Library Council
Wednesday October 22, 2025
9:00 AM, Zoom and 311G

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

Agenda

I. Call to Order

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

II. Approval of Minutes from 10/08/25 Library Council Meeting

Library Council approved the 10/08/25 minutes.

III. Public Comments

Chair Skaggs noted that no members of the public registered to speak.

IV. Information Items

A. Senate Update (Bonnell)

Angela Bonnell, Chair of Academic Senate, provided the following updates:

- From September 24 Academic Senate Meeting:
    - Chief Information Security Officer Dan Taube gave a presentation related to cybersecurity on campus.
    - There was also a rare and complicated situation regarding the rescinding of a previously approved motion from March 2025, which Senate had to navigate through.
- From October 8 Academic Senate Meeting:
    - Associate Vice President for Budget and Planning Amanda Hendrix gave a presentation on the fiscal year (FY) 2026 operating budget and FY 2027 operating capital requests.
        - This occurs in the Senate each fall semester.
        - FY 26 is the transition year for the new budgeting model, which will be implemented in FY 27.
    - Two faculty members gave public comments on block scheduling. They expressed concerns about the Registrar's guidelines, which have been in place since 2021, but there are concerns about the implementation of those guidelines.
    - There are concerns about the federal government's involvement with higher education, especially nine institutions being offered incentives if they agree to adopt administration policies. Seven of the nine so far have rejected the offer.
        - Nationally, there are threats to shared governance in higher education, particularly in the Texas system.

        - Civil discourse is an integral element in higher education and especially in the Academic Senate, which is a public body and subject to the Open Meetings Act. Deliberations occur openly and public comment is permitted. Work in the Senate adheres to the fundamental elements of intellectual freedom - the right to think, speak, be heard, and dissent without fear of reprisal.
        - The Senate passed a resolution supporting shared government, quoting policy 4.1.8 on institutional and program priorities. Bonnell read the policy as follows:
          As articulated in the Illinois State University Constitution and the Bylaws of the Academic Senate, and as agreed to in the Memorandum of Understanding on Board of Trustees and Academic Senate Procedures on Academic Senate Actions, within the limits established by legislative statute and the authority delegated thereby to the Board of Higher Education and the Board of Trustees, the Academic Senate shall be the primary body to recommend educational policies of the University related to academic issues, faculty affairs issues, and educational issues related to student life and to advise administrators on their implementation. As such, University administrators shall consult the Academic Senate when making significant institutional and program priority judgments and must be certain that all facts are considered, positions are objectively presented, and parties are consulted before recommending action. Moreover, when facts at the disposal of administrators indicate specific priorities, these should be fully aired in the Senate. The Senate should give advice, assure support or opposition, and/or debate philosophical questions.
    - In the provost's remarks, there was an update on the classroom door locks project. The project will be done in four phases and the 400 locks in the first three phases will be about three-quarters of the way installed in the next couple of weeks.
- There will be two Resilience, Innovation, Sustainability, and Excellence (RISE) Taskforce town halls held, one on October 22 and one on October 23. Please attend if you would like more information or to ask questions. There will likely be some pointed questions on some of the things that would affect faculty specifically, such as sabbaticals and the Academic Impact Fund.

V. Discussion Items - Continued from 10/08 Meeting

A. **AI Working Group Recommendations for Activating AI Tools**

Chair Skaggs stated this was the continuation of a discussion item from the previous Library Council (LC) meeting. She noted that the tenure-track faculty (TT) caucus met the previous day to discuss this.

Chris Worland shared that the non-tenure-track faculty (NTT) caucus also did the same. They discussed a lot of the same questions from the last LC meeting. They discussed equitable workloads for those that may need to serve on the evaluation teams. He explained that all current NTTs were subject librarians, some of whom had multidisciplinary areas. There may be times when there were three or four tools needing evaluation at the same time or in short order that would all impact one subject area, causing one librarian to have to serve on all those evaluation teams. That felt like it could be a lot of work, especially if it's at busy times of the year or for multiple tools/teams at once. He noted that Grace Norris, as Electronic Resources Librarian, coordinating the work made sense to them. They also discussed how ties would be broken, if there was a split decision among the team on a review. Who makes the final decision?

Chair Skaggs shared that equitable distribution also came up when TTs met to discuss this. They were also concerned about the burden being put on Norris and the electronic resources (e-resources) team, which was mentioned at the last LC meeting also. One suggestion was that it would be up to the Electronic Resources Librarian, currently Norris, to notify the Head of Liaison Services, currently Kate Tallman, and then that individual would loop in needed subject librarians and they could determine if there was a need to evaluate the tool or not. This would be the procedure for public-facing tools.

