ARTICLE

Digital Transformation of the Legal Educational Space. How Does Artificial Intelligence Affect the Training of Law Students?

Kirill Molodyko,

Tashkent State University of Law (Tashkent, Uzbekistan)

https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6828-8416

https://doi.org/10.21684/2412-2343-2026-13-1-89-106

Received: March 12, 2025
Reviewed: May 3, 2025
Accepted: November 26, 2025

Abstract. This article examines three issues related to the use of artificial intelligence in legal education, based primarily on an analysis of the American experience. The first issue is how the use of artificial intelligence changes the assessment of law school students. I take the position that there is no need to get caught up in an "arms race" between the programs used by students and those used by teachers, but rather that it is advisable to return to assessment based, as a rule, on written work in class and oral responses in class. I draw attention to the incorrect formalistic use of Turnitin in post-Soviet law schools and propose measures to remedy this situation. The second part covers the issue of AI law students' use of AI in classroom discussions. The third part focuses on the experience of using video cameras in classrooms in US and EU. In this part of the article, I analyze the approaches used in American universities and high schools, since the experience of the latter can largely be applied to universities, except for the consent of students' parents. I argue that the use of video cameras in law school classrooms should be significantly restricted. Since the legislation of post-Soviet countries does not currently regulate this issue, this gives law schools the opportunity to develop a balanced policy on the use of video cameras in classrooms, through a broad dialogue between the administration, faculty, students, and local representatives of civil society. Law schools should serve

as an example for other departments at traditional universities, as only law schools within universities have the qualifications to develop these rules. Universities that are the first to develop and adopt such a sensible policy will gain significant image advantages over other law schools that do not.

Keywords: artificial intelligence (AI); freedom of speech; Turnitin; privacy; video cameras; law schools.

To cite: Molodyko, K. (2026). Digital transformation of the legal educational space. How does artificial intelligence affect the training of law students? *BRICS Law Journal*, *13*(1), 89–106.

Table of Contents

Introduction

In 2023–2024, many post-Soviet law schools adopted policies on the use of artificial intelligence by students in preparing their homework. Some of them have allowed students to use AI in their homework assignments, provided that they disclose this fact, describe which paragraphs of the work were prepared with AI, and the generative model used. Students immediately took advantage of this opportunity. There is no doubt that before this permission was granted, they also used AI, in particular ChatGPT as the most well-known tool and a number of lesser-known tools, but they did so illegally.

I would like to express my concern about the fact that Turnitin is widely used in law schools in post-Soviet countries, but in a very formal way. The "originality" of students' papers is assessed by a formal score, but not in accordance with the opinion of the instructors. This is completely wrong.

It is no secret that communication and academic discussions between legal scholars in post-Soviet countries are conducted mainly in Russian. Surprisingly, in the largest database of academic works in Russian, e-library.ru,[1] I found only one article

[1] https://www.elibrary.ru/

on the application of Turnitin, and even that one article is about an English university.[2] The widespread use of Turnitin in post-Soviet law schools is strangely combined with a lack of any academic discussion about the methodology of its application. I hope that my article will be the beginning of this discussion. Of course, there are many details about using Turnitin that can't be covered in this short article.

1. AI, Plagiarism and Grading Law Students

When I was a master's student at Harvard University in 2013–2014, midterm and final exams were usually done at home. More specifically, I only took two midterms and one final exam in class for the entire master's program. Before the Covid-19 pandemic, a lot of law schools around the world were following the American model and moving toward more and more exams being taken at home. Instructors faced ethical problems even before the spread of AI, for example, some unscrupulous students hired excellent students to prepare their homework. The way to combat this was to have students defend their homework orally in class, answering questions from the professor. My key thesis is that AI in legal education means "analog counter-revolution," that is, a return to in-person midterm and final exams in the classroom, either oral or written. In cases where take-home exams remain, students will then have to defend their work orally in class. Unfortunately, recently I have read a lot of excellent home-taken papers whose authors then couldn't answer any questions based on their paper. University administrations prefer computer based final exams because they provide anonymity while grading and have a significant anti-corruption effect in emerging societies where historically there has been a lot of corruption in education. In real life, the only way to check law students' knowledge now is in-class oral or written exams. Achieving the goals of legal education can't be based in final exams exclusively and requires free discussion in the classroom. In addition, it is better when students write lecture notes and exams in class, as this develops their attentiveness, meticulousness and fine motor skills.

When it comes to AI as a method of combating academic plagiarism, in my opinion, university administrations have become overly reliant on anti-plagiarism systems, particularly in Asian countries on the Turnitin system. In my opinion, the Turnitin results are not always interpreted correctly in law schools. There is no doubt that Turnitin is useful in combating the most blatant forms of academic plagiarism, such as copying several pages of text without citing the author. However, practical experience shows that AI systems have already learned how to bypass Turnitin. Student work done using AI shows the "originality" required by university administrations, as usual, below 20 or 25 percent. In general, Turnitin's originality

[2] Moshanova, T. (2019). Management of teaching the bachelors in pharmacology and psychology at the University of Westminster (London). *Medical Education Today, 4*(8), 54–70. (In Russian).

criterion when used formally is questionable and misleading because, technically, the percentage of originality increases when students replace other authors' ideas with very brief summaries paraphrasing the details. Such replacements, which provoke incorrect interpretation of the Turnitin results, should be viewed negatively because they reduce the ability of law students, regardless of whether they become scholars or practitioners in the future, to cite and analyze their colleagues complete arguments.

