

Transportation Librarians Roundtable

August 13, 2026

Transcript with light verbatim edit by Google Gemini AI

WEBVTT

1

00:00:00.000 --> 00:00:01.380

Alleman, Rosalyn (OST): Presentation

2 00:00:02.250 --> 00:00:20.020 Alleman, Rosalyn (OST): And also, don't use the chat during the presentation. We are trying to... I think I have it turned off, but we're still trying to adjust to using Zoom instead of Teams, so we appreciate your cooperation and understanding. Over to you, Bob.

3 00:00:20.740 --> 00:00:21.959 Bob Cullen: Thank you, Rosalyn.

4 00:00:22.610 --> 00:00:28.799 Bob Cullen: So, today's, as highlighted in recent email announcements, today...

5 00:00:29.060 --> 00:00:33.989 Amy Boggess: This is one of our group ones, and I'm not really interested in this one.

6 00:00:35.060 --> 00:00:41.160 Bob Cullen: Okay, today's speaker is Laura Saunders, and

7 00:00:41.320 --> 00:00:52.050 Bob Cullen: The title of her presentation is, Challenging Myths Slash Disinformation in Special Libraries in an Age of AI and Alternative Facts.

8 00:00:52.160 --> 00:00:56.059 Bob Cullen: And let me go ahead and

9 00:00:57.100 --> 00:01:08.100 Bob Cullen: just share some biographical information on our speaker. Laura Saunders is a professor and associate dean.

10 00:01:12.960--> 00:01:14.820 chrismgm: Okay, how come I just lost...

11 00:01:18.140--> 00:01:19.710 Alleman, Rosalyn (OST): Hey, Bob, we can't hear you.

12 00:01:19.710--> 00:01:25.649 Bob Cullen: at Simmons University School of Law of the Simmons Center for Information... Oh, you can't hear me?

13 00:01:25.650--> 00:01:26.969 Alleman, Rosalyn (OST): You're okay now, go ahead.

14 00:01:26.970 --> 00:01:27.690 Bob Cullen: Can you hear me now?

15 00:01:27.690 --> 00:01:28.280 Alleman, Rosalyn (OST): Yeah.

16 00:01:28.280 --> 00:01:45.450 Bob Cullen: All right, I'll go ahead and start from the first line here. Laura Saunders is a professor and associate dean at Simmons University School of Library and Information Science, as well as the director of the Simmons Center for Information Literacy.

17 00:01:45.680 --> 00:01:59.400 Bob Cullen: Laura's teaching and research focus on the areas of information literacy, including news media literacy and mis- and disinformation, as well as reference services in academic libraries.

18 00:01:59.400 --> 00:02:08.740 Bob Cullen: Laura's most recent books include Reference and Information Services, An Introduction, the 7th Edition, which she co-edited with Melissa Wong.

19 00:02:08.810 --> 00:02:17.419 Bob Cullen: And the open access textbook, which is titled Instruction in Libraries and Information Settings: An Introduction,

20 00:02:17.420 --> 00:02:30.149 Bob Cullen: co-authored with Melissa Wong. And the previous book, I think I may have stumbled a little on the phrasing, she co-edited that one with Melissa Wong. This second book she

21 00:02:30.150 --> 00:02:40.500 Bob Cullen: co-authored with Melissa Wong. Parenthetically, I'm so grateful that Laura does have this textbook available as open access

22 00:02:43.110 --> 00:02:49.680 Bob Cullen: material, and as I mentioned to her, I will be sharing a link for that textbook to all of you when I do my follow-up email.

23 00:02:50.070 --> 00:03:03.480 Bob Cullen: On today's TLR. So, moving on, Laura has a PhD and a Master of Library and Information Science, both from Simmons University, and a Bachelor of Arts in English Literature

24 00:03:03.630 --> 00:03:05.159 Bob Cullen: From Boston University.

25 00:03:13.480 --> 00:03:15.090 Alleman, Rosalyn (OST): Bob, you keep fading in.

26 00:03:15.090 --> 00:03:18.529 Bob Cullen: Laura is the 2019 recipient of the Award for Excellence in Graduate Teaching.

27 00:03:18.970 --> 00:03:21.000 Bob Cullen: And in terms of...in terms of hearing me?

28 00:03:21.870 -->00:03:24.330 Alleman, Rosalyn (OST): Okay, go ahead. You're back in again.

29 00:03:24.700 -->00:03:44.959 Bob Cullen: Okay, just in case I missed the last sentence there, I don't know what's going on. Laura is the 2019 recipient of Simmons University's Provost Award for Excellence in Graduate Teaching. Real briefly, I should mention, and I think I did make note of this in at least a couple of my email announcements, that I had the privilege

30 00:03:44.960 -->00:03:52.540 Bob Cullen: of attending Laura's presentation on today's topic. It was last fall, in October.

31 00:03:52.540 -->00:03:54.920 Bob Cullen: She addressed the

32 00:03:55.210 -->00:04:03.160 Bob Cullen: SLA New England community of librarians, and

33 00:04:03.160 -->00:04:16.620 Bob Cullen: I was among those who were lucky enough to attend Laura's presentation, and she did a first-rate job, really, some great information, great insight. She really

34 00:04:16.620 -->00:04:24.860 Bob Cullen: Has a talent for, an enviable talent for combining expertise and enthusiasm, and she really made it such a worthwhile presentation that

35 00:04:24.860 -->00:04:42.970 Bob Cullen: I followed up with her afterwards and said, I would really love to have you be a speaker for one of our TLRs in 2026, and she very graciously accepted the invite, and so here we are today, and I can assure you, you're in for a very

36 00:04:42.970 -->00:04:45.339 Bob Cullen: Worthwhile, thought-

37 00:04:51.780 -->00:04:53.109 Alleman, Rosalyn (OST): And you're off again.

38 00:04:59.340 -->00:05:05.059 Bob Cullen: provoking presentation from Laura, and I'll start fading out again. But so, Laura, it's all yours.

39 00:05:05.060 -->00:05:15.599 Laura Saunders (she/her): Okay, thank you so much. I'm gonna go ahead and share my screen, and thank you for that great introduction, Bob. I definitely hope I can live up to expectations.

40 00:05:15.600 -->00:05:23.030 Laura Saunders (she/her): But I want to say thank you again for the invitation. Thanks to all of you for coming. I hope that you find this useful.

41 00:05:23.030 -->00:05:41.420 Laura Saunders (she/her): I'm gonna go ahead and get started so that hopefully we can get through all of the content and then have plenty of time still for discussion and questions and things like that. So again, this presentation is Challenging

Myths and Disinformation in Special Libraries in an Age of AI and Alternative Facts.

42 00:05:41.430 -->00:05:46.330 Laura Saunders (she/her): And I am joining you from Simmons University School of Library and Information Science.

43 00:05:46.690 -->00:05:53.899 Laura Saunders (she/her): So just really quickly to go over my agenda for this session and what I hope that you will get out of it.

44 00:05:53.900 -->00:06:18.179 Laura Saunders (she/her): I just want to talk briefly about the landscape of mis- and disinformation, so a little bit of foundational background, but the bulk of the time I want to spend on some evidence-based strategies for combating mis- and disinformation and verifying information. So we'll spend a little bit of time on the SIFT method, and then a more updated version of SIFT4AI,

45 00:06:18.180 -->00:06:25.620 Laura Saunders (she/her): And then we'll just touch very briefly on some other evidence-based approaches. So again, I want to really try to keep this practical.

46 00:06:25.910 -->00:06:39.750 Laura Saunders (she/her): And then we'll have a quick wrap-up, and as I said, there'll definitely be time for discussion and questions. So, I'm hoping by the end of the session that you will have had time to discuss the current field of mis- and disinformation, at least briefly.

47 00:06:39.750 -->00:06:53.399 Laura Saunders (she/her): Define and apply some evidence-based methods of mitigating mis- and disinformation, and then explore the intersections of mis- and disinformation with AI, which is practically unavoidable at this point.

48 00:06:53.940 -->00:07:07.090 Laura Saunders (she/her): I always like to get started by giving you my perspective on information literacy and information access, because I think those are really the foundations of

49 00:07:07.210 -->00:07:19.330 Laura Saunders (she/her): what we are looking at here. So, mis- and disinformation, those are not new things, even though some of the ways in which they're being created and shared right now might be new.

