

Hirevue · Adaptability · All jobs

Prepared for Hirevue by Corymb

Analysis Information

- Summary produced on: July 2026
- The vendor's clients did not supply specific assessment dates. The vendor confirmed that the records fall within the audit period, so the analysis covers applicants assessed during 2025 and 2026 and a narrower window could not be applied. Records from one of the vendor's clients include applicants assessed outside the United States, whose self-identified ethnicity categories were mapped to the EEO-1 categories this report requires.

Purpose

New York City Local Law 144 requires employers using an automated employment decision tool to have that tool checked for bias every year. This report analyzes the scoring algorithm for Adaptability used for All jobs. The analysis checks whether the tool selects candidates from different demographic groups at meaningfully different rates, using the impact ratio the law defines: the selection rate for a given group, divided by the selection rate of whichever group is selected most often.

Methodology

The law requires three comparisons: gender, race and ethnicity, and the intersection of the two. When results come from more than one employer using the same tool, we combine them into a single aggregate view. Applicant counts are summed across employers, the selection rate is the share of that category's combined applicants who were selected, and impact ratios are averaged on a log scale, weighted by each employer's applicants in that category, and then converted back. The aggregate impact ratios below cannot be recalculated directly from the aggregate selection rates in the same table, and methods built for a single employer cannot be applied to these combined values.

How to Read This Report

This page explains the terms used in the tables ahead.

Tier

Hirevue sorts every applicant into a Bottom, Middle, or Top tier based on their assessment result. That gives two cut points to check for bias: Top plus Middle vs. Bottom, and Top vs. Middle plus Bottom.

Selection Rate

The share of applicants in a demographic group who land above a given tier threshold. A selection rate of 0.67 means 67% of that group scored into the higher tier or tiers being compared.

Impact Ratio

One group's selection rate divided by the selection rate of whichever group is selected most often (the comparator group). A ratio close to 1.00 means the two groups are selected at similar rates; the further from 1.00, the bigger the gap.

Comparator Group

The group every other group in that table is measured against; by definition its own impact ratio is 1.00, so the table shows a badge instead of a number.

N/A

There was not enough data for that group at that threshold to calculate a meaningful statistic (too few applicants, or none at all).

Hirevue Aggregate Bias Audit Analysis: Adaptability, All jobs

Selection rates and impact ratios reflect the thresholds between tiers based on Hirevue’s recommended use of the tool.

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Gender

Demographic Group	Top + Middle Tier vs. Bottom Tier				Top Tier vs. Middle + Bottom Tier		
	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio
Male	14,027	0.65	0.93		14,027	0.32	0.82
Female	7,170	0.70	Comparator Group		7,170	0.39	Comparator Group

A value marked "N/A" means there was not enough data to calculate that statistic. 1324 applicants had unknown or missing demographic information for the Top plus Middle vs. Bottom Tier analysis, and 1324 for the Top vs. Middle plus Bottom Tier analysis; those applicants are excluded from this table.

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	Top + Middle Tier vs. Bottom Tier				Top Tier vs. Middle + Bottom Tier		
	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio
Hispanic or Latino	1,701	0.67	0.95		1,701	0.36	0.95
White	8,496	0.64	0.91		8,496	0.31	0.82
Black or African American	2,197	0.68	0.94		2,197	0.32	0.84
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	22	0.73	N/A		22	0.41	N/A
Asian	7,604	0.70	Comparator Group		7,604	0.36	0.98
Native American or Alaska Native	41	0.59	N/A		41	0.24	N/A
Two or More Races	1,036	0.69	0.99		1,036	0.39	Comparator Group

A value marked "N/A" means there was not enough data to calculate that statistic. 1424 applicants had unknown or missing demographic information for the Top plus Middle vs. Bottom Tier analysis, and 1424 for the Top vs. Middle plus Bottom Tier analysis; those applicants are excluded from this table.

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

Demographic Group	Top + Middle Tier vs. Bottom Tier				Top Tier vs. Middle + Bottom Tier		
	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio
Male Hispanic or Latino	1,187	0.66	0.97		1,187	0.33	0.76
Male White	5,711	0.62	0.92		5,711	0.29	0.69
Male Black or African American	1,328	0.66	0.99		1,328	0.30	0.73
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	13	0.69	N/A		13	0.38	N/A
Male Asian	4,854	0.68	1.01		4,854	0.34	0.80
Male Native American or Alaska Native	19	0.53	N/A		19	0.26	N/A
Male Two or More Races	668	0.66	0.98		668	0.35	0.82
Female Hispanic or Latino	492	0.68	Comparator Group		492	0.43	Comparator Group
Female White	2,675	0.67	0.99		2,675	0.35	0.82
Female Black or African American	853	0.71	1.07		853	0.35	0.86
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	7	1.00	N/A		7	0.57	N/A
Female Asian	2,583	0.73	1.09		2,583	0.42	1.00
Female Native American or Alaska Native	22	0.64	N/A		22	0.23	N/A
Female Two or More Races	349	0.77	N/A		349	0.47	N/A

A value marked "N/A" means there was not enough data to calculate that statistic. 1760 applicants had unknown or missing demographic information for the Top plus Middle vs. Bottom Tier analysis, and 1760 for the Top vs. Middle plus Bottom Tier analysis; those applicants are excluded from this table.

