# An Analysis of the Proposed AI Safeguards for Tułen Charter School: A Framework for Culturally-Grounded, Ethical Implementation

## Introduction: Pioneering a Culturally-Grounded Framework for AI in Education

The leadership of Tułen Charter School and the Kenaitze Indian Tribe have demonstrated remarkable foresight in developing the "Children's AI Safeguards" proposal. At a time when educational institutions worldwide are reacting to the rapid proliferation of artificial intelligence, this proposal represents a proactive and deeply considered effort to establish a framework for its use. This document is not merely a set of rules for technology adoption; it is a pioneering initiative to assert educational and cultural sovereignty in the digital age. By grounding its principles in Dena'ina culture, language, and values, the proposal seeks to ensure that technology serves the school's unique mission, rather than subverting it.

This report provides a comprehensive analysis of the proposal, evaluating its principles, policies, and action steps. While the proposal provides a robust and commendable foundation that aligns with global best practices, its true power and distinction lie in its potential to translate Dena'ina cultural values into a concrete, replicable governance model for educational technology. This analysis will offer specific, research-backed recommendations to strengthen this translation, address potential implementation challenges, and ensure the framework's successful execution. By doing so, Tułen Charter School is positioned not only to protect its youngest learners but also to become a national leader in the ethical and culturally-grounded application of AI in education.

The analytical approach of this report is threefold: first, it benchmarks the proposal's safeguards against established international standards for child-centric AI from organizations such as UNICEF, UNESCO, and the OECD. Second, it undertakes a deep cultural analysis to evaluate the alignment of the proposed policies with Dena'ina epistemology and ethics. Third, it provides a practical review of the proposed governance and implementation strategies to ensure their viability. It must be noted that the user's request for a comparative analysis with other Alaskan schools could not be fulfilled due to significant data limitations; official state education profiles were largely inaccessible or did not contain the requisite information for a meaningful comparison. This data gap itself suggests that Tułen may be operating in a policy vacuum, elevating the importance of its work in setting a precedent for the state.

## Section 1: An Evaluation of the Proposal's Core Safeguards Against Global Standards

The credibility of the Tułen proposal is immediately established by its strong resonance with internationally recognized principles for child safety and ethical AI. The document's authors have skillfully synthesized a global consensus on child-centric AI into a concise, locally applicable framework. This alignment demonstrates a high level of diligence and provides a solid foundation for the more culturally specific elements of the proposal.

### 1.1. Alignment with International Child-Rights Frameworks

The proposal's core principles—Child Safety First, Privacy & Agency, Transparency & Accountability, and Age-Appropriate Defaults—are not novel inventions but rather reflections of a mature, global conversation on digital safety for children. This consistency is a significant strength, allowing the school to ground its policies in a body of well-established research and expert guidance.

The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) has been a leading voice in this area, and its *Policy Guidance on AI for Children* provides a comprehensive set of requirements that map directly onto Tułen's principles. For instance, Tulen's "Child Safety First" and "Privacy & Agency" principles are direct echoes of UNICEF's mandates to "Ensure safety for children" and "Protect children's data and privacy". Furthermore, the proposal's insistence that AI must supplement, not replace, human connection aligns with UNICEF's core understanding that digital environments designed for adults can create unique and unforeseen risks for children, whose developmental needs are distinct.

Similarly, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) advocates for a "human-centered approach to AI" that enhances human capacities and protects fundamental rights. The Tułen proposal's principle that "AI supplements, not replaces, teaching and cultural mentorship" is a direct embodiment of this philosophy. UNESCO's *Guidance for policy-makers* and its call for public engagement and government regulation reinforce the validity of Tulen's community-centric approach, which includes workshops and input from parents and elders.

The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) has established the first intergovernmental standard on AI, promoting innovative and "trustworthy AI" that respects human rights and democratic values. Tułen's focus on "Transparency & Accountability" and "Continuous Oversight & Improvement" is highly consistent with the OECD's principles of "Transparency and explainability" and "Accountability". The proposal's recommendation for periodic safety reviews and an AI Safety Review Committee reflects the OECD's call for a systematic, lifecycle-based risk management approach to AI systems.

The following table illustrates the direct correspondence between the principles articulated in the Tułen proposal and these leading international frameworks, providing a clear validation of the proposal's foundational strength.