50 00:07:19.380 -->00:07:38.510 Laura Saunders (she/her): But mis- and disinformation has been around for as long as information itself has been around, and I think one thing that we're all aware of as people working in the library and information science field is that libraries have always had a strong commitment to access to information.

51 00:07:38.850 -->00:07:43.329 Laura Saunders (she/her): So we see this in the ALA Code of Ethics, the Library Bill of Rights, and so on.

52 00:07:43.560 -->00:07:58.009 Laura Saunders (she/her): Beyond libraries, there is also acknowledgement of access to information from governmental and non-governmental entities. So, for instance, the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights.

53 00:08:15.240 -->00:08:20.550 Laura Saunders (she/her): Article 19 specifically talks about access to information as a human right. Many countries have Freedom of Information laws that help guarantee citizens access to information, especially government information. And the United States, although we don't have an explicit right to information in the Constitution,

54 00:08:20.550 -->00:08:28.379 Laura Saunders (she/her): There have been some legal arguments to say that the First Amendment that talks about freedom of speech and that

55 00:08:28.380 -->00:08:45.470 Laura Saunders (she/her): Other amendments that talk about voting rights and things like that imply access to information as a right, because as the argument goes, we can't exercise our other rights fully unless we have access to the information to inform the decisions that we might make.

56 00:08:45.640 -->00:08:50.289 Laura Saunders (she/her): So I like to start with that as some grounding, because I think that

57 00:08:51.300 -->00:09:16.050 Laura Saunders (she/her): Access to information is incredibly important, and I agree that it's a human right, but I also think access to information in and of itself, so that physical access, whether it's in hard copy or online, is only a starting point. And without the skills and competencies to evaluate what we're looking at and to separate the trustworthy and reliable from the not trustworthy and reliable,

58 00:09:16.060 -->00:09:21.209 Laura Saunders (she/her): Without that, access doesn't mean much.

59 00:09:21.290 -->00:09:37.520 Laura Saunders (she/her): And as we know, there have been a lot of challenges posed by mis- and disinformation. So I'm just outlining a couple of things here that I think are worth being aware of why mis- and disinformation are so problematic.

60 00:09:37.520 -->00:09:43.089 Laura Saunders (she/her): One of the first things is that mis- and disinformation tend to persist in our memory.

61 00:09:43.090 -->00:09:53.950 Laura Saunders (she/her): So once we're exposed to mis- and disinformation, and we embed that into our memory, it gets really hard to correct it, even if we're open to the corrections.

62 00:09:53.950 -->00:10:08.980 Laura Saunders (she/her): So, we can hear what the facts are later on, we may even accept that that's the fact, but a lot of times, unconsciously, the mis- or disinformation will reassert itself. And then, of course, sometimes we're...

63 00:10:08.980 -- > 00:10:10.009 DITJJC: But I'm on mute.

64 00:10:10.520 -- > 00:10:18.350 Laura Saunders (she/her): sometimes we're not open to the corrections. So our biases interfere

65 00:10:18.350 -- > 00:10:18.710 DITJJC: Okay.

66 00:10:18.710 -- > 00:10:23.320 Laura Saunders (she/her): with us accepting corrections, and that, of course, will then cause

67 00:10:23.320 -- > 00:10:23.850 DITJJC: Come out in a bit.

68 00:10:23.850 -- > 00:10:25.719 Laura Saunders (she/her): this information to persist.

69 00:10:25.720 -- > 00:10:31.280 Alleman, Rosalyn (OST): Sorry, Laura, can I just ask everybody to please check to make sure that your mute is on?

70 00:10:32.140 -- > 00:10:33.349 Alleman, Rosalyn (OST): That you're muted?

71 00:10:34.550 -- > 00:10:35.190 Alleman, Rosalyn (OST): Thank you.

72 00:10:36.130 -- > 00:10:38.449 Laura Saunders (she/her): Thank you.

73 00:10:39.020 -- > 00:10:53.260 Laura Saunders (she/her): Mis and disinformation can really impact our quality of life. Health information is a perfect example. If we don't have access to good health information, we can't make good decisions to inform our own health and the health of our loved ones.

74 00:10:53.650 -- > 00:11:06.300 Laura Saunders (she/her): Mis and disinformation have also been shown to have disproportionate impacts, and what I mean by that is that people who are in marginalized groups often feel the impacts of mis - and disinformation more.

75 00:11:06.550 -- > 00:11:17.230 Laura Saunders (she/her): This can be due to things like lack of access to technology to get at good, reliable information. It can be lack of access to education

76 00:11:17.230 -- > 00:11:28.020 Laura Saunders (she/her): To learn the skills to evaluate the information, as well as the fact that many disinformation campaigns will target marginalized groups.

77 00:11:28.060 -- > 00:11:46.320 Laura Saunders (she/her): And then finally, we're all feeling the effects of increased polarization and partisanship. This isn't something that I need to go into a lot of detail about, I think we're all aware of it, but the problem, especially related to mis - and disinformation, is the increased polarization is pushing us towards

78 00:11:46.320-- > 00:11:56.719 Laura Saunders (she/her): declining trust in the civic organizations that we have historically relied on for reliable information. In some cases, that declining trust might be

79 00:11:56.830-- > 00:11:59.060 Laura Saunders (she/her): legitimate.

80 00:11:59.160-- > 00:12:05.599 Laura Saunders (she/her): But it still means that we don't have as many places that we can rely on

81 00:12:05.940 -- > 00:12:09.120 Laura Saunders (she/her): Or that we will rely on for good information.

82 00:12:09.120-- > 00:12:32.370 Laura Saunders (she/her): And it's also pushing us toward a lack of consensus about what is actually factual or truthful information. And so, if we can't agree amongst ourselves on what to trust and what we think is factual , this can make it easier for people to share mis - and disinformation. It adds to the confusion, and it makes it harder for us to know what to trust.

83 00:12:33.930-- > 00:12:49.400 Laura Saunders (she/her): So that is sort of where we're starting from, and it can feel a little bit overwhelming sometimes, but the good news is that there are some evidence -based approaches that have been shown by research h

84 00:12:49.400 -- > 00:12:56.289 Laura Saunders (she/her): To be effective at evaluating information in order to figure out what is reliable and trustworthy.

85 00:12:56.290 -- > 00:13:03.429 Laura Saunders (she/her): And not only have these approaches been shown to be effective for individuals to identify mis - and disinformation,

86 00:13:03.460 -- > 00:13:12.000 Laura Saunders (she/her): But there has also been some research to suggest that training people in these approaches

87 00:13:12.180-- > 00:13:26.280 Laura Saunders (she/her): Has a longterm effect, that they may be less likely to succumb to mis- and disinformation, and potentially even less likely to share mis- and disinformation, for instance, on social media.

88 00:13:26.850 -- > 00:13:29.640 Laura Saunders (she/her): So what are some of these approaches?

89 00:13:30.700 -- > 00:13:42.889 Laura Saunders (she/her): The first one we're going to talk about is information, news, or media literacy as a response. So, this is instruction or techniques that can be taught that

90 00:13:42.890 -->00:14:06.270 Laura Saunders (she/her): have been shown to be effective in identifying mis- and disinformation. And what we're going to spend the most time on today is lateral reading, which I'll get into in a little bit more depth in a minute, and a specific implementation of lateral reading that's known as the SIFT method. And as I said, there's plenty of research now to show that lateral reading is effective for verifying facts.

91 00:14:06.750 -->00:14:16.180 Laura Saunders (she/her): So, if we teach people...first of all, if we adopt these skills ourselves as librarians, and then if we teach people to use these skills,

92 00:14:16.370 -->00:14:17.950 Laura Saunders (she/her): we

93 00:14:18.070 -->00:14:34.459 Laura Saunders (she/her): should all get better at identifying mis- and disinformation. It is important to recognize that there's always limitations to research, and for mis- and disinformation, for lateral reading specifically, and information, news, and media literacy.

94 00:14:34.850 -->00:14:42.620 Laura Saunders (she/her): One of the biggest limitations is that most of the research has been done in Western, urban, and educated environments.

95 00:14:42.660 -->00:14:53.240 Laura Saunders (she/her): So, while it has been shown to be effective in those environments, we really do need to do more research in other environments to see if the results still hold up.

