



UNCONTROLLED if COPIED or PRINTED

Keswick School is not liable for the contents of this document

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE POLICY (KS/CUR/112)

Committee Responsible:	Curriculum Committee
Lead Officer:	AI Lead / Deputy Headteacher – Curriculum
Date of Review:	October 2025
Date to be Reviewed:	October 2026
Signed:	
Date:	



ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE POLICY

REVIEW SHEET

The information in the table below details earlier versions of this document with a brief description of each review and how to distinguish amendments made since the previous version date.

Version Number	Version Description	Date of Revision
1	Original	October 2025

Ref:	Artificial Intelligence	Type:	Policy
Version:	01	Owner:	AI Lead / Deputy Headteacher – Curriculum
Date:	October 2025	Status:	Draft

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE POLICY

Contents

1.0	Introduction	Page 4
2.0	Relationship with Other School Policies	Page 4
3.0	Core Ethical Principles	Page 6
4.0	Roles and Responsibilities	Page 6
5.0	Guidance for Staff Use	Page 7
6.0	Guidance for Student Use (Ages 11-18)	Page 7
7.0	Academic Integrity and Assessment	Page 8
8.0	Data Protection and Privacy (UK GDPR Compliance)	Page 8
9.0	Safeguarding and Online Safety	Page 9
10.0	AI Literacy, Training, and Support	Page 9
11.0	Evaluating and Approving AI Tools	Page 9
12.0	Monitoring, Review, and Updates	Page 10
13.0	Reporting Concerns and Policy Breaches	Page 10
Appendix 1	Glossary of AI Terms	
Appendix 2	Access to List of Approved AI Tools	
Appendix 3	AI Referencing and Acknowledgement Examples	
Appendix 4	Link to DfE Generative AI Product Safety Expectations	
Appendix 5	Key School Contacts	
Appendix 6	AI Tool Evaluation Checklist	
Appendix 7	Student AI Use Guidance Table (Summary Scenarios)	

Ref:	Artificial Intelligence	Type:	Policy
Version:	01	Owner:	AI Lead / Deputy Headteacher – Curriculum
Date:	October 2025	Status:	Draft

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE POLICY

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Rationale

1.1.1 Artificial Intelligence (AI), particularly generative AI (GenAI), is rapidly evolving and offers significant potential to enhance educational outcomes, support teaching and learning, streamline administrative tasks, and prepare students for the future. However, AI also presents challenges and risks related to academic integrity, data protection, safeguarding, bias, and ethical use.

1.2 Purpose

1.2.1 This policy establishes a clear framework for the responsible, ethical, and effective use of AI by all members of the Keswick School community. It aims to maximise the benefits of AI while mitigating risks, ensuring alignment with our school's values, UK regulatory requirements (including UK GDPR, KCSIE, DfE guidance, and JCQ regulations), and safeguarding principles.

1.3 Scope

1.3.1 This policy applies to all staff (teaching, support, leadership), students (Years 7-13), governors/trustees, volunteers, trainees, and third-party providers using AI tools on behalf of the school. It covers all uses of AI for school-related purposes, whether on school premises, using school equipment, or off-site using personal devices. It encompasses generative AI (text, image, code, etc.), analytical AI, and AI embedded within other software platforms used by the school.

1.4 Aims

1.4.1 This policy aims to empower all members of the Keswick School community – staff, students, and parents – to engage with Artificial Intelligence not merely as passive users, but as critical, ethical, and creative thinkers. Our objective is to future-proof the education we offer, ensuring students are prepared not only to navigate an AI-influenced future but to actively shape, lead, and adapt within it.

1.4.2 The key areas of the policy are to:

- Establish clear guidelines for the ethical, responsible, and secure use of AI.
- Promote the effective integration of *approved* AI tools to support pedagogical innovation, enhance learning, and potentially reduce workload.
- Ensure compliance with all relevant UK legislation and guidance.
- Develop AI literacy among students and staff.
- Implement a robust process for evaluating and approving AI tools.
- Safeguard the well-being, privacy, and data security of all students and staff.
- Uphold the highest standards of academic integrity.
- Provide clear expectations and accountability for all users.

