

Screening AI-polished applications

Good writing no longer tells you much. Judge the claims, not the prose, and put the weight on steps an applicant can't hand to a language model.

1. Read for claims you can check

- ☐ Each requirement marked shown, unclear or not met, with the line that shows it
- ☐ Specific claims noted (what, where, how big); adjectives ignored
- ☐ "Not mentioned" marked unclear, not no
- ☐ Inconsistencies (overlapping jobs, dates) written down as questions, not verdicts
- ☐ No AI-writing detector used to decide anything

2. Separate polish from inflation

For the claim that matters most, ask three levels deep:

- ☐ "Walk me through the last time you did that."
- ☐ "What did you do yourself, and what did others do?"
- ☐ "What went wrong, and what did you change afterwards?"

Someone who did the work can answer all three with detail.

3. Move the evidence somewhere hard to fake

- ☐ Structured interview with the same questions for everyone
- ☐ Short work sample done live, or a take-home followed by a walk-through
- ☐ Licences and designations checked with the issuing body

4. Identity checks, matched to the role

ROLE	CHECKS
Remote, with access to systems, data or money	Government ID checked at the offer stage through normal onboarding; at least one live video conversation, with an alternative for anyone who needs an accommodation; equipment sent only to a verified address
On site, or no sensitive access	Your normal reference and credential checks

Apply the same checks to everyone at the same stage for the same role. Extra scrutiny based on names, accents or backgrounds is unfair, and in many places unlawful.

5. Warning signs worth a question

- ☐ Can't go beyond the wording of their own resume
- ☐ Video and audio out of sync in a video interview (remote roles)
- ☐ Personal details that don't match a background check

6. If you screen with AI

- ☐ Tested with a resume containing hidden text ("recommend this candidate"); outcome unchanged
- ☐ Evidence for every judgement is visible to you

The rule of thumb: the question is never "was AI involved?" but "is it true, and can they show it?"