

	AI Misuse Procedure
Cross References	🍌 AI Policy / Acceptable Use Arrangements 🍌 Teaching Learning and Assessment Policy 🍌 Online Safety Policy 🍌 Child Protection and Safeguarding Policy 🍌 Strategies for Managing Behaviour in the Online Learning Environment
Date	October 2026

1. Purpose

Apricot Learning Online recognises that artificial intelligence (AI) can support learning when used appropriately. This procedure sets out how suspected inappropriate or unauthorised use of AI in student work will be reviewed, discussed, recorded and responded to.

The purpose of the procedure is educational rather than punitive. Any response should help the student understand appropriate AI use, protect the integrity of learning and assessment, and be proportionate to the circumstances.

2. Acceptable Use of AI

Where permitted by the teacher and appropriate to the task, students may use AI as a learning aid.

Appropriate uses may include:

- generating or developing ideas;
- supporting grammar, spelling or clarity of expression;
- asking for explanations of concepts;
- receiving feedback on work or practising skills; and
- supporting research or planning where the student checks the reliability of the information produced.
- Students must be transparent about significant AI assistance where required by the teacher, Apricot or an awarding body. AI must not be used to complete assessed work on the student's behalf, fabricate evidence or references, disguise copied material, or present AI-generated content as entirely the student's own work where this is not permitted.

Students must not enter personal, confidential, safeguarding or other sensitive information about themselves or another person into public AI tools. Any use of AI for formal qualifications must comply with the relevant awarding-body rules.

3. Stage 1: Review

Where AI misuse is suspected, the teacher should review the work and consider whether AI may have been used inappropriately, without permission or without appropriate acknowledgement.

The review should take account of the student's usual attainment, prior work, subject knowledge and the context of the task. Indicators may include unusually sophisticated vocabulary or sentence construction, material not previously demonstrated by the student, sudden changes in style, inaccurate information, fabricated facts or fictitious references.

These indicators do not prove AI misuse. AI detection tools may be used only as supporting information and must never be relied upon as the sole basis for a decision. Professional judgement, discussion with the student and comparison with previous work should form the basis of the review.

Stage 2: Discussion

Where appropriate, the teacher should discuss the work with the student, preferably one-to-one, in a calm and non-accusatory manner.

- Use open-ended questions to explore whether, how and why AI was used.
- Ask the student to explain how the work was completed and the process they followed.
- Clarify the permitted role and boundaries of AI for the task.
- Discuss the impact inappropriate AI use can have on learning, assessment and academic integrity.
- Where necessary, explain the educational response or remediation that may follow.

The discussion should recognise the student's age, understanding, SEND, prior teaching about AI and whether expectations for the task were sufficiently clear.

5. Stage 3: Report and Record

Where inappropriate or unauthorised AI use is identified, the teacher should report the finding to the designated AI Lead.

- Record an appropriate example or summary of the misuse.
- Agree any educational response or remediation.
- Notify the student and, where appropriate, the parent/carers and/or commissioning school or local authority.
- Escalate any safeguarding, online safety, data-protection or qualification-integrity concern through the relevant Apricot procedure.

Where the work contributes to a regulated qualification or formal assessment, the relevant awarding-body requirements must take precedence and the matter must be escalated appropriately.

6. Possible Educational Responses

Teachers should use professional judgement, knowledge of the student and the circumstances to select the most appropriate response. Options may include:

- a reminder or formal warning about appropriate AI use;
- resubmission of the work;
- completion of a different or supervised task;
- a discussion or learning activity on responsible AI use and academic integrity;
- additional teaching about referencing, source checking or acknowledgement of AI assistance;
- notification to parents/carers and/or the commissioner; and
- further action under another Apricot procedure where the misuse is serious, repeated or linked to wider concerns.

The response should be proportionate to the nature of the misuse, the student's age and understanding, the clarity of previous expectations and whether this is a first or repeated incident.

7. Stage 4: Evaluation and Improvement

Apricot will use reported incidents to improve practice rather than simply record individual misuse. The AI Lead will monitor themes and consider whether changes are required to teaching, assessment design, staff guidance or student education.

- Review this procedure annually and following significant or recurring incidents.
- Discuss emerging AI risks and effective practice through appropriate staff meetings, training and the annual conference.
- Monitor patterns in student and staff use of AI.
- Share relevant developments and learning with students, teachers and Apricot HQ.
- Review ways of designing learning and assessment that reduce opportunities for inappropriate AI use while supporting legitimate and beneficial uses of technology.

8. Safeguarding and Inappropriate AI Content

Where AI use involves harmful, sexual, abusive, extremist, threatening, exploitative or otherwise safeguarding-related content, the matter must not be treated solely as academic misuse. Staff must follow the Child Protection and Safeguarding Policy and Online Safety Policy immediately.

Staff should not ask a student to recreate, resend or reproduce harmful material unnecessarily in order to evidence a concern.

9. Review

This procedure will be reviewed annually and sooner where significant developments in AI technology, awarding-body requirements, statutory guidance or Apricot's operating arrangements make this necessary.

Authorised by: Jodie Phillips, Operations Director

Date: October 2026

Review Date: October 2027