

New York City Local Law 144 “Bias Audit” for Advantage Workforce Services, LLC (AWS) for Barista

Conducted by DCI Consulting Group (DCI)

Analysis Information

- Summary produced on: June 28, 2024
- Data were based on eligible workers in New York who took this assessment between January 1, 2023 to December 31, 2023
- A threshold is established to distinguish between individuals in the dataset who were eligible for a shift and accepted it, and those who were eligible but did not accept it, and this threshold was used for analysis purposes.

Purpose

The “bias audit” reported here meets the requirements of the New York City (NYC) Local Law 144 that regulates the use of automated employment decision tools (AEDTs) in accordance with the final rules published by the NYC Department of Consumer and Worker Protection (DCWP) on April 6, 2023.

About DCI Consulting Group (DCI)

DCI is a human resources consulting firm headquartered in Washington, D.C. Since 2001, DCI has provided expert solutions to hundreds of organizations on complex issues, with particular emphasis on equal employment opportunity analytics, employee selection and assessment, independent third-party reviews, and litigation support work. DCI's team of Industrial/Organizational Psychologists and Labor Economists are recognized for their applied experience in complex quantitative analytics, adverse impact measurement, pay equity, job analysis, validation research and job-relatedness evaluations, and routinely perform work in the context of affirmative action plans under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor's Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs compliance evaluations, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission systemic investigations, and expert witness work on matters related to Title VII, Executive Order 11246, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

“Bias Audit” Analysis Methodology *

The assessment used here determines the shift for which a given candidate is eligible based on position type. The dataset analyzed included all individuals within the stated time period who accepted and worked a shift. For each individual, information about the specific shift position, job family, shift date, and demographics were provided. The “selection rate**” for each demographic group was determined by:

1. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group in the associated job family (i.e., those who would be eligible for the shift based on position type), then,
2. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group and job family who accepted and worked the shift for a position type for which they were eligible, and
3. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group and job family who were otherwise eligible but did not accept and work the shift, and then
4. dividing the total number accepted and worked by the number considered otherwise eligible.

Note that if a shift position had $N < 20$, this was deemed insufficient data to allow for generating a bias audit report.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

NYC's Local Law 144 and the rules published by the DWCP stipulate specific analyses that must be conducted. Specifically, an 'impact ratio' must be calculated for each demographic group, which is specified by NYC as the **focal demographic group** "selection rate" divided by the **comparator demographic group** "selection rate" (i.e., the group with the highest "selection rate"). Further, the law states that the demographic groups need to be compared in three specific ways:

1. Gender comparison (i.e., Male, Female).
2. Race/ethnicity comparison (i.e., Hispanic or Latino, White, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, Native American or Alaska Native, Two or More Races).
3. An intersectional comparison that is the combination of gender and race/ethnicity (e.g., Hispanic or Latino Male, Hispanic or Latino Female, White Male, White Female).

The NYC law impact ratio has been defined by the DCWP's published rules and is calculated as:

$$\text{NYC Law Impact Ratio} = \frac{\textit{selection rate of demographic (focal) group}}{\textit{selection rate of most selected (comparator) demographic group}}$$

The DCWP's published rules specify that impact ratios need not be calculated for groups that "comprise less than 2 percent of the data being used for the 'bias audit.'" While this rule, taken from the Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures (1978), is typically used to safeguard against analyses based on sample sizes that are too small, the 2% rule of thumb alone does not sufficiently preclude conducting analyses on small sample sizes that could yield nonsensical impact ratios. As such, when viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made, the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless. As the number of groups being compared increases (e.g., when considering the intersectional gender x race/ethnicity analyses), the issues with impact ratio calculations based on small samples become more prevalent and problematic.

Results are presented in tables, each of which provides an indication of the demographic group (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, or both), the number of eligible workers that comprise the demographic group, the "selection rate" for the demographic group, and the NYC law impact ratio. In each analysis table, an impact ratio of 1.00 will indicate the highest selected (comparator) demographic group against which each other (focal) demographic group is compared. If multiple demographic groups have the highest "selection rate", these will all have an impact ratio of 1.00. Further, as specified by NYC for this law, each table contains a footnote specifying the number of individuals for whom demographic information is unavailable. Finally, each page containing report tables provides additional notes for the reader to bear in mind when viewing the results.

* A number of the requirements specific to NYC Local Law 144 are not aligned to contemporary adverse impact analysis practices (e.g., Morris and Dunleavy, Adverse impact analysis: Understanding data, statistics, and risk, 2017). However, these analyses were conducted as stipulated by NYC for the sole purpose of meeting the specific requirements of Local Law 144.

** Although the term "selection rate" is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

AWS 2024 Bias Audit Analysis for Barista in the Food Service FOH Job Family

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Gender

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate**”	Impact Ratio
Male	48	0.05	0.69
Female	63	0.07	1.00

Note: There were 0 individuals with unknown or missing gender information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate**”	Impact Ratio
Hispanic or Latino	24	0.06	0.73
White	11	0.07	0.92
Black or African American	46	0.05	0.65
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Asian	4	0.07	0.93
Native American or Alaska Native	2	—	—
Two or More Races	16	0.08	1.00

Note: There were 0 individuals with unknown or missing race/ethnicity information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

Table Selection Rates (SRs) have been rounded to 2 decimals, however, calculations of Impact Ratios (IRs) are based on the full, un-rounded SRs. Given this, two equal SRs may produce a different IR. For example, if the Comparator Group SR = 0.52136, the Group 1 SR = 0.47486, and the Group 2 SR = 0.46514, then the Group 1 IR = 0.91081 and the Group 2 IR = 0.89217. In the table, these values rounded to 2 decimal places will display as Comparator SR = 0.52, Group 1 SR = 0.47, Group 2 SR = 0.47, Group 1 IR = 0.91, and Group 2 IR = 0.89.

When viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

AWS 2024 Bias Audit Analysis for Barista in the Food Service FOH Job Family
NYC Law Impact Ratios for the Combination of Gender and Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate***”	Impact Ratio
Male Hispanic or Latino	6	0.03	0.31
Male White	5	0.05	0.52
Male Black or African American	18	0.04	0.42
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Male Asian	4	0.09	0.89
Male Native American or Alaska Native	1	—	—
Male Two or More Races	10	0.09	0.94
Female Hispanic or Latino	18	0.08	0.85
Female White	5	0.10	1.00
Female Black or African American	28	0.06	0.63
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Female Asian	—	—	—
Female Native American or Alaska Native	1	—	—
Female Two or More Races	5	0.05	0.53

Note: There were 0 individuals with unknown or missing gender or race/ethnicity information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

Table Selection Rates (SRs) have been rounded to 2 decimals, however, calculations of Impact Ratios (IRs) are based on the full, un-rounded SRs. Given this, two equal SRs may produce a different IR. For example, if the Comparator Group SR = 0.52136, the Group 1 SR = 0.47486, and the Group 2 SR = 0.46514, then the Group 1 IR = 0.91081 and the Group 2 IR = 0.89217. In the table, these values rounded to 2 decimal places will display as Comparator SR = 0.52, Group 1 SR = 0.47, Group 2 SR = 0.47, Group 1 IR = 0.91, and Group 2 IR = 0.89.

When viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

New York City Local Law 144 “Bias Audit” for Advantage Workforce Services, LLC (AWS) for Bartender

Conducted by DCI Consulting Group (DCI)

Analysis Information

- Summary produced on: June 28, 2024
- Data were based on eligible workers in New York who took this assessment between January 1, 2023 to December 31, 2023
- A threshold is established to distinguish between individuals in the dataset who were eligible for a shift and accepted it, and those who were eligible but did not accept it, and this threshold was used for analysis purposes.

Purpose

The “bias audit” reported here meets the requirements of the New York City (NYC) Local Law 144 that regulates the use of automated employment decision tools (AEDTs) in accordance with the final rules published by the NYC Department of Consumer and Worker Protection (DCWP) on April 6, 2023.

About DCI Consulting Group (DCI)

DCI is a human resources consulting firm headquartered in Washington, D.C. Since 2001, DCI has provided expert solutions to hundreds of organizations on complex issues, with particular emphasis on equal employment opportunity analytics, employee selection and assessment, independent third-party reviews, and litigation support work. DCI's team of Industrial/Organizational Psychologists and Labor Economists are recognized for their applied experience in complex quantitative analytics, adverse impact measurement, pay equity, job analysis, validation research and job-relatedness evaluations, and routinely perform work in the context of affirmative action plans under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor's Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs compliance evaluations, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission systemic investigations, and expert witness work on matters related to Title VII, Executive Order 11246, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

“Bias Audit” Analysis Methodology *

The assessment used here determines the shift for which a given candidate is eligible based on position type. The dataset analyzed included all individuals within the stated time period who accepted and worked a shift. For each individual, information about the specific shift position, job family, shift date, and demographics were provided. The “selection rate**” for each demographic group was determined by:

1. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group in the associated job family (i.e., those who would be eligible for the shift based on position type), then,
2. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group and job family who accepted and worked the shift for a position type for which they were eligible, and
3. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group and job family who were otherwise eligible but did not accept and work the shift, and then
4. dividing the total number accepted and worked by the number considered otherwise eligible.

Note that if a shift position had $N < 20$, this was deemed insufficient data to allow for generating a bias audit report.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

NYC's Local Law 144 and the rules published by the DWCP stipulate specific analyses that must be conducted. Specifically, an 'impact ratio' must be calculated for each demographic group, which is specified by NYC as the **focal demographic group** "selection rate" divided by the **comparator demographic group** "selection rate" (i.e., the group with the highest "selection rate"). Further, the law states that the demographic groups need to be compared in three specific ways:

1. Gender comparison (i.e., Male, Female).
2. Race/ethnicity comparison (i.e., Hispanic or Latino, White, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, Native American or Alaska Native, Two or More Races).
3. An intersectional comparison that is the combination of gender and race/ethnicity (e.g., Hispanic or Latino Male, Hispanic or Latino Female, White Male, White Female).

The NYC law impact ratio has been defined by the DCWP's published rules and is calculated as:

$$\text{NYC Law Impact Ratio} = \frac{\textit{selection rate of demographic (focal) group}}{\textit{selection rate of most selected (comparator) demographic group}}$$

The DCWP's published rules specify that impact ratios need not be calculated for groups that "comprise less than 2 percent of the data being used for the 'bias audit.'" While this rule, taken from the Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures (1978), is typically used to safeguard against analyses based on sample sizes that are too small, the 2% rule of thumb alone does not sufficiently preclude conducting analyses on small sample sizes that could yield nonsensical impact ratios. As such, when viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made, the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless. As the number of groups being compared increases (e.g., when considering the intersectional gender x race/ethnicity analyses), the issues with impact ratio calculations based on small samples become more prevalent and problematic.

Results are presented in tables, each of which provides an indication of the demographic group (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, or both), the number of eligible workers that comprise the demographic group, the "selection rate" for the demographic group, and the NYC law impact ratio. In each analysis table, an impact ratio of 1.00 will indicate the highest selected (comparator) demographic group against which each other (focal) demographic group is compared. If multiple demographic groups have the highest "selection rate", these will all have an impact ratio of 1.00. Further, as specified by NYC for this law, each table contains a footnote specifying the number of individuals for whom demographic information is unavailable. Finally, each page containing report tables provides additional notes for the reader to bear in mind when viewing the results.

* A number of the requirements specific to NYC Local Law 144 are not aligned to contemporary adverse impact analysis practices (e.g., Morris and Dunleavy, Adverse impact analysis: Understanding data, statistics, and risk, 2017). However, these analyses were conducted as stipulated by NYC for the sole purpose of meeting the specific requirements of Local Law 144.

** Although the term "selection rate" is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

AWS 2024 Bias Audit Analysis for Bartender in the Food Service FOH Job Family

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Gender

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate**”	Impact Ratio
Male	63	0.07	0.94
Female	61	0.07	1.00

Note: There were 13 individuals with unknown or missing gender information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate**”	Impact Ratio
Hispanic or Latino	38	0.09	0.73
White	19	0.13	1.00
Black or African American	38	0.04	0.34
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Asian	5	0.09	0.74
Native American or Alaska Native	—	—	—
Two or More Races	18	0.09	0.71

Note: There were 21 individuals with unknown or missing race/ethnicity information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

Table Selection Rates (SRs) have been rounded to 2 decimals, however, calculations of Impact Ratios (IRs) are based on the full, un-rounded SRs. Given this, two equal SRs may produce a different IR. For example, if the Comparator Group SR = 0.52136, the Group 1 SR = 0.47486, and the Group 2 SR = 0.46514, then the Group 1 IR = 0.91081 and the Group 2 IR = 0.89217. In the table, these values rounded to 2 decimal places will display as Comparator SR = 0.52, Group 1 SR = 0.47, Group 2 SR = 0.47, Group 1 IR = 0.91, and Group 2 IR = 0.89.

When viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

AWS 2024 Bias Audit Analysis for Bartender in the Food Service FOH Job Family

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

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate***”	Impact Ratio
Male Hispanic or Latino	19	0.10	0.73
Male White	13	0.14	1.00
Male Black or African American	15	0.03	0.26
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Male Asian	4	0.09	0.66
Male Native American or Alaska Native	—	—	—
Male Two or More Races	8	0.08	0.56
Female Hispanic or Latino	19	0.09	0.66
Female White	6	0.12	0.89
Female Black or African American	23	0.05	0.38
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Female Asian	1	—	—
Female Native American or Alaska Native	—	—	—
Female Two or More Races	10	0.11	0.79

Note: There were 23 individuals with unknown or missing gender or race/ethnicity information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

Table Selection Rates (SRs) have been rounded to 2 decimals, however, calculations of Impact Ratios (IRs) are based on the full, un-rounded SRs. Given this, two equal SRs may produce a different IR. For example, if the Comparator Group SR = 0.52136, the Group 1 SR = 0.47486, and the Group 2 SR = 0.46514, then the Group 1 IR = 0.91081 and the Group 2 IR = 0.89217. In the table, these values rounded to 2 decimal places will display as Comparator SR = 0.52, Group 1 SR = 0.47, Group 2 SR = 0.47, Group 1 IR = 0.91, and Group 2 IR = 0.89.

When viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

New York City Local Law 144 “Bias Audit” for Advantage Workforce Services, LLC (AWS) for Brand Ambassador

Conducted by DCI Consulting Group (DCI)

Analysis Information

- Summary produced on: June 28, 2024
- Data were based on eligible workers in New York who took this assessment between January 1, 2023 to December 31, 2023
- A threshold is established to distinguish between individuals in the dataset who were eligible for a shift and accepted it, and those who were eligible but did not accept it, and this threshold was used for analysis purposes.

Purpose

The “bias audit” reported here meets the requirements of the New York City (NYC) Local Law 144 that regulates the use of automated employment decision tools (AEDTs) in accordance with the final rules published by the NYC Department of Consumer and Worker Protection (DCWP) on April 6, 2023.