96 00:14:53.240 -->00:15:03.180 Laura Saunders (she/her): The other challenge, and this is always a challenge in research, is that we typically don't have longitudinal data. So what we have are things like pre- and post-tests

97 00:15:03.180 -->00:15:08.580 Laura Saunders (she/her): To show if people perform better after receiving some information literacy

98 00:15:08.580 -->00:15:14.750 Laura Saunders (she/her): training. And that's still useful, but it doesn't necessarily tell us how long those effects last.

99 00:15:14.750 -->00:15:32.539 Laura Saunders (she/her): And then finally, as useful as these are, they can be hard to scale, especially outside of school. The good news is a number of states are adopting media literacy into their curriculum frameworks, so hopefully our kids are going to be learning these skills.

100 00:15:32.590 -->00:15:40.339 Laura Saunders (she/her): But once we're outside of school, it can be hard to get at a core group of people to help them develop these skills.

101 00:15:41.780 -->00:15:48.690 Laura Saunders (she/her): But with that said, it has been shown to be effective. So first of all, what is lateral reading?

102 00:15:48.690 -- > 00:16:09.199 Laura Saunders (she/her): If you think back to your training in school, most of us were taught, when we're reading something, to spend a lot of time with the text. So this is called vertical reading. We'll read very closely, very carefully, to try and make sense of what we're reading, and part of that was often

103 00:16:09.200 -- > 00:16:26.980 Laura Saunders (she/her): trying to decipher the intentions of the author. Was this author trying to persuade us of something? Did they have a certain kind of bias that might have consciously or unconsciously influenced what they were saying? Did they have good sources that they drew on, and things like that.

104 00:16:26.980 -- > 00:16:39.400 Laura Saunders (she/her): And vertical reading can be effective, but especially when we're trying to verify facts that we might come across in news types of information or news sources, vertical reading

105 00:16:39.400 -- > 00:16:48.489 Laura Saunders (she/her): doesn't actually help us very much. What helps us instead is lateral reading. So if vertical reading is staying with the

106 00:16:48.730 -- > 00:17:03.809 Laura Saunders (she/her): first text and reading it very closely, lateral reading is the opposite. It's moving away from the first text and looking across a number of other sources to see if we can find confirming or disconfirming information.

107 00:17:04.589 -- > 00:17:21.800 Laura Saunders (she/her): And like I said, the SIFT method is just a very specific approach to lateral reading that was developed by Mike Caulfield, and this has, again, been shown to be very effective. So what does SIFT stand for? It's an acronym that stands for STOP, Investigate the Source.

108 00:17:21.839 -- > 00:17:25.920 Laura Saunders (she/her): Find better coverage, and trace claims back.

109 00:17:26.030 -- > 00:17:31.979 Laura Saunders (she/her): So, if we follow these four steps, we should often be able to

110 00:17:32.110 -- > 00:17:51.559 Laura Saunders (she/her): pretty reliably verify if the information that we have come across, wherever we have come across it, whether it's in our social media feed, whether it's on a podcast or some other kind of news show, or even in reports, white papers, other kinds of information that we might get in the course of our work,

111 00:17:51.820 -- > 00:18:14.650 Laura Saunders (she/her): we should be able to decide if it's something that we can trust. So I want to walk us through a quick example. You might have noticed that I'm already drinking my third cup of coffee today. So I am someone who enjoys my coffee. So, let's just imagine, maybe I'm scrolling through my social media feed, or maybe I'm looking at Google News, and I see this headline:

112 00:18:14.650-- > 00:18:20.030 Laura Saunders (she/her): The coffee sweet spot: how much a day is safe and linked to heart benefits.

113 00:18:20.030-- > 00:18:22.730 Laura Saunders (she/her): Well, maybe this has caught my attention now.

114 00:18:22.730-- > 00:18:29.289 Laura Saunders (she/her): As I said, I like coffee. I typically drink multiple cups a day.

115 00:18:29.760-- > 00:18:43.140 Laura Saunders (she/her): So I'm gonna be interested in the idea that not only is it quote -unquote safe to drink coffee, but there might actually be benefits to it. So if I start skimming through this

116 00:18:43.330-- > 00:18:45.950 Laura Saunders (she/her): article, I'll see that

117 00:18:46.170-- > 00:18:59.250 Laura Saunders (she/her): It says things like, coffee can reshape gut bacteria and keep you young. Oh boy, this is just getting better and better. But what SIFT is telling me is stop.

118 00:18:59.250-- > 00:19:18.490 Laura Saunders (she/her): Before I start reading more about this and letting it influence my thinking, I want to take a step back and do a little bit of investigation. So the first thing I do is stop. I don't read any more in that New York Post article about whether or not coffee is not only safe, but actually good for you.

119 00:19:18.970-- > 00:19:25.210 Laura Saunders (she/her): And what I want to do next is investigate the source. So, you might have noticed

120 00:19:25.410-- > 00:19:29.379 Laura Saunders (she/her): in that first slide that I showed you

121 00:19:29.880-- > 00:19:35.990 Laura Saunders (she/her): that this headline is from the New York Post. So I want to take that source.

122 00:19:35.990-- > 00:19:38.580 Laura Saunders (she/her): And I want to find out a little bit more about it.

123 00:19:38.580-- > 00:20:00.200 Laura Saunders (she/her): Now, some of us might already be familiar with the New York Post, that's great, but if we weren't familiar with it, one thing we could do is go to a website called Media Bias Fact Check, and I do want to say that there are references and resources at the end of the slides, so don't worry about trying to note all of this down. Rosalyn is going to share all of this at the end of the

124 00:20:04.300 -- > 00:20:07.200 Laura Saunders (she/her): session. So, we can go to Media

Bias Fact Check, and I will say, this website looks

125 00:20:07.850 -->00:20:25.970 Laura Saunders (she/her): kind of crazy. It has an early 1990s sort of web feel to it. There tend to be a lot of ads, it's not very pretty, but it's a really good site for finding out more about a lot of different information sources.

126 00:20:25.970 -->00:20:42.839 Laura Saunders (she/her): So you can put in the title of almost any news source you can think of, both nationally and internationally, and it also does ratings of things like think tanks. So I put in the New York Post, and what it gives me is this bias and credibility check.

127 00:20:42.900 -->00:20:57.519 Laura Saunders (she/her): So, if you can see this spectrum with the two arrows at the end, and there's a little yellow dot that shows me that New York Post is considered right of center, so it's right-leaning.

128 00:20:57.520 -->00:21:15.809 Laura Saunders (she/her): That in and of itself is not necessarily a bad thing, but it's something to keep in mind. There's definitely more bias in this source than some others that I might look at. Below that is a little chart that shows me that it is also considered mixed in terms of how factual its reporting is.

129 00:21:15.820 -->00:21:22.750 Laura Saunders (she/her): And there's a detailed report, I only took a screenshot of some of it, but you can see that

130 00:21:23.080 -->00:21:37.080 Laura Saunders (she/her): it tells me that it only has a medium credibility score. Like I said, this isn't the worst source that I could look at, but especially if we're talking about health information and health decisions,

131 00:21:37.120 -->00:21:48.509 Laura Saunders (she/her): I might not want to stop there. In addition to Media Bias Fact Check, Wikipedia can also be a great resource for just finding some quick information about

132 00:21:48.520 -->00:22:12.399 Laura Saunders (she/her): a news resource. So, if we go to the New York Post page on Wikipedia, we'll see things like it's described, again, as conservative. It's also described as a tabloid. So if I'm familiar with that word, I'll know right away that tabloid usually has a little bit of a pejorative connotation. So that is gonna put up a little bit of a red flag for me.

133 00:22:12.660 -->00:22:27.140 Laura Saunders (she/her): And then, below that, it tells me that the post has been frequently criticized over the years for its controversial headlines and editorial choices, along with accusations of bias in its political coverage.

134 00:22:27.140 -->00:22:37.289 Laura Saunders (she/her): So if I wasn't already skeptical, by now I probably am getting skeptical of this headline, in part because of the source that I found

it in.