Note: because of how these results are combined across employers, methods built for a single employer's analysis do not apply to the aggregate values above, and the aggregate impact ratios cannot be computed directly from the aggregate selection rates shown.

Notes and limitations

- Impact ratios are not reported for categories representing less than 2% of the data used for this audit, as permitted by 6 RCNY 5-301(d). Applicant counts and selection rates for those categories are shown above and are as follows: Female Two or More Races (349 applicants, selection rate 0.77); Native American or Alaska Native (41 applicants, selection rate 0.59); Female Native American or Alaska Native

(22 applicants, selection rate 0.64); Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (22 applicants, selection rate 0.73); Male Native American or Alaska Native (19 applicants, selection rate 0.53); Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (13 applicants, selection rate 0.69); Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (7 applicants, selection rate 1.00).

- Applicants who identified as non-binary or transgender cannot be represented in the sex categories that EEO-1 Component 1 defines, and are counted among the applicants with unknown demographic information noted beneath each table.
- Selection rates reflect the thresholds between assessment tiers. Organizations differ in how, and whether, they use a score to make a decision, so these rates may not correspond to any single employer's operational use of the tool.

 **Corymb** conducted this analysis and prepared this report for Hirevue. Questions about these results or how to read them: reach us at discovery@corymb.ai.

Hirevue · Communication · All jobs

Prepared for Hirevue by Corymb

Analysis Information

- Summary produced on: July 2026
- The vendor's clients did not supply specific assessment dates. The vendor confirmed that the records fall within the audit period, so the analysis covers applicants assessed during 2025 and 2026 and a narrower window could not be applied. Records from one of the vendor's clients include applicants assessed outside the United States, whose self-identified ethnicity categories were mapped to the EEO-1 categories this report requires.

Purpose

New York City Local Law 144 requires employers using an automated employment decision tool to have that tool checked for bias every year. This report analyzes the scoring algorithm for Communication used for All jobs. The analysis checks whether the tool selects candidates from different demographic groups at meaningfully different rates, using the impact ratio the law defines: the selection rate for a given group, divided by the selection rate of whichever group is selected most often.

Methodology

The law requires three comparisons: gender, race and ethnicity, and the intersection of the two. When results come from more than one employer using the same tool, we combine them into a single aggregate view. Applicant counts are summed across employers, the selection rate is the share of that category's combined applicants who were selected, and impact ratios are averaged on a log scale, weighted by each employer's applicants in that category, and then converted back. The aggregate impact ratios below cannot be recalculated directly from the aggregate selection rates in the same table, and methods built for a single employer cannot be applied to these combined values.

How to Read This Report

This page explains the terms used in the tables ahead.

Tier

Hirevue sorts every applicant into a Bottom, Middle, or Top tier based on their assessment result. That gives two cut points to check for bias: Top plus Middle vs. Bottom, and Top vs. Middle plus Bottom.

Selection Rate

The share of applicants in a demographic group who land above a given tier threshold. A selection rate of 0.67 means 67% of that group scored into the higher tier or tiers being compared.

Impact Ratio

One group's selection rate divided by the selection rate of whichever group is selected most often (the comparator group). A ratio close to 1.00 means the two groups are selected at similar rates; the further from 1.00, the bigger the gap.

Comparator Group

The group every other group in that table is measured against; by definition its own impact ratio is 1.00, so the table shows a badge instead of a number.

N/A

There was not enough data for that group at that threshold to calculate a meaningful statistic (too few applicants, or none at all).

Hirevue Aggregate Bias Audit Analysis: Communication, All jobs

Selection rates and impact ratios reflect the thresholds between tiers based on Hirevue’s recommended use of the tool.

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Gender

Demographic Group	Top + Middle Tier vs. Bottom Tier				Top Tier vs. Middle + Bottom Tier		
	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio
Male	30,206	0.66	0.93		30,206	0.32	0.83
Female	19,342	0.69	Comparator Group		19,342	0.36	Comparator Group

A value marked "N/A" means there was not enough data to calculate that statistic. 3260 applicants had unknown or missing demographic information for the Top plus Middle vs. Bottom Tier analysis, and 3260 for the Top vs. Middle plus Bottom Tier analysis; those applicants are excluded from this table.

