Community Literacy of Machine Learning: Engineering practical support for participatory design and auditing

Aaron Halfaker
Wikimedia Research
San Francisco, CA, USA
ahalfaker@wikimedia.org

Stuart Geiger
Univ. of California, Berkely
Berkeley Inst. of Data Science
Berkeley, CA, USA
sgeiger@gmail.com

Abstract
ORES is cool. People do fun stuff around it. Thinking about transparency in terms of crowd literacy is interesting. We see evidence of crowd literacy growing around ORES. Crowd literacy allows groups of people to exert power over governing algorithms.

Author Keywords
Algorithm; Fairness; Transparency; Wikipedia; Collaboration; Participatory design; Auditing

ACM Classification Keywords
G.4 [MATHEMATICAL SOFTWARE]: Algorithm design and analysis; H.4.2 [Types of Systems]: Decision support (e.g., MIS); H.5.3 [Group and Organization Interfaces]: Collaborative computing

Introduction
I am a paper

Literacy of social algorithms
It's hard.

CSCW and group knowledges
Communities of practice! Distributed cognition! There are ways that groups *think*.[1]

ORES: Participatory machine learning probe

ORES is a system. It's pretty transparent. We deployed it in Wikipedia. People are doing some very CSCWy things around it and showing deep literacy.

Discussion

We should think of ML literacy differently. Collaborative/participatory processes allow for natural, social processes to support literacy. We should build a proper auditing system to support this stuff. Power struggles are real. This isn't the holy grail. But it surfaces some cool stuff.

REFERENCES

1. Kate Crawford. 2016. Can an algorithm be agonistic? Ten scenes from life in calculated publics. *Science, Technology, & Human Values* 41, 1 (2016), 77–92.