Library Council
Wednesday November 12, 2025
9:00 AM, Zoom and 311G

Library Council Present: Chad Buckley, Colby Cilento, 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 9:00 AM.

Chair Skaggs noted that Dean Carrie Forbes may have to miss the meeting due to car trouble. Angela Yon will not be in attendance as she is presenting at a conference.

II.   Approval of Minutes from 10/22/25 Library Council Meeting

Library Council approved the 10/22/25 minutes.

III.   Public Comments

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

IV.   Discussion Items - Continued from 10/08 Meeting

A. **Policies or Procedures for Recording/Transcribing Meetings**

Chair Skaggs explained that there was a request to discuss the use of AI assistants, such as Otter.ai, to transcribe or record in-person or online meetings, sometimes without participants' knowledge or consent. She suggested being transparent about their use and giving an opportunity for consent to be given before using them. She asked if norms should be adopted for their use.

Colby Cilento agreed with the best practice being to get consent from others. She noted this was not just something that occurred in internal meetings but had happened to her in workshop settings and others with students. She wanted to figure out how to disable that by default.

Skaggs and Cilento discussed if a formal policy were needed, or if this should just be communicated as best practice.

Chair Skaggs noted that there were internal documents available which detailed how to run meetings; this could be implemented as a practice alongside those.

Sue Franzen, Associate Dean for Public Services and Organizational Development, asked who was using these tools in meetings; whereby, Jayna Leipart Guttilla and Cilento indicated that they had attended meetings where they were later or contemporaneously notified by the tools that they had been activated.

Franzen explained that if you are using Otter.ai, it would default to recording and transcribing all your meetings on your calendar, unless you went in and turned off that setting.

Chair Skaggs suggested that at the next Information Assets and Public Services meetings, this could be broached, so it was communicated to be a working norm to ask for permission before using transcription or recording tools.

Chair Skaggs recognized Grace Allbaugh, Humanities and Social Sciences Librarian. Allbaugh explained that there could be a potential issue for American with Disabilities Act accommodations if transcribing was not permitted.

Cilento suggested that the meeting information could include language about accommodation, so that those could be requested if needed. She noted Otter.ai also took screenshots and other recording tasks, potentially without consent, which she was not entirely comfortable with.

B. **AI Working Group Updates**

Chair Skaggs recognized the AI Working Group members in attendance – Grace Allbaugh, Joe Blaney, Grace Norris, Eric Willey, and Paul Unsbee. She noted Library Council (LC) won't meet again until December, so they needed to address some of the questions that were raised previously. Should all AI tools be turned off at this time? This is a lingering question from the AI Working Group, as some things are currently enabled.

Joe Blaney, Interim Dean for Information Assets, shared draft AI position statements that the working group had created. There were two versions available for review.

Allbaugh shared that regarding turning tools on or off by default, the group framed their discussion from a decision tree perspective. They decided it would be best to defer to having them off by default out of caution and a conservative mindset. If they were off by default, it made sense to start reviewing from scratch.

Chair Skaggs agreed and noted that Angela Yon, who was not in attendance, had also shared that she favored turning them off by default.

Grace Norris, Electronic Resources Librarian, explained that the reason that decision was not definitive was that at the last meeting Dean Forbes suggested there may be concerns from some on campus already using the tools which were presently turned on. If we move forward by turning them off, perhaps an email or some type of announcement could be sent out to let users know they were being turned off until they were able to be evaluated.

Allbaugh noted that faculty members or students using those tools should let their liaisons know because that would be valuable information for the evaluation.

Chair Skaggs asked what AI tools were currently enabled on library resources; whereby, Norris noted there was a list of them. She believed that they were OVID AI article summaries, Ebook Central AI research assistant, and Web of Science AI and natural language search. Hein had one coming out in the fall, but no date had been given yet. That one could be deactivated beforehand.

Chair Skaggs noted she had heard there was negative feedback from faculty about the Ebook Central tool.

Allbaugh explained that a faculty member had not realized the tool was activated until after their students completed an assignment which involved deep reading. Ultimately, that faculty member felt the tool ruined the activity and the summary content it provided was not great. There was a veiled threat to not request eBooks from the library anymore for use in such assignments if those tools were not turned off.

