

Library Council
Thursday, December 11, 2025
3:00 PM, Zoom and 311G

Library Council Present: Chad Buckley, Colby Cilento, Ellie Harman, Logan Janicki, Jayna Leipart Guttilla, Lindsey Skaggs, Angela Yon

Agenda

I. Call to Order

Chair Lindsey Skaggs called the meeting to order at 9:00 AM.

II. Approval of Minutes from 11/12/25 Library Council Meeting

Library Council approved the 11/12/25 minutes.

III. Public Comments

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

IV. Information Items

A. Exhibits Team Updates (Koopmans/Neuffer)

Heather Koopmans, Co-Chair, Exhibits Team, explained that the Exhibits Team had been working to update their guidelines and policy documents. That work had been ongoing for a while, after being discussed for years. She noted that the current guidelines on file were from 2012, and obviously much had changed. One of their goals was to consider the work it took to mount exhibits, noting there was not a lot of language or processes in place to put boundaries around that. They created a draft document based on conversations and research into other institutions' practices, in particular other academic libraries with centralized exhibits, not just in archives or special collections, but that also invited proposals from around the university.

Michelle Neuffer, Co-Chair, Exhibits Team, explained that the big change would be how proposals would be accepted moving forward. In the past, they had been accepted on a rolling basis but that has been paused during the last year because the amount of work had been unsustainable. One of the strategies to mitigate that is to accept proposals once per year, which will help plan out exhibits with more advanced notice. External proposals will open in spring 2026 and be accepted for the fall 2026 and spring 2027 semesters. She noted Dean Forbes suggested narrowing the scope for external proposals for that round to something related to Milner's 50th anniversary. This will help the Exhibits Team get their feet back under them and allow them to devote time to a big event in the library. They will also not accept any proposals for exhibits with less than three months' notice, which marks another change.

Neuffer noted the caveat that they would welcome internal exhibits from within Milner with more flexibility. Those are often smaller and constitute less time investment. They have been in contact with Special Collections Librarian Rebecca Fitzsimmons and University Archivist April Anderson-Zorn as they work with them the most and they curate their own exhibits. They provided helpful

feedback. The Exhibits Team also met with administration and received feedback, including good suggestions on narrowing scope, the ability to change processes again if needed, and how to build in assessment after the first round of proposal acceptance.

Koopmans noted that another new feature they are considering implementing is having exhibits have a library sponsor. This is something other institutions do. If the exhibit proposed was coming from outside of the library, the proposer would need to find a sponsor within the library to help carry out the project. She noted this would likely fall to liaisons in many cases, as that has how it had tended to flow already. It will be discussed at January's liaison meeting. Another new feature is changes to insurance policies. Insurance will no longer be offered for works borrowed from other entities. The purpose of the guidelines document is not to outline every step or detail, but to at least establish a higher-level framework and sense of scope and general processes. There are major considerations when hosting an exhibit. Please contact Koopmans or Neuffer with any questions, feedback, or suggestions. The document is still in a draft version presently; some changes are still being made based on administration comments.

Chair Skaggs thanked Koopmans and Neuffer, noting that exhibits are very labor intensive and she appreciated their work.

V. Discussion Items

A. Ovid AI Evaluation – Experience with the Process, Recommendation

Chair Skaggs stated that Ovid's AI article summary tool has now been assessed by an evaluation group per the AI Working Group's recommendations. She noted that Kate Tallman, Head of Liaison Services, was unable to attend the meeting to discuss, but Electronic Resources Librarian Grace Norris, and the other evaluators, Laura Killingsworth and Joshua Altshuler, were available.

Grace Norris noted that her role was to reach out to the vendor with the group's questions and she attended the first meeting of the evaluation group but would defer to the others about how the rest of the process went.

Chair Skaggs had the evaluation fact sheet that the group completed. She explained that the AI tool created summaries of articles. In terms of the key takeaways, the group found that the summaries the tool produced did not differ much from the article abstracts and may not actually present the most useful content from a particular article. For example, the summary might highlight something mentioned in the article that differs from what the author chose to highlight. It essentially provides a differently worded abstract than the one the author wrote. The tool also contains the following disclaimer:

"AI Article Summary provides a short, machine-generated summary of an article. Outputs generated through AI-enabled features are not tested, reviewed or verified by Wolters Kluwer Health or endorsed or guaranteed to be current, accurate, or complete. Users of the AI-enabled features should independently review and verify all outputs as to appropriateness for any or all use cases or applications and authorized use."

