

Everything you need in your hand on the day.

Run sheet, room setup, the twelve scenario cards with answer notes, the knowledge check key, and the two forms you must collect before anyone leaves.

PART 1 / 5

Before the day

Four hours of preparation. Skip the first item and the day still works; skip the second and it does not.

PRINT AND PREPARE

- ☐ **Scenario cards — one set per table**
Part 3 of this pack. Print single-sided on card, cut along the borders. Six tables means six sets.
- ☐ **Commitment cards — one per member of staff, plus 10%**
Part 5. Two per A4 sheet.
- ☐ **Attendance record — one per track**
Part 5. This is evidence item E-05 and it is the only thing a market surveillance authority will definitely ask for.
- ☐ **Your own hallucination screenshot**
Ask a model for a specific reference inside your own exam specification. Screenshot the confident wrong answer. Put the real document beside it. Do not use a generic example — teachers discount those instantly.
- ☐ **Three worked struggle-test examples from three departments**
One obviously fine, one obviously not, one that splits the department. The third is the one you run longest.
- ☐ **Your school's actual answer for each data column**

- Consumer account, school licence, enterprise agreement — which tools sit where. If you do not know, say so on the day; the honesty lands well and it is a finding for the register.
-
- ☐ **The register open on a laptop, connected to the projector**
You will edit it live in M4. Watching the document fill in changes how seriously the room treats it.
-
- ☐ **Two room numbers on a flipchart for the M3 / M4 split**
The most common failure of this day is people drifting into the wrong track after the break.
-
- ☐ **A box by the door**
For the commitment cards. Collection at the door runs near 100%. Collection by email afterwards runs around 40%.
-

PEOPLE WHO MUST BE IN THE ROOM

WHO	FOR WHICH MODULE	WHY IT MATTERS
Designated safeguarding lead	M5, co-delivering	If they cannot attend, move the module. Do not run the safeguarding section without them.
Head of school	M1 open, M6 close	They name the accountable owner out loud at the end. The day lands differently when the commitment comes from the top.
Data protection lead	M4	Often external. Brief them beforehand — most know GDPR well and the AI Act barely at all.
Every head of department	M3	The struggle test is a subject-specialist judgement. Nobody else can make it for them.

Run sheet

Timings assume a 09.00 start and a single 20-minute break. The right-hand column is what you do, not what you say.

Room and materials
Cabaret tables of six. Card sets face down. Projector tested with your screenshot open.

Box by the door.
Flipchart with room numbers.

09.00 M1 · 45	What these systems actually are Slides 4–8. Three-runs demo, the confidence screenshot, the data columns, then the hallucination hunt.	Ban the word "thinks". Debrief worst hit rate first. Collect hunt sheets.
09.45 M2 · 40	The law, in the form it reaches a classroom Slides 9–12. Four rules, the red line, then red-amber-green with the card sets.	Debrief only cards 4, 8, 11. Photograph every table sort. Minute what the room decides.
10.25 BREAK · 20	Split the room Say the M3 / M4 split twice before the break and once again as people leave.	Point at the flipchart.
10.45 M3 · 60	Teaching track Slides 14–16. Struggle test, assessment redesign, then rebuild one task in department groups.	30 min on the rebuild. Groups that stall have not named the underlying skill. Collect by department.
10.45 M4 · 60	Operations track — parallel Slides 17–18. Nine-question vendor screen run live against a real tool, then disclosure lines.	Send template T4 before they leave the room. Edit the register live.
11.45 M5 · 50	Safeguarding, bias and the harder conversations Slides 20–21. Rejoin as one room. DSL co-delivers the first section. Bias audit, then parent scripts.	Say the reporting route in full. Ask two people to repeat it back. Frame the discomfort before, not after.
12.35 M6 · 30	Your commitments, on the record Slides 23–25. Knowledge check marked as a room, commitment cards, then what happens next.	Do not let this get squeezed. Head names the owner. Stand at the door with the box.

IF YOU LOSE TIME

Cut the M5 parent scripts and shorten the M1 debrief. Never cut M6 — training that produces no artefact produces no evidence, and M6 is the entire evidentiary point of the day.

Scenario cards

MODULE 2 • RED, AMBER, GREEN • 20 MINUTES

Print single-sided on card and cut. One set per table. Tables sort into banned, needs a decision, and fine. Do not tell them which three are contested — the friction is the activity.

