

Title:	Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) Policy
Associated Policies:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Online Safety and Acceptable Use Policy ● Safeguarding and Child Protection ● Data Protection ● Freedom of Information ● Anti-Bullying ● Peer on Peer Abuse
Appendices	<p>Appendix A Joint Council for Qualifications Artificial Intelligence (AI) Use in Assessments: Protecting the Integrity of Qualifications</p> <p>Appendix B Department for Education Generative artificial intelligence (AI) in education</p> <p>Appendix C Generative AI in Schools: Findings from a Randomised Controlled Trial (EEF, 2024).</p> <p>Appendix D Generative AI: product safety expectations (DfE, 2025).</p>

1	Policy Statement
	<p>This AI Policy outlines the principles and guidelines governing the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) technologies within Northampton School for Girls.</p> <p>Artificial Intelligence is defined as “a branch of computer science that focuses on creating software capable of mimicking behaviours and processes we would consider “intelligent” if exhibited by humans, including reasoning, learning, problem-solving, and exercising creativity.”</p>

2	Who does this policy apply to?
	This policy applies to all stakeholders, including students, teachers, staff, and administrators.

3	Who is responsible for carrying out this policy?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Teaching Staff: Ensure AI tools are used appropriately in teaching and assessment. ● Examinations Officer: Monitor AI’s impact on academic integrity. ● Deputy Headteacher for Quality of Education: Oversee the integration of AI into pedagogy. ● Designated Safeguarding Lead (DSL): Safeguard students from risks associated with AI. ● IT Manager: Maintain compliance with data protection standards and ensure secure deployment of AI tools. ● Associate Assistant Headteacher for Computing and Innovation: Oversee whole-school IT, ensuring the effective and responsible use of AI across educational and operational contexts. ● Headteacher and Governors: Ensure policy implementation and review.

4	What are the principles behind the policy?
	<p>A recent trial by the EEF (2024) demonstrated that generative AI tools can maintain lesson quality while saving time, emphasising the importance of their thoughtful application in education. AI can greatly enhance education by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reducing teacher workload through tools that automate routine tasks, such as grading and attendance tracking, as highlighted in DfE guidance. ● Streamlining administrative processes, improving efficiency across the school. ● Enhancing communication efficiency through AI-driven insights into school operations. ● Increasing accessibility for students, particularly those with learning difficulties, by using adaptive technologies.

- Personalising learning through online platforms, which align with DfE's emphasis on differentiated instruction.
- Supporting learners via intelligent tutoring systems, providing targeted feedback and reinforcement.

At NSG, we aim to empower students to use AI responsibly, viewing it as a learning aid rather than a shortcut. This policy promotes ethical AI use while addressing risks such as bias, data privacy, and misinformation.

5 Procedures (standards)

Intellectual Property and AI-Generated Content

As artificial intelligence tools become more integrated into education, it is essential to understand the implications of intellectual property (IP) rights in relation to AI-generated content. The Department for Education (DfE) highlights the importance of ensuring that both staff and students are aware of who owns AI-generated material and how it can be legally and ethically used. At NSG, all AI-assisted work must be properly attributed, and students and staff must ensure that AI-generated content does not infringe upon existing copyright laws.

Additionally, users should be cautious when inputting original ideas, research, or personal data into AI platforms, as ownership of generated content may vary depending on the terms of service of different AI providers. To maintain compliance with copyright and fair use policies, all AI-assisted work should be reviewed critically and, where necessary, supplemented with original input and proper citations.

Product Safety and AI Tools

The DfE emphasises the importance of ensuring that AI tools used in education meet appropriate safety and reliability standards. We are committed to selecting AI platforms that align carefully with the [Generative AI: Product Safety Expectations](#), ensuring that they function transparently, ethically, and without risk to users.

Before integrating any AI tool into teaching and learning, staff must assess its reliability, accuracy, and potential risks, including data security concerns and algorithmic biases. AI applications should support, rather than replace, human decision-making and must not expose students to harmful or misleading content. Regular monitoring and evaluation will be conducted to ensure compliance with safety standards, and any concerns related to AI tool performance or misuse will be addressed promptly.

