



Generative AI Policy

Policy approval date	October 2025
Policy review date	October 2026
Policy Lead	Tim Eburn
Governor or SLT approval	SLT
Governor Committee responsible for policy	Curriculum

Introduction:

Richard Hale School recognises that AI Generative technology provides a good opportunity for children and young people to learn. We are committed to ensuring that all students, staff and governors will be able to use generative AI technology ethically and safely.

This policy aims to provide a robust framework for the ethical and efficient use of generative AI technologies at Richard Hale School. Its principal purpose is to provide a set of guidelines to uphold our shared values to ensure the successful incorporation of AI into our school community. This policy is a working document and will be reviewed termly, especially following updates from examination bodies (JCQ) and the Department for Education (DfE).

Scope of the Policy

This policy applies to all staff, students, governors, volunteers and visitors who utilise generative AI resources both on and off the premises. It covers all forms of generative AI technology that support learning, teaching, assessment, student wellbeing and administrative processes.

Use of AI tools and data/content created using such tools must comply with the following policies:

- Behaviour Policy
- Child Protection Policy
- Feedback, Marking and Assessment Policy
- Homework and Independent Study Policy
- NEA Policy
- Online Safety Policy
- Word Processing Policy

Data, Privacy, Security and Compliance

We recognise and respect our obligations under the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and other UK data protection laws to safeguard student and staff data privacy when deploying generative AI technologies. Staff and students MUST NEVER input confidential or sensitive personal information (including student names, photos, grades, or health data) into public, general-purpose AI tools (e.g., free versions of ChatGPT, Gemini) which lack a formal, UK-compliant Data Processing Agreement (DPA) with the school.

Any data intended for input or generated by generative AI tools must be anonymised by the user (teacher/staff) before use, and any resulting content must be stored securely on the school's approved internal network.

Ethical Use of Generative AI

Responsible use by Teaching Staff

Teachers are expected to model responsible and ethical use of generative AI technologies. This includes the appropriate integration of these technologies into their lessons, in a manner that enhances teaching and learning, without compromising academic integrity. Teachers should strive to use these tools to inspire creativity and original thinking among students, rather than for direct content creating. Teacher's discretion is key in ensuring that the use of generative AI aligns with the schools' educational objectives and ethical standards. Teachers are strongly encouraged to use AI to support the consistent application of the Five-a-Day Teaching & Learning framework and to reinforce Rosenshine's Principles of Instruction (e.g., generating tailored scaffolds, daily review quizzes)

Use by Teacher	Considerations
Drafting ideas for lesson plans and other activities.	Teachers must critically evaluate and fact-check ALL AI-generated content. Teachers retain full professional accountability for the accuracy and pedagogical soundness of all material used in the classroom.
Help with design of assessment questions or other forms of assessment.	Generated questions are often low-order or lack nuance. Teachers must review and edit all items to ensure they align with curriculum specifics and require higher-order thinking skills where appropriate.
Customising materials (simplifying language, adjusting to different reading levels, creating tailored activities for different interests)	Generally, when asked to customise material, generative AI won't introduce new concepts so is less likely to introduce factually incorrect information.
Providing custom feedback to students.	Generative AI should not be used to mark student work. AI-generated feedback must be generalised and focused on technique or style, never on specific student performance data. AI must not be used for final grading or moderation decisions.
Writing reports.	Our parental body expect reports to be written by their teachers and not by generative AI. Teachers must not use it for this purpose.
Authenticating Student Work	AI detection tools are unreliable and MUST NOT be relied upon. Authentication is achieved through retaining evidence of student process (drafts, planning) and teacher knowledge of the student's normal work.

*Disclaimer: Not an exhaustive list. For representational purposes only.

Responsible use by Support Staff

Support staff, including administration and ICT teams, should also adhere to responsible use of generative AI technologies. Any interaction with the generative AI tools should prioritise the protection of student data and respect for privacy. It is crucial for support staff to understand their responsibilities for ethical use and to ensure these tools are employed in a secure manner that benefits the school community.

Use by Support Staff	Considerations
Streamlining administrative tasks e.g. drafting emails, generating reports, newsletters, and meeting minutes.	Whilst generative AI can assist in these tasks it should not be relied upon. Manual checking is essential.
Anything involving personal information.	You should ensure that student data is kept secure and that all AI systems comply with data protection regulations. Data used or produced by generative AI tools should be anonymised and stored securely.

*Disclaimer: The above provides a representation and is not an exhaustive list.

