

# AI Governance Workshop

## Policy Development Worksheet (Grades 9-12)

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Stakeholder Role: \_\_\_\_\_ Committee Members: \_\_\_\_\_

### The Governance Challenge

Westbrook USD (15,000 students, 25 schools) is deploying “SecureNet AI” district-wide. As the Student Technology Governance Committee, you must develop policy recommendations for the Board of Education.

#### Constraints:

- Must comply with FERPA and COPPA
- Cannot exceed current IT staffing
- Must be explainable to community
- System goes live in 60 days

### Stakeholder Position Statement

My assigned role: \_\_\_\_\_

My primary concerns:

---

---

Key questions I'll raise:

---

---

### Policy Area 1: Automated Response Authority

#### The Question

What actions should SecureNet AI take automatically vs. requiring human approval?

#### Individual Analysis

Threat Level	My Recommended Automated Action	My Recommended Human Approval Threshold
<b>Critical</b> (active attack)		
<b>High</b> (probable threat)		
<b>Medium</b> (suspicious activity)		
<b>Low</b> (anomaly detected)		

**AI Consultation Notes****AI's stated false positive rate:**

---

**AI's acknowledged limitation:**

---

**Trade-off AI identified:**

---

**Committee Decision****Final recommendation:**

---

**Rationale addressing all stakeholders:**

---

---

**Policy Area 2: Behavioral Monitoring Scope****The Question**

What student behaviors should SecureNet AI monitor, and how should alerts be handled?

**Individual Analysis**

Activity Type	Monitor? (Y/N)	Alert Threshold	Alert Recipient	My Reasoning
Web browsing (educational)				
Web browsing (non-educational)				
Search queries				
Communications				
Behavioral patterns				

**Legal Framework Notes****FERPA implications:**

---

**COPPA implications (students under 13):**

---

**AI Consultation Notes****Examples AI gave of helpful monitoring:**

---

**False positive scenarios AI acknowledged:**

---

**Committee Decision****Monitoring scope recommendation:**

---

**False positive handling procedure:**

---

**Student notification policy:**

---

**Policy Area 3: Data Retention and Learning****The Question**

How long should SecureNet AI retain data, and should it learn from student behavior patterns?

**Individual Analysis**

Data Type	My Recommended Retention	My Reasoning
Routine activity logs		
Security alerts		
Behavioral models		
Incident investigation data		

**AI Consultation Notes****AI's claimed accuracy improvement with learning:**

---

**Data requirements for learning:**

---

**AI's perspective on student profiles:**

---

**Committee Decision****Data retention policy:**

---

**Machine learning policy:**

---

**Student data access rights:**

- Can students see what data exists about them? \_\_\_\_\_
- Can students request data deletion? \_\_\_\_\_
- How are students notified of monitoring? \_\_\_\_\_

**Consensus Documentation****Areas of Agreement**

---

---

**Areas of Disagreement**

Policy Area	Positions in Tension	Resolution Approach

### Trade-offs Explicitly Accepted

## Policy Brief Summary

*For Board of Education presentation*

### Recommendation 1: Automated Response Authority

### Recommendation 2: Behavioral Monitoring Scope

### Recommendation 3: Data Retention and Learning

### Implementation Considerations

## Reflection

What was the hardest trade-off your committee faced?

How did SecureNet AI's input influence your recommendations?

What NICE Framework Work Roles engage in this type of governance work?

How would you apply this experience to a future career in cybersecurity policy?

*From "True Teamwork: Building Human-AI Partnerships" — NICE K12 2025 Dr. Ryan Straight, University of Arizona • ryanstraight@arizona.edu*