



## Response to information request

July 2025

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)

### Your Question:

You asked about policies regulating the use of artificial intelligence (AI) technologies in education.

### Our Response:

The rapid development of AI-powered tools has urged state legislators to develop policies and guidelines related to the integration and responsible use of these technologies in schools. Early 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-powered tools. The nine recommendations include:

1. **Establish state AI networks** so people, groups and agencies can connect, communicate, collaborate and coordinate efforts across each state.
2. **Develop targeted AI guidance** for distinct groups using, integrating or supporting the use of AI-powered tools in education.
3. **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.
4. **Integrate into standards and curricula** the AI knowledge and skills students need to prepare them for success in the workforce.
5. **Assess local capacity and needs** to determine how local districts, schools and postsecondary institutions to integrate AI successfully.
6. **Develop resource allocation plans** for AI implementation in schools, districts and postsecondary institutions to ensure that the implementation of AI is successful, sustainable and available to all students.
7. **Assess risk management** to reduce risks associated with AI.
8. **Create strong AI procurement policies** to help districts and institutions identify AI tools that align with their education goals.
9. **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.

SREB plans to publish new recommendations as the AI Commission approves them. Additional SREB [resources](#) also provide a thorough snapshot of policies and practices in member states. The remainder of this document provides a snapshot of AI in recent state legislation, data security and privacy concerns, state task forces, postsecondary systems and workforce efforts, and state education agency guidance.

### **Policies Relating to AI Generally**

Many of the policies and guidelines related to AI's use in education stem from more overarching policies applicable to all state agencies, including the examples below:

- **Arkansas H.B. 1958** (Enacted, 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

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.

Commented [TM1]: I didnt know about these additions - thank you!

employee to make any final decisions. The bill also requires public entities to develop training for employees on appropriate uses of AI and automated decision tools in deciding an outcome in the course of their employment.

- **District of Columbia [Mayor's Order 2024-028](#)** (2024). Articulates six overarching AI benchmarks that DC government agencies must consider when deploying an AI tool, and establishes an AI taskforce and advisory group.
- **Maryland [Executive Order 01.01.2024.02](#)** (2024). Establishes the [AI Subcabinet](#) and directs state efforts to catalyze the responsible and productive use of artificial intelligence by state agencies.
- **Virginia [Executive Order 46](#)** (2025). Prohibits any employee of a state agency from downloading or using the DeepSeek AI application on state-owned or leased equipment, or through a state-owned, -operated, or -maintained wireless network.
- **Washington [Executive Order 24-01](#)** (2024). Requires the state to develop [guidelines](#) related to state use of generative AI to ensure its ethical and transparent use, including how the government may procure, use and monitor the use of generative AI.

## Policies Related to AI in Education

While states are exploring what opportunities AI offers to enhance learning, policymakers are seeking to understand how to maximize benefits and minimize risks associated with this evolving technology.

- The **Connecticut State Department of Education** launched an [AI instruction pilot program](#) in seven school districts, lasting from January to June 2025.
- Florida [H.B. 1361](#) (Enacted, 2024) aims to expand the use of artificial intelligence by charging the University of Florida [Lastinger Center for Learning](#) to collaborate with school districts and award grants to eligible school districts. The bill specifies that these funds may be used for subscription fees and professional learning to support and accelerate learning for students in grades six through 12, and it appropriates \$2 million in recurring funds from the General Revenue Funds to the Center for the grant program.
- **Illinois [S.B. 1920](#)** (Sent to the Governor, 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.
- **Nebraska [L.B. 1284](#)** (Enacted, 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.
- **Nevada [A.B. 406](#)** (Enacted, 2025) prohibits a public school from using AI-powered tools to perform the functions and duties of a school counselor, school psychologist or school social worker that relate to the mental health of students. It requires the state department of education to develop a policy for the use of AI-powered tools by such school employees while providing therapy, counseling or other mental or behavioral health services to students.
- The **New Jersey Department of Education** launched [two grant programs](#) to encourage the use of AI-powered tools in instruction, which is 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.
- 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

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.

data, expand online learning in rural areas, support students with disabilities, supplement learning, while also mitigating risk.

- **Tennessee [H.B. 1630](#) / [S.B. 1711](#)** (Enacted, 2024) requires the board of trustees of each public institution of higher education and the governing body of each local education agency (LEA) and each public charter school to adopt a policy regarding the use of AI-powered technology used by students, faculty and staff for instructional and assignment purposes. It 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.
- **Texas [H.B. 3512](#)** (Enacted, 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. This bill was included as introduced legislation in the first quarterly report of the year.
- **Virginia [Executive Order 30](#)** (2024) enacts [AI Policy Standards](#) and [Guidelines for AI Integration throughout Education](#) which include guiding principles, strategies for success, and roles/responsibilities, as key components for guidelines for AI integration through education.

