



GoodTime - Applicant Screening Tool

New York City Local Law 144 Bias Audit Report
Last Updated: July 3, 2025



Compliance Statement

This report has been prepared by Fairly AI, Inc., an independent auditor, in accordance with the requirements of New York City Local Law 144 for Automated Employment Decision Tools (AEDTs). It provides an independent bias audit but does not categorically make a determination as to whether GoodTime's use of Applicant Screening Tool qualifies as an AEDT under the law, nor does it evaluate compliance with the notice or public disclosure requirements of NYC Local Law 144.

Key Findings

Tool Audited: GoodTime - Applicant Screening Tool

Audit Period: June 2025

Sample size: 72000

Our analysis found no evidence of disparate impact, as all groups had a selection rate of at least 80% of the most favored group's selection rate across (i) sex, (ii) race/ethnicity, and (iii) all combinations of sex and race/ethnicity, provided the sample size met the minimum threshold for reliable analysis.

Summary

This report summarizes the bias audit results and methodology for Applicant Screening Tool, developed by GoodTime, in compliance with New York City Local Law 144 Bias Audit.

Our audit examines scoring patterns across demographic groups to ensure fair treatment of all applicants. The analysis compares the percentage of candidates scoring above the minimum threshold (69th percentile) across demographic categories.

The outcome data used in this audit was provided by GoodTime. Fairly AI has conducted the analysis based on this data and has not independently verified its accuracy, completeness, or representativeness. The findings of this audit are therefore reliant on the integrity of the data as provided by GoodTime.

Tool Description

Description of the tool, including how candidates are scored.

The tool is designed to streamline candidate screening by integrating with Applicant Tracking Systems (ATS). Jobs are set up with three tiers of candidate requirements:

1. Required: Must-have qualifications (pass/fail).
2. Ideal: Core qualifications desired for the role.
3. Nice-to-Have: Optional attributes that can help a candidate stand out but aren't mandatory.

Once candidates apply via the ATS, the tool automatically evaluates resumes. Each candidate is scored (0–100) and classified into one of three statuses:

1. Recommended
2. Review
3. Not Recommended

AEDT Classification

This tool may qualify as an Automated Employment Decision Tool under NYC Local Law 144 because it:

1. Uses computational processes derived from artificial intelligence.
2. Substantially assists employment decision-making by providing standardized resume scoring algorithm.
3. Materially impacts natural persons by influencing which candidates advance in the hiring process.

Implementation Process

This evaluation takes place at the “Review Applications” stage in the job pipeline. Based on scores and internal decisions, candidates are moved to the next stage or marked as not recommended.

Data Collection

How demographic data was collected

All demographic data were synthetically generated using reality-rooted scenarios supplied by Fairly AI. Demographic categories are designed to align with EEOC reporting requirements including:

- Sex (Female, Male, Other, Prefer not to answer)
- Race/Ethnicity (American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, Two or more races, White, Other, Prefer not to answer)

Audit Results

Candidate Scoring Methodology Analysis

The tool has numerical scoring from 0 to 100. The scores are then used to group the candidates into 3 different statuses (4 different buckets):

0: Not recommended (Doesn't meet all hard requirements)

1 - 69: Not Recommended

70 - 84: Review

85+: Recommended

The tool provides a dashboard that shows all candidates and their status to the talent acquisition team. Since all candidates are shown to the recruiters and there is not a designated pass/fail cutoff at the candidate level, the scoring rate methodology is in alignment with NYC Local Law 144's recommendation.

Categories representing < 2 % of the audit dataset are excluded per § 5-301(d) and are noted by asterisk (*). No categories in this dataset were excluded.

Impact Ratio Analysis: Sex

Sex	# of Applicants	Scoring Rate	Impact Ratio
unknown	17749	61.01	0.99
female	18093	61.52	1.0
male	18294	61.62	1.0
other	17864	60.38	0.98

Impact Ratio Analysis: Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	# of Applicants	Scoring Rate	Impact Ratio
Other	7512	61.16	0.98
Asian	17333	60.88	0.98
White	8733	60.7	0.98
Hispanic Or Latino	8982	61.86	1.0
American Indian Or Alaskan Native	4432	60.79	0.98
Unknown	3218	62.15	1.0
Native Hawaiian Or Other Pacific Islander	12988	60.66	0.98
Two Or More Races	4423	61.81	0.99
Black Or African American	4379	61.91	1.0

