



AI for healthcare administration

Improving administrative workflows while
respecting sensitive data and clinical boundaries.

WORKS WITH THE ASSISTANTS TEAMS ALREADY USE



EDITION 22 / EMBER & CORAL

EXECUTIVE WORKING EDITION - 08 OCT 2026

22

AT A GLANCE

Improving administrative workflows while respecting sensitive data and clinical boundaries.



Healthcare organizations carry heavy administrative load: scheduling, registration, documentation support, patient communication, referrals, prior authorization paperwork and coding support. AI can reduce that load, but patient information is among the most sensitive data an organization holds, and clinical judgment must stay with licensed clinicians. This playbook covers administrative use only. It explains where AI fits, how the tools work, how to set boundaries so nothing drifts into clinical advice, how to protect privacy, how to measure value, and how to run a careful pilot. It does not provide medical, legal or compliance advice.

WHO IT IS FOR

Practice managers, clinic and hospital administrators, revenue cycle and patient access leaders, compliance and privacy officers, and operations leaders at provider groups, clinics, dental and allied health practices.

TIME TO USE

60 minutes to read; one working session to apply

What you will have at the end

- A shortlist of administrative workflows that suit AI support
- A clear boundary between administrative assistance and clinical decision-making
- A privacy and vendor checklist your compliance lead can use
- A pilot plan with baseline measures and a stop rule

Contents

01	Administrative relief without crossing clinical lines	03
02	Use cases and clear no-go zones	04
03	How the tools work and where they go wrong	06
04	Governance, roles and accountability	07
05	Privacy, safety and fairness controls	09
06	Baselines, metrics and test sets	10
07	Implementation guide	12
08	Common pitfalls and an illustrative scenario	13
09	Vendor questions for a high-sensitivity environment	15
10	A first quarter that produces evidence	16
11	Terms used in this publication	17



EXECUTIVE BRIEF

Administrative relief without crossing clinical lines

01



The opportunity is time returned to patients and staff. The boundary is that AI supports administration and never replaces clinical judgment.

Administrative work consumes a large share of effort in most healthcare settings. Front desk teams juggle phone calls, reminders, cancellations and registration forms. Clinicians spend time on documentation. Billing and coding staff chase missing information. Patients wait on hold or struggle to understand letters and instructions. These tasks are repetitive, text-heavy and well defined, which makes them reasonable candidates for AI assistance.

The same environment raises the stakes. Patient information is highly sensitive and protected by privacy and security law in most jurisdictions. A mistake in scheduling can delay care. A mistake in a patient message can cause confusion or harm. For this reason, this playbook limits itself to administrative use: scheduling, communications about logistics, documentation support that a clinician reviews and signs, and coding and billing support that a qualified coder verifies. It does not address diagnosis, treatment recommendations or triage decisions.

- Use AI for administrative drafting, summarizing, sorting and reminding, with a named staff member responsible for each output.
- Never use AI output as clinical advice, and design tools to refuse and redirect clinical questions to the care team.
- Treat privacy, access control and vendor agreements as entry requirements, not extras.
- Keep patients informed when they interact with automated tools, and give them an easy path to a person.
- Measure effect on staff time, access and patient experience, and watch for harm as carefully as benefit.




NOT MEDICAL OR COMPLIANCE ADVICE

Healthcare is regulated and varies by country and region. Check current privacy, security, medical device and professional requirements with your compliance officer and counsel before any pilot that touches patient data.

WORKING QUESTION

Which administrative task takes your staff the most time per week for the least skill, and what does a wrong output in that task cost?


WHERE IT FITS

Use cases and clear no-go zones

02



Sort workflows by the harm a mistake could cause, and keep clinical content out of scope.



USE CASE	FIT	HUMAN CHECK
Scheduling support: reminders, rescheduling options, waitlist matching	Strong	Staff confirm complex or urgent cases; clinical urgency decided by clinicians
Patient communication drafts: appointment logistics, preparation instructions from approved materials, billing explanations	Good	Staff review templates once; sensitive messages reviewed individually
Documentation support summarizing a visit note into a letter or structuring a template	Good with care	Clinician reviews and signs every clinical document

USE CASE	FIT	HUMAN CHECK
Administrative coding support: suggesting codes for coder review from documentation	Moderate	Certified coder verifies against documentation and rules
Referral and prior authorization paperwork assembly	Good	Staff verify attachments, identifiers and payer requirements
Call and message routing, FAQ answers from approved content	Good	Escalate anything clinical to a nurse or clinician
Symptom assessment, triage, diagnosis or treatment advice	No-go for this playbook	Clinical governance and regulatory requirements apply; out of scope

The no-go zone is the single most important design decision. Any tool that talks to patients will eventually be asked about symptoms, medications or test results. It must be configured to recognize those requests, decline to answer, and point the person to the clinical team or emergency services as appropriate. Test this directly with realistic prompts before launch and after every change.

