



CODEBASH

CODING FOR EVERYONE

PROJECT ORACLE

Four-lesson teacher pack

A Year 9 AI and ethics enquiry

Under what conditions, if any, should Project ORACLE be used in a school?

A four-lesson sequence combining two digital investigations, evidence-based case preparation, a structured approval hearing and an individual verdict.

PUBLIC TEACHER GUIDE | PRINT ON A4

ORACLE is a fictional case study, not a real product. All incidents and people in the learning activities are fictional. Pupils use evidence to evaluate potential benefits, limitations, risks and safeguards rather than being directed to a single yes-or-no conclusion.

The public guide does not include solutions or lock codes. See the access note in this pack for the manually verified school request process.

Project overview and teacher setup

Project ORACLE is designed for Year 9 in four lessons of 70 minutes. Pupils work mainly in pairs for investigation, then in stakeholder teams. They collect evidence in the first two lessons, use it to prepare a case in Lesson 3, and test recommendations in a hearing in Lesson 4.

Project element	Teacher reference
Enquiry	Under what conditions, if any, should Project ORACLE be used in a school?
Possible decisions	Approve; reject; or approve with specified safeguards.
Learning outcomes	Distinguish rules, machine learning and generative AI; evaluate data and output; identify risks; reason from evidence; propose practical safeguards; justify an individual judgement.
Materials	Internet-connected pupil devices, access to the public tool, printed or digital case-file sheets, hearing prep sheet and individual verdict sheet, plus board/projector.
Assessment evidence	Investigation findings, evidence links, team hearing brief, spoken contribution and individual verdict.

Before the sequence

- Open Project ORACLE before the lesson. No pupil account is needed. Check that both rooms and the optional reading links work on school devices and the school network.
- Prepare one case-file sheet per pair, and make sure pairs can save or retain findings from both rooms for Lessons 3 and 4.
- Plan pairs and accessibility supports. Make sure both partners take part in reading, discussion and writing.
- For Lesson 3, prepare stakeholder allocations and a hearing prep sheet for each team. For Lesson 4, arrange the room and decide whether to run one or two parallel hearings.
- Two optional companion escape missions are linked after the five-stage investigations. They add closed-form evidence puzzles with no required writing; they do not replace the investigations or fit into the four 70-minute lessons without extra time.
- The activities use fictional scenarios only. Do not enter pupil names, personal circumstances or real school records into the tool or worksheets.

Read, discuss and write

Step	What the pair does
Read	Read File A, File B and File C. Find useful details from at least two files.
Discuss	Talk about what the evidence shows and what the school should do. Both partners explain their thinking.
Write	Answer the three questions: what you found, what the school should do, and whether your plan works when the new problem happens. Brief notes are enough.

What to look for in the answers

Pupils read the three files and talk with a partner. They answer three short questions: what they found, what the school should do, and whether their plan works when a new problem is introduced. Look for details from at least two files, a reason for the school decision and a practical response to the new problem. Different evidence-backed decisions are welcome. Factual checks are optional. Use optional research leads to test a claim, not to replace the fictional case evidence. After saving a stage, pairs can compare their reasoning with the summary shown and revise their answers.

Lesson 1: The AI Archive

Enquiry: How did computers move from following instructions to generating answers?

Learning intentions: distinguish conventional programs, rule-based AI and machine learning; explain why data matters; recognise that human-like output does not prove understanding; and check the reliability of generated information.

Time	Teacher sequence and instructions
0-8 min	Opening: What counts as AI? Classify a calculator, spellchecker, chess program, recommendation system, facial recognition system, chatbot and search engine. Ask whether automation alone makes something AI. Accept provisional answers and return to them after the investigation.
8-13 min	Introduce the investigation. Explain the fictional school decision. Model one comparison of File A and File B, then show the three questions pupils will answer. Both partners should take part.
13-38 min	Read, discuss and write. Allow about five minutes for each stage. Pairs read the three files, discuss the school decision and write three brief answers, including a response to the new problem. Adjust the pace if pairs need more time. Download their case-file PDF to keep or print. Optional research, factual checks and escape missions are not required.
38-50 min	Compare and improve answers. Pairs share one school decision with another pair. Ask whether it would work when the new problem happens, what still needs checking and whether they would change their answer.
50-67 min	Teacher-led debrief. Build a shared timeline from explicit rules to learning from examples and generative output. Discuss what changed, what remains dependent on people and data, and why claims need checking. Use the stage reference to discuss whether pupils' suggested safeguards would work.
67-70 min	Individual exit response. Pupils answer: What is one important difference between a rule-based program and a machine-learning system? Or: Why should a confident AI-generated answer still be checked?

What to introduce, not read aloud in full

Suggested brief: 'A fictional school is considering ORACLE. The governors need evidence before voting. You will read three documents in each file and compare at least two before making a judgement.' The pupil page explains the scenario and task. Pairs read the documents themselves; reading a card together or projecting one comparison is an optional accessibility support, not a requirement.

