



AI READINESS AND SAFEGUARDING MANUAL | 2026 EXPANDED EDITION

Offline AI Classroom Readiness Framework

A field manual for resilient AI literacy, responsible classroom use, child safety and procurement under uneven connectivity.

Jonathan Kennedy Sowah

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

For schools, education providers and development partners designing AI learning in Ghana and across Africa.

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	Readiness thesis	Separate AI literacy and human judgement from continuous access to a live model.
2	LOCAL architecture	Design a learning objective, offline core, controlled connection, accountability and evidence.
3	Risk and safeguarding	Classify use, minimise data, protect children and prepare incident response.
4	Teaching and assessment	Preserve learner thinking, verification, authorship and oral defence.
5	Procurement and pilot	Test ordinary conditions, total cost, exit routes and a 90-day learning cycle.

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.

AI readiness is not an internet connection

Readiness is the ability to understand, question, verify and govern AI systems while protecting learning and human agency.

A school is AI-ready when teachers and learners can make responsible decisions before, during and after AI use - including when the system is unavailable.

READINESS LAYER	DECISION	VISIBLE EVIDENCE
Learning	What human capability is being developed?	Task and assessment before tool selection
People	Who can explain limits and supervise use?	Demonstrated teacher and leader judgement
Infrastructure	Which mode works without continuous connection?	Offline core, local resources and fallback
Governance	What is permitted, conditional or prohibited?	Policy, data rules and escalation
Evidence	How will the school know whether AI helped?	Learning, workload, safety and equity measures

UNESCO's teacher framework organises competency around a human-centred mindset, ethics, AI foundations and applications, AI pedagogy, and professional learning. Treat these as capabilities to demonstrate rather than topics to cover.

PRACTITIONER DEPTH

DECISION BRIEF	Begin with human capability and institutional judgement. Connectivity changes how a lesson is delivered, but readiness depends on whether learners can anticipate, question and verify outputs and whether adults can govern data, safety and assessment.
EVIDENCE TO LEAVE	Establish a baseline task completed without AI, a risk and data map, an approved-use register, teacher judgement evidence and a continuity plan for unavailable systems.
FIELD CHALLENGE	Disconnect the tool during planning. If the learning objective disappears, AI has replaced the lesson rather than strengthened it.

DECISION GATE

ASSUMPTION	EVIDENCE OWNER	NEXT REVIEW	STOP / SCALE RULE
[] Named	[] Assigned	[] Dated	[] Recorded

Preserve learning when the network disappears

Offline-first does not mean offline-only. It gives every connection a bounded purpose and every lesson a continuity path.

MOVE	QUESTION	DESIGN EVIDENCE
Learning objective	What human capability must remain visible?	Objective and authentic task
Offline core	What can learners predict, compare or create without connection?	Unplugged/local lesson path
Controlled connection	Which bounded interaction requires a live model?	Connection window and fallback
Accountable judgement	Who reviews risk, accuracy and consequence?	Named human review and escalation
Learning evidence	What proves the learner did the thinking?	Process evidence and oral explanation

LOCAL design rule

If removing the AI tool also removes the learning objective, the lesson may be teaching tool access rather than transferable AI literacy.

PRACTITIONER DEPTH

DECISION BRIEF	LOCAL separates intellectual purpose from connection. Learners should encounter the concept, evidence and human decision offline; a bounded connection can then add critique, comparison or computation without becoming the sole source of knowledge.
EVIDENCE TO LEAVE	For each lesson, record the offline core, connection purpose and duration, approved data, responsible adult, verification source, fallback mode and evidence captured before and after AI use.
FIELD CHALLENGE	Run the full lesson in offline mode once. The result should be less convenient, not educationally empty.

DECISION GATE

ASSUMPTION	EVIDENCE OWNER	NEXT REVIEW	STOP / SCALE RULE
☐ Named	☐ Assigned	☐ Dated	☐ Recorded

Move deliberately between unplugged, local and connected learning

A resilient lesson can change mode without losing its intellectual purpose.

