Ethics and Transparency Panel

Author:	Deputy Chief Constable Michaela Kerr
Date:	11th August 2026
Subject:	**Leicestershire Police Use of AI**

1. Executive Summary

Leicestershire Police recognises that Artificial Intelligence (AI) presents significant opportunities to improve efficiency, productivity and service delivery whilst also introducing ethical, legal and operational risks that require robust governance.

The Force has implemented a comprehensive AI governance framework through its Artificial Intelligence Policy and Procedure April 2026, supported by training, oversight arrangements and approval processes designed to ensure AI is deployed responsibly, transparently and with human accountability retained at all times.
A redated copy of that policy can be found at the end of this report.

The Force currently authorises only Microsoft 365 Copilot Chat and Microsoft 365 Copilot as standalone AI tools. Other commercial AI products including ChatGPT, Gemini, DeepSeek and Perplexity are prohibited for Force use.

AI is authorised to support productivity, administration, research, knowledge management and business efficiency.
It is not authorised for creating evidential materials, witness statements, MG forms or court-ready documentation outside specific approved trials. Human review remains mandatory and accountability always rests with the officer or staff member making the decision.

The Force welcomes external scrutiny and recognises the importance of maintaining public confidence through transparency, ethical governance and clear accountability.

---

2. Current AI Use within Leicestershire Police:

The Force uses AI in three principal ways:

- Supporting organisational effectiveness and efficiency.
- Supporting operational effectiveness and efficiency.
- Supporting decision-support and process improvement. [Artificial...April 2026 | PDF]

Examples include:

- Microsoft 365 Copilot.
- Automated document redaction tools.
- AI-enabled digital evidence management capabilities.
- AI-supported transcription and summarisation services.
- GoodSAM communication tools.

The policy recognises AI as an umbrella term covering machine learning, generative AI, large language models and natural language processing technologies.

---

3. Responses to Panel Questions:

1. *How will the public be informed about AI technologies currently deployed by the Force? Should a register be published?*

Leicestershire Police already publishes governance documents and policies governing AI use. Transparency is embedded as a core principle of the Force AI framework. Users must declare AI use within formal reports or documents where appropriate, and the policy contains explicit requirements relating to transparency and explainability.

The Force does not currently maintain a publicly available register of every AI-enabled capability. Many AI features are integrated into broader technology products, making a comprehensive register challenging to maintain. The policy specifically states it is not intended to provide a comprehensive list of all integrated AI tools.

However, there is merit in exploring publication of a proportionate AI transparency register covering significant AI-enabled systems used by the Force. Such a register could:

- Increase public confidence.
- Demonstrate ethical accountability.
- Explain safeguards and human oversight.
- Align with emerging national good practice.

This is an area that the Force will continue to consider as national policing guidance develops.

---

2. *What assurance exists that AI does not unduly influence officer decision-making?*

The Force policy explicitly states that AI must support, and not replace, professional judgement. AI cannot make operational decisions without human review and can never be used as justification for poor decision-making. Responsibility and liability always remain with the officer or staff member.

The policy also includes specific guidance warning against confirmation bias and the risk of using AI to reinforce pre-existing assumptions. Officers are instructed to frame prompts neutrally, consider alternative perspectives and verify outputs independently.

Furthermore:

- Human review is mandatory.

- AI outputs are advisory rather than authoritative.
- Formal governance processes prohibit operational decision-making by AI agents.
- All approved AI agents must retain human accountability.

---

3. *How frequently are AI tools re-tested for bias?*

Approved AI tools undergo risk assessment, ethical review and validation before use. The policy acknowledges the risk of bias and stereotyping and requires mitigation measures to be considered.

For AI agents developed within the Force, governance arrangements require:

- Testing with realistic scenarios.
- Testing of misuse scenarios.
- Review by subject matter experts.
- Defined monitoring and review processes.
- Annual review arrangements for approved agents.

As AI technologies evolve rapidly, revalidation is undertaken whenever major changes occur, alongside scheduled reviews.

---

4. *How are users trained to recognise algorithmic bias?*

Training materials developed by Team Leicestershire Academy emphasise:

- The limitations of AI.
- User accountability.
- Human verification.
- Recognition of bias.
- Secure and ethical use.

Force policy specifically requires users to:

- Be alert to bias and stereotyping.
- Identify harmful or discriminatory outputs.
- Challenge AI-generated content.
- Report concerning outputs.

All officers and staff are reminded that AI outputs must be treated critically and never accepted without review.

---

5. *How are diverse communities protected?*

The Force's Equality Impact Assessment explicitly considers risks relating to:

- Race.
- Sex.
- Disability.
- Sexual orientation.
- Religion and belief.
- Gender reassignment.
- Age.
- Pregnancy and maternity.
- Marriage and civil partnership.

The policy recognises risks of:

- Racial bias.

- Gender bias.
- Underrepresentation.
- Misrepresentation of minority groups.
- Potential adverse impact on LGBTQIA+ communities.

