# Learning *on our* terms.

**THE REGIONAL FRAMEWORK**

A Caribbean Framework for Responsible Education Technology and Artificial Intelligence, 2026–2030

*Technology must earn its place. Learning comes first.*

**THE FIVE CLEAR GATES**

**C** CURRICULUM **L** LEARNER **E** EQUITY **A** ACCOUNTABILITY **R** RESILIENCE

**IMPLEMENTATION STANDARD / CONSULTATION EDITION**

**Adrian Dunkley**
President, Caribbean AI Association

**2026**

Independent CAIA consultation draft v0.1

RESEARCH & PUBLIC POLICY / REGIONAL FRAMEWORK

# Technology must earn its place in the classroom.

The framework gives schools, educators, ministries and technology suppliers an operational decision structure. Every proposal must demonstrate a learning purpose, learner protection, equity and language access, accountable data practices and resilience - with a credible comparison to the best realistic alternative.

**An operational standard for safe, measurable, locally relevant learning**

A five-stage public-interest test: define an educational problem, compare realistic alternatives, pass safeguards, test independent learning and make a documented scale-or-stop decision.

The framework applies to early childhood, primary, secondary, tertiary, TVET and adult learning. It governs digital platforms, assessments, learning analytics, adaptive products and generative AI.

The five CLEAR gates are explained below. They are proposed institutional criteria, not a certified risk score.

Photograph omitted in this edition.

School education activity, Haiti. Adalex1998 (2026), CC BY 4.0. Identification/child-use permissions require final editorial review.

## The CLEAR policy gates

| C | L | E | A | R |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| CURRICULUM | LEARNER | EQUITY | ACCOUNTABILITY | RESILIENCE |
| Learning impact | Safety development | Language access | Privacy redress | Continuity value |

C = Curriculum; L = Learner safety; E = Equity; A = Accountability; R = Resilience. Critical failures block procurement regardless of any weighted score.

**Release status.** This is a working consultation edition. The simulated multidisciplinary analysis is not a convened regional expert panel. Legal mapping, research verification and stakeholder validation remain open.

**Proposed policy standard | Working Draft v0.1 | Caribbean AI Association | Adrian Dunkley, President | 9 October 2026**

*This draft has not been endorsed by UNESCO, CARICOM or governments; its multidisciplinary discussions and independent challenges are simulated analytical exercises, not convened real-world consultations.*

The Caribbean is not one education system. It comprises different examinations, curricula, languages, regulatory regimes, access constraints and climate exposures. Some systems are large enough to run independent causal tests, while small jurisdictions must pool non-identifying evaluation capacity. Regional cooperation should standardise principles, evidence reporting, safety contracts and reusable tools, not erase national authority or culture. [S02] [S03] [S04]

Education technology must be evaluated against the counterfactual: what students and teachers would achieve with the best realistic alternative, including paper, textbooks, radio, school libraries, low-cost tutoring and in-person classroom practices. Procurement driven by device counts or AI headlines risks mistaking technological activity for learning. UNESCO identifies relevance, equity, scale and sustainability; the 2026 OECD synthesis distinguishes task completion with GenAI from durable learning. [S01] [S10]

This draft defines 'EdTech' as any digital or digital-enabled system materially affecting instruction, assessment, inclusion, administration, learner records or the learning environment. 'AI in education' includes algorithmic ranking and prediction, automated translation or feedback, adaptive learning and generative systems. 'Learner' includes children and adults. The system must make room for no-technology decisions and for context-appropriate low-tech delivery. [S08] [S09]

# 1. Purpose, status and theory of change

This framework is a proposed voluntary regional standard. Its desired outcomes are improved independently demonstrated learning, greater participation by excluded learners, more effective teacher time, trusted data governance and continuity of education under shocks. Inputs such as tablets, licences, AI prompts or hours online are not outcomes. The core causal pathway is instructional problem -> appropriate solution -> teacher support and learner safeguards -> measured implementation fidelity -> independent learning and equity results -> decision to scale, adapt or stop. Every proposal must specify the comparison condition before pilot approval.

National ministries remain responsible for adaptation. The Caribbean AI Association can steward templates, convene a regional evidence observatory, train review boards and maintain public registers, but may not certify or override government procurement absent an agreement. Cross-sector partners must publish their roles, funding, vendor conflicts and restrictions on using student data. [S01] [S02] [S03]

# 2. Rights and non-negotiable principles

The non-negotiables are children's best interests; equal access and reasonable accommodation; teacher accountability and final authority for consequential decisions; purpose limitation and minimal data collection; transparency proportionate to age; freedom from discrimination, manipulation and covert surveillance; continued availability of human learning and offline alternatives; environmental and fiscal sustainability; and accessible complaint and redress. A technology that cannot meet these conditions fails even if its prototype is engaging.