2.0 RELATIONSHIP WITH OTHER SCHOOL POLICIES

2.1 This Artificial Intelligence (AI) Policy operates in conjunction with, and provides specific guidance that complements, several existing Keswick School policies. Its principles and procedures should be understood and applied alongside the broader frameworks established in these key documents. The most pertinent policies include:

Ref:	Artificial Intelligence	Type:	Policy
Version:	01	Owner:	AI Lead / Deputy Headteacher – Curriculum
Date:	October 2025	Status:	Draft

- 2.2 Safeguarding and Child Protection Policy (KSMAT/STAT/040)**
- 2.2.1 This AI policy upholds the school’s commitment to safeguarding. It provides specific guidance on mitigating online safety risks associated with AI, such as exposure to harmful content or inappropriate interactions, ensuring alignment with KCSIE. The DSL has a key role in overseeing these aspects (see Section 9.0).
- 2.3 Data Protection Policy (UK GDPR) (KSMAT/STAT/023)**
- 2.3.1 All AI use involving personal data must comply with UK GDPR and the school's Data Protection Policy. This AI policy details how data protection principles (lawful basis, transparency, DPIAs etc.) apply to the procurement and use of AI tools (see Section 8.0). The DPO is central to ensuring compliance.
- 2.4 Online Safety Policy (KS/P&B/034) (including Acceptable Use of IT)**
- 2.4.1 This AI policy extends the principles of online safety and acceptable IT use to the specific context of AI tools. It addresses responsible online behaviour when interacting with AI and reinforces existing filtering and monitoring arrangements (see Section 9.0)
- 2.5 Behaviour Policy (KSMAT/STAT/044) and Academic Honesty**
- 2.5.1 This AI policy reinforces the school’s expectations for student conduct. It defines the misuse of AI in producing schoolwork as malpractice and outlines procedures for addressing such breaches (see Section 7.0).
- 2.6 Exams Policy (KES/CUR/050) (including Malpractice and Cyber Attack elements)**
- 2.6.1 This AI policy clarifies the (generally prohibited) use of AI in formal assessments, including NEA/coursework, unless explicitly permitted by examining bodies of JCQ. Unauthorised use constitutes malpractice under the Exams Policy (see Section 7.0). It also aligns with the school's policy on resilience against cyber threats that could impact assessments.
- 2.7 Curriculum Policy (KS/CUR/062) and Teaching and Learning Policy (KS/CUR/088)**
- 2.7.1 This AI policy supports the curriculum by guiding the integration of AI as an educational tool and the development of AI literacy for both students and staff. It informs pedagogical approaches to using AI effectively and ethically in teaching and learning (see Sections 5.0, 6.0 and 10.0).
- 2.8 Homework Policy (KS/CUR/067)**
- 2.8.1 This AI policy provides specific guidance on the acceptable and ethical use of AI tools by students when completing homework, ensuring it supports learning rather than replacing a student effort (see Section 6.0).
- 2.9 Staff Code of Conduct (KSMAT/STAT/039)**
- 2.9.1 This AI policy outlines additional responsibilities for staff regarding the professional, ethical, and secure use of AI tools, data handling, and maintaining professional boundaries (see Section 5.0 and 4.0).
- 2.10 Data Security Breach Management (KSMAT/STAT/052) and Cyber Response Plan (KSMAT/STAT/113)**
- 2.10.1 Should the use or compromise of an AI system lead to a data breach or cyber incident, the procedures outlined in these policies will be enacted. This AI policy emphasizes the secure use of AI to prevent such incidents (see Section 8.0).

Ref:	Artificial Intelligence	Type:	Policy
Version:	01	Owner:	AI Lead / Deputy Headteacher – Curriculum
Date:	October 2025	Status:	Draft

2.11 Marking and Feedback Policy (KS/CUR/026)

2.11.1 This AI policy informs how AI may be ethically used by staff to support marking and feedback processes and clarifies expectations around authenticating student work where AI may have been used (see Sections 5.0 and 7.0).

3.0 CORE ETHICAL PRINCIPLES

3.1 The use of AI at Keswick School is governed by the following core ethical principles (see Appendix 15.0 section 15.1 for definitions and further detail):

- *Fairness and Equity*: Striving to ensure AI use is fair, equitable, and actively mitigates potential bias.
- *Transparency and Explainability*: Committing to openness about how and when AI is used, within the bounds of technical feasibility.
- *Accountability and Human Oversight*: It does not replace professional judgement or student effort.
- *Safety, Security, and Robustness*: Prioritising the safety and security of users and data, and ensuring the reliability of approved AI tools.
- *Privacy*: Strictly adhering to data protection laws (UK GDPR) in all AI use involving personal data.
- *Beneficence and Non-maleficence*: Employing AI purposefully to benefit education while actively avoiding harm.
- *Academic Integrity*: Ensuring AI use does not undermine academic honesty or the development of students' own skills and understanding.

4.0 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

4.1 **Governing Body/Trust Board**: Responsible for approving this policy and overseeing its implementation and review.

4.2 **Headteacher & Senior Leadership Team (SLT)**: Responsible for the overall implementation, communication, and operationalisation of this policy, aligning it with the School Development Plan, allocating resources (including for training), leading the AI tool approval process, ensuring legal compliance, and addressing serious policy breaches. [Oversight: Miss J Railton (SLT). The AI Lead, Mr D Cragon (TLR holder), also supports SLT in this area.]

