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ABSTRACT

Societal biases can lead to disparate impacts on, and treatment of, different demographic groups. This can have substantial effects on the outcomes of public resource allocation scenarios like child welfare, housing allocations for homeless persons, etc. In recent years, there has been an increasing interest in devising algorithms for allocating public resources. However, ensuring the fairness and equitability of these algorithms is challenging since the definition of fairness is highly intermedial, multi-modal, and domain-specific. Moreover, the allocation of these resources is dynamic and time-dependent in nature. While there exist several notions of fairness in the Machine Learning (ML) literature, their applicability to Fair Division (FD) of resources is limited. In our research, we aim to bridge the gap between the Fair ML and economic theories of FD for public resource allocation. More specifically, we will study different application areas such as policing, homelessness, and eviction, devise fair algorithms and metrics for these resources, and evaluate their effectiveness in public policymaking.
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1 BACKGROUND AND MOTIVATION

Public systems that manage the social problem of resource allocation often have to make complex decisions under great uncertainty. They have to make decisions about resource assignment to individuals while maintaining the underlying capacity constraints, which often become difficult due to poor assessment of needs and inefficient understanding of the compatibility between services and individuals [1, 2]. For example, severe discrimination has been observed in child welfare services, which in turn can create permanent turmoil in a child’s life [3].

The notion of fairness in fair division literature can be broadly defined in three separate ways: Envy-freeness, Proportionality, and Equitability [4]. These metrics model the problem of assigning a set of resources \( K = \{1, 2, \ldots, k\} \) to a set of agents \( N = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \) where each agent has its preferences for each of the resources based on a valuation function \( v \). Envy-freeness ensures that no participating agent wishes to swap their resources with another agent, thus allocation \( A_i \) for agent \( i \) will be envy-free if \( \forall i, j \in N : v_i(A_i) \geq v_j(A_j) \). Proportionality refers that in a system with \( n \) agents, each agent will receive \( 1/n \) th of the agent’s total utility for all of the resources. Thus an allocation \( A_i \) is proportional for agent \( i \) if \( \forall i \in N : v_i(A_i) \geq 1/n [5] \). Finally, Equitable allocation implies that each agent will receive equal utilities [6], an allocation \( A_i \) is equitable for agent \( i \) if \( \forall i, j \in N : v_i(A_i) = v_j(A_j) \).

While these metrics ensure optimal allocation based on utility function, they do not measure biases against different demographic groups. However, it is imperative to ensure equitable distributions of scarce resources among different demographic groups. Prior research has shown that algorithmic methods can promote disparate impacts [7, 8]. Several recent works have focused on these concerns and proposed algorithmic fairness notions such as demographic parity [9], equalized odds [10], equal opportunity [10], and counterfactual fairness [11]. However, most of these notions are defined for static environments [12], and do not account for allocation systems that are dynamic in nature where the supply and demand of resources continuously shift over time.

Motivated by the lack of fairness notions in this domain, we are working on three different societal resource allocation problems, Homelessness, Policing, and Eviction. In these three domains, the decision algorithm has to allocate resources among different demographic groups. We combine the concepts of FD and ML literature to apply in the allocation of societal resources, more specifically show how these metrics result in different allocation decisions.

2 CURRENT WORK

Fairness in Predictive Policing: Predictive Policing algorithms assign police officers across a city based on historical crime data. Past
works show that these algorithms can suffer from multiple drawbacks, such as feedback loop (past decisions affecting subsequent decisions), and unfairness (in terms of protected attributes) [8, 13].

This project presents a solution for both of these issues by incorporating causal inference in the algorithm. We define a causal framework to allocate police officers in a fixed geographic area of a city called "Police Beat". We demonstrate that this causality-driven framework was able to allocate police officers optimally across beats within a policing district based on the true underlying criminality. Moreover, we apply this algorithm (PropFair) in a novel dataset obtained from the City of Chicago (through Freedom of Information Act requests) and show that there is significant variability in policing allocation across different neighboring beats for underlying criminality (Figure 1). The work is accepted as an extended abstract at AAMAS 2023 [14].

**Fairness in Homeless Service Delivery:** According to federal guidelines, homelessness can be defined as the absence of stable and permanent residences which include shelters, inhabitable places such as cars, parks, and various public access places. Since 2007, more than 550,000 people experience homelessness on regular basis, while 1.5 million people seek homeless delivery services each year [15]. Though each year congress provides funds to the homeless delivery services, the funds, and efforts are insufficient to handle the ongoing homelessness crisis in the United States [16, 17]. Moreover, the allocation of these services has a significantly different impact on utilities for people of different demographic groups. In this work, we show that one group performing comparatively better than the other for one metric can do worse for a different metric (Figure 2). Even the performance can also shift if the metrics are converted from additive to multiplicative for gained utilities. We defined two metrics, Improvement, and Regret, by adapting the idea of equitable allocation of fair division literature. We defined Improvement as the metric of how well an agent is doing for the best-suited option for an allocation and Regret as the metric of how well an agent is doing in an allocation based on the worst possible allocation, similar definitions are presented for multiplicative measures (Gain and Shortfall). We also applied these metrics to a novel dataset collected from the homeless management information system (HMIS) of a metropolitan area from 2007 through 2014. We demonstrate that one group can appear privileged based on Improvement over the other group, whereas it may appear less privileged by the allocation than the other group on the Regret metric for an assignment policy. The work is published at FAccT 2022 [18].

### 3 FUTURE PLAN AND CONCLUSION

In the future, we would like to pursue the following research directions:

**Robust fairness in dynamic police allocation?**

Our current causal model can handle both feedback loops and unfairness in terms of demographics. However, we are continuing our project to understand whether there are any other hidden confounders that can impact the allocation policy. We are also performing extensive experiments for bench-marking our method with existing policing algorithms such as predictive policing and Polya urn model [13].

**How to specify appropriate fairness notion for Eviction?**

Thousands of US residents get evicted from their houses each year. These decisions are typically bi-level meaning, they come from the landlords and the courts where they can disagree on various grounds. This makes it a complex decision-making process, where social biases can creep in. To this end, we obtained a real world eviction dataset and currently working on modeling the process and characterizing fairness.

Finally, we are extending our work on homelessness. Though our work [18] shows the trade-offs in fairness metrics, we are working on how these metrics can be used to formulate a fairness guideline.

In summary, we hope to continue working on novel societal resource allocation problems. We believe our research will contribute to characterizing fairness in these domains, generate new computational models, and inform future research for how to ensure fairness in critical societal resource allocation.
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