

Developing Policy and Protocols for the use of Generative AI in K-12 Classrooms



Purpose

Generative Artificial Intelligence (genAI) can be leveraged for use in education in a variety of ways with students and to enhance and streamline the work of staff in other roles that directly or indirectly support students. Districts can integrate genAI into educational practices while mitigating risk through developing guidance and/or policy that promotes **safe, ethical, and effective** use of AI among students and staff.

This resource is intended to provide resources and a framework for districts developing such policies. It is intended to be used along with ODE's [Generative Artificial Intelligence \(AI\) in K-12 Classrooms](#) guidance.

Policy Landscape

Prior to setting school and district policies on the use of AI technologies, it is vital that school and district leaders are aware of federal and state policies that impact the use of these technologies. [The Oregon Student Information Protection Act \(OSIPA\)](#), [Children's Internet Protection Act \(CIPA\)](#), [Children's Online Privacy Protection Act \(COPPA\)](#), and [Family Educational Rights Privacy Act \(FERPA\)](#) are privacy laws which have implications for AI use by students and staff. More information relating to the implications of these laws specific to AI policy development can be found embedded throughout this document.

When making policy decisions related to genAI, it is important to consider the learning opportunities that might be enhanced or limited for students. As AI literacy is becoming a necessary job skill for most careers, districts must consider both the benefits and risks of how genAI is embedded into the educational landscape. Being aware of other policies both within and outside of Oregon can be helpful in making informed decisions.

Federal Policies & Guidance

The US Office of Educational Technology is currently working on developing policies and supports that focus on the effective, safe, and fair use of genAI-enabled educational technology. Their [Artificial Intelligence website](#) can provide a great starting point for understanding current policies in this area.

While there have been no federal policies related to the use of genAI technologies in education, at the release of this resource, in March 2025, the U.S. Copyright Office, Library of Congress, released a policy that has impacts on the use of works containing material generated by artificial intelligence. The full text of this policy can be reviewed [here](#).

The US Office of Educational Technology published a brief in May 2023 titled "[Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Teaching and Learning](#)." In October 2024 they released "[Empowering Education Leaders: A Toolkit for Safe, Ethical, and Equitable AI Integration](#)." These briefs provide insights and recommendations regarding building ethical, equitable policies in addition to information about the use of genAI in teaching, best practices for instruction including formative assessment, and research around the use of genAI in classrooms and beyond. These briefs along with additional work supported by the US Office of Educational Technology support a focus on the effective, safe, and fair use of genAI-enabled educational technology. Furthermore, the US Department of Education's "[Avoiding the Discriminatory Use of Artificial Intelligence](#)" helps districts be aware of, monitor for, and actively prevent the potential for AI tools to discriminate against individual students and/or focal groups.

While not specific to genAI, the US Department of Education in January 2024 released its updated [National Educational Technology Plan \(NETP\)](#). The plan is framed around the concept of the three Digital Divides in education:

- **Digital Use Divide:** Inequitable implementation of instructional tasks supported by technology which can vary between students who are asked to actively use technology in their learning to analyze, build, produce, and create using digital tools and students encountering instructional tasks where they are asked to use technology for passive assignment completion.
- **Digital Design Divide:** Inequitable access to time and support of professional learning for teachers, educators, and practitioners to build their professional capacity to design learning experiences for students using education technology.
- **Digital Access Divide:** Inequitable access to connectivity, devices, and digital content. This divide also includes considerations for equitable accessibility and access to instruction in digital health, safety, and citizenship skills.

The three Digital Divides include the following equity considerations for the use of AI:

- How can the district ensure all students who use genAI are given opportunities to use do so in creative, dynamic ways?
- How can the district dedicate sufficient time and resources to educator professional learning around integration of genAI into instruction?
- How can the district support all students having access to broadband internet and the devices that capitalize on that access so they can benefit from available genAI tools?

Policy Guidance from National Organizations

As K-12 schools and districts spend more time learning about the use of generative AI in classrooms, policies continue to change at a rapid pace with districts that initially banned platforms such as ChatGPT shifting toward embracing its potential in the classroom.