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	Top + Middle Tier vs. Bottom Tier				Top Tier vs. Middle + Bottom Tier		
	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio
Hispanic or Latino	6,536	0.68	0.99		6,536	0.34	0.97
White	19,477	0.64	0.92		19,477	0.31	0.84
Black or African American	8,841	0.67	0.96		8,841	0.33	0.90
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	61	0.69	N/A		61	0.36	N/A
Asian	12,256	0.70	Comparator Group		12,256	0.38	Comparator Group
Native American or Alaska Native	137	0.66	N/A		137	0.28	N/A
Two or More Races	2,175	0.69	0.99		2,175	0.37	1.00

A value marked "N/A" means there was not enough data to calculate that statistic. 3325 applicants had unknown or missing demographic information for the Top plus Middle vs. Bottom Tier analysis, and 3325 for the Top vs. Middle plus Bottom Tier analysis; those applicants are excluded from this table.

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

Demographic Group	Top + Middle Tier vs. Bottom Tier				Top Tier vs. Middle + Bottom Tier		
	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio
Male Hispanic or Latino	3,664	0.69	Comparator Group		3,664	0.34	0.94
Male White	12,430	0.64	0.96		12,430	0.30	0.84
Male Black or African American	4,613	0.64	0.95		4,613	0.30	0.81
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	31	0.71	N/A		31	0.35	N/A
Male Asian	7,623	0.68	1.07		7,623	0.35	Comparator Group
Male Native American or Alaska Native	72	0.62	N/A		72	0.21	N/A
Male Two or More Races	1,280	0.66	1.01		1,280	0.34	0.95
Female Hispanic or Latino	2,758	0.66	0.94		2,758	0.34	0.93
Female White	6,759	0.65	0.96		6,759	0.33	0.89
Female Black or African American	4,123	0.70	1.00		4,123	0.36	0.99
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	28	0.68	N/A		28	0.39	N/A
Female Asian	4,373	0.73	1.11		4,373	0.42	1.15
Female Native American or Alaska Native	65	0.69	N/A		65	0.35	N/A
Female Two or More Races	854	0.74	N/A		854	0.42	N/A

A value marked "N/A" means there was not enough data to calculate that statistic. 4135 applicants had unknown or missing demographic information for the Top plus Middle vs. Bottom Tier analysis, and 4135 for the Top vs. Middle plus Bottom Tier analysis; those applicants are excluded from this table.

Note: because of how these results are combined across employers, methods built for a single employer's analysis do not apply to the aggregate values above, and the aggregate impact ratios cannot be computed directly from the aggregate selection rates shown.

Notes and limitations

- Impact ratios are not reported for categories representing less than 2% of the data used for this audit, as permitted by 6 RCNY 5-301(d). Applicant counts and selection rates for those categories are shown above and are as follows: Female Two or More Races (854 applicants, selection rate 0.74); Native American or Alaska Native (137 applicants, selection rate 0.66); Male Native American or Alaska Native (72 applicants, selection rate 0.62); Female Native American or Alaska Native (65 applicants, selection rate 0.69); Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (61 applicants, selection rate 0.69); Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (31 applicants, selection rate 0.71); Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (28 applicants, selection rate 0.68).
- Applicants who identified as non-binary or transgender cannot be represented in the sex categories that EEO-1 Component 1 defines, and are counted among the applicants with unknown demographic information noted beneath each table.
- Selection rates reflect the thresholds between assessment tiers. Organizations differ in how, and whether, they use a score to make a decision, so these rates may not correspond to any single employer's operational use of the tool.

 **Corymb** conducted this analysis and prepared this report for Hirevue. Questions about these results or how to read them: reach us at discovery@corymb.ai.

Hirevue · Composure · All jobs

Prepared for Hirevue by Corymb

Analysis Information

- Summary produced on: July 2026
- The vendor's client did not supply specific assessment dates. The vendor confirmed that the records fall within the audit period, so the analysis covers applicants assessed during 2025 and 2026 and a narrower window could not be applied. Records from one of the vendor's clients include applicants assessed outside the United States, whose self-identified ethnicity categories were mapped to the EEO-1 categories this report requires.

Purpose

New York City Local Law 144 requires employers using an automated employment decision tool to have that tool checked for bias every year. This report analyzes the scoring algorithm for Composure used for All jobs. The analysis checks whether the tool selects candidates from different demographic groups at meaningfully different rates, using the impact ratio the law defines: the selection rate for a given group, divided by the selection rate of whichever group is selected most often.

Methodology

The law requires three comparisons: gender, race and ethnicity, and the intersection of the two. When results come from more than one employer using the same tool, we combine them into a single aggregate view. Applicant counts are summed across employers, the selection rate is the share of that category's combined applicants who were selected, and impact ratios are averaged on a log scale, weighted by each employer's applicants in that category, and then converted back. The aggregate impact ratios below cannot be recalculated directly from the aggregate selection rates in the same table, and methods built for a single employer cannot be applied to these combined values.

How to Read This Report

This page explains the terms used in the tables ahead.

Tier

Hirevue sorts every applicant into a Bottom, Middle, or Top tier based on their assessment result. That gives two cut points to check for bias: Top plus Middle vs. Bottom, and Top vs. Middle plus Bottom.

