



AMERICAN
PSYCHOLOGICAL
ASSOCIATION

Responsible Use of AI in Assessment

A PRACTICAL OVERVIEW

APA COMMITTEE ON PSYCHOLOGICAL TESTS AND ASSESSMENT (CPTA)



Copyright © 2026 by the American Psychological Association. This material may be reproduced and distributed without permission provided that acknowledgment is given to the American Psychological Association. This material may not be reprinted, translated, or distributed electronically without prior permission in writing from the publisher. For permission, contact APA, Rights and Permissions, 750 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20002-4242.

Suggested Citation

American Psychological Association, APA Committee on Psychological Tests and Assessment (CPTA). (2026). *Responsible Use of AI in Assessment: A Practical Overview*. Retrieved from <https://www.apa.org/science/programs/testing/responsible-use-ai-assessment-full-report.pdf>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	II
Executive Summary	1
1) Transparency and Accountability	2
2) Bias and Fairness	3
3) Privacy and Confidentiality	5
4) Informed Consent	6
5) Competence and Training	7
6) Human Oversight	9
7) Impact on Applied and Clinical Work	10
8) Continuous Improvement	12
Conclusion	14
Glossary	15
Other Resources	17

Introduction

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is rapidly transforming the landscape of psychological and educational assessment, introducing both unprecedented opportunities and complex challenges. This document aims to provide psychologists and researchers with a concise yet extensive framework to assist in understanding and evaluating the ethical and practical implications of AI in assessment practices across diverse domains, including but not limited to clinical, industrial/organizational, and educational settings.

This document addresses critical decision-making junctures such as tool selection, administration, scoring, interpretation, and reporting, highlighting both traditional and emerging considerations to help ensure validity, reliability, fairness, and transparency in AI-enhanced assessment. While the primary audience is psychologists working in various sectors, the information herein may also benefit consumers of psychological services and the public.

By outlining domain-specific considerations and providing actionable resources, the statement empowers practitioners and researchers to make more informed decisions about integrating AI into assessment, helping them uphold the highest standards of professional practice and measurement.

Executive Summary

This document provides a broad framework for helping psychologists and assessment professionals understand and evaluate the ethical and practical implications of AI in psychological and educational assessment. As AI technologies become progressively integrated into assessment practices across clinical, industrial/organizational, educational, and other domains, psychologists are increasingly asked to navigate new opportunities and challenges to uphold the highest standards of validity, reliability, fairness, and transparency.

To assist in such efforts, this document addresses critical decision-making junctures—including tool selection, administration, scoring, interpretation, and reporting—by outlining domain-specific considerations and offering actionable resources. Key areas covered include:

- **Transparency and Accountability:** Psychologists evaluate whether AI systems are understandable, well documented, and supported by clear lines of responsibility for outcomes, recognizing that accountability for AI-generated results is shared among developers, organizations, and users.
- **Bias and Fairness:** Psychologists work to identify, evaluate, and mitigate biases in AI models, striving for equitable and just outcomes in assessment.
- **Privacy and Confidentiality:** Practices emphasizing robust data governance, privacy frameworks, and informed consent to protect sensitive information are essential.
- **Competence and Training:** Psychologists pursue foundational and ongoing education in AI technologies, measurement and assessment science, ethics, and human oversight.
- **Human Oversight:** Having active involvement of psychologists with relevant substantive and quantitative expertise to review, interpret, and intervene in AI-generated outputs is indispensable, and facilitates ethical and context-sensitive decision-making.
- **Impact on Applied and Clinical Work:** There are myriad benefits and risks of AI in various settings. Maximizing benefits and minimizing risks entails a dedicated focus on validation, fairness, and transparency.
- **Continuous Improvement:** Psychologists can best adapt to new research, technologies, and ethical standards by regularly reviewing and updating their AI systems and practices.

Lastly, this document underscores that psychologists have a professional responsibility within their scope of practice and influence to contribute to and uphold the ethical use of AI in assessment in collaboration with developers, organiza-

tions, policymakers, relevant stakeholders, laws, and institutional policies.

HOW TO USE THIS DOCUMENT

This document is designed to support psychologists and assessment professionals in making informed, ethical, and defensible decisions about the use of AI in assessment. It is not a prescriptive checklist or compliance guide; rather, it offers a structured framework to support professional judgment across assessment contexts, domains, and decision points.

Sections are organized around core considerations relevant to AI-enabled assessment (e.g., transparency and accountability, bias and fairness, privacy and confidentiality, informed consent, competence and training, and human oversight). Readers may consult sections selectively based on their role, setting, or stage of the assessment process; the document is intended to be used flexibly rather than read linearly.

Guiding questions within each section are meant to prompt critical evaluation of AI tools, practices, and outputs, including when reviewing vendor materials, designing or revising assessment workflows, conducting audits, or consulting with stakeholders.

This document is intended to complement—not replace—ethical codes, laws, regulations, and professional standards governing psychological assessment. Readers are encouraged to revisit existing ethical codes, laws, regulations, and professional standards as technologies, evidence, and expectations evolve.

Responsibility for the ethical and appropriate use of AI in assessment ultimately rests with qualified professionals. This document supports that responsibility by promoting thoughtful, context-sensitive, and evidence-informed practice.

This document was developed by the American Psychological Association (APA) Committee on Psychological Tests and Assessment (CPTA) and represents the views of its authors. It does not represent the official policy or position of the APA or any of its other boards, committees, divisions, or subunits. This document is intended as an informational resource to support decision-making by psychologists and assessment professionals. It does not constitute legal advice, establish binding professional standards, or create enforceable obligations beyond those set forth in applicable ethical codes, laws, and regulations. The considerations and recommendations herein reflect the authors' understanding at the time of publication and are subject to revision as science, technology, law, and professional standards evolve. Reference to external frameworks, standards, or organizations (e.g., NIST Privacy Framework, OECD AI Principles, EU AI Act) is for informational purposes and does not imply formal adop-

tion, endorsement, or approval by APA. Psychologists remain responsible for complying with all ethical codes, laws, and regulations applicable to their jurisdiction, setting, and scope of practice.

1) TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Transparency refers to providing users and stakeholders with clear, accessible information about an AI system's functioning. In psychological assessment, this includes reviewing available documentation describing how the model was developed, what data informed its training, and how its outputs are generated and intended to be used. **Accountability** refers to the presence of clearly defined roles and responsibilities for decisions informed by AI, ensuring that organizations, developers, and users understand their part in addressing errors, misuse, or unintended consequences.

