.01		4,646	0.45	1.00
Male Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Male Two or More Races	281	0.71	0.91		293	0.43	1.02
Female Hispanic or Latino	252	0.73	1.10		252	0.38	0.89
Female White	1,526	0.72	0.96		1,526	0.38	0.84
Female Black or African American	449	0.80	1.08		449	0.41	0.89
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Female Asian	1,993	0.75	Comparator Group		2,001	0.44	Comparator Group
Female Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Female Two or More Races	0	—	—		0	—	—

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 1,398 applicants with unknown or missing gender and race information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 1,448 applicants with unknown or missing gender and race information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.

# **New York City Local Law 144 “Bias Audit” for HireVue for Drive for Results and Initiative for All jobs**

## **Conducted by DCI Consulting Group (DCI)**

### **Analysis Information**

- Summary produced on: July 5, 2025
- Data analyzed were based on nationwide applicants who were assessed between June 1, 2024 to June 1, 2025
- The assessment assigns applicants to one of three tiers (i.e., Bottom Tier, Middle Tier, Top Tier), yielding 2 threshold comparisons for analysis (i.e., the threshold between Top/Middle Tier and Bottom Tier and the threshold between Top Tier and Middle/Bottom Tier)

### **Purpose**

The “bias audit” reported here is consistent with the use case wherein historical data from multiple employers using the same automated employment decision tool (AEDT) are used as the basis of the audit. This audit and report address the requirements of the New York City (NYC) Local Law 144 that regulates the use of AEDTs in accordance with the final rules published by the NYC Department of Consumer and Worker Protection (DCWP) on April 6, 2023.

### **About DCI Consulting Group (DCI)**

DCI is a human resources consulting firm headquartered in Washington, D.C. Since 2001, DCI has provided expert solutions to hundreds of organizations on complex issues, with particular emphasis on equal employment opportunity analytics, employee selection and assessment, independent third-party reviews, and litigation support work. DCI’s team of Industrial/Organizational Psychologists and Labor Economists are recognized for their applied experience in complex quantitative analytics, adverse impact measurement, pay equity, job analysis, validation research and job-relatedness evaluations, and routinely perform work in the context of affirmative action plans under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor’s Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs compliance evaluations, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission systemic investigations, and expert witness work on matters related to Title VII, Executive Order 11246, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

### **“Bias Audit” Analysis Methodology<sup>1</sup>**

The analyses conducted for this audit are based on data from multiple employers using the AEDT in one or more different implementations as part of their selection processes. Analyses were conducted separately for each employer’s implementation(s) (hereafter these individual, or de-aggregated, analyses will be referred to as “by implementation”) and then results were aggregated to provide the tables in this report (referred to as “aggregated”). Before describing the aggregation process, a foundational understanding of the methodology used for analysis (related to a singular implementation of the AEDT by an employer) is required. As noted in the Analysis Information above, the AEDT assigns an applicant to a tier based on their performance. NYC’s Local Law 144 and the rules published by the DCWP stipulate specific requirements for conducting the required analyses. Where the AEDT assigns applicants to tiers, an 'impact ratio' must be calculated for each demographic group for each threshold separating the tiers.<sup>2</sup> Note that NYC specifies this calculation to be the Focal Demographic Group selection rate divided by the Comparator Demographic Group selection rate. This analysis is conducted separately for each implementation of the AEDT in the dataset provided to DCI.

The law further specifies that the demographic groups need to be compared in three specific ways:

1. Gender comparison (i.e., Male, Female).
2. Race/ethnicity comparison (i.e., Hispanic or Latino, White, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, Native American or Alaska Native, Two or More Races).
3. An intersectional comparison that is the combination of gender and race/ethnicity (e.g., Hispanic or Latino Male, Hispanic or Latino Female, White Male, White Female).

The NYC law impact ratio has been defined by the DCWP's published rules and is calculated as:

$$\text{NYC Law Impact Ratio} = \frac{\text{selection rate of demographic (focal) group}}{\text{selection rate of most selected (comparator) demographic group}}$$

## Results Aggregation Methodology

For each AEDT implementation where sufficient data were available to analyze, the number of applicants, number of applicants selected, number of applicants not selected, selection rate, and impact ratio for each demographic group were calculated. These results were then aggregated to produce the tables in this report. To be able to aggregate results meaningfully across a range of implementations for the AEDT, there are a number of specific, nuanced issues that must be considered that are not required when conducting a bias audit in a singular implementation. These aggregation considerations and related decisions are as follows:

- Data were analyzed separately per implementation because the context around using the AEDT, the jobs for which they were used, the normative samples, and the composition of the specific applicant pools vary and cannot be assumed to be equivalent, nor can they be collapsed across implementations.
- Within an aggregation group, a single, consistent comparator group must be identified for all implementations of the AEDT to be able to produce interpretable aggregate impact ratios.
- Two factors are balanced when determining the aggregation comparator group: 1) selection rate and 2) statistical coverage. The comparator has the highest selection rate amongst those demographic groups with sufficient statistical coverage across implementations.<sup>3</sup>
- For all viable implementations analyzed in the aggregation group, aggregated values are calculated using recommended professional practices.<sup>4, 5</sup>

## Results Tables

Aggregated results are presented in tables, each of which provides an indication of the demographic group (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, or both), the aggregated number of applicants that comprise the demographic group, the aggregated selection rate for the demographic group, and the aggregated NYC law impact ratio. In each analysis table, the comparator group is identified. Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.

Finally, as specified by NYC for this law, each table contains a footnote specifying the number of applicants from the viable implementations analyzed for an aggregation group for whom demographic information is unavailable. Each page containing report tables also provides additional notes for the reader to bear in mind when viewing the results.

<sup>1</sup> A number of the requirements specific to NYC Local Law 144 are not aligned to contemporary adverse impact analysis practices (e.g., Morris and Dunleavy, Adverse impact analysis: Understanding data, statistics, and risk, 2017). However, these analyses were conducted as stipulated by NYC for the sole purpose of meeting the specific requirements of Local Law 144.

<sup>2</sup> Due to this balancing of factors, there may be some instances where aggregated impact ratios reported in a table will exceed 1.0.

<sup>3</sup> Selection rates and impact ratios calculated for the tables in this report are based on the thresholds between tiers. This may or may not reflect employer-specific operational use of the AEDT with respect to making selection process decisions.

<sup>4</sup> Sufficient data for a demographic group to be analyzed for an implementation requires that group comprise at least two-percent of the sample, and that there be at least three applicants above the threshold and three applicants below the threshold in the demographic group.

<sup>5</sup> When aggregating the number of applicants, results from each implementation in the aggregation group are summed; when aggregating the selection rate, results from each implementation are averaged; when aggregating the impact ratio, results from each implementation analysis must first be converted to a natural logarithm, averaged, and then exponentiated to yield the average ratio value.

## HireVue Aggregate “Bias Audit” Analysis for Drive for Results and Initiative for All jobs

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for Gender

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Male	15,759	0.70	1.00		15,779	0.38	Comparator Group
Female	11,884	0.71	Comparator Group		11,891	0.36	0.94

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 1,053 applicants with unknown or missing gender information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 1,053 applicants with unknown or missing gender information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Hispanic or Latino	4,449	0.65	1.00		4,449	0.36	0.92
White	8,516	0.68	0.96		8,528	0.32	0.79
Black or African American	5,112	0.70	1.00		5,126	0.42	1.03
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Asian	7,731	0.70	Comparator Group		7,764	0.42	Comparator Group
Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Two or More Races	846	0.68	1.01		863	0.36	0.94

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 1,490 applicants with unknown or missing race information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 1,779 applicants with unknown or missing race information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.

## HireVue Aggregate “Bias Audit” Analysis for Drive for Results and Initiative for All jobs

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for the Combination of Gender and Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Male Hispanic or Latino	2,120	0.63	0.97		2,134	0.40	1.04
Male White	4,834	0.63	0.91		4,849	0.31	0.80
Male Black or African American	2,525	0.68	0.96		2,525	0.38	1.00
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Male Asian	4,879	0.70	1.00		4,886	0.40	Comparator Group
Male Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Male Two or More Races	208	0.69	0.86		219	0.33	0.76
Female Hispanic or Latino	2,246	0.65	0.99		2,246	0.36	0.96
Female White	3,520	0.66	0.95		3,520	0.33	0.81
Female Black or African American	2,357	0.70	1.03		2,357	0.41	1.04
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Female Asian	2,700	0.70	Comparator Group		2,700	0.37	0.96
Female Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Female Two or More Races	186	0.67	0.96		180	0.43	1.34

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 1,884 applicants with unknown or missing gender and race information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 1,888 applicants with unknown or missing gender and race information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.



# **New York City Local Law 144 “Bias Audit” for HireVue for Personality - Agreeableness for All jobs**

## **Conducted by DCI Consulting Group (DCI)**

### **Analysis Information**

- Summary produced on: July 5, 2025
- Data analyzed were based on nationwide applicants who were assessed between June 1, 2024 to June 1, 2025
- The assessment assigns applicants to one of three tiers (i.e., Bottom Tier, Middle Tier, Top Tier), yielding 2 threshold comparisons for analysis (i.e., the threshold between Top/Middle Tier and Bottom Tier and the threshold between Top Tier and Middle/Bottom Tier)

### **Purpose**

The “bias audit” reported here is consistent with the use case wherein historical data from multiple employers using the same automated employment decision tool (AEDT) are used as the basis of the audit. This audit and report address the requirements of the New York City (NYC) Local Law 144 that regulates the use of AEDTs in accordance with the final rules published by the NYC Department of Consumer and Worker Protection (DCWP) on April 6, 2023.

### **About DCI Consulting Group (DCI)**

DCI is a human resources consulting firm headquartered in Washington, D.C. Since 2001, DCI has provided expert solutions to hundreds of organizations on complex issues, with particular emphasis on equal employment opportunity analytics, employee selection and assessment, independent third-party reviews, and litigation support work. DCI’s team of Industrial/Organizational Psychologists and Labor Economists are recognized for their applied experience in complex quantitative analytics, adverse impact measurement, pay equity, job analysis, validation research and job-relatedness evaluations, and routinely perform work in the context of affirmative action plans under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor’s Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs compliance evaluations, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission systemic investigations, and expert witness work on matters related to Title VII, Executive Order 11246, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

### **“Bias Audit” Analysis Methodology<sup>1</sup>**

The analyses conducted for this audit are based on data from multiple employers using the AEDT in one or more different implementations as part of their selection processes. Analyses were conducted separately for each employer’s implementation(s) (hereafter these individual, or de-aggregated, analyses will be referred to as “by implementation”) and then results were aggregated to provide the tables in this report (referred to as “aggregated”). Before describing the aggregation process, a foundational understanding of the methodology used for analysis (related to a singular implementation of the AEDT by an employer) is required. As noted in the Analysis Information above, the AEDT assigns an applicant to a tier based on their performance. NYC’s Local Law 144 and the rules published by the DCWP stipulate specific requirements for conducting the required analyses. Where the AEDT assigns applicants to tiers, an 'impact ratio' must be calculated for each demographic group for each threshold separating the tiers.<sup>2</sup> Note that NYC specifies this calculation to be the Focal Demographic Group selection rate divided by the Comparator Demographic Group selection rate. This analysis is conducted separately for each implementation of the AEDT in the dataset provided to DCI.