Selection Rate

The share of applicants in a demographic group who land above a given tier threshold. A selection rate of 0.67 means 67% of that group scored into the higher tier or tiers being compared.

Impact Ratio

One group's selection rate divided by the selection rate of whichever group is selected most often (the comparator group). A ratio close to 1.00 means the two groups are selected at similar rates; the further from 1.00, the bigger the gap.

Comparator Group

The group every other group in that table is measured against; by definition its own impact ratio is 1.00, so the table shows a badge instead of a number.

N/A

There was not enough data for that group at that threshold to calculate a meaningful statistic (too few applicants, or none at all).

Hirevue Bias Audit Analysis: Composure, All jobs

Selection rates and impact ratios reflect the thresholds between tiers based on Hirevue’s recommended use of the tool.

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Gender

Demographic Group	Top + Middle Tier vs. Bottom Tier				Top Tier vs. Middle + Bottom Tier		
	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio
Male	466	0.68	Comparator Group		466	0.34	Comparator Group
Female	675	0.67	0.99		675	0.34	1.00

A value marked "N/A" means there was not enough data to calculate that statistic. 31 applicants had unknown or missing demographic information for the Top plus Middle vs. Bottom Tier analysis, and 31 for the Top vs. Middle plus Bottom Tier analysis; those applicants are excluded from this table.

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	Top + Middle Tier vs. Bottom Tier				Top Tier vs. Middle + Bottom Tier		
	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio
Hispanic or Latino	118	0.67	0.82		118	0.30	0.67
White	441	0.66	0.81		441	0.36	0.81
Black or African American	428	0.66	0.80		428	0.30	0.68
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	2	0.50	N/A		2	0.50	N/A
Asian	44	0.82	Comparator Group		44	0.34	0.77
Native American or Alaska Native	17	0.53	N/A		17	0.24	N/A
Two or More Races	63	0.73	0.89		63	0.44	Comparator Group

A value marked "N/A" means there was not enough data to calculate that statistic. 59 applicants had unknown or missing demographic information for the Top plus Middle vs. Bottom Tier analysis, and 59 for the Top vs. Middle plus Bottom Tier analysis; those applicants are excluded from this table.

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

Demographic Group	Top + Middle Tier vs. Bottom Tier				Top Tier vs. Middle + Bottom Tier		
	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio
Male Hispanic or Latino	63	0.67	0.79		63	0.30	0.68
Male White	176	0.69	0.82		176	0.37	0.83
Male Black or African American	160	0.64	0.77		160	0.31	0.70
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	2	0.50	N/A		2	0.50	N/A
Male Asian	25	0.84	Comparator Group		25	0.20	0.45
Male Native American or Alaska Native	7	0.57	N/A		7	0.29	N/A
Male Two or More Races	18	0.72	N/A		18	0.44	N/A
Female Hispanic or Latino	54	0.67	0.79		54	0.28	0.62
Female White	257	0.65	0.77		257	0.36	0.81
Female Black or African American	267	0.67	0.79		267	0.30	0.67
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	N/A	N/A		0	N/A	N/A
Female Asian	19	0.79	N/A		19	0.53	N/A
Female Native American or Alaska Native	10	0.50	N/A		10	0.20	N/A
Female Two or More Races	45	0.73	0.87		45	0.44	Comparator Group

A value marked "N/A" means there was not enough data to calculate that statistic. 69 applicants had unknown or missing demographic information for the Top plus Middle vs. Bottom Tier analysis, and 69 for the Top vs. Middle plus Bottom Tier analysis; those applicants are excluded from this table.

Notes and limitations

- Impact ratios are not reported for categories representing less than 2% of the data used for this audit, as permitted by 6 RCNY 5-301(d). Applicant counts and selection rates for those categories are shown above and are as follows: Female Asian (19 applicants, selection rate 0.79); Male Two or More Races (18 applicants, selection rate 0.72); Native American or Alaska Native (17 applicants, selection rate 0.53); Female Native American or Alaska Native (10 applicants, selection rate 0.50); Male Native American or

Alaska Native (7 applicants, selection rate 0.57); Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (2 applicants, selection rate 0.50); Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (2 applicants, selection rate 0.50).

- Applicants who identified as non-binary or transgender cannot be represented in the sex categories that EEO-1 Component 1 defines, and are counted among the applicants with unknown demographic information noted beneath each table.
- Selection rates reflect the thresholds between assessment tiers. Organizations differ in how, and whether, they use a score to make a decision, so these rates may not correspond to any single employer's operational use of the tool.

 **Corymb** conducted this analysis and prepared this report for Hirevue. Questions about these results or how to read them: reach us at discovery@corymb.ai.

Hirevue · Dependability · All jobs

Prepared for Hirevue by Corymb

Analysis Information

- Summary produced on: July 2026
- The vendor's clients did not supply specific assessment dates. The vendor confirmed that the records fall within the audit period, so the analysis covers applicants assessed during 2025 and 2026 and a narrower window could not be applied. Records from one of the vendor's clients include applicants assessed outside the United States, whose self-identified ethnicity categories were mapped to the EEO-1 categories this report requires.