Card 01

Sort me

A teacher uses AI to draft an email to a parent about a behaviour incident. She reads it, rewrites two sentences, and sends it under her own name.

RED AMBER GREEN

Card 02

Sort me

The school is offered an exam proctoring tool that flags suspicious candidates by analysing facial expression and signs of stress during the paper.

RED AMBER GREEN

Card 03

Sort me

A teaching assistant pastes a pupil's full SEN report into a free consumer chatbot on her personal account, to get a plain-English summary for a cover teacher.

RED AMBER GREEN

Card 04

Sort me

A head of year generates all 180 of his tutor group's end-of-term report comments with AI from the grade data, reads each one, edits about a third, and signs them off.

RED AMBER GREEN

Card 05

Sort me

During online lessons, a dashboard scores each student's attention and engagement from their webcam feed and shows the teacher a live ranking.

RED AMBER GREEN

Card 06

Sort me

A science teacher generates twenty extra practice questions on moles for a revision sheet, checks the answers herself, and fixes three that were wrong.

RED AMBER GREEN

Card 07

Sort me

Admissions uses an AI tool to rank applicants by predicted academic success, and the registrar interviews the top forty.

RED AMBER GREEN

Card 08

Sort me

A wellbeing platform asks students to write a short check-in each Monday, and uses AI to analyse the *written text* for signs of low mood, flagging concerns to the pastoral team.

RED AMBER GREEN

Card 09

Sort me

The marketing team publishes an AI-generated image of smiling students in the new prospectus. It is not labelled, and no real student is depicted.

RED AMBER GREEN

Card 10

Sort me

A Year 12 student does not understand hypothesis testing. She asks a model to explain it four different ways, then writes her lab report entirely herself.

RED AMBER GREEN

Card 11

Sort me

A teacher drafts a university reference for a student using AI, feeding in the student's grades and his own bullet-point notes. He edits it and signs it.

RED AMBER GREEN

Card 12

Sort me

The MIS has a new feature that flags students at risk of underachieving, based on attendance and historical grade patterns. Tutors see the flags.

RED AMBER GREEN

Answer notes — facilitator only

Nine of these sort themselves. Debrief only cards 4, 8 and 11, and write down where the room lands — those three become school policy.

CARD	SORT	WHY
01	GREEN	She read it, edited it, and owns it. This is drafting assistance, and the human decision is intact.
02	RED	Inferring emotional or stress states from expression in an education setting. Article 5(1)(f). Not a procurement decision — a prohibition.
03	RED	Special-category personal data into an unapproved consumer tool. Banned by data protection law and school policy rather than by Article 5 — a useful distinction to draw out.
04	CONTESTED	Run this one. He read and signed every comment, so the human decision survives. But 180 comments reviewed in one sitting is review in name only, and report comments feed a reported judgement. The room usually splits on volume, not principle. Ask: at what number does reviewing stop being reviewing?
05	RED	Attention and engagement inferred from webcam. The clearest breach on the deck. Nothing to weigh.
06	GREEN	She verified and corrected. This is the model use case.
07	AMBER	Admission and assignment is an Annex III high-risk use. Obligations deferred to December 2027, so not banned — but it needs a written decision, human review of every rejection, and a place in the register today.
08	CONTESTED	Run this one. The Article 5 prohibition is tied to inference from biometric data. Text is not biometric, so this probably falls outside it — but it is emotion inference on children in a school, at scale, with pastoral consequences. Legal and right are not the same question. Ask the room which one they are answering.
09	AMBER	Article 50 transparency became enforceable on 2 August 2026. Add a label. Cheap to fix, embarrassing to be caught on.

CARD	SORT	WHY
10	GREEN	She used it to understand, then did the work. If your policy makes this cheating, your policy is wrong.
11	CONTESTED	Run this one. No prohibition applies. But a reference is a personal testimony whose whole value is that a named human vouched for the student. Rooms divide sharply and often along age lines. Ask: would you tell the student? Would you tell the university? If not, why not?
12	AMBER	Arguably assessing the appropriate level of education. Needs a decision, a named owner, and a rule that a flag never triggers an action on its own.

DO NOT RESOLVE THE CONTESTED THREE TOO FAST

The instinct is to give the room an answer. Resist it. Whatever the school decides on cards 4, 8 and 11 becomes policy, and policy the staff argued their way into is complied with very differently from policy they were handed. Minute the outcome and add it to the policy annex the same week.

