

# 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*