

HR18 · STEP 5 · FINAL

Bias / Consistency Review of HR Artifacts

## Final Redlined Corrections

---

Final corrected review text with approved wording changes, preserving performance meaning while removing biased or inconsistent phrasing.

### ABOUT THIS DOCUMENT

This is a **sample** deliverable from the **Bias / Consistency Review of HR Artifacts** workflow (HR18) in AGASI AiOS. It shows the expected structure and tone. All names, numbers, and facts are **fictional**.

---

# Final Redlined Corrections

**Prepared By:** HR Governance Analyst (with GenAI drafting assistance) **Validated By:** Diversity Reviewer; HR Director, People & Culture **Date:** Current correction approval cycle **Organisation:** Northbridge Advisory Partners **Classification:** Internal - Restrict Access **Status:** Approved for implementation

Each correction below maps to a finding from the Language Bias Scan (B#) or the Consistency Assessment (C#). Severity was assigned during the validation step. Only corrections with a recommendation of Accept or Modify (post-modification) are included. Rejected items are documented in the Approved Bias Audit Report.

---

## Correction 1 — Performance Review Narratives (G2)

---

**Finding Ref:** B1 | **Severity:** Minor | **Recommendation:** Accept

**Original:** Steering presentations could be tighter — we need more time for questions.

**Revised:** The VP of Technology noted that the steering presentation during the review period exceeded the allocated time by 8 minutes, reducing the question period. The client's survey comment recommended that future presentations allow more time for discussion.

**Rationale:** The original passage quoted a subjective client comment ("tighter") as evaluative evidence without translating it into a specific, measurable observation. The revision restates the feedback using the factual time overrun from Evidence Log Entry 5, preserving the development signal without the subjective framing (Bias Scan B1).

---

## Correction 2 — Performance Review Narratives (G3)

---

**Finding Ref:** B2, B11 | **Severity:** Major | **Recommendation:** Accept

**Original:** The shortfall is partly attributable to the onboarding period, but proactive pipeline engagement was limited.

**Revised:** The target of two proposal contributions was not met (one completed). The employee joined mid-year, reducing the available contribution window to approximately five months. During this period, one potential follow-on engagement was identified and flagged to the Practice Head but was not progressed to a formal proposal.

**Rationale:** "Proactive" is a subjective qualifier not anchored to a defined standard for this role level, and research indicates the term carries gendered evaluation risk. The conjunction "but" negated the onboarding-period acknowledgement. The revision states the factual shortfall, the structural constraint, and the specific actions taken, allowing the reader to assess performance without embedded judgement (Bias Scan B2, B11).

---

## Correction 3 — Performance Review Narratives (G4)

---

**Finding Ref:** B3 | **Severity:** Minor | **Recommendation:** Accept

**Original:** The planned follow-up session was deprioritised during the GenAI pilot implementation phase.

**Revised:** The planned follow-up session did not occur in the second half of the review period. The employee and Practice Head agreed to defer it during the GenAI pilot implementation phase to manage workload. No alternative format (written asset or shorter session) was discussed at the time of deferral.

**Rationale:** The passive construction obscured who made the deprioritisation decision. The revision attributes the decision and notes that no mitigation was explored, which is relevant context for evaluating the knowledge-sharing shortfall (Bias Scan B3).

---

## Correction 4 — Promotion Panel Outcomes (Candidate 2, Knowledge Sharing)

---

**Finding Ref:** B4, C1 | **Severity:** Major | **Recommendation:** Accept

**Original:** The L&D Manager noted that the candidate's delivery track record suggests capability that has not been channelled into internal contribution, and that a post-promotion expectation rather than a pre-promotion gate is appropriate here.

**Revised:** The L&D Manager noted that the candidate's delivery record demonstrates the underlying capability for knowledge sharing, but the candidate has not yet delivered formal sessions, publications, or documented mentoring. The panel agreed that the Knowledge Sharing gap should be addressed through a documented post-promotion commitment (two contributions in the first six months) rather than serving as a promotion gate, on the basis that the candidate meets the framework's readiness threshold of Strong on at least 4 of 6 criteria. This treatment differs from Candidate 4, whose Knowledge Sharing gap (rated Partial, not No Evidence) was weighed as a contributing factor in the deferral decision. The panel notes that this difference in treatment is justified by the distinct reasons for deferral in Candidate 4's case (incomplete 360-degree feedback and persistent delegation concerns across three review cycles), not by the Knowledge Sharing criterion alone.

**Rationale:** "Channelled" placed implicit blame on the candidate. The revision also addresses the cross-artifact consistency finding (C1) by explicitly documenting why Knowledge Sharing was treated differently for Candidate 2 versus Candidate 4, preventing the appearance of inconsistent criterion application (Bias Scan B4; Consistency Assessment C1).

---

## Correction 5 — Promotion Panel Outcomes (Candidate 3)

---

**Finding Ref:** B5 | **Severity:** Minor | **Recommendation:** Accept

**Original:** The nominating manager specifically noted the candidate "waited for the Engagement Manager to initiate."

**Revised:** The nominating manager noted that the managed services upsell opportunity was identified by the candidate but not progressed beyond initial identification. The candidate did not submit a proposal or engage the Engagement Manager to initiate the commercial process.

