CHRIST THE REDEEMER CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

Artificial Intelligence in Professional Practice and Learning

A Division-Wide Review: Findings, Strengths, and Recommendations

Prepared by Daverne Consulting Inc.

May 2026

Christ The Redeemer
CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

SCOPE OF REVIEW

This report addresses five domains: (1) Governance and Policy, (2) AI Use by Staff and Its Impact on Learning and Assessment, (3) AI Use by Students, (4) AI and Data Privacy, and (5) AI and Division-Level Processes. Data was gathered through focus groups with staff and students, and surveys completed by parents, students, teachers, and school and central office administrators.

Executive Summary

Christ The Redeemer (CTR) Catholic Schools engaged Daverne Consulting to conduct a system-wide review of artificial intelligence use across the division. The review was undertaken in the spring of 2026 and drew on a substantial and diverse evidence base: focus groups with staff, administrators, and students across multiple school communities, and surveys completed by approximately 1,177 parents, 907 students, 406 teachers, and 40 school and central office administrators.

The data gathered through this review suggests that AI is neither a peripheral nor a future concern for CTR Catholic Schools. It appears to be a present reality, already embedded in the professional practice of administrators and teachers, and increasingly present in the learning lives of students. The pace of this shift has been notable: focus group conversations revealed that many students had limited familiarity with AI tools as recently as a year ago and are now using them regularly. The landscape appears to have shifted faster than policy, professional development, or assessment practice has been able to follow — a challenge that is by no means unique to CTR, but one that may warrant attention nonetheless.

CTR is not starting from scratch. The division has demonstrated meaningful early engagement — including professional development initiated as early as 2023, a published administrative procedure (AP GEN #27), and a culture of ethical reflection among staff that is genuinely notable. These are real strengths. The data also surfaces some areas that may benefit from further development — including the gap between what policy intends and what practice looks like in classrooms; between administrator confidence and teacher readiness; between what students are asking for in the way of clear guidelines and what they are currently receiving; and between what perceptions parents have about what AI is and how it is used by their children and what they understand about the division's approach.

The central observation of this review is that CTR may wish to consider additional proactive actions with intentional, structured engagements — not by embracing AI uncritically, but by continuing to lead its use with the moral clarity, pedagogical deliberateness, and human-centred values that define Catholic education. The question for CTR is perhaps not whether AI will be part of the educational experience of its students and staff — it already appears to be — but rather the degree to which the division will shape that experience going forward.

Methodology and Participants

This review employed a mixed-methods approach, combining qualitative focus group data with quantitative and qualitative survey data across all major stakeholder groups. The intent was not solely to measure the prevalence of AI use, but to develop a richer understanding of how it is experienced, what concerns it raises, what it means to people in different roles, and what the division's community believes might be helpful going forward.

1,177	907	406	40
Parent Responses *Survey*	Student Responses *Survey (Gr. 7–12)*	Teacher Responses *Survey*	Admin Responses *Survey*

Additionally, focus groups were conducted with staff, school administrators, and students across multiple school communities within the division. An interim report capturing early focus group findings was shared with senior administration prior to the completion of this review. The present report synthesizes all available data and should be read as the complete record of findings.

Survey data was collected using structured instruments developed in alignment with the five domains established in the project scope. Open-text responses were analyzed for themes and sentiment. Where survey data and focus group data appear to be in tension, both perspectives are noted. Where they are consistent, that consistency is observed as lending additional confidence to the finding.

One methodological note warrants mention: the student survey was administered to grades 7 through 12 only, meaning the perspectives of elementary students are reflected primarily through the parent survey and, to a degree, through teacher and administrator perspectives. The underlying assumption was that younger learners would have less exposure to AI tools. This was borne out in the focus group conversations where it was clear that students just entering junior high had limited or no experience using AI while high school students were much more familiar.

Stakeholder Perspectives: Summary of Key Themes

The following section summarizes the dominant themes emerging from each stakeholder group, drawing on both focus group and survey data.

Staff and Administrator Focus Groups *Multiple sessions across school communities*

Key Themes

- AI use among staff is widespread, normalized, and purposeful — described as an integrated part of professional workflow rather than an experimental tool.
- Time savings are meaningful and are being redirected toward higher-value work, including direct student interaction and instructional responsiveness.
- Staff expressed strong interest in collaborative, peer-based professional development rather than one-off information sessions.
- A consistent desire for clearer divisional guidance emerged — particularly around what AI should not be used for, described by some participants as a 'blacklist' approach rather than a permissive framework.
- Ethical reflection was notably present and self-generated. Staff drew their own lines around AI-generated prayer and around uses that might displace authentic human connection — without being prompted to do so.
- Concern about student over-reliance on AI was a consistent theme, with participants expressing interest in proactive instructional approaches rather than simple prohibition.

Relationship to Other Data Sources

Focus group findings are strongly corroborated by both the teacher and administrator surveys. The administrator survey in particular confirms high rates of AI use and positive perceived impact, while the teacher survey reveals the preparedness gap — staff use AI confidently in their own practice but feel less equipped to guide students pedagogically. The ethical awareness evident in focus groups is reflected in survey responses, though it is expressed more abstractly in survey format.

Student Focus Groups *Three school communities, March 2026*

Key Themes

- Students describe AI as woven into daily life — for academic support, study, creative projects, and personal curiosity — and broadly accept its presence as a given.
- The dominant student message was not 'stop AI' but 'help us use it wisely': clear guidelines, consistent expectations, and explicit instruction in responsible use.
- Students expressed genuine concern about overreliance — including in themselves, and more prominently in their peers — and articulated thoughtful connections between AI dependence and the erosion of critical thinking and personal identity.
- Inconsistency across teachers and courses was a significant frustration. Students described navigating different and sometimes contradictory expectations with little school-level guidance to draw on.
- AI detection tools were identified as unreliable and, occasionally, a source of unfair accusations, contributing to some erosion of trust.
- Older students raised deeper questions about human development, identity, and what it means to learn — perspectives that deserve acknowledgment.

Relationship to Other Data Sources

Student focus group themes are largely consistent with the student survey, which confirms high rates of use for understanding and study support, strong stated values around learning rather than shortcutting, and a clear appetite for clearer rules. The focus groups offered somewhat more candid accounts of assignment completion as a use case — suggesting the survey may undercount this behaviour. The perception gap finding — where students report their own use favourably but assume widespread misuse among peers — emerged in focus groups and is supported by the survey data.

Parent Survey *1,177 respondents*

Key Themes

- Parents are anxious about AI's impact on their children's learning, with overreliance, loss of critical thinking, and academic integrity cited most frequently as concerns.
- The large majority — approximately 83.6% — want clear rules from schools as the most helpful support the division could provide.
- Approximately 69% of parents feel not very informed or not at all informed about school expectations for AI use.
- Opinion is divided on approach: roughly half support limited use with clear rules, a quarter support fuller integration, and about one in five would prefer restriction.
- A notable minority expressed strong opposition to AI in schools, with some citing faith-based concerns about technology's dehumanizing potential.
- Parents of students with learning differences offered some of the most positive perspectives, describing AI tools as providing meaningful independence and support.