### Policies Related to Data Security and Privacy

States are weighing the advantages and risks of emerging technologies, especially relating to data security and privacy in education settings. 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, including safeguarding student data and promoting secure digital learning environments. CoSN 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. The following policies relate to data security and AI in education:

- **California [A.B. 1064](#)** (Passed House, 2025) would prohibit developers of AI systems from knowingly or recklessly using the personal information of a child to train an AI product without parent or guardian consent. Would also prohibit developers from producing an AI product that is intended to be used by or on a child.
- **Indiana [S.B. 150](#)** (Enacted, 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.

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.

## Task Forces and Commissions on AI

Education Commission of the States (ECS) has identified at least 29 total states with current or former task forces or commissions related to AI in education. Seventeen 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.

Commented [TM2]: I like this addition!

State	Task Force/Commission	Reports
Alabama	<a href="#">Governor’s Task Force on Generative Artificial Intelligence</a>	<a href="#">GenAI Task Force Final Report</a> (Nov 2024)
Arizona	<a href="#">AI Steering Committee</a>	
Arkansas	<a href="#">AI &amp; Analytics Center of Excellence</a> (Terminates June 27, 2025)	<a href="#">AI Working Group Initial Report</a> (Feb 2025)
California	<a href="#">Artificial Intelligence in Education Workgroup</a>	
Colorado	<a href="#">Artificial Intelligence Impact Task Force</a> (2024 legislative session)	<a href="#">Report and Recommendations</a> (Feb 2025)
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>	
Georgia	<a href="#">Senate Study Committee on Artificial Intelligence</a> (2024)	<a href="#">Senate Study Committee on AI Final Report</a> (Dec 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)	
Idaho	<a href="#">2024 Artificial Intelligence Working Group</a> (2024 legislative session)	
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> (Dec 2024)
Indiana	<a href="#">Artificial Intelligence Task Force</a> (Terminated after publishing report)	<a href="#">Artificial Intelligence Task Force: Final Report</a> (Oct 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.

Kentucky	Artificial Intelligence Task Force: Established by the Legislative Research Commission, terminated after publishing report	<a href="#">Artificial Intelligence Task Force Findings &amp; Recommendations</a> (Nov 2024)
Maine	<a href="#">Maine Artificial Intelligence Task Force</a>	
Maryland	<a href="#">Governor’s Artificial Intelligence Subcabinet Workgroup on Artificial Intelligence Implementation</a>	<a href="#">2025 Maryland AI Enablement Strategy &amp; AI Study Roadmap</a> (Jan 2025)
Massachusetts	<a href="#">AI Strategic Task Force</a>	<a href="#">Massachusetts AI Strategic Task Force 2024 Report to the Governor</a> (Dec 2024)
Mississippi	<a href="#">AI Regulation (AIR) Task Force</a>	
New Jersey	<a href="#">Artificial Intelligence Task Force</a>	<a href="#">Report to the Governor on Artificial Intelligence</a> (Nov 2024)
New Mexico	<a href="#">Artificial Intelligence Work Group</a>	
Oklahoma	<a href="#">Governor’s Task Force on Emerging Technologies</a>	<a href="#">Artificial Intelligence Strategy to Support State Agencies in Oklahoma</a> (Dec 2023)
Oregon	<a href="#">Joint Task Force on Artificial Intelligence</a> (2023-2024 legislative interim) and <a href="#">State Government Artificial Intelligence Advisory Council</a>	<a href="#">State Government Artificial Intelligence Advisory Council Final Recommended Action Plan</a> (Feb 2025)
Rhode Island	<a href="#">State of Rhode Island AI Task Force</a>	
South Dakota	<a href="#">Study Committee on Artificial Intelligence and Regulation of Internet Access by Minors</a> (2024 legislative session)	
Tennessee	<a href="#">Artificial Intelligence Advisory Council</a>	<a href="#">AI Advisory Council Status Report to the General Assembly</a> (May 2025)
Texas	<a href="#">Artificial Intelligence Advisory Council</a>	
Vermont	<a href="#">Artificial Intelligence Task Force</a>	<a href="#">Artificial Intelligence Task Force: Final Report</a> (Jan 2020)
Virginia	<a href="#">Artificial Intelligence Task Force</a>	
Washington	<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> (Dec 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.