4.3 **Data Protection Officer (DPO)**: [DPO Name/Contact Details - See Appendix 15.0 section 15.5]. Responsible for advising on UK GDPR compliance related to AI, supporting and reviewing Data Protection Impact Assessments (DPIAs), and acting as a contact point for data protection queries/breaches involving AI.

4.4 **Designated Safeguarding Lead (DSL)**: [DSL Name/Contact Details - See Appendix 15.0 section 15.5]. Responsible for overseeing safeguarding implications of AI use, ensuring alignment with KCSIE and school safeguarding policies, managing related concerns, and contributing to AI tool evaluation from a safeguarding perspective.

4.5 **AI Lead**: [AI Lead Name/Contact Details - See Appendix 15.0 section 15.5]. Responsible for defining acceptable AI use, conducting technical evaluations, and overseeing the implementation and management of approved AI tools and related infrastructure (e.g., filtering, monitoring), supported by the Network Manager. The AI Lead maintains the Approved AI Tools List.

Ref:	Artificial Intelligence	Type:	Policy
Version:	01	Owner:	AI Lead / Deputy Headteacher – Curriculum
Date:	October 2025	Status:	Draft

The AI Lead is also responsible for delivering AI education to students (e.g., via assemblies), staff (e.g., via training), and parents (e.g., via engagement initiatives). Furthermore, the AI Lead, in collaboration with the Deputy Head for Curriculum, will provide guidance on AI-related malpractice.

- 4.6 **Exams Officer:** In collaboration with the Deputy Head for Curriculum, responsible for educating and informing students on what constitutes malpractice, particularly concerning AI use in assessments, and for establishing procedures for collecting written evidence of students' understanding of these academic integrity requirements.
- 4.7 **Teaching Staff:** Responsible for adhering to this policy, exercising professional judgement when using AI, critically evaluating AI outputs, guiding and supervising student use appropriately, promoting AI literacy, authenticating student work, and reporting concerns.
- 4.8 **All Staff:** Responsible for reading, understanding, and adhering to this policy, completing required training, using only approved AI tools for school purposes, protecting personal/confidential data, and reporting concerns.
- 4.9 **Students:** Responsible for understanding and adhering to relevant sections of this policy, using AI tools responsibly and ethically, upholding academic integrity, using only approved tools for schoolwork, never inputting personal data into unapproved tools, and reporting harmful/concerning content or misuse.
- 4.10 **Parents/Carers:** Encouraged to familiarise themselves with the school's approach to AI, support responsible AI use at home, engage with school communications, and raise concerns via appropriate channels (e.g., Form Tutor, Head of Year).

5.0 GUIDANCE FOR STAFF USE

- 5.1 Staff are encouraged to explore approved AI tools (see Appendix 15.0 section 15.2 for access to list) to enhance professional practice, improve efficiency, and support student learning.
- 5.2 Staff must remain fully accountable for the quality, accuracy, appropriateness, and ethical implications of any AI-assisted work.
- 5.3 All AI-generated outputs must be thoroughly reviewed, fact-checked, and evaluated for bias, accuracy, and pedagogical suitability before use.
- 5.4 Staff must not input identifiable personal or sensitive data (student, staff, parent) into unapproved or 'open' AI tools. Approved tools must be used for tasks involving potentially sensitive information, following DPO guidance and DPIA requirements where applicable.
- 5.5 Staff must respect copyright laws and not input copyrighted materials into AI tools, especially those that may use inputs for training.

6.0 GUIDANCE FOR STUDENT USE (AGES 11-18)

- 6.1 Students may use approved AI tools (see Appendix 15.0 section 15.2) for specific learning activities (e.g. research with verification, understanding concepts, skill practice, brainstorming) under teacher guidance.

Ref:	Artificial Intelligence	Type:	Policy
Version:	01	Owner:	AI Lead / Deputy Headteacher – Curriculum
Date:	October 2025	Status:	Draft

- 6.2 AI must not substitute genuine effort, critical thinking, independent learning, or the development of core academic skills. The student is responsible for their learning and submitted work.
- 6.3 Submitting AI-generated work as one's own is strictly prohibited and constitutes malpractice (see Section 7.0). Use must be appropriately acknowledged (see Appendix 15.0 section 15.3).
- 6.4 Students must realise that prohibited use include plagiarism, assessment misuse where forbidden (e.g., by JCQ or school), over-reliance, creating harmful content.
- 6.5 Students must not input personal information (their own or others') or confidential school information into any AI tool unless explicitly approved and guided by a teacher for a specific task using a vetted tool
- 6.6 AI use requires supervision (especially KS3), adherence to age restrictions, use of approved tools only, and immediate reporting of any concerning content or interactions to a staff member.