Relationship to Other Data Sources

Among the stakeholder groups surveyed, parents reflect the broadest range of perspectives on AI in schools, including the highest concentration of concern about whether AI should be present in learning environments at all.. While staff and students are largely engaged with AI and focused on how to use it well, just under 20% of parents indicated a preference for restricting AI use in schools altogether — a sentiment that appears, from open-text responses, to be somewhat more concentrated among parents of younger elementary-age children. This perspective likely reflects a combination of factors: limited familiarity with how AI is being used in schools, genuine concern about the developmental appropriateness of AI for young learners, and — notably — the finding that just over half of parents expressed trust in schools to manage AI use appropriately. Open-text responses suggest that, for a number of parents, this concern extends beyond institutional judgment to a more fundamental question about supervision at home. Several parents described the challenge in candid terms — AI is "hard to supervise," "almost impossible to block," and even with home guidelines and supervision AI was available to their children on their phones. These are not unreasonable concerns, and they are ones that no division policy can fully resolve. None of this points to a communication failure on the part of the school — parent engagement with school communications is generally variable, and the gap in awareness is a broadly shared challenge. Schools may consider more of a shotgun approach including formal communication and social media as a means to help inform parents on the approach and use in school with some considerations for supervision of students working at home.

Teacher Survey *406 respondents across all grades and subject areas*

Key Themes

- AI use is widespread: approximately 64% of teachers use AI at least weekly, with resource development, lesson planning, and communication as the most common applications.
- 33% of teachers report saving three or more hours per week through AI use. Focus group conversations are worth noting here — participants tended to revise their initial estimates upward as the discussion progressed, suggesting that the survey figure may understate the actual impact among even less engaged users. Those same focus group accounts suggesting the impact among the most engaged users is considerable with some individuals indicating time saved in entire days over a week.
- Only 16.5% of teachers feel very confident in identifying inappropriate AI use — a figure that, alongside the preparedness data in the findings below, points to a meaningful professional development need across the division.
- Approximately 47% of teachers believe students use AI inappropriately very often or often — a figure somewhat higher than administrator estimates and considerably higher than student self-reports.
- Academic integrity and assessment design emerged as areas of particular uncertainty, especially among teachers in writing-intensive courses.
- There is strong interest in professional development, with a clear preference for collaborative, peer-based formats over formal sessions.

Relationship to Other Data Sources

Teacher survey findings are broadly consistent with focus group accounts from staff. The preparedness gap — using AI confidently as a professional tool while feeling less equipped to integrate it pedagogically — is the most significant finding in this group and is corroborated across both data sources. The perception of widespread student misuse, which is higher among teachers than among students themselves, is a notable divergence worth monitoring.

School and Central Office Administrator Survey *40 respondents*

Key Themes

- All 40 administrators surveyed use AI in their professional work; 57.5% use it daily.
- The majority describe the overall impact of AI as very or somewhat positive, making administrators the most consistently optimistic group in the data set.
- 67.5% of administrators favour intentional integration of AI into learning — a notably more ambitious position than the teacher survey, where 58.9% prefer limited use with clear rules.
- Academic integrity, student data privacy, and staff professional use were each identified by more than half of administrators as areas needing clearer divisional policy or guidance.
- Professional development needs were widely identified, with a preference for practical, applied learning and continued sharing of effective practices.
- Catholic identity in AI use was rated as very important by 82.5% of administrators, though practical integration of faith into AI conversations is at an early stage.

Relationship to Other Data Sources

Administrator perspectives are the most internally consistent of any group, reflecting a shared confidence in AI's value and a shared sense that divisional-level structure is needed to support its use well. The gap between administrator enthusiasm for integration and teacher preference for limited use with rules is one of the more meaningful divergences in the data set, and may be worth considering as the division shapes its professional development approach.

Where the Data Converges — and Where It Diverges

Strong Convergence Across All Groups

- AI should support learning, not replace it — this value is expressed consistently across every stakeholder group, including students themselves.
- Clear, consistent guidelines are the most frequently requested support across all groups — staff, students, administrators, and parents.
- Professional development for teachers is widely identified as a priority, including by teachers themselves.

Notable Divergences

- Administrators favour intentional integration more strongly than teachers, who lean toward limited use with clear rules. This may reflect current familiarity as much as anything and may also warrant attention in how professional development is designed and delivered.
- Staff and students are largely past the question of whether AI belongs in schools; a percentage of the parent community is still working through that question. Engagement strategies may need to account for this difference.
- Perceptions of student AI misuse vary significantly by group: teachers estimate it as more prevalent than administrators, and considerably more prevalent than students report for themselves. This perception gap, alongside the focus group finding that students tend to report their own use favourably while assuming more widespread misuse among peers, suggests that the actual picture may be more nuanced than any single vantage point captures.
- The Catholic identity dimension resonates most strongly among administrators and, in practical terms, is expressed most authentically through staff members' own ethical reasoning rather than through formal faith frameworks. This distinction is worth preserving in how the division approaches the topic.

Findings by Domain

1. Governance and Policy

CTR's current administrative procedure governing AI use, AP GEN #27, provides a philosophically grounded and values-aligned foundation from which to build. Its background section is particularly strong — drawing on Catholic social teaching, Pope Francis' reflections on technology and human dignity, and a clear articulation of the risks of dehumanization that AI may introduce into relationships. This reflects considered institutional thinking about what it means to be a Catholic school division in an era of rapid technological change.

The operational content of the procedure, as might be expected at this stage of AI integration in schools, reflects the inherent challenge of writing specific guidance for a landscape that was — and continues to be — rapidly shifting. Roles and responsibilities are outlined in broad terms, with principals and teachers carrying much of the interpretive weight at the school and classroom level. The procedure notes that teachers shall clarify for students if, when, and how AI may be used — a reasonable and appropriate expectation — though survey data suggests that many teachers feel uncertain about how to fulfill it consistently. This is less a critique of the procedure than an observation about timing: what was a reasonable starting point in 2023 may benefit from some additional operational specificity now that the division has two years of experience to draw on.

> *"We need to tread lightly with AI... Understanding how these LLMs are working and how our inputs continue to reteach these machines." — School Administrator*

Administrator survey data offers some helpful context here. When asked which areas might benefit from clearer policy or guidance, 60% of administrators identified academic integrity, 57.5% identified student data privacy, and 57.5% identified staff professional use. These responses suggest that the interest in greater clarity is felt at the leadership level as well as among teachers and students. At the same time, 60% of administrators described the overall impact of AI in their school as very or somewhat positive — suggesting that the concern is less with AI itself and more with the desire for a shared framework for navigating its use consistently.

