



Guidance on Using Artificial Intelligence (AI) in AAQEP Reviews

Artificial intelligence (AI) tools are increasingly available in today's digital workspaces. While the dynamic nature of evolving technologies may cause frequent adjustments to specific guidance, AAQEP approaches the use of AI in accreditation reviews in light of the following key principles:

- AI should support and not replace human decision making.
- AI must be used ethically in order to preserve the security of intellectual property and other sensitive information, confidentiality with regard to a provider's self-study and stakeholders, and the trustworthiness of peer review grounded in professional judgment.
- AI use must be acknowledged appropriately.

In consideration of the different participants in an accreditation review, AAQEP generally recognizes *providers'* prerogative to use AI tools in accordance with institutional/state policy; limits *reviewers* to using built-in AI tools for writing/editing only; and restricts *commissioners* from any AI use. The Q&A below offers more specific guidance for each of these roles.

Q&A on Using AI in AAQEP Accreditation Reviews

AI Use by Providers	
Can providers use AI tools when working on their AAQEP accreditation proposals, self-study reports, or annual reports?	Yes. Providers are welcome to use AI to assist and support their work as long as they follow any relevant institutional, state, and local policies and disclose where AI has been used.
How can providers disclose the ways in which they have used AI?	Providers must describe any AI use in the introduction and/or other relevant sections of their reports.
AI Use by Reviewers	
Can reviewers use AI tools to analyze or summarize content generated by the provider ?	No. Proposals and self-study reports are not only intellectual property but may include sensitive data that should not be exposed to AI systems. And because professional judgment is key to the review process, the expertise of each reviewer is essential in independently summarizing the case

	presented, reviewing data, and identifying clarifying and stakeholder questions.
Can reviewers use AI tools on content that they (the reviewers) generate ?	<p>Yes and no:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviewers may use text editing and refinement options (such as to improve narrative tone or to shorten features) within the key documents teams use in their review. Content generated by reviewers must not be uploaded to external platforms. To keep professional judgment at the center of the review process and to preserve its trustworthiness and accuracy, reviewers may not use the “summarize” or “analyze” features within documents. The expertise of each reviewer is essential in independently summarizing any notes or review of documents throughout the process without the aid of any AI tool.
How can reviewers disclose the ways in which they have used AI in their reports?	<p>Reviewers must disclose any AI use in the introduction and/or other relevant sections of their reports.</p> <p><i>Example: AI disclosure: The team used Google Gemini for writing assistance in refining some of this report’s narrative.</i></p>
Can reviewers use AI tools to record or transcribe their team meetings or stakeholder interviews?	No. These conversations are confidential; therefore these meetings may not be recorded or transcribed automatically.
AI Use by Accreditation Commissioners	
Can commissioners use AI tools to generate summaries of or questions about the provider’s self-study or the team’s QRT Report?	No. Self-study reports are not only intellectual property but include sensitive data that may not be exposed to AI systems. And because professional judgment is key to the review process, commissioners must independently review data, summarize the case presented, and identify clarifying questions.
Can commissioners use AI tools to generate decision language, notations, or rationales?	No. The trustworthiness of the decision relies on commissioners’ authentic professional judgment and communications about their actions.