A child should be able to tell when the system is AI, what information is recorded, when a teacher can review errors and whom to contact for help. Parents receive plain-language information and meaningful routes to object or request assistance. Where the learner is an adult, autonomy, worker/academic rights, accessibility and data privacy remain relevant. The framework aligns

broadly with UNICEF child-centred guidance and UNESCO teacher/student competencies, without purporting to create new legal duties. [S06] [S07] [S09]

## 3. Regional context and information architecture

Regional baseline assessment must separate access (attendance, devices, school power, connectivity), learning (independent reading and mathematics), equity (disability, language, location, income), teacher capacity, safety and fiscal constraints. Use UIS SDG4 for international indicators, CXC subject reports for relevant examinations, national PEP/NGSA/SEA/BGCSE and related primary assessments, and OECD PISA where participating. Report the exam, age, year, test revisions, denominator and provenance for each figure.

CSEC candidate passes are not population-wide learning proficiency and cannot be directly compared with PISA's proficiency levels; SEA mean scores are not percentages passing. The Republic of Trinidad and Tobago explicitly cautioned in 2025 that changes to its SEA mathematics assessment establish a different benchmark. Many small territories lack public disaggregation and must be classified as 'awaiting official verification'. [S15] [S21] [S22] [S29] [S30]

## 4. CLEAR decision gates - an original operational synthesis

| | |
|---|---|
| C | Curriculum & learning |
| L | Learner safety |
| E | Equity & language |
| A | Accountability & data |
| R | Resilience & value |

Before adoption, an Education Technology Review Board must document all five CLEAR gates. C = Curriculum and learning: identify specific foundational or advanced learning objectives, pedagogical pathway and valid unaided outcome measures. L = Learner development and safeguarding: apply age, autonomy, mental health, discrimination and duty-of-care tests. E = Equity, access and local language: prove the tool works for low-connectivity schools, learners with disabilities and locally relevant languages, or fund a credible accommodation. A = Accountability, privacy and AI governance: describe processing, security, lawful basis, human recourse, monitoring and contract obligations. R = Resilience and value for money: test offline operation, disaster recovery, total life cost, open exit and e-waste.

A proposal failing any mandatory safeguard must be returned or rejected, regardless of weighted score. An additional advisory 100-point prioritisation score is proposed: Learning 25; Equity 20; privacy and accountability 15; child safety 15; teachers 10; resilience 10; total life value 5. Minimum provisional categories are 80–100 eligible for controlled scale if evaluation supports it, 60–79 redesign or extended pilot, below 60 decline. These are proposed policy weights and thresholds, not validated predictive scores; public consultation and pilot calibration are required before use. Unknown critical facts are never scored as zero or passed silently: they block scaling until resolved.

## 5. Risk taxonomy and disallowed deployments

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 0 | **Non-personal** | baseline checks |
| 1 | **Teacher assist** | human verification |
| 2 | **Learner facing** | school safeguards |
| 3 | **Sensitive AI** | independent review |
| 4 | **Disallowed** | reject deployment |

Class 0: offline/non-personal informational resources (e.g. approved teacher-created worksheets); standard school quality checks. Class 1: teacher-assistive tools without children's identifiable data; verification and curriculum alignment. Class 2: learner-facing digital resources or adaptive learning with approved content, minimised account data and moderated support; dedicated school review and parental notice. Class 3: high-impact learner analytics, generative tutors with identifiable minors, sensitive disability data, predictive dropout alerts or automated high-stakes feedback;

enhanced child impact assessment, independent testing, human review, ethics approval for research where needed and limited pilot only. Class 4: proposed prohibited practice: covert biometric emotion inference, hidden child profiling, advertising based on learner data, automatic expulsion or admissions decisions without meaningful human determination, persistent companion bots that exploit emotional vulnerability, and undisclosed tracking. National law may impose stricter or different classifications.

