The algorithms covered in "Wrongfully Accused by An Algorithm," "To Predict and Serve," and "Machine Bias" address different tasks related to the criminal justice system. Briefly describe these different goals and comment on any potential ethical concerns. For which of these goals do you think algorithms should be used? Explain.

**Wrongfully Accused by An Algorithm:**

In "Wrongfully Accused by An Algorithm," the primary task that was mentioned throughout the article was facial recognition of suspected criminals. The main goal of facial recognition in the criminal justice system is to effectively identify crime suspects without violating any human rights. Facial recognition, when used by police departments, should be used for an investigative lead only and not probable cause for an arrest. Despite the fact that facial recognition, when used properly, is very effective at detecting criminals, there are many places where the technology can go awry especially in terms of ethical concerns. For example, due to lack of diversity in images used to develop underlying databases, facial recognition only works relatively well on white men while the results are less accurate for other demographics. I believe that facial recognition in the criminal justice system should be used under two conditions: algorithmic developers use more representative/diverse data sets when training the model, and police departments ban the use of low-quality search images. If both of these conditions are met, the facial recognition system will be able to effectively identify crime suspects without violating the rights of the citizens.

**To Predict and Serve:**

In “To Predict and Serve,” the primary task related to the criminal justice system that was mentioned throughout the article was the notion of “predictive policing.” Predictive policing, as explained in the article, is software designed to learn and reproduce patterns in crime data to identify likely targets for police intervention, in order to prevent crime or solve past crimes. Although predictive policing is something that citizens can get behind, it has raised several ethical concerns including, but not limited to: lack of transparency from police departments and private firms that implement these models, unnecessarily targeting specific groups more than others, and systematic bias within police-recorded data sets. Unlike facial recognition, I don’t believe predictive policing software should be used in the criminal justice system. The reason it shouldn’t be used is because there is a stark difference between increasing arrests and reducing crime.

**Machine Bias:**

In “Machine Bias,” the task related to the criminal justice system that was highlighted in the article was the use of risk assessment scores. These risk assessment scores, which are increasingly common in courtrooms across the nation, are used to inform decisions about who can be set free at every individual stage of the criminal justice system. These scores are often done in conjunction with an evaluation of a defendant’s rehabilitation needs. The main ethical surrounding risk assessment scores are that they are unreliable in forecasting future violent crimes, while at the same time unnecessarily targeting certain groups. For example, the risk scores used in Broward County, Florida falsely flagged black defendants as future criminals twice the rate as white defendants. And, white defendants were mislabeled as low risk more often than black defendants. Until the accuracy of the algorithm is improved, especially in terms of disparities in flagging individuals as high/low risk, I don’t think risk assessment scores should be used in the criminal justice system.