The law further specifies that the demographic groups need to be compared in three specific ways:

1. Gender comparison (i.e., Male, Female).
2. Race/ethnicity comparison (i.e., Hispanic or Latino, White, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, Native American or Alaska Native, Two or More Races).
3. An intersectional comparison that is the combination of gender and race/ethnicity (e.g., Hispanic or Latino Male, Hispanic or Latino Female, White Male, White Female).

The NYC law impact ratio has been defined by the DCWP's published rules and is calculated as:

$$\text{NYC Law Impact Ratio} = \frac{\text{selection rate of demographic (focal) group}}{\text{selection rate of most selected (comparator) demographic group}}$$

## Results Aggregation Methodology

For each AEDT implementation where sufficient data were available to analyze, the number of applicants, number of applicants selected, number of applicants not selected, selection rate, and impact ratio for each demographic group were calculated. These results were then aggregated to produce the tables in this report. To be able to aggregate results meaningfully across a range of implementations for the AEDT, there are a number of specific, nuanced issues that must be considered that are not required when conducting a bias audit in a singular implementation. These aggregation considerations and related decisions are as follows:

- Data were analyzed separately per implementation because the context around using the AEDT, the jobs for which they were used, the normative samples, and the composition of the specific applicant pools vary and cannot be assumed to be equivalent, nor can they be collapsed across implementations.
- Within an aggregation group, a single, consistent comparator group must be identified for all implementations of the AEDT to be able to produce interpretable aggregate impact ratios.
- Two factors are balanced when determining the aggregation comparator group: 1) selection rate and 2) statistical coverage. The comparator has the highest selection rate amongst those demographic groups with sufficient statistical coverage across implementations.<sup>3</sup>
- For all viable implementations analyzed in the aggregation group, aggregated values are calculated using recommended professional practices.<sup>4, 5</sup>

## Results Tables

Aggregated results are presented in tables, each of which provides an indication of the demographic group (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, or both), the aggregated number of applicants that comprise the demographic group, the aggregated selection rate for the demographic group, and the aggregated NYC law impact ratio. In each analysis table, the comparator group is identified. Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.

Finally, as specified by NYC for this law, each table contains a footnote specifying the number of applicants from the viable implementations analyzed for an aggregation group for whom demographic information is unavailable. Each page containing report tables also provides additional notes for the reader to bear in mind when viewing the results.

<sup>1</sup> A number of the requirements specific to NYC Local Law 144 are not aligned to contemporary adverse impact analysis practices (e.g., Morris and Dunleavy, Adverse impact analysis: Understanding data, statistics, and risk, 2017). However, these analyses were conducted as stipulated by NYC for the sole purpose of meeting the specific requirements of Local Law 144.

<sup>2</sup> Due to this balancing of factors, there may be some instances where aggregated impact ratios reported in a table will exceed 1.0.

<sup>3</sup> Selection rates and impact ratios calculated for the tables in this report are based on the thresholds between tiers. This may or may not reflect employer-specific operational use of the AEDT with respect to making selection process decisions.

<sup>4</sup> Sufficient data for a demographic group to be analyzed for an implementation requires that group comprise at least two-percent of the sample, and that there be at least three applicants above the threshold and three applicants below the threshold in the demographic group.

<sup>5</sup> When aggregating the number of applicants, results from each implementation in the aggregation group are summed; when aggregating the selection rate, results from each implementation are averaged; when aggregating the impact ratio, results from each implementation analysis must first be converted to a natural logarithm, averaged, and then exponentiated to yield the average ratio value.

## HireVue Aggregate “Bias Audit” Analysis for Personality - Agreeableness for All jobs

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for Gender

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Male	11,393	0.66	0.94		11,393	0.34	0.95
Female	8,473	0.70	Comparator Group		8,473	0.36	Comparator Group

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 502 applicants with unknown or missing gender information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 502 applicants with unknown or missing gender information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Hispanic or Latino	3,697	0.67	0.98		3,697	0.33	0.91
White	9,169	0.68	Comparator Group		9,169	0.35	0.98
Black or African American	3,578	0.61	0.88		3,578	0.33	0.92
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Asian	2,500	0.67	0.98		2,500	0.36	Comparator Group
Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Two or More Races	749	0.67	0.97		749	0.34	0.95

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 699 applicants with unknown or missing race information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 699 applicants with unknown or missing race information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.

## HireVue Aggregate “Bias Audit” Analysis for Personality - Agreeableness for All jobs

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for the Combination of Gender and Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Male Hispanic or Latino	1,617	0.64	0.91		1,617	0.34	0.92
Male White	6,180	0.66	0.93		6,180	0.35	0.93
Male Black or African American	1,497	0.62	0.86		1,497	0.30	0.82
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Male Asian	1,454	0.67	0.93		1,454	0.35	0.94
Male Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Male Two or More Races	207	0.69	0.93		207	0.32	0.83
Female Hispanic or Latino	2,034	0.69	0.98		2,034	0.33	0.91
Female White	2,884	0.72	Comparator Group		2,884	0.37	Comparator Group
Female Black or African American	1,936	0.66	0.94		1,936	0.32	0.87
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Female Asian	976	0.67	0.95		976	0.39	1.02
Female Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Female Two or More Races	180	0.73	1.00		180	0.32	0.86

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 877 applicants with unknown or missing gender and race information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 877 applicants with unknown or missing gender and race information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.

# **New York City Local Law 144 “Bias Audit” for HireVue for Personality - Conscientiousness for All jobs**

## **Conducted by DCI Consulting Group (DCI)**

### **Analysis Information**

- Summary produced on: July 5, 2025
- Data analyzed were based on nationwide applicants who were assessed between June 1, 2024 to June 1, 2025
- The assessment assigns applicants to one of three tiers (i.e., Bottom Tier, Middle Tier, Top Tier), yielding 2 threshold comparisons for analysis (i.e., the threshold between Top/Middle Tier and Bottom Tier and the threshold between Top Tier and Middle/Bottom Tier)

### **Purpose**

The “bias audit” reported here is consistent with the use case wherein historical data from multiple employers using the same automated employment decision tool (AEDT) are used as the basis of the audit. This audit and report address the requirements of the New York City (NYC) Local Law 144 that regulates the use of AEDTs in accordance with the final rules published by the NYC Department of Consumer and Worker Protection (DCWP) on April 6, 2023.

### **About DCI Consulting Group (DCI)**

DCI is a human resources consulting firm headquartered in Washington, D.C. Since 2001, DCI has provided expert solutions to hundreds of organizations on complex issues, with particular emphasis on equal employment opportunity analytics, employee selection and assessment, independent third-party reviews, and litigation support work. DCI’s team of Industrial/Organizational Psychologists and Labor Economists are recognized for their applied experience in complex quantitative analytics, adverse impact measurement, pay equity, job analysis, validation research and job-relatedness evaluations, and routinely perform work in the context of affirmative action plans under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor’s Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs compliance evaluations, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission systemic investigations, and expert witness work on matters related to Title VII, Executive Order 11246, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

### **“Bias Audit” Analysis Methodology<sup>1</sup>**

The analyses conducted for this audit are based on data from multiple employers using the AEDT in one or more different implementations as part of their selection processes. Analyses were conducted separately for each employer’s implementation(s) (hereafter these individual, or de-aggregated, analyses will be referred to as “by implementation”) and then results were aggregated to provide the tables in this report (referred to as “aggregated”). Before describing the aggregation process, a foundational understanding of the methodology used for analysis (related to a singular implementation of the AEDT by an employer) is required. As noted in the Analysis Information above, the AEDT assigns an applicant to a tier based on their performance. NYC’s Local Law 144 and the rules published by the DCWP stipulate specific requirements for conducting the required analyses. Where the AEDT assigns applicants to tiers, an 'impact ratio' must be calculated for each demographic group for each threshold separating the tiers.<sup>2</sup> Note that NYC specifies this calculation to be the Focal Demographic Group selection rate divided by the Comparator Demographic Group selection rate. This analysis is conducted separately for each implementation of the AEDT in the dataset provided to DCI.

The law further specifies that the demographic groups need to be compared in three specific ways:

1. Gender comparison (i.e., Male, Female).
2. Race/ethnicity comparison (i.e., Hispanic or Latino, White, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, Native American or Alaska Native, Two or More Races).
3. An intersectional comparison that is the combination of gender and race/ethnicity (e.g., Hispanic or Latino Male, Hispanic or Latino Female, White Male, White Female).

The NYC law impact ratio has been defined by the DCWP's published rules and is calculated as:

$$\text{NYC Law Impact Ratio} = \frac{\text{selection rate of demographic (focal) group}}{\text{selection rate of most selected (comparator) demographic group}}$$

## Results Aggregation Methodology

For each AEDT implementation where sufficient data were available to analyze, the number of applicants, number of applicants selected, number of applicants not selected, selection rate, and impact ratio for each demographic group were calculated. These results were then aggregated to produce the tables in this report. To be able to aggregate results meaningfully across a range of implementations for the AEDT, there are a number of specific, nuanced issues that must be considered that are not required when conducting a bias audit in a singular implementation. These aggregation considerations and related decisions are as follows:

- Data were analyzed separately per implementation because the context around using the AEDT, the jobs for which they were used, the normative samples, and the composition of the specific applicant pools vary and cannot be assumed to be equivalent, nor can they be collapsed across implementations.
- Within an aggregation group, a single, consistent comparator group must be identified for all implementations of the AEDT to be able to produce interpretable aggregate impact ratios.
- Two factors are balanced when determining the aggregation comparator group: 1) selection rate and 2) statistical coverage. The comparator has the highest selection rate amongst those demographic groups with sufficient statistical coverage across implementations.<sup>3</sup>
- For all viable implementations analyzed in the aggregation group, aggregated values are calculated using recommended professional practices.<sup>4, 5</sup>

## Results Tables

Aggregated results are presented in tables, each of which provides an indication of the demographic group (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, or both), the aggregated number of applicants that comprise the demographic group, the aggregated selection rate for the demographic group, and the aggregated NYC law impact ratio. In each analysis table, the comparator group is identified. Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.

Finally, as specified by NYC for this law, each table contains a footnote specifying the number of applicants from the viable implementations analyzed for an aggregation group for whom demographic information is unavailable. Each page containing report tables also provides additional notes for the reader to bear in mind when viewing the results.

<sup>1</sup> A number of the requirements specific to NYC Local Law 144 are not aligned to contemporary adverse impact analysis practices (e.g., Morris and Dunleavy, Adverse impact analysis: Understanding data, statistics, and risk, 2017). However, these analyses were conducted as stipulated by NYC for the sole purpose of meeting the specific requirements of Local Law 144.

<sup>2</sup> Due to this balancing of factors, there may be some instances where aggregated impact ratios reported in a table will exceed 1.0.

<sup>3</sup> Selection rates and impact ratios calculated for the tables in this report are based on the thresholds between tiers. This may or may not reflect employer-specific operational use of the AEDT with respect to making selection process decisions.

