

ALL-SIS Faculty Services Survey 2025

I. Introduction

Purpose

The Academic Law Libraries Special Interest Section (ALL-SIS) Faculty Services Committee periodically conducts a survey focused on presenting the range of faculty services provided by academic libraries. The committee conducted the last Faculty Services Survey in 2017, and the new survey presents an opportunity to update AALL members on current and emerging practices in faculty services in academic law libraries. Moving forward, the committee plans to conduct a new survey every three years.

Survey Overview

The survey consisted of fourteen questions, with the first five questions covering institutional information and faculty services personnel. The remaining survey questions focused on four areas central to faculty services: instructional support, research support, scholarly support, and communications and outreach. For each of these areas, the survey asked two questions. The first was a multiple-choice question asking about the types of services provided in the relevant area, with an “other” option that gave respondents the opportunity to explain further. The second question for the first three areas (instructional support, research support, and scholarly support) was an open-ended question that asked how recent innovations in legal research, such as generative AI, had affected the provision of services in the relevant area. For communications and outreach, the survey asked a second multiple choice question about how respondents keep faculty up to date on developments and innovations in their fields of research. The survey concluded with an open-ended question asking respondents if there was anything else they would like to share about faculty services at their institution.

The committee sent out the survey to ALL-SIS members through the ALL-SIS email list in January 2025, and respondents submitted answers between January and March of 2025. The committee received a total of seventy-three submissions. Of those submissions, twenty-two contained no survey question responses and were removed from the results. The committee removed another submission because the respondent did not report the law school name and the answers were incomplete.

There were multiple responses from the same schools in a few instances: for six schools, two respondents from the same school submitted a response, and for one school, three respondents from that school submitted separate responses. In these cases, the committee combined multiple answers for a school into a single entry. For multiple choice answers, all answers selected by at least one respondent from the school were included. For open-ended answers, all answers were included, with separate comments indicated. The final data consisted of reports from forty schools. US respondents were from schools in California, Connecticut, Washington, DC, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maryland, Michigan, Montana, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Vermont, and Virginia. There was also one respondent from a school in Canada.

Contents of Report

Part II summarizes institutional characteristics based on ABA data. Part III provides a detailed summary of responses to the survey questions that directly relate to faculty services (Questions 4 to 14). Part IV summarizes key takeaways. The following appendices are included at the end of the report: Appendix A: 2024 ABA 509 Information Report Data, Appendix B: Open-Ended Responses (Questions 7, 9, 11, and 14), and Appendix C: Full Survey Instrument. A secure, enterprise-grade version of ChatGPT was used to generate an initial template for the format of the report, and the committee reviewed the generated content for errors. All data analysis in the report was conducted without the use of generative AI.

II. Institutional Characteristics: ABA 509 Information Report Data

Question 3 of the Faculty Services Survey asked if the committee could include ABA data on the respondent's law school in the published survey report. This resulted in the inclusion of the following statistics from the 2024 ABA Standard 509 Information Reports for thirty-five out of forty schools: full-time librarians, part-time librarians, total librarians, full-time faculty members, non-full-time faculty members, and total faculty. Respondents from two schools specified that the committee should not include ABA data in the report, respondents from two schools did not answer this question, and ABA data is not available for a fifth school because it is located outside of the United States.

Question 2 of the survey asked for the number of professional librarians employed by the respondent's library. However, this report includes the ABA data rather than self-reported data on the number of professional librarians for the sake of clarity and consistency. For example, the ABA report separates out the number of part-time and full-time librarians.

Summary statistics from the 2024 ABA Standard 509 Information Reports across the thirty-five schools (mean and range) are listed below, and a full table listing ABA statistics for these schools is in Appendix A. There was considerable range in the size of library staff and faculty served, with the number of total librarians ranging from one to twenty-two and the number of total faculty ranging from thirteen to seven hundred and fifty-five.

Measure	Mean (rounded to the nearest tenth)	Range (min–max)
Full-Time Librarians	7.5	1–22
Part-Time Librarians	0.3	0–2
Total Librarians	7.7	1–22
Full-Time Faculty Members	57.9	12–236
Non-Full-Time Faculty	103.5	1–519
Total Faculty	161.4	13–755

III. Faculty Services Survey Responses

This section presents responses to the survey questions that directly relate to faculty services (Questions 4 to 14). Each question is listed below along with relevant tables, respondent comments, and, for the open-ended questions, a descriptive summary of results.

