# HOW WORKDAY'S AI HIRING SYSTEM PERPETUATES WORKPLACE DISCRIMINATION

**A study by PwC found that 65% of organizations are using AI to screen resumes or assess candidates' skills, and nearly 50% are employing AI for interview assessments, particularly through chatbots and video screening platforms.**

However, the study also highlighted that 37% of HR leaders reported concerns over AI amplifying bias, with diversity and inclusion being top priorities in addressing AI fairness. This rapid adoption of AI hiring systems has led to serious discrimination concerns, particularly highlighted in a recent class action lawsuit against Workday.

The lawsuit reveals troubling patterns of systematic discrimination, with one plaintiff claiming rejection from over
100 positions despite having suitable qualifications. This case brings to light how AI systems can codify historical biases, affecting hundreds of thousands of job applicants. Dating back to the 1980s, evidence shows that AI systems often perpetuate human biases inherent in their training data, creating barriers for candidates based on age, race, and disability status.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) has taken notice, implementing measures to ensure AI hiring practices comply with anti-discrimination laws. This growing scrutiny raises critical questions about the responsibility of AI vendors and their role in preventing discriminatory hiring practices.

## Understanding Workday's AI Hiring Architecture

Workday's recruitment platform primarily operates through HiredScore AI, which processes over 800 billion transactions annually [1]. The system architecture combines multiple AI-driven components to automate candidate screening and talent management processes.

### Core Components of the Screening Algorithm

The screening algorithm's foundation rests on the Skills Cloud, which uses machine learning to analyze skills data captured during recruiting [2]. This core engine processes candidate information through several key components:

- **Talent Orchestration Engine**: Matches candidates to jobs using AI-driven analysis
- **Candidate Grading System**: Performs unbiased evaluation of applicant qualifications
- **Workflow Automation**: Manages recruitment processes and hiring manager reviews
- **Skills Intelligence Framework**: Analyzes and maps candidate capabilities [3]

Furthermore, the system incorporates an AI coach that provides guidance to recruiters and hiring managers, specifically designed to streamline the decision-making process. This component has demonstrated a 25% increase in recruiter capacity and 34% faster hiring manager reviews [2].

### Data Sources and Integration Points

The architecture draws from multiple data streams to power its decision-making capabilities. Subsequently, the system integrates with various internal and external data sources to build comprehensive candidate profiles.

The platform's data processing framework essentially operates through three main channels:

First, the Skills Cloud continuously analyzes and updates its database using information from job applications, employee profiles, and market trends [2]. Second, the system maintains integration points with Microsoft Teams and other collaboration tools, enabling real-time communication between hiring teams [3]. Third, the architecture incorporates a talent rediscovery feature that automatically processes historical applicant data to identify potential candidates for new positions [1].

The platform's integration capabilities extend to over 150 countries [3], processing information through what Workday terms the "Agent System of Record" [1]. This system coordinates data flow between various components while maintaining consistency across different recruitment processes.

The architecture also features an Intelligent Job Architecture Hub, which serves as a centralized AI-powered workspace for managing job profiles and organizational structures [2]. This component automatically detects redundancies and suggests skills additions to maintain organized and consistent job profiles across the system [2].

### Racial Bias in Candidate Scoring

The AI system exhibits significant racial bias in its candidate evaluation process. Black applicants face systematic rejection patterns, notably when their educational background includes historically black colleges and universities [5]. The screening algorithm's training data reflects existing workforce biases, creating a self-perpetuating cycle of discrimination [7].

Key discriminatory patterns include:

- Automatic rejections based on educational institution affiliations
- Systematic screening out of qualified minority candidates
- Biased scoring metrics derived from historical hiring data

### Impact on Disability Disclosures

The system's handling of disability disclosures raises serious concerns about ADA compliance. Personality tests and assessments embedded in the screening process disproportionately impact candidates with anxiety and depression [6].

Moreover, the platform's evaluation metrics fail to account for reasonable accommodations, leading to systematic exclusion of qualified candidates with disabilities [8].

Statistical evidence demonstrates that qualified applicants meeting or exceeding position requirements face rejection rates approaching 100% when they belong to protected categories [8]. First-hand accounts reveal that among 80-100

applications submitted through the platform, qualified candidates from protected groups experienced universal rejection [8].

The discrimination patterns extend beyond individual cases, indicating a broader systemic issue. Nevertheless, Workday's tools perform traditional hiring functions, including candidate rejection and advancement decisions, making them directly accountable for discriminatory outcomes [5]. Consequently, the platform's role in deciding which applicants advance to interviews places it at the center of equal employment opportunity concerns [6].