135 00:23:41.180 -->00:22:41.180 Laura Saunders (she/her): So, what do I want to do next? Well, what

136 00:22:41.370 -->00:22:50.950 Laura Saunders (she/her): SIFT tells me is the next thing I should do is try to find better coverage. In other words, I should go out and do more searching on the topic

137 00:22:51.460 -->00:23:09.700 Laura Saunders (she/her): to see if I can find other sources that are saying the same thing, but are perhaps more reliable sources. So if I go to Google, or DuckDuckGo, or whatever your favorite search source might be, and I look for coffee and

138 00:23:09.700 -->00:23:11.540 Laura Saunders (she/her): cardiovascular health,

139 00:23:11.810 -->00:23:31.490 Laura Saunders (she/her): I will find something like this. So this is from Discover Magazine. It says, the American Heart Association deems 5 cups of coffee safe, but warns against energy drinks. Okay, so this is another headline from another publication, and I can do the same steps, where I can go to look at

140 00:23:31.870 -->00:23:50.449 Laura Saunders (she/her): a rating for Discover Magazine on Media Bias Fact Check, and what I find here is it's rated as pro-science, it's rated high for factual reporting, and down below it tells me it's got a high credibility rating. So here, I'm starting to feel a little bit more

141 00:23:50.450 -->00:24:07.540 Laura Saunders (she/her): confident. It's saying at least some of the same things as the New York Post, but it's coming from a more reliable source. And I could keep going with this. I could keep looking for additional sources to see how many of them are confirming each other and which are the most reliable.

142 00:24:08.580 -->00:24:22.500 Laura Saunders (she/her): But what I want to do now is just jump ahead to the last step in SIFT, which is to trace claims, quotes, and media back to the original context. So, in other words, I want to find out where did this all start?

143 00:24:22.500 -->00:24:41.249 Laura Saunders (she/her): If it's textual information, like reporting on research, I can do a lot of the kinds of searching that we as librarians are very familiar with to figure out where did this originally come from. And some of the sources that I already looked at might have even referenced the original research.

144 00:24:41.350 -->00:24:51.320 Laura Saunders (she/her): If we're looking at things like...this is obviously becoming more and more common now, multimedia sources, videos, images, things like that.

145 00:24:51.730-->00:24:59.800 Laura Saunders (she/her): We can do reverse image searches and things like that to try and find the original context for what we're looking at.

146 00:25:00.110 -->00:25:09.890 Laura Saunders (she/her): So, if I do this kind of search for the coffee headline, what I'm going to find is there is a peer-reviewed publication from the American Heart Association

147 00:25:10.480 -->00:25:29.810 Laura Saunders (she/her): And here, I know some of this might be small on your screen, so I apologize, but mostly what I want to point out, you don't have to read all of this, but mostly what I want to point out is this is coming from the American Heart Association, which is a very trustworthy source. It's a peer-reviewed publication. It outlines that for us.

148 00:25:29.810 -->00:25:50.510 Laura Saunders (she/her): And then I can look through this and even just look through the statement highlights and see that it is saying some of the same things that Discover and New York Post said. So, for instance, it tells me the latest research indicates that up to 5 8-ounce cups of coffee a day is generally safe for most adults.

149 00:25:50.510 -->00:26:08.470 Laura Saunders (she/her): And appears to be linked to a lower risk of several cardiovascular conditions. So there are a lot more caveats around this. It's not saying, go ahead, go out and drink 5 cups of coffee a day. It's just saying that there's some evidence to support some of these ideas.

150 00:26:08.580 -->00:26:11.800 Laura Saunders (she/her): But here, at least, I can start to look at

151 00:26:11.800 -->00:26:36.730 Laura Saunders (she/her): the original information. I can also see that the AHA is telling me more research is needed, and that higher amounts of caffeine can increase risk of high blood pressure, and so on. So, here I've traced the claim back to the original source, and now I can look to see if I feel like the reporting that was done was accurate. If I wanted to delve even deeper, I could read more into this report to find

152 00:26:36.730 -->00:26:37.900 Laura Saunders (she/her): things like

153 00:26:38.300 -->00:27:01.019 Laura Saunders (she/her): whether or not the research... what was the sample size, for instance, of the research? What methods were used? I could even look to see if there's any disclosures about research funding. Maybe this was funded by the coffee lobby, and even if it's a peer-reviewed publication from the AHA, I might still want to ask myself if that might have influenced things at all.

154 00:27:01.620 -->00:27:04.810 Laura Saunders (she/her): So that is

155 00:27:05.450 -->00:27:12.450 Laura Saunders (she/her): the four steps of SIFT, the four

sort of very quick steps that we can take

156 00:27:12.480 -->00:27:31.490 Laura Saunders (she/her): for verifying information. Now, while SIFT has four steps, Mike Caulfield also suggests one more step, or what he sometimes calls a move or a habit, and that's to check your emotions. So one thing that research has also told us is that

157 00:27:31.490 -->00:27:36.959 Laura Saunders (she/her): misinformation and disinformation, and especially disinformation that is

158 00:27:37.460 -->00:27:52.239 Laura Saunders (she/her): being purposefully created and shared in order to try and trick us, or mislead us, often is done in such a way to stir up our emotions, to make us angry, to make us scared, to make us excited.

159 00:27:52.600 -->00:28:05.920 Laura Saunders (she/her): Because as our emotions get stirred up, we often won't pay quite as much attention, our cognitive, critical thinking skills will be interfered with. So, Caulfield

160 00:28:06.030 -->00:28:22.899 Laura Saunders (she/her): invites us to just kind of take a step back, especially if we feel our emotions being riled up, and just ask ourselves what's going on here, and maybe think of that as all the more reason to engage in some lateral reading before we accept what's right in front of us.

161 00:28:23.170 -->00:28:48.120 Laura Saunders (she/her): So, those are the steps for SIFT and lateral reading. I do want to say these work incredibly well. We don't always have to do all of the steps all of the time, right? So, let's say we come across a piece of information, we go to check the source, and we find out that the source is really highly rated. Maybe we already know something about it, and it's something that we would typically trust anyway.

162 00:28:48.120 -->00:28:48.990 Laura Saunders (she/her): That might be enough for us, especially depending on the criticality of the information. So, like I said, if we're looking at health information and things like that,

163 00:28:57.770 -->00:29:05.000 Laura Saunders (she/her): we're gonna want to put a little bit of extra time and effort in. But let's just say we come across something that's a little bit less

164 00:29:05.310 -->00:29:13.099 Laura Saunders (she/her): important, or a little bit less likely to have a major impact on our lives. Maybe you're scrolling through your

165 00:29:13.370 -->00:29:28.049 Laura Saunders (she/her): social media, and you find something about... I saw a headline about how they were doing research into dogs' levels of hearing, and whether or not they might be able to hear frequencies that

166 00:29:28.100-->00:29:31.929 Laura Saunders (she/her): previously we didn't realize.

167 00:29:31.980 -->00:29:35.029 Laura Saunders (she/her): That's all well and good. It's interesting.

168 00:29:35.060 -->00:29:52.490 Laura Saunders (she/her): Depending on who you are, that might be more than interesting, but it's not impacting my life at this moment, and so while I might be interested in it, I may not feel much need to do a lot of investigation into the trustworthiness.

169 00:29:52.490 -->00:29:56.359 Laura Saunders (she/her): My point here is that we're getting bombarded with information

170 00:29:56.370 -->00:30:21.060 Laura Saunders (she/her): all day, every day. We cannot be expected to verify every piece of information that comes across our desk or our newsfeed. So we do have to do what Sam Weinberg calls critical ignoring. We have to recognize when something is worth the time of investigation, and when it is okay to just let it go. So I just think that's an important thing to add in there.

171 00:30:22.400 -->00:30:30.879 Laura Saunders (she/her): So, like I said, SIFT was developed a number of years ago. In fact, Mike Caulfield's been working on this for some decades now.

172 00:30:31.490 -->00:30:45.200 Laura Saunders (she/her): And it works really well, as I said, for news information, things that we might come across in reports. It even does work for peer-reviewed articles, things that come into our social media feed.

173 00:30:45.420 -->00:30:52.290 Laura Saunders (she/her): But with the explosion of AI, a lot of people pointed out that SIFT

174 00:30:52.660 -->00:30:58.319 Laura Saunders (she/her): may not be the best or only approach for dealing with AI.

175 00:30:58.690 -->00:31:04.780 Laura Saunders (she/her): So, Mike Caulfield has now been working on what he calls SIFT4AI, and one thing that

176 00:31:04.780 -->00:31:23.120 Laura Saunders (she/her): he pointed out is that using the SIFT method can still be effective if all we're trying to do is verify facts, even if those facts were generated by AI. So, say you do a search, and maybe Google Gemini tells you some stuff, or it gives you some answers.