Chair Skaggs noted the challenge that could pose for students. She highlighted Altshuler's comments in the report about the lack of specificity in the summaries and that as general readers, the abstract provided a better indicator of the content of the article. Evaluators found the tool to be an overall low risk but also redundant and that it was confusing for users to distinguish

between the summary content and the abstract because of the location in which the product provided the summary. They debated whether the tool should be activated or deactivated but landed on deactivation because of the redundancy and that it was potentially more confusing than helpful. Turning it off would have little to no impact on end users.

Chair Skaggs noted Tallman's takeaways from the evaluation process. The evaluation group spent less than three hours on the evaluation, including meetings. The question that remains is when the evaluation process will be triggered in the future. Having liaisons review tools as they are released might be burdensome, especially at certain times of the year. There is not a clear answer to this right now, what the trigger points are.

Dean Carrie Forbes suggested that the trigger could be that a faculty member or a librarian is interested in a tool or heard something about it.

Chair Skaggs felt this was a reasonable approach. If a librarian learned about a tool and thought it could be useful, or saw an announcement of a tool, that would be a good starting point. She also noted that Tallman mentioned that she was not entirely sure this one case would be representative of how the process may be for other types of AI tools.

Laura Killingsworth noted this was not an extensive tool to review, where others may require a lot more effort to properly evaluate. This was clicking a button and getting an abstract-length summary.

Chair Skaggs felt this was a successful test case. As we continue, there will be inevitable tweaks in the process of tool evaluation. Library Council is happy to revisit as needed.

B. AI Position Statement

Chair Skaggs explained that the AI Working Group had created two draft AI position statements, and subsequently Library Council held a special working session to edit those into a draft statement. That draft was sent out to the library for feedback and currently read as follows:

“Milner Library recognizes the influx of commercially available generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools currently on the market, including those available in library databases and platforms. When the tools are optional, Milner Library will critically evaluate them to determine if they meet the needs of our users and align with our mission, vision, and values and the university's guiding principles on the responsible use of AI before deciding whether to make them available. We strive to keep abreast of tools as they become available, but there may be a delay in evaluation if tools become available without our notice. AI tools should supplement human cognitive processes, not be a substitute for them. In evaluating these tools, we aim to ensure they promote student and faculty success.

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, and we encourage users to decide whether to

make use of each tool. We will be transparent about the products that include or integrate AI tools by placing a public note on the A-Z Database List.”

Chair Skaggs explained that there were two small changes made from feedback she received after Library Council met. From Grace Norris, one suggestion was changing where it previously read “when possible, Milner Library will critically evaluate...” to “**when the tools are optional**, Milner Library will critically evaluate...” because some tools are integrated and cannot be disabled. From Joshua Altshuler, another suggestion was that since users have agency, adding “we encourage users to decide whether to make use of each tool.”

Library Council had no objections to the additions.

Chair Skaggs noted that the statement would be posted under guidelines on the policies and guidelines page of the library website. The contact information would direct to the liberesources@ilstu email address but could change if they became inundated with questions.

Colby Cilento moved, seconded by Chad Buckley, to adopt the AI position statement for the library. The motion passed unanimously, and the position statement was adopted.

C. Assessment Working Group Status

Chair Skaggs explained that earlier in the year, an Assessment Working Group was formed. There have been changes now with new administration and a new assessment librarian position, so it was time to discharge this group.

VI. Celebratory Items

University Service Initiative Award

Chair Skaggs shared that Caitlin Stewart, Teaching and Learning Librarian, received ISU’s Service Initiative Award. This reflects well on her and Milner.

Maureen Brunsdale Retirement

Chair Skaggs noted that Maureen Brunsdale, Head of Special Collections, would be retiring as of December 31, but her last day in the building would be December 15. She noted Brunsdale’s accomplishments during her tenure, as highlighted by Dean Forbes in an email. She thanked Brunsdale for her service and contributions to Milner. At the holiday potluck, there would be a cake to celebrate with her.

VII. Announcements/Other

Community Team Hockey Outing

Dean Forbes shared that the Community Team had put together an outing to see the Bloomington Bison on Sunday, December 14.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Skaggs at 3:32 p.m.

Submitted by C. Cilento
7 January 2026