Question 4. Who in the library is involved with providing faculty services? (Select all that apply) (40 responses)

Response Option	Number of Libraries	Percent
Library-employed/managed research assistants	21	52.5
Library paraprofessional staff	18	45.0
Librarians who serve as faculty liaisons	23	57.5
Librarians who do not serve as faculty liaisons (NOT liaisons)	18	45.0
One or more dedicated faculty services liaisons	13	32.5
Other (please specify)	3	7.5

Comments in Response to "Other (please specify)"
Any Librarian who is asked or available at the time
Library director
All professional librarians - we do not call them liaisons

How Many/Which Employment Categories Used (out of 38 responses using listed categories)	Number of Libraries	Percent
All five listed employment categories	2	5.3
4 of the 5 listed categories:	6	15.8
All categories except Librarians who serve as faculty liaisons	3	7.9
All categories except Library paraprofessional staff	2	5.3
All categories except One or more dedicated faculty services liaisons	1	2.6
3 of the 5 listed categories:	7	18.4
Library-employed RAs, Paraprofessionals, One or more dedicated liaison	3	7.9

Library-employed RAs, NOT Liaisons, One or more dedicated liaison	2	5.3
Library-employed RAs, Paraprofessionals, NOT Liaisons	1	2.6
Paraprofessionals, Liaisons, One or more dedicated liaison	1	2.6
2 of the 5 listed categories:	15	39.5
Library-employed RAs & Liaisons	5	13.2
Paraprofessionals & NOT Liaisons	4	10.6
Paraprofessionals & Liaisons	3	7.9
Liaisons & NOT Liaisons	2	5.3
Library-employed RAs & NOT Liaisons	1	2.6
1 of the 5 listed categories:	8	21.0
Liaisons	7	18.4
Library-employed RAs	1	2.6

Question 5. How many research assistants does your library employ or manage? (40 responses)

Response Option	Number of Libraries	Percent
0	16	40.0
1-2	7	17.5
3-6	14	35.0
7-10	3	7.5
11-15	0	0
16+	0	0

Question 6. What types of instructional support do you offer to law faculty? (Select all that apply) (38 responses)

Response Option	Number of Libraries	Percent
Providing in-class presentations or trainings	38	100
Offering course-specific student consults	36	94.7
Collaborating on curriculum development	13	34.2
Creating online learning materials or assignments	23	60.6
Curating an exams database	20	52.6
Maintaining course reserves	38	100
Other (please specify)	5	13.2

Comments in Response to "Other (please specify)"
Assisting with Open Educational Resources to use in courses
Creating course-specific research guides
We coordinate memo and brief trainings with the major database vendors for the law school's 1L legal research and writing courses. We also help faculty obtain review copies of texts that they are considering adopting for their classes.
Trainings for Faculty Assistants and faculty-hired and managed Research Assistants
curating lists of study aides by subject, creating course-specific libguides

How Many/Which Instructional Support Services Provided (out of 38 responses using listed categories)	Number of Libraries	Percent
All 6 listed instructional support services	8	21.1
5 of the 6 listed services:	10	26.3
All services except Collaborating on curriculum development	5	13.2
All services except Curating an exams database	3	7.9
All services except Creating online learning materials or assignments	2	5.3
4 of the 6 listed services:	11	28.9
All services except Collaborating on curriculum development & Curating an exams database	7	18.4
All services except Collaborating on curriculum development & Creating online learning materials or assignments	4	10.6
3 of the 6 listed services:	7	18.4
Providing in-class presentations or trainings, Offering course-specific student consults, Maintaining course reserves	6	15.8
Providing in-class presentations or trainings, Curating an exams database, Maintaining course reserves	1	2.6
2 of the 6 listed services:	2	5.3
Providing in-class presentations or trainings & Maintaining course reserves	2	5.3

Question 7. How have recent innovations in legal research, such as generative AI, affected instructional support at your law school?