Teacher prompts during the room

Ask: What can you point to in the evidence? What are you inferring? What would change your mind? If pupils get stuck, invite them to compare two examples or identify what a system's designers specified, supplied or checked. Record one potential benefit and one limitation for later use.

Retain: five specific evidence details and hearing implications, the unlocked findings, a development timeline, one evidence-backed benefit and one limitation.

Quick glossary for pupils new to AI

Term	Plain-English meaning
Algorithm	A set of steps a computer follows to calculate something or make a recommendation.
IF/THEN rule	A written instruction: if a certain situation occurs, then take a stated action.
Learning from examples	Finding patterns in sample data instead of writing a separate rule for every case.
Generative AI	A system that makes new text or images from learned patterns; its claims still need checking.
AI winter	A period when enthusiasm and funding fell because AI had not met high expectations.

Lesson 2: The ORACLE Ethics Audit

Enquiry: What should happen when an AI decision affects a person?

Learning intentions: identify accuracy, bias, proxy, privacy, transparency and accountability risks; explain who may be affected; and recommend safeguards that can be checked.

Time	Teacher sequence and instructions
0-8 min	Opening prediction. Present the fictional recommendation that a Year 9 pupil has only a 20 percent chance of passing GCSE Computer Science and should not choose it. Ask whether the school should follow, ignore or cautiously use it. Pupils list what evidence they would need.
8-13 min	Audit briefing. Explain that the fictional governors want five proposed uses or incidents examined. Point pupils to the brief on the room page. For each case, pairs compare documents, consider who may be affected and suggest a safeguard. No real pupil characteristics are involved.
13-38 min	Read, discuss and write. Allow about five minutes per stage to read the files, talk and write three brief answers. Both partners should explain their thinking. Adjust the pace if pairs need more time. Factual checks and outside research are optional. Download the case-file PDF to keep or print.
38-48 min	Provisional decision. Each pair chooses approve, reject or approve with safeguards. Conditional approval must include practical safeguards linked to identified risks and remaining tests.
48-62 min	Compare and test decisions. Pairs compare with another team. Ask each to challenge one safeguard with a case scenario and explain a difference by referring to evidence, not preference. Revise a provisional decision where necessary.
62-67 min	Teacher-led debrief. Use the five Audit questions in the stage reference. Bring the discussion back to fairness, necessity, meaningful challenge and named responsibility.
67-70 min	Individual exit response. Identify one use of AI you would permit in a school and one safeguard you would require. Explain your answer.

What to introduce, not read aloud in full

Suggested brief: 'The governors now want to know whether ORACLE could be used responsibly. Your team will investigate five fictional cases and test both the evidence and possible safeguards.' Pupils read the three documents in each case for themselves. Read or project a document only when your class would benefit from shared reading or a model of how to compare evidence.

Safeguard coaching

If a pupil proposes only 'check it' or 'be fair', ask: Who checks? Which output or decision is checked? When? How can the person affected challenge it? What record would show the safeguard was followed?

Retain: five Audit evidence details and hearing implications, the unlocked findings, data-minimisation reasoning, allocation of responsibility, provisional decision and at least three proposed safeguards.

More words for the Ethics Audit

Term	Plain-English meaning
Bias	A pattern of unfair results, even when nobody meant to treat people unfairly.
Safeguard	A specific action that reduces a risk, such as a check by a named person.
Appeal	A chance to challenge a decision and have the evidence checked again.

Lesson 3: Preparing the Approval Case

Enquiry: How can evidence be used to build and challenge a convincing argument?

Learning intentions: connect claims to evidence and reasoning, consider stakeholder priorities, anticipate counterarguments, and propose safeguards with named responsibility.

Time	Teacher sequence and instructions
0-7 min	Retrieval starter. Without notes, pupils answer: one difference between rule-based AI and machine learning; one way training data matters; one ORACLE ethical risk; and one practical safeguard. Pairs then check and improve answers with their case files.
7-15 min	Hearing briefing and stakeholder allocation. Introduce the fictional governing board's three options: approve, approve with enforceable safeguards, or reject until substantial changes are made. Allocate one role to each team.
15-27 min	Organise the evidence bank. Sort findings into capability and benefit; accuracy and reliability; bias and fairness; privacy and data use; transparency and challenge; accountability and human oversight. Complete claim, evidence, reasoning and condition links using both investigations.
27-45 min	Construct the case. Teams prepare an opening position, two potential benefits with evidence, three significant risks across at least two categories, specific safeguards, a responsibility statement and a test for what evidence could change their position.
45-57 min	Challenge exchange. Pair with a different stakeholder team. Give each team two minutes to present its position and strongest evidence. The listeners ask an evidence, impact, safeguard and accountability question. Record the hardest challenge.
57-66 min	Revise and assign speaking roles. Improve the case in response. Assign opening speaker, evidence lead, safeguards lead and question lead. Pupils may hold more than one role in a small team.
66-70 min	Individual readiness check. Complete: Our current recommendation is __ because __. Our strongest evidence is __; it matters because __. The strongest challenge to our case is __.