2. AI Use by Staff and Its Impact on Learning and Assessment

One of the more consistent findings across all staff-facing data sources is that AI use among CTR teachers and administrators appears widespread, normalized, and purposeful. Focus group participants described AI as an integrated component of their professional workflow. Administrator survey data is consistent with this: 57.5% of administrators report using AI daily, and all 40 surveyed use it at least occasionally — with communications, instructional support, policy writing, and data analysis among the primary applications. Among teachers, approximately 64% report using AI at least weekly, with resource development, lesson planning, assessment design, and communication as the most common uses.

Time savings reported by staff are meaningful. Among administrators, 52.5% described efficiency gains as significant or transformational. Among teachers, 33% report saving three or more hours per week through AI use — and focus group accounts suggest that among the most engaged users, the impact is considerably more substantial, with some participants describing the experience as equivalent to having access to a dedicated professional assistant. Consistent with focus group findings, staff tend to describe these savings not as reductions in professional effort, but as opportunities to redirect time toward higher-value work — direct student interaction, relationship building, and instructional responsiveness.

57.5%	33%	42%
Admins using AI daily *Administrator Survey*	Teachers saving 3+ hrs/wk *Teacher Survey*	Teachers feel less than prepared to guide students *Teacher Survey*

A noteworthy tension in this domain is the gap between staff AI use in their own professional practice and staff readiness to guide student AI use pedagogically. Only 9.4% of teachers describe themselves as very prepared to guide students in responsible AI use, and 42% describe themselves as not very prepared or not prepared at all. Many teachers appear to use AI with confidence and skill as a professional tool while feeling considerably less certain about how to integrate it into student learning, how to design AI-appropriate assessments, and how to respond to suspected misuse. This gap likely reflects the pace at which the technology has moved and the relative absence of structured professional development on the pedagogical dimensions of AI.

Assessment and academic integrity emerge as areas of particular professional uncertainty. Teachers in writing-intensive courses, in particular, described the challenge of designing assessments that remain meaningful in an environment where AI can produce competent work on demand. Approximately 47% of teachers believe students use AI inappropriately very often or often — a figure somewhat higher than administrator estimates and considerably higher than students' own self-reports.

It is worth noting that a similar pattern appeared within the student focus groups themselves: while few participants indicated that they personally had used AI in ways they considered inappropriate, many expressed the belief that many of their peers were doing exactly that. This is a common dynamic in self-reported behaviour data, and it suggests that the true prevalence of AI misuse may be somewhat difficult to assess with confidence from any single vantage point. What it does suggest, perhaps more usefully, is that the perception of widespread misuse — regardless of its precise accuracy — may be shaping the culture around AI use in ways that are worth being aware of.

> *"Going beyond writing email and report card comments and into how AI can be used to improve student learning. Instructional PD and video tutorials." — School Administrator*

3. AI Use by Students

Student AI use appears diverse, uneven, and largely self-directed. The student survey, completed by 907 students in grades 7 through 12, reflects a population that spans the full spectrum — from enthusiastic and sophisticated users to students who have never used AI at all and, in some cases, feel strongly that they should not. Approximately 13% of students report never using AI, and a notable thread of open-text responses reflects principled opposition grounded in concerns about environmental impact, critical thinking, and authenticity. These perspectives are worth acknowledging.

Among students who do use AI, the dominant pattern appears to be use for understanding and study support rather than for completing work. Eighty-one percent of student survey respondents describe their use as helping them understand or improve their work, as opposed to helping them finish faster or doing most of the work for them. Study guides, practice questions, concept explanations, and grammar support are among the most commonly described academic applications. Focus group conversations offered somewhat more candid accounts, with participants acknowledging assignment completion as a use case as well — suggesting that the survey may undercount this behaviour to some degree.

Students demonstrate notable self-awareness about the risks associated with AI misuse. When asked how common it is for students to use AI to complete work without genuine learning, 48% described it as very common or common. Eighty-six percent of students agree or strongly agree that AI should help them learn rather than do the work for them. The values appear largely to be present. What students most consistently report lacking are the structures — clear expectations, explicit instruction in responsible use, and consistent application across teachers and courses — that might help them act on those values more reliably. It is worth noting, however, that structures alone are unlikely to eliminate misuse entirely. Some students will continue to use AI to save time or avoid effort regardless of the rules in place, and any policy framework may be more realistic if it accounts for this rather than assuming that clarity of expectation will resolve the behaviour on its own. Efforts aimed at developing instructional best practices with the intentional use of AI tools may be the most effective longer-term response — designing learning experiences where AI has a defined and purposeful role, and where the authenticity of student thinking remains visible and assessable, regardless of what tools were used along the way. The following observation from a focus group participant captures this tension well:

> *"School isn't just about getting the answer; it's about learning how to think. If I skip that part, what am I really learning?" — High School Student, Focus Group*

This student's observation points to what may be the most substantive educational challenge surfaced by this review. There is a fundamental difference between how AI functions for adult professionals and how it may function for young learners — a difference that may warrant careful consideration as the division shapes its approach.

Adult professionals using AI as an assistant bring decades of accumulated knowledge, critical judgment, and domain expertise to their interactions with the tool. They generally know enough to evaluate what AI produces, to recognize errors, to push back, and to use outputs selectively. For these users, AI amplifies capacity they already possess. Young learners are in a fundamentally different position. They are in the process of building the very knowledge, skills, and cognitive habits that make it possible to use AI well. If AI shortcuts that developmental process — if students never struggle through the construction of an argument, never work through a difficult problem independently, never develop their own voice in writing — there is a reasonable concern that they may arrive at adulthood without the foundational capacities that allow a person to use AI as a genuine tool rather than a permanent substitute for thinking.

The analogy to calculators in mathematics is instructive: mathematical reasoning is developed first, and tools that extend it are introduced deliberately and sequentially. The question for CTR — and for education more broadly — is how a similar logic might apply across learning areas in a context where students already have access to AI outside of school and that access cannot be fully controlled. The goal may not be to keep AI out of student learning, but to be thoughtful about sequencing — identifying which skills and knowledge students need to develop through genuine cognitive effort before AI assistance is introduced, and designing learning experiences that protect that development while still building the AI literacy students will need. This is as much a curriculum and assessment design challenge as it is a policy question.

The AI detection issue also surfaces with some frequency in the student data. Students appear broadly aware that detection tools are unreliable — 41% disagree or strongly disagree that such tools produce reliable results — and a number of students report having been identified as potentially using AI on work they completed themselves. This experience of being wrongly suspected may be contributing to some erosion of trust and may be worth monitoring. Detection-based approaches alone are unlikely to be a sustainable long-term strategy, and the data suggests they may carry some unintended relational costs.

The most consistent message from students across communities is a request for clarity and consistency: tell us the rules, apply them consistently across teachers and courses, and help us learn to use AI well rather than simply discouraging its use. This is a reasonable and, on the whole, constructive ask.