MODE	BEST FOR	EXAMPLES	CONTINUITY TEST
Unplugged foundation	Concepts, values and judgement	Classification, data labels, decision rules, bias cases	No device or internet required
Local digital	Practice, comparison and production	Stored outputs, local datasets, small models, school network	No external connection required
Controlled connection	Model interaction and current information	Approved generative use, update, expert collaboration	Bounded, supervised and recoverable

Mode conversion exercise

Connected task	_____

What learners must understand	_____

Offline equivalent	_____

What only connection adds	_____

Fallback trigger	_____

PRACTITIONER DEPTH

DECISION BRIEF	Use mode changes to deepen understanding. Unplugged activity exposes mental models; local tools enable safe repetition; connected systems provide wider capability. Learners should know which mode they are in and what new risk or affordance it introduces.
EVIDENCE TO LEAVE	Create a mode map showing objective, resources, data movement, teacher control, failure response and transition cue for every phase of the lesson.
FIELD CHALLENGE	Ask learners to explain what the connected model can infer that the offline activity cannot - and what contextual knowledge the model still lacks.

DECISION GATE

ASSUMPTION	EVIDENCE OWNER	NEXT REVIEW	STOP / SCALE RULE
☐ Named	☐ Assigned	☐ Dated	☐ Recorded

Teach four moves around every AI interaction

The goal is not better prompting alone. It is stronger anticipation, scrutiny and responsibility.

MOVE	LEARNER ACTION	TEACHER PROMPT	EVIDENCE
Predict	State what a trustworthy answer should contain	What do you expect, and why?	Pre-use reasoning
Interrogate	Question source, confidence, gaps and assumptions	What is missing or uncertain?	Annotated output
Verify	Check claims using evidence, calculation or observation	How could we know?	Verification trail
Own	Improve with context, judgement and disclosure	What is your contribution and responsibility?	Final work and oral defence

The strongest AI literacy task makes the learner's mind visible before the system's answer appears.

PRACTITIONER DEPTH

DECISION BRIEF	Prediction prevents passive acceptance. Inspection makes assumptions visible. Verification anchors claims in evidence. Responsibility returns the final decision to a person who can explain consequences. Practise all four even when an output appears correct.
EVIDENCE TO LEAVE	Collect the learner's pre-output prediction, annotated output, verification trail, revision rationale and final oral or written defence. Preserve unsuccessful checks because they reveal judgement development.
FIELD CHALLENGE	Provide a fluent but subtly misleading output. Assess whether learners detect, investigate and communicate uncertainty rather than whether they produce a polished answer.

DECISION GATE

ASSUMPTION	EVIDENCE OWNER	NEXT REVIEW	STOP / SCALE RULE
[] Named	[] Assigned	[] Dated	[] Recorded

Classify the use before choosing controls

Risk depends on the data, age, autonomy, consequence and ability to challenge the output.

CLASS	EXAMPLE	DEFAULT POSITION	MINIMUM CONTROL
A - Low	Teacher uses approved AI to draft non-sensitive examples	Permitted	Human review and disclosure where relevant
B - Moderate	Learners use AI on a bounded classroom task	Conditional	Supervision, no restricted data, verification
C - High	AI influences grading, profiling or support decisions	Exceptional review	Impact assessment, appeal and accountable human decision
D - Prohibited	Unapproved biometric, covert monitoring or unsafe child interaction	Do not use	Escalate through policy and safeguarding route

Five risk questions

Is identifiable or sensitive data involved? Can the learner meaningfully refuse or challenge? Is the output consequential? Could bias or error harm a learner? Can the institution explain and reverse the decision?

