

# AI Policy Development Checklist for Medical Education

October 2025

The AAMC created this checklist to help institutions develop or update policies to address the use of artificial intelligence (AI). This checklist was created using sample policies and resources shared by respondents to the 2024 AAMC AACOM Curriculum SCOPE Survey.

To learn more about how the AAMC is supporting and leading the advancement of AI in academic medicine, check out [aamc.org/AI](https://aamc.org/AI) for opportunities to learn and network with colleagues and experts, access other critical resources, and explore key collaborations across the global health professions education community.

## Contents

[Step 1: Policy Planning](#)

[Step 2: Policy Content and Structure](#)

[Step 3: Institution-Specific AI Access](#)

[Step 4: Implementation, Review, and Updates](#)

- [Additional Elements and Resources to Consider](#)
- [Institutional Policies, Guidelines, and Resources Used to Create This Checklist](#)

*Note: This checklist was developed with the assistance of OpenAI's ChatGPT (July 2025), which provided synthesized language and examples drawn from publicly available institutional AI policies.*

October 2025

---

## Step 1: Policy Planning

*Consider the purpose of the AI policy, the audience, who needs to be involved in its creation, and what policies overlap, should be updated, or connected.*

- ☐ **Define the purpose.** What is the goal of the policy? Is it to enable innovation, mitigate risk, ensure academic integrity, or a combination of these?

Examples: [University of Cincinnati \(UC\)](#) focuses on the ethical, responsible, and secure use of AI technologies. [Thomas Jefferson University \(Jefferson\)](#) leads with a clear purpose statement.

- ☐ **Identify the target audience (e.g., learners, faculty, staff).** Who is the AI policy for? Is it university wide? Or specific to the medical school?

Examples: [University of Illinois College of Medicine \(UI COM\)](#) focuses on student and learner use. [Johns Hopkins University \(Hopkins\)](#) focuses on faculty and staff involved in teaching. [University of Nebraska Medical Center \(UNMC\)](#) provides clear delineation of AI use cases across different institutional roles including students, faculty, researchers, and clinical staff.

- ☐ **Align or integrate the AI policy with relevant policies.** A best practice is often a central, stand-alone AI policy that serves as a single source of truth and is explicitly referenced in other relevant documents. Consider existing policies focused on data governance, data privacy and use, academic integrity, research ethics, and applicable laws.

Examples: [Jefferson](#) and [Cornell University \(Cornell\)](#) explicitly connect AI use to academic integrity statements and policies. [Boston University \(BU\)](#) and [UNMC](#) connect AI use back to existing code of conduct and research integrity policies.

- ☐ **Involve key contributors (e.g., learners, curriculum committee, IT, compliance office).** Who should have a role in developing, reviewing, and approving the AI policy?

Examples: [BU's](#) Using Generative AI in Coursework policy was codeveloped by learners and faculty. [Hopkins](#) ensured contributors spanned colleges and disciplines.

October 2025

## Step 2: Policy Content and Structure

Consider the format of the policy and what items should be addressed. Some items will be applicable, and others might not be necessary depending on the purpose of and audience for the AI policy.

- ☐ **Include the setting for the AI policy.** Will it apply across academic, clinical, and research settings?

Examples: [Jefferson](#) specifies all levels and learning environments. [UNMC](#) notes the policy is in support of academic, research, and patient care missions.

### Clinical setting-oriented items to consider:

- ☐ **Prohibit the use of nonapproved AI tools for patient-related activities.**

Examples: [University of California, Irvine, School of Medicine \(UCISOM\)](#) (citing the UCI Health policy in its student handbook) and [UI COM](#) prohibit the use of AI in writing patient notes outside supported electronic health records.

- ☐ **Prohibit the entry of protected health information or educational records into noninstitutional AI tools.**

Example: [UCISOM](#) warns against the use of third-party tools when working with sensitive data.

- ☐ **Require clinical supervisor approval and oversight when learners use approved AI tools in patient care contexts.**

- ☐ **Mandate compliance with federal laws, such as FERPA and HIPAA, and institutional data governance policies, with specific protocols for the evaluation and approval of AI tools.**

Examples: [UCISOM](#) and [Hopkins](#) require compliance with FERPA and HIPAA.

- ☐ **Define the responsibilities of the policy's target audience.** Require users to disclose AI use, verify accuracy of outputs, and document how AI contributed to their work.

Example: [BU](#) requires students to submit appendices detailing how and why AI was used in coursework.

- ☐ **Differentiate prohibited, permitted (with attribution), and encouraged uses.**

Examples: [Cornell's](#) three-tier framework for AI use consists of prohibit, permit with attribution, and encourage. [BU](#) offers suggested ways learners can leverage AI.

October 2025

---

## Step 2: Policy Content and Structure, continued

- ☐ **Clarify violations (e.g., using AI without disclosure) and consequences for unauthorized use.**

Examples: [UI COM](#) treats misuse as a violation of academic integrity. [Hopkins](#) suggests connecting with divisional academic integrity officers and the Office of Student Conduct to address violations of course policy.