The Turnitin administration asked the international academic community to pay attention to some methodological publications.[3] Wright and Nigel paper was presented in response to Cranfield University's policy to prevent students from submitting their work multiple times to Turnitin. The authors voiced alarm about banning the type of formative assessment that multiple submissions provide, suggesting:

both students and teachers are trained to recognize that Turnitin should be regarded only as a tool to assist in the detection of plagiarism. It is designed to be used in tandem with (rather than entirely replace) traditional measures for assessing academic integrity (such as identifying abrupt changes in written structure and style).

The authors provide examples of ways to use Turnitin for intentional cheating; however, they recognize that students often plagiarize due to their lack of understanding regarding citing and integrating outside sources.[4] Jones emphasizes that Turnitin is not a plagiarism detection service but a text-matching system that still requires that the instructor determine whether the writing is, in fact, plagiarism.[5]

The results of the Bensal, Miraflores & Tan study reaffirmed certain laudable benefits claimed by Turnitin, while these also revealed a few limitations in the software's promise of detecting plagiarism, especially in the common instances of misuse of the PDS and blurred lines between the concepts of originality and plagiarism. The use of Turnitin was found to engender conflicting attitudes among the students towards avoiding this academic offense. Hence, this paper strongly recommends the careful guidance of stakeholders (teachers and students) in the proper use of the promising PDS as well as the re-evaluation of the plagiarism policy or approach of the institution in order to "educate-to-avoid" instead of promoting "detect-to-punish" measures in upholding academic integrity.[6]

---

[3] Turnitin. Literature review. Independently Published Studies on Turnitin Services. https://content.learninghouse.com/clients/aurora/courses/faculty_resource/turnitin_literature_review.pdf

[4] Wright, D., Owens, A., & Nigel, D. (2008). *Making the case for multiple submissions to Turnitin* (paper presented at the 3rd International plagiarism conference). https://go.turnitin.com/l/45292/2025-09-16/cpbc7g/45292/1758052955RqhfJvlR/Wright2008_fullpaper.pdf

[5] Jones, K. O. (2008). Practical issues for academics using the Turnitin plagiarism detection software. *CompSysTech'08: Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Computer Systems and Technologies and Workshop for PhD Students in Computing*, Article 50.

[6] Bensal, E., Miraflores, E., & Tan. N. C. (2013). Plagiarism: Shall we turn to Turnitin? *CALL-EJ, 14*(2), 2–22.

Mphahlele & McKenna analyzed institutional policies and other documents related to plagiarism from public universities across South Africa, and this was then augmented with interviews with members of institutional plagiarism committees. The results of the study revealed that technology is a key facet in these universities' attempts to reduce the incidents of plagiarism, and that Turnitin is the most favored text-matching tool. However, the software is misunderstood to be predominantly a plagiarism detection tool for policing purposes, ignoring its educational potential for student development. The implication is that, if Turnitin is primarily used as a policing tool, students are not only denied access to nuanced pedagogical interventions that might develop their academic writing, but its misuse could also change students' behavior in undesirable ways.[7]

According to Aditya Sai Srinivas & Bharathi conclusion, Turnitin, as a ubiquitous tool in the academic arena, offers a dual-edged sword in the quest for maintaining academic integrity. Turnitin pros: effective plagiarism detection, deterrent effect, educational feedback, integration with Learning Management Systems, continuous database expansion. Turnitin cons: false positives, privacy concerns, overemphasis on originality scores, limited to text-based content, cost and accessibility.[8]

It is also important that, if you search the Internet for which Turnitin score is normal, you'll see a big number of opinions on different sites that a score above 20% or 25% usually means plagiarism. However, that's wrong and officially Turnitin creators and administrators never stated that. The paper with a score 40% could be brilliant and meet all necessary academic standards if this level of citing is relevant based on the particular research aims and methodology. Scientists and experts write detailed arguments in favor of their position for a specific purpose. I admit that sometimes they write too much. However, student papers that have the ideal level of "originality" (or "pseudo-originality") always represent a very simplified and distorted version of complex concepts. The real world is complex.

A significant portion of the recent MIT report[9] is devoted to the question of how instructors should use Turnitin to evaluate various practical situations. Unfortunately, in post-Soviet law schools, faculty members are usually not taught this at all. Moreover, instructors often do not even have the right to manually re-evaluate a student's work if the Turnitin score is formally above 20% or 25%. This unpleasant practice, which distorts the normal use of Turnitin, must be stopped. Any Turnitin result should be interpreted by the teacher, but instructors must first be trained in correct interpretation. An analogy can be drawn with medical diagnostics, where any data

---

[7] Mphahlel, A., & McKenna, S. (2019). The use of Turnitin in the higher education sector: Decoding the myth. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 44*(7), 1079–1089.