Safeguards include:
- Ethical review processes.
- Equality Impact Assessments.
- Human oversight.
- Transparency requirements.
- Mandatory reporting of biased outputs.

---

6. *How will AI use within OELs be identified and disclosed?*

The policy requires disclosure whenever AI has been used to support internal efficiencies in operational records. It specifically states that where AI has been used to assist writing an OEL entry on NICHE, its use must be disclosed.
For investigations, AI-assisted material must be retained, disclosed appropriately and accompanied by records of prompts, inputs and software used.

The Force is considering proportionate quality-assurance mechanisms, including audit or dip-sampling arrangements, as AI adoption matures.

---

7. *How confident is the Force that staff can identify unsuitable information?*

The policy provides extensive guidance on prohibited information categories including:
- SECRET and TOP SECRET information.
- CHIS-related material.
- Legally privileged information.
- Sensitive operational data.
- System credentials.
- Protected information subject to handling restrictions.

Comprehensive awareness materials have been issued force-wide.

While confidence is increasing, the Force recognises this remains an area requiring continual education, supervision and reinforcement.

---

8. *What monitoring exists to identify inappropriate uploads?*

The policy establishes responsibility for monitoring AI use through the Digital Board, Information Security and Digital Services teams.

Approved AI systems operate within secured Microsoft 365 environments, reducing uncontrolled data sharing risks.

Users are required to report concerns, incidents or breaches immediately and supervisors are responsible for escalation.

---

9. *Is performance management used where excessive AI reliance is suspected?*

There is currently no specific performance framework measuring AI usage volume. The Force focuses on compliance with policy rather than levels of use.
Where misuse, repeated policy breaches or poor professional judgement are identified, these would be managed through existing supervisory, misconduct, learning and performance arrangements in the same way as other technology misuse.
The key consideration remains whether work complies with policy, ethics and professional standards rather than the quantity of AI use.

---

10. How will emerging harms be identified?

The Force acknowledges that AI risks will evolve over time. Governance arrangements include:

- AI Working Group oversight.
- Productivity and Efficiency Board scrutiny.
- Digital Board monitoring.
- Information Security assessment.
- Annual reviews.
- Incident reporting mechanisms.

The policy may be amended rapidly if emerging risks are identified, and the Deputy Chief Constable acting as SIRO can revoke AI use where necessary.

---

11. If AI produced harmful or biased outputs tomorrow, how would the Force respond?
The Force approach is based on:

1. Detection through users, supervisors, audits and monitoring.
2. Reporting through supervisors, Information Security or Data Protection processes.
3. Investigation using retained prompts, inputs and outputs where appropriate.
4. Mitigation through corrective action, retraining, restrictions or withdrawal of tools.
5. Accountability retained with the individual and the organisation rather than the AI system.

The policy requires users to verify all outputs and maintain accountability for final products.

---

11. Should annual AI reports be presented to the Ethics and Transparency Panel?

The Force recognises significant value in continuing ethical scrutiny of AI and would welcome this being identified as one of the annual thematics scheduled for discussion with the panel.

---

4. Summary

The Force would suggest the following Challenges and Areas of Good Practice relate to our current use of AI:

Good Practice

- Approved AI policy with Chief Officer governance.
- Clear prohibition of unapproved AI tools.
- Strong information security safeguards.
- Mandatory human review.
- Equality and ethical considerations explicitly addressed.
- Formal governance pathways for AI agents.
- Force-wide awareness and training programme.
- Dedicated approval and validation framework.

Ongoing Challenges

- Maintaining public understanding of AI use.
- Keeping pace with technological change.
- Detecting subtle algorithmic bias.
- Measuring organisational benefits.
- Ensuring consistent disclosure of AI-assisted work.
- Balancing innovation with public confidence.
- Developing mature auditing and assurance arrangements.

5. Conclusion

Leicestershire Police has established a comprehensive governance framework that seeks to enable innovation whilst protecting public trust, evidential integrity and organisational accountability. The Force's approach is founded on transparency, human oversight, ethical use, information security and proportional governance.
AI is viewed as an assistive technology rather than a replacement for professional judgement. Officers and staff remain accountable for decisions, actions and outcomes at all times.

The Force welcomes ongoing support from the Ethics and Transparency Panel as AI technologies continue to evolve and opportunities to improve service delivery and protecting the public develop.

Ethical Dilemma Discussion:

To assist Leicestershire Police in assessing and further developing AI policy, use and safeguards – the force would ask the panel to provide their recommendations and insights into the following questions:

- What would increase your confidence in the Police's use of AI?
- What does 'fair' use of AI by the police mean to you?
- Are there particular communities or groups you think could be affected by AI? If so how do the panel advise on the risk being managed?
- How much information do you think the police should publish about their use of AI?
- If an AI-assisted decision is wrong, who do you think should be held accountable?
- What would ethical and responsible use of AI in policing look like from your perspective?

.

Please note that this report has been written with support from co-pilot, in line with force policy and guidance