



## FCCPS AI Advisory Committee Agenda

**Date of Meeting:** Friday, February 6, 2026

**Location of Meeting:** FCCPS School Board Office (Multi-Purpose Room)

**Time of Meeting:** 8:30–9:30 AM (in-person).

- **Adopt agenda (3 min) Approve prior minutes (3 min)**
- **Public comment (up to 4 min)**
- **Liaisons' updates (5 min)**
- **Team artifacts review + Team Charter v1 vote (12 min)**
  - Alignment Map / Team Contract / Roles & Leads (informational)
  - **Vote: approve Team Charter v1**
- **Focus Block: Shared baseline (capabilities/limits + classroom reality) (23 min)**
  - Definitions + assumptions
  - Priority misconceptions
  - 3 classroom scenarios + draft grade bands
- **Decisions/action items/parking lot (7 min)**
- **Confirm next steps / adjourn (3 min)**



## FCCPS AI Advisory Committee Minutes

**Date of Meeting:** Friday, February 6, 2026

**Location of Meeting:** FCCPS School Board Office (Multi-Purpose Room)

**Time of Meeting:** 8:30~9:50 AM (in-person).

Members Present:	Members Present:
Members Absent:	Co-Chairs: John Black (Chair), Tina Beaty (Vice Chair) School Board Liaisons (non-voting): Jerrod Anderson; Bethany Henderson Committee Members (present): Elizabeth Chua; Anubav Vasudevan; Jillian Burkley; Tom Sabo; David Berol; Thomas Colvin, Susan Nelson Visitors/Public: John Lewis; additional visitors (names not captured)
Item:	Notes:
Adoption of the Agenda	Chair reviewed the standing agenda model and conducted a voice vote. No objections noted; agenda adopted.
Approval of Prior Minutes	The January 23, 2026 minutes were approved by a unanimous vote.
Public Comments	Visitors introduced themselves; no formal public comments were offered beyond introductions and questions.
School Board / Staff Liaison Updates	Liaisons reiterated parallel input streams (staff/teacher/admin work, student input, public town halls) that will converge for the April School Board checkpoint. Scope guidance: this committee should focus on broad, general policy guidance (not vendor selection, detailed implementation planning, or prescriptive professional-development hour requirements).

	Liaisons noted that the committee may recommend a cadence for revisiting the AI policy (review cycle).
Team Formation and Workstream Structure	<p>Chair summarized patterns from members' questionnaire responses (aggregated, not individual) and reviewed decision-making and collaboration constraints for a public advisory committee (avoid multi-member back-and-forth outside noticed meetings; use 1:1 lead/co-lead pairs; route synthesis back to Chair for sharing in meetings).</p> <p>Chair proposed initial workstreams and nominated leads/co-leads (working assignments; subject to refinement):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research &amp; shared baseline: Tom Sabo and Elizabeth Chua</li> <li>• Policy/recommendation drafting: David Berol (with Chair support)</li> <li>• Classroom Practice &amp; Examples: Anubav Vasudevan and Susan Nelson</li> <li>• Assessment &amp; Integrity: David Berol (with Chair support)</li> <li>• Data/privacy/security: Jillian Burkley (with Chair support)</li> <li>• Communications/community input: Tina Beaty and Adriana Palacios</li> <li>• Implementation/change adoption: Jillian Burkley and Adriana Palacios Bonarrigo</li> <li>• Equity/access: Tom Sabo and Elizabeth Chua.</li> </ul>
Team Charter v1 (review and edits)	<p>Chair presented a revised Team Charter (v1 draft) synthesized from prior meeting discussion and questionnaire inputs, including team values (e.g., integrity/transparency; psychological safety &amp; respectful challenge; equity &amp; inclusion; evidence/practicality; accountability; iteration/adaptability).</p> <p>Draft mission statement discussed: "Recommend an age-appropriate, human-centered approach to AI that personalizes learning and prepares students for the future while protecting fairness, belonging, safety, and integrity." A motion was raised to revise "personalizes learning" to "enhances learning." Members also discussed scope language (e.g., "students" vs broader "FCCPS community" language) to reflect policy impacts on educators/staff/families while</p>

	<p>remaining within the committee's remit. An additional proviso was added to note that the team charter is a working document, subject to revision.</p> <p>The committee adopted Team Charter v1 unanimously.</p>
Focus Block: Shared Baseline (Sprint A/B/C + Converge)	<p>The committee completed a rapid, sticky-note-based focus block to surface assumptions, misconceptions to address, classroom scenario guidance, and a draft grade-band structure for organizing guidance.</p> <p>Highlights (see Appendix A for full capture):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Top assumption by dot-vote: "Students &amp; staff will have AI access regardless of school policy."</li> <li>• Top misconception by dot-vote: "AI replaces teachers."</li> <li>• Scenario guardrails emphasized: constrain AI-written full student responses without personal contribution; prohibit autonomous grading/feedback without educator review; identify where AI support may be beneficial (e.g., lesson ideation; writing revision support).</li> <li>• Grade-band converge dot-vote favored Option C (Elementary/Middle/High) as a workable starting structure.</li> </ul>
Next Steps and Adjournment	<p>Next meeting focus: members will provide "Top 3 risks" and "Top 3 opportunities" for AI in FCCPS; workstream synthesis will be presented for discussion and vote, where appropriate. Motion to adjourn was made; meeting adjourned by voice vote.</p>

### Action Items (captured from discussion)

- **John Black:** Post meeting materials (including sticky-note board photos) to the committee Miro board and send a post-meeting email summarizing assignments, deadlines, and next-meeting inputs.
- **Tom Sabo + Elizabeth Chua (Research & Shared Baseline):** Draft a one-page "working definitions + assumptions" document based on Sprint A and relevant research; provide materials to Chair in advance for display and committee discussion/vote at the next meeting.