<sup>4</sup> Sufficient data for a demographic group to be analyzed for an implementation requires that group comprise at least two-percent of the sample, and that there be at least three applicants above the threshold and three applicants below the threshold in the demographic group.

<sup>5</sup> When aggregating the number of applicants, results from each implementation in the aggregation group are summed; when aggregating the selection rate, results from each implementation are averaged; when aggregating the impact ratio, results from each implementation analysis must first be converted to a natural logarithm, averaged, and then exponentiated to yield the average ratio value.

## HireVue Aggregate “Bias Audit” Analysis for Personality - Conscientiousness for All jobs

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for Gender

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Male	24,804	0.67	0.99		24,804	0.34	Comparator Group
Female	12,547	0.68	Comparator Group		12,547	0.33	0.98

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 1,688 applicants with unknown or missing gender information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 1,688 applicants with unknown or missing gender information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Hispanic or Latino	6,406	0.70	0.98		6,406	0.36	0.94
White	15,774	0.68	0.98		15,774	0.35	0.95
Black or African American	6,850	0.65	0.92		6,850	0.30	0.80
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Asian	6,385	0.62	0.88		6,385	0.28	0.77
Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Two or More Races	1,470	0.70	Comparator Group		1,470	0.37	Comparator Group

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 1,954 applicants with unknown or missing race information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 1,954 applicants with unknown or missing race information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.

## HireVue Aggregate “Bias Audit” Analysis for Personality - Conscientiousness for All jobs

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for the Combination of Gender and Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Male Hispanic or Latino	2,715	0.67	0.97		3,756	0.35	0.95
Male White	11,212	0.68	0.99		11,519	0.35	Comparator Group
Male Black or African American	2,953	0.63	0.92		3,961	0.31	0.86
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Male Asian	3,875	0.59	0.88		3,975	0.28	0.80
Male Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Male Two or More Races	600	0.68	1.00		742	0.38	1.00
Female Hispanic or Latino	2,276	0.69	1.00		2,545	0.34	0.98
Female White	4,000	0.68	Comparator Group		4,000	0.33	0.94
Female Black or African American	2,286	0.66	0.96		2,591	0.32	0.86
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Female Asian	2,249	0.59	0.86		2,249	0.26	0.80
Female Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Female Two or More Races	221	0.70	1.01		221	0.34	0.96

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 2,363 applicants with unknown or missing gender and race information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 2,553 applicants with unknown or missing gender and race information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.



# **New York City Local Law 144 “Bias Audit” for HireVue for Personality - Emotional Stability for All jobs**

## **Conducted by DCI Consulting Group (DCI)**

### **Analysis Information**

- Summary produced on: July 5, 2025
- Data analyzed were based on nationwide applicants who were assessed between June 1, 2024 to June 1, 2025
- The assessment assigns applicants to one of three tiers (i.e., Bottom Tier, Middle Tier, Top Tier), yielding 2 threshold comparisons for analysis (i.e., the threshold between Top/Middle Tier and Bottom Tier and the threshold between Top Tier and Middle/Bottom Tier)

### **Purpose**

The “bias audit” reported here is consistent with the use case wherein historical data from multiple employers using the same automated employment decision tool (AEDT) are used as the basis of the audit. This audit and report address the requirements of the New York City (NYC) Local Law 144 that regulates the use of AEDTs in accordance with the final rules published by the NYC Department of Consumer and Worker Protection (DCWP) on April 6, 2023.

### **About DCI Consulting Group (DCI)**

DCI is a human resources consulting firm headquartered in Washington, D.C. Since 2001, DCI has provided expert solutions to hundreds of organizations on complex issues, with particular emphasis on equal employment opportunity analytics, employee selection and assessment, independent third-party reviews, and litigation support work. DCI’s team of Industrial/Organizational Psychologists and Labor Economists are recognized for their applied experience in complex quantitative analytics, adverse impact measurement, pay equity, job analysis, validation research and job-relatedness evaluations, and routinely perform work in the context of affirmative action plans under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor’s Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs compliance evaluations, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission systemic investigations, and expert witness work on matters related to Title VII, Executive Order 11246, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

### **“Bias Audit” Analysis Methodology<sup>1</sup>**

The analyses conducted for this audit are based on data from multiple employers using the AEDT in one or more different implementations as part of their selection processes. Analyses were conducted separately for each employer’s implementation(s) (hereafter these individual, or de-aggregated, analyses will be referred to as “by implementation”) and then results were aggregated to provide the tables in this report (referred to as “aggregated”). Before describing the aggregation process, a foundational understanding of the methodology used for analysis (related to a singular implementation of the AEDT by an employer) is required. As noted in the Analysis Information above, the AEDT assigns an applicant to a tier based on their performance. NYC’s Local Law 144 and the rules published by the DCWP stipulate specific requirements for conducting the required analyses. Where the AEDT assigns applicants to tiers, an 'impact ratio' must be calculated for each demographic group for each threshold separating the tiers.<sup>2</sup> Note that NYC specifies this calculation to be the Focal Demographic Group selection rate divided by the Comparator Demographic Group selection rate. This analysis is conducted separately for each implementation of the AEDT in the dataset provided to DCI.

The law further specifies that the demographic groups need to be compared in three specific ways:

1. Gender comparison (i.e., Male, Female).
2. Race/ethnicity comparison (i.e., Hispanic or Latino, White, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, Native American or Alaska Native, Two or More Races).
3. An intersectional comparison that is the combination of gender and race/ethnicity (e.g., Hispanic or Latino Male, Hispanic or Latino Female, White Male, White Female).

The NYC law impact ratio has been defined by the DCWP's published rules and is calculated as:

$$\text{NYC Law Impact Ratio} = \frac{\text{selection rate of demographic (focal) group}}{\text{selection rate of most selected (comparator) demographic group}}$$

## Results Aggregation Methodology

For each AEDT implementation where sufficient data were available to analyze, the number of applicants, number of applicants selected, number of applicants not selected, selection rate, and impact ratio for each demographic group were calculated. These results were then aggregated to produce the tables in this report. To be able to aggregate results meaningfully across a range of implementations for the AEDT, there are a number of specific, nuanced issues that must be considered that are not required when conducting a bias audit in a singular implementation. These aggregation considerations and related decisions are as follows:

- Data were analyzed separately per implementation because the context around using the AEDT, the jobs for which they were used, the normative samples, and the composition of the specific applicant pools vary and cannot be assumed to be equivalent, nor can they be collapsed across implementations.
- Within an aggregation group, a single, consistent comparator group must be identified for all implementations of the AEDT to be able to produce interpretable aggregate impact ratios.
- Two factors are balanced when determining the aggregation comparator group: 1) selection rate and 2) statistical coverage. The comparator has the highest selection rate amongst those demographic groups with sufficient statistical coverage across implementations.<sup>3</sup>
- For all viable implementations analyzed in the aggregation group, aggregated values are calculated using recommended professional practices.<sup>4, 5</sup>

## Results Tables

Aggregated results are presented in tables, each of which provides an indication of the demographic group (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, or both), the aggregated number of applicants that comprise the demographic group, the aggregated selection rate for the demographic group, and the aggregated NYC law impact ratio. In each analysis table, the comparator group is identified. Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.

Finally, as specified by NYC for this law, each table contains a footnote specifying the number of applicants from the viable implementations analyzed for an aggregation group for whom demographic information is unavailable. Each page containing report tables also provides additional notes for the reader to bear in mind when viewing the results.

<sup>1</sup> A number of the requirements specific to NYC Local Law 144 are not aligned to contemporary adverse impact analysis practices (e.g., Morris and Dunleavy, Adverse impact analysis: Understanding data, statistics, and risk, 2017). However, these analyses were conducted as stipulated by NYC for the sole purpose of meeting the specific requirements of Local Law 144.

<sup>2</sup> Due to this balancing of factors, there may be some instances where aggregated impact ratios reported in a table will exceed 1.0.

<sup>3</sup> Selection rates and impact ratios calculated for the tables in this report are based on the thresholds between tiers. This may or may not reflect employer-specific operational use of the AEDT with respect to making selection process decisions.

<sup>4</sup> Sufficient data for a demographic group to be analyzed for an implementation requires that group comprise at least two-percent of the sample, and that there be at least three applicants above the threshold and three applicants below the threshold in the demographic group.

<sup>5</sup> When aggregating the number of applicants, results from each implementation in the aggregation group are summed; when aggregating the selection rate, results from each implementation are averaged; when aggregating the impact ratio, results from each implementation analysis must first be converted to a natural logarithm, averaged, and then exponentiated to yield the average ratio value.

## HireVue Aggregate “Bias Audit” Analysis for Personality - Emotional Stability for All jobs

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for Gender

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Male	11,393	0.68	Comparator Group		11,393	0.35	Comparator Group
Female	8,473	0.64	0.94		8,473	0.33	0.91

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 502 applicants with unknown or missing gender information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 502 applicants with unknown or missing gender information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Hispanic or Latino	3,697	0.69	0.98		3,697	0.35	0.87
White	9,149	0.65	0.93		9,149	0.32	0.86
Black or African American	3,571	0.70	Comparator Group		3,571	0.37	Comparator Group
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Asian	2,476	0.70	1.01		2,476	0.38	1.01
Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Two or More Races	749	0.69	0.99		749	0.35	0.94

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 632 applicants with unknown or missing race information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 632 applicants with unknown or missing race information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.

## HireVue Aggregate “Bias Audit” Analysis for Personality - Emotional Stability for All jobs

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for the Combination of Gender and Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Male Hispanic or Latino	1,617	0.72	0.97		1,617	0.38	0.92
Male White	6,180	0.66	0.93		6,180	0.34	0.90
Male Black or African American	1,497	0.71	Comparator Group		1,497	0.38	Comparator Group
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Male Asian	1,454	0.71	0.99		1,454	0.38	1.00
Male Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Male Two or More Races	207	0.64	0.97		207	0.32	1.05
Female Hispanic or Latino	2,034	0.68	0.92		2,034	0.35	0.81
Female White	2,884	0.62	0.86		2,884	0.31	0.79
Female Black or African American	1,936	0.69	0.93		1,936	0.40	0.94
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Female Asian	976	0.71	0.95		976	0.39	0.93
Female Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Female Two or More Races	180	0.68	0.91		180	0.33	0.76

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 877 applicants with unknown or missing gender and race information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 877 applicants with unknown or missing gender and race information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.

# **New York City Local Law 144 “Bias Audit” for HireVue for Personality - Extraversion for All jobs**

## **Conducted by DCI Consulting Group (DCI)**

### **Analysis Information**

- Summary produced on: July 5, 2025
- Data analyzed were based on nationwide applicants who were assessed between June 1, 2024 to June 1, 2025
- The assessment assigns applicants to one of three tiers (i.e., Bottom Tier, Middle Tier, Top Tier), yielding 2 threshold comparisons for analysis (i.e., the threshold between Top/Middle Tier and Bottom Tier and the threshold between Top Tier and Middle/Bottom Tier)

### **Purpose**

The “bias audit” reported here is consistent with the use case wherein historical data from multiple employers using the same automated employment decision tool (AEDT) are used as the basis of the audit. This audit and report address the requirements of the New York City (NYC) Local Law 144 that regulates the use of AEDTs in accordance with the final rules published by the NYC Department of Consumer and Worker Protection (DCWP) on April 6, 2023.