4. AI and Data Privacy

Data privacy concerns are present across all stakeholder groups, though they appear most acute among parents, where they arise alongside broader anxieties about AI accuracy, content appropriateness, and the protection of children's personal information. Several parent survey respondents referenced recent data security incidents in the school context specifically, suggesting that sensitivity to these issues may be heightened at this particular moment.

Among administrators and teachers, privacy awareness appears generally present, though not necessarily uniform across the division. AP GEN #27 includes appropriate direction prohibiting the disclosure of personally identifiable information into AI tools and restricting the upload of student work to division-approved platforms. The challenge, as with many aspects of this review, may lie less in the policy itself and more in ensuring consistent understanding and application at the classroom level, where teachers make real-time judgments about what information to include in prompts, often without a readily accessible summary of key expectations to draw on — a challenge common to most organizations where detailed policy documents exist but are not regularly consulted in the course of daily work.

It is worth noting that the privacy landscape for AI tools is not uniform. Consumer-facing AI tools — personal accounts with platforms such as ChatGPT or Gemini — operate under terms that may include data retention and model training provisions that differ meaningfully from the protections available through education-specific accounts and division-approved platforms. Staff using division-provided tools through their CTR accounts are generally operating within a more protective framework than those using personal accounts. Making this distinction clear and accessible to staff may be more practically useful than a blanket caution about AI and privacy, which can inadvertently confirm a broad concern that the reality does not fully support.

The intervention tools exploration work reviewed as part of this engagement reflects thoughtful consideration of student-facing AI tools that carry their own data governance considerations. As the division potentially moves toward more structured use of AI tools for student learning and intervention support, a clear and consistently communicated framework for third-party tool evaluation may become increasingly useful. The current procedure references approved software but does not describe the evaluation criteria or process by which tools attain that status — a gap that may be worth addressing.

5. AI and Division-Level Processes

At the division level, AI adoption has been meaningful and, in several respects, ahead of the formal policy curve. Professional development was initiated in 2023, prior to the point at which most comparable divisions had begun to engage systematically with AI. The division provided staff with access to Gemini accounts, which administrators describe as having been valuable for day-to-day professional work. A working group process engaged humanities teachers on the classroom implications of AI at a relatively early stage. These represent genuine system investments.

The intervention tools work reviewed as part of prior system work reflects additional forward-thinking consideration of AI tools with specific potential for literacy support, differentiated instruction, and learning intervention at the Tier 2 and Tier 3 levels. This kind of applied, student-outcomes-focused thinking about AI is a productive direction worth continuing to develop.

At the same time, the data suggests that division-level AI work has to this point been perceived as somewhat more responsive than strategic — which is entirely understandable, and arguably appropriate, given the pace at which the field has moved. There is a reasonable argument that experience necessarily precedes strategy in a domain this new and this fluid - the division needed to build capacity, observe outcomes, and gather evidence before it could responsibly set a strategic direction. In many respects, that is precisely what CTR has been doing. The professional development investments, the tool access decisions, the working group processes, and the consultation underlying this review are all part of building the knowledge base from which a more deliberate strategic posture can now emerge. Some of the connective tissue — a shared language for talking about AI across the division, clear criteria for evaluating and approving tools, and a systematic approach to professional development — may now be within reach in a way that it simply was not two years ago.

Strengths

The data across all five domains reflects a number of genuine organizational strengths. These are worth naming clearly, both in their own right and because they represent the foundation on which any future development would naturally build.

Early and Sustained Engagement

CTR initiated AI professional development in early 2023, ahead of most comparable divisions. The progression of PD from foundational awareness through to academic integrity and tool-specific tutorials reflects sustained institutional commitment rather than reactive compliance.

Staff Ethical Awareness

Focus group data reveals a notable degree of moral reflection among staff around AI use. The voluntary articulation of personal boundaries — around prayer, student voice, and authentic human connection — emerged from participants themselves, unprompted. This ethical instinct is a meaningful organizational asset.

Strong Administrator Engagement

All 40 administrators surveyed use AI in their professional work, and the majority describe its impact as positive. This level of familiarity may create favourable conditions for school-level leadership on this issue.

Meaningful Efficiency Gains

Time savings reported by both teachers and administrators appear substantial, and staff consistently describe redirecting that time toward higher-value relational and instructional work. This reflects a productive use of AI that aligns with the intent of the division's policy.

A Values-Grounded Policy Foundation

AP GEN #27's background section reflects careful thinking about what Catholic education means in the context of AI. The grounding in human dignity, authentic relationship, and the risks of dehumanization is distinctive and provides a genuine starting point for the operational work ahead.

Student Self-Awareness

Students demonstrate a thoughtful understanding of the potential risks of AI misuse, including its possible impact on their own development. Eighty-six percent indicate that AI should support rather than replace their learning — a value orientation the division may be able to build on.

Areas for Continuous Improvement: Options for Consideration

The following options are offered for senior administration's consideration, organized by domain and broadly sequenced by readiness — that is, by the degree to which CTR already has foundations in place to act. Given the pace at which AI continues to evolve, specific multi-year timelines are deliberately avoided in favour of identifying what appears actionable now and what may benefit from further groundwork. These are suggestions, not prescriptions, and the division is best positioned to determine which are most relevant to its current context and priorities.

1. Governance and Policy: Building on AP GEN #27

AP GEN #27 is an excellent base from which to consider some additional direction. The philosophical foundation is sound and distinctively Catholic. Stakeholders across all groups have indicated an interest in greater operational specificity — perhaps some concrete guidance that would help staff, students, and families understand more clearly what acceptable use looks like in practice. A companion document to the current administrative procedure, offering draft language for consideration, is included with this report. The following observations may be helpful in reviewing it.

The procedure might benefit from a tiered use framework — a plain-language articulation of the difference between AI uses that are generally acceptable, those that are acceptable with teacher direction and transparency, and those that fall outside the division's expectations. Making these distinctions explicit in policy may help address the single most consistent request emerging from the data across every stakeholder group.

A dedicated section on academic integrity and AI might also be considered — one that defines what AI-related misconduct looks like, describes how transparency and citation of AI use is expected, and clarifies the process when concerns arise. On the question of AI detection, the data suggests it may be worth considering explicit guidance that situates detection tools as one input among many rather than a primary mechanism for assessing integrity. Process-based evidence of student learning — drafts, revision history, in-class work, oral conferences — may offer more reliable and more relationally sound approaches.

A specific provision regarding AI use in faith contexts might also be considered. The distinction between using AI to support the development of faith resources and using AI to generate prayer for use with students or staff emerged organically and consistently from focus group participants and reflects genuine moral reasoning that may be worth honouring in the division's formal guidance.

Finally, establishing a regular and genuine review cycle for AP GEN #27 may be worth considering — given the pace of change in this field, an annual review may be more appropriate than a typical multi-year cycle. Ongoing feedback from staff, gathered through the collaborative professional learning structures described below, could serve as a natural and low-burden mechanism for

surfacing what is working, what is creating confusion, and what the policy may need to address as practice continues to evolve.

