AI Hiring Tool Evidence Review

Criteria Corp

Dr. Milos Kankaras | Center for Psychology

Sample review. Prepared from the published index, with no commissioning buyer and no buyer documents.

Particular	Detail
Prepared for	Sample (no commissioning buyer)
Vendor reviewed	Criteria Corp, Los Angeles, United States
Tool described	Cognitive, personality and skills testing with AI scoring of structured video interviews.
Basis	Public documentation only
Sources accessed	22 September 2026
Report date	24 November 2026
Report number	AHR-SAMPLE-criteria-corp
Rubric	Version 1, eight criteria, fixed and published before any vendor was scored

What this review covers

This review records what the vendor publishes about the validity and fairness of its scores, read against eight criteria. The scope is documentation transparency. It is not an assessment of product quality, of the model or of the underlying science, and it is not legal advice or advice on whether the product is valid for your use.

1. Summary

Documented 2, partial 3, absent 3, of eight criteria.

D 2	P 3	A 3

Criteria Corp publishes documentation that fully meets two of the eight criteria, meets three in part, and publishes nothing that the search protocol found for three.

Documented: Technical manual or validity report and reliability, by group. Published in part only: Validity coefficients, construct definition and human oversight and route to contest a score. No public source found: Adverse impact by subgroup, comparability across languages, versions and modes and independent review.

Comparability across languages, versions and delivery modes matters most if you will use the tool in more than one language or country.

For a purchase or renewal decision, the criteria that are partial or absent are the ones to settle with the vendor in writing before you rely on its scores. Section 4 gives three questions for that purpose, taken from the lowest-scoring criteria.

2. Scorecard

Eight criteria, rubric version 1. D = documented, P = partial, A = absent.

Criterion	Level	On the public record
C1 Technical manual or validity report	D Documented	Per-test information briefs download without a form. The full technical manual was not reached.
C2 Validity coefficients	P Partial	A validation methodology is published, including the statistical corrections applied. No individual coefficient with its sample size and an interval was found on the pages examined.
C3 Adverse impact by subgroup	A Absent	No public source found by the search protocol on 22 September 2026.
C4 Construct definition	P Partial	Instruments are named and the kinds of validity evidence are listed. Individual constructs are not defined on the pages examined.
C5 Comparability across languages, versions and modes	A Absent	No public source found by the search protocol on 22 September 2026.
C6 Human oversight and route to contest a score	P Partial	A reviewer route. No candidate-facing route to query or contest a score was found.
C7 Independent review	A Absent	No public source found by the search protocol on 22 September 2026.
C8 Reliability, by group	D Documented	A named coefficient, for a named instrument, with its sample size, on an open page. It is not broken out by group or by language.

Reading the levels

Level	Meaning
D Documented	The information is publicly available, specific and sourced, and reachable without a sales conversation.
P Partial	Information is published but is general, undated, unquantified, or reachable only on providing contact details.
A Absent	No public source was found by the search protocol on the stated access date. This records the outcome of a search, not a finding that nothing exists.

3. Evidence on record

Extracts from the vendor sources shown. Criteria with no public source are not listed here; the scorecard records them as absent.

Criterion	Evidence	Source
C1 Technical manual or validity report (documented)	Per-test information briefs are published on the open web as direct downloads, for example the Criteria Cognitive Aptitude Test brief at criteriacorp.com/files/Criteria-InfoBrief-CCAT.pdf, alongside a scientific validation page. The company states it ...	https://www.criteriacorp.com/science/testing-validation (accessed 22 September 2026)
C2 Validity coefficients (partial)	The method is described: "collect CCAT scores from a sample of incumbents, collect supervisor performance ratings, compute correlation, correct for restriction of range and measurement error".	https://www.criteriacorp.com/science/testing-validation (accessed 22 September 2026)
C4 Construct definition (partial)	Instruments are named, including the Criteria Cognitive Aptitude Test and Emotify, with content and construct validity described as part of the validation process.	https://www.criteriacorp.com/science/testing-validation (accessed 22 September 2026)
C6 Human oversight and route to contest a score (partial)	"You get the final say in which candidates progress to the next stage of your hiring process."	https://www.criteriacorp.com/interview/AI-Scoring (accessed 22 September 2026)
C8 Reliability, by group (documented)	"Based on a sample of 97,929 test takers, the Cronbach's alpha for the CCAT is 0.86."	https://www.criteriacorp.com/science/testing-validation (accessed 22 September 2026)

Documents you supplied

No documents were supplied for this review, so the scorecard reflects the public record only.

4. Three questions to put to the vendor

Taken from the lowest-scoring criteria and framed on the reference audit standard of the Center. Ask for each answer in writing and keep the reply with your procurement file.

Criterion	Question to put to the vendor	A sufficient answer and the standard behind it
1. Comparability across languages, versions and modes (C5, absent)	Please show that scores from Criteria Corp mean the same thing across the language versions, test versions and delivery modes we will use: which groups were compared, with what method, and what was done with items that behaved differently.	An equivalence or differential-item-functioning study that names the groups and the method, lists the flagged items, and records what happened to each. *Audit standard, section 4: invariance testing; section 5: flagged items and their disposition; section 6: partial invariance.*
2. Adverse impact by subgroup (C3, absent)	Please give adverse-impact figures for Criteria Corp by named subgroup: selection rates or impact ratios, the reference group, the period and the applicant pool they describe.	Named groups, a stated reference group, a dated period and figures, not a statement that no adverse impact was found. *Audit standard, section 7: adverse impact; section 3: grouping variables tested.*
3. Independent review (C7, absent)	Please name any independent reviewer or auditor of Criteria Corp, the date and scope of the review, and where its summary is published.	A named reviewer who is not a related party, with the date, the scope and a posted summary. *Audit standard: independence rule; section 9: disposition and sign-off.*

5. Method, corrections and sign-off

The eight criteria and their level definitions were fixed and published on 22 September 2026, before any vendor was scored. Each vendor is searched in the same way: its own site and the documents it links, any published bias-audit summary, and one general search per topic. Information given in a sales conversation, behind a login or by third parties is not counted. A level of absent records the outcome of that search on the date shown; it does not show that the information does not exist. The levels describe published documentation. They do not rank vendors.

Corrections: write to milos@centerforpsychology.me. A source the search did not reach, from the vendor or from you, is re-scored under the published corrections policy: the change is dated and the previous level is retained.

Independence. This sample was prepared without a commissioning buyer.

Disclaimer. This review records what the vendor publishes about the validity and fairness of its scores, read against eight criteria, as at the date its sources were accessed. It does not test the product and does not assess product quality, the model or the underlying science. It does not cover information that is not published. A rating of absent records the outcome of a search, not a finding that nothing exists. This review is not legal advice and is not advice on whether the product is valid, suitable or lawful for your use. Decisions on purchase, renewal and use remain yours, and you should take any legal or professional advice you need. The Center for Psychology accepts no liability for decisions made in reliance on this review.

Signed: _____

Dr. Milos Kankaras

Center for Psychology

Date: _____