Stakeholder perspectives

Stakeholder	Perspective to represent
School leadership	Consistency, efficiency, cost and school improvement, alongside responsibility for safe and lawful use.
Teachers	Useful support and workload, balanced with accuracy, professional judgement and accountability.
Pupils and families	Helpful and fair support, alongside privacy, explanation, correction and appeal.
ORACLE developer	Potential benefits and the case for approval, alongside honest limits, testing and responsibility.
Independent ethics panel	Evidence, proportionality, fairness and safeguards that can be enforced.

Facilitation note

A stakeholder role shapes emphasis; it does not require a pupil to defend an indefensible position. Teams may argue for conditional approval or rejection where the evidence supports it. Ensure every pupil contributes in a suitable way and retains an independent final judgement.

Lesson 4: The ORACLE Approval Hearing

Enquiry: Under what conditions, if any, should Project ORACLE be used in a school?

Learning intentions: present and test evidence-based arguments, assess whether safeguards are enforceable, and reach an independent verdict.

Time	Teacher sequence and instructions
0-6 min	Set up and conduct. Seat stakeholder teams facing the chair and governing panel. Give the evidence clerk a recording sheet. Display the sequence and rules: challenge ideas, cite evidence, distinguish fact/inference/opinion, allow position changes, and identify responsibility.
6-14 min	Team preparation. Teams revisit their brief, agree the strongest evidence and safeguards, and choose who will speak. The chair confirms the order and gives a time warning.
14-26 min	Opening cases: 12 minutes. Allow up to two minutes per team. Each states its stakeholder, recommendation, two reasons and most important safeguard. The clerk records positions without evaluating them. With more than six teams, use parallel hearings.
26-44 min	Evidence questioning and rebuttal: 18 minutes. The chair runs five rounds: accuracy and reliability; bias and fairness; privacy and data use; transparency and appeal; accountability and human oversight. Invite one question, a short response and one evidence-based rebuttal in each round.
44-52 min	Safeguard negotiation: 8 minutes. Build a proposed framework. For each safeguard, decide accept, revise or reject. The panel tests whether it is specific, checkable and likely to reduce the identified risk.
52-57 min	Closing statements: 5 minutes. Give each team up to one minute to state its final recommendation, the most important evidence heard, whether its position changed and its non-negotiable condition.
57-67 min	Individual verdict: 10 minutes. Pupils work independently. Their verdict may differ from their team's role. Require a decision, a benefit, two risks, evidence from both investigations, safeguards if approving, accountability and a reconsideration trigger.
67-70 min	Final reflection. Pupils answer: Which evidence had the greatest effect on your judgement? Or: Which safeguard would be hardest for a school to enforce?

Hearing roles

Role	Responsibility
Chair	Manages time, invites speakers, keeps discussion focused and applies the conduct rules. The teacher may chair or appoint a pupil.
Evidence clerk	Records claims, the evidence cited, questions and proposed safeguards without deciding the verdict.
Stakeholder teams	Present cases, answer questions and challenge claims using evidence from the case file.
Governing panel	Evaluates evidence and tests the specificity, checkability and likely effect of proposed safeguards.

Hearing setup, questions and decision test

Room and materials checklist

- Arrange stakeholder teams so they can see the chair and governing panel. Leave a clear speaking position and provide a visible timer.
- Place the evidence clerk where claims can be heard and recorded. Provide the case-file findings and hearing prep sheet to each team.
- Display the enquiry, speaking order, phase timings and the five question-round topics.
- For a large class, run two parallel hearings, each with a pupil chair and evidence clerk. The teacher can circulate and support access without being the sole decision-maker.
- Allow rehearsal, notes and accessible contribution options. Spoken performance is not the only assessed outcome.

Question stems for the chair and teams

- Which Archive finding or Audit incident supports that claim?
- Who could benefit or be harmed, and how do you know?
- How would the school know whether this system is working fairly?
- What information should an affected pupil receive, and who can correct it?
- Who has authority to stop or suspend the system?
- What should happen after a harmful mistake?
- Could the benefit be achieved by a less intrusive method?

Minimum standard for an enforceable safeguard

A strong safeguard states what must happen, who is responsible, when it applies, how compliance can be checked and what happens if it fails. Use the test: **Is it specific? Can it be checked? Would it meaningfully reduce the named risk?**

Possible framework topics

Permitted and prohibited uses; human review before significant decisions; checking sources in generated educational content; testing for unfair outcomes; data minimisation, access and retention; explanations, correction and appeal; ongoing monitoring; named responsibility; and suspension or withdrawal when standards are not met.

Access to the private answer key

Not included in this public guide

To request the answer key, email support@codebash.co.uk from a school email address. Requests are manually verified. The public teacher guide does not contain stage solutions or lock codes.

