

April 2026

*Erin Whinnery, Adrienne Fischer,  
& Heena Kuwayama*

[ewhinnery@ecs.org](mailto:ewhinnery@ecs.org), [afischer@ecs.org](mailto:afischer@ecs.org),  
& [hkuwayama@ecs.org](mailto:hkuwayama@ecs.org)

The rapid growth of AI has driven state legislators to develop policies and guidelines related to the integration and responsible use of these technologies in schools. In 2025, the **Southern Regional Education Board (SREB)** AI Commission published a set of nine [recommendations](#) aimed at guiding states, schools, and higher education institutions in the adoption of AI. The nine recommendations include:

- **Establish state AI networks** so people, groups and agencies can connect, communicate, collaborate and coordinate AI efforts across each state.
- **Develop targeted AI guidance** for distinct groups using, integrating or supporting the use of AI in education.
- **Provide high quality professional development** by working with local districts and institutions to develop plans to provide and incentivize high-quality professional development for AI.
- **Integrate into standards and curricula** the AI knowledge and skills students need to prepare them for success in the workforce.
- **Assess local capacity and needs** to determine the capacity of local districts, schools and postsecondary institutions to integrate AI successfully.
- **Develop resource allocation plans** for AI implementation in schools, districts and institutions of higher education to ensure that the implementation of AI is successful, sustainable and available to all students.
- **Assess risk management** to reduce risks associated with AI. States should establish statewide AI networks so people, groups and agencies can connect, communicate, collaborate and coordinate AI efforts across each state.
- **Create strong AI procurement policies** to help districts and institutions identify AI tools that align with their education goals.
- **Align development strategies** across K-12 education, postsecondary institutions, workforce training systems, and economic development agencies to ensure that these systems effectively prepare students and workers for an AI-driven economy.

Additional SREB [resources](#) also provide a thorough snapshot of policies and practices in member states. The remainder of this document provides an overview of recent federal actions related to AI policy, as well as a snapshot of AI in recent state legislation, governors' executive orders, and other state policy actions.

## Federal Developments

Several recent federal policy actions have addressed AI usage and regulation across the country. In January 2025, the President signed [Executive Order 14179](#), which aimed to remove barriers to American leadership in AI by requiring several officials and agencies to coordinate to develop a national [AI action plan](#). In April 2025, [Executive Order 14277](#) established the White House Task Force on Artificial Intelligence Education and the Presidential Artificial Intelligence Challenge to highlight student and educator achievements in AI. The order also aims to provide greater resources to support K-12 AI education, prioritize AI training for teachers, and increase participation in AI-related apprenticeships. In December 2025, the President signed [Executive Order 14365](#), which aims to restrict states from enacting AI laws that are not aligned with the White House's policy to sustain and enhance the United States' global AI dominance.

The order creates a task force to challenge such laws and encourages federal agencies to assess whether they may condition their grants on states not enacting such laws. In addition, the order requires the development of a [national policy framework](#) for AI, which was released in March 2026.

## Recent State Policy Actions

Many of the policies and guidelines related to AI's use in education stem from more overarching policies applicable to all state agencies. These policies cover a wide range of topics related to AI, including: state and local AI policy adoption, allowable uses of AI in education, data privacy protections, and AI literacy instruction, among other things.

## State and Local Policy Adoption Requirements

Several states have required the development of statewide guidelines or model policies relating to AI in education. Some have also required that local districts develop and/or adopt policies regarding AI use in educational settings.