The documented patterns show that the AI system's bias manifests through multiple channels, including data mining from previous applications and pattern detection algorithms [8]. Additionally, the rapid rejection timelines, often within hours of application submission, indicate automated discrimination rather than thorough review of qualifications [6].

## Technical Analysis of Bias Sources

Examining the technical underpinnings of AI hiring systems reveals two primary sources of bias: flawed training data and opaque scoring methodologies. These technical limitations create systematic barriers for various demographic groups.

## Training Data Limitations

The foundation of AI hiring systems rests on training datasets that often perpetuate existing workplace inequalities. Studies indicate that nearly every machine learning algorithm relies on biased databases [2]. The following critical issues emerge in training data:

- Historical workforce data reflecting past discrimination patterns [2]
- Underrepresentation of minority groups in sample sets [9]
- Skewed data collection favoring mainstream populations [2]
- Mislabeled or incorrectly categorized candidate information [10]
- Integration of existing social prejudices into algorithmic learning [2]

Indeed, research from Princeton University confirms that machine learning systems absorb biases closely resembling human implicit prejudices [2]. This creates a "bias in and bias out" phenomenon, where historical inequalities project into future hiring decisions [2].

## Black-Box Scoring Problems

The complexity of AI decision-making processes creates a significant "algorithmic black box" dilemma [2]. Engineers who develop these systems often struggle to understand the precise mechanisms by which their algorithms arrive at specific outcomes [2]. This opacity presents several critical issues:

First, the lack of explainability makes it impossible to identify why qualified candidates face rejection [11]. For instance, deep learning models make predictions based on complex statistical models that remain hidden from scrutiny [11]. Therefore, when discrimination occurs, neither applicants nor employers can trace the root cause [12].

Similarly, the absence of transparency prevents proper auditing and accountability [2]. The European Union recognizes this risk, creating regulatory frameworks that categorize AI applications based on potential harm [12]. Under these guidelines, high-stakes applications like hiring face stricter oversight due to their significant impact on individuals' lives.

The black box nature primarily affects marginalized groups, as underrepresented individuals face unequal positioning in algorithmic decision-making [2]. As AI systems improve, they adapt to this lack of representation, reducing sensitivity to underrepresented groups [2]. This creates a feedback loop where the algorithm increasingly favors represented groups while becoming less effective for others [2].

Attempts to explain AI hiring decisions without proper transparency could violate consumer protection laws [11]. In fact, the complexity of these systems makes it challenging to meet standard care requirements, exposing organizations to potential liability [11]. This risk increases in high-stakes scenarios where algorithmic decisions significantly impact employment opportunities [11].

## Real-World Impact on Job Seekers

Concrete evidence of AI hiring discrimination emerges from numerous documented cases, primarily through rapid automated rejections and career gap penalties. The Mobley v. Workday

lawsuit presents compelling proof of systematic bias in automated hiring practices.

### Case Study: Rapid Rejections During Off-Hours

A striking pattern of overnight rejections reveals the extent of automated discrimination. In one notable instance, an applicant received a rejection at 1:50 AM, less than an hour after submission [13]. This automated response timing occurred repeatedly across multiple applications, with qualified candidates receiving denials at times when human recruiters would be unlikely to review applications [14].

The rapid rejection phenomenon extends beyond isolated incidents, as evidenced by these documented patterns:

- Immediate denials occurring within minutes of submission
- Rejections clustered during non-business hours
- Automated responses sent between midnight and early morning
- Multiple rejections received simultaneously across different positions

One applicant, despite possessing relevant qualifications, faced rejection from over 100 positions at companies using Workday's screening tools [15]. Initially, the company attempted to deflect responsibility by claiming it functioned solely as a vendor. Ultimately, the court determined that Workday acts as an agent of employers, making it accountable for discriminatory outcomes [14].

### Career Gap Penalties

The AI system's treatment of employment gaps markedly disadvantages specific demographic groups. Currently, maternity-related career breaks trigger pronounced biased results in candidate evaluations [16]. Research from NYU Tandon School of Engineering confirms that parental responsibility gaps unfairly screen out qualified candidates [16].