Transparency in this case means that psychologists using AI as well as those involved in the development of psychological assessments that use AI can explain how an AI system generates its recommendations or scores (i.e., how the input leads to its output). Accountability means that both the developers of the tool and the psychologists who use it are responsible for the proper application of the tool and understand their part in addressing errors, misuse, or unintended consequences. For example, if an AI system is used to recommend interventions for students, transparency could involve clear explanations of logic behind each recommendation, and accountability can entail a process where humans reviewed and verified the justification(s) for each recommendation ultimately made.

Psychologists are accustomed to working to ensure transparency and accountability in traditional assessment tools by reviewing test manuals, technical reports, and validation studies. This work is assisted by their expert understanding of psychology and professional, legal, and ethical standards. Their assessment practices are equally applicable to all AI assessments. As a minimum threshold, psychologists can expect clear, accessible documentation about how an AI system was developed, what types of data informed its training, how outputs are generated at a conceptual level ("it just knows" is unlikely to be considered adequate justification in high-stakes decision-making contexts), and how its output may be best interpreted¹. They may also know how to use the tool appropriately and who is responsible for monitoring the system's performance and addressing any issues that arise, as well as procedures to follow should issues emerge (e.g., the process for alerting the developer about observed patterns of objectively incorrect outputs).



Just as psychologists ask, "Is the scoring procedure for this test clearly documented, and who is responsible for its accuracy?", with AI, they can also ask, "Are the logic and data underlying the development and use of this AI system clearly documented, do I understand how the results/outputs are generated, and who is accountable for its outcomes?" In cases where AI introduces new processes (e.g., automatically generating personalized feedback reports for students based on their test results, automatically screening job applicants), transparency and accountability help ensure that even those with limited technical backgrounds can understand the system's basic functioning, how the output is generated, and know where to turn if something goes wrong.

Guiding Questions

- Is the AI system's decision-making process explained in clear, accessible language?
- Who is responsible for monitoring, validating, and correcting errors or biases in the system?
- What are the procedures for reporting and addressing unintended outcomes?
- Is the AI system's logic clearly documented and accessible?
- How is the AI solution generating those outputs? Do I understand how the output/results are generated? Can I explain this process clearly to my client?
- How can I provide feedback to the AI-assessment developer so they can improve their products?
- What other psychologists can I connect with to impart and receive additional expert guidance?

¹ Defining the level of detail on how output is generated is beyond the scope of this document. However, formal recommendations on the level of detail can be developed and regularly adjusted as the complexity of models and the feasibility of describing how output is generated increase. For instance, is it sufficient to know what features are used to generate the output or do psychologists also need to know and explain the weight of each feature's contribution? Should there be different expectations for models of different complexity (e.g., one must know the features of traditional models but only the general logic and input data for deep learning models)?

Additional Resources

- American Psychological Association. (2024). Companion checklist: Evaluation of an AI-enabled clinical or administrative tool [PDF]. <https://www.apaservices.org/practice/business/technology/tech-101/evaluating-artificial-intelligence-tool-checklist.pdf>
- Best AI Agents. (2024, December 30). *AI transparency benchmarks: Tools and frameworks*. <https://bestaiagents.org/blog/ai-transparency-benchmarks-tools-and-frameworks/>
- Cheong, B. C. (2024). Transparency and accountability in AI systems: Safeguarding wellbeing in the age of algorithmic decision-making. *Frontiers in Human Dynamics*, 6:1421273. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fhumd.2024.1421273>
- European Commission Directorate-General for Communications Networks, Content and Technology. (2025, September 26). *Guidelines and Code of Practice on transparent AI systems*. Shaping Europe's Digital Future. <https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/faqs/guidelines-and-code-practice-transparent-ai-systems>
- National Institute of Standards and Technology. (n.d.). *Trustworthy and responsible AI*. <https://www.nist.gov/trustworthy-and-responsible-ai>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (n.d.). *OECD AI principles overview*. <https://oecd.ai/en/ai-principles>

Example Scenario

A school psychologist is considering an AI-powered tool for identifying students at risk of academic difficulties (e.g., lack of student engagement, low grades, potential dropout). Before using the tool, they review the vendor's documentation that explains the data sources, decision logic, what is being used to generate outputs and how, and known limitations. The vendor also provides a contact for reporting errors and a process for reviewing and correcting any misclassifications and clear instructions on how to use the tool appropriately, including suggestions for how to interpret the results/outcomes of the tool. This transparency and accountability enable the psychologist to make informed decisions and to explain the tool's functioning and oversight to students, parents, and school administrators.

2) BIAS AND FAIRNESS

Bias in AI systems describes systematic deviations from true values—think measurement error—that increase the likelihood of output errors. Biases can occur at any stage of the AI pipeline and are commonly referenced in terms of their origin and/or impact, but can be roughly organized into three types: *data or pre-existing bias* results from biases inherent in the data set(s) used to train the AI model (e.g., developing a new test for children based on information and data from

adult populations), *development or technical bias* results from the inappropriate use of algorithms when developing the AI model (e.g., using scoring rules from Test A to score responses on Test B), and *interaction or emerging bias* results from misuse of the AI system leading to impaired performance and outcome disparities (e.g., administering a test in a client's second language without consideration for the impact on psychometrics [automation bias] because the test is not available in their native language [privilege bias]) (Alvarez et al., 2024; Hanna et al., 2025). A concept related to bias is **fairness**. Whereas bias pertains to (systematic) technical issues in an AI system, fairness is a broader social concept that addresses concerns of ethics, equity, and justice that may arise from bias, as well as other assessment issues.

In the context of AI-based assessment, psychologists can attend to bias and fairness in AI systems in much the same way they already identify and mitigate the biases of different measurement instruments to promote fairness in assessment practice. This involves understanding the way an AI tool derives its outcomes and the factors plausibly affecting its reliability and validity. This includes the degree to which the training data match salient characteristics and culture of the examinee and the fit between the AI tool's designed purpose and its use in assessment. For example, speech-to-text transcriptions of clinical material performed by general large language models (LLMs) can contain more errors than domain-specific LLMs (Hou et al., 2025), illustrating AI tools designed for general use are not guaranteed to perform well in specialized applications like assessment.

