Library Council
Wednesday October 8, 2025
9:00 AM, Zoom and 311G

Library Council Attendance: Chad Buckley, Colby Cilento, Carrie Forbes, Ellie Harman, Logan Janicki, Jayna Leipart Guttilla, Lindsey Skaggs, Chris Worland, Angela Yon

Agenda

I. Call to Order

Chair Lindsey Skaggs called the meeting to order at 9:01 AM.

II. Approval of Minutes from 9/10/25 Library Council Meeting

Library Council approved the 9/10/25 minutes.

III. Public Comments

Chair Skaggs recognized Emily Baldoni, who had registered to speak.

Emily Baldoni, Metadata Librarian, shared comments related to the Artificial Intelligence Working Group recommendations, which were on the agenda. She thanked the group members for their work and for creating the AI tools fact sheet. She asked for clarification about the scope of the recommendations document. The title was general, but the charge was currently written to restrict the scope to AI summary tools. However, there are also AI tools such as research assistants in Primo VE, or assisted search tool overlays that summarize search results, and others. The fact sheet seems to be focused on AI powered search assistants that the end user interacts with.

Baldoni noted we are also starting to see the release of AI powered metadata services from some vendors, such as Clarivate offering AI-enhanced MARC records for Ebook Central. That is still using AI but is a fundamentally different case than how the AI research assistant tools are being used. It is not just between the end user and the database but changing the metadata on the backend. This is not something a user can choose to opt out or decline to use but will impact searches in less visible ways. The questions used to evaluate an AI metadata tool would be different than those used for AI search assistants or summary tools. She wanted to make a case for developing guidelines and methods for evaluating tools that speak to those specific scenarios.

IV. Information Items

A. AI Working Group Recommendations for Activating AI Tools (Norris)

Grace Norris, AI Working Group member and Electronic Resources Librarian, explained that the charge for the group was to develop a procedure and protocol for the increasing number of AI tools present in electronic resources (e-resources). They were asked to address and provide recommendations for tool scenarios. For all scenarios, the recommendation is that when anyone becomes aware of a tool, they notify the e-resources team via the liberesources@ilstu email address. Typically, they would be notified by the vendor but sometimes there could be a tool they missed. Once notified, e-resources would recommend that the tool be turned off and reach out to the appropriate subject liaison(s) for that resource, or if it was a general resource, reach out to Kate Tallman, Head of Liaison Services. An appropriate evaluation group would then be identified and formed. Once that group completed their evaluation, their recommendation - to activate or deactivate the tool - would be shared at a public services meeting.

Norris explained that the scenarios they looked at were as follows:

- #1: An AI summary tool has been turned on by the vendor automatically but could be disabled
- #2: An AI summary tool is available and could be turned on with no additional expenditure
- #3: An AI summary tool is available and could be turned on with additional expenditure
- #4: An AI summary tool cannot be turned off and is available for all users automatically

Norris shared that for scenario #3, the collection development group would share resource information with the affected liaisons and determine if it was worth pursuing and if the cost was feasible. An evaluation would then be made if there was interest and presented at a collection development meeting. For scenario #4, they would follow the same approach in forming an evaluation group, then once the evaluation was completed, it would be presented at a public services meeting. The liaisons of the affected area or the evaluation group would also determine if perhaps an external resource or disclaimer should be pursued for that tool.

Norris explained they also considered whether there should be frequently asked questions (FAQ) or libguide about how to use these tools once they were turned on. In terms of evaluation, they came up with an AI fact sheet as a base document, which was more suggestive and not comprehensive. Different subject areas will want to employ different criteria and evaluation methods, so evaluation groups can delete or add those as needed. An AI tool in e-resources document was also created to keep a running list of those tools they knew about. Those are in the working group folder but should be moved to a technical services department folder or somewhere else where anyone can access them.

Norris addressed Baldoni's question. The original scope was for summarization tools, but they could also see natural language searches and other tools coming up. They suggest still using the fact sheet and tweaking based on what other evaluation methods might be needed. She noted that the Ebook Central example mentioned came up yesterday, so it was not considered by the working group. The suggestion would be to still use the fact sheet as a baseline and include metadata and cataloging personnel rather than subject liaisons.

Angela Yon noted she and Baldoni discussed this yesterday with each other. It made sense to involve metadata and cataloging, but she thinks an evaluation would have to be made and does not know who would do that.

Norris stated that the working group suggested e-resources reach out to affected stakeholders to form the evaluation group, which in that case would involve metadata and cataloging, and ask who they wanted to be in that group. The recommendation is that each tool has an evaluation group appointed. Appointment would be voluntary.

