Survey Context:

Total respondents: 26

Total LEAs responded: 18

By LEA size[1]:

- 3 large LEAs (50,000+ students)
- 15 small LEAs (0-49,999 students)

Total respondents by role:

- Teaching and Learning (T&L): 10
- IT/Information Leader: 16

Survey Analysis:

1. **Artificial Intelligence policy**
    - 2 of the 16 LEAs (13%) have a generative Artificial Intelligence policy.[2]
    - 1 of the 3 large LEAs (33%) has a policy, while 1 of the 13 small LEAs (8%) does not.

2. **Community objections regarding the use of Artificial Intelligence**
    - 8 of the 18 (44%) LEAs have received community objections regarding the use of Artificial Intelligence.[3]
    - 2 of the 3 large LEAs (67%) of LEAs have received objections, while 6 of the 15 small LEAs (40%) have.
    - 3 of the 10 T&L respondents (30%) reported that their LEA had received objections, whereas 5 of the 16 IT respondents (31%) reported objections.

3. **Groups that provided objections**
    - Seven respondents indicated that teachers provided the objections and five indicated that parents did. Other objections were provided by administrators, IT, operations, elected officials, staff, and students.
    - Seven respondents reported objections due to lack of privacy.
    - Four respondents reported objections regarding reliability.
    - Other objections were on autonomy, job security, quality, cheating, bias, cost, and unethical use.

[1] As defined by student enrollment in SY 2023-2024.
[2] Two LEAs with multiple respondents answered differently and were therefore not included.
[3] Note that 4 LEAs with multiple respondents had different answers but were categorized as an affirmative response.

4. **Implementation of generative Artificial Intelligence**
    - 10 of the 18 LEAs (56%) have implemented generative Artificial Intelligence.[4]
    - 1 of the 3 large LEAs (33%) have implemented generative Artificial Intelligence, whereas 9 of the 15 small LEAs (60%) did.[3]
    - 6 of the 10 respondents (60%) in T&L roles reported that their LEA implemented generative Artificial Intelligence, whereas 7 of the 16 IT respondents (44%) reported that their LEA implemented generative Artificial Intelligence.

5. **Challenges the LEA has faced with implementing and using generative Artificial Intelligence**
    - Eleven respondents mentioned that security and data privacy was a challenge that the LEA faced.
    - Cost, training challenges, integration with preexisting systems, and compliance were each mentioned by eight respondents.
    - Other challenges were staff use without vetting, understanding when and how to use generative Artificial Intelligence, and understanding the risks and biases that come with Artificial Intelligence.
    - One respondent indicated that there were no challenges.

6. **Areas in which the LEA has achieved success in implementing and utilizing generative Artificial Intelligence**
    - Eight respondents mentioned the increased production from implementing generative Artificial Intelligence.
    - Five mentioned improved skills and training.
    - Four mentioned improved decision making.
    - Other areas of success included personalization, equity, cost savings, and enhanced investigative capabilities.

7. **Types of usage of generative Artificial Intelligence**
    - Fifteen respondents indicated that generative Artificial Intelligence was used for lesson planning.
    - Eleven indicated that it was used for administrative processes.
    - Nine respondents indicated that Artificial Intelligence was not used.
    - Eight indicated that it was used for information technology and for curriculum development/communications.
    - Other uses were for community outreach/communications, teacher PD, virtual tutoring, operations, student support services, and IEPs. Note that all respondents' answers were used.

8. **Groups in the organization that frequently utilize generative Artificial Intelligence**
    - Fifteen respondents indicated that teachers frequently utilize generative Artificial Intelligence.
    - Twelve indicated Information Technology staff.
    - Other users were administrators, curriculum, students, counselors, and operations.

[4] Three LEAs with multiple respondents had different answers but were categorized as an affirmative response.

- Eight respondents indicated that no group used Artificial Intelligence. Note that all respondents' answers were used.

9. **Additional comments or thoughts on generative Artificial Intelligence in the LEA**
   Overall, LEAs indicated that they were in the early stages of using Artificial Intelligence, starting with exploration, pilots using AI-powered tools and still developing policies. Guidelines from MSDE regarding best practices would be helpful.

10. **Preparation of the LEA to implement generative Artificial Intelligence and its uses**
    - On a scale from 1 to 5, the average level of preparedness of the LEA to implement generative Artificial Intelligence and its uses was 2.5.[5] No one rated their LEA preparedness as a 5 and 7 of 18 LEAs (39%) of respondents indicated a rating of 3.
    - The average level of preparedness reported by respondents was 2.0 for large LEAs and 2.6 for small LEAs.
    - The average level of preparedness reported by respondents in T&L roles was 2.9, whereas the average level of preparedness reported by IT respondents was 2.3.

[5] For LEAs that had more than one respondent, responses were averaged.