

Classroom AI Policy for Ontario Schools

Student, Teacher and Administrator Guides

With Research and Revision Notes

Canada | September 2026

An independent proposal for school review.

IN THIS EDITION

Student 1 Pager	2
Teacher 1 Pager	3
Administrator Proposal	4 to 10
Research and Revision Notes	11 to 17

Numbers above refer to pages in this combined PDF.

David Lamond, M.Ed.

Ontario College of Teachers

Research checked 20 September 2026.

Review draft. Not an adopted policy or Ministry publication.

AI in Our Learning

Student one-pager | Ontario schools, Canada

Proposed school rules - review draft | September 2026

1. Check the task

INDEPENDENT WORK: do it without generative AI, using any supports your teacher has approved.

AI FOR NAMED STEPS: use AI only for the steps and tools your teacher names.

AI INVESTIGATION: explore AI within the approved activity. Safety rules still apply.

If you are unsure, ask before using AI. You never need to buy an AI subscription.

2. Keep your thinking visible

Try first. Check important answers using your learning materials or real sources. Be ready to explain your work. Changing AI's words does not make a forbidden use okay.

Say: "I used [tool] for [step]. I checked [answer]. My own contribution was [what I did]."

3. Protect people and private information

Do not put names, addresses, passwords, private schoolwork, photographs or voice recordings into AI. Use only the account and tool your teacher approves. Do not bypass filters or lie about your age.

Never make or share fake pictures, videos or recordings that embarrass, sexualize, threaten or impersonate someone. "It was a joke" does not make it acceptable.

4. Pictures, video and voices need extra permission

Under 13: your teacher operates AI demonstrations; do not use generators yourself.

Ages 13-14: approved text activities only, with supervision. Your teacher operates any visual demonstration.

Ages 15+: images need a separately approved activity. In the first pilot, teachers operate video/audio tools. No face swaps or copies of real people's voices at any age.

5. If something goes wrong

Stop. Do not forward, download or ask for a copy. Tell your teacher or another trusted adult immediately. If someone makes a harmful fake of you, it is not your fault. Ask for help even if you used a tool you were not meant to use.

AI is not a trusted adult. Take worrying advice or messages to a real person.

Need help or a non-AI option? Speak to your class teacher or the school office.

For younger children: read this together with a teacher or caregiver.

David Lamond, M.Ed.

Ontario College of Teachers

AI in Classroom Practice

Teacher one-pager | Ontario schools, Canada

Proposed school rules - review draft | September 2026

| Before the lesson

Name the learning goal, approved tool/account and allowed steps. Check the tool register, age eligibility, required notice/consent and accessible non-AI route. Approval of a brand does not approve every feature. Do not require paid accounts or home access.

Label the task: INDEPENDENT WORK / AI FOR NAMED STEPS / AI INVESTIGATION. Define permitted assistive technology and ordinary editing tools separately. If unclear, clarify before judging misuse.

| Use AI where you can check the result

Draft lesson options, fictional examples, practice questions and non-confidential translations. Review accuracy, sources, curriculum fit, bias, cultural appropriateness and accessibility before sharing. Model disclosure. Use an initial student attempt, selected process evidence and a short independent learning check.

Student disclosure: "I used [tool] for [step]. I checked [claim] using [source/method]. My own contribution was [thinking or changes]." Do not collect entire private chat histories.

| Respect age and media limits

Under 13: teacher-operated, previewed demonstrations only. Ages 13-14: supervised approved text; no student image/audio/video generation in the pilot. Ages 15+: separately approved image projects; video/audio teacher-operated initially. Use fictional non-identifying subjects. No face swaps or voice cloning of real people.

Pre-review sensitive imagery, religious/cultural representation and translations. Never permit humiliating, sexualized, threatening or impersonating content.

| Protect data and professional judgment

No identifiable student work, grades, IEPs, health/family information, images or voices in generative AI during the pilot. Removing a name may be insufficient. Local models also require approval. No student agents connected to school records, email, public posting or payments.