- **Arkansas [H.B. 1958](#)** (2025): Requires public entities, including public school districts, open-enrollment charter schools, and postsecondary institutions, to establish policies for the authorized use of AI and automated decision tools. Policies must define authorized uses and require an authorized human employee to make any final decisions.
- **Illinois [S.B. 1920](#)** (2025): Requires the state board of education to develop and publish guidance for school districts and educators on the use of AI in elementary and secondary education by July 1, 2026.
- **Ohio [H.B. 96](#)** (2025): Requires the department to develop a model policy on AI. Requires school districts and community colleges to adopt a policy on AI.
- **Tennessee [H.B. 1630](#) / [S.B. 1711](#)** (2024): Requires the governing body of each public institution of higher education, local education agency (LEA), and public charter school to adopt a policy regarding the use of AI by students, faculty, and staff for instructional and assignment purposes. Requires the board of each LEA and public charter school to report to the department of education such adopted policies and methods of enforcement for the upcoming school year. See [here](#) for media coverage on implementation.

## Allowable or Prohibited Uses of AI in Education

Many state policies address specific uses of AI technologies within school environments or by students, education employees, or state agencies (including education agencies).

- **Nevada [A.B. 406](#)** (2025): Prohibits a public school from using AI to perform the functions and duties of a school counselor, school psychologist, or school social worker which relate to the mental health of students. Requires the state department of education to develop a policy for the use of AI by such school employees while providing therapy, counseling, or other mental or behavioral health services to students.
- **New York [S.B. 8831](#)** (2026): Prohibits the use of AI systems to affect employees' rights under a collective bargaining agreement or result in the loss or transfer of an employee's duties to an AI system in a school district, board of cooperative educational services, county vocational education and extension board, district corporation, the state university of New York, the city university of New York, or a community college.
- **Utah [H.B. 44](#)** (2026): Allows a local education agency to establish a policy permitting a student to use AI glasses to respond to safety threats, for a special education accommodation, or for a medical necessity.

## Data Security and Privacy

The Consortium for School Networking (CoSN) [State and Federal Cybersecurity Policy and Education Report](#) highlights that lawmakers in 42 states proposed 258 cybersecurity-related bills, with 29 becoming law in 2024. The report underscores increasing awareness of the integration of AI and cybersecurity challenges facing K-12 schools and recommends policymakers mitigate risks through regular assessments of AI's cybersecurity implications, the integration of AI in cybersecurity monitoring, the development of AI security standards, cross-sector collaboration on emerging threats, and regular policy updates to keep pace with evolving technologies.

- **Indiana [S.B. 150](#)** (2024): Establishes an AI taskforce and integrates AI and cybersecurity in education by enabling schools to adopt cybersecurity policies aligned with state guidelines, enact mandatory training, and create technology usage policies. Additionally, it permits state agencies to submit an inventory of AI technologies in use or under consideration and clarifies state and local government ownership of records. Beginning in 2027, institutions connecting to state technology infrastructure must complete cybersecurity assessments every three years and ensure ongoing compliance with state standards.
- **Rhode Island [Executive Order 24-06](#)** (2024): Establishes an AI Center of Excellence, charged with creating policies related to AI use and security. Creates a Chief Data Officer role, responsible for data operations, data quality and standards. The EO provides for the creation of a statewide data platform that will make it easier to access and use data and leverage best practices from existing data systems.

## AI-Generated Deepfakes

At least [43 states](#) have passed legislation addressing the creation and/or distribution of nonconsensual sexually explicit deepfakes, with at least 28 explicitly prohibiting the creation of AI-generated child sexual abuse material. In addition, some states have incorporated the distribution of AI-generated deepfakes into their definitions of cyberbullying or sexual misconduct.

- **Illinois [H.B. 3851](#)** (2025): Expands the definition of “cyber-bullying” to include the posting or distribution of an unauthorized digital replica if said posting or distribution places a student in reasonable fear of harm, causes a substantially detrimental effect on a student’s physical or mental health, or substantially interferes with a student’s academic performance or ability to participate in or benefit from the services, activities, or privileges provided by a school.
- **Minnesota [H.F. 4024](#)** (2024): Establishes a statutory definition of campus sexual misconduct that include nonconsensual dissemination of a deepfake depicting intimate parts or sexual acts. All public postsecondary institutions and private postsecondary institutions that offer in-person courses on a campus located in the state are required to adopt a policy on sexual misconduct.

