





Preventing Bias and Ensuring Data Quality in AI Models for Agencies

Agencies can prevent bias and ensure data quality in their AI models by implementing a comprehensive strategy that spans governance, technical, and organizational practices.

Below are key approaches, supported by current best practices and industry recommendations:



1. Establish Robust Data Governance

- Develop Clear Policies: Implement data governance frameworks that define rules for data collection, storage, usage, and sharing¹. This includes documenting data sources, maintaining data lineage, and enforcing compliance with regulatory standards.
- **Create Oversight Bodies:** Form governing boards or councils with data stewards to set standards, enforce policies, and foster a culture of accountability and continuous improvement in data management².



2. Ensure Data Quality Across Key Dimensions

- Accuracy: Validate data to remove errors or inconsistencies before using it to train Al models. Rigorous data validation processes are essential for reliable outcomes³.
- **Completeness:** Use comprehensive datasets that cover all relevant aspects of the problem. Incomplete data can introduce bias and reduce model effectiveness³.
- **Consistency:** Standardize data formats and structures across sources to enable models to learn meaningful patterns³.
- **Timeliness:** Use up-to-date data, especially for applications requiring real-time insights. Regularly refresh datasets to maintain relevance³.
- **Relevance:** Carefully select data that is directly related to the AI model's objectives, using feature engineering to extract meaningful information³.

2



3. Mitigate Bias Through Inclusive Practices

- **Diverse and Representative Data:** Train AI models on datasets that reflect the diversity of the populations they serve, not just to avoid algorithmic bias but to ensure equitable outcomes³.
- Bias Detection and Correction: Integrate bias detection mechanisms and correction techniques during algorithm development and model evaluation⁴.
- **Regular Impact Assessments:** Conduct AI impact assessments at multiple stages of the model lifecycle to identify and address potential sources of bias⁵.
- Stakeholder Involvement: Involve a diverse range of stakeholders—including ethicists, sociologists, legal experts, and community representatives—to identify and mitigate biases that may not be apparent from a technical perspective⁴.

4. Promote Transparency and Accountability

- **Model Auditing:** Ensure AI models are auditable so users can understand and trust their results. This includes making model decisions explainable and documenting the steps taken to mitigate bias⁶.
- **Transparency in Decision-Making:** Clearly communicate how AI systems make decisions and the measures in place to ensure fairness and equity⁴.
- **Contestability:** Establish procedures for staff or affected individuals to contest or appeal automated decisions, providing a mechanism for accountability and redress⁵.

5. Continuous Monitoring and Improvement

- Ongoing Quality Monitoring: Continuously track data quality metrics such as accuracy, completeness, and consistency to identify and address issues as they arise¹.
- Iterative Model Training: Implement feedback loops and enable AI systems to learn and adapt over time, refining models as new, diverse data becomes available⁶.
- Ethical AI Frameworks: Embed ethical standards and regular bias checks into the AI development process to ensure responsible use⁶.

Preventing Bias and Ensuring Data Quality in Agency Artificial Intelligence (AI) Models

3

Summary Table: Key Actions for Agencies

	ACTION AREA	BEST PRACTICES/GUIDELINES
	Data Governance	Clear policies, oversight boards, data stewards
	Data Quality	Validation, completeness, consistency, timeliness, relevance
	Bias Mitigation	Representative data, bias detection, impact assessments
6	Transparency & Accountability	Model auditing, explainability, contestability
	Continuous Improvement	Ongoing monitoring, iterative training, ethical frameworks

By following these guidelines, agencies can significantly reduce the risk of bias and improve the quality of data used in their AI models, leading to more reliable, fair, and trustworthy outcomes for the public.



ARTICLE

How can transparent procedures help staff contest biased automated decisions

Transparent procedures are essential for enabling staff to contest biased automated decisions because they provide clarity on how decisions are made and on what basis, thus leveling the informational playing field between the decision-maker and those affected. Here's how transparency directly supports contestability:



Duty to Give Reasons: Transparent systems are required to provide clear explanations for automated decisions, detailing the factors and logic that led to a particular outcome. This enables staff to understand the rationale behind a decision and identify if and where bias may have occurred⁷.



Procedural Equality: By making the decision-making process visible and understandable, transparency ensures that all parties have equal access to the information needed to challenge a decision. This helps address the "informational asymmetries" that often exist in automated systems, where only the system's designers or operators understand how outcomes are determined⁸.



Explainability and Accountability: Transparent procedures often include mechanisms such as algorithmic impact assessments and data audits, which not only document how decisions are made but also assign responsibility for those decisions. This makes it possible to trace decisions back to specific data inputs or algorithmic rules, and to hold accountable those responsible for biased outcomes⁹.



Redress Mechanisms: Transparency is a prerequisite for effective redress. When staff can see and understand the logic and data behind a decision, they are empowered to contest it through formal channels, providing evidence and arguments based on the disclosed information¹⁰.



Building Trust and Empowerment: When agencies are open about their AI systems' operations, staff are more likely to trust the fairness of those systems and feel empowered to challenge decisions they believe are unjust.

In summary, transparent procedures transform opaque, "black box" AI decisions into accountable, contestable actions. This empowers staff to effectively challenge biased outcomes, ensures procedural fairness, and promotes trust in automated decision-making systems.



For more information or assistance, scan the QR code or call 1-888-216-3544.



- 1. Data Quality in AI: Challenges, Importance, and Best Practices In Time Tec Blog
- 2. ey-nascio-survey-report-vfinal.pdf
- 3. Data Quality in AI: Challenges, Importance, and Best Practices In Time Tec Blog
- 4. How to Mitigate Bias in AI Systems Through AI Governance
- 5. Preventing Racial Bias in Federal AI
- 6. Preparing Data for AI: A Guide for Government Agencies | Casepoint
- 7. The Right to Contest Automated Decisions The Digital Constitutionalist
- 8. Contesting Automated Decisions by Emre Bayamlıoğlu :: SSRN
- 9. Frontiers | Transparency and accountability in AI systems: safeguarding wellbeing in the age of algorithmic decision-making
- 10. Greenlining-Institute-Algorithmic-Bias-Explained-Report-Feb-2021.pdf



About LexisNexis® Risk Solutions

LexisNexis[®] Risk Solutions harnesses the power of data and advanced analytics to provide insights that help businesses and governmental entities reduce risk and improve decisions to benefit people around the globe. We provide data and technology solutions for a wide range of industries including insurance, financial services, healthcare and government. Headquartered in metro Atlanta, Georgia, we have offices throughout the world and are part of RELX (LSE: REL/NYSE: RELX), a global provider of information-based analytics and decision tools for professional and business customers. For more information, please visit www.risk.lexisnexis.com, and www.relx.com.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of RELX Inc. Other products and services may be registered trademarks or trademarks of their respective companies. © 2025 LexisNexis[®] Risk Solutions. NXR16962-00-0625-EN-US