PRACTITIONER DEPTH

DECISION BRIEF	Risk rises with identifiable data, vulnerable users, system autonomy and consequence. A low-risk drafting aid and an automated decision about learner opportunity must not share the same approval path.
EVIDENCE TO LEAVE	Maintain a use register recording purpose, user age, data class, decision consequence, human reviewer, reversibility, approved system, retention and review date.
FIELD CHALLENGE	Move one variable at a time from low to high risk. Identify exactly when additional consent, review, restriction or prohibition becomes necessary.

DECISION GATE

ASSUMPTION	EVIDENCE OWNER	NEXT REVIEW	STOP / SCALE RULE
[] Named	[] Assigned	[] Dated	[] Recorded

Minimise before you secure

The safest unnecessary data is the data the school never collects, uploads or retains.

DATA FLOW	QUESTION	OWNER / EVIDENCE
Collection	What is entered, captured or inferred? Is each field necessary?	
Identity	Can the task use anonymous, fictional or aggregated data?	
Transmission	Where does data travel, including subprocessors and model providers?	
Retention	How long is data, chat history and output retained?	
Access	Who can see, export, correct and delete it?	
Exit	What happens to data and learner work when the service ends?	

Red line

Do not enter identifiable learner records, health information, safeguarding details, assessment records or private communications into an unapproved AI service. Align institutional practice with Ghana's Data Protection Act, child protection requirements and qualified review.

PRACTITIONER DEPTH

DECISION BRIEF	Security controls cannot justify collecting unnecessary information. Replace names with codes, remove free-text identifiers, use synthetic data for practice and define deletion before upload. Data minimisation reduces both technical exposure and governance burden.
EVIDENCE TO LEAVE	Produce a data-flow diagram covering collection, device, network, provider, storage, access, retention, deletion and incident ownership. Verify each step against policy and contract terms.
FIELD CHALLENGE	Take the proposed dataset and remove every field not essential to the learning objective. Require a written reason for each field restored.

DECISION GATE

ASSUMPTION	EVIDENCE OWNER	NEXT REVIEW	STOP / SCALE RULE
☐ Named	☐ Assigned	☐ Dated	☐ Recorded

Turn safeguarding principles into operating controls

A policy is only real when a teacher knows what to do at the moment of risk.

CHECK	DECISION TEST	EVIDENCE / OWNER
☐	Age terms, account model and parental/guardian communication are reviewed.	
☐	The school defines permitted, conditional and prohibited uses with examples.	
☐	Learners know how to report harmful, manipulative or sexual content safely.	
☐	Staff know the immediate stop, preserve, report and support sequence.	
☐	No learner is required to disclose personal experience to make a prompt realistic.	
☐	Accessibility, disability and language risks are considered in reporting routes.	
☐	The designated safeguarding lead and external escalation routes are current.	
☐	Incidents are reviewed for system change, not only individual blame.	

Ghana's National Child Online Protection Framework emphasises coordinated responsibility, effective protection mechanisms, accessible reporting, professional training and respect for children's rights in digital environments.

PRACTITIONER DEPTH

DECISION BRIEF	Safeguarding lives in moments: a harmful output appears, a learner shares personal information or a teacher sees concerning content. Controls must tell each person what to stop, preserve, report and communicate.
EVIDENCE TO LEAVE	Keep approved-use rules, learner briefing, supervision ratios, content and data controls, escalation contacts, response times, incident forms and age-appropriate explanations of limitations.
FIELD CHALLENGE	Rehearse a near miss with staff. If responsibilities or reporting routes are unclear under time pressure, the policy is not operational.

DECISION GATE

ASSUMPTION	EVIDENCE OWNER	NEXT REVIEW	STOP / SCALE RULE
☐ Named	☐ Assigned	☐ Dated	☐ Recorded

Build verification into the task

A warning label is not a verification method. Define what must be checked and how.