About DCI Consulting Group (DCI)

DCI is a human resources consulting firm headquartered in Washington, D.C. Since 2001, DCI has provided expert solutions to hundreds of organizations on complex issues, with particular emphasis on equal employment opportunity analytics, employee selection and assessment, independent third-party reviews, and litigation support work. DCI's team of Industrial/Organizational Psychologists and Labor Economists are recognized for their applied experience in complex quantitative analytics, adverse impact measurement, pay equity, job analysis, validation research and job-relatedness evaluations, and routinely perform work in the context of affirmative action plans under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor's Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs compliance evaluations, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission systemic investigations, and expert witness work on matters related to Title VII, Executive Order 11246, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

“Bias Audit” Analysis Methodology *

The assessment used here determines the shift for which a given candidate is eligible based on position type. The dataset analyzed included all individuals within the stated time period who accepted and worked a shift. For each individual, information about the specific shift position, job family, shift date, and demographics were provided. The “selection rate**” for each demographic group was determined by:

1. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group in the associated job family (i.e., those who would be eligible for the shift based on position type), then,
2. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group and job family who accepted and worked the shift for a position type for which they were eligible, and
3. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group and job family who were otherwise eligible but did not accept and work the shift, and then
4. dividing the total number accepted and worked by the number considered otherwise eligible.

Note that if a shift position had $N < 20$, this was deemed insufficient data to allow for generating a bias audit report.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

NYC's Local Law 144 and the rules published by the DWCP stipulate specific analyses that must be conducted. Specifically, an 'impact ratio' must be calculated for each demographic group, which is specified by NYC as the **focal demographic group** "selection rate" divided by the **comparator demographic group** "selection rate" (i.e., the group with the highest "selection rate"). Further, the law states that the demographic groups need to be compared in three specific ways:

1. Gender comparison (i.e., Male, Female).
2. Race/ethnicity comparison (i.e., Hispanic or Latino, White, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, Native American or Alaska Native, Two or More Races).
3. An intersectional comparison that is the combination of gender and race/ethnicity (e.g., Hispanic or Latino Male, Hispanic or Latino Female, White Male, White Female).

The NYC law impact ratio has been defined by the DCWP's published rules and is calculated as:

$$\text{NYC Law Impact Ratio} = \frac{\textit{selection rate of demographic (focal) group}}{\textit{selection rate of most selected (comparator) demographic group}}$$

The DCWP's published rules specify that impact ratios need not be calculated for groups that "comprise less than 2 percent of the data being used for the 'bias audit.'" While this rule, taken from the Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures (1978), is typically used to safeguard against analyses based on sample sizes that are too small, the 2% rule of thumb alone does not sufficiently preclude conducting analyses on small sample sizes that could yield nonsensical impact ratios. As such, when viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made, the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless. As the number of groups being compared increases (e.g., when considering the intersectional gender x race/ethnicity analyses), the issues with impact ratio calculations based on small samples become more prevalent and problematic.

Results are presented in tables, each of which provides an indication of the demographic group (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, or both), the number of eligible workers that comprise the demographic group, the "selection rate" for the demographic group, and the NYC law impact ratio. In each analysis table, an impact ratio of 1.00 will indicate the highest selected (comparator) demographic group against which each other (focal) demographic group is compared. If multiple demographic groups have the highest "selection rate", these will all have an impact ratio of 1.00. Further, as specified by NYC for this law, each table contains a footnote specifying the number of individuals for whom demographic information is unavailable. Finally, each page containing report tables provides additional notes for the reader to bear in mind when viewing the results.

* A number of the requirements specific to NYC Local Law 144 are not aligned to contemporary adverse impact analysis practices (e.g., Morris and Dunleavy, Adverse impact analysis: Understanding data, statistics, and risk, 2017). However, these analyses were conducted as stipulated by NYC for the sole purpose of meeting the specific requirements of Local Law 144.

** Although the term "selection rate" is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

AWS 2024 Bias Audit Analysis for Brand Ambassador in the Retail Job Family

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Gender

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate**”	Impact Ratio
Male	77	0.96	0.99
Female	81	0.98	1.00

Note: There were 0 individuals with unknown or missing gender information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate**”	Impact Ratio
Hispanic or Latino	32	1.00	1.00
White	9	0.90	0.90
Black or African American	84	0.97	0.97
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	—	—
Asian	5	1.00	1.00
Native American or Alaska Native	1	—	—
Two or More Races	21	1.00	1.00

Note: There were 0 individuals with unknown or missing race/ethnicity information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

Table Selection Rates (SRs) have been rounded to 2 decimals, however, calculations of Impact Ratios (IRs) are based on the full, un-rounded SRs. Given this, two equal SRs may produce a different IR. For example, if the Comparator Group SR = 0.52136, the Group 1 SR = 0.47486, and the Group 2 SR = 0.46514, then the Group 1 IR = 0.91081 and the Group 2 IR = 0.89217. In the table, these values rounded to 2 decimal places will display as Comparator SR = 0.52, Group 1 SR = 0.47, Group 2 SR = 0.47, Group 1 IR = 0.91, and Group 2 IR = 0.89.

When viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

AWS 2024 Bias Audit Analysis for Brand Ambassador in the Retail Job Family

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

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate***”	Impact Ratio
Male Hispanic or Latino	15	1.00	1.00
Male White	7	0.88	0.88
Male Black or African American	36	0.97	0.97
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Male Asian	5	1.00	1.00
Male Native American or Alaska Native	1	—	—
Male Two or More Races	11	1.00	1.00
Female Hispanic or Latino	16	1.00	1.00
Female White	2	—	—
Female Black or African American	46	0.96	0.96
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	—	—
Female Asian	—	—	—
Female Native American or Alaska Native	—	—	—
Female Two or More Races	10	1.00	1.00

Note: There were 0 individuals with unknown or missing gender or race/ethnicity information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

Table Selection Rates (SRs) have been rounded to 2 decimals, however, calculations of Impact Ratios (IRs) are based on the full, un-rounded SRs. Given this, two equal SRs may produce a different IR. For example, if the Comparator Group SR = 0.52136, the Group 1 SR = 0.47486, and the Group 2 SR = 0.46514, then the Group 1 IR = 0.91081 and the Group 2 IR = 0.89217. In the table, these values rounded to 2 decimal places will display as Comparator SR = 0.52, Group 1 SR = 0.47, Group 2 SR = 0.47, Group 1 IR = 0.91, and Group 2 IR = 0.89.

When viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

New York City Local Law 144 “Bias Audit” for Advantage Workforce Services, LLC (AWS) for Busser

Conducted by DCI Consulting Group (DCI)

Analysis Information

- Summary produced on: June 28, 2024
- Data were based on eligible workers in New York who took this assessment between January 1, 2023 to December 31, 2023
- A threshold is established to distinguish between individuals in the dataset who were eligible for a shift and accepted it, and those who were eligible but did not accept it, and this threshold was used for analysis purposes.

Purpose

The “bias audit” reported here meets the requirements of the New York City (NYC) Local Law 144 that regulates the use of automated employment decision tools (AEDTs) in accordance with the final rules published by the NYC Department of Consumer and Worker Protection (DCWP) on April 6, 2023.

About DCI Consulting Group (DCI)

DCI is a human resources consulting firm headquartered in Washington, D.C. Since 2001, DCI has provided expert solutions to hundreds of organizations on complex issues, with particular emphasis on equal employment opportunity analytics, employee selection and assessment, independent third-party reviews, and litigation support work. DCI's team of Industrial/Organizational Psychologists and Labor Economists are recognized for their applied experience in complex quantitative analytics, adverse impact measurement, pay equity, job analysis, validation research and job-relatedness evaluations, and routinely perform work in the context of affirmative action plans under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor's Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs compliance evaluations, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission systemic investigations, and expert witness work on matters related to Title VII, Executive Order 11246, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

“Bias Audit” Analysis Methodology *

The assessment used here determines the shift for which a given candidate is eligible based on position type. The dataset analyzed included all individuals within the stated time period who accepted and worked a shift. For each individual, information about the specific shift position, job family, shift date, and demographics were provided. The “selection rate**” for each demographic group was determined by:

1. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group in the associated job family (i.e., those who would be eligible for the shift based on position type), then,
2. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group and job family who accepted and worked the shift for a position type for which they were eligible, and
3. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group and job family who were otherwise eligible but did not accept and work the shift, and then
4. dividing the total number accepted and worked by the number considered otherwise eligible.

Note that if a shift position had $N < 20$, this was deemed insufficient data to allow for generating a bias audit report.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

NYC’s Local Law 144 and the rules published by the DWCP stipulate specific analyses that must be conducted. Specifically, an 'impact ratio' must be calculated for each demographic group, which is specified by NYC as the **focal demographic group** “selection rate” divided by the **comparator demographic group** “selection rate” (i.e., the group with the highest “selection rate”). Further, the law states that the demographic groups need to be compared in three specific ways:

1. Gender comparison (i.e., Male, Female).
2. Race/ethnicity comparison (i.e., Hispanic or Latino, White, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, Native American or Alaska Native, Two or More Races).
3. An intersectional comparison that is the combination of gender and race/ethnicity (e.g., Hispanic or Latino Male, Hispanic or Latino Female, White Male, White Female).

The NYC law impact ratio has been defined by the DCWP's published rules and is calculated as:

$$\text{NYC Law Impact Ratio} = \frac{\textit{selection rate of demographic (focal) group}}{\textit{selection rate of most selected (comparator) demographic group}}$$

The DCWP’s published rules specify that impact ratios need not be calculated for groups that “comprise less than 2 percent of the data being used for the ‘bias audit.’” While this rule, taken from the Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures (1978), is typically used to safeguard against analyses based on sample sizes that are too small, the 2% rule of thumb alone does not sufficiently preclude conducting analyses on small sample sizes that could yield nonsensical impact ratios. As such, when viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made, the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless. As the number of groups being compared increases (e.g., when considering the intersectional gender x race/ethnicity analyses), the issues with impact ratio calculations based on small samples become more prevalent and problematic.

Results are presented in tables, each of which provides an indication of the demographic group (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, or both), the number of eligible workers that comprise the demographic group, the “selection rate” for the demographic group, and the NYC law impact ratio. In each analysis table, an impact ratio of 1.00 will indicate the highest selected (comparator) demographic group against which each other (focal) demographic group is compared. If multiple demographic groups have the highest “selection rate”, these will all have an impact ratio of 1.00. Further, as specified by NYC for this law, each table contains a footnote specifying the number of individuals for whom demographic information is unavailable. Finally, each page containing report tables provides additional notes for the reader to bear in mind when viewing the results.

* A number of the requirements specific to NYC Local Law 144 are not aligned to contemporary adverse impact analysis practices (e.g., Morris and Dunleavy, Adverse impact analysis: Understanding data, statistics, and risk, 2017). However, these analyses were conducted as stipulated by NYC for the sole purpose of meeting the specific requirements of Local Law 144.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

AWS 2024 Bias Audit Analysis for Busser in the Food Service FOH Job Family

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Gender

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate**”	Impact Ratio
Male	124	0.13	0.92
Female	123	0.14	1.00

Note: There were 13 individuals with unknown or missing gender information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate**”	Impact Ratio
Hispanic or Latino	62	0.15	0.94
White	14	0.09	0.58
Black or African American	117	0.13	0.83
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Asian	6	0.11	0.70
Native American or Alaska Native	4	—	—
Two or More Races	32	0.16	1.00

Note: There were 19 individuals with unknown or missing race/ethnicity information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

Table Selection Rates (SRs) have been rounded to 2 decimals, however, calculations of Impact Ratios (IRs) are based on the full, un-rounded SRs. Given this, two equal SRs may produce a different IR. For example, if the Comparator Group SR = 0.52136, the Group 1 SR = 0.47486, and the Group 2 SR = 0.46514, then the Group 1 IR = 0.91081 and the Group 2 IR = 0.89217. In the table, these values rounded to 2 decimal places will display as Comparator SR = 0.52, Group 1 SR = 0.47, Group 2 SR = 0.47, Group 1 IR = 0.91, and Group 2 IR = 0.89.

When viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

AWS 2024 Bias Audit Analysis for Busser in the Food Service FOH Job Family
NYC Law Impact Ratios for the Combination of Gender and Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate***”	Impact Ratio
Male Hispanic or Latino	28	0.15	0.76
Male White	9	0.09	0.49
Male Black or African American	58	0.13	0.70
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Male Asian	5	0.11	0.58
Male Native American or Alaska Native	3	—	—
Male Two or More Races	14	0.13	0.69
Female Hispanic or Latino	33	0.15	0.81
Female White	5	0.10	0.52
Female Black or African American	59	0.13	0.70
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Female Asian	1	—	—
Female Native American or Alaska Native	—	—	—
Female Two or More Races	18	0.19	1.00

Note: There were 19 individuals with unknown or missing gender or race/ethnicity information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

Table Selection Rates (SRs) have been rounded to 2 decimals, however, calculations of Impact Ratios (IRs) are based on the full, un-rounded SRs. Given this, two equal SRs may produce a different IR. For example, if the Comparator Group SR = 0.52136, the Group 1 SR = 0.47486, and the Group 2 SR = 0.46514, then the Group 1 IR = 0.91081 and the Group 2 IR = 0.89217. In the table, these values rounded to 2 decimal places will display as Comparator SR = 0.52, Group 1 SR = 0.47, Group 2 SR = 0.47, Group 1 IR = 0.91, and Group 2 IR = 0.89.

When viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

New York City Local Law 144 “Bias Audit” for Advantage Workforce Services, LLC (AWS) for Concession - Stand Worker

Conducted by DCI Consulting Group (DCI)

Analysis Information

- Summary produced on: June 28, 2024
- Data were based on eligible workers in New York who took this assessment between January 1, 2023 to December 31, 2023
- A threshold is established to distinguish between individuals in the dataset who were eligible for a shift and accepted it, and those who were eligible but did not accept it, and this threshold was used for analysis purposes.

Purpose

The “bias audit” reported here meets the requirements of the New York City (NYC) Local Law 144 that regulates the use of automated employment decision tools (AEDTs) in accordance with the final rules published by the NYC Department of Consumer and Worker Protection (DCWP) on April 6, 2023.

About DCI Consulting Group (DCI)

DCI is a human resources consulting firm headquartered in Washington, D.C. Since 2001, DCI has provided expert solutions to hundreds of organizations on complex issues, with particular emphasis on equal employment opportunity analytics, employee selection and assessment, independent third-party reviews, and litigation support work. DCI's team of Industrial/Organizational Psychologists and Labor Economists are recognized for their applied experience in complex quantitative analytics, adverse impact measurement, pay equity, job analysis, validation research and job-relatedness evaluations, and routinely perform work in the context of affirmative action plans under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor's Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs compliance evaluations, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission systemic investigations, and expert witness work on matters related to Title VII, Executive Order 11246, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

“Bias Audit” Analysis Methodology *

The assessment used here determines the shift for which a given candidate is eligible based on position type. The dataset analyzed included all individuals within the stated time period who accepted and worked a shift. For each individual, information about the specific shift position, job family, shift date, and demographics were provided. The “selection rate**” for each demographic group was determined by:

1. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group in the associated job family (i.e., those who would be eligible for the shift based on position type), then,
2. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group and job family who accepted and worked the shift for a position type for which they were eligible, and
3. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group and job family who were otherwise eligible but did not accept and work the shift, and then
4. dividing the total number accepted and worked by the number considered otherwise eligible.

