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Introduction:
The increased accessibility of technology is often employed as rationale for data extraction and surveillance. This paper examines critical perspectives on surveillance and educational technologies from Library and Information Science (LIS) literature, as well as those from disability studies that concern technology development more broadly. This research aims to understand how a disability justice framework can interrogate both the overall expansion of surveillance technologies and justifications for increased surveillance that argue that data extraction and analytics lead to increased accessibility for disabled users. As an activist approach toward disability advocacy that underscores the connections between white supremacy, sexism and colonialism as central to ableism, disability justice recognizes surveillance technologies as embedded in systems of power that disproportionately harm people of color. Using a disability justice framework, this student showcase proposal argues against the expansion of surveillance technologies—especially in the name of increasing accessibility.

Theoretical Framework:
This essay takes a descriptive research approach to examine the tensions implicit between the expansion of surveillance technology and its supposed promise of accessibility. These promises have historically been broken after the needed information has been extracted from the
disabled. Mills (2009) refers to this phenomena as the “assistive pretext” which operationalizes disability as a resource for technoscientific development. Nagy (2022) expands on this concept in her investigation into how disability can itself be constitutive of new forms of AI and big data-based surveillance. She discusses how new AI survey regimes have historically been weaponized to make the inner lives neurotypical and neurodivergent alike open to observation.

**Research Question:**
How can a disability justice framework interrogate the expansion of surveillance technologies vis-à-vis learning analytics when these technologies have been understood as opportunities to build accessible technology?

**Methodology:**
The study utilized a systematic literature review approach to examine the connections between the LIS literature concerning surveillance and library- or education-related technologies and the disability studies literature concerning extractive technological practices and surveillance as they relate to disability. Google Scholar was used to locate relevant literature. The inclusion criteria included:
1) studies that examined the data analytics and/or data extractive properties of educational and library technologies
2) studies published from 2008-2022, with a focus on recent studies from 2012 onward
3) studies that discuss disability as it relates to extractive technological processes and/or surveillance
4) peer-reviewed journal articles. Publications outside of the LIS, education, and disability studies literature were excluded from the review.

**Expected Results and Conclusion:**
We predict several gaps within the literature. This paper responds to the conference theme of “social Justice and information equity; human rights”. Much of the disability studies literature ignores the systems of power such as racism and classism that adversely affect members of the community. There is especially a lack of research on antiracist work within disability studies. This is particularly disconcerting because already people of color are especially vulnerable to surveillance. LIS as a discipline has not examined surveillance and the disabled experience. We plan to fill some of these gaps in the future related work through a qualitative research study that will include interviews with disabled librarians to gain their perspectives on the implications of learning technologies and data analytics.
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