

Purpose

This document lays out the principles and policies that Veritas Christi Hybrid Academy uses with regard to the use of artificial intelligence (AI). It was created in the Fall of 2025 by CJ Newburn and reviewed by the Board.

Statement of integrity on use of AI: Only a couple of minor ideas were used from a generated document on AI policies for a Christian school. AI feedback was requested on the writing style and applied after a complete draft was finished.

Background

Why now

Artificial intelligence has exploded on the scene, in the public square and in education. It is a radically-impactful change that we can't ignore. AI has gone beyond a Google search to being able to provide complex answers and insightful feedback on uploaded documents in less than a second. AI is a very powerful tool. In and of itself, it's neutral, and can be used for great good or great evil. It's our choice how we want to harness it here at Veritas Christi Hybrid Academy. We will not ignore it and cannot wish it away.

God is working

We see God working in the world around us, and that includes His work in and through tech. We see the advent of AI as an opportunity to double down and deepen the implementation of key values such as

- Seeking and doing God's will
- Acting with uncompromised integrity in all that we do
- Using and developing the gifts that He gives us
- Increasing communication and collaboration, working more closely in the Body of Christ, among teachers, parents, and students
- Recognizing that parents have primary responsibility for their students

Educational goals

Some of our educational goals include

- Clear communication
- Creativity
- Rigorous thinking
- Systematic checking
- Personal responsibility



There are many fruits of that hard labor!

- Deep satisfaction with substantive accomplishment
- Greater confidence that we can master still-harder tasks
- Our minds are stronger muscles
- Mustering courage to exercise personal responsibility

Instructional methods

We believe that AI could help achieve those goals and focus our efforts in the most important areas of our development, or could be used to thwart them. As a negative example, if the exercise is to read the text and check that you've learned definitions and concepts, having AI fill in the answers would be counterproductive. It'd still be counterproductive to fill in the 80% you can remember and have AI provide answers for the rest. If a student fills in an answer that wasn't in the book and wasn't taught in class, such that it's obviously been blindly filled in from AI, teachers would serve students well to give them no credit, even if the answer was correct. Some possible methods of instruction are reflected in the following table.

Grade range	Primary instructional method	Possible role of AI
Jr high	Carefully tailored, explicit, step by step instruction, basic comprehension	Research, Grammarly
Underclassmen	Structured exercises, formulating arguments with specific textual support	Feedback on style, clarity, conciseness
Upperclassmen	Applying more complex processes and algorithms, abstraction, free-form essays, research papers	Feedback on arguments, conciseness

Implications

There are many implications of the above. When a particular method is prescribed for learning, shortcutting that method to get an answer without following the process robs us of our integrity, robs us of the learning opportunity, and robs us of the sense of accomplishment from working hard to achieve a challenging goal.

Teachers can rise to the challenge of carefully formulating the learning goals of each assignment, prescribing a specific method for reaching those goals, and establishing a rubric that measures the effective achievement of those goals. That formulation can provide crisp and clear guidance on whether and where AI is appropriate to use. They have the option of precluding the use of AI entirely, as may be especially appropriate for simple assignments in lower grades. Or they may prescribe some appropriate use of AI for specific purposes, can work with students to track whether and how it was used, and can follow up with an analysis of whether and where it focused and improved the learning process or thwarted it.



Acting outside of integrity is not a viable option for God's people. Claiming work by others, including by AI, as one's own isn't just cheating or plagiarism or taking a shortcut. **It's morally wrong:** lying and contorting our values to put time over character. It separates us from God.

Declarations of academic integrity

Where there is even a question of whether and where AI could have been used, whether it's in math or composition or short answers or essays, we now require students to make a declaration of whether, where, and how they used AI. Such statements are useless unless they are completely candid, such as

- I didn't have time to study, so I Googled the answers and filled them in
- I studied and filled in my own answers first, and used AI to check them. I ended up changing answers for #3 and #7. My earlier answers were <...> and <...>
- I asked ChatGPT for feedback on conciseness and style. The changes I made based on that feedback were made between 7:55 and 8:31pm on Tuesday the 12th, as reflects in the Google doc history.
- I had trouble with proofs and got stuck on problem #4. I had it check my logic, and found a flaw <describe>. I fixed that flaw and now see that I had to apply the <...> theorem to accomplish the proof.
- I asked Perplexity AI for topic ideas. It gave me <...> and that inspired me to choose <...> for my topic sentence.