Safeguarding, accessibility and assessment

Safeguarding and responsible use

- All people, school events and pupil scenarios in the project are fictional. Do not ask pupils to disclose or enter personal characteristics, family circumstances, disability, behaviour history or safeguarding information.
- Do not use real pupil records as evidence or ask pupils to explain a risk through a personal experience. Redirect personal disclosures sensitively and follow the school's safeguarding procedures.
- Treat the tool as a fictional learning case study, not a real product, pupil assessment system or source of decisions about pupils.
- Set expectations for respectful disagreement. Pupils critique ideas, evidence and system design, not one another or groups of people.
- Use school-approved devices and network access. Provide a paper or teacher-supported alternative if a pupil cannot access the tool.

Accessibility and inclusion

- Offer vocabulary cards, shortened evidence extracts, visual timelines and read-aloud support.
- Assign pair roles clearly and use optional hints. Allow role rotation with a short verbal or written cue.
- Provide sentence starters and partially completed evidence-link grids where useful.
- Allow rehearsal before speaking and accept a recorded or teacher-supported contribution when speaking in the hearing creates a significant barrier.
- Do not make success depend on speed, colour recognition or reading dense text without support. Pair pupils strategically and provide additional processing time where needed.
- Extension: evaluate stakeholder conflicts, rank safeguards by effectiveness and feasibility, distinguish legal compliance from ethical acceptability, or write a reasoned minority report.

Success criteria

Level	Evidence of success
Emerging	Identifies a relevant benefit or risk, gives a simple opinion, refers to some evidence and suggests a broad safeguard.
Developing	Explains more than one benefit or risk, uses relevant case-file evidence, recognises another perspective and proposes a practical safeguard.
Secure	Connects claims, evidence and reasoning; evaluates competing considerations; uses both investigations; assigns responsibility for specific safeguards; and reaches a justified individual conclusion.
Advanced	Evaluates evidence quality and limits, responds to counterarguments, distinguishes acceptable and unacceptable uses, proposes proportionate enforceable safeguards and explains what new evidence could change the decision.

Assessment reminder

The individual verdict is independent of the stakeholder role. Assess evidence and reasoning, not whether a pupil chooses approval or rejection, and do not make public speaking the only route to demonstrating learning.

Optional research leads

Use these four short, focused leads to test a case-file judgement, not as a five-stage scavenger hunt. Each lead is linked inside the relevant room stage. External sources explain a general idea; they are not evidence that a fictional ORACLE incident occurred. The source card's original short summary provides a fallback if the site is blocked or a pupil needs a simpler reading route.

The AI Archive

Stage 4: What do AI and machine learning mean? | Raspberry Pi Foundation, Experience AI | 3-minute focused read.
[Open the source online](#)

In-room fallback: Their explanations for ages 11 to 14 distinguish systems built from rules from systems that learn patterns from example data.

Pair enquiry: How does that distinction help explain the two filters? What does it not tell you about Filter Two's reliability?

Stage 5: Checking AI-generated information | BBC Bitesize Guide to AI | 2-minute focused read: see the source-checking tips. [Open the source online](#)

In-room fallback: The BBC advises checking sources rather than relying on a single piece of convincing-looking AI-generated content.

Pair enquiry: Apply that advice to the unverified study in the archive. Which claim needs another source?

The ORACLE Ethics Audit

Stage 2: How can bias enter training data? | Raspberry Pi Foundation, Experience AI | 2-minute focused read: find 'Bias in, bias out'. [Open the source online](#)

In-room fallback: An example learning activity shows how a limited dataset can produce flawed or biased predictions.

Pair enquiry: How is the selection case similar, and what is different about the opportunity score's inputs?

Stage 3: Collecting only the data you need | UK Information Commissioner's Office | 2-minute focused read: first two sections. [Open the source online](#)

In-room fallback: The ICO explains data minimisation as collecting only the personal data needed for a clear purpose. This guidance is written for organisations, so use the short explanation above if the full page is difficult.

Pair enquiry: Which requested ORACLE data seems unnecessary for the stated schoolwork check-in purpose?

Teacher check

Open the links on school devices before teaching; external pages may change or be filtered. Pupils do not need an outside account or an external link to complete a stage. Ask them to name the publisher, distinguish source guidance from fictional evidence, and say what a source does not prove.

The AI Archive: case 1

Can ORACLE be trusted with school deadlines?

Decision: Should pupils use ORACLE to find out homework and trip deadlines?

A. Supplier's announcement | fictional trial

Six volunteers exchanged messages with ORACLE without knowing whether they were speaking to a person or a computer. Four thought they were speaking to a person. This trial was inspired by the imitation game proposed by Alan Turing in 1950. Volunteers called the replies friendly and convincing. The supplier says immediate answers, even when the school office is closed, show that ORACLE is ready for everyday school questions.

B. School information check | 12 questions

Staff checked 12 replies against current school information. Ten were correct; two were wrong. Both wrong answers matched an older information sheet. ORACLE gave no warning that its information might be out of date. Staff have not tested differently worded questions.