Below are sample comments from respondents. See Appendix B for a full list of responses to Question 7.

Sample Comments
It hasn't
Recent innovations have not significantly affected instructional support, but we likely will include AI content in future in-class presentations and trainings.
Incorporating AI into ALR course and mentioning in guest lectures. Vendors have come to do AI trainings.
We've had increased requests from faculty to create/maintain resources on generative AI for use in their courses, such as a recorded lecture.
When we do seminar research sessions, we now show genAI tools. We now need to consult with faculty about their policies and tailor research sessions accordingly.
Yes, reliable AI checkers are needed. BTW, there aren't any. Also, how to use AI to help with Syllabi and to create lessons and class activities.

Summary of Results

Reports of the impact of recent innovations in legal research, such as generative AI, on instructional support varied among respondents. For some libraries, recent innovations have had little or no impact on instructional support. Others have altered their instructional support activities, including holding vendor trainings focused on generative AI, incorporating generative AI into legal research instruction, preparing AI-focused resources to support faculty instruction, and using AI to develop class materials.

Question 8. What types of research services do you provide to law faculty? (Select all that apply) (36 responses)

Response Option	Number of Libraries	Percent
Legal research	34	94.4
Empirical research	16	44.4
Interdisciplinary research	30	83.3
Literature reviews	26	72.2
Bibliography creation	20	55.5
Document delivery	35	97.2
Other (please specify)	6	16.7

Comments in Response to "Other (please specify)"
effective research organization methods
ILL
Research plans and tools for faculty RAs
limited cite checking
Bluebooking, Citation checking
citation checking for books and/or articles

How Many/Which Research Services Provided (out of 36 responses using listed categories)	Number of Libraries	Percent
All 6 listed research services	9	25.0
5 of the 6 listed services:	8	22.2
All services except Empirical research	7	19.5
All services except Bibliography creation	1	2.8
4 of the 6 listed services:	11	30.5
All services except Empirical research & Literature reviews	3	8.3
All services except Empirical research & Bibliography creation	4	11.1
All services except Literature reviews & Bibliography creation	4	11.1
3 of the 6 listed services:	5	13.9
Legal research, Interdisciplinary research, Document delivery	2	5.6
Legal research, Empirical research, Document delivery	1	2.8
Legal research, Empirical research, Interdisciplinary research	1	2.8
Legal research, Bibliography creation, Document delivery	1	2.8
2 of the 6 listed services:	1	2.8
Legal research & Document delivery	1	2.8
1 of the 6 listed services:	2	5.6
Document delivery	2	5.6

Question 9. How have recent innovations in legal research, such as generative AI, affected the research support you provide?

Below are sample comments from respondents. See Appendix B for a full list of responses to Question 9.

Sample Comments
It hasn't.
They haven't impacted our research support very much other than increased difficulty in assessing requests from faculty, as we have had some instances of document delivery requests for gen-AI-hallucinated materials.
It has not affected it significantly yet. Some librarians may use AI based research tools such as Research Rabbit to assist with some faculty research.
Comment 1: We use generative AI at times to assist with code development for empirical projects, such as developing Python code for a particular situation. Otherwise, we avoid using it for research.

Comment 2: It has helped us a bit in writing/refining Python code for some empirical projects. Otherwise, we avoid it generally.

fielding questions from faculty about AI assistants; tutorials for faculty on using AI assistants; running some faculty research questions through AI assistants

We are looking for opportunities to incorporate Gen AI into research product where it makes sense to, and with full disclosure of its use. We have also received requests from faculty for items generated by AI, some of which include hallucinations. We have provided additional research based on Generative AI content.

Summary of Results

A number of respondents indicated recent innovations had thus far had little or minimal impact on research support. Others noted specific ways that generative AI has been incorporated into research support, such as developing code for empirical projects, providing training on AI research tools, and running faculty questions through a generative AI tool. A few respondents noted encountering AI-hallucinated citations in requests for material.