[8] Aditya Sai Srinivas, T., & Bharathi, M. (2024). Turnitin: The good, the bad, and the unseen dimensions. *Research and Applications of Web Development and Design, 7*(1), 31–39.

[9] Obeng-Ofori, D., Chinaza Adaobi, C., & Atianashie, M. A. (2025). *Understanding Turnitin: A comprehensive guide for students and educators*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

from diagnostic equipment is meaningless until it is interpreted by a qualified doctor. In medicine, doctors usually try to use several alternative methods of diagnosing patients in order to increase reliability. Also, I do not consider the current situation of Turnitin's monopoly in many Asian law schools to be positive. It is necessary to look for opportunities to use several alternative systems simultaneously.

2. AI Used by Students While Seminars in Classrooms

Seminars in classroom develop qualities necessary for lawyers that can't be tested by a final written exam in class, which is why law school students get some marks during the semester through oral discussions in seminars. It is very important that students and professors have the opportunity to speak freely in class without fear that all their statements in class will be recorded and then analysed by someone for opaque purposes.

I support an opinion of Schneebaum that students trained in law, if they take efforts and if their professors have taught them well, should be able to act as advocates, and should know how to do it, not only in courtrooms, but in boardrooms, in the office, and in correspondence. They should be able to make their case for themselves, or for those for or with whom they work, in whatever field of endeavor they enter. Advocacy is something inherent in our daily lives, and most of us engage in it without thinking. We constantly try to persuade others to embrace our point of view, and in all likelihood we do so with at least some degree of success. So, when we were successful in getting someone else to do something meaningful—a parent who allowed us to follow an educational trajectory; a friend who accepted an invitation to join us; a teacher whose approval we needed to take a next step in school—when we brought them around, how did we do it? Probably, we did instinctively just what law schools should be teaching and refining … The responsibility of the academic universities, therefore, is not to ensure that students entering specific areas have studied those areas to the depth at which experienced practitioners are comfortable. Training programs, law firms, and government agencies can tailor specific skill sets to their particular needs better. The educational institution's job is to increase the level of basic skills: reading, writing, listening, speaking, or in this case advocacy, the stock in trade of legal practice and the currency of legal education properly conceived.[10]

Nowadays law students actively use AI not only when preparing homework assignments but also in class during seminars. This leads to a situation where, instead of preparing for class at home, a race begins to see who can formulate the answer to the professor's question faster with the help of AI. Of course, the use of the internet is not permitted during classroom final exams. A lot of post-Soviet law schools allow

[10] Schneebaum, S. M. (2025). The goals of legal education: A U.S. Practitioner's perspective. *BRICS Law Journal, 12*(1), 7, 13.

students to use unannotated texts of regulatory legal acts during exams. However, it should be noted that students earn part of their cumulative points not for exams, but for their participation in seminars, so the rules for using sources in seminars and exams need to be standardized. We may even end up banning the use of the Internet in regular seminars as a general rule, with a few exceptions. It could be useful to engage students in classroom discussion, develop their independent critical thinking, and even the development of fine motor skills, which is greatly facilitated by traditional old-fashioned handwritten notes on paper.

Harvard and its professors have been trying to shift the undergraduate experience this fall, to turn its students into more open-minded and academically engaged people … Students are being encouraged to take notes by hand, rather than on their phones or laptops, to avoid digital distractions. And to help students overcome fears about speaking up, professors are adopting rules that bar students from sharing what people say inside. Classrooms are supposed to be places where there can be a free exchange of ideas, the committee observed in its report. Yet in the spring of 2024, only a third of Harvard seniors said they felt completely free to "express personal feelings and beliefs about controversial topics," down from 46 percent the year before.[11]

According to the Harvard Crimson, the Harvard University has so far recognized the use of AI as a discretionary power of teachers as a temporary option. At the same time, those teachers who do not prohibit AI are provided with methodological support for transforming their courses into 'AI-resilient' ones, i.e., resistant to abuse by neural networks.

Gone are the blanket bans, the moral panic about the effect on learning, the vague threats of disciplinary action. Now, professors are taking a more nuanced approach in their syllabi. They are acknowledging AI, setting clearer guidelines for its use, and designing assignments that preempt it. One of my professors mentioned that some classes have moved away from take-home essays, opting instead for in-person exams or oral presentations. Others treat AI the way professors once treated Google: useful for gathering or summarizing background information, but not as a replacement for thinking or writing. I've seen syllabi that explicitly outline where AI use is allowed and where it crosses the line. These changes are, in my view, encouraging. Faculty are showing flexibility and realism. They're acknowledging the tools students actually use and setting us up to use them responsibly and enhance learning. But while professors are adapting, many students do not use that flexibility responsibly. Too often, AI is still being used as a shortcut, not a supplement. It's a way to get through a p-set faster, finish a discussion post in 30 seconds, and skim