Question	ORACLE's reply	Current information
When is the history project due?	Friday	Moved to Wednesday
Can I return my trip form on Monday?	Yes	Forms due Friday

C. Pupil-support proposal

Pupils sometimes miss announcements or cannot reach the office at lunchtime. Staff also occasionally give outdated information. Immediate answers could help, but a wrong date could mean missing a trip or submitting work late. The school could restrict questions, try a limited pilot, or wait for more testing. Staff cannot check every reply instantly.

Read these files with your partner. Use details from at least two files when answering the questions on the matching sheet. Use the glossary if a word is unfamiliar.

The AI Archive: case 2

The rule machine

Decision: Which questions should the school help desk answer?

A. Help desk rule card

The fictional school tool follows instructions its designers wrote: IF the message says 'forgot password', THEN send reset steps. IF it says 'two deadlines clash', THEN send it to a tutor. Otherwise, send the standard help page. A pupil writes, 'I can do the homework on paper, but I cannot use the online system at home this week.' There is no rule for an offline way to hand in work. The tool sends the standard page, which only explains how to log in.

B. Technician's test log

The team tried 12 password-reset messages; all 12 got the reset steps. Four messages about offline work all got the standard page. After a technician added an offline-work rule, all four test messages were sent to a tutor. The test shows a useful strength: the same written rule gives the same response each time. It also shows that the tool did not invent a helpful new rule by itself.

C. Tutor's note to governors

The tutor says routine resets take staff away from other support. Pupils often describe the same problem in different words, and the office has limited lunchtime cover. One proposal puts an 'Ask a person' button behind the pupil login. Another allows a message without logging in but needs someone to monitor it. Neither route has been tested with locked-out pupils.

Read these files with your partner. Use details from at least two files when answering the questions on the matching sheet. Use the glossary if a word is unfamiliar.

The AI Archive: case 3

The abandoned laboratory

Decision: Should the school use Atlas to translate letters to families?

A. Atlas launch announcement | fictional project

The Atlas team says its computer will translate school letters into many languages reliably within two years. At a public demonstration, it gets 19 of 20 short sentences right. The sentences were picked in advance and used topics the team had practised. A school governor calls the display impressive and asks when families could use the tool. The team has not yet tried it on unfamiliar letters.

B. Independent test | six months later

Reviewers give Atlas 100 sentences taken from letters it has not seen. It translates 31 accurately. It especially struggles with unusual phrasing and messages about appointments. The reviewers point to limited computing power and too few varied examples to train or test with. They do not say translation by computer is impossible. They say that the demonstration did not show it was ready for real school letters.

C. Funding committee minute

The promised two-year deadline passes without a dependable service, and the committee cuts this project's funding. Other research continues. Falling confidence and investment after over-promising is sometimes called an 'AI winter'. The school still wants to reach families in different languages, but qualified translation checking costs money. It must decide whether to fund a narrow pilot, demand another test, or spend the budget elsewhere.

Read these files with your partner. Use details from at least two files when answering the questions on the matching sheet. Use the glossary if a word is unfamiliar.

The AI Archive: case 4

Learning from examples

Decision: Which email filter should the school use?

A. How the two filters work

Filter One blocks messages only when they contain phrases on a list written by staff. Filter Two was trained using messages that staff labelled 'spam' or 'not spam'. It looks for patterns in those examples. When someone sends spam using new wording, Filter One misses it. Filter Two catches some of it. Staff still have to decide whether the labels and examples they supplied were good enough.

B. Trial results | 50 new messages

In a fictional test, Filter One blocks 12 of 20 spam messages and incorrectly blocks one of 30 genuine messages. Filter Two blocks 17 of 20 spam messages but also blocks five genuine messages, including three club newsletters. The team calls Filter Two 'more effective' because it catches more spam. The school office asks whether missing a genuine club message also matters.

C. Training examples audit

The learning filter's examples contain many sales messages but few genuine newsletters. That could help explain blocked newsletters, but has not been proved to be the only cause. The team could add examples and test again. Keeping blocked messages for review would avoid permanent deletion, but the office currently checks that folder only at 4 pm. Some club messages need a reply earlier in the day.

Read these files with your partner. Use details from at least two files when answering the questions on the matching sheet. Use the glossary if a word is unfamiliar.

The AI Archive: case 5

The convincing answer

Decision: Should pupils use ORACLE's local-history fact box?

A. ORACLE fact box | fictional town archive

A teacher asks ORACLE for a short introduction to a local-history project. It replies: 'The town archive opened in 1912 and lists 840 maps. A 2022 study by the Centre for Civic Memory proved that every map is accurate. Pupils can safely copy details from any map without checking them.' The answer sounds ready to use. It gives no link or page number for the claimed study.

B. Archive catalogue search

The catalogue says the archive opened in 1912 and lists 840 maps. The number describes items in the collection, not how accurate their contents are. A search of the catalogue and its linked publications finds no study with the title or research centre that ORACLE named. That search is not proof that no such study exists anywhere, but the class has not found a source that supports the claim.

C. Archivist's advice

The archivist explains that some maps advertised proposed roads rather than roads actually built. Those maps can still show what planners hoped to do. The teacher has one lesson available and wants pupils to begin comparing sources. One pupil wants a simple fact box; another wants to inspect original maps. The class has not yet checked the date or purpose of the map chosen for the first assignment.

