



iCIMS Bias Audit

**Summary of Results from 2024 Audit in
response to New York City Local Law
144/2021**

iCIMS, Lauren.Bonfiglio@icims.com 2025-06-27T13:45:29.437Z



Date: February 24, 2025

iCIMS engaged BABL AI, Inc. (“BABL”) to perform an independent bias audit of the iCIMS “Candidate Ranking” algorithm in accordance with the requirements outlined in NYC Local Law No. 144 of 2021. The bias audit was concluded on February 14, 2025. The Candidate Ranking feature was first distributed in Winter 2021. A summary of the bias audit results is set forth below.

NOTE: The below summary has been prepared by iCIMS, Inc. in collaboration with BABL AI. This summary is intended for use for (a) iCIMS’ compliance with Local Law 144/2021; and (b) to assist iCIMS’ customers with their compliance efforts. However, this summary report should not be relied on exclusively or dispositively by any employer to satisfy their own legal obligations. iCIMS’ customers are advised to confer with their own legal counsel as to how they can be fully compliant with the law. A complete audit report can be obtained by iCIMS’ customers if requested in writing to responsibleai@icims.com.

System Description

BABL AI was engaged to audit iCIMS Candidate Ranking Algorithm. Candidate Ranking is an automated feature in the iCIMS Applicant Tracking System (ATS) which assists recruiters in the hiring process. The feature supports candidate screening by ranking applicants based on their match with requirements of a job. The algorithm determines a similarity score for candidate's resume text compared with the job description text by using only skills and titles defined in an iCIMS proprietary taxonomy. No other attributes are used.

The feature outputs a ranked list of all candidates of a job based on their match score, and all subsequent decisions are made by the user – typically, a recruiter. A positive outcome in the context of this audit is defined by being in the top 10 of the ranking produced by the algorithm. The results for candidates that belong to various self-declared demographic groups are displayed below.



Conclusions

BABL's opinions for the bias audit of Candidate Ranking algorithm by iCIMS are as follows:

Audit Section	Opinion
Disparate Impact	PASS ✓
Governance	PASS ✓
Risk Assessment	PASS ✓
Overall	PASS ✓

Type(s) of Data Collected

Source and Explanation of the Data Used to Conduct the Bias Audit

The source of the data used by iCIMS to test for bias and disparate impact was collected over the period of time from November 2023 through November 2024. This was anonymized production data on jobs, candidates, and candidate rankings against the jobs. iCIMS provided BABL with copies of its bias testing data and disparate impact results. Details about the testing of such data are set forth below:

Testing conducted by: iCIMS

Date of last testing: December 2024

Time span of data: November 2023 through November 2024

PCVs for which disparate impact was quantified:

1. Gender
2. Race/ethnicity

Positive outcome: Being in the top 10 of the ranking produced by the algorithm.

User-configurable settings that can affect positive outcome:

1. Administrator-controlled settings for job descriptions in the ATS
2. Filters and sorts applied by users, such as by:
 - a. Application information
 - b. Candidate Information

c. Textual elements – e.g., keyword

Settings on which disparate impact was tested: a wide set of permutations and combinations of administrator settings for a variety of jobs in a variety of industries, and without applying any filtering or sorting options.

Metric corresponding to the selection rate: the number of candidates of a demographic group being in the top 10 ranking over the total number of candidates of that group.

Selection Rates and Impact Ratios

Non-intersectional, Gender, sorted by Impact ratio

	N applicants	Selection rate	Impact ratio
Female	29,332	0.641	1.000
Male	32,598	0.625	0.975

Non-intersectional, Race/ethnicity, sorted by Impact ratio

	N applicants	Selection rate	Impact ratio
White	23,203	0.648	1.000
Black or African American	14,714	0.639	0.986
Asian	7,325	0.632	0.975
Two or more races	2,493	0.627	0.967
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	233	0.622	N/A*
Native American or Alaskan Native	522	0.613	N/A*
Hispanic or Latino	8,850	0.607	0.936

*N/A refers to the demographic group representing less than 2% of the total N applications in the table. Numbers in red indicate values below the four-fifths rule.

Intersectionals, sorted by Impact ratio

		N applicants	Selection rate	Impact ratio ⁶
Male	Hispanic or Latino	4,934	0.600	0.915
	White	12,276	0.643	0.980
	Asian	4,143	0.636	0.970
	Black or African American	6,635	0.624	0.952
	Native American or Alaskan Native	290	0.638	N/A
	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	130	0.638	N/A
	Two or more races	1,175	0.608	0.927
Female	Hispanic or Latino	3,845	0.617	0.941
	White	10,706	0.656	1.000
	Asian	3,119	0.624	0.952
	Black or African American	7,953	0.652	0.995
	Native American or Alaskan Native	223	0.601	N/A
	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	102	0.598	N/A
	Two or more races	1,282	0.647	0.986

N/A refers to the demographic group representing less than 2% of the total N applications in the table. Numbers in red indicate values below the four-fifths rule.