Impact Ratio Analysis: Intersectional

Race/Ethnicity	Sex	# of Applicants	Scoring Rate	Impact Ratio
Other	unknown	1875	61.23	0.97
Other	female	1889	62.15	0.98
Other	male	1909	61.71	0.98
Other	other	1839	59.49	0.94
Asian	unknown	4219	60.39	0.95
Asian	female	4405	61.45	0.97
Asian	male	4401	61.03	0.96
Asian	other	4308	60.61	0.96
White	unknown	2208	61.1	0.97
White	female	2121	61.95	0.98
White	male	2204	61.48	0.97
White	other	2200	58.32	0.92
Hispanic Or Latino	unknown	2188	63.03	1.0
Hispanic Or Latino	female	2282	60.91	0.96
Hispanic Or Latino	male	2288	62.89	0.99

Race/Ethnicity	Sex	# of Applicants	Scoring Rate	Impact Ratio
Hispanic Or Latino	other	2224	60.61	0.96
American Indian Or Alaskan Native	unknown	1059	57.41	0.91
American Indian Or Alaskan Native	female	1156	62.72	0.99
American Indian Or Alaskan Native	male	1139	61.55	0.97
American Indian Or Alaskan Native	other	1078	61.22	0.97
Unknown	unknown	749	60.75	0.96
Unknown	female	797	61.48	0.97
Unknown	male	819	63.0	1.0
Unknown	other	853	63.19	1.0
Native Hawaiian Or Other Pacific Islander	unknown	3262	60.73	0.96
Native Hawaiian Or Other Pacific Islander	female	3238	60.01	0.95
Native Hawaiian Or Other Pacific Islander	male	3285	60.94	0.96
Native Hawaiian Or Other Pacific Islander	other	3203	60.94	0.96

Race/Ethnicity	Sex	# of Applicants	Scoring Rate	Impact Ratio
Two Or More Races	unknown	1076	62.83	0.99
Two Or More Races	female	1127	62.64	0.99
Two Or More Races	male	1127	61.93	0.98
Two Or More Races	other	1093	59.84	0.95
Black Or African American	unknown	1113	61.55	0.97
Black Or African American	female	1078	63.27	1.0
Black Or African American	male	1122	62.21	0.98
Black Or African American	other	1066	60.6	0.96

Appendix: Statistical Analysis and Methodology

This section explains the two essential testing concepts used in the audit: Impact Ratio and Statistical significance. These measures help determine whether the AEDT treats demographic groups fairly and whether the results of our audit are statistically sound and reliable.

Impact Ratio

We used impact ratios to measure fairness across demographic groups. While the NYC Local Law 144 itself sets no pass/fail threshold, we interpret the results using the EEOC's 80 % rule (29 CFR § 1607.4D).

1. The impact ratio compares each group's pass or scoring rate to that of the group with the highest rate.
2. A ratio below 0.80 may suggest a potential fairness concern.
3. A ratio below 0.60 is considered a high-risk indicator and should be reviewed immediately.

Statistical Significance

We use statistical tests to determine if observed differences between groups are meaningful or could be due to random chance.

1. Statistical significance tells us if an observed difference is larger than what we would expect from random variation.
2. For each comparison, we calculate a p-value, which is the probability of observing a difference at least as large as the one found if, in reality, the AEDT treated all groups identically.
3. A p-value below 0.05 (5%) suggests the difference is statistically significant and less likely to be due to random chance.

By combining these two measures, we ensure our audit provides a comprehensive and reliable assessment of potential disparate impact.

About New York City Local Law 144 Bias Audits

New York City Local Law 144 mandates that employers and employment agencies conduct independent bias audits on automated employment decision tools (AEDTs) before using them in hiring or promotion decisions. The audits must assess whether the AEDT exhibits disparate impact based on sex, race/ethnicity, or other protected characteristics by analyzing selection rates. Employers must also provide public disclosures about the audit results and notify candidates when an AEDT is used in their evaluation. Compliance with Local Law 144 ensures greater transparency and fairness in hiring practices.

About Fairly AI

Fairly AI is a leader in AI Trust, Risk, and Security Management, specializing in independent qualitative assessments and quantitative testing for AI models and LLM applications. With proven expertise in financial services, Fairly AI extends established Model Risk Management governance processes—including stress testing, scenario analysis, and benchmarking—to AI, ensuring safe, secure, and compliant adoption. Our work with institutions like the Vector Institute and Partnership on AI demonstrates our commitment to AI ethics and governance. As NYC Local Law 144 requires rigorous bias audits of automated employment decision tools, Fairly AI's deep technical expertise, regulatory knowledge, and independent testing capabilities make us a highly qualified auditor. Fairly AI is SOC2 Type 2 and ISO/IEC 42001 certified.