In light of these developments, several organizations have emerged as leading voices regarding the development of AI use policy for K-12 schools and have released comprehensive guidance documents:

AI for Education - [Guide to Developing an AI Policy For Your School](#)

CoSN - [Readiness Checklist](#)

CoSN - [Maturity Checklist](#)

Kapor Center - [Responsible AI and Tech Justice: A Guide for K-12 Education](#)

ILO Group - [Framework for Implementing Artificial Intelligence \(AI\) in K-12 Education](#)

ISTE - [Setting Conditions For Success: Creating Effective Responsible Use Policies for Schools](#)

TeachAI - [Guidance for Schools](#)

TeachAI - [Foundational Policy Ideas](#)

These resources can be used in isolation or in combination with each other and/or this resource.

Oregon District Guidance/Policies

Some Oregon districts have developed AI policies and/or guidance and have agreed to share these so they may serve as examples for others:

Salem-Keizer Public Schools - [Academic Integrity and use of AI](#) & [Staff Use of AI](#)

Eugene 4J SD - [AI Application Guidelines](#)

North Clackamas SD - [Artificial Intelligence in the North Clackamas SD](#)

Tigard Tualatin SD - [Academic Integrity](#) & [Responsible Use of Technology](#)

Hillsboro - [Generative AI Guidance](#)

Schools and districts who are exploring the use of generative AI tools are encouraged to contact the Oregon Department of Education when developing policy related to AI technologies for both technical support as well as opportunities to connect with other districts in order to learn from each other. Please contact ODE's Digital Learning Team (ode.digitallearning@ode.oregon.gov) with questions, current policies, and technical support needs.

How To Use The Worksheet

The worksheet is designed to help districts determine both their process for policy development as well as the specifics of that policy.

1. Guidance/policy principles: This lists overarching principles that districts will want to consider when making decisions about guidance/policy and the process for developing it.
2. Guidance or policy?: Here, the document describes a process for determining whether *policy* or *guidance* around genAI use is needed within the district.
3. Goals: After this determination, the majority of the worksheet follows a backwards design approach.
 - a. Each section begins with a goal that AI guidance/policy should meet.
 - b. Aligned to each goal is a set of recommended tasks for districts to follow.
 - c. Each section will pose several related guiding questions for districts to consider as they plan and accomplish those tasks, with the answer to each serving as a component of either the district's planning process or guidance/policy.

Guidance/Policy Principles

Generative AI tools are a new and rapidly evolving development which requires educators to consider novel and not-yet-defined issues. However, there are established principles of technology integration which apply well to genAI. When considering principles to apply to AI guidance or policy, there is a mix of those which apply to educational technology in general and some that are unique to the use of AI tools.

These principles are described here in detail. Remember to consider these principles when making process or guidance/policy decisions.

- **Align AI guidance to district's existing policies, mission, and values:** Thinking deeply about what practices align with established policies, mission, and values allows a district to capitalize on the promise of genAI in line with established principles, and can reduce the need to create novel policy from scratch.
- **Use genAI to support the growth of all students:** AI greatly increases educator's ability to improve outcomes for all students through differentiating instruction, and special consideration should be applied for using genAI to support students experiencing poverty, multilingual learners, students with disabilities, and students identified as TAG. Also, the US Department of Education has created a framework around equity in digital learning known as the "[Three Digital Divides](#)" - the digital *use* divide (the passive vs creative ways students are enabled to use technology), the digital *design* divide (how prepared teachers are to support the creative use of digital tools by their students), and the digital *access* divide (whether students have access to broadband connectivity and modern devices that allow for creative use of technology). This framework may be useful in considering how genAI can make learning more equitable.
- **Maintain safety:** The use of genAI tools has implications for student safety in several areas including bias, guardrails, data privacy, and oversharing.
 - Bias: Since genAI outputs are modeled after content generated by humans - who are inherently biased - genAI can also generate output that is biased. Part of AI literacy is helping staff and students understand this and develop practices to notice, call out, and react appropriately to biased outputs. Relatedly, staff must be prepared to support the emotional needs of students who have experienced and been harmed by biased content.
 - Guardrails: Next, "guardrails" refer to the restrictions AI developers place on what content can and cannot be generated by their tools. Verifying a tools' guardrails, including age range considerations, prior to student use is an essential practice. Certain tools are meant to be used only by users of a certain age and/or only with parent permission. Districts need to be aware of these policies and consider the parameters for safe use, as aligned to state and federal student data privacy laws (OSIPA, FERPA, CIPA, and COPPA). ISTE's [Setting Conditions For Success: Creating Effective Responsible Use Policies for Schools](#) provides additional details regarding use policies.