## Curriculum and Professional Development

In addition to specifying allowable uses of AI or requiring the adoption of AI usage policies, some states have attempted to ensure that students and teachers are equipped to responsibly and ethically use AI technologies by requiring certain AI literacy instruction and professional development opportunities.

- The **New Jersey** Department of Education launched [two grant programs](#) to encourage the use of AI in instruction, funded by \$1.5 million in Gov. Murphy’s budget. The “Artificial Intelligence Innovation in Education Grant” will fund AI-driven classroom initiatives in 10 school districts, while the “Expanding Career

Pathways in Artificial Intelligence Grant” will help two vocational school districts to create, develop and publish an AI and robotics curriculum.

- **Texas H.B. 3512** (2025): Among other things, mandates AI training for certain school district employees, aligning it with existing cybersecurity training requirements. The Texas Department of Information Resources will certify AI training programs, ensuring they cover AI literacy, best practices, and responsible deployment.
- **Utah H.B. 273** (2026): Among other provisions, requires the state board of education to adopt computer science standards and objectives, and include AI standards in core computer science standards.
- **Virginia H.B. 171** (2026): Existing law requires a school division’s acceptable use policy for the internet to include a component on internet safety for students. This bill requires that the instructional program includes instruction on key modern digital safety topics, including AI-generated content.

### **Other Relevant Policies**

The examples below highlight additional policy approaches states have taken to addressing AI in education, including policies requiring research on the impacts of AI, setting procurement standards, or addressing multiple AI-related concerns at once.

- The **Florida K-12 AI Education Task Force** is a statewide grassroots initiative led by the CS Everyone center at the University of Florida, which provides guidance regarding AI in Florida schools.
- **Idaho S.B. 1227** (2026): Requires the department of education to develop a statewide framework for generative AI in education, and requires each district and charter school to adopt a policy governing its use. Requires the department of education to recommend AI literacy standards, assessment guidelines, and a professional development plan. Requires that procurement of any generative AI-related tools and applications complies with state and federal data privacy laws and allows the department of education to establish a list of approved tools or model procurement guidelines.
- **Nebraska L.B. 1284** (2024): Establishes the Dyslexia Research Grant Program. Funds are to be used for the purpose of researching the use of AI -based writing assistance by individuals with dyslexia.
- In January 2025, the **Pennsylvania** Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights published a **policy brief** analyzing AI’s potential impact in K-12 classrooms. The report highlights AI’s potential to enhance data, expand online learning in rural areas, support students with disabilities, supplement learning, while also addressing risk mitigation.
- **Virginia H.B. 1186 / S.B. 394** (2026): Requires the department of education to compile information on current uses of AI for student instruction, and establish guidance for safe, ethical, and equitable use of AI in instructional settings. Requires each school board to establish, implement, and enforce policies consistent with this guidance. Requires the department of education to establish and oversee the AIS Innovation in Education Pilot Program to evaluate and scale safe and innovative uses of AI systems in schools.

### **Postsecondary and Workforce Development**

While many of the broader education policies above may encompass postsecondary institutions, some states have also introduced policies more narrowly focused on AI within postsecondary education and workforce development. States and postsecondary systems are working to understand what impacts AI will have on instruction, operations, and the job market. For a high-level look at implications, EDUCAUSE released their **second report** on the AI landscape in higher education in February 2025. EDUCAUSE released an **additional report** on the impact of AI on work in higher education in January 2026.

In general, the findings of these reports indicate that AI is a priority for many postsecondary institutions. In addition, findings highlight that the majority of institutions have an AI-related strategy that includes training for faculty and staff, that institutions are creating guidelines around AI use, and that the higher education community is both optimistic about the opportunities AI presents and concerned about the risks associated with its use.