Responsible use by Students

Generative AI technologies hold great potential for enhancing learning, but this also brings responsibilities. Students are expected to use these tools in a manner that respects Richard Hale School's academic and ethical principles. This includes acknowledging the sources of AI generated content and using these tools to support, rather than replace their original thinking or creativity.

Use by student:	Considerations:
To formulate ideas, for example, creating essay structures.	Generative AI tools are generally effective in producing outlines as a starting point for an assignment.
To provide feedback on writing.	Declaration is required when AI use exceeds standard, widely-accepted grammar/spell-check functions (e.g., using AI to rewrite paragraphs, restructure arguments, or generate content). Students must follow subject-specific declaration rules set by their teacher.
As a research tool.	A good understanding of the tool and its limitations is crucial, particularly the tendency for generative AI to give misinformation. Students must cite AI-generated content (including prompts) as a Source, and verify every factual claim using reliable, human-authored sources before inclusion in work.

Generating images to include in assignments.	The best image generation tools come at a cost and students need to be aware of copyright concerns.
--	---

*Disclaimer: The above provides a representation and is not an exhaustive list.

In general, students must understand the following principles:

- AI tools used in academic work must not be used for cheating, plagiarism or any other unethical behaviour.
- AI tools must not be used to impersonate individuals or organisations, in a misleading or malicious manner, or to generate content that is unlawful harmful or offensive.
- AI generated content should not be considered a substitute for student effort or original work. Students are required to put in their own effort to understand the material and produce unique content.
- It is the responsibility of students to verify the accuracy of information received from any AI sources (including search engines) used.
- Students must always clearly credit/acknowledge the use of known AI technology in their work when they have actively engaged with it, the use of the particular AI model, as well as the prompts used. This declaration must include the name of the AI model and the date of generation (to mitigate potential version differences)
- Aside from internal schoolwork and assessments, students must also be made aware that the inclusion of AI content in work submitted to an external qualification (e.g. NEA or coursework) is malpractice and may have to be reported to the exam board leading potentially to disqualification from that unit, qualification or all qualifications with that exam board (see JCQ regulations section below). Candidates must ensure their teacher is able to authenticate that the work is entirely their own by retaining evidence such as drafts, planning documents, or viva-voce notes in line with JCQ requirements.
- Students must maintain confidentiality in their interactions with AI tools and must not disclose any confidential or personal information about themselves or any other people to the AI model since the information may be in the public domain and accessible to others.
- Students should not use AI tools for advice on emotionally socially complex problems or other sensitive issues (for example medical diagnoses or wellbeing concerns).
- Students who breach this policy may face disciplinary action by the school.

Integrity and Avoidance of Plagiarism:

Plagiarism is a serious offence at Richard Hale School. Whilst generative AI technologies can provide beneficial insights, it is important that the work students produce is reflective of their understanding and knowledge. Students must not represent AI generated content as their own original work. Instead, it should serve as a tool to stimulate their ideas and enrich their assignments while upholding Richard Hale School's values of honesty and integrity.

Teacher and Candidate Responsibilities in Line with JCQ Guidance

[AI-Use-in-Assessments Apr25 FINAL.pdf](#)

The guidance emphasises the following requirements:

- As has always been the case, and in accordance with section 5.3(j) of the JCQ General Regulations of Approved Centres (<https://www.jcq.org.uk/exams-office/general-regulations/>), all work submitted for qualification assessments must be the candidates' own;
- Candidates who misuse AI such that the work they submit for assessment is not their own will have committed malpractice, in accordance with JCQ regulations, and may attract severe sanctions.
- Candidates and centre staff must be aware of the risks of using AI and must be clear on what constitutes malpractice.
- Candidates must make sure that work submitted for assessment is demonstrably their own. If any sections of their work are reproduced directly from AI generated responses, those elements must be identified by the candidates and they must understand that this will not allow them to demonstrate that they have independently met the marking criteria and therefore will not be rewarded.
- Teachers assessing the work must only accept work for assessment which they consider to be the candidates own (in accordance with section 5.3(j) of the JCQ General Regulations for Approved Centres); and
- Where teachers have doubts about the authenticity of candidates' work submitted for assessment (for example, they suspect that parts of it have been generated by AI but this has not been acknowledged), they must investigate and take appropriate action.
- Candidates are reminded that the use of AI tools to generate, structure, paraphrase, or summarise content for externally marked components (e.g., NEAs, coursework) will be treated as malpractice.
- Teachers MUST utilise knowledge of a student's normal work, progress, and planning documents to authenticate work. Detection tools alone are insufficient. Where doubt remains, the teacher must initiate the internal school investigation process as per the Malpractice Policy.