177 00:31:23.120 -->00:31:38.070 Laura Saunders (she/her): You can still use the SIFT method to double-check the information that Gemini is giving you. You're just not going to investigate Gemini itself as a source, because it's not your typical kind of source.

178 00:31:38.150-- > 00:31:43.479 Laura Saunders (she/her): But with that said, Caulfield has also taught us, or is showing us, that

179 00:31:44.010-- > 00:31:48.469 Laura Saunders (she/her): There are other ways that we can use AI,

180 00:31:48.810-- > 00:31:53.649 Laura Saunders (she/her): AI tools themselves for fact verification.

181 00:31:54.340-- > 00:32:09.960 Laura Saunders (she/her): So, what Caulfield tells us is when we're using artificial intelligence, and in particular LLMs like Gemini or ChatGPT, what we should be doing is using them to help us find evidence

182 00:32:10.400 -- > 00:32:28.000 Laura Saunders (she/her): for claims and information, not asking them for answers. So, in other words, you don't necessarily want to ask Claude or Gemini or ChatGPT, is coffee safe for me, or does coffee have heart benefit s?

183 00:32:28.500 -- > 00:32:34.529 Laura Saunders (she/her): The LLM will give us an answer, but it's going to be a lot harder for us to figure out

184 00:32:34.560 -- > 00:32:37.100 Laura Saunders (she/her): How trustworthy that answer is.

185 00:32:37.100-- > 00:32:54.930 Laura Saunders (she/her): And as we know, LLMs were not developed with the idea of answering fact -based questions. They may do a decent job of it some of the time, but that's not their purpose. So instead, what we should be doing is asking them to help us source the evidence.

186 00:32:55.900 -- > 00:33:11.770 Laura Saunders (she/her): So, Mike Caulfield gives us 3 strategies, or 3 steps, for using AI to verify information. So, the 3 steps, and we're going to go through these as well, are stop and get it in. And what he means by that is

187 00:33:11.830-- > 00:33:23.180 Laura Saunders (she/her): take the claim that you found wherever you found it, and get it into an AI system to start the search process.

188 00:33:23.280-- > 00:33:37.310 Laura Saunders (she/her): The next step is to investigate the evidence and find better sources, and then track down the claim. So, as you can see, the steps are actually pretty similar to SIFT, we're just implementing it a little bit differently.

189 00:33:37.310-- > 00:33:57.050 Laura Saunders (she/her): So, again, let's take a look at an example. Let's walk through an example. So, as I said, the first step is get it in. So, as with lateral reading, we want to stop what we're doing when we come across a claim that we feel like is worth investigating, and just drop it into our preferred AI system.

190 00:33:57.050 -- > 00:34:08.940 Laura Saunders (she/her): So, let's just say, again, I'm on social media, I come across this headline that doctors are warning of temporal hollowing from rapid GLP-1 weight loss.

191 00:34:09.080 -- > 00:34:24.260 Laura Saunders (she/her): I don't know what temporal hollowing is, but it doesn't sound good, it sounds a little scary. So, what I can do is just drop this claim into AI, and what Caulfield tells us is we don't have to worry about the prompt just yet.

192 00:34:24.270 -- > 00:34:32.199 Laura Saunders (she/her): We're going to get to that in a minute, but all we want to do now is kind of drop the claim in there and see what the AI system tells us.

193 00:34:33.870 -- > 00:34:36.650 Laura Saunders (she/her): And what the system

194 00:34:36.920 -- > 00:34:55.200 Laura Saunders (she/her): told me is it kind of gave me a definition of temporal hollowing, but it also told me this headline is just a headline, and it can't actually weigh any evidence based on just that headline, which is good! That was actually a decent answer from the AI.

195 00:34:55.199 -- > 00:34:58.609 Laura Saunders (she/her): So then what Caulfield tells us is that the next step

196 00:34:58.610 -- > 00:35:02.000 Laura Saunders (she/her): Is to ask for evidence.

197 00:35:02.090 -- > 00:35:06.359 Laura Saunders (she/her): So, this is where we want to start using our prompts.

198 00:35:06.390 -- > 00:35:25.600 Laura Saunders (she/her): So Caulfield gives us a few examples of prompts, and I'm going to get to those in just a minute, but one is to say something along the lines of, take the claim that we found and put it into this sort of formula of, "is there good evidence that XYZ

199 00:35:25.630 -- > 00:35:34.049 Laura Saunders (she/her): happens." And we can also tell the AI system what output we want. So in this case, I said, is

200 00:35:34.200 -- > 00:35:48.719 Laura Saunders (she/her): this good evidence that Ozempic causes temporal hollowing, give a table that shows the surrounding context that supports this as strong or weak evidence. But at this point, all I've given it is that clip from the headline.

201 00:35:49.740 -- > 00:35:51.189 Laura Saunders (she/her): So, as I said, what

202 00:35:51.320 -- > 00:35:57.890 Laura Saunders (she/her): I did this in Gemini, I believe, so

what it told me is a headline is weak evidence

203 00:35:57.890 -->00:36:21.250 Laura Saunders (she/her): that Ozempic directly causes temporal hollowing. It tells me a little bit about what temporal hollowing is and why it might happen with a GLP-1, and then it gave me this little breakdown of the source type, it's a digital headline. The implication for evidence strength is that media coverage can include expert commentary, but the strength level is weak

204 00:36:21.250 -->00:36:25.199 Laura Saunders (she/her): based on what I've given it so far. So, like I said, this is not bad.

205 00:36:25.290 -->00:36:30.549 Laura Saunders (she/her): So now, the next step that Caulfield tells us to

206 00:36:30.550 -->00:36:36.859 Laura Saunders (she/her): engage in is to investigate evidence. So here again, we're asking the AI for evidence, not answers.

207 00:36:36.860 -->00:36:54.260 Laura Saunders (she/her): And what Caulfield suggests we do is use neutral questioning or neutral phrasing. This got me very excited when I saw this, because this is what we were taught to do as librarians, right? When we work with our patrons, we try to keep our questions neutral so that we're not leading them in one direction or another.

208 00:36:54.260 -->00:37:04.329 Laura Saunders (she/her): Well, as we know, AI systems are sycophantic. They have learned to tell us what they think we want. So we have to be careful not to

209 00:37:04.510 -->00:37:08.509 Laura Saunders (she/her): tip the scales, right? So, neutral questioning is important.

210 00:37:08.740 -->00:37:14.789 Laura Saunders (she/her): We can ask for additional information on a topic, and we can ask for elaboration.

211 00:37:16.000 -->00:37:31.419 Laura Saunders (she/her): Okay, so here are some example prompts from Mike Caulfield, and they're prompts that we can just kind of lift from him, and then plug in the claims that we want to investigate. So some of these prompts include, "evaluate the claim that..."

212 00:37:31.480 -->00:37:36.159 Laura Saunders (she/her): Or, "read the room. What do a variety of experts say about..."

213 00:37:36.400 -->00:37:44.799 Laura Saunders (she/her): "Categorize the elements of this claim as unusual, unprecedented, noteworthy, or normal, and it's okay to have empty categories."

214 00:37:44.800 -- > 00:37:57.709 Laura Saunders (she/her): or "search for and reason about the evidence against this claim, then search for and reason about the evidence for this claim."
So all of these prompts are asking for

215 00:37:57.710-- > 00:38:04.280 Laura Saunders (she/her): a similar kind of thing. It's asking the system to help us find evidence

216 00:38:04.500 -- > 00:38:09.160 Laura Saunders (she/her): for or against the claim that we're looking at. They're all

217 00:38:09.370 -- > 00:38:17.299 Laura Saunders (she/her): phrased, obviously, a little bit differently, and as we all probably know, different phrasing in a prompt

218 00:38:17.830-- > 00:38:29.089 Laura Saunders (she/her): gets us different answers. So it can actually be worthwhile to try the prompt in a couple of different ways, and see how the answers compare to each other. But however we do it,

219 00:38:29.500 -- > 00:38:44.130 Laura Saunders (she/her): This is the kind of thing we should expect. So I tried, "read the room, what are a variety of experts saying about Ozempic and temporal hollowing? How does scientific, professional, popular, and media coverage break down, and what does it tell us?"

