



Digital Learning Advisory Council

Meeting Minutes

July 14, 2026

Attendees

- Nick Caruso — Connecticut Association of Boards of Education (CABE)
- Doug Casey — Connecticut Commission for Educational Technology
- Andy DePalma — EASTCONN
- Cathie Drury — Coventry Public Schools
- Josh Elliott — Fairfield University
- Tom Goldenberg — Southern Connecticut State University
- Irene Parisi — Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE)
- Josh Smith — Region 15 Public Schools

Welcome

Co-Chair Nick Caruso welcomed members to the advisory meeting shortly after 2:00 PM. He noted the three agenda items, all of which address the use of artificial intelligence (AI) in education.

Artificial Intelligence Advisory Framework

Doug Casey introduced a [draft AI advisory framework](#), which the Commission reviewed at its [June 1, 2026 meeting](#). During that discussion, Commission members addressed the need to provide time-sensitive guidance to education leaders and to the State's legislative and executive branches. He outlined the framework's guiding principles, including human oversight of AI use, AI literacy, support for educators, equity of access, and data privacy. With these tenets as background, Doug described three major work products that the Commission would address through the framework:

- Annual Report: This would address technology developments, risks, opportunities, and exemplary implementations of AI at the local level. The report would inform state leaders and contextualize legislative decisions.
- Rapid Advisory Capacity: With the insight of the AI and Digital Literacy Advisory members as well as other experts, the Commission would provide timely guidance on platform changes, security issues, and regulatory developments.
- Scenario Planning: Conducted once every year and a half, this work would include tabletop exercises to examine potential service disruptions or AI-driven challenges.

Doug opened the floor to discussion, prompting advisory members to discuss framework components, potential contributors to the annual report, advisory capacity, and scenario planning. Jonathan noted alignment with recommendations emerging from a multi-organization alliance of education leaders working on critical issues. He emphasized the need for timely guidance and suggested reordering the work products so that “Rapid Advisory Capacity” is listed first.

Clint asked how the framework would address K – 12 curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Doug clarified that state guidance on those areas resides under the [CSDE’s Academic Office](#), which Irene Parisi leads. Irene affirmed that forthcoming guidance on intelligent systems will address AI procurement, adoption, and literacy, tapping insights from the CSDE’s AI pilot. (A report on that work is forthcoming from the [Center for Connecticut Education Research Collaboration](#).) She also noted overlapping concerns with emerging national conversations about screen time and calls for AI moratoriums.

Andy DePalma raised the issue of non-instructional applications, such as how AI may change compliance tasks, such as the processing of Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests. Nick provided context on increasing FOIA burdens and ways AI might help districts address these requests. Doug highlighted the need to define thresholds for convening rapid advisory support in response to issues impacting schools, universities, and libraries.



Members shared examples of AI-related risks, such as automated copyright infringement claims and large-scale data scans. The group discussed the impacts on hiring practices, transparency requirements, and the gray areas surrounding AI disclosures.

Members discussed the advisory group's role, resources needed to sustain long-term efforts, and opportunities to leverage external partners. These could include education leadership organizations such as CAFE and CAPSS, as well as the Center for School Safety and Crisis Preparation, which operates at the intersection of technology, school physical security, and online safety. Doug noted that some work products could be integrated into existing annual reports and that workflow design will determine staffing needs.

Public Act 26-15: An Act Concerning Online Safety

The recently enacted Connecticut Public Act 26-15 addresses a number of these concerns. Doug briefed members on the AI-related components of the law, including requirements for schools to provide AI literacy instruction, inclusion of AI literacy in pre-service training for teachers, and the creation of an AI Academy. The law would also require social media and online platforms to identify and address instances of users planning self-harm or harm to others. Of interest to schools, universities, and libraries, the law would also require the disclosure of AI use in hiring and performance evaluations.

Cathie asked about the implications for higher education admissions; Doug clarified that the legislation applies to employers' use of automated employment-related decision tools.

CSDE AI Guidance

Irene provided an update on the draft Guidance on Intelligent Systems and Emerging Technology. She is using this more general language to describe technologies including but not limited to AI. The guidance will include definitions, core values, literacy frameworks, risk guidance, procurement considerations, instructional integration across grade bands, professional learning, and caregiver resources.



She shared challenges related to terminology consistency, alignment with standards, and balancing innovation with screen time concerns. Members offered encouragement and advice, including support for using terms like “guardrails.” Cathie appreciated the effort to define the safe and ethical limits of technology use. Jonathan mentioned the [Screen Shift](#) service from EdAdvance. Through surveys, classroom walkthroughs, and other assessments, districts can identify the uses and impact of technology in teaching and learning.

E-Rate Notice of Public Rulemaking

While not on the meeting agenda, Andy raised the expected notice of public rulemaking (NPRM) from the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) regarding the E-rate program. Doug described anticipated timelines for the NPRM release, public comment, and the NPRM’s suggestion to link funding to screen time measures. Members noted state and national reliance on E-rate funding to sustain Internet connections to schools and libraries.