[11] Hartocollis, A. (2025, October 6). *Harvard students skip class and still get high grades, faculty say*. The New York Times. https://www.nytimes.com/2025/10/06/us/harvard-students-absenteeism.html?ysclid=mlw6p3zslv313594157

the readings without actually opening the book. Shifts in AI policies require that students re-engage with learning, not just efficiency.[12]

Historically, the problem with law schools was that they only taught students how to analyze texts. As a result, by the end of their studies, students lost their good school math skills, since in many countries it is impossible to enter law school without good results on the state standard math test. The introduction of economic analysis of law, driven from American universities to Europe 10–15 years ago, required certain math skills of European law students. Students at law schools and schools of public administration began to learn to be at least "qualified users" of data, in particular for reading basic econometric tables and being able to conduct econometric research at a basic level. Law schools now face a similar challenge: teaching students to critically evaluate the results of AI and conduct basic AI research.

The spread of ChatGPT does not mean, of course, that there is no longer a need to study statistics and relevant programs like Stata. From a practical point of view, it seems appropriate to teach students first and foremost the basics of probability theory and mathematical statistics, as well as basic econometrics, as this forms a more rigorous and objective view of the world around them. Without this, they will not be able to correctly interpret the results of AI.

3. Use of Video Cameras in Classrooms

I would like to express my concern about the widespread installation of video cameras in classrooms at law schools in various countries. Historically, they were installed to enable sick students to watch missed lectures later. Then, at Harvard University, there was a scandal involving the secret use of video cameras to monitor the "correctness" of students' emotions in response to their teachers' words. Let me share some details:

In November 2014, the Harvard University was coming under fire from faculty and students for secretly photographing about 2,000 undergraduates in 10 lecture halls as a part of a study on classroom attendance. The experiment was disclosed at a faculty meeting and first reported in The Harvard Crimson student newspaper. Harvard computer science professor Harry Lewis asked administrators about the study during the meeting, saying he learned about it from two colleagues. "You should do studies only with the consent of the people being studied," Lewis told The Boston Globe. Brett Biebelberg, a junior involved in student government, called the study's secretive nature "strikingly hypocritical," given that the university recently adopted an honor code for the first time. Students and teachers were not notified because researchers did not want to introduce potential bias into the study,

[12] Previn, C. E. F. (2025, September 10). *Harvard professors are adapting to AI. It's time students do the same.* The Harvard Crimson. https://www.thecrimson.com/article/2025/9/10/previn-harvard-ai-polocies/

Harvard administrators said. The cameras took pictures every minute and a computer program used them to count empty and occupied seats.[13]

Two policies were issued as a result of this scandal for internal use and for external use like in media respectively.

Concerning internal use:

Video cameras to be used for safety, security or facilities management purposes may be installed in any location except for the following: (a) dormitory rooms; (b) the living quarters of other residential facilities; (c) restrooms and bathing facilities; (d) locker rooms and other changing facilities; (e) classrooms; and (f) offices of individuals.[14]

Concerning external use:

Photography and video/audio recording/filming in active classrooms is NOT permitted. Exceptions are only granted with Harvard Kennedy School Office of Communications and Public Affairs office (OCPA) approval, and with the prior permission of the instructor, who is required to obtain advance permission from all students in the classroom. All students in the room must sign photo/video release forms provided by the media organization, and pre-approved by OCPA, prior to the filming/photo shoot.[15]

Unfortunately, the anti-academic practice of video cameras use in classrooms without instructors and students' authorization is now actively followed by the university administrations of many law schools in different countries. I believe that such AI experiments are harmful and do not promote the free exchange of opinions between teachers and students, which is necessary for the high-quality training of lawyers.

I conducted an extensive search of the websites of schools and universities in post-Soviet countries. I discovered a fundamental difference between regulations in secondary schools and universities. Some secondary schools have a normal public policy on the use of video cameras. Usually, this policy allows video cameras to be installed in corridors, public halls, and school entrances, but not in toilets or changing rooms. Also, large secondary schools in post-Soviet countries usually have a staff physician to provide emergency assistance to teachers and children, and cameras cannot be installed in his office. The issue of video cameras in secondary schools' classrooms in Russia is at the discretion of the parents, who must give their

---

[13] AP News. (2014, November 6). *Harvard under fire for secret classroom photos*. https://apnews.com/general-news-08c74d3580f04a7380bd993a23c9d03c. *See also* The Guardian. (2014, November 6). *Harvard lambasted for secretly photographing students without consent*. https://www.theguardian.com/education/2014/nov/06/harvard-secret-photographing-students-classrooms-attendance-study/

[14] Harvard University. (2016, May). *Policy of installation and use of video cameras*. Office of the Provost. https://provost.harvard.edu/sites/g/files/omnuum12476/files/2025-10/final_video_camera_policy_may_25_2016_2.pdf

[15] Harvard Kennedy School of Government. (n.d.). *Video use and filming policy*. https://www.hks.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/OCPA/HKS%20Video%20Use%20Policy.pdf

unanimous voluntary written consent. I consider this policy to be balanced and reasonable. However, the rules for universities including their internal policies are not so clear.