7.0 ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AND ASSESSMENT

- 7.1 Upholding academic integrity is fundamental. This policy reinforces the school's Curriculum Policy and Behaviour Policy.
- 7.2 Presenting AI-generated work as original is plagiarism and/or malpractice.
- 7.3 Students must clearly acknowledge AI assistance when submitting work, following school guidance (Appendix 15.0 section 15.3). Failure to do so is a breach of policy.
- 7.4 Using AI in formal assessments (including NEA/coursework) is only permitted where explicitly allowed by the examining body (e.g., JCQ) and the school. Unauthorised use constitutes malpractice and may lead to severe sanctions, including disqualification.
- 7.5 Any concerns regarding AI malpractice must be raised with both Miss J Railton and the AI lead as soon as they arise.
- 7.6 Teachers will authenticate student work using a range of pedagogical methods, such as direct supervision, reviewing drafts and version histories (e.g., in Google Docs), vivas, and in-class questioning. Reflecting current evidence, AI detection tools will not be used as the sole basis for identifying academic misconduct, given their demonstrated unreliability and the potential for biased outcomes against students, particularly those with English as an Additional Language (EAL) or Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND).

8.0 DATA PROTECTION AND PRIVACY (UK GDPR COMPLIANCE)

- 8.1 All use of AI involving personal data must strictly comply with UK GDPR and the Data Protection Act 2018, and the school's Data Protection Policy.
- 8.2 Identifiable personal data (names, contact details, specific sensitive circumstances etc.) **MUST NOT** be entered into 'open' or unapproved generative AI tools (see Appendix 15.0 section 15.2).
- 8.3 Processing personal data using AI requires a valid lawful basis, transparency, purpose limitation, data minimisation, accuracy, storage limitation, security, and accountability.

Ref:	Artificial Intelligence	Type:	Policy
Version:	01	Owner:	AI Lead / Deputy Headteacher – Curriculum
Date:	October 2025	Status:	Draft

- 8.4 Data Protection Impact Assessments (DPIAs) are mandatory for AI processing likely to result in high risk (e.g., processing children's data systematically, special category data, profiling) and must be completed before implementation, involving the DPO if involving new data processors with whom we do not currently hold GDPR compliant contract clauses e.g. ChatGTP
- 8.5 Consent, where required (e.g., using student work for AI training), must be explicit, informed, and freely given (with parental consent usually needed for under 13s).
- 8.6 Third-party AI vendors must be vetted for GDPR compliance, security, and data usage practices (including model training). Data Processing Agreements (DPAs) are required.

9.0 SAFEGUARDING AND ONLINE SAFETY

- 9.1 The use of AI must align with the school's commitment to safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children (KCSIE and Safeguarding Policy (KSMAT/STAT/040)).
- 9.2 Measures (filtering, monitoring, supervision) will be used to mitigate risks associated with AI, such as exposure to harmful/inappropriate content, bias, misinformation, or unsuitable interactions. School-provided access and approved tools will meet DfE standards (Appendix 15.0 section 15.4).
- 9.3 Supervision levels will be appropriate to the students' age and the AI tool being used.
- 9.4 Students will be educated on online safety risks related to AI (misinformation, deepfakes, data privacy, potential for exploitation), through the whole year assembly structure.
- 9.5 All members of the school community MUST report any safeguarding concerns related to AI use immediately via established procedures (reporting to the DSL or deputies).

10.0 AI LITERACY, TRAINING AND SUPPORT

- 10.1 Keswick School is committed to providing ongoing AI literacy education and training for staff and students.
- 10.2 Staff CPD will cover ethical use, data protection, practical applications, critical evaluation, school policy, and identifying AI-generated content.
- 10.3 Student education (initially delivered by assembly with the aspiration to integrate into the curriculum, e.g., Computing, PD) will cover AI concepts, responsible use, critical evaluation, ethics, academic integrity, and online safety.
- 10.4 Guidance and resources will be shared with parents/carers.

11.0 EVALUATING AND APPROVING AI TOOLS

- 11.1 Only AI tools that have undergone the school's formal evaluation and approval process may be used for school purposes involving student interaction or school data.
- 11.2 The process involves proposal, DPO consultation (including DPIA screening/completion), technical/safety/safeguarding checks, ethical review, educational value assessment by AI Lead and final SLT approval.

Ref:	Artificial Intelligence	Type:	Policy
Version:	01	Owner:	AI Lead / Deputy Headteacher – Curriculum
Date:	October 2025	Status:	Draft

11.3 An up-to-date list of Approved AI Tools is maintained centrally and accessible to staff (see Appendix 15.0 section 15.2) the use of these tools is reinforced in staff CPD. Use of unapproved tools is prohibited.