220 00:38:44.340 -- > 00:38:46.229 Laura Saunders (she/her): And with that prompt,

221 00:38:46.890 -- > 00:39:11.789 Laura Saunders (she/her): Gemini gave me this overview. So it gave me a little summary. Among scientific, clinical, popular, etc, discourse around temporal hollowing, it highlights a notable gap between medical reality and public perception. So this is interesting. It's already telling me I need to be careful. That headline grabbed my attention, but it sounds like there's not necessarily a lot of hard

222 00:39:11.790-- > 00:39:28.880 Laura Saunders (she/her): evidence to support it. And then, it gave me a breakdown by the format type, so by clinical and scientific information, by popular information, it showed me what the consensus was, what the context was. Now, again, I would need to spend more time with this

223 00:39:28.880 -- > 00:39:34.280 Laura Saunders (she/her): and investigate it a little bit more closely to see if it seems like I'm getting good information.

224 00:39:34.490 -- > 00:39:47.900 Laura Saunders (she/her): But at least I can see that it is answering my prompt in the way that I asked it to. It looks like it's giving me some balanced breakdown. What you might notice, though, is that I still don't have any other

225 00:39:47.920 -->00:40:03.189 Laura Saunders (she/her): sources of information. It's giving me broadly these ideas that there is a scientific and clinical domain that has a consensus, but it's not giving me the specific sources of information. So I can go back to Gemini, and I can

226 00:40:03.840 -->00:40:21.759 Laura Saunders (she/her): ask for an answer in a different way. So this time, I'm saying, "evaluate the claim that it causes temporal hollowing," but here again, I'm asking it to present the results on a table with the following columns: Citation to a source, summary of results, a rating of the strength of the findings weighted against the evidence.

227 00:40:21.760 -->00:40:39.630 Laura Saunders (she/her): And I tell it also, "do not make up citations. Use real research studies. If anything is unclear or uncertain, say so." Now, this prompt isn't foolproof. It doesn't mean that I'm not still going to get some inaccurate information or some hallucinated citations.

228 00:40:40.130 -->00:40:44.600 Laura Saunders (she/her): But it is pushing the system to give me something

229 00:40:44.630 -->00:40:55.819 Laura Saunders (she/her): better than what it may have done otherwise. And here, I do get my table that gives me those citations that I asked for, so the specific sources. Again, they're not

230 00:40:55.820 -->00:41:20.679 Laura Saunders (she/her): formatted as any kind of citation that I've seen before, but at least it's giving me enough information that I could probably go and find these studies. It's also giving me a summary of the results and an evaluation of them. Are these moderate or strong or weak claims, and why are they considered that way? Like I said, I still wouldn't rely on all of this, especially depending on

231 00:41:20.680 -->00:41:29.329 Laura Saunders (she/her): what I need the information for, and how important it is to me. But now I've got some evidence that I can actually follow up on.

232 00:41:30.810 -->00:41:33.760 Laura Saunders (she/her): And...sorry.

233 00:41:33.850 -->00:41:39.760 Laura Saunders (she/her): And then at the bottom of that table, the LLM gave me some

234 00:41:39.760 -->00:41:58.530 Laura Saunders (she/her): core areas of uncertainty and scientific ambiguity. So, it really helped to highlight for me where there are questions that still remain. And then finally, and I just want to kind of move along here, because I know we're getting close to time, and I want to have some time for questions.

235 00:41:58.530 -->00:42:20.319 Laura Saunders (she/her): The last step for using AI to help us verify claims is to track it down. So just as we do with SIFT, we want to follow the sources

back to the original and try to check the answers that the LLM gave us, to see if we think they were accurate and on point.

236 00:42:20.470 -->00:42:37.680 Laura Saunders (she/her): Okay? So, again, you would want to take all of those citations that they gave you and follow them up using our regular librarian skills, find those resources, find those reports, and analyze them ourselves. And again, we want to do this

237 00:42:37.750 -->00:42:48.379 Laura Saunders (she/her): depending on the criticality of the information, we may not always find it necessary to do this. If I'm just looking into temporal hollowing for my own interest,

238 00:42:48.380 -->00:43:01.120 Laura Saunders (she/her): I might be content to let it sit there. But if I was doing something for work, for research, or if I was seriously thinking of embarking on a new health regimen, I might want to dig a little deeper.

239 00:43:01.750 -->00:43:17.639 Laura Saunders (she/her): So like I said, those are the top two things I wanted to cover for today, but I do want to acknowledge that there are other approaches to combating mis- and disinformation, and some of them could also be useful to us in our work. And these are also evidence-based.

240 00:43:17.640 -->00:43:42.270 Laura Saunders (she/her): So one is debunking or fact-checking. So this is the human component of having a person, using whether it's lateral reading skills or something else, a person or an organization takes a claim and does some real legwork to try and find out if that claim is reliable and trustworthy. So you can think of things like PolitiFact and Snopes as

241 00:43:42.270 -->00:43:49.010 Laura Saunders (she/her): debunking and fact-checking sites. And research has shown that these can be effective.

242 00:43:49.140 -->00:44:08.309 Laura Saunders (she/her): In terms of helping them to understand what kind of information is reliable. The challenges for this are scope and reach and bias. So, in other words, there's so much information out there, and human beings and organizations can only fact-check

243 00:44:08.310 -->00:44:24.909 Laura Saunders (she/her): such a minimal amount of it, that it's hardly going to make a dent. They're only going to reach certain people, too, and the people who trust the debunking sites may have a certain bias

244 00:44:24.960 -->00:44:34.339 Laura Saunders (she/her): for trusting them, and likewise, the individuals or the organizations doing the fact-checking may also have some biases, so we have to watch out for that.

245 00:44:35.310 -->00:44:48.690 Laura Saunders (she/her): With that said, though, because we are information experts who have some real knowledge of how to do fact-checking, this is something that potentially we could engage in ourselves.

246 00:44:48.690 -->00:44:58.859 Laura Saunders (she/her): If we thought that it would be a useful service under certain circumstances with our patrons or our employers, we might engage in some of that.

247 00:44:59.070 -->00:45:13.780 Laura Saunders (she/her): Other things that have been shown to be useful are nudges and accuracy primes. Basically, what these are, are little suggestions that ask or encourage people to evaluate information,

248 00:45:13.850 -->00:45:33.080 Laura Saunders (she/her): before they read it, or at least before they share it online. So the idea with these nudges is they're supposed to alert people to societal norms, right? It's not considered good practice to share misinformation, and it's meant to quote-unquote improve our online behavior.

249 00:45:33.210 -->00:45:45.910 Laura Saunders (she/her): So there have been some mixed results, but one new study that came out recently, and it was an international study that had a huge number, a couple hundred thousand,

250 00:45:46.000 -->00:46:08.020 Laura Saunders (she/her): in the sample, did show that these nudges can be pretty effective. The challenge is they can be scalable, but only with cooperation. So, in other words, the way that these studies were done, the nudges are given on social media platforms, before a person decides to share a post.

251 00:46:08.890 -->00:46:18.040 Laura Saunders (she/her): And so, that's great, but the platforms would actually have to cooperate with us, and any sort of engagement is voluntary.

252 00:46:18.570 -->00:46:31.839 Laura Saunders (she/her): With that said, I do think libraries could use this sort of nudging behavior in a different kind of way. So, for instance, we could share accuracy nudges

253 00:46:31.900 -->00:46:39.820 Laura Saunders (she/her): with things like, maybe with our Wi-Fi passwords. So, as we're giving people access to the Wi-Fi, we might

254 00:46:39.880 -->00:46:48.669 Laura Saunders (she/her): urge them to think about what they're accessing, and how they're using it, or how they're sharing it. Or we could have signs near

255 00:46:48.690 -->00:47:07.990 Laura Saunders (she/her): near computers, or near charging stations, or things like that. So, it's not quite the same as having it right at the moment of interaction, but they're small steps that we could take based on evidence that might help to

sort of prime people's behavior a little bit.

256 00:47:08.740 -->00:47:14.870 Laura Saunders (she/her): All right, and so with that, I want to just wrap up with a few final thoughts.

257 00:47:15.050 -->00:47:28.310 Laura Saunders (she/her): The main thing is we're facing a lot of challenges right now, unfortunately, right? A lot of these are not necessarily new, like I said, mis- and disinformation is not a new challenge in and of itself.