### *Postsecondary Degree Programs in AI*

Several institutions of higher education now offer degree programs or other training focused on AI.

- University of Pennsylvania: [B.S.E.](#) in Artificial Intelligence
- Carnegie Mellon University: [B.S.](#) in Artificial Intelligence
- Purdue University: [B.A., B.S.](#), or [M.S.](#) in Artificial Intelligence
- George Washington University: [D.Eng.](#) in Artificial Intelligence & Machine Learning
- University of Texas at Austin: [M.S.](#) in Artificial Intelligence (100% online)
- University of Iowa: [One-on-one trainings](#) available from the Office of Teaching, Learning, and Technology
- [Michigan Virtual Custom AI Training](#) (virtual or in-person)

### *Postsecondary and Workforce AI Policies*

In addition to offering programs focused on AI, some states and postsecondary systems have taken specific policy actions aiming to expand AI access and expertise in the workforce.

- The **Michigan [Statewide Workforce Plan](#)** (2024) expands access to certificates and degrees that equip residents for success in a growing technological society. Aims to increase the percentage of adults with a certificate or degree from 51% to 60% by 2030.
- **Minnesota State**, consisting of 33 public institutions, released an AI [guidance document](#) on policy intersections, considerations, and recommendations. The recommendations can inform institutional efforts to develop their own generative AI tools. Many include agreements with technology conglomerates to ensure that the tools remain internal to the university and not available to the public.
- **New Jersey [S. 3432](#)** (2024): Invests in AI statewide, offering tax credits to eligible businesses where at least 50% of employees work on AI-related tasks. Encourages partnerships with state educational institutions to support employment in technology sectors.
- **Massachusetts Institute of Technology** has a task force on the [Work of the Future](#) to learn how the continued growth of AI will change the skills and work required by employees and businesses. Postsecondary institutions are developing undergraduate, graduate, and professional degrees in AI, as well as tailored professional development opportunities to meet current and future demands.

### **Task Forces and Commissions on AI**

Education Commission of the States (ECS) has identified that at least 33 states and Washington, D.C. have current or former task forces or commissions related to AI in education. Twenty-six of these task forces or commissions have published reports containing guidelines and recommendations related to AI, many of which include a focus on AI literacy, educator training, ethical uses of AI, equitable access to AI tools, and partnerships between K-12 systems, higher education, industry, and state agencies in supporting AI initiatives. Several task forces have been decommissioned after publishing their required report, while others remain ongoing.

Education Commission of the States strives to respond to information requests within 48 hours. This document reflects our best efforts but it may not reflect exhaustive research. Please let us know if you would like a more comprehensive response. Our staff is also available to provide unbiased advice on policy plans, consult on proposed legislation and testify at legislative hearings as third-party experts.