West Virginia	<a href="#">West Virginia Task Force on Artificial Intelligence</a> and <a href="#">Select Committee on Artificial Intelligence</a>	
Wisconsin	<a href="#">Governor’s Task Force on Workforce and Artificial Intelligence</a>	<a href="#">Advisory Action Plan</a> (July 2024)

### Postsecondary and Workforce Development

States and postsecondary systems are working to understand what impacts AI-powered tools will have on instruction, operations and the labor market. For a high-level look at implications, EDUCAUSE released their [second report](#) on the AI landscape in higher education in February 2025. The following are key findings of the report.

- There was an 8% increase of respondents in agreement that AI is a priority at their institution (57% compared to 49% in 2024).
- 11% of respondents reported their institution has no AI-related strategy.
- The most common elements of AI-related strategy at higher education institutions are training for faculty (63%) and staff (56%), followed by making AI tools more accessible (50%).
- Thirteen percent of respondents reported that AI has not impacted their institution’s policies and guidelines. 46% of respondents shared that new guidelines are being created that consider AI.
- Nine percent of respondents viewed their institution’s cybersecurity and privacy policies to be sufficient in addressing the privacy risks related to AI.
- Two percent of respondents said new sources of funding are covering the new AI-related costs within their institution.

The following examples demonstrate the range of activity at the postsecondary policy or institution level.

- 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. These 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](#)** (Enacted, 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.
- 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

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.

- [Michigan Virtual Custom AI Training](#) (virtual or in-person)
- [One-on-one trainings](#) available from the University of Iowa Office of Teaching, Learning, and Technology

### State Agency Guidance

The number of states with agency guidance pertaining to AI is constantly in flux, but ECS identified at least 29 states with published guidance. The guidance documents range from brief overviews to extensive frameworks, and common themes include the importance of a human-centered approach, ethical and responsible uses of AI, issues related to equitable access, the need for AI literacy, and data privacy.

Commented [HK3]: There's a table that includes all 29 states in the CZI report, but it would add at least a page to this - should I put it in, or is it fine to leave this as is?

Commented [TM4R3]: I would add it! thanks!

State	Guidance
Alabama	<a href="#">AI Policy Template for Local Education Agencies</a>
Arizona	<a href="#">Generative Artificial Intelligence in K-12 Education</a>
California	<a href="#">Learning With AI, Learning About AI</a>
Colorado	<a href="#">Roadmap for AI in K-12 Education</a>
Connecticut	<a href="#">Guidance on Artificial Intelligence</a>
Delaware	<a href="#">Generative AI in the Classroom</a>
	<a href="#">Classroom Management when Integrating Gen. AI</a>
	<a href="#">Gen. AI in Internet Safety Policies, Acceptable Use Policies, and Codes of Conduct Guidance</a>
Georgia	<a href="#">Leveraging AI in the K-12 Setting</a>
Hawai'i	<a href="#">AI Guidance for Employees</a>
	<a href="#">AI Guidance for Student Use</a>
Indiana	<a href="#">Artificial Intelligence Guidance</a>
Kentucky	<a href="#">Artificial Intelligence Guidance Brief</a>
Louisiana	<a href="#">Guidance for K-12 Schools</a>
Maine	<a href="#">Maine: The AI Roadmap</a>
Michigan	<a href="#">Planning Guide for AI: A Framework for School Districts</a>
Minnesota	<a href="#">Artificial Intelligence in Education</a>
Mississippi	<a href="#">Artificial Intelligence: Guidance for K-12 Classrooms</a>
Nevada	<a href="#">Nevada's STELLAR Pathway to AI Teaching and Learning: Ethics, Principles, and Guidance</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.

New Jersey	<a href="#">AI Resource Page</a>
New Mexico	<a href="#">AI Guidance for K-12 Education 1.0</a>
North Carolina	<a href="#">North Carolina Gen. AI Implementation Recommendations and Considerations for PK-13 Public Schools</a>
North Dakota	<a href="#">North Dakota K-12 AI Guidance Framework</a>
Ohio	<a href="#">AI Toolkit</a>
Oklahoma	<a href="#">Guidance and Considerations for Using Artificial Intelligence in Oklahoma K-12 Schools</a>
Oregon	<a href="#">Generative AI in K-12 Classrooms</a>
Utah	<a href="#">Artificial Intelligence Framework for Utah P-12 Education</a>
Virginia	<a href="#">Guidelines for AI Integration throughout Education</a>
Washington	<a href="#">Human-Centered Artificial Intelligence in Schools</a>
West Virginia	<a href="#">Guidance, Considerations, &amp; Intentions for the Use of Artificial Intelligence in West Virginia Schools</a>
Wisconsin	<a href="#">Empowering Lifelong Learning: AI Guidance for Enhancing K-12 and Library Education</a>
Wyoming	<a href="#">Guidance for Wyoming School Districts on Developing Artificial Intelligence Use Policy</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.

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.