This meeting will be held at Litchfield Intermediate School and via Teleconference

REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT No. 20
BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING
Special Meeting Agenda

Policy Committee

5:30 p.m., November 5, 2026

Meeting Link: meet.google.com/fbm-vrdk-iue
Dial-In: 1 909-584-5936
PIN: 880 833 441#

Committee Members

Ashley Westfall, Chair	Ashley Hall Daddona
Margaret Hunt	Billie Jean Sideris

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Policy Committee Special Meeting Minutes of December 11, 2025
3. AI (Artificial Intelligence)
4. Adjournment

REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT No. 20
BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING
Special Meeting Minutes
December 11, 2025

Policy Committee

Committee Members

Ashley Westfall, Chair	Ashley Hall Daddona
Margaret Hunt	Billie Jean Sideris

1. Call to Order The Policy Committee meeting held at Lakeview High and via teleconference was called to order at 5:15 p.m. by Ashley Westfall.

   Members present: Ashley Westfall, Chair, Ashley Hall Daddona, and Billie Jean Sideris.

   Also present: Jeffrey Villar, Ph.D., Superintendent, and Julie Haggard, Assistant Superintendent Pupil Services.

   Absent: Margaret Hunt.

2. Approval of Policy Committee Special Meeting Minutes of November 20, 2025
   Ashley Hall Dadonna made a motion for the Approval of Policy Committee Special Meeting Minutes of November 20, 2025. Billie Jean Sideris seconded the motion. There was no discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Review/Edit/Discuss Series 6000 - Students
   The Policy Committee members reviewed CABE Policies 6141.51 Advanced Courses or Programs, Eligibility Criteria for Enrollment, Policy 6141.52 Challenging Curriculum Policy (Criteria for Identification of Eligible Grade 8, 9 Students) and the Shipman policy, Policy Addressing Enrollment in an Advanced Course or Program and Challenging Curriculum. During discussion, the Policy Committee members agreed to move forward the Shipman policy with edits to the full Board for first read at its next meeting.

   The Policy Committee members reviewed CABE Policy 6172.4 Title I Parent Involvement and the Shipman policy, Parent and Family Engagement Policy for Title I Students. During discussion, the Policy Committee members agreed to use the Shipman policy and move it forward to the full Board for first read at its next meeting.

   The following policies were reviewed and edited as needed. These policies will go to the Board for first read at its next meeting.

   Policy 6000 Concepts and Roles in Instruction
   Policy 6111 School Calendar
   Policy 6112 School Day
   Policy 6114 Emergencies and Disaster Preparedness

Policy 6141.22 Religion and Religious Accommodation
Policy 6141.311 Limited English Proficiency Program
Policy 6141.312 Migrant Students
Policy 6141.326 Electronic Resources
Policy 6141.3221 Computers: Websites/Pages

The Policy Committee declined to advance Policy 6114.7 Safe Schools, noting it as redundant.

4. Adjournment There being no further business to come before this committee, the meeting adjourned at 6:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Christine Escobar
Secretary, pro-tem

AI Policy Development Guide: Comparative Decisions Framework and District Policy Examples

AI Policy Development Guide: Comparative Decision Framework and District Policy Examples

The purpose of this document is to assist the Board of Education Policy Subcommittee as it works to develop a comprehensive K-12 AI policy. The document was created using AI tools but also required considerable human research, formatting, editing, and content revision. In order to facilitate a meaningful discussion, we have identified and reviewed sample policies from the Connecticut Technical Education and Career System (CTECS), Stratford Public Schools, Weston Public Schools, Westport (NY) Public Schools, and Greenwich Public Schools. The CABE model policy served as a basis for a RSD 20-centric revision and was also incorporated into this document.

Committee members may consider using the following sequential decision-making roadmap to identify, think about, and debate key foundational components of an AI policy. The roadmap follows six steps. Each of the steps is expanded upon in individual sections following the table.

- **Step 1: Educational Philosophy** — Determine *why* AI is being introduced. Establish foundational principles by choosing between Human-Centered Productive Struggle (Westport), Adaptability/Digital Literacy (Greenwich/Weston), or Career-Technical Alignment (Stratford/CTECS).
- **Step 2: Grade-Level Access** — Determine *who* may access generative AI tools. Decide whether to hard-code a three-tiered grade band (PK-5 ban, 6-8 literacy, 9-12 active use under RSD20) into policy or adopt a universal policy delegating grade-level rules to administrative regulation.
- **Step 3: Student Use and Academic Integrity** — Define *how* AI is used in instruction. Select an authorization system (Traffic-Light vs. Categorical) and establish clear misuse verification pathways (Process-Based Verification vs. Code of Conduct Enforcement).
- **Step 4: Legal and Privacy Requirements** — Establish non-negotiable legal guardrails. Mandate compliance with Connecticut privacy statutes (C.G.S. §§ 10-234aa–dd), federal laws (FERPA/COPPA), and emerging AI mandates (PA 23-16, PA 24-151), explicitly noting state-specific statutory requirements.
- **Step 5: Staff and Administrative Boundaries** — Set guidelines for adult usage. Choose whether to strictly prohibit AI-generated employee evaluations (Greenwich) or permit decision-support drafting under human review (Westport/RSD20), while defining permitted instructional design applications.
- **Step 6: Governance and Procurement** — Institute mechanisms for ongoing oversight. Adopt a robust multi-point vendor evaluation framework (Stratford/RSD20) and charter a standing AI Advisory Committee to manage continuous policy iteration and annual updates.

1: Educational Vision and Foundational Philosophy

Decision Question 1: *What core educational philosophy should guide the district's approach to AI?*

Policy Option Framework

Philosophical Approach	Core Policy Direction	Model Alignment
Option A: Human-Centered Learning & Preservation of Productive Struggle	Focuses on preserving human reasoning, critical thinking, authentic problem-solving, and meaningful interpersonal interactions. Explicitly asserts that AI efficiency must not supersede the educational value of the learning process or replace cognitive effort.	*Westport NY Draft Policy 8636*
Option B: Adaptability, Innovation, and Digital Literacy	Frames AI as an essential emerging technology necessary to equip students with adaptability, digital literacy, critical thinking, and communication skills required for higher education, the workforce, and civic life.	*Greenwich Policy 4118.53/6141.3273*, *Weston Policy P 6187*, *Draft RSD20 Policy 6141.3273*
Option C: Graduate Competencies and Career-Technical Alignment	Explicitly aligns AI instruction with the district's Portrait of a Graduate and workforce-development targets, emphasizing technical competencies such as coding, data analysis, machine learning, innovation, and ethical usage.	*Stratford Policy P6141.3273*, *CTECS Policy #5006*

Educational Vision and Foundational Philosophy Comparative District Policy Examples

Westport Public Schools (*Westport Draft Policy 8636*): Westport establishes a strict human-centered philosophy designed to protect the integrity of student reasoning and the learning process. The policy mandates that AI must support rather than replace core cognitive activities, explicitly stating:

"AI should support learning, not replace the intellectual effort, productive struggle, creativity, judgment, relationships, and human interaction through which meaningful learning occurs."

The policy further dictates that the speed or efficiency with which an AI tool generates an answer or product shall never take priority over the time, effort, reasoning, and human interaction necessary for authentic learning.

Greenwich Public Schools (*Greenwich Policy 4118.53/6141.3273*) & Weston Public Schools (*Weston Policy P 6187*): Greenwich centers its vision on preparing students for an evolving digital society by fostering high levels of learning, adaptability, critical thinking, and digital literacy. Rather than restricting access out of concern for technological risk, Greenwich explicitly mandates a non-ban stance in its core policy text:

"Greenwich Public Schools is not banning the student or teacher use of AI, but each student will need to be aware of the limitations and guidelines of its usage."

Similarly, *Weston Policy P 6187* frames generative AI as a tool to foster a dynamic, engaging learning environment and requires that the benefits of AI be accessible to all staff and students through the adopted curriculum.

Stratford Public Schools (*Stratford Policy P6141.3273*): Stratford grounds its AI vision directly in its district *Portrait of a Graduate*, emphasizing workforce readiness and technical mastery. The policy stresses that technology must enhance rather than substitute for human instruction:

"Emphasize augmentation over automation, ensuring AI supports rather than replaces instructional roles" and *"AI should augment student effort rather than replace it."*

Stratford explicitly encourages building 21st-century technical skills, urging students to utilize AI to learn coding, data analysis, and machine learning.

Draft Regional School District 20 (*Draft RSD20 Policy 6141.3273*): Draft RSD20 grounds its educational philosophy in six foundational guiding principles, led by Principle 5 (*Center People / Prioritize Human Interactions*), which dictates:

"People, not machines, should be at the center of decision-making, and educators, students, and families should retain their agency as the primary decision-makers."

Educational Vision and Foundational Philosophy Governance Takeaways & Analyst Considerations

- **Policy vs. Regulation Distinction:** The Board of Education is responsible for establishing the overarching educational vision in formal Board Policy (e.g., electing Option A, B, or C). The Superintendent translates this vision into daily classroom practices, software white-lists, and lesson-level guidelines through Administrative Regulations.
- **Risk Tolerance & Community Expectations:** Option A (Westport) provides maximum protection against academic integrity erosion and is ideal for communities prioritizing traditional humanities and deep cognitive struggle. Option B (Greenwich/Weston) suits districts aiming to position themselves as modern digital leaders. Option C (Stratford/CTECS) is highly recommended for vocational-technical environments or districts with strong STEM/career-pathway mandates.

2. Grade-Level Access and Developmental Appropriateness

Decision Question 2: *Should AI access vary by grade level, or should a single districtwide policy apply to all PK-12 students?*

Option A: Tiered Access Based on Grade Band (Draft RSD20 Model & Greenwich Conceptual Alignment)

While Greenwich Public Schools conceptually supports age-appropriate implementation through administrative regulation, *Draft RSD20 Policy 6141.3273* (Section IV) provides explicit, codified policy language establishing a strict three-tiered developmental grade-band model:

- **PK–5 Band (Prohibition / Exclusion):** Student-facing generative AI is strictly prohibited from classroom use and discussion (*Draft RSD20 Policy 6141.3273*, Section IV). Young learners must focus entirely on foundational literacy, numeracy, and social-emotional development.
    - *Mandatory Statutory Exception:* Student-facing AI access in PK–5 is permitted solely when incorporated as a documented accommodation within a student's Individualized Education Program (IEP) or Section 504 Plan (*Draft RSD20 Policy 6141.3273*, Section IV.1).
- **Grades 6–8 Band (Instruction & Literacy Focus):** Direct student creation using generative AI remains restricted. Instead, instruction focuses on foundational AI literacy, explaining what AI is, its capabilities, inherent risks, practical applications, ethical considerations, bias awareness, and digital citizenship (*Draft RSD20 Policy 6141.3273*, Section IV). Students are explicitly barred from incorporating hands-on generative AI creation into their academic work.

Continued on next page

- **Grades 9–12 Band (Supervised Active Use):** High school students are permitted to actively use approved generative AI tools to support academic work under direct faculty supervision (*Draft RSD20 Policy 6141.3273*, Section IV). All use in this tier requires mandatory attribution, disclosure of AI assistance, and strict adherence to academic integrity expectations.

