

Candidate Relevancy FAQ's

Employers who post jobs on ADP's recruiting platforms may refer to an applicant's Candidate Relevancy or Profile Relevancy score. Candidate Relevancy and Profile Relevancy rely on artificial intelligence and machine learning to provide an initial comparison of an applicant's education, experience, and skills against the education, experience, and skills requirements in the job description. This is intended to be one of many factors that a potential employer will review in making its interview decisions; there are no cut-off scores and all applications remain visible to employers. Candidates who opt out will have their score listed as "Not available."

These FAQs provide additional information about the data these tools collect, store, and retain, and the results of the most recent impartial evaluations of these tools.

1. What is Candidate Relevancy?

ADP's Candidate Relevancy and Profile Relevancy tools (for ease of reference both will jointly be referred to as "Candidate Relevancy" unless otherwise noted) use artificial intelligence and machine learning algorithms to conduct an initial review of an application, and are designed to be utilized by employers as one tool, among others, in the hiring process.¹ Specifically, Candidate Relevancy conducts a mathematical assessment of how close the skills, education and/or experience on an applicant's resume match the skills, education, and/or experience listed on the relevant job description. This process quantifies the "relevancy" between the applicant's resume and the job posting. The Candidate Relevancy model also leverages past decisions derived from millions of resumes and job descriptions where the selection decision is already known.

The scores are intended to be used as one of many factors by an employer in determining who to advance to the next round in the hiring process. Candidate Relevancy is not intended to replace human judgment during any step of the recruitment process and is designed in such a way that there are no cut-off scores that would eliminate applicants from being visible to employers in the user interface. Employers are provided access to all applications, enabling them to make human decisions on which candidates to pursue.

2. How is the Candidate Relevancy score determined?

The Candidate Relevancy model first parses the information concerning the education, experience, and skills contained in the applicant's resume or application and in the relevant job description. This information is formatted to allow a mathematical assessment to be conducted of how close the applicant's education, skills, and experience match those found in the relevant

¹ The Candidate Relevancy score is displayed to employers using ADP's Recruitment Management product, while the Profile Relevancy score is displayed to employers using ADP's WorkforceNow Recruitment platform.

job description. Candidate Relevancy does not extract or utilize the applicant’s name, address, race, ethnicity, gender or protected demographic information.

Each job requisition is classified using a job and sector taxonomy. The Candidate Relevancy model creates three sub-scores indicating how close the applicant’s education, skills, and experience matches those found in the job description. The three scores are then weighted to create the Candidate Relevancy Score. The weights sum to 1 and reflect the relative importance of each component. Since the job descriptions do not define the importance of each component, the importance (i.e., the weights) must be estimated empirically from the data. Separate weights are created for each sector in which the open job resides. The weights are determined by a machine learning model.

The resulting weighted score (the final Candidate Relevancy score) is intended to be used by an employer as only one tool, among others, to aid in the selection of whom to interview or prioritize during the hiring pipeline.

3. What data does Candidate Relevancy collect and what are ADP’s retention policies regarding the information?

Type of Data	Collected from	Retention Policy
Resume data	ADP WorkforceNow Recruitment or ADP Recruitment Management	Three years
Job descriptions	ADP WorkforceNow Recruitment or ADP Recruitment Management	Three years

4. Is Candidate Relevancy an automated employment decision tool covered by New York City Local Law 144 (“the NYC Ordinance”)?

The NYC Ordinance covers automated screening or selection tools that provide “output”—such as scores, classifications, or recommendations—to an employer, and which are used to significantly assist or substitute a human’s decision-making process. Under the NYC Ordinance, to substantially assist or substitute a human’s decision-making process means: (1) to rely solely on a simplified output without consideration to other factors; (2) to use a simplified output as a consideration in a list of criteria but weight the output more heavily than other criteria the set; or (3) to use the output to overrule human decision-making conclusions.

Candidate Relevancy is not intended by ADP to be relied upon solely by employers in making employment decisions and is not meant to substantially assist or replace discretionary decision making in employment decisions. Moreover, Candidate Relevancy is not intended to be used as a criterion that is weighted more than any other criterion in making employment decisions and is not intended to be used to overrule conclusions derived from other factors, including human decision-making.

Candidate Relevancy is intended to be one source of assistance in helping to prioritize candidates selected for next steps. Education, skills, and experience must be evaluated and validated by employers through person-to-person interviews and background checks, among other things. Candidate Relevancy is not intended to replace human judgment during any step of the recruitment process and is designed in such a way that there are no cut-off scores that would eliminate candidates from being visible to employers in the user interface. Employers are thereby provided access to all candidates, enabling them to make human decisions on which candidates to pursue.

If Candidate Relevancy is used as intended by ADP, ADP does not believe Candidate Relevancy to be an automated employment decision tool as defined by the New York City Ordinance and its related final rules.

Nothing herein is intended to be a legal opinion and does not constitute legal advice. You should consult with an attorney before taking any action in reliance on the information provided herein including whether Candidate Relevancy is an automated employment decision tool.

