

Explainable AI Candidate Ranking Benchmark

A practical framework for testing whether a screening tool applies job-related criteria consistently and shows enough evidence for a recruiter to challenge the result.

Updated September 26, 2026

Use this benchmark on one real role. Freeze the rubric before reviewing the applicant pool, score the same sample manually and with the screening tool, then compare the evidence behind each criterion score.

Starter scoring rubric

Criterion	Weight	Evidence to inspect	0 / 3 / 5 scoring guide
Role-specific experience	35%	Projects, responsibilities, and outcomes stated in the resume	Absent / relevant evidence / direct, sustained evidence
Required skills	30%	Named tools or methods supported by work examples	Absent / partial match / all required skills supported
Measured outcomes	20%	Results stated by the candidate, with scope or a measurable change	None / one relevant result / several relevant results
Career context	15%	Progression or transferable experience relevant to this role	Unsupported / plausible connection / clear connection

Replace these criteria with the requirements for the role. Weights must total 100%. Missing information stays missing; do not infer it.

Hypothetical scoring example

Candidate A scores 72 out of 100. This example shows the evidence trail a reviewer should expect. It does not describe a real applicant or hiring outcome.

Criterion	Resume evidence	Score	Weighted
Role-specific experience	Candidate A states that they led two recruiting-system implementations.	4/5	28/35
Required skills	Three of four required tools are supported. One tool is not mentioned.	3/5	18/30
Measured outcomes	The resume states a 22% reduction in time to fill and names the project context.	5/5	20/20
Career context	The candidate moved from implementation work into recruiting operations.	2/5	6/15

Audit checklist

- Use criteria tied to the work, not protected traits or proxies.
- Require a resume excerpt or an explicit missing-evidence note for every score.
- Review high, middle, and low-ranked candidates.
- Check that the rationale points to evidence that appears in the resume.
- Record human overrides and the reason for each override.
- Test again when the role, rubric, or model changes.

Method and limitations

This is a practical review framework, not a validated employment test or legal opinion. A high rubric score does not verify a resume claim, predict job performance, or replace interviews and reference checks. Modern Recruiter's ten successful hires and client testimonials are owner-attested operating evidence, not a controlled study. Teams should test the method with their own roles, applicant pools, policies, and counsel.

Citation

Modern Recruiter. Explainable AI Candidate Ranking Benchmark. Updated September 26, 2026.
<https://modernrecruiter.ai/resources/explainable-ai-candidate-ranking-benchmark/>