



AI-Assisted Communications Position Statement and Procedure - October 2026

Our Position

Twynham Learning welcomes communication from parents, carers and other stakeholders, including concerns, complaints, suggestions and feedback. We recognise that individuals may sometimes express dissatisfaction strongly, particularly where matters affecting children are involved. Open communication is essential to maintaining positive relationships between our schools and the communities we serve. We recognise that artificial intelligence (AI) is increasingly used to help individuals draft, edit and structure correspondence, and that it can improve accessibility, including for disadvantaged communities. We do not discourage the reasonable use of AI, nor will we refuse to consider correspondence simply because AI tools have been used.

However, the increasing volume, length and complexity of AI-generated correspondence presents a growing challenge for schools and many other public bodies.

Schools and Academy Trusts operate with finite resources, and they must balance the time spent reviewing, investigating, and responding to correspondence against their primary responsibilities for education, safeguarding, pupil welfare, and school improvement.

When used inappropriately, AI can generate extensive correspondence in seconds, sometimes containing multiple questions, allegations, legal references and demands for action. Such communications can require many hours of professional and administrative time to review and address. This can place a disproportionate burden on school leaders, teachers and support staff, diverting valuable resources away from supporting children and delivering education.

Of particular concern is the potential for AI to introduce matters or make points that the sender did not consciously intend to.

AI-generated correspondence can include additional allegations, assertions, hypothetical scenarios, legal arguments or requests for information which extend considerably beyond an individual's original concerns. Over the past few years, we have found on many occasions across Twynham Learning that when clarification is sought, it becomes apparent the sender did not intend to make certain points, does not understand some assertions, or was unaware that specific demands were included.

This creates an avoidable situation in which schools may be required to spend considerable time examining issues that were never genuinely intended to form part of the correspondence. It can also cause unnecessary concern or stress for staff or others who may be the subject of inaccurate or unintended allegations, assertions or statements.

Our responsibility is therefore twofold:

- 1. To ensure that genuine concerns receive appropriate consideration**
- 2. To protect the limited resources available to our schools from unnecessary, repetitive or disproportionate administrative demands.**

Human responsibility remains essential

We believe schools are about human interactions. AI can help individuals communicate effectively, but it does not replace personal responsibility for the content of correspondence.

Individuals submitting AI-assisted communications remain responsible for ensuring that the information, questions, allegations and/or requests contained within them accurately reflect their own knowledge, intentions and concerns.

The use of AI does not create an entitlement to unlimited correspondence, repeated reconsideration of matters already concluded, or individual responses to every question, assertion, hypothetical proposition or legal argument generated by an AI tool.

We therefore expect all AI-assisted correspondence to be:

- **Personally reviewed:** The sender should read and understand the entire communication before submitting it
- **Accurate:** Factual assertions, quotations, legal references and allegations should be checked for accuracy
- **Authentic:** The content should genuinely reflect the sender's own concerns, experiences, intentions and position
- **Relevant:** Correspondence should focus on the substantive matter being raised rather than peripheral or automatically generated arguments
- **Clear and concise:** Communications should identify the specific issue, any relevant evidence and the action or response being sought
- **Proportionate:** The length, frequency and complexity of correspondence should be reasonable in relation to the matter under consideration.

How Twynham Learning will respond

Twynham Learning remains committed to considering concerns fairly, respectfully and in accordance with applicable policies, statutory duties and regulatory requirements. We will always consider and respond appropriately to:

- New and substantive general enquiries, concerns or complaints raised
- Significant new evidence relating to matters previously considered
- Safeguarding and child protection matters, complaints & whistleblowing disclosures
- Statutory information requests, including Freedom of Information and Subject Access
- Matters requiring a response under legislation, regulation or the Trust's published policies and procedures.

Where correspondence has one or more of the following characteristics, the Trust may seek clarification, verify statements, consolidate its response or decline to provide further substantive responses:

- Substantially repeats matters already considered and appropriately answered or repeatedly seeks to reopen a complaint or review that has been concluded
- Reformulates previously addressed questions without introducing materially new information
- Contains extensive generic, speculative, peripheral or apparently automatically generated material unrelated to the substantive concern
- Includes factual assertions, quotations or legal references that appear inaccurate and may require verification or clarification
- Introduces allegations, requests or demands that the sender cannot confirm genuinely reflect their intentions
- Creates a disproportionate administrative burden through its volume, frequency or unnecessary complexity.