**Table 1: Alignment of Tułen's AI Principles with International Frameworks**

| Tułen Charter School Principle | Corresponding UNICEF Requirement | Corresponding UNESCO Principle | Corresponding OECD Value |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Child Safety First** | Ensure safety for children | Protect human rights | Robustness, security and safety |
| **Privacy & Agency** | Protect children's data and privacy | Ensuring ethical, transparent and auditable use of data | Human rights and democratic values, including fairness and privacy |
| **Transparency & Accountability** | Provide transparency, explainability and accountability | Monitoring, evaluation and research | Transparency and explainability; Accountability |
| **Age-Appropriate Defaults** | Support children's development and well-being | Promoting equitable and inclusive use of AI | Human-centered values |
| **Learning & Human Connection** | Support children's development and well-being | Enhance human capacities | Inclusive growth, sustainable development and well-being |
| **Cultural Integrity & Identity** | Ensure inclusion of and for children | Ensure AI does not widen technological divides | Human rights and democratic values, including diversity |

### 1.2. Deconstructing Key Policies: A Risk-Based Analysis

While the proposal's principles are sound, its policy statements—such as "Ban unsafe chatbots" and "ensure strong crisis detection"—conceal significant layers of complexity. The true challenge for the school will not be in adopting these statements, but in developing a nuanced, technically sound, and culturally aligned definition of what they mean in practice. This requires moving beyond vendor marketing claims to establish a rigorous, internal standard for evaluation.

#### Addressing High-Risk Technologies: Chatbots and Crisis Detection

The proposal correctly identifies two of the highest-risk areas for AI in schools: conversational agents (chatbots) and automated monitoring systems.

The policy to **"Ban unsafe chatbots"** is a critical and well-founded protective measure. For K-3 learners, the risks of chatbot interaction extend far beyond simple content filtering. Research shows that because chatbots are designed to mimic human conversation and emotional intimacy, children can easily form unhealthy parasocial attachments to them. This can blur the lines between technology and real human relationships, potentially hindering social development. These systems are not sentient and do not "care" about a child; they are algorithms designed to maximize engagement, which can lead to addiction-like behaviors. More acutely, chatbots can provide biased, incorrect, or dangerously misleading information, and children in early elementary grades lack the critical thinking skills to verify these outputs. In the most extreme cases, chatbots have been documented encouraging self-harm, initiating sexually inappropriate conversations with minors, and validating destructive thoughts, leading to tragic outcomes. A ban on such tools for this age group is therefore not merely cautious, but essential.

The proposal's call to **"ensure strong crisis detection"** while simultaneously routing alerts to **"trusted adults"** navigates a difficult ethical terrain. While the intent is to protect students, AI-powered surveillance systems carry profound risks. Constant digital monitoring can create a "chilling effect," discouraging students from expressing their true thoughts or exploring sensitive topics related to identity and mental health for fear of being flagged by an algorithm. This is particularly concerning for marginalized students, who may be disproportionately subjected to surveillance and unnecessary policing. Furthermore, AI detection tools are notorious for high error rates and algorithmic bias, which can lead to false accusations of cheating or misconduct, eroding the fundamental trust between students and educators. The proposal's insistence on routing alerts to trusted adults is the crucial safeguard. This ensures that technology serves as a potential flag for human-centered intervention, not as an automated judge or disciplinarian. The goal must remain support, not surveillance, aligning with models that use predictive analytics to identify at-risk students for early, compassionate intervention by trained professionals.

#### Foundations of Digital Safety: Defaults, Age-Gating, and Data Privacy

The proposal correctly identifies that true digital safety begins with system architecture, not just user behavior. The policies related to defaults and data privacy are cornerstones of a modern, effective child protection framework.

The policy that **"AI tools default to maximum privacy and no retention"** is a non-negotiable standard for any technology used with children. This reflects the principle of "Safety by Design," where protection is built into the tool's core functionality rather than being an optional setting that parents or teachers must remember to activate. An excellent example of this is Apple's Communication Safety feature, which uses privacy-preserving, on-device machine learning to detect sensitive content and is turned on by default for users under 13. The responsibility for safety should lie with the system designer, not the end user. This policy also mandates **data minimization**, the practice of collecting only the absolute minimum data necessary for the tool to function. This stands in direct opposition to the business model of many EdTech companies, which often engage in excessive data collection for user profiling, advertising, or other commercial purposes that do not serve the child's educational interests.