A proponent may not reduce classification through cosmetic changes. Independent review examines functional behaviour, model updates, data paths and potential misuse. Models supporting high-stakes decisions must publish uncertainty, contestability, monitoring and human-authority protocols; weak predictive performance or disparate outcomes require suspension. Consumer general-purpose chatbots are not approved default solutions for young pupils simply because they are free. [S09] [S11] [S12] [S32]

## 6. Early childhood, primary and adolescent development

For ages 0–5 prioritise human interaction, play, movement, oral language, stories and nurturing relationships. No child-directed unsupervised open-ended GenAI. Digital support should primarily help educators and caregivers prepare inclusive activities; if used by children, it should be short, purposeful, adult-mediated and evaluated for developmental benefit. For ages 6–11, favour teacher-managed structured tools and foundational literacy/numeracy with printed equivalents; do not use open chatbots as substitute teachers.

For approximately ages 12–15, school-approved GenAI may be introduced for supervised fact-checking, creativity and methods critique after basic independent skills are demonstrated. For ages 16–17, supervised exploration and disclosure-guided assessment can expand, subject to terms of service, child protection, school rules and applicable local law. Ages are proposed pedagogical bands, not statutory thresholds. Accessibility may require different routes; safeguarding protections cannot be waived without lawful justification. All learner-facing AI must clearly identify itself and offer escalation to humans. [S08] [S09]

## 7. Classroom pedagogy and teacher agency

Teachers should begin with an instructional problem such as persistent fraction misconceptions, inaccessible large-print materials or time spent drafting formative questions, rather than product capabilities. Where AI helps prepare lessons or translate an explanation, teachers must validate factual accuracy, cultural sensitivity, level appropriateness and citations before student use. A teacher's professional judgement is not a model approval stamp: systems should allow editing, explain how content is produced and record versions for quality assurance.

Weekly formative checks should include unaided retrieval, explanation in learners' own words, transfer to novel examples and oral reasoning. Track effects on teacher workload with measured preparation, feedback and administrative time, not vendor self-reports. Any teacher evaluation using engagement, logins or AI predictions must undergo industrial relations and human-rights review. Provide teacher release time for training and school champions rather than uncompensated evening training. [S06] [S10] [S26]

## 8. Learning assessment and academic integrity

All schools and institutions should define allowable use for each assessment: no AI, AI as planning support, AI collaboration with disclosure, or AI as the object of critical analysis. Students must know these rules before work begins. For core mathematics, reading and discipline-specific foundational skills, assess a meaningful portion without AI assistance. Assess explanation, source validation, design decisions and transfer, not only final polished outputs; oral defences, process portfolios and in-class demonstrations can be suitable when equitable.

Academic integrity should focus on teachable standards of attribution, evidence, provenance and permitted assistance. Do not impose high-stakes punishment

based only on AI text detector scores, which require independent validation for demographic and language bias. Review detection tool purpose, error rates, procedural fairness and student appeal routes. The AI Assessment Scale provides a reference to adapt, not a universal mandatory grading scheme. [S13] [S14]

## 9. Inclusion, culture, multilingual learning and local knowledge

Local relevance is a design requirement, not an afterthought. Educational materials should be assessed in relevant combinations of English, Jamaican Patwa, Haitian Creole, French, Spanish, Dutch, Papiamento/Papiamentu, Kwéyòl, Sranan Tongo and Indigenous languages. Content panels should include teachers, linguists, community storytellers, disability advocates and youth. Local references must not default to North American seasons, currencies, schooling structures and social norms when Caribbean contexts would be more meaningful.

Technology should support rather than devalue oral traditions, music, regional history, agriculture, marine science, disaster literacy and local creative work. AI translation and speech tools must be tested for dialect errors, meaning shifts and harmful stereotypes; user-generated local language corpora require consent, provenance, benefit sharing and cultural authority. Test screen readers, captions, contrast, keyboard navigation, hearing needs, dyslexia and alternative assessment accommodations to standards equivalent to WCAG 2.2 AA where applicable. [S02] [S07] [S09]

## 10. Data rights, security and cybersecurity

For each tool, a ministry or school must record data fields, purpose, controller/processor responsibility, lawful basis, minor consent/guardian process where required, retention and deletion schedules, subprocessors, international transfers, security controls and breach procedures. Avoid unnecessary date of birth, biometrics, precise location, contact networks and detailed psychological profiles. Anonymisation must be tested especially where a class contains only a few learners.