- **Data Privacy & Oversharing:** Lastly, data privacy is vital. Staff and students must understand that any personally identifying information (PII) they enter into an AI tool becomes public knowledge. A cornerstone of AI literacy is teaching strict avoidance of oversharing (sharing personal information with AI). One emerging solution to these safety concerns, in addition to sound policy and robust AI literacy, is using “closed” or “custom” genAI tools. While more complex, these allow districts to customize what data sets the AI tool pulls from, what types of queries it will respond to and how, and/or protects data entered from being accessed by external sources.
- **Define ethical use:** Student plagiarism is likely one of the most common ethical concerns with the use of AI. AI use policies should define to what extent genAI can be used and how students need to disclose the use of genAI based on the type of assignment. Districts may want to consider similar disclosure requirements for staff. Another, and likely more consequential aspect of ethical AI use, connects to digital citizenship: how do students’ actions with genAI tools impact their own well-being and that of their peers and other community members? GenAI has brought about novel forms of abuse and harassment, especially in the form of synthetic media (e.g. “deepfakes”). A robust digital citizenship effort is recommended in the face of this challenge.
- **Center human decision-making:** There is a natural tendency when using genAI tools to allow them to “do the thinking” as they seem to mimic human thought and performance. However, these tools are imperfect, sometimes providing output that is biased or inaccurate. Therefore, centering human decision making in the use of AI tools is vital. Consider the “80/20 principle”, which refers to the general practice of allowing AI tools to do 80% of a task, while the human user’s role is to perform the other 20% by revising and improving the output based on their human perspective and insight. This principle applies regardless of context, whether AI is being used for instructional purposes or by other staff using tools to enhance or streamline their work.
- **Support innovation in use and policy:** As this technology is expanding at rapid speed, it is likely that its uses in education will continue to expand, thus providing additional ways in which to create equitable learning opportunities for students. Establishing collaborative learning structures for teachers that allow staff to experiment and develop novel and expanded uses of AI by learning together before they utilize AI tools with students can help your staff and students maximize the benefits that AI offers. Additionally, building a process for revision into guidance/policy allows districts to be more responsive to the changing AI landscape and its impact on student learning.

Guidance or Policy?

The overall goal of guidance or policy is to ensure safe and ethical use of AI. The first decision point facing districts is whether guidance or policy is needed to support the district’s plans with how they use genAI. Policy creation or revision is a lengthier and more complex process as it may require school board approval, while guidance generally does not, as it simply clarifies applications of existing policy. Therefore, districts may first want to determine if guidance will be sufficient, and if so, pursue that simpler solution instead of crafting policy from scratch. This decision will center around the district’s existing policies that could apply to genAI use. These might include, but are not limited, to:

- Acceptable/Responsible Use Policy
- Data Governance Policy
- Data Privacy Policy
- Student Code of Conduct Policy
- Academic Integrity Policy
- Harassment, intimidation or bullying, and cyberbullying Policy (ORS 339.356)

The fundamental question districts should ask is “Do our existing policies align with our goals around **safe and ethical** use of AI tools?”. To make that determination, it’s helpful to first have a clear definition of safe and ethical use. Listed below are foundational aspects of safe and ethical use. This list is not exhaustive, and local context may prompt additional considerations. Next, are work spaces to consider your existing policies, whether guidance or policy is needed, and next steps for aligning existing policy to AI needs.

Safe Use: Below are the main aspects of Safe Use (see “Guidance/Policy Principles” above for more detail).

- Bias
- Content guardrails
- Data privacy & Oversharing

Safe use step 1: Which of your existing policies address safe use of technology? List or link below.

Safe use step 2: Do these policies address safety needs related to genAI use?

Yes

No

Yes - only guidance is needed to clarify how policies apply to safe use of genAI.
No - existing policy needs to be revised, and/or new policy needs to be created.

Safe use step 3: What is needed to support safe use?

If guidance was the determination, what clarification should that guidance focus on?

If policy revision or creation is needed, what gaps should policy fill? Module 9 of [“Empowering Education Leaders: A Toolkit for Safe, Ethical, and Equitable AI Integration”](#) can support this assessment.

