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: February 25, 2025

- Data were based on eligible workers in New York who took this assessment between January 1, 2024 to December 31, 2024

- 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.

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.

AWS 2025 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	886	0.07	0.83
Female	783	0.08	1.00

Note: There were 140 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	364	0.08	0.77
White	169	0.08	0.77
Black or African American	811	0.07	0.74
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	2	0.00	—
Asian	42	0.10	0.96
Native American or Alaska Native	18	0.06	—
Two or More Races	201	0.10	1.00

Note: There were 202 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.

AWS 2025 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	191	0.06	0.56
Male White	112	0.07	0.64
Male Black or African American	388	0.06	0.53
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Male Asian	33	0.09	—
Male Native American or Alaska Native	11	0.09	—
Male Two or More Races	116	0.11	1.00
Female Hispanic or Latino	163	0.10	0.88
Female White	55	0.07	0.65
Female Black or African American	419	0.09	0.77
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	2	0.00	—
Female Asian	7	0.00	—
Female Native American or Alaska Native	7	0.00	—
Female Two or More Races	80	0.08	0.67

Note: There were 225 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.

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: February 25, 2025

- Data were based on eligible workers in New York who took this assessment between January 1, 2024 to December 31, 2024

- 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.

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.

AWS 2025 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	886	0.08	0.92
Female	783	0.09	1.00

Note: There were 140 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	364	0.09	0.50
White	169	0.18	1.00
Black or African American	811	0.05	0.28
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	2	0.00	—
Asian	42	0.07	0.40
Native American or Alaska Native	18	0.17	—
Two or More Races	201	0.11	0.64

Note: There were 202 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.

AWS 2025 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	191	0.10	0.58
Male White	112	0.18	0.98
Male Black or African American	388	0.03	0.17
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Male Asian	33	0.09	—
Male Native American or Alaska Native	11	0.00	—
Male Two or More Races	116	0.12	0.66
Female Hispanic or Latino	163	0.07	0.40
Female White	55	0.18	1.00
Female Black or African American	419	0.07	0.38
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	2	0.00	—
Female Asian	7	0.00	—
Female Native American or Alaska Native	7	0.43	—
Female Two or More Races	80	0.11	0.62

Note: There were 225 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.

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: February 25, 2025

- Data were based on eligible workers in New York who took this assessment between January 1, 2024 to December 31, 2024

- 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.

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.

AWS 2025 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	131	0.61	0.92
Female	101	0.66	1.00

Note: There were 17 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	43	0.58	0.58
White	20	0.55	0.55
Black or African American	122	0.64	0.64
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Asian	6	1.00	1.00
Native American or Alaska Native	3	0.33	—
Two or More Races	29	0.69	0.69

Note: There were 26 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.

AWS 2025 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	23	0.52	0.52
Male White	13	0.62	0.62
Male Black or African American	62	0.61	0.61
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Male Asian	5	1.00	1.00
Male Native American or Alaska Native	2	0.50	—
Male Two or More Races	22	0.64	0.64
Female Hispanic or Latino	19	0.63	0.63
Female White	7	0.43	0.43
Female Black or African American	59	0.68	0.68
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Female Asian	1	1.00	—
Female Native American or Alaska Native	1	0.00	—
Female Two or More Races	7	0.86	0.86

Note: There were 28 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.

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: February 25, 2025

- Data were based on eligible workers in New York who took this assessment between January 1, 2024 to December 31, 2024

- 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.

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.

AWS 2025 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	886	0.14	0.94
Female	783	0.15	1.00

Note: There were 140 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	364	0.15	1.00
White	169	0.11	0.73
Black or African American	811	0.15	0.95
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	2	0.00	—
Asian	42	0.10	0.62
Native American or Alaska Native	18	0.17	—
Two or More Races	201	0.13	0.84

Note: There were 202 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.