### **About DCI Consulting Group (DCI)**

DCI is a human resources consulting firm headquartered in Washington, D.C. Since 2001, DCI has provided expert solutions to hundreds of organizations on complex issues, with particular emphasis on equal employment opportunity analytics, employee selection and assessment, independent third-party reviews, and litigation support work. DCI’s team of Industrial/Organizational Psychologists and Labor Economists are recognized for their applied experience in complex quantitative analytics, adverse impact measurement, pay equity, job analysis, validation research and job-relatedness evaluations, and routinely perform work in the context of affirmative action plans under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor’s Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs compliance evaluations, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission systemic investigations, and expert witness work on matters related to Title VII, Executive Order 11246, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

### **“Bias Audit” Analysis Methodology<sup>1</sup>**

The analyses conducted for this audit are based on data from multiple employers using the AEDT in one or more different implementations as part of their selection processes. Analyses were conducted separately for each employer’s implementation(s) (hereafter these individual, or de-aggregated, analyses will be referred to as “by implementation”) and then results were aggregated to provide the tables in this report (referred to as “aggregated”). Before describing the aggregation process, a foundational understanding of the methodology used for analysis (related to a singular implementation of the AEDT by an employer) is required. As noted in the Analysis Information above, the AEDT assigns an applicant to a tier based on their performance. NYC’s Local Law 144 and the rules published by the DCWP stipulate specific requirements for conducting the required analyses. Where the AEDT assigns applicants to tiers, an 'impact ratio' must be calculated for each demographic group for each threshold separating the tiers.<sup>2</sup> Note that NYC specifies this calculation to be the Focal Demographic Group selection rate divided by the Comparator Demographic Group selection rate. This analysis is conducted separately for each implementation of the AEDT in the dataset provided to DCI.

The law further specifies that the demographic groups need to be compared in three specific ways:

1. Gender comparison (i.e., Male, Female).
2. Race/ethnicity comparison (i.e., Hispanic or Latino, White, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, Native American or Alaska Native, Two or More Races).
3. An intersectional comparison that is the combination of gender and race/ethnicity (e.g., Hispanic or Latino Male, Hispanic or Latino Female, White Male, White Female).

The NYC law impact ratio has been defined by the DCWP's published rules and is calculated as:

$$\text{NYC Law Impact Ratio} = \frac{\text{selection rate of demographic (focal) group}}{\text{selection rate of most selected (comparator) demographic group}}$$

## Results Aggregation Methodology

For each AEDT implementation where sufficient data were available to analyze, the number of applicants, number of applicants selected, number of applicants not selected, selection rate, and impact ratio for each demographic group were calculated. These results were then aggregated to produce the tables in this report. To be able to aggregate results meaningfully across a range of implementations for the AEDT, there are a number of specific, nuanced issues that must be considered that are not required when conducting a bias audit in a singular implementation. These aggregation considerations and related decisions are as follows:

- Data were analyzed separately per implementation because the context around using the AEDT, the jobs for which they were used, the normative samples, and the composition of the specific applicant pools vary and cannot be assumed to be equivalent, nor can they be collapsed across implementations.
- Within an aggregation group, a single, consistent comparator group must be identified for all implementations of the AEDT to be able to produce interpretable aggregate impact ratios.
- Two factors are balanced when determining the aggregation comparator group: 1) selection rate and 2) statistical coverage. The comparator has the highest selection rate amongst those demographic groups with sufficient statistical coverage across implementations.<sup>3</sup>
- For all viable implementations analyzed in the aggregation group, aggregated values are calculated using recommended professional practices.<sup>4, 5</sup>

## Results Tables

Aggregated results are presented in tables, each of which provides an indication of the demographic group (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, or both), the aggregated number of applicants that comprise the demographic group, the aggregated selection rate for the demographic group, and the aggregated NYC law impact ratio. In each analysis table, the comparator group is identified. Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.

Finally, as specified by NYC for this law, each table contains a footnote specifying the number of applicants from the viable implementations analyzed for an aggregation group for whom demographic information is unavailable. Each page containing report tables also provides additional notes for the reader to bear in mind when viewing the results.

<sup>1</sup> A number of the requirements specific to NYC Local Law 144 are not aligned to contemporary adverse impact analysis practices (e.g., Morris and Dunleavy, Adverse impact analysis: Understanding data, statistics, and risk, 2017). However, these analyses were conducted as stipulated by NYC for the sole purpose of meeting the specific requirements of Local Law 144.

<sup>2</sup> Due to this balancing of factors, there may be some instances where aggregated impact ratios reported in a table will exceed 1.0.

<sup>3</sup> Selection rates and impact ratios calculated for the tables in this report are based on the thresholds between tiers. This may or may not reflect employer-specific operational use of the AEDT with respect to making selection process decisions.

<sup>4</sup> Sufficient data for a demographic group to be analyzed for an implementation requires that group comprise at least two-percent of the sample, and that there be at least three applicants above the threshold and three applicants below the threshold in the demographic group.

<sup>5</sup> When aggregating the number of applicants, results from each implementation in the aggregation group are summed; when aggregating the selection rate, results from each implementation are averaged; when aggregating the impact ratio, results from each implementation analysis must first be converted to a natural logarithm, averaged, and then exponentiated to yield the average ratio value.

## HireVue Aggregate “Bias Audit” Analysis for Personality - Extraversion for All jobs

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for Gender

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Male	11,393	0.71	Comparator Group		11,393	0.37	Comparator Group
Female	8,473	0.64	0.90		8,473	0.32	0.85

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 502 applicants with unknown or missing gender information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 502 applicants with unknown or missing gender information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Hispanic or Latino	3,697	0.65	0.94		3,697	0.31	0.85
White	9,169	0.70	1.00		9,169	0.38	Comparator Group
Black or African American	3,571	0.63	0.91		3,578	0.32	0.83
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Asian	2,500	0.70	Comparator Group		2,500	0.36	0.94
Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Two or More Races	749	0.65	0.93		749	0.31	0.77

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 699 applicants with unknown or missing race information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 699 applicants with unknown or missing race information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.

## HireVue Aggregate “Bias Audit” Analysis for Personality - Extraversion for All jobs

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for the Combination of Gender and Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Male Hispanic or Latino	1,617	0.68	0.93		1,617	0.35	0.94
Male White	6,198	0.72	0.98		6,198	0.39	Comparator Group
Male Black or African American	1,497	0.69	0.95		1,504	0.35	0.90
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Male Asian	1,476	0.73	Comparator Group		1,476	0.39	1.01
Male Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Male Two or More Races	207	0.75	1.05		207	0.38	0.89
Female Hispanic or Latino	2,034	0.62	0.85		2,034	0.28	0.74
Female White	2,884	0.66	0.91		2,884	0.36	0.91
Female Black or African American	1,936	0.56	0.76		1,936	0.25	0.65
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Female Asian	976	0.66	0.91		976	0.30	0.77
Female Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Female Two or More Races	180	0.66	0.87		180	0.37	0.83

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 945 applicants with unknown or missing gender and race information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 945 applicants with unknown or missing gender and race information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.



# **New York City Local Law 144 “Bias Audit” for HireVue for Personality - Openness for All jobs**

## **Conducted by DCI Consulting Group (DCI)**

### **Analysis Information**

- Summary produced on: July 5, 2025
- Data analyzed were based on nationwide applicants who were assessed between June 1, 2024 to June 1, 2025
- The assessment assigns applicants to one of three tiers (i.e., Bottom Tier, Middle Tier, Top Tier), yielding 2 threshold comparisons for analysis (i.e., the threshold between Top/Middle Tier and Bottom Tier and the threshold between Top Tier and Middle/Bottom Tier)

### **Purpose**

The “bias audit” reported here is consistent with the use case wherein historical data from multiple employers using the same automated employment decision tool (AEDT) are used as the basis of the audit. This audit and report address the requirements of the New York City (NYC) Local Law 144 that regulates the use of AEDTs in accordance with the final rules published by the NYC Department of Consumer and Worker Protection (DCWP) on April 6, 2023.

### **About DCI Consulting Group (DCI)**

DCI is a human resources consulting firm headquartered in Washington, D.C. Since 2001, DCI has provided expert solutions to hundreds of organizations on complex issues, with particular emphasis on equal employment opportunity analytics, employee selection and assessment, independent third-party reviews, and litigation support work. DCI’s team of Industrial/Organizational Psychologists and Labor Economists are recognized for their applied experience in complex quantitative analytics, adverse impact measurement, pay equity, job analysis, validation research and job-relatedness evaluations, and routinely perform work in the context of affirmative action plans under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor’s Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs compliance evaluations, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission systemic investigations, and expert witness work on matters related to Title VII, Executive Order 11246, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

### **“Bias Audit” Analysis Methodology<sup>1</sup>**

The analyses conducted for this audit are based on data from multiple employers using the AEDT in one or more different implementations as part of their selection processes. Analyses were conducted separately for each employer’s implementation(s) (hereafter these individual, or de-aggregated, analyses will be referred to as “by implementation”) and then results were aggregated to provide the tables in this report (referred to as “aggregated”). Before describing the aggregation process, a foundational understanding of the methodology used for analysis (related to a singular implementation of the AEDT by an employer) is required. As noted in the Analysis Information above, the AEDT assigns an applicant to a tier based on their performance. NYC’s Local Law 144 and the rules published by the DCWP stipulate specific requirements for conducting the required analyses. Where the AEDT assigns applicants to tiers, an 'impact ratio' must be calculated for each demographic group for each threshold separating the tiers.<sup>2</sup> Note that NYC specifies this calculation to be the Focal Demographic Group selection rate divided by the Comparator Demographic Group selection rate. This analysis is conducted separately for each implementation of the AEDT in the dataset provided to DCI.

The law further specifies that the demographic groups need to be compared in three specific ways:

1. Gender comparison (i.e., Male, Female).
2. Race/ethnicity comparison (i.e., Hispanic or Latino, White, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, Native American or Alaska Native, Two or More Races).
3. An intersectional comparison that is the combination of gender and race/ethnicity (e.g., Hispanic or Latino Male, Hispanic or Latino Female, White Male, White Female).

