

PRINTABLE RUBRIC

AI Governance Scorecard

Score one specific AI use - not AI in general.

Use this rubric after reading, observing, or interviewing. Circle one score for each dimension. A score is only useful when your Evidence Contribution Record shows what supports it.

[] 0 = unacceptable or no evidence [] 1 = major weakness [] 2 = acceptable with conditions [] 3 = strong public value

1. Human learning - Does the use strengthen thinking, creation, judgment, and productive struggle?	
0	No evidence of learning value, or the tool replaces the student's thinking.
1	Possible value, but major learning risks or weak evidence.
2	Useful for a clear goal if specific limits and checks are in place.
3	Strong evidence that it deepens learning while the student remains the thinker.
2. Human relationships - Does it protect meaningful work with educators, peers, families, and communities?	
0	It replaces or weakens essential human relationships.
1	It saves time but reduces important interaction or trust.
2	It supports relationships if adults set clear boundaries.
3	It makes human feedback, collaboration, or belonging stronger.
3. Privacy and safety - Are data use, consent, security, and ways to get help clear?	
0	Sensitive data, hidden practices, or no meaningful protection.
1	Some safeguards exist, but students cannot understand or challenge them.
2	Data is limited and protected; clear consent and support are required.
3	Privacy and safety are understandable, tested, enforceable, and easy to use.
4. Equity and access - Who benefits, who is left out, and who may face added harm?	
0	The use creates or deepens unfair barriers or harms.
1	Access expands, but important groups or needs are ignored.
2	Most students can benefit if disability, language, cost, and access needs are met.
3	The design measurably expands opportunity and reduces unfair gaps.

PRINTABLE RUBRIC

AI Governance Scorecard

Continue scoring, then record the evidence behind each choice.

5. Student and educator agency - Can people understand, question, refuse, appeal, and help shape the use?	
0	The system acts on people with no meaningful choice or appeal.
1	People are informed but have little real influence.
2	People can question, opt out, and seek review under clear rules.
3	Students and educators help design, evaluate, and change the system.
6. Ownership and economic value - Who owns the data, tools, work, and value created?	
0	Public resources mainly create private value or dependence.
1	Ownership is unclear, or the school cannot take its data and work elsewhere.
2	Contracts protect student work, portability, and public interests.
3	The arrangement builds durable public or community capability and shared value.
7. Accountability and reversibility - Who is responsible, and can the use be reviewed, corrected, or stopped?	
0	No responsible party, independent review, correction, or exit path.
1	Responsibility exists on paper but is hard to use or enforce.
2	Named people monitor the use, answer complaints, and can pause it.
3	Independent evidence, regular review, public reporting, redress, and an exit path are built in.
8. Public value - Does the use solve a real educational problem at a fair total cost?	
0	No clear problem, weak evidence, or unacceptable cost.
1	A possible benefit, but costs and alternatives are not understood.
2	A defined need and reasonable cost if results are measured and compared.
3	Clear public benefit, defensible cost, transparent results, and reusable learning.

SCORE SNAPSHOT

LEARNING	RELATIONSHIPS	PRIVACY	EQUITY	AGENCY	OWNERSHIP	ACCOUNT.	PUBLIC VALUE

A total score does not make the decision. Explain the strongest evidence, the conditions you would require, and the evidence still missing on the two-page Evidence Contribution Record.