11.4 Approved tools are subject to periodic review.

12.0 MONITORING, REVIEW AND UPDATES

12.1 The AI Lead and SLT will monitor the implementation and effectiveness of this policy.

12.2 This policy will be formally reviewed annually, or more frequently by the AI Lead if significant technological or regulatory changes occur.

12.3 Review will involve consultation with stakeholders (DPO, DSL, AI Lead, where appropriate staff / students/parents/governors). Updates will be communicated to the school community.

13.0 REPORTING CONCERNS AND POLICY BREACHES

13.1 Any member of the school community with concerns about AI use (ethical, data protection, safeguarding, academic misconduct, policy breaches) should report them promptly.

13.2 Concerns should typically be raised with a relevant staff member (Form Tutor, Head of Year, Head of Department, Line Manager). Specific concerns can be directed to the AI Lead, DPO (data protection), DSL (safeguarding), or SLT.

13.3 Concerns and suspected breaches will be investigated thoroughly and fairly according to established school procedures (e.g., Staff Disciplinary Policy, Behaviour Policy).

13.4 Breaches will be taken seriously and may result in disciplinary action for staff or students, commensurate with severity. Malpractice in formal assessments may lead to JCQ sanctions.

Ref:	Artificial Intelligence	Type:	Policy
Version:	01	Owner:	AI Lead / Deputy Headteacher – Curriculum
Date:	October 2025	Status:	Draft

Glossary of AI Terms

- **Artificial Intelligence (AI):** Computer systems performing tasks typically requiring human intelligence (e.g., learning, problem-solving, decision-making).
- **Generative AI (GenAI):** AI capable of creating new content (text, images, code, audio, video) based on patterns learned from vast datasets it was trained on. Examples: ChatGPT, Google Gemini, Midjourney.
- **Large Language Model (LLM):** A type of AI model trained on massive amounts of text data, enabling understanding and generation of human-like language. Powers many GenAI chatbots.
- **Machine Learning (ML):** A subset of AI where systems learn from data to improve performance on a task without being explicitly programmed.
- **Prompt:** The instruction, question, or input given by a user to an AI tool.
- **Prompt Engineering:** The skill of crafting effective prompts to elicit desired and accurate outputs from AI tools.
- **Bias (in AI):** Systematic errors or prejudices in AI outputs, often reflecting biases present in the training data or algorithm design, leading to potentially unfair or discriminatory outcomes.
- **Hallucination (AI):** When an AI generates plausible sounding but factually incorrect or nonsensical information.
- **Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA):** A process required under UK GDPR to identify and minimise data protection risks associated with processing likely to result in high risk to individuals' rights and freedoms. Often mandatory for significant AI deployment in schools.
- **UK GDPR:** The UK General Data Protection Regulation, the primary data protection law in the UK.
- **Intellectual Property (IP):** Rights relating to creations of the mind, such as copyright for written or artistic works.
- **Academic Misconduct/Malpractice:** Actions that breach academic integrity rules (e.g., plagiarism, cheating). In the context of AI, includes submitting AI-generated work as one's own or failing to acknowledge AI use appropriately.
- **Filtering (in AI Safety):** Mechanisms designed to prevent AI tools from generating or users from accessing harmful, inappropriate, or prohibited content.
- **Monitoring (in AI Safety):** Systems for logging AI usage (prompts, outputs) and potentially alerting supervisors to attempts to access harmful content or potential safeguarding disclosures.
- **Open AI Tool:** Generally, refers to publicly accessible AI tools (often free versions) where user input may be used by the provider for model training or other purposes, posing significant data privacy risks regarding personal or confidential input. *Use for school purposes involving personal/sensitive data is generally prohibited by this policy.*
- **Closed AI Tool:** Generally, refers to AI tools (often enterprise, subscription, or specifically vetted educational versions) with stronger data protection agreements and commitments, where user input is typically kept private and not used for model training outside the user's organisation. *These are the types of tools considered for approval for handling potentially sensitive tasks.*

Ref:	Artificial Intelligence	Type:	Policy
Version:	01	Owner:	AI Lead / Deputy Headteacher – Curriculum
Date:	October 2025	Status:	Draft

Access to List of Approved AI Tools

A current list of AI tools approved for use by staff and/or specific student year groups within Keswick School is maintained centrally by the AI Lead. This list specifies permitted use cases, target year groups (if applicable), and any specific conditions for each tool.