Question 10. What types of scholarly and publishing services do you provide to law faculty? (Select all that apply) (33 responses)

Response Option	Number of Libraries	Percent
Citation assistance	16	48.5
Formatting assistance	12	36.4
Research impact metrics	19	57.6
Copyright and licensing guidance	16	48.5
Assistance with prepublications, scholarly profiles and author identifiers (e.g., ORCID)	21	63.6
Institutional database for faculty scholarship	27	81.8
Other (please specify)	6	18.2

Comments in Response to "Other (please specify)"
Faculty scholarship display
Editing and updating of serial publications
Database of news articles and publication display cases to promote scholarship; Data and document preservation
Creating keywords
Institutional Repository support
We have repository and pure4EGS as well as SSRN and other profiles

How Many/Which Scholarly and Publishing Services Provided (out of 32 responses using listed categories)	Number of Libraries	Percent
All 6 listed research services	4	12.5
5 of the 6 listed services:	1	3.1
All services except Copyright and licensing guidance	1	3.1
4 of the 6 listed services:	13	40.6
All services except Citation assistance & Formatting assistance	5	15.6
All services except Formatting assistance & Research impact metrics	2	6.3
All services except Formatting assistance & Copyright and licensing guidance	2	6.3
All services except Research impact metrics & Copyright and licensing guidance	1	3.1
All services except Citation assistance & Copyright and licensing guidance	1	3.1
All services except Formatting assistance & Assistance with prepublications	1	3.1
All services except Formatting assistance & Institutional database for faculty scholarship	1	3.1
3 of the 6 listed services:	3	9.4
Citation assistance, Assistance with prepublications, Institutional database	1	3.1
Research impact metrics, Copyright and licensing guidance, Assistance with prepublications	1	3.1
Research impact metrics, Assistance with prepublications, Institutional database	1	3.1
2 of the 6 listed services:	5	15.6
Citation assistance & Institutional database	2	6.3
Research impact metrics & Institutional database	1	3.1
Copyright and licensing guidance & Institutional database	1	3.1

Assistance with prepublications & Institutional database	1	3.1
1 of the 6 listed services:	6	18.8
Institutional database	3	9.4
Citation assistance	1	3.1
Research impact metrics	1	3.1
Copyright and licensing guidance	1	3.1

Question 11. How have recent innovations in legal research, such as generative AI, affected the scholarly support you provide?

Below are sample comments from respondents. See Appendix B for a full list of responses to Question 11.

Sample Comments
Not at all
Little to no impact.
Comment 1: Not sure that it has.
Comment 2: Gen AI is not the innovation that is most impacting our scholarly support; instead, our potential area for growth in scholarly support is the increasing curation of online scholarship profiles, using digital identifiers (DOI for titles; OrcID for authors), for faculty.
We now use GenAI to draft abstracts for inclusion in our institutional repository. With more librarians, we'll also get back to research impact metrics, copyright assistance, and scholarly profiles, etc.
Some copyright implications around GenAI. So far, the impact has been minimal.

Summary of Results

For most respondents, recent innovations have not significantly affected scholarly support at their school. However, a couple respondents did note impacts. One library uses generative AI to draft abstracts for their institutional repository. Another respondent noted that they have dealt with some copyright implications around generative AI.

Question 12. What types of outreach and communication methods do you use to promote faculty services to law professors? (Select all that apply) (35 responses)

Response Option	Number of Libraries	Percent
Individual email check-ins	28	80.0
Faculty-wide email newsletters	19	54.3
One-on-one meetings	26	74.3
Workshops & events	21	60.0
Tours	11	31.4
University service (academic senate, committees)	12	34.3
Other (please specify)	7	20

Comments in Response to "Other (please specify)"
Weekly faculty update email from the library
Centralized email box for quicker response
Occasional faculty-wide emails (not in newsletter format) about services; regularly scheduled "office hours" promoted to faculty
Faculty-wide email announcements
Email to Faculty once a semester; and a website page dedicated to scholarly support
Presentations at monthly faculty meetings
Faculty Meetings