Franzen noted that if currently active tools were to be turned off, there needed to be a timeline established for doing so. She suggested the beginning of the spring semester, or even after the conclusion of it, so it did not impact any faculty who had incorporated the tools into their curriculum. The first trail review of a tool, Ovid's, is currently happening. Perhaps we want to wait to hear how that review goes before proceeding further because it seems like it is going to be time consuming to evaluate each of the tools.

Chair Skaggs noted it made sense to turn the existing tools off at the end of this semester, if we did not want to do so mid-semester. Currently, the most impactful tool is Ebook Central's, and there have already been negative experiences reported with it. She asked if there was a sandbox available to test these tools in or if they would have to be activated to do so; whereby, Norris was uncertain but could find out from the vendors.

Allbaugh suggested picking an end date; that way testing could be set up for the three which would be deactivated to clear the deck.

Cilento recommended turning them off after this semester, as after spring would mean another six plus months of those unevaluated tools being active and more would be likely to crop up in the meantime.

Eric Willey, Head of Technical Services, noted that not every step of the review process required the tool to be used; whereby, Chad Buckley agreed and noted that some of that process may be reviewing documentation.

Chair Skaggs summarized that the Hein tool could be turned off as it is released, and Ebook Central and Web of Science's tools can be turned off after the semester. Ovid's tool is currently under review. There was a low risk of turning off two to three tools at present. If anyone were using them on campus, she was sure we would hear about it. Given the negative experiences with Ebook Central, it seems appropriate to turn that off until further evaluation and analysis can be undertaken.

Allbaugh noted she and Norris discussed the options for pushing one eBook rather than another, because of the issues with Ebook Central. Suppressing tools is one thing, but as Norris had pointed out, suppressing content would be another. She reminded the instructor whose assignment was impeded that that title was available from another source as well.

Chris Worland asked how those who may have feedback about the tools should contact us to ask more about them.

Chair Skaggs referred to the position statement and the working group's drafts. She noted there was no contact information in the statement presently, but it could be added.

Allbaugh stated that a lot of the language in the statements was curbed from the tenure-track faculty (TT) caucus meeting notes. She explained that there were two statements because the working group did not feel it had the requisite authority to speak for the library, so they wanted to give it over to Library Council (LC).

Blaney noted the group had already gone beyond the initial scope and so in the spirit of not creating permanent work for the time-limited group, the statement was not being transferred to LC for consideration.

Norris explained that the two versions presented were not complete. She noted that Paul Unsbee, Director of Library Information Technology Services, had comments based on a statement from WGLT that he shared at the prior meeting. Primarily, he noted that there was more context in their statement about how they use AI, when they use AI, and how they will not use AI, that we may wish to consider adding.

Worland expressed his preference for the first version of the statement presented. He noted that the second version had language about confirmation of accuracy. He understood the sentiment there but noted the library also provided access to a lot of resources that were opinion or editorial based, or even retracted, and we did not control content to that level. He wouldn't want to think that turning on an AI tool is somehow equivalent to saying we agree to the veracity and accuracy of it. That almost feels like we are digging into whether AI can always be accurate, and if we can't guarantee it can be accurate then that's a reason to not turn it on. There's other content the library provides that is not always accurate that we are not necessarily flagging.

Norris suggested being clear that just because we evaluated the AI tool, it doesn't mean that it is accurate; whereby, Logan Janicki suggested a disclaimer that it could still be inaccurate despite prior testing.

Paul Unsbee is against publishing the statement in its current form. He doesn't think it will answer a lot of questions in the way it is presently written. It basically says AI exists, and we strive to review it but doesn't say who is doing that work or how. It is not really an overall AI statement but a sliver; it is a good starting point. He feels accuracy is something we need to take on ownership of. If these tools are summarizing information, accuracy is important for research purposes. Perhaps we could say that we have not found extreme inaccuracies; we should not imply accuracy and should probably say the opposite. Personally, this is why he feels it important to turn these tools off until we can review them, because of the accuracy. With any AI tool, you must look at the risk level of how important it is that it is accurate. He noted a problem with the Primo VE AI search tool that removed results related to topics like Palestine and covid-19. That's a level of inaccuracy we should be able to confidentially say we will turn off. There should be a line we are comfortable with saying we will not cross with a research tool.

