



AI GOVERNANCE | 2026 PRACTITIONER EDITION

Ghana School AI Policy Template and Implementation Guide

A decision-ready policy architecture with implementation controls, incident routes and review questions.

Jonathan Kennedy Sowah

AI Engineer and K-12 STEM Systems Builder
Ghana | Africa | jonathansowah.com

For school boards, leaders, teachers, safeguarding teams, data leads, parents and programme partners in Ghana.

FIELD-TESTED THINKING | PRACTITIONER TEMPLATES | EVIDENCE ANCHORS

What this manual helps you decide

Move from idea to explicit decisions, owners, evidence and next actions.

1	Govern decisions, not fashionable language	A usable policy states who may do what, for which purpose, with which data, oversight and consequence.
2	Separate permitted, conditional and prohibited uses	A single rule cannot govern lesson planning, learner practice, assessment and high-impact decisions equally.
3	Minimise data before securing systems	The safest unnecessary data is data the school never shares.
4	Preserve authorship, verification and fair judgement	AI policy should clarify when assistance supports learning and when it invalidates the evidence an assessment seeks.
5	Build an incident route and living review cycle	A policy becomes real when people know what to do at the moment of concern.
6	90-day application	Use 90 days to inventory use, consult stakeholders, classify risks, rehearse response and approve a reviewable policy.

Use the manual as a decision cycle

1 OBSERVE	2 DECIDE	3 ASSIGN	4 REVIEW
Start with the ordinary operating condition, not the launch-day exception.	Record the choice, the alternatives rejected and the assumption carrying the most risk.	Name one accountable owner, the supporting actors and the evidence they must produce.	Set a date and define what evidence will trigger continuation, repair, redesign or stop.

A completed template is not evidence of success. Pair every decision with an observable artefact, a named owner and a scheduled review.

Govern decisions, not fashionable language

A usable policy states who may do what, for which purpose, with which data, oversight and consequence.

Policy should preserve learning, human agency, child rights and accountability across staff, learner, administrative and third-party uses.

DESIGN MOVE	WHAT IT REQUIRES	EVIDENCE TO KEEP
Scope	Cover school devices, personal devices, free and paid services, embedded AI and vendor-operated systems.	System inventory and responsible owner
Purpose	Name educational and operational aims as well as uses the school will not pursue.	Board-approved purpose statement
Roles	Assign approval, safeguarding, data, curriculum, procurement, incident and review authority.	Named responsibility matrix
Definitions	Use plain explanations of AI, generative AI, personal data, sensitive data and automated decision-making.	Staff and learner comprehension check

Decision questions

1. Which decisions remain human and accountable?
2. Does the policy cover informal experimentation and embedded features?
3. Who can approve, restrict or suspend a use?
4. Can a learner or parent understand the policy without specialist language?

Decision gate

PROCEED WHEN	PAUSE OR REDESIGN WHEN
Scope, authority and educational purpose are explicit and communicated.	The policy is copied from another institution or covers only one named platform.

Field application

List every current AI touchpoint in the school, including features inside existing software. Compare the inventory with the draft scope and close hidden gaps.

Separate permitted, conditional and prohibited uses

A single rule cannot govern lesson planning, learner practice, assessment and high-impact decisions equally.

Classify use by purpose, data sensitivity, learner vulnerability, consequence and reversibility. Apply stronger controls as stakes rise.

DESIGN MOVE	WHAT IT REQUIRES	EVIDENCE TO KEEP
Permitted	Low-risk uses with approved data, visible review and no material decision about a person.	Published examples and minimum controls
Conditional	Uses requiring approval, disclosure, supervision, verification or an alternative route.	Approval record and named conditions
Prohibited	Uses that expose sensitive data, impersonate people, evade assessment or automate high-impact judgement.	Clear examples and enforcement route
Exceptions	Define who may authorise research or accessibility exceptions and how they are reviewed.	Time-bound exception register

Decision questions

1. What harm could occur if the output is wrong, biased or disclosed?
2. Can the affected person appeal or use a non-AI route?
3. What changes when the learner is younger or more vulnerable?
4. Is the intended use reversible?