I found a lot of papers about video surveillance systems for schools and universities in the post-Soviet segment of the Internet. These papers describe only the positive effects of introducing video surveillance systems in schools, and often contain very minor technical details about specific video surveillance systems. In my opinion, this means that this content is most likely sponsored by video system manufacturers. There is an example that claims that video systems have positive features such as improved student concentration, as students under video surveillance are less distracted by extraneous activities and have improved performance from teachers who know that if they violate students' rights, they can be proven guilty by video recording, add to this the prevention of fires, the immediate identification of the causes of quarrels, fights, and conflicts among students, and determination of who is at fault, and also combating the theft of property.[16]

In my opinion, all these arguments are unconvincing. I have serious doubts that achieving these goals requires video cameras in school classrooms; rather, this seems to be a case of lobbying by video equipment manufacturers. In terms of student concentration, my personal experience shows that the level of distraction among students, particularly talking to neighbors or browsing the internet, is the same in classrooms with video cameras as in classrooms without them. I have not seen a single convincing study with opposite conclusions that was conducted independently of university administrations or video camera manufacturers. If it is necessary to investigate teachers' actions in response to student complaints about serious violations, this can be done by surveying students. Furthermore, such complaints are rare if the university administration does not encourage overly-alarmist and scandal-seeking students who constantly invent violations of their rights (and while I clearly affirm that students' rights are important, there can be a culture of absurdity). In the event of a fire in the classroom, the teacher and students will immediately see the fire and leave the classroom. I have not found any information about a single fire during daytime classes at universities in post-Soviet countries in five recent years that has resulted in the death of professors or students. In addition, high-quality temperature and smoke detectors that operate automatically and detect a potential fire much earlier than video cameras are technically more important and sufficient for preventing fires. Fights between students are more common in secondary schools than at universities. In over 10 years of teaching in different post-Soviet country law schools, I have never seen a single classroom physical altercation between students. Fights probably do happen sometimes in practice, but no one would fight in a university classroom.

---

[16] Smaylova, D. B., & Kulmamirov, S. A. (2022). Approach to organizing a university video surveillance system. *Young Scientist, 7*(402), 5–10. (In Russian).

I would like to provide additional information from several relevant sources, some of which are academic and some of which are not. According to the Harvard Crimson:

Harvard professors are reimagining how they teach. Some are encouraging students to embrace AI to crunch data, translate primary sources, and brush up on course material before exams. Others are trying to AI-proof their classes with in-person exams and assignments. Whatever their approach to AI, many Harvard instructors say there's no going back to how they used to teach. "It doesn't make sense to prohibit AI and then assign take home essays," Dean of Undergraduate Education Amanda Claybaugh wrote in an email. Though College administrators have said submitting AI-generated work without attribution violates its Honor Code, it gives instructors flexibility on how to treat AI use in their own classrooms. The University's initial guidelines on AI, issued in summer 2023, also nod to academic integrity concerns but provide no specifics on what to do when students use AI for their coursework. Now most of the sampled Harvard course policies allow students to use AI, at least to some extent. For instance, the syllabus for Stat 100 says the course "encourages students to explore the use of generative artificial intelligence" in order to "gain conceptual and theoretical insights, as well as assistance with coding." Six of the sampled courses include outright bans on the use of AI. And the majority of the courses discourage AI use on at least some assignments.[17]

The scandal at Harvard in November 2014 has already been described above (fortunately I graduated from Harvard six months earlier), but it would be wrong to take it out of the wider overall context of what was happening in 2014 and the following years. Therefore, I consider it appropriate to give a more detailed historical overview. Walker described a similar scandal happened in the Washington County School District in Tennessee 2014. His opinion is the following. Video technology can improve safety and classroom practice, but using it to spy and find 'bad teachers' should be a non-starter. Whether they are planted in a classroom, scattered throughout the school or both, video cameras provoke wildly polarized reactions. One group envisions a safe and secure school and a happy teaching staff using video to improve practice and excitedly sharing "eureka" moments with their colleagues. The other is horrified at the thought of schools being transformed into invasive, zero privacy zones, staffed by suspicious educators, intimidated by the judging and unforgiving eye of a video camera in their classroom. Most educators probably sit somewhere in the middle. While they recognize the role video cameras play in school security, they have serious and valid concerns over privacy and the impact an excess of surveillance can have on school climate. And although teachers can benefit from the observation and reflection that a sensible use of cameras can cultivate, the