Require encryption in transit and at rest, restricted staff roles, audit logs proportionate to risk, vetted vendor identity, patching, incident response and exportability. For child-facing tools, prohibit advertising targeted using educational records and bar use of identifiable student material to train outside models without a separate independently lawful, consent-appropriate agreement. Seek jurisdiction-specific legal advice; a regional charter cannot assert identical data-protection rules across CARICOM, French, Dutch, UK and US territories. [S09] [S11] [S12]

## 11. AI model-specific assurance and red teaming

High-risk AI products need model/system cards: publisher, model version, tasks, allowed ages, pedagogical scope, sources, languages, sensitive features, evaluation datasets, geographic transferability, known failure modes, data destinations and update cadence. Model changes that affect outputs trigger regression testing, notice to schools and, where material, renewed approval. Teacher and learner-facing systems must mark AI outputs as suggestions, not facts, and support citations to local curricula.

Red-team tests should simulate jailbreaks, disclosure of another pupil's data, sexual or violent content, self-harm messages, racial/linguistic stereotypes, unsafe pseudoscience, politically manipulative lesson plans, coercive companionship, hallucinated Caribbean laws and exams, abusive teacher surveillance and prompt injection through retrieved web pages or files. Record reproducible examples, severity, remediation, residual risk and exact tested version. Do not attempt harmful tests with real children; use synthetic records and trained adults. [S09] [S12] [S32]

## 12. School connectivity, device access and disaster continuity

Digital deployment presupposes electricity, functioning devices, transport, maintenance, accessible content and affordable household access; connectivity alone cannot guarantee learning. Each service must state minimum bandwidth, offline capabilities, synchronisation conflict handling, storage limits and failover. Schools should stock and routinely test printable lesson packs and accessible low-tech equivalents. Districts must track recovery time and continuity after outages or hurricanes, not merely restore logins.

For mobile populations, remote islands and conflict-affected settings, prioritise content caching, open curricula, radio/SMS support when safe and simple teacher-managed transfer, alongside psychosocial and safeguarding provision. For Haiti, no EdTech programme may substitute for access to safe teachers, buildings and protection. Hurricane Melissa in 2025 and Haiti school closures demonstrate the need for crisis-first requirements; neither event proves a specific EdTech intervention improves outcomes. [S23] [S24] [S25] [S27] [S35]

## 13. Procurement, vendor duties and competition

Every solicitation should include a problem statement, no-procurement option, performance specification, common evaluation datasets and a contestable award rubric. Bids must disclose beneficial ownership/conflicts, data subprocessing chains, proprietary model dependencies, recurrent token/API charges, training requirements, update/change terms, accessibility, incident response and exit costs. Vendors must not claim efficacy merely from testimonials or student engagement. Source code escrow, public procurement rules or open standards may be needed for critical infrastructure.

Contracts require student data ownership/portability, deletion proof, end-of-term export, audit rights, breach notice deadlines aligned to national law, non-training promises, change-control procedures, independent safety testing, local language responsibility, accessibility remediation and non-performance termination rights.

Prefer interoperable data schemas and procurement groups for very small islands, provided they preserve national control and competition. [S01] [S12] [S32]

## 14. Finance, economics and economic inclusion

- Licence & devices
- Connectivity & energy
- Teacher support
- Safety & accessibility
- Exit & continuity

Assess whole-life cost for a five-year planning horizon, separating devices, replacement, connectivity, electricity, accessibility, licences, AI usage, localisation, teacher release time, cybersecurity, evaluation, maintenance, procurement and termination. Cost per enrolled learner is insufficient if take-up and accessibility vary; additionally publish cost per reached learner and cost per demonstrated incremental unit of learning, with uncertainty. Avoid claiming economic savings before controlled evidence; include alternative interventions such as human tutoring and textbooks.

Use a net-present-cost comparison with explicit discount rate scenario assumptions, not guessed national budgets. Model optimistic/base/pessimistic scenarios for exchange rates, hurricane downtime, price increases and model vendor withdrawal. Analyse distribution by rural, low-income, disability, language and island groups; savings achieved by excluding hard-to-reach learners are not acceptable success. Reserve funding for domestic teacher training, local-language OER, Caribbean small firms, open standards and research capacity without creating anti-competitive purchasing preferences. [S01] [S03] [S31]

# 15. Evidence standards, pilots and causal evaluation

01 Baseline / independent measure

02 Credible control or low-tech alternative

03 Duration & exposure tracking

04 Delayed unaided learner assessment

05 Stop, adapt, or scale with evidence

Pre-register intervention hypotheses, intended outcomes, analysis and adverse events, and compare against a real alternative. Preferred design when feasible: school- or classroom-level cluster randomisation with blinded/independent scoring and intention-to-treat analysis, accounting for clustering and missingness. Where randomisation is infeasible, a prospectively planned stepped-wedge, regression discontinuity, difference-in-differences or matched comparison may be used with explicit assumptions. Small island systems may coordinate across jurisdictions while retaining local heterogeneity.