Decision gate

PROCEED WHEN	PAUSE OR REDESIGN WHEN
Every common use has a risk class, controls and accountable approver.	Rules rely on vague phrases such as use responsibly without examples or consequences.

Field application

Give staff twelve realistic scenarios and ask them to classify each independently. Revise any rule that produces inconsistent interpretation.

Minimise data before securing systems

The safest unnecessary data is data the school never shares.

Procurement and classroom practice should limit collection, prohibit avoidable sensitive inputs and make vendor obligations inspectable.

DESIGN MOVE	WHAT IT REQUIRES	EVIDENCE TO KEEP
Data map	Record what enters the system, where it travels, how long it remains and who can access it.	Approved data-flow diagram
Account model	Avoid unmanaged learner accounts and clarify age, consent, identity and administrative controls.	Account standard and access review
Vendor diligence	Review training use, retention, deletion, subprocessors, security, model changes and exit rights.	Contract checklist and risk decision
Change control	Require review when terms, features, models, ownership or data practices materially change.	Vendor change log and reapproval date

Decision questions

1. Can the task use fictional, anonymised or school-controlled data?
2. Does the vendor use inputs or outputs to train systems?
3. Can the school export and delete its information?
4. What happens if the service changes or closes?

Decision gate

PROCEED WHEN	PAUSE OR REDESIGN WHEN
Data necessity is documented and vendor obligations are proportionate to risk.	Free access, popularity or a privacy-policy link substitutes for due diligence.

Field application

Trace one learner interaction from prompt to deletion. If any storage, access, training or accountability step is unknown, restrict the use until resolved.

Preserve authorship, verification and fair judgement

AI policy should clarify when assistance supports learning and when it invalidates the evidence an assessment seeks.

Assessment rules must follow the purpose of the task. Disclosure and process evidence are usually stronger than impossible promises of detection.

DESIGN MOVE	WHAT IT REQUIRES	EVIDENCE TO KEEP
Task rules	State allowed assistance, prohibited substitution, disclosure method and consequences before work begins.	Assessment-specific instruction
Process evidence	Use drafts, checkpoints, source trails, code history, oral defence and in-class performance.	Authenticity evidence pack
Verification	Require factual, mathematical, code, citation and bias checks appropriate to the subject.	Verification protocol and corrected output
Alternative route	Provide equitable non-AI options where access, disability, belief or privacy requires them.	Documented alternative with equivalent standard

Decision questions

1. What capability is this assessment intended to evidence?
2. Which assistance is analogous to existing approved support?
3. Can the learner explain and defend every consequential choice?
4. Is the rule fair to learners with unequal access?

Decision gate

PROCEED WHEN	PAUSE OR REDESIGN WHEN
Rules are task-specific, teachable, observable and connected to authentic evidence.	The school depends on unreliable AI detectors or applies one prohibition to every task.

Field application

Redesign one existing assignment so authorship can be judged through process, explanation and transfer even when AI tools are available.

Build an incident route and living review cycle

A policy becomes real when people know what to do at the moment of concern.

Schools should stop harm, support the learner, preserve proportionate evidence, report through safeguarding routes and learn without defaulting to blame.

DESIGN MOVE	WHAT IT REQUIRES	EVIDENCE TO KEEP
Report	Provide accessible routes for harmful output, manipulation, privacy breach, impersonation or unsafe contact.	Learner-facing reporting guidance
Respond	Define immediate stop, support, preservation, escalation and communication responsibilities.	Incident playbook and named leads
Review	Analyse incidents, near misses, complaints, inequity and vendor change for system improvement.	Termly policy review record
Communicate	Give staff, learners and families age-appropriate examples, rights, expectations and support routes.	Briefing materials and comprehension evidence

Decision questions

1. Can a learner report without fear or specialist vocabulary?
2. Who decides whether safeguarding, legal or regulatory escalation is needed?
3. How will near misses improve rules and training?
4. What review trigger operates between annual policy dates?

Decision gate

PROCEED WHEN	PAUSE OR REDESIGN WHEN
The incident route is rehearsed, accessible and connected to existing safeguarding structures.	The document has sanctions but no support, escalation, learning or urgent suspension path.

Field application

Run a tabletop exercise involving harmful generated content and accidental personal-data disclosure. Record delays, ambiguity and conflicting responsibilities.

