

April 14, 2026: AiDiEx Summary

Featured topics:

- Open Educational Resources
- Scholarly Communications

The sessions began with brief overviews of the key issues related to the impact of artificial intelligence (generative or otherwise) on the featured topic, followed by specific questions. The following notes are brief recaps of each discussion.

Discussion 1: Open Educational Resources (OER)

1. Have you experienced a situation in which an educator or researcher has been hesitant to publish with an open license for fear of AI ingesting? What did you say? If you haven't experienced this, what would you say to someone in this situation?

- *Participants mentioned they haven't experienced a lot of questions from OA authors about this yet, possibly because they aren't aware of how GenAI systems are using their work*
- *The idea of whether or not GenAI's authorized use of open materials could be a deterrent for potential authors was explored*
- *Potential benefits to discuss with authors:*
 - ingesting reliable open material could help counter the quality problem of generated output, contributing to knowledge in a different way;*
 - Opportunity for works to have greater reach/impact (as long as citing/linking back is guaranteed)*

2. What criticisms do you have of CC Signals? What opportunities do you think they provide?

- *The challenge of enforcing the Signals was the most frequently cited criticism; the lack of legal "teeth" might encourage AI companies to just ignore them: "Like putting up a "please no slapping sign" in a warzone"*
- *The potential for confusion between CC Signals and CC licenses is another drawback*
- *The opportunity for creating a pathway to encourage citing was discussed as a benefit*

- 3. If you weren't going to use a CC signal, would you have any sort of statement in its place? What would that statement look like?**
- *Something legally enforceable, otherwise, they would likely be ignored*
 - *Most participants wanted statements that would prevent their work from being ingested*
 - *Discussion of the parallel idea of copyright and opt-in/opt-out models as legal mechanism for ingestion*
 - *Even if not heeded, still a form of agency and opportunity to indicate how you stand on the issue*
- 4. With the many possible uses for AI in the OER creation process, where do you draw the line on acceptable use of AI in the development of OER? That is, where might people go too far?**
- *Creating the actual content was generally felt to be too far*
 - i. *OER advocates have worked hard to negate the assumption that open = low quality by emphasizing the expert-created and vetted aspects; concerns that AI-generated content could erode the progress on this message since academia in particular does not trust or respect AI output*
 - ii. *If content is created by AI, expert review needs to be emphasized*
 - *Not disclosing the use of AI also viewed as unacceptable*
 - *Questions of open publishing values and ethical/moral lines were explored*
- 5. Who do you consider responsible for developing a useful standard for AI disclosure in OER Creation? What challenges do they / we face going forward with such a project?**
- *[Example statement](#) shared*
 - *Open textbook publishers were discussed as possible leaders, e.g., BC OpenTextbooks*
 - *Building something directly into the Pressbook template*
 - *Consistency is key– national or even international standards would be beneficial, perhaps a Creative Commons standard*
- 6. When you see AI disclosures in educational content, how does it impact your perception of the authors and of the content itself?**
- *Overwhelming sense of distrust, participants felt more suspicious, skeptical, and critical of AI generated content*
 - i. *Although those outside of library/information professions seem more willing to embrace AI content*
 - *Does a negative reaction to AI-generated content create a stigma that prevents transparency in its use? – “distrust creates a structural disincentive to disclose”*

- *Specifics in disclosure statements would help better inform readers and also give authors the opportunity to better explain use/rationale, especially helpful for collaborative efforts*

7. How does AI use in general support or contradict the values of open education and scholarship?

- *Supports:*
 - information sharing*
 - building upon existing knowledge*
 - provides another avenue for people to obtain knowledge/education*
- *Contradictions:*
 - Environmental sustainability,*
 - Exploitative labour, harming people in lower resource settings rather than rising up*
 - Emphasis on profits, enriching corporations instead of society*
 - Paywalls for the best quality versions of tools*

Discussion 2: Scholarly Communications

1. How has AI changed how we support research and scholarly communications?

- *Overall sense that AI has made supporting research and scholarly communications more difficult and complex, challenges include:*
 - Fact-checking hallucinated citations*
 - Supporting student research amidst varying AI-use policies from faculty*
 - Understanding and explaining the limitations of different AI tools for research*
 - Navigating how to advise researchers on acceptable AI use in publishing*
 - Reminding researchers of copyright concerns that could impact what they want to do*
 - Proliferation of tools available and the speed at which new tools or changes to existing tools occur*

2. What does responsible use of AI in open research look like? E.g., in publishing support, peer-review, etc.

- *General distrust of AI being useful for thoughtful peer-review, but may be useful for general summarizing*
 - AI is not a peer, so it can't do peer-review!*
- *Avoiding AI entirely might not be best approach, can provide help for finding more traditionally difficult sources, such as grey lit*

- *Acceptance and definitions of acceptable use are currently discipline-specific, difficult to generalize for all of academia*
- *Limiting to one institution-approved tool is not an effective approach,-- “education of university IT departments may be necessary...they need to know that AI for research is not like other enterprise business.”*
- *Need for institutional support to develop critical AI literacy for research applications*
- *AI could be helpful for making connections and helping with research impact, rather than content creation*

3. How have you supported researchers with questions around AI? E.g. In navigating rules from publishers, or determining if their work is sold to AI?

- *Participants received questions on:*
 - i. *Relationship between CC licences and AI training*
 - ii. *Models for AI disclosure statements for local open journals*
 - iii. *Concerns about work being used to train AI*
 - iv. *Concerns about AI being used to review work*
 - v. *Questions about disclosure and what should be disclosed*
 - vi. *Questions about the safety of using AI tools for proof-reading*
- *Possible future questions may emerge from authors as awareness grows that academic publishers are licensing their works to AI companies for training*
 - i. [ITHAKA Generative AI Licensing Agreement Tracker shared](#)
- *Advocating for researchers in database licencing*
- *Helping authors learn about what to look for in publishing agreements*
 - i. *Lack of acknowledgement for the labour library folks put in helping researchers/authors navigate this world is becoming problematic*

4. How do you stay up to date with changes in AI when it comes to research, publishing, and scholarly communications?

- *General consensus that this is very difficult given the amount of information, the speed at which new products are developed, and the rate at which existing tools change*
- *Support via local communities of practice, professional development opportunities, and email discussion lists*
- *Waiting for the competition to peter out to see what emerges as the top tools*
- *General feeling that we aren't ready to promote tools yet*
- *Feeling of not wanting to do a disservice to students by not working with these tools since they are likely to use them in their careers*
- *Evaluating summaries and “broad-strokes” information to distill emerging evergreen best practices*
- [Aaron Tay](#) mentioned as a helpful source of information

5. What evaluation criteria do you apply to new AI commercial products, such as Consensus? E.g. How are you evaluating them, ethical implications of use?

- *Participants mostly evaluate through trying the tools themselves, but concerns about the environmental impacts of playing with the tools was discussed*
- *Interest in establishing and sharing rubrics for evaluating these tools*
 - i. [Model rubric example](#) shared
- *Concern over how these tools impact user privacy and our obligations to protect users*

Follow-up survey:

Please answer this one-question [survey](#) to share your thoughts on how these discussions could evolve.