



# Guidance on the Use of AI for Graduate Admissions Committees

---

The following guidance is intended to assist graduate admissions committees as they consider using AI to improve the efficiency of their admissions processes. We encourage you to submit any questions as a “Policy Inquiry” on our [Connect with the Graduate School form](#) so that we can review and update this document as needed.

## **GRADUATE SCHOOL POLICY ON THE USE OF AI IN ADMISSIONS**

---

Policy 3.1.3 establishes the Graduate School’s requirements and prohibitions with regard to admissions:

The use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools in application review processes must:

- Not involve processes or software that violate FERPA, record retentions, or institutional data privacy policies, or that share applicant data with third parties.
- Not involve subjective judgement, nor subvert human judgement, of student success or potential.
- Not involve directly ranking, selecting, or eliminating candidates.
- Be communicated to applicants on the program’s application page.
- Be reviewed by the admissions committee on an annual basis to assess potential bias, privacy, and intellectual property issues.

CONTINUED >

## WHERE AI CAN BE USEFUL

While ensuring that student information is not shared with the third parties, the following AI uses may reduce administrative work for admissions committees:

- Summarizing transcripts and application materials, by for example:
  - Extracting structured information from unstructured materials (e.g., course lists, term-by-term GPA, timelines of degrees).
  - Flagging missing materials.
  - Highlighting potential issues such as GPA thresholds.
- Assisting in establishing committee member assignments.
  - Distributing review assignments based on predetermined criteria (e.g., research area tags provided by applicants).
  - Checking reviewer forms for completeness, including empty rubric fields or missing comments.
  - Highlighting inconsistent ratings across reviewers.
- Supporting blind review processes by identifying and removing personal identifiers from application materials, with human verification.
- Providing neutral, factual background information—such as explanations of international grading systems or credential format.
- Drafting template communications for applicants in multiple languages.

## PRECAUTIONS FOR GRADUATE ADMISSIONS COMMITTEES USING AI

Below are thematic areas where the use of AI requires intentional oversight, clear documentation, and alignment with Graduate School policy.

### 1. Transparency and Disclosure to Applicants

Graduate School Policy 3.1.3 requires programs to disclose AI use in the admissions process on the program's application page. Programs should:

- Clearly state what AI tools are used and for what purpose (e.g., “used to summarize transcripts,” not “used to evaluate applicants”).
- Maintain an annual archive of the disclosure text for audit and compliance purposes.
- Ensure that disclosure language is clear, nontechnical, and accessible.

CONTINUED >

## 2. Transparency and Disclosure to Applicants

Any AI tool used in admissions must comply with FERPA and institutional data privacy rules. Programs should:

- Confirm that AI tools are fully on-premises (hosted on university-owned servers and infrastructure), university licensed, or certified by campus IT as compliant with data policies.
- Prohibit the use of free, public, or consumer AI tools that send data to third party servers.
- Establish a required annual review with IT security to ensure tools remain compliant as vendor practices or legislation change.

## 3. Avoiding the Use of AI for Subjective Evaluation

Policy explicitly prohibits AI from making subjective judgments about potential, likelihood of success, or fit. Programs should:

- Require committees to document which parts of the review are strictly human led (e.g., rubric scoring, statement evaluation, letters review).
- Train reviewers to recognize that AI-generated summaries may omit nuance and should never substitute for reading applications.

## 4. Preventing Algorithmic Bias and Maintaining Equity

Even nonevaluative AI uses may unintentionally introduce inequities. Programs should:

- Conduct an annual bias review, as required by policy, examining:
  - Application areas where AI might systematically misread or misclassify materials (e.g., international transcripts, multilingual writing).
  - Whether any applicant groups are disproportionately flagged for administrative issues (e.g., “missing” materials that are actually format differences).
- Require human verification for all flags, summarizations, or alerts generated by AI.

## 5. Maintaining Human Oversight in All Decision-Making

AI tools can support administrative work but cannot evaluate or rank applicants.

Programs should:

- Document in committee procedures that “AI-assisted steps” end before any reviewer judgment.
- Ensure reviewers understand that AI-generated summaries are informational aids—not evaluative shortcuts.
- Track who on the committee has AI training and provide refresher training annually.

CONTINUED >

## **6. Preparing for Appeals and Public Records Requests**

Committees must be able to show how AI was used in a given cycle. Programs should:

- Keep a yearly log of:
  - Which tools were used and for what functions
  - With what prompts or workflow steps
  - Any identified issues or changes from prior years
- Save a PDF “snapshot” of AI-related procedures at the start of every admissions cycle for auditability.
- Keep AI outputs within the admissions file to ensure a complete, comprehensible record of the process.

*These guidelines were developed in Winter quarter of 2026. The Graduate School intends to revise this document regularly as the use of Artificial Intelligence evolves.*