Note that if a shift position had $N < 20$, this was deemed insufficient data to allow for generating a bias audit report.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

NYC’s Local Law 144 and the rules published by the DWCP stipulate specific analyses that must be conducted. Specifically, an 'impact ratio' must be calculated for each demographic group, which is specified by NYC as the **focal demographic group** “selection rate” divided by the **comparator demographic group** “selection rate” (i.e., the group with the highest “selection rate”). Further, the law states that the demographic groups need to be compared in three specific ways:

1. Gender comparison (i.e., Male, Female).
2. Race/ethnicity comparison (i.e., Hispanic or Latino, White, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, Native American or Alaska Native, Two or More Races).
3. An intersectional comparison that is the combination of gender and race/ethnicity (e.g., Hispanic or Latino Male, Hispanic or Latino Female, White Male, White Female).

The NYC law impact ratio has been defined by the DCWP's published rules and is calculated as:

$$\text{NYC Law Impact Ratio} = \frac{\textit{selection rate of demographic (focal) group}}{\textit{selection rate of most selected (comparator) demographic group}}$$

The DCWP’s published rules specify that impact ratios need not be calculated for groups that “comprise less than 2 percent of the data being used for the ‘bias audit.’” While this rule, taken from the Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures (1978), is typically used to safeguard against analyses based on sample sizes that are too small, the 2% rule of thumb alone does not sufficiently preclude conducting analyses on small sample sizes that could yield nonsensical impact ratios. As such, when viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made, the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless. As the number of groups being compared increases (e.g., when considering the intersectional gender x race/ethnicity analyses), the issues with impact ratio calculations based on small samples become more prevalent and problematic.

Results are presented in tables, each of which provides an indication of the demographic group (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, or both), the number of eligible workers that comprise the demographic group, the “selection rate” for the demographic group, and the NYC law impact ratio. In each analysis table, an impact ratio of 1.00 will indicate the highest selected (comparator) demographic group against which each other (focal) demographic group is compared. If multiple demographic groups have the highest “selection rate”, these will all have an impact ratio of 1.00. Further, as specified by NYC for this law, each table contains a footnote specifying the number of individuals for whom demographic information is unavailable. Finally, each page containing report tables provides additional notes for the reader to bear in mind when viewing the results.

* A number of the requirements specific to NYC Local Law 144 are not aligned to contemporary adverse impact analysis practices (e.g., Morris and Dunleavy, Adverse impact analysis: Understanding data, statistics, and risk, 2017). However, these analyses were conducted as stipulated by NYC for the sole purpose of meeting the specific requirements of Local Law 144.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

AWS 2024 Bias Audit Analysis for Concession - Stand Worker in the Food Service FOH Job Family

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Gender

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate**”	Impact Ratio
Male	161	0.17	1.00
Female	112	0.13	0.76

Note: There were 15 individuals with unknown or missing gender information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate**”	Impact Ratio
Hispanic or Latino	63	0.15	0.82
White	14	0.09	0.50
Black or African American	149	0.17	0.91
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	2	—	—
Asian	10	0.19	1.00
Native American or Alaska Native	5	—	—
Two or More Races	27	0.13	0.73

Note: There were 27 individuals with unknown or missing race/ethnicity information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

Table Selection Rates (SRs) have been rounded to 2 decimals, however, calculations of Impact Ratios (IRs) are based on the full, un-rounded SRs. Given this, two equal SRs may produce a different IR. For example, if the Comparator Group SR = 0.52136, the Group 1 SR = 0.47486, and the Group 2 SR = 0.46514, then the Group 1 IR = 0.91081 and the Group 2 IR = 0.89217. In the table, these values rounded to 2 decimal places will display as Comparator SR = 0.52, Group 1 SR = 0.47, Group 2 SR = 0.47, Group 1 IR = 0.91, and Group 2 IR = 0.89.

When viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

AWS 2024 Bias Audit Analysis for Concession - Stand Worker in the Food Service FOH Job Family
NYC Law Impact Ratios for the Combination of Gender and Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate***”	Impact Ratio
Male Hispanic or Latino	33	0.17	0.77
Male White	11	0.11	0.52
Male Black or African American	80	0.18	0.83
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	—	—
Male Asian	10	0.22	1.00
Male Native American or Alaska Native	5	—	—
Male Two or More Races	15	0.14	0.64
Female Hispanic or Latino	27	0.13	0.57
Female White	2	0.04	0.18
Female Black or African American	67	0.15	0.68
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	—	—
Female Asian	—	—	—
Female Native American or Alaska Native	—	—	—
Female Two or More Races	12	0.13	0.57

Note: There were 29 individuals with unknown or missing gender or race/ethnicity information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

Table Selection Rates (SRs) have been rounded to 2 decimals, however, calculations of Impact Ratios (IRs) are based on the full, un-rounded SRs. Given this, two equal SRs may produce a different IR. For example, if the Comparator Group SR = 0.52136, the Group 1 SR = 0.47486, and the Group 2 SR = 0.46514, then the Group 1 IR = 0.91081 and the Group 2 IR = 0.89217. In the table, these values rounded to 2 decimal places will display as Comparator SR = 0.52, Group 1 SR = 0.47, Group 2 SR = 0.47, Group 1 IR = 0.91, and Group 2 IR = 0.89.

When viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

New York City Local Law 144 “Bias Audit” for Advantage Workforce Services, LLC (AWS) for Counter Staff - Cashier

Conducted by DCI Consulting Group (DCI)

Analysis Information

- Summary produced on: June 28, 2024
- Data were based on eligible workers in New York who took this assessment between January 1, 2023 to December 31, 2023
- A threshold is established to distinguish between individuals in the dataset who were eligible for a shift and accepted it, and those who were eligible but did not accept it, and this threshold was used for analysis purposes.

Purpose

The “bias audit” reported here meets the requirements of the New York City (NYC) Local Law 144 that regulates the use of automated employment decision tools (AEDTs) in accordance with the final rules published by the NYC Department of Consumer and Worker Protection (DCWP) on April 6, 2023.

About DCI Consulting Group (DCI)

DCI is a human resources consulting firm headquartered in Washington, D.C. Since 2001, DCI has provided expert solutions to hundreds of organizations on complex issues, with particular emphasis on equal employment opportunity analytics, employee selection and assessment, independent third-party reviews, and litigation support work. DCI's team of Industrial/Organizational Psychologists and Labor Economists are recognized for their applied experience in complex quantitative analytics, adverse impact measurement, pay equity, job analysis, validation research and job-relatedness evaluations, and routinely perform work in the context of affirmative action plans under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor's Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs compliance evaluations, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission systemic investigations, and expert witness work on matters related to Title VII, Executive Order 11246, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

“Bias Audit” Analysis Methodology *

The assessment used here determines the shift for which a given candidate is eligible based on position type. The dataset analyzed included all individuals within the stated time period who accepted and worked a shift. For each individual, information about the specific shift position, job family, shift date, and demographics were provided. The “selection rate**” for each demographic group was determined by:

1. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group in the associated job family (i.e., those who would be eligible for the shift based on position type), then,
2. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group and job family who accepted and worked the shift for a position type for which they were eligible, and
3. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group and job family who were otherwise eligible but did not accept and work the shift, and then
4. dividing the total number accepted and worked by the number considered otherwise eligible.

Note that if a shift position had $N < 20$, this was deemed insufficient data to allow for generating a bias audit report.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

NYC’s Local Law 144 and the rules published by the DWCP stipulate specific analyses that must be conducted. Specifically, an 'impact ratio' must be calculated for each demographic group, which is specified by NYC as the **focal demographic group** “selection rate” divided by the **comparator demographic group** “selection rate” (i.e., the group with the highest “selection rate”). Further, the law states that the demographic groups need to be compared in three specific ways:

1. Gender comparison (i.e., Male, Female).
2. Race/ethnicity comparison (i.e., Hispanic or Latino, White, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, Native American or Alaska Native, Two or More Races).
3. An intersectional comparison that is the combination of gender and race/ethnicity (e.g., Hispanic or Latino Male, Hispanic or Latino Female, White Male, White Female).

The NYC law impact ratio has been defined by the DCWP's published rules and is calculated as:

$$\text{NYC Law Impact Ratio} = \frac{\textit{selection rate of demographic (focal) group}}{\textit{selection rate of most selected (comparator) demographic group}}$$

The DCWP’s published rules specify that impact ratios need not be calculated for groups that “comprise less than 2 percent of the data being used for the ‘bias audit.’” While this rule, taken from the Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures (1978), is typically used to safeguard against analyses based on sample sizes that are too small, the 2% rule of thumb alone does not sufficiently preclude conducting analyses on small sample sizes that could yield nonsensical impact ratios. As such, when viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made, the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless. As the number of groups being compared increases (e.g., when considering the intersectional gender x race/ethnicity analyses), the issues with impact ratio calculations based on small samples become more prevalent and problematic.

Results are presented in tables, each of which provides an indication of the demographic group (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, or both), the number of eligible workers that comprise the demographic group, the “selection rate” for the demographic group, and the NYC law impact ratio. In each analysis table, an impact ratio of 1.00 will indicate the highest selected (comparator) demographic group against which each other (focal) demographic group is compared. If multiple demographic groups have the highest “selection rate”, these will all have an impact ratio of 1.00. Further, as specified by NYC for this law, each table contains a footnote specifying the number of individuals for whom demographic information is unavailable. Finally, each page containing report tables provides additional notes for the reader to bear in mind when viewing the results.

* A number of the requirements specific to NYC Local Law 144 are not aligned to contemporary adverse impact analysis practices (e.g., Morris and Dunleavy, Adverse impact analysis: Understanding data, statistics, and risk, 2017). However, these analyses were conducted as stipulated by NYC for the sole purpose of meeting the specific requirements of Local Law 144.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

AWS 2024 Bias Audit Analysis for Counter Staff - Cashier in the Food Service FOH Job Family

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Gender

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate**”	Impact Ratio
Male	217	0.23	1.00
Female	172	0.20	0.87

Note: There were 22 individuals with unknown or missing gender information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate**”	Impact Ratio
Hispanic or Latino	71	0.17	0.65
White	22	0.15	0.55
Black or African American	233	0.26	1.00
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	—	—
Asian	10	0.19	0.70
Native American or Alaska Native	4	—	—
Two or More Races	35	0.17	0.66

Note: There were 25 individuals with unknown or missing race/ethnicity information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

Table Selection Rates (SRs) have been rounded to 2 decimals, however, calculations of Impact Ratios (IRs) are based on the full, un-rounded SRs. Given this, two equal SRs may produce a different IR. For example, if the Comparator Group SR = 0.52136, the Group 1 SR = 0.47486, and the Group 2 SR = 0.46514, then the Group 1 IR = 0.91081 and the Group 2 IR = 0.89217. In the table, these values rounded to 2 decimal places will display as Comparator SR = 0.52, Group 1 SR = 0.47, Group 2 SR = 0.47, Group 1 IR = 0.91, and Group 2 IR = 0.89.

When viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

AWS 2024 Bias Audit Analysis for Counter Staff - Cashier in the Food Service FOH Job Family
NYC Law Impact Ratios for the Combination of Gender and Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate***”	Impact Ratio
Male Hispanic or Latino	29	0.15	0.52
Male White	15	0.16	0.54
Male Black or African American	125	0.29	1.00
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	—	—
Male Asian	9	0.20	0.69
Male Native American or Alaska Native	3	—	—
Male Two or More Races	22	0.21	0.72
Female Hispanic or Latino	39	0.18	0.63
Female White	5	0.10	0.35
Female Black or African American	104	0.24	0.82
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Female Asian	—	—	—
Female Native American or Alaska Native	1	—	—
Female Two or More Races	13	0.14	0.48

Note: There were 31 individuals with unknown or missing gender or race/ethnicity information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

Table Selection Rates (SRs) have been rounded to 2 decimals, however, calculations of Impact Ratios (IRs) are based on the full, un-rounded SRs. Given this, two equal SRs may produce a different IR. For example, if the Comparator Group SR = 0.52136, the Group 1 SR = 0.47486, and the Group 2 SR = 0.46514, then the Group 1 IR = 0.91081 and the Group 2 IR = 0.89217. In the table, these values rounded to 2 decimal places will display as Comparator SR = 0.52, Group 1 SR = 0.47, Group 2 SR = 0.47, Group 1 IR = 0.91, and Group 2 IR = 0.89.

When viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

New York City Local Law 144 “Bias Audit” for Advantage Workforce Services, LLC (AWS) for Custodial

Conducted by DCI Consulting Group (DCI)

Analysis Information

- Summary produced on: June 28, 2024
- Data were based on eligible workers in New York who took this assessment between January 1, 2023 to December 31, 2023
- A threshold is established to distinguish between individuals in the dataset who were eligible for a shift and accepted it, and those who were eligible but did not accept it, and this threshold was used for analysis purposes.

Purpose

The “bias audit” reported here meets the requirements of the New York City (NYC) Local Law 144 that regulates the use of automated employment decision tools (AEDTs) in accordance with the final rules published by the NYC Department of Consumer and Worker Protection (DCWP) on April 6, 2023.

About DCI Consulting Group (DCI)

DCI is a human resources consulting firm headquartered in Washington, D.C. Since 2001, DCI has provided expert solutions to hundreds of organizations on complex issues, with particular emphasis on equal employment opportunity analytics, employee selection and assessment, independent third-party reviews, and litigation support work. DCI's team of Industrial/Organizational Psychologists and Labor Economists are recognized for their applied experience in complex quantitative analytics, adverse impact measurement, pay equity, job analysis, validation research and job-relatedness evaluations, and routinely perform work in the context of affirmative action plans under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor's Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs compliance evaluations, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission systemic investigations, and expert witness work on matters related to Title VII, Executive Order 11246, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

“Bias Audit” Analysis Methodology *

The assessment used here determines the shift for which a given candidate is eligible based on position type. The dataset analyzed included all individuals within the stated time period who accepted and worked a shift. For each individual, information about the specific shift position, job family, shift date, and demographics were provided. The “selection rate**” for each demographic group was determined by:

1. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group in the associated job family (i.e., those who would be eligible for the shift based on position type), then,
2. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group and job family who accepted and worked the shift for a position type for which they were eligible, and
3. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group and job family who were otherwise eligible but did not accept and work the shift, and then
4. dividing the total number accepted and worked by the number considered otherwise eligible.

Note that if a shift position had $N < 20$, this was deemed insufficient data to allow for generating a bias audit report.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

NYC’s Local Law 144 and the rules published by the DWCP stipulate specific analyses that must be conducted. Specifically, an 'impact ratio' must be calculated for each demographic group, which is specified by NYC as the **focal demographic group** “selection rate” divided by the **comparator demographic group** “selection rate” (i.e., the group with the highest “selection rate”). Further, the law states that the demographic groups need to be compared in three specific ways:

1. Gender comparison (i.e., Male, Female).
2. Race/ethnicity comparison (i.e., Hispanic or Latino, White, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, Native American or Alaska Native, Two or More Races).
3. An intersectional comparison that is the combination of gender and race/ethnicity (e.g., Hispanic or Latino Male, Hispanic or Latino Female, White Male, White Female).