Option B: Universal PK-12 Policy with Administrative/Teacher Discretion

Under this alternative framework, the Board adopts a uniform districtwide policy applying across all grade levels (PK–12) without hard-coding grade-band prohibitions into top-level board policy text (*Westport Draft Policy 8636*, *Stratford Policy P6141.3273*, *CTECS Policy #5006*).

- **Implementation Mechanics:** The Board sets universal expectations concerning ethics, safety, and academic integrity, while delegating age-appropriate implementation guidelines, tool selection, and classroom usage parameters to district administration and classroom educators.
- **Administrative Authority:** The Superintendent or administrative leadership retains full authority to restrict, permit, or scaffold specific AI applications based on contextual learning objectives and student developmental maturity (*Westport Draft Policy 8636*).

Grade-Level Access and Developmental Appropriateness Governance Takeaways & Analyst Considerations

- **Policy vs. Regulation Structure:** Enshrining rigid grade bands (Option A) into Board Policy ensures total community alignment and clear boundaries, but requires formal Board action to alter as technology evolves. Codifying a universal policy (Option B) gives the Superintendent administrative flexibility to adjust age thresholds through Administrative Regulation as generative tools become embedded in elementary learning software.
- **Equity and Accessibility:** Regardless of the model selected, boards must ensure that grade-band restrictions do not accidentally impede assistive technology or legally mandated accommodations under Section 504 or IDEA.

3. Student Use, Instructional Practice, and Academic Integrity

Decision Question 3: *How should educators communicate permissible AI use, and how should educators address suspected misuse?*

Instructional Guidance Frameworks

Districts deploy two distinct operational systems to communicate assignment-level expectations to students:

Option A: Traffic-Light Authorization System (*Greenwich Policy 4118.53/6141.3273 Framework*)

Educators assign one of three authorization tiers to every academic task:

- **Green Tier:** AI use is fully permitted using district-approved tools to enhance learning.
- **Yellow Tier:** AI use is conditionally permitted only for specific, teacher-designated sub-tasks (e.g., brainstorming, outlining, or debugging code).
- **Red Tier:** AI use is strictly prohibited. Mandatory Red categories include personal reflections, first-draft writing assignments, foundational skill assessments, or any activity requiring unassisted individual cognition.

Option B: Categorical Permitted vs. Prohibited Uses (*Stratford Policy P6141.3273, Westport Draft Policy 8636, CTECS Policy #5006, Draft RSD20 Policy 6141.3273*)

Districts define clear, pre-established functional boundaries codified across all coursework:

- **Permitted Uses:**
  - Brainstorming, idea generation, and thought organization/outlining.
  - Research support, summarizing large datasets, and exploring multiple perspectives.
  - Draft feedback on grammar, spelling, syntax, and clarity.
  - Study assistance, including generating practice questions and study guides.
  - Developing technical skills (e.g., coding, data analysis, machine learning).
  - Adaptive learning, language translation, and accessibility scaffolds.
- **Prohibited Uses:**
  - Submitting AI-generated content as original student work (plagiarism).
  - Completing assignments, assessments, or exams using AI to misrepresent skill level or circumvent academic expectations.
  - Fabricating data, research sources, or citations.
  - Generating false, deceptive, or harmful content, including misinformation, deepfakes, or manipulated media.
  - Utilizing unauthorized, non-approved AI software or hardware on school grounds.

Verification of Misuse and Response Procedures

When unauthorized or deceptive AI use is suspected, district policies follow one of two distinct administrative pathways:

Option A: Process-Based Verification Pathway (*Westport Draft Policy 8636*)

Westport establishes a non-punitive, process-oriented investigative protocol that precedes any formal disciplinary action. When a student's submitted work raises reasonable concern regarding authentic ownership, the district initiates a restorative inquiry:

1. **Inquiry Phase:** The educator pauses formal grading and initiates a dialogue with the student.
2. **Process Evidence:** The student is provided the opportunity to demonstrate authentic ownership by producing process documentation, edit history records, version-tracked drafts, or research notes.
3. **Oral Defense:** The student may be asked to orally explain their reasoning, research steps, or the underlying concepts presented in the work.
4. **Determination:** If the student successfully demonstrates process ownership, the work is evaluated normally. If ownership cannot be established, the matter proceeds to administrative review.

Option B: Traditional Code of Conduct Enforcement Pathway (*CTECS Policy #5006, Stratford Policy P6141.3273, Greenwich Policy 4118.53/6141.3273*)

Under this model, unauthorized AI use is immediately classified as academic dishonesty, cheating, or plagiarism.

1. **Direct Referral:** Suspected infractions bypass secondary process-verification protocols and are referred directly to school administration.
2. **Disciplinary Action:** Incidents are adjudicated under existing student discipline policies and codes of conduct (*CTECS Policy #5006*, Section V).
3. **Penalties:** Sanctions include formal disciplinary warnings, mandatory zero scores on affected assessments, parent notifications, academic probation, or temporary loss of district technology access privileges.

Student Use, Instructional Practice, and Academic Integrity Governance Takeaways & Analyst Considerations

- **Administrative Regulations & Student Handbooks:** While the Board sets the overarching definitions of academic dishonesty in Board Policy, the specific operational mechanics (such as the Traffic Light framework or process-defense protocols) should be embedded in Superintendent Administrative Regulations and published in annual Student/Parent Handbooks.

- **Pedagogical Durability:** Policy guidelines should mandate that professional development committees (e.g., PDEC) train educators to design assignments that are "durable" against AI shortcutting—emphasizing in-class writing, oral defenses, and process documentation over isolated take-home prose generation.
- **Professional development** will require time and funding.

4. Privacy, Compliance, and Legal Requirements

Decision Question 4: *How should the policy incorporate Connecticut privacy requirements and emerging statutory mandates?*

Core Statutory Privacy Requirements & Jurisdictional Differences

All valid school district AI policies must establish strict compliance mechanisms for student data privacy, but boards must recognize key state-level jurisdictional distinctions across district models:

- **Connecticut District Models (*CTECS Policy #5006, Stratford Policy P6141.3273, Greenwich Policy 4118.53, Draft RSD20 Policy 6141.3273*):** Ground their privacy mandates strictly in Connecticut General Statutes, specifically the Connecticut Student Data Privacy Act (**C.G.S. §§ 10-234aa through 10-234dd**), alongside federal mandates including the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (**FERPA**, 20 U.S.C. § 1232g) and the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act (**COPPA**).
- **Out-of-State Comparison Model (*Westport Draft Policy 8636*):** While serving as an exemplary philosophical model, Westport's draft policy explicitly cites New York statutory references (**New York Education Law §2-d**, **New York Labor Law §203-d**, **8 NYCRR Part 121**, and the **NY Public Officers Law**). Connecticut school boards adopting language from Westport must translate all statutory references to corresponding Connecticut General Statutes.
- **Mandatory Privacy Guardrails (Universal):**
    - *Prohibition on PII Input:* Absolutely prohibit entering Student Personally Identifiable Information (PII), confidential personnel records, or protected educational records into unapproved, consumer-grade, or public AI platforms.
    - *Pre-Deployment Authorization:* Requirement that all AI platforms undergo formal district-level data privacy, technical security, and contractual review before classroom deployment.

Emerging Legislative & Statutory Requirements (PA 23-16, PA 24-151, Greenwich & Draft RSD20)

To address advanced technological risks, progressive policies incorporate statutory provisions derived from Connecticut Public Act 23-16 (*An Act Concerning Artificial Intelligence, Automated Decision-Making and Personal Data Privacy*) and Public Act 24-151:

- **AI Companion Restrictions:** Strict prohibition of AI systems designed to simulate emotional, romantic, or dependency-based relationships with students, preventing psychological manipulation and unvetted social-emotional influence (*Draft RSD20 Model*).
- **Synthetic Media & Provenance Controls:** Require mandatory disclosure and identification of AI-generated images, audio, and video content used in district operations. Strictly prohibit generating deceptive deepfakes, manipulated media, or attempts to alter/circumvent digital provenance markings and watermarks.
- **Vendor Compliance & Attestations:** AI vendors must formally certify compliance with state AI standards, including non-discrimination safeguards (PA 23-16), active detection of harmful content, minor safety protocols, data minimization, and algorithmic transparency.

Privacy, Compliance, and Legal Requirements Governance Takeaways & Analyst Considerations

- **Board Legal Liability:** Protecting student PII is an unalienable Board responsibility. Public AI models that train on user prompt inputs violate C.G.S. § 10-234aa if student data is entered. Board Policy must explicitly prohibit entering PII into unvetted tools and hold staff legally and professionally accountable for compliance.

5. Staff Responsibilities and Administrative Use

Decision Question 5: *What limitations should govern staff and administrative use of AI?*

Personnel Decisions and Evaluative Documents

Districts diverge significantly on whether administrative personnel may utilize AI tools when evaluating staff and managing personnel records:

Option A: Strict Prohibition on AI Evaluative Documents (*Greenwich Policy 4118.53/4218.53*)

Greenwich enforces an absolute ban on administrative AI use for employee evaluations and formal personnel documentation.

- **Banned Documents:** Administrators are strictly prohibited from using AI to generate, draft, or summarize *"teacher observation notes, improvement plans, evaluations"* (*Greenwich Policy 4118.53/4218.53*, Page 2).
- **Authenticity Mandate:** The policy dictates that all individual student reports and staff evaluations must reflect *"staff members' professional own analysis and their sense of the authentic needs of the student being discussed."*

Option B: Human Judgment & Decision Support Requirement (*Westport Draft Policy 8636, Draft RSD20 Policy 6141.3273 / Administrative Regulations*)

This framework allows AI to function as an administrative efficiency tool for drafting routine operational materials, provided human agency is strictly preserved.

- **High-Stakes Prohibitions:** AI systems are explicitly prohibited from making high-stakes determinations. RSD20 Draft Administrative Regulation section VI.2.d mandates that AI shall not be used to make:
    1. *"Final or ultimate personnel decisions."*
    2. *"Student placement or discipline decisions."*
    3. *"High-stakes determinations without human reflection and review."*
- **Human Review Standard:** AI outputs may only serve as supplementary decision-support drafts; all final evaluative judgments must reflect independent human analysis and substantive human review.

Professional, Instructional, and Operational Uses

Districts encourage certified staff to leverage AI efficiency to enhance instruction, subject to explicit operational boundaries:

- **Permitted Staff Applications:**
    - Designing lesson plans, unit frameworks, and engaging project prompts (*Stratford 3.1*).
    - Developing rubrics, assessment tools, exemplars, and success criteria.
    - Creating instructional scaffolds and differentiated learning materials for diverse learners, including accommodations aligned with IEPs and 504 Plans (*Draft RSD20*).
    - Employing AI as a smart search engine to gather, synthesize, and organize instructional concepts.
    - Drafting non-confidential administrative communications, schedules, and routine workflow automations.
- **Mandatory Operating Conditions:**
    - *Personal Accountability:* Staff remain fully accountable for reviewing every AI-generated output for factual accuracy, pedagogical value, copyright compliance, and implicit bias before classroom distribution.
    - *Data Anonymization:* Staff must strip all student PII, educational records, or confidential personnel data before entering prompts into authorized tools.
    - *Disclosure:* Staff must maintain professional transparency by disclosing substantive AI assistance in content creation.

Staff Responsibilities and Administrative Use Governance Takeaways & Analyst Considerations

- **Labor and Collective Bargaining:** Restricting administrative AI use in personnel evaluations (Option A) protects labor relations and prevents union grievances concerning automated supervision. If Option B is chosen, clear language must guarantee that employee evaluations remain the direct product of human observation and professional supervisor judgment.