Staff can access the Approved AI Tools List via: Policies Approved AI Tools List or at <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1n0JDb6ShTiyNHQU41f7w1ksoWCwU9Tlj0wenjwiycg>

Use of AI tools not on this list for school purposes involving student interaction or school data (personal or confidential) is prohibited without undergoing the formal evaluation and approval process outlined in Section 11.0 of this policy and Appendix 15.6

Ref:	Artificial Intelligence	Type:	Policy
Version:	01	Owner:	AI Lead / Deputy Headteacher – Curriculum
Date:	October 2025	Status:	Draft

AI Referencing and Acknowledgement Examples

Students and staff must clearly acknowledge the use of AI tools where they have contributed to submitted work or resources, where permitted and appropriate. Requirements may vary by assignment; always check teacher instructions. Failure to acknowledge constitutes plagiarism/malpractice. (Based on JCQ guidance and general academic practice):

1. **General Use Acknowledgement (e.g., for brainstorming, initial understanding):**
 - *Example Statement:* "I used ChatGPT 4.5 (OpenAI) on 15th October 2025 to help brainstorm initial themes for this project and summarise class notes on [Topic]. The final research, analysis, and writing are my own work."

2. **Referencing Specific AI Output (if directly quoted, paraphrased, or used as a specific information source):** Treat the AI tool like a source.
 - *In-text Citation Example:* (OpenAI ChatGPT 4, 16 October 2025) or according to Google Gemini (16 October 2025), one perspective is...
 - *Bibliography/Reference List Entry Example (adapt citation style as needed):*
 - OpenAI. (2025, October 16). *ChatGPT 4 response to prompt "[Insert the exact prompt you used here]"*. [Insert unedited large language model output].
 - Google. (2025, October 16). *Google Gemini response to prompt "[Insert exact prompt here]"*. [Large language model]. [Insert unedited large language model output].

3. **Acknowledging AI in Creative Work (e.g., Images):**
 - *Example Caption:* "Figure 1: Conceptual image generated using Midjourney (17 October 2025) based on the prompt '[Insert prompt here]'".

4. **JCQ Requirements (Formal Assessments):** For NEA/Coursework **where AI use is permitted** by JCQ/exam board rules, students *must* provide the specific prompts used and the resulting output, along with clear referencing, as part of their submission if required by the board. Students must sign a declaration that work is their own, failure to do so may result in disqualification.

Ref:	Artificial Intelligence	Type:	Policy
Version:	01	Owner:	AI Lead / Deputy Headteacher – Curriculum
Date:	October 2025	Status:	Draft

Link to DfE Generative AI Product Safety Expectations

Staff involved in evaluating or procuring AI tools, particularly the AI Lead and SLT, must refer to and use the detailed DfE guidance to assess technical safety and safeguarding features:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/generative-ai-product-safety-expectations/generative-ai-product-safety-expectations>

See also the main DfE GenAI in Education Guidance:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/generative-artificial-intelligence-in-education/generative-artificial-intelligence-ai-in-education>

Ref:	Artificial Intelligence	Type:	Policy
Version:	01	Owner:	AI Lead / Deputy Headteacher – Curriculum
Date:	October 2025	Status:	Draft

Key School Contacts

- **Data Protection Officer (DPO):**
Mrs Ruth Lawler (Director of Finance & Operations) ruthlawler@keswick.cumbria.sch.uk
- **Designated Safeguarding Lead (DSL):**
Ms Wendy Lightfoot (Deputy Head Pastoral)- wendylightfoot@keswick.cumbria.sch.uk
- **AI Lead:**
Mr Dave Cragon (Head of Physics / AI Lead) - davecragon@keswick.cumbria.sch.uk
- **Senior Leader with AI Oversight:**
Miss Julie Railton (Deputy Head Curriculum) – julierailton@keswick.cumbria.sch.uk

Ref:	Artificial Intelligence	Type:	Policy
Version:	01	Owner:	AI Lead / Deputy Headteacher – Curriculum
Date:	October 2025	Status:	Draft

AI Tool Evaluation Checklist

Proposal Details: Tool Name, Vendor, Intended Use, Rationale, Target Users	
Safety & Safeguarding: Compliance with DfE Safety Expectations (Filtering, Monitoring, Reporting)? Age Appropriateness? Alignment with KCSIE? Specific Safeguarding Risks Identified & Mitigated - DSL Consulted if needed	
Data Protection & Privacy: UK GDPR Compliance Confirmed? Compliant DPA Available? Vendor Data Usage Policy (especially re: model training)? Adequate Security Measures? DPIA Required (DPO Consult)? If DPIA required, completed satisfactorily & signed off? Data Location & Transfer Safeguards?	
Ethical Considerations: Potential for Bias Assessed & Mitigated? Transparency of Operation? Mechanisms for Accountability/Human Oversight? Impact on Equity?	
Educational Value & Effectiveness: Clear Pedagogical Purpose/Benefit? Curriculum Alignment? Evidence of Effectiveness (if available)?	
Functionality & Usability: Reliability & Robustness? Ease of Use? Accessibility Features (SEND)? Technical Compatibility?	
Intellectual Property (IP): Clarity on Ownership (Inputs/Outputs)? Respects Copyright Law?	
Cost & Sustainability: Value for Money? Fair Licensing Terms? Vendor Viability?	
Overall Recommendation: Approve / Approve with Conditions / Reject. AI Lead Review & Date. SLT Decision & Date.	

