

04072026 Teacher Training Batch 1 Day 1

DigiGyel: Building AI-Ready Youth and Schools
Period: 2026-07 | Type: TRAINING

Executive Summary

DAILY TRAINING REPORT: DAY 1

Program Name: Digital Lopen AI Training for Teachers

Project Umbrella: DigiGyel: Building AI-Ready Youth and Schools

Coordinating Agencies: Ministry of Education and Skills Development (MoESD) and VTOB Foundation

Funding Support: The Dariu Foundation, Beat and Regula Curti Foundation

Framework Alignment: Standard 8 (Artificial Intelligence) of the Bhutan Education Technology Framework (ETF)

Training Profile

Date: 4th July 2026

Daily Theme: Human-Centred AI and AI Foundations

Target Audience: 46 Teacher Participants (Primary and secondary educators, focal teachers, and school leaders representing diverse Dzongkhags and Thromdes)

1. Opening and Setting Expectations (09:00 – 10:30)

The inaugural session of Phase 1 of the DigiGyel Project officially commenced with a dedicated cohort of 46 teacher participants. Facilitators introduced the core training objectives, noting that this initiative builds upon the foundations of the Digital Literacy Initiative (DLI 2022–2025) to move Bhutanese schools beyond basic digital skills into AI readiness.

To ground the training in national priorities, the Royal Vision was highlighted by projecting the words of His Majesty The Fifth King from the Royal Decree on Education Reform: "Technology is the argument of our time and a major indicator of social progress." During the "AI and Me" icebreaker activity, the 46 teachers broke into collaborative circles to share their initial experiences with AI, outline what they hoped to achieve over the training, and voice their primary concerns regarding AI integration in Bhutanese classrooms.

2. Introduction to AI and Classroom Opportunities (11:00 – 12:30)

This session demystified the core concepts of Artificial Intelligence, defining it as systems capable of human-like tasks such as language processing, pattern recognition, and problem-solving. Teachers analyzed everyday AI integrations (like predictive text, streaming recommendations, and navigation maps) before evaluating its direct utility in teaching.

The cohort evaluated a case study featuring a Science teacher from Samtse who used ChatGPT to generate a Class VII ecosystem lesson plan in seconds due to a heavy workload. Following active discussion, the 46 educators concluded that while AI saves critical planning time, teachers remain strictly responsible for verifying accuracy, curriculum alignment, and local context.

3. Human-Centred AI and The Boundaries of Authority (13:30 – 14:30)

Aligned with the Digital Literacy Standards for Teachers (DLST), this session focused on the human elements behind technology. Teachers learned that AI does not operate independently; every system is shaped by human data choices and inherent design biases.

Facilitators projected two AI-generated image outputs: Prompt 1 ("A teacher") and Prompt 2 ("A Bhutanese teacher teaching in a rural school"). This sparked a critical discussion on how Western-trained datasets make generic, non-local assumptions by default. Teachers also analyzed scenarios where AI generated generic report card comments or reading passages filled with unfamiliar Western themes like "snowmen and baseball". The participants established a firm consensus that AI contributes information, not authority, drawing a strict line between low-stakes decisions (drafting worksheets) and high-stakes decisions (student promotion, final grading, and student wellbeing) which must always require human judgment.

4. AI Foundations: How AI Learns (14:30 – 15:30)

The afternoon block transitioned into technical structures. Teachers examined the core formula: Data + Algorithms + Human Design = AI Output. It was emphasized that AI does not reason or comprehend meaning; it maps probabilities and recognizes patterns.

Using their laptop webcams, the 46 teachers experimented with Google's Teachable Machine website, training a mini-AI model to distinguish between physical objects to witness firsthand how raw training data directly alters system behavior. The cohort then analyzed what happens when a chatbot is trained on minimal Bhutanese data, leading to incorrect historical outputs. This drove home the final rule: human verification is mandatory because AI is built on pattern matching, not objective fact-checking.

5. AI Tools Exploration and Prompt Engineering (15:30 – 16:30)

Participants explored specific educational tools classified by purpose, including content generation (Gemini), visual design (Canva AI), productivity (Brisk Teaching), and localized translation (Monlam AI).

Rather than executing simple queries, teachers were trained in advanced prompting frameworks to optimize educational outputs:

1. The Five "S" Model (State, Structure, Style, Scope, Source)
2. The R-T-C-O Model (Role + Task + Context + Output)

As a practical output, every teacher utilized an AI tool to design a customized, differentiated learning activity for their respective subject matter, tailoring content for struggling learners alongside extension tasks for advanced students.

6. Reflection, Sharing, and Day 1 Key Takeaways (16:30 – 17:00)

The intensive day concluded with an interactive reflection session. The 46 teacher participants reviewed unique case

studies regarding low-connectivity environments—such as a teacher in Laya utilizing AI offline via a shared device to generate lesson ideas—proving that AI use can be adapted to local infrastructure realities.

Core Takeaways of Day 1:

1. Human Agency: AI is designed, trained, and controlled entirely by human choices and values.
2. Teacher Accountability: AI provides information, not authority; the educator remains completely accountable for all final classroom and ethical decisions.
3. Data and Patterns: AI learns through data and pattern recognition, meaning its outputs must always be critically reviewed for accuracy and local Bhutanese curriculum alignment.

Project Director

Approved by
Approved: 07/07/2026