6. Procurement, Oversight, and Continuous Governance

Decision Question 6: *How should AI tools be approved, and how will the district ensure ongoing oversight and policy review?*

Tool Approval and Procurement Models

Districts establish structural review mechanisms before acquiring or deploying AI tools:

Option A: Centralized Administrative Approval (*Greenwich Policy 4118.53/6141.3273*)

Authority is delegated to a designated administrative officer (e.g., Director of Technology or Data Privacy Officer) who evaluates and approves AI products via standard administrative privacy workflows.

Option B: Comprehensive Vendor Evaluation Framework (*Stratford Policy P6141.3273 Section 5.0, Draft RSD20 Policy 6141.3273 Section VII*)

Vendors must satisfy a multi-point criteria matrix prior to district adoption:

1. **Data Privacy & Cybersecurity:** Secure encryption protocols for data transmission/storage and full compliance with FERPA, COPPA, and C.G.S. §§ 10-234aa–dd (*Stratford 5.1, 5.2*).
2. **Bias Mitigation & Reporting Mechanisms:** Vendors must disclose active efforts to mitigate algorithmic bias and provide direct mechanisms for educators to flag and report potential model bias (*Stratford 5.7*).
3. **Accessibility & Inclusivity:** Full compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), requiring screen reader compatibility and multi-language translation tools (*Stratford 5.3*).
4. **Crisis-Detection Capabilities:** Integrated safety protocols to detect and flag inputs indicating student harm or distress (*Draft RSD20 Administrative Regulations Section VII*).
5. **Data Control & Retention:** Clear, transparent data retention schedules and enforceable protocols for permanent data deletion upon district request (*Stratford 5.2*).
6. **Mandatory Pilot Testing:** Requirement that platforms undergo a controlled district pilot phase prior to full-scale adoption (*Stratford 5.8*).

7. **Train-the-Trainer Support Models:** Requirement that vendors provide scalable, train-the-trainer professional development models (*Stratford 5.5*).
8. **Service Level Agreements (SLAs):** Require SLAs that define technical support response times, system uptime guarantees, and transparent pricing structures (*Stratford 5.5, 5.6*).

6.2 Ongoing Governance Structures & Regulation-Level Mechanics

To ensure continuous oversight, districts establish formal governance structures:

Option A: Dedicated Standing AI Advisory Committee / Taskforce (*Stratford Policy P6141.3273, Draft RSD20 Admin Reg cps 2/26 Appendix B*)

Establishes an independent oversight body operating under a formal charter (*RSD20 Appendix B*).

- **Composition:** District and building administrators, classroom teachers, instructional technology staff, special education personnel, cybersecurity leaders, students, parents, BOE members, and legal counsel (*Stratford 6.1, RSD20 Admin Reg Section III.1*).
- **Meeting Cadence & Duties:** Meets at least quarterly to conduct PA 23-16 AI impact assessments, evaluate emerging tools, oversee pilot programs, identify PDEC training needs, and submit annual policy recommendations to the Board (*Stratford 6.1, RSD20 Appendix B*).

Option B: Expanded Technology Advisory Committee (*Draft RSD20 Policy 6141.3273*)

Expands the charge of an existing district technology advisory committee to encompass generative AI governance, pilot oversight, and statutory compliance monitoring.

Procurement, Oversight, and Continuous Governance Takeaways & Analyst Considerations

- **Board Policy vs. Administrative Regulation Execution:** The decision to establish an AI Advisory Committee should be authorized in formal **Board Policy** (*Stratford Policy P6141.3273, Section 6.1*). However, the specific committee charter, membership roster, meeting schedules, and building-level implementation checklists belong in Superintendent Administrative Regulations (*Draft RSD20 Regulation cps 2/26, Appendices A & B*). This structure ensures strong Board governance without entangling trustees in administrative management.
- Consider Administrative capacity. Several model policies assume administrative positions that may not exist in smaller districts.

DRAFT Region 20

4118.53-4218.53 Electronic Resources - Generative AI (Artificial Intelligence)

Instruction/Personnel - Certified-Non-Certified

Electronic Resources

Generative AI (Artificial Intelligence)

The Board of Education is committed to providing our students with the most innovative and effective educational experiences, fostering high levels of learning and opportunities for self-expression, while maintaining the highest levels of academic integrity. As our schools prepare students for a future that demands adaptability, critical thinking, and digital literacy, we recognize both the potential and the risks of generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) and related technologies, including their impact on teaching and learning, operational performance, and student success.

This policy provides a framework for thoughtful, age-appropriate AI use while setting expectations for ethical use, data protection, academic integrity, professional learning, and ongoing oversight. As with all technologies, users must be mindful of and adhere to considerations that ensure responsible and ethical AI use, especially by mitigating bias, promoting transparency, and ensuring accessibility for all students.

I. Definitions and Scope

For purposes of this policy:

1. Artificial Intelligence (AI) refers to technologies that perform tasks that typically require human intelligence, including but not limited to content generation, data analysis, pattern recognition, predictive modeling, decision support, or adaptive learning.
2. AI tools include generative AI systems, machine learning applications, adaptive educational platforms, and AI-enabled administrative or operational systems.
3. Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) refers to AI-enabled systems that generate text, images, audio, video, code, or other content in response to prompts or data inputs.
4. Users include students, staff, contractors, and vendors who access or deploy AI tools in connection with District programs or operations.

This policy applies to all AI tools used for instructional, assessment, administrative, or operational purposes within the District, whether provided by the District or accessed independently by staff or students when used for school-related activities.

II. Guiding Principles

The District's use of AI shall be guided by the following principles:

1. Fairness: AI tools shall be selected, deployed, and monitored to avoid bias, discrimination, or disparate impact on students, staff, or families, particularly based on legally protected characteristics.

2. Transparency: The District shall promote transparency by ensuring that students, staff, and families understand when and how AI tools are used in instruction, assessment, and District operations.
3. Accountability: Human oversight and clear lines of responsibility shall be maintained for decisions and outcomes influenced or supported by AI systems.
4. Security and Privacy: The District shall protect student and staff data by ensuring that AI tools comply with applicable Federal and State privacy, security, and data protection laws and standards.
5. Center People / Prioritize Human Interactions: People, not machines, should be at the center of decision-making, and educators, students, and families should retain their agency as the primary decision-makers. [https://education.mn.gov/MDE/dse/tech/AI/AIEd/]
6. Continuous Improvement: AI tools and technology are evolving rapidly; the District will monitor and adjust its use of and approach to AI as new information comes to light and new capabilities emerge.

Ill. Framework for Use

Before using or introducing AI tools in any setting, the District will consider the following:

Technological: Is the tool safe, transparent, and age-appropriate?
Curricular: Does it support what students are learning, when they are learning it?
Pedagogical: Does it reinforce critical thinking, creativity, and active engagement?
Implementation: Is it usable and supported in classrooms?

[https://www.childtrends.org/publications/make-ai-work-for-learning]

IV. Ethical Principles and Responsible Use

The District is committed to the ethical and responsible use of AI. Accordingly,

1. Human Oversight and Agency: AI systems shall support, not replace, professional judgment and decision-making. Final responsibility for instructional, evaluative, and operational decisions remains with District personnel.
2. Avoidance of Discrimination and Disparate Impact: The District shall evaluate AI tools for potential bias and inequitable outcomes and shall take corrective action when such risks are identified. To that end, the District shall develop procedures to evaluate the AI tools' ability to address such impacts.
3. Privacy and Data Protection: AI use shall respect individual privacy rights and limit data collection and retention to what is necessary for legitimate educational purposes and comply with records retention schedules.
4. Equity: The District shall consider accessibility, digital equity, and inclusive design when adopting or approving AI tools to ensure that AI use does not exacerbate existing inequities.

IV. Academic Integrity and Instructional Practices

The Board recognizes that AI may be a valuable instructional tool when used safely, responsibly, and ethically.

Age-appropriate Use:

Kindergarten–Grade 5: Student-facing generative AI shall not be used or discussed in the classroom setting. [Exception for IEP / 504.]

Grade 6-8: Students may be taught about what AI is, its capabilities, risks, and practical applications. Students may not incorporate the hands-on use of generative AI into their academic work.

Grade 9-12: Students may be taught about emerging AI technologies and how to use them, and may be permitted to incorporate the use of generative AI into their academic work under faculty supervision and with attribution.

Permitted Uses:

AI tools may be used, consistent with the age guidelines above, teacher direction, and District guidance, for purposes such as:

Students

- Promoting critical thinking and analysis
- Prompting AI tools to provide outlines and other supports for structuring original work.
- Researching and gathering various perspectives on topics and issues.
- Breaking down complex concepts.
- Synthesizing large datasets or large quantities of independent research material.

b. Professional Staff

- Teaching students to evaluate AI outputs and think critically.
- Supporting differentiation and accessibility (Creating scaffolds for diverse learners).
- Enhancing instructional planning and analysis.

2. Prohibited Uses: AI tools shall not be used to:

Students

- Substitute for original work.
- Circumvent academic expectations or District codes of conduct.
- Complete assignments, assessments, or examinations in a manner that misrepresents a student's knowledge or skills.

Professional Staff

- Substitute original work.
- Assume professional tasks without acknowledgment, review, and sound judgment.

- Acknowledgment and Disclosure: In all situations, students and staff are expected to acknowledge, attribute, and explain their use of AI tools to promote transparency, reflection, and ethical decision-making.

V. Data Privacy, Security, and Procurement

Recognizing that AI tools may process sensitive information, the District establishes the following safeguards:

Legal Compliance: All AI tools must comply with the Family Educational Rights Act (FERPA), Connecticut student privacy laws, and other applicable federal and state requirements.

Procurement and Review: The District shall maintain a review and approval process for AI tools, including:

a. Evaluation of vendor data practices and security measures.

b. Verification of compliance with State data protection standards.

c. Review of claims regarding AI functionality, limitations, and data use.

Data Minimization and Security: AI tools shall collect and retain only data necessary for educational purposes, and appropriate measures shall be in place to protect against unauthorized access or misuse.

VI. Professional Development and AI Literacy

The District shall support ongoing professional development related to AI. Such professional development shall include, but not be limited to:

Support training for educators and administrators on AI literacy, ethical use, data privacy, and instructional integration.

Modeling responsible AI use and embedding ethical considerations into instruction, helping students develop critical thinking and digital citizenship skills.

VII. Stakeholder Engagement and Policy Review

To ensure this policy remains responsive to evolving technology and guidance:

The Board shall review this policy on a regular cycle and update it as needed to reflect changes in technology, law, and State guidance.

The District shall engage educators, students, and families in reviewing AI practices and policy implementation to promote transparency and trust.

VIII. Implementation and Administration

The Superintendent or designee shall develop administrative regulations to implement this policy. Such elements shall include those related to students, staff, and administrative operational productivity and functionality to more effectively align with the Board's mission to meet the needs of all students.