Purpose

New York City Local Law 144 requires employers using an automated employment decision tool to have that tool checked for bias every year. This report analyzes the scoring algorithm for Dependability used for All jobs. The analysis checks whether the tool selects candidates from different demographic groups at meaningfully different rates, using the impact ratio the law defines: the selection rate for a given group, divided by the selection rate of whichever group is selected most often.

Methodology

The law requires three comparisons: gender, race and ethnicity, and the intersection of the two. When results come from more than one employer using the same tool, we combine them into a single aggregate view. Applicant counts are summed across employers, the selection rate is the share of that category's combined applicants who were selected, and impact ratios are averaged on a log scale, weighted by each employer's applicants in that category, and then converted back. The aggregate impact ratios below cannot be recalculated directly from the aggregate selection rates in the same table, and methods built for a single employer cannot be applied to these combined values.

How to Read This Report

This page explains the terms used in the tables ahead.

Tier

Hirevue sorts every applicant into a Bottom, Middle, or Top tier based on their assessment result. That gives two cut points to check for bias: Top plus Middle vs. Bottom, and Top vs. Middle plus Bottom.

Selection Rate

The share of applicants in a demographic group who land above a given tier threshold. A selection rate of 0.67 means 67% of that group scored into the higher tier or tiers being compared.

Impact Ratio

One group's selection rate divided by the selection rate of whichever group is selected most often (the comparator group). A ratio close to 1.00 means the two groups are selected at similar rates; the further from 1.00, the bigger the gap.

Comparator Group

The group every other group in that table is measured against; by definition its own impact ratio is 1.00, so the table shows a badge instead of a number.

N/A

There was not enough data for that group at that threshold to calculate a meaningful statistic (too few applicants, or none at all).

Hirevue Aggregate Bias Audit Analysis: Dependability, All jobs

Selection rates and impact ratios reflect the thresholds between tiers based on Hirevue's recommended use of the tool.

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Gender

Demographic Group	Top + Middle Tier vs. Bottom Tier				Top Tier vs. Middle + Bottom Tier		
	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio
Male	15,704	0.64	0.84		15,704	0.32	0.78
Female	4,639	0.76	Comparator Group		4,639	0.41	Comparator Group

A value marked "N/A" means there was not enough data to calculate that statistic. 1173 applicants had unknown or missing demographic information for the Top plus Middle vs. Bottom Tier analysis, and 1173 for the Top vs. Middle plus Bottom Tier analysis; those applicants are excluded from this table.

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	Top + Middle Tier vs. Bottom Tier				Top Tier vs. Middle + Bottom Tier		
	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio
Hispanic or Latino	715	0.63	0.91		715	0.32	0.88
White	9,875	0.63	0.84		9,875	0.30	0.72
Black or African American	2,234	0.67	0.88		2,234	0.35	0.82
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	9	0.78	N/A		9	0.33	N/A
Asian	6,902	0.73	Comparator Group		6,902	0.40	Comparator Group
Native American or Alaska Native	6	0.67	N/A		6	0.33	N/A
Two or More Races	789	0.69	0.93		789	0.33	0.82

A value marked "N/A" means there was not enough data to calculate that statistic. 986 applicants had unknown or missing demographic information for the Top plus Middle vs. Bottom Tier analysis, and 986 for the Top vs. Middle plus Bottom Tier analysis; those applicants are excluded from this table.

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

Demographic Group	Top + Middle Tier vs. Bottom Tier				Top Tier vs. Middle + Bottom Tier		
	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio
Male Hispanic or Latino	539	0.62	0.86		539	0.33	0.85
Male White	7,858	0.60	0.74		7,858	0.27	0.59
Male Black or African American	1,653	0.64	0.77		1,653	0.33	0.69
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	5	0.80	N/A		5	0.40	N/A
Male Asian	4,869	0.72	0.91		4,869	0.39	0.87
Male Native American or Alaska Native	4	0.50	N/A		4	0.25	N/A
Male Two or More Races	604	0.65	0.81		604	0.29	0.65
Female Hispanic or Latino	162	0.64	N/A		162	0.29	N/A
Female White	1,827	0.74	0.93		1,827	0.38	0.84
Female Black or African American	558	0.76	0.92		558	0.41	0.87
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	2	1.00	N/A		2	0.50	N/A
Female Asian	1,836	0.78	Comparator Group		1,836	0.44	Comparator Group
Female Native American or Alaska Native	2	1.00	N/A		2	0.50	N/A
Female Two or More Races	166	0.81	N/A		166	0.46	N/A

A value marked "N/A" means there was not enough data to calculate that statistic. 1431 applicants had unknown or missing demographic information for the Top plus Middle vs. Bottom Tier analysis, and 1431 for the Top vs. Middle plus Bottom Tier analysis; those applicants are excluded from this table.