How Many/Which Outreach and Communication Methods Used (out of 34 responses using listed categories)	Number of Libraries	Percent
All 6 listed methods	1	2.9
5 of the 6 listed methods:	7	20.6
All methods except University service	4	11.8
All methods except Tours	2	5.9
All methods except Workshops & events	1	2.9
4 of the 6 listed methods:	8	23.5
All methods except Workshops & University Service	2	15.6
All methods except Faculty-wide email newsletters & Tours	2	5.9
All methods except One-on-one meetings & University Service	1	5.9
All methods except Faculty-wide email newsletters & University Service	1	2.9
All methods except One-on-one meetings & Tours	1	2.9
All methods except Workshops & Tours	1	2.9
All services except Formatting assistance & Institutional database for faculty scholarship	1	2.9
3 of the 6 listed methods:	9	26.5
Individual email check-ins, One-on-one meetings, Workshops & events	4	11.8
Individual email check-ins, Faculty-wide email newsletters, Workshops & events	1	2.9
Individual email check-ins, One-on-one meetings, Tours	1	2.9

Individual email check-ins, One-on-one meetings, University service	1	2.9
Individual email check-ins, Faculty-wide email newsletters, One-on-one meetings	1	2.9
Individual email check-ins, Workshops & events, University service	1	2.9
2 of the 6 listed methods:	8	23.5
Individual email check-ins & One-on-one meetings	3	8.8
Faculty-wide email newsletters & Workshops & events	2	5.9
Individual email check-ins & Faculty-wide email newsletters	1	2.9
Workshops & events & University service	1	2.9
Faculty-wide email newsletters & University service	1	2.9
1 of the 6 listed methods:	1	2.9
One-on-one meetings	1	2.9

Question 13. How do you keep faculty up to date on developments and innovations in their fields of research? (select all that apply) (32 responses)

Note: Due to an error, this survey question did not include a box for respondents to provide information in response to “Other (please specify).”

Response Option	Number of Libraries	Percent
Liaison communications	20	62.5
Customized email alerts (bill tracking, case updates, new publications, etc.)	24	75.0
Vendor communications	12	37.5
Social media monitoring	7	21.9
Curated newsletters or blogs	9	28.1
RSS feeds	3	9.4
Other (please specify)	4	12.5

How Many/Which Methods to Keep Faculty Up to Date Used (out of 31 responses using listed categories)	Number of Libraries	Percent
All 6 listed methods	1	3.2
5 of the 6 listed methods:	0	0
4 of the 6 listed methods:	5	16.1
All methods except Curated newsletters & RSS feeds	2	6.5
All methods except Social media & RSS feeds	1	3.2
All methods except Liaison communications & RSS feeds	1	3.2
All methods except Liaison communications & Social media	1	3.2
3 of the 6 listed methods:	8	25.8
Liaison communications, Customized email, Social media	3	9.7
Liaison communications, Customized email, Vendor communications	2	6.5
Liaison communications, Customized email, Curated newsletters	1	3.2
Liaison communications, Vendor communications, Curated newsletters	1	3.2
Customized email alerts, Vendor communications, RSS feeds	1	3.2
2 of the 6 listed methods:	8	25.8
Liaison communications & Customized email	4	12.9
Liaison communications & Vendor communications	1	3.2
Liaison communications & Curated newsletters	1	3.2
Customized email & Vendor communications	1	3.2
Customized email & Curated newsletters	1	3.2
1 of the 6 listed methods:	9	29.0
Customized email	5	16.1
Liaison communications	3	9.7
Curated newsletters	1	3.2

Question 14. Is there anything else you'd like to tell us about Faculty Services at your institution?

Below are sample comments from respondents. See Appendix B for a full list of responses to Question 14.

Sample Comments
We do have a dedicated faculty services department (4 professional librarians and 2 paraprofessional staff), but most of our other departments are ALSO involved in supporting faculty instruction, research and publication. Our reference librarians serve as faculty liaisons, performing research and providing instruction for their professors; our FCIL librarians use their expertise to do the same for our FCIL faculty; our access services team supports course reserves and interlibrary loans; our technology team develops and maintains online tools supporting faculty, such as platforms for past exams, news articles, online textbooks, and research collections; our digital initiatives team scans materials for digital collections; our Special Collections team works closely with faculty to utilize rare books and manuscripts for both teaching and research in legal history. So our whole library collaborates on faculty services, and it's one of the most important parts of our mission.
In case it is not clear - faculty services is managed by a dedicated faculty services librarian, who coordinates all services for faculty. We generally employ a bespoke approach that is centered around presence in faculty spaces/committees/activities. Being seen and being active reminds people that we can assist and also informs us of areas where we can offer assistance proactively rather than simply waiting for someone to contact us.
We do not use a liaison librarian system; instead we have several faculty services units managed by a full-time staff member. These services are supported by student workers.
We tend to be more responsive to faculty needs currently. In the past, with more librarians, we were able to be more proactive.
We'd love to help more with Scholarly & Publishing Communications but are too short staffed now to do so.