**Rationale:** "Waited for" characterises the candidate's behaviour as passive. The revision states what did and did not happen, allowing the reader to assess the gap without a subjective framing of the candidate's disposition (Bias Scan B5).

---

## Correction 6 — Promotion Panel Outcomes (Candidate 4)

---

**Finding Ref:** B6, B12 | **Severity:** Major | **Recommendation:** Accept

**Original:** Peer feedback and the manager narrative both flag a pattern of centralising decisions rather than empowering team leads. [...] the delegation concern has appeared in two previous review cycles [...] suggesting this is a persistent pattern rather than a recent gap.

**Revised:** Peer feedback and the manager narrative identify specific instances where the candidate made client-facing decisions that the team lead role is expected to handle at Senior Engagement Manager level (per the delegation expectations defined in the Senior EM competency profile). This development area has been noted in two prior review cycles. The panel noted that no documented development intervention (coaching, delegation protocol, or structured feedback) was implemented after the prior two flags, and that this absence of organisational follow-through should be considered alongside the candidate's individual accountability when evaluating the persistence of the gap.

**Rationale:** "Centralising" and "empowering" are evaluative terms without behavioural anchoring. Citing a "persistent pattern" over three cycles without referencing whether the organisation supported change shifts all accountability to the candidate. The revision anchors the delegation gap to a defined competency expectation and acknowledges the shared accountability (Bias Scan B6, B12).

---

## Correction 7 — Promotion Panel Outcomes (Candidate 1)

---

**Finding Ref:** B7, C3 | **Severity:** Minor | **Recommendation:** Modify

**Original:** The panel discussed the nominating manager's argument that the onboarding period (the candidate joined mid-year) constrained commercial contribution opportunities.

**Revised:** The panel discussed the nominating manager's argument that the candidate's mid-year start date reduced the available contribution window to approximately five months for the current review cycle. The panel agreed that this structural constraint partially mitigates the Business Development shortfall but does not fully account for the absence of pipeline engagement, given that one follow-on opportunity was identified but not progressed.

**Rationale:** The original acknowledged the constraint without defining its scope. The revision quantifies the constraint and states what the panel concluded about its mitigating effect, making the rationale verifiable. Cross-references the compensation deferral for the same employee (C3), where tenure is cited as a separate reason for deferral (Bias Scan B7; Consistency Assessment C3).

---

## Correction 8 — Compensation Recommendation Rationale (EMP-041)

---

**Finding Ref:** B9, C3 | **Severity:** Major | **Recommendation:** Accept

**Original:** Under Internal Equity Guidelines Section 4.1, employees with less than six months of service at the review effective date should be assessed on a case-by-case basis "considering the offer benchmark at time of hire." [...] The compa-ratio of 0.90 sits at the Watch threshold (not Below Threshold), and the six-month tenure does not meet the standard eligibility criterion for a mandatory adjustment. Recommendation: reassess at the next mid-year review.

**Revised:** Under Internal Equity Guidelines Section 4.1, employees with less than six months of service at the review effective date should be assessed on a case-by-case basis. EMP-041's compa-ratio of 0.90 sits at the Watch threshold boundary. While the six-month tenure does not trigger a mandatory adjustment, the Compensation Analyst notes the following equity considerations: (1) the employee's promotion candidacy was deferred at the current calibration panel, meaning no promotion-linked adjustment will occur; (2) the Watch threshold compa-ratio may fall below threshold by the next mid-year review if market benchmarks move upward, given the survey vintage of the current benchmark file. Recommendation: reassess at the next mid-year review with an interim market check in the next survey update window to confirm the compa-ratio has not deteriorated below 0.90.

**Rationale:** The original applied the tenure criterion mechanically without addressing the equity risk of deferring an employee already at the threshold boundary. The revision retains the deferral recommendation but documents the equity considerations and adds a safeguard (interim market check) to prevent silent erosion. Also addresses the cross-artifact inconsistency where tenure is cited in compensation but a different rationale (Business Development gaps) is used for the same employee's promotion deferral (Bias Scan B9; Consistency Assessment C3).

---

## Correction 9 — Compensation Recommendation Rationale (EMP-063)

---

**Finding Ref:** B10 | **Severity:** Minor | **Recommendation:** Accept

**Original:** EMP-063 was missed in a prior review cycle due to a department transfer during a prior restructure (worded in passive voice without system attribution).

**Revised:** EMP-063 was not included in the prior annual review cycle. The omission occurred because the department transfer during a prior restructure was not reflected in the HRIS compensation review roster in time. The HRIS Administrator has confirmed this was a system process gap, not an intentional exclusion. The current recommendation includes a correction for the compounded shortfall.

**Rationale:** The original used passive language that did not attribute accountability for the missed review. The revision identifies the root cause (HRIS process gap) and confirms the correction addresses the compounded effect (Bias Scan B10).