Do not delegate final grading, discipline, safeguarding or disability decisions. No AI detectors in the pilot. Investigate integrity concerns through conversation and proportionate evidence, follow established procedures, and provide a review route.

| Respond and report

Stop unsafe activity; support the student without blame. Contact the safeguarding lead promptly and fulfil any direct reporting duty. Do not request, copy or forward suspected abuse imagery. Refer data exposures to the privacy/security lead. If the named lead is unavailable, contact the principal or deputy immediately. Record minimal necessary facts through the approved channel.

Before rollout, leadership must publish named contacts, tool approvals and the full policy.

David Lamond, M.Ed.

Ontario College of Teachers

Classroom AI Policy for Ontario Schools

Administrator proposal | Canada | September 2026

Version 2.0 - first draft for institutional review. Research checked 20 September 2026. This is an independent educator proposal, not Ministry guidance or an adopted school policy.

| The decision requested

Approve a limited, supervised pilot with named accountable staff, an approved-tool register, clear assignment permissions, a safeguarding response and an equivalent non-AI learning route. Student access starts only after the controls below are operational. No purchase or student account is authorized by this document.

| Purpose and scope

Use AI where it supports demonstrable learning, teacher preparation or accessible instruction. Preserve independent thinking, relationships, privacy and professional judgment. These proposed rules cover text, code, search assistants, embedded AI features, image/video/audio generation, local models and agents that take actions. School-related harm is addressed through existing conduct procedures, including relevant off-campus conduct within institutional authority.

| Six decisions before launch

1. Name the principal as accountable owner, a curriculum lead, a privacy/security reviewer and a safeguarding lead, with deputies and a working reporting route.
2. Adopt the age and capability restrictions on page 2. Verify each product's current terms for the exact education account and feature.
3. Approve tools by use case, age, data and enabled capability. Start with teacher preparation using non-personal material and a small supervised text pilot for eligible students.
4. Adopt the three assignment labels and disclosure routine on page 3; preserve approved accommodations.
5. Put the incident procedure on page 5 into staff practice before students use the tools.
6. Notify families, train staff, provide accessible alternatives and set a 30-day pilot review. Review the policy each term and after significant changes.

| What success means

Students can explain their own work, check a claim against an authentic source, describe how AI helped, and report harmful content safely. Staff know what is approved and who is responsible. Measure learning without AI as well as task completion with it.

Prepared by David Lamond, M.Ed.

Ontario College of Teachers

1. Permission depends on age AND capability

These are proposed conservative school rules, not universal legal age thresholds. Product terms, applicable law and institutional restrictions all apply; use the strictest relevant restriction. A birthday does not automatically confer access. Consent cannot override a product prohibition.

| Under 13

No independent generative-AI accounts or student-operated general-purpose chatbots, image, audio or video generators. Teach AI literacy through unplugged activities, teacher-selected examples and teacher-operated demonstrations. Teachers preview outputs before display. Do not upload children's identities, work containing personal information, images or voices. Approved assistive technology remains subject to individual review rather than a blanket withdrawal.

| Ages 13-14

Permit only supervised, curriculum-linked text activities in specifically approved education accounts, after required notices and consent processes. No independent image, voice or video generation in the initial pilot. A teacher may operate a reviewed visual demonstration using fictional, non-identifying content. Disable public sharing, personal uploads and external actions where possible; if essential safeguards cannot be provided, do not approve the activity.

| Ages 15-17, and enrolled students 18+

Approved text and coding activities may be used within the assignment permission. Image generation requires a separate teacher-approved brief, a reviewed tool and supervision. Video and synthetic audio remain teacher-operated during the initial pilot; later student projects require documented leadership approval, a purpose and safety review. Use fictional characters, objects or diagrams. No face swaps, cloning real people's voices or synthetic depictions of identifiable people in the pilot, including consenting classmates. The same school conduct restrictions apply to adult students.

| Prohibited for everyone

Creating, requesting, uploading or circulating sexualized depictions of minors; non-consensual intimate imagery; humiliating body edits; threatening, hateful or discriminatory media; impersonation; fabricated evidence; or material intended to harass. Calling something a joke, obtaining peer consent, or labelling it AI does not authorize a prohibited use. Good-faith reporting and accidental exposure are handled supportively and distinguished from deliberate creation or distribution.

| Content and cultural care

Use curriculum-linked, age-appropriate content consistent with the school's published conduct and safeguarding standards. Pre-review clothing, bodies, gestures, religious imagery, sacred figures, symbols, political impersonation and translations where these may cause harm or offence. Do not generate ridicule of beliefs or communities. Respectful, teacher-led study of religion, history, identity and culture remains possible within the curriculum and applicable rights protections. Do not use AI as an authority on sacred or community-held knowledge.

