



FAIRHAVEN POLICY SUB COMMITTEE MINUTES

August 25, 2026

MEMBERS PRESENT: Nicole Pacheco, Erik Andersen (via Zoom)
STAFF PRESENT: Assistant Superintendent Mark Balestracci
OTHERS PRESENT: Katherine Ware, Technology Engagement & Library Media Coordinator for the Fairhaven Public Schools

The meeting was called to order by Mrs. Pacheco at 2:31 pm.

The Subcommittee received the draft of the Artificial Intelligence Policy for review (Attachment A). Mrs. Ware explained the draft AI Policy stating it is recognized as a state model by Peak AI and was developed through extensive collaboration between district leaders and external experts, including representatives from the University of Massachusetts Lowell and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT). Stating the framework establishes a Human-AI-Human model that emphasizes AI as a supportive tool for human thought rather than a replacement and aims to balance technological adoption with the preservation of traditional pedagogy and direct human interaction.

Assistant Superintendent Balestracci explained the following are approved primary platforms for the District: Google Gemini, which was selected as the primary AI platform due to its strict compliance with student data privacy standards and non-storage / logging of individual queries unlike ChatGPT, NotebookLM (under Gemini), Brisk, Magic School, Canva Education, and Pear Deck Assessment. He then explained prohibited uses are inputting personal or identifiable student data into unvetted AI systems, student surveillance, as sole evidence in academic misconduct investigations, or drafting IEPs and other sensitive educational documents. Assistant Superintendent Balestracci explained that students are also prohibited from sharing personal images or submitting unacknowledged AI generated work.

The Subcommittee discussed the implementation strategy and safety safeguards. Mrs. Ware explained that automatic keyword triggers generate real time administrative alerts for concerning queries and immediate human intervention protocols redirect students to appropriate support resources when needed. She stated the District is collaborating with Google Gemini to embed filters that flag mental health keywords such as self harm or suicidal ideation and redirect students to human help. The Subcommittee discussed curriculum and professional development, creating study tools and learning coding basics. Assistant Superintendent explained this policy will help maintain uniform, district wide administrative controls.

Mr. Andersen made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mrs. Pacheco, passed unanimously (2-0). Adjourned at 3:20 pm.

Sheri Souza
Secretary to the School Committee
Fairhaven Public Schools

Approved
September 16, 2026

District Commitment	Principle
AI may support learning, but it may not replace student thinking, educator judgment, or authentic demonstration of understanding.	Authenticity and Learning
Student, staff, and family data must be protected. Personally identifiable, confidential, or sensitive	Privacy and Protection

Artificial Intelligence Policy

Fairhaven Public Schools

Prepared for Fairhaven Public Schools

Draft for Review

This document is structured from the district's prior draft policy, revised DESE-aligned guidelines, PEA²K cohort workbook language, and the Playlab analysis recommendations.

Board-level governance document. This policy sets district expectations, oversight structures, and required safeguards for the use of artificial intelligence across teaching, learning, and operations.

1. Purpose

Fairhaven Public Schools recognizes that artificial intelligence (AI), including generative AI, is increasingly present in teaching, learning, and district operations. This policy establishes the district's governing expectations for safe, ethical, equitable, transparent, and educationally sound use of AI. The district's approach is grounded in a Human-AI-Human model: people begin the work with purpose and context, AI may provide support within approved boundaries, and people retain responsibility for review, judgment, and final decisions.

PEAK also made suggestion to input something about Portrait of a Graduate (Human to Machine Contact) – refer to literature review articles 56, 98, 101)--this is where it already fits in.

2. Scope

- This policy applies to all district employees, contractors, volunteers, students, and third-party vendors using or providing AI-enabled tools in connection with Fairhaven Public Schools.
- It applies to instructional use, professional use, operational use, student use, procurement, communications, data handling, assessment, and decision-making.
- This policy should be read alongside the district's Acceptable Use Policy, student handbook, code of conduct, curriculum expectations, privacy notices, and all applicable federal and Massachusetts laws.

