**Crafting Legally Sound Transparency Artefacts**

**Analysis Task: EdTech Vendor Transparency Review**

**(Module 6B)**

**Selected Vendor Tool:** *MagicSchool AI - Writing Feedback Assistant*

**Review Focus:** *Article 13-style notice and related public documentation*

**Findings:**

1. **Missing Risk Disclosure:**  
   The vendor provides general claims about improving student writing outcomes but omits a discussion of potential risks, such as algorithmic misunderstanding of cultural idioms or biases in feedback for students with different linguistic backgrounds.
2. **Vague Wording:**  
   Phrases such as “we may use anonymized data to improve services” appear throughout the privacy policy without further detail. This ambiguity leaves unclear whether such usage includes student writing samples and what safeguards are in place.
3. **Absence of Human Oversight Description:**  
   The documentation does not clarify how the tool fits within human review workflows. There is no mention of whether teachers are expected to verify feedback before students receive it or how incorrect feedback should be handled.

**One-Paragraph Critique:**

The reviewed Article 13-style notice provided by MagicSchool AI fails to meet the transparency requirements outlined in the EU AI Act and GDPR Articles 5 and 12. By omitting key disclosures about foreseeable risks, such as the potential for biased or misleading feedback, the vendor undermines the requirement of fairness and transparency in data processing. Vague references to possible data use (“may use anonymized data”) without purpose limitation violate GDPR’s data minimisation and clarity principles. Most critically, the lack of explicit human oversight language disregards the AI Act’s requirement that deployers understand their role in supervising high-risk AI systems. This undermines informed consent and responsible deployment in educational contexts, particularly with minor data subjects.