Managing Correspondence

Twynham Learning has a responsibility to manage correspondence fairly, efficiently and proportionately, ensuring that staff time and public resources are used appropriately while maintaining meaningful and accessible communication with parents, carers and other stakeholders.

The Trust will not assume correspondence has been AI-generated solely because of its length, complexity or style. Nor will substantive issues raised be disregarded because they are unsubstantiated when submitted or accompanied by inaccurate or irrelevant material.

To achieve this, the Trust reserves the right to manage correspondence in a reasonable and proportionate manner, consistent with its published policies and legal obligations.

Where appropriate, this may include:

- **Requesting clarification:** Asking the sender to provide a concise summary of the key issues they wish the Trust to consider, particularly where correspondence is lengthy, repetitive or contains numerous supplementary arguments
- **Confirming the sender's intentions:** Seeking confirmation that the concerns, allegations or requests presented genuinely reflect the sender's own position and that they wish the Trust to consider them
- **Applying established procedures:** Referring correspondence to an existing complaints, review or other relevant process to ensure that matters are considered through the appropriate channels
- **Managing concluded matters:** Explaining that matters already investigated, addressed or concluded will not ordinarily be reconsidered unless materially new evidence or information is presented, subject to applicable procedures and statutory rights
- **Using AI to support efficient administration:** Where correspondence is exceptionally lengthy or complex, the Trust may use its approved AI tool to help identify and summarise the principal matters requiring consideration, subject to appropriate information governance, data protection and confidentiality safeguards. The original correspondence will be retained, and an appropriately authorised member of staff will check any summary against it. The AI Prompt used will ensure that a concise summary of the key issues raised, along with any requests to resolve the matter, is produced. AI will never be used to help determine the validity, seriousness or outcome of a complaint. Substantive decisions and responses will remain the responsibility of school or Trust staff.

To ensure resources are focussed correctly, the Trust cannot permit the volume, repetition or complexity of correspondence, whether AI-assisted or otherwise, to divert disproportionate resources away from its primary responsibility to educate, safeguard and support pupils. It will nevertheless ensure that genuine concerns receive appropriate consideration and that decisions are taken fairly and consistently.

Any decision to restrict correspondence, establish communication boundaries or cease responding to a particular matter will be made in accordance with the Trust's relevant policies and procedures, with appropriate oversight by a Head of School, Headteacher, Executive Headteacher, Trust Head of Service, Trust Director or the CEO, as appropriate.

Such measures will not prevent an individual from raising genuinely new concerns, reporting safeguarding matters, exercising statutory rights or accessing applicable complaints and review procedures.

The Trust will always consider reasonable adjustments where required, recognising that some individuals may rely on assistive technologies, including AI, to communicate effectively.

This statement supplements, and does not replace, the Trust's complaints, safeguarding, whistleblowing or other policies. Where a statutory requirement or applicable procedure provides a greater or different right, that requirement or procedure will take precedence.

Taken together, these principles support the Trust's commitment to considering genuine concerns fairly, maintaining appropriate human oversight and managing correspondence proportionately. The Trust will continue to uphold statutory rights, safeguarding responsibilities and reasonable adjustments, regardless of whether correspondence has been prepared using AI.

Alignment with national guidance

Twynham Learning's position statement and procedure is informed by national guidance on the responsible use of AI, fair handling of complaints and proportionate management of public resources.

Department for Education (DfE) – The DfE's [Best Practice Guidance for Academies Complaints Procedures](#) supports schools in establishing reasonable arrangements for managing persistent, repetitive or unreasonable correspondence. Its [guidance on generative AI in education](#) emphasises human oversight, accuracy and accountability when using AI. These principles underpin the Trust's expectations that correspondence should be authentic, relevant and proportionate.

Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) – The ICO's May 2026 [guidance on AI-generated Freedom of Information requests](#) recognises the administrative burden created by lengthy, repetitive or unnecessarily complex AI-generated requests. It encourages accuracy, clarity and personal responsibility, while explaining existing statutory provisions for managing unreasonable information requests. AI use alone is not grounds for refusal, and the provisions governing information requests do not automatically extend to complaints.

National Governance Association (NGA) and Confederation of School Trusts (CST) – The NGA, alongside Browne Jacobson, has addressed [complaints in the age of AI](#), emphasising effective procedures and governance oversight. CST's [Governing AI in School Trusts](#) similarly highlights accountability, appropriate safeguards and responsible use of AI.

---END---