AI Use and Marking

NSG recognises the importance of maintaining the integrity of assessments and adheres to JCQ's guidance on the use of AI in marking. AI tools may support the marking process but must not replace professional judgment. Staff must critically evaluate AI-generated insights to ensure accuracy and fairness.

Acceptable uses of AI in marking:

- Assisting with identifying trends or patterns in student responses.
- Providing initial feedback on standardised or multiple-choice assessments for teacher validation.

Unacceptable uses of AI in marking:

- Allowing AI to grade open-ended or subjective responses without teacher oversight.
- Using AI tools without validating their accuracy or suitability for the context.

Acceptable Use for Staff

Staff must ensure that AI tools:

- Do not perpetuate bias, discrimination, or inequality, in line with DfE recommendations to critically evaluate AI outputs.
- Are reviewed for accuracy and appropriateness, recognising the limitations of generative AI tools in providing reliable information.
- Support, but do not replace, professional judgment in teaching and assessment, as emphasised by JCO guidance on maintaining the integrity of qualifications.

The EEF trial highlighted best practices for using AI, such as leveraging it for generating ideas, creating quizzes, and adapting lesson materials. Staff are encouraged to follow these principles to maximise efficiency and maintain educational standards.

Examples of acceptable use:

- Using AI to analyse patterns in student performance.
- Generating topic outlines to assist lesson planning.
- Facilitating differentiated learning tasks.

Examples of unacceptable use:

- Relying solely on AI for assessment decisions.
- Using AI-generated content without thorough review.
- Ignoring potential biases in AI-generated recommendations.

Allowing students to submit AI-generated content as their own in coursework constitutes malpractice under JCO regulations. Such actions undermine the integrity of qualifications, resulting in severe consequences, including the potential disqualification of the student and sanctions against the school for failing to uphold assessment standards.

Acceptable Use for Students

Students are encouraged to use AI tools to enhance their learning, provided they adhere to principles of academic integrity and transparency. In line with DfE guidance, students will receive education on ethical AI use, including understanding its limitations, risks of bias, and the importance of critical evaluation of AI-generated content.

The EEF trial emphasised the importance of guiding students to use AI as a tool for enhancement rather than a replacement for effort. This includes using AI to clarify difficult concepts or organise study materials, always with an awareness of ethical considerations.

Examples of acceptable use:

- Simplifying complex texts for better understanding.
- Creating revision topic lists.
- Gathering information for assignments.

Examples of unacceptable use:

- Submitting AI-generated work as their own.
- Incorporating AI content without proper citation.
- Using AI to cheat on tests or quizzes.

In line with DfE guidance, students will receive education on ethical AI use, including understanding its limitations, risks of bias, and the importance of critical evaluation of AI-generated content.

If students use AI to generate content and submit it as their own without proper acknowledgment, this breaches JCQ rules and is classified as malpractice. Such behaviour compromises the integrity of assessments and can lead to serious consequences, including disqualification from qualifications or being barred from future exams. It is essential for students to understand that using AI dishonestly is equivalent to cheating and will be dealt with accordingly.

Inappropriate AI use can:

- Breach data protection laws and expose sensitive information, violating GDPR regulations as highlighted in DfE guidance.
- Enable cyberbullying, harassment, or discrimination by misusing AI-powered tools, such as generating deep fakes or using AI to impersonate individuals with the intent to deceive, harm, or cause distress.
- Disseminate misinformation or harmful content, undermining critical thinking skills and academic integrity.

NSG will:

- Implement robust data security measures to protect sensitive information when using AI.
- Educate students and staff about risks, incorporating lessons from DfE's data protection advice.
- Monitor AI use to prevent ethical violations and ensure compliance with legislative requirements.
- Provide regular training for staff on ethical AI use.
- Equip students with resources to responsibly integrate AI into learning.
- Include AI ethics and applications in the curriculum.

Breaches of this policy may be dealt with under our disciplinary and behaviour policies.

6 Policy Review

The world of AI technology is constantly evolving, meaning any policy regarding its use needs to be flexible and regularly reviewed. With this in mind, this policy will be monitored as part of the NSG's annual internal review and reviewed on a three year cycle or as required by legislature changes.