Primary outcomes are independently assessed unaided reading, mathematics or domain-specific competence measured after a meaningful delay. Secondary outcomes include teacher workload, access, disability participation, retention, learner agency, critical reasoning and cost. Guard against contamination, exam coaching, differential attrition, seasonal schooling disruptions and algorithmic changes between study arms. Collect child-appropriate consent/assent and ethics approval where research rules require. Release a pre-analysis plan, aggregate protocol and negative results. [S01] [S10] [S13]

# 16. Measurement dashboard and decision thresholds

Publish six families: (1) independently assessed learning with confidence intervals and baseline; (2) reach and equity by safe disaggregation; (3) child safety, complaint resolution and wellbeing; (4) teacher capability, time and trust; (5) privacy, cybersecurity and product failures; (6) five-year cost, resilience and vendor lock-in. Proposed gates: zero unresolved critical safeguarding incidents at scale; a measured improvement in the named learning objective or defensible non-inferiority for accessibility support; no materially widened disadvantage gap; practical offline fallback; and affordable recurrent cost. These are policy criteria, not empirical claims.

Use suppressed/pooled cells for small cohorts; publish missing values as 'not reported', not 0. Distinguish registered users from active users, time online from learning and survey satisfaction from independent attainment. Ministries should set locally credible minimum detectable effects after power calculation, rather than one universal percentage improvement. Report unintended consequences separately. [S04] [S29] [S30]

# 17. Institutions and roles (RACI)

A regional evidence and standards secretariat convened through willing partners would maintain open templates, procurement language, model testing guidance and update notices. Each ministry appoints an EdTech Review Board with pedagogy, data protection, special education, child rights and finance voices. School heads authorise limited classroom use within approved programmes; teachers remain accountable for instruction; vendors disclose technical facts and repair incidents; independent researchers evaluate; learners and families exercise information and complaint rights.

A board should maintain at least an annual public report of approvals, rejections and withdrawals, plus a confidential incident register. The association must publish a conflict-of-interest register when its members advise on vendors, finance pilots or supply technology. A 'CAIA-aligned' badge should not be offered until external certification methods are agreed and audited; otherwise

it risks becoming an unsupported endorsement. [S02] [S03]

## 18. Implementation phases and exit conditions

Phase 0 (first 90 days): establish mandate and jurisdiction review, inventory technology already in schools, prioritise learning problems, record baseline and red-line uses. Phase 1 (months 3–6): test low-risk teacher tools, build professional development, privacy templates and language/accessibility panels. Phase 2 (months 6–12): run preregistered limited pilots with appropriate comparators and safety monitoring. Phase 3 (months 12–24): scale only interventions meeting learning/equity/child safety/cost gates. Phase 4 (months 24–36): pool replication studies, procurement learnings and local content production; revise policy with evidence.

Stop or roll back when material child harm is alleged, critical exploit remains unresolved, required legal basis fails, vendor refuses deletion/audit, unaided learning is consistently worse than comparison, equity gap widens without credible remediation, costs exceed approved cap without results or an emergency cannot be handled by planned continuity. Maintain a documented teach-out transition; students must not lose educational access because an AI service fails. [S01] [S09] [S10]

## 19. Practical policy use cases

Mathematics tutor, secondary: teacher validates worked solutions and selects hint-first mode, students show independent reasoning, model cannot award consequential grades; preregister delayed unaided items, evaluate low-bandwidth operation. Child-focused assistant, ages 6–11: reject open-ended unsupervised access; permit teacher-mediated curriculum resources only. Teacher lesson preparation: class 1 if no identifiable learner material is shared; verify sources and cultural relevance; measure saved teacher time and learner comprehension. Special-needs reading aid: allow narrow well-tested assistive features with user control, accessibility tests and privacy safeguards; evaluate supported participation and independent learning as relevant.

Dropout prediction: class 3 because false positives/negatives can stigmatise or deny services; use supportive outreach with meaningful human review, impact assessment and subgroup calibration. Student biometric emotion detector: proposed class 4 prohibition because intrusive inference is difficult to justify for learning. University thesis support: allow explicit disclosure categories and viva/oral checks; prohibit fabrication and unsupported automatic misconduct decisions. Learning management system: class 2 when handling standard pupil records; ensure interoperable export, security and parent/student rights. [S12] [S13] [S14]

## 20. Regional differentiation and country adaptation

CARICOM full members can align implementation with HRD 2030 and CXC where relevant; OECS schools can coordinate CPEA-aligned teacher content and small-system evaluation; Dutch and French Caribbean must adapt to their applicable language and wider legal systems; US and UK territories must separately check local and federal/territorial rules; Cuba, Haiti and the Dominican Republic should participate as equal Caribbean peers without assuming identical exams or economic conditions. Data sharing should use common schema and safe aggregation, not unified identifiable pupil databases.