Thus, just as psychologists regularly ask, "What actual or potential bias(es) could this test introduce if used with this examinee?" and "Based on the entirety of information I have about the test instrument and examinee, and in the context of the referral question(s), does the use of this test improve what is our shared understanding of fairness?", these questions can also be asked when deciding whether and how to use a specific AI tool during assessment. Ultimately, that decision depends on an informed, professional judgment guided by the situation-specific pros and cons of using the AI tool. Fortunately, different approaches have been proposed to help developers and users identify and evaluate bias and fairness in AI models (e.g., Wang et al., 2022).

Guiding Questions

- What is my purpose for using this AI tool, and what are the expected gains?
 - What evidence exists supporting the way I intend to use this AI tool? [Akin to comparing different tests for construct relevance, decision-making effectiveness, and other psychometric properties when planning an assessment battery.]
 - What evidence exists challenging the way I intend to use this AI tool?



- » What evidence is missing from the vendor's documentation and broader literature?
- What are the similarities and differences between my examinee and the population(s) from which the training data used to create this AI tool were sourced?
 - » What types of biases are possible and relevant due to these similarities and differences?
- What types of disparities might result from or be perpetrated by using this AI tool in this way with this examinee?
 - » How do those disparities compare to the expected gains from using this AI tool with this examinee in this situation?
- How is fairness as a social concept defined and agreed upon in the current situation?
 - » Given this definition, how is it operationalized?
 - » Based on this operationalization, which choice of AI-based assessment—including not using the AI tool—improves fairness and how?
- What viable alternatives to using the AI tool exist, including those that might not deliver the expected gains of the AI tool but might better minimize bias and maximize fairness?

Additional Resources

- Alvarez, J. M., Colmenarejo, A. B., Elobaid, A., Fabbrizzi, S., Fahimi, M., Ferrara, A., Ghodsi, S., Mougán, C., Papa-georgiou, I., Reyero, P., Russo, M., Scott, K. M., State, L., Zhao, X., & Ruggieri, S. (2024). Policy advice and best practices on bias and fairness in AI. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 26:31. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-024-09746-w>
- Bundy, A. (2016). Preparing for the future of artificial intelligence. *AI & Society: Knowledge, Culture, and Communications*, 32(2), 285–287. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-016-0685-0>

- Fulmer, R., Davis, T., Costello, C., & Joerin, A. (2021). The ethics of psychological artificial intelligence: Clinical considerations. *Counseling and Values*, 66, 131–144. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cvj.12153>
- Hagendorff, T. (2020). The ethics of AI ethics: An evaluation of guidelines. *Minds and Machines*, 30, 99–120. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-020-09517-8>
- Hanna, M. G., Pantanowitz, L., Jackson, B., Palmer, O., Visweswaran, S., Pantanowitz, J., Deebajah, M., & Rashidi, H. H. (2025). Ethical and bias considerations in artificial intelligence/machine learning. *Modern Pathology*, 38(3): 100686. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.modpat.2024.100686>
- Hou, Z., Liu, H., Bian, J., He, X., & Zhuang, Y. (2025). Enhancing medical coding efficiency through domain-specific fine-tuned large language models. *NPJ Health Systems*, 2(1): 14. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s44401-025-00018-3>
- House of Lords. (2018). *AI in the UK: Ready, willing and able?* <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld201719/ldselect/ldai/100/100.pdf>
- Wang, H. E., Landers, M., Adams, R., Subbaswamy, A., Kharrazi, H., Gaskin, D. J., & Saria, S. (2022). A bias evaluation checklist for predictive models and its pilot application for 30-day hospital readmission models. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association: JAMIA*, 29(8), 1323–1333. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocac065>
- Yudkowsky, E. (2008). Artificial intelligence as a positive and negative factor in global risk. In N. Bostrom & M. M. Čirković (Eds.), *Global catastrophic risks* (pp. 1–45). Oxford University Press.
- Yudkowsky, E., & Bostrom, N. (2011). The ethics of artificial intelligence. In K. Frankish & W. Ramsey (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of artificial intelligence* (pp. 316–334). Cambridge University Press.

Example Scenario

A clinical psychologist's health system recently integrated an AI-enabled documentation tool into its electronic health

record to help clinicians summarize interview notes and draft preliminary report language. The vendor markets the tool for general clinical documentation and suggests it can support assessment documentation, including results summarization and report writing. Before using the tool in psychological assessment work, the psychologist reviews vendor documentation (see Transparency and Accountability), institutional policy, and the scholarly literature to evaluate the tool's performance on assessment documentation tasks, privacy protections, and differential error patterns (differential bias) across patient groups. She finds evidence that the tool performs adequately for general note summarization but limited evidence for assessment contexts. Given feasible alternatives, she elects to limit use of the tool to administrative note summarization and relies on established assessment procedures for assessment documentation tasks.

3) PRIVACY AND CONFIDENTIALITY

Privacy refers to an individual's right to control their personal information, whereas **confidentiality** is the obligation to protect that information from unauthorized access or disclosure. In the context of AI-powered assessment, these principles advise that sensitive data, such as test responses, demographic details, protected health information, or behavioral indicators, are collected, processed, and stored securely, with clear boundaries on who can access the data and for what purposes. For example, if an AI tool is used to analyze student essays for a psychoeducational assessment, privacy and confidentiality dictate that the essays be securely stored, not be repurposed for unrelated research or commercial uses without explicit consent, and if appropriate, be anonymized. Client data/information, including but not limited to test responses, are not processed on public, consumer-grade versions of LLMs and would be handled using systems that demonstrably meet applicable privacy, security, and data-governance standards.

Psychologists are already familiar with privacy and confidentiality through practices such as obtaining informed consent, limiting data collection to what is necessary, and securing records. These practices apply to AI, such that psychologists can work toward ensuring that AI systems comply with recognized privacy frameworks (e.g., the NIST Privacy Framework 1.1 that addresses AI-specific risks like inadvertent exposure and bias and the OECD AI Principles that emphasize privacy by design and robust data governance).

Just as psychologists ask, "Are client data stored securely and only accessible to authorized personnel?," with AI, they could also ask, "Does this AI system restrict access and provide clear data retention and deletion policies?" In cases where AI introduces new risks, such as the potential for data to be used in model training or for unintended inferences, privacy and confidentiality require proactive safeguards and transparent communication with clients.

Guiding Questions

- Are only the minimum necessary data collected and processed by the AI system?
- Are data anonymization and encryption practices in place?
- Who has access to the data, with what access privileges and for how long, and are there clear and acceptable policies for retention and deletion?
- Have clients been informed about how their data will be stored, secured, and used by AI, and have they consented?
- Does the AI system have safeguards to prevent unauthorized use or disclosure of data? If an unauthorized use or disclosure occurs, will I be notified by the AI system and how/when?