The NYC law impact ratio has been defined by the DCWP's published rules and is calculated as:

$$\text{NYC Law Impact Ratio} = \frac{\textit{selection rate of demographic (focal) group}}{\textit{selection rate of most selected (comparator) demographic group}}$$

The DCWP’s published rules specify that impact ratios need not be calculated for groups that “comprise less than 2 percent of the data being used for the ‘bias audit.’” While this rule, taken from the Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures (1978), is typically used to safeguard against analyses based on sample sizes that are too small, the 2% rule of thumb alone does not sufficiently preclude conducting analyses on small sample sizes that could yield nonsensical impact ratios. As such, when viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made, the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless. As the number of groups being compared increases (e.g., when considering the intersectional gender x race/ethnicity analyses), the issues with impact ratio calculations based on small samples become more prevalent and problematic.

Results are presented in tables, each of which provides an indication of the demographic group (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, or both), the number of eligible workers that comprise the demographic group, the “selection rate” for the demographic group, and the NYC law impact ratio. In each analysis table, an impact ratio of 1.00 will indicate the highest selected (comparator) demographic group against which each other (focal) demographic group is compared. If multiple demographic groups have the highest “selection rate”, these will all have an impact ratio of 1.00. Further, as specified by NYC for this law, each table contains a footnote specifying the number of individuals for whom demographic information is unavailable. Finally, each page containing report tables provides additional notes for the reader to bear in mind when viewing the results.

* A number of the requirements specific to NYC Local Law 144 are not aligned to contemporary adverse impact analysis practices (e.g., Morris and Dunleavy, Adverse impact analysis: Understanding data, statistics, and risk, 2017). However, these analyses were conducted as stipulated by NYC for the sole purpose of meeting the specific requirements of Local Law 144.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

AWS 2024 Bias Audit Analysis for Custodial in the General Labor Job Family

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Gender

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate**”	Impact Ratio
Male	35	0.05	1.00
Female	16	0.05	0.84

Note: There were 23 individuals with unknown or missing gender information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate**”	Impact Ratio
Hispanic or Latino	10	0.04	0.78
White	—	—	—
Black or African American	33	0.06	1.00
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Asian	—	—	—
Native American or Alaska Native	—	—	—
Two or More Races	6	0.06	0.97

Note: There were 35 individuals with unknown or missing race/ethnicity information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

Table Selection Rates (SRs) have been rounded to 2 decimals, however, calculations of Impact Ratios (IRs) are based on the full, un-rounded SRs. Given this, two equal SRs may produce a different IR. For example, if the Comparator Group SR = 0.52136, the Group 1 SR = 0.47486, and the Group 2 SR = 0.46514, then the Group 1 IR = 0.91081 and the Group 2 IR = 0.89217. In the table, these values rounded to 2 decimal places will display as Comparator SR = 0.52, Group 1 SR = 0.47, Group 2 SR = 0.47, Group 1 IR = 0.91, and Group 2 IR = 0.89.

When viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

AWS 2024 Bias Audit Analysis for Custodial in the General Labor Job Family

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

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate***”	Impact Ratio
Male Hispanic or Latino	7	0.05	0.74
Male White	—	—	—
Male Black or African American	21	0.06	0.84
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Male Asian	—	—	—
Male Native American or Alaska Native	—	—	—
Male Two or More Races	5	0.07	1.00
Female Hispanic or Latino	3	0.04	0.53
Female White	—	—	—
Female Black or African American	12	0.06	0.85
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Female Asian	—	—	—
Female Native American or Alaska Native	—	—	—
Female Two or More Races	1	0.03	0.44

Note: There were 37 individuals with unknown or missing gender or race/ethnicity information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

Table Selection Rates (SRs) have been rounded to 2 decimals, however, calculations of Impact Ratios (IRs) are based on the full, un-rounded SRs. Given this, two equal SRs may produce a different IR. For example, if the Comparator Group SR = 0.52136, the Group 1 SR = 0.47486, and the Group 2 SR = 0.46514, then the Group 1 IR = 0.91081 and the Group 2 IR = 0.89217. In the table, these values rounded to 2 decimal places will display as Comparator SR = 0.52, Group 1 SR = 0.47, Group 2 SR = 0.47, Group 1 IR = 0.91, and Group 2 IR = 0.89.

When viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

New York City Local Law 144 “Bias Audit” for Advantage Workforce Services, LLC (AWS) for Dishwasher

Conducted by DCI Consulting Group (DCI)

Analysis Information

- Summary produced on: June 28, 2024
- Data were based on eligible workers in New York who took this assessment between January 1, 2023 to December 31, 2023
- A threshold is established to distinguish between individuals in the dataset who were eligible for a shift and accepted it, and those who were eligible but did not accept it, and this threshold was used for analysis purposes.

Purpose

The “bias audit” reported here meets the requirements of the New York City (NYC) Local Law 144 that regulates the use of automated employment decision tools (AEDTs) in accordance with the final rules published by the NYC Department of Consumer and Worker Protection (DCWP) on April 6, 2023.

About DCI Consulting Group (DCI)

DCI is a human resources consulting firm headquartered in Washington, D.C. Since 2001, DCI has provided expert solutions to hundreds of organizations on complex issues, with particular emphasis on equal employment opportunity analytics, employee selection and assessment, independent third-party reviews, and litigation support work. DCI's team of Industrial/Organizational Psychologists and Labor Economists are recognized for their applied experience in complex quantitative analytics, adverse impact measurement, pay equity, job analysis, validation research and job-relatedness evaluations, and routinely perform work in the context of affirmative action plans under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor's Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs compliance evaluations, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission systemic investigations, and expert witness work on matters related to Title VII, Executive Order 11246, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

“Bias Audit” Analysis Methodology *

The assessment used here determines the shift for which a given candidate is eligible based on position type. The dataset analyzed included all individuals within the stated time period who accepted and worked a shift. For each individual, information about the specific shift position, job family, shift date, and demographics were provided. The “selection rate**” for each demographic group was determined by:

1. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group in the associated job family (i.e., those who would be eligible for the shift based on position type), then,
2. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group and job family who accepted and worked the shift for a position type for which they were eligible, and
3. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group and job family who were otherwise eligible but did not accept and work the shift, and then
4. dividing the total number accepted and worked by the number considered otherwise eligible.

Note that if a shift position had $N < 20$, this was deemed insufficient data to allow for generating a bias audit report.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

NYC’s Local Law 144 and the rules published by the DWCP stipulate specific analyses that must be conducted. Specifically, an 'impact ratio' must be calculated for each demographic group, which is specified by NYC as the **focal demographic group** “selection rate” divided by the **comparator demographic group** “selection rate” (i.e., the group with the highest “selection rate”). Further, the law states that the demographic groups need to be compared in three specific ways:

1. Gender comparison (i.e., Male, Female).
2. Race/ethnicity comparison (i.e., Hispanic or Latino, White, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, Native American or Alaska Native, Two or More Races).
3. An intersectional comparison that is the combination of gender and race/ethnicity (e.g., Hispanic or Latino Male, Hispanic or Latino Female, White Male, White Female).

The NYC law impact ratio has been defined by the DCWP's published rules and is calculated as:

$$\text{NYC Law Impact Ratio} = \frac{\textit{selection rate of demographic (focal) group}}{\textit{selection rate of most selected (comparator) demographic group}}$$

The DCWP’s published rules specify that impact ratios need not be calculated for groups that “comprise less than 2 percent of the data being used for the ‘bias audit.’” While this rule, taken from the Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures (1978), is typically used to safeguard against analyses based on sample sizes that are too small, the 2% rule of thumb alone does not sufficiently preclude conducting analyses on small sample sizes that could yield nonsensical impact ratios. As such, when viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made, the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless. As the number of groups being compared increases (e.g., when considering the intersectional gender x race/ethnicity analyses), the issues with impact ratio calculations based on small samples become more prevalent and problematic.

Results are presented in tables, each of which provides an indication of the demographic group (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, or both), the number of eligible workers that comprise the demographic group, the “selection rate” for the demographic group, and the NYC law impact ratio. In each analysis table, an impact ratio of 1.00 will indicate the highest selected (comparator) demographic group against which each other (focal) demographic group is compared. If multiple demographic groups have the highest “selection rate”, these will all have an impact ratio of 1.00. Further, as specified by NYC for this law, each table contains a footnote specifying the number of individuals for whom demographic information is unavailable. Finally, each page containing report tables provides additional notes for the reader to bear in mind when viewing the results.

* A number of the requirements specific to NYC Local Law 144 are not aligned to contemporary adverse impact analysis practices (e.g., Morris and Dunleavy, Adverse impact analysis: Understanding data, statistics, and risk, 2017). However, these analyses were conducted as stipulated by NYC for the sole purpose of meeting the specific requirements of Local Law 144.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

AWS 2024 Bias Audit Analysis for Dishwasher in the Food Service BOH Job Family

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Gender

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate**”	Impact Ratio
Male	396	0.42	1.00
Female	221	0.34	0.80

Note: There were 68 individuals with unknown or missing gender information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate**”	Impact Ratio
Hispanic or Latino	124	0.37	0.92
White	36	0.30	0.74
Black or African American	337	0.40	1.00
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	3	—	—
Asian	7	—	—
Native American or Alaska Native	7	—	—
Two or More Races	82	0.39	0.97

Note: There were 89 individuals with unknown or missing race/ethnicity information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

Table Selection Rates (SRs) have been rounded to 2 decimals, however, calculations of Impact Ratios (IRs) are based on the full, un-rounded SRs. Given this, two equal SRs may produce a different IR. For example, if the Comparator Group SR = 0.52136, the Group 1 SR = 0.47486, and the Group 2 SR = 0.46514, then the Group 1 IR = 0.91081 and the Group 2 IR = 0.89217. In the table, these values rounded to 2 decimal places will display as Comparator SR = 0.52, Group 1 SR = 0.47, Group 2 SR = 0.47, Group 1 IR = 0.91, and Group 2 IR = 0.89.

When viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

AWS 2024 Bias Audit Analysis for Dishwasher in the Food Service BOH Job Family

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

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate***”	Impact Ratio
Male Hispanic or Latino	73	0.41	0.90
Male White	26	0.29	0.64
Male Black or African American	207	0.44	0.96
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	2	—	—
Male Asian	5	—	—
Male Native American or Alaska Native	6	—	—
Male Two or More Races	56	0.46	1.00
Female Hispanic or Latino	49	0.32	0.71
Female White	8	—	—
Female Black or African American	125	0.36	0.78
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	—	—
Female Asian	1	—	—
Female Native American or Alaska Native	1	—	—
Female Two or More Races	24	0.30	0.65

Note: There were 101 individuals with unknown or missing gender or race/ethnicity information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

Table Selection Rates (SRs) have been rounded to 2 decimals, however, calculations of Impact Ratios (IRs) are based on the full, un-rounded SRs. Given this, two equal SRs may produce a different IR. For example, if the Comparator Group SR = 0.52136, the Group 1 SR = 0.47486, and the Group 2 SR = 0.46514, then the Group 1 IR = 0.91081 and the Group 2 IR = 0.89217. In the table, these values rounded to 2 decimal places will display as Comparator SR = 0.52, Group 1 SR = 0.47, Group 2 SR = 0.47, Group 1 IR = 0.91, and Group 2 IR = 0.89.

When viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

New York City Local Law 144 “Bias Audit” for Advantage Workforce Services, LLC (AWS) for Event Server

Conducted by DCI Consulting Group (DCI)

Analysis Information

- Summary produced on: June 28, 2024
- Data were based on eligible workers in New York who took this assessment between January 1, 2023 to December 31, 2023
- A threshold is established to distinguish between individuals in the dataset who were eligible for a shift and accepted it, and those who were eligible but did not accept it, and this threshold was used for analysis purposes.

Purpose

The “bias audit” reported here meets the requirements of the New York City (NYC) Local Law 144 that regulates the use of automated employment decision tools (AEDTs) in accordance with the final rules published by the NYC Department of Consumer and Worker Protection (DCWP) on April 6, 2023.

About DCI Consulting Group (DCI)

DCI is a human resources consulting firm headquartered in Washington, D.C. Since 2001, DCI has provided expert solutions to hundreds of organizations on complex issues, with particular emphasis on equal employment opportunity analytics, employee selection and assessment, independent third-party reviews, and litigation support work. DCI's team of Industrial/Organizational Psychologists and Labor Economists are recognized for their applied experience in complex quantitative analytics, adverse impact measurement, pay equity, job analysis, validation research and job-relatedness evaluations, and routinely perform work in the context of affirmative action plans under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor's Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs compliance evaluations, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission systemic investigations, and expert witness work on matters related to Title VII, Executive Order 11246, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

“Bias Audit” Analysis Methodology *

The assessment used here determines the shift for which a given candidate is eligible based on position type. The dataset analyzed included all individuals within the stated time period who accepted and worked a shift. For each individual, information about the specific shift position, job family, shift date, and demographics were provided. The “selection rate**” for each demographic group was determined by:

1. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group in the associated job family (i.e., those who would be eligible for the shift based on position type), then,
2. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group and job family who accepted and worked the shift for a position type for which they were eligible, and
3. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group and job family who were otherwise eligible but did not accept and work the shift, and then
4. dividing the total number accepted and worked by the number considered otherwise eligible.

Note that if a shift position had $N < 20$, this was deemed insufficient data to allow for generating a bias audit report.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

NYC's Local Law 144 and the rules published by the DWCP stipulate specific analyses that must be conducted. Specifically, an 'impact ratio' must be calculated for each demographic group, which is specified by NYC as the **focal demographic group** "selection rate" divided by the **comparator demographic group** "selection rate" (i.e., the group with the highest "selection rate"). Further, the law states that the demographic groups need to be compared in three specific ways:

1. Gender comparison (i.e., Male, Female).
2. Race/ethnicity comparison (i.e., Hispanic or Latino, White, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, Native American or Alaska Native, Two or More Races).
3. An intersectional comparison that is the combination of gender and race/ethnicity (e.g., Hispanic or Latino Male, Hispanic or Latino Female, White Male, White Female).

The NYC law impact ratio has been defined by the DCWP's published rules and is calculated as:

$$\text{NYC Law Impact Ratio} = \frac{\textit{selection rate of demographic (focal) group}}{\textit{selection rate of most selected (comparator) demographic group}}$$

The DCWP's published rules specify that impact ratios need not be calculated for groups that "comprise less than 2 percent of the data being used for the 'bias audit.'" While this rule, taken from the Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures (1978), is typically used to safeguard against analyses based on sample sizes that are too small, the 2% rule of thumb alone does not sufficiently preclude conducting analyses on small sample sizes that could yield nonsensical impact ratios. As such, when viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made, the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless. As the number of groups being compared increases (e.g., when considering the intersectional gender x race/ethnicity analyses), the issues with impact ratio calculations based on small samples become more prevalent and problematic.

Results are presented in tables, each of which provides an indication of the demographic group (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, or both), the number of eligible workers that comprise the demographic group, the "selection rate" for the demographic group, and the NYC law impact ratio. In each analysis table, an impact ratio of 1.00 will indicate the highest selected (comparator) demographic group against which each other (focal) demographic group is compared. If multiple demographic groups have the highest "selection rate", these will all have an impact ratio of 1.00. Further, as specified by NYC for this law, each table contains a footnote specifying the number of individuals for whom demographic information is unavailable. Finally, each page containing report tables provides additional notes for the reader to bear in mind when viewing the results.