Chris Worland asked if e-resources had the right level of support to take in and coordinate the evaluation groups. The working group, by its nature, was meant to be short-term and time limited. Would the evaluation groups report back to e-resources? He was curious to hear from Norris about whether e-resources had the capacity for this work or if the library needed to consider that this be added as an additional role to a person or group.

Yon noted Worland made a good point. This is continuing work which someone would need to oversee and be responsible for. She is curious about what other institutions are doing about this and what their evaluation methods are. She suspects vendors aren't assessing the metadata they are driving to us, and there may be unwanted consequences of mixing it in with our metadata and discovery system. We need to know the percentages of AI metadata being included. That's more of an e-resources/metadata thing, but someone needs to do that work on a continuing basis.

Worland noted that someone needed to be responsible for coordinating the efforts, not necessarily making the decisions. He wouldn't want to put that on Norris if that was not part of her job description.

Norris shared that the initial thought was that e-resources would be the coordinator for this work, including getting the proper individuals on board for the evaluation groups. There are vendor questions in the fact sheet and e-resources could take the lead on those given their relationships with them. The evaluation groups would be the true determiner, but she would be available to assist. There are some duties in e-resources that Seth Peterson and Logan Janicki, electronic resource specialists, would plan to take over for her so she could do this. This is e-resources work, and she is not concerned with the scope of it.

Skaggs asked who would win out if there were a couple of subject liaisons evaluating a tool who came to different conclusions. She noted this was a problem that had been encountered from time to time, such as when there was a Primo/Alma Working Group. She served on that when she had discovery services as part of her position but never felt she had the authority to make the call. If there were a difference of opinion and no resolution at the public services meeting, the default was usually inaction. Individuals in the library had different perspectives on these tools so they could come to different conclusions. It would be important to know who had the authority to make the call if there was a disagreement, which comes with the territory of working groups.

Worland asked what Library Council (LC) should do now in terms of the working group, is there some other direction we had for them or should their work be considered complete.

Norris explained there were a few things she hoped that LC would decide on, such as the location of documents for future access and whether every AI tool should have an FAQ or libguide, or if that should be up to the evaluation group. She also noted that the working group discussed having information on the A-Z list or some kind of disclaimer about AI tools, or a public note in Primo VE.

Skaggs liked the idea of having a disclaimer for any tool that could not be deactivated, similar to the language in the A-Z list for databases requiring accounts. Having an FAQ for every tool might be unwieldy, but it may be worth having a blanket statement about evaluating and using the tools. Now that the material from the working group has been distributed to the library, they can give feedback on it. If there was a tool that was currently turned off, it might be a good test use case. She would email the library to ask for them to provide feedback to be considered by LC.

Dean Carrie Forbes noted that in the case of disagreement, there may need to be voting by the evaluation group to have the majority prevail, unless another group such as Library Council was given that authority.

Cilento would not feel comfortable with LC having decision making authority without involvement in the evaluation process. She agrees with Lindsey about adding disclaimers.

Dean Forbes noted there could be an overall AI guide which includes that content.

Worland asked if the same process should be initiated if a faculty member had a question about turning on a tool or if they heard about a tool they wished to explore. He wouldn't want to open e-resources up to having to answer a ton of questions.

Norris noted that completed evaluations would be available in Milner's shared drive so the reasoning for enabling or disabling those tools could be shared with inquiring faculty.

Dean Forbes referenced the software purchasing process, which would also be a factor for some AI tools.

Yon asked if the charge section for the working group should be revised to include more than just summary tools; whereby, Norris stated she was fine with doing so but did not know if that was her decision to make.

Dean Forbes affirmed that the working group would be finishing these documents, but the ongoing evaluation work would move to e-resources plus the designated evaluation groups.

Skaggs would solicit feedback from the library. She confirmed with LC that they would convene the second meeting in October to discuss this in two weeks.

V. Discussion Items

A. **Guidelines for Forming Search Committees (Forbes)**

Dean Carrie Forbes had provided LC with a document outlining draft guidelines for forming search committees. She noted it had been provided shortly before the meeting, so it could be on the agenda for discussion at the next meeting as well. She reviewed the documentation from human resources and the LC bylaws for search committee formation information. There was only wording about associate dean searches in the bylaws; the rest was rather vague. Previously, LC could go into a closed session to discuss search committee volunteers it had solicited, but that was no longer permitted per the Open Meetings Act (OMA) and some concerns were expressed about discussing volunteers in an open meeting.