5. Did ADP conduct a bias audit on Candidate Relevancy?

Yes. At ADP integrity is everything and is at the foundation of how we design and develop our solutions and services. Although ADP believes that Candidate Relevancy, if used as intended by ADP, does not fall within the scope of the NYC Ordinance, ADP is committed to ensuring that transparency and accountability is embedded in ADP's offerings.

ADP obtained an independent bias audit of Candidate Relevancy and Profile Relevancy from BLDS, LLC, an independent auditor, in April of 2023. The independent auditors concluded that no valid statistical evidence of bias is present in the scoring produced by Candidate Relevancy or Profile Relevancy.

6. What was the result of the bias audit conducted on Candidate Relevancy?

In April of 2023, an independent auditor, BLDS, LLC, performed an impartial evaluation of Candidate Relevancy. The version of Candidate Relevancy audited became available on October 29, 2022. The independent auditors concluded that no valid statistical evidence of bias is present.

A summary of the scoring rates and impact ratios² based on sex and race/ethnicity and the intersection of sex and race/ethnicity, and adjusted for Simpson’s Paradox, are set forth in the following charts:

Sex Categories			
	Applicants	Scoring Rate	Impact Ratio
Female	573,856	47.3%	1.000
Male	478,161	46.6%	0.986
Unknown Gender	397,979	--	--

Race/Ethnicity Categories			
	Applicants	Scoring Rate	Impact Ratio
Asian	97,576	47.0%	0.956
Black or African American	278,592	46.5%	0.946
Hispanic or Latino	196,581	47.5%	0.965
Two or More Races	40,542	48.9%	0.994
White	385,751	49.2%	1.000
Unknown Race/Ethnicity	439,250	--	--

Intersectional Categories				
		Applicants	Scoring Rate	Impact Ratio
Female	Asian	40,617	48.4%	0.992
	Black or African American	166,039	46.7%	0.957
	Hispanic	99,243	46.9%	0.962
	Two or More Races	22,186	48.8%	1.000
	White	196,823	48.5%	0.993
Male	Asian	51,661	46.1%	0.945
	Black or African American	103,143	45.3%	0.928
	Hispanic	87,864	47.1%	0.965
	Two or More Races	14,187	47.1%	0.966
	White	183,819	48.6%	0.996
Unknown Intersectionality		447,475	--	--

² Consistent with the New York City Ordinance, impact ratio means either (1) the selection rate for a category divided by the selection rate of the most selected category or (2) the scoring rate for a category divided by the scoring rate for the highest scoring category.

American Indian or Alaska Natives or the Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islanders were not included in computing the Impact Ratio because both categories had less than 1% of the population and the New York City Ordinance does not require their inclusion when computing the Impact Ratio. In the opinion of the independent auditors, the inclusion of such small numbers would allow the race/ethnicity or intersectional categories of American Indian or Alaska Natives or Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islanders to be the highest selection rate based on a small number of cases. Allowing such a small sample as the reference group to judge other categories is questionable as the standard for judging the results of other categories for many jobs/sectors would be set based on only a handful of cases. The table below reports the data adjusted for Simpson’s Paradox on the categories that were not used in computing the Impact Ratio.

Populations Less Than 1%		
	Applicants	Scoring Rate
Native American / Alaska Native	5,050	45.4%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander	4,329	48.7%
Female Native American / Alaska Native	2,662	44.7%
Male Native American / Alaska Native	1,749	46.4%
Female Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander	2,240	50.5%
Male Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander	1,706	52.3%

This analysis was conducted across all uses of Candidate Relevancy where sufficient self-ID information was available. Nothing in these FAQ’s should be taken as a guarantee that a particular client’s use of Candidate Relevancy will never result in adverse impact or bias.

7. What was the result of the bias audit conducted on Profile Relevancy?

An independent bias audit of Profile Relevancy was also conducted by BLDS, LLC in April of 2023. The version of Profile Relevancy audited became available on January 4, 2023.³ The independent auditors concluded that no valid statistical evidence of bias is present.

This analysis defined “selection” as candidates placed in the “High” category and in the “High or Medium” category. A summary of the selection rates and impact ratios based on sex and race/ethnicity and the intersection of sex and race/ethnicity, and adjusted for Simpson’s Paradox, are set forth in the following charts:

Sex Categories				
Selection Classified as High				
	Applicants	Selections	Scoring Rate	Impact Ratio
Female	965,033	403,384	41.8%	1.000
Male	753,234	313,345	41.6%	0.996

³ Candidate Relevancy and Profile Relevancy rely on the same algorithm to produce a numerical relevancy score (1 to 100). Candidate Relevancy displays the numerical score (1 to 100) to recruiters, while Profile Relevancy converts the numerical score into a High, Medium, or Low relevancy category. Because the interface is different at this time, ADP obtained separate independent bias audits for Candidate Relevancy and Profile Relevancy.