As this review was specifically tasked with potential policy impacts a draft adaptation of AP GEN #27 is included as a companion document to this report. It is offered as a thinking tool only — a starting point for internal discussion rather than a recommended or final document.

> *"Not to get caught up in the world telling us we need it. Let's chart our path aligned to our beliefs." — School Administrator*

2. Professional Development: Supporting Teacher Confidence

The gap between administrator confidence and teacher readiness is perhaps the most actionable finding in this review. Many teachers are using AI productively in their own professional practice while feeling less certain about how to integrate it pedagogically and how to guide students. Within the context of AI classroom use, bridging this gap may represent the highest-priority professional development opportunity available to the division at this time.

One of the more consistent themes across both the focus groups and the teacher survey is the strong preference for collaborative, peer-based professional learning over formal one-off sessions. In focus group conversations this sentiment was expressed with notable conviction — teachers described wanting to learn alongside colleagues, to see what is actually working in classrooms similar to their own, and to have structured time to work through the pedagogical questions together rather than receive direction from above. The teacher survey open-text responses echo this consistently, with repeated references to CLC time, peer sharing, and school-based discussion as the preferred formats. The preparedness data adds further weight: with only 9.4% of teachers feeling very prepared to guide students in responsible AI use, the appetite for support is evident — and the form that support takes may matter as much as its content. The division's existing CLC structure may be the most natural and least disruptive vehicle for this work, with AI integration becoming a sustained focus rather than an occasional agenda item.

Professional development might usefully be differentiated by role and context. Depending on the appetite for integration at early grade levels, elementary teachers may benefit from developmentally grounded guidance on what age-appropriate AI literacy looks like for younger learners, and on how to talk with families about AI use at home. Secondary teachers, particularly those in writing-intensive or humanities courses, may benefit most from practical support in assessment redesign — how to create assignments that make AI a legitimate tool for some purposes while still preserving the authenticity of student thinking and voice.

On the instructional design side specifically, a number of other practical approaches might be considered. A division-maintained prompt library — a curated collection of tested prompts organized by subject area, grade level, and purpose — could lower the barrier for teachers who are uncertain where to begin. AI-integrated lesson plan templates that build in explicit decision points around whether and how AI might support a given learning goal could make the pedagogical thinking more visible and consistent. Those collaborative CLC’s or subject-specific working groups, modelled on the

humanities working group convened in 2023, could allow teachers to develop relevant examples within their own disciplines rather than working from generic guidance. A small bank of model lessons demonstrating what thoughtful, age-appropriate AI integration looks like at different grade levels — developed by CTR teachers for CTR curriculum — might also be a practical and relatively accessible starting point.

The use of division-provided tools — Gemini in particular — might be a specific focus within this collaborative work, with attention to prompting skills, appropriate use cases, data privacy considerations, and the distinction between AI as a teacher productivity tool and AI as a student learning tool.

The faith-AI intersection may also warrant specific attention. Fifty-two percent of teachers indicated they would use Catholic AI tools, such as Magisterium AI, if provided with professional development opportunities — a meaningful signal of openness that the division may be positioned to respond to.

3. Student AI Literacy: Supporting Learning While Building Capacity

The student data, and particularly the core tension identified in the findings around young learners and cognitive development, may point toward a shift in orientation — from an emphasis primarily on prohibition and detection toward a greater emphasis on explicit instruction in responsible, purposeful use. This is not a relaxation of expectations; it is a recognition that prohibition without instruction has had limited effectiveness and that students themselves are asking for something more substantive.

The fundamental question of sequencing — when and how AI is introduced into student learning, and what foundational skills students need to develop through genuine cognitive effort before AI assistance is offered — may be one of the most important questions the division engages with over the coming years. There are no easy answers to this question, and the research base is still developing. What the data does suggest is that addressing it thoughtfully, within a Catholic framework that takes seriously both the development of the whole person and the realities of the world students will inhabit, is work that CTR is well positioned to lead.

In the near term, assessment design may be the most practical lever available. Where AI use in assignments is permitted, making that explicit — communicating the parameters of acceptable use in advance and expecting documentation and reflection on how AI was used — may reduce confusion and support integrity. Where AI use is not permitted, communicating that clearly and explaining the rationale may be more effective than silent prohibition. A division-wide AI literacy framework for students, articulating what students at different grade levels might be expected to understand about AI, might also be a worthwhile medium-term investment.

Parent engagement on student AI use may benefit from a realistic and appropriately scoped approach. The parent community is anxious and genuinely concerned about their children's learning. More accessible, targeted formats — brief resources sent home through students, short video explainers, social media posts or simple guidance for family conversations — may be more effective than formal written communications alone.

4. Data Privacy: Strengthening Clarity

The data privacy provisions in AP GEN #27 are appropriate in principle and may benefit from some additional operational clarity. A brief, accessible summary of data privacy expectations for staff — including the important distinction between division-approved tools operating under education-specific data agreements and consumer AI tools that do not carry the same protections — might help ensure more consistent practice across the division.

As the division potentially moves toward more structured use of student-facing AI tools for learning support and intervention, a formal evaluation framework for third-party tools — with clear criteria addressing data governance, privacy compliance, age appropriateness, and alignment with divisional values — may become increasingly valuable.

5. Division-Level Processes: Providing Support in a Time of Change

The division has responded thoughtfully to AI as an emerging reality. A possible next step might be to consider how that responsive posture could be complemented by the addition of functional supports — not by attempting to predict where AI will be in several years, which is not reliably possible, but by putting in place organizational infrastructure that would allow CTR to adapt more deliberately as the landscape continues to evolve and to support staff as they cope and adapt day to day with this changing landscape.

One practical step that may be within reach is the establishment of a regular review cycle for AP GEN #27, with a clear trigger for review as the landscape shifts. This is also addressed in the governance recommendations above; it is noted here as well because it sits naturally within the division's broader operational planning rather than belonging solely to a policy conversation. Given the pace of change in this field, an annual review may be more appropriate than the typical multi-year cycle applied to administrative procedures. Ongoing feedback from staff, gathered through the collaborative professional learning structures already suggested by staff, could serve as a natural and low-burden mechanism for surfacing what is working, what is creating confusion, and what the policy may need to address as practice continues to evolve. This approach would allow the division to stay reasonably current without requiring dedicated resources in demand elsewhere.

The division might also consider developing a brief, plain-language statement of its AI philosophy — this could be a stand alone document or defined within the existing AP. A statement that articulates for all stakeholders, in accessible terms, how CTR thinks about AI, what it believes AI can and cannot contribute to Catholic education, and what commitments the division is making as it navigates this terrain. Such a document might serve multiple purposes: a shared reference point for decision-making, a tool for principals in school-level conversations, and a signal to parents that the division has engaged thoughtfully with these questions rather than simply following wherever the technology leads.

