**Case 1: The Hiring Bot That Hates Career Gaps**

What’s Happening?

A company uses an AI to screen job applicants. It scans résumés, ranks candidates, and—uh oh—rejects way more women with career gaps (like those who took time off for caregiving).

What’s Problematic?

🔍 Bias Alert! The AI likely learned from past hiring data, which was skewed against women who paused careers.

🔍 Fairness Fail: It penalizes a common life choice (caregiving) that disproportionately affects women.

🔍 Transparency Trouble: Applicants don’t know why they were rejected—just a cold, automated "no."

One Improvement Idea

✅ Audit & Retrain the AI

Run bias tests (e.g., check rejection rates by gender/gap length).

Add fairness rules (e.g., don’t downgrade resumes for gaps under 2 years).

Explain decisions—give applicants feedback like, "Your skills match, but we prioritized recent experience."

**Case 2: The Overzealous Exam Proctoring AI**

What’s Happening?

A school uses AI to watch students via webcam during tests. It flags "cheating" based on eye movements… but keeps accusing neurodivergent students (e.g., those with ADHD or autism who may not make typical eye contact).

What’s Problematic?

🔍 Bias Alert! The AI assumes "normal" eye behavior = honesty, ignoring natural diversity.

🔍 Privacy Concern: Constant surveillance feels invasive, especially for kids.

🔍 False Positives: Innocent students get stressed or punished unfairly.

One Improvement Idea

✅ Human-in-the-Loop + Better Training

Flag, don’t auto-punish: Let teachers review AI alerts before acting.

Train the AI on neurodiverse students so it learns different "normal" behaviors.

Offer opt-outs (e.g., let students test in-person if they’re uncomfortable).

Final Verdict: AI Needs Guardrails!

Both cases show how AI can accidentally discriminate if we don’t design it carefully. The fix? Test for bias, involve humans, and always ask: "Could this harm someone unfairly?"