

Tony Nguyen

Dr. Gina Sprint

CPSC 222 01

13 October 2022

### Data Ethics 3

I find some details about this assignment's reading pretty interesting. I have to admit that I have not thought about this matter before, yet Ms. O'Neil introduced it to me unexpectedly. The writer mentioned that the IMPACT score – the score that is used to measure teachers' performance – was built upon statistical attributes. These attributes include students' progression in mathematics and language skills. However, educating a person does not mean teaching them to perform well academically. We cannot rely solely on a person's ability to succeed to say if they are educated or not. We can't code or create a perfect scale to measure if a teacher has taught their students well; we can only build a scale to see if a teacher has made an impact on their learners. With that, one of the possible attributes that may be useful in such cases is how better the students are in taking care of their own and being a decent citizen of their community compared to before "claiming their education." I said "claiming" because it will be up to someone to interpret an opinion differently, so the instructor has to choose a feasible and reasonable approach when teaching someone. Regardless, I think one way we can do to see if a student has become more responsible or not is to let them reflect on what they believe. I find it somewhat relatable to EQ scores, but if a high EQ score means that person can think beyond themselves, then it would be a success in education – to live for the common good. Back to the IMPACT score, after the score was released and more than two hundred teachers were fired, the feedback loop returned to its original position – not knowing the actual cause of underperforming

students. Furthermore, the measuring system did not reflect nor improve on its algorithm. That system prejudiced the reality and used their calculation to affirm it. It did not point out the root of the problem but instead took extensive action without knowing the effectiveness. This reminded me of an example in previous Data Ethics assignments when an AI model predicted a cure for cancer by killing everyone on Earth. If this was the case, it was truly harmful to our society. Personally, I am lucky enough not to be a victim of such rating systems. Nevertheless, an automated data-based system appears and serves my life a lot. I use Spotify, YouTube, and Netflix for entertainment, and those services use robust algorithms to predict and rate my preference. Their algorithms are powerful; they do an excellent job of knowing what I like, but they are not always perfect. However, I can constantly interact with those suggestions, meaning the algorithm can improve itself. This is entirely different from what I have learned about the IMPACT score, which is unfair and very biased. Besides, I also find it unfortunate that the school administrator did not take action based on the recommendation of faculties: The already-lacking-teacher areas now even have fewer teachers than before.