Ref:	Artificial Intelligence	Type:	Policy
Version:	01	Owner:	AI Lead / Deputy Headteacher – Curriculum
Date:	October 2025	Status:	Draft

AI Tool Evaluation Checklist (completed)

Proposal Details: Tool Name, Vendor, Intended Use, Rationale, Target Users	Gemini Teen - Google Student use KS4/5 following guidance assemblies. Provide students with a safe, data-protected, and guard-railed AI platform.
Safety & Safeguarding: Compliance with DfE Safety Expectations (Filtering, Monitoring, Reporting)? Age Appropriateness? Alignment with KCSIE? Specific Safeguarding Risks Identified & Mitigated - DSL Consulted if needed	Flash2.5 model with a double check for appropriateness of response (a model checks the model). Filters for CSAM / extensively tested both in school DC and by Common Sense Media (low risk). Logging/Monitoring part of Google core service covered by Google Vault. Fact Check Option. No image generation. Conversation retention both in user account and Google Vault.
Data Protection & Privacy: UK GDPR Compliance Confirmed? Compliant DPA Available? Vendor Data Usage Policy (especially re: model training)? Adequate Security Measures? DPIA Required (DPO Consult)? If DPIA required, completed satisfactorily & signed off? Data Location & Transfer Safeguards?	GDPR-compliant part of Google for Education Core service, covered by DPA, which covers existing data held by Google on the Keswicksch.co.uk domain - no additional data exposure. DPIA not completed as part of existing Google Tools (no further exposure). Data input not used for further model training / automatic human review / advertising.
Ethical Considerations: Potential for Bias Assessed & Mitigated? Transparency of Operation? Mechanisms for Accountability/Human Oversight? Impact on Equity?	The issue of bias remains across all models; the importance of training students during assemblies. The fact-check option allows model responses to be cross-checked. In DC testing for bias (e.g., the Andrew Tate model), views were appropriately pushed back and challenged.
Educational Value & Effectiveness: Clear Pedagogical Purpose/Benefit? Curriculum Alignment? Evidence of Effectiveness (if available)?	Allow a safer model for students to use, if prompted correctly, and an excellent learning tool. This is not a specifically programmed learning tool and does not directly align with curriculum. Planned use with KS4/5 students to support studies after AI assemblies.
Functionality & Usability: Reliability & Robustness? Ease of Use? Accessibility Features (SEND)? Technical Compatibility?	Hosted on Google servers, ensuring high reliability and data security. Functionality equivalent to Gemini 2.5. No image Gen Read mode allows responses to be read to students.
Intellectual Property (IP): Clarity on Ownership (Inputs/Outputs)? Respects Copyright Law?	Data is covered by existing tenancy data owned and controlled as part of the Keswicksch.co.uk domain by Keswick School. Inputs and outputs are not used for model training.
Cost & Sustainability: Value for Money? Fair Licensing Terms? Vendor Viability?	Free, included as part of a Google for Education domain.
Overall Recommendation: Approve / Approve with Conditions / Reject. AI Lead Review & Date. SLT Decision & Date.	

Ref:	Artificial Intelligence	Type:	Policy
Version:	01	Owner:	AI Lead / Deputy Headteacher – Curriculum
Date:	October 2025	Status:	Draft

Student AI Use Guidance Table (Summary Scenarios)

Keswick School follow a traffic light system of use:

Green generally fine, Amber use with caution, Red use is prohibited

(If in doubt check with the member of staff setting the work)

