

Bias Audit for Ashby's Criteria Evaluation Model

Ashby



Table of contents

Table of contents	2
Bias evaluation for Ashby's Criteria Evaluation model	2
Introduction and executive summary	2
Background	3
About NYC LL144	3
Bias audit requirements	3
System description	3
Bias evaluation results	4
Data used	4
Univariate Categories	5
Results by gender	5
Results by race	5
Intersectional Categories	5
Results by race and gender	5
About FairNow	6

Bias evaluation for Ashby's Criteria Evaluation model

Report prepared by FairNow on August 8, 2025

Introduction and executive summary

This report presents a bias audit of Ashby's Criteria Evaluation model in alignment with the specifications for New York City's Local Law 144 (referred to as NYC LL144, or the NYC AEDT law). Ashby's Criteria Evaluation model evaluates job applicant resumes against user-defined job criteria for a given role, and provides a determination of whether the applicant meets each criterion. Users review Ashby model outputs for a given applicant at the criterion level.

The results of this audit found no groups for which the selection rate was less than 80% of the selection rate of the most favored group when analyzing race, gender or combinations thereof.

Background

About NYC LL144

NYC LL144 entered effect on July 5th, 2023. The law prohibits employers and employment agencies from using Automated Employment Decision Tools (AEDTs) to make or substantially assist in hiring or promotion decisions without meeting specified requirements, detailed below:

1. **Annual bias audit:** Employers must engage an independent auditor to conduct a bias audit of any in-scope AEDTs to evaluate candidate pass rates along the lines of gender, race and intersectional pairs of the two.
2. **Notice to candidates:** Employers must provide candidates with at least 10 business days notice before administering the AEDT, and include instructions on how to request an alternative assessment method if one is available.
3. **Published results:** Employers must publish the date and a summary of the results of the most recent bias audit on the employment section of their website.

This report represents an independent bias audit in alignment with the requirements of NYC LL144. It does not entail an evaluation of whether usage of Ashby's Criteria Evaluation model constitutes an AEDT under NYC LL144 specifications, and it does not include a review of the notice or published result specifications under NYC LL144.

Bias audit requirements

A bias audit as defined by NYC LL144 requires the following:

- The assessment includes a review of gender, race, and intersectional pairs of the two.
- A 'selection' or 'scoring' rate is calculated for each category.
- An impact ratio is calculated for each category.
- Counts are included for applicants with unknown gender or race.

The evaluation outlined in this document has been conducted in accordance with the NYC LL144 bias audit requirements.

System description

The intent of Ashby's Criteria Evaluation model is to aid recruiting and hiring teams in assessing candidate qualifications against user-defined job criteria. Users are responsible for uploading job postings, and specifying the set of job criteria that are relevant for each posting. Ashby leverages an algorithm to parse applicant resumes and provide a determination of whether each applicant meets each of the specified job criteria. Applicant resumes are evaluated so that they will receive a designation of "meets", "does not meet" or "uncertain" against each job criterion. The algorithm

generates an “uncertain” result when Ashby’s systems are unable to make a confident determination of whether a candidate does or does not meet the criterion based on the existing resume text.

Ashby’s product does not aggregate individual applicant-criteria outcomes into applicant-level scores for rank-ordering or evaluation purposes. In alignment with product usage, this audit evaluates scoring at the applicant-criteria level, where “meets” represents a passing score. All applicant-criteria flagged by Ashby’s model as “uncertain” were excluded from analysis for the purposes of this audit.

Bias evaluation results

Data used

This evaluation includes historical data from applicants assessed by Ashby’s Criteria Evaluation model during the period of July 25th, 2024 to July 24th, 2025, covering 9,984,060 applicant-criteria. This data represents all applicant-criteria evaluated by the model during this period from all Ashby customers who evaluated at least 500 criteria over this time period.

Demographic data was provided from each Ashby customer, where candidates were asked to self-select their race/ethnicity and gender. Demographic data was missing on candidates who chose a “decline to specify” option in the survey or did not respond to the question. Candidate demographic information was not imputed or inferred in any way.

Gender was represented as one of the following values:

- Female
- Male
- Unknown (not included in the analysis)
- Decline to specify (not included in the analysis)

Race/Ethnicity was represented as one of the following values:

- Asian
- Black
- Hispanic/Latino
- Native American
- Two or More Races
- White
- Unknown (not included in the analysis)
- Decline to specify (not included in the analysis)

Univariate Categories

Results by gender

Gender	# of Applicant-criteria	# Selected	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio
Female	3,616,376	2,003,238	55.4%	96.6%
Male	5,898,557	3,383,044	57.4%	100.0%

There were 469,127 applicant-criteria for which the applicant's gender was not known. This data was not included in the above table.

Results by race

Race	# of Applicant-criteria	# Selected	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio
Asian	3,832,985	2,246,406	58.6%	100.0%
Black	933,350	481,850	51.6%	88.1%
Hispanic/Latino	777,880	413,822	53.2%	90.8%
Native American	49,042	26,511	54.1%	N/A
Two or More Races	398,366	223,073	56.0%	95.5%
White	3,147,144	1,783,843	56.7%	96.7%

"N/A" refers to categories that comprised less than 2% of the total. These groups are excluded from the analysis.

There were 845,293 applicant-criteria for which the applicant's race/ethnicity was not known. This data was not included in the above table.

Intersectional Categories

Results by race and gender

Race	Gender	# of Applicant-criteria	# Selected	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio
Asian	Female	1,275,479	739,292	58.0%	98.3%
Asian	Male	2,507,790	1,478,046	58.9%	100.0%
Black	Female	404,433	200,441	49.6%	84.1%

Black	Male	522,007	277,836	53.2%	90.3%
Hispanic/Latino	Female	311,980	163,034	52.3%	88.7%
Hispanic/Latino	Male	457,814	246,434	53.8%	91.3%
Native American	Female	17,220	8,830	51.3%	N/A
Native American	Male	30,647	16,991	55.4%	N/A
Two or More Races	Female	158,861	85,354	53.7%	N/A
Two or More Races	Male	231,210	133,038	57.5%	97.6%
White	Female	1,258,914	701,213	55.7%	94.5%
White	Male	1,866,505	1,070,578	57.4%	97.3%

“N/A” refers to categories that comprised less than 2% of the total. These groups are excluded from the analysis.

There were 941,200 applicant-criteria for which the applicant's gender or race/ethnicity were not known. This data was not included in the above table.

About FairNow

FairNow is an organization dedicated to helping companies leverage AI in a responsible, fair, and well-managed way. FairNow is an independent auditor in alignment with the specifications of New York City Local Law 144.