Read these files with your partner. Use details from at least two files when answering the questions on the matching sheet. Use the glossary if a word is unfamiliar.

The ORACLE Ethics Audit: case 1

The invented revision guide

Decision: Should pupils use this AI-written revision page?

A. ORACLE draft | not shared with pupils

ORACLE drafts a Year 9 revision page about rain and rivers. It says heat from the Sun can turn water into vapour and cooling vapour can form clouds. It then claims, 'Every drop of rain that lands on the ground immediately reaches a river.' It credits a 2021 article called 'Where Every Raindrop Goes' but gives no author, link or page number. The polished layout makes the page look ready to share.

B. Teacher's checks

The school's geography textbook supports the explanation about vapour and clouds. It also says some rain flows over land into streams and rivers, some soaks into the ground, and some later evaporates. The teacher cannot find the cited article in the school library catalogue or by searching for its exact title online. That does not prove it exists nowhere, but it means the draft's source has not been verified.

C. Department decision note

The department needs revision material this week. One teacher wants to keep the useful explanation after checking it; another prefers the existing textbook. Drafts can be regenerated or shortened after review, and the shared folder does not distinguish reviewed versions from new ones. The team has not agreed who approves changes or which version pupils will receive.

Read these files with your partner. Use details from at least two files when answering the questions on the matching sheet. Use the glossary if a word is unfamiliar.

The ORACLE Ethics Audit: case 2

The opportunity algorithm

Decision: How should the school choose pupils for its computing programme?

A. Enrichment programme score

The fictional school offers a limited number of places on a computing enrichment programme. ORACLE awards points for a home computer, optional online practice, after-school club attendance and past teacher recommendations. The form does not ask about income or family background. Staff say the score is quick and rewards interest. A pupil who shares a device at home can still be keen and capable, even if they cannot complete every optional task.

B. Pilot review | 40 fictional applicants

Of 20 applicants with reliable home computer access, 14 score above the invitation line. Of 20 without it, four do. The groups' average class-work marks are similar. Some high-mark pupils with fewer out-of-school activities are missed. This small pilot raises a question; it cannot show that every score is unfair or identify one cause of the gap on its own.

C. Selection panel discussion

The panel has fewer places than applicants and wants a consistent process. Practice and club attendance may show interest, but transport, caring duties and device access affect participation. A proposal removes the direct home-computer question while retaining those other inputs. Reviewing class work or hearing applicants' explanations would take longer. The revised score has not yet been tested.

Read these files with your partner. Use details from at least two files when answering the questions on the matching sheet. Use the glossary if a word is unfamiliar.

The ORACLE Ethics Audit: case 3

The schoolwork monitor

Decision: Should the school use ORACLE to spot pupils who need help with schoolwork?

A. Proposal | why collect data?

The school wants to spot when a pupil may need help with class work so a teacher can offer a check-in. The draft plan starts with recent assignments and school-platform sign-ins. ORACLE also requests school messages, search history, location through the day, private social-media posts, friendship information and past safeguarding records. The plan gives no reason why those extra sources would help with the stated schoolwork check-in.

B. Privacy review

A reviewer asks who could see the records, when they would be deleted and how a pupil could correct an error. The plan has no answers yet. Even school-platform sign-ins can mislead: a pupil might work offline. The reviewer suggests trying the least intrusive schoolwork information first, checking it with a teacher, and refusing unrelated personal information.

C. Meeting note | two viewpoints

A member of staff worries that fewer records might miss someone needing help. A pupil representative worries about tracking location and personal posts. Another pupil completes assignments on paper rather than online. Staff have limited time for checking alerts. The group must decide whether automated signals add useful evidence or mainly create more checks and unnecessary monitoring.

Read these files with your partner. Use details from at least two files when answering the questions on the matching sheet. Use the glossary if a word is unfamiliar.

The ORACLE Ethics Audit: case 4

The unexplained punishment

Decision: How should staff decide whether this pupil can go on the trip?

A. Trip screen | recommendation, not decision

ORACLE shows a fictional pupil a behaviour-risk score of 82 out of 100 and recommends not allowing them on a school trip. A teacher wants the trip to be safe for everyone, but the screen does not show which events or records produced the score. The trip decision has not been made. Staff are due to discuss it tomorrow.

B. Request to check the record

The pupil asks why they might miss the trip. A support teacher finds that two late arrivals are listed as behaviour incidents, but cannot tell whether those entries caused the high score. The pupil says a bus delay explains the late arrivals and wants the school to check. The current process has no clear way to show the reasons, correct the entries or appeal the recommendation.

C. Governor's question

The governor wants staff to consider safety without treating a number as the final decision. The trip leaves on Friday. The next scheduled appeal meeting is the following week. A family could provide information about the bus delay before Friday, but staff have not requested it. No named person currently has responsibility for resolving the disputed records before the trip decision.