AWS 2025 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	191	0.13	0.71
Male White	112	0.13	0.68
Male Black or African American	388	0.15	0.83
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Male Asian	33	0.09	—
Male Native American or Alaska Native	11	0.18	—
Male Two or More Races	116	0.13	0.70
Female Hispanic or Latino	163	0.18	1.00
Female White	55	0.07	0.40
Female Black or African American	419	0.14	0.77
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	2	0.00	—
Female Asian	7	0.14	—
Female Native American or Alaska Native	7	0.14	—
Female Two or More Races	80	0.14	0.75

Note: There were 225 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.

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: February 25, 2025

- Data were based on eligible workers in New York who took this assessment between January 1, 2024 to December 31, 2024

- 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.

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.

AWS 2025 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	886	0.18	1.00
Female	783	0.14	0.78

Note: There were 140 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	364	0.16	0.91
White	169	0.10	0.55
Black or African American	811	0.18	1.00
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	2	0.00	—
Asian	42	0.12	0.66
Native American or Alaska Native	18	0.17	—
Two or More Races	201	0.17	0.96

Note: There were 202 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.

AWS 2025 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	191	0.20	1.00
Male White	112	0.12	0.58
Male Black or African American	388	0.20	0.98
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Male Asian	33	0.12	—
Male Native American or Alaska Native	11	0.18	—
Male Two or More Races	116	0.18	0.91
Female Hispanic or Latino	163	0.11	0.56
Female White	55	0.07	0.37
Female Black or African American	419	0.17	0.85
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	2	0.00	—
Female Asian	7	0.14	—
Female Native American or Alaska Native	7	0.14	—
Female Two or More Races	80	0.14	0.69

Note: There were 225 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.

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: February 25, 2025

- Data were based on eligible workers in New York who took this assessment between January 1, 2024 to December 31, 2024

- 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.

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.

AWS 2025 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	886	0.14	1.00
Female	783	0.14	0.99

Note: There were 140 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	364	0.12	0.73
White	169	0.10	0.60
Black or African American	811	0.16	0.95
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	2	0.00	—
Asian	42	0.17	1.00
Native American or Alaska Native	18	0.11	—
Two or More Races	201	0.11	0.66

Note: There were 202 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.

AWS 2025 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	191	0.13	0.77
Male White	112	0.10	0.61
Male Black or African American	388	0.15	0.95
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Male Asian	33	0.18	—
Male Native American or Alaska Native	11	0.18	—
Male Two or More Races	116	0.12	0.74
Female Hispanic or Latino	163	0.12	0.72
Female White	55	0.11	0.67
Female Black or African American	419	0.16	1.00
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	2	0.00	—
Female Asian	7	0.14	—
Female Native American or Alaska Native	7	0.00	—
Female Two or More Races	80	0.10	0.62

Note: There were 225 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.

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: February 25, 2025

- Data were based on eligible workers in New York who took this assessment between January 1, 2024 to December 31, 2024

- 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.

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.

AWS 2025 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	769	0.04	1.00
Female	443	0.03	0.67

Note: There were 120 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	247	0.06	1.00
White	93	0.03	0.50
Black or African American	653	0.02	0.35
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	6	0.00	—
Asian	34	0.00	—
Native American or Alaska Native	11	0.00	—
Two or More Races	126	0.06	0.86

Note: There were 162 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.

AWS 2025 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	143	0.08	1.00
Male White	67	0.04	0.58
Male Black or African American	398	0.03	0.36
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	5	0.00	—
Male Asian	30	0.00	—
Male Native American or Alaska Native	9	0.00	—
Male Two or More Races	78	0.05	0.67
Female Hispanic or Latino	99	0.05	0.66
Female White	23	0.00	—
Female Black or African American	251	0.02	0.21
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	0.00	—
Female Asian	3	0.00	—
Female Native American or Alaska Native	2	0.00	—
Female Two or More Races	44	0.07	0.89

Note: There were 179 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.