Summary of Results

Respondents used this question to provide additional information about how faculty services are structured at their library and to highlight challenges with staffing.

IV. Key Takeaways

Although one might expect that larger schools with larger library staffs would offer the widest range of services or methods of communication and outreach, while smaller schools/staffs would offer less—and although there might be some truth to that assumption overall in practice—it was interesting to see that actually, smaller schools/library staffs sometimes offer a surprising range of services, while larger schools/libraries sometimes provide more narrowly circumscribed services. The survey reveals that there is a wide variety and diversity as to how academic legal libraries provide services, and to some extent it runs the gamut from the smallest to the largest institutions.

The use of generative AI among schools in the areas of instructional support, research support, and scholarly publishing varied widely across schools, with some schools making no or minimal use of generative AI while others have incorporated it into their faculty services activities. Based on respondent comments, the most common use of generative AI was in instructional support activities, with fewer applications noted for research support and scholarly support. The schools that have made use of generative AI demonstrate how it can be used to effectively augment conventional approaches to faculty services, including incorporating AI topics into instructional activities, using it to develop code for empirical projects, and employing it to draft abstracts for institutional repositories. Respondents also noted some of the unique challenges that generative AI presents for faculty services, particularly regarding its accuracy. Overall, respondents indicate that schools are taking a careful approach to incorporating generative AI into faculty services, with a focus on how it can best enhance conventional activities, rather than replace them.

Appendix A: 2024 ABA 509 Information Report Data

For respondents that gave permission (thirty-five of forty schools), data from the 2024 ABA Standard 509 Information Reports on number of librarians and number of faculty is listed below.

Law School	Full-Time Librarians	Part-Time Librarians	Total Librarians	Full-Time Faculty Members	Non-Full-Time Faculty	Total Faculty
LS01	1	0	1	24	34	58
LS02	2	0	2	19	30	49
LS03	2	0	2	12	1	13
LS04	3	0	3	30	27	57
LS05	2	1	3	51	49	100
LS06	3	0	3	18	41	59
LS07	4	0	4	27	44	71
LS08	4	0	4	34	54	88
LS09	4	0	4	42	127	169
LS10	4	0	4	39	61	100
LS11	5	0	5	40	41	81
LS12	5	0	5	63	73	136
LS13	5	0	5	40	33	73
LS14	4	1	5	57	99	156
LS15	7	0	7	61	125	186
LS16	7	0	7	69	175	244
LS17	6	1	7	57	114	171
LS18	7	0	7	36	46	82
LS19	6	2	8	30	69	99
LS20	8	0	8	58	74	132
LS21	9	0	9	73	86	159
LS22	9	0	9	64	63	127
LS23	9	0	9	65	71	136
LS24	8	1	9	59	195	254
LS25	9	0	9	51	76	127
LS26	10	0	10	49	72	121
LS27	8	2	10	50	195	245
LS28	10	1	11	53	84	137
LS29	11	0	11	56	96	152
LS30	11	0	11	119	89	208
LS31	12	0	12	63	151	214
LS32	12	0	12	64	85	149
LS33	13	1	14	96	189	285
LS34	19	0	19	120	335	455
LS35	22	0	22	236	519	755

Appendix B: Open-Ended Responses (Questions 7, 9, 11, and 14)

The full list of responses to open-ended Questions 7, 9, 11, and 14 are listed below.

Question 7. How have recent innovations in legal research, such as generative AI, affected instructional support at your law school?

