

Dear Institute and Center Leaders —

Artificial Intelligence's (AI) unrelenting movement into nearly all facets of human life presents psychoanalytic educators with both challenges and opportunities. Psychoanalysis and psychoanalytic psychotherapy training programs face an increasingly urgent need to craft AI-use policies for faculty, students, and administration. We are sharing some organizing principles you can use when crafting AI-use policies sensitive to the specific, local culture of your institution. We hope they lead to productive discussions at your institution.

The attached copied "Organizing Principles for Crafting AI Use Policies in Psychoanalytic Education" emerged from meetings of the CAI Institute/Center Working Group. The CAI convened this group to provide a supportive, collegial setting where institute and center leadership could openly share their observations, concerns and approaches to AI's emergence. We have been meeting monthly since March 2025. We are always happy to welcome interested new members!

At a recent meeting of the Working Group Luis Nagy, Director of the New Center for Psychoanalysis in LA, shared an AI policy document he's preparing for NCP. His insightful framing and generosity of mind were central in drafting the attached document. Our community owes him a significant debt.

There are two important reasons why we're sharing organizing principles for crafting policy rather than recommended policies. The first is that every institute/center has unique needs, structures and members. It would be presumptuous and counter-productive for us to say some version of "here's the policy you should use." But the second reason is even more central to the challenges we face. Engaging questions of AI's promise and peril is an often anxious-making experience. Since the inception of the CAI we've learned that community and conversation are the best antidotes to what frequently becomes an avoidant, mind-numbing

AI anxiety. So, we offer these organizing principles in the spirit of trying to nurture supportive local engagement in the task of crafting AI-use policies.

In hope,
Todd Essig and Amy Levy
CAI Chairs

=====

Organizing Principles for Crafting AI Use Policies in Psychoanalytic Education

(A CAI document: October, 2025)

Purpose

These organizing principles are intended to help psychoanalytic institutes and centers craft policies for the ethical, professional, and educational use of Artificial Intelligence (AI). They aim to protect the distinctive qualities of psychoanalytic work while recognizing AI's potential to support administrative, research, clinical and educational tasks. They aim to strike a creative balance between the competing needs for regulation and for innovation.

AI may offer speed, efficiency, and a deepening of thought, but it also carries risks: breaches of confidentiality, distortions, seductive illusions of intimacy, a foreclosure of uncertainty, and a cognitive and emotional "de-skilling" from off-loading tasks onto an AI. In contrast, psychoanalytic care depends on reverie, fantasy, unconscious communication, and an authentic human encounter. These organizing principles attempt to minimize the risks while protecting psychoanalytic values and experiences. While these are our goals, we are cognizant that AI is an unprecedented technology which is unfortunately running live "safety-checks" on the general population. Our guidelines are

based on what can only be an incomplete understanding of the short and long-term effects of AI usage.

Consequently, effective policies will need to be dynamic documents open to rapid accelerations in AI capacities, policies that strive to safeguard against the risks while also cultivating AI fitness and engagement. What follows points to an aspirational policy goal of ensuring psychoanalytic communities remaining engaged, thoughtful participants in an AI Age that is rapidly transforming self-experience, intimate relations (including all forms of psychoanalytic care), organizational aspects of professional life, and even desire itself.

Organizing Principles

A. Core Psychoanalytic Values

1. Preserve the Analytic Frame

AI use must never compromise core qualities central of psychoanalytic practice: unconscious communication, tolerance for uncertainty, genuine care, and the human presence of analyst and analysand.

2. Prioritize Patient Welfare

Patient well-being is paramount. We must work to establish use-patterns that may allow AI to assist, but never replace, human clinical judgment, empathy, or the analytic relationship itself.

3. Support Analytic Capacities

AI should not replace the development of psychoanalytic skills: listening, remembering, tolerating uncertainty, and engaging unconscious processes. Supervision and training should rely on lived experience rather than mechanical reproduction.

4. Supervision Requires Memory

Policies should insure that supervision substantively includes remembered experience in order to preserve unconscious

meanings rather than relying on AI transcripts or summaries. This includes clarifying what constitutes "remembered experience" in an era of digital note-taking. Students using HIPPA-compliant AI-generated session transcripts and summaries should discuss such use with their supervisors.

5. Bring Psychoanalytic Understanding to AI Use

AI use within psychoanalysis, mental healthcare in general, and the culture at large should be an object of psychoanalytic inquiry and educational focus. AI is currently designed to be persuasive, sycophantic even. It can create illusions of intimacy or certainty. Policies should help teachers, supervisors, and students recognize and resist these dynamics in themselves and in the people they care for.

B. Ethics and Responsibility

6. Maintain Professional Responsibility

Clinicians, students, and faculty remain fully responsible for their professional work, regardless of AI involvement. Final accountability is always human.

7. Safeguard Confidentiality

Protected Health Information (PHI) must never be entered into a non-secure AI implementation. In addition, confidentiality is both a legal obligation and a symbolic container for unconscious life. Even disguised information potentially recognizable by the patient or one of their intimates should not be entered into a non-secure AI implementation.

8. Practice Transparency and Informed Consent

Patients, students, and colleagues have the right to know when AI implementations are used. Disclosure should be routine practice. In addition, when appropriate informed consent should be secured. When informed consent is needed but the consequences of the AI use are unknown, informed consent is impossible and use should be avoided.

9. Align with Ethical and Legal Standards

AI use must comply with all applicable laws and applicable professional ethics codes (including those of APsA).

10. Establish Clear Prohibited Uses

Explicitly prohibit AI use in contexts that could compromise clinical integrity, including generating clinical notes or treatment summaries; providing AI-based diagnostic suggestions without supervisory consultation; creating automated responses to patient communications; using AI to evaluate student clinical competencies; using AI during crisis intervention or emergency situations; and using AI during sessions.