2. Classroom practice and assessment

| Label each assignment in words

INDEPENDENT WORK: no generative AI for the assessed task. Explicitly identify permitted accessibility supports and ordinary editing tools.

AI FOR NAMED STEPS: list the exact permitted steps, tool, input restrictions and evidence required. For example: obtain feedback on an original paragraph, then revise it yourself; do not generate the submitted paragraph.

AI INVESTIGATION: use approved AI extensively to investigate, compare or create within a defined brief. Assess the student's reasoning, verification and decisions. Safety, privacy and age restrictions still apply. There is no unlimited-use category.

If no label is given, students ask before using generative AI. Unclear instructions prompt clarification, not an automatic misconduct finding. Labels refer to learning goals, not a hierarchy from bad to good.

| Disclosure and evidence

Use: "I used [tool] for [step]. I checked [claim or output] using [source or method]. My own contribution was [thinking, changes or decisions]." If none was used: "I did not use generative AI for this task." Cite authentic sources for factual claims. Where generated content is itself analysed or quoted, identify it using the required citation style.

Keep proportionate evidence: an initial attempt, selected non-sensitive prompts or excerpts, revisions and a short explanation. Do not require whole private chat histories or account passwords. Rewriting AI output does not by itself make unauthorized use acceptable.

| Teach the skill before measuring the product

Begin with an unaided attempt. Use hints rather than completed answers when learning a process. Finish with a brief independent explanation, problem or transfer task. Allow equivalent accessible demonstrations of understanding. No assignment is guaranteed to be AI-proof.

| Teacher uses and limits

Approved uses include drafting lesson options, fictional examples, practice questions and translations from non-confidential material. Teachers check correctness, curriculum fit, reading level, bias, cultural appropriateness, accessibility and copyright before use. Verify sensitive translations with a qualified person.

Teachers retain responsibility for assessment, feedback and reporting. During the pilot, do not upload identifiable student work, grades, IEPs, health information or family correspondence to generative AI. Use fictional or properly reviewed non-identifying examples. Any future processing of student data requires a separate documented institutional review, not individual teacher consent.

| Fair integrity response

Do not use AI detectors in the pilot or treat a score as proof. Discuss the work with the student, examine permitted process evidence and provide an accessible opportunity to demonstrate learning. Follow the school's assessment and conduct processes, consider the clarity of instructions and accommodations, document evidence, and provide a review route. No automatic zero or sanction based only on suspicion, writing style or a detector result.

3. Tool approval, privacy and technical controls

| One register, owned by the school

Record: tool and supplier; exact account edition; features; allowed ages and roles; approved purpose; permitted and prohibited data; terms checked/date; legal authority and notice/consent route; storage region and international transfers; retention/deletion; model-training use; subprocessors; access controls; accessibility; testing results; approver; expiry and rollback owner. Approval of one feature does not approve all features under the same brand.

| Default data rule

Students must not enter personal or confidential information, faces, voices, locations, passwords or identifying work into AI. Staff use non-personal or synthetic material during the pilot. Removing a name alone may not prevent identification. Do not upload licensed textbooks, confidential assessments or community-held materials without the necessary rights and authorization.

| Review before approval

Privacy/security staff examine contracts, collection/use/disclosure, training settings, retention, deletion, breach notification, access rights, export and exit arrangements. Complete a proportionate privacy and child-impact assessment and any legally required process. "Education," "enterprise," "Canadian-hosted" and "not used for training" are not complete safety guarantees. Check the actual configuration and contract.