[17] Mao, W. C., Paulus V. H., & Rengel V. D. (2025, September 19). *Embrace AI or go analog? Harvard faculty adapt to a new normal*. The Harvard Crimson. https://www.thecrimson.com/article/2025/9/19/AI-Shapes-Classroom-Embrace/

situation gets dicey if clips are used to evaluate performance and cameras are there to merely snoop. For all their perceived benefits, video cameras come equipped with vast potential for abuse. Serious privacy concerns that impact students and staff, for example, have to be addressed. The National Education Association believes that education employees must be guaranteed the rights of privacy—including freedom from audio or video surveillance without the prior written permission of the individual. An investigation by the School Matters blog and Washington County educators revealed, among other things, who sponsored cameras (the Gates Foundation), their purpose (to produce observational clips for teacher evaluations), where the video clips would be stored (in Utah by the thereNow project), how much control teachers would have over the cameras (none), and whether parents were notified that their children would be videotaped (no). Cameras in classroom will not lead to the improvement of teaching, especially if they are used to evaluate teachers using a system that is basically flawed from the beginning. "The district just didn't think this through properly," says Janice Allen, an elementary school teacher and vice-president of the Washington County Education Association. "There were still a lot of unanswered questions"—including whether the video was going to be used in research to support dubious methods of teacher evaluation. Addressing the pitfalls of cameras in the classroom, Jack Hassard, a former high school teacher, current professor at Georgia State University and education blogger, wrote in 2011:

Video can be an effective tool for teachers only if they are in control of how, when, and why video technology is used in their classroom ... Cameras in the classroom will not lead to the improvement of teaching, especially if they are used to evaluate teachers using a system that is basically flawed from the beginning ... Using video to evaluate teacher performance is overly behaviorist, and reduces teaching to a set of skills that some trained observer looks for when viewing a video tape … Video shouldn't be about discovering who is a "good" or "bad" teacher,

Wessling says.

It should be about the teacher being able to look at a clip and saying: "OK, here is what happened in this lesson, and this is how I'm going to deconstruct it, so that I can learn how to get better tomorrow."[18]

In October 2023, The Guardian published brief information about an American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) new report. It has found that despite claims from companies, surveillance technology in US schools does not improve student safety and constant surveillance can, in fact, cause a number of harms to students including making students less likely to report dangerous behavior. The report concludes that there is little to no independent research or evidence that supports that this technology works. Surveillance tech companies say their technology can and has

[18] Walker, T. (2015, January 23). *Cameras in the classroom: Is big brother evaluating you?* NeaToday. https://www.nea.org/nea-today/all-news-articles/cameras-classroom-big-brother-evaluating-you

been effective at preventing conflict, violence abuse and self-harm. Chad Marlow, a senior policy counsel for the ACLU's national office and the report's lead author, said that from a research standpoint, these claims are impossible to prove and are misleading to school officials and administrators. The report's extensive review of tech companies' websites and marketing materials showed that companies rarely provide any data to support claims around efficacy.[19]

In more detail, this ACLU research report examines the EdTech Surveillance (educational technologies used for surveillance) industry in US K-12 schools. Using in-depth investigation into industry products, an incident audit, student focus groups, and national polling, this report scrutinizes industry claims, assesses the efficacy of the products, and explores the impacts EdTech Surveillance has on students and schools. The report concludes by offering concrete actions school districts, elected officials, and community members can take to ensure decisions about using surveillance products are consistent and well-informed. This includes model legislation and decision-making tools, which will often result in the rejection of student surveillance technologies.[20]

Also, it is important to take into account the following conclusions of the enquiry conducted in 2020 by the University of Michigan Ford School of Public Policy. Our analysis reveals that Face Recognition (FR) will likely have five types of implications: exacerbating racism, normalizing surveillance and eroding privacy, narrowing the definition of the "acceptable" student, commodifying data, and institutionalizing Schools have begun to use facial recognition to track students and visitors for a range of uses, from automating attendance to school security. inaccuracy. Because FR is automated, it will extend these effects to more students than any manual system could. On the basis of this analysis, we strongly recommend that use of FR be banned in schools. However, we have offered some recommendations for its development, deployment, and regulation if schools proceed to use the technology. Normalizing Surveillance Implementing FR in schools will normalize the experience of being constantly surveilled starting at a young age. Furthermore, once implemented, it will be hard to control how administrators use FR and for what purposes. The analogical case of closed circuit television (CCTV) reveals how surveillance technologies can undergo mission creep: CCTV systems in secondary schools in the United Kingdom (UK) were originally instituted for school security, but in practice became most often used for monitoring student behavior. Considering FR's similarities to CCTV in terms of form and function, it is likely that FR will also undergo mission creep as administrators

---

[19] Gistone, S. (2023, October 4). *School surveillance tech does more harm than good, ACLU report finds*. The Guardian. https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2023/oct/04/school-surveillance-tech-aclu-report

[20] Marlow, C., Greytak, E., Duarte, K., & Sun, S. (2023). *Digital dystopia: The danger in buying what the EdTech surveillance industry is selling*. American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU). https://www.aclu.org/publications/digital-dystopia-the-danger-in-buying-what-the-edtech-surveillance-industry-is-selling

expand the usage of the technology outside of what was originally defined. The normalization of surveillance will result in negative psychological and social effects for students. Defining the Acceptable Student FR in schools is also likely to discipline young people in unexpected ways, by narrowing the definition of the "acceptable student" and punishing those who fall outside that definition … FR systems in schools are poised to privilege some students and exclude and punish others based on expressions of individuality and characteristics outside of their control.[21]