National annexes must declare curriculum, language mix, available outcomes, disability law, child protection obligations, data law, procurement authority, international transfer requirements, weather/hazard risks, budget horizon and workforce capacity. The 33-jurisdiction roster attached to the grey paper is a research coverage register, not certification that 33 national datasets or policies were fully assessed. Country-specific rules remain provisional until reviewed by named local education and legal experts. [S02] [S03] [S29]

# 21. Research agenda and unresolved questions

Research priorities include: does hint-first AI tutoring outperform the best low-cost teacher-led alternatives on delayed unaided CSEC mathematics performance; can Patois/Creole-aware formative feedback improve comprehension without degrading formal assessment competence; which offline-first combinations minimise learning loss after hurricanes; what is the marginal value of an AI licence compared with teacher coaching and printed materials; do assistants alter students' metacognition, truth-checking, wellbeing or dependence; and which neurodivergent learners benefit from which accommodations? Factor in consent, privacy, scientific novelty and plausible clinical/educational risk.

Each study should identify age band, language, device access, sample, comparator, preregistered methods, duration, cost and ethics. Multi-island replication should report local heterogeneity, not only pooled averages. Open-source model evaluation sets should remove personally identifying data and use copyright/consent-safe Caribbean content. Do not invent pilot results; this draft provides testable protocols only. [S09] [S10] [S13]

# 22. Governance publication and annual revision

CAIA should publish the final framework, machine-readable standards, national annexes, risk-screening forms, approved/rejected decision logs and independent review responses. Provide versions in English, Spanish, French and Dutch with Creole/plain-language adaptations funded and quality-checked locally. Plain-language summaries for families and students must be co-designed with them and offered in accessible formats. The external reference institutions must be cited accurately without implied sponsorship.

A six-month technical update cycle can address rapid model changes, while the substantive standard is reviewed annually and after a major safeguarding failure. Publication conditions require public comment, regional regulator/legal review, educational validation and CAIA editorial approval. The present document is an original proposal informed by established sources; claims of regional consensus and effectiveness cannot be made before those processes occur. [S02] [S05] [S09]

REFERENCE AUDIT / VERIFIED SOURCE IDENTIFIERS

# Bibliography and source audit trail

Entries [S01]–[S36] are reproduced from the underlying working manuscript, including evidence classifications and limitations. Web links remain clickable in the electronic PDF.

[S01] UNESCO (2023). Global Education Monitoring Report 2023: Technology in Education. Evidence: Global research synthesis. High: intergovernmental synthesis; limitation: Global applicability; local transfer needs tests.
https://gem-report-2023.unesco.org/

[S02] UNESCO Kingston (2024). Caribbean Artificial Intelligence Policy Roadmap. Evidence: Regional policy roadmap. High: regional primary policy; limitation: Not a school-level EdTech procurement standard.
https://caribbean.un.org/en/319013-caribbean-artificial-intelligence-policy-roadmap

[S03] CARICOM (2017). CARICOM Human Resource Development 2030 Strategy. Evidence: Regional strategy. High: official regional strategy; limitation: National uptake differs.
https://caricom.org/wp-content/uploads/HRD-STRATEGY-CARICOM-FEB.pdf

[S04] CARICOM (n.d.). Readiness for Action: Baseline for HRD 2030. Evidence: Regional baseline. High: official baseline; limitation: Historical and incomplete.
https://caricom.org/documents/readiness-for-action-the-baseline-and-situational-analysis-report-for-phase-i-of-the-caricom-hrd-2030-strategy/

[S05] UNICEF LACRO (2026). Accelerating educational outcomes through Digital Transformation in LAC. Evidence: Implementation plan. High: regional UN plan; limitation: Not Caribbean-only.
https://www.unicef.org/lac/en/reports/accelerating-educational-outcomes-digital-transformation-latin-america-caribbean

[S06] UNESCO (2024). AI Competency Framework for Teachers. Evidence: Global competency framework. High: normative standard; limitation: Requires teacher union/local curricular adaptation.
https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/ai-competency-framework-teachers