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: February 25, 2025

- Data were based on eligible workers in New York who took this assessment between January 1, 2024 to December 31, 2024

- 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.

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.

AWS 2025 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	1054	0.38	1.00
Female	621	0.28	0.73

Note: There were 143 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	365	0.32	0.84
White	115	0.26	0.69
Black or African American	873	0.38	1.00
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	6	0.33	—
Asian	35	0.40	—
Native American or Alaska Native	33	0.24	—
Two or More Races	200	0.30	0.79

Note: There were 191 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.

AWS 2025 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	224	0.35	0.83
Male White	88	0.24	0.56
Male Black or African American	521	0.42	1.00
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	2	0.00	—
Male Asian	26	0.50	—
Male Native American or Alaska Native	25	0.24	—
Male Two or More Races	127	0.35	0.82
Female Hispanic or Latino	135	0.25	0.59
Female White	25	0.32	—
Female Black or African American	347	0.31	0.73
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	2	1.00	—
Female Asian	7	0.14	—
Female Native American or Alaska Native	8	0.25	—
Female Two or More Races	67	0.19	0.46

Note: There were 214 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.

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: February 25, 2025

- Data were based on eligible workers in New York who took this assessment between January 1, 2024 to December 31, 2024

- 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.

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.

AWS 2025 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	886	0.24	0.95
Female	783	0.25	1.00

Note: There were 140 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	364	0.25	0.81
White	169	0.31	1.00
Black or African American	811	0.22	0.72
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	2	0.50	—
Asian	42	0.29	0.91
Native American or Alaska Native	18	0.22	—
Two or More Races	201	0.22	0.71

Note: There were 202 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.

AWS 2025 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	191	0.24	0.63
Male White	112	0.29	0.75
Male Black or African American	388	0.23	0.60
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Male Asian	33	0.27	—
Male Native American or Alaska Native	11	0.18	—
Male Two or More Races	116	0.20	0.52
Female Hispanic or Latino	163	0.27	0.71
Female White	55	0.38	1.00
Female Black or African American	419	0.22	0.57
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	2	0.50	—
Female Asian	7	0.43	—
Female Native American or Alaska Native	7	0.29	—
Female Two or More Races	80	0.28	0.72

Note: There were 225 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.

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: February 25, 2025

- Data were based on eligible workers in New York who took this assessment between January 1, 2024 to December 31, 2024

- 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.

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.

AWS 2025 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	769	0.04	1.00
Female	443	0.02	0.50

Note: There were 120 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	247	0.04	0.75
White	93	0.05	1.00
Black or African American	653	0.02	0.34
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	6	0.00	—
Asian	34	0.03	0.55
Native American or Alaska Native	11	0.09	—
Two or More Races	126	0.04	0.74

Note: There were 162 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.

AWS 2025 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	143	0.05	0.82
Male White	67	0.06	1.00
Male Black or African American	398	0.02	0.38
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	5	0.00	—
Male Asian	30	0.03	0.56
Male Native American or Alaska Native	9	0.11	—
Male Two or More Races	78	0.05	0.86
Female Hispanic or Latino	99	0.03	0.51
Female White	23	0.04	—
Female Black or African American	251	0.01	0.20
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	0.00	—
Female Asian	3	0.00	—
Female Native American or Alaska Native	2	0.00	—
Female Two or More Races	44	0.02	0.38

Note: There were 179 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.

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: February 25, 2025

- Data were based on eligible workers in New York who took this assessment between January 1, 2024 to December 31, 2024

- 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.

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.

AWS 2025 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	1054	0.20	0.86
Female	621	0.23	1.00

Note: There were 143 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	365	0.17	0.77
White	115	0.22	0.97
Black or African American	873	0.22	1.00
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	6	0.33	—
Asian	35	0.20	—
Native American or Alaska Native	33	0.24	—
Two or More Races	200	0.19	0.83

Note: There were 191 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.