| Local and open-weight models

Running a model on a school device can reduce external transfers in a properly configured deployment. It does not ensure accuracy, moderation or privacy. IT must test telemetry, plugins, logs, backups, device access, model provenance/licence, patching, filtering and deletion. Students must not install unapproved models or bypass safeguards. An offline tool still requires educational, safeguarding and accessibility review.

| Agents and connected tools

Keep student agents disconnected from email, payments, public posting, contacts, school records and unrestricted file access during the pilot. Use sandboxed coding tasks without secrets. Treat webpages, uploaded documents and generated instructions as untrusted inputs: they may try to redirect an agent or expose information. Any later action-taking pilot requires least privilege, human approval before external actions, a log, spending limits where relevant, and a tested stop/recovery process.

| High-stakes exclusions

Do not delegate admissions, final grades, discipline, safeguarding judgments, disability determinations or mental-health advice to AI. No emotion recognition, covert classroom recording or biometric surveillance in this pilot. AI companions must not replace trusted adults or school support services.

| Reapproval triggers

Material model/feature or contract changes; a new age group, data type or integration; unsafe outputs; or a privacy/security incident. Pause the affected use until reviewed. Do not assume yesterday's approval covers today's product update.

4. Responding to harmful AI content

| Student instruction

Stop interacting. Do not share, download or ask someone to send the content. Tell a teacher or trusted adult immediately. A harmed student is not responsible for what someone else created. Help is available even if the student was using an unapproved tool.

| Staff response: protect first

1. Ensure immediate safety and obtain urgent assistance where needed. Listen privately, avoid blame and do not require a student to display harmful material to a class or group.
2. Notify the safeguarding lead promptly. Follow applicable direct child-protection reporting duties; internal escalation does not replace them. Use established emergency, police and child-protection routes where warranted.
3. Do not request, forward, reproduce or place suspected child sexual abuse material in routine incident records. Record minimal contextual details such as the platform, account name, time and URL only where safe and lawful. Obtain specialist direction for handling devices and evidence; do not independently investigate or instruct students to collect copies.
4. Safeguarding and privacy leads coordinate containment, platform reporting/removal, affected-person support and any required notifications. In an Ontario response, [Cybertip.ca](https://www.cybertip.ca) and [NeedHelpNow.ca](https://www.needhelpnow.ca) are relevant specialist resources. Family notification must consider safety and statutory requirements rather than occur automatically in every case.
5. Address peer circulation and retaliation without identifying the harmed student publicly. Provide a trusted contact, practical learning adjustments and follow-up. Do not require confrontation or mediation with the person responsible.
6. Apply fair conduct procedures to alleged misuse. Separate support for the harmed person from fact-finding and disciplinary decisions. Record only what is needed, restrict access and follow retention requirements.

| Other incidents

For a data disclosure, disable the affected connection where safe, contact the privacy/security lead, preserve appropriate technical logs and follow the breach plan. For inappropriate model output, stop the activity, support students and review the tool and lesson before reuse. Accidental exposure should not discourage reporting.

| Practice before launch

Run three short staff scenarios: a humiliating image shared in a group chat; a student uploading an identifying document; and a chatbot encouraging secrecy or dependency. Confirm who receives reports during class, after hours and when the lead is absent. Use written fictional scenarios, never real abusive images.

| Safeguarding communication

Explain the harm in age-appropriate language without demonstrating how to create it or naming abuse-enabling services. Younger pupils need a simple message: "Do not make fake pictures or recordings that hurt people. Tell an adult if you see one."

5. Implementation and accountability

| Days 1-10: establish the conditions

Principal appoints leads and consults teachers, student-support staff, families and age-appropriate student representatives. Inventory embedded AI features already available. Privacy/IT reviews candidates and disables unapproved access where feasible. Publish the register, reporting route, assignment labels and equivalent non-AI route. Start no student pilot until these conditions are met.

| Days 11-30: limited pilot

Curriculum lead trains participating staff using real classroom examples and the incident scenarios. Provide accessible family information explaining purpose, tools, data, restrictions, notice/consent arrangements and alternatives. Teachers teach one AI-literacy lesson before use, then run one approved activity with an unaided learning check. No personal paid subscription or home access is required.

| At day 30: decide using evidence

Review independent student understanding, access barriers, staff workload including checking time, incorrect/harmful outputs, incidents, student/family feedback and whether students can explain the rules. Use minimal, aggregated records. Small pilot findings guide local decisions; they are not proof of schoolwide benefit.