Note: because of how these results are combined across employers, methods built for a single employer's analysis do not apply to the aggregate values above, and the aggregate impact ratios cannot be computed directly from the aggregate selection rates shown.

Notes and limitations

- Impact ratios are not reported for categories representing less than 2% of the data used for this audit, as permitted by 6 RCNY 5-301(d). Applicant counts and selection rates for those categories are shown above and are as follows: Female Two or More Races (166 applicants, selection rate 0.81); Female

Hispanic or Latino (162 applicants, selection rate 0.64); Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (9 applicants, selection rate 0.78); Native American or Alaska Native (6 applicants, selection rate 0.67); Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (5 applicants, selection rate 0.80); Male Native American or Alaska Native (4 applicants, selection rate 0.50); Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (2 applicants, selection rate 1.00); Female Native American or Alaska Native (2 applicants, selection rate 1.00).

- Applicants who identified as non-binary or transgender cannot be represented in the sex categories that EEO-1 Component 1 defines, and are counted among the applicants with unknown demographic information noted beneath each table.
- Selection rates reflect the thresholds between assessment tiers. Organizations differ in how, and whether, they use a score to make a decision, so these rates may not correspond to any single employer's operational use of the tool.

 **Corymb** conducted this analysis and prepared this report for Hirevue. Questions about these results or how to read them: reach us at discovery@corymb.ai.

Hirevue · Service Focus · All jobs

Prepared for Hirevue by Corymb

Analysis Information

- Summary produced on: July 2026
- The vendor's clients did not supply specific assessment dates. The vendor confirmed that the records fall within the audit period, so the analysis covers applicants assessed during 2025 and 2026 and a narrower window could not be applied. Records from one of the vendor's clients include applicants assessed outside the United States, whose self-identified ethnicity categories were mapped to the EEO-1 categories this report requires.

Purpose

New York City Local Law 144 requires employers using an automated employment decision tool to have that tool checked for bias every year. This report analyzes the scoring algorithm for Service Focus used for All jobs. The analysis checks whether the tool selects candidates from different demographic groups at meaningfully different rates, using the impact ratio the law defines: the selection rate for a given group, divided by the selection rate of whichever group is selected most often.

Methodology

The law requires three comparisons: gender, race and ethnicity, and the intersection of the two. When results come from more than one employer using the same tool, we combine them into a single aggregate view. Applicant counts are summed across employers, the selection rate is the share of that category's combined applicants who were selected, and impact ratios are averaged on a log scale, weighted by each employer's applicants in that category, and then converted back. The aggregate impact ratios below cannot be recalculated directly from the aggregate selection rates in the same table, and methods built for a single employer cannot be applied to these combined values.

How to Read This Report

This page explains the terms used in the tables ahead.

Tier

Hirevue sorts every applicant into a Bottom, Middle, or Top tier based on their assessment result. That gives two cut points to check for bias: Top plus Middle vs. Bottom, and Top vs. Middle plus Bottom.

Selection Rate

The share of applicants in a demographic group who land above a given tier threshold. A selection rate of 0.67 means 67% of that group scored into the higher tier or tiers being compared.

Impact Ratio

One group's selection rate divided by the selection rate of whichever group is selected most often (the comparator group). A ratio close to 1.00 means the two groups are selected at similar rates; the further from 1.00, the bigger the gap.

Comparator Group

The group every other group in that table is measured against; by definition its own impact ratio is 1.00, so the table shows a badge instead of a number.

N/A

There was not enough data for that group at that threshold to calculate a meaningful statistic (too few applicants, or none at all).

Hirevue Aggregate Bias Audit Analysis: Service Focus, All jobs

Selection rates and impact ratios reflect the thresholds between tiers based on Hirevue’s recommended use of the tool.

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Gender

Demographic Group	Top + Middle Tier vs. Bottom Tier				Top Tier vs. Middle + Bottom Tier		
	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio
Male	8,995	0.70	Comparator Group		8,995	0.37	Comparator Group
Female	11,236	0.65	0.94		11,236	0.32	0.87

A value marked "N/A" means there was not enough data to calculate that statistic. 1704 applicants had unknown or missing demographic information for the Top plus Middle vs. Bottom Tier analysis, and 1704 for the Top vs. Middle plus Bottom Tier analysis; those applicants are excluded from this table.

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	Top + Middle Tier vs. Bottom Tier				Top Tier vs. Middle + Bottom Tier		
	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio
Hispanic or Latino	4,351	0.69	0.98		4,351	0.36	Comparator Group
White	7,096	0.64	0.90		7,096	0.34	0.93
Black or African American	5,218	0.67	0.93		5,218	0.32	0.90
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	35	0.69	N/A		35	0.43	N/A
Asian	2,688	0.71	Comparator Group		2,688	0.35	0.97
Native American or Alaska Native	77	0.65	N/A		77	0.31	N/A
Two or More Races	800	0.66	0.92		800	0.34	0.95

A value marked "N/A" means there was not enough data to calculate that statistic. 1670 applicants had unknown or missing demographic information for the Top plus Middle vs. Bottom Tier analysis, and 1670 for the Top vs. Middle plus Bottom Tier analysis; those applicants are excluded from this table.

