Appleby AI Guidebook

FOR FACULTY & TEACHING STAFF



Appleby College AI Guidebook - Faculty & Teaching staff

1. Our position

Appleby College's public commitment is **that every student will be able to learn with AI, think independently without it, and use it responsibly to improve the world**. Three commitments follow from that, and they are the frame for everything in this guidebook.

Commitment	What it asks of you
We protect the struggle	Identify, for every task you set, the thinking students must do unaided. Design so that some evidence of learning is always gathered without AI available.
We form character, not only competence	Teach disclosure, verification and privacy as habits rather than enforcing them as rules. Model them in your own practice.
We build what comes next	Give students opportunities to create with AI and not only to use it.

2. The distinction that matters most

AI can make a piece of work look considerably better without making the student who submitted it any more capable. A student can hand in something polished and remain less able to explain, recall, or apply the learning afterwards.

An excellent AI-assisted submission is not, on its own, evidence that learning has occurred. The risk is not primarily one of dishonesty. It is that a student hands over the difficult part of a task before they have done enough thinking to learn from it, and that we lose the ability to see what they have misunderstood.

The habits most exposed are deep reading, writing as a way of working out what one thinks, problem formulation, judgement about sources, and distinctiveness of voice. These are precisely the habits that we cultivate as a school.

3. What this means in your classroom

Four habits, which apply across subjects and which students should meet consistently wherever they go in the school:

- **Students think first.** They attempt, retrieve, read, discuss, draft, or solve before seeking AI support.
- **AI acts as a coach.** Questioner, feedback partner, counter-argument generator, practice designer, alternative explanation. Not a ghostwriter and not an answer machine.
- **Students verify and disclose.** They check claims against credible sources, document material AI use, and can explain what they accepted, rejected, and changed.
- **Students demonstrate independence.** They regularly show their learning in settings where AI is unavailable.

For each task you set, name the cognitive work that must remain the student's own. That single sentence tells you which assessment condition applies, what to tell students, and what to look for in their work.

4. Assessment

Faculty members are encouraged to adapt their assessments to ensure an authentic evaluation of student performance. Appleby has adopted the two-path approach, espoused by the University of Sydney.

Two-Path Approach to Assessment

Recognizing that AI use is increasingly undetectable and will soon be ubiquitous, Appleby adopts a two-lane approach to assessment that balances the need to authenticate student knowledge while preparing students for an AI-integrated future.

Path 1: Secured, Supervised, Verified Assessments

These assessments authenticate individual student knowledge, thinking, and communication without AI assistance:

- Teacher supervises the work process
- Typed assignments use secure examination platforms e.g. exam.net
- Assessments may be hand-written and produced in class
- Students have no advanced knowledge of assessment questions
- Presentations are note-free and screen-free, demonstrating student expertise
- Discussions do not allow students to use external notes or AI assistance

Path 2: AI-Embracing Assessments

These assessments acknowledge AI as a learning tool and focus on higher-order skills:

- Students have full access to AI; appropriate AI use is permitted
- Assessments are redesigned with expanded scope and authentic, real-world application
- The process of creating work may be evaluated alongside the final product
- Students document where and how they used AI as an assistant
- Reflections may be incorporated to clarify how AI augmented thinking

Faculty members will communicate clearly which lane applies to each assessment. Some assessments may incorporate elements of both lanes.

Faculty Communication Responsibilities

- Consider articulating your approach to AI in course outlines
- Provide explicit permission, instruction, and guidance before AI may be used in learning experiences
- Ensure appropriate age restrictions are followed
- Communicate clearly which lane (1 or 2) applies to each assessment
- Select only pre-approved AI technologies/services for student use

5. Professional use of AI platforms/systems

Area	Examples
Planning & curriculum	Lesson plans and unit sequencing; differentiated texts and tasks; rubrics and success criteria; worked exemplars and deliberately flawed anti-exemplars; anticipating where students will go wrong.
Assessment design	Question generation; redesigning tasks for AI-off or AI-with-evidence; retrieval practice items; drafting marking schemes.
Accessibility & inclusion	Adjusting reading level; plain-language versions; alt text; scaffolds and supports aligned to accommodation plans; translation of materials for families.
Communication	Drafting and refining correspondence; meeting agendas; department documentation. Your voice remains essential.
Research & synthesis	Summarising and comparing literature; refreshing subject knowledge; consolidating information from multiple sources, with claims verified before use
Administration	Spreadsheet formulas; scheduling logic; template building; routine document formatting