(cf. 5121.3 —Academic Dishonesty/Plagiarism)

(cf. 6141.321 — Student Responsible Use of the Internet)

(cf. 6162.51 — Surveys of Students (Student Privacy))

Legal Reference: Public Act 23-16 An Act Concerning Artificial Intelligence, Automated Decision-Making and Personal Data Privacy

Public Act 24-151 An Act Authorizing and Adjusting Bonds of the State and Concerning Provisions Related to State and Municipal Tax Administration, General Government and School Building Projects

Policy adopted:

R6141.3273

R4118.53/4218.53

Instruction/Personnel — Certified - Non-Certified

Electronic Resources

Generative AI (Artificial Intelligence)

I. Purpose and Scope

The Board of Education, in its commitment to supporting teachers and students in their use of generative AI, recognizes many challenges to overcome and significant opportunities to explore that will ultimately deepen the teaching/learning process.

These administrative regulations implement Board of Education Policy 6141.3273/4118.53/4218.53, Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI). They align with the State of Connecticut's Policy Al-Ol and are intended to guide the responsible, ethical, secure, and effective use of GAI across instructional, professional, and operational contexts.

These regulations establish procedures and guidance for students, certified and non-certified district employees, administrators, contractors, and vendors acting on behalf of the board of education.

Il. Definitions

For the purposes of these regulations:

1. Artificial Intelligence (AI) refers to technologies that perform tasks that typically require human intelligence, including but not limited to content generation, data analysis, pattern recognition, predictive modeling, decision support, or adaptive learning.

2. AI tools include generative AI systems, machine learning applications, adaptive educational platforms, and AI-enabled administrative or operational systems.

3. Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) refers to AI-enabled systems that generate text, images, audio, video, code, or other content in response to prompts or data inputs.

4. Users include students, staff, contractors, and vendors who access or deploy AI tools in connection with District programs or operations.

These regulations apply to all AI tools used for instructional, assessment, administrative, or operational purposes within the District, whether provided by the District or accessed independently by staff or students when used for school-related activities.

III. Collaboration and Oversight

The Superintendent or designee shall establish a District-Wide GAI Advisory Committee to support implementation, oversight, and continuous improvement of AI use across the district. The Committee shall operate in a collaborative, transparent manner, soliciting and encouraging input from staff, students, and the community, and supporting responsible innovation. (The District should assess whether an existing "group, "such as a technology advisory committee, can assume this added responsibility.)

1. Composition: The Committee shall include representation from:

    a. District and building administrators.

    b. Classroom teachers.

    c. Instructional technology staff.

    d. Curriculum, instructional, and assessment leaders.

    e. Student support services/special education staff members.

    f. Staff responsible for data privacy and cybersecurity.

    g. Students (as appropriate).

    h. Parents/guardians (as appropriate).

    i. Legal counsel (as appropriate).

2. Responsibilities: The GAI Advisory Committee shall:

    a. Review emerging GAI tools and their potential uses.

    b. Monitor compliance with District policy, State guidance, and applicable laws and regulations.

    c. Develop and recommend guidance for instructional and operational use.

    d. Identify professional learning needs and resource gaps.

    e. Evaluate, advise on, and plan for equity, accessibility, and bias considerations related to school and home/community use, and attend to, but are not limited to, the identified needs of students with Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) and 504 plans, training programs, data collection and analysis, and tools.

    f. Advise on data privacy, cybersecurity, and vendor risks.

    g. Provide regular updates to the Board of Education on:

i. GAI initiatives and pilot programs. ii.

Implementation progress.

iii. Emerging risks and opportunities.

iv. Recommended policy revision and resource needs.

IV. Student Use of GAI

I. Instructional Use: GAI shall not replace direct instruction, human judgment, or authentic student learning. GAI may be used as an instructional support tool to:

a. Enhance learning, promote creativity, and advance critical thinking.

b. Explore multiple approaches to problem-solving or creative expression.

c. Brainstorm ideas, generate outlines, or organize thoughts for assignments and projects.

d. Support research and study skills, including summarizing content, generating study guides, or developing practice questions.

e. Receive differentiated learning opportunities and explanations or supports, along with assistance with grammar, spelling, syntax, or clarity in student-generated work, when permitted by the teacher.

f. Support language development, translation, or comprehension, as authorized.

g. Enhance accessibility through adaptive or assistive features consistent with instructional expectations.

h. Analyze, evaluate, and critique AI-generated content to build digital literacy and critical thinking skills.

i. Learn about and reinforce the appropriate, ethical, and responsible use of AI systems.

j. Other educational uses approved by the teacher and consistent with Board policy, District guidelines, and academic integrity standards.

k. Student use of GAI must be:

i. Age-appropriate.

ii. Aligned with curriculum goals.

iii. Supervised by educators.

iv. Consistent with academic integrity expectations.

2. Academic Integrity: Students shall be instructed on:

   a. Appropriate and Inappropriate Uses of GAI.

   b. Proper attribution and disclosure when GAI is used.

   c. The limits of GAI accuracy and reliability.

   (Unauthorized use of GAI to complete assignments, assessments, or examinations may constitute academic dishonesty and shall be addressed in accordance with the District Code of Conduct.)

3. Data Privacy and Safety: Only district-approved GAI tools may be used in instructional settings unless otherwise authorized. Students shall not input:

   a. Personally identifiable information (PII).

   b. Confidential student or staff data.

   c. Protected educational records.

V. Staff Use of GAI

1. Appropriate use of GAI tools for staff includes, but is not limited to, the following applications:

a. Support instructional planning, including but not limited to lesson design, curriculum development, and instructional differentiation.

b. Develop or revise instructional materials, assessments, rubrics, or other activities.

c. Provide feedback, exemplars, or instructional supports for students, consistent with professional judgment and district/departmental/grade-level guidelines.

d. Support professional learning, reflection, and continuous improvement.

e. Enhance accessibility and inclusive practices for students, consistent with IEPs, 504 Plans, and other individualized plans.

f. Improve efficiency in routine professional tasks, such as drafting communications, organizing information, or summarizing instructional data.

g. Model responsible, transparent, and ethical AI use for students.

h. Other instructional or professional uses authorized by the District and aligned with Board policy, collective bargaining agreements, professional standards, and applicable laws.

2. Staff remain responsible for:

a. Reviewing and verifying all GAI-generated content.

b. Evaluating AI tools and outputs for accuracy, bias, appropriateness, and instructional value.

c. Collaborating with colleagues to share effective practices related to AI-supported instruction.

d. Ensuring alignment with district curriculum and standards.

e. Maintaining professional judgment and accountability.

3. Ethical and Responsible Use:

a. Use GAI in a manner consistent with professional ethics.

b. Identify and mitigate potential bias or inaccuracies.

c. Be transparent when GAI is used to generate or substantially assist instructional materials.

4. Privacy and Confidentiality: Staff shall not input:

a. Student educational records.

b. Personnel records.

c. Confidential District data into non-approved GAI platforms.

d. General sharing of personally identifiable information (PII).

VI. Operational Productivity and Administrative Use

1. Permitted Uses: GAI may be used to improve operational functionality, including, but not limited to:

a. Drafting non-confidential communications.

b. Summarizing publicly available information.

c. Supporting workflow automation.

d. Assisting with planning, scheduling, or reporting tasks.

2. Personnel Oversight

a. GAI shall function as a decision-support tool, not a decision-maker.

b. Inputs should be general in nature and not contain staff or other PII.

c. All outputs must be reviewed by a qualified employee before use.

d. GAI shall not be used to make:

i. Final or ultimate personnel decisions.

ii. Student placement or discipline decisions.

iii. High-stakes determinations without human reflection and review.

VII. Vendor Management and Technology Approval

1. All GAI tools must undergo District review before adoption.

2. Evaluation criteria shall include:

a. Data privacy and security protection.

b. Compliance with FERPA, State law, and District policy.

c. Transparency regarding data use and retention.

d. Bias mitigation and accessibility features.

3. The GAI Advisory Committee shall assist in reviewing and recommending tools for approval.

VIII. Professional Learning and Capacity Building

The District shall provide ongoing professional development for staff and administrators, including, but not limited to, the following:

1. Responsible and ethical GAI use.

2. Instructional integration.

3. Data privacy and cybersecurity.

4. Equity and accessibility considerations.

5. Emerging risks and best practices.

IX. Monitoring, Review, and Continuous Improvement

1. The Superintendent or designee shall ensure regular monitoring of GAI use across the district.

2. The GAI Advisory Committee shall annually review:

a. Implementation effectiveness

b. Compliance with policy and regulations

c. Emerging legal, ethical, and technology developments

3. Recommendations for revisions to policy, regulations, and resource allocation shall be presented to the Board of Education as needed (or requested)

X. Considerations for Effective Generative AI Use (Directed Towards Student Use)

- Before assigning an AI-required task, ensure all students have access to the tool and can comply with the technology's user agreement and CT's student privacy law (CGS §§10-234m through IQ-234dd).
- Review how generative GAI works, expectations for safe and ethical use, and the role the teacher expects this tool to play in completing and approaching the assignment.
- Ensure students are provided with instruction and reminders in the following areas:
- How and when to cite and provide attribution of sources; when and where generative AI can and cannot be used; effective uses of generative AI; users assume responsibility for the results when using AI; when permissions are required, and Terms of Use are followed; what constitutes cheating? What constitutes support?
- Academic Integrity — Policy and practical applications.
- Consider requiring students to acknowledge and document how they used generative AI tools. For example, students could use ChatGPT to get feedback on their essay drafts and explain which suggestions they agreed with or didn't, encouraging them to use the tool as a partner rather than having it do all the work for them. It can and should be used to augment learning and instruction. Augmentation over automation.
- Provide students with direct instruction on the limitations and flaws related to generative AI technology, including hallucinations, bias, inaccuracies, and misinformation. Remind students to think critically, fact-check using primary sources, and note that AI can have implicit bias and present incorrect information.
- Identify potential risks and outline what responsible use entails. Regularly remind students about the safety risks of sharing personal information with AI bots and of using them to invade others' privacy.

XI. Considerations for Teachers:

- Confer with colleagues on what writing assignments look like in an era when students can employ chatbots to generate prose for them.

- Review lessons to ensure durability of learning against the use of AI
- Openly discuss complex ethical questions with students, colleagues, parents/guardians, and community members, such as whether it is considered cheating when a student asks generative AI to fabricate a rough draft that they can then revise themselves.

• Use generative AI programs as smart search engines that present information in ways that are easy to understand.

- Use AI to generate ideas, topics, writing assignments, and other materials for engaging lessons.

XII.

The only certainty about AI technology is that it will become more impactful in all our lives; it will continue to raise complex and contentious pedagogical and ethical dilemmas; and it will provide teachers and students with new and unforeseen opportunities. The above "guidelines" are intended to initiate healthy, productive discussions and advance higher levels of critical thinking nd cognitive engagement.

Regulation approved:

cps 2/26

6141.3273

4118.53/4218.53

Appendix A

Building-Level Implementation Checklist

Leadership

[ ] Consider establishing a GAI Advisory Committee or adding a GAI advisory agenda to an appropriate established committee

[ ] Communicate District GAI expectations to staff

Instructional Practices

[ ] Identify approved GAI tools

[ ] Establish classroom expectations for GAI to align with policy [ ]

Incorporate digital literacy and academic integrity in instruction

Student Guidance

[ ] Include GAI expectations and guidelines in the student handbook and parent communications

Staff Support

[ ] Ensure GAI professional learning opportunities are a recurring agenda item for the Professional Development and Evaluation Committee (PDEC)

[ ] Ensure professional learning opportunities are informed, developed, and implemented by expert district teachers, administrators, and staff members [ ] Establish a consultation process for questions and responsive support

Monitoring

[Review incidents or concerns related to GAI use

[ ] Provide feedback to district administration

Appendix B

GAI Advisory Committee Charter

Name: District-Wide Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) Advisory Committee

Role: Advises the Superintendent of Schools and provides updates to the Board of Education

Membership: Administrators, teachers, instructional technology staff, student services/special education educators, data privacy/cybersecurity personnel, students, and/or parents/guardians (as appropriate)

Responsibilities:

- Review emerging GAI tools and trends
- Recommend guidance, resources, and training
- Assess equity, privacy, and bias implications
- Provide regular reports to the Board of Education

Meetings: At least quarterly, or as determined by the Superintendent

6141.3273

4118.53/4218.53

Appendix C

Student Handbook Alignment Language

The _____ Board of Education permits limited use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI) tools to support learning when authorized by teachers. Students are expected to use GAI responsibly, protect personal and confidential information, and follow academic integrity standards. Misuse of GAI may result in disciplinary action consistent with the Student Code of Conduct.