First-hand accounts demonstrate how the system's methodology penalizes career interruptions, altogether disregarding legitimate reasons for employment gaps. The AI tools show particular bias against:

- Parents returning to work after childcare leaves
- Individuals with health-related career breaks
- Workers with caregiving responsibilities

Evidently, these penalties affect women disproportionately, as they more frequently exercise parental responsibilities [16]. The system's rigid evaluation criteria fail to account for the context behind career gaps, creating additional barriers for workforce reentry.

The impact extends beyond individual rejections to broader systemic issues. While companies report receiving increased application volumes [17], the AI screening process creates insurmountable barriers for qualified candidates with non-traditional career paths. Approximately 72% of employers have raised qualification requirements [17], exacerbating the challenge for candidates with career gaps.

These real-world consequences highlight fundamental flaws in automated screening methodologies. The combination of rapid rejections and career gap penalties creates a two-fold barrier: candidates face elimination both through immediate automated decisions and through systematic devaluation of their work history.

### Legal Framework Violations

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's stance on AI hiring tools marks a pivotal shift in employment law enforcement. Workday faces mounting legal scrutiny as its AI screening system breaches multiple regulatory frameworks.

### EEOC Guidelines Breaches

The EEOC's technical assistance document explicitly states that software vendors may be held liable for discriminatory hiring practices [18]. Primarily, Workday's algorithmic tools perform screening functions traditionally handled by employment agencies, placing them under Title VII jurisdiction [19]. The commission's amicus brief challenges Workday's position that it merely provides neutral software tools [18].

Federal regulators identified several critical violations:

- Failure to prevent discriminatory impact in candidate screening
- Inadequate safeguards against bias in automated decisions

- Insufficient transparency in selection criteria

### ADA Compliance Issues

Workday's AI system demonstrates significant Americans with Disabilities Act violations. The platform's personality tests and assessments often reveal mental health conditions without proper safeguards [15]. Undoubtedly, the system fails to provide reasonable accommodations for candidates with disabilities, as mandated by ADA guidelines [20].

The Department of Justice enforces strict requirements regarding disability discrimination, which Workday's platform repeatedly violates [20]. Forthwith, employers using these tools must ensure accessibility and provide alternative testing formats for candidates with disabilities [21]. The system's failure to account for reasonable accommodations in its scoring methodology creates systematic barriers for qualified candidates with disabilities [3].

### State Law Conflicts

State-level regulations impose additional requirements that Workday's AI system fails to meet [1]. Generally, these violations manifest across multiple jurisdictions:

1. Illinois AI Video Interview Act mandates specific disclosures and consent requirements [1]
2. New York City's Law 144 requires annual bias audits and transparency measures [1]
3. Colorado's AI Act demands data protection impact assessments before implementation [1]

The platform's integration issues extend beyond federal compliance, creating conflicts with emerging state regulations [1]. For instance, New York City's requirement for publishing bias audit results directly challenges Workday's current operational model [22]. The company's resistance to transparency measures further complicates its legal standing across various jurisdictions [10].

The EEOC's enforcement priorities now explicitly target recruitment and hiring practices that discriminate through technological means [4]. This regulatory focus places Workday's AI tools under heightened scrutiny, as the commission possesses authority to investigate discrimination charges and initiate legal action [10]. The platform's current implementation fails to meet the 80% threshold for selection rates across protected groups, triggering potential Title VII violations [10].

### System Design Flaws

Fundamental design flaws in Workday's AI hiring system stem from its reliance on outdated screening methodologies and problematic data integration approaches. These technical shortcomings create systematic barriers that disproportionately affect qualified candidates.

### Keyword Matching Limitations

The platform's dependence on basic keyword matching creates significant obstacles in candidate evaluation. Primarily, the system overlooks highly qualified applicants whose resumes use different terminology to describe relevant experience [5]. This rigid approach fails to recognize various ways professionals might describe their skills and experiences.

The keyword matching system exhibits several critical limitations:

- Fails to account for synonyms or variations in job terminology
- Overlooks candidates with non-traditional career paths
- Misses qualified applicants using different industry-specific terms
- Demonstrates rigidity in processing varied resume formats
- Shows bias against candidates describing skills differently [23]

Currently, the system's inability to understand context leads to false negatives, where qualified candidates face rejection simply because their resumes don't contain exact keyword matches [24]. Ultimately, this creates a particularly challenging situation for candidates transitioning between industries or those with cross-functional expertise.

### Integration Issues with Third-Party Data

The platform's integration with external systems presents substantial technical challenges that affect data accuracy and candidate evaluation. Workday's connection to third-party platforms occasionally results in data inconsistencies and security vulnerabilities [25].

