

HR18 · STEP 0 · INTERIM

Bias / Consistency Review of HR Artifacts

Language Bias Scan Results

Line-level scan identifying biased, subjective, or inconsistent language in people review materials, with the affected text grouped for correction.

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**.

Language Bias Scan Results

Prepared By: HR Governance Analyst (with GenAI drafting assistance) **Scan Date:** Current bias review cycle **Organisation:** Northbridge Advisory Partners **Artifacts Scanned:** 4 (Policy Draft Redlines, Performance Review Narratives, Promotion Panel Outcomes, Compensation Recommendation Rationale) **Classification:** Internal - Restrict Access

Findings Table

#	Source Artifact	Passage	Bias Type	Explanation
B1	Performance Review Narratives (G2)	"Steering presentations could be tighter"	Subjective Qualifier	Quoted client feedback used in an evaluative narrative without defining what "tighter" means in measurable terms. The qualifier shapes the Partially Meets rating without a behavioural standard for comparison.
B2	Performance Review Narratives (G3)	"proactive pipeline engagement was limited"	Subjective Qualifier	"Proactive" is an evaluative descriptor applied without a defined standard for what proactive engagement looks like at this role level. Research indicates "proactive" is disproportionately expected of certain demographics in performance contexts.
B3	Performance Review Narratives (G4)	"deprioritised during the GenAI pilot implementation phase"	Vague Justification	Passive construction obscures accountability for the deprioritisation decision. It is unclear whether the employee chose to deprioritise or was directed to by the manager, which affects how the shortfall should be attributed.
B4	Promotion Panel Outcomes (Candidate 2)	"capability that has not been channelled into internal contribution"	Subjective Qualifier	"Channelled" implies the candidate should have self-directed their knowledge-sharing without organisational support or expectation-setting. The language places individual blame for a potentially systemic gap in role expectations.
B5	Promotion Panel Outcomes (Candidate 3)	"waited for the Engagement Manager to initiate"	Subjective Qualifier	Characterises the candidate's behaviour as passive without establishing whether the candidate had the authority or expectation to initiate independently. The nominating manager's framing may reflect a cultural expectation about self-promotion rather than a defined role requirement.
B6	Promotion Panel Outcomes (Candidate 4)	"centralising decisions rather than empowering team leads"	Vague Justification	"Centralising" is used pejoratively without defining what the appropriate decision-making scope is at Engagement Manager level. The delegation expectation is not anchored to a documented competency standard, making it difficult to verify consistent application.
B7	Promotion Panel Outcomes (Candidate 1)	"the onboarding period... constrained commercial contribution opportunities"	Vague Justification	The panel acknowledges a systemic barrier (shorter tenure) but does not define how this should adjust the evidence threshold. The same barrier is not acknowledged for other candidates who may have faced different but comparable constraints.
B8	Policy Draft Redlines (S5.4, original)	"managed with sensitivity to cultural differences"	Cultural Bias	The original language uses a vague framing that positions acquired-firm employees as requiring special handling rather than defining specific integration behaviours. "Sensitivity" is undefined and patronising in the absence of concrete standards. Note: this passage is in the original text being redlined; the revised text addresses the issue.
B9	Compensation Recommendation Rationale (EMP-041)	"mixed results... does not meet the standard eligibility criterion"	Vague Justification	The deferral applies a tenure-based eligibility criterion mechanically without addressing whether the 0.90 compa-ratio (at the Watch threshold boundary) constitutes an equity risk that tenure policy should not override. The rationale does not explain why tenure takes precedence over equity in this case.
B10	Compensation Recommendation Rationale (EMP-063)	"missed in the prior review cycle due to a department transfer"	Vague Justification	The language frames a systemic failure (missed review cycle) in passive terms without attributing accountability. The employee bears the financial consequence of the oversight, but the rationale does not address whether expedited correction is warranted to prevent compounding inequity.

#	Source Artifact	Passage	Bias Type	Explanation
B11	Performance Review Narratives (G3)	"but proactive pipeline engagement was limited"	Gendered Language	The conjunction "but" following the onboarding acknowledgement negates the mitigating context. Combined with "proactive" (B2), the sentence structure applies a higher implicit standard to commercial contribution than is evidenced for the role's tenure period. Research links "proactive" expectations to gendered performance evaluation patterns.
B12	Promotion Panel Outcomes (Candidate 4)	"the delegation concern has appeared in two previous review cycles"	Vague Justification	The historical pattern is cited as evidence of a persistent gap, but no documentation of prior development support or intervention is referenced. Citing a recurring concern without evidence that the organisation addressed it previously shifts accountability entirely to the candidate.

Prevalent Patterns

The most common bias pattern across all four artifacts is the use of **subjective qualifiers and vague justifications in evaluative and decision-influencing passages**. Performance narratives and promotion panel rationale rely on language that sounds precise ("proactive", "channelled", "centralising") but lacks anchoring to defined behavioural standards or measurable thresholds. This pattern is compounded by inconsistent acknowledgement of systemic barriers: the promotion panel recognises that onboarding timing constrained one candidate's opportunities but does not apply an analogous recognition for other forms of constraint. In the compensation domain, mechanical application of eligibility criteria (tenure, standard cap) proceeds without explicit consideration of whether those rules produce equitable outcomes in edge cases. Collectively, these patterns create a risk that decisions appear evidence-based while the underlying language embeds unexamined assumptions about expected behaviours and contribution timelines.