3. Governing Principles

Principle	District Commitment
Authenticity and Learning	AI may support learning, but it may not replace student thinking, educator judgment, or authentic demonstration of understanding.
Privacy and Protection	Student, staff, and family data must be protected. Personally identifiable, confidential, or sensitive

Principle	District Commitment
	information may not be entered into unauthorized AI systems.
Safety and Legal Compliance	Only vetted and approved AI tools may be used in district work. The district will maintain compliance with FERPA, COPPA, PPRA, IDEA, Section 504, ADA, Title VI, Title IX, CIPA, and 603 CMR 23.00.
Transparency and Accountability	District users must be clear when AI meaningfully contributes to content, decisions, recommendations, or communication. Human users remain accountable for all final outputs and decisions.
Equity and Inclusive Access	AI implementation must address access, use, and design divides and must be monitored for bias, accessibility barriers, and disparate impact across student groups.
Human Oversight	AI may inform work but may not independently make high-stakes educational, disciplinary, employment, or service access decisions.

PEAK's Suggestion: *"Fairhaven Public Schools is committed to building AI Literacy for all students as a core educational priority. The district will align AI literacy instruction with MA DLCS standards and embed topics including algorithmic bias, data privacy, misinformation, ethical decision-making, and environmental impacts across content areas and grade levels – not solely in technology courses"*

4. Governance and Oversight

- The district shall maintain a cross-departmental AI Governance Committee with representation from instruction and curriculum, educational technology, special education and student services, data and assessment, finance and operations, human resources, legal and compliance, and family and community engagement.
- The Committee will oversee phased implementation, review proposed tools and practices, coordinate policy review, monitor equity and compliance indicators, and issue an annual AI impact update.
- Designated point people in each department will coordinate local implementation and surface emerging needs, risks, and promising practices.
- The AI Governance Committee will establish annual student advisory input processes, including focus groups and surveys, to gather student perspectives on AI tool use, classroom norms, and reported concerns. Student voice will be documented and used to inform policy revisions and tool selection

- **Peak's Suggestion:** *Fairhaven Public Schools is committed to a transparent, multilingual communication with families about how AI is used in classrooms and operations. The district will host at least one annual AI literacy session for families, offered with multilingual supports, and will share plain-language summaries of AI tool use through the district website and AI Hub. Family input will be solicited through surveys and incorporated into the annual policy review.*

District Roles and Responsibilities

Role	Responsibility Summary
Superintendent and School Committee	- Approve the policy and major revisions. - Ensure district oversight, resourcing, and alignment with strategic priorities.
AI Governance Committee	- Recommend tool approval criteria, monitor implementation, and review district data on use, access, bias, and effectiveness. - Support annual updates to policy and guidelines and coordinate stakeholder engagement.
Administrators and Supervisors	- Ensure staff implementation aligns with district expectations, approved tools, and professional responsibilities. - Support communication with families and ensure academic integrity and student discipline processes are fair and instruction-centered.
Educators and Staff	- Use only approved tools, protect data, verify outputs, and model transparent, ethical use. - Design assignments and assessments with clear expectations for permitted AI use.
Students	- Follow district, school, classroom, and assignment-specific expectations for AI use. - Disclose AI use as required, protect personal information, verify information, and remain responsible for submitted work.
Vendors	- Disclose where and how AI is used, how data is handled, what safeguards exist, and what bias-mitigation and accessibility measures are in place.

5. District-Wide Student AI Acceptable Use Scale

Teachers will identify the applicable AI-use level for an assignment, task, or course activity. Students must follow that direction and disclose use accordingly.

Level	Meaning
Level 0 - No AI Use	No AI assistance is permitted. Work must be fully student-generated unless an accessibility accommodation has been approved.
Level 1 - AI for Idea Generation Only	AI may be used for brainstorming, questioning, or planning. Students disclose use and retain the substance of the work.
Level 2 - AI-Assisted Editing	AI may be used to improve clarity, organization, or mechanics of student-created work. Students disclose use and preserve authorship.
Level 3 - AI for Specified Tasks	AI may complete teacher-defined support tasks such as generating examples, practice questions, or structured feedback. Students disclose and, when requested, cite prompts or interactions.
Level 4 - Full AI Use with Human Oversight	AI is intentionally integrated into the learning task. Students cite or disclose use, critically evaluate outputs, and demonstrate original reasoning, reflection, and accountability.

6. Required Safeguards

Procurement and Vendor Review

- All AI-enabled products must undergo district review before approval or renewal.
- Vendor review must include AI capability disclosure, data use and retention terms, training data or model governance information when available, accessibility documentation, bias-mitigation evidence, age requirements, and legal compliance assurances.
- Special education, multilingual learner, instructional, technology, and compliance perspectives must be included in the review process when student-facing tools are considered.