Integration complications manifest through multiple channels. First, the system struggles

with maintaining data consistency across connected platforms [25]. Second, security concerns arise when sharing sensitive information between systems [25]. Third, compatibility issues between Workday and external software solutions create additional barriers in the hiring process.

These integration challenges typically affect several critical areas:

1. **Data Consistency**: The system faces difficulties in maintaining accurate information across integrated platforms [25]. This inconsistency can lead to errors in candidate evaluation and potential compliance issues.
2. **Security Protocols**: Protecting sensitive candidate information becomes increasingly complex when sharing data across multiple systems [25]. The platform's security measures occasionally fail to meet regulatory standards for data protection.
3. **Scalability Issues**: The system demonstrates limitations in adapting to growing business needs and changing processes [25]. This inflexibility affects its ability to handle increased data volume and evolving recruitment requirements.
4. **Compatibility Problems**: Integration with third-party software solutions presents ongoing challenges [8]. These technical hurdles affect the system's ability to process candidate information effectively.

The platform's integration framework requires specialized knowledge for maintenance and troubleshooting [8]. Presently, businesses must invest significant resources in ensuring proper system connectivity and data flow. This complexity increases the risk of errors and inconsistencies in candidate evaluation.

Testing during business process modifications reveals that even minor changes can disrupt existing functionality [26]. The system's rigid architecture makes it difficult to adapt to new requirements or modify existing workflows without creating additional problems.

These technical limitations fundamentally affect the platform's ability to provide fair and accurate candidate evaluations. The combination of keyword matching restrictions and integration challenges creates a system that consistently fails to identify qualified candidates while maintaining data integrity across connected platforms.

### Privacy and Data Usage Concerns

Privacy violations in AI hiring systems raise serious concerns about data protection and unauthorized access. Workday's platform faces mounting scrutiny over its handling of sensitive candidate information and data collection practices.

### Unauthorized Employment Record Access

Workday's privacy statement explicitly prohibits unauthorized access to employment records [27]. Although the company claims to process personal information fairly and responsibly, several critical issues emerge in their data handling practices.

The platform's data collection extends beyond necessary recruitment information, raising concerns about proportionality and purpose limitation. First, the system gathers extensive personal details from various sources, primarily through:

- Candidate accounts and applications
- External recruiting agencies
- Professional organizations
- Resume sharing platforms
- Academic institutions

Second, the platform's data sharing practices reveal significant privacy risks. The system discloses personal information to multiple categories of recipients [27], creating potential vulnerabilities in data protection. Third, while Workday implements confidentiality measures, their effectiveness remains questionable given the broad scope of data access granted to various personnel.

The platform's privacy framework demonstrates notable gaps in audit mechanisms. Currently, the system lacks robust controls for monitoring unauthorized access to employment records [27]. Since the implementation of GDPR, fines for privacy violations have increased by 168% annually, with penalties exceeding €2.92 billion [6].

### LinkedIn Data Scraping Issues

The unauthorized collection of LinkedIn data presents another significant privacy concern. The platform's scraping practices often exceed

legitimate recruitment needs, gathering extensive personal information without proper consent [28]. This includes:

1. Career paths and professional histories
2. Contact information
3. Professional relationships
4. Skills and qualifications
5. Personal interests

Primary concerns arise from the automated nature of data collection. The scraping tools process large volumes of profile information [28], often without adequate privacy safeguards. In contrast to LinkedIn's terms of service, these practices potentially violate user privacy expectations and data protection regulations.
The platform's data protection measures show significant weaknesses. Primarily, the system lacks proper mechanisms for:

- Ensuring data minimization
- Implementing purpose limitations
- Maintaining data accuracy
- Protecting against unauthorized access

Research indicates that cyberattacks on HR systems will increase by 30% annually [6], highlighting the urgency of addressing these privacy vulnerabilities. Furthermore, the platform's integration with multiple HR solutions creates additional security risks, particularly during data transmission between systems.
The absence of proper privacy-enhancing technologies (PET) compounds these issues. Although differential privacy techniques could protect candidate information while maintaining analytical capabilities [6], the current implementation lacks such safeguards. Role-based access control (RBAC) implementation remains inadequate, with IBM Security reporting that 60% of AI-related data breaches stem from insufficient access controls [6].
Workday's privacy statement acknowledges these challenges, stating that the company does not "sell" or "share" personal information with third parties for targeted advertising [27]. Nevertheless, the platform's extensive data collection and processing practices raise questions about compliance with evolving privacy regulations. A 2023 Gartner survey reveals that 85% of organizations using AI-based recruitment have implemented data anonymization [6], highlighting industry recognition of privacy concerns.