Additional Resources

- Eliot, L. (2023, January 27). Generative AI ChatGPT can disturbingly gobble up your private and confidential data, forewarns AI ethics and AI law. Forbes. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/lanceeliot/2023/01/27/generative-ai-chatgpt-can-disturbingly-gobble-up-your-private-and-confidential-data-forewarns-ai-ethics-and-ai-law/?sh=3cac963d7fdb>
- Heikkilä, M. (2023, April 19). OpenAI's hunger for data is coming back to bite it. MIT Technology Review. <https://www.technologyreview.com/2023/04/19/1071789/openais-hunger-for-data-is-coming-back-to-bite-it>
- Maxwell, W., Girot, C., & Perset, K. (2024, June 26). *Six crucial policy considerations for AI, data governance, and privacy: Insights from the OECD*. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. <https://oecd.ai/en/wonk/six-policy-considerations-ai-data-governance-and-privacy>
- National Institute of Standards and Technology. (n.d.). *Privacy framework*. <https://www.nist.gov/privacy-framework>
- Nield, D. (2023, July 16). How to use generative AI tools while still protecting your privacy. Wired. <https://www.wired.com/story/how-to-use-ai-tools-protect-privacy>
- OpenAI. (2023, June 23). Privacy policy. OpenAI. <https://openai.com/policies/privacy-policy>
- Schade, M. (n.d.). Data usage for consumer services FAQ. OpenAI. <https://help.openai.com/en/articles/7039943-data-usage-for-consumer-services-faq>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2021, August 25). Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). <https://studentprivacy.ed.gov/ferpa>

Example Scenario

A school psychologist uses an AI tool to screen for learning difficulties. Before implementation, they ensure that student

responses are anonymized, stored in encrypted databases, and only accessible to authorized staff. The consent form explains how the AI will use and retain data, and the psychologist verifies that the tool complies with all applicable privacy guidelines. This approach protects student privacy and maintains confidentiality, even as new technologies are adopted.

4) INFORMED CONSENT

Prior to delivery of services, psychologists identify the “client” and, except when otherwise exempt, obtain and document informed consent (and assent when relevant) prior to the initiation of testing using language understandable to the individual(s) involved (APA, 2017). To the extent reasonable and possible, information about the testing purpose and process, including confidentiality protections (see Privacy and Confidentiality) are made available free of charge and in accessible formats to all clients and examinees prior to testing (AERA, APA, & NCME, 2014). Obtaining specific permissions for the use of certain technologies during the assessment process (e.g., audio recording, telepsychology) is also a recommended best practice (APA, 2017, 2024). These standards and practice guidelines naturally extend to the use of AI systems in the assessment process and offer relatively clear direction for obtaining and documenting both permission and informed consent from clients and examinees prior to AI use.

Although psychologists are already acquainted with the process of informing clients and examinees about the above topics, determining which information about an AI system is relevant and how to provide an appropriately accessible explanation of sometimes complex AI tools might seem confusing and daunting. However, the responsibility of attaining the level

of competence needed to do so rests with the psychologist, consistent with professional ethical standards and in coordination with available training and consultation (see Competency and Training). Psychologists aspire to clearly explain key characteristics of the AI system (e.g., general operational mechanisms, privacy limitations, evidence of utility), how and why they wish to use the AI tool, and distinctive considerations associated with its use, as well as available alternatives and possible undesired outcomes from not using the AI system. This aspiration aligns with the current ethical code of several relevant organizations and contemporary standards and best practices of the field (AERA, APA, & NCME, 2014; APA, 2017, 2024). While striving for transparency, actual scoring, however, does not need to be explained in detail (to uphold test security and validity).

Guiding Questions

- Who is the “client” and are there other involved parties that could or should provide informed consent for the use of an AI tool during this assessment?
- How and why is this AI tool being used for this assessment?
- What are the general operational mechanisms of this AI tool and how will it be implemented during this assessment?
 - » Is it permissible, feasible, and not contraindicated to provide the client and other relevant parties copies of the vendor’s documentation? If so, is this documentation both clear and accessible?
 - » How does the vendor’s documentation describe the AI system’s limits of privacy and confidentiality? If the AI system does not have adequate security measures, can additional protections be reasonably put in place? How do I clearly inform the client and other relevant parties of the risks to privacy and limits of confidentiality?
 - » Does the AI system alert me to any unauthorized use or release of information? If so, when and how would I be alerted?
- What risks and undesired outcomes are possible when using this AI tool? What gains are possible when using this AI tool?
- What information or operational mechanisms are contraindicated and/or not appropriate for disclosure to the client and/or other involved parties (e.g., disclosure of specific details pertaining to how an AI-powered automated scoring tool derives scores)?
 - » How can I maximize transparency to allow the client to make an adequately informed decision without jeopardizing the integrity and security of test materials or other assessment techniques, including that of the AI system or tool?



Additional Resources

- Ad Hoc Task Force on AI-Based Assessments. (2023, January). SIOP statements: Considerations and recommendations for the validation and use of AI-based assessments for employee selection. <https://www.siop.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/Considerations-and-Recommendations-for-the-Validation-and-Use-of-AI-Based-Assessments-for-Employee-Selection-January-2023.pdf>
- American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education (Eds.). (2014). Standards for educational and psychological testing. AERA.
- American Psychological Association. (2017). *Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct* (2002, amended effective June 1, 2010, and January 1, 2017). <https://www.apa.org/ethics/code>
- American Psychological Association (2024). *Proposed Revision of Guidelines for the Practice of Telepsychology*. Retrieved from <https://www.apa.org/practice/guidelines/telepsychology-revisions.pdf>
- American Psychological Association. (2025, December). *Ethical guidance for AI in the professional practice of health service psychology*. Psychology Topics. <https://www.apa.org/topics/artificial-intelligence-machine-learning/ethical-guidance-ai-professional-practice>
- Cohen, I. G., & Slottje, A. (2024). Artificial intelligence and the law of informed consent. In B. Solaiman & I. G. Cohen (Eds.), *Research handbook on health, AI and the law*. (pp. 167-182). Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781802205657.ch10>

Example Scenario

An Industrial/Organizational (I/O) psychologist is contracted by a private airline to conduct annual psychological evaluations of company pilots who receive aerial firefighting assignments. One component of the annual evaluation is completion of two flights using an AI-powered virtual reality full flight simulator (AI-VR-FFS) that allows the psychologist to assess, among other things, pilots' executive functioning and aeronautical decision-making skills. Prior to conducting any evaluations involving the AI-VR-FFS, the psychologist completed a 4-hour training offered by the vendor to attain competence in its use, including a thorough understanding of its operational mechanisms. As the psychologist identified the company as the "client," she determined that obtaining informed consent from the individual pilots was not required; however, following professional best practices, she decided to obtain assent. As part of the broader assenting process, the psychologist explains the purpose and general operating mechanisms of the AI-VR-FFS, provides each pilot access to documentation from the vendor on the development and validation of the AI system used by the simulator, outlines



how their data are securely retained for six years prior to deletion, and states that no feasible alternatives are available. She then obtains and documents each pilot's written assent prior to initiating their evaluation.