C. Operational Guidelines

11. Differentiate Contexts of Use

Acceptable AI use varies by context—administrative, educational, research, or clinical. What is permitted in one setting may be prohibited in another. For example, AI might assist in literature reviews but be prohibited in process notes or case presentations.

12. Critically Assess AI Outputs

All AI outputs must be evaluated for accuracy, bias, and distortion. AI outputs should never be given the authority of something a person produced. Treat AI-generated content as first drafts requiring substantial human review and revision.

13. Guide Detection and Assessment

Develop approaches for responding to suspected unauthorized AI use that include understanding the limited value of AI detection tools. Instead, create assessment methods that account for AI's presence and foster honest dialogue about AI use rather than surveillance

14. Implement Data Governance

Develop frameworks for: data retention and deletion policies for AI interactions; policies on institutional vs. personal AI accounts; protocols for vetting and approving specific AI vendors and

implementations; regular auditing of AI use across the institution; protection of research participant data when using AI

15. Address Intellectual Property and Attribution

Establish clear guidelines regarding: ownership of AI-assisted work products; required citation standards for AI tool use (e.g., versions, prompts, dates); protection of institutional intellectual property when using AI platforms; rights and responsibilities regarding copyrighted materials that incorporate AI

D. Educational Framework

16. Promote Educational Integrity Policies should help students document and reflect on their AI use. Faculty should model appropriate practices and integrate AI fitness into curricula. AI is as much an object of study as it is a tool for use. Establish clear rubrics for evaluating work that may involve AI assistance and protocols for addressing violations that emphasize learning over punishment.

17. Support Professional Development

Policies should encourage and help provide resources for comprehensive AI education across the institution. This includes supporting AI fitness for faculty, supervisors, and students; workshops on emerging AI capabilities and risks; peer support groups for sharing use cases and clinical challenges; documentation of AI competency for accreditation purposes where appropriate; and support services for developing critical AI assessment skills. These and other professional development initiatives should foster both technical competence and critical reflection on AI's impact on psychoanalytic practice and education.

18. Protect Research Integrity

Research-relevant policies should ensure that AI use maintains professional standards of academic rigor and transparency. This includes establishing IRB review requirements for AI use in research, developing clear standards for reporting AI use in publications, implementing validation requirements for AI-

assisted data analysis, and maintaining transparency about AI's role in research design and execution. Researchers should clearly document when and how AI tools are employed, ensuring that the psychoanalytic research community can properly evaluate the scholarship produced.

E. Equity and Access

19. Acknowledge Power and Equity Remain alert to the structural asymmetries between psychoanalytic practitioners and the corporate entities that design and profit from AI. Ensure that AI use does not reinforce inequities in education or access to care. Consider providing equitable access to approved AI tools and ensuring policies don't disadvantage students with different resource levels.

20. Consider Accessibility and Accommodation

Ensure AI policies address the complex intersection of technology and accessibility. This includes establishing clear guidelines for when AI tools might appropriately serve as accessibility accommodations, carefully reviewing policies to prevent inadvertently disadvantaging students with disabilities, and balancing equity concerns when AI tools are used for learning support. Policies should recognize that AI may provide essential assistance for some learners while ensuring that its use doesn't create new barriers or stigma for those who rely on it for accommodation purposes.

F. Institutional Implementation

21. Model Institutional Transparency Institutes should disclose when and how they use AI in communications, teaching, or evaluation. Faculty should clearly state in syllabi how AI may be used. Students should disclose and reflect on their use of AI in assignments and supervision.

22. Plan for Sustainable Implementation

Consider institutional capacity to ensure AI integration is both effective and sustainable over time. This includes budgeting for

appropriate AI tools and training, developing cost-benefit analysis frameworks to guide decision-making, allocating resources for ongoing support, creating remediation pathways for policy violations that emphasize learning and growth, and establishing clear reporting procedures for AI-related incidents. Sustainable implementation requires not just initial investment but ongoing commitment to support, evaluation, and adaptation as both technology and institutional needs evolve.

23. Commit to Ongoing Review and Reflection AI

technologies evolve rapidly. Policies should be reviewed regularly, revised in light of new risks and opportunities, and accompanied by reflective dialogue about AI's impact on psychic life, education, and clinical practice.

G. Closing Reflection

AI is not neutral. It enters analytic life in the consulting room, the classroom, and administration as a new agent, fantasy, temptation, and defense. It may evoke dependency, idealization, and inappropriate certainty. It may amplify our biases and assumptions, offer new ones, and give rise to feelings of revulsion and avoidance, as well as feelings of awe and wonderment. Crafting policies should be geared to protecting what is most human in our work, and to reflecting critically on how AI is shaping psychic life, institutions, and the future of psychoanalysis itself.

The task before each institution is not merely regulatory but deeply psychoanalytic: to understand how AI functions in the institutional unconscious, how it shapes transference and countertransference, and how we can maintain the essential human encounter that defines our work while thoughtfully engaging with technological change. These guidelines offer a framework for that engagement, inviting each community to develop policies that honor both their unique culture and our shared psychoanalytic values.

H. AI Use Disclosure

An early draft of the organizing principles was shared with ChatGPT 5 along with the text of Dr. Nagy's draft. The prompt included an instruction to also access university AI-use policies to suggest organizing principles not present in the early draft or implicit in Dr. Nagy's draft. That result was extensively edited by Dr. Essig and then uploaded to Claude 4.1 with a prompt once again to access university AI-use guidelines and suggest organizing principles not present. That was then edited by Drs. Essig and Levy and the result shared with our team of human collaborators. Their contributions were then included in this, our October, 2025 draft.