Chair Skaggs explained they discussed having additional criteria on the fact sheet that could help, almost like a flow chart if not explicitly that, which could help determine if an evaluation should be undertaken in the first place. There could be criteria that would lead to a tool not even needing to be evaluated because it was a nonstarter. An example of such criteria would be if there was any cost associated with the tool, or if xyz applies then it would not be necessary to proceed through the rest of the evaluation.

Logan Janicki noted that the civil service (CS) caucus had not met to discuss this. He spoke with the rest of the e-resources team yesterday about what to do when the evaluation group doesn't agree about a tool. Their perspective was to do a vote and majority rules. If the voting was tied, they would advocate erring on the side of enabling the tool rather than finding a further tiebreaker. Thus, if 50 percent of the evaluation team wanted the tool turned on, it would be.

Worland agreed with the suggestion of having a rubric that could offer some default "no" scenarios as well as what considerations would apply for a "yes". There could be a baseline to cross for a tool to be considered for review. He noted the guiding documents the working group provided have a lot of language that could be used for that. This approach could help reduce administrative work and the decisions for some tools could be quickly decided via rubric.

Janicki noted that as more tools were added, they could refer to the other evaluations. He asked how they would communicate information about the enabled tools to patrons, which was discussed at the last LC meeting. He was not a fan of having a dedicated AI tools webpage or section of the website. He explained it would be really hard for users to come across that authentically, he would be more in favor of a note in the entries in the A-Z list or on Primo, where users would have more opportunity to encounter the disclaimer that the database has the tool.

Skaggs highlighted the statement on bias in cataloging that appears on records in Primo VE. Something similar could be added to reach users but she thought that starting with the A-Z list sounded reasonable. She explained that as far as having a statement on the website, that would not be the place to list AI resources but there could be a library position statement on the ethical use of AI. If the library chooses to enable a tool, it will be seen as an endorsement of it. There was concern in TT caucus about that. What happens in a scenario where a student uses a library licensed resource and gets incorrect information from it or it hallucinates information, and the student gets a bad grade but argues they used library resources, which reflects poorly on the library. The TT caucus was in favor of taking a default stance of turning the tools off, when that is possible. There could then be a statement on ethical use of AI from the library and where we stand with library tools, so we could explain that an evaluation is done of each tool before enabling (if there is a choice) and the reason for that is because we value good research practices and don't want to train students to use tools that ultimately won't serve or teach them. She asked if such a statement could be put on the website.

Colby Cilento shared that the Graduate School has such a statement on their website and the Committee for the Ethical Use of Artificial Intelligence on campus also has a website which has that information for campus.

Dean Carrie Forbes stated that something could be drafted and shared with the provost's office in case of concerns.

Chair Skaggs noted at the last LC meeting, they discussed the scope of the evaluations and were comfortable leaving that to public facing tools. There was discussion that if there are workflow related tools, like cataloging enhancements, then the people in the departments using them should be evaluating them more straightforwardly. There was a suggestion to update the preamble in the working group's charge to clarify that this process is for public facing tools.

Chair Skaggs also shared that Caitlin Stewart, Teaching and Learning Librarian, also noted that the laboratory school librarians use our resources and would want to be consulted for certain databases for the evaluation groups. This could be something the Head of Liaison Services could coordinate. The general desire of the TT caucus was also that when negotiating with vendors, they could attempt to request that they opt out of new tools initially and require notification when those would be added. This would be great but would of course depend on the terms of the contracts.

Dean Forbes asked if there were faculty that might be engaging with tools that were turned on previously by default. She noted if they were, and those tools were suddenly deactivated, that could be disruptive. She suggested that perhaps during the evaluation process, the liaison librarian would find out if the tool had already been being used, if it was one which had been turned on already.

Chair Skaggs noted that Head of Technical Services Eric Willey had suggested perhaps going to the Consortium of Academic and Research Libraries in Illinois (CARLI) to see if they wanted to create a central repository for the evaluation worksheets so those could be shared with other institutions and others could share their own, to not duplicate work among the consortia libraries. Norris had reached out to discuss this.

Chair Skaggs suggested the following as next steps for this item:

- Provide feedback from caucuses and LC discussions to AI Working Group for them to consider and potentially incorporate.
- Recommend moving forward with OVID AI article summaries as a test case using the fact sheet, Norris already contacted subject librarians.
- Pass on recommendation to turn off tools initially (when possible).

Cilento moved, seconded by Jayna Leipart Guttilla, to proceed in the manner outlined by Skaggs. The motion passed unanimously.

Skaggs shared a link to a WGLT post on artificial intelligence in the newsroom: https://www.wglt.org/artificial-intelligence-a-i-in-the-newsroom, that Director of Library Information Technology Services Paul Unsbee had provided to her.