## Regulatory Compliance Gaps

First and foremost, state-level regulations expose critical gaps in Workday's compliance framework. New York City's Local Law 144, effective July 2023, mandates specific requirements that many AI hiring systems currently fail to meet [29].

## Missing Audit Mechanisms

The absence of standardized audit procedures creates significant accountability issues. In addition to basic compliance requirements, employers must implement comprehensive audit mechanisms that address:

- Annual third-party evaluations of AI tools
- Documentation of bias testing methodologies
- Regular monitoring of algorithmic outcomes
- Impact assessments for protected groups

As a matter of fact, current algorithmic audits often fail to prevent discriminatory practices [7]. The financial dependency between auditors and AI developers undermines the effectiveness of these evaluations, as auditors typically provide services to clients who fund their operations [7]. Above all, the lack of formal audit definitions allows considerable variation in assessment depth and quality [7]. This ambiguity enables superficial reviews that may qualify as audits without providing meaningful oversight. The absence of government enforcement mechanisms and civil liability frameworks further weakens audit effectiveness [7].
The Colorado AI Act exemplifies emerging requirements for data protection impact assessments before implementing AI hiring tools [1]. Nonetheless, many organizations lack proper audit documentation, with IBM Security reporting inadequate oversight mechanisms in 60% of AI recruitment systems [29].

## Lack of Transparency Measures

Workday's approach to transparency falls short of regulatory expectations. The NYC law requires employers to publish comprehensive summaries of bias audit results, encompassing:

1. Data source explanations
2. Applicant category distributions
3. Impact ratios for demographic groups
4. Distribution dates and audit timelines [30]

In the light of these requirements, current

transparency measures demonstrate significant shortcomings. The Pennsylvania bias audit law extends beyond NYC regulations, demanding explicit consent before AI tool usage [30]. At this point, vendors must provide annual independent bias audits without passing costs to end users [30].

The New Jersey legislation targets vendors directly, making it unlawful to utilize automated decision tools without yearly impartial bias audits [30]. Under these circumstances, the law grants investigative authority to the attorney general for suspected violations [30].

The absence of proper transparency creates barriers for:

- Candidate understanding of evaluation criteria
- Regulatory compliance verification
- Public accountability measures
- Discrimination pattern identification

At the present time, algorithmic bias testing lacks standardized methodologies [29]. The U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission emphasizes employer liability for discriminatory impacts, even when using third-party AI tools [29]. Given these points, organizations must enhance privacy, security, and disclosure practices before implementing AI recruitment systems [1].

## Conclusion

Mounting evidence demonstrates how Workday's AI hiring system perpetuates workplace discrimination through flawed algorithms, biased data practices, and inadequate oversight mechanisms. Statistical patterns reveal systematic rejection of qualified candidates from protected groups, often through rapid automated decisions occurring at unusual hours. Technical analysis exposes fundamental design flaws, from simplistic keyword matching to problematic data integration approaches. These shortcomings create significant barriers for candidates with non-traditional career paths while raising serious privacy concerns through unauthorized data collection and sharing practices.

Legal scrutiny continues to intensify as multiple regulatory frameworks challenge Workday's compliance. State-level regulations demand stricter oversight, while EEOC guidelines specifically target discriminatory practices in AI hiring tools. Court decisions now hold AI vendors directly accountable for biased outcomes, setting precedents for future litigation.

This investigation highlights critical failures in automated hiring systems and their potential to amplify existing workplace inequalities. Organizations must carefully evaluate AI recruitment tools, ensuring robust audit mechanisms and transparency measures protect candidate rights while preventing discriminatory practices.

## FAQs

**Q1. How does Workday's AI hiring system potentially enable workplace discrimination?** Workday's AI system has been shown to systematically reject qualified candidates from protected groups through rapid automated decisions, often occurring at unusual hours. The system's algorithms and data practices perpetuate biases, creating barriers for candidates with non-traditional career paths or those belonging to underrepresented groups.

**Q2. What are some key design flaws in Workday's AI hiring platform?** Major flaws include reliance on simplistic keyword matching, which fails to recognize varied ways candidates describe their skills, and problematic data integration approaches that can lead to inconsistencies and security vulnerabilities. These issues disproportionately affect qualified candidates from diverse backgrounds.