Knowledge check — answer notes

MODULE 6 · OPEN BOOK · MARKED AS A ROOM

Not a test. Where the room disagrees is where your policy is unclear — note those and put them on the review agenda.

01 When did the Article 4 AI literacy duty start applying?

2 February 2025. Not August 2026 — that is when national market surveillance authorities began supervising and enforcing it.

Watch for: staff assuming the obligation is new. It is not; only the checking is.

02 What began on 2 August 2026?

Enforcement of the AI literacy duty by national market surveillance authorities, and the **Article 50 transparency obligations** becoming enforceable.

Watch for: confusion with the high-risk deferral to December 2027. Different articles.

03 Name the Article 5 prohibition that specifically names education.

Using AI to **infer the emotions** of a person in an education institution. Article 5(1)(f). The exception is narrow — medical or safety reasons only, read restrictively.

Accept any answer that gets "emotions" and "banned". Precision on the article number is not the point.

04 Give one example of a school tool that would breach it.

Attention or focus scoring from webcam · engagement analytics using facial expression · sentiment analysis of student faces or voices · proctoring that flags stress from expression · a wellbeing dashboard inferring mood from biometrics.

If someone names a tool your school actually runs, stop and write it down. That is the most valuable thirty seconds of the day.

05 You draft a report comment with AI. Who is responsible for it?

You are. Anything issued under your name is your responsibility, whatever produced the first draft. AI may support marking; a human makes and owns the decision.

06 **A parent messages the school chatbot. What must they be told?**

That they are interacting with an **AI system**. Where someone could reasonably assume a human wrote or answered something, say otherwise.

07 **Name two of the four education uses listed as high-risk.**

Admission and assignment · evaluating learning outcomes, including steering the learning process · assessing the appropriate level of education · monitoring behaviour during tests.

Add that obligations are deferred to December 2027, and that the register you build now is the same register you will need then.

08 **A student's work returns a high AI-detection score. What do you do first?**

Talk to the student. Ask about the work — how they got there, why they made a choice, what they would change. A detection score is not proof, and detectors are wrong most often for EAL writers and unusual voices.

This is the question that reliably splits a staffroom. Whatever the room concludes, write it down – it is your academic integrity procedure and it needs to exist before you need it.

09 **What may you never put into a tool that is not on the register?**

Any pupil personal data. And never safeguarding records, medical information, SEN reports or staff HR matters into any tool without written approval.

10 **Who do you tell when an AI-related problem occurs, and how fast?**

The accountable owner, within one working day. Reportable: incorrect output acted on, personal data exposed, a suspected prohibited practice, a disputed integrity decision, a safeguarding concern.

Reporting in good faith carries no penalty.

The room should be able to say the name without looking it up. If they cannot, that is your finding.

Forms to collect

Print, collect, file. These two forms are evidence item E-05, and they are what turns a good day into a defensible one.

Commitment card

MODULE 6 • ONE PER MEMBER OF STAFF • COLLECT AT THE DOOR

NAME AND ROLE

THREE THINGS I WILL START DOING

ONE THING I WILL STOP DOING

ONE QUESTION I STILL HAVE

SIGNED AND DATED

Attendance and completion record

EVIDENCE ITEM E-05 · ONE PER TRACK · RETAIN INDEFINITELY

School _____ Date _____ Facilitator _____

NAME	ROLE	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6	CARD IN

Record M3 and M4 separately — the differentiated split is how you evidence that training was proportionate to role and technical knowledge, which is what Article 4 actually asks for.

WITHIN A WEEK OF THE DAY

File the attendance record, the commitment cards, the hallucination-hunt sheets, the photographed card sorts and the redesigned tasks. Update the register with everything named on the day. Minute the decisions the room reached on cards 4, 8 and 11 and add them to the policy annex. Diarise the annual review.

Scope and limits. This pack is a practical facilitation tool. It is not legal advice and does not create a presumption of compliance. Article 4 requires measures proportionate to your context — only your school can judge what is sufficient.

Verify before you rely. The timeline reflects the position following the political agreement of 7 May 2026 on the Digital Omnibus, which was still subject to formal adoption. Confirm the current position with your national market surveillance authority before delivery.

AIL-02 · Rev A · Companion to AIL-01 and the INSET deck.