Ethical Use: Below are the main aspects of **Student** Ethical Use (see “Guidance/Policy Principles” above for more detail).

- Digital ethics:
 - How does the content you’re creating and/or sharing impact you and others?
 - How does the content you and others are consuming and/or sharing impact you and others?
- Academic integrity:
 - Assessments
 - Crediting sources/plagiarism

The main factors for **Staff** Ethical Use to consider are:

- Centering human decision making
- Disclosure of use

Ethical use step 1: Which of your existing policies address ethical use of technology? List or link below.

Ethical use step 2: Do these policies address ethical needs related to genAI use?

Yes

No

Yes - only guidance is needed to clarify how policies apply to safe use of genAI.
No - existing policy needs to be revised, and/or new policy needs to be created.

Ethical use step 3: What is needed to support ethical use?

If guidance was the determination, what clarification should that guidance focus on?

If policy revision or creation is needed, what gaps should policy fill? Module 9 of “[Empowering Education Leaders: A Toolkit for Safe, Ethical, and Equitable AI Integration](#)” can support this assessment.

Goal A: Value and integrate input from community partners, including caregivers, students, teachers, and administrators

Recommended tasks:

- Form an AI-focused committee: Forming an AI committee can help you both foster internal leadership as well as engage important partners within the community. Involve staff, students, parents and caregivers along with community partners and district and school leadership. Consider including perspectives of all staff who might use AI in their work and/or need to be aware of the impacts of AI use in schools -classified staff, counselors, social workers, school psychologists, and school nurses are examples of additional roles to include in policy formation or tech adoption decisions and may lend insight to your process. *(Depending on the size of the school or district, consider partnering with other schools or districts across the state in order to engage collaboratively with this process.)* Modules 6, 7, and 10 of [“Empowering Education Leaders: A Toolkit for Safe, Ethical, and Equitable AI Integration”](#) offer additional guidance.
- Review the [“Community Engagement Toolkit.”](#)
- Provide teaching and learning sessions to community members about the use of AI programs in schools including both opportunities and concerns/risks. Schools and districts are encouraged to use the above tools as a starting point for these sessions.
- Consult with Tribes as required by the [Tribal Consultation toolkit](#).
- Consult with the school board to share perspectives learned during community engagement
- Consult the [Equity Decision Tools for School Leaders](#). *Suggested focus: Deepening Question – Does your decision deepen a sense of community and relational trust?*

<p>Process questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Who are the internal staff and external partners to consult with in your district? Are there existing groups or structures that can be leveraged to facilitate this collaboration, such as school site councils or parent groups? How will participants be recruited? What other considerations may impact the success of this group given what you know about local needs and who will be participating?• How can parents and caregivers be brought alongside as partners in supporting ongoing safe and ethical use of AI by students in all settings?• How might AI spark dialogue around broader media/ digital/ algorithmic literacies that will continue to impact students’ lives?• How are opportunities for educators to share their experiences related to the equity implications of AI being created when developing policy and revisiting policy?• How are student, family, and the larger communities’ voices being centered in developing AI policy, specifically regarding equity implications for multilingual students and students with disabilities?• How are youth voices involved in choosing and using AI for learning?	<p>Process takeaways:</p>
	<p>Guidance/policy takeaways:</p>

Goal B: Articulate how AI will be used to align with and advance the district’s established mission and values

Recommended tasks:

- Examine how the use of AI supports your district’s mission and values, and provide communication around this topic that is accessible to the community
- Clearly define your vision for learning and how educational technology broadly and AI specifically might align with that vision. Continue to refer to this during policy development to ensure alignment between your vision and the policies being developed

<p>Process question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• How will feedback received during the engagement process be used as an opportunity for clarity and alignment to the district’s established mission and values? <p>Guidance/policy question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What are your district’s mission, vision, and values? How does AI use by students and staff embody these cornerstones? Does AI use potentially conflict with them in any way?	<p>Process takeaways:</p>
	<p>Guidance/policy takeaways:</p>

Goal C: Focus on student and staff safety, and review products and services

Recommended tasks:

