AI Governance Workshop

Policy Development Worksheet (Grades 9-12)

Name:	Date:			
Stakeholder Role:		Committee	Members:	
The Governance Challenge				
Westbrook USD (15,000 students, 25 school Student Technology Governance Committee Board of Education.	,			
Constraints:				
 Must comply with FERPA and COP Cannot exceed current IT staffing Must be explainable to community System goes live in 60 days 	PPA			
Stakeholder Position Statement				
My assigned role:				
My primary concerns:		_		
Key questions I'll raise:		_		
Policy Area 1: Automated Respon	se Authority			
The Question				
What actions should SecureNet AI take au	itomatically vs. requiring hun	nan approval?		

Individual Analysis

Threat Level	My Recommended Automa Action	My Recomme Threshold	nded Human Approval
Critical (active attack) High (probable threat) Medium (suspicious activity) Low (anomaly detected)			
AI Consultati	on Notes		
AI's stated fal	se positive rate:		
AI's acknowle	dged limitation:		
Trade-off AI i	\det ified:		
Committee Do			
Rationale add	ressing all stakeholders:		
Policy Area (2: Behavioral Monitorin	ug Scope	
The Question	. Bellavioral iviolition	ag Scope	
-	ehaviors should SecureNet A	I monitor, and how show	ıld alerts be handled?
Individual An	alysis		
Activity Type	Monitor? (Y/N) Alert	Threshold Alert Re	ecipient My Reasoning
Web browsing (educational)			

Web browsing (non- educational) Search queries Communica- tions Behavioral patterns Legal Framework N FERPA implication COPPA implication			
educational) Search queries Communications Behavioral patterns Legal Framework N FERPA implication			
Search queries Communications Behavioral patterns Legal Framework N FERPA implication			
tions Behavioral patterns Legal Framework N FERPA implication			
Behavioral patterns Legal Framework N FERPA implication			
Legal Framework N FERPA implication			
FERPA implication			
FERPA implication			
	lotes		
COPPA implication	ns:		
COLLII III piicatio	ns (students i	under 13):	
AI Consultation No	otes		
Examples AI gave	of helpful mo	nitoring:	
False positive scena	urios AI ackn	owledged:	
Taile Pasier e seeme			
Committee Decision	n		
Monitoring scope r	ecommendat	ion:	
False positive hand	ling procedu	re:	
Student notification	n 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

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	

Data Type

Trade-offs Explicitly	Accepted	
Policy Brief Summa	OPV	
For Board of Education	presentation	
Recommendation 1:	Automated Response Authority	
Recommendation 2:	Behavioral Monitoring Scope	
Recommendation 3:	Data Retention and Learning	
Implementation Con	siderations	
Reflection What was the hardes	st trade-off your committee faced?	
How did SecureNet	AI's input influence your recommendations?	
What NICE Framew	ork Work Roles engage in this type of gover	rnance work?

How would you apply	y this experience to a future care	eer in cybe	rsecurity policy?
	$Building\ Human-AI\ Partnerships"-\\ryanstraight@arizona.edu$	- NICE K12	2025 Dr. Ryan Straight,