5) COMPETENCE AND TRAINING

Foundations of psychologists' competencies are established during their pre-professional training years through coursework, experiential learning opportunities and supervision, and other scholarly endeavors (e.g., research involvement). Psychologists' ongoing efforts to maintain and advance their competencies are supported by formal and informal education and training grounded in established scientific and professional knowledge. When psychologists plan to provide services and engage in other professional activities new to them or involving novel components, such as the use of AI in assessment, they are required to pursue and attain relevant competencies through venues such as education, training, consultation and supervised experiences, and self-study (APA, 2014).

AI systems and tools are increasingly embedded within the work of psychologists, strongly encouraging psychologists to possess at least basic competencies in both AI technologies and their ethical use. For both emerging and established psychologists, a wide range of workshops, asynchronous training materials (e.g., webinars), and other training and resources specifically focused on applications of AI in psychological assessment are available. However, the current lack of generally recognized standards for preparatory training obliges psychologists to evaluate AI training resources carefully, and employ AI assessment tools with excess caution, always taking reasonable steps to consistently develop their competencies while prioritizing the protection of clients, examinees, and other involved parties.

If you plan to use an AI-enhanced assessment, consider



beginning with foundational training in the following areas, along with relevant application-specific training that might be available:

1. **AI Fundamentals:** Understanding basic concepts in AI, including machine learning, natural language processing, and algorithmic decision-making, as well as introductory principles of both generative and agentic AI systems.
2. **Human Oversight:** Understanding how to review, interpret, and intervene in AI-generated outputs to ensure professional judgment remains central.
3. **Tool-Specific Training:** Completion of training offered by the vendors of the tools you plan to use, including operational mechanisms, documentation, and security protocols.
4. **Continuing Education:** Participate in professional development opportunities focused on AI in assessment.

Guiding Questions

- Have I completed foundational training in both AI technologies and assessment science relevant to my practice area?
- What knowledge and skills have I acquired for using a given AI system or tool as I wish to use it in assessment?
- Do I understand the operational mechanisms, limitations, and intended uses of the specific AI tool I plan to use?
 - » Am I familiar with the vendor's documentation and contemporary literature relevant for the AI system or tool?
 - » Am I familiar with the legal, ethical, and professional standards governing the use of AI in assessment within my jurisdiction and specialty, and those governing the use of this AI system or tool as I plan for it to be used?
 - » Have I received training in identifying and mitigating bias, ensuring fairness, and safeguarding privacy when using AI in assessment?

» Have I attained a level of competence that allows me to apply this knowledge and these skills effectively in practice?

- Where can I find relevant education, training, supervised experiences, consultation, and other opportunities for building my competencies in AI and its use in assessment?
- Do I have access to ongoing professional development, supervision, or consultation to maintain and advance my competencies in AI-enhanced assessment?
- Have I established or otherwise identified a process for reviewing AI-generated outputs, intervening when necessary, and documenting my oversight?
- Am I prepared to communicate the role, risks, and benefits of AI tools to clients and other stakeholders in clear, accessible language?

Additional Resources

- To support ongoing competence and training in AI-enhanced assessment, psychologists are encouraged to consult authoritative resources and participate in professional development opportunities created by recognized organizations.

Example Scenario

Student: A doctoral student wishes to employ LLMs in their dissertation study to extract the emotional sentiment from participants' responses on a performance-based measure. After discussing the study idea with their doctoral mentor, who has expertise in both AI and assessment, the student reviews the available literature on both LLMs and the specific performance-based instrument they plan to use in their study. The student also attends a half-day workshop on using LLMs in psychological research hosted at the annual meeting of a professional psychology organization and plans to enroll in a machine learning course at their university next semester.

The student and their mentor also meet with the chair of the university's Institutional Review Board to discuss the varied ethical considerations involved in this type of research and identify appropriate safeguards relevant to the student's dissertation study, including both the protection of study participants and test materials. Lastly, the student and their mentor schedule biweekly "research supervision" meetings where they discuss the dissertation work and new publications on the topic, to help the student build more competence for responsible application of AI in assessment research.

Faculty: A psychology faculty member teaches graduate-level courses in assessment and supervision within a professional training program. Recognizing that students are increasingly exposed to AI-enabled tools in research, coursework, and practicum settings, the faculty member seeks to build sufficient competence to responsibly integrate discussion and instruction on AI into their teaching.

To do so, the faculty member completes foundational training on AI concepts relevant to assessment (e.g., machine learning, LLM, automation bias), reviews professional guidance on AI use in psychological assessment, and participates in continuing education focused on ethical, legal, and psychometric considerations of AI-enhanced tools. The faculty member also consults with colleagues who have expertise in assessment science and AI technology to better understand current limitations, risks, and appropriate instructional boundaries.

When incorporating AI topics into coursework, the faculty member emphasizes critical evaluation rather than tool endorsement. Students are taught how to ask informed questions about AI-enabled assessment tools, including issues of validity, bias and fairness, transparency, privacy, and human oversight. Classroom activities focus on case analysis, interpretation of vendor documentation, and discussion of appropriate versus inappropriate uses of AI in assessment contexts, rather than exclusively consisting of hands-on practice with (appropriately vetted) AI systems.

The faculty member clearly communicates to students that competence in AI-enhanced assessment does not require mastery of AI development but rather the ability to critically evaluate AI tools within one's scope of practice, recognize when AI use is contraindicated, and apply professional judgment responsibly. By maintaining their own competence and modeling cautious, evidence-based reasoning, the faculty member supports students' preparedness for emerging assessment practices while upholding ethical and professional standards.