6141.3273

4118.53/4218.53

Appendix D

Professional Expectations for Staff

Staff are encouraged to use GAI as a professional support and instructional design tool, while remaining responsible for all instructional and operational decisions. Educators should make every effort to ensure that instruction, assignments, and assessments are durable against GAI misuse and can adapt to the use of emerging technologies. GAI outputs must be reviewed for accuracy, bias, and appropriateness. Confidential information shall not be entered into nonapproved GAI systems. Professional staff are responsible for reviewing and following the policy and are encouraged to recommend updates and revisions to the GAI Advisory Committee or designated committee and the Superintendent.

CTECS
Connecticut Technical Education and Career System

Policy 5006 - Student Use of Artificial Intelligence Technologies

CTECS CONNECTICUT TECHNICAL EDUCATION AND CAREER SYSTEM

Student Use of Artificial Intelligence Technologies

I. Introduction

This policy outlines the guidelines and regulations for the use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) within CTECS to promote responsible and ethical AI usage while harnessing its educational potential. For this policy, the term "AI" means technology that can generate new and original content such as text, images, videos, code, music, data or other content. When used appropriately, AI can enhance learning experiences, promote critical thinking, and prepare students for the future. However, it is crucial to ensure that AI is utilized responsibly by students in the school environment, avoiding plagiarism and the propagation of misinformation, bias or harmful content.

II. Responsible Use of AI

- Authorized AI Tools: Only authorized AI tools and applications, approved by the school administration, may be used on school premises or for school-related activities. Students must adhere to the approved list of AI resources.
- Plagiarism Prevention: AI tools may be used to assist students in identifying and preventing plagiarism. Students are encouraged to review their work to ensure originality, and to detect the difference between paraphrasing and plagiarism.
- Information Accuracy: It is essential to critically evaluate information obtained through AI tools. Students and educators must verify the accuracy of AI-generated content and use reliable sources to cross-reference information.
- Nondiscrimination: AI tools and applications shall be assessed by school officials prior to approval to ensure that no such system shall result in any unlawful discrimination against any individual or group or has any unlawful disparate impact on any individual or group on the basis of any actual or perceived differentiating characteristic, including, but not limited to, age, genetic information, color, ethnicity, race, creed, religion, national origin, ancestry, sex, gender identity or expression, sexual orientation, marital status, familial status, pregnancy, veteran status, disability or lawful source of income.

III. Prohibitions

- Plagiarism: Plagiarism, whether facilitated by AI or not, is strictly prohibited. Students are

expected to produce original work and provide proper citations when using AI-generated content.

- Misinformation: Creating, sharing, or promoting false information or AI-generated content with malicious intent is prohibited. Students should use AI to enhance their understanding of subjects, not to deceive or misinform.

- Unapproved AI Tools: The use of unauthorized AI tools, software, or hardware on school premises or for school-related activities is strictly forbidden.

- Nondiscrimination: The district's policy of nondiscrimination applies to the use of AI. CTECS does not discriminate in any employment practice, education program or educational activity on the basis of a protected class. AI tools shall not be used by anyone in the school community in a manner that creates or perpetuates discriminatory content.

IV. Instructional Use of AI

- Curriculum Integration: Teachers are encouraged to incorporate AI-related topics and tools into the curriculum to familiarize students with AI technology and its ethical use as appropriate to the lesson.

- AI Projects: Students may engage in AI-related projects that align with educational objectives and ethical guidelines. These projects should encourage critical thinking, problem-solving, and creativity.

- Ethical Education: The school will provide educational resources and guidance to help students understand the ethical implications of AI, including issues related to bias, discriminatory impact, misinformation, privacy, and fairness.

V. Accountability and Consequences

Violations of this AI usage policy will be subject to appropriate disciplinary action, as determined by the school administration. Consequences may include warnings, academic penalties, or more severe measures, depending on the severity and repetition of the offense.

The school will provide opportunities for students and educators to undergo AI ethics training to ensure responsible usage.

VI. Review and Amendments

This policy will be reviewed periodically to ensure its relevance and effectiveness. Amendments may be made as necessary to reflect changes in AI technology and educational best practices.

VII. Conclusion

CTECS recognizes the transformative potential of AI in education and is committed to ensuring its responsible use. By adhering to this policy, we aim to harness the benefits of AI while instilling in our students the importance of ethical behavior and critical thinking in the digital age.

By signing the acknowledgement, all members of the school community acknowledge their commitment to abide by this AI usage policy.

Legal Reference:

Public Act 23-16, An Act Concerning Artificial Intelligence, Automated Decision-Making and Personal Data Privacy

Dr. Justin Lowe, Interim Superintendent
Policy Issued: August 2024

Greenwich Public Schools

4118.53-4218.52-6141.3273 Electronic Resources - Generative AI (Artificial Intelligence)

5118.53R/6141.3273R02 Generative AI - Students Regulation

6141.3273R/4118.53R/4218.53R Enelectronic Resources - Generative AI Regulation - Staff

Greenwich Public Schools
Greenwich, CT
Personnel — Certified and Non-Certified (4118.53-4218.53)
Instruction (6141.3273)

Greenwich Public Schools acknowledges that technology is ever-changing and that artificial intelligence (AI), including generative forms of AI, is becoming more a part of our everyday lives. The responsible and ethical integration of generative AI into the Greenwich Public School District's educational environment is a necessary consideration as technology continues to evolve. It is our responsibility to educate and train students to utilize AI in an ethical and educational way.

Therefore, Greenwich Public Schools is not banning the student or teacher use of AI, but each student will need to be aware of the limitations and guidelines of its usage.

The Board of Education is committed to providing our students with the most innovative and effective educational experiences to foster high levels of learning and opportunities for self-expression. As our schools prepare students for a future that demands adaptability, critical thinking and digital literacy, we recognize the potential of generative artificial intelligence (AI) and other related technology tools.

As with all technologies, users must be mindful of and adhere to all considerations, ensuring responsible and ethical use, especially as it relates to supporting academic integrity, promoting transparency, and ensuring the benefits of AI are accessible to all students.

While ensuring the responsible use for those interacting with and creating content from generative AI technologies, the Board underscores its commitment to fostering a dynamic and engaging learning environment that leverages the advances in AI to enhance student learning outcomes and equip students with the skills and dispositions needed for success in the digital age.

AI should also bolster teaching and learning through an instructional lens while ensuring compliance with Connecticut data privacy expectations.

A regulation, developed by the superintendent, for utilizing AI for innovative, organizational, and management uses shall be established in order to keep pace with technology advancements across the field of Artificial Intelligence.

The Board understands that, as with any new technology, the understanding of appropriate use may evolve with time. The Board directs the superintendent to consult with student and staff users to review the regulation regularly and make necessary changes.

AI is not a substitute for human creativity, judgement, and creation. District regulations must adhere to the following:

- AI use by students must align with district policies and regulations around academic integrity, such that students may not misrepresent AI or partially AI-generated work as their own.
- Should staff use AI in professional work, they must do so in a manner consistent with a code of conduct. For example, individual student reports must reflect staff members' professional own analysis and their sense of the authentic needs of the student being discussed.
- Use of AI by the administration to create employee-performance documents (i.e. teacher observation notes, improvement plans, evaluations) is prohibited.

(cf. 6141.321 – Student Responsible Use of the Internet)
(cf. 5121.3 – Academic Dishonesty/Plagiarism)
(cf. 6162.51 – Surveys of Students (Student Privacy)

Policy adopted by the Greenwich Board of Education: 6/12/2025

A. Definitions

1. **Generative Artificial Intelligence**: algorithms (such as ChatGPT) that can be used to create new content, including audio, code, images, text, simulations, and videos.
2. **Non-generative Artificial Intelligence:** encompasses a wide range of techniques that focus on programmed rules and tasks such as classification, prediction, and decision-making.
    - *The difference between traditional AI and generative AI lies in their capabilities and applications. Traditional AI systems are primarily used to analyze data and make predictions, while generative AI creates new data similar to its training data.*
3. **Student User**: Any Grade 6-12 GPS student who utilizes AI as a resource in order to create new work. **This regulation does not cover PK-5 Students*
4. **Student Consumer:** Any GPS student who uses resources and materials generated by AI
5. **Personally Identifiable Information:** Public Act 16-189 defines student data privacy. **Personally identifiable information** is any information that represents an individual, and it could lead to identification through address, name, grade, or any other information attached to a particular student.
6. **Machine Learning:** Machine Learning (ML) is a branch of artificial intelligence (AI) and computer science that focuses on using data and algorithms to enable AI to imitate the way that humans learn, gradually improving its accuracy.
7. **AI Companion:** *Public Act 26-15* defines an AI Companion as any artificial intelligence system with a natural language interface that provides adaptive, human-like responses and is capable of sustaining a relationship or simulating interpersonal/emotional connections across multiple interactions. Narrowly tailored educational tools are excluded.
8. **Synthetic Digital Content:** *Public Act 26-15* defines as audio, image, text, or video content generated or substantially modified by an AI system.

B. Adherence to Data Privacy:

CT Data Privacy Law: "Educators, school leaders, and education technology providers should review and understand their obligations under Connecticut's student data privacy law (Connecticut General Statutes §§ 10-234aa through 10-234dd). The statute applies to any situation in which districts use educational technology that captures or accesses personal student information, records, or data." (CSDE, 2024)

Forms must be completed and signed off by the company to determine that their platforms are in compliance with CT Data Privacy Law, FERPA and IDEA. The district manages all compliance forms through the Educational Data and Systems Program Coordinator (or designee) who oversees district technology platforms for instructional

use.

Additionally, Public Act 26-15 establishes statewide requirements for AI systems, including safeguards for AI accessible to minors, disclosure requirements, and provenance marking of synthetic content. GPS incorporates its standards into tool approval and student use expectations.

By Oct 1, 2027. GPS approval form will require vendor attestation of compliance with Public Act 26-15: (a) clear AI-not-human disclosure; (b) self-harm/suicidal-ideation detection protocols; (c) safeguards against romantic/sexual interaction, encouragement of self-harm, violence, disordered eating, or substance use, and addictive design directed at minors; (d) qualification as a narrowly tailored educational tool where applicable; (e) a synthetic-content provenance plan

B1 - Student Access and Permissions

1. Students on GPS campuses or with GPS internet access must:
    - Protect their personally identifiable information (see Definition 5) (DP)
    - Limit uploading reference materials to those that are necessary. (DP)
    - Use district-approved tools that provide access to school personnel for review of all session outcomes.

