BeAccessible
CREATING ACCESS FOR ALL

BiasLens

PROOF AND TRUST

Fictional-Data Recruitment Case Study

A practical BiasLens walkthrough showing how one AI-assisted recruitment process moves from concern to an evidence-led investigation question.

BIASLENS PROOF ASSET

Fictional Recruitment Case Study

Fictional demonstration data. Not legal advice. Not a finding of discrimination.

Executive summary

This fictional case study shows how BiasLens examines one AI-assisted recruitment workflow without turning incomplete evidence into a binary pass/fail conclusion. The method defines the system, inventories evidence, identifies possible bias pathways, interprets outcome differences cautiously, records limitations and decides what requires investigation next.

Case reference: BL-DEMO-RECRUIT-001 | Northstar Services (fictional)

System and decision context

System: AI-assisted candidate screening used to support shortlisting decisions.
Decision context: recruitment shortlisting for a fictional professional-services role.
Assessment trigger: concern that disabled applicants may be under-represented in shortlisted outcomes.
BiasLens question: What does the available evidence support, what remains unverified, and what requires investigation?

1. Evidence inventory

Available

System purpose and shortlisting workflow documented internally.

Available

Fictional aggregate applicant and shortlist counts for the demonstration period.

Unverified

Vendor statement that the model was tested for fairness without supporting validation evidence.

Missing

Clear evidence showing the validation population adequately represents affected disability groups.

Unverified

Internal keyboard spot-check suggests a possible upload barrier, but no structured accessibility test report exists.

Missing

Reliable evidence explaining disability disclosure patterns and non-disclosure within the applicant pool.

BiasLens preserves the distinction between evidence present, evidence absent and evidence that remains unverified.

2. Possible bias pathways

Preexisting

A representation gap may exist if disabled people or disability-related needs were insufficiently represented in historic or validation data. Possible pathway only; this does not establish that it caused the observed outcome difference.

Technical

A possible keyboard or accessibility barrier in the upload step may affect who can complete the process successfully. A spot-check is not comprehensive accessibility testing and is not a WCAG conformance finding.

Emergent

The applicant population, use context or vendor model may change after deployment. Material change can create new risk even when earlier evidence was stronger.

3. Fictional fairness signal

Disability-disclosed analysis group: 40 applications, 12 shortlisted, 30% selection rate.
Comparison group: 80 applications, 36 shortlisted, 45% selection rate.

Selection-rate ratio: 0.67

> **Interpretation: this fictional outcome difference is a signal requiring investigation. It does not establish causation or unlawful discrimination.**

Critical limitation: the comparison group must not be described as non-disabled people. Disability non-disclosure can occur, and the fictional data does not establish the actual disability status of everyone outside the disclosed group.

4. Limitations that remain visible

- The data is entirely fictional and exists only to demonstrate BiasLens methodology.
- The group sizes are not statutory thresholds or legal safe harbours.
- The outcome difference alone does not explain cause.
- The vendor fairness statement remains an assertion until supported by evidence.
- An accessibility spot-check does not equal structured testing, validation or conformance.

5. Recommended next actions

- Improve denominator and disclosure-quality evidence before drawing stronger conclusions.
- Request the vendor's validation methodology, affected-group evidence, fairness testing scope and material limitations.
- Conduct structured accessibility testing across the full candidate workflow.
- Investigate where the outcome difference enters the process rather than assuming the AI model is the sole cause.
- Record rationale, evidence status, limitations, owners and due dates in the organisation's governance evidence trail.
- Reassess after material model, vendor, workflow or applicant-population change.

6. What BiasLens clarified

- There is an observable fictional outcome difference, but the current evidence does not establish why it exists.
- The vendor's fairness statement is not yet verified evidence.
- Disability visibility is incomplete because disclosure status cannot be treated as a complete proxy for disability status.
- Accessibility evidence is incomplete and requires structured testing.
- The organisation now has specific evidence questions and next actions rather than a vague question such as Is the AI biased?

BiasLens tells you what your evidence supports - and what it does not.

Next step

Assess one AI system: https://biaslens.beaccessible.co.za/enquire
Methodology: https://biaslens.beaccessible.co.za/methodology | hello@beaccessible.co.za