[S07] UNESCO (2024). AI Competency Framework for Students. Evidence: Global competency framework. High: normative standard; limitation: Needs age and language adaptation.
https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/ai-competency-framework-students

[S08] UNESCO (2023). Guidance for Generative AI in Education and Research. Evidence: Global guidance. High: global guidance; limitation: Age recommendations are not a replacement for domestic law.
https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/guidance-generative-ai-education-and-research

[S09] UNICEF Innocenti (2025). Guidance on AI and Children 3.0. Evidence: Child rights framework. High: child-rights synthesis; limitation: Not country-specific legislation.
https://www.unicef.org/innocenti/reports/policy-guidance-ai-children

[S10] OECD (2026). Digital Education Outlook 2026: Effective Uses of GenAI. Evidence: Global research synthesis. High: international review; limitation: OECD systems overrepresented.
https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/oecd-digital-education-outlook-2026_062a7394-en.html

[S11] European Commission (2026). Guidelines on Ethical Use of AI and Data in Teaching and Learning. Evidence: Comparator regulatory guidance. High: primary policy; limitation: EU law cannot be transplanted wholesale.
https://education.ec.europa.eu/focus-topics/digital-education/actions/plan/ethical-guidelines-for-educators-on-using-artificial-intelligence

[S12] UK Department for Education (2026). Generative AI Product Safety Standards. Evidence: Comparator procurement standard. High: government standard; limitation: UK context not automatically Caribbean law.
https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/generative-ai-product-safety-standards

[S13] Bastani et al. (2025). Generative AI without guardrails can harm learning. Evidence: Peer-reviewed randomized field trial. High: RCT, peer reviewed; limitation: One Turkish high school; limited external validity.
https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2422633122

[S14] Perkins, Roe & Furze (2024). The AI Assessment Scale Revisited. Evidence: Scholarly framework/preprint. Moderate: framework paper; limitation: Not a Caribbean validation study.
https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.09029

[S15] CXC (2026). CSEC Mathematics and English A Subject Reports. Evidence: Regional official subject analysis. High: exam owner; limitation: Publication page alone is not an aggregate data table.
https://www.cxc.org/subject-reports/

[S16] Jamaica Gleaner / CXC announcement (2026). Regional CSEC Mathematics Pass Rate Rises to 42%. Evidence: Regional exam news. Moderate: reporting of official figures; limitation: Confirm detailed denominators with CXC raw bulletin.
https://jamaica-gleaner.com/article/news/20260819/regional-csec-mathematics-pass-rate-rises-42-cent-english-holds-80-cent

[S17] Jamaica Ministry of Education (2025). Improved Performance in 2025 CSEC English and Maths. Evidence: Official national results. High: government statistics; limitation: CSEC pass metric is candidate-specific, not all youth proficiency.
https://moey.gov.jm/improved-performance-in-2025-csec-english-and-maths/

[S18] Jamaica Information Service (2026). 79% of PEP Students Master Literacy, 75% Numeracy. Evidence: Official national results. High: government news service; limitation: PEP competence definition differs from UNESCO literacy.
https://jis.gov.jm/79-per-cent-of-pep-students-master-literacy-75-per-cent-numeracy/

[S19] Guyana Department of Public Information (2026). NGSA Pass Rates Improve Across Four Subject Areas. Evidence: Official national assessment. High: government publication; limitation: NGSA not equivalent to PEP or CSEC.
https://dpi.gov.gy/ngsa-pass-rates-improve-across-all-four-subject-areas/

[S20] Guyana Ministry of Education (2026). CSEC Math Performance Increases to 34.5%. Evidence: Official national results. High: government news page; limitation: Preliminary national figures.
https://www.education.gov.gy/en/index.php/media2/external-news/11776-csec-math-performance-increases-to-34-5-per-cent

[S21] Trinidad and Tobago Ministry of Education (2025). SEA 2025 National Performance and New Assessment Framework. Evidence: Official national examination report. High: government release; limitation: Mean score is not pass rate; revised test limits trends.
https://storage.moe.gov.tt/wpdevelopment/2025/07/Media-Release-2025-SEA-Recognition-Ceremony-A-Celebration-of-Achievement-Equity-and-New-Benchmarks-in-Education.pdf

[S22] OECD (2026). PISA 2025 Dominican Republic Country Note. Evidence: Standardized cross-country survey. High: international assessment; limitation: Coverage of in-school 15-year-olds; sample context.
https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/pisa-2025-results-volume-i-country-notes_2d4ff9ea-en/dominican-republic_62e061bc-en.html

