

Austin Anderson

#### Reading #1: How Predictive Policing Software Works

I like the fact the HunchLab uses decision trees in order to predict where crime-prone areas are, as these are the most easily explainable, easily fixable, and most accountable algorithms. These are the kind of algorithms that should be utilized in government agencies until we can become more transparent and accountable with more advanced algorithms.

#### Reading #2: Websites and apps for sharing crime and safety data have become outlets for racial profiling

I find that this problem of people using crime reporting apps in discriminatory manners isn't really anything new. The original crime reporting method of calling 911 or non-emergency numbers has had this same problem for ages and there's not been a fix found yet.

#### Reading #3: Is Predictive Policing the Law-Enforcement Tactic of the Future?

This is a very tricky subject with two very salient arguments on either side of it. While algorithms that highlight areas where crime is most likely to be taking place are undoubtedly useful, the feedback loop problem and the ability to racially target with the excuse that the algorithm told you so is a massive red flag and must be fixed before these algorithms can be implemented.

#### Reading #4: Interactive Predictive Policing Program in South Pasadena, California

Some of this predictive policing stuff seems unnecessary. If a beat cop is patrolling a certain area for a long period of time, he will learn these hotspots and figure out all of this by himself. I guess this could be helpful for police who do not commonly work these areas, but this all seems like it would go unused by officers familiar with the area.

#### Reading #5: How Big Data Is Helping the NYPD Solve Crimes Faster

I find this system to be really impressive. The ability for police to be able to determine possible suspects in the area, obtain warrants quickly but still ethically and legally, and find key information quickly and effectively is really cool. As long as it doesn't overstep its bounds into privacy invasion, I think this system should be encouraged as a way to make policing more efficient.

#### Reading #6: Algorithms in the Criminal Justice System

I find individual prediction algorithms to be much less appealing than area/neighborhood predictive algorithms. While areas with large amounts of crime should be watched and well policed, individuals being predictively targeted is something I think oversteps the "innocent until proven guilty" line. Neighborhoods don't have this right, but individuals do.

Austin Anderson

#### Reading #7: Machine Bias

I think that this shows that algorithms need to be somewhat helped along by their creators. They need to be prompted to take in past crimes and other risk factors not related to personal characteristics in order to determine risk. In theory, all courtroom/sentencing decisions should be able to be made without race/zip code/gender/ etc. \*Insert inspiring picture of blind lady justice here\*

#### Reading #8: Response to ProPublica article

This response made some good points against the pro publica article's representation of the facts, but this seems like a whole lot of convoluted statistical jargon as opposed to a summarized response as to why PP's assertion was wrong.

#### Reading #9: Pro public response to Response

This seems to be level headed, cut through the statistics showcase of results from algorithms designed by Northpointe. While I can't speak to who is really right here because there is simply a lot of statistical data I don't understand well enough to comment, Pro publica seems to have presented their findings in a digestible form while Northpointe seems to be throwing statistic after statistic that don't actually confront the problematic impact of their system being utilized.