Options for Editing Admin Procedure GEN #27

The following are offered as specific options for additions or modifications to the existing administrative procedure. They are intended to complement and build on the current document. The philosophical background section of AP GEN #27 is a genuine strength and might be retained in its entirety; the suggestions below address primarily the operational procedures section. All are offered for consideration and adaptation as the division sees fit. A complete draft of a revised AP GEN #27 is provided as a companion document to this report.

Option for Consideration: Tiered Use Framework

The procedure might be strengthened by a plain-language articulation of three categories of AI use:

- **Generally Acceptable:** AI use for personal productivity, professional development, research, brainstorming, study support, concept clarification, and language assistance.
- **Acceptable With Direction and Transparency:** AI use in student work, when explicitly permitted by the teacher for a specific assignment, with clear parameters communicated in advance and documentation or citation of AI use required from the student.
- **Not Consistent With CTR Expectations:** Submitting AI-generated content as one's own work without disclosure; using AI to impersonate others; using AI to generate fabricated communications or images; using AI as a substitute for human pastoral care, counselling, or authentic spiritual practice; using non-approved AI tools for work involving student information.

Option for Consideration: Academic Integrity and AI

A dedicated section on academic integrity might include provisions along the following lines:

- AI-related academic misconduct might be defined as: submitting AI-generated content as one's own original work without disclosure, in circumstances where the assignment was designed to assess the student's own knowledge, skill, or voice.
- When AI use is permitted, students might be expected to document their use — including the tool used, the prompts entered, and a brief reflective account of how they evaluated and adapted the AI's output.
- Teachers might be encouraged to draw on process-based evidence — drafts, revision history, in-class work, oral conferences — as primary mechanisms for assessing academic integrity. AI detection tools, given their known limitations and the relational risks associated with false positives, might be positioned as one contextual input rather than a primary evidentiary standard.
- Consequences for AI-related academic misconduct would continue to follow the Student Conduct and Discipline Process (STU 01).

Option for Consideration: Faith and AI

A provision along the following lines might be considered for addition to the procedures section:

CTR Catholic Schools recognizes that AI may appropriately support the development of faith education resources, professional development materials, and curriculum planning within religious studies and other faith-integrated contexts. AI-generated content used in faith contexts might be reviewed carefully for theological accuracy and appropriateness. The use of AI to generate prayer or scripture intended for use with students or staff in formal liturgical or

devotional contexts may not be consistent with CTR's commitment to authentic human spiritual leadership, and might be discouraged accordingly. This distinction reflects the moral reasoning expressed by staff participants during focus group consultations and affirms that some dimensions of Catholic school life are understood to be irreducibly human.

Option for Consideration: Data Privacy and Tool Approval

The data privacy section might be strengthened to include:

- Staff are encouraged to use only division-approved AI tools for any work involving student information. Approved tools have been evaluated for data privacy compliance and operate under education-specific data protection agreements that differ meaningfully from the terms governing consumer AI tools. The use of consumer AI tools — personal accounts with ChatGPT, Gemini, or similar platforms — for work involving student information is not recommended, as those tools do not carry the same privacy protections as division-approved platforms.
- A description of the criteria used to evaluate and approve AI tools for use within the division, including data governance, privacy compliance (FOIP and PIPA), age appropriateness, and alignment with divisional values.
- An active, maintained link to the current list of division-approved AI tools, with an expectation of regular review and updating.

Summary of Near-Term Considerations

The following is offered as a consolidated reference point, drawing together the key considerations identified across the five domains of this review. These are not presented as a sequential action plan — the division is best positioned to determine priorities, sequencing, and ownership. They are intended simply as a summary of what was heard through this engagement and may be most actionable in the near term. Clearly, not all elements listed below are achievable with the same level of resource allocation and decisions must be made as to what is not only achievable, but manageable.

Policy and Governance

- Consider a review of AP GEN . 27 to add operational specificity — particularly a tiered use framework, academic integrity provisions, and a faith and AI provision — while retaining the philosophical background section in its entirety.
- Establish a regular and genuine review cycle for AP GEN . 27, with staff feedback gathered through existing collaborative learning structures serving as a primary input.
- Consider developing a brief, plain-language statement of the division's AI philosophy for use with all stakeholder groups.

Professional Development

- Prioritize collaborative, peer-based professional learning on AI integration — with the existing CLC structure as the primary vehicle — rather than one-off information sessions.
- Differentiate professional development by role and grade level, with particular attention to secondary teachers in writing-intensive courses and elementary teachers navigating age-appropriate AI literacy.
- Consider developing practical instructional design supports — a division-maintained prompt library, AI-integrated lesson plan templates, and model lessons developed by CTR teachers for CTR curriculum.

Student AI Literacy and Assessment

- Move toward explicit, consistent communication of AI expectations at the assignment level — clearly stating when AI is permitted, under what conditions, and what documentation is expected.
- Shift the emphasis of academic integrity efforts from detection-based approaches toward process-based evidence of student learning.
- Consider developing a division-wide AI literacy framework articulating age-appropriate expectations for student understanding and use of AI across grade levels.

Data Privacy

- Develop a brief, accessible summary of data privacy expectations for staff — including the distinction between division-approved tools and consumer AI platforms — and communicate it through practical rather than policy-based formats.
- Establish a formal evaluation framework for third-party AI tools, with clear criteria to guide decisions as the tool landscape continues to evolve.

Division-Level Infrastructure

- Consider how existing roles and structures might absorb accountability for ongoing AI monitoring, tool evaluation, and professional development coordination, without requiring new dedicated resources.

- Continue and expand the applied, student-outcomes-focused work on AI tools for learning support and intervention already underway within the division.

Conclusion

The data gathered through this review reflects an organization that has been proactive in its engagement regarding AI's use and potential. CTR has a staff culture characterized by genuine ethical reflection, and that has students who — whatever their individual practices — largely understand the difference between using AI to learn and using AI to avoid learning. Together, these are not incidental qualities — these are genuine cultural and organizational strengths that make next steps possible and manageable.

The areas identified for potential further development are what might be considered as an organic evolution of division actions already taken and in process. At this stage, they are largely questions of operational specificity — translating good values and, in some cases existing practice, into clearer guidance. This would include increasing professional capacity by equipping teachers with the pedagogical confidence to match their growing tool familiarity; and stronger perceptions of organizational intentionality — moving from the necessary work of risk-taking and experimentation toward more structured engagement with greater system coherence while keeping the ability to adapt in this shifting landscape. CTR has already been moving systematically along this process, has done the foundational work and the teaching staff is ready for next steps.