Expand only if required controls work, staff are prepared and the learning evidence supports the use. Continue a limited pilot or stop an activity if benefits are unclear. Pause immediately for serious safety/privacy failures; do not wait for the scheduled review.

| Days 31-90 and each term

Improve the guidance and training, review the register, check changes in law and product terms, and publish a plain-language change log. Invite student feedback without giving student ambassadors access to classmates' chats, safeguarding reports or private records. An AI-literacy badge demonstrates learning, not blanket permission to use tools.

| Family notice template

"We propose to use [approved tool and feature] for [specific learning purpose] with [eligible group]. Students will use [account arrangement] with [supervision]. Permitted data are [description]; excluded data are [description]. Data handling, retention and contact details are available at [school notice location]. [Explain required notice/consent accurately.] An equivalent route without this AI tool is available through the class teacher. Concerns can be raised with [role/contact]." Complete every field before issuing.

| Adoption record - complete before circulation as policy

Approving authority / date / effective date / policy owner and deputy / safeguarding contact and deputy / privacy contact / approved register location / linked assessment, conduct and safeguarding policies / next review date / locally verified legal requirements.

The student and teacher sheets are summaries of this proposal. Institutional approval and completed contact details are required before they are presented as school rules.

6. Ontario context and the reasons behind the rules

| Ontario obligations must be checked separately

Ontario public school boards operate under MFIPPA privacy obligations; do not substitute British Columbia's statutory framework. The IPC's education resources are an appropriate starting point. Private and international institutions need their own applicability review. This Ontario-framed proposal does not establish compliance in another jurisdiction. [R4]

The official Ontario material identifies O. Reg. 52/26, Digital Technology Affecting Individuals Under Age 18, with a consolidation beginning 1 July 2026. The full text could not be reliably retrieved in this review. Before adoption, counsel/privacy staff must verify its exact notice requirements, age distinctions, applicability and any other current EDSTA duties. Do not treat this draft as a completed legal implementation assessment. [R5]

Use current Growing Success and board assessment rules. The policy adds AI-specific clarity without replacing professional assessment, accommodation or appeal requirements. IPC/OHRC principles published in January 2026 provide a current privacy and human-rights reference; these principles are guidance, not a substitute for legislation. [R6-R7]

| Why these choices

Age and feature gates: York Region's public guidance separates K-6 learning about AI from approved enterprise chatbot use in Grades 7-12. This proposal adds a conservative age floor and stricter media controls; those additions are author recommendations. [R1]

Human evidence of learning: a randomized high-school mathematics study found poorer subsequent unaided performance with an unrestricted GPT-4 interface; a tutor with safeguards mitigated that loss. This supports testing independent learning, not a claim that all AI harms learning. [R8]

Dignity and reporting: Canadian child-protection guidance identifies serious harms from sexualized deepfakes. This proposal also prohibits non-sexual humiliating edits and impersonation. [R9]

Clear short rules: Ottawa-Carleton publishes student-facing guidance addressing privacy, disclosure and unreliable AI detectors. Its named tools are board-specific and are not approvals for another school. [R2]

Child rights and literacy: UNICEF's 2025 guidance and the OECD/European Commission's finalized 2026 AI-literacy framework help connect protection, participation and teachable competence. [R10-R11]

| Document status

Research-informed first draft. No Ministry, government, school board or research institution endorsement is claimed. The June 2026 source documents remain preserved. Full references and revision notes accompany this proposal.

David Lamond, M.Ed.

Ontario College of Teachers

Research and Revision Notes

Ontario school AI policy | Evidence checked 20 September 2026

Prepared for the Version 2.0 first draft. This is a targeted primary-source review, not a systematic review or a census of school adoption. Publication dates, page updates and search-engine crawl dates are different. No events after the check date are assumed.

Recommended evidence hierarchy

Use applicable Ontario law and institutional policy for duties; actual school-board documents for operational precedents; child-rights and education frameworks for design; and empirical studies for bounded claims about learning. Vendor documentation establishes a capability, not educational benefit or child safety.