CLAIM TYPE	VERIFICATION ROUTE	DO NOT RELY ON
Factual/current	Authoritative current source and date	Confident wording or citations not opened
Numerical	Independent calculation and input inspection	Generated arithmetic
Historical/cultural	Multiple credible sources and local expertise	Single dominant narrative
Scientific	Curriculum-aligned reference and experiment where possible	Plausible explanation alone
Personal/consequential	Qualified accountable human judgement	Automated recommendation

Bias comparison protocol

Hold the task constant. Change one identity or context variable. Compare framing, assumptions, omissions and recommendations. Document the limitation and decide whether the tool, prompt, dataset or use case should change.

PRACTITIONER DEPTH

DECISION BRIEF	Verification should be designed before the prompt. Specify which claims require checking, which sources are acceptable and what learners should do when sources disagree. Uncertainty must be communicated, not hidden behind confident language.
EVIDENCE TO LEAVE	Require a claim-evidence table, source-quality notes, calculation checks, quoted context, disagreement record and final statement of confidence and limitations.
FIELD CHALLENGE	Use a locally specific question for which generic web material is incomplete. Observe whether learners seek community, curriculum or primary evidence rather than inventing certainty.

DECISION GATE

ASSUMPTION	EVIDENCE OWNER	NEXT REVIEW	STOP / SCALE RULE
☐ Named	☐ Assigned	☐ Dated	☐ Recorded

Protect authorship and make thinking visible

Assessment must show what the learner can do with and without assistance.

EVIDENCE	WHAT IT REVEALS	IMPLEMENTATION
Pre-use prediction	Prior reasoning and expectations	Capture before any AI interaction
Prompt and output log	How the tool shaped the process	Use bounded extracts, not surveillance
Verification trail	Evidence judgement and correction	Require opened sources or calculations
Revision commentary	Human contribution and decisions	Learner explains what changed and why
Oral defence	Ownership, transfer and understanding	Ask a new-context question
No-AI checkpoint	Independent foundational capability	Use proportionately for essential skills

Disclosure sentence

I used [system] for [bounded purpose]. I verified [claims/elements] using [method]. I rejected or changed [output] because [reason]. The final judgement and responsibility are mine.

PRACTITIONER DEPTH

DECISION BRIEF	Assessment should distinguish supported production from independent capability. Capture what the learner knew before AI, which suggestions were accepted or rejected and whether the learner can reproduce the reasoning without the tool.
EVIDENCE TO LEAVE	Use process logs, version history, annotated prompts and outputs, oral defence, unseen transfer task and a clear declaration of assistance. Moderate samples across teachers.
FIELD CHALLENGE	Remove access to the tool and ask for a related task. The difference between product quality and independent explanation identifies where learning may be superficial.

DECISION GATE

ASSUMPTION	EVIDENCE OWNER	NEXT REVIEW	STOP / SCALE RULE
☐ Named	☐ Assigned	☐ Dated	☐ Recorded

Certify judgement, not attendance

Teachers need the confidence to stop, adapt and explain an AI activity - not merely operate a tool.

DIMENSION	1 - FRAGILE	2 - EMERGING	3 - WORKABLE	4 - DURABLE
Human agency	Accepts output	Adds a warning	Designs human review	Builds policy and peer judgement
Foundations	Uses interface	Explains broad limits	Tests failure patterns	Teaches models and uncertainty
Pedagogy	Adds AI to task	Links to objective	Redesigns assessment	Evaluates learning and workload
Safety	Assumes platform safety	Knows rules	Applies controls	Leads incident learning
Professional learning	Works alone	Shares examples	Uses evidence to improve	Coaches and calibrates peers

UNESCO's teacher progression of acquire, deepen and create is useful for planning development. Evidence should include task design, risk judgement, classroom application, learner work and reflective adaptation.