### Faculty-oriented items to consider:

- ☐ **Set expectations for faculty.** State policies in syllabi and assess learning outcomes fairly.  
Examples: [Cornell](#) and [BU](#) call on instructors to model transparent use of AI and be explicit in expectations of use.
- ☐ **Encourage faculty to align their AI policy with course learning goals.**  
Example: [Cornell](#) encourages revisions to learning outcomes given the role AI may play in the course.
- ☐ **Acknowledge the unreliability of AI detection tools.**  
Example: [Cornell](#) encourages revisions to learning outcomes given the role AI may play in the course.

October 2025

---

## Step 3: Institution-Specific AI Access

*Use the policy to list all available AI tools and resources.*

### ☐ Address limitations in access to premium tools.

Example: [BU](#) acknowledges differences in AI tools that are free and those that require subscriptions.

### ☐ Provide a list of the AI tools your institution supports and has vetted for security and privacy.

Examples: [UCISOM](#) offers clear directions on the institutionally vetted, available AI tools and those that are blocked. [UC](#) lists all the AI tools available to its students, faculty, and staff.

### ☐ Include guidance for accessible and assistive AI use.

Example: [Cornell](#) supports Universal Design for Learning for fair AI integration.

October 2025

---

## Step 4: Implementation, Review, and Updates

*Create a governance plan, assign an owner, and develop an appropriate review cycle.*

- ☐ **Assign responsibility for policy oversight and implementation support (e.g., Office of Medical Education).**

Examples: [UI COM](#) and [BU](#) assign policy review to education offices or academic committees.

- ☐ **Schedule regular policy reviews to account for rapidly evolving technologies.** Most policies include annual or semiannual review clauses. Time stamping when the policy was last updated is also important. Policies should include clear criteria for emergency updates and stakeholder notification procedures.
- ☐ **Create a communications plan to effectively disseminate the AI policy to all community members.** Ensure the policy is published and available.
- ☐ **Update relevant training and job support materials to include AI policy guidance.**
- ☐ **Create feedback mechanisms for continuous improvement, including learner and faculty input on policy effectiveness and emerging needs.**

October 2025

---

## Additional Elements and Resources to Consider for Inclusion

- ☐ **Define key terms aligned with current AI research and medical education applications (e.g., generative AI, predictive analytics).**

Examples: [Jefferson](#) includes clear, accessible definitions as part of the policy. [UC](#) offers an “About AI” resource page. Definitions should reflect the evolving nature of AI technology and include relevant limitations and capabilities.

- ☐ **Provide practical syllabus templates and assignment modification examples for educators.**

Examples: [Cornell](#) provides guidance for assignment design, and [Hopkins](#) provides example syllabi statements.

- ☐ **Create FAQs or additional guidelines to address common questions and concerns.**

Examples: [Cornell](#) offers FAQs for faculty. [UC](#) offers general guidelines and additional guidance for students and research.

October 2025

---

## Institutional Policies, Guidelines, and Resources Used to Create This Checklist

*The following institutions have AI policies and resources that supported the development of this checklist. Their approaches vary; some have comprehensive AI information hubs intended for university-wide use while others have stand-alone generative AI policies that are specific to the medical school.*

### Examples of Institution-Wide AI Resource Hubs That Include AI Policies

**Cornell University.** Administrators at Cornell convened a committee in 2023 to develop guidelines for the use of generative AI for education at Cornell. Recommendations for faculty and university administrators were published as a stand-alone report and then converted into a user-friendly resource hub. This hub includes sample syllabus statements for AI use.

**Johns Hopkins University.** Developed by a diverse range of contributors, this site for faculty and staff at Hopkins presents guidelines and best practices for integrating generative AI into teaching. It offers a cross-university approach to supporting faculty and staff and is easy to navigate and use.

**University of Cincinnati.** Sponsored by the university's Digital Technology Solutions team, content is curated and intended for faculty, learners, and staff. This site was selected as exemplary because of its comprehensive, university-wide approach that features easy-to-use AI guidelines, resources, and tools. Links to relevant, existing policies ensure alignment.

### Examples of Stand-Alone AI Policies

**Boston University.** This institution-wide policy addresses the use of generative AI in coursework and includes clear requirements for both learners and instructors. This policy was created by learners in a computing and data sciences (CDS) course. The policy was then endorsed by the CDS Academic Policy Committee and unanimously approved by the CDS faculty.

**Thomas Jefferson University.** This policy defines the acceptable use of generative AI for learners in academic courses and identifies related policies, guidelines, and best practices. This policy is concise, focused, and clearly defines the scope, audience, and purpose.

**University of California, Irvine, School of Medicine.** The Office of Medical Education has integrated AI use guidelines into the student handbook. This policy is practical, concise, and focused on the tools available. It includes links to relevant policies from the clinical enterprise to ensure institutional alignment.

**University of Illinois College of Medicine.** Approved by the College Committee on Instruction and Appraisal, this policy focuses specifically on the use of AI for medical students, giving it a clear orientation and focus.

**University of Nebraska Medical Center.** Created by the Chief Compliance Officer, this policy focuses on generative AI use in the academic medicine setting. It leverages an institutional wiki page to connect with existing, relevant policies but offers a stand-alone AI policy that is clear, focused, and easy to navigate.