The NYC law impact ratio has been defined by the DCWP's published rules and is calculated as:

$$\text{NYC Law Impact Ratio} = \frac{\text{selection rate of demographic (focal) group}}{\text{selection rate of most selected (comparator) demographic group}}$$

## Results Aggregation Methodology

For each AEDT implementation where sufficient data were available to analyze, the number of applicants, number of applicants selected, number of applicants not selected, selection rate, and impact ratio for each demographic group were calculated. These results were then aggregated to produce the tables in this report. To be able to aggregate results meaningfully across a range of implementations for the AEDT, there are a number of specific, nuanced issues that must be considered that are not required when conducting a bias audit in a singular implementation. These aggregation considerations and related decisions are as follows:

- Data were analyzed separately per implementation because the context around using the AEDT, the jobs for which they were used, the normative samples, and the composition of the specific applicant pools vary and cannot be assumed to be equivalent, nor can they be collapsed across implementations.
- Within an aggregation group, a single, consistent comparator group must be identified for all implementations of the AEDT to be able to produce interpretable aggregate impact ratios.
- Two factors are balanced when determining the aggregation comparator group: 1) selection rate and 2) statistical coverage. The comparator has the highest selection rate amongst those demographic groups with sufficient statistical coverage across implementations.<sup>3</sup>
- For all viable implementations analyzed in the aggregation group, aggregated values are calculated using recommended professional practices.<sup>4, 5</sup>

## Results Tables

Aggregated results are presented in tables, each of which provides an indication of the demographic group (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, or both), the aggregated number of applicants that comprise the demographic group, the aggregated selection rate for the demographic group, and the aggregated NYC law impact ratio. In each analysis table, the comparator group is identified. Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.

Finally, as specified by NYC for this law, each table contains a footnote specifying the number of applicants from the viable implementations analyzed for an aggregation group for whom demographic information is unavailable. Each page containing report tables also provides additional notes for the reader to bear in mind when viewing the results.

<sup>1</sup> A number of the requirements specific to NYC Local Law 144 are not aligned to contemporary adverse impact analysis practices (e.g., Morris and Dunleavy, Adverse impact analysis: Understanding data, statistics, and risk, 2017). However, these analyses were conducted as stipulated by NYC for the sole purpose of meeting the specific requirements of Local Law 144.

<sup>2</sup> Due to this balancing of factors, there may be some instances where aggregated impact ratios reported in a table will exceed 1.0.

<sup>3</sup> Selection rates and impact ratios calculated for the tables in this report are based on the thresholds between tiers. This may or may not reflect employer-specific operational use of the AEDT with respect to making selection process decisions.

<sup>4</sup> Sufficient data for a demographic group to be analyzed for an implementation requires that group comprise at least two-percent of the sample, and that there be at least three applicants above the threshold and three applicants below the threshold in the demographic group.

<sup>5</sup> When aggregating the number of applicants, results from each implementation in the aggregation group are summed; when aggregating the selection rate, results from each implementation are averaged; when aggregating the impact ratio, results from each implementation analysis must first be converted to a natural logarithm, averaged, and then exponentiated to yield the average ratio value.

## HireVue Aggregate “Bias Audit” Analysis for Personality - Openness for All jobs

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for Gender

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Male	11,393	0.65	0.91		11,393	0.33	0.87
Female	8,473	0.72	Comparator Group		8,473	0.39	Comparator Group

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 502 applicants with unknown or missing gender information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 502 applicants with unknown or missing gender information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Hispanic or Latino	3,697	0.67	0.93		3,697	0.33	1.05
White	9,149	0.68	0.95		9,169	0.37	1.01
Black or African American	3,571	0.68	0.96		3,571	0.36	1.04
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Asian	2,476	0.67	0.94		2,500	0.38	Comparator Group
Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Two or More Races	749	0.71	Comparator Group		749	0.37	1.07

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 632 applicants with unknown or missing race information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 699 applicants with unknown or missing race information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.

## HireVue Aggregate “Bias Audit” Analysis for Personality - Openness for All jobs

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for the Combination of Gender and Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Male Hispanic or Latino	1,617	0.67	0.96		1,617	0.34	0.89
Male White	6,180	0.65	0.90		6,180	0.33	0.83
Male Black or African American	1,497	0.66	0.91		1,497	0.34	0.83
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Male Asian	1,454	0.65	0.90		1,454	0.33	0.82
Male Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Male Two or More Races	207	0.68	0.85		207	0.37	0.79
Female Hispanic or Latino	2,034	0.68	0.98		2,034	0.33	0.85
Female White	2,884	0.73	Comparator Group		2,884	0.41	Comparator Group
Female Black or African American	1,936	0.71	1.03		1,936	0.36	0.93
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Female Asian	976	0.69	0.97		976	0.35	0.87
Female Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Female Two or More Races	180	0.74	1.03		180	0.35	0.88

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 877 applicants with unknown or missing gender and race information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 877 applicants with unknown or missing gender and race information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.

# **New York City Local Law 144 “Bias Audit” for HireVue for Problem Solving for All jobs**

## **Conducted by DCI Consulting Group (DCI)**

### **Analysis Information**

- Summary produced on: July 5, 2025
- Data analyzed were based on nationwide applicants who were assessed between June 1, 2024 to June 1, 2025
- The assessment assigns applicants to one of three tiers (i.e., Bottom Tier, Middle Tier, Top Tier), yielding 2 threshold comparisons for analysis (i.e., the threshold between Top/Middle Tier and Bottom Tier and the threshold between Top Tier and Middle/Bottom Tier)

### **Purpose**

The “bias audit” reported here is consistent with the use case wherein historical data from multiple employers using the same automated employment decision tool (AEDT) are used as the basis of the audit. This audit and report address the requirements of the New York City (NYC) Local Law 144 that regulates the use of AEDTs in accordance with the final rules published by the NYC Department of Consumer and Worker Protection (DCWP) on April 6, 2023.

### **About DCI Consulting Group (DCI)**

DCI is a human resources consulting firm headquartered in Washington, D.C. Since 2001, DCI has provided expert solutions to hundreds of organizations on complex issues, with particular emphasis on equal employment opportunity analytics, employee selection and assessment, independent third-party reviews, and litigation support work. DCI’s team of Industrial/Organizational Psychologists and Labor Economists are recognized for their applied experience in complex quantitative analytics, adverse impact measurement, pay equity, job analysis, validation research and job-relatedness evaluations, and routinely perform work in the context of affirmative action plans under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor’s Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs compliance evaluations, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission systemic investigations, and expert witness work on matters related to Title VII, Executive Order 11246, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

### **“Bias Audit” Analysis Methodology<sup>1</sup>**

The analyses conducted for this audit are based on data from multiple employers using the AEDT in one or more different implementations as part of their selection processes. Analyses were conducted separately for each employer’s implementation(s) (hereafter these individual, or de-aggregated, analyses will be referred to as “by implementation”) and then results were aggregated to provide the tables in this report (referred to as “aggregated”). Before describing the aggregation process, a foundational understanding of the methodology used for analysis (related to a singular implementation of the AEDT by an employer) is required. As noted in the Analysis Information above, the AEDT assigns an applicant to a tier based on their performance. NYC’s Local Law 144 and the rules published by the DCWP stipulate specific requirements for conducting the required analyses. Where the AEDT assigns applicants to tiers, an 'impact ratio' must be calculated for each demographic group for each threshold separating the tiers.<sup>2</sup> Note that NYC specifies this calculation to be the Focal Demographic Group selection rate divided by the Comparator Demographic Group selection rate. This analysis is conducted separately for each implementation of the AEDT in the dataset provided to DCI.

The law further specifies that the demographic groups need to be compared in three specific ways:

1. Gender comparison (i.e., Male, Female).
2. Race/ethnicity comparison (i.e., Hispanic or Latino, White, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, Native American or Alaska Native, Two or More Races).
3. An intersectional comparison that is the combination of gender and race/ethnicity (e.g., Hispanic or Latino Male, Hispanic or Latino Female, White Male, White Female).

The NYC law impact ratio has been defined by the DCWP's published rules and is calculated as:

$$\text{NYC Law Impact Ratio} = \frac{\text{selection rate of demographic (focal) group}}{\text{selection rate of most selected (comparator) demographic group}}$$

## Results Aggregation Methodology

For each AEDT implementation where sufficient data were available to analyze, the number of applicants, number of applicants selected, number of applicants not selected, selection rate, and impact ratio for each demographic group were calculated. These results were then aggregated to produce the tables in this report. To be able to aggregate results meaningfully across a range of implementations for the AEDT, there are a number of specific, nuanced issues that must be considered that are not required when conducting a bias audit in a singular implementation. These aggregation considerations and related decisions are as follows:

- Data were analyzed separately per implementation because the context around using the AEDT, the jobs for which they were used, the normative samples, and the composition of the specific applicant pools vary and cannot be assumed to be equivalent, nor can they be collapsed across implementations.
- Within an aggregation group, a single, consistent comparator group must be identified for all implementations of the AEDT to be able to produce interpretable aggregate impact ratios.
- Two factors are balanced when determining the aggregation comparator group: 1) selection rate and 2) statistical coverage. The comparator has the highest selection rate amongst those demographic groups with sufficient statistical coverage across implementations.<sup>3</sup>
- For all viable implementations analyzed in the aggregation group, aggregated values are calculated using recommended professional practices.<sup>4, 5</sup>

## Results Tables

Aggregated results are presented in tables, each of which provides an indication of the demographic group (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, or both), the aggregated number of applicants that comprise the demographic group, the aggregated selection rate for the demographic group, and the aggregated NYC law impact ratio. In each analysis table, the comparator group is identified. Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.

Finally, as specified by NYC for this law, each table contains a footnote specifying the number of applicants from the viable implementations analyzed for an aggregation group for whom demographic information is unavailable. Each page containing report tables also provides additional notes for the reader to bear in mind when viewing the results.

<sup>1</sup> A number of the requirements specific to NYC Local Law 144 are not aligned to contemporary adverse impact analysis practices (e.g., Morris and Dunleavy, Adverse impact analysis: Understanding data, statistics, and risk, 2017). However, these analyses were conducted as stipulated by NYC for the sole purpose of meeting the specific requirements of Local Law 144.

<sup>2</sup> Due to this balancing of factors, there may be some instances where aggregated impact ratios reported in a table will exceed 1.0.

<sup>3</sup> Selection rates and impact ratios calculated for the tables in this report are based on the thresholds between tiers. This may or may not reflect employer-specific operational use of the AEDT with respect to making selection process decisions.

<sup>4</sup> Sufficient data for a demographic group to be analyzed for an implementation requires that group comprise at least two-percent of the sample, and that there be at least three applicants above the threshold and three applicants below the threshold in the demographic group.

<sup>5</sup> When aggregating the number of applicants, results from each implementation in the aggregation group are summed; when aggregating the selection rate, results from each implementation are averaged; when aggregating the impact ratio, results from each implementation analysis must first be converted to a natural logarithm, averaged, and then exponentiated to yield the average ratio value.

## HireVue Aggregate “Bias Audit” Analysis for Problem Solving for All jobs

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for Gender

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Male	9,727	0.71	0.99		9,727	0.36	0.99
Female	3,113	0.72	Comparator Group		3,113	0.36	Comparator Group

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 307 applicants with unknown or missing gender information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 307 applicants with unknown or missing gender information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Hispanic or Latino	425	0.80	0.98		439	0.37	0.82
White	6,773	0.60	0.82		6,759	0.29	0.68
Black or African American	1,635	0.72	0.99		1,628	0.42	1.00
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Asian	2,888	0.73	Comparator Group		2,875	0.44	Comparator Group
Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Two or More Races	361	0.65	0.89		378	0.36	0.98

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 1,041 applicants with unknown or missing race information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 979 applicants with unknown or missing race information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.