State	Task Force/Commission	Reports
Alabama	<a href="#">Governor’s Task Force on Generative Artificial Intelligence</a> (2024)	<a href="#">GenAI Task Force Final Report</a> (November 2024)
Arizona	<a href="#">AI Steering Committee</a>	
Arkansas	<a href="#">AI &amp; Analytics Center of Excellence</a> (Terminated June 27, 2025)	<a href="#">AI Working Group Initial Report</a> (February 2025)
California	<a href="#">Artificial Intelligence in Education Workgroup</a>	
Colorado	<a href="#">Artificial Intelligence Impact Task Force</a> <a href="#">Governor’s AI Policy Workgroup</a>	<a href="#">Report and Recommendations</a> (February 2025) <a href="#">Proposed AI Policy Framework</a> (March 2026)
Connecticut	<a href="#">Connecticut Artificial Intelligence Working Group</a> (Terminated after publishing report)	<a href="#">Connecticut Artificial Intelligence Working Group Report</a> (February 2024)
Delaware	<a href="#">Delaware AI Commission</a>	<a href="#">Annual Report</a> (2024) <a href="#">Annual Report</a> (2025)
District of Columbia	<a href="#">Advisory Group on AI Values Alignment</a> (Terminates December 31, 2026) <a href="#">AI Taskforce</a> (Terminates December 31, 2026)	
Georgia	<a href="#">Senate Study Committee on Artificial Intelligence</a> (2024) <a href="#">Senate Study Committee on Artificial Intelligence and Digital Currency</a> (2025) <a href="#">Senate Impact of Social Media and Artificial Intelligence on Children and Platform Privacy Protection Study Committee</a> (2025)	<a href="#">Senate Study Committee on AI Final Report</a> (December 2024) <a href="#">Final Report of the Senate Impact of Social Media and AI on Children and Platform Privacy Protection Study Committee</a> (2025)
Idaho	<a href="#">2024 Artificial Intelligence Working Group</a> <a href="#">2025 Artificial Intelligence Working Group</a>	
Illinois	<a href="#">Generative AI and Natural Language Processing Task Force</a>	<a href="#">Report of the Generative AI and Natural Language Processing Task Force</a> (December 2024)
Indiana	<a href="#">Artificial Intelligence Task Force</a> (Terminated after publishing report)	<a href="#">Artificial Intelligence Task Force: Final Report</a> (October 2024)

Education Commission of the States strives to respond to information requests within 48 hours. This document reflects our best efforts but it may not reflect exhaustive research. Please let us know if you would like a more comprehensive response. Our staff is also available to provide unbiased advice on policy plans, consult on proposed legislation and testify at legislative hearings as third-party experts.

Kansas	<a href="#"><u>Kansas Legislative Artificial Intelligence Taskforce</u></a>	
Kentucky	Artificial Intelligence Task Force: Established by the Legislative Research Commission, terminated after publishing report	<a href="#"><u>Artificial Intelligence Task Force Findings &amp; Recommendations</u></a> (November 2024)
Louisiana	<a href="#"><u>Louisiana Board of Elementary and Secondary Education Artificial Intelligence Committee</u></a>	
Maine	<a href="#"><u>Maine Artificial Intelligence Task Force</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Maine Artificial Intelligence Task Force Report</u></a> (October 2025)
Maryland	<a href="#"><u>Governor’s Artificial Intelligence Subcabinet Workgroup on Artificial Intelligence Implementation</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>2025 Maryland AI Enablement Strategy &amp; AI Study Roadmap</u></a> (January 2025) <a href="#"><u>Report on the Sufficiency of the Governor’s Artificial Intelligence Subcabinet and Evaluation of Potential Transition</u></a> (December 2025)
Massachusetts	<a href="#"><u>AI Strategic Task Force</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Massachusetts AI Strategic Task Force 2024 Report to the Governor</u></a> (December 2024)
Mississippi	<a href="#"><u>AI Regulation (AIR) Task Force</u></a>	
New Jersey	<a href="#"><u>Artificial Intelligence Task Force</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Report to the Governor on Artificial Intelligence</u></a> (November 2024)
New Mexico	<a href="#"><u>Artificial Intelligence Work Group</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>LESC Artificial Intelligence Working Group Report</u></a> (July 2025)
North Carolina	<a href="#"><u>AI Leadership Council</u></a>	
Ohio	<a href="#"><u>Ohio’s AI in Education Coalition</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Ohio’s AI in Education Coalition: AI Strategy</u></a> (November 2024)
Oklahoma	<a href="#"><u>Governor’s Task Force on Emerging Technologies</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Artificial Intelligence Strategy to Support State Agencies in Oklahoma</u></a> (December 2023)
Oregon	<a href="#"><u>Joint Task Force on Artificial Intelligence</u></a> (2023-2024 legislative interim) <a href="#"><u>State Government Artificial Intelligence Advisory Council</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Final Report and Recommendations: Joint Task Force on Artificial Intelligence</u></a> <a href="#"><u>State Government Artificial Intelligence Advisory Council Final</u></a>

Education Commission of the States strives to respond to information requests within 48 hours. This document reflects our best efforts but it may not reflect exhaustive research. Please let us know if you would like a more comprehensive response. Our staff is also available to provide unbiased advice on policy plans, consult on proposed legislation and testify at legislative hearings as third-party experts.