2. Students on GPS campuses or with GPS internet access cannot use any AI tool that does not comply with the data privacy policies of the State of Connecticut and the GPS Policy.
    - Any new curricular tool for students must be vetted by the Educational Data and Systems Coordinator for approval using the approval form.
    - AI Tools must provide access to see everything a student did during the session with the chatbot.

3. If tools are approved for grade-level and class-specified student use, administrators, certified staff, and educators have autonomy over using approved AI tools within the classroom, and students must adhere to the teacher's classroom-based procedures for use.

C. **Student Guidance on Adhering to Data Privacy**

1. Students should not upload ANY identifiable information in a tool.
    - **Personally Identifiable Information (PII) includes but is not limited to:** First and Last Names, including initials, emails, addresses, ID Numbers, Photographs or Images of Self or others.
2. Minimize any data upload to what is necessary.
3. Data collection concerns: Ensure only the approved sites are used to create documents via AI while at school and on the school network.
4. All tools that are approved by GPS have either signed Children's Online Privacy Protection (COPPA) or are CT privacy-compliant

D. Student Guidance on Ethical Use and Academic Integrity

These Core Tenets focus on promoting human welfare and preventing harm:

- **Accountability:** Ensure that use of AI aligns with the specific assignment guidelines and is approved by the teacher. Example violations include:
  - *Cheating:* Using AI tools to complete assignments, homework, quizzes, tests, or any other form of evaluation without explicit permission from the teacher is considered cheating.
  - *Unauthorized Assistance:* Using AI tools to get answers or solutions to problems assigned as independent work or homework without teacher approval is prohibited.
  - *Interference with Learning Objectives:* Using AI tools to bypass the intended learning goals of an assignment is not permitted.
- **Accuracy**: Verify the information provided by the AI, as it may not always be accurate or reliable. AI-generated content can be inaccurate, misleading, or entirely fabricated (sometimes called "hallucinations") and may contain copyrighted material. Generating false or misleading information using AI tools and presenting it as factual is prohibited.
- **Responsibility**: Ensuring individuals are answerable for their actions
  - *Impersonation & Digital Harassment*: Creating fake profiles, social media pages, or AI-generated content that impersonates students, teachers, or staff—whether to mislead, harass, or mock—is strictly prohibited. This includes generating AI-generated images, videos, or deepfakes designed to misrepresent an individual. Under *Public Act 26-15*, AI-generated audio, image, and video content must be marked and detectable as synthetic; removing, circumventing, or concealing such markings to misrepresent content as authentic is an aggravating factor in any violation of this provision.
  - Students are responsible for any content published under their own name, including AI-generated or manipulated material.
- **Transparency**: Clearly indicate which parts of the schoolwork, assignment, or drafts were generated or assisted by the AI.
  - *Plagiarism*: Using AI tools to generate text, code, or any other work submitted as one's own without proper attribution is prohibited. Students shall use proper citation formats to attribute the AI.

E. Student Guidance on Appropriate Education Use

Acceptable Student Use of AI Tools:

1. **Approved Sites:**

a. Grades 9-12: GPS-approved Student-Facing AI Site for Grades 9-12, as outlined in the Student Digital Toolbox.

b. Grades 6-12: GPS-approved digital tools that include components with embedded artificial intelligence supports, as outlined in the Student Digital Toolbox.

2. **Learning Aid**: Students may use AI tools for learning purposes, such as:
   a. Grammar and spell-checking.
   b. Clarifying complex topics or concepts.
   c. Practicing language skills.
   d. Generating ideas for brainstorming.
3. **Research:** Students may use AI tools to gather information and research topics but must ensure all sources are properly cited, and parameters of use are based on teacher discretion.
4. **Collaboration and Communication**: AI tools can be used for collaborative projects to facilitate communication and idea sharing.
5. **Digital Tutoring:** non-generative tutors that ask students questions (Socratic method) to lead to understanding are permitted.
6. **Special Considerations:** Students with an IEP or 504 Plan may use AI as their plan specifies; plan accommodations override grade-band limits.

Companion, Emotional, or Therapeutic Use: Using AI tools for companionship, simulated friendship or romantic relationships, emotional support, or as a substitute for counseling or mental health services is prohibited. AI Companions (see Definition 7) are not approved for student use on GPS devices or networks. Students experiencing emotional distress should be directed to school counselors, trusted adults, or appropriate support services. Staff who become aware of student companion-style AI use that raises wellbeing concerns should follow existing student support referral procedures.

Secondary Student Code of Conduct:

1. Improper AI Use: Submitting work from another source, including the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) technology without explicit teacher consent.
2. Violation of academic integrity includes using text or any other type of response written by a generation system as one's own (e.g., entering a prompt into an artificial intelligence tool, such as ChatGPT, and using the output in a paper) without proper citation.

Unacceptable Student Use of AI Tools:

1. **Breach of GPS Data Privacy:** Use of non-approved tools on campus using district Wi-Fi.
2. **Plagiarism:** Using AI tools to generate text, code, or any other work that is submitted as one's own without proper attribution is prohibited.
3. **Cheating:** Using AI tools to complete assignments/HW quizzes, tests, or any other form of evaluation without explicit permission from the teacher is considered cheating.

4. **Misinformation:** Generating false or misleading information using AI tools and presenting it as factual is prohibited.
5. **Unauthorized Assistance:** Using AI tools to get answers or solutions to problems assigned as independent work without teacher approval is prohibited.
6. **Interference with Learning Objectives:** Using AI tools to bypass the intended learning goals of an assignment is not permitted. *For example, fully translating a foreign language assignment without actively engaging in the translation process undermines skill development.*
7. **Impersonation & Digital Harassment:** Creating fake profiles, social media pages, or AI-generated content that impersonates students, teachers, or staff, whether to mislead, harass, or mock, is strictly prohibited. This includes generating AI-generated images, videos, or deepfakes designed to misrepresent an individual.

E1 - Middle School Students, Grades 6 through 8, Educator Support:

The Traffic-Light System To assist students with identifying when they may use Artificial Intelligence, staff are encouraged to use the "traffic-light" color system to guide students as to how they may use the district-approved tools.

- **Green**: Students can use district-approved AI tools to complete their assignment(s).
- **Yellow**: Controlled use of tools to complete their assignment(s).
- **Red**: Students may not use district-approved tools to complete the assignment.
    - Writing any part of a first draft, unless the teacher designed it as an AI-drafting exercise.
    - Use on any assignment (including homework) the teacher hasn't cleared, except grammar/spell-check.
    - Passing off AI content as personal reflection, opinion, or experience.
    - Turning in AI information without checking it against an independent source.

Regulation Updated: August 2026

Certified Staff: Greenwich Public Schools recognizes that a critical dimension of a quality educational program is the extent to which it provides staff with relevant professional and instructional tools that afford students the opportunity to have a meaningful learning experience.

As such, these instructional tools will support the district's commitment to providing all students with a consistent learning experience aligned with the Connecticut Core Standards. The district also recognizes its responsibility to protect student privacy, adhere to ethical use of such tools, maintain transparency and accountability in establishing clear guidelines and standards, ensure quality and effectiveness, and adhere to applicable federal and state laws and regulations related to AI.

Non-Certified Staff: Greenwich Public Schools recognizes that job functions and roles can be greatly enhanced by utilizing AI to produce documents, job descriptions, and more efficiently by providing a draft for staff as a basis to begin document production within seconds.

A. Definitions

Generative Artificial Intelligence: algorithms (such as ChatGPT) that can be used to create new content, including audio, code, images, text, simulations, and videos."

Non-generative Artificial Intelligence: encompasses a wide range of techniques that focus on programmed rules and tasks such as classification, prediction, and decision-making"

The difference between traditional AI and generative AI lies in its capabilities and application. Traditional AI systems are primarily used to analyze data and make predictions, while generative AI is creating new data similar to its training data.

Staff User: Any GPS employee, certified or non-certified who utilizes AI as a resource

Staff Consumer: Any GPS employee who uses resources and materials generated by AI

Student User: Any GPS student who utilizes AI as a resource

Student Consumer: Any GPS student who uses resources and materials generated by AI

Personal Identifiable Information: Public Act 16-189 defines student data privacy. Personally identifiable information is any information which represents an individual and that information could lead to identification through address, name, grade, any information attached to a particular student.

Machine Learning: Machine learning (ML) is a branch of artificial intelligence (AI) and computer science that focuses on using data and algorithms to enable AI to imitate the way that humans learn, gradually improving its accuracy.

CT Data Privacy Law:

"Educators, school leaders, and education technology providers should review and understand their obligations under Connecticut's student data privacy law (Connecticut General Statutes §§ 10-234aa through 10-234dd). The statute applies to any situation in which districts use educational technology that captures or accesses personal student information, records, or data." (CSDE, 2024)

Forms must be completed and signed off by the company to determine that their platforms are in compliance with CT law. The district manages all compliance forms through the Research Administrator based at Havemeyer who oversees all district technology platforms for instructional use.

B. Access and Permissions

- Access and professional use of Generative and Non Generative Artificial Intelligence Tools are permitted for Greenwich Public Schools staff.
- Any AI tool that does not meet the data privacy policy for the State of Connecticut, and the GPS Policy, cannot be used by students on GPS campuses or with GPS internet access.
- Any new curricular tool for staff or teachers must be vetted by the Research Manager for approval, using the approval form.
- In the eventuality that tools are approved for grade-level specified student use, educators have autonomy on the use of approved AI tools within the classroom.

C. Ethical Use

Use in the Creation of Instructional Resources:

- Ensure that all AI use is aligned to curriculum standards, and vetted before used in instruction.
- Maintaining student anonymity and privacy- personal identifying information (PII) when generating AI prompts

Citing:

- Acknowledgment / citation of AI use if important
- Following expectations of assignment
    - Use of AI as a tool to help generate ideas not do your work for you
    - What skills are you being asked to demonstrate
    - Can use to summarize research (but not do the research for you)

For students:

Adherence to Policy:

Review your School's student and faculty handbooks and policies. GPS expects that schools will be developing and updating their policies as we better understand the implications of using Generative AI tools. In the meantime, faculty should be clear with students they're teaching and advising about their policies on permitted uses, if any, of Generative AI in classes and on academic work. Students are also encouraged to ask their instructors for clarification about these policies as needed. - Harvard.edu (2024)

D. Data Privacy and Security

Teacher Guidance on Utilizing AI for Professional Work (not with students)

- Staff should not upload ANY student identifiable information in a tool.
- Individual student names should not be put into AI
- Minimize any data upload to what is absolutely necessary
- Data collection concerns: make sure that only the approved sites are used to create documents via AI while at school and on the school network.
- All tools that are approved by GPS have signed COPA and data privacy to secure information

Typical Use Cases:

1. Grading Assistance: upload student work for assessment results to support/grading/feedback/data analysis
2. Create Assessments: create assessments or assignments based on standards and learning objectives. However, any assessments/assignments must be administered through a tool approved by the district for student use.
3. Modify content or assignments to meet the needs of individual students without utilizing their name. For instance, modifying the reading level of a passage or literary work.

Personally Identifiable Information (PII) includes, but is not limited to:

1. Staff/Student/Parent Guardian First and Last Names, including initials
2. Staff/Student/Parent Guardian Emails
3. Staff/Student/Parent Guardian Addresses
4. Student ID Numbers
5. Student/Staff Photographs

E. Academic Integrity

- AI-generated content can be inaccurate, misleading, or entirely fabricated (sometimes called "hallucinations") or may contain copyrighted material. You are responsible for any content that you publish that includes AI-generated material.
- Educator use of AI generated content should be ***properly cited.****
- Student academic integrity when utilizing AI prohibits a student from utilizing a generation system and presenting that work as one's one.

