

Rotherham Aspire - Statement of Intent

Safe use of 'Artificial Intelligence or AI' tools by staff and students.

Many teachers and other school staff are already experimenting with the latest generation of AI tools which are now widely available. Large Language Models or LLMs such as **ChatGPT**, **Google Gemini** and **Microsoft Co-pilot** are easily available and most have free to use versions. Education specific tools are also becoming increasingly available. They undoubtedly have a lot of potential for use within schools for lesson resource creation, lesson support, help with administrative tasks amongst a range of other purposes.

Like any new technology it is important that schools are cautious with its adoption and they should evaluate and address any potential risks before rolling it out widely. It is important that staff are trained on the appropriate use of the tools and pass this onto students as well.

At Rotherham Aspire we are aware and monitor one of the main risks which is around the sharing of personal information with these tools. It is unclear with many of them what happens to the data inputted, so to be safe the key message to Aspire staff is to **never share any personal data with these tools, this has been covered by the Aspire DPO at the Data Protection Training update**. There are already specific report writing tools available, if these are used, personal data inputted should be limited to student first name only which is normally not identifiable.

There are also concerns about the sharing of original work that contains intellectual property (IP) such as pupil essays, case studies, observations, Voc Ed assessments, with tools that may keep and use any data shared with them. With the available tools developing very rapidly it is important your school or trust sets some clear guidelines for staff to follow.

If Rotherham Aspire staff wish to encourage the use of AI tools by their students, they should be aware some tools have minimum age restrictions.

1 Compliance Manager and Exams Officer Responsibilities

- Ensure policies and procedures are in place to monitor and authenticate students' work, addressing AI misuse. (See Appendix 1)
- **Maintain a malpractice policy that covers AI use, including guidelines on when AI may be used and how it should be acknowledged. (See Aspire Malpractice Policy)**
- Regularly review and update policies to reflect AI developments and associated risks.
- Ensure staff are trained to identify AI misuse, carried out by the DPO at annual training (see Appendix 1)
- Communicate with parents about AI-related risks and the importance of students' work being their own, at Friends and family days.
- Ensure students are aware of the consequences of AI misuse, including potential disqualification.
- Ensure students understand their declaration of authenticity and the penalties for false declarations.

- Have a process for addressing AI misuse within the centre before declarations of authenticity are made.
- Ensure teachers do not rely solely on AI tools for marking student work.
- Employ AI detection tools and ensure staff and students are aware of their use.

Informing teachers of AI use.

- All vocational qualifications and Functional skills are subject to internal and external verification inspections. As part of these inspections the misuse of AI is monitored and any misuse is highlighted within the report. Following these inspections students will also be informed of any misuse of AI. These inspections are designed to ensure that all student work is their own and authentic. AI detection tools will be made available to assessors and IV's/IQA's.

2 Teachers Responsibilities

- Accept only work that is demonstrably the student's own. Aspire has provided information on how to check this (see Appendix 1)
- Investigate any doubts about the authenticity of a student's work and take appropriate action.
- Make students aware of:
 - appropriate and inappropriate AI use
 - the risks of AI misuse
 - the consequences of AI misuse, including disqualification.
- Guide students on proper referencing and acknowledgement of AI-generated content.
- Reinforce the importance of independent research and original work.
- Ensure students sign authenticity declarations and understand their significance.
- Collaborate with colleagues to monitor AI use and refine school policies.
- Follow school policies if AI misuse is suspected before students sign the authenticity declaration.
- Do not use AI tools as the sole basis for marking student work.

3 Examples of acceptable uses (students and Staff)

Students and staff must be made aware of what is acceptable and unacceptable use of AI for assessments and work submitted for marking.

Acceptable use constitutes:

- Generation of whole class lesson resources or ideas
- Generation of bespoke resources to encourage engagement of individual pupils
- Generic letter generation such as for class trips
- Using LLMs to quickly generate different resources for a range of abilities.
- Analysing anonymous attainment data to identify trends
- Summarising publicly available long documents or published articles (The IP is already in the public domain)

- Using LLMs or other tools to mark work factual work such as maths or science questions that are anonymised or codified (eg. student 1, student 2 etc., UPNs, student initials etc.)
- Image creation from text prompts for illustration of coursework.
- Assessors may use AI voice activated tools to record and then transcribe assessment records for example: observations.
- AI algorithms can analyse data about student performance and create questions that are tailored to the individual student's level of understanding and learning progress. This can help ensure that students are being challenged appropriately and that the exam is effective in assessing their knowledge and skills.
- All acceptable uses of AI must be acknowledged if used as part of an assessment or as research for an assessment.
- Work submitted for assessment must be their own and reflect their knowledge, skills, and understanding. If not this constitutes malpractice and can lead to a disqualification and a future ban from qualifications.
- Students must sign a declaration to state that the work submitted is authentication on all work presented for assessment.

4 Examples of unacceptable use of AI (Students and Staff)

- Using AI to compare and score job applications (this could count as '*automated decision making*' under GDPR)
- Sharing student full names and other personal data with LLMs to generate individual named reports
- Uploading student work with their full names and asking an AI tool to evaluate or score it.
- Students using LLMs to rewrite the work of others or to draft new essays based on prompts, then submitting AI generated content as their own original work
- AI tools must not be used by Tutors/Assessors/Teachers to construct assessment documentation, for example observations, witness statements etc.
- Student's assessments must not be created by AI tools; assessors should monitor student work for evidence of AI tool use. AI detection tools to be used and see (Appendix 1)

Teachers know their students best and, with assessors, remain best placed to identify whether work is a student's own. This means that teachers and assessors in Aspire are key in ensuring that only work which is the student's own is accepted for assessment and that any concerns regarding authenticity are carefully looked into.

5 AI Misuse

Where a student has used one or more AI tools they must appropriately acknowledge this use and not submit work for assessment as 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.
- Use of any AI tool during examinations (No Aspire examinations allow any form of ICT support except a lap top for reasonable adjustments and access arrangements as agreed. All such equipment is not to be connected to the wifi and internet.

AI misuse constitutes malpractice

6 Key points considered by Rotherham Aspire senior leaders

All staff have received a briefing on acceptable use and unacceptable use of AI tools, particularly around the sharing of personal data. Staff have been made aware of any age restrictions on tools and staff must check before using specific tools.

Aspire Staff have received information regarding the following aspects and the relevant policies have been updated:

- Incorporate the safe and acceptable use of AI tools in lessons for students
- The **data protection policy** includes reference to use of AI
- The relevant **privacy notice** has been updated to include the sharing of personal data via AI tools
- The **Child Protection and Safeguarding Policy** and/or **Online Safety policy** now reference the use of AI tools.
- The use of AI tools is referenced in the **staff code of conduct and acceptable use policy**.
- Currently Rotherham Aspire does not expect the wide use of AI tools in the school and therefore does not require a standalone **AI policy**.
- Ensure staff don't step into the territory of '*automated decision making and profiling*', an example would be using AI to compare and shortlist job applications. This would breach UK GDPR. _ The HR team have been formally informed of this.
- If in the future Aspire may decide they do wish to share staff or pupil personal data for specific purposes. If this development occurs, it will be essential to complete '**data protection impact assessments**' or DPIAs before any proposed personal data sharing to evaluate any potential risk.

JCQ information on AI can be found at:

https://www.jcq.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2025/04/AI-Use-in-Assessments_Apr25_FINAL.pdf

Appendix 1

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 themselves, 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.