

Re: Workstream lead orientation -- WS-DPS + WS-IPD deliverables for 6 Mar

From: Jillian Burkley jillianburkley@gmail.com

To: John Black john.black@outlook.com

Sent: Thursday, February 12 at 22:20

Hi John,

Thank you again for the thorough orientation; it provided exactly what I needed to get started.

I've put together a draft briefing package for WS-DPS that covers all three deliverables you outlined:

1. Risk Tier Framework (3 tiers with plain-language categories and minimum requirements)
2. Procurement/Governance Decision Checklist (what must be true before adoption, mapped by tier)
3. Top Risks + Mitigations + Suggested Owners (5 risks with severity ratings)

Plus the readiness checklist items (3 guardrails, 3 tradeoffs, dependencies). I've drawn from frameworks in my doctoral capstone on ethical AI integration for students with disabilities and adapted them for FCCPS.

This is all v0.1 — meant as a starting point for our discussion, not a finished product. I'd especially value your input on:

- Whether the 3-tier model fits the FCCPS context
- FCCPS-specific tool examples and procurement realities
- The tradeoff questions for committee discussion

Also, I have several pages from my doctoral capstone (AIEIP) that directly support our WS-DPS work, including compliance frameworks, risk evidence, and core values that may align with the principles we establish at Meeting 3. Would it be appropriate for me to add these to the Resources and Policy Development sections of the Miro board?

Would you have 15–20 minutes this weekend or early next week to sync? I'm flexible on timing.

Best,

Jillian

 Burkley_AI systems can harm students.pdf

 Burkley_Current Regulatory and Ethical Gaps.pdf

 Burkley_Equity, Transparency, Accountability.pdf

 Burkley_Program Services overview.pdf

 Burkley_The DEIPAR framework Jillians Corner.pdf

 Burkley_The four program components.pdf

 Burkley_The Greece case study_Jillians Corner.pdf

Kids make up 21.7% of the U.S. population—about 73 million.

But they're 100% of our FUTURE.

Dr. Jillian Burkley, DSW, LICSW, MSW

"She/Her/Hers"

Confidentiality notice: This email, including any attachments, contains information that may be confidential or privileged—the data is intended for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the contents of this information is prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately by replying to the "reply to sender only" message and delete all electronic and hard copies of the communication, including attachments.

On Thu, Feb 12, 2026 at 1:14PM Jillian Burkley <jillianburkley@gmail.com> wrote:

Hey John,

Thank you for the orientation. This is very helpful.

Status: In progress on both workstreams.

Blockers/dependencies: None at this time, though I anticipate needing input from FCCPS staff on legal/privacy constraints and implementation capacity as both workstreams develop.

Co-lead coordination: I'll reach out to you directly to align on WS-DPS priorities and cadence, and will contact Adriana to establish a working rhythm for WS-IPD. My goal is to have an initial check-in with both co-leads this week.

Looking forward to making progress toward the March 6 checkpoint.

Best,

Jillian

Kids make up 21.7% of the U.S. population—about 73 million.

But they're 100% of our FUTURE.

Dr. Jillian Burkley, DSW, LICSW, MSW

"She/Her/Hers"

Confidentiality notice: This email, including any attachments, contains information that may be confidential or privileged—the data is intended for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the contents of this information is prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately by replying to the "reply to sender only" message and delete all electronic and hard copies of the communication, including attachments.

On Tue, Feb 10, 2026 at 11:15PM John Black <john.black@outlook.com> wrote:

Hi Jillian,

Thank you for leading two workstreams. I'm sending a quick orientation so we're aligned on outputs, timing, and how your work plugs into committee convergence.

Your workstreams

- WS-DPS: Data Privacy/Security/Records considerations
- WS-IPD: Implementation/PD & Change Adoption
 - Lead: you
 - Co-lead(s): (Myself for WS-DPS and Adriana Palacios for WS-IPD — please coordinate directly)

Next deliverables (target checkpoint)

WS-DPS — Privacy/Security/Governance Criteria v0 (for Meeting 4, Thu 6 Mar)

Definition of done:

- Tool/data risk categories (plain language) + minimum requirements by category
- A short “procurement/governance” decision checklist (what must be true before adoption)
- Top risks + mitigations + suggested owners

WS-IPD — Implementation Support Plan v0 (for Meeting 4, Thu 6 Mar)

Definition of done:

- Proposed implementation supports (PD, exemplars, templates) + who the audience is

- Review cadence / update mechanism (how guidance stays current)
- Key dependencies (tech, comms, legal/privacy, assessment) and sequencing

Meeting 4 (6 Mar) convergence gate (important)

By Meeting 4, each workstream needs to be converged enough to support:

- a shared set of policy principles (from Meeting 3)
- an agreed recommendations outline/domains
- a first-pass risk register with mitigations and owners

A lightweight readiness checklist for your deliverables

- 3 “non-negotiable” constraints/guardrails
- 3 decision points / tradeoffs the committee must resolve
- Top risks + mitigations (or clearly “N/A” where appropriate)
- Any dependencies you need from other workstreams or FCCPS staff

Next step (10 minutes)

Please reply to me (not reply-all) with:

1. Your current status (not started / in progress)
2. Any blockers or dependencies
3. Your plan for coordinating with co-lead(s)

How to think about the next phase (diverge → converge)

In the workstreams, we want smart divergence: identify the real constraints (privacy/records/security) and the operational realities (implementation capacity) that make certain policy options infeasible.

At convergence gates, we compress that into decision-ready criteria and sequencing that align with the principles—so we can move from “what we wish were true” to “what we can responsibly do.”

Thanks,

John