AWS 2025 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	224	0.17	0.67
Male White	88	0.17	0.69
Male Black or African American	521	0.21	0.84
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	2	1.00	—
Male Asian	26	0.19	—
Male Native American or Alaska Native	25	0.24	—
Male Two or More Races	127	0.18	0.73
Female Hispanic or Latino	135	0.19	0.75
Female White	25	0.40	—
Female Black or African American	347	0.25	1.00
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	2	0.00	—
Female Asian	7	0.14	—
Female Native American or Alaska Native	8	0.25	—
Female Two or More Races	67	0.21	0.84

Note: There were 214 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.

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: February 25, 2025

- Data were based on eligible workers in New York who took this assessment between January 1, 2024 to December 31, 2024

- 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.

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.

AWS 2025 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	769	0.85	0.95
Female	443	0.90	1.00

Note: There were 120 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	247	0.81	0.90
White	93	0.84	0.93
Black or African American	653	0.90	1.00
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	6	0.83	—
Asian	34	0.85	0.95
Native American or Alaska Native	11	0.91	—
Two or More Races	126	0.86	0.96

Note: There were 162 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.

AWS 2025 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	143	0.80	0.86
Male White	67	0.79	0.84
Male Black or African American	398	0.87	0.93
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	5	0.80	—
Male Asian	30	0.83	0.89
Male Native American or Alaska Native	9	0.89	—
Male Two or More Races	78	0.87	0.93
Female Hispanic or Latino	99	0.81	0.86
Female White	23	0.96	—
Female Black or African American	251	0.94	1.00
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	1.00	—
Female Asian	3	1.00	—
Female Native American or Alaska Native	2	1.00	—
Female Two or More Races	44	0.82	0.87

Note: There were 179 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.

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: February 25, 2025

- Data were based on eligible workers in New York who took this assessment between January 1, 2024 to December 31, 2024

- 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.

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.

AWS 2025 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	1054	0.23	0.94
Female	621	0.25	1.00

Note: There were 143 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	365	0.26	0.95
White	115	0.28	1.00
Black or African American	873	0.21	0.76
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	6	0.17	—
Asian	35	0.26	—
Native American or Alaska Native	33	0.27	—
Two or More Races	200	0.26	0.93

Note: There were 191 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.

AWS 2025 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	224	0.27	0.80
Male White	88	0.34	1.00
Male Black or African American	521	0.20	0.59
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	2	0.00	—
Male Asian	26	0.15	—
Male Native American or Alaska Native	25	0.28	—
Male Two or More Races	127	0.24	0.69
Female Hispanic or Latino	135	0.25	0.74
Female White	25	0.08	—
Female Black or African American	347	0.22	0.66
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	2	0.00	—
Female Asian	7	0.57	—
Female Native American or Alaska Native	8	0.25	—
Female Two or More Races	67	0.31	0.92

Note: There were 214 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.

New York City Local Law 144 "Bias Audit" for Advantage Workforce Services, LLC (AWS) for Merchandiser

Conducted by DCI Consulting Group (DCI)

Analysis Information

- Summary produced on: February 25, 2025

- Data were based on eligible workers in New York who took this assessment between January 1, 2024 to December 31, 2024

- 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.

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.

AWS 2025 Bias Audit Analysis for Merchandiser in the Retail Job Family

NYC Law Impact Ratios for Gender

Demographic Group	No. of Eligible Workers	"Selection Rate**"	Impact Ratio
Male	131	0.39	1.00
Female	101	0.34	0.86

Note: There were 17 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	43	0.42	0.93
White	20	0.45	1.00
Black or African American	122	0.36	0.80
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Asian	6	0.00	—
Native American or Alaska Native	3	0.67	—
Two or More Races	29	0.31	0.69

Note: There were 26 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.

