



K-12 AI Policy Design Template

A board-ready AI policy in 10 sections

Dr. Alexis S. Smith | 910-227-9073 | alexis@ascendainow.com | [linkedin.com/in/alexisssmith](https://www.linkedin.com/in/alexisssmith) | www.ascendainow.com

How to Use This Template

This template gives a K-12 digital learning program a complete, board-ready Artificial Intelligence (AI) policy in 10 sections. It is the working tool for Stage 2, Govern, of the Ascend AI NOW™ Framework for Responsible AI (Diagnose, Govern, Architect, Deploy, Scale).

1. Complete the [AI Governance Readiness Diagnostic](#) first, so the policy targets your actual gaps.
2. Replace every bracketed field, such as [District Name], with your own language.
3. Keep the guidance notes (marked "Guidance") while drafting, then delete them before adoption.
4. Route the draft through your legal counsel and your stakeholder group (see the companion Stakeholder Engagement Guide) before board approval.

This template is an educational resource. It is not legal advice; confirm federal and state requirements with counsel.

1 Purpose and Mission Alignment

[District Name] uses Artificial Intelligence (AI) to advance [mission statement], with every student's safety, privacy, and equitable opportunity as the governing priorities. This policy sets the rules for selecting, approving, using, and reviewing AI tools in [program name].

Guidance: Name 2 to 3 equity commitments from your strategic plan here. A policy anchored to mission survives leadership changes; a policy anchored to vendor terms of service does not.

2 Scope and Definitions

This policy applies to all students, employees, contractors, and volunteers who use AI tools for instruction, assessment, advising, operations, or communication on behalf of [District Name], on district or personal devices.

Term	Definition for this policy
Artificial Intelligence (AI) tool	Any software that generates content, predictions, scores, or recommendations from data, including features embedded in existing platforms
Generative AI	AI that produces text, images, audio, video, or code in response to a prompt
Approved tool	A tool listed in the district AI Tool Inventory after review under Section 6
Student data	Any personally identifiable information from education records, as defined by FERPA and [state law]

Term	Definition for this policy
High-impact use	Any use that affects grades, placement, discipline, eligibility, or services for a student

3 Roles and Decision Rights

Every AI decision has a named owner. No tool reaches students without an approval on record.

Role	Decides	Accountable for
[Superintendent or designee]	Final approval of high-impact uses	Policy adoption and annual report to the board
AI Ethics Committee	Tool approval and annual review	Bias, equity, and integrity findings
Chief Technology Officer or Director of Digital Learning	Technical and data privacy review	Vendor agreements and the AI Tool Inventory
Principals and program leads	Building and program implementation	Training completion and incident reporting
Teachers and staff	Classroom use within approved tools	Disclosure to students and families

Guidance: The AI Ethics Committee should include faculty, student, family, and governance representation (see the Stakeholder Engagement Guide).

4 Approved and Prohibited Uses

Permitted with approved tools: lesson planning, differentiated materials, feedback drafts reviewed by the teacher, accessibility supports, and operational tasks that contain no student data.

Permitted only with a human decision-maker: any high-impact use. AI may inform; a qualified person decides and documents the decision.

Prohibited:

- Entering student personally identifiable information into any tool that is not approved
- Using AI as the sole basis for grades, placement, discipline, or special education decisions
- Emotion recognition or biometric surveillance of students
- Undisclosed AI-generated communication to families

5 Student Data Privacy

No student data enters an AI tool unless that tool is approved and covered by a signed data privacy agreement. Each approved tool must meet all 3 layers of law below.

Law	What it requires of your AI tools	Policy commitment
FERPA (federal)	Protects education records; vendors may receive them only under district control for a legitimate educational interest	Vendors act under district direct control and may not reuse records
COPPA, amended Rule (federal)	For services directed to children under 13: separate parental consent for most third-party disclosures, a written data retention policy, and a written information security program. Full compliance required since April 22, 2026	Vendors certify compliance in writing; disclosure for AI model training is not permitted
[State student data privacy law]	In Georgia: the Student Data Privacy, Accessibility, and Transparency Act, O.C.G.A. 20-2-660 through 20-2-668, which limits how operators may use student data	Contracts cite the state law by name and section

Guidance: Replace the third row with your own state statute. Attendees outside Georgia should confirm their law with their state education agency.

6 Vendor Vetting and the AI Tool Inventory

Every AI tool, including AI features added to platforms you already license, passes this review before use:

- ☐ Signed data privacy agreement naming FERPA, COPPA, and [state law]
- ☐ Written statement that student data is not used to train AI models
- ☐ Data retention and deletion timeframe on record
- ☐ Evidence of bias testing or a vendor statement of known limitations
- ☐ Accessibility conformance documentation
- ☐ Named district owner and review date added to the AI Tool Inventory

7 Bias, Equity, and Access

[District Name] reviews each approved tool for disparate impact on students by race, disability, English learner status, and income. Where a tool requires devices, connectivity, or paid tiers, the district provides equivalent access or does not require the tool.

Guidance: Equity is the core of the AI Power Gap™. Assign the review to the AI Ethics Committee and report findings to the board each year.

8 Academic Integrity and Transparency

Teachers state, for each assignment, whether AI use is not permitted, permitted with disclosure, or encouraged. Students disclose AI assistance as directed. AI detection software is not used as the sole evidence of misconduct. Families are told which AI tools their children use and how to ask questions.

9 Training

No employee uses an approved AI tool with students before completing role-specific training: teachers on instructional use and integrity, counselors and advisors on high-impact decisions, administrators on oversight and procurement. Training is refreshed every year.

10 Incident Reporting and Review Cycle

Any suspected privacy breach, biased output, or misuse is reported to [role] within [24 hours]. The AI Ethics Committee reviews this policy every [12 months], and immediately when a law, a major tool, or a serious incident changes the risk.

Adoption Checklist

- ☐ Readiness Diagnostic completed and gaps recorded
- ☐ All bracketed fields replaced and guidance notes removed
- ☐ Stakeholder review completed (Stakeholder Engagement Guide, Phase 3)
- ☐ Legal counsel review completed
- ☐ Board approval date recorded: [date]
- ☐ Policy published in plain language for families and students

Sources

CoSN. (2026). *U.S. State of EdTech 2026*. Consortium for School Networking. <https://www.cosn.org/wp-content/uploads/2026/05/U.S.-State-of-EdTech-2026.pdf>

Davis Polk & Wardwell. (2026). *FTC prioritizes COPPA enforcement as new compliance obligations take effect*. <https://www.davispolk.com/insights/client-update/ftc-prioritizes-coppa-enforcement-new-compliance-obligations-take-effect>

Federal Trade Commission. (2025, April 22). Children's Online Privacy Protection Rule. *Federal Register*. <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2025/04/22/2025-05904/childrens-online-privacy-protection-rule>

Student Data Privacy, Accessibility, and Transparency Act, O.C.G.A. §§ 20-2-660 through 20-2-668. <https://law.onecle.com/georgia/title-20/chapter-2/article-15/index.html>



Prepared by Dr. Alexis S. Smith

Fractional Chief Artificial Intelligence Officer | Founder & Chief Executive Officer, Ascend AI NOW, LLC
CoSN Thought Partner | CoSN K-12 CTO Academy Mentor | TAIMScore™ Certified Assessor
alexis@ascendainow.com | www.ascendainow.com | Free Readiness Diagnostic:
ascendainow.com/k12assessment