## HireVue Aggregate “Bias Audit” Analysis for Problem Solving for All jobs

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for the Combination of Gender and Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Male Hispanic or Latino	138	0.81	1.08		138	0.52	1.38
Male White	5,395	0.59	0.86		5,386	0.29	0.63
Male Black or African American	1,145	0.70	Comparator Group		1,138	0.42	1.04
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Male Asian	2,143	0.69	0.97		2,128	0.42	Comparator Group
Male Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Male Two or More Races	218	0.56	0.87		229	0.34	0.95
Female Hispanic or Latino	287	0.82	1.09		287	0.40	1.05
Female White	1,287	0.62	0.88		1,307	0.32	0.78
Female Black or African American	399	0.84	1.12		399	0.51	1.21
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Female Asian	654	0.80	1.12		692	0.42	0.99
Female Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Female Two or More Races	63	0.84	1.19		63	0.40	0.77

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 891 applicants with unknown or missing gender and race information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 828 applicants with unknown or missing gender and race information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.



# **New York City Local Law 144 “Bias Audit” for HireVue for Relationship Building for All jobs**

## **Conducted by DCI Consulting Group (DCI)**

### **Analysis Information**

- Summary produced on: July 5, 2025
- Data analyzed were based on nationwide applicants who were assessed between June 1, 2024 to June 1, 2025
- The assessment assigns applicants to one of three tiers (i.e., Bottom Tier, Middle Tier, Top Tier), yielding 2 threshold comparisons for analysis (i.e., the threshold between Top/Middle Tier and Bottom Tier and the threshold between Top Tier and Middle/Bottom Tier)

### **Purpose**

The “bias audit” reported here is consistent with the use case wherein historical data from multiple employers using the same automated employment decision tool (AEDT) are used as the basis of the audit. This audit and report address the requirements of the New York City (NYC) Local Law 144 that regulates the use of AEDTs in accordance with the final rules published by the NYC Department of Consumer and Worker Protection (DCWP) on April 6, 2023.

### **About DCI Consulting Group (DCI)**

DCI is a human resources consulting firm headquartered in Washington, D.C. Since 2001, DCI has provided expert solutions to hundreds of organizations on complex issues, with particular emphasis on equal employment opportunity analytics, employee selection and assessment, independent third-party reviews, and litigation support work. DCI’s team of Industrial/Organizational Psychologists and Labor Economists are recognized for their applied experience in complex quantitative analytics, adverse impact measurement, pay equity, job analysis, validation research and job-relatedness evaluations, and routinely perform work in the context of affirmative action plans under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor’s Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs compliance evaluations, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission systemic investigations, and expert witness work on matters related to Title VII, Executive Order 11246, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

### **“Bias Audit” Analysis Methodology<sup>1</sup>**

The analyses conducted for this audit are based on data from multiple employers using the AEDT in one or more different implementations as part of their selection processes. Analyses were conducted separately for each employer’s implementation(s) (hereafter these individual, or de-aggregated, analyses will be referred to as “by implementation”) and then results were aggregated to provide the tables in this report (referred to as “aggregated”). Before describing the aggregation process, a foundational understanding of the methodology used for analysis (related to a singular implementation of the AEDT by an employer) is required. As noted in the Analysis Information above, the AEDT assigns an applicant to a tier based on their performance. NYC’s Local Law 144 and the rules published by the DCWP stipulate specific requirements for conducting the required analyses. Where the AEDT assigns applicants to tiers, an 'impact ratio' must be calculated for each demographic group for each threshold separating the tiers.<sup>2</sup> Note that NYC specifies this calculation to be the Focal Demographic Group selection rate divided by the Comparator Demographic Group selection rate. This analysis is conducted separately for each implementation of the AEDT in the dataset provided to DCI.

The law further specifies that the demographic groups need to be compared in three specific ways:

1. Gender comparison (i.e., Male, Female).
2. Race/ethnicity comparison (i.e., Hispanic or Latino, White, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, Native American or Alaska Native, Two or More Races).
3. An intersectional comparison that is the combination of gender and race/ethnicity (e.g., Hispanic or Latino Male, Hispanic or Latino Female, White Male, White Female).

The NYC law impact ratio has been defined by the DCWP's published rules and is calculated as:

$$\text{NYC Law Impact Ratio} = \frac{\text{selection rate of demographic (focal) group}}{\text{selection rate of most selected (comparator) demographic group}}$$

## Results Aggregation Methodology

For each AEDT implementation where sufficient data were available to analyze, the number of applicants, number of applicants selected, number of applicants not selected, selection rate, and impact ratio for each demographic group were calculated. These results were then aggregated to produce the tables in this report. To be able to aggregate results meaningfully across a range of implementations for the AEDT, there are a number of specific, nuanced issues that must be considered that are not required when conducting a bias audit in a singular implementation. These aggregation considerations and related decisions are as follows:

- Data were analyzed separately per implementation because the context around using the AEDT, the jobs for which they were used, the normative samples, and the composition of the specific applicant pools vary and cannot be assumed to be equivalent, nor can they be collapsed across implementations.
- Within an aggregation group, a single, consistent comparator group must be identified for all implementations of the AEDT to be able to produce interpretable aggregate impact ratios.
- Two factors are balanced when determining the aggregation comparator group: 1) selection rate and 2) statistical coverage. The comparator has the highest selection rate amongst those demographic groups with sufficient statistical coverage across implementations.<sup>3</sup>
- For all viable implementations analyzed in the aggregation group, aggregated values are calculated using recommended professional practices.<sup>4, 5</sup>

## Results Tables

Aggregated results are presented in tables, each of which provides an indication of the demographic group (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, or both), the aggregated number of applicants that comprise the demographic group, the aggregated selection rate for the demographic group, and the aggregated NYC law impact ratio. In each analysis table, the comparator group is identified. Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.

Finally, as specified by NYC for this law, each table contains a footnote specifying the number of applicants from the viable implementations analyzed for an aggregation group for whom demographic information is unavailable. Each page containing report tables also provides additional notes for the reader to bear in mind when viewing the results.

<sup>1</sup> A number of the requirements specific to NYC Local Law 144 are not aligned to contemporary adverse impact analysis practices (e.g., Morris and Dunleavy, Adverse impact analysis: Understanding data, statistics, and risk, 2017). However, these analyses were conducted as stipulated by NYC for the sole purpose of meeting the specific requirements of Local Law 144.

<sup>2</sup> Due to this balancing of factors, there may be some instances where aggregated impact ratios reported in a table will exceed 1.0.

<sup>3</sup> Selection rates and impact ratios calculated for the tables in this report are based on the thresholds between tiers. This may or may not reflect employer-specific operational use of the AEDT with respect to making selection process decisions.

<sup>4</sup> Sufficient data for a demographic group to be analyzed for an implementation requires that group comprise at least two-percent of the sample, and that there be at least three applicants above the threshold and three applicants below the threshold in the demographic group.

<sup>5</sup> When aggregating the number of applicants, results from each implementation in the aggregation group are summed; when aggregating the selection rate, results from each implementation are averaged; when aggregating the impact ratio, results from each implementation analysis must first be converted to a natural logarithm, averaged, and then exponentiated to yield the average ratio value.

## HireVue Aggregate “Bias Audit” Analysis for Relationship Building for All jobs

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for Gender

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Male	7,322	0.66	0.97		7,342	0.32	0.92
Female	5,001	0.68	Comparator Group		5,008	0.35	Comparator Group

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 408 applicants with unknown or missing gender information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 408 applicants with unknown or missing gender information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Hispanic or Latino	1,106	0.72	1.16		1,106	0.42	1.42
White	4,077	0.62	0.95		4,065	0.26	0.78
Black or African American	2,658	0.63	0.96		2,662	0.33	0.96
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Asian	3,371	0.66	Comparator Group		3,376	0.36	Comparator Group
Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Two or More Races	317	0.65	0.99		317	0.42	1.31

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 1,030 applicants with unknown or missing race information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 839 applicants with unknown or missing race information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.

## HireVue Aggregate “Bias Audit” Analysis for Relationship Building for All jobs

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for the Combination of Gender and Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Male Hispanic or Latino	453	0.67	0.97		467	0.42	1.07
Male White	2,172	0.60	0.83		2,172	0.23	0.58
Male Black or African American	1,476	0.59	0.82		1,476	0.26	0.69
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Male Asian	2,148	0.64	0.87		2,163	0.31	0.79
Male Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Male Two or More Races	26	0.49	0.73		26	0.39	1.33
Female Hispanic or Latino	612	0.70	0.93		612	0.40	0.94
Female White	1,796	0.65	0.87		1,796	0.31	0.82
Female Black or African American	1,066	0.73	Comparator Group		1,066	0.37	Comparator Group
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Female Asian	1,045	0.67	0.89		1,045	0.36	0.90
Female Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Female Two or More Races	69	0.70	0.83		69	0.55	1.21

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 731 applicants with unknown or missing gender and race information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 731 applicants with unknown or missing gender and race information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.

# **New York City Local Law 144 “Bias Audit” for HireVue for Team Orientation for All jobs**

## **Conducted by DCI Consulting Group (DCI)**

### **Analysis Information**

- Summary produced on: July 5, 2025
- Data analyzed were based on nationwide applicants who were assessed between June 1, 2024 to June 1, 2025
- The assessment assigns applicants to one of three tiers (i.e., Bottom Tier, Middle Tier, Top Tier), yielding 2 threshold comparisons for analysis (i.e., the threshold between Top/Middle Tier and Bottom Tier and the threshold between Top Tier and Middle/Bottom Tier)

### **Purpose**

The “bias audit” reported here is consistent with the use case wherein historical data from multiple employers using the same automated employment decision tool (AEDT) are used as the basis of the audit. This audit and report address the requirements of the New York City (NYC) Local Law 144 that regulates the use of AEDTs in accordance with the final rules published by the NYC Department of Consumer and Worker Protection (DCWP) on April 6, 2023.

### **About DCI Consulting Group (DCI)**

DCI is a human resources consulting firm headquartered in Washington, D.C. Since 2001, DCI has provided expert solutions to hundreds of organizations on complex issues, with particular emphasis on equal employment opportunity analytics, employee selection and assessment, independent third-party reviews, and litigation support work. DCI’s team of Industrial/Organizational Psychologists and Labor Economists are recognized for their applied experience in complex quantitative analytics, adverse impact measurement, pay equity, job analysis, validation research and job-relatedness evaluations, and routinely perform work in the context of affirmative action plans under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor’s Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs compliance evaluations, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission systemic investigations, and expert witness work on matters related to Title VII, Executive Order 11246, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

### **“Bias Audit” Analysis Methodology<sup>1</sup>**

The analyses conducted for this audit are based on data from multiple employers using the AEDT in one or more different implementations as part of their selection processes. Analyses were conducted separately for each employer’s implementation(s) (hereafter these individual, or de-aggregated, analyses will be referred to as “by implementation”) and then results were aggregated to provide the tables in this report (referred to as “aggregated”). Before describing the aggregation process, a foundational understanding of the methodology used for analysis (related to a singular implementation of the AEDT by an employer) is required. As noted in the Analysis Information above, the AEDT assigns an applicant to a tier based on their performance. NYC’s Local Law 144 and the rules published by the DCWP stipulate specific requirements for conducting the required analyses. Where the AEDT assigns applicants to tiers, an 'impact ratio' must be calculated for each demographic group for each threshold separating the tiers.<sup>2</sup> Note that NYC specifies this calculation to be the Focal Demographic Group selection rate divided by the Comparator Demographic Group selection rate. This analysis is conducted separately for each implementation of the AEDT in the dataset provided to DCI.