What other schools and systems provide

York Region offers a particularly relevant Ontario example because its public guidance explicitly differentiates younger pupils from secondary-age access. Ottawa-Carleton demonstrates how privacy, disclosure and detector restrictions can be communicated to students. These are verified examples, not evidence that every classroom implements them uniformly.

TeachAI is a practical starting template. Australia supplies an officially endorsed national framework. British Columbia and Quebec add Canadian comparators. UNESCO and UNICEF supply international normative guidance; the OECD/European Commission framework supports AI-literacy curriculum design. Their different purposes matter: a competency framework is not a procurement contract, and a template is not a legal policy.

There is no defensible popularity ranking in this review. The June brief's claim that TeachAI is the template most districts borrow from was not supported by adoption data. Prefer "credible and useful reference frameworks" over "the most popular policies."

What has changed, and what was previously missing

The finalized international literacy framework was announced on 18 June 2026, the date of the original brief. Ontario's indexed O. Reg. 52/26 has a consolidation beginning in July 2026. These warrant a fresh update. UNICEF version 3 and the high-school mathematics trial predate June; adding them improves the evidence base rather than proving they were newly published after the handbook.

Model branding is deliberately kept out of the standing policy. The capability register distinguishes cloud text, local models, image/audio/video and action-taking agents. Product names, editions, age terms and enabled features belong in a dated technical annex checked at approval time.

Research interpretation

The high-school mathematics trial is more directly relevant to school learning than using a small adult essay/EEG study as the handbook's empirical backbone. It supports testing what students can do without assistance and comparing tutoring designs. It does not establish a universal age threshold or long-term effects across K-12.

The proposed under-13 and under-15 media restrictions are precautionary choices for this initial school pilot. No reviewed study establishes 15 as a universal scientific safety boundary. They intentionally go beyond a vendor's minimum account age and can be revisited using supervised pilot evidence.

Creative presentation recommendations

Use one seven-page leadership proposal, separate printable student/teacher sheets and a public article explaining the reasoning. Keep the tool register digital and dated so a vendor update does not require reprinting the whole policy. Put assignment labels beside task instructions, using words as well as colour. Teach reporting through short fictional scenarios. Add a simple age-appropriate AI-literacy activity and an independent explanation to each pilot lesson.

For K-3, read the student sheet with pupils and distil it orally into "Ask first; protect people; tell an adult." The one-page sheet is not a complete early-years lesson. For families, use the notice template in the administrator draft and provide accessible translations reviewed by a qualified person.

What to retain, correct and add

Retain

Human judgment; AI literacy; verification; clear task permissions; disclosure; privacy; accessibility and alternatives; scepticism about detector-based accusations.

Correct

Remove “every major review” proving bans fail. Evidence supports differentiated choices, and bans on specific tools or harmful uses remain appropriate.

Remove the broad claim that Ontario has no guidance. School-board guidance and relevant 2026 provincial material are identifiable; this review does not establish the existence or absence of one comprehensive province-wide K-12 AI policy.

Replace generic Canadian FIPPA/FOIPPA language with an Ontario MFIPPA anchor for public boards and a specific applicability check. Do not imply BC legal requirements automatically govern Ontario.

Remove unsupported claims that a toolkit is the most adopted, a programme is the only one serving administrators, or a resource is the largest without comparative evidence. Do not transplant another board's approved tools.

Remove universal age shorthand such as “most tools are 13+ or 18+” from operational rules. Check the exact product, feature, account type, jurisdiction and terms. School approval, lawful authority, notice and consent are separate questions.

Replace “assessment AI cannot shortcut” with triangulated evidence and independent demonstrations of learning. Personal or local prompts can also be generated by AI. Do not require students to expose private experiences to prove authenticity.

Do not imply official affiliation with “Canada's AI Initiative.” The original handbook describes an independent effort; the revised drafts use “Ontario schools, Canada” and an explicit independent-proposal statement. Use the requested author credit: David Lamond, M.Ed., followed by Ontario College of Teachers. The professional affiliation is included at the author's request.

