

TalentMatch AI

HireScore Bias Investigation Report

Executive Summary

Bias Severity: High

Primary Affected Groups: Female candidates - Candidates outside Greater Accra and Ashanti regions
Candidates from smaller or less represented universities

Top 3 Recommended Actions: 1. Rebalance training data representation 2. Introduce fairness constraints during model training 3. Add human review for top-ranked candidate decisions

Task 1 : Bias Type Analysis

1 . Historical Bias

Present? Yes Evidence: - Past hiring data shows male hires = 7 % vs female hires = 2 %
Software engineering roles dominate training data (6 0 0 0 / 1 0 0 0)

Disadvantaged Groups: - Female applicants - Non-software applicants

2 . Sampling Bias

Present? Yes Evidence: - Regional imbalance (Accra + Ashanti = 8 5 0 0 hires vs other regions 1 5 0 0) - University representation is skewed toward top universities

Underrepresented Groups: - Candidates from Northern, Volta, Upper regions - Candidates from smaller universities

3 . Measurement Bias

Present? Yes Evidence: - Age derived from graduation year may disadvantage career changers - Line connections count may disadvantage newer professionals

Unfair Measurements: - Social network size does not equal job competence - Extracurricular activities be unequally accessible

4 . Proxy Bias

Present? Yes

Proxy Features: - University name (proxy for socioeconomic status) - Location of previous employment (proxy for region/ethnicity) - LinkedIn connections (proxy for social capital)

Impact: These features can reinforce existing regional and gender inequalities.

Task 2 : Bias Pipeline Mapping

[Historical Hiring Decisions] ↓ [Training Data Collection] → Bias Point # 1: Historical inequality reflected in hiring records ↓ [Feature Selection] → Bias Point # 2: Use of demographic proxy features [Training] → Bias Point # 3: Model learns biased patterns from skewed data ↓ [Deployment & Monitoring] → Bias Point # 4: Unequal ranking of candidates ↓ [Biased Outcomes]

Task 3 : Mitigation Strategies

Immediate Actions

Feature Removal: - Remove or de-emphasize: - University name - Region of origin - Age derived from graduation year

Threshold Adjustments: - Use group-aware thresholding to ensure equal top-ranking representation

Weekly Monitoring Metrics: Gender representation in top 100 - Regional distribution of scores - Score variance between groups

Short-Term Actions

New Data Collection: Gather more applications from underrepresented regions - Collect role-specific performance outcomes

Model Retraining: - Introduce fairness regularization - Use stratified sampling

Human Oversight: - Review top 20 % of ranked candidates manually

Long-Term Actions

Fairness Metric Choice: - Equal opportunity fairness is recommended

Process Changes: - Provide clients with fairness audit reports

Transparency: - Disclose scoring criteria at high level to applicants

Success Metrics

- Female representation in top rankings increases
 - Regional representation improves
 - No single group exceeds 60% dominance in top candidates
-

Timeline

- Week 1 : Feature audit
- 1 - 3 months: Retraining and data collection
- 6 - 12 months: Governance and policy changes