Dean Forbes shared that previous libraries she was employed at had very comprehensive documents and checklists for searches. She asked how a call for volunteers should be solicited, and whether LC needed to be involved. She noted in the draft document that the call was coming from the dean but could be deferred to the supervisor of the position or another individual. She understood the practice at Milner had been for the search committee to select their own chair, but she also received feedback that could be awkward, and some end up chairing because no one else will. She also noted that some individuals may not volunteer to be on a committee because they do not wish to end up as the chair. She suggested she, as the dean, could appoint the chair to help with that process. She appreciates the volunteer culture at Milner but noted that the same individuals volunteered repeatedly and maybe if directly asked, someone new would be willing to serve.

Skaggs liked the idea of the dean identifying the chair as a first step in the process. She noted that different classifications may have different needs or requirements for searches, there are some civil service (CS) positions that do not require a Master of Library Science degree that have had screening committees appointed by the dean rather than search committees with volunteers solicited at LC.

Dean Forbes noted that human resources (HR) said it was appropriate to have a supervisor serve as chair of a subordinate position's search committee. In some cases, because of the type of position, that may make the most sense.

Skaggs noted the tradition of soliciting volunteers and that she wouldn't want to necessarily take that away if individuals were instead asked to serve, but Forbes was correct that oftentimes the same individuals volunteered and were on many searches.

Dean Forbes asked Skaggs to clarify if she was suggesting that the chair be identified first, then a call be made for volunteers for the rest of the committee.

Skaggs stated that the chair could perhaps assist the dean in identifying other potential members to serve. She noted that with searches for tenure track faculty members (TT), she believed there may be requirements for classification representation on the search committees.

Cilento agreed, noting she recalled being told during prior search committee formations that there needed to be certain representation. She was unsure if this was a requirement or just a traditional method of committee formation at Milner.

Dean Forbes noted she did not believe that applied to all searches; whereby, Chad Buckley shared that he believed it did for administrator positions.

Worland believed there was some flexibility in search committee compositions, other than maybe for a dean or associate dean. For some positions, it would make sense to have a small group comprise the committee, noting the interview process was different depending on the classifications, in particular for CS employees.

Worland noted there were instances in the past where he wished the formation of a search committee had been more transparent, but others where it had been very transparent, and the number of volunteers received was low. He favored deciding based on what makes sense for the position.

Dean Forbes stated there could be general guidelines but delineate some differences for committees by the type of position. In her opinion, specialized positions could benefit from having a third or fourth committee member who was external and did not know the position well.

Skaggs asked if they wanted to specify that a search committee chair be named first and could assist with the composition, or if there should be calls for a chair and subsequently the other members.

Cilento noted she was on board with the idea of selecting the chair first, either via volunteer or dean selection, then working on the composition of the remainder of the committee. Perhaps the chair could send a call for volunteers.

Yon asked Dean Forbes if she would be assigning the chairperson; whereby, Dean Forbes clarified she would ask someone to serve, rather than assign.

Yon asked if then the chair would issue a call for volunteers or would Library Council continue to do so.

Dean Forbes shared she did not think it would make sense for LC to do so because of the issue with the closed session.

Cilento noted she would have some concerns about the chair potentially having the sole authority to seat the entire committee. She would favor the dean having oversight or working with the chair to select members.

Dean Forbes asked if the supervisor for the hiring position typically served as chair of the search committee; whereby, Cilento noted that they did sometimes, but others had as well, such as the associate dean or other volunteers.

Skaggs would send this out for feedback as well from the library. This would be an action item for the next meeting to adopt the guidelines based on the feedback received.

VI. Celebratory Items

<u>Karmine Beecroft recognition</u>
Dean Forbes highlighted a news story about Karmine Beecroft and their work with Queer Coalition at ISU, celebrating the 10th anniversary of Queer Talks.

<u>Lindsey Skaggs recognition</u>
Yon congratulated Skaggs on being invited to present a national webinar based on her poster at the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) conference this past spring.

Skaggs explained that the webinar was about conducting bite-sized usability testing and would be held in February. It would be through the Florida Library Virtual Campus and distributed through the Consortium of Academic Research Libraries in Illinois (CARLI) and other consortiums.

VII. Announcements/Other

<u>Faculty & Staff Appreciation Luncheon</u>
Dean Forbes shared that ISU's Faculty & Staff Appreciation Luncheon will be held on October 14. Please register if you would like to attend.

Homecoming
Dean Forbes shared that decorating for the homecoming décor contest would occur soon. Homecoming week is October 13-19.

Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned by Chair Skaggs at 9:58 a.m.

Submitted by C. Cilento
15 October 2025