The law further specifies that the demographic groups need to be compared in three specific ways:

1. Gender comparison (i.e., Male, Female).
2. Race/ethnicity comparison (i.e., Hispanic or Latino, White, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, Native American or Alaska Native, Two or More Races).
3. An intersectional comparison that is the combination of gender and race/ethnicity (e.g., Hispanic or Latino Male, Hispanic or Latino Female, White Male, White Female).

The NYC law impact ratio has been defined by the DCWP's published rules and is calculated as:

$$\text{NYC Law Impact Ratio} = \frac{\text{selection rate of demographic (focal) group}}{\text{selection rate of most selected (comparator) demographic group}}$$

## Results Aggregation Methodology

For each AEDT implementation where sufficient data were available to analyze, the number of applicants, number of applicants selected, number of applicants not selected, selection rate, and impact ratio for each demographic group were calculated. These results were then aggregated to produce the tables in this report. To be able to aggregate results meaningfully across a range of implementations for the AEDT, there are a number of specific, nuanced issues that must be considered that are not required when conducting a bias audit in a singular implementation. These aggregation considerations and related decisions are as follows:

- Data were analyzed separately per implementation because the context around using the AEDT, the jobs for which they were used, the normative samples, and the composition of the specific applicant pools vary and cannot be assumed to be equivalent, nor can they be collapsed across implementations.
- Within an aggregation group, a single, consistent comparator group must be identified for all implementations of the AEDT to be able to produce interpretable aggregate impact ratios.
- Two factors are balanced when determining the aggregation comparator group: 1) selection rate and 2) statistical coverage. The comparator has the highest selection rate amongst those demographic groups with sufficient statistical coverage across implementations.<sup>3</sup>
- For all viable implementations analyzed in the aggregation group, aggregated values are calculated using recommended professional practices.<sup>4, 5</sup>

## Results Tables

Aggregated results are presented in tables, each of which provides an indication of the demographic group (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, or both), the aggregated number of applicants that comprise the demographic group, the aggregated selection rate for the demographic group, and the aggregated NYC law impact ratio. In each analysis table, the comparator group is identified. Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.

Finally, as specified by NYC for this law, each table contains a footnote specifying the number of applicants from the viable implementations analyzed for an aggregation group for whom demographic information is unavailable. Each page containing report tables also provides additional notes for the reader to bear in mind when viewing the results.

<sup>1</sup> A number of the requirements specific to NYC Local Law 144 are not aligned to contemporary adverse impact analysis practices (e.g., Morris and Dunleavy, Adverse impact analysis: Understanding data, statistics, and risk, 2017). However, these analyses were conducted as stipulated by NYC for the sole purpose of meeting the specific requirements of Local Law 144.

<sup>2</sup> Due to this balancing of factors, there may be some instances where aggregated impact ratios reported in a table will exceed 1.0.

<sup>3</sup> Selection rates and impact ratios calculated for the tables in this report are based on the thresholds between tiers. This may or may not reflect employer-specific operational use of the AEDT with respect to making selection process decisions.

<sup>4</sup> Sufficient data for a demographic group to be analyzed for an implementation requires that group comprise at least two-percent of the sample, and that there be at least three applicants above the threshold and three applicants below the threshold in the demographic group.

<sup>5</sup> When aggregating the number of applicants, results from each implementation in the aggregation group are summed; when aggregating the selection rate, results from each implementation are averaged; when aggregating the impact ratio, results from each implementation analysis must first be converted to a natural logarithm, averaged, and then exponentiated to yield the average ratio value.

HireVue Aggregate “Bias Audit” Analysis for Team Orientation for All jobs

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Gender

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Male	8,015	0.61	0.96		8,015	0.30	Comparator Group
Female	3,223	0.64	Comparator Group		3,223	0.29	0.99

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 452 applicants with unknown or missing gender information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 452 applicants with unknown or missing gender information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Hispanic or Latino	2,048	0.60	0.92		2,048	0.29	0.77
White	3,001	0.59	0.92		3,001	0.24	0.58
Black or African American	1,874	0.65	Comparator Group		1,874	0.30	0.80
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Asian	3,738	0.61	0.93		3,738	0.30	0.77
Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Two or More Races	449	0.63	0.98		449	0.38	Comparator Group

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 530 applicants with unknown or missing race information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 530 applicants with unknown or missing race information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.

## HireVue Aggregate “Bias Audit” Analysis for Team Orientation for All jobs

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for the Combination of Gender and Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Male Hispanic or Latino	1,555	0.61	0.96		1,555	0.30	0.96
Male White	2,194	0.58	0.92		2,187	0.30	0.88
Male Black or African American	1,366	0.63	Comparator Group		1,366	0.29	0.90
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Male Asian	2,368	0.58	0.91		2,368	0.29	0.86
Male Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Male Two or More Races	334	0.59	0.93		334	0.31	Comparator Group
Female Hispanic or Latino	482	0.60	0.94		482	0.26	0.83
Female White	719	0.64	0.93		699	0.31	0.89
Female Black or African American	365	0.64	1.11		365	0.27	0.92
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Female Asian	1,270	0.66	0.94		1,270	0.32	0.98
Female Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Female Two or More Races	0	—	—		0	—	—

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 679 applicants with unknown or missing gender and race information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 679 applicants with unknown or missing gender and race information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.



# **New York City Local Law 144 “Bias Audit” for HireVue for Think for All jobs**

## **Conducted by DCI Consulting Group (DCI)**

### **Analysis Information**

- Summary produced on: July 5, 2025
- Data analyzed were based on nationwide applicants who were assessed between June 1, 2024 to June 1, 2025
- The assessment assigns applicants to one of three tiers (i.e., Bottom Tier, Middle Tier, Top Tier), yielding 2 threshold comparisons for analysis (i.e., the threshold between Top/Middle Tier and Bottom Tier and the threshold between Top Tier and Middle/Bottom Tier)

### **Purpose**

The “bias audit” reported here is consistent with the use case wherein historical data from multiple employers using the same automated employment decision tool (AEDT) are used as the basis of the audit. This audit and report address the requirements of the New York City (NYC) Local Law 144 that regulates the use of AEDTs in accordance with the final rules published by the NYC Department of Consumer and Worker Protection (DCWP) on April 6, 2023.

### **About DCI Consulting Group (DCI)**

DCI is a human resources consulting firm headquartered in Washington, D.C. Since 2001, DCI has provided expert solutions to hundreds of organizations on complex issues, with particular emphasis on equal employment opportunity analytics, employee selection and assessment, independent third-party reviews, and litigation support work. DCI’s team of Industrial/Organizational Psychologists and Labor Economists are recognized for their applied experience in complex quantitative analytics, adverse impact measurement, pay equity, job analysis, validation research and job-relatedness evaluations, and routinely perform work in the context of affirmative action plans under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor’s Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs compliance evaluations, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission systemic investigations, and expert witness work on matters related to Title VII, Executive Order 11246, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

### **“Bias Audit” Analysis Methodology<sup>1</sup>**

The analyses conducted for this audit are based on data from multiple employers using the AEDT in one or more different implementations as part of their selection processes. Analyses were conducted separately for each employer’s implementation(s) (hereafter these individual, or de-aggregated, analyses will be referred to as “by implementation”) and then results were aggregated to provide the tables in this report (referred to as “aggregated”). Before describing the aggregation process, a foundational understanding of the methodology used for analysis (related to a singular implementation of the AEDT by an employer) is required. As noted in the Analysis Information above, the AEDT assigns an applicant to a tier based on their performance. NYC’s Local Law 144 and the rules published by the DCWP stipulate specific requirements for conducting the required analyses. Where the AEDT assigns applicants to tiers, an 'impact ratio' must be calculated for each demographic group for each threshold separating the tiers.<sup>2</sup> Note that NYC specifies this calculation to be the Focal Demographic Group selection rate divided by the Comparator Demographic Group selection rate. This analysis is conducted separately for each implementation of the AEDT in the dataset provided to DCI.

The law further specifies that the demographic groups need to be compared in three specific ways:

1. Gender comparison (i.e., Male, Female).
2. Race/ethnicity comparison (i.e., Hispanic or Latino, White, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, Native American or Alaska Native, Two or More Races).
3. An intersectional comparison that is the combination of gender and race/ethnicity (e.g., Hispanic or Latino Male, Hispanic or Latino Female, White Male, White Female).

The NYC law impact ratio has been defined by the DCWP's published rules and is calculated as:

$$\text{NYC Law Impact Ratio} = \frac{\text{selection rate of demographic (focal) group}}{\text{selection rate of most selected (comparator) demographic group}}$$

## Results Aggregation Methodology

For each AEDT implementation where sufficient data were available to analyze, the number of applicants, number of applicants selected, number of applicants not selected, selection rate, and impact ratio for each demographic group were calculated. These results were then aggregated to produce the tables in this report. To be able to aggregate results meaningfully across a range of implementations for the AEDT, there are a number of specific, nuanced issues that must be considered that are not required when conducting a bias audit in a singular implementation. These aggregation considerations and related decisions are as follows:

- Data were analyzed separately per implementation because the context around using the AEDT, the jobs for which they were used, the normative samples, and the composition of the specific applicant pools vary and cannot be assumed to be equivalent, nor can they be collapsed across implementations.
- Within an aggregation group, a single, consistent comparator group must be identified for all implementations of the AEDT to be able to produce interpretable aggregate impact ratios.
- Two factors are balanced when determining the aggregation comparator group: 1) selection rate and 2) statistical coverage. The comparator has the highest selection rate amongst those demographic groups with sufficient statistical coverage across implementations.<sup>3</sup>
- For all viable implementations analyzed in the aggregation group, aggregated values are calculated using recommended professional practices.<sup>4, 5</sup>

## Results Tables

Aggregated results are presented in tables, each of which provides an indication of the demographic group (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, or both), the aggregated number of applicants that comprise the demographic group, the aggregated selection rate for the demographic group, and the aggregated NYC law impact ratio. In each analysis table, the comparator group is identified. Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.

Finally, as specified by NYC for this law, each table contains a footnote specifying the number of applicants from the viable implementations analyzed for an aggregation group for whom demographic information is unavailable. Each page containing report tables also provides additional notes for the reader to bear in mind when viewing the results.

<sup>1</sup> A number of the requirements specific to NYC Local Law 144 are not aligned to contemporary adverse impact analysis practices (e.g., Morris and Dunleavy, Adverse impact analysis: Understanding data, statistics, and risk, 2017). However, these analyses were conducted as stipulated by NYC for the sole purpose of meeting the specific requirements of Local Law 144.

<sup>2</sup> Due to this balancing of factors, there may be some instances where aggregated impact ratios reported in a table will exceed 1.0.