Activity Type	Permitted Use Y/N	Key Considerations & Risks	Example of Acceptable Use (with acknowledgement)	Example of Misuse/Malpractice
Brainstorming Ideas	Yes (But if for use in lessons check)	Teacher permission may be needed. Good starting point requires independent development. Risk: Lack of original thought if over-relied upon. Acknowledge if ideas directly influence submitted work.	Using Gemini to generate potential essay themes for History, selecting one, then conducting independent research using library resources.	Copying an AI-generated essay outline directly into a plan without further development or attribution.
Background Research	Yes (with extreme caution)	Verification Mandatory: All factual claims from AI <i>must</i> be verified using multiple reliable sources. Cannot be sole source. High risk of inaccuracies/hallucinations. Acknowledge use.	Asking Gemini for a brief overview of an event, then verifying details using textbooks and academic journals. Citing the verified sources, not AI.	Citing an AI-generated summary as fact without checking its accuracy or finding corroborating sources. Relying solely on AI for research.
Summarising notes / resources	Yes (with caution)	Check accuracy against original. Useful for revision/understanding <i>own</i> notes or <i>provided</i> materials (if permitted). Risk: Misinterpretation/omission. Acknowledge if used to prepare for assessed work. Not for summarising text one hasn't read as a substitute for reading.	Pasting own typed lecture notes into Copilot to generate a bullet-point summary for revision. Acknowledge if preparing for assessment.	Submitting an AI-generated summary of a required reading text as if it were the student's own summary notes, without having read the original.

Ref:	Artificial Intelligence	Type:	Policy
Version:	01	Owner:	AI Lead / Deputy Headteacher – Curriculum
Date:	October 2025	Status:	Draft

Tutoring / Content Assistance	Yes	Use Gemini to explain a topic or concept you are unsure of from lessons or teach yourself new material. If used, tell your teacher (they want to know!)	Start with the prompt: I would like you to act as an AQA GCSE Physics tutor and paste your question or problem in.	Answer the following question for me.
Drafting Text (Essays etc.)	NO	Strictly Prohibited. All written work submitted must be the student's own composition. High likelihood of plagiarism and academic misconduct.	N/A	Asking ChatGPT/Copilot to write any part of an essay/report/code and submitting it as original work.
Checking Grammar/Spelling	Yes (using approved tools only; with caution)	Focus on correcting errors in student's <i>own</i> writing, not rewriting content/ideas or improving style significantly. Student must understand & implement changes. Risk: Over-reliance hinders proofreading skills; potential to alter meaning inadvertently.	Using an approved tool like Microsoft Word on a completed essay draft to identify typos and grammatical errors, then manually correcting them.	Pasting an essay into an AI tool and accepting all "rewrite for clarity" or "improve fluency" suggestions without critical review; using AI to meet word count.
Generating Code Snippets	Depends (Teacher Permission Required)	Must understand the code. Must be integrated into larger, student-written program. Must be acknowledged. Risk: Code may be flawed, inefficient, or unsuitable; hinders learning if used as shortcut.	Using GitHub Copilot to suggest a function structure for a specific task, then writing, testing, and debugging the function independently. Acknowledge.	Copying a large block of AI-generated code into a project without understanding how it works or acknowledging the source.
Generating Images/Artwork	Depends (Teacher Permission Required)	Cannot be submitted as entirely student's own original work if AI-generated. Must be acknowledged clearly (tool, date, prompt). Risk: Image bias/inaccuracies; copyright issues.	Using DALL-E to create a background image for a presentation slide, with a clear caption acknowledging the source and prompt.	Submitting an AI-generated image in an Art portfolio claiming it as entirely original hand-drawn work.

Ref:	Artificial Intelligence	Type:	Policy
Version:	01	Owner:	AI Lead / Deputy Headteacher – Curriculum
Date:	October 2025	Status:	Draft

Translation	Generally Discouraged (Malpractice in Lang assessments) ; Permitted as accessibility aid (Teacher permission needed)	Not for language learning assessments testing own skills. Can be inaccurate/lose nuance. Must be acknowledged if used.	Using Google Translate (if permitted) to understand a difficult phrase during research for a history essay (not a language assessment). Acknowledge. Use by EAL in non-assessment conditions	Using an AI tool to translate an entire essay written in English into French for submission in a French lesson.
Formal Assessments (NEA/Coursework)	Strictly follow JCQ rules & Teacher instructions	Misuse is Malpractice. Only permitted if explicitly allowed by exam board/teacher for specific tasks (e.g., initial research with verification). Mandatory referencing & potential submission of interaction logs if used. Authentication checks will apply.	(Only if explicitly permitted) Using AI for initial research (verified), writing assessment independently, fully referencing AI use per guidelines.	Any unacknowledged use; copying AI content; using AI to bypass demonstrating required skills/knowledge; using AI when/where prohibited.

For further guidance/clarification speak to the AI Lead or Deputy Head of Curriculum. Also see “**Keswick School: Your AI Smart Guide!**” Student guide available at <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1vklzL3cuNoAkiabseAPPDM2ktmtD1yuEmbWJMII5Po>

Ref:	Artificial Intelligence	Type:	Policy
Version:	01	Owner:	AI Lead / Deputy Headteacher – Curriculum
Date:	October 2025	Status:	Draft