258 00:47:28.880 -->00:47:40.049 Laura Saunders (she/her): But the scope and scale of the challenges are new, and AI is really complicating things. The way that AI enables people to make

259 00:47:40.270 -->00:47:51.910 Laura Saunders (she/her): fake information that looks incredibly real, and then share that information widely is very problematic, as we have seen. Lots and lots of fake

260 00:47:52.090 -->00:48:10.199 Laura Saunders (she/her): information of all different media are out there, and they're fooling people. And then, of course, AI complicates things because of the way we interact with it, and it is teaching us, or it's giving us information that seems useful and helpful and trustworthy, but is not necessarily.

261 00:48:10.320 -->00:48:25.210 Laura Saunders (she/her): But the good news is that there is evidence to support that the skills that we have, and information literacy competencies in general, are effective at combating mis- and disinformation, so I would say that we have a role to play here.

262 00:48:25.390 -->00:48:37.719 Laura Saunders (she/her): And with that, I want to open this up to questions and discussion. I'd love to hear what your own experiences have been, and I'm going to stop sharing my screen so that I can see a little bit better.

263 00:48:38.770 -->00:48:53.459 Bob Cullen: Excellent. Thank you very much, Laura, and just do the usual show of hands, and I'll call on you, and I'll go ahead and turn over to Gabby. By the way, Rosalyn, let me know if I start to fade in and out again, okay, with the volume. Go ahead, Gabby, the floor is yours.

264 00:48:53.460 -->00:48:58.919 gabriele hysong: Oh, thank you. I'm not really having this issue in my library, but

265 00:48:59.260 -->00:49:17.860 gabriele hysong: Just in general. But, are you familiar with Ad Fontus Media, where it tells you how far right, how far left a particular publication is? And then also Ground News, which tells you whether, you know, who's covering what.

266 00:49:17.930 --> 00:49:20.149 gabriele hysong: And, you know, maybe just...

267 00:49:20.200 --> 00:49:39.639 gabriele hysong: a far-right paper is just covering a particular subject, and nobody on the left, or nobody in the middle. So those are two resources that I look at also. And then convincing people that something may be not legitimate may be really hard, because

268 00:49:40.140 --> 00:49:48.259 gabriele hysong: if you're dealing with people who are willfully ignorant, they're like, I don't care what the facts are.

269 00:49:48.330 --> 00:49:54.840 gabriele hysong: I don't care, I'm gonna believe this. So then you have that kind of problem, too, and I know, working in... if you're a public librarian, I'm sure, and maybe at a university, but I work for a corporation, and so I don't run across that, but just in dealing... just looking at social media, and the headlines, and...

270 00:50:15.060 --> 00:50:29.220 gabriele hysong: you know, it's like, you can have access to the facts and everything, and even smart people will say, I don't care, this is how I believe, and then that's it. So, that's my two cents worth. Thank you.

271 00:50:29.890 --> 00:50:53.400 Laura Saunders (she/her): Thank you so much, Gabby. And yes, Ad Fontes is great, and Ground News is one that I actually just became familiar with recently, but yes, those are two really great resources. And I agree, the way I've heard it described, and I think this is useful, is if we think of people being on a spectrum of, say, 1 to 10, the 8 through 10s are already with us. They already kind of get it.

272 00:50:53.520 --> 00:50:55.629 Laura Saunders (she/her): So we don't really have to...

273 00:50:55.720 --> 00:51:00.399 Laura Saunders (she/her): We don't have to argue with them. And maybe the 1 through 2 or 3s

274 00:51:00.440 --> 00:51:04.289 Laura Saunders (she/her): they're just not gonna be convinced no matter what we say, so...

275 00:51:04.290 --> 00:51:22.960 Laura Saunders (she/her): it's not gonna be fruitful to argue with them. But there's definitely a range in the middle that might be open to having their mind changed, or hearing the facts, and so that's where we can concentrate our time.

276 00:51:23.110 --> 00:51:24.380 Laura Saunders (she/her): Hopefully. Okay.

277 00:51:24.380 --> 00:51:32.510 gabriele hysong: Thanks, yeah, that's probably it, it's kind of like wrestling with a pig in the mud. You realize the pig really enjoys that.

278 00:51:33.080 --> 00:51:34.370 Laura Saunders (she/her): Sadly.

279 00:51:34.370-- > 00:51:44.510 Bob Cullen: Always have to watch out for that. Thank you, thank you very much, Gabby. I'll go ahead now and ask Enid White to share her views or questions. Go ahead, Enid.

280 00:51:45.690 -- > 00:51:56.400 Enid9: This presentation was fantastic, and I think it's something that needs to get out to more people. You know, we know that the accuracy rate of LLMs is way below 50%.

281 00:51:56.810-- > 00:52:10.270 Enid9: And so using the SIFT tool, excuse me, and the tool you talked about with LLMs is something I think that needs to be widely

282 00:52:10.440 -- > 00:52:21.510 Enid9: generated to all the different groups. I could see this as a really good presentation, even though I don't work with them anymore with the DOTs.

283 00:52:22.470 -- > 00:52:25.520 Enid9: Because they do a lot of research.

284 00:52:25.690 -- > 00:52:45.639 Enid9: And they work with a lot of universities, and a lot of the individuals that are doing the research are so into believing everything that comes out of ChatGPT, OpenAI, any LLM, and you can't get it through their head that the accuracy rate is so low.

285 00:52:45.640 -- > 00:52:53.159 Enid9: And for you to lay that out, I like the way that the chart came out, and then you can take each one of those and look at

286 00:52:53.170-- > 00:52:54.190 Enid9: you know

287 00:52:54.560 -- > 00:53:12.150 Enid9: is it believable? Is it something you need to look at? So, I think this type of presentation is something that really needs to go out into a larger audience, not just the librarians, but the research managers, the engineers, the professors, students.

288 00:53:12.770-- > 00:53:22.959 Enid9: My daughter's teachers at the community college here push for them to use LLMs, and I keep telling her, be very, very careful.

289 00:53:23.080 -- > 00:53:32.220 Enid9: It's a two-sided sword. It gives you not only inconsistent information, but you also have the problem with

290 00:53:32.220 -- > 00:53:45.549 Enid9: the theft of your intellectual property. So, I love your presentation. Thank you for bringing that out, and I hope that maybe more people can see it in the future. Maybe ACCC will pick it up.

291 00:53:45.900 -- > 00:53:47.470 Enid9: But thank you, Laura.

292 00:53:48.350 -- > 00:53:50.369 Laura Saunders (she/her): Thank you, Enid, I appreciate it.

293 00:53:51.990 -- > 00:54:02.060 Bob Cullen: Appreciate your thoughts and insights there, Enid. Go ahead now and call on Amanda Carter. Go ahead, Amanda.

294 00:54:04.040 -- > 00:54:05.000 Amanda J. Carter, OR DOT Librarian (she/her): Hi.

295 00:54:05.490 -- > 00:54:20.889 Amanda J. Carter, OR DOT Librarian (she/her): Hi, Dr. Saunders. So, I'd like to say thank you for this first. I've been an information literacy supporter since school. It was something I focused on. I wrote a paper on archival literacy. I'm all about literacy, and especially now with the internet and

296 00:54:20.890 -- > 00:54:37.020 Amanda J. Carter, OR DOT Librarian (she/her): to Gabby's point, where people are just like, "this is what I believe," I think that's part of the information overload that occurs with the digital age, and all of that information that's available, and how do you know what to determine is the most accurate? So, reminding us of the SIFT method and

297 00:54:37.020 -- > 00:54:44.659 Amanda J. Carter, OR DOT Librarian (she/her): transferring that to the AI perspective, I think, is fabulous, and I think it's useful. Everybody's always...

298 00:54:46.100 -- > 00:55:05.789 Amanda J. Carter, OR DOT Librarian (she/her): So, everybody is very paranoid about AI prompts, as they well should be. However, it's the future, and we have to learn to work with it, and so just like when the internet came on, now we have to figure out how to use that to our best benefit, and now we have to figure out how to use AI to our best benefit, and I think that this

299 00:55:05.790 -- > 00:55:25.420 Amanda J. Carter, OR DOT Librarian (she/her): focus on the prompts and how to ask AI for assistance is very, very helpful. I've been trying to encourage AI literacy, or at least learning how to use these prompts for a while with the people I work with and with everyone else, so there are particular

300 00:55:25.450 -- > 00:55:39.020 Amanda J. Carter, OR DOT Librarian (she/her): trainings that I encourage people to use, and this one just got added to it. So once this gets posted on Rosa P, I'm going to be sharing it with my team as well, because I think this is a really great, simplified way to say, hey, double-check your sources.