PRACTITIONER DEPTH

DECISION BRIEF	Teacher readiness includes selecting appropriate uses, setting boundaries, designing verification, protecting data, interpreting learner work and stopping an unsafe activity. Attendance at training is only an input.
EVIDENCE TO LEAVE	Assess a lesson design, rehearsal, risk decision, incident scenario, classroom application, learner evidence review and an adaptation for constrained infrastructure.
FIELD CHALLENGE	Present an attractive tool that violates one programme rule. Readiness is demonstrated when the teacher declines or redesigns the activity and can explain why.

DECISION GATE

ASSUMPTION	EVIDENCE OWNER	NEXT REVIEW	STOP / SCALE RULE
☐ Named	☐ Assigned	☐ Dated	☐ Recorded

Test the ordinary day, not the sales demonstration

Require vendors to show graceful failure, local control, child protection and full recurring cost.

CHECK	DECISION TEST	EVIDENCE / OWNER
☐	The learning objective is documented independently of the product.	
☐	Core learning remains possible without continuous connectivity.	
☐	Minimum device, memory, storage and update requirements match the estate.	
☐	The product supports shared-device pedagogy and accessible participation.	
☐	Data location, subprocessors, retention, export and deletion are documented.	
☐	Teachers can supervise accounts, activity and inappropriate output.	
☐	The vendor demonstrates an outage, failure recovery and support escalation.	
☐	Total cost includes data, licences, infrastructure, training and replacement.	
☐	The institution has an exit route for content, data and learner work.	

Decision: ☐ Approve pilot ☐ Approve with conditions ☐ Redesign ☐ Do not proceed

PRACTITIONER DEPTH

DECISION BRIEF	Procurement evidence should come from representative devices, bandwidth, class size and staff. Test login, update, export, deletion, accessibility, support and failure recovery. Demonstrations curated by vendors reveal capability, not operating fit.
EVIDENCE TO LEAVE	Attach a scored ordinary-day test, data-processing map, recurring-cost schedule, service levels, exit test, safeguarding evidence and unresolved exceptions to the procurement record.
FIELD CHALLENGE	Ask the vendor to run the workflow after connectivity is removed and with a low-spec shared device. Observe what fails gracefully and what becomes inaccessible.

DECISION GATE

ASSUMPTION	EVIDENCE OWNER	NEXT REVIEW	STOP / SCALE RULE
☐ Named	☐ Assigned	☐ Dated	☐ Recorded

Stop, support, preserve, report, learn

Prepare a proportionate response before a harmful output, privacy breach or unsafe interaction occurs.

STEP	ACTION	KEY QUESTION
1. Stop	End the unsafe interaction and prevent further exposure	Is anyone in immediate danger?
2. Support	Protect the learner's wellbeing and dignity	What support is needed now?
3. Preserve	Record only the evidence needed under policy	What must be retained securely?
4. Report	Use safeguarding, privacy, IT and leadership routes	Who has accountability and statutory duties?
5. Learn	Review root cause and repair the system	What control, training or design must change?

Incident record

Date, system and use	_____
People affected	_____
Immediate protection	_____
Escalation and owner	_____
System change and review date	_____

PRACTITIONER DEPTH

DECISION BRIEF	Incident response should protect people first, preserve proportionate evidence and avoid blame-driven concealment. The review must identify technical, instructional and governance causes, then assign a system change and verification date.
EVIDENCE TO LEAVE	Record the event, people affected, immediate support, evidence retained, notifications, decision authority, root cause, control change and follow-up confirmation.
FIELD CHALLENGE	Test the route with a fictional incident. Measure the time required to reach the safeguarding, privacy and technical owners and identify conflicting instructions.

DECISION GATE

ASSUMPTION	EVIDENCE OWNER	NEXT REVIEW	STOP / SCALE RULE
☐ Named	☐ Assigned	☐ Dated	☐ Recorded

Learn before you scale

Pilot a bounded use case with representative teachers, learners and infrastructure.