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

Demographic Group	Top + Middle Tier vs. Bottom Tier				Top Tier vs. Middle + Bottom Tier		
	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio
Male Hispanic or Latino	2,015	0.73	Comparator Group		2,015	0.39	Comparator Group
Male White	3,295	0.67	0.92		3,295	0.36	0.92
Male Black or African American	1,952	0.69	0.95		1,952	0.34	0.85
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	14	0.79	N/A		14	0.57	N/A
Male Asian	1,268	0.73	1.00		1,268	0.37	0.94
Male Native American or Alaska Native	28	0.68	N/A		28	0.32	N/A
Male Two or More Races	315	0.65	N/A		315	0.38	N/A
Female Hispanic or Latino	2,251	0.66	0.90		2,251	0.33	0.83
Female White	3,698	0.62	0.85		3,698	0.31	0.79
Female Black or African American	3,186	0.66	0.90		3,186	0.32	0.81
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	21	0.62	N/A		21	0.33	N/A
Female Asian	1,368	0.70	0.95		1,368	0.33	0.83
Female Native American or Alaska Native	49	0.63	N/A		49	0.31	N/A
Female Two or More Races	477	0.66	0.92		477	0.32	0.82

A value marked "N/A" means there was not enough data to calculate that statistic. 1998 applicants had unknown or missing demographic information for the Top plus Middle vs. Bottom Tier analysis, and 1998 for the Top vs. Middle plus Bottom Tier analysis; those applicants are excluded from this table.

Note: because of how these results are combined across employers, methods built for a single employer's analysis do not apply to the aggregate values above, and the aggregate impact ratios cannot be computed directly from the aggregate selection rates shown.

Notes and limitations

- Impact ratios are not reported for categories representing less than 2% of the data used for this audit, as permitted by 6 RCNY 5-301(d). Applicant counts and selection rates for those categories are shown above and are as follows: Male Two or More Races (315 applicants, selection rate 0.65); Native American

or Alaska Native (77 applicants, selection rate 0.65); Female Native American or Alaska Native (49 applicants, selection rate 0.63); Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (35 applicants, selection rate 0.69); Male Native American or Alaska Native (28 applicants, selection rate 0.68); Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (21 applicants, selection rate 0.62); Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (14 applicants, selection rate 0.79).

- Applicants who identified as non-binary or transgender cannot be represented in the sex categories that EEO-1 Component 1 defines, and are counted among the applicants with unknown demographic information noted beneath each table.
- Selection rates reflect the thresholds between assessment tiers. Organizations differ in how, and whether, they use a score to make a decision, so these rates may not correspond to any single employer's operational use of the tool.

 **Corymb** conducted this analysis and prepared this report for Hirevue. Questions about these results or how to read them: reach us at discovery@corymb.ai.

Hirevue · Willingness to Learn · All jobs

Prepared for Hirevue by Corymb

Analysis Information

- Summary produced on: July 2026
- The vendor's clients did not supply specific assessment dates. The vendor confirmed that the records fall within the audit period, so the analysis covers applicants assessed during 2025 and 2026 and a narrower window could not be applied. Records from one of the vendor's clients include applicants assessed outside the United States, whose self-identified ethnicity categories were mapped to the EEO-1 categories this report requires.

Purpose

New York City Local Law 144 requires employers using an automated employment decision tool to have that tool checked for bias every year. This report analyzes the scoring algorithm for Willingness to Learn used for All jobs. The analysis checks whether the tool selects candidates from different demographic groups at meaningfully different rates, using the impact ratio the law defines: the selection rate for a given group, divided by the selection rate of whichever group is selected most often.

Methodology

The law requires three comparisons: gender, race and ethnicity, and the intersection of the two. When results come from more than one employer using the same tool, we combine them into a single aggregate view. Applicant counts are summed across employers, the selection rate is the share of that category's combined applicants who were selected, and impact ratios are averaged on a log scale, weighted by each employer's applicants in that category, and then converted back. The aggregate impact ratios below cannot be recalculated directly from the aggregate selection rates in the same table, and methods built for a single employer cannot be applied to these combined values.

How to Read This Report

This page explains the terms used in the tables ahead.

Tier

Hirevue sorts every applicant into a Bottom, Middle, or Top tier based on their assessment result. That gives two cut points to check for bias: Top plus Middle vs. Bottom, and Top vs. Middle plus Bottom.

Selection Rate

The share of applicants in a demographic group who land above a given tier threshold. A selection rate of 0.67 means 67% of that group scored into the higher tier or tiers being compared.