Equity and Accessibility

- The district will monitor access divide, use divide, and design divide concerns through regular review cycles.
- All student-facing AI implementation must consider multilingual learners, students with disabilities, students from under-resourced households, and historically marginalized groups.
- The district will review disaggregated data related to access, use patterns, outcomes, and reported harms and will take corrective action when disparities are identified.

PEAK's Suggestion: "The district will conduct an annual equity review of AI implementation that disaggregates data by race/ethnicity, disability status, multilingual learner status, and socioeconomic background. The review will examine: device and internet access, AI tool usage rates, academic outcomes in AI-integrated settings, and reported harms or concerns. Results will be shared with the AI Governance Committee and used to inform corrective action and policy updates."

Phased Implementation

Phase	Focus
Exploration	Build shared AI literacy, establish governance, inventory current tools, and conduct initial equity and compliance review.
Piloting	Test vetted tools in limited contexts with clear goals, staff support, and structured feedback.
Scaling	Expand only after review of pilot evidence, equity considerations, training readiness, and legal compliance.
Sustaining and Adapting	Review annually, update guidance as technology changes, and maintain feedback loops with staff, students, and families.

7. Prohibited Uses

STAFF–Prohibited Uses

Staff members are prohibited from:

- Using non-approved AI tools for district work, instructional planning, communications, or any task involving student or staff data when district approval is required.
- Entering protected or confidential information into any AI tool — including student records, IEP content, disciplinary records, health information, staff evaluations, personally identifiable information (PII), or any other confidential district data.
- Uploading, entering, or prompting AI tools with any image, photo, or visual likeness of a student. This includes photographs, screenshots, video stills, or any other visual representation that could identify a student. Doing so may violate FERPA, COPPA, and Massachusetts Student Records Regulations (603 CMR 23.00), and may expose students to risks including facial recognition, data profiling, or the generation of harmful synthetic media.
- Using AI to generate, render, alter, or produce any image depicting a student — real or synthetic — including AI-generated illustrations, avatars, or deepfake-style content that uses or approximates a student's likeness, without explicit written consent and district approval. This prohibition applies even when the intent is educational or benign.
- Using AI to make or finalize high-stakes decisions regarding grading, discipline, placement, eligibility, hiring, staff evaluation, or access to services without meaningful human review, professional judgment, and documented authority. AI may inform — it may never decide.
- Relying on AI detection tools as definitive evidence of academic misconduct or as the primary method for identifying integrity violations. Detection tools are unreliable and may disproportionately flag multilingual learners and students with disabilities.

- Using AI to impersonate another person, generate deceptive or harmful content, misrepresent authorship, or produce content intended to mislead students, families, or colleagues.
- Allowing AI-generated content to replace professional judgment, grade-level expectations, required accessibility accommodations, or civil rights protections under IDEA, Section 504, ADA, Title VI, or Title IX.
- Using AI to monitor students or staff for surveillance purposes — including analyzing classroom interactions, tracking movements, or generating behavioral profiles — in ways that infringe on privacy rights or create a culture of surveillance.
- Deploying AI tools with students before those tools have been vetted for data privacy compliance (FERPA, COPPA, 603 CMR 23.00), accessibility standards, and bias mitigation.

Human-AI-Human Reminder for Staff: All AI use should begin with a human question or need, and every AI output must be reviewed, critically evaluated, and approved by a qualified human before it influences any decision, communication, or instructional practice.

STUDENTS — Prohibited Uses

Students are prohibited from:

- Using non-approved AI tools for schoolwork unless explicitly permitted by their teacher for a specific assignment or purpose.
- Entering personal or private information into any AI tool — including their own or others' full names, addresses, student ID numbers, health information, or any information about other students or staff.
- Uploading, sharing, or entering any photo, image, or visual likeness of themselves or any other student into an AI tool. This includes school photos, selfies, screenshots, or any image that could identify a person. Student images are protected under FERPA and COPPA, and sharing them with AI platforms — even casually — can put your privacy and safety at risk.
- Using AI to generate, alter, or create any image that depicts a real student, staff member, or other person — including deepfakes, AI-generated avatars, or manipulated photos. Creating or sharing such content is a serious violation of privacy and dignity, and may also violate district bullying and harassment policies and Massachusetts law (see Massachusetts Bill H.4744: An Act to Prevent Abuse and Exploitation).
- Submitting AI-generated content as their own original work without disclosure, unless the assignment explicitly permits and defines that use.
- Using AI to impersonate another person, create fake or deceptive content, generate harmful or harassing material, or manipulate media to bully, intimidate, or mislead others.
- Over-relying on AI in ways that replace their own thinking and learning. AI is a thought partner — not a substitute for developing your own knowledge, skills, and ideas.
- Using AI to bypass accessibility supports or accommodations that are part of their IEP or 504 plan without educator guidance.
- Sharing AI-generated content that contains misinformation, bias, or harmful stereotypes without identifying and addressing those issues first.