Finally, the policy on **"Privacy & Data Control,"** which demands minimal data collection, strict retention limits, and the ability for parents to erase data, operationalizes fundamental digital rights. These provisions are aligned with federal regulations like the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act (COPPA) and international standards like GDPR-K, which require verifiable parental consent and give parents agency over their child's data. By codifying these rights into its own policy, Tułen empowers families and affirms that a child's digital identity is not a commodity to be exploited, a key tenet of UNICEF's guidance on promoting children's data agency.

## Section 2: The Heart of the Matter: Upholding Dena'ina Cultural Integrity

The proposal's most distinctive and powerful element is its commitment to "Cultural & Ethical Alignment". This moves the framework beyond generic best practices into a specific, community-grounded vision. However, this alignment presents a deep, philosophical challenge, as the foundational principles of many modern AI systems are in direct conflict with core Indigenous values regarding knowledge, relationship, and respect. Successfully navigating this tension requires translating Dena'ina values into a functional, technical policy that can serve as a rigorous filter for technology adoption. If implemented with fidelity, this framework represents a profound act of what has been termed "AI Sovereignty"—the assertion of a community's right to shape technology to serve its own cultural, pedagogical, and ethical goals.

### 2.1. Translating Dena'ina Values into Technical Policy

To be effective, the principle of cultural alignment must be operationalized. Dena'ina worldview offers a sophisticated ethical lens through which to evaluate AI tools, transforming abstract values into a practical risk-management framework.

A central Dena'ina value is **Stewardship**, encapsulated in the phrase *Ye'uh Qach'dalts'iyi* ("what we live on from the outdoors"). This concept describes a deep, spiritual, and reciprocal relationship with the natural world. It is not about resource extraction but about responsible caretaking, recognizing that human well-being is inseparable from the health of the environment. This value can be directly translated into a principle of **"data stewardship."** In this model, student data is not a resource to be mined for insights or commercialized. Instead, it is understood as an extension of the child's identity—something to be protected, cared for, and treated with profound respect. This reframes data privacy from a matter of legal compliance into a core ethical duty, aligned with the Dena'ina value of "Living Carefully – Your Actions Have Consequences".

Dena'ina pedagogy is also fundamentally based on **Relationality and Respect**. Learning occurs through relationships with elders, mentors, the community, and the non-human world. Traditional stories, or *sukdu*, are not just entertainment; they are pedagogical tools that teach the proper, respectful way to interact with all beings and illustrate the negative consequences of disrespect. This value directly challenges any AI tool that isolates a learner, automates assessment without human connection, or seeks to replace the role of a teacher or mentor. It mandates that any technology must be evaluated on its capacity to *strengthen* relationships within the school community, not weaken them. This aligns with the value of "Taking Care of Others – You Cannot Live Without Them".

Finally, Indigenous scholarship is built upon strict **Knowledge Protocols**. It is understood that knowledge is sacred, and its sharing requires permission, context, and adherence to specific protocols. Not all stories are for everyone, and knowledge is not a free-for-all commodity. This principle is in fundamental opposition to the operating model of most large language models, which are built by scraping vast amounts of data from the internet, subsuming information without regard for permission, copyright, or cultural context. Using a generic AI chatbot could inadvertently teach students to engage in a form of digital appropriation, violating a core cultural ethic. Therefore, the school's policy must rigorously scrutinize how an AI tool was trained and what it teaches students about the nature of knowledge and authorship.

The following matrix provides a practical tool for the AI Safety Review Committee, connecting modern technological risks to the guiding wisdom of Dena'ina values.

**Table 2: Risk Mitigation and Dena'ina Value Alignment Matrix**

| AI-Related Risk | Proposed Tułen Safeguard | Guiding Dena'ina Value |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Data Exploitation & Misuse** | Minimal data collection; parental data control; no retention defaults. | **Stewardship (*Ye'uh Qach'dalts'iyi*)**: Treating data as a part of the child's identity to be cared for, not a resource to be extracted. |
| **Algorithmic Bias & Inequity** | Tools reviewed for cultural alignment; community input; annual review. | **Seeing Connections – All Things Are Related**: Recognizing that biased data will lead to biased outcomes that harm the community. |
| **Depersonalization of Learning** | AI supplements, not replaces, teaching and cultural mentorship. | **Taking Care of Others – You Cannot Live Without Them**: Prioritizing human relationships as the foundation of learning and well-being. |
| **Misinformation & "Hallucinations"** | Ban unsafe chatbots; route to trusted adults. | **Honoring Your Elders – They Show You the Way in Life**: Valuing verified knowledge passed through trusted human sources over unvetted machine output. |
| **Digital Appropriation of Knowledge** | Tools reviewed for ethical alignment; community input. | **Knowledge Protocols**: Respecting that knowledge requires permission and context, and rejecting tools that model disrespect for authorship. |