6) HUMAN OVERSIGHT

Human oversight refers to the active involvement of qualified individuals in monitoring, reviewing, and, when necessary, intervening in the operation and output of AI systems. In the

context of AI-powered assessment, this means that psychologists or other qualified professionals with demonstrated competence in psychological assessment and the relevant AI-enabled tools remain engaged throughout the process by reviewing AI-generated outputs, interpreting results, and making final decisions. Human oversight plays a critical role in supporting the ethical use of AI tools, making errors or "hallucinations" (incorrect or misleading outputs) more likely to be identified and corrected, and allows the unique context of each assessment to be considered. For example, human oversight can require that a psychologist reviews the summary for accuracy and appropriateness of AI-generated outputs before sharing it with the client or making recommendations. When appropriate, psychologists clearly explain to stakeholders (e.g., clients, courts) why and how changes to AI-powered assessment results were altered.

Human oversight can take several forms, the most relevant of which are:

- **Human-in-the-loop (HITL)** oversight refers to workflows in which psychologists remain directly involved at key decision points, reviewing, interpreting, and, when necessary, overriding AI-generated outputs before they influence assessment conclusions or recommendations. In psychological assessment, HITL is essential because AI systems might produce patterns, summaries, or preliminary inter-



pretations that require contextualization, integration with other data sources, and professional judgments regarding revision. HITL processes ensure that psychologists actively evaluate the plausibility, appropriateness, and potential impact of AI-generated information, particularly in high-stakes contexts (e.g., diagnostic formulation, eligibility determinations, employment decisions, or forensic evaluations). HITL does not imply that psychologists control all aspects of the AI system; rather, it ensures that their expertise remains the final checkpoint before any AI-assisted conclusion is used to inform decisions about individuals.

- **Human-on-the-loop (HOTL)** oversight involves psychologists monitoring AI systems at a broader, systemic level rather than reviewing and intervening in every individual output. This model is appropriate when AI tools perform low-risk, well validated, or highly standardized functions (e.g., automating administrative tasks, scoring well-established and objective response formats (e.g., multiple-choice questions with defined correct answers), or flagging potential anomalies for later review). In HOTL workflows, psychologists are responsible for periodic auditing, reviewing patterns of system performance, identifying emerging biases or errors, and ensuring that the tool continues to function as intended within its defined scope of use. HOTL emphasizes that psychologists oversee the conditions under which AI operates (e.g., data quality, system updates, and organizational policies) while recognizing that day-to-day outputs may not require direct human intervention. Importantly, HOTL does not replace HITL in many contexts; instead, HOTL complements HITL by helping ensure that the broader system remains trustworthy, fair, and aligned with professional standards.

Together, HITL and HOTL provide a layered model of oversight that reflects the realities of AI-enabled assessment. Psychologists cannot control every aspect of AI development or deployment, but they can ensure that their professional judgment, ethical obligations, and contextual expertise remain central to how AI-generated information is interpreted and used. This dual model approach also supports consequential validity by ensuring that both individual-level decisions and system-level impacts are monitored, evaluated, and addressed within psychologists' actual sphere of influence.

In traditional assessment, psychologists are responsible for interpreting test results, considering contextual factors, and making judgment calls based on their expertise. This practice generalizes to AI in similar ways. Specifically, psychologists would not rely solely on AI-generated outputs without careful review and, if necessary, revision. Just as psychologists might question an unexpected test score and seek additional information, they can also scrutinize AI-generated outputs and results for plausibility and relevance. Human oversight is especially important when AI systems are used in high-stakes deci-

sions, such as clinical diagnosis or employment selection, where errors can have more significant consequences.

Guiding Questions

- Are qualified professionals involved in reviewing and interpreting AI-generated outputs? Do those professionals know who to consult if further questions arise?
- Is there a process for identifying and correcting errors, biases, or inappropriate recommendations made by the AI system?
- Are users empowered to modify, override, or question AI-generated decisions?
- Does this AI system include mechanisms for human review and intervention? If so, where do those interventions occur in the process?

Additional Resources

- Best AI Agents. (2024, December 9). *Human oversight in AI systems: 5 key controls*. <https://bestaiagents.org/blog/human-oversight-in-ai-systems-5-key-controls/>
- Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence and amending Regulations (EC) No 300/2008, (EU) No 167/2013, (EU) No 168/2013, (EU) 2018/858, (EU) 2018/1139 and (EU) 2019/2144 and Directives 2014/90/EU, (EU) 2016/797 and (EU) 2020/1828 (Artificial Intelligence Act), Official Journal L 2024/1689 (2024). <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj/eng>. **Article 14: Human Oversight | EU Artificial Intelligence Act**
- Stewart, A. (2025, December 30). *Best practices for human oversight and where human intervention is necessary in AI-driven processes*. Dialzara. <https://dialzara.com/blog/human-oversight-in-ai-best-practices>

Example Scenario

A psychologist uses an AI tool to generate preliminary interpretations of assessment data. Before finalizing the report, the psychologist reviews the AI's output, checks for errors and inconsistencies, and adjusts the interpretation based on their professional judgment and knowledge of the client's context and history. This process ensures that the final recommendations are accurate, ethical, and tailored to the individual.

7) IMPACT ON APPLIED AND CLINICAL WORK

The integration of AI into applied assessment settings has the potential to transform how assessment is used in many industries and settings. Using employment assessments as an example, AI-powered tools can streamline resume screening, automate skills assessments, and provide data-driven insights into candidate fit, potentially increasing efficiency and consistency in hiring processes. AI stands to produce similar



benefits in clinical settings, both directly and indirectly. Direct benefits might include the potential removal of certain barriers underlying treatment disparities (e.g., AI-powered translation tools can increase tailored access to care) and improved efficiency of service delivery (e.g., AI tools assisting in test scoring and report writing can accelerate the delivery of assessment findings). Indirect benefits might include reduced burdens on psychologists (e.g., AI-assisted billing could reduce stress while freeing up time to see additional clients), expedited scientific advancements (e.g., AI-assisted test administration and scoring permits accelerated data collection for traditionally time-demanding tests), and increased training opportunities (e.g., clinical avatars offer students unlimited test administration practice) that could prove more ethical (e.g., replacing student volunteers with clinical avatars avoids exposing volunteers to test materials).