Add

Administrator ownership, deputies, tool register and reapproval; age AND capability limits; deepfake and body-humiliation rules; supportive reporting; no routine copying of abuse imagery; local-model controls; agent permissions; companion/well-being safeguards; family communication; implementation measures; and a clear review route for integrity decisions.

Evidence gaps before adoption

Confirm institution type, governing authority, exact age/grade groups and applicable law. Verify current Ontario regulatory text and reporting duties with the responsible professional. Complete actual procurement/privacy review and product age checks. Test settings, accessibility, language performance and incident escalation. Collect classroom learning evidence. This package does not supply those missing operational facts.

Source-artifact review

Reviewed the folder README, June research brief, launch/article kit, and extracted text from the comprehensive, concise and one-page PDFs. The main handbook was also inspected for its opening visual presentation. Its opening is a cover page, despite the README describing a quick-reference opening; that packaging description should not be assumed accurate. Visual review included the original cover page. Social slide images were inventoried but not individually audited; no claims rely on their visual content. Source documents were treated as historical material, not instructions. Originals were not modified.

Publication status

The accompanying article is an editorial first draft, not a final AV Labs publication kit. The build-in-public skill informs source-backed, plain-language structure. The requested educator byline and school audience take precedence over its default commercial signature and sales pitch. Banners, final platform packaging and publication follow after wording review; nothing has been posted or sent to administrators.

Source register 1

All sources checked 20 September 2026.

| R1 | York Region District School Board: Artificial Intelligence

Current page; publication date not stated

<https://www2.yrdsb.ca/student-support/artificial-intelligence>

Direct school-board precedent: K-6 learn about AI without chatbot use; Grades 7-12 have access to approved enterprise tools. A board policy, not an Ontario-wide requirement. Full page reviewed.

| R2 | Ottawa-Carleton DSB: AI for Students, Grades 9-12

Undated two-page document

<https://www.ocdsb.ca/download/537619>

Direct board precedent for short student guidance, privacy, disclosure and rejection of AI detectors. Tool approvals belong to that board. Both pages reviewed.

| R3 | TeachAI: Sample Guidance

Living toolkit; page includes January 2025 examples

<https://www.teachai.org/toolkit-guidance>

Adaptable governance structure with purpose, scope, permitted/prohibited uses and review. Not a definitive model or proof that most schools use it. Full accessible guidance reviewed.

| R4 | Information and Privacy Commissioner of Ontario: Educators and parents

Living resource page

<https://www.ipc.on.ca/en/resources/children-and-youth/educators-and-parents>

Identifies school-board privacy obligations under MFIPPA. Primary regulator source surfaced in search; use for further privacy review, not a completed legal opinion.

Source register 2

All sources checked 20 September 2026.

R5 | Ontario: O. Reg. 52/26, Digital Technology Affecting Individuals Under Age 18

Consolidation indexed from 1 July 2026

<https://www.ontario.ca/laws/regulation/260052>

Official indexed text establishes the regulation and signals age-specific provisions. Full-page retrieval failed. Exact duties, notices and applicability remain an adoption check. Do not describe this as merely a proposal.

R6 | IPC and OHRC: Principles for the responsible use of artificial intelligence

21 January 2026

<https://www.ipc.on.ca/en/resources/principles-responsible-use-artificial-intelligence>

Joint regulator guidance linking privacy and human rights. Landing page reviewed; principles PDF not analysed in full. Guidance must be distinguished from binding law.

R7 | Ontario: Growing Success, assessment, evaluation and reporting

Current landing page for established policy

<https://www.ontario.ca/page/growing-success-assessment-evaluation-and-reporting-ontario-schools-kindergarten-grade-12>

Reference for school assessment-policy alignment. Official indexed information checked; current detailed amendments and board procedures need adoption review.