Selection filters

- Is the task administrative, with the content coming from approved material?
- Can staff verify the output quickly against a record?
- What is the worst plausible error, and who would catch it?
- Does the use require patient identifiers, and can it be done with less?
- Will patients be told when they are dealing with an automated tool?

COMMON MISTAKE

Allowing a patient-facing assistant to answer general health questions because it sounds helpful. That is clinical territory. Keep the scope to logistics and approved information.

WORKING QUESTION

If a patient asked your front-line assistant about a symptom, what exactly would happen today?

HOW IT WORKS

How the tools work and where they go wrong

03

Administrative AI combines three ingredients: a language model, your approved content and your systems. Each needs boundaries.

A language model drafts and summarizes text. Connected to your scheduling system, it can read availability and propose slots. Connected to your approved patient materials, it can answer logistical questions such as where to park or how to prepare for a procedure. Connected to a visit note, it can structure the note into a letter, for a clinician to correct and sign. The model has no medical authority. It produces fluent text, and fluent text can be wrong.

01 Input

Staff or patients provide a request, or a system passes in a document such as a visit note or referral form.

02 Retrieve

The tool looks up approved content or system records needed for the task, and nothing more.

03 Draft

The model writes a message, summary or suggestion using only that material.

04 Check

A named staff member or the clinician reviews, edits and approves before it is sent, filed or billed.

Known failure modes

- Wrong patient or wrong record: identifiers are mixed up between similar names or dates of birth.
- Omission in summaries: a medication, allergy or instruction is dropped from a letter drawn from a note.
- Invented detail: the tool fills a gap with plausible but untrue text.
- Coding drift: suggested codes unsupported by the documentation, or missing specificity.

- Boundary leakage: a patient-facing tool answers a clinical question.
- Voice transcription errors on names, drug names and numbers.

DESIGN RESPONSE

Minimize the data given to the tool, show the source record beside the draft, require sign-off by the accountable person, and test refusal behavior on clinical questions.

WORKING QUESTION

For your top three candidate workflows, what is the smallest amount of patient data the tool needs?

OPERATING MODEL

Governance, roles and accountability

04

Healthcare organizations already have governance structures. Put AI under them rather than beside them.

ROLE	OWNS	TYPICAL PERSON
Executive sponsor	Priorities, risk appetite, resourcing	Administrator, COO or practice owner
Privacy and security officer	Data protection, access controls, vendor assessment, incident response	Privacy officer or compliance lead
Clinical lead	Boundary between administrative and clinical content; sign-off on clinical documents	Medical director or senior clinician
Workflow owner	Process design, templates, metrics	Practice manager, patient access or revenue cycle lead

ROLE	OWNS	TYPICAL PERSON
Coding lead	Verification of coding support and audit	Certified coder or coding manager
Front-line champions	Daily use, issue reporting	Reception lead, scheduler, medical secretary

Create a short approval path for new AI uses: a one-page description of the workflow, data used, vendor, review step, patient impact and metrics, reviewed by the privacy officer and clinical lead before any pilot. Keep a register of approved uses so there is a single answer to what AI is used for here. This avoids staff quietly adopting consumer tools for convenience, which is a common and serious privacy risk.

Document what happens when something goes wrong. A wrong appointment message, a misdirected letter or a tool answering a clinical question should have a defined route: stop the tool if needed, assess the impact, notify those responsible, correct the record and learn. Your existing incident process probably covers most of this; extend it to include AI-related events and make sure staff know it applies.

Governance basics

- Register of approved AI uses with owners
- Privacy and clinical review before any pilot
- Policy on what staff may never enter into unapproved tools
- Defined incident route covering AI errors
- Patient-facing disclosure when automated tools are used
- Training for everyone who uses or reviews outputs

WORKING QUESTION

Who in your organization can say no to an AI proposal, and do they know that is their job?

RISKS AND CONTROLS

Privacy, safety and fairness controls

05



Controls must be concrete: who can see what, what is logged, and what a person must check.

RISK	CONTROL	OWNER
Patient data exposed to an unapproved or poorly protected tool	Approved tools only; vendor agreement and security review; access by role	Privacy officer
Clinical advice given to patient	Scope limited to logistics; refusal behavior tested; escalation to staff	Clinical lead
Error in a clinical document	Clinician reviews and signs; source note shown with draft	Clinical lead
Incorrect coding or billing	Coder verifies against documentation; periodic audit	Coding lead
Unequal access or experience	Provide phone and in-person routes; check language and accessibility; review outcomes by group	Workflow owner
Data kept longer than necessary	Retention rules for prompts and outputs; deletion on schedule	Privacy officer



Privacy law in most places requires that you protect patient information, limit use to legitimate purposes, control access and have agreements with vendors who handle the data. The details vary by country and region. Rather than trying to summarize them here, ask your privacy officer to map each proposed use to the applicable requirements and to confirm that the vendor agreement covers them. If the vendor will not sign the agreement your regulations require, the answer is no.