* A number of the requirements specific to NYC Local Law 144 are not aligned to contemporary adverse impact analysis practices (e.g., Morris and Dunleavy, Adverse impact analysis: Understanding data, statistics, and risk, 2017). However, these analyses were conducted as stipulated by NYC for the sole purpose of meeting the specific requirements of Local Law 144.

** Although the term "selection rate" is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

AWS 2024 Bias Audit Analysis for Event Server in the Food Service FOH Job Family

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Gender

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate**”	Impact Ratio
Male	200	0.21	0.91
Female	199	0.23	1.00

Note: There were 46 individuals with unknown or missing gender information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate**”	Impact Ratio
Hispanic or Latino	100	0.24	0.68
White	54	0.36	1.00
Black or African American	164	0.19	0.52
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Asian	12	0.22	0.62
Native American or Alaska Native	4	—	—
Two or More Races	48	0.24	0.67

Note: There were 59 individuals with unknown or missing race/ethnicity information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

Table Selection Rates (SRs) have been rounded to 2 decimals, however, calculations of Impact Ratios (IRs) are based on the full, un-rounded SRs. Given this, two equal SRs may produce a different IR. For example, if the Comparator Group SR = 0.52136, the Group 1 SR = 0.47486, and the Group 2 SR = 0.46514, then the Group 1 IR = 0.91081 and the Group 2 IR = 0.89217. In the table, these values rounded to 2 decimal places will display as Comparator SR = 0.52, Group 1 SR = 0.47, Group 2 SR = 0.47, Group 1 IR = 0.91, and Group 2 IR = 0.89.

When viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

AWS 2024 Bias Audit Analysis for Event Server in the Food Service FOH Job Family
NYC Law Impact Ratios for the Combination of Gender and Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate***”	Impact Ratio
Male Hispanic or Latino	49	0.26	0.64
Male White	33	0.34	0.86
Male Black or African American	75	0.17	0.43
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Male Asian	8	0.18	0.44
Male Native American or Alaska Native	3	—	—
Male Two or More Races	23	0.22	0.54
Female Hispanic or Latino	50	0.23	0.59
Female White	20	0.40	1.00
Female Black or African American	87	0.20	0.49
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Female Asian	2	—	—
Female Native American or Alaska Native	1	—	—
Female Two or More Races	25	0.27	0.66

Note: There were 69 individuals with unknown or missing gender or race/ethnicity information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

Table Selection Rates (SRs) have been rounded to 2 decimals, however, calculations of Impact Ratios (IRs) are based on the full, un-rounded SRs. Given this, two equal SRs may produce a different IR. For example, if the Comparator Group SR = 0.52136, the Group 1 SR = 0.47486, and the Group 2 SR = 0.46514, then the Group 1 IR = 0.91081 and the Group 2 IR = 0.89217. In the table, these values rounded to 2 decimal places will display as Comparator SR = 0.52, Group 1 SR = 0.47, Group 2 SR = 0.47, Group 1 IR = 0.91, and Group 2 IR = 0.89.

When viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

New York City Local Law 144 “Bias Audit” for Advantage Workforce Services, LLC (AWS) for Event Setup and Takedown

Conducted by DCI Consulting Group (DCI)

Analysis Information

- Summary produced on: June 28, 2024
- Data were based on eligible workers in New York who took this assessment between January 1, 2023 to December 31, 2023
- A threshold is established to distinguish between individuals in the dataset who were eligible for a shift and accepted it, and those who were eligible but did not accept it, and this threshold was used for analysis purposes.

Purpose

The “bias audit” reported here meets the requirements of the New York City (NYC) Local Law 144 that regulates the use of automated employment decision tools (AEDTs) in accordance with the final rules published by the NYC Department of Consumer and Worker Protection (DCWP) on April 6, 2023.

About DCI Consulting Group (DCI)

DCI is a human resources consulting firm headquartered in Washington, D.C. Since 2001, DCI has provided expert solutions to hundreds of organizations on complex issues, with particular emphasis on equal employment opportunity analytics, employee selection and assessment, independent third-party reviews, and litigation support work. DCI's team of Industrial/Organizational Psychologists and Labor Economists are recognized for their applied experience in complex quantitative analytics, adverse impact measurement, pay equity, job analysis, validation research and job-relatedness evaluations, and routinely perform work in the context of affirmative action plans under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor's Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs compliance evaluations, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission systemic investigations, and expert witness work on matters related to Title VII, Executive Order 11246, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

“Bias Audit” Analysis Methodology *

The assessment used here determines the shift for which a given candidate is eligible based on position type. The dataset analyzed included all individuals within the stated time period who accepted and worked a shift. For each individual, information about the specific shift position, job family, shift date, and demographics were provided. The “selection rate**” for each demographic group was determined by:

1. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group in the associated job family (i.e., those who would be eligible for the shift based on position type), then,
2. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group and job family who accepted and worked the shift for a position type for which they were eligible, and
3. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group and job family who were otherwise eligible but did not accept and work the shift, and then
4. dividing the total number accepted and worked by the number considered otherwise eligible.

Note that if a shift position had $N < 20$, this was deemed insufficient data to allow for generating a bias audit report.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

NYC's Local Law 144 and the rules published by the DWCP stipulate specific analyses that must be conducted. Specifically, an 'impact ratio' must be calculated for each demographic group, which is specified by NYC as the **focal demographic group** "selection rate" divided by the **comparator demographic group** "selection rate" (i.e., the group with the highest "selection rate"). Further, the law states that the demographic groups need to be compared in three specific ways:

1. Gender comparison (i.e., Male, Female).
2. Race/ethnicity comparison (i.e., Hispanic or Latino, White, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, Native American or Alaska Native, Two or More Races).
3. An intersectional comparison that is the combination of gender and race/ethnicity (e.g., Hispanic or Latino Male, Hispanic or Latino Female, White Male, White Female).

The NYC law impact ratio has been defined by the DCWP's published rules and is calculated as:

$$\text{NYC Law Impact Ratio} = \frac{\textit{selection rate of demographic (focal) group}}{\textit{selection rate of most selected (comparator) demographic group}}$$

The DCWP's published rules specify that impact ratios need not be calculated for groups that "comprise less than 2 percent of the data being used for the 'bias audit.'" While this rule, taken from the Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures (1978), is typically used to safeguard against analyses based on sample sizes that are too small, the 2% rule of thumb alone does not sufficiently preclude conducting analyses on small sample sizes that could yield nonsensical impact ratios. As such, when viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made, the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless. As the number of groups being compared increases (e.g., when considering the intersectional gender x race/ethnicity analyses), the issues with impact ratio calculations based on small samples become more prevalent and problematic.

Results are presented in tables, each of which provides an indication of the demographic group (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, or both), the number of eligible workers that comprise the demographic group, the "selection rate" for the demographic group, and the NYC law impact ratio. In each analysis table, an impact ratio of 1.00 will indicate the highest selected (comparator) demographic group against which each other (focal) demographic group is compared. If multiple demographic groups have the highest "selection rate", these will all have an impact ratio of 1.00. Further, as specified by NYC for this law, each table contains a footnote specifying the number of individuals for whom demographic information is unavailable. Finally, each page containing report tables provides additional notes for the reader to bear in mind when viewing the results.

* A number of the requirements specific to NYC Local Law 144 are not aligned to contemporary adverse impact analysis practices (e.g., Morris and Dunleavy, Adverse impact analysis: Understanding data, statistics, and risk, 2017). However, these analyses were conducted as stipulated by NYC for the sole purpose of meeting the specific requirements of Local Law 144.

** Although the term "selection rate" is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

AWS 2024 Bias Audit Analysis for Event Setup and Takedown in the General Labor Job Family

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Gender

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate**”	Impact Ratio
Male	32	0.05	1.00
Female	8	0.02	0.46

Note: There were 6 individuals with unknown or missing gender information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate**”	Impact Ratio
Hispanic or Latino	9	0.04	0.54
White	2	0.05	0.73
Black or African American	25	0.04	0.59
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	—	—
Asian	2	0.07	1.00
Native American or Alaska Native	2	—	—
Two or More Races	1	0.01	0.13

Note: There were 8 individuals with unknown or missing race/ethnicity information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

Table Selection Rates (SRs) have been rounded to 2 decimals, however, calculations of Impact Ratios (IRs) are based on the full, un-rounded SRs. Given this, two equal SRs may produce a different IR. For example, if the Comparator Group SR = 0.52136, the Group 1 SR = 0.47486, and the Group 2 SR = 0.46514, then the Group 1 IR = 0.91081 and the Group 2 IR = 0.89217. In the table, these values rounded to 2 decimal places will display as Comparator SR = 0.52, Group 1 SR = 0.47, Group 2 SR = 0.47, Group 1 IR = 0.91, and Group 2 IR = 0.89.

When viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

AWS 2024 Bias Audit Analysis for Event Setup and Takedown in the General Labor Job Family
NYC Law Impact Ratios for the Combination of Gender and Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate***”	Impact Ratio
Male Hispanic or Latino	8	0.06	1.00
Male White	1	0.04	0.65
Male Black or African American	18	0.05	0.85
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	—	—
Male Asian	2	—	—
Male Native American or Alaska Native	1	—	—
Male Two or More Races	1	0.01	0.24
Female Hispanic or Latino	—	—	—
Female White	1	—	—
Female Black or African American	6	0.03	0.50
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Female Asian	—	—	—
Female Native American or Alaska Native	1	—	—
Female Two or More Races	—	—	—

Note: There were 8 individuals with unknown or missing gender or race/ethnicity information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

Table Selection Rates (SRs) have been rounded to 2 decimals, however, calculations of Impact Ratios (IRs) are based on the full, un-rounded SRs. Given this, two equal SRs may produce a different IR. For example, if the Comparator Group SR = 0.52136, the Group 1 SR = 0.47486, and the Group 2 SR = 0.46514, then the Group 1 IR = 0.91081 and the Group 2 IR = 0.89217. In the table, these values rounded to 2 decimal places will display as Comparator SR = 0.52, Group 1 SR = 0.47, Group 2 SR = 0.47, Group 1 IR = 0.91, and Group 2 IR = 0.89.

When viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

New York City Local Law 144 “Bias Audit” for Advantage Workforce Services, LLC (AWS) for Food Service Worker

Conducted by DCI Consulting Group (DCI)

Analysis Information

- Summary produced on: June 28, 2024
- Data were based on eligible workers in New York who took this assessment between January 1, 2023 to December 31, 2023
- A threshold is established to distinguish between individuals in the dataset who were eligible for a shift and accepted it, and those who were eligible but did not accept it, and this threshold was used for analysis purposes.

Purpose

The “bias audit” reported here meets the requirements of the New York City (NYC) Local Law 144 that regulates the use of automated employment decision tools (AEDTs) in accordance with the final rules published by the NYC Department of Consumer and Worker Protection (DCWP) on April 6, 2023.

About DCI Consulting Group (DCI)

DCI is a human resources consulting firm headquartered in Washington, D.C. Since 2001, DCI has provided expert solutions to hundreds of organizations on complex issues, with particular emphasis on equal employment opportunity analytics, employee selection and assessment, independent third-party reviews, and litigation support work. DCI's team of Industrial/Organizational Psychologists and Labor Economists are recognized for their applied experience in complex quantitative analytics, adverse impact measurement, pay equity, job analysis, validation research and job-relatedness evaluations, and routinely perform work in the context of affirmative action plans under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor's Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs compliance evaluations, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission systemic investigations, and expert witness work on matters related to Title VII, Executive Order 11246, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

“Bias Audit” Analysis Methodology *

The assessment used here determines the shift for which a given candidate is eligible based on position type. The dataset analyzed included all individuals within the stated time period who accepted and worked a shift. For each individual, information about the specific shift position, job family, shift date, and demographics were provided. The “selection rate**” for each demographic group was determined by:

1. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group in the associated job family (i.e., those who would be eligible for the shift based on position type), then,
2. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group and job family who accepted and worked the shift for a position type for which they were eligible, and
3. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group and job family who were otherwise eligible but did not accept and work the shift, and then
4. dividing the total number accepted and worked by the number considered otherwise eligible.

Note that if a shift position had $N < 20$, this was deemed insufficient data to allow for generating a bias audit report.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

NYC’s Local Law 144 and the rules published by the DWCP stipulate specific analyses that must be conducted. Specifically, an 'impact ratio' must be calculated for each demographic group, which is specified by NYC as the **focal demographic group** “selection rate” divided by the **comparator demographic group** “selection rate” (i.e., the group with the highest “selection rate”). Further, the law states that the demographic groups need to be compared in three specific ways:

1. Gender comparison (i.e., Male, Female).
2. Race/ethnicity comparison (i.e., Hispanic or Latino, White, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, Native American or Alaska Native, Two or More Races).
3. An intersectional comparison that is the combination of gender and race/ethnicity (e.g., Hispanic or Latino Male, Hispanic or Latino Female, White Male, White Female).

The NYC law impact ratio has been defined by the DCWP's published rules and is calculated as:

$$\text{NYC Law Impact Ratio} = \frac{\textit{selection rate of demographic (focal) group}}{\textit{selection rate of most selected (comparator) demographic group}}$$

The DCWP’s published rules specify that impact ratios need not be calculated for groups that “comprise less than 2 percent of the data being used for the ‘bias audit.’” While this rule, taken from the Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures (1978), is typically used to safeguard against analyses based on sample sizes that are too small, the 2% rule of thumb alone does not sufficiently preclude conducting analyses on small sample sizes that could yield nonsensical impact ratios. As such, when viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made, the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless. As the number of groups being compared increases (e.g., when considering the intersectional gender x race/ethnicity analyses), the issues with impact ratio calculations based on small samples become more prevalent and problematic.

Results are presented in tables, each of which provides an indication of the demographic group (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, or both), the number of eligible workers that comprise the demographic group, the “selection rate” for the demographic group, and the NYC law impact ratio. In each analysis table, an impact ratio of 1.00 will indicate the highest selected (comparator) demographic group against which each other (focal) demographic group is compared. If multiple demographic groups have the highest “selection rate”, these will all have an impact ratio of 1.00. Further, as specified by NYC for this law, each table contains a footnote specifying the number of individuals for whom demographic information is unavailable. Finally, each page containing report tables provides additional notes for the reader to bear in mind when viewing the results.

* A number of the requirements specific to NYC Local Law 144 are not aligned to contemporary adverse impact analysis practices (e.g., Morris and Dunleavy, Adverse impact analysis: Understanding data, statistics, and risk, 2017). However, these analyses were conducted as stipulated by NYC for the sole purpose of meeting the specific requirements of Local Law 144.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

AWS 2024 Bias Audit Analysis for Food Service Worker in the Food Service BOH Job Family

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Gender

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate**”	Impact Ratio
Male	115	0.12	0.82
Female	97	0.15	1.00

Note: There were 35 individuals with unknown or missing gender information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate**”	Impact Ratio
Hispanic or Latino	37	0.11	0.71
White	19	0.16	1.00
Black or African American	121	0.15	0.93
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Asian	4	—	—
Native American or Alaska Native	—	—	—
Two or More Races	28	0.13	0.85

Note: There were 38 individuals with unknown or missing race/ethnicity information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

Table Selection Rates (SRs) have been rounded to 2 decimals, however, calculations of Impact Ratios (IRs) are based on the full, un-rounded SRs. Given this, two equal SRs may produce a different IR. For example, if the Comparator Group SR = 0.52136, the Group 1 SR = 0.47486, and the Group 2 SR = 0.46514, then the Group 1 IR = 0.91081 and the Group 2 IR = 0.89217. In the table, these values rounded to 2 decimal places will display as Comparator SR = 0.52, Group 1 SR = 0.47, Group 2 SR = 0.47, Group 1 IR = 0.91, and Group 2 IR = 0.89.

When viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

AWS 2024 Bias Audit Analysis for Food Service Worker in the Food Service BOH Job Family
NYC Law Impact Ratios for the Combination of Gender and Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate***”	Impact Ratio
Male Hispanic or Latino	19	0.11	0.67
Male White	12	0.13	0.84
Male Black or African American	65	0.14	0.86
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Male Asian	2	—	—
Male Native American or Alaska Native	—	—	—
Male Two or More Races	13	0.11	0.66
Female Hispanic or Latino	17	0.11	0.70
Female White	6	—	—
Female Black or African American	54	0.15	0.96
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Female Asian	2	—	—
Female Native American or Alaska Native	—	—	—
Female Two or More Races	13	0.16	1.00

Note: There were 44 individuals with unknown or missing gender or race/ethnicity information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

Table Selection Rates (SRs) have been rounded to 2 decimals, however, calculations of Impact Ratios (IRs) are based on the full, un-rounded SRs. Given this, two equal SRs may produce a different IR. For example, if the Comparator Group SR = 0.52136, the Group 1 SR = 0.47486, and the Group 2 SR = 0.46514, then the Group 1 IR = 0.91081 and the Group 2 IR = 0.89217. In the table, these values rounded to 2 decimal places will display as Comparator SR = 0.52, Group 1 SR = 0.47, Group 2 SR = 0.47, Group 1 IR = 0.91, and Group 2 IR = 0.89.

When viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

New York City Local Law 144 “Bias Audit” for Advantage Workforce Services, LLC (AWS) for General Labor

Conducted by DCI Consulting Group (DCI)

Analysis Information

- Summary produced on: June 28, 2024
- Data were based on eligible workers in New York who took this assessment between January 1, 2023 to December 31, 2023
- A threshold is established to distinguish between individuals in the dataset who were eligible for a shift and accepted it, and those who were eligible but did not accept it, and this threshold was used for analysis purposes.

Purpose

The “bias audit” reported here meets the requirements of the New York City (NYC) Local Law 144 that regulates the use of automated employment decision tools (AEDTs) in accordance with the final rules published by the NYC Department of Consumer and Worker Protection (DCWP) on April 6, 2023.

About DCI Consulting Group (DCI)

DCI is a human resources consulting firm headquartered in Washington, D.C. Since 2001, DCI has provided expert solutions to hundreds of organizations on complex issues, with particular emphasis on equal employment opportunity analytics, employee selection and assessment, independent third-party reviews, and litigation support work. DCI's team of Industrial/Organizational Psychologists and Labor Economists are recognized for their applied experience in complex quantitative analytics, adverse impact measurement, pay equity, job analysis, validation research and job-relatedness evaluations, and routinely perform work in the context of affirmative action plans under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor's Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs compliance evaluations, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission systemic investigations, and expert witness work on matters related to Title VII, Executive Order 11246, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

“Bias Audit” Analysis Methodology *

The assessment used here determines the shift for which a given candidate is eligible based on position type. The dataset analyzed included all individuals within the stated time period who accepted and worked a shift. For each individual, information about the specific shift position, job family, shift date, and demographics were provided. The “selection rate**” for each demographic group was determined by:

1. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group in the associated job family (i.e., those who would be eligible for the shift based on position type), then,
2. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group and job family who accepted and worked the shift for a position type for which they were eligible, and
3. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group and job family who were otherwise eligible but did not accept and work the shift, and then
4. dividing the total number accepted and worked by the number considered otherwise eligible.

Note that if a shift position had $N < 20$, this was deemed insufficient data to allow for generating a bias audit report.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

NYC’s Local Law 144 and the rules published by the DWCP stipulate specific analyses that must be conducted. Specifically, an 'impact ratio' must be calculated for each demographic group, which is specified by NYC as the **focal demographic group** “selection rate” divided by the **comparator demographic group** “selection rate” (i.e., the group with the highest “selection rate”). Further, the law states that the demographic groups need to be compared in three specific ways:

1. Gender comparison (i.e., Male, Female).
2. Race/ethnicity comparison (i.e., Hispanic or Latino, White, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, Native American or Alaska Native, Two or More Races).
3. An intersectional comparison that is the combination of gender and race/ethnicity (e.g., Hispanic or Latino Male, Hispanic or Latino Female, White Male, White Female).

The NYC law impact ratio has been defined by the DCWP's published rules and is calculated as:

$$\text{NYC Law Impact Ratio} = \frac{\textit{selection rate of demographic (focal) group}}{\textit{selection rate of most selected (comparator) demographic group}}$$

The DCWP’s published rules specify that impact ratios need not be calculated for groups that “comprise less than 2 percent of the data being used for the ‘bias audit.’” While this rule, taken from the Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures (1978), is typically used to safeguard against analyses based on sample sizes that are too small, the 2% rule of thumb alone does not sufficiently preclude conducting analyses on small sample sizes that could yield nonsensical impact ratios. As such, when viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made, the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless. As the number of groups being compared increases (e.g., when considering the intersectional gender x race/ethnicity analyses), the issues with impact ratio calculations based on small samples become more prevalent and problematic.

Results are presented in tables, each of which provides an indication of the demographic group (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, or both), the number of eligible workers that comprise the demographic group, the “selection rate” for the demographic group, and the NYC law impact ratio. In each analysis table, an impact ratio of 1.00 will indicate the highest selected (comparator) demographic group against which each other (focal) demographic group is compared. If multiple demographic groups have the highest “selection rate”, these will all have an impact ratio of 1.00. Further, as specified by NYC for this law, each table contains a footnote specifying the number of individuals for whom demographic information is unavailable. Finally, each page containing report tables provides additional notes for the reader to bear in mind when viewing the results.

* A number of the requirements specific to NYC Local Law 144 are not aligned to contemporary adverse impact analysis practices (e.g., Morris and Dunleavy, Adverse impact analysis: Understanding data, statistics, and risk, 2017). However, these analyses were conducted as stipulated by NYC for the sole purpose of meeting the specific requirements of Local Law 144.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

AWS 2024 Bias Audit Analysis for General Labor in the General Labor Job Family

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Gender

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate**”	Impact Ratio
Male	369	0.56	0.82
Female	244	0.69	1.00

Note: There were 5 individuals with unknown or missing gender information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate**”	Impact Ratio
Hispanic or Latino	141	0.63	1.00
White	22	0.59	0.94
Black or African American	342	0.60	0.95
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	4	—	—
Asian	16	0.59	0.94
Native American or Alaska Native	7	—	—
Two or More Races	64	0.60	0.95

Note: There were 3 individuals with unknown or missing race/ethnicity information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

Table Selection Rates (SRs) have been rounded to 2 decimals, however, calculations of Impact Ratios (IRs) are based on the full, un-rounded SRs. Given this, two equal SRs may produce a different IR. For example, if the Comparator Group SR = 0.52136, the Group 1 SR = 0.47486, and the Group 2 SR = 0.46514, then the Group 1 IR = 0.91081 and the Group 2 IR = 0.89217. In the table, these values rounded to 2 decimal places will display as Comparator SR = 0.52, Group 1 SR = 0.47, Group 2 SR = 0.47, Group 1 IR = 0.91, and Group 2 IR = 0.89.

When viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

AWS 2024 Bias Audit Analysis for General Labor in the General Labor Job Family

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

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate***”	Impact Ratio
Male Hispanic or Latino	81	0.60	0.86
Male White	16	0.62	0.89
Male Black or African American	196	0.55	0.79
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	3	—	—
Male Asian	12	—	—
Male Native American or Alaska Native	5	—	—
Male Two or More Races	42	0.58	0.84
Female Hispanic or Latino	56	0.69	1.00
Female White	6	—	—
Female Black or African American	141	0.69	1.00
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	—	—
Female Asian	4	—	—
Female Native American or Alaska Native	1	—	—
Female Two or More Races	21	0.64	0.92

Note: There were 5 individuals with unknown or missing gender or race/ethnicity information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

Table Selection Rates (SRs) have been rounded to 2 decimals, however, calculations of Impact Ratios (IRs) are based on the full, un-rounded SRs. Given this, two equal SRs may produce a different IR. For example, if the Comparator Group SR = 0.52136, the Group 1 SR = 0.47486, and the Group 2 SR = 0.46514, then the Group 1 IR = 0.91081 and the Group 2 IR = 0.89217. In the table, these values rounded to 2 decimal places will display as Comparator SR = 0.52, Group 1 SR = 0.47, Group 2 SR = 0.47, Group 1 IR = 0.91, and Group 2 IR = 0.89.

When viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

New York City Local Law 144 “Bias Audit” for Advantage Workforce Services, LLC (AWS) for Line Cook

Conducted by DCI Consulting Group (DCI)

Analysis Information

- Summary produced on: June 28, 2024
- Data were based on eligible workers in New York who took this assessment between January 1, 2023 to December 31, 2023
- A threshold is established to distinguish between individuals in the dataset who were eligible for a shift and accepted it, and those who were eligible but did not accept it, and this threshold was used for analysis purposes.

Purpose

The “bias audit” reported here meets the requirements of the New York City (NYC) Local Law 144 that regulates the use of automated employment decision tools (AEDTs) in accordance with the final rules published by the NYC Department of Consumer and Worker Protection (DCWP) on April 6, 2023.

About DCI Consulting Group (DCI)

DCI is a human resources consulting firm headquartered in Washington, D.C. Since 2001, DCI has provided expert solutions to hundreds of organizations on complex issues, with particular emphasis on equal employment opportunity analytics, employee selection and assessment, independent third-party reviews, and litigation support work. DCI's team of Industrial/Organizational Psychologists and Labor Economists are recognized for their applied experience in complex quantitative analytics, adverse impact measurement, pay equity, job analysis, validation research and job-relatedness evaluations, and routinely perform work in the context of affirmative action plans under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor's Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs compliance evaluations, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission systemic investigations, and expert witness work on matters related to Title VII, Executive Order 11246, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

“Bias Audit” Analysis Methodology *

The assessment used here determines the shift for which a given candidate is eligible based on position type. The dataset analyzed included all individuals within the stated time period who accepted and worked a shift. For each individual, information about the specific shift position, job family, shift date, and demographics were provided. The “selection rate**” for each demographic group was determined by:

1. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group in the associated job family (i.e., those who would be eligible for the shift based on position type), then,
2. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group and job family who accepted and worked the shift for a position type for which they were eligible, and
3. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group and job family who were otherwise eligible but did not accept and work the shift, and then
4. dividing the total number accepted and worked by the number considered otherwise eligible.

Note that if a shift position had $N < 20$, this was deemed insufficient data to allow for generating a bias audit report.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

NYC's Local Law 144 and the rules published by the DWCP stipulate specific analyses that must be conducted. Specifically, an 'impact ratio' must be calculated for each demographic group, which is specified by NYC as the **focal demographic group** "selection rate" divided by the **comparator demographic group** "selection rate" (i.e., the group with the highest "selection rate"). Further, the law states that the demographic groups need to be compared in three specific ways:

1. Gender comparison (i.e., Male, Female).
2. Race/ethnicity comparison (i.e., Hispanic or Latino, White, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, Native American or Alaska Native, Two or More Races).
3. An intersectional comparison that is the combination of gender and race/ethnicity (e.g., Hispanic or Latino Male, Hispanic or Latino Female, White Male, White Female).

The NYC law impact ratio has been defined by the DCWP's published rules and is calculated as:

$$\text{NYC Law Impact Ratio} = \frac{\textit{selection rate of demographic (focal) group}}{\textit{selection rate of most selected (comparator) demographic group}}$$

The DCWP's published rules specify that impact ratios need not be calculated for groups that "comprise less than 2 percent of the data being used for the 'bias audit.'" While this rule, taken from the Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures (1978), is typically used to safeguard against analyses based on sample sizes that are too small, the 2% rule of thumb alone does not sufficiently preclude conducting analyses on small sample sizes that could yield nonsensical impact ratios. As such, when viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made, the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless. As the number of groups being compared increases (e.g., when considering the intersectional gender x race/ethnicity analyses), the issues with impact ratio calculations based on small samples become more prevalent and problematic.

Results are presented in tables, each of which provides an indication of the demographic group (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, or both), the number of eligible workers that comprise the demographic group, the "selection rate" for the demographic group, and the NYC law impact ratio. In each analysis table, an impact ratio of 1.00 will indicate the highest selected (comparator) demographic group against which each other (focal) demographic group is compared. If multiple demographic groups have the highest "selection rate", these will all have an impact ratio of 1.00. Further, as specified by NYC for this law, each table contains a footnote specifying the number of individuals for whom demographic information is unavailable. Finally, each page containing report tables provides additional notes for the reader to bear in mind when viewing the results.

* A number of the requirements specific to NYC Local Law 144 are not aligned to contemporary adverse impact analysis practices (e.g., Morris and Dunleavy, Adverse impact analysis: Understanding data, statistics, and risk, 2017). However, these analyses were conducted as stipulated by NYC for the sole purpose of meeting the specific requirements of Local Law 144.

** Although the term "selection rate" is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

AWS 2024 Bias Audit Analysis for Line Cook in the Food Service BOH Job Family

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Gender

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate**”	Impact Ratio
Male	212	0.23	0.88
Female	167	0.26	1.00

Note: There were 46 individuals with unknown or missing gender information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate**”	Impact Ratio
Hispanic or Latino	78	0.23	0.86
White	33	0.27	1.00
Black or African American	183	0.22	0.81
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	—	—
Asian	7	—	—
Native American or Alaska Native	7	—	—
Two or More Races	53	0.25	0.93

Note: There were 63 individuals with unknown or missing race/ethnicity information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

Table Selection Rates (SRs) have been rounded to 2 decimals, however, calculations of Impact Ratios (IRs) are based on the full, un-rounded SRs. Given this, two equal SRs may produce a different IR. For example, if the Comparator Group SR = 0.52136, the Group 1 SR = 0.47486, and the Group 2 SR = 0.46514, then the Group 1 IR = 0.91081 and the Group 2 IR = 0.89217. In the table, these values rounded to 2 decimal places will display as Comparator SR = 0.52, Group 1 SR = 0.47, Group 2 SR = 0.47, Group 1 IR = 0.91, and Group 2 IR = 0.89.

When viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

AWS 2024 Bias Audit Analysis for Line Cook in the Food Service BOH Job Family
NYC Law Impact Ratios for the Combination of Gender and Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate***”	Impact Ratio
Male Hispanic or Latino	41	0.23	0.75
Male White	27	0.30	0.98
Male Black or African American	93	0.20	0.64
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	—	—
Male Asian	4	—	—
Male Native American or Alaska Native	7	—	—
Male Two or More Races	27	0.22	0.72
Female Hispanic or Latino	36	0.24	0.77
Female White	4	—	—
Female Black or African American	88	0.25	0.81
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Female Asian	2	—	—
Female Native American or Alaska Native	—	—	—
Female Two or More Races	25	0.31	1.00

Note: There were 70 individuals with unknown or missing gender or race/ethnicity information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

Table Selection Rates (SRs) have been rounded to 2 decimals, however, calculations of Impact Ratios (IRs) are based on the full, un-rounded SRs. Given this, two equal SRs may produce a different IR. For example, if the Comparator Group SR = 0.52136, the Group 1 SR = 0.47486, and the Group 2 SR = 0.46514, then the Group 1 IR = 0.91081 and the Group 2 IR = 0.89217. In the table, these values rounded to 2 decimal places will display as Comparator SR = 0.52, Group 1 SR = 0.47, Group 2 SR = 0.47, Group 1 IR = 0.91, and Group 2 IR = 0.89.

When viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

New York City Local Law 144 “Bias Audit” for Advantage Workforce Services, LLC (AWS) for Onsite Captain

Conducted by DCI Consulting Group (DCI)

Analysis Information

- Summary produced on: June 28, 2024
- Data were based on eligible workers in New York who took this assessment between January 1, 2023 to December 31, 2023
- A threshold is established to distinguish between individuals in the dataset who were eligible for a shift and accepted it, and those who were eligible but did not accept it, and this threshold was used for analysis purposes.

Purpose

The “bias audit” reported here meets the requirements of the New York City (NYC) Local Law 144 that regulates the use of automated employment decision tools (AEDTs) in accordance with the final rules published by the NYC Department of Consumer and Worker Protection (DCWP) on April 6, 2023.

About DCI Consulting Group (DCI)

DCI is a human resources consulting firm headquartered in Washington, D.C. Since 2001, DCI has provided expert solutions to hundreds of organizations on complex issues, with particular emphasis on equal employment opportunity analytics, employee selection and assessment, independent third-party reviews, and litigation support work. DCI's team of Industrial/Organizational Psychologists and Labor Economists are recognized for their applied experience in complex quantitative analytics, adverse impact measurement, pay equity, job analysis, validation research and job-relatedness evaluations, and routinely perform work in the context of affirmative action plans under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor's Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs compliance evaluations, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission systemic investigations, and expert witness work on matters related to Title VII, Executive Order 11246, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

“Bias Audit” Analysis Methodology *

The assessment used here determines the shift for which a given candidate is eligible based on position type. The dataset analyzed included all individuals within the stated time period who accepted and worked a shift. For each individual, information about the specific shift position, job family, shift date, and demographics were provided. The “selection rate**” for each demographic group was determined by:

1. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group in the associated job family (i.e., those who would be eligible for the shift based on position type), then,
2. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group and job family who accepted and worked the shift for a position type for which they were eligible, and
3. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group and job family who were otherwise eligible but did not accept and work the shift, and then
4. dividing the total number accepted and worked by the number considered otherwise eligible.

Note that if a shift position had $N < 20$, this was deemed insufficient data to allow for generating a bias audit report.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

NYC's Local Law 144 and the rules published by the DWCP stipulate specific analyses that must be conducted. Specifically, an 'impact ratio' must be calculated for each demographic group, which is specified by NYC as the **focal demographic group** "selection rate" divided by the **comparator demographic group** "selection rate" (i.e., the group with the highest "selection rate"). Further, the law states that the demographic groups need to be compared in three specific ways:

1. Gender comparison (i.e., Male, Female).
2. Race/ethnicity comparison (i.e., Hispanic or Latino, White, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, Native American or Alaska Native, Two or More Races).
3. An intersectional comparison that is the combination of gender and race/ethnicity (e.g., Hispanic or Latino Male, Hispanic or Latino Female, White Male, White Female).

The NYC law impact ratio has been defined by the DCWP's published rules and is calculated as:

$$\text{NYC Law Impact Ratio} = \frac{\textit{selection rate of demographic (focal) group}}{\textit{selection rate of most selected (comparator) demographic group}}$$

The DCWP's published rules specify that impact ratios need not be calculated for groups that "comprise less than 2 percent of the data being used for the 'bias audit.'" While this rule, taken from the Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures (1978), is typically used to safeguard against analyses based on sample sizes that are too small, the 2% rule of thumb alone does not sufficiently preclude conducting analyses on small sample sizes that could yield nonsensical impact ratios. As such, when viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made, the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless. As the number of groups being compared increases (e.g., when considering the intersectional gender x race/ethnicity analyses), the issues with impact ratio calculations based on small samples become more prevalent and problematic.

Results are presented in tables, each of which provides an indication of the demographic group (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, or both), the number of eligible workers that comprise the demographic group, the "selection rate" for the demographic group, and the NYC law impact ratio. In each analysis table, an impact ratio of 1.00 will indicate the highest selected (comparator) demographic group against which each other (focal) demographic group is compared. If multiple demographic groups have the highest "selection rate", these will all have an impact ratio of 1.00. Further, as specified by NYC for this law, each table contains a footnote specifying the number of individuals for whom demographic information is unavailable. Finally, each page containing report tables provides additional notes for the reader to bear in mind when viewing the results.

* A number of the requirements specific to NYC Local Law 144 are not aligned to contemporary adverse impact analysis practices (e.g., Morris and Dunleavy, Adverse impact analysis: Understanding data, statistics, and risk, 2017). However, these analyses were conducted as stipulated by NYC for the sole purpose of meeting the specific requirements of Local Law 144.

** Although the term "selection rate" is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

AWS 2024 Bias Audit Analysis for Onsite Captain in the Captain Job Family

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Gender

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate**”	Impact Ratio
Male	12	1.00	1.00
Female	9	1.00	1.00

Note: There were 3 individuals with unknown or missing gender information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate**”	Impact Ratio
Hispanic or Latino	3	1.00	1.00
White	3	1.00	1.00
Black or African American	10	1.00	1.00
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Asian	2	1.00	1.00
Native American or Alaska Native	—	—	—
Two or More Races	2	1.00	1.00

Note: There were 4 individuals with unknown or missing race/ethnicity information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

Table Selection Rates (SRs) have been rounded to 2 decimals, however, calculations of Impact Ratios (IRs) are based on the full, un-rounded SRs. Given this, two equal SRs may produce a different IR. For example, if the Comparator Group SR = 0.52136, the Group 1 SR = 0.47486, and the Group 2 SR = 0.46514, then the Group 1 IR = 0.91081 and the Group 2 IR = 0.89217. In the table, these values rounded to 2 decimal places will display as Comparator SR = 0.52, Group 1 SR = 0.47, Group 2 SR = 0.47, Group 1 IR = 0.91, and Group 2 IR = 0.89.

When viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

AWS 2024 Bias Audit Analysis for Onsite Captain in the Captain Job Family

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

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate***”	Impact Ratio
Male Hispanic or Latino	3	1.00	1.00
Male White	1	1.00	1.00
Male Black or African American	4	1.00	1.00
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Male Asian	2	1.00	1.00
Male Native American or Alaska Native	—	—	—
Male Two or More Races	1	1.00	1.00
Female Hispanic or Latino	—	—	—
Female White	2	1.00	1.00
Female Black or African American	6	1.00	1.00
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Female Asian	—	—	—
Female Native American or Alaska Native	—	—	—
Female Two or More Races	1	1.00	1.00

Note: There were 4 individuals with unknown or missing gender or race/ethnicity information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

Table Selection Rates (SRs) have been rounded to 2 decimals, however, calculations of Impact Ratios (IRs) are based on the full, un-rounded SRs. Given this, two equal SRs may produce a different IR. For example, if the Comparator Group SR = 0.52136, the Group 1 SR = 0.47486, and the Group 2 SR = 0.46514, then the Group 1 IR = 0.91081 and the Group 2 IR = 0.89217. In the table, these values rounded to 2 decimal places will display as Comparator SR = 0.52, Group 1 SR = 0.47, Group 2 SR = 0.47, Group 1 IR = 0.91, and Group 2 IR = 0.89.

When viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

New York City Local Law 144 “Bias Audit” for Advantage Workforce Services, LLC (AWS) for Prep Cook

Conducted by DCI Consulting Group (DCI)

Analysis Information

- Summary produced on: June 28, 2024
- Data were based on eligible workers in New York who took this assessment between January 1, 2023 to December 31, 2023
- A threshold is established to distinguish between individuals in the dataset who were eligible for a shift and accepted it, and those who were eligible but did not accept it, and this threshold was used for analysis purposes.

Purpose

The “bias audit” reported here meets the requirements of the New York City (NYC) Local Law 144 that regulates the use of automated employment decision tools (AEDTs) in accordance with the final rules published by the NYC Department of Consumer and Worker Protection (DCWP) on April 6, 2023.

About DCI Consulting Group (DCI)

DCI is a human resources consulting firm headquartered in Washington, D.C. Since 2001, DCI has provided expert solutions to hundreds of organizations on complex issues, with particular emphasis on equal employment opportunity analytics, employee selection and assessment, independent third-party reviews, and litigation support work. DCI's team of Industrial/Organizational Psychologists and Labor Economists are recognized for their applied experience in complex quantitative analytics, adverse impact measurement, pay equity, job analysis, validation research and job-relatedness evaluations, and routinely perform work in the context of affirmative action plans under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor's Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs compliance evaluations, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission systemic investigations, and expert witness work on matters related to Title VII, Executive Order 11246, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

“Bias Audit” Analysis Methodology *

The assessment used here determines the shift for which a given candidate is eligible based on position type. The dataset analyzed included all individuals within the stated time period who accepted and worked a shift. For each individual, information about the specific shift position, job family, shift date, and demographics were provided. The “selection rate**” for each demographic group was determined by:

1. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group in the associated job family (i.e., those who would be eligible for the shift based on position type), then,
2. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group and job family who accepted and worked the shift for a position type for which they were eligible, and
3. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group and job family who were otherwise eligible but did not accept and work the shift, and then
4. dividing the total number accepted and worked by the number considered otherwise eligible.

Note that if a shift position had $N < 20$, this was deemed insufficient data to allow for generating a bias audit report.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

NYC's Local Law 144 and the rules published by the DWCP stipulate specific analyses that must be conducted. Specifically, an 'impact ratio' must be calculated for each demographic group, which is specified by NYC as the **focal demographic group** "selection rate" divided by the **comparator demographic group** "selection rate" (i.e., the group with the highest "selection rate"). Further, the law states that the demographic groups need to be compared in three specific ways:

1. Gender comparison (i.e., Male, Female).
2. Race/ethnicity comparison (i.e., Hispanic or Latino, White, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, Native American or Alaska Native, Two or More Races).
3. An intersectional comparison that is the combination of gender and race/ethnicity (e.g., Hispanic or Latino Male, Hispanic or Latino Female, White Male, White Female).

The NYC law impact ratio has been defined by the DCWP's published rules and is calculated as:

$$\text{NYC Law Impact Ratio} = \frac{\textit{selection rate of demographic (focal) group}}{\textit{selection rate of most selected (comparator) demographic group}}$$

The DCWP's published rules specify that impact ratios need not be calculated for groups that "comprise less than 2 percent of the data being used for the 'bias audit.'" While this rule, taken from the Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures (1978), is typically used to safeguard against analyses based on sample sizes that are too small, the 2% rule of thumb alone does not sufficiently preclude conducting analyses on small sample sizes that could yield nonsensical impact ratios. As such, when viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made, the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless. As the number of groups being compared increases (e.g., when considering the intersectional gender x race/ethnicity analyses), the issues with impact ratio calculations based on small samples become more prevalent and problematic.

Results are presented in tables, each of which provides an indication of the demographic group (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, or both), the number of eligible workers that comprise the demographic group, the "selection rate" for the demographic group, and the NYC law impact ratio. In each analysis table, an impact ratio of 1.00 will indicate the highest selected (comparator) demographic group against which each other (focal) demographic group is compared. If multiple demographic groups have the highest "selection rate", these will all have an impact ratio of 1.00. Further, as specified by NYC for this law, each table contains a footnote specifying the number of individuals for whom demographic information is unavailable. Finally, each page containing report tables provides additional notes for the reader to bear in mind when viewing the results.

* A number of the requirements specific to NYC Local Law 144 are not aligned to contemporary adverse impact analysis practices (e.g., Morris and Dunleavy, Adverse impact analysis: Understanding data, statistics, and risk, 2017). However, these analyses were conducted as stipulated by NYC for the sole purpose of meeting the specific requirements of Local Law 144.

** Although the term "selection rate" is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

AWS 2024 Bias Audit Analysis for Prep Cook in the Food Service BOH Job Family

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Gender

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate**”	Impact Ratio
Male	215	0.23	0.89
Female	167	0.26	1.00

Note: There were 49 individuals with unknown or missing gender information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate**”	Impact Ratio
Hispanic or Latino	93	0.28	1.00
White	33	0.27	0.97
Black or African American	192	0.23	0.82
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	—	—
Asian	5	—	—
Native American or Alaska Native	5	—	—
Two or More Races	46	0.22	0.79

Note: There were 56 individuals with unknown or missing race/ethnicity information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

Table Selection Rates (SRs) have been rounded to 2 decimals, however, calculations of Impact Ratios (IRs) are based on the full, un-rounded SRs. Given this, two equal SRs may produce a different IR. For example, if the Comparator Group SR = 0.52136, the Group 1 SR = 0.47486, and the Group 2 SR = 0.46514, then the Group 1 IR = 0.91081 and the Group 2 IR = 0.89217. In the table, these values rounded to 2 decimal places will display as Comparator SR = 0.52, Group 1 SR = 0.47, Group 2 SR = 0.47, Group 1 IR = 0.91, and Group 2 IR = 0.89.

When viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

AWS 2024 Bias Audit Analysis for Prep Cook in the Food Service BOH Job Family
NYC Law Impact Ratios for the Combination of Gender and Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate***”	Impact Ratio
Male Hispanic or Latino	43	0.24	0.75
Male White	24	0.27	0.83
Male Black or African American	104	0.22	0.68
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	—	—
Male Asian	3	—	—
Male Native American or Alaska Native	5	—	—
Male Two or More Races	26	0.21	0.66
Female Hispanic or Latino	49	0.32	1.00
Female White	6	—	—
Female Black or African American	84	0.24	0.74
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Female Asian	1	—	—
Female Native American or Alaska Native	—	—	—
Female Two or More Races	19	0.23	0.72

Note: There were 66 individuals with unknown or missing gender or race/ethnicity information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

Table Selection Rates (SRs) have been rounded to 2 decimals, however, calculations of Impact Ratios (IRs) are based on the full, un-rounded SRs. Given this, two equal SRs may produce a different IR. For example, if the Comparator Group SR = 0.52136, the Group 1 SR = 0.47486, and the Group 2 SR = 0.46514, then the Group 1 IR = 0.91081 and the Group 2 IR = 0.89217. In the table, these values rounded to 2 decimal places will display as Comparator SR = 0.52, Group 1 SR = 0.47, Group 2 SR = 0.47, Group 1 IR = 0.91, and Group 2 IR = 0.89.

When viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

New York City Local Law 144 “Bias Audit” for Advantage Workforce Services, LLC (AWS) for Runner

Conducted by DCI Consulting Group (DCI)

Analysis Information

- Summary produced on: June 28, 2024
- Data were based on eligible workers in New York who took this assessment between January 1, 2023 to December 31, 2023
- A threshold is established to distinguish between individuals in the dataset who were eligible for a shift and accepted it, and those who were eligible but did not accept it, and this threshold was used for analysis purposes.

Purpose

The “bias audit” reported here meets the requirements of the New York City (NYC) Local Law 144 that regulates the use of automated employment decision tools (AEDTs) in accordance with the final rules published by the NYC Department of Consumer and Worker Protection (DCWP) on April 6, 2023.

About DCI Consulting Group (DCI)

DCI is a human resources consulting firm headquartered in Washington, D.C. Since 2001, DCI has provided expert solutions to hundreds of organizations on complex issues, with particular emphasis on equal employment opportunity analytics, employee selection and assessment, independent third-party reviews, and litigation support work. DCI's team of Industrial/Organizational Psychologists and Labor Economists are recognized for their applied experience in complex quantitative analytics, adverse impact measurement, pay equity, job analysis, validation research and job-relatedness evaluations, and routinely perform work in the context of affirmative action plans under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor's Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs compliance evaluations, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission systemic investigations, and expert witness work on matters related to Title VII, Executive Order 11246, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

“Bias Audit” Analysis Methodology *

The assessment used here determines the shift for which a given candidate is eligible based on position type. The dataset analyzed included all individuals within the stated time period who accepted and worked a shift. For each individual, information about the specific shift position, job family, shift date, and demographics were provided. The “selection rate**” for each demographic group was determined by:

1. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group in the associated job family (i.e., those who would be eligible for the shift based on position type), then,
2. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group and job family who accepted and worked the shift for a position type for which they were eligible, and
3. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group and job family who were otherwise eligible but did not accept and work the shift, and then
4. dividing the total number accepted and worked by the number considered otherwise eligible.

Note that if a shift position had $N < 20$, this was deemed insufficient data to allow for generating a bias audit report.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

NYC’s Local Law 144 and the rules published by the DWCP stipulate specific analyses that must be conducted. Specifically, an 'impact ratio' must be calculated for each demographic group, which is specified by NYC as the **focal demographic group** “selection rate” divided by the **comparator demographic group** “selection rate” (i.e., the group with the highest “selection rate”). Further, the law states that the demographic groups need to be compared in three specific ways:

1. Gender comparison (i.e., Male, Female).
2. Race/ethnicity comparison (i.e., Hispanic or Latino, White, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, Native American or Alaska Native, Two or More Races).
3. An intersectional comparison that is the combination of gender and race/ethnicity (e.g., Hispanic or Latino Male, Hispanic or Latino Female, White Male, White Female).

The NYC law impact ratio has been defined by the DCWP's published rules and is calculated as:

$$\text{NYC Law Impact Ratio} = \frac{\textit{selection rate of demographic (focal) group}}{\textit{selection rate of most selected (comparator) demographic group}}$$

The DCWP’s published rules specify that impact ratios need not be calculated for groups that “comprise less than 2 percent of the data being used for the ‘bias audit.’” While this rule, taken from the Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures (1978), is typically used to safeguard against analyses based on sample sizes that are too small, the 2% rule of thumb alone does not sufficiently preclude conducting analyses on small sample sizes that could yield nonsensical impact ratios. As such, when viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made, the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless. As the number of groups being compared increases (e.g., when considering the intersectional gender x race/ethnicity analyses), the issues with impact ratio calculations based on small samples become more prevalent and problematic.

Results are presented in tables, each of which provides an indication of the demographic group (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, or both), the number of eligible workers that comprise the demographic group, the “selection rate” for the demographic group, and the NYC law impact ratio. In each analysis table, an impact ratio of 1.00 will indicate the highest selected (comparator) demographic group against which each other (focal) demographic group is compared. If multiple demographic groups have the highest “selection rate”, these will all have an impact ratio of 1.00. Further, as specified by NYC for this law, each table contains a footnote specifying the number of individuals for whom demographic information is unavailable. Finally, each page containing report tables provides additional notes for the reader to bear in mind when viewing the results.

* A number of the requirements specific to NYC Local Law 144 are not aligned to contemporary adverse impact analysis practices (e.g., Morris and Dunleavy, Adverse impact analysis: Understanding data, statistics, and risk, 2017). However, these analyses were conducted as stipulated by NYC for the sole purpose of meeting the specific requirements of Local Law 144.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

AWS 2024 Bias Audit Analysis for Runner in the Food Service FOH Job Family

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Gender

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate**”	Impact Ratio
Male	128	0.14	0.92
Female	126	0.15	1.00

Note: There were 45 individuals with unknown or missing gender information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate**”	Impact Ratio
Hispanic or Latino	56	0.14	0.89
White	17	0.11	0.74
Black or African American	134	0.15	1.00
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	—	—
Asian	7	0.13	0.85
Native American or Alaska Native	2	—	—
Two or More Races	25	0.12	0.82

Note: There were 62 individuals with unknown or missing race/ethnicity information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

Table Selection Rates (SRs) have been rounded to 2 decimals, however, calculations of Impact Ratios (IRs) are based on the full, un-rounded SRs. Given this, two equal SRs may produce a different IR. For example, if the Comparator Group SR = 0.52136, the Group 1 SR = 0.47486, and the Group 2 SR = 0.46514, then the Group 1 IR = 0.91081 and the Group 2 IR = 0.89217. In the table, these values rounded to 2 decimal places will display as Comparator SR = 0.52, Group 1 SR = 0.47, Group 2 SR = 0.47, Group 1 IR = 0.91, and Group 2 IR = 0.89.

When viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

AWS 2024 Bias Audit Analysis for Runner in the Food Service FOH Job Family

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

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate***”	Impact Ratio
Male Hispanic or Latino	28	0.15	0.88
Male White	10	0.10	0.63
Male Black or African American	61	0.14	0.85
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	—	—
Male Asian	5	0.11	0.67
Male Native American or Alaska Native	2	—	—
Male Two or More Races	14	0.13	0.80
Female Hispanic or Latino	27	0.13	0.77
Female White	7	0.14	0.85
Female Black or African American	73	0.17	1.00
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Female Asian	1	—	—
Female Native American or Alaska Native	—	—	—
Female Two or More Races	11	0.12	0.71

Note: There were 68 individuals with unknown or missing gender or race/ethnicity information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

Table Selection Rates (SRs) have been rounded to 2 decimals, however, calculations of Impact Ratios (IRs) are based on the full, un-rounded SRs. Given this, two equal SRs may produce a different IR. For example, if the Comparator Group SR = 0.52136, the Group 1 SR = 0.47486, and the Group 2 SR = 0.46514, then the Group 1 IR = 0.91081 and the Group 2 IR = 0.89217. In the table, these values rounded to 2 decimal places will display as Comparator SR = 0.52, Group 1 SR = 0.47, Group 2 SR = 0.47, Group 1 IR = 0.91, and Group 2 IR = 0.89.

When viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

New York City Local Law 144 “Bias Audit” for Advantage Workforce Services, LLC (AWS) for Warehouse Associate - Entry Level

Conducted by DCI Consulting Group (DCI)

Analysis Information

- Summary produced on: June 28, 2024
- Data were based on eligible workers in New York who took this assessment between January 1, 2023 to December 31, 2023
- A threshold is established to distinguish between individuals in the dataset who were eligible for a shift and accepted it, and those who were eligible but did not accept it, and this threshold was used for analysis purposes.

Purpose

The “bias audit” reported here meets the requirements of the New York City (NYC) Local Law 144 that regulates the use of automated employment decision tools (AEDTs) in accordance with the final rules published by the NYC Department of Consumer and Worker Protection (DCWP) on April 6, 2023.

About DCI Consulting Group (DCI)

DCI is a human resources consulting firm headquartered in Washington, D.C. Since 2001, DCI has provided expert solutions to hundreds of organizations on complex issues, with particular emphasis on equal employment opportunity analytics, employee selection and assessment, independent third-party reviews, and litigation support work. DCI's team of Industrial/Organizational Psychologists and Labor Economists are recognized for their applied experience in complex quantitative analytics, adverse impact measurement, pay equity, job analysis, validation research and job-relatedness evaluations, and routinely perform work in the context of affirmative action plans under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor's Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs compliance evaluations, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission systemic investigations, and expert witness work on matters related to Title VII, Executive Order 11246, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

“Bias Audit” Analysis Methodology *

The assessment used here determines the shift for which a given candidate is eligible based on position type. The dataset analyzed included all individuals within the stated time period who accepted and worked a shift. For each individual, information about the specific shift position, job family, shift date, and demographics were provided. The “selection rate**” for each demographic group was determined by:

1. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group in the associated job family (i.e., those who would be eligible for the shift based on position type), then,
2. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group and job family who accepted and worked the shift for a position type for which they were eligible, and
3. obtaining the number of individuals in the demographic group and job family who were otherwise eligible but did not accept and work the shift, and then
4. dividing the total number accepted and worked by the number considered otherwise eligible.

Note that if a shift position had $N < 20$, this was deemed insufficient data to allow for generating a bias audit report.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

NYC’s Local Law 144 and the rules published by the DWCP stipulate specific analyses that must be conducted. Specifically, an 'impact ratio' must be calculated for each demographic group, which is specified by NYC as the **focal demographic group** “selection rate” divided by the **comparator demographic group** “selection rate” (i.e., the group with the highest “selection rate”). Further, the law states that the demographic groups need to be compared in three specific ways:

1. Gender comparison (i.e., Male, Female).
2. Race/ethnicity comparison (i.e., Hispanic or Latino, White, Black or African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Asian, Native American or Alaska Native, Two or More Races).
3. An intersectional comparison that is the combination of gender and race/ethnicity (e.g., Hispanic or Latino Male, Hispanic or Latino Female, White Male, White Female).

The NYC law impact ratio has been defined by the DCWP's published rules and is calculated as:

$$\text{NYC Law Impact Ratio} = \frac{\textit{selection rate of demographic (focal) group}}{\textit{selection rate of most selected (comparator) demographic group}}$$

The DCWP’s published rules specify that impact ratios need not be calculated for groups that “comprise less than 2 percent of the data being used for the ‘bias audit.’” While this rule, taken from the Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures (1978), is typically used to safeguard against analyses based on sample sizes that are too small, the 2% rule of thumb alone does not sufficiently preclude conducting analyses on small sample sizes that could yield nonsensical impact ratios. As such, when viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made, the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless. As the number of groups being compared increases (e.g., when considering the intersectional gender x race/ethnicity analyses), the issues with impact ratio calculations based on small samples become more prevalent and problematic.

Results are presented in tables, each of which provides an indication of the demographic group (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, or both), the number of eligible workers that comprise the demographic group, the “selection rate” for the demographic group, and the NYC law impact ratio. In each analysis table, an impact ratio of 1.00 will indicate the highest selected (comparator) demographic group against which each other (focal) demographic group is compared. If multiple demographic groups have the highest “selection rate”, these will all have an impact ratio of 1.00. Further, as specified by NYC for this law, each table contains a footnote specifying the number of individuals for whom demographic information is unavailable. Finally, each page containing report tables provides additional notes for the reader to bear in mind when viewing the results.

* A number of the requirements specific to NYC Local Law 144 are not aligned to contemporary adverse impact analysis practices (e.g., Morris and Dunleavy, Adverse impact analysis: Understanding data, statistics, and risk, 2017). However, these analyses were conducted as stipulated by NYC for the sole purpose of meeting the specific requirements of Local Law 144.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

AWS 2024 Bias Audit Analysis for Warehouse Associate - Entry Level in the General Labor Job Family

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Gender

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate**”	Impact Ratio
Male	210	0.32	1.00
Female	83	0.23	0.73

Note: There were 57 individuals with unknown or missing gender information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate**”	Impact Ratio
Hispanic or Latino	63	0.28	0.80
White	13	0.35	1.00
Black or African American	163	0.29	0.81
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	—	—
Asian	9	0.33	0.95
Native American or Alaska Native	5	—	—
Two or More Races	32	0.30	0.85

Note: There were 74 individuals with unknown or missing race/ethnicity information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

Table Selection Rates (SRs) have been rounded to 2 decimals, however, calculations of Impact Ratios (IRs) are based on the full, un-rounded SRs. Given this, two equal SRs may produce a different IR. For example, if the Comparator Group SR = 0.52136, the Group 1 SR = 0.47486, and the Group 2 SR = 0.46514, then the Group 1 IR = 0.91081 and the Group 2 IR = 0.89217. In the table, these values rounded to 2 decimal places will display as Comparator SR = 0.52, Group 1 SR = 0.47, Group 2 SR = 0.47, Group 1 IR = 0.91, and Group 2 IR = 0.89.

When viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.

AWS 2024 Bias Audit Analysis for Warehouse Associate - Entry Level in the General Labor Job Family
NYC Law Impact Ratios for the Combination of Gender and Race/Ethnicity

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	“Selection Rate***”	Impact Ratio
Male Hispanic or Latino	40	0.29	0.85
Male White	9	0.35	1.00
Male Black or African American	117	0.33	0.94
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	—	—
Male Asian	6	—	—
Male Native American or Alaska Native	4	—	—
Male Two or More Races	22	0.31	0.88
Female Hispanic or Latino	22	0.27	0.78
Female White	4	—	—
Female Black or African American	42	0.21	0.60
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Female Asian	3	—	—
Female Native American or Alaska Native	—	—	—
Female Two or More Races	9	0.27	0.79

Note: There were 85 individuals with unknown or missing gender or race/ethnicity information; data from these individuals are not included in the calculations for this table.

Table Selection Rates (SRs) have been rounded to 2 decimals, however, calculations of Impact Ratios (IRs) are based on the full, un-rounded SRs. Given this, two equal SRs may produce a different IR. For example, if the Comparator Group SR = 0.52136, the Group 1 SR = 0.47486, and the Group 2 SR = 0.46514, then the Group 1 IR = 0.91081 and the Group 2 IR = 0.89217. In the table, these values rounded to 2 decimal places will display as Comparator SR = 0.52, Group 1 SR = 0.47, Group 2 SR = 0.47, Group 1 IR = 0.91, and Group 2 IR = 0.89.

When viewing tables of results in this report, for each comparison being made the reader should consider the number of individuals in each of the following: 1) focal demographic group above the threshold, 2) focal demographic group below the threshold, 3) comparator demographic group above the threshold, and 4) comparator demographic group below the threshold. If the number of individuals in any of these is small, the impact ratio calculated may be volatile or meaningless.

** Although the term “selection rate” is used here to reflect consistency with the language used in NYC LL 144, the rate represents the workers who have chosen to accept a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform.

This "bias audit" does not represent the company's opinion that the assessment in use is an automated employment decision tool (AEDT) as defined by NYC Local Law 144 or that an AWS employee's choice to book and work a position made available to them through the Instawork Platform constitutes a covered employment decision by AWS as defined by NYC Local Law 144.