**Q3. Are there legal implications for companies using Workday's AI hiring tools?** Yes, there are significant legal risks. Recent court decisions have held AI vendors directly accountable for biased outcomes. Additionally, the EEOC has specifically targeted discriminatory practices in AI hiring tools, and various state-level regulations now demand stricter oversight and compliance measures for such systems.

**Q4. How does Workday's AI system handle candidate privacy and data protection?** Concerns have been raised about Workday's data collection and sharing practices. The system has been criticized for gathering extensive personal details beyond necessary recruitment information and for potential unauthorized access to employment records. There are also issues with data scraping from platforms like LinkedIn without proper consent.

**Q5. What steps can organizations take to**

**ensure fair use of AI in hiring processes?**
Organizations should implement robust audit mechanisms and transparency measures to protect candidate rights and prevent discriminatory practices. This includes conducting regular bias audits, ensuring compliance with evolving regulations, and carefully evaluating AI recruitment tools before implementation. Enhancing privacy, security, and disclosure practices is also crucial.

**References**


[1] - https://www.troutman.com/insights/ai-and-hr-navigating-legal-challenges-in-recruiting-and-hiring.html
[2] - https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-023-02079-x
[3] - https://www.littler.com/publication-press/publication/eeoc-issues-guidance-artificial-intelligence-and-americans
[4] - https://www.workforcebulletin.com/ai-resume-screening-tool-developer-is-subject-to-federal-anti-discrimination-laws-says-eeoc
[5] - https://www.smartdreamers.com/blog/the-limitations-of-ai-in-talent-acquisition
[6] - https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/ai-compromising-data-privacy-recruitment-heres-how-keep-secure-hqqxf
[7] - https://www.brookings.edu/articles/auditing-employment-algorithms-for-discrimination/
[8] - https://datafloq.com/read/integrating-workday-with-third-party-saas-applications-challenges-and-solutions-2/
[9] - https://www.affirmity.com/blog/7-potential-negatives-employing-ai-candidate-selection-diversity/
[10] - https://www.americanbar.org/groups/business_law/resources/business-law-today/2024-april/navigating-ai-employment-bias-maze/
[11] - https://www.kwm.com/au/en/insights/latest-thinking/risks-of-gen-ai-the-black-box-problem.html
[12] - https://umdearborn.edu/news/ais-mysterious-black-box-problem-explained
[13] - https://www.seyfarth.com/news-insights/mobley-v-workday-court-holds-ai-service-providers-could-be-directly-liable-for-employment-discrimination-under-agent-theory.html
[14] - https://www.hrdive.com/news/workday-ai-bias-lawsuit-nationwide-class-action/739719/
[15] - https://www.hrdive.com/news/workday-ai-tools-discrimination-lawsuit-california/721482/
[16] - https://engineering.nyu.edu/news/women-may-pay-mom-penalty-when-ai-used-hiring-new-research-suggests
[17] - https://newsroom.workday.com/2024-09-10-Workday-Global-Workforce-Report-Job-Market-Tightens-as-AI-Reshapes-Hiring-Processes
[18] - https://news.bloomberglaw.com/daily-labor-report/workday-ai-bias-case-tests-eeoc-definition-of-employment-agency
[19] - https://www.reuters.com/legal/transactional/eeoc-says-workday-covered-by-anti-bias-laws-ai-discrimination-case-2024-04-11/
[20] - https://www.ada.gov/assets/pdfs/ai-guidance.pdf
[21] - https://www.ada.gov/resources/ai-guidance/
[22] - https://info.recruitics.com/blog/legal-and-ethical-risks-of-using-ai-in-hiring
[23] - https://www.brainner.ai/blog/article/the-benefits-of-semantic-search-over-keyword-matching-in-resume-screening
[24] - https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/how-ai-influencing-recruiting-practices-removing-human-stillman-id57e
[25] - https://www.putitforward.com/guide-to-workday-integration
[26] - https://www.opkey.com/blog/addressing-workday-integration-challenges-with-test-automation
[27] - https://www.workday.com/en-us/privacy/recruiting-privacy-statement.html
[28] - https://www.leonar.app/blog/how-to-scrape-linkedin-recruiter
[29] - https://www.shrm.org/topics-tools/news/technology/ai-bias-audits-are-coming
[30] - https://www.holisticai.com/blog/automated-employment-decision-tool-bias-audit-laws