De-identification can lower risk for some uses, such as analyzing call themes or scheduling patterns, but it is not a magic word. Removing names is not always enough, because other details can identify a person. Have your privacy lead decide what counts as sufficiently de-identified for each purpose, and check current guidance.



Patient communication carries trust. People should know when they are dealing with an automated tool, be able to reach a human easily and be offered alternatives if they prefer. Consider accessibility and language needs. A fast, friendly automated reminder that confuses an older patient or one with limited English can reduce access.

CHECK CURRENT REQUIREMENTS

Rules on data handling, automated communication, consent and medical documentation differ by jurisdiction and change. Confirm with your compliance team and counsel.

WORKING QUESTION

Could you list, today, every tool that has touched patient information in the last month, and who approved each?

MEASURING VALUE

Baselines, metrics and test sets

06

Measure staff time, access and patient experience, and also measure errors and harm.

Choose a narrow workflow and measure it before you change it. For example, record how many minutes a scheduler spends on a reschedule request, how many calls are abandoned, how many no-shows occur, how long it takes to produce a referral letter, or how many claims are returned for missing information. Collect two to four weeks of data using the same method you will use in the pilot.

METRIC	HOW TO MEASURE	NOTE
Handling time per task	Sample timed tasks before and during pilot	Include review time

METRIC	HOW TO MEASURE	NOTE
Call abandonment and wait	From the phone system	Watch for patient frustration with automation
No-show and late cancellation rate	From the scheduling system	Many factors; compare like periods
Letter or note turnaround	Time from visit to signed document	Clinician review time included
Claim return rate for administrative errors	From billing system, by reason	Verify with coding audit
Error and near-miss log	Staff report any wrong output and what caught it	Zero reports is a warning sign, not a success
Patient feedback	Short survey or comments on communication	Include those who opted for a human

Test before launch

01 Build a test set

Assemble 40 to 60 realistic, de-identified or synthetic cases: scheduling requests, messages, sample notes and clinical questions the tool must refuse.

02 Define correct

Have the workflow owner and clinical lead write the expected outcome for each case.

03 Score

Mark each output correct, minor error, major error or properly declined. Any major error or any answered clinical question blocks launch.

04 Repeat

Re-run after any change to the tool, content or settings.

ILLUSTRATIVE ARITHMETIC

If a scheduler handles 30 reschedule requests a day at 6 minutes each, and a tool prepares options in 3 minutes, the gross saving is 90 minutes a day. Include staff checking time, and use your own figures.

 WORKING QUESTION

What error rate would make you stop the pilot, and who has the authority to stop it?

 IMPLEMENTATION

Implementation guide

07



Begin with low-risk administrative tasks, small data, and a pilot that a privacy officer has approved.



01 Select a workflow

Pick a repetitive administrative workflow with a clear owner, such as appointment reminders, referral letter drafts or call routing for common logistical questions.

02 Run the approval path

Document data used, vendor, review step and patient impact. Obtain privacy and clinical sign-off.

03 Prepare approved content

Collect the templates, policies and patient information materials the tool may use. Remove outdated versions.

04 Configure and test

Limit scope, set refusal behavior for clinical questions, test with the case set and fix failures.

05 Pilot

Run for four to eight weeks in one clinic or team, with the error log, weekly review and patient disclosure in place.

06 Decide and document

Compare to baseline, review incidents and feedback, and decide to scale, change or stop.

Before the pilot goes live

- Privacy officer and clinical lead have signed off
- Vendor agreement covers patient data as required
- Tool scope is administrative and clinical questions are refused
- Staff are trained, with named reviewers for each output
- Patients are told when automation is used and can reach a person
- Baseline, error log and stop rule are in place



Involve front-line staff early. Schedulers and medical secretaries know where the real problems are, which forms cause errors and which patients need extra help. They are also the ones who will notice when the tool misbehaves. Run a short practice session with real but non-sensitive examples, and agree that raising a concern is part of the job.

Plan for downtime. If the tool is unavailable, the clinic must run without it. Keep manual procedures current and test them, so that a vendor outage does not become a patient access problem.



WORKING QUESTION

Which administrative workflow could you pilot with the least patient data and the clearest reviewer?

PITFALLS

Common pitfalls and an illustrative scenario

08



The expensive mistakes are privacy shortcuts, scope creep into clinical content and unreviewed output.

