

Library Council
Thursday, December 4, 2025
3:00 PM, 311G

Library Council Present: 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 3:02 P.M.

II. Discussion Items – Draft AI Policy Statement

Chair Lindsey Skaggs explained that this special meeting was set as a working session for Library Council (LC) to edit the draft artificial intelligence (AI) policy statement that was presented for consideration by the AI Working Group at the last Library Council meeting. The goal was to create a finalized version to be able to send to the library for comment and consideration ahead of the next LC meeting, where it could be voted on. It would be nice to have this finalized before the end of the semester.

Chair Skaggs thanked Logan Janicki and Chris Worland for the edits they had made in the document so far. She noted that she also added some comments. Some of the comments and changes were simple copyediting, and some were more substantive changes which LC would review. The working group produced two versions of the draft statement. Both were substantially similar except for the second statement containing language about potential delay in evaluation and verbiage about accuracy.

Chris Worland referred to the [Generative Artificial Intelligence Values Statement from DePaul University's library](#), which had been linked in the document for reference. Two words that jumped out at him from that statement were reliability and applicability. He explained that reliability could work across multiple disciplines as opposed to a term like accuracy which could be tricky when it came to social sciences, especially as things became outdated or historical.

Chair Skaggs agreed. She did not want to include the word 'accuracy' for purposes of intent and clarity. DePaul's statement was more robust than ours would be. The purpose behind this statement was to let the campus community know that AI tools are integrated into library resources and that when they can be evaluated, they will be evaluated, while keeping our values and missions in mind. We know AI is not perfect and includes biases. Adding something about reliability and replicability would be helpful. DePaul's statement is also a statement of values and not neutral. This would expand the scope of the statement that has been drafted and may require more input.

Dean Carrie Forbes suggested making a lighter version of their statement. She feels our policy is aligned.

Colby Cilento mentioned that the ISU's Committee for the Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence ("AI Committee") created a website and has information on the university's AI policies and

position; whereby, Chair Skaggs noted that could be added to the piece about mission, vision, and values.

Dean Forbes noted that we could also reach out to this group about our statement, and perhaps they could link it on their webpage; whereby, Cilento shared that they have linked to the Graduate School's AI position statement. She noted we did not need to reproduce their content in our statement but could provide a link to it.

All agreed it was important to keep language about striving to stay abreast of tools and that there may be a delay in evaluation if they were made available without notice.

Skaggs and Worland discussed the language about reliability and applicability and placed it in the second paragraph.

Chair Skaggs noted that presently the word 'flaws' appeared in the language about known imperfections. She adjusted it to read "reflecting the biases of both the creators and underlying training data". She addressed the accuracy issue.

Angela Yon asked why we would not want to say it was inaccurate; whereby, Worland explained that there was lots of information that we provided access to which may not be accurate, and that we did not vet the accuracy of.

Yon noted she would not equate AI to a library database.

Cilento and Worland noted that #4 of the AI Committee's guiding principles was accuracy and read as follows: "*The University is dedicated to ensuring the accuracy of information created by or added to AI tools it supports. The University acknowledges the indispensable role of human fact-checkers. Illinois State takes responsibility for any AI-assisted information incorporated into our communication materials. The University believes that all users of AI are responsible to confirm that information created or modified by AI tools is accurate.*" Cilento expressed surprise that they would include the first sentence.

Cilento noted she was searching other libraries for language about AI and databases and found statements from other university libraries explicitly noting the difference and addressing the accuracy of outputs, several included the following: "*AI tools are not databases. AI tools lack the curated precision of traditional databases but can provide quick answers and facilitate exploratory research. Some AI tools can assist in locating sources, but library databases remain the most reliable repositories of authoritative and scholarly information.*"

LC agreed to adopt similar language in their statement as follows: "*Generative AI is an emerging technology with known imperfections. AI tools produce outputs which inherently reflect the biases and positionality of the tool's creators and the underlying data on which they were trained. They lack the curated precision of traditional library resources and cannot guarantee the accuracy or source of their information. While they may be useful for exploratory research, users should confirm the accuracy, reliability, and applicability of generative AI outputs. Even tools Milner Library has reviewed and approved must be used with these limitations in mind.*"

Chair Skaggs and Logan Janicki discussed the language of placing a note, or flag, on the A-Z Database list to identify resources with AI tools.

Cilento asked whether we needed to add any contact information; noting that was discussed at the previous LC meeting. She stated that as far as placement, Chad Buckley had suggested at the last meeting that the statement be placed on the Policies and Guidelines page, under About, on the Milner Library website. She suggested putting it under guidelines, as opposed to policies, as it was a statement, and there was already another statement, on privacy, under guidelines.

Chair Skaggs noted she would send the statement out for feedback. She would speak to Grace Norris, Electronic Resources Librarian, about whether the generic 'contact us' information, or the e-resources team's email, would be added to the contact box on the webpage.

Chair Skaggs also noted that sometimes, when feedback is solicited, a small amount of opposition or concern can sink the entire endeavor. She would like to vote on the statement at the next meeting. If there was significant feedback from the library, it could be communicated by their council representatives and/or voted accordingly, if needed.

Cilento noted that there would never be total consensus on anything. Those concerned could express it to their representatives who could then bring that feedback to the council, or they could sign up to speak at the meeting themselves.

Chair Skaggs noted that sometimes without unanimous consensus, decisions were delayed; whereby, Cilento agreed. As Library Council, we want to be able to accomplish things when we are empowered or asked to act.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Skaggs at 3:57 p.m.

Submitted by C. Cilento
8 December 2025