Read these files with your partner. Use details from at least two files when answering the questions on the matching sheet. Use the glossary if a word is unfamiliar.

The ORACLE Ethics Audit: case 5

Who is responsible?

Decision: What should happen before the school uses ORACLE again?

A. Incident timeline | fictional case

On Monday, ORACLE links one fictional pupil to another pupil's record and recommends excluding the first from an activity. On Tuesday, a staff member sends the recommendation to a family without checking which record it used. On Wednesday, the family questions it and staff discover the mismatch. The exclusion was not carried out, but the family has spent two days worrying about a claim that was not based on their child's record.

B. Warnings and missed checks

The developer's trial log had already noted that the matching tool could link two different records. The school had not tested it with its own made-up test records before use. A staff member assumed a high score meant the record had been checked. The contract named no school contact responsible for reviewing important recommendations or pausing the tool after an error.

C. Repair meeting

The developer offers a software fix. Staff say the activity exclusion was never carried out, but the family received an incorrect recommendation and worried for two days. The contract names no person able to pause the tool. Nobody has checked whether other records were affected. The school must decide what evidence and responsibilities would be needed before restarting, rather than treating a code change as a complete repair.

Read these files with your partner. Use details from at least two files when answering the questions on the matching sheet. Use the glossary if a word is unfamiliar.

Pair case file: The AI Archive

Read the matching files with your partner. Talk about the questions, then write three short answers. Use details from at least two files. You can disagree if you explain why. Do not include real pupil or family details.

1. Can ORACLE be trusted with school deadlines?

Should pupils use ORACLE to find out homework and trip deadlines?

1. Compare the conversation test in File A with the answer check in File B. What do the two tests tell you? Use one result from each.
2. Would you let pupils use ORACLE for deadlines? Explain why. If you would allow it, say what the school needs to do first.
3. **Now try this:** A teacher changes the homework deadline this morning. ORACLE still has the old date. A pupil asks it when the homework is due. Could the pupil get the wrong date under your plan? Explain what you would change or check.

Question	Our answer
1. What we found	
2. What the school should do	
3. Would our plan work?	

2. The rule machine

Which questions should the school help desk answer?

1. Compare Files A and B. Which messages got useful replies, and which did not? Explain what changed when staff added a new rule.
2. Would you use this help desk? Say which questions it could answer and what a pupil should do if it cannot help.
3. **Now try this:** A pupil cannot log in. The help desk does not recognise their message. Its 'Ask a person' button is on a page that needs a login. How would this pupil get help under your plan? Would you need to change anything?

Question	Our answer
1. What we found	
2. What the school should do	
3. Would our plan work?	

Pair case file: The AI Archive

Read the matching files with your partner. Talk about the questions, then write three short answers. Use details from at least two files. You can disagree if you explain why. Do not include real pupil or family details.

3. The abandoned laboratory

Should the school use Atlas to translate letters to families?

1. Compare the sentences in File A with those in File B. How did the results differ? Why might that matter for a school letter?
2. Would you use Atlas for any school letters? Explain which ones, if any, and how you would check the translations.
3. **Now try this:** Atlas translates an appointment letter but gives the wrong time. The staff member checking it cannot read the translated language. Would your plan catch the wrong time? Who could check it, or what should the school do instead?

Question	Our answer
1. What we found	
2. What the school should do	
3. Would our plan work?	

4. Learning from examples

Which email filter should the school use?

1. Compare the two filters in File B. Which caught more spam? Which blocked more real messages? Use both results in your answer.
2. Choose Filter One, Filter Two or neither. Explain why, and what should happen to a real message that gets blocked.
3. **Now try this:** A real club message gets blocked. Pupils need to reply by 2 pm, but staff only check blocked messages at 4 pm. Would your plan let pupils see the message in time? What would you change?

Question	Our answer
1. What we found	
2. What the school should do	
3. Would our plan work?	

Pair case file: The AI Archive

Read the matching files with your partner. Talk about the questions, then write three short answers. Use details from at least two files. You can disagree if you explain why. Do not include real pupil or family details.

5. The convincing answer

Should pupils use ORACLE's local-history fact box?

1. Compare the fact box in File A with the catalogue in File B. Which claims are supported, and which have not been checked?

2. Say what you would keep, change or remove from the fact box. Explain why, using the files.

3. **Now try this:** A pupil finds a map showing a road and writes that the road existed. The map actually shows a planned road that was never built. Would your advice stop this mistake? What should the pupil check about the map?

Question	Our answer
1. What we found	
2. What the school should do	
3. Would our plan work?	

Pair case file: The ORACLE Ethics Audit

Read the matching files with your partner. Talk about the questions, then write three short answers. Use details from at least two files. You can disagree if you explain why. Do not include real pupil or family details.

1. The invented revision guide

Should pupils use this AI-written revision page?