See below for more details on a template for such declarations.

Teachers can role model academic integrity by describing where they used AI, e.g.

- To get style feedback on a student's paper
- To analyze the logical progression (syllogism) of a student's five-paragraph essay
- To generate a rubric for an assignment
- To generate test questions and an answer key
- To help grade math assignments and generate suggested alternatives or corrections to students' work

Accompaniment

We're all going through a momentous shift from not using AI to finding whether and how it could help further our goals. We're all going to make mistakes. We won't get this right the first try.

We have the opportunity to have more discussion and communication than ever before about educational goals, and whether specific steps and actions further those goals and focus our efforts, or distract or even compromise them. There will be self-reflection and candid feedback.

Dealing with AI is not primarily an exercise in either policing or seeing what we can get away with. It's a chance to explore what's out there within reasonable limits under the careful and prudent guidance of teachers and parents, and to discern together how to use tools to further



what our Lord is doing in us here and now. We encourage students to be open and frank about the challenges they face in exercising academic integrity and personal responsibility. We invite teachers and parents to create an environment where students will be rewarded with help in sorting out what to do and how, rather than being shamed for early mistakes, even if there are natural consequences. We seek to come alongside of students to coach them, rather than lording over them.

Our expectation is that in the development of use of AI, students may end up redoing assignments or doing different assignments when it's found that the use of AI hindered the accomplishment of learning goals. The goal isn't to shame students or catch them doing wrong, *per se*, but rather to help them develop a strong sense of integrity and ability in doing the right thing.

In this new territory, teachers will also have to communicate with parents about what they are ok with! We want to be respectful of parents who may wish to avoid the use of AI in many situations. We expect that to be an ongoing dialog and a journey of discovery. Yes, that will be challenging and time-consuming, but it's a worthy endeavor!

References

- The Community of Learners [talk](#) from S25 on AI, which has resources for plagiarism checking

Suggested requirements

VCH relies on teachers to determine whether and where AI is conducive in meeting the educational goals of any given assignment. We invite parents to review what's being asked or allowed of their students, and to engage with the teacher in sorting out what's best for their children. We anticipate that use of AI may be totally optional in some classes, while others may have explicit exercises in the use of AI for targeted purposes. For example, Google Gemini may help with research, but sources should be cited and checked. Or two versions of a paper could be turned in; one before and after applying selective suggestions (not bulk changes) from use of the Perplexity LLM (Large Language Model).

Tracking

For all written assignments, we recommend that teachers require the use of a Google doc. Google docs automatically track the history of all changes, minute by minute. Teachers can clearly see and judge what changes were made in what periods of time, and can infer when large chunks of work have been done too quickly and copied in.



Integrity statement

We propose using the following table in each assignment where AI may be involved. We understand that this may get adjusted over time and by class. In each of the two columns below, there are several options. Students are asked to at least put a check mark by all that apply, and to make specific references where relevant to instances for each, e.g. Q3,5 for questions 3 & 5.

Where I used AI for this assignment Check/reference details for all that apply		How I regard my work on this assignment Check/reference details for all that apply	
None		I'm proud of doing the work on my own	
I did the work myself first and indicated where I made changes with input from AI		I learned from any input that I got from AI	
I used AI to generate at least some answers, as indicated		AI helped me get it down faster, but I didn't learn as much as I could have	
I leaned heavily on AI		AI got in the way of my learning as much as I could have	
Further comments			
Signed (student)		Date	

The intention is to distribute a header like this, potentially tailored for each class, to students for them to attach to each relevant assignment.

Dealing with inappropriate use of AI

Teachers look for inappropriate use of AI and raise this to the VCH Board. Specific cases can be referred to CJ Newburn, serving as a Dean of Students and Head of School. He's very willing to discuss issues as they come up with teachers, parents, and students.

The first natural consequence is for students to be asked to redo work that didn't comply with expected norms. Where there is a perception that AI was intentionally misused, there will be communication with parents, and students may be written up. Students may be given a 0 for a grade, but will be given a chance to explain themselves.