- Staff using consumer tools on their own because approved options are slow to arrive.
- A patient-facing assistant that drifts into health advice.
- Signing clinical documents without reading the full draft because it looked right.
- Accepting coding suggestions without checking the documentation.



- Not telling patients that automated tools are in use.
- Measuring only speed and ignoring errors and patient experience.
- No manual fallback during outages.

**ILLUSTRATIVE SCENARIO (HYPOTHETICAL)**

A small clinic pilots a reminder and rescheduling assistant. In testing, a tester asks whether a symptom is serious. The tool answers. The team tightens the instructions, adds a refusal and handoff, and retests until it declines every clinical question. Only then does the pilot start. Testing the boundary before launch prevented a real incident.



A subtler problem is automation bias. Reviewers who see mostly correct drafts begin to skim. The first error that slips through usually appears after weeks of good results. Counter this by rotating reviewers, seeding occasional known errors in training exercises, and keeping review time realistic in schedules.

Finally, remember that administrative friction is often a symptom of a process problem. If a form is confusing, a tool that fills it faster may entrench a bad form. Where possible, fix or remove the step first.

**WORKING QUESTION**

What is the first sign you would see if reviewers had started to skim, and who would notice?



BUYING AND VENDORS

Vendor questions for a high-sensitivity environment

09

Ask for specifics in writing. Reassuring language is not a control.

TOPIC	ASK	WHY IT MATTERS
Agreements	Will you sign the data protection agreement our regulations require? Provide it before the trial.	Legal prerequisite
Data use	Is patient data used to train models? Who can access it? Where is it stored and processed?	Privacy and control
Security	What certifications or independent assessments exist, and can we see summaries?	Assurance
Boundaries	Show how the tool refuses clinical questions. Let us test it.	Safety
Integration	How does it connect to our scheduling, records and billing systems, and with what permissions?	Limits data exposure
Logging and exit	Can we see logs, delete data and export our content?	Accountability and lock-in

Do not accept a product whose claims depend on clinical performance unless it is regulated and validated for that use and your clinical governance has approved it. That is outside this playbook. For administrative tools, insist on a trial with your own de-identified or synthetic cases, written answers to security questions, and references from similar organizations.

Before you sign

- Data protection agreement is signed as required
- Security review is complete and documented
- Refusal behavior has been tested by your team
- Pricing and contract terms are clear, including price at scale

- Incident notification terms are acceptable
- You have an exit and data deletion plan

S.

WORKING QUESTION

Which vendor claim would you ask to see demonstrated on your own cases before believing it?

30 / 60 / 90

A first quarter that produces evidence

10

N

Spend 90 days approving, testing and piloting one administrative workflow under privacy and clinical oversight.

First 30 days: ground it

- Name the sponsor, privacy officer, clinical lead and workflow owner
- Create the approval path and register of AI uses
- Select one low-risk administrative workflow and capture a baseline
- Issue a clear staff rule on tools that may not be used with patient data

**Days 31 to 60: test it**

- Complete vendor review and agreements before any patient data is used
- Build and score a 40 to 60 case test set, including clinical questions the tool must refuse
- Train reviewers and front-line staff, including how to report errors
- Add patient disclosure and a human route to the workflow



Days 61 to 90: decide

- Run the pilot in one team with a weekly review of errors and near-misses
- Compare results to baseline, including patient and staff feedback
- Decide to scale, change or stop, with the privacy officer and clinical lead
- Update policies, training and downtime procedures

GLOSSARY

Terms used in this publication

11

TERM	MEANING
Administrative use	Work that supports operations such as scheduling, letters and billing, as opposed to clinical decisions.
Protected health information	Identifiable patient information that privacy law requires you to safeguard; the term and rules vary by jurisdiction.
Data protection agreement	A contract setting how a vendor may handle your patient data.
De-identification	Removing or masking details so a person cannot reasonably be identified.
Prior authorization	A payer's approval step required before certain services or medicines.
Administrative coding	Assigning standard codes to diagnoses and procedures for billing and reporting.
Referral	A request for a patient to be seen by another provider.
No-show rate	The share of booked appointments missed without notice.
Revenue cycle	The administrative process from registration to payment collection.
Automation bias	The tendency to over-trust automated output and review it less carefully.
Refusal behavior	The designed response of a tool when asked something outside its scope.
Audit log	A record of who used a system and what was done.

A note on use

This playbook covers administrative use only. It is not medical, legal or compliance advice. Check current privacy security and professional requirements in your jurisdiction.



TAKE THE NEXT STEP

Take the free Halden assessment at halden.company/assessments, or talk to us at halden.company/contact about turning this into a plan for your organization.