<sup>3</sup> Selection rates and impact ratios calculated for the tables in this report are based on the thresholds between tiers. This may or may not reflect employer-specific operational use of the AEDT with respect to making selection process decisions.

<sup>4</sup> Sufficient data for a demographic group to be analyzed for an implementation requires that group comprise at least two-percent of the sample, and that there be at least three applicants above the threshold and three applicants below the threshold in the demographic group.

<sup>5</sup> When aggregating the number of applicants, results from each implementation in the aggregation group are summed; when aggregating the selection rate, results from each implementation are averaged; when aggregating the impact ratio, results from each implementation analysis must first be converted to a natural logarithm, averaged, and then exponentiated to yield the average ratio value.

## HireVue Aggregate “Bias Audit” Analysis for Think for All jobs

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for Gender

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Male	29,875	0.71	Comparator Group		29,828	0.39	Comparator Group
Female	14,465	0.68	0.96		14,459	0.38	0.97

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 1,940 applicants with unknown or missing gender information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 1,936 applicants with unknown or missing gender information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Hispanic or Latino	6,558	0.62	0.88		6,572	0.34	0.80
White	17,593	0.69	0.95		17,622	0.37	0.86
Black or African American	8,399	0.66	0.90		8,404	0.39	0.91
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Asian	8,969	0.73	Comparator Group		8,975	0.42	Comparator Group
Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Two or More Races	1,547	0.64	0.96		1,580	0.33	0.88

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 2,717 applicants with unknown or missing race information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 2,912 applicants with unknown or missing race information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.

## HireVue Aggregate “Bias Audit” Analysis for Think for All jobs

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for the Combination of Gender and Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Male Hispanic or Latino	3,787	0.64	0.94		3,795	0.34	0.88
Male White	12,619	0.70	0.98		12,634	0.38	0.92
Male Black or African American	4,930	0.67	0.95		4,922	0.37	0.94
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Male Asian	5,873	0.72	Comparator Group		5,884	0.41	Comparator Group
Male Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Male Two or More Races	756	0.67	0.95		765	0.42	0.99
Female Hispanic or Latino	2,555	0.61	0.89		2,555	0.30	0.83
Female White	4,218	0.67	0.94		4,258	0.36	0.82
Female Black or African American	2,827	0.63	0.90		2,833	0.34	0.92
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Female Asian	2,836	0.74	1.02		2,850	0.42	1.05
Female Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Female Two or More Races	180	0.54	1.05		180	0.12	0.96

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 3,162 applicants with unknown or missing gender and race information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 3,357 applicants with unknown or missing gender and race information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.

# **New York City Local Law 144 “Bias Audit” for HireVue for Willingness to Learn for All jobs**

## **Conducted by DCI Consulting Group (DCI)**

### **Analysis Information**

- Summary produced on: July 5, 2025
- Data analyzed were based on nationwide applicants who were assessed between June 1, 2024 to June 1, 2025
- The assessment assigns applicants to one of three tiers (i.e., Bottom Tier, Middle Tier, Top Tier), yielding 2 threshold comparisons for analysis (i.e., the threshold between Top/Middle Tier and Bottom Tier and the threshold between Top Tier and Middle/Bottom Tier)

### **Purpose**

The “bias audit” reported here is consistent with the use case wherein historical data from multiple employers using the same automated employment decision tool (AEDT) are used as the basis of the audit. This audit and report address the requirements of the New York City (NYC) Local Law 144 that regulates the use of AEDTs in accordance with the final rules published by the NYC Department of Consumer and Worker Protection (DCWP) on April 6, 2023.

### **About DCI Consulting Group (DCI)**

DCI is a human resources consulting firm headquartered in Washington, D.C. Since 2001, DCI has provided expert solutions to hundreds of organizations on complex issues, with particular emphasis on equal employment opportunity analytics, employee selection and assessment, independent third-party reviews, and litigation support work. DCI’s team of Industrial/Organizational Psychologists and Labor Economists are recognized for their applied experience in complex quantitative analytics, adverse impact measurement, pay equity, job analysis, validation research and job-relatedness evaluations, and routinely perform work in the context of affirmative action plans under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor’s Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs compliance evaluations, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission systemic investigations, and expert witness work on matters related to Title VII, Executive Order 11246, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

### **“Bias Audit” Analysis Methodology<sup>1</sup>**

The analyses conducted for this audit are based on data from multiple employers using the AEDT in one or more different implementations as part of their selection processes. Analyses were conducted separately for each employer’s implementation(s) (hereafter these individual, or de-aggregated, analyses will be referred to as “by implementation”) and then results were aggregated to provide the tables in this report (referred to as “aggregated”). Before describing the aggregation process, a foundational understanding of the methodology used for analysis (related to a singular implementation of the AEDT by an employer) is required. As noted in the Analysis Information above, the AEDT assigns an applicant to a tier based on their performance. NYC’s Local Law 144 and the rules published by the DCWP stipulate specific requirements for conducting the required analyses. Where the AEDT assigns applicants to tiers, an 'impact ratio' must be calculated for each demographic group for each threshold separating the tiers.<sup>2</sup> Note that NYC specifies this calculation to be the Focal Demographic Group selection rate divided by the Comparator Demographic Group selection rate. This analysis is conducted separately for each implementation of the AEDT in the dataset provided to DCI.

The law further specifies that the demographic groups need to be compared in three specific ways:

1. Gender comparison (i.e., Male, Female).
2. Race/ethnicity comparison (i.e., Hispanic or Latino, White, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, Native American or Alaska Native, Two or More Races).
3. An intersectional comparison that is the combination of gender and race/ethnicity (e.g., Hispanic or Latino Male, Hispanic or Latino Female, White Male, White Female).

The NYC law impact ratio has been defined by the DCWP's published rules and is calculated as:

$$\text{NYC Law Impact Ratio} = \frac{\text{selection rate of demographic (focal) group}}{\text{selection rate of most selected (comparator) demographic group}}$$

## Results Aggregation Methodology

For each AEDT implementation where sufficient data were available to analyze, the number of applicants, number of applicants selected, number of applicants not selected, selection rate, and impact ratio for each demographic group were calculated. These results were then aggregated to produce the tables in this report. To be able to aggregate results meaningfully across a range of implementations for the AEDT, there are a number of specific, nuanced issues that must be considered that are not required when conducting a bias audit in a singular implementation. These aggregation considerations and related decisions are as follows:

- Data were analyzed separately per implementation because the context around using the AEDT, the jobs for which they were used, the normative samples, and the composition of the specific applicant pools vary and cannot be assumed to be equivalent, nor can they be collapsed across implementations.
- Within an aggregation group, a single, consistent comparator group must be identified for all implementations of the AEDT to be able to produce interpretable aggregate impact ratios.
- Two factors are balanced when determining the aggregation comparator group: 1) selection rate and 2) statistical coverage. The comparator has the highest selection rate amongst those demographic groups with sufficient statistical coverage across implementations.<sup>3</sup>
- For all viable implementations analyzed in the aggregation group, aggregated values are calculated using recommended professional practices.<sup>4, 5</sup>

## Results Tables

Aggregated results are presented in tables, each of which provides an indication of the demographic group (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, or both), the aggregated number of applicants that comprise the demographic group, the aggregated selection rate for the demographic group, and the aggregated NYC law impact ratio. In each analysis table, the comparator group is identified. Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.

Finally, as specified by NYC for this law, each table contains a footnote specifying the number of applicants from the viable implementations analyzed for an aggregation group for whom demographic information is unavailable. Each page containing report tables also provides additional notes for the reader to bear in mind when viewing the results.

<sup>1</sup> A number of the requirements specific to NYC Local Law 144 are not aligned to contemporary adverse impact analysis practices (e.g., Morris and Dunleavy, Adverse impact analysis: Understanding data, statistics, and risk, 2017). However, these analyses were conducted as stipulated by NYC for the sole purpose of meeting the specific requirements of Local Law 144.

<sup>2</sup> Due to this balancing of factors, there may be some instances where aggregated impact ratios reported in a table will exceed 1.0.

<sup>3</sup> Selection rates and impact ratios calculated for the tables in this report are based on the thresholds between tiers. This may or may not reflect employer-specific operational use of the AEDT with respect to making selection process decisions.

<sup>4</sup> Sufficient data for a demographic group to be analyzed for an implementation requires that group comprise at least two-percent of the sample, and that there be at least three applicants above the threshold and three applicants below the threshold in the demographic group.

<sup>5</sup> When aggregating the number of applicants, results from each implementation in the aggregation group are summed; when aggregating the selection rate, results from each implementation are averaged; when aggregating the impact ratio, results from each implementation analysis must first be converted to a natural logarithm, averaged, and then exponentiated to yield the average ratio value.

## HireVue Aggregate “Bias Audit” Analysis for Willingness to Learn for All jobs

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for Gender

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Male	26,319	0.68	Comparator Group		26,398	0.37	Comparator Group
Female	10,142	0.68	1.00		10,194	0.35	0.96

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 1,698 applicants with unknown or missing gender information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 1,706 applicants with unknown or missing gender information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Hispanic or Latino	3,899	0.69	1.04		3,899	0.40	1.02
White	15,612	0.60	0.84		15,608	0.27	0.68
Black or African American	6,333	0.68	0.95		6,337	0.40	Comparator Group
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Asian	8,306	0.71	Comparator Group		8,311	0.36	0.88
Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Two or More Races	1,247	0.64	0.98		1,271	0.35	0.94

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 2,635 applicants with unknown or missing race information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 2,444 applicants with unknown or missing race information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.

## HireVue Aggregate “Bias Audit” Analysis for Willingness to Learn for All jobs

### NYC Law Impact Ratios for the Combination of Gender and Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top + Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier	Impact Ratio for Top Tier vs Middle + Bottom Tier
Male Hispanic or Latino	2,576	0.68	1.06		1,007	0.50	1.27
Male White	11,678	0.59	0.83		5,612	0.28	0.75
Male Black or African American	4,140	0.67	0.95		2,102	0.40	1.11
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Male Asian	5,547	0.71	Comparator Group		5,073	0.40	1.03
Male Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Male Two or More Races	762	0.62	0.95		279	0.44	1.34
Female Hispanic or Latino	1,126	0.70	1.03		931	0.43	1.09
Female White	3,230	0.63	0.88		3,169	0.30	0.75
Female Black or African American	1,589	0.74	1.06		1,363	0.44	1.19
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	—	—		0	—	—
Female Asian	2,498	0.74	0.98		2,559	0.38	Comparator Group
Female Native American or Alaska Native	0	—	—		0	—	—
Female Two or More Races	63	0.86	0.99		110	0.48	1.05

A cell with “—” indicates insufficient data to calculate this aggregate statistic.

Note: There were 2,972 applicants with unknown or missing gender and race information for Top/Middle Tier vs Bottom Tier analyses; there were 1,830 applicants with unknown or missing gender and race information for Top Tier vs Middle/Bottom Tier analyses; data from applicants with missing demographic data are not included in the calculations for this table.

Please note that, due to the methods required to aggregate results, methods or analyses intended for singular implementations cannot be applied to the aggregated values in the table. Additionally, this means that the aggregated impact ratios reported in the tables cannot be computed directly from the aggregated selection rates appearing in the tables.