It is worth noting that the broader educational landscape is beginning to see the emergence of AI-first school models that represent a more radical reimagining of what school can look like. Alpha School, a private K–12 network operating across multiple American cities, has attracted considerable attention for its "2 Hour Learning" model, in which students complete all academic work in two hours daily through a personalized AI program, with staff serving in a guide role rather than as instructional leaders — monitoring student progress, providing support as needed, and leading arts, physical education, and life skills programming in the afternoons. The model's proponents point to strong standardized test results, though these claims are based on internal analyses and have not been independently verified, and questions have been raised about governance practices and the breadth of the educational experience it provides. Whether models like Alpha represent a genuine innovation or a narrow reframing of what education is for remains an open and important question. What they do illustrate, perhaps most usefully for CTR, is that the question of AI's role in education is no longer theoretical — and that the choices a division makes about how to position AI relative to teachers, relationships, and the development of the whole person are choices with real consequences. CTR's community has been clear, across every stakeholder group consulted in this review, that the human dimensions of Catholic education — teacher expertise, authentic relationship, moral formation, and community — are not incidental to the educational mission – they are a critical foundation. AI, in this context, is most appropriately and generally understood as a tool that can strengthen a teacher's capacity to fulfil that mission, not as a substitute for it.

The pace of AI development makes prediction unreliable and humility appropriate. The decisions CTR makes in the near term — about policy, about professional development, about how it talks to students and families about AI, and about the degree to which it will shape rather than simply follow the technology — may matter considerably for the culture in which its students and staff navigate this terrain in the years ahead. CTR is not alone in navigating this terrain — school divisions across Alberta are actively working through similar questions, and the work of this review positions CTR well to contribute to and benefit from that broader professional conversation. The opportunity to lead that work, with Catholic values as both compass and anchor, is one that this review encourages the division to continue with care and confidence.

Daverne Consulting Inc.
May 2026

CHRIST THE REDEEMER CATHOLIC SCHOOLS — APPENDIX

Administrative Procedure GEN #27

Guidelines for Artificial Intelligence Use — Draft for Consideration, June 2026

Procedure Number	GEN #27
Effective Date	September 2023
Revised Date	June 2026 (Draft for Consideration)
Related Policies	Student Conduct and Discipline (STU 01), Technology Use, FOIP, PIPA
Applies To	All CTR Catholic Schools staff and students

Background

Artificial intelligence (AI) refers to computer systems that simulate human intelligence, including reasoning, learning, and problem-solving. AI tools are becoming increasingly present in education, the workplace, and daily life. As with any technology, their use raises important questions about purpose, ethics, and human dignity.

CTR Catholic Schools approaches AI through the lens of Catholic social teaching, which affirms the dignity of every person, the importance of authentic human relationship, and the responsibility to use technology in ways that serve the common good. Pope Francis has reflected that technology, including artificial intelligence, must always be at the service of human beings and human flourishing, never a replacement for the irreplaceable dimensions of human connection, creativity, and conscience.

The rapid adoption of AI tools in schools — by staff, students, and families — makes it both appropriate and necessary for the division to provide guidance that is grounded in these values. This procedure is intended to support staff and students in using AI thoughtfully, ethically, and in ways that are consistent with CTR's mission and the development of the whole person.

This procedure recognizes that AI is not inherently good or bad, but that its value depends entirely on how, when, and for what purpose it is used. It also recognizes that the landscape of AI tools and capabilities is changing rapidly, and that any guidance offered today may require revision as that landscape continues to evolve. A regular review cycle for this procedure is therefore both expected and appropriate.

> *"The development of artificial intelligence should serve to enrich the quality of human relationships and not diminish them. Whatever human beings produce, in science or technology, can always be put at the service of the integral development of the human person and of the whole human community." — Pope Francis*

Definitions

Artificial Intelligence (AI): Computer systems capable of performing tasks that typically require human intelligence, including language generation, image creation, data analysis, and problem-solving. For the purposes of this procedure, AI tools include but are not limited to generative AI platforms such as Gemini, ChatGPT, Copilot, and similar applications.

Division-Approved AI Tools: AI tools that have been reviewed and approved by CTR Catholic Schools for use in professional practice or student-facing contexts. Approved tools have been evaluated against the division's data privacy, security, and values criteria. A current list of approved tools is maintained and updated by the division. Staff are expected to use approved tools for any work involving student information.

Consumer AI Tools: AI platforms accessed through personal or non-institutional accounts that are not subject to education-specific data protection agreements. Consumer tools may retain user inputs

for model training or other purposes and do not carry the same privacy protections as division-approved platforms.
Generative AI: A category of AI tools capable of producing original text, images, audio, or other content in response to user prompts. This is the category of AI most directly relevant to academic integrity and instructional use.
AI-Assisted Work: Work that has been developed or refined with the support of AI tools, with the user retaining meaningful intellectual ownership through evaluation, adaptation, and judgment.
Academic Misconduct (AI-Related): Submitting AI-generated content as one's own original work without disclosure, in circumstances where the assignment was designed to assess the student's own knowledge, skill, or voice.

Procedures

1. Tiered Framework for AI Use

The following framework is intended to provide staff and students with a shared understanding of how AI use is approached within CTR Catholic Schools. It is not exhaustive, and teachers retain professional discretion to set specific expectations for their courses and assignments within this framework.

1.1 Generally Acceptable

The following uses of AI are generally acceptable within CTR Catholic Schools, subject to the data privacy requirements outlined in Section 4:

- AI use for personal productivity, professional development, research support, brainstorming, concept clarification, and language assistance.
- AI use by teachers for resource development, lesson planning, assessment design, report card comments, and communication drafts.
- AI use by students for study support, concept clarification, practice questions, and understanding feedback on their own work.
- AI use for the development of faith education resources and professional development materials, subject to the provisions in Section 5.

1.2 Acceptable With Direction and Transparency

The following uses of AI are acceptable when explicitly permitted by the teacher for a specific assignment, with clear parameters communicated in advance:

- AI use by students in the completion of academic work, where the teacher has specified that AI assistance is permitted and has defined the scope of acceptable use.
- When AI use is permitted on an assignment, students are expected to document their use, including the tool used, the nature of the prompts entered, and a brief account of how they evaluated and adapted the AI's output. Teachers may specify the format for this documentation.
- AI-assisted work submitted for assessment should reflect the student's own intellectual engagement with and judgment about the AI's output. Simply accepting and submitting AI-generated content without meaningful adaptation does not constitute acceptable use under this category.

1.3 Not Consistent With CTR Expectations

The following uses of AI are not consistent with CTR Catholic Schools' values and expectations:

- Submitting AI-generated content as one's own original work without disclosure, in circumstances where the assignment was designed to assess the student's own knowledge, skill, or voice.
- Using AI to impersonate another person, generate fabricated communications, or create misleading content.

- Using AI as a substitute for human pastoral care, counselling, or authentic relationship in the school context.
- Using AI to generate deepfakes, manipulated images, or other content intended to deceive or harm.
- Using non-approved AI tools for any work involving personally identifiable student information.
- Using AI to generate prayer or scripture intended for use with students or staff in formal liturgical or devotional contexts (see Section 5).

2. Academic Integrity and AI

CTR Catholic Schools is committed to supporting academic integrity in an environment where AI tools are widely accessible. The following provisions are intended to provide clarity for staff, students, and families.