Human-AI-Human Reminder for Students: Good AI use starts with your question and ends with your judgment. Always ask: Did I think about this? Do I understand it? Is it accurate, fair, and honest? Your voice and your thinking matter most.

8. Current District Approved AI Tools:

The district's list of approved AI tools was developed using resources and vetted agreements from the Student Data Privacy Consortium, ensuring each tool meets established standards for protecting student data. This approach reflects a commitment to using practical, field-tested privacy solutions designed to address real-world challenges in safeguarding learner information.

**List subject to change based on available tools and Student Data Privacy agreements.*

Staff Tools	Student Tools
Gemini & Notebook LM (through the Google Education Suite)	Gemini & NotebookLM (through the Google Education Suite)
Brisk (Free Version)	Brisk Student (Free)
Diffit (Free Version)	Magic School Student (Free)
SchoolAI (Free Version)	Canva Education
Magic School (Free Version)	
Project Read (Free Version)	
Canva Education	
Pear Deck Assessment with AI tool (Paid Version)	
Playlab AI (Just signed DPA)	

9. Review and Revision

This policy will be reviewed at least annually and may be revised sooner in response to changes in law, technology, district practice, or evidence of risk or harm. Administrative regulations and implementation guidance may be updated more frequently so long as they remain consistent with this policy.

(PEAK's suggestion) "The AI Governance Committee will public an annual AI Impact Report that includes: (1) a summary of approved tools and any changes to the approved list; (2) equity data on access and use patterns disaggregated by student demographics; (3) any identified harms or concerns

and corrective actions taken; (4) community feedback received and how it shaped implementation. This report will be shared with the School Committee and posted publicly on the district website.”

10. Adoption

Adopted by: _____

Date adopted: _____

Next review date: _____

References

- AI for Education. (n.d.). *Lower student AI literacy predicts higher propensity to use AI on assignments*.
<https://www.aiforeducation.io/blog/lower-ai-literacy-more-likely-to-use-ai>
- AI for Education. (n.d.). *State AI guidance for K–12 schools*.
<https://www.aiforeducation.io/ai-resources/state-ai-guidance>
- Center for Innovative Teaching & Learning, Indiana University Bloomington. (n.d.). *How to productively address AI-generated text in your classroom*.
<https://citl.indiana.edu/teaching-resources/academic-integrity/ai-generated-text.html>
- Chang, M. W., Chen, K. S., & Chen, C. C. (2025). Evidence-based policymaking and governance of education policy in the AI era: A study of the New Taipei City AI Education Bureau. *Journal of Education Research*, (380), 4–19.
- Common Sense Media. (2024, August). *Generative AI in K–12 education: Challenges and opportunities*.
<https://www.common Sense Media.org/sites/default/files/research/report/generative-ai-in-k-12-education-white-paper-updated-aug-2024-final-2.pdf>
- Diliberti, M. K., Lake, R. J., & Weiner, S. R. (2025). *More districts are training teachers on artificial intelligence: Findings from the American School District Panel*. <http://voltbis.com/cra956-31.html>
- Ditch That Textbook. (2025, May 19). *AI and cheating: 20 things educators should consider*.
<https://ditchthattextbook.com/ai-cheating-considerations/>
- Elgersma, C. (2024, June 13). *How to help prevent AI use for plagiarism*. Common Sense Media.
<https://www.common Sense Media.org/education/articles/how-to-help-prevent-ai-use-for-plagiarism>
- Elgersma, C. (2025, May 19). *ChatGPT and beyond: How to handle AI in schools*. Common Sense Education.
<https://www.common Sense Media.org/education/articles/chatgpt-and-beyond-how-to-handle-ai-in-schools>
- Eutsler, L., Rivera, B., Barnes, M., & Cummings, J. (2025). Artificial intelligence policies in K–12 school districts in the United States: A content analysis shaping education policy. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2025.2476589>
- Ghimire, A., & Edwards, J. (2024, July). From guidelines to governance: A study of AI policies in education. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence in Education* (pp. 299–307). Springer Nature Switzerland. https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-031-64312-5_36
- Gouseti, A., James, F., Fallin, L., & Burden, K. (2025). The ethics of using AI in K–12 education: A systematic literature review. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, 34(2), 161–182.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1475939X.2024.2428601>
- Gulson, K., Knight, S., Bello y Villarino, J. M., Vlies, P. R., Huang, X., Kitto, K., ... Cumbo, B. (2026). *Governing AI in education: Policy opportunities for building participatory and equitable futures*. University of Technology Sydney.
https://appi.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2026/02/Gulson_Governing-AI-in-education-PIP-1.pdf