Where AI must not be used

- Entering identifiable student information into any tool other than Flint K12. Flint K12 allows for the use of student email addresses and student names. No other personal information should be entered.
- Entering safeguarding, counselling, medical, or family information into any AI tool, including approved ones. There is no compliant tool for this.
- Producing a summative grade, or a report card comment used without substantive rewriting.
- Substituting AI-generated feedback for your own professional judgement.
- Deploying an AI tool or custom assistant directly to students without AI Oversight Group review.

6. Feedback, marking and comments

Inside Flint K12, activities may be configured to provide AI feedback to students. This is typically in relation to practice activities. AI may surface patterns, flag possible misconceptions and draft formative comments for your review, but **no grade or comment should reach a student or a report card without faculty review.**

AI generated feedback must not supplant a Faculty member's professional judgement. Report card comments require more than avoiding copy-and-paste. A comment should reflect your knowledge of that particular student and must avoid generic commentary.

7. Communicating with parents and students

When you write to parents, to students, or to external organisations, your distinctive voice is essential. AI may help with clarity, tone, structure, and brevity. It should not replace the way you write or the relationship the writing carries. Translation is a legitimate and valuable use for our international families, provided no identifiable information about a student is included and a fluent speaker reviews anything consequential before it is sent.

8. Data, Privacy & Approved AI tools

It is imperative that Faculty do not use other AI systems or AI systems that are linked to non-Appleby accounts – Faculty cannot use a personal account for school related work. Requests for additional tools go through the Service Desk, which triggers a vendor privacy assessment, and are reviewed by the AI Oversight Group.

Tool	Approved for	NOT approved for
Flint K12	Assessment activities; uploading student work; formative evaluation for faculty review. Minimal Identifiable student information for account creation purposes. Usage intended for all students.	Confidential school information - counselling, medical or family information.
Microsoft Copilot	Professional work: planning, drafting, research, administration. Minimal Identifiable student information for account creation purposes. Usage intended for all students.	Confidential school information – counselling, medical or family information.
Open AI ChatGPT	Professional work as above.	Identifiable student information. Confidential school information - counselling, medical or family information.

Tool	Approved for	NOT approved for
Anthropic Claude	Professional work as above.	Identifiable student information. Confidential school information - counselling, medical or family information.
Perplexity AI	Professional work as above.	Identifiable student information. Confidential school information - counselling, medical or family information.

9. Safeguarding and wellbeing

Never enter a safeguarding concern into an AI tool.

Watch for AI companionship. Students form attachments to conversational systems and may substitute them for friendships or for asking an adult for help. Signs include withdrawal from peers and describing an AI as a confidant. Treat it as you would any other wellbeing concern and refer through the usual channels.

Manipulated images of students. Content that misrepresents a real member of our community is a safeguarding matter, not a technology matter, and should be reported immediately rather than handled within a department.

AI is not a source of mental health support and should not be recommended to a student as one.

10. Transparency in both directions

Our students are required to disclose when and how they have used AI. Similarly, Faculty members should disclose:

- Where AI has materially shaped a document, resource, or communication intended for students, parents, or the public.
- Discuss your own AI use with your classes. Students learn more from watching a teacher verify, reject, and rewrite AI output than from being told to do it.
- Where you have chosen not to use AI for something.

11. When you suspect misuse

- **Start with a conversation.** Ask the student to talk you through their process and their thinking. This is usually more informative than any other step.
- **AI detection scores are not evidence.** They produce false positives, and they do so unevenly across student populations. Do not rely on a detector as the basis of an allegation.
- **Look at the work in context:** drafts, process evidence, classwork, and whether the submission is consistent with what you have seen this student do unaided.
- **Escalate through the Academic Integrity policy** where the conversation does not resolve it.

12. Beyond usage, examine and investigate

Our positioning statement commits us to students who examine these systems and not only use them. Within your discipline, that means making room for the questions: who built this, and on whose work? Whose voices does it carry, and whose does it leave out? What does it cost, environmentally and otherwise, and who benefits?