301 00:55:39.020 -- > 00:55:47.229 Amanda J. Carter, OR DOT Librarian (she/her): make sure that you have multiple sources, make sure that the search engine or the AI or whatever is answering your questions

302 00:55:47.230 -- > 00:55:54.189 Amanda J. Carter, OR DOT Librarian (she/her): is actually showing you valid uses. And I'm also glad that Gabby pointed out the

303 00:55:54.490 -- > 00:56:11.820 Amanda J. Carter, OR DOT Librarian (she/her): the news articles, I actually forgot which one it was, because I was going to mention Ground News as well. It is a little bit newer to me, but I've known about it for a little while, but that's a good one. And so, all of these resources are great, and I look forward to digging into them deeper, so thank you.

304 00:56:13.020 -- > 00:56:27.679 Laura Saunders (she/her): Thank you so much, Amanda. I really appreciate it. And, you know, I do want to pick up on your point about information overload. So I just very briefly alluded to Sam Weinberg mentioning a couple times now on LinkedIn

305 00:56:27.680 -- > 00:56:48.139 Laura Saunders (she/her): what he calls critical ignoring, and I think that's part of information literacy now, right, is figuring out what can we just not pay attention to? But also, to your point about AI, I agree, it's here, lots of people are using it, so we have to figure out how to use it effectively. But also

306 00:56:48.190 -- > 00:56:54.270 Laura Saunders (she/her): be able to make some informed decisions about when not to use it, and how not to use it.

307 00:56:54.270 -- > 00:57:16.710 Laura Saunders (she/her): So I really appreciate that, and I'll just quickly say that I mentioned Mike Caulfield a bunch of times, he's in the references, but he has a substack called Ends of Argument, and he's extremely active on LinkedIn, so if you want to follow him, he's constantly putting updates about how to use these tools more effectively.

308 00:57:17.610-- > 00:57:18.490 Bob Cullen: Yeah, great.

309 00:57:18.990 -- > 00:57:37.859 Bob Cullen: Thank you, I had forgotten about the substack that he has. Appreciate your highlight. I know you talked about it previously, in that presentation last year. So, thank you very much. We might have time for another comment or question, if anybody has any. Again, the show of hands there. Just to give you a sense of the cross-section so far, though,

310 00:57:37.880 -- > 00:57:48.329 Bob Cullen: Laura, you definitely have gone nationwide this afternoon. Gabby works at Rolls -Royce,

311 00:58:48.400 -- > 00:57:54.390 Bob Cullen: based in Indiana, so we got Indiana there.

312 00:57:54.390-- > 00:58:11.920 Bob Cullen: Enid is from the great state of Wyoming. She had a very productive and noteworthy career at the Wyoming Department of Transportation, but she still stays very much involved and engaged in our community, which is great.

313 00:58:11.920-- > 00:58:20.419 Bob Cullen: And then, Amanda is the librarian for the Oregon

Department of Transportation there on the Pacific Coast.

314 00:58:20.420 -->00:58:31.159 Bob Cullen: So if nothing else, as usual for the TLR, I think there's been a healthy cross-section regionally, so I just wanted to make note of that.

315 00:58:31.300 -->00:58:42.420 Bob Cullen: We are coming up...I think we are at the end of the hour here. I do want to say, along with thanking you for a wonderful

316 00:58:42.430 -->00:58:51.179 Bob Cullen: very thought-provoking presentation. Laura, I just want to ask you this: You are on sabbatical right now, and

317 00:58:51.180 -->00:58:58.290 Bob Cullen: not asking you to look into a crystal ball or ask AI, prompting AI to answer this.

318 00:58:58.290 -->00:59:14.040 Bob Cullen: Do you have any particular goals that you hope to pursue during the sabbatical with respect to what you've been talking about today in terms of information literacy? What lies ahead, or what's already underway now?

319 00:59:14.530 -->00:59:37.969 Laura Saunders (she/her): Right. Yes, absolutely. So, one of my main focuses for sabbatical will be to try to create more content through the Center for Information Literacy related to AI and other literacies. So, through the Center for Information Literacy, we've been running monthly webinars on different information literacy topics.

320 00:59:38.050 -->00:59:45.840 Laura Saunders (she/her): So I'm working hard to keep that going, but in the meantime, I'm waiting, fingers crossed, on some

321 00:59:45.840 -->01:00:10.809 Laura Saunders (she/her): grant proposals that, if they come through, I'll really be able to scale this up, and my hope is to develop some open source curriculum for librarians, so basically things like what I did today, but make it so that there are sets of slides and maybe even worksheets and activities and things like that, that librarians could just take and use themselves.

322 00:00:11.720 -->01:00:30.140 Laura Saunders (she/her): And maybe doing some training sessions for librarians to engage in some of this kind of teaching themselves. I mean, I know many of them already do it, but there are some that I think would like to do it and haven't felt like they had the background yet.

323 01:00:31.150 -->01:00:37.239 Bob Cullen: Yeah. Great. Well, I wish you much success on that, and thank you.

324 01:00:37.340 -->01:01:00.060 Bob Cullen: And again, thank you very much for all the wealth of information you shared with us today. I drink multiple cups of coffee on a daily basis, too, so I will be sure to heed what you highlighted during your presentation. I'll check my

emotions, and I won't get too excited if they say coffee can add decades to your life, or something like that.

325 0 1:0 1:00.820 --> 0 1:0 1:19.150 Bob Cullen: But seriously, some very important points, and just in terms of that SIFT method, I think that's something very invaluable, and something that we can all bear in mind and make use of. So, thank you again.

326 0 1:0 1:19.260 --> 0 1:0 1:38.499 Bob Cullen: And having said that, all good things must come to an end. I think this has been a very fruitful past hour, just in terms of Laura's presentation, and also the comments and feedback from those of you during the Q&A portion of the hour.

327 0 1:0 1:38.500 --> 0 1:0 1:58.330 Bob Cullen: So having said that, and again expressing gratitude to our distinguished speaker, Laura, I also want to, along with Rosalyn, extend our deep gratitude to all of you for taking the time to join us today. Very much appreciated. The next TLR is scheduled

328 0 1:0 1:58.330 --> 0 1:0 2:05.119 Bob Cullen: for next month, on Thursday, September 11th, and our distinguished speaker on that

329 0 1:0 2:05.210 --> 0 1:0 2:09.510 Bob Cullen: date comes from the great state of Montana. It's the Montana

330 0 1:0 2:09.510 --> 0 1:0 2:25.260 Bob Cullen: DOT librarian, Anders Johnson. I think Anders is here. I don't know if he has anything he might want to say with respect to his presentation. I know I've mentioned it in some of the recent email announcements. If you're so inclined, Anders, you're welcome to

331 0 1:0 2:25.260 --> 0 1:0 2:27.109 Bob Cullen: say something about it.

332 0 1:0 2:27.310 --> 0 1:0 2:28.539 Anders Johnson: Hey, Bob, sure.

333 0 1:0 2:28.540 --> 0 1:0 2:29.869 Bob Cullen: able to attend.

334 0 1:0 2:29.870 --> 0 1:0 2:42.219 Anders Johnson: Sure, very briefly, I'd like to invite everyone to attend the TLR next month, where I'll be presenting on NACO, the Name Authority Cooperative, and I'm going to be talking about

335 0 1:0 2:42.280 --> 0 1:0 2:49.949 Anders Johnson: Name disambiguation and how to enhance your library metadata, and I'm gonna showcase Montana-specific

336 0 1:0 2:50.120 --> 0 1:0 2:52.780 Anders Johnson: projects related to NACO.

337 0 1:0 3:02.870 --> 0 1:0 3:02.870 Anders Johnson: I realize that cataloging may be dry to

some people, or not particularly interesting, but I promise that I'll try to make it engaging to both catalogers and non-catalogers alike.

338 0 1:03:04.620 --> 0 1:03:09.600 Bob Cullen: Okay, great. Thank you, Anders. We're looking forward to that. You have a tough act to follow, of course.