Impact Ratio

One group's selection rate divided by the selection rate of whichever group is selected most often (the comparator group). A ratio close to 1.00 means the two groups are selected at similar rates; the further from 1.00, the bigger the gap.

Comparator Group

The group every other group in that table is measured against; by definition its own impact ratio is 1.00, so the table shows a badge instead of a number.

N/A

There was not enough data for that group at that threshold to calculate a meaningful statistic (too few applicants, or none at all).

Hirevue Aggregate Bias Audit Analysis: Willingness to Learn, All jobs

Selection rates and impact ratios reflect the thresholds between tiers based on Hirevue’s recommended use of the tool.

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Gender

Demographic Group	Top + Middle Tier vs. Bottom Tier				Top Tier vs. Middle + Bottom Tier		
	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio
Male	29,943	0.65	0.88		29,943	0.32	0.79
Female	13,651	0.72	Comparator Group		13,651	0.38	Comparator Group

A value marked "N/A" means there was not enough data to calculate that statistic. 1933 applicants had unknown or missing demographic information for the Top plus Middle vs. Bottom Tier analysis, and 1933 for the Top vs. Middle plus Bottom Tier analysis; those applicants are excluded from this table.

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	Top + Middle Tier vs. Bottom Tier				Top Tier vs. Middle + Bottom Tier		
	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio
Hispanic or Latino	3,794	0.68	0.94		3,794	0.34	0.88
White	19,566	0.63	0.88		19,566	0.31	0.79
Black or African American	6,406	0.66	0.91		6,406	0.34	0.84
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	42	0.86	N/A		42	0.40	N/A
Asian	11,661	0.72	1.00		11,661	0.38	Comparator Group
Native American or Alaska Native	108	0.66	N/A		108	0.28	N/A
Two or More Races	1,963	0.72	Comparator Group		1,963	0.37	0.95

A value marked "N/A" means there was not enough data to calculate that statistic. 1987 applicants had unknown or missing demographic information for the Top plus Middle vs. Bottom Tier analysis, and 1987 for the Top vs. Middle plus Bottom Tier analysis; those applicants are excluded from this table.

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

Demographic Group	Top + Middle Tier vs. Bottom Tier				Top Tier vs. Middle + Bottom Tier		
	Number of Applicants	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio		Number of Applicants	Selection Rate	Impact Ratio
Male Hispanic or Latino	2,341	0.69	0.97		2,341	0.34	0.90
Male White	14,144	0.61	0.86		14,144	0.29	0.76
Male Black or African American	3,899	0.64	0.89		3,899	0.31	0.81
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	27	0.85	N/A		27	0.33	N/A
Male Asian	7,706	0.70	Comparator Group		7,706	0.36	Comparator Group
Male Native American or Alaska Native	62	0.61	N/A		62	0.16	N/A
Male Two or More Races	1,301	0.69	0.98		1,301	0.34	0.91
Female Hispanic or Latino	1,388	0.68	0.95		1,388	0.33	0.89
Female White	5,131	0.70	0.98		5,131	0.36	0.96
Female Black or African American	2,446	0.70	0.97		2,446	0.37	0.97
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	13	0.92	N/A		13	0.54	N/A
Female Asian	3,713	0.75	1.06		3,713	0.42	1.16
Female Native American or Alaska Native	46	0.72	N/A		46	0.43	N/A
Female Two or More Races	622	0.78	N/A		622	0.43	N/A

A value marked "N/A" means there was not enough data to calculate that statistic. 2688 applicants had unknown or missing demographic information for the Top plus Middle vs. Bottom Tier analysis, and 2688 for the Top vs. Middle plus Bottom Tier analysis; those applicants are excluded from this table.

Note: because of how these results are combined across employers, methods built for a single employer's analysis do not apply to the aggregate values above, and the aggregate impact ratios cannot be computed directly from the aggregate selection rates shown.

Notes and limitations

- Impact ratios are not reported for categories representing less than 2% of the data used for this audit, as permitted by 6 RCNY 5-301(d). Applicant counts and selection rates for those categories are shown above and are as follows: Female Two or More Races (622 applicants, selection rate 0.78); Native

American or Alaska Native (108 applicants, selection rate 0.66); Male Native American or Alaska Native (62 applicants, selection rate 0.61); Female Native American or Alaska Native (46 applicants, selection rate 0.72); Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (42 applicants, selection rate 0.86); Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (27 applicants, selection rate 0.85); Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (13 applicants, selection rate 0.92).

- Applicants who identified as non-binary or transgender cannot be represented in the sex categories that EEO-1 Component 1 defines, and are counted among the applicants with unknown demographic information noted beneath each table.
- Selection rates reflect the thresholds between assessment tiers. Organizations differ in how, and whether, they use a score to make a decision, so these rates may not correspond to any single employer's operational use of the tool.

 **Corymb** conducted this analysis and prepared this report for Hirevue. Questions about these results or how to read them: reach us at discovery@corymb.ai.