STATE OF NEW YORK

6852

2021-2022 Regular Sessions

IN SENATE

May 19, 2021

Introduced by Sen. RAMOS -- read twice and ordered printed, and when printed to be committed to the Committee on Labor

AN ACT to amend the labor law, in relation to establishing criteria for the sale of automated employment decision tools

The People of the State of New York, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:

1 Section 1. The labor law is amended by adding a new section 203-f to 2 read as follows: 3 <u>§ 203-f. Sale of automated employment decision tools. 1. For purposes</u> of this section, the following terms shall have the following meanings: 4 5 a. "Automated employment decision tool" means any system used to filter employment candidates or prospective candidates for hire in a way б 7 that establishes a preferred candidate or candidates without relying on 8 candidate-specific assessments by individual decision-makers. Automated 9 employment decision tools shall include personality tests, cognitive 10 ability tests, resume scoring systems and any system whose function is 11 governed by statistical theory, or whose parameters are defined by such systems, including inferential methodologies, linear regression, neural 12 13 networks, decision trees, random forests and other learning algorithms. 14 b. "Disparate impact report" means an analysis, including but not 15 limited to testing, of the extent to which use of an automated employment decision tool is likely to result in an adverse impact to the 16 detriment of any group on the basis of sex, race or ethnicity. A dispa-17 rate impact report shall differentiate between candidates who were 18 19 selected and candidates who were not selected by the tool and shall 20 include a disparate impact analysis as specified in the uniform guide-21 lines on employee selection procedures promulgated by the United States 22 equal employment opportunity commission. c. "Disability accommodation policy" means an overview of the proce-23 24 dures an automated employment decision tool relies on to ensure that

25 <u>candidates with disabilities can receive reasonable accommodations in</u>

EXPLANATION--Matter in <u>italics</u> (underscored) is new; matter in brackets [-] is old law to be omitted.

LBD10862-01-1

S. 6852

1	the hiring process in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities
2	Act of 1990, as amended (Public Law 101-336).
3	d. "Employment decision" means to screen candidates for employment.
4	2. It shall be unlawful to sell or offer for sale an automated employ-
5	ment decision tool that fails to comply with the following provisions:
6	a. A disparate impact report shall be conducted one year prior to the
7	sale or the offering for sale of an automated employment decision tool.
8	A public disclosure report shall be provided to the department no less
9	than annually and shall include the results of the most recent disparate
10	impact report for each automated employment decision tool available for
11	sale in the state. Such report shall also include the disability accom-
12	modation policy of the vendor.
13	b. Every sale of such tool shall include a copy of the most recent
14	public disclosure report at no additional cost.
15	c. No less than annually, a disparate impact report shall be produced
16	to assess the actual impact of any automated employment decision tool
17	used by any employer to select candidates for jobs within the state.
18	Such disparate impact report shall be provided to the employer but shall
19	not be publicly filed and shall be subject to all applicable privileges.
20	d. Such tool shall be sold or offered for sale with a notice stating
21	that such tool is subject to the provisions of this section.
22	3. A person who uses an automated employment decision tool to screen a
23	candidate for an employment decision shall provide notice to each such
24	candidate that an automated employment decision tool subject to dispa-
25	rate impact reporting was used in connection with assessing the candi-
26	date and shall notify each such candidate of the job qualifications or
27	characteristics that such tool was used to assess.
28	4. a. A person who violates any provision of this section or any rule
29	or regulation promulgated thereunder, shall be subject to a civil penal-
30	ty of up to five hundred dollars for the first violation and for each
31	additional violation occurring on the same day as the first violation,
32	and a civil penalty of not less than five hundred dollars, nor more than
33	one thousand five hundred dollars, for each subsequent violation.
34	b. Violations shall accrue on a daily basis for each automated employ-
35	ment decision tool that is sold or offered for sale in violation of
36	subdivision two of this section.
37	c. Each instance in which notice is not provided to a candidate prior
38	to the use of an automated employment decision tool, in violation of
39	subdivision three of this section, shall constitute a single violation
40	
40	and each thirty day period thereafter in which such notice is not
41	provided to such candidate shall constitute a separate violation.
41 42	provided to such candidate shall constitute a separate violation. 5. The commissioner may initiate an investigation if a preponderance
41 42 43	provided to such candidate shall constitute a separate violation. 5. The commissioner may initiate an investigation if a preponderance of the evidence establishes a suspicion of a violation, including but
41 42 43 44	provided to such candidate shall constitute a separate violation. 5. The commissioner may initiate an investigation if a preponderance of the evidence establishes a suspicion of a violation, including but not limited to, mandating a third party disparate impact audit. The
41 42 43 44 45	provided to such candidate shall constitute a separate violation. 5. The commissioner may initiate an investigation if a preponderance of the evidence establishes a suspicion of a violation, including but not limited to, mandating a third party disparate impact audit. The commissioner may also initiate in a court of competent jurisdiction any
41 42 43 44	provided to such candidate shall constitute a separate violation. 5. The commissioner may initiate an investigation if a preponderance of the evidence establishes a suspicion of a violation, including but not limited to, mandating a third party disparate impact audit. The commissioner may also initiate in a court of competent jurisdiction any action or proceeding that may be appropriate or necessary for the
41 42 43 44 45 46 47	provided to such candidate shall constitute a separate violation. 5. The commissioner may initiate an investigation if a preponderance of the evidence establishes a suspicion of a violation, including but not limited to, mandating a third party disparate impact audit. The commissioner may also initiate in a court of competent jurisdiction any action or proceeding that may be appropriate or necessary for the correction of any violation issued pursuant to this section, including
41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48	provided to such candidate shall constitute a separate violation. 5. The commissioner may initiate an investigation if a preponderance of the evidence establishes a suspicion of a violation, including but not limited to, mandating a third party disparate impact audit. The commissioner may also initiate in a court of competent jurisdiction any action or proceeding that may be appropriate or necessary for the correction of any violation issued pursuant to this section, including mandating compliance with the provisions of this section or such other
41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49	provided to such candidate shall constitute a separate violation. 5. The commissioner may initiate an investigation if a preponderance of the evidence establishes a suspicion of a violation, including but not limited to, mandating a third party disparate impact audit. The commissioner may also initiate in a court of competent jurisdiction any action or proceeding that may be appropriate or necessary for the correction of any violation issued pursuant to this section, including mandating compliance with the provisions of this section or such other relief as may be appropriate.
41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50	<pre>provided to such candidate shall constitute a separate violation. 5. The commissioner may initiate an investigation if a preponderance of the evidence establishes a suspicion of a violation, including but not limited to, mandating a third party disparate impact audit. The commissioner may also initiate in a court of competent jurisdiction any action or proceeding that may be appropriate or necessary for the correction of any violation issued pursuant to this section, including mandating compliance with the provisions of this section or such other relief as may be appropriate. 6. The department may promulgate rules and regulations as it deems</pre>
41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49	provided to such candidate shall constitute a separate violation. 5. The commissioner may initiate an investigation if a preponderance of the evidence establishes a suspicion of a violation, including but not limited to, mandating a third party disparate impact audit. The commissioner may also initiate in a court of competent jurisdiction any action or proceeding that may be appropriate or necessary for the correction of any violation issued pursuant to this section, including mandating compliance with the provisions of this section or such other relief as may be appropriate.

53 § 2. This act shall take effect immediately.