Move from policy draft to operating control

Use 90 days to inventory use, consult stakeholders, classify risks, rehearse response and approve a reviewable policy.

PERIOD	GATE	FIELD WORK	OUTPUT
Days 1-15	Diagnose	Observe ordinary conditions, establish the baseline and name the highest-risk assumptions.	Approved baseline and decision register
Days 16-30	Design	Select a bounded use case, define responsibilities and agree the evidence standard.	Signed design brief and risk controls
Days 31-60	Pilot	Run repeated practice under normal constraints; log failures, adaptations and participant experience.	Pilot evidence pack and repair log
Days 61-75	Review	Compare intended capability with observed performance and test equity, cost and continuity.	Review decision with conditions
Days 76-90	Institutionalise	Assign recurring ownership, budget, cadence and escalation routes before expansion.	Operating plan and next review date

Decision record

Policy owner	_____
Safeguarding lead	_____
Data lead	_____
Permitted use	_____
Conditional use	_____
Prohibited use	_____
Incident route	_____
Next review trigger	_____

This template is an implementation aid, not legal advice. Adapt it to current Ghanaian law, regulator guidance, school governance and the needs of the learners affected.

Evidence anchors and further reading

The frameworks translate public guidance and implementation evidence into practical decision tools.

SOURCE	RESOURCE	ADDRESS
UNICEF Innocenti	Guidance on AI and Children, version 3.0 (2025)	https://www.unicef.org/innocenti/reports/policy-guidance-ai-children
UNESCO	AI Competency Framework for Teachers (2024, updated 2026)	https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/ai-competency-framework-teachers
Ghana Cyber Security Authority	National Child Online Protection Framework (2024)	https://www.csa.gov.gh/resources/National%20COP%20Framework.pdf
UNICEF	Guidance on AI and Children, version 3.0 (2025)	https://www.unicef.org/innocenti/reports/policy-guidance-ai-children
Ghana Cyber Security Authority	National Child Online Protection Framework (2024)	https://www.csa.gov.gh/resources/National%20COP%20Framework.pdf

Use these sources as starting points. Confirm current law, policy, curriculum and regulator guidance before making consequential institutional decisions. This manual is an implementation aid, not legal, financial or safeguarding advice.

Evidence quality protocol

CHECK	QUESTION	RECORD
Currency	Is the source still current for the decision date, jurisdiction and learner group?	Version, publication date and date checked
Authority	Is it primary guidance, independent research, implementation evidence or vendor material?	Source type and responsible institution
Fit	Do its assumptions match the school, infrastructure, language, staffing and safeguarding context?	Transfer limits and local verification needed
Use	Which decision does this source inform, and what would cause that decision to change?	Decision link, owner and review trigger

Turn AI principles into daily school practice

A practical contribution to stronger AI, coding, robotics and STEM education systems in Ghana and Africa.

The value of a framework is not the elegance of its diagram. It is the quality of the decisions, routines and learning that it makes possible.

About Jonathan Kennedy Sowah

Jonathan is a Ghanaian AI engineer and K-12 STEM systems builder working across robotics, coding, applied artificial intelligence, teacher development and context-aware education technology. His wider portfolio has reached 25,000+ learners, trained 2,500+ educators and engaged 100+ schools. KodeVR has more than 10,000 active learners.

He works with schools, governments, companies and development partners to turn high-visibility technology ambitions into practical learning systems that can operate under real African conditions.

Use this work responsibly

Adapt the tools to the programme, participants, institution and regulatory context. Record assumptions. Seek qualified technical, legal, safeguarding, financial and evaluation review where the decision requires it.

Before commissioning implementation support

QUESTION	A STRONG ANSWER SHOULD NAME
What capability must remain after the engagement?	The learner, teacher and institutional behaviours that should continue without external supervision.
What conditions shape delivery?	The ordinary timetable, infrastructure, language, safeguarding, procurement and maintenance realities.
How will quality be governed?	Decision owners, evidence definitions, review cadence, repair route and stop-or-scale thresholds.
What will the institution inherit?	Reusable learning assets, local capability, documented routines, data rights and an affordable continuity plan.

jonathansowah.com | info@jonathansowah.com