		<a href="#">Recommended Action Plan</a> (February 2025)
<b>Rhode Island</b>	<a href="#">State of Rhode Island AI Task Force</a>	
<b>South Dakota</b>	<a href="#">Study Committee on Artificial Intelligence and Regulation of Internet Access by Minors</a> (2024 legislative session)	
<b>Tennessee</b>	<a href="#">Artificial Intelligence Advisory Council</a>	<a href="#">AI Advisory Council Status Report to the General Assembly</a> (May 2025) <a href="#">AI Advisory Council Action Plan</a> (November 2025)
<b>Texas</b>	<a href="#">Artificial Intelligence Advisory Council</a>	
<b>Utah</b>	<a href="#">Pro-Human Artificial Intelligence Task Force</a>	
<b>Vermont</b>	Artificial Intelligence Task Force (Terminated in 2020) <a href="#">Council on Artificial Intelligence</a>	<a href="#">Artificial Intelligence Task Force: Final Report</a> (January 2020) <a href="#">AI Council Report on AI Use &amp; Data Management</a> (January 2024)
<b>Washington</b>	<a href="#">Artificial Intelligence Task Force</a> (includes an <a href="#">Education and Workforce Development Subcommittee</a> )	<a href="#">Inaugural Report of the Washington State Artificial Intelligence Task Force</a> (December 2024) <a href="#">Interim Report of the Washington State Artificial Intelligence Task Force</a> (December 2025)
<b>West Virginia</b>	<a href="#">West Virginia Task Force on Artificial Intelligence</a> <a href="#">Select Committee on Artificial Intelligence</a> (2024 legislative session)	
<b>Wisconsin</b>	<a href="#">Governor’s Task Force on Workforce and Artificial Intelligence</a>	<a href="#">Advisory Action Plan</a> (July 2024)

## State Agency Guidance

ECS has identified at least 35 states with published state agency guidance pertaining to AI. The guidance documents range from brief overviews to extensive frameworks, and common themes include the importance of a human-centered approach, ethical uses of AI, and issues related to equitable access, AI literacy, and data privacy.

State	Guidance
<b>Alabama</b>	<a href="#">AI Policy Template for Local Education Agencies</a>

Education Commission of the States strives to respond to information requests within 48 hours. This document reflects our best efforts but it may not reflect exhaustive research. Please let us know if you would like a more comprehensive response. Our staff is also available to provide unbiased advice on policy plans, consult on proposed legislation and testify at legislative hearings as third-party experts.