B. **Guidelines for Forming Search Committees**

Chair Skaggs stated this was the continuation of a discussion item from the previous Library Council (LC) meeting. There was an opportunity for additional feedback. She had received a note about an editing change in the document but did not hear anything substantive about this from TT caucus.

Worland noted that NTTs had discussed this. In general, it made sense to them but as they discussed it longer, they recalled some experiences of being "volun-told" to serve on committees. With NTTs, CS, and un-tenured faculty, there can be concerns about the power differential and the ability to say "no", even when asked kindly and told it is optional. The concern is those employees won't feel they can decline a request from the dean to serve. Another concern was equitable workloads. If supervisors are leaned on to serve on committees and as chairs, that would mean someone like Tallman would be on the committee for every single subject librarian and have a disproportionate number of requests to serve. The same could be true for Willey, who also supervises a large number of individuals. Some searches are significant time commitments, and being the chair is even more of one.

Skaggs was concerned with how this would be reflected in guidelines. The reality with forming search committees is, while they have mostly been volunteer based, there have been some asks and it has not always been voluntary. The issue of putting the burden of service and/or serving as chair on folks that are not compensated for service work is a concern.

Worland explained that NTT caucus also discussed that there was an unwritten rule that tenured or tenure-line faculty would be the chair because they have service in their job descriptions. There has been an expectation that NTTs or CS should not or could not serve as chair. That may not have been communicated directly widely but has been communicated indirectly in several situations, especially for a tenure-line position search. Being a chair is not just a large time commitment but there also needs to be a level of support and guidance as to what a good chair should be doing.

Jayna Leipart Guttilla agreed with Worland's comments. She has served on three search committees at Milner, and the tasks, timelines, and questions have been different for all of them. It would be helpful and more equitable if there was consistent documentation.

Dean Forbes noted that could be addressed. She and Cilento discussed having documentation for how searches were to be conducted and standard expectations of those serving on committees at other institutions.

Dean Forbes explained there had been discussion at the last LC meeting about whether the search chair should be appointed by the dean or selected via volunteer.

Worland noted that if there were no volunteers, individuals would need to be asked. If there was more support to serve as chair, it could help those asked to feel better about serving.

Dean Forbes stated she would like there to be opportunities for chairs that were not tenure-track faculty, but it is a gray area because there is an expectation for TTs to have that service where it is more optional for NTTs and CS.

Worland thought serving as a search chair could be a good learning opportunity for someone if they were interested and properly supported.

Dean Forbes explained at a previous institution, they would specifically put individuals who had not served before on search committees so they could learn the process from the chair and feel like they gained the necessary experience for future service.

Chair Skaggs noted she was told that no one chairs their first time on a committee, which makes sense, but that guidance would help. She explained she was also surprised by the lack of standardization for search materials at Milner. A template could be created from some of the existing tools and materials.

Dean Forbes suggested a template repository, where the templates can be stored and pulled and adapted for future searches.

Leipart Guttilla asked who would put that together; whereby, Skaggs volunteered to start gathering materials.

Dean Forbes shared that Tracy Berner, Business Manager, and her predecessor, may have some documentation. We could also request anyone in the library with templates from past searches to provide them.

Chair Skaggs noted a folder could be created in Microsoft Teams. She referenced Worland's comments about NTTs or CS chairing searches. She noted that she knew of a search committee previously for a TT position, comprised of volunteers. There was no designated chair or Associate Dean (who often ends up chairing), and a CS person felt like they got pushed into being chair for lack of volunteers and they felt it was inappropriate. She is comfortable endorsing the guidelines, as they stand with the clarification that the dean identifies the chair first.

Cilento agreed and noted that having standard documentation on expectations and for evaluating/interviewing candidates would likely make people feel much more comfortable serving on committees and reduce prep work.

Dean Forbes asked if there should be representatives from each caucus on each search committee. She explained that depending on the type of position, it may not be necessary. As an example, she noted an upcoming search in patron services.

Worland noted that NTT caucus discussed this and also agreed that for some positions it made more sense to have those directly impacted by the position serve.

Cilento agreed that it could depend on the position. For something like an associate dean or dean, it would be important to have broad representation from all classifications.

VI. Celebratory Items

There were no celebratory items.

VII. Announcements/Other

Election for TT seat on LC Council
Chair Skaggs noted that Angela Yon would be on sabbatical for the spring 2026 semester so a TT representative would need to be elected to serve that portion of her term. She explained this was a great opportunity for someone who wanted to serve to serve a short stint on LC and not be an officer.

Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned by Chair Skaggs at 9:57 a.m.

Submitted by C. Cilento
29 October 2025