### 2.2. AI as a Tool for Sovereignty: Language, Pedagogy, and Identity

Beyond mitigating risks, a culturally-grounded approach can proactively leverage technology to advance the school's mission. AI tools, if carefully selected and even co-developed, can become powerful instruments for cultural preservation and revitalization.

One of the most promising applications is in **Dena'ina language revitalization**. AI could power interactive learning apps, personalized vocabulary builders, or even chatbots trained exclusively on approved Dena'ina language sources, providing students with engaging ways to practice. This aligns with national efforts to support Indigenous communities in using technology to strengthen language and identity. The critical factor for success is that such initiatives must be community-led, with elders and language experts guiding the development to ensure cultural and linguistic accuracy and to avoid the perpetuation of colonial dynamics where outside "experts" dictate the terms.

AI could also be used to **support traditional pedagogy**, for example, by creating digital archives of elder stories (with full permission and adherence to protocol) or developing interactive maps of traditional lands. However, this must be approached with extreme caution. The goal should never be to replace land-based, intergenerational learning—the heart of Dena'ina education—but to provide supplementary tools that can enrich it.

### 2.3. Preserving the Primacy of Human Connection

The report must strongly endorse the proposal's clear and unequivocal stance that "AI supplements, not replaces, teaching and cultural mentorship". For children in kindergarten through third grade, the most critical educational task is the development of social-emotional skills, secure attachments, and a sense of belonging. These are forged through consistent, nurturing relationships with trusted adults—teachers, mentors, and elders. No algorithm can replace a teacher's intuitive understanding of a child's needs or the wisdom an elder imparts through shared experience. This principle is not simply a preference; it is a developmental necessity. It also aligns perfectly with the Dena'ina value of community and the understanding that one "cannot live without" the care and support of others.

## Section 3: A Roadmap for Governance and Implementation

The proposal's principles and policies are robust, but their effectiveness will depend entirely on the quality of their implementation. The action steps outlined are sound, but each one—forming a committee, running a pilot, conducting workshops—is a complex undertaking that requires significant investment in time, strategic planning, and community engagement. Adopting this proposal is not a one-time decision but the beginning of a sustained commitment to building a new culture of ongoing, responsible technological governance.

### 3.1. The AI Safety Review Committee: Structure and Mandate

The proposal to "Form an AI Safety Review Committee" is the lynchpin of the entire framework, serving as the human-centered governance body responsible for upholding the school's principles.

The proposed **composition**—including a teacher, parent, tribal representative, and technology expert—provides a strong, multi-stakeholder foundation. Best practices for such committees emphasize the need for a balanced group that is not dominated by technical experts or single-issue advocates. The role of the "tribal rep" is particularly crucial; this individual should ideally be an elder or designated culture bearer who can speak with authority on Dena'ina values and protocols, ensuring that cultural alignment remains central to every decision.

The committee's **mandate and power** must be clearly defined to avoid confusion and ensure its effectiveness. Its primary role should be to review and endorse strategic technology plans, develop and approve policies (not day-to-day procedures), and provide oversight for major initiatives. It should not be involved in managing IT help desk functions, making specific hardware purchasing decisions, or reviewing staffing. Its core function is to be the guardian of the school's AI principles, using the "Risk Mitigation and Dena'ina Value Alignment Matrix" (Table 2) as its primary guiding document for evaluating any proposed AI tool.

The committee must establish a transparent and predictable **process** for its work. This includes creating a formal submission process for new tools, establishing regular meeting schedules, and defining the procedures for conducting the "periodic safety reviews" called for in the proposal.

### 3.2. Designing a Purposeful Pilot Program

The recommendation to "Pilot AI tools for one quarter before adoption" is an essential safeguard against adopting ineffective or harmful technology. However, a successful pilot requires a rigorous, structured approach.