However, these benefits are not guaranteed. For instance, AI-based assessments might violate their well-intended purposes and reinforce existing biases and exacerbate inequities, lack transparency in their decision-making, or produce unfair or undesired outcomes. Moreover, psychologists themselves may have inequitable access to AI training relevant to their practice. These considerations and others would be important to carefully and transparently monitor and attend to on an ongoing basis.

Note that different states often have different regulations regarding AI use in specific situations. In the employment setting, for example, states vary in whether to notify applicants that AI systems will be used and in whether to obtain applicants' consent. Overall, whenever you plan to administer an AI-powered assessment, be sure to understand relevant current state law.

Guiding Questions

- Has the AI system been validated for use in employment decisions or the intended clinical application, and is its performance regularly audited for issues of bias?

- Are the criteria and data used by the AI system clearly documented and accessible to decision-makers?
- Is there a process for examinees or clients to contest or seek clarification on AI-driven decisions?
- Does this AI system promote fairness, transparency, and accountability in employment decisions or the intended clinical application?
- What is being assessed by the AI assessment, and how is it combining that information to inform the result/output?

Additional Resources

- Ad Hoc Task Force on AI-Based Assessments. (2023, January). SIOP statements: Considerations and recommendations for the validation and use of AI-based assessments for employee selection. <https://www.siop.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/Considerations-and-Recommendations-for-the-Validation-and-Use-of-AI-Based-Assessments-for-Employee-Selection-January-2023.pdf>
- Khurana, R. (2025, November 20). *AI in hiring: Emerging legal developments and compliance guidance for 2026*. JD Supra. <https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/ai-in-hiring-emerging-legal-5898815/>
- Parker, K. D., Lewis, G.T., and Sparhawk, I. F. (2025). The DOL publishes best practices that employers can follow to decrease the legal risks associated with using AI in employment decisions. *National Law Review*, 360. <https://natlawreview.com/article/dol-publishes-best-practices-employers-can-follow-decrease-legal-risks-associated>
- Watson, J. (2024, August). *U.S. regulations on hiring with AI: a state-by-state guide*. Workable. <https://resources.workable.com/tutorial/us-regulations-on-hiring-with-ai-state-by-state>

Example Scenario

Employment: A large company implements an AI tool to screen job applications for a customer service role. Before deployment, human resource professionals review the tool's documentation that details the data sources and how they were evaluated for bias, development process, including how scoring algorithms were evaluated and how validity and reliability were demonstrated, and known limitations. The company establishes a process for regular audits to detect and address potential biases and ensures that candidates can request explanations for AI-influenced decisions. Human resource staff retain final decision-making authority, using AI recommendations as one datapoint among many. This approach helps the organization to be more efficient while maintaining fairness, transparency, and accountability in hiring.

Clinical: A test publisher recently introduced an AI tool designed to generate a personalized assessment report that integrates clinician-provided information about the examinee's psychosocial background with score interpretations of two well-validated psychoeducational measures. The AI tool makes use of a proprietary LLM, operates within an appropriately secure environment, and was empirically tested against tra-

ditional clinician-generated reports, which demonstrated the tool's acceptable overall quality. However, minimal details are provided pertaining to its development (e.g., source and characteristics of training data, strategies used to investigate and reduce bias) or other performance metrics (e.g., report accuracy). The astute psychologist recognizes the minimal risks to privacy and confidentiality posed by the AI tool and decides to cautiously use it with his clients following appropriately informed parental consent and student assent (see Informed Consent). However, given the lack of transparency about the development and operational mechanisms of the AI tool and limited empirical support for its use, the psychologist decides the most appropriate use of the AI-generated report is to help him hypothesize possible interpretations rather than accepting the AI tool's interpretations with certainty. Thus, the psychologist writes his own assessment reports and only includes interpretations suggested by the AI-generated report when additional, independent evidence substantiates the interpretation (e.g., when an interpretation suggested in the AI-generated report objectively aligns with results from other tests administered as part of the assessment battery that were not reported to the AI tool).

8) CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

Continuous improvement refers to the ongoing process of evaluating, updating, and refining AI systems to ensure they remain effective, ethical, and aligned with current societal values and technological advancements. In psychological assessment, this means regularly reviewing AI tools for accuracy, fairness, and relevance, and updating these tools and practice guidelines as new research, technologies, and ethical standards emerge or challenge previously accepted knowledge. Continuous improvement also involves learning from real-world use, troubleshooting in a timely manner, addressing unintended consequences with humility, and adapting to changes in the populations being assessed, the contexts in which assessments are used, and new developments or changes in the laws and other policies governing the use of AI. For example, an AI system used for employment screening might be periodically audited to ensure it does not develop or perpetuate new, yet unforeseen biases as workforce demographics and job requirements evolve.

Psychologists are already familiar with the concept of continuous improvement through practices such as regularly reviewing assessment tools, updating test materials and norms, completing continuing education training, and adhering to updated ethical guidelines. These practices also generalize to AI-based assessments, such that psychologists advocate for and participate in the regular evaluation of AI systems, demand transparency and accountability from developers and peers, encourage the integration of feedback from diverse users, and support the adoption of new standards as they are developed. Such efforts are essential to uphold the integrity of assessment practices and to ensure that psychol-





ogists' professional judgment and ethical obligations remain central to AI-enabled assessment. Psychologists involved in developing, selecting, administering, and/or interpreting psychological measurement instruments or are otherwise engaged in psychological assessment are uniquely positioned for evaluating AI-enabled assessment tools within their scope of practice, and may bear the responsibility for overseeing and advancing the ethical use of AI in assessment given the narrow range of professionals for which psychological assessment is within their scope of practice. This unique position underscores the importance of psychologists' active engagement in evaluating, updating, and refining AI systems, as well as advocating standards that protect the validity and fairness of assessment.

Guiding Questions

- Is there a process for regularly reviewing and updating the AI system based on new research, feedback, and societal changes?
- Are mechanisms in place to monitor for unintended consequences or emerging biases in the moment and over time?
- Are mechanisms in place to monitor for the intended and identify unintended benefits?

- Are mechanisms in place to ensure that evolving job requirements are being incorporated into the assessment as appropriate?
- How are updates to ethical guidelines and best practices incorporated into the use and oversight of AI systems?
- Is this AI system regularly updated and evaluated to reflect current knowledge and ethical standards?

