Teacher Answer Key

Case Study

1. A potential benefit: the monitoring system identified language that could indicate a student in crisis — exactly the kind of intervention that supporters say these tools enable. If Miguel had been in genuine current distress, the flag might have been appropriate. A harm: Miguel was writing honestly about a resolved past experience, the review happened without parental notification beforehand, and the experience was humiliating and violated his sense of trust that writing about difficult personal history would be treated with confidentiality.

2. After this experience, Miguel might avoid writing honestly about personal struggles, mental health experiences, or any sensitive topic on a school device, knowing that anything he writes can be read by a company's reviewer and shared with school staff. The reading identifies this as harmful because students who self-censor are less able to access support for mental health concerns, ask questions about identity, or engage deeply with sensitive topics — all things that matter for their development and wellbeing.

Multiple Choice

1. A

2. D

3. C

Matching

1-B, 2-D, 3-A, 4-E, 5-C

Fill-in-the-Blank

1) 2020, 2) trust, 3) remote

Short Answer (Sample Responses)

Q1: First, facial recognition components of some proctoring tools are less accurate on darker-skinned faces, meaning Black and Latino students are more likely to be falsely flagged for cheating. Second, students who take exams in shared family spaces — without a private quiet room — are flagged for environmental conditions beyond their control, disproportionately affecting students from lower-income households. Third, students with anxiety, autism, or ADHD have reported that being observed causes distress that degrades their performance.

Q2: When students know that everything they type on school devices is monitored and may be reviewed, they may avoid writing about mental health struggles, questions about sexuality or identity, or engagement with sensitive historical or political topics. The reading identifies this as harmful because those are precisely the areas where students may most need to explore, reflect, and potentially seek help — and surveillance suppresses that exploration, particularly for already-marginalized students.

Q3: The evidence is limited and contested. A 2019 Brennan Center for Justice report found that many school surveillance programs were implemented without evidence of effectiveness and without adequate assessment of potential harms. Research on school climate has found that high levels of surveillance can reduce students' sense of trust and belonging — factors associated with dropout rates and poor academic outcomes — suggesting that surveillance tools deployed to protect students may in some cases undermine the conditions in which students thrive.