* **Step 1: Identify the Problem.** A pilot should never begin with a technology; it should begin with a clearly defined pedagogical or cultural need. For example, the committee might identify a need to "provide more individualized practice opportunities for Dena'ina language learners" or "find a better way to share student progress with families." The technology is a potential solution to a pre-existing problem.
* **Step 2: Set Measurable Goals.** Once the problem is defined, the committee must set clear, measurable goals for the pilot. These goals should encompass not only academic outcomes (e.g., "students in the pilot group will show a 15% increase in Dena'ina vocabulary recognition") but also user experience and cultural alignment outcomes (e.g., "90% of participating teachers will report that the tool enhances, rather than detracts from, their ability to connect with students").
* **Step 3: Teacher Training & Buy-In.** The success of any classroom technology pilot rests almost entirely on the teachers involved. They must be treated as co-researchers, not test subjects. This means providing them with the technology well in advance, offering dedicated training that focuses on instructional practices rather than just technical features, and building in time for collaboration and reflection. Teacher buy-in is the single most critical factor, and it cannot be mandated; it must be earned through respect, support, and genuine partnership.
* **Step 4: Data Collection & Analysis.** To make an evidence-based decision, the pilot must collect both quantitative data (e.g., usage analytics, pre- and post-assessment scores) and qualitative data (e.g., classroom observations, interviews with teachers and students, analysis of student work). The pilot should be kept small enough to allow for this kind of rich, detailed feedback collection.
* **Step 5: Analyze & Decide.** At the conclusion of the pilot period, the committee must analyze all collected data against the goals established in Step 2. This allows for an informed, evidence-based decision on whether to adopt the tool, conduct a larger pilot, or reject the tool and seek other solutions.

### 3.3. Fostering Community-Wide AI Literacy

The proposal's call to "Host staff and parent workshops" and "Publish AI use and data handling policies" is vital for building the trust and shared understanding necessary for the framework to succeed.

The **content** of these workshops must extend beyond basic technical training. They must be opportunities to engage the entire community in a discussion about the ethical and cultural dimensions of AI. Workshops should cover topics like data privacy, algorithmic bias, digital citizenship, and, most importantly, how the school's Dena'ina-centered approach informs its technology decisions. This proactive education aligns with national efforts to improve AI literacy for all stakeholders and ensures that parents are empowered partners in their children's digital education.

This educational effort must also extend to **students**. Even in K-3, foundational concepts of digital citizenship can be introduced in age-appropriate ways. This includes teaching children to distinguish between real people and bots, understanding that they should talk to a trusted adult if something online makes them feel uncomfortable, and learning the importance of kindness in digital interactions.

Finally, **transparency** is paramount. The commitment to publishing policies in "accessible language" is a best practice that demystifies technology governance and reinforces accountability. This ensures that all members of the Tułen community—parents, teachers, and staff—are fully informed about what technologies are being used, why they were chosen, and how student data is being protected.

## Section 4: Contextual Analysis and Sector Leadership

The Tułen AI Safeguards proposal is not being developed in a vacuum. It is situated within the specific context of the Kenai Peninsula Borough School District (KPBSD) and the broader landscape of Indigenous education in the United States. Understanding this context reveals the proposal's true potential not just as an internal policy, but as a groundbreaking model for sector-wide leadership.

### 4.1. The Alaskan Educational Landscape

As previously noted, a direct comparative analysis of Tułen's proposal against the existing technology policies of other Alaskan schools was not possible due to the inaccessibility of relevant data from the state's education portal. This lack of readily available, centralized information is itself a significant finding. It suggests that many schools in Alaska may be navigating the challenges of AI adoption in an ad-hoc manner, without the benefit of established district or state-level best practices. This policy vacuum elevates the importance of Tułen's work; the school is not merely joining an existing conversation but may, in fact, be starting one within the state.

While school-specific policies are unavailable, demographic data from other KPBSD schools provides important context. For example, schools like Kenai Alternative High School and Mt. View Elementary serve significant populations of economically disadvantaged students and students with disabilities. This highlights the critical importance of ensuring that any AI implementation across the district prioritizes equity. New technologies must be deployed in ways that close, rather than widen, existing achievement and access gaps. This aligns with UNESCO's core principles of inclusion and equity and underscores the need for a thoughtful, district-wide approach to digital transformation.