- Self-assess for and develop readiness: Before implementing the use of AI, ensure district leadership, operational, data, technical, and security readiness. The [CoSN Readiness checklist](#) can be a particularly useful tool for this step.
- Ensure that student data privacy is central to conversations by reviewing aligned policies including [Family Educational Rights & Privacy Act \(FERPA\)](#), the [Children's Internet Privacy Act \(CIPA\)](#), the [Children's Online Privacy and Protection Act \(COPPA\)](#) and the [Oregon Student Information Protection Act \(OSIPA\)](#).
 - FERPA: FERPA requires schools to protect the privacy of personally identifiable information (PII) in education records and give parents certain rights over this information. AI systems trained on student data containing PII may reveal sensitive student information, making it difficult to comply with FERPA's high de-identification standard. Thus, schools must ensure AI tools facilitate exercising parents' and eligible students' FERPA rights, such as accessing and amending education records.
 - CIPA: CIPA requires schools receiving E-Rate funding to implement internet filtering and content monitoring. Schools often use AI tools to facilitate online content filtering and student monitoring required by CIPA.
 - COPPA: COPPA requires companies to obtain verifiable parental consent before collecting data from children under 13. The law regulates edtech companies that collect student data to train AI tools used in schools with children under 13, and limits how children's data can be used to train AI tools without parental consent.
 - OSIPA: OSIPA prohibits operators of online services from using student data for targeted advertising or creating student profiles for non-educational purposes. It requires operators to implement security measures to protect student data and notify schools of unauthorized disclosures. Under OSIPA, schools can contract with AI providers to use student data for specific educational purposes like personalizing learning, but providers cannot use the data for other purposes. As some vendors are unaware of this Oregon-specific law, districts should inquire as to how vendors adhere to OSIPA.
 - Here are links to the data privacy policies of the most commonly used tools' vendors - [OpenAI](#), [Microsoft](#), [Google](#), [Meta](#), [Anthropic](#), [MagicSchool](#), and [Khanmigo](#).
- Consider the safety and privacy implications of multimodal AI tools (those which can capture images and sound as well as text).
- Consider guidelines and policies for school and student safety: Include references to policies addressing harassment, intimidation, bullying, and cyberbullying as required by [ORS 339.356](#).
- Include protocols for reviewing a tool's privacy policies and features prior to use. Both updates of existing tools and release of new tools are occurring frequently. Staying abreast of these developments while reviewing tools' safety and data policies prior to staff and student use is essential. An AI playground - a space where staff can collaboratively experiment with AI tools without students - can support this practice.
- Consult the [Equity Decision Tools for School Leaders](#). *Suggested focus: Review Equity Decision tree discussion (step #1) and revise as needed based on findings from community engagement.*
- Review [ODE's Digital Instructional Material Toolkit](#) to ensure that you are making evidence-based decisions on the use of educational technologies (edtech) in schools.
- Consider developing a tool for evaluation by building off of tools such as [EdTech Center's Online/Tech Tool Evaluation](#) as a starting point for review. Also, third party organizations, such as Common Sense Media, have begun maintaining a [list of AI tools they have reviewed](#), as has [ISTE](#).
- The US Department of Education has [a website dedicated to assisting districts with student privacy issue](#).
- Consult Module 2 and "Informed adoption" within "[Empowering Education Leaders: A Toolkit for Safe, Ethical, and Equitable AI Integration](#)"

Process questions:

- What ongoing methods of staff professional development and student learning will best ensure understanding of how to use AI ethically and the consequences of using AI to harass, bully, or intimidate?
- If you used the “[Readiness Checklist](#)” or similar self-assessment tool, what areas emerged as strengths? How can you leverage these areas of strength? What areas need to progress before widespread AI use by students and staff? How will you develop readiness in these areas?

Guidance/policy questions:

- What are your existing policies around harassment, intimidation, bullying, and cyberbullying? Do they need to be revised to address AI-related concerns, particularly as they relate to synthetic media and the potential creation or sharing of deepfakes? How might these concerns affect equitable practices in school discipline?
- Do you currently have a process in place to determine if a tool is safe and appropriate for students to use? Are there resources you plan to use in order to review AI tools, such as those from [Common Sense Media](#) or [ISTE](#)? Consider partnering with your ESD or other neighboring districts.
- Which staff will hold this responsibility for reviewing tools? How will their findings be shared with others?
- What qualities will you use to determine if an AI tool is safe and effective for student use?
- Will the use of multimodal tools be permitted? If so, what additional guidelines are needed to ensure that students’ images and voices (or any other PII) are not uploaded via a multimodal tool?