2.1 Definition of AI-Related Academic Misconduct

AI-related academic misconduct occurs when a student submits AI-generated content as their own original work without disclosure, in circumstances where the assignment was designed to assess the student's own knowledge, skill, or voice. This includes work where AI was used to generate a substantial portion of the content, regardless of whether the student made minor edits.

2.2 Teacher Responsibilities

Teachers are expected to:

- Communicate clearly to students, at the beginning of each assignment or unit, whether AI use is permitted, and if so, under what conditions and to what extent.
- Design assessments that are appropriate to the learning goals and that consider the role AI may play in student work.
- Use process-based evidence — including drafts, revision history, in-class work, and oral conferences — as primary mechanisms for assessing academic integrity where concerns arise.
- Exercise professional judgment in responding to suspected AI misuse, recognizing that AI detection tools have significant limitations and may produce false positives. Detection tools may be used as one contextual input but should not serve as the sole or primary basis for an allegation of misconduct.

2.3 Student Responsibilities

Students are expected to:

- Understand and follow the AI use expectations communicated by their teacher for each assignment.
- Document their AI use when required, including the tool, the prompts used, and how they evaluated and adapted the output.
- Submit work that reflects their own intellectual engagement, even when AI assistance has been used.
- Seek clarification from their teacher if they are uncertain whether a particular use of AI is acceptable for a given assignment.

2.4 Consequences

Consequences for AI-related academic misconduct are addressed through the Student Conduct and Discipline Process (STU 01) and should be applied consistently and educatively, with attention to the student's understanding of why the behaviour is inconsistent with the division's values and expectations. The goal is to support the development of integrity alongside the development of AI literacy.

3. Roles and Responsibilities

3.1 The Division

- Maintains and communicates a current list of division-approved AI tools.
- Provides professional development to support staff in using AI effectively, ethically, and in alignment with divisional values.
- Reviews and updates this procedure on a regular cycle, with an expectation of at minimum annual review given the pace of change in the field.
- Seeks feedback from staff through collaborative professional learning structures to inform ongoing policy development.

3.2 School Administrators

- Communicate divisional AI guidelines to staff, students, and families within their school community.
- Support teachers in implementing AI guidelines consistently and with confidence.
- Address questions or concerns about AI use at the school level, referring to the division as needed.
- Contribute to the division's regular review of this procedure by sharing school-level observations and feedback.

3.3 Teachers

- Communicate clear expectations to students about AI use for each assignment or unit, specifying whether AI is permitted and under what conditions.
- Design learning experiences that are intentional about when and how AI is introduced, with attention to the developmental needs of students and the learning goals of the course.
- Use division-approved AI tools for professional practice involving student information.
- Engage in professional development related to AI integration and academic integrity.
- Bring questions or concerns about AI use to their administrator or to divisional supports as appropriate.

3.4 Students

- Follow the AI use expectations communicated by their teacher for each assignment.
- Use AI as a tool to support their learning, not as a substitute for their own thinking and effort.
- Document AI use when required and be prepared to discuss and explain their work.
- Ask their teacher for clarification when they are unsure whether a particular use of AI is appropriate.

3.5 Parents and Guardians

- Support their child in understanding and following divisional and school expectations for AI use.
- Engage in conversations with their child about responsible AI use, including at home.
- Direct questions about school or divisional AI expectations to the school administrator or teacher.

4. Data Privacy and Approved Tools

4.1 Use of Approved Tools

Staff are expected to use only division-approved AI tools for any work involving student information. Division-approved tools operate under education-specific data protection agreements and have been evaluated for compliance with FOIP, PIPA, and the division's data governance standards. Consumer AI tools — including personal accounts with platforms such as ChatGPT, Gemini, or Copilot — do not carry the same privacy protections and should not be used for work involving student information.

4.2 Tool Evaluation Criteria

AI tools considered for divisional approval are evaluated against the following criteria:

- Compliance with applicable privacy legislation, including FOIP and PIPA.
- Data governance provisions, including data retention, use, and sharing practices.
- Age appropriateness and suitability for the educational context.
- Security standards and breach notification protocols.

- Alignment with CTR Catholic Schools' values and educational mission.

4.3 Personally Identifiable Information

Staff must not enter personally identifiable student information — including names, student ID numbers, assessment data, or other identifying details — into non-approved AI tools. When using approved tools, staff should enter only the information necessary for the task at hand and in accordance with the terms of the approved platform.

4.4 Current Approved Tools List

A current list of division-approved AI tools is maintained by [insert responsible department] and is available at [insert link]. This list is reviewed and updated at least annually. Staff are encouraged to contact their administrator or [insert responsible contact] if they wish to propose a tool for divisional review.

5. AI and Catholic Identity

CTR Catholic Schools affirms that AI may appropriately support the work of Catholic education in a number of ways, including the development of faith education resources, curriculum planning, professional development materials, and administrative support. Staff using AI in these contexts are encouraged to review AI-generated content carefully for theological accuracy, pastoral appropriateness, and alignment with Catholic teaching.

The use of AI to generate prayer or scripture intended for use with students or staff in formal liturgical or devotional contexts is not consistent with CTR's commitment to authentic human spiritual leadership. Prayer and formal acts of worship are understood within the Catholic tradition as expressions of genuine human relationship with God and with one another — dimensions of school life that are irreducibly human. This does not preclude the use of AI for researching, preparing, or contextualizing faith content; it reflects the community's own discernment about where the boundaries of appropriate use lie.

> *This provision reflects themes that emerged consistently and spontaneously in staff consultations conducted as part of the 2026 AI Review. It represents the community's own moral reasoning and is offered here as formal recognition of that discernment.*

6. Professional Development

CTR Catholic Schools is committed to providing staff with the professional learning supports needed to use AI effectively, ethically, and with confidence. Professional development related to AI is expected to be ongoing and collaborative rather than delivered through one-off information sessions. The division's existing Collaborative Learning Community (CLC) structure is an appropriate vehicle for sustained AI professional learning.

Professional development priorities may include:

- Practical use of division-approved AI tools, including Gemini and other approved platforms.
- Instructional design for AI-integrated learning, including assessment design and the development of subject-specific prompt libraries and model lessons.
- Academic integrity in an AI environment, including how to communicate expectations to students and how to respond to concerns.
- Age-appropriate AI literacy for students, including approaches for different grade levels.
- Data privacy and responsible use, including the distinction between approved and consumer tools.
- Faith and AI, including the use of Catholic AI resources where appropriate.

7. Review and Amendment

This procedure will be reviewed on an annual basis, or more frequently as warranted by significant changes in AI technology, legislation, or divisional practice. The review process will draw on feedback

from staff gathered through collaborative professional learning structures, as well as input from administrators, students, and families as appropriate.

Amendments to this procedure are subject to approval by [insert appropriate authority] and will be communicated to all staff and made available to students and families through [insert communication channels].