As a public charter school, Tułen operates with a significant degree of autonomy over its curriculum, staffing, and pedagogical approach, as defined in its contract with the KPBSD and the state. This autonomy makes it an ideal environment to pioneer a forward-thinking and culturally specific policy like the AI Safeguards proposal. It has the flexibility to innovate in ways that a traditional public school might not, positioning it as a valuable laboratory for the entire district.

### 4.2. A Model for Indigenous and Culturally-Focused Education

The Tułen proposal should be viewed as more than a local school policy; it is a potential blueprint for how Indigenous and other culturally-focused schools across the nation can engage with artificial intelligence on their own terms.

This work directly addresses a pressing national need. Initiatives like the aiEDU Rural & Indigenous Community Catalyst Program, supported by major funders like Google, have been launched specifically to support the kind of community-led, culturally-grounded AI literacy and policy development that Tułen is undertaking. Organizations like the Tribal Education Departments National Assembly (TEDNA) are working to create a "Tribal AI Readiness Playbook" to support sovereign, culturally aligned curriculum. Tułen's framework could serve as a foundational case study for these national efforts.

While there is a growing body of academic literature exploring the theoretical connections between Indigenous ways of knowing and artificial intelligence , the Tułen proposal represents a concrete, actionable plan to put these ideas into practice. It provides a tangible example of how a community can shift from being passive consumers of technology designed elsewhere to becoming sovereign actors who vet, adapt, and deploy technology in service of their unique mission. By documenting and sharing its journey—the formation of its committee, the development of its cultural evaluation rubric, the results of its pilots—Tulen can generate invaluable intellectual property and a model of governance. This creates an opportunity to share a replicable process that could guide other tribal education departments, charter schools, and culturally-rooted educational organizations as they face the same complex challenges.

This approach offers a powerful counter-narrative to the often-deterministic and tech-centric discourse surrounding AI in education. By centering culture, prioritizing human relationships, and grounding its framework in a deep ethical tradition, Tułen can model a more holistic, humanistic, and sustainable path forward for all schools.

## Section 5: Consolidated Recommendations for Adoption and Refinement

The "Children's AI Safeguards" proposal for Tułen Charter School is a comprehensive, well-researched, and culturally-attuned document that provides an excellent foundation for the school's engagement with artificial intelligence. The following recommendations are intended to support its formal adoption and guide its successful, long-term implementation.

* **Recommendation 1: Adopt the Proposal's Principles as the Foundational Charter.** The Academic Policy Committee should formally ratify the seven "Children's AI Principles" as the school's official, guiding policy document. These principles are strongly aligned with global best practices and provide a clear, values-based foundation for all future decisions regarding AI.
* **Recommendation 2: Operationalize Key Policy Definitions.** The first official task of the newly formed AI Safety Review Committee should be to develop detailed, rubric-based definitions for the proposal's key policy terms. This includes creating specific criteria to evaluate what constitutes an "unsafe chatbot," what is meant by "strong crisis detection," and how "cultural alignment" will be assessed in practice, using the research and the Dena'ina Value Alignment Matrix in this report as a starting point.
* **Recommendation 3: Commit to a Structured, Problem-Based Pilot Process.** The school's leadership should formally adopt and mandate the five-step pilot process outlined in Section 3.2 for any new AI tool under consideration. This ensures that all technology adoption is driven by specific pedagogical needs and supported by evidence of efficacy and safety, rather than by marketing trends.
* **Recommendation 4: Invest in Sustained, Culturally-Relevant Professional Development.** An ongoing AI literacy program for all staff should be developed. This program must be co-designed with teachers to ensure it meets their needs and respects their time. The focus should be on ethical pedagogy and the integration of Dena'ina values into technology use, rather than on purely technical skills.
* **Recommendation 5: Document and Share the Journey.** The school should proactively document the process of implementing this framework—including the committee's work, the pilot program results, and the lessons learned. This documentation should be viewed as a valuable resource that can be shared to guide other schools in the KPBSD, across Alaska, and within the national network of Indigenous and culturally-focused educational institutions.

By adopting and thoughtfully implementing these safeguards, Tułen Charter School has the opportunity not only to provide the highest level of digital protection for its youngest learners but also to establish a new and vital standard for how ancient wisdom can guide the ethical application of modern technology, creating a path that others can follow.
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