[S23] UNICEF (2025). Education under attack in Haiti. Evidence: Humanitarian situation report. High: UN monitoring; limitation: Humanitarian situation changes rapidly.
https://www.unicef.org/press-releases/education-under-attack-haiti

[S24] UNICEF (2026). Haiti Humanitarian Appeal 2026. Evidence: UN humanitarian response. High: UN response; limitation: Not learning proficiency measure.
https://www.unicef.org/appeals/haiti

[S25] UNICEF (2025). Hurricane Melissa Disrupts Schooling for Nearly 477,000 Children. Evidence: Emergency impact assessment. High: UN emergency source; limitation: Time-bound event; not permanent school closure count.
https://www.unicef.org/press-releases/hurricane-melissa-disrupts-schooling-nearly-477000-children-across-caribbean

[S26] UNICEF Jamaica (2025). Jamaican Teachers Reimagine Classrooms With AI. Evidence: Programme monitoring. Moderate: programme case; limitation: Training attendance is not student learning.
https://www.unicef.org/jamaica/blog/jamaican-teachers-reimagine-classrooms

[S27] World Bank (2024). Empowering Futures: Digital Transformation in Eastern Caribbean. Evidence: Programme case study. Moderate: programme reporting; limitation: Impact not established by independent RCT.
https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2024/08/05/empowering-futures-digital-transformation-in-the-eastern-caribbean

[S28] UNICEF Eastern Caribbean (n.d.). Transforming Education. Evidence: Regional education programme. Moderate: programme overview; limitation: Limited cross-national outcomes.
https://www.unicef.org/easterncaribbean/transforming-education

[S29] UNESCO Institute for Statistics (2026). SDG4 Country Profiles. Evidence: Global official education data portal. High: harmonised statistical source; limitation: Coverage varies; some missing or modelled values.
https://www.uis.unesco.org/en/data/sdg4-country-profiles

[S30] UNESCO Institute for Statistics (2026). SDG4 Data Browser. Evidence: Official data access system. High: official statistical portal; limitation: Do not replace missing observations with guesses.
https://databrowser.uis.unesco.org/

[S31] World Bank (2024). Tackling the Learning Crisis in Latin America and the Caribbean. Evidence: Regional economic analysis. High: regional multilateral analysis; limitation: LAC average should not be called Caribbean estimate.
https://www.worldbank.org/en/results/2024/03/22/tackling-the-learning-crisis-in-latin-america-and-the-caribbean

[S32] OECD (2023). Digital Education Outlook 2023: AI Guidelines and Guardrails. Evidence: Evidence/policy synthesis. High: OECD synthesis; limitation: Transferability to low-resource islands must be tested.
https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/oecd-digital-education-outlook-2023_c74f03de-en/full-report/opportunities-guidelines-and-guardrails-for-effective-and-equitable-use-of-ai-in-education_2f0862dc.html

[S33] UNESCO UIS (2025). SDG4 Profile - Jamaica. Evidence: Country official stats. High: official country profile; limitation: Do not mix modelled and administrative observations.
https://uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/country-profile/SDG4-Profile-Jamaica.pdf

[S34] UNESCO UIS (2025). SDG4 Profile - Cuba. Evidence: Country official stats. High: official country profile; limitation: Sparse observed measures and modelling.
https://download.uis.unesco.org/SDG4/SDG4-Profile-Cuba.pdf

[S35] UNICEF Jamaica (2026). Inclusive Learning Recovery Following Hurricane Melissa. Evidence: Programme case. Moderate: programme monitoring; limitation: No counterfactual learning effect measured.
https://www.unicef.org/jamaica/press-releases/unicef-supports-inclusive-learning-recovery-following-hurricane-melissa

[S36] OECD (2026). PISA 2025 Dominican Republic - Education GPS. Evidence: Official performance data. High: OECD data; limitation: Do not compare PISA points to CSEC pass percentages.
https://gpseducation.oecd.org/CountryProfile?plotter=h5&primaryCountry=DOM&topic=PI

# Photographic provenance and release note

NacionRD (2019), Dominican Republic school science event, Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0. Adalex1998 (2026), school education activity in Haiti, Creative Commons Attribution 4.0. These are documentary source images, not generated people. Confirm identifiable children’s privacy and image-use conditions before any external mass publication.

**Publication control:** Visual redesign 11 October 2026; source narrative and bibliographic identifiers retained from 9 October 2026 drafts. No real third-party peer review, government endorsement or regional consensus is implied. This document remains a consultation draft.