F. Academic Integrity - STUDENT

Core AI Use Attributes

1. **Transparency**: Clearly indicate which parts of the assignment were generated or assisted by the AI chatbot.
2. **Attribution**: Use proper citation formats as demonstrated above to attribute the AI chatbot.
3. **Contextual Use**: Ensure that the use of AI chatbots aligns with the assignment guidelines and is approved by the teacher.
4. **Accuracy**: Verify the information provided by the AI chatbot, as it may not always be accurate or reliable.

Acceptable Student Use of AI Tools using Personal Device/Wi-Fi

1. Learning Aid: Students may use AI tools for learning purposes, such as:

Stratford Public Schools

6141.3272, 4118.53/4218.53 Use of Artificial Intelligence in Education

Stratford Public Schools

Administration Center
1000 East Broadway, Stratford, CT 06615

BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY: USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN EDUCATION
P6141.3273(a)
P4118.53/
P4218.53

AI Policy Cover Page
Board of Education Policy: Use of Artificial Intelligence in Education

Section 1: Purpose and Commitment:
The Board of Education is committed to fostering high levels of learning, critical thinking, and opportunities for self-expression through innovative and effective educational practices. In alignment with our Portrait of a Graduate, this policy acknowledges the transformative potential of generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) in education, while emphasizing responsible, ethical, and equitable use. By leveraging AI tools, we aim to enhance teaching and learning outcomes while equipping students with essential skills for the digital age. The use of AI in Stratford Public Schools shall be aligned with the mission and vision of the school district.
This policy applies to AI software, services, and appliances and encompasses the use of AI tools on school premises, during school-sponsored activities, and in the completion of school-related assignments and/or projects. It also applies to developed, procured, and embedded AI.

As per PA 23-16, Artificial Intelligence (AI) means an AI system that:

- Performs tasks under varying and unpredictable circumstances without significant human oversight or can learn from experience and improve such performance when exposed to data sets,
- Is developed in any context, including, but not limited to, software or physical hardware, and capable of solving tasks that require human-like perception, cognition, planning, learning, communication, or physical
  action,
- Is designed to think or act like a human, including, but not limited to, a cognitive architecture or neural network or act rationally, including, but not limited to, an intelligent software agent or embodied robot that achieves goals using perception, planning, reasoning, learning, communication, decision-making or action,
- Is made up of a set of techniques, including, but not limited to, machine learning, that is designed to approximate a cognitive task.

P6141.3273(b)
P4118.53/
P4218.53

Section 2: General Guidelines for AI Use

The use of AI in educational settings must adhere to principles of:

- Ethical Responsibility: Ensuring transparency, fairness, and inclusivity.
- Privacy and Security: Protecting personal and private information as mandated by Connecticut's student privacy laws including (but not limited to) FERPA and COPPA.
- Critical Thinking: Promoting thoughtful and informed engagement with AI tools, recognizing their limitations and potential biases.
- Equitable Access: Guaranteeing all students have access to the necessary tools and training to use AI effectively.

Section 3: Staff Use of AI:

Staff are encouraged to explore the potential of AI tools provided by the district to support instructional practices and administrative tasks while maintaining their central role in the teaching and learning process. Staff AI prompting and vetting of AI-generated content must prioritize content area and grade-level standards and take into consideration an understanding of best practices in high-quality task design.

3.1. Sample Permitted Uses:

- Instructional Design: Generating lesson plans, writing prompts, and project ideas.
- Assessment Support: Developing rubrics or providing feedback on staff and student success.
- Content Generation: Using AI for brainstorming, topic exploration, or producing supplemental materials.
- Research Assistance: Employing AI as a smart search tool to gather and analyze information efficiently.

3.2. Professional Development:

- Staff will be offered training on (including but not limited to):
    - The effective and ethical use of AI tools.
    - Recognizing and mitigating potential biases in AI-generated content.
    - Integrating AI into teaching and learning while adhering to academic integrity standards.

3.3. Instructional Practices:

- Create assignments that challenge students to integrate AI tools responsibly, fostering higher-order thinking.

- Incorporate discussions about the ethical implications of AI and its role in modern society.
- Emphasize augmentation over automation, ensuring AI supports rather than replaces instructional roles.

3.4. Collaborative Planning:

- Engage in professional collaboration to:
  - Develop consistent guidelines for AI use.
  - Share best practices for integrating AI into teaching.
  - Address complex ethical and pedagogical challenges posed by AI technologies.

3.5. Equity and Access:

- Teachers must ensure all students have access to AI tools required for assignments.
- Students must be informed about user agreements and compliance with privacy laws before using AI tools.

Section 4: Student Use of AI:

Students are encouraged to use specified age appropriate AI tools as partners in their learning journey, provided such use aligns with principles of academic integrity and responsible technology use.

4.1. Sample Permitted Uses:

- Academic Support: Using AI to generate ideas, refine essays, or receive feedback on drafts to support learning and comprehension.
- Research Assistance: Employing AI for summarizing information or exploring topics including the enhancement of subject-specific learning and skill development.
- Skill Development: Enhancing digital literacy and critical thinking skills by understanding AI's capabilities and limitations.Students are encouraged to use AI to learn coding, data analysis, machine learning, and other technical skills relevant to 21st century careers.
- Creative Projects: AI tools may be used for creative applications such as art generation, music composition, or design, provided they align with the academic objectives and ethical standards outlined in that specific course curriculum.

4.2. Instruction and Training:

- Students will be offered explicit instruction on:
  - When and how to cite AI-generated content.

- The ethical boundaries of AI use, distinguishing between support and cheating.
- The potential biases, inaccuracies, and risks of AI-generated content.
- Privacy concerns and the importance of not sharing personal or private data with AI tools.

4.3. Academic Integrity:

- Students must disclose when they use AI tools to assist in creating assignments or projects. Proper attribution to the AI tool or platform must be included as per teacher or district guidelines. For example, students may include:
  - How AI was used to enhance their work.
  - Which AI-generated suggestions they adopted or rejected and why.
- AI should augment student effort rather than replace it.
- Prohibited Uses:
  - Students are prohibited from using AI tools to plagiarize, cheat, or otherwise misrepresent their own work. This includes using AI to:
    - Generate essays, problem sets, or answers without appropriate attribution or authorization and/or fabricate data or sources.
  - AI must not be used to engage in activities that harm others, such as cyberbullying, harassment, or the creation of inappropriate or offensive content.
  - Students must not use AI tools to collect, share, or misuse personal information about peers, teachers, or others.
  - The use of AI tools not approved by the district for school-related purposes is prohibited.
- Guardrails for AI Use:
  - AI tools should not replace critical thinking or independent learning. Students are encouraged to engage with materials personally before seeking AI assistance.
  - AI-generated content must be verified by students for accuracy and relevance.
  - Students must ensure that AI use aligns with assignment guidelines and teacher expectations.

4.4. Equity and Access:

- Teachers must ensure all students have access to AI tools required for assignments.
- Students must be informed about user agreements and compliance with privacy laws before using AI tools.

P6141.3273(e)
P4118.53/
P4218.53

Section 5: Oversight and Continuous Improvement

5.0 Procurement:

Any district-approved resources with embedded AI, as well as any AI platforms specifically designed for educational application and adopted by the district, must be in compliance with the points outlined in this section of the AI policy.

5.1 Compliance with Legal and Ethical Standards

- AI platforms must adhere to all federal, state, and local laws regarding data privacy, accessibility, and educational technology standards.
- Vendors must provide transparency regarding data collection, storage, and usage, ensuring compliance with FERPA, COPPA, and other relevant regulations.
- AI tools must align with ethical AI principles, including fairness, accountability, and transparency.

5.2 Data Privacy and Security

- AI platforms must use secure encryption protocols for data transmission and storage.
- Personally identifiable information (PII) of students, teachers, and staff must be safeguarded against unauthorized access.
- Vendors must disclose data retention policies and provide options for data deletion upon request.

5.3 Educational Value and Pedagogical Alignment

- AI tools must align with district curricula, instructional goals, and state learning standards.
- Platforms should support differentiated instruction, assistive learning, and inclusivity for diverse student needs.
- Platforms must comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and provide accessibility features such as screen reader compatibility and language translation.
- AI tools should not create or exacerbate inequities among students based on socioeconomic status, language, or learning ability.

5.4 Transparency and Explainability

- Vendors must provide clear documentation on how AI-driven decisions are made, including algorithms used and potential biases.
- Staff must have access to explanations of AI-generated recommendations or insights.

5.5 Cost and Sustainability

- Pricing must be transparent, with clear breakdowns of initial costs, licensing, maintenance, and potential future upgrades.
- The platform should be scalable and adaptable to evolving educational needs and technological advancements.
- AI solutions must demonstrate cost-effectiveness in terms of long-term benefits and support requirements.
- When applicable, platforms adopted by the district will utilize a train the trainer model.

5.6 Vendor Accountability and Support

- Vendors must offer dedicated customer support with defined response times for technical and operational issues.
- Service level agreements (SLAs) must outline uptime guarantees, troubleshooting procedures, and update policies.
- Vendors must be responsive to district feedback and willing to make necessary adjustments for optimal implementation.

5.7 Bias and Fairness Mitigation

- Vendors must disclose efforts to mitigate biases in AI models and provide mechanisms for educators to flag and report potential bias.

5.8 Pilot Testing and Evaluation

- Platforms should undergo a pilot phase within the district before full-scale implementation.
- Measurable outcomes and educator feedback must inform final procurement decisions.
- The district reserves the right to discontinue use if the platform does not meet expectations for effectiveness, safety, and ethical compliance.

By adhering to these procurement expectations, the school district ensures that AI platforms contribute positively to education while upholding ethical, legal, and pedagogical standards.

Section 6: Establishment of AI Taskforce

6.1. AI Taskforce:

The district has established an AI Taskforce comprised of staff, administrators, students, parents, board of education members, community members and legal experts (when necessary) to continually:

- Study the potential advantages and challenges of AI in education to maintain an ability and willingness to recognize and adapt to shifting risks and opportunities.
- Recommend training programs for teachers, students, and parents/legal custodians.
- Develop policies ensuring safe, equitable, and effective use of AI tools in a human-centered manner testing for and protecting against bias.
- Ensure that training related to AI use and the input of data into AI systems complies with applicable laws, regulations, and policies.
- Complete impact assessments on adopted AI systems pursuant to PA 23-16.
- Appointment and/or removal of taskforce members will be determined by the Superintendent.

6.2 Privacy and Data Security:

- The district will evaluate any systems and/or tools with embedded AI prior to implementation to ensure they comply with privacy laws, including FERPA and COPPA as well as district policies.
- Staff and students must not input sensitive information into AI systems.
- AI tools must not be used to store or process confidential or sensitive school-related data without district approval.
- Consequences of misuse:
    - Violations of this policy will be addressed in accordance with the Stratford Public Schools Code of Conduct.
    - Consequences may include loss of access to AI tools, academic penalties, or other disciplinary actions as deemed appropriate.