1. Compare Files A and B. Find one explanation the textbook supports and one claim it contradicts. What happened when the teacher looked for the article?
2. Would you fix the page or use the textbook instead? Explain how you would make sure pupils get correct information.
3. **Now try this:** A teacher checks the page. Someone then asks ORACLE to shorten it, and the wrong rain claim comes back. It still says 'checked by a teacher'. Should pupils use the new page yet? What needs to happen before it is shared?

Question	Our answer
1. What we found	
2. What the school should do	
3. Would our plan work?	

2. The opportunity algorithm

How should the school choose pupils for its computing programme?

1. Compare the invitation numbers and class-work marks in File B. What difference do you notice? Use File A to suggest a possible reason.
2. How would you choose pupils? Say which information you would use, and how pupils with fewer chances to practise could still get a place.
3. **Now try this:** The school stops asking whether pupils have a home computer. It still gives points for online practice and after-school clubs. One pupil shares a device and has no transport home after a club. Could this pupil still lose out under your plan? What would you change or find out?

Question	Our answer
1. What we found	
2. What the school should do	
3. Would our plan work?	

Pair case file: The ORACLE Ethics Audit

Read the matching files with your partner. Talk about the questions, then write three short answers. Use details from at least two files. You can disagree if you explain why. Do not include real pupil or family details.

3. The schoolwork monitor

Should the school use ORACLE to spot pupils who need help with schoolwork?

1. Compare Files A and B. What is the school trying to find out? Which requested information seems useful, and which does not? Explain your choices.

2. Would you use this system? Say what information, if any, it should collect and what a teacher should do before acting on an alert.

3. Now try this: A pupil does their homework on paper and rarely signs in online. ORACLE says they are not doing their work. Would your plan prevent the pupil being wrongly judged? What should the teacher check?

Question	Our answer
1. What we found	
2. What the school should do	
3. Would our plan work?	

4. The unexplained punishment

How should staff decide whether this pupil can go on the trip?

1. Compare Files A and B. What does the score tell staff, and what does it leave out? What does the pupil want staff to check?

2. Explain what staff should check and who should decide. How could they hear the pupil's side before the trip?

3. Now try this: The pupil can ask staff to look at the decision again. But the meeting is booked for next week, after the trip has already left. Would this help the pupil join this trip? What needs to happen earlier?

Question	Our answer
1. What we found	
2. What the school should do	
3. Would our plan work?	

Pair case file: The ORACLE Ethics Audit

Read the matching files with your partner. Talk about the questions, then write three short answers. Use details from at least two files. You can disagree if you explain why. Do not include real pupil or family details.

5. Who is responsible?

What should happen before the school uses ORACLE again?

1. Use Files A and B to find one missed check by the developer and one by the school. What happened to the family?
2. Say what needs fixing before ORACLE is used again. Who should tell the family, check the repair and stop the tool if it makes another mistake?
3. **Now try this:** The developer fixes the software. The family still has not been told the claim was wrong, and nobody at school can stop the next wrong message being sent. Is fixing the software enough? What else must happen before the school uses it again?

Question	Our answer
1. What we found	
2. What the school should do	
3. Would our plan work?	

Printable hearing preparation sheet

Stakeholder represented: _____

Recommendation: ☐ Approve ☐ Reject ☐ Approve with conditions

Use evidence from both investigations. Link each claim to evidence and explain why it matters to the decision.

Claim	Evidence: Archive or Audit finding	Reasoning: why it matters	Condition / safeguard

Two likely challenges and our evidence-based responses

Challenge / counterargument	Our response and supporting evidence

Three to five safeguards (what must happen, who is responsible, when, how checked):

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____

Speaking roles: Opening _____ Evidence _____ Safeguards _____ Questions _____

Printable individual verdict sheet

Choose one: ☐ Approve ☐ Reject ☐ Approve with conditions

1. My recommendation and main reason

I recommend this because:

2. One potential educational benefit, supported by Archive evidence

Benefit and relevant AI Archive evidence:

3. Two significant risks, using evidence from both investigations

Risk	Evidence from an Archive or Audit finding	Why it matters

4. Specific safeguards (complete if recommending approval or conditional approval)

What must happen, who is responsible, and how will it be checked?

5. Accountability and review

Who is accountable, and why?
The school should suspend or reconsider ORACLE if:

What evidence or event could make you change your verdict?

Teacher quick reference

Lesson	Main product to retain	Teacher check before moving on
1. AI Archive	Five findings, development timeline, a potential benefit and a limitation.	Can pupils distinguish rules, learned patterns and generated output, and explain why output needs checking?
2. Ethics Audit	Five findings, data decisions, responsibility, provisional decision and proposed safeguards.	Can pupils name who may be affected and connect a risk to a practical control?
3. Approval Case	Categorised evidence bank, team brief, challenge received and revised case.	Does the case use both rooms and link claims, evidence, reasoning and conditions?
4. Approval Hearing	Clerk's record, negotiated safeguards, spoken contribution and individual verdict.	Does each verdict include evidence, accountability and a review or suspension trigger?

Public guide and answer key

The public guide includes no solutions or lock codes. Request an answer key via support@codebash.co.uk from a school email address. Requests are manually verified.