Process takeaways:

Guidance/policy takeaways:

Goal D: Describe how different applications of AI can potentially help advance areas of equity within district schools and improve outcomes for all students, specifically district and school student focal groups

Recommended tasks:

- Apply ODE’s equity decision tree: AI presents education leaders with novel questions and challenges. [ODE’s Equity Decision Tools](#) can support leaders with making clear choices with a consistent check against guiding values and input before arriving at recommendations for teacher and student practices. *Suggested starting place: Decision Tree and Deepening Questions – What is the problem? What are the interior conditions?*
- Consult Modules 3, 4, and “Accessibility” within “[Empowering Education Leaders: A Toolkit for Safe, Ethical, and Equitable AI Integration](#)”

<p>Guidance/policy questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Who are the focal groups of students in your district who would be most affected or impacted by these decisions? How can AI potentially be leveraged to support these needs? What are the implications of not using AI to address these needs?• If we consider AI literacy as a required job skill, what would be the implications of denying certain students access to AI?• In what ways can AI use by staff independent of students create efficiencies for staff that allow them more time and energy to support students?• How can AI tools be incorporated into 504, IEP, and intervention plans to support students’ individual learning needs?• What are the equity implications of AI being used in schools or for assignments outside of school? Do all students have equal access in and outside of school to the broadband connection and advanced devices needed?• How are these equity implications being addressed through policy, particularly for historically and systemically marginalized student groups?• To what extent is AI enabling adaptation to students’ strengths and not just deficits? Is AI enabling improved support for learners with disabilities and English language learners?• Will students be permitted to use premium AI tools they have purchased access to? What are the equity implications of some students having access to tools with more or less advanced features based on whether their family can afford to purchase access?	<p>Process takeaways:</p>
	<p>Guidance/policy takeaways:</p>

Goal E: Outline how AI literacy will be developed for all staff, students, and families

Recommended tasks:

- Promote AI literacy and build capacity: This is an important aspect of readiness is developing AI literacy in staff and students and can be integrated into ongoing digital learning efforts. Devoting time and funding toward ongoing professional learning to build educator’s capacity to use AI positively and appropriately is also key. Here is a [list of existing AI literacy resources](#) to support that need [also, please see ODE’s [Generative Artificial Intelligence \(AI\) in K-12 Classrooms](#), for further guidance].
- Review the Office of Educational Technology’s [Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Teaching and Learning](#) guidance to get support on how to practice ACE (Always Center Educators) in AI (pp. 25-36).
- Consider the various audiences requiring training to include IT personnel, classroom teachers, librarians and library staff, media specialists, school staff, families, and students. Create a professional development calendar with focused topics for each group.
- Provide training and support for educators, students, and families around the use of AI technologies, including how to use it effectively and responsibly and how to mitigate any potential negative impacts.
- Ensure that educator training is grounded in research based approaches for technology integration. Matt Koehler’s [TPACK Framework](#) or Liz Kolb’s [Triple E Framework](#) can be a helpful guide in ensuring that technology generally, and AI specifically, is used intentionally in the classroom.
- Plan opportunities for teachers and other staff to collaboratively experiment with AI tools prior to utilizing them with students. Consider first having staff identify how to use the tools to enhance and streamline tasks. Then once more comfortable with the tools, have them progress to experimenting with ways they would utilize AI tools instructionally.
- Consult Module 8 within “[Empowering Education Leaders: A Toolkit for Safe, Ethical, and Equitable AI Integration](#)”

Process questions:

- How will regular ongoing professional learning for all staff be implemented, and funded?
- What structures and resources can you leverage to develop AI literacy for caregivers and the larger school community?

Guidance/policy questions:

- How will you ensure students have equitable access to develop career related skills related to AI literacy? Is there an existing [AI literacy resource](#) you would want to use? How can you integrate AI literacy into the curriculum? How can AI literacy be integrated into career connected learning?
- How can AI literacy be incorporated as a component of broader literacy and equity training so that all staff understand the importance of this topic and how it relates to their work?
- How can librarians, library staff, and media specialists serve as leaders in this work?
- How are educators, students, and families being trained in digital literacy to ensure that they have the skills necessary to ethically and productively navigate and use AI technologies?

Process takeaways:

Guidance/policy takeaways:

Goal F: Establish parameters for use of AI in assessment practices

Recommended tasks:

- Define when AI can or cannot be used on an assessment, ensuring that the assessment purpose (determining student knowledge and skills to inform instruction) is not lost
- Understand how AI tools may support differentiation, and consider the equity implications of preventing AI use for students
- Consider how AI tools facilitate the use of authentic assessments, performance assessments, and Project-Based Learning (PBL)
- Consider how pedagogical practices might shift with the introduction of AI in the classroom and how these shifts may focus on assessment of process versus product
- Consider utilizing a scale for use of genAI on assessments, such as the [Artificial Intelligence Assessment Scale \(AIAS\)](#) (see pg 7) or the [Kapor Center's AI Classroom Assignment Norms Tool](#).
- Consult "Accessibility" and "Informed adoption" within "[Empowering Education Leaders: A Toolkit for Safe, Ethical, and Equitable AI Integration](#)"

<div>Guidance/policy questions:</div> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• What will be allowable uses of AI tools for different types of assessments?• Will these parameters be modified for students with certain learning needs? If so, how? Will this need to be considered for students on IEPs or 504 plans or multilingual learners?• Considering current assessment practices, what new approaches will AI tools support? How will teachers be trained in implementing these different forms of assessment?	<div>Process takeaways:</div>
	<div>Guidance/policy takeaways:</div>

Goal G: Provide mechanisms for monitoring and evaluating the impact of AI use and for adjusting policy and procedures to meet changing needs

Recommended tasks:

- Plan to regularly monitor and evaluate the impacts of AI and adjust policy and implementation plans accordingly: With the use of AI in schools, it is important to monitor the ongoing academic, behavioral, and social-emotional impacts on both staff and students. Consider processes to allow for the regular evaluation and revision of guidance/policy related to genAI.
- Consult USDE's "[Avoiding the Discriminatory Use of Artificial Intelligence](#)" to better understand and avoid the potential for discriminatory use of genAI tools
- Implement the policy with fidelity - it might be helpful to start with one school or grade level band before rolling out district wide.
- Monitor the implementation of AI technologies in classrooms closely, and be prepared to make adjustments if any negative impacts on equity or other concerns arise.
- Develop accountability measures to ensure that the technology is implemented in appropriate ways that align with the educator professional development and community training provided. Adjust learning opportunities as needed.
- Consider ways in which to review the effectiveness of the policy by engaging with local parent teacher organizations (or other similar organizations) regarding the use of the technology outside of the classroom.
- Review the AI policy with your team on a consistent basis to ensure that the policy responds to the pace of change within the field.
- Consult Module 7 within "[Empowering Education Leaders: A Toolkit for Safe, Ethical, and Equitable AI Integration](#)"

Process question:

- How can voices of educators and the larger school community continue to be central to the process of implementation and monitoring of AI products and services in schools?

Guidance/policy questions:

- What processes are currently in place to monitor academic and social-emotional impact on students? What additional practices might you want to put in place to monitor impact of AI tools, particularly around the advent of synthetic media and the threat of deepfakes?
- Is there a specific plan in place to respond to deepfakes as they relate to harassment, intimidation, bullying, and cyberbullying? Are current threat assessment models incorporating the threat of deepfakes?
- How will you respond if negative impacts are observed? How will you respond if a positive impact is observed?
- Is AI leading to narrower student activities (e.g., procedural math problems), or the fuller range of activities highlighted in the [National Educational Technology Plan \(NETP\)](#), which emphasizes features such as personalized learning, project-based learning, learning from visualizations, simulations, and virtual reality, as well as learning across school, community, and familial settings?
- Is AI supporting the whole learner, including social dimensions of learning such as enabling students to be active participants in small group and collaborative learning? For example, does AI contribute to aspects of student collaboration we value like shared attention, mutual engagement, peer help, self-regulation, and building on each other's contributions?

Process takeaways:

Guidance/policy takeaways:

Compiled Process and Guidance/Policy Takeaways

This resource provides an outline of both AI use guidance as well as a process for developing guidance. Below is a space to compile and format those outlines to inform next steps.

Compiled process takeaways:

Compiled guidance/policy takeaways:

For an editable Word version, click [here](#).

*For more information, please contact ODE's Digital Learning Team
at ode.digitallearning@ode.oregon.gov*