

# Tracking In Education Software

## Point 1: Violations of Privacy

- Sale/license of personal information
  - New York Attorney General Letitia James and New York State Education Department (NYSED) Commissioner Betty A. Rosa announced a \$750,000 settlement with College Board for violating students' privacy and unlawfully licensing that personal data to others. [2]
- Bias in surveillance
  - The investigation pointed out that low-income students (who tend to be disproportionately Black and Hispanic) rely more heavily on school devices and are exposed to more surveillance than affluent students; it also uncovered that schools and companies were often not required to disclose the use and extent of their monitoring to students and parents. In some cases, districts can opt to have a company send alerts directly to law enforcement instead of a school contact.[3]

## Point 2: Inaccuracies in Predictive Models

- Data may be incorrect
  - Panelists said "threat events are too infrequent to build an accurate threat model" and "there will be too many false positives" [1]
    - Panelists made up of "experts" [selected with] "consultation with the project officer at the National Institute of Justice."
- Context not used
  - While the system flagged Logsdon-Wallace for referencing the word "suicide," context was never part of the equation, he said. Two days later, in mid-September, a school counselor called his mom to let her know what officials had learned. The meaning of the classroom assignment — that his mental health had improved — was seemingly lost in the transaction between Gaggie and the school district.[4]

[1] <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7249/j.ctt1btc150>

[2]

<https://ag.ny.gov/press-release/2024/attorney-general-james-and-nysed-commissioner-rosa-secure-750000-college-board>

[3] <https://www.wired.com/story/student-monitoring-software-privacy-in-schools/>

[4]

<https://www.the74million.org/article/gaggle-surveillance-minneapolis-families-not-smart-ai-monitoring/>