- **All members:** Submit “Top 3 risks” and “Top 3 opportunities” inputs by the requested deadline communicated by the Chair (target: the Friday following the meeting) for synthesis.
  - **Workstream leads/co-leads (as nominated):** Begin between-meeting synthesis in 1:1 pairs and route outputs to the Chair for compilation and presentation at the next noticed meeting.
- 

## Appendix A — Focus Block Outputs (from posted sticky notes)

### Sprint A — Assumptions (design constraints)

Prompt: “We must design for...”

1. “Students & staff will have AI access regardless of school policy” — **Upvotes: 5**
2. “We do not know if AI will produce net benefits” — Upvotes: 0
3. “POLICY IS FOR MORE THAN JUST STUDENTS” — Upvotes: 0
4. “Do we need to be more safe or avantgarde?” — Upvotes: 0
5. “STUDENTS UNDERSTAND HOW AI WORKS” — **Upvotes: 1**
6. “Assumption: for educators: Actionable, but non-pedagogical recommendations” — Upvotes: 0
7. “Policy must provide the right balance of detail & flexibility” — **Upvotes: 1**
8. “We’re regulating school-related behavior.” — **Upvotes: 1**
9. “We must specify that the policy needs be cyclically revisited” (“ANNUALLY?” written along the side) — Upvotes: 0
10. “Policy can’t be time bound only for review due to velocity of change” — Upvotes: 0
11. “ENHANCING STUDENT LEARNING” — **Upvotes: 1**

12. "Parents must have a voice..." — Upvotes: 0

### Sprint B — Misconceptions (dot-vote: most harmful if unaddressed)

Prompt: "Misconceptions to kill (write as a quote someone would say)."

#### Highest dot-votes:

- "AI replaces teachers" — 5
- "AI HURTS / impedes LEARNING" — 3
- "AI will make us DUMBER" — 2
- "Adequate guardrails can be baked into AI software" — 2
- "Community members must leverage AI or become irrelevant" — 1

#### Other misconceptions captured (0 visible dots):

- "This policy is: ABSOLUTE / LITERAL / INFLEXIBLE / FOREVER"
- "AI will save time or money"
- "Gen AI is THE ONLY AI THAT MATTERS"
- "It's JUST GOOGLE"
- "AI is a new kind of literacy"
- "YOU know when you are using AI"
- "Schools need to be as cutting edge as workplaces"
- "AI use is cheating"
- "Wealthy schools will have unfair advantage with AI"
- "We can tell when a student or teacher uses AI"

### Sprint C1 — Scenario: Student Use (learning)

- Allowed — "AI to help synthesize / summarize ideas" — 1
- Student use — "Using AI for grammatical review (changes by band)" — 0
- Allowed — "Student + teacher research + idea generation" — 1

- Constrained — “Student + teacher write entire response w/o edits / personal contributions” — **2**
- Allowed — “AI to identify weaknesses in writing” — **2**
- Constraint — “AI generated papers” — **1**
- Allowed — “AI driven tool use (Dreambox, Lexia)” — **0**
- “AI developed for the child entering adulthood readiness?” — **0**
- Beneficial — “Discussion of risks related to AI use” — **2**

### Sprint C2 — Scenario: Teacher Use (instructional + professional)

Constrained / not allowed by default:

- “NOT ALLOWED — teachers may not use AI to create grades, feedback without reviewing and approving every word.” — **2**
- “TEACHER USE — NOT ALLOWED: AUTONOMOUS GRADING” — **0**
- Allowed / beneficial (default OK):
  - “Allowed — teachers may use AI to draft lesson ideas, save time on planning” — **2**
  - “TEACHER USE — ALLOWED: AUTOMATED LESSON PLAN GENERATION” — **0**
  - “Use AI to flesh out a lesson plan...hands-on yet screen-free activity” — **0**
  - “Use of AI to aid in curriculum design / scheduling of assignments” — **0**
- Teacher constrained (guardrails needed):
  - “Allow students open access to AI-powered tools in the classroom all the time / no structure” — **0**
  - “Use of AI to suggest/generate feedback on the structure/style of written work” — **1**

### Sprint C3 — Scenario: Assessment Integrity (quick triage)

- “Teachers can’t assign long-form essays any more?” — **0**

- “AI class support for classroom observation” — 0
- “AI for behavioral support diagnostic” — **1**

### Converge — Grade Bands (vote)

Prompt: “Choose the most workable starting point.”

Option A (PK–2 / 3–5 / 6–8 / 9–12): 2 visible dots total

Option C (Elementary / Middle / High): 5 visible dots total (highest)

### Parking Lot

- “Tool vs Tutor” / “External Support Store” / “to ASK. Shop” / “Feel SAFE/BRAVE” — 0
- “Assessment Integ...” / “Human Insight” / “Start → END” / “before Submit” — 0
- “AI is only External Support.” — 1