6.3 Policy Review:

This policy will be reviewed regularly by the AI Taskforce to adapt to evolving AI technologies and educational needs. Updates will reflect ongoing research, technological advancements, feedback from stakeholders, and evolving educational needs.

6.4 Community Engagement:

The Board will actively engage the school community to:

- Discuss ethical and practical implications of AI use.
- Promote transparency and understanding of AI's role in education.
- Ensure all families understand how AI is being used in the school system as well as how to monitor its use at home.

P6141.3273(h)
P4118.53/
P4218.53

Section 7: Conclusion

As AI technologies continue to evolve, this policy serves as a framework for fostering innovation while addressing the complex ethical, pedagogical, and practical challenges they present. By promoting responsible and equitable use of AI, the Board of Education reaffirms its commitment to preparing students for success in an increasingly digital world.

Weston Public Schools

6187 Generative AI (Artificial Intelligence)

6187 Regulation Generative AI (Artificial Intelligence)

P 6187 Generative AI (Artificial Intelligence)

The Weston Board of Education is committed to providing its students with the most innovative and effective educational experiences to foster high levels of learning and opportunities for self-expression. As Weston prepares students for a future that demands adaptability, critical thinking, and digital literacy, the district recognizes the potential of generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) and other related technology tools.

For purposes of this policy, generative AI refers to any software that uses machine learning to produce text and/ or media. As with all educational materials as defined in Policy 6161, including technologies, users must be mindful of and adhere to all considerations ensuring responsible and ethical use, especially as it relates to mitigating bias, promoting transparency, and ensuring the benefits of AI are accessible to all staff and students.

Generative AI (Artificial Intelligence) for teachers and students is aligned to the Weston Public Schools Policy 6161 and will be taken into consideration, along with the attached regulations, when making decisions to incorporate such tools into the educational environment in Weston.

While ensuring the responsible use for those interacting with and creating content from generative AI technologies, the Board underscores its commitment to fostering a dynamic and engaging learning environment. The district understands its responsibility to leverage the advances in AI to enhance student learning outcomes and equip students with the skills and dispositions needed for success in the digital age through the adopted curriculum.

Legal References:

Policy References:

4118.2, Personnel - Certified

4118.35 Employee Use of the District's Computer Systems and Electronic Communications

5125.1, Student Privacy

5135, Student Use of the District's Computer Systems and Internet Safety

6010.1, Academic Honesty

6161, Equipment, Books, and Materials

Administrative Regulations

4118.2, Personnel - Certified

4118.35 Employee Use of the District's Computer Systems and Electronic Communications

5135, Student Use of the District's Computer Systems and Internet Safety

6161, Equipment, Books, and Materials

Policy Adopted: June 17, 2024

Weston Public Schools Weston, Connecticut

R 6187 Generative AI (Artificial Intelligence)

The Weston Board of Education, in its commitment to supporting teachers and students in their use of generative AI, recognizes many challenges to overcome and significant opportunities to explore that will ultimately deepen the teaching/learning process. The following considerations are offered to guide, support, and deliver on the opportunities expressed in P5125.1/5135/6010.1/6161

Weston Public Schools uses a "team" approach when making decisions to adopt effective generative AI tools for students and teachers. A district AI Advisory Committee, including staff and administrators will be charged with studying the potential advantages and challenges of AI and recommending training on the tools for teachers, students, and parents to support the district's commitment to using AI ethically, responsibly and safely. Any tool that involves the use of student data must comply with the CT Student Privacy Law.

In addition to the general policy guidelines, the following specific guidelines are set forth for greater clarification. Effective Generative AI tools for students and staff should be considered on the basis of:

Guidelines for Adopting Effective Generative AI Tools for Students:

- The tool must comply with the technology's user agreement and CT's student privacy law.
- The tool will meet the internal criteria aligned to the guidelines as put forth by the AI Advisory Committee
- The tool will support the appropriate use of Generative AI as defined in Policies P5125.1/5135/6010.1/6161

Guidelines for Adopting Effective Generative AI Tools:

- The tool supports Weston's pedagogical approaches to the district's curriculum framework and expectations for lesson and activity design for students.
- The tool creates an environment for colleagues to confer, collaborate, and openly discuss and generate ideas, topics, student tasks, and other ways to enhance the curriculum implementation
- The teacher's use of the tool will follow the best practices guidelines set forth by the AI Advisory Committee, which highlight the value of teacher expertise

The only certainty that exists in the area of AI technology is it will continue to evolve and be more impactful in all of our lives; it will continue to raise complex and contentious pedagogical and ethical dilemmas, and it will provide teachers and students with new and

unforeseen opportunities. The above "guidelines" are provided with the hope of initiating healthy and productive discussions and advancing higher levels of critical thinking and cognitive engagement.

Regulation adopted: June 17, 2024

Weston Public Schools Weston, Connecticut

Westport Public Schools

Draft Policy 8636 Artificial Intelligence (AI)

Draft Policy 8636

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (AI)

Purpose

The Board of Education recognizes that AI is increasingly embedded in digital tools used in education, employment, communication, and everyday life. The Board also supports the responsible, effective, and developmentally appropriate use of AI in the curriculum, District operations, digital citizenship, and students' preparation for life beyond school. At the same time, the Board is responsible for the healthy and productive learning environment of the district and approaches AI with this paramount in mind.

AI may provide opportunities to enhance teaching, learning, accessibility, communication, creativity, and District operations. It may also create risks involving accuracy, bias, privacy, security, academic integrity, equity, copyright, and students' learning processes.

The District will approach AI in a manner that protects students' thinking, learning processes, and experiences. AI should support learning, not replace the intellectual effort, productive struggle, creativity, judgment, relationships, and human interaction through which meaningful learning occurs.

Definitions

For purposes of this policy:

AI means a machine-based system that performs tasks commonly associated with human intelligence, including recognizing patterns, analyzing information, making predictions, recommending actions, or generating content in any form, including, but not limited to, text, images, audio, video, computer code, data analysis, or other content in response to user input.

District-approved tool means an AI tool that has been reviewed and authorized for the proposed use in accordance with District procedures concerning instruction, technology, accessibility, privacy, security, and legal compliance.

Guidelines

All District policies, regulations, procedures, instructional expectations, and codes of conduct remain applicable when AI is used. AI may not be used to violate, evade, or circumvent any District policy, regulation, procedure, instructional expectation, contractual obligation, or legal requirement.

Guiding Principles

The use of AI for District purposes shall be guided by the following principles:

- Support Learning, Not Replace Learning: AI should support learning rather than replace the thinking, reading, writing, calculation, problem-solving, discussion, creativity, or skill development required by the learning objective. The speed with which AI can produce an answer or product shall not take priority over the time, effort, reasoning, and human interaction necessary for meaningful learning.
- Human Responsibility: Students and employees remain responsible for the content, accuracy, quality, appropriateness, and consequences of work they create, submit, use, distribute, or publish with the assistance of AI.
- Human Judgment: AI may assist with analysis and decision-making but may not serve as a substitute for human judgment or as the predominant basis for grading, placement, disciplinary, personnel, evaluative, or other consequential decisions.
- Transparency and Authenticity: Students and employees shall represent their work honestly and will disclose the use of AI when required by this policy, District regulations, administrative guidance, or the individual responsible for the assignment or activity.
- Privacy and Security: AI tools may be used for District purposes only when their use complies with applicable laws, regulations, contracts, and District policies governing privacy, security, records, and acceptable use, being careful not to divulge personally identifiable information.
- Equity and Access: No student shall be disadvantaged because the student does not have access to an AI tool, paid service, device, or internet connection outside of school. Conversely, no student will be rewarded or gain advantage for using AI on an assignment unless expressly instructed to do so and provided with access by staff or faculty.

Developmentally Appropriate Student Use

Student use of AI shall be developmentally appropriate, connected to an instructional purpose, and consistent with the intended learning objective. AI shall not replace the use or development of foundational skills, original student thinking, or meaningful human interaction.

The Superintendent or designee shall establish developmentally appropriate guidance, which may restrict or prohibit independent student use of AI in particular grade levels or instructional contexts.

Student Use and Academic Integrity

Students are responsible for submitting work that reflects their own learning and for the accuracy, appropriateness, and originality of that work.

Instructional staff shall communicate whether and how AI may be used for an assignment. If permission is not communicated, students must assume that AI is not permitted.

Students may not use AI to replace their own thinking or required work, complete an assessment without permission, submit AI-generated content as their own, fabricate information or sources, disclose protected information through an unapproved tool, or violate any District policy or regulation.

Unauthorized or misleading use of AI shall be addressed in accordance with the Code of Conduct and applicable academic integrity expectations.

When there is a reasonable concern that work does not reflect a student's own learning, the student may be asked to explain the work, provide evidence of the process used, or demonstrate understanding in another way.

Employee Use and Professional Responsibility

Employees may use District-approved AI tools when consistent with their professional responsibilities, applicable laws, District policies and regulations, and instructional or operational expectations.

AI may support planning, differentiation, accessibility, communication, analysis, and other professional tasks. It shall complement, not replace, employee expertise, professional judgment, and knowledge of students.

Employees remain responsible for all AI-assisted content they use, share, or rely upon and must review it for accuracy, appropriateness, bias, accessibility, copyright, privacy, and alignment with District expectations.

AI may not serve as the sole basis for grading, discipline, placement, special education, counseling, personnel, or other decisions that significantly affect any student.

Employees shall disclose substantive use of AI when relevant to authorship, authenticity, transparency, trust, or the educational purpose of the material. Routine use of embedded assistive features does not require disclosure unless otherwise directed.

Employees may not enter student records, confidential personnel information, or other protected information into an AI tool unless the action is expressly authorized by the Superintendent of Schools or designee.

Data Privacy, Confidentiality, and Security

Students and employees may use only District-approved AI tools for District purposes.

Protected, confidential, proprietary, sensitive, or personally identifiable information may not be entered into an AI tool unless the action is expressly authorized by the Superintendent of Schools or designee.

Use of AI shall comply with applicable privacy, security, records, copyright, and data protection laws, as well as District policies, contracts, and data privacy agreements.

The Superintendent or designee will use an established process for reviewing and approving AI tools and their permitted uses, in consultation with the Data Protection Officer and appropriate instructional, technology, and administrative leaders.

Equity and Access

Students will not be required to purchase or independently obtain access to an AI service to complete District coursework, nor should coursework be assigned without ensuring appropriate access for the assignment.

When student use of an AI tool is appropriate, the District shall provide access to an approved tool or a reasonable alternative that allows the student to meet the same learning objective.

Training and Communication

The District shall provide students with developmentally appropriate instruction and employees with professional learning concerning the responsible use of AI.

The District shall communicate applicable expectations to students, employees, and families.

Cross-References

- 0115, Student Harassment and Bullying Prevention and Intervention
- 1120, School District Records
- 1120R, School District Records Regulation
- 4526, Computer Network and Technology Acceptable Use
- 4526R, Computer Network and Technology Acceptable Use Regulations
- 4526.1, Internet Safety
- 4526.1R, Internet Safety Regulations
- 5300, Code of Conduct
- 5500, Student Records
- 5550, Student Privacy
- 8635, Protecting Personally Identifiable Information and Notification of Security Breach

Legal References

- Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, 20 USC §1232g; 34 CFR Part 99
- New York Education Law §2-d
- Public Officers Law §84 et seq.
- New York Labor Law §203-d
- New York State Technology Law §208
- 8 NYCRR Part 121

Adoption date: