Ripon Grammar School

AI Policy

1. Introduction

Ripon Grammar School recognises that this is a field of research and technology that is likely to see exponential growth in the coming years and that will play a central role in the futures of our students. An RGS education must fully prepare students to embrace that future and the opportunities and challenges it will present. We also recognise the potential for Artificial Intelligence (AI) to enhance teaching and learning and to reduce the workload of both teaching and non-teaching staff.

This policy sets out how the school aims to exploit the potential and opportunities created by AI in a safe, ethical and effective way that compliments and serves the school's wider aims and ethos.

This policy should be read in conjunction with the following policies:

- Assessment and Reporting Policy
- Child Protection Policy
- Data Protection Policy
- E-Safety Protocol
- ICT – Acceptable Usage Policy – Students
- ICT – Acceptable Use Agreement – ICT Staff Policy
- ICT – Internet Policy
- Privacy Notice for Parents and Carers
- Privacy Notice for Staff and Governors
- Privacy Notice for Students

This policy makes reference to and is informed by the following external guidance and documentation:

- Using AI in education settings: support materials - GOV.UK
- Generative artificial intelligence (AI) in education - GOV.UK
- Generative AI: product safety expectations - GOV.UK
- AI Use in Assessments: Your role in protecting the integrity of qualifications - JCQ Joint Council for Qualifications

2. Policy

2.1 Rationale and aims of this policy

The aims of this policy are to:

- Promote the responsible and balanced use of AI to empower students and staff while upholding the values and ethos of the school and protecting the human relationships, creativity and interactions upon which these are built.
- Safeguard the privacy rights and data security of all members of our school community.
- Ensure that wherever possible intellectual property rights are not infringed through the use of AI.
- Uphold the principles of fairness, transparency and academic integrity in the use of AI.
- Ensure appropriate human oversight and understanding of AI systems and outcomes.

- Foster a culture of AI literacy and critical thinking regarding the impacts and limitations of AI.

2.2 Aims for the use of AI at RGS:

- To reduce the workload of teaching and non-teaching staff in order to allow greater time and energy to be directed into providing the very best educational experience for our students.
- To provide more personalised learning for students, including those with SEND.
- To allow teachers and students to develop resources more closely tailored to their needs and interests (e.g. translating a set of class notes into a short podcast).
- To ensure that students are AI literate and are able to exploit the opportunities offered by AI while navigating the threats and dangers posed.

3. Procedures for Implementing the Policy

3.1 Selecting and monitoring the AI systems in use at RGS

- AI tools and platforms used in school must be approved by the IT Manager, the DSL and the Data Protection Officer.
- Decisions will be based on an evaluation of a tool's safety and effectiveness with reference to the DfE 'Product Safety Expectations' and other relevant guidance.
- Where tools are to be used by students, careful attention will be paid to the age restrictions imposed or suggested by product developers. Within school students will only be able to access age-appropriate tools and they will not be directed to access other tools outside school.
- The list of approved AI tools will be regularly updated and reviewed to ensure continued compliance with appropriate guidance and legislation. Staff and students can request for tools and platforms to be added to this list provided that they meet the required safety standards and expectations. Such requests should be made to the Network Manager.
- The safe use of AI systems in school will be monitored primarily through the school's monitoring and filtering software with concerns raised with the safeguarding team via the IT support staff.

3.2 Staff use

3.2.1 Guiding Principles

- **Alignment with Educational Goals** – Staff should promote the responsible and balanced use of AI while upholding the values and ethos of the school and protecting the human relationships, creativity and interactions upon which these are built.
- **Maintain human oversight and ensure careful evaluation of AI tools and output** – All AI generated content should be carefully evaluated for bias, accuracy and relevance before it is used with students.
- **Transparency** – Staff should always be transparent about how and when AI has been used, especially when AI has been used to evaluate or provide feedback on student's work.
- **Academic integrity and rigour**– Students must be educated about the risks of plagiarism and over-reliance on AI tools. This includes close reference to JCQ guidance, but also the promotion of academic rigour and ensuring that students understand the dangers to their own knowledge and learning if they entirely outsource the cognitive challenge of their learning to AI.

- **Protect the privacy rights and data of staff and students** – Staff must ensure that their use of AI tools is GDPR compliant and that AI systems are never allowed to learn from staff or student data. Only using approved AI tools will help to achieve this.
- **Ensure that intellectual property rights are carefully observed and protected** – AI tools must not be allowed to learn from student produced work. To protect against secondary copyright infringement, AI produced resources should not be published beyond the school and must not be placed on the internet / school website.
- **Promote critical thinking and AI literacy** – whenever AI is used or discussed with students, teachers should endeavour to develop students' AI literacy and to develop the knowledge and critical thinking skills that will allow them to navigate use of AI safely and effectively.

3.2.2 AI and Report Writing

- Teachers must be transparent about when AI has been used to generate student reports.
- Only school-approved AI tools may be used to produce reports and student data and privacy must be carefully protected.
- All AI generated reports must be carefully proof-read, evaluated and edited as appropriate.
- The use of AI to generate student reports must ensure that reports provide the relevant information about student progress as advised by Heads of Department and the DH Curriculum.

3.2.3 Resource Creation

- AI has the potential to save teachers considerable time in the creation of learning resources. However, it is vital that all resources are carefully evaluated for bias, accuracy and suitability.
- Using enterprise AI tools designed for use in UK schools might help to ensure that resources are directly relevant to the UK curriculum. Oak Academy's Aila is one such tool.
- AI has great potential for personalising resources to the specific needs of students, including SEND students. However, Teaching Assistants should not be tasked with the production of such resources and this remains the responsibility of the class teacher.
- A powerful advantage of AI tools is the ability to very quickly translate a set of resources from one medium into another (for example, transforming a set of class notes or essays into a short podcast). Teachers should look to leverage this tool where possible.

3.2.4 Assessment

- All AI generated assessments, mark schemes and rubrics must be subject to comprehensive review by qualified subject experts to ensure their accuracy, relevance to learning objectives and appropriate scope and rigor.
- AI generated assessment and feedback must only be used on low stakes or formative assessments and must not replace or augment human oversight of high stakes or summative assessments.
- Where AI is used to provide assessment or feedback, it remains vital that there is a clear element of human oversight and evaluation.
- Teachers must be transparent about when and how AI has been used in assessing and providing feedback on student work.

3.2.5 Other administrative uses

- Staff might also make effective use of AI in the completion of other administrative tasks, which might include: summarising and formulating responses to letters, emails and other correspondence; drafting and reviewing school policies and other documentation to ensure compliance with external guidance; the completion of performance management documentation and the analysis of student performance data.
- In any such uses of AI tools, the guiding principles (listed in 3.2.1 above) remain wholly unchanged and applicable.

3.3 Student use

3.3.1 Context – student's existing use of AI tools

- It is acknowledged that data suggests that the majority of young people are already using AI tools regularly outside school and that many of students may be more proficient in the use of AI than some of their teachers. However, within school students will only be able to use school approved AI tools at an age when this is appropriate. Teachers will not encourage the use of AI tools outside of school that are not age appropriate.
- Staff should be alert to the fact that many students are extremely proficient in the use of AI tools and home learning tasks should be designed to ensure that such tools are not misused to circumvent or avoid the completion of tasks that are crucial to student progress. Staff should always be clear about when and how AI might be used by students in the completion of tasks, both in and out of school.

3.3.2 Curriculum Integration

- The curriculum in IT and PSHCE will be regularly reviewed to ensure that students are taught about relevant developments in AI technology at age-appropriate points. This will include education to ensure that students are aware of the ethical questions posed by the development of AI as well as both the threats, challenges and opportunities created by AI. This will be supported by the pastoral programme.
- Individual Heads of Department are responsible for planning and monitoring the way in which AI is integrated into their departmental schemes of learning and the regular classroom practice within their departments. Heads of Department should be guided by developments in the IT curriculum and should pay careful attention to the age-appropriateness of IT tools that are employed in class.

3.3.3 Further guidance on student use of AI tools

- Teachers should be explicit about the dangers of students outsourcing the cognitive work of their learning to AI tools and the impact this could have on their acquisition and retention of knowledge.
- Whether using their own AI generated content, or guiding students in their own use of AI tools, teachers must explicitly teach the skills of critical thinking and AI literacy. Students must be encouraged and required to critically evaluate AI generated content for bias, accuracy and relevance.
- AI can provide powerful personalised support to students, with some AI tools able to act as a kind of 'AI tutor'. While this is a powerful tool that students should be encouraged to use in a measured, responsible and effective way, it should supplement human instruction, not replace it.

- Students' must be educated about the importance of academic integrity and the ways in which they can maintain this while also making effective use of AI tools. This includes educating students about how to correctly acknowledge, record and cite the use of AI tools in the completion of their work.

3.3.4 Safeguarding and Child Protection issues related to the use of AI

The school's safeguarding duties apply equally to AI-enabled activities as they do to all other online and offline activities. AI does not create a separate safeguarding framework; it introduces new risks that must be managed through existing safeguarding, child protection, online safety and data protection procedures.

- The school recognises that AI systems may generate harmful, inaccurate or age-inappropriate content, though it is hoped filtering and monitoring will reduce such risks. Any safeguarding concerns arising from AI-generated content will be managed through existing safeguarding and child protection procedures.
- The school recognises that AI-enabled grooming should be recognised as an online safeguarding risk. Teachers must receive appropriate training and students must be educated about such risks and how to mitigate these.
- AI can also increase risks of peer-on-peer abuse, including through the production of deep fakes, AI-generated abusive imagery and AI-generated harassment. Creation or sharing of such material is prohibited in school and will be investigated under existing safeguarding frameworks.
- The school recognises that AI chatbots can influence students' self-esteem, body image, emotional wellbeing and social relationships, especially when students use such chatbots as trusted friends or advisors. Students should be taught the necessary critical awareness and encouraged to remember the importance of real relationships and trusted adults.

3.3.5 Use of AI when completing assessments

- It is important that class teachers fully and carefully explain to students the risks of malpractice that AI use can pose when completing assessments including NEAs and coursework. This includes sharing relevant JCQ guidance with students, but also explaining to students how risks can be mitigated and avoided (such as through thorough and accurate academic referencing – JCQ advice on this is included in appendix 2 of this policy).
- NEA and coursework should be completed in such a way as to minimise the threat of AI misuse and to enable teachers to identify such misuse as and when it occurs. Advice from the relevant JCQ guidance is included in appendix 2 of this policy.
- Wherever possible, AI misuse should be identified before students sign their declaration of authentication, this means that the situation can be rectified internally and the school does not have to notify the awarding organisation. Students must understand the implications of signing their declaration.
- While AI detection tools are available, staff should be aware that these are capable of false positives. Where possible, the professional judgement of class teachers and their knowledge of a student's typical work should be used to help identify possible AI misuse.

4. Responsibilities

4.1 Headteacher and School Governors

- Approve and oversee implementation of the AI policy across the school.
- Ensure adequate resources for ongoing staff training on AI innovations and ethical and strategic integration of AI within the school's wider school development plans.

4.2 Senior Leadership Team

- Regular review and evaluation of AI policy and its implementation across school.
- Ensure new AI systems align with school development plans before procurement.
- Co-ordinate training on AI best practice and support capability building. (BCF)
- Ensure transparency about AI use to the school community.
- Perform policy compliance audits and reviews as part of regular and ongoing quality assurance practices and departmental reviews.
- Ensure approved AI tools and systems used in school are fully compliant with relevant guidance, including relevant safeguarding and GDPR legislation. (DSL and Data Protection Officer)

4.3 Network Manager

- Oversee and regularly review the school's list of approved AI tools and systems and ensure that these are compliant with relevant guidance, in collaboration with DSL and Data Protection Officer.
- Ensure that effective filtering and monitoring of AI tools is in place and report any instances of misuse or any safeguarding concerns to the DSL.
- Remain abreast of significant developments in the field of AI and advise staff and school leaders appropriately.
- Ensure that school devices and networks are set up and maintained so as to minimise emerging threats and to fully exploit the opportunities created by AI. To advise the school's leadership on changes to the school IT infrastructure that might be required.

4.4 Heads of Department

- Customise any AI integration to ensure effectiveness within curriculum and activities.
- Support teachers in thoughtful classroom AI incorporation.
- Ensure that all use of AI fully aligns with the school's wider learning aims and school values.
- Contribute to the sharing of good practice across the school and the continuing evolution of the school's AI policy.

4.5 Teachers and Teaching Assistants

- Participate in relevant AI-related professional development.
- Educate students on using AI responsibly, ethically and safely (building AI literacy)
- Carefully evaluate AI generated outputs for accuracy, bias and relevance.
- Maintain human oversight of AI systems and ensure that AI supplements but does not replace powerful student-teacher relationships.
- Be transparent about AI use.
- Collaborate and share best practice on AI use.

4.6 Non-teaching Staff

- Participate in relevant AI-related professional development.
- Protect the privacy rights and data of staff and students in the collecting, storing and sharing of data.
- Identify and mitigate the risks of bias, discrimination or other unintended harms from AI systems.

4.7 Students

- Use AI to supplement rather than replace their own critical thinking and creativity.
- Reference any AI-sourced information appropriately.
- Exercise discretion when using AI tools and only use RGS approved AI tools when in school.
- Adhere to school policies regarding acceptable levels of AI use.

4.8 Parents

- Encourage responsible, ethical and safe use of AI tools.
- Partner with the school to foster AI literacy and critical thinking skills.
- Stay informed about school policies relating to the use of AI in education.

Appendix 1 – Approved AI tools at RGS

	Staff use	Student use
Fully approved and GDPR compliant	CoPilot Chat GPT (Paid) AILA (Oak Academy) TeachMate National College	CoPilot (over 13s – Year 9 and above)
Approved but cannot enter any GDPR data	Chat GPT (Free) Replit Gemini	
Not approved		All others for students under 13 or without parental consent for those older.

Appendix 2 – Extracts from JCQ Guidance on use of AI in assessments

Definitions of AI misuse:

AI misuse is where a student has used one or more AI tools but has not appropriately acknowledged this use and has submitted work for assessment when it is not their own.

Examples of AI misuse include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Copying or paraphrasing sections of AI-generated content so that the work submitted for assessment is no longer the student's own.
- Copying or paraphrasing whole responses of AI-generated content.
- Using AI to complete parts of the assessment so that the work does not reflect the student's own work, analysis, evaluation or calculations.
- Failing to acknowledge use of AI tools when they have been used as a source of information.
- Incomplete or poor acknowledgement of AI tools.
- Submitting work with intentionally incomplete or misleading references or bibliographies.

Ways to avoid AI misuse:

a. Consider restricting access to online AI tools on centre devices and networks;
b. Ensure access to online AI tools is restricted on centre devices used for exams;
c. Set reasonable deadlines for submission of work and providing reminders;
d. Where appropriate, allocate time for sufficient portions of work to be completed in class under direct supervision to allow the teacher to authenticate all of each student's work with confidence;

e. Examine intermediate stages in the production of work in order to ensure work is underway in a planned and timely manner and work submitted represents a natural continuation of earlier stages;
f. Introduce classroom activities that use the level of knowledge/understanding achieved during the course thereby making the teacher confident the student understands the material;
g. Consider whether it is helpful to engage students in a short verbal discussion about their work to ascertain they understand it and it reflects their own independent work;
h. Do not accept, without further investigation, work which staff suspect has been taken from AI tools without proper acknowledgement or is otherwise plagiarised – doing so encourages the spread of this practice and is likely to constitute staff malpractice which can attract sanctions.
i. Issuing tasks for centre-devised assignments which are, wherever possible, topical, current and specific, and require the creation of content which is less likely to be accessible to AI models trained using historic data

How students should reference AI use in their work:

- If a student uses an AI tool which provides details of the sources it has used in generating content, these sources must be verified by the student and referenced in their work in the normal way.
- Where an AI tool does not provide such details, students must ensure they independently verify the AI-generated content – and reference the sources they have used.
- Students acknowledging the use of AI and showing clearly how they have used it allows teachers and assessors to review how AI has been used and whether the use was appropriate in the context of the particular assessment. This is particularly important given that AI-generated content is not subject to the same academic scrutiny as other published sources.
- Where AI tools have been used as a source of information, student acknowledgement must show the name of the AI source used and the date the content was generated.
- The student must retain a copy of the question(s) and computer-generated content for reference and authentication purposes, in a non-editable format (such as a screenshot) and provide a brief explanation of how it has been used.
- This must be included with the work the student submits for assessment, so the teacher/assessor is able to review the work, the AI-generated content and how it has been used.

Potential indicators of AI misuse

If the following are seen in student work, it may be an indication the student has misused AI:

a. A default use of American spelling, currency, terms and other localisations.
b. A default use of language or vocabulary which may not accord with the qualification level (though be aware AI tools may be instructed to employ different languages, registers and levels of proficiency when generating content).
c. A lack of direct quotations and/or use of references where these are required/ expected (though some AI tools will produce quotations and references).
d. Inclusion of references which cannot be found or verified (some AI tools have provided false references to books or articles by real authors).
e. A lack of reference to events occurring after a certain date (reflecting when an AI tool's data source was compiled), which may be notable for some subjects.
f. Instances of incorrect and/or inconsistent use of first-person and third-person perspective where generated text is left unaltered.
g. A difference in the language style used when compared to that used by a student in the classroom or in other previously submitted work.
h. A variation in the style of language evidenced in a piece of work, if a student has taken significant portions of text from AI and then amended it.

i. A lack of graphs/data tables/visual aids where these would normally be expected.
j. A lack of specific local or topical knowledge.
k. Content being more generic in nature rather than relating to the student themself, or a specialised task or scenario, if this is required or expected.
l. The inadvertent inclusion by students of warnings or provisos produced by AI to highlight the limits of its ability, or the hypothetical nature of its output.
m. The submission of student work in a typed format, where their normal output is handwritten.
n. The unusual use of several concluding statements throughout the text, or several repetitions of an overarching essay structure within a single lengthy essay, which can be a result of AI being asked to produce an essay several times to add depth and variety or to overcome its output limit.
o. The inclusion of strongly stated non-sequiturs or confidently incorrect statements within otherwise cohesive content.
p. Overly verbose or hyperbolic language that may not be in keeping with the candidate's usual style.