The report's authors continue that commodifying Data FR in schools is likely to generate new data on students and create new markets in commodifying student data. Previous experience with similar data-generating technologies suggests that providers of these technologies will seek to commodify data collected, creating concerns about ownership, consent, value, and market exploitation. Providers may even offer FR services at no cost in exchange for the ability to collect and monetize the data. Altogether, our analysis indicates that the institution of FR in schools threatens students' data privacy and security, will result in data collection without consent, and will create a culture of permissiveness regarding data collection, leaving young people particularly vulnerable to unauthorized use of their personal information. Based on our analysis, we strongly recommend that the technology be banned for use in schools. However, if schools and departments of education decide to proceed with FR, then they must do so cautiously, after extensive expert deliberation and public participation (particularly among vulnerable groups), and with a clear regulatory framework that considers the social, ethical, racial, and economic dimensions of the technology—far more than the technology's accuracy. While we strongly recommend a ban, below we provide policy recommendations if schools decide it is absolutely necessary to implement the technology. If any alternative measures are available to meet the intended goals, do not purchase or use FR. Do not use FR technology to police student behavior![22]

In the US, this issue is regulated at the state level. Only one state out of 50 which is Louisiana has passed a very radical law requiring cameras to be installed in every high school classroom. However, it is unclear how the courts will view this. Texas's approach continues to serve as a national model for balancing classroom transparency with student and staff privacy. Texas led the way with classroom surveillance with a 2015 law the Texas Education Code. It gives parents and school staff the right to request cameras in self-contained special education classrooms (Texas Education Code 29.022). Once installed, the cameras must record both video and audio throughout the classroom, including any attached "timeout" areas. Restrooms and changing areas are off-limits, except for accidental capture. Schools

---

[21] Galligan, C., Rosenfeld, H., Kleinman, M., & Parthasarath, S. (2020). *Cameras in the classroom: Facial recognition technology in schools* (pp. 8–10). University of Michigan Ford School of Public Policy.

[22] Supra 11, 13, 15–16.

are required to keep recordings for at least three months and can use them only to review safety concerns or reported incidents—not for teacher evaluations or continuous live monitoring.[23]

Many school administrators will work closely with district boards and state departments when considering the installation of cameras in classrooms, due to the complex legal requirements involved. Beyond compliance, there are also reputational concerns and risks that schools must carefully manage when using security cameras in classrooms. The five following dimensions are distinguished inside this general problem.

A. Consent: Most states require written consent from multiple parties for the use of cameras in classrooms, including parents, students and teachers. Effectively communicating and obtaining approval for their installation can often be a complex and challenging process.

B. Incorrect use or placement of cameras: Federal law prohibits the use of video cameras in areas where there is a reasonable expectation of privacy. This broad definition can create challenges for administrators when determining camera placements in classrooms to ensure compliance with both federal and state regulations.

C. Ethical concerns: Students, teachers and parents often have concerns about constant video oversight in classrooms. These concerns include being filmed excessively when it's unnecessary, as well as the potential misuse or improper storage of footage captured by cameras in classrooms.

D. Legal infractions: The complex legal frameworks surrounding the use of cameras in classrooms can leave schools concerned about inadvertently violating regulations. With local laws frequently changing, staying up-to-date with policies is often a challenge for administrators.

E. Institutional trust: Excessive use of security cameras in classrooms can erode trust between students and the school community, potentially damaging the institution's educational reputation.[24]

Universities in EU countries, regardless of whether they were part of the Soviet Union or not, generally have internal policies on the use of video cameras, which are published on the universities' official websites, but they are rather vague and sometimes also very outdated. It is impossible to understand clearly and comprehensively when and for what purpose the use of video cameras is permitted in classrooms without the consent of professors and students. Let's take as an example the policies of two universities from EU countries, one of which is located in a post-Soviet country and the other in a country that is not post-Soviet.

---

[23] Lord D. (n.d.). *Inside the new laws putting cameras in America's classrooms*. Videoloft. https://videoloft.com/inside-the-new-laws-putting-cameras-in-americas-classrooms/

[24] Avigilon. (n.d.). *Is it illegal to have cameras in classrooms? A complete guide*. https://www.avigilon.com/blog/cameras-in-classrooms

University of Bologna (Italy). The personal data of University's employees and collaborators is processed solely in order to carry out the institutional functions of the University, in line with the relevant legislative and regulatory requirements (governing such matters as work, pensions, social security and taxation) and in compliance with the instructions given by the Data Controller. The data may also be processed by public and private parties (Foundations, Associations, etc.), appointed as Data Processors pursuant to and in accordance with Article 28 of Regulation (EU) 2016/679, for the purposes of managing University activities and outsourcing University services. In addition to the purposes expressly indicated above, the University may process the data needed to carry out a task in the public interest or exercise public powers assigned to the University. Data may be processed in an anonymised or pseudonymised form for storage in the public interest, for scientific or historical research or for statistical purposes.[25]