- Howard, S. K., Swist, T., Gasevic, D., Bartimote, K., Knight, S., Gulson, K., ... Selwyn, N. (2022). Educational data journeys: Where are we going, what are we taking and making for AI? *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 3, 100073.
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2666920X22000285>
- Joshi, S. (2026). *Policy recommendations for New Jersey's artificial intelligence leadership in K-12, higher education, and workforce development*. <https://www.preprints.org/manuscript/202601.1351>
- Kim, K., & Kwon, K. (2024). A systematic review of evaluation in K-12 artificial intelligence education from 2013 to 2022. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 33(1), 103-131.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2024.2335499>
- Kundu, A., & Bej, T. (2025). AI policies in school education: A comparative study on China, Singapore, Finland, and the US. *Journal of Science and Technology Policy Management*.
<https://www.emerald.com/jstpm/article/doi/10.1108/JSTPM-06-2024-0218/1302351>
- Lee, S. J., & Kwon, K. (2024). A systematic review of AI education in K-12 classrooms from 2018 to 2023. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 6, 100211.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100211>
- Liang, W., Yuksekgonul, M., Mao, Y., Wu, E., & Zou, J. (2023, July 10). GPT detectors are biased against non-native English writers. *Patterns*.
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2666389923001307>
- Ma, M., Ng, D. T. K., Liu, Z., & Wong, G. K. W. (2025). Fostering responsible AI literacy: A systematic review of K-12 AI ethics education. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 8, 100422.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2025.100422>
- Mangione, G. R. J., Pieri, M., & De Santis, F. (2024). Revitalizing education in rural and small schools: The role of AI in teachers' professional development. *Italian Journal of Educational Technology*, 32(1), 21-35.
- Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (n.d.). *Artificial intelligence (AI) in K-12 schools*. <https://www.doe.mass.edu/edtech/ai/default.html>
- Miao, F., & Holmes, W. (2021). *AI and education: A guidance for policymakers*. UNESCO Publishing.
- North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. (2024, January 16). *North Carolina generative AI implementation recommendations and considerations for PK-13 public schools*.
<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1U-AwwwBg7gIJ4ZDlcKVzARuFRPWwUWzqRN2rOgT9zIA>
- Peracchia, K., & Sayers, B. (n.d.). *Denver Public Schools handbook on AI in schools*. Denver Public Schools.
<https://www.canva.com/design/DAGD8k1Fz48/IL31zPtSjwUzwlxAgEiW8A/view>
- Rice, M. (2025). The micropolitical landscape of publicly discoverable policies for generative AI in large US school districts. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, 34(2), 201-217.
- Roberts, A. B., & Richardson, J. W. (2025). The role of artificial intelligence in schools: A case of policy formation. *Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership*, 28(1), 136-146.

- Schiff, D. (2022). Education for AI, not AI for education: The role of education and ethics in national AI policy strategies. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 32(3), 527–563.
- Spencer, J. (2025, February 12). *A continuum for using AI in schools*.
<https://spencereducation.com/a-continuum-for-using-ai-in-schools/>
- TeachAI. (2025). *AI guidance for schools toolkit*. <https://www.teachai.org/toolkit>
- UNESCO. (n.d.). *Artificial intelligence in education*.
<https://www.unesco.org/en/digital-education/artificial-intelligence>
- Wang, K., Dong, K., Wu, J., & Wu, J. (2025). Patterns of artificial intelligence policies in China: A nationwide perspective. *Library Hi Tech*, 43(1), 295–325.
- Wang, Y. (2021). When artificial intelligence meets educational leaders' data-informed decision-making: A cautionary tale. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 69, 100872.
- White, S. V., Childs, J., Koshy, S., & Scott, A. (2024, May). Policy implementation in the era of responsible artificial intelligence (AI) use in K–12 education. In *Proceedings of the 2024 RESPECT Annual Conference* (pp. 81–85).