Alaska	<a href="#"><u>Artificial Intelligence for K-12: Recommendations and Considerations for Districts</u></a>
Arizona	<a href="#"><u>Generative Artificial Intelligence in K-12 Education</u></a>
California	<a href="#"><u>Learning With AI, Learning About AI</u></a>
Colorado	<a href="#"><u>Roadmap for AI in K-12 Education</u></a>
Connecticut	<a href="#"><u>Guidance on Artificial Intelligence</u></a>
Delaware	<a href="#"><u>Generative AI in the Classroom</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Classroom Management when Integrating Gen. AI</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Gen. AI in Internet Safety Policies, Acceptable Use Policies, and Codes of Conduct Guidance</u></a>
Georgia	<a href="#"><u>Leveraging AI in the K-12 Setting</u></a>
Hawai'i	<a href="#"><u>AI Guidance for Employees</u></a> <a href="#"><u>AI Guidance for Student Use</u></a>
Indiana	<a href="#"><u>Artificial Intelligence Guidance</u></a>
Kentucky	<a href="#"><u>Artificial Intelligence Guidance Brief</u></a>
Louisiana	<a href="#"><u>Guidance for K-12 Schools</u></a>
Maine	<a href="#"><u>Maine: The AI Roadmap</u></a>
Massachusetts	<a href="#"><u>Massachusetts Guidance for Artificial Intelligence in K-12 Education</u></a>
Michigan	<a href="#"><u>Planning Guide for AI: A Framework for School Districts</u></a>
Minnesota	<a href="#"><u>Artificial Intelligence in Education</u></a>
Mississippi	<a href="#"><u>Artificial Intelligence: Guidance for K-12 Classrooms</u></a>
Missouri	<a href="#"><u>Artificial Intelligence Guidance for Local Education Agencies 1.0</u></a>
Montana	<a href="#"><u>Montana Artificial Intelligence in K12 Education Guidelines</u></a>
Nevada	<a href="#"><u>Nevada's STELLAR Pathway to AI Teaching and Learning: Ethics, Principles, and Guidance</u></a>
New Jersey	<a href="#"><u>AI Resource Page</u></a>
New Mexico	<a href="#"><u>AI Guidance for K-12 Education 1.0</u></a>
North Carolina	<a href="#"><u>North Carolina Gen. AI Implementation Recommendations and Considerations for PK-13 Public Schools</u></a>
North Dakota	<a href="#"><u>North Dakota K-12 AI Guidance Framework</u></a>
Ohio	<a href="#"><u>AI Toolkit</u></a> <a href="#"><u>AI In Education Model Policy</u></a>

Education Commission of the States strives to respond to information requests within 48 hours. This document reflects our best efforts but it may not reflect exhaustive research. Please let us know if you would like a more comprehensive response. Our staff is also available to provide unbiased advice on policy plans, consult on proposed legislation and testify at legislative hearings as third-party experts.

Oklahoma	<a href="#"><u>Guidance and Considerations for Using Artificial Intelligence in Oklahoma K-12 Schools</u></a>
Oregon	<a href="#"><u>Generative AI in K-12 Classrooms</u></a>
Rhode Island	<a href="#"><u>Artificial Intelligence (AI) Guidance for Local Education Agencies (LEAs)</u></a>
Utah	<a href="#"><u>Artificial Intelligence Framework for Utah P-12 Education</u></a>
Vermont	<a href="#"><u>Vermont AI Guidance for Education 1.0</u></a>
Virginia	<a href="#"><u>Guidelines for AI Integration throughout Education</u></a>
Washington	<a href="#"><u>Human-Centered Artificial Intelligence in Schools</u></a>
West Virginia	<a href="#"><u>Guidance, Considerations, &amp; Intentions for the Use of Artificial Intelligence in West Virginia Schools</u></a>
Wisconsin	<a href="#"><u>Empowering Lifelong Learning: AI Guidance for Enhancing K-12 and Library Education</u></a>
Wyoming	<a href="#"><u>Guidance for Wyoming School Districts on Developing Artificial Intelligence Use Policy</u></a>

## Additional Resources

- [Teach AI Resources for Policy and Guidance on AI in Education](#)
- [Designing for Education with Artificial Intelligence](#) – U.S. Department of Education, 2024
- [An Ethical and Equitable Vision of AI in Education: Learning Across 28 Exploratory Projects](#) – Digital Promise, 2024
- [Review of Guidance from Seven States on AI in Education](#) – Digital Promise, 2024
- [Districts and AI: Tracking Early Adopters and What This Means for 2024-25](#) – CRPE, 2024
- [AI & Accessibility in Education](#) – CoSN, 2024
- [Generative AI for Education Hub](#) – Stanford University, 2025
- [Framework for Implementing Artificial Intelligence in State Education Agencies](#) – ILO Group, 2024

## Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Samuel Comai, Sam Kreie, and Jenny McCann, students at American University, for their research and support with this information request.