Comments
It hasn't
Unsure, as faculty are reluctant to adopt.
No
Minimally, so far.
We have to include a section about AI and research in our presentations.
Comment 1: Just awareness of the tools in the databases. Unsure of their use. Comment 2: At this time, the Law Center's Honor Code prohibits students from using generative AI (GAI) tools on exams unless authorized by their professor. There is currently no law school-wide policy related to using GAI for papers, and use is determined by each professor for their course. As a result, the use of GAI by professors in the classroom has varied, with some taking on the role of early adopters and some being more cautious. The Law Library has not yet received a request from a professor for an instructional session that is primarily focused on GAI, and we have not yet offered training sessions that are primarily focused on GAI tools. We have incorporated guidance on using GAI generally, as well as some sample searches comparing specific GAI tools to traditional computer-assisted legal research methods, into our skills-based and subject-based training. We emphasize the importance of checking the accuracy of any research results returned by GAI. We also take care to stress the importance of following each professor's policies on GAI use for the class, and in the future, ethical considerations like the Model Rules of Professional Conduct. Our Law Library Director is on the Law Center's AI committee, so we have a seat at the table to participate in formulating new policies on GAI.
Comment 1: We can provide instructional support in these if necessary, but generally it is covered in the legal technology classes offered by the law librarians Comment 2: Not beyond general conversation about it.
Added coverage of AI research tools to legal research instruction; faculty services librarian conducted training on Westlaw and Lexis AI assistants
Yes, reliable AI checkers are needed. BTW, there aren't any. Also, how to use AI to help with Syllabi and to create lessons and class activities.
Comment 1: Too early to tell. Comment 2: Not yet
Not terribly from my perspective.
no change so far
We include coverage of Legal Database AIs in the 1L legal writing classes during in-class presentations.
No
When we do seminar research sessions, we now show genAI tools. We now need to consult with faculty about their policies and tailor research sessions accordingly.
Recent innovations have not significantly affected instructional support, but we likely will include AI content in future in-class presentations and trainings.
Incorporating AI into ALR course and mentioning in guest lectures. Vendors have come to do AI trainings.

outside speakers; integrated into ALR
Presented a faculty workshop on how to use generative AI; fielded questions from faculty about how to access and/or use generative AI tools that are available through the university
We've had increased requests from faculty to create/maintain resources on generative AI for use in their courses, such as a recorded lecture.
We provide instruction on AI tools as part of legal research instruction.
We are offering a legal tech series including Gen AI topics; we've created a Head of Emerging Legal Technology librarian position whose work deals heavily with keeping up with innovations in legal research; librarians have offered guidance to faculty and administrators on formulating policy regarding GenAI
Use AI as a research tool when doing faculty and other research. Use it to help compile data from multiple sources. Use it to create AI "apps" to help with faculty projects or grading, etc.
Not very much. We've offered training sessions on the use of AI.
Increases the need for info sessions on generative AI
Relatively little, beyond adding a few slides about it in classroom instruction.
Not being taught much, except by Lexis/Westlaw reps. Technically not allowed per honor code.

Question 9. How have recent innovations in legal research, such as generative AI, affected the research support you provide?

Comments
it hasn't
Yes. Some tasks are easier to complete even if there is more cleanup work on projects.
Minimally, so far.
Not much
Comment 1: As far as I know, we don't use AI for research. Comment 2: Thus far, our faculty are more interested in researching legal generative AI than in using it for their own research projects. We have assisted on a number of projects on the topic. As far as our own knowledge of GAI, we have partnered with our CALR vendors to test GAI tools. Knowing how GAI tools work (and how well) has offered some insights on how to improve our non-AI research techniques. We don't anticipate that GAI tools will result in time-savings for research, but rather that they will help us reframe and consider new approaches to research. We would disclose using GAI for a faculty member's research project, and we would refrain from using GAI if a faculty member requested it.
Comment 1: We use generative AI at times to assist with code development for empirical projects, such as developing Python code for a particular situation. Otherwise, we avoid using it for research. Comment 2: It has helped us a bit in writing/refining Python code for some empirical projects. Otherwise, we avoid it generally.
fielding questions from faculty about AI assistants; tutorials for faculty on using AI assistants; running some faculty research questions through AI assistants
Not as much. We just caution faculty about verifying sources.
Comment 1: Too early to tell Comment 2: No effect yet
Not very much
no change to services

