

Citizens' juries: Brief for expert witnesses

General briefing for all witnesses

You are asked to present to two citizens' juries, each of 18 people. Both juries will last for five days but you are only required to attend for a small part of that time (see Appendix A) although you are welcome to attend for longer. The first jury will meet from 18–22 February 2019 in the Inspire Room, [Welcome Centre](#), Coventry CV1 2HG. The second jury will meet from 25 Feb-1 March 2019 in the Charles Halle Room, [Bridgewater Hall](#), Manchester M2 3WS.

Both juries will be charged with answering the same set of questions about artificial intelligence (AI) and the need for explanations when decisions are determined by AI. In particular, the juries will consider, and answer questions about, four scenarios: two in healthcare, one in criminal justice, and one concerning job recruitment. The jury questions will be provided to you in a separate document.

The two juries will be run by skilled facilitators: Kyle Bozentko and Sarah Atwood of the [Jefferson Center](#) (the developers of the citizens' jury method).

Each jury will contain a cross-section of adults from in and around Coventry (first jury) and Manchester (second jury). They will be selected to include a mix of people in terms of age, gender, ethnic group, educational attainment, employment status and attitudes to artificial intelligence. As the jury will have people with different levels of educational attainment, including people with no educational qualifications and people with university degrees, it is important that you try to explain things as simply as you can. Please be mindful to avoid acronyms, technical jargon, (or define the terms if you do use these) and do not assume that the audience has any prior knowledge of your subject. Try to make your presentation as interesting and as clear as possible. Avoid making claims based on facts which are uncertain or disputed. Finish with a slide summarising your main points.

Please draw up a presentation that addresses the questions set out for your presentation in the jury process outline in Appendix A of this brief. A slide template will be provided for you to use with these slide headings as a guide (though feel free to use the colours, logo etc. of your organisation if you wish). Comments on this brief and suggested changes to the questions set out for each witness are very welcome, but please do that before you draw up your presentation, and then address the agreed questions in your presentation.

When drawing up your presentation, please be mindful of:

- Thinking about your audience: assuming the jury have no knowledge of the subject, and relating what you say to the questions they have been posed;
- Not trying to cover too much material, and repeat the main messages (e.g. say what you are going to say, say it, then say what you said)
- Illustrating your points with examples
- What the other expert witnesses will be covering (as set out in Appendix A).

A digital projector will be available on site but please use any visual aids or other devices you think will help you explain things more clearly. The time allotted for each presentation is described below.

You are also asked to answer questions posed by the jurors. Some jurors may lack confidence, so please respond positively to any question you receive. When answering questions, please try to make your answers clear and concise. If you do not know the answer to a question, please say so.

The time limit for your presentation and the time limit for questions from the jury will be set and agreed with you in advance. Typically, this will be around 15 minutes presentation and a similar amount of time for questions although it is likely to vary from speaker to speaker.

The questions being posed to the jurors are not value-free, but could be said to be based on several normative assumptions:

1. There is potential for considerable public and individual benefit, and potential for harm, from using AI
2. The greater the AI accuracy, the greater its potential good, and conversely, the greater its inaccuracy, the greater its potential harm
3. There is potential good that can result from providing an explanation to an individual when the individual is affected by another agent's decision
4. Currently, as AI performance increases, the potential to offer an explanation for AI-determined decisions decreases (*ceteris paribus*).

The juries are particularly concerned with exploring and understanding the values of a cross-section of the public, in the trade-off between AI performance and explainability (4 above) in different contexts. Ultimately, the citizens' juries are about asking members of the public how these competing goods should be balanced.

Proposed timetable

Your slides will be reviewed by Malcolm Oswald (Citizens' Juries cic) and/or Jefferson Center team, then by an independent oversight panel whose role is to ensure that the materials provide a fair balance of information and are not biased. The timetable for slide development is shown in the table below.

Activity	To be completed by
MO provides draft jury questions, presentation time limits, and slide template with slide headings to witnesses and introduces to Sarah Atwood (SA) & Kyle Bozentko (KB) from the Jefferson Centre team	3/4 January 2019
First draft of slides completed by witnesses	16 January 2019
SA/MO/KB review slides and agrees to any changes with witness (second draft slides)	23 January 2019
Second draft slides sent to oversight panel for review	24 January 2019
Oversight panel review slides and identify changes needed	1 February 2019
SA//MO/KB agree to final changes with witnesses based on oversight panel comments (final draft slides)	8 February 2019
MO prints copies of final slides for jurors' ring binder for reference	15 February 2019
First jury begins	18 February 2019

If you foresee any issues with this timetable (e.g. planned holidays), please discuss them with Malcolm Oswald.

Briefing for impartial witnesses

Impartial witnesses should confine their presentations and answers to questions to matters of fact rather than values. You should try to describe the world rather than judge it. As far as possible, try to choose what you say so as to give a balanced perspective. Your role is to inform the jury to help them answer the jury questions.

Briefing for partial witnesses

The two “partial witnesses” are making arguments that are not value-free. Your role is to help the jury to understand some of the arguments behind the jury questions. Please choose what you consider to be the most important arguments to make your case (either in favour of AI performance or in favour of explainability). Avoid misrepresenting the facts to make your case. Equally, stick to one side of the argument and do not try to provide a balanced perspective (it is the jury’s job to do the balancing).