<i>Selection Classified as High or Medium</i>				
	Applicants	Selections	Scoring Rate	Impact Ratio
Female	1,016,605	754,321	74.2%	1.000
Male	798,979	589,647	73.8%	0.994
Unknown Sex	3,321,033	--	--	--

Race / Ethnicity Categories				
Selection Classified as High				
	Applicants	Selections	Scoring Rate	Impact Ratio
Asian	112,345	44,841	39.9%	0.926
Black or African American	382,898	161,410	42.2%	0.978
Hispanic or Latino	276,856	116,809	42.2%	0.979
Two or More Races	52,340	22,564	43.1%	1.000
White	583,157	247,424	42.4%	0.984

Selection Classified as High or Medium				
	Applicants	Selections	Scoring Rate	Impact Ratio
Asian	122,964	89,946	73.1%	0.958
Black or African American	397,718	298,755	75.1%	0.983
Hispanic or Latino	287,605	215,204	74.8%	0.980
Two or More Races	53,340	40,741	76.4%	1.000
White	615,422	462,207	75.1%	0.983
Unknown Race/Ethnicity	3,619,203	--	--	--

Intersectional Categories					
Selection Classified as High					
		Applicants	Selections	Scoring Rate	Impact Ratio
Female	Asian	47,381	19,022	40.1%	0.871
	Black or African American	222,814	95,186	42.7%	0.927
	Hispanic/Latino	144,144	61,157	42.4%	0.920
	Two or More Races	29,177	13,044	44.7%	0.970
	White	312,614	131,826	42.2%	0.915
Male	Asian	54,302	21,990	40.5%	0.878
	Black or African American	141,863	61,071	43%	0.934
	Hispanic/Latino	114,492	49,013	42.8%	0.929
	Two or More Races	15,126	6,974	46.1%	1.000
	White	252,595	105,942	41.9%	0.910

Selection Classified as High or Medium					
		Applicants	Selections	Scoring Rate	Impact Ratio
Female	Asian	51,315	37,744	73.6%	0.933
	Black or African American	230,364	174,966	76.0%	0.963
	Hispanic/Latino	148,700	111,852	75.2%	0.954
	Two or More Races	29,633	22,998	77.6%	0.984
	White	329,146	246,432	74.9%	0.950
Male	Asian	59,395	43,482	73.2%	0.928
	Black or African American	146,513	111,052	75.8%	0.961
	Hispanic/Latino	118,486	89,467	75.5%	0.958
	Two or More Races	15,263	12,035	78.8%	1.000
	White	268,121	200,124	74.6%	0.947
Unknown Intersectional		3,642,481	--	--	--

American Indian or Alaska Natives or the Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islanders were not included in computing the Impact Ratio because both categories had less than 1% of the population, and the New York City Ordinance does not require their inclusion when computing the Impact Ratio. In the opinion of the independent auditors, the inclusion of such small numbers would allow the race/ethnicity or intersectional categories of American Indian or Alaska Natives or Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islanders to be the highest selection rate based on a trivial number of cases. Allowing such a small sample as the reference group to judge other categories is questionable as the standard for judging the results of other categories for many jobs/sectors would be set based on only a handful of cases. The table below reports the data, adjusted for Simpson’s Paradox, on the categories that were not used in computing the Impact Ratio.

Populations Less Than 1%			
Selection Classified as High			
	Applicants	Selections	Selection Rate
Native American / Alaska Native	4,940	2,259	45.7%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander	3,151	1,599	50.7%
Female Native American / Alaska Native	2,606	1,173	45.0%
Male Native American / Alaska Native	1,257	602	47.9%
Female Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander	1,567	780	49.8%
Male Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander	831	469	56.4%

Selection Classified as High or Medium			
	Applicants	Selections	Selection Rate
Native American / Alaska Native	4,955	3,887	78.4%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander	3,151	2,603	82.6%
Female Native American / Alaska Native	2,617	2,026	77.4%
Male Native American / Alaska Native	1,257	1,031	82.0%
Female Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander	1,583	1,287	81.3%
Male Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander	847	717	84.6%

This analysis was conducted across all uses of Profile Relevancy where sufficient self-ID information was available. Nothing in these FAQ's should be taken as a guarantee that a particular client's use of Profile Relevancy will never result in adverse impact or bias.

8. Can applicants opt out of having their resume reviewed by Candidate Relevancy? What happens if someone opts out?

All applicants are included in the applicant queue for a recruiter to review. Individuals applying through ADP's recruiting platforms can choose not to have their application reviewed by Candidate Relevancy or Profile Relevancy tools. Each opt-out choice is job-specific and opts the candidate out for the specific job posting only. For applicants who have chosen to opt out, their score will be listed as "Not Available," which is the same indicator used if a relevancy score is unavailable for reasons other than opt-out (e.g., technical issues, poor resolution on resume pdf, etc.).

ADP's Commitment to Ethical Artificial Intelligence

For more information about ADP's commitment to ethical artificial intelligence please refer to <https://www.adp.com/about-adp/artificial-intelligence.aspx>.

For any questions or inquiries, please contact AIEthics@adp.com.

This document and all of its contents is the property of ADP, Inc. This document is for information purposes only. Diagrams, tables, percentages and/or outcomes used in this document is for illustration purposes only. Individual outcomes vary by customer. ADP's customers are solely responsible for its use of ADP technology. ADP will not be responsible for any liability, loss or damage of any kind resulting from or connected with the use of this document.