Additional Resources

- Sentinel Technologies. (n.d.). *Pillar 10: Continuous evaluation and improvement*. SAGE-AI. https://sage-ai-framework.org/framework/continuous_improvement.html

Example Scenario

A psychological assessment platform uses AI to score and interpret cognitive tests for job applicants. The organization establishes a schedule for annual audits of the AI system, incorporates user feedback from stakeholders and test-takers, and updates the system in response to new research. When the World Economic Forum releases new guidelines for responsible AI, the organization reviews and integrates relevant recommendations into their practices. This commitment to continuous improvement helps ensure that the AI system remains accurate, ethical, and responsive to changing needs.

Conclusion

The integration of AI into assessment presents both significant opportunities and complex challenges. As outlined in this document, psychologists strive to approach AI-enhanced assessment with a commitment to ethical practice, transparency, fairness, and continuous improvement. By attending to critical domains such as bias and fairness, privacy and confidentiality, informed consent, competence and training, and human oversight, practitioners can help guarantee that AI tools are used responsibly and effectively.

Continuous professional development, grounded in authoritative resources and training, is essential for maintaining competence in this rapidly evolving field. Psychologists are encouraged to remain vigilant, regularly review and update their knowledge and practices, and advocate for the highest standards in AI-assisted assessment.

Ultimately, the responsible use of AI in assessment depends on the expertise and judgment of psychologists. By upholding the values and recommendations outlined in this document, practitioners can harness the benefits of AI while safeguarding the integrity of assessment and the well-being of those they serve.

Lastly, it must be noted that the information and resources presented in this document are not static; rather, the nature of both AI and assessment warrants a regular review and, when deemed necessary, revision of this document.

Glossary

Accountability

The presence of clearly defined roles and responsibilities for decisions informed by an AI system. Accountability ensures that developers, organizations, and qualified professionals understand their respective obligations for monitoring performance, addressing errors, and responding to unintended consequences.

AI System/AI Tool

A computational system that uses algorithms—often including machine learning or natural language processing—to perform tasks such as scoring, classification, prediction, or generating text. In assessment, AI tools may support administration, scoring, interpretation, or reporting.

Automation Bias

A cognitive bias in which users place undue trust in automated outputs, leading them to overlook errors or fail to apply appropriate professional judgment.

Bias (Data/Pre-Existing Bias)

Systematic error introduced when the data used to train an AI model are unrepresentative, skewed, or reflect historical inequities.

Bias (Development/Technical Bias)

Systematic error introduced through model architecture, feature selection, algorithmic design, or evaluation methods.

Bias (Interaction/Emerging Bias)

Systematic error that arises from the context of use, user behavior, or deployment conditions, which may cause an AI system to perform differently across individuals or groups.

Black Box

A term describing AI systems whose internal processes are not easily interpretable or transparent to users, making it difficult to understand how inputs are transformed into outputs.

Client

The individual, group, or organization for whom psychological services are provided. In assessment, the client may be the examinee, a parent/guardian, an employer, or another authorized entity depending on the context.

Clinical Avatars

AI-powered, human-like representation of a client designed for use in education, enhanced clinical training, and provision of safe, interactive training scenarios without the need for human volunteers. Clinical avatars can also be used as an adjunctive tool to support real-time, data-driven, and person-centered treatment decisions.

Confidentiality

The ethical and legal obligation to protect client information from unauthorized access, disclosure, or misuse.

Data Governance

The policies, procedures, and safeguards that guide how data are collected, stored, accessed, protected, and deleted throughout the lifecycle of an AI system.

Emergent Bias

See Bias (Interaction/Emerging Bias).

Fairness

A context-dependent judgment about whether assessment processes and outcomes are equitable and just for relevant stakeholder groups, given the intended use, population, and constraints.

Hallucination

An AI-generated output that is incorrect, fabricated, or unsupported by the input data or model knowledge. Hallucinations may appear plausible and therefore require human review.

Human Oversight

The active involvement of qualified professionals in reviewing, interpreting, and intervening in AI-generated outputs to ensure ethical, accurate, and contextually appropriate use.

Human-in-the-Loop (HITL)

An oversight model in which a human expert directly reviews and approves AI-generated outputs before they influence decisions.

Human-on-the-Loop (HOTL)

An oversight model in which a human monitors AI system performance at a broader level—through audits, reviews, or system checks—rather than intervening in every individual output.

Informed Assent

A process in which individuals who cannot legally provide informed consent (e.g., minors) are given developmentally appropriate information about the assessment and voluntarily agree to participate.

Informed Consent

The process of providing individuals with clear, understandable information about the purpose, procedures, risks, benefits, and limits of confidentiality associated with an assessment, allowing them to voluntarily agree to participate.

Interpretability

The degree to which the internal logic or decision-making processes of an AI system can be understood by humans.

Large Language Model (LLM)

A type of AI model trained on large text corpora to generate, summarize, classify, or analyze natural language. LLMs may produce errors (“hallucinations”) and require human oversight in assessment contexts.

Model Training

The process by which an AI system learns patterns from data to generate predictions or outputs. The characteristics of the training data influence model performance and potential biases.

Privacy

An individual’s right to control their personal information, including how it is collected, used, stored, and shared.

Privacy by Design

An approach in which privacy protections are embedded into the architecture and operation of an AI system from the outset.

Qualified Professional

A professional with demonstrated competence in psychological assessment and sufficient understanding of the AI-enabled tool to evaluate, interpret, and oversee its use responsibly.

Stakeholder

Any person or group affected by the assessment process or its outcomes, including examinees, clients, parents/guardians, educators, employers, decision-makers, organizations, and communities.

Test User

An individual or organization that selects, administers, scores, interprets, or makes decisions based on an assessment instrument or system. Test users have the training and competence appropriate to the level of interpretation required.

Transparency

The availability of clear, accessible information about how an AI system functions, including how it was developed, what data informed its training, how outputs are generated, and how those outputs are intended to be used.

Other Resources

- The Association for Test Publishers is publishing many resources that readers might find helpful. Some are free to non-members or available for a small fee. They can be found here: [ATP Resources](#).
- [Building a Responsible AI Framework: 5 Key Principles for Organizations - Professional & Executive Development | Harvard DCE](#)
- [ITC/ATP Guidelines for Technology-Based Assessment](#)
- [Evaluating AI Tools—Artificial Intelligence at Purdue University](#)
- [APA's AI Tool Guide for Practitioners](#) and [Companion Checklist: Evaluation of an AI-Enabled Clinical or Administrative Tool](#)



AMERICAN
PSYCHOLOGICAL
ASSOCIATION