AWS 2025 Bias Audit Analysis for Merchandiser 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	23	0.48	0.84
Male White	13	0.38	0.67
Male Black or African American	62	0.39	0.68
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Male Asian	5	0.00	—
Male Native American or Alaska Native	2	0.50	—
Male Two or More Races	22	0.36	0.64
Female Hispanic or Latino	19	0.37	0.64
Female White	7	0.57	1.00
Female Black or African American	59	0.32	0.56
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Female Asian	1	0.00	—
Female Native American or Alaska Native	1	1.00	—
Female Two or More Races	7	0.14	0.25

Note: There were 28 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.

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: February 25, 2025

- Data were based on eligible workers in New York who took this assessment between January 1, 2024 to December 31, 2024

- 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.

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.

AWS 2025 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	1054	0.19	0.78
Female	621	0.25	1.00

Note: There were 143 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	365	0.25	0.97
White	115	0.24	0.95
Black or African American	873	0.19	0.74
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	6	0.17	—
Asian	35	0.14	—
Native American or Alaska Native	33	0.24	—
Two or More Races	200	0.26	1.00

Note: There were 191 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.

AWS 2025 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	224	0.21	0.67
Male White	88	0.25	0.80
Male Black or African American	521	0.17	0.53
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	2	0.00	—
Male Asian	26	0.15	—
Male Native American or Alaska Native	25	0.24	—
Male Two or More Races	127	0.24	0.76
Female Hispanic or Latino	135	0.31	1.00
Female White	25	0.20	—
Female Black or African American	347	0.22	0.70
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	2	0.00	—
Female Asian	7	0.14	—
Female Native American or Alaska Native	8	0.25	—
Female Two or More Races	67	0.28	0.91

Note: There were 214 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.

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: February 25, 2025

- Data were based on eligible workers in New York who took this assessment between January 1, 2024 to December 31, 2024

- 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.

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.

AWS 2025 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	886	0.15	1.00
Female	783	0.15	0.99

Note: There were 140 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	364	0.14	0.84
White	169	0.12	0.71
Black or African American	811	0.16	0.96
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	2	0.50	—
Asian	42	0.17	1.00
Native American or Alaska Native	18	0.11	—
Two or More Races	201	0.15	0.90

Note: There were 202 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.

AWS 2025 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	191	0.14	0.79
Male White	112	0.13	0.72
Male Black or African American	388	0.17	1.00
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	—	—	—
Male Asian	33	0.15	—
Male Native American or Alaska Native	11	0.18	—
Male Two or More Races	116	0.14	0.80
Female Hispanic or Latino	163	0.14	0.82
Female White	55	0.11	0.63
Female Black or African American	419	0.15	0.87
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	2	0.50	—
Female Asian	7	0.14	—
Female Native American or Alaska Native	7	0.00	—
Female Two or More Races	80	0.16	0.94

Note: There were 225 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.

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: February 25, 2025

- Data were based on eligible workers in New York who took this assessment between January 1, 2024 to December 31, 2024

- 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.

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.

AWS 2025 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	769	0.07	1.00
Female	443	0.06	0.84

Note: There were 120 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	247	0.09	0.72
White	93	0.08	0.64
Black or African American	653	0.06	0.49
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	6	0.17	—
Asian	34	0.12	1.00
Native American or Alaska Native	11	0.00	—
Two or More Races	126	0.05	0.40

Note: There were 162 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.

AWS 2025 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	143	0.07	0.52
Male White	67	0.10	0.78
Male Black or African American	398	0.07	0.53
Male Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	5	0.20	—
Male Asian	30	0.13	1.00
Male Native American or Alaska Native	9	0.00	—
Male Two or More Races	78	0.03	0.19
Female Hispanic or Latino	99	0.11	0.83
Female White	23	0.00	—
Female Black or African American	251	0.04	0.27
Female Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	0.00	—
Female Asian	3	0.00	—
Female Native American or Alaska Native	2	0.00	—
Female Two or More Races	44	0.09	0.68

Note: There were 179 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.