PERIOD	ACTION	EVIDENCE	GATE
Weeks 1-2	Diagnose infrastructure, judgement and learner needs	Baseline, data map and risk register	Purpose approved
Weeks 3-4	Design offline core, connection and controls	Rehearsed lesson and policy fit	Readiness approved
Weeks 5-6	Run first classroom application	Observation and learner process	Continue / stop
Weeks 7-8	Repair failure points and repeat	Comparison evidence	Model workable
Weeks 9-10	Review safety, workload, learning and equity	Pilot learning memo	Conditions set
Weeks 11-12	Decide on scale, redesign or stop	Signed decision record	Institutional decision

Pilot measures

Learning: quality of prediction, verification and transfer. Implementation: time, workload, failure and access. Safety: incidents, near misses and reporting. Equity: participation, device access and language/accessibility barriers. Cost: complete recurring cost per meaningful learner experience.

PRACTITIONER DEPTH

DECISION BRIEF	A 90-day pilot should answer a small number of consequential questions about learning, safety, workload, inclusion, infrastructure and cost. Define stop conditions before delivery so enthusiasm cannot erase adverse evidence.
EVIDENCE TO LEAVE	Publish a pilot question set, baseline, observation schedule, incident log, cost record, learner evidence sample, change log and signed scale or stop decision.
FIELD CHALLENGE	Include the school least likely to succeed under the proposed model. A pilot made only of exceptional sites estimates best-case performance, not scale readiness.

DECISION GATE

ASSUMPTION	EVIDENCE OWNER	NEXT REVIEW	STOP / SCALE RULE
[] Named	[] Assigned	[] Dated	[] Recorded

AI-supported local climate communication

A fictional JHS example showing how the LOCAL architecture preserves learning.

LOCAL MOVE	DESIGN
Learning objective	Learners distinguish observation, claim and recommendation; communicate uncertainty responsibly.
Offline core	Teams analyse a printed local weather dataset, graph patterns and draft a community message.
Controlled connection	An approved AI system critiques clarity and identifies missing questions during a ten-minute window.
Accountable judgement	Teacher reviews safety and accuracy; learners verify suggestions against the dataset.
Learning evidence	Original graph, pre-AI draft, annotated output, final message and oral defence.
If the connection fails, the investigation, analysis and communication objective remains intact. The AI interaction adds critique; it does not own the thinking.	

PRACTITIONER DEPTH

DECISION BRIEF	This lesson preserves local data interpretation as the core intellectual work. AI contributes bounded critique after learners have formed claims. The sequence protects authorship and allows the activity to continue when connectivity fails.
EVIDENCE TO LEAVE	Keep the original dataset, first graph, pre-AI draft, prompt and output, verification annotations, final message and oral defence rubric. Compare the reasoning before and after critique.
FIELD CHALLENGE	Introduce one unsupported suggestion from the AI output. Learners should trace it to evidence, reject or qualify it and explain the public consequence of leaving it uncorrected.

DECISION GATE

ASSUMPTION	EVIDENCE OWNER	NEXT REVIEW	STOP / SCALE RULE
[] Named	[] Assigned	[] Dated	[] Recorded

Evidence anchors and further reading

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

SOURCE	RESOURCE	ADDRESS
UNESCO	AI Competency Framework for Teachers (2024)	https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/ai-competency-framework-teachers
UNESCO	AI Competency Framework for Students (2024)	https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000391105
UNESCO GEM Report	Technology in education: A tool on whose terms? (2023)	https://gem-report-2023.unesco.org/
UNICEF Innocenti	Digital Learning, Real Classrooms: Implementation Research in Ghana (2025)	https://www.unicef.org/innocenti/reports/digital-learning-real-classrooms
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
African Union	Continental Artificial Intelligence Strategy (2024)	https://au.int/en/documents/20240809/continental-artificial-intelligence-strategy
African Union	Continental Education Strategy for Africa 2026-2035 (2025)	https://static.au.int/en/documents/20250616/continental-education-strategy-africa-2026-2035

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

Build AI capability that survives the connection

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