We have encountered citations for research that were AI hallucinations. At this point we have not made much use of AI in the research context.
No
Faculty generally want electronic materials and seem to be less interested in print resources.
Recent innovations have not significantly affected research support.
Use AI for double-checking and have done trainings/demos for faculty on AI.
We sometimes use generative AI for research, usually in conjunction with traditional research tools.
They haven't impacted our research support very much other than increased difficulty in assessing requests from faculty, as we have had some instances of document delivery requests for gen-AI-hallucinated materials.
It has not affected it significantly yet. Some librarians may use AI based research tools such as Research Rabbit to assist with some faculty research.
We are looking for opportunities to incorporate Gen AI into research product where it makes sense to, and with full disclosure of its use. We have also received requests from faculty for items generated by AI, some of which include hallucinations. We have provided additional research based on Generative AI content.
It hasn't.
most relevant to our training of library RAs
Not at all

Question 11. How have recent innovations in legal research, such as generative AI, affected the scholarly support you provide?

Comments
it hasn't
No
Little to no impact.
Comment 1: Not sure that it has. Comment 2: Gen AI is not the innovation that is most impacting our scholarly support; instead, our potential area for growth in scholarly support is the increasing curation of online scholarship profiles, using digital identifiers (DOI for titles; OrcID for authors), for faculty.
Comment 1: Does not affect this. Comment 2: No
n/a
Comment 1: Too early to tell. Comment 2: Not yet
Not sure
none
AI has not affected our scholarly support.
We now use GenAI to draft abstracts for inclusion in our institutional repository. With more librarians, we'll also get back to research impact metrics, copyright assistance, and scholarly profiles, etc.
Recent innovations have not significantly affected scholarly support.
Has not affected as much as with instruction and research.
It has not yet.
Some copyright implications around GenAI. So far, the impact has been minimal.

It hasn't.
Not at all

Question 14. Is there anything else you'd like to tell us about Faculty Services at your institution?

Comments
We tend to be more responsive to faculty needs currently. In the past, with more librarians, we were able to be more proactive.
no
We do have a dedicated faculty services department (4 professional librarians and 2 paraprofessional staff), but most of our other departments are ALSO involved in supporting faculty instruction, research and publication. Our reference librarians serve as faculty liaisons, performing research and providing instruction for their professors; our FCIL librarians use their expertise to do the same for our FCIL faculty; our access services team supports course reserves and interlibrary loans; our technology team develops and maintains online tools supporting faculty, such as platforms for past exams, news articles, online textbooks, and research collections; our digital initiatives team scans materials for digital collections; our Special Collections team works closely with faculty to utilize rare books and manuscripts for both teaching and research in legal history. So our whole library collaborates on faculty services, and it's one of the most important parts of our mission.
In case it is not clear - faculty services is managed by a dedicated faculty services librarian, who coordinates all services for faculty. We generally employ a bespoke approach that is centered around presence in faculty spaces/committees/activities. Being seen and being active reminds people that we can assist and also informs us of areas where we can offer assistance proactively rather than simply waiting for someone to contact us.
No
We do not use a liaison librarian system; instead we have several faculty services units managed by a full-time staff member. These services are supported by student workers.
No.
We'd love to help more with Scholarly & Publishing Communications but are too short staffed now to do so.

Appendix C: Full Survey Instrument

Question	Response Options
1. What is the name of your law school?	
2. How many professional librarians does your library employ?	
3. Can we include ABA data on your law school in our published survey report?	Yes No
4. Who in the library is involved with providing faculty services? (Select all that apply)	Library-employed/managed research assistants Library paraprofessional staff Librarians who serve as faculty liaisons Librarians who do not serve as faculty liaisons One or more dedicated faculty services liaisons Other (please specify)
5. How many research assistants does your library employ or manage?	0 1-2 3-6 7-10 11-15 16+
6. What types of instructional support do you offer to law faculty? (Select all that apply)	Providing in-class presentations or trainings Offering course-specific student consults Collaborating on curriculum development Creating online learning materials or assignments Curating an exams database Maintaining course reserves Other (please specify)
7. How have recent innovations in legal research, such as generative AI, affected instructional support at your law school?	
8. What types of research services do