Allbaugh noted her involvement in the drafting but explained that after reading the statements again this morning, the first one felt like a statement defending turning them off and never on again. There is a possibility we evaluate them and don't turn them on. The second statement feels like a conversation about whether we potentially turn them on. She asked if we were defending turning tools off if there are people who want to use them, and we deny them that, or if we are

becoming a part of the larger AI conversation. She noted it was not up to the working group to decide that.

Jayna Leipart Guttilla requested the draft statements be sent to LC members if it was up to them to finalize it.

Chair Skaggs said LC will review and mark-up the statements, then could go back to the working group for their thoughts since it was their source material, or could skip that and go to the library in general for comment; whereby, the working group expressed that was their preference. If you have any comments, go to your representative on LC. LC could flesh out if they wanted to have a more descriptive section in terms of how the evaluation is conducted. To Worland's point, do we want to include contact information? Who would the point of contact be? It is challenging that we don't have a discovery librarian who would probably be the point of contact. She also believes people will contact the person they know in the building if they have concerns.

Worland noted that questions or comments may come into the virtual reference service or service desk, which are staffed by students and a variety of people. He thinks there should be clear contact information that can be directed to.

Norris suggested the liberesources@ilstu email as the contact. They could then be routed as appropriate, if needed.

Buckley noted there was an About Milner section on the website where this statement could be posted.

Chair Skaggs asked if LC could meet to discuss this and make changes; whereby, Cilento stated that if they were going to vote on it, they could not meet about it unless it was in an open meeting per the Open Meetings Act. They could hold a special meeting just to work on it though.

Chair Skaggs asked if the working group needed council feedback on the OVID test case or anything else.

Norris shared her initial thoughts, that figuring out how to search and evaluate the tool was a hurdle. Having to do a full evaluation for every tool may be cumbersome and take a long time. Not that it doesn't mean we shouldn't do that work, but the time and work it takes should be considered. It was also difficult to get the evaluation team together because of everyone's schedules, so that was even more reason this would take time. Maybe we should set an expectation in the position statement that evaluations may take a long time.

Allbaugh recalled in a prior meeting discussion about having some points of evaluation that could be hard outs, where you knew if a question had a certain answer you could decide to continue or not.

Norris suggested that the evaluation groups could stop if they found something alarming when they started testing.

Allbaugh suggested language in the workflow that indicated that if and when there was a hard stop, the group did not need to complete the rest of the evaluation.

Skaggs noted that tools would be easier to identify if there were criteria which made them a definite "no". She gave the example of the Primo VE tool which only searched subsets of records and that made it a "no" because when students were looking for things like picture books and teaching materials, it would only return articles, and they wouldn't know we had those things in our collection. It would be more challenging to analyze summary tools.

Willey confirmed that the AI Working Group was relieved of duty.

V.   Celebratory Items

<u>Recognition for Baldoni and Yon</u>
Emily Baldoni and Angela Yon are presenting at the Core Forum.

<u>Milner Game Night</u>
Janicki gave a shoutout to Milner Game Night. He was vaguely involved with it, but it went very well. Anecdotally, from the desk, he could tell students loved contributing to the whiteboard and was glad it was still running. Skaggs noted there had been a nice writeup in the Vidette.

<u>Recognition for Scott and Baldoni</u>
Blaney announced there would be a tea and crumpets event to celebrate Rachel Scott's recent article. There would also be a Friday happy-hour drink in honor of Baldoni's book.

VI.   Announcements/Other

<u>Election for TT seat on LC Council</u>
Chair Skaggs reminded the LC election committee that they needed to hold an election for Angela Yon's seat while she is on sabbatical in the spring.

<u>Search Committee Documentation</u>
Chair Skaggs noted that she asked for search committee documentation at the last meeting. She will touch base with Dean Forbes about potential LC involvement with that. The idea was to put together documentation on how to run searches and score candidates. A lot of that exists but has not been compiled and put together for consistency.

<u>Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies Librarian</u>
Franzen stated that the candidates for the vacant Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies Librarian would be on campus in late November and early December.

<u>Adjournment</u>
The meeting was adjourned by Chair Skaggs at 9:50 a.m.

Submitted by C. Cilento
20 November 2025