At Vilnius University (Lithuania), video surveillance is carried out on the territory of the University (courtyards, near warehouses, garages, etc.), at the entrances to the premises of the University, and in the premises (lobbies, corridors, server rooms, entrances to certain internal premises, etc.). Video surveillance is prohibited in premises where the Data Subject expects absolute data protection and where such surveillance would be degrading to human dignity (e.g., toilets, changing rooms, etc.). Video surveillance in the workplace is prohibited, except where the nature of the work makes it necessary to ensure the safety of persons, property or public order, and in other cases where other methods or means are inadequate and/or inappropriate for the purposes set out. Where video surveillance is carried out at an employee's workplace, such employees shall be informed of the processing of their video data by signature or by any other means proving that they have been informed.[26]

Conclusion

Law schools in various post-Soviet countries are now fiercely competing for both national and international students, as well as for the best teachers. In my opinion, the quality of knowledge they offer is gradually becoming equal. For this reason, other factors will also be significant in this competition, including the level of freedom within the law school in the opinion of professors, students, prospective students and their parents. I am confident that the law schools that offer the most balanced model of using artificial intelligence without excesses prevailing in this

---

[25] Alma Mater Studiorum—University of Bologna. Privacy Policy Statement. https://www.unibo.it/en/university/privacy-policy-and-legal-notes/privacy-policy/privacy-policy-statement

[26] Order of the Rector of Vilnius University on the approval of the description of the procedure for the processing of video surveillance data at Vilnius University No. R-530 of October 2, 2018. https://www.old.vu.lt/site_files/Vertimai/EN_Translation_Vaizdo_duomen%C5%B3_tvarkymo_taisykl%C4%97s.pdf

competition. According to my observations, strong law students have no objections to the idea of writing exams by hand in class or answering the teacher's questions about their homework orally in class. From a technical point of view, mass oral questioning of students in class requires an increase in the number of academic hours for seminars on individual disciplines, but this is normal. It should be borne in mind that other students hear the answers given by students in class and can also ask them questions, which contributes to the quality of legal education. With regard to the use of video cameras in classrooms, it is advisable for post-Soviet law schools to develop balanced internal policies that take into account the opinions of professors, students, and representatives of local civil society. In particular, there is nothing wrong with using video cameras in final written exams in classrooms to prevent cheating. A few post-Soviet law schools have started to broadcast the most important exams live on YouTube in order to increase the openness and transparency of the learning process, if they remain in an oral physical presence format (MA thesis defense, doctoral entrance exams). I fully approve of this in cases where the candidates agree. At the same time, I believe that the use of video cameras in law school classrooms during regular classes should be significantly limited and should be used as a methodological aid for teachers, but not for evaluating students and teachers. For example, some classes taught by new teachers who are in their first year at law schools could be recorded with their consent and the consent of all students in their class. These recordings could only be used for the purpose of obtaining confidential methodological assistance and feedback from senior, experienced professors. Similarly, some professors, with their consent and that of their students, could conduct several public classes each year. The recordings would be available to all faculty members and students of the law school, but could not be used directly or indirectly to evaluate the teacher or students.

References

Aditya Sai Srinivas, T., & Bharathi, M. (2024). Turnitin: The good, the bad, and the unseen dimensions. *Research and Applications of Web Development and Design, 7*(1), 31–39. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10418156

Bensal, E., Miraflores, E., & Tan. N. C. (2013). Plagiarism: Shall we turn to Turnitin? *CALL-EJ, 14*(2), 2–22.

Galligan, C., Rosenfeld, H., Kleinman, M., & Parthasarath, S. (2020). *Cameras in the classroom: Facial recognition technology in schools*. University of Michigan Ford School of Public Policy.

Jones, K. O. (2008). Practical issues for academics using the Turnitin plagiarism detection software. *CompSysTech'08: Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Computer Systems and Technologies and Workshop for PhD Students in Computing*, Article 50. https://doi.org/10.1145/1500879.1500935

Moshanova, T. (2019). Management of teaching the bachelors in pharmacology and psychology at the University of Westminster (London). *Medical Education Today, 4*(8), 54–70. (In Russian).

Mphahlel, A., & McKenna, S. (2019). The use of Turnitin in the higher education sector: Decoding the myth. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 44*(7), 1079–1089. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1573971

Schneebaum, S. M. (2025). The goals of legal education: A U.S. Practitioner's perspective. *BRICS Law Journal, 12*(1), 5–19. https://doi.org/10.21684/2412-2343-2025-12-1-5-19

Smaylova, D. B., & Kulmamirov, S. A. (2022). Approach to organizing a university video surveillance system. *Young Scientist, 7*(402), 5–10. (In Russian).

Wright, D., Owens, A., & Nigel, D. (2008). *Making the case for multiple submissions to Turnitin* (paper presented at the 3rd International plagiarism conference). https://go.turnitin.com/l/45292/2025-09-16/cpbc7g/45292/1758052955RqhfJvlR/Wright2008_fullpaper.pdf

Information about the author

Kirill Molodyko (Tashkent, Uzbekistan) – Associate Professor, Department of International Law and Human Rights, Tashkent State University of Law (35 Sayilgokh St., Tashkent, 100047, Uzbekistan; e-mail: kirill.molodyko@tsul.uz).