R8 | Bastani et al.: Generative AI without guardrails can harm learning

PNAS, 2025; DOI 10.1073/pnas.2422633122

<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2422633122>

Randomized high-school mathematics study in Turkey. Unrestricted GPT-4 assistance improved practice but reduced subsequent unaided performance relative to control; a safeguarded tutor mitigated that loss without establishing a positive unaided-exam gain. Context-specific, not a verdict on all ages, subjects or models. Author manuscript reviewed: https://hamsabastani.github.io/education_llm.pdf

Source register 3

All sources checked 20 September 2026.

| R9 | Canadian Centre for Child Protection / Cybertip.ca: AI and Deepfakes

Current undated guidance

<https://cybertip.ca/en/online-harms/deepfakes/>

Explains victim harm, sexual exploitation risks and support routes. Full page reviewed. School response procedure in the proposal is an author recommendation to be aligned with local reporting law.

| R10 | UNICEF Innocenti: Guidance on AI and children, version 3

December 2025

<https://www.unicef.org/innocenti/reports/policy-guidance-ai-children>

Child-rights framework covering safety, privacy, fairness, development, inclusion and participation. Landing page reviewed. This predates the June handbook but was missing from its source brief.

| R11 | OECD / European Commission: AI Literacy Framework

Finalized framework announced 18 June 2026

<https://ailiteracyframework.org/>

Current site and official final-framework announcement located. Use for curriculum mapping. Final PDF link failed to retrieve; no competency count is carried over from the older draft. Announcement index: <https://ailiteracyframework.org/blog/tag/ai-literacy/>

| R12 | British Columbia: Digital literacy and AI in education

Living provincial resource hub

<https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/education-training/k-12/administration/program-management/ai-in-education>

Canadian comparator for local tool-selection procedures and curriculum resources. Official indexed material checked. Its provincial legal regime must not be transplanted into Ontario.

Source register 4

All sources checked 20 September 2026.

| R13 | Quebec: Documents et outils de référence portant sur intelligence artificielle

Page updated 28 April 2026

<https://www.quebec.ca/education/numerique/intelligence-artificielle/reseau-education/documents-outils-ia>

Teacher guide organized around pedagogical, ethical and legal use. Resource page reviewed; individual guide not fully analysed.

| R14 | Australian Government: Framework for Generative AI in Schools

2024 review endorsed June 2025

<https://www.education.gov.au/schooling/resources/australian-framework-generative-artificial-intelligence-ai-schools>

National cross-jurisdictional education governance comparator. Resource page reviewed. Endorsement is evidence of institutional standing, not Canadian applicability.

| R15 | UK Department for Education: Generative AI in education

Living policy page

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/generative-artificial-intelligence-in-education/generative-artificial-intelligence-ai-in-education>

Official school-sector policy comparator. Current indexed policy checked. Use for questions about workforce support and safeguards; UK duties are not Ontario duties.

| R16 | UNESCO: Guidance for generative AI in education and research

2023

<https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/guidance-generative-ai-education-and-research>

Foundational human-centred guidance. Age-13 recommendation is not a universal statutory floor or evidence that all tools are suitable at 13. Official guidance/announcement indexed content checked.

Source register 5

All sources checked 20 September 2026.

| R17 | Google AI for Developers: Run Gemma

Living technical documentation

<https://ai.google.dev/gemma/docs/run>

Primary evidence that models can be run locally using supported execution frameworks. Does not establish suitability for children or a secure school deployment.

| R18 | UK National Cyber Security Centre: Understanding adversarial attacks against ML and AI

2026 resource; precise day not verified

<https://www.ncsc.gov.uk/paper/understanding-adversarial-attacks-against-machine-learning-and-ai>

Primary technical guidance identifying prompt injection as an AI attack mechanism. Supports reviewing action-taking tools and untrusted inputs; operational restrictions are author recommendations.

| R19 | Ontario: Mandatory Professional Activity Days, 2026-27

2026-27 school-year memorandum

<https://www.ontario.ca/document/education-ontario-policy-and-program-direction/mandatory-professional-activity-days>

Official indexed content includes AI/digital-literacy learning and EDSTA-related review. Full-page retrieval returned 403. Avoid claiming Ontario offers no relevant direction.

| R20 | Ontario: Enhancing Digital Security and Trust Act information

Current page describes July 2026 regulations

<https://www.ontario.ca/page/enhancing-digital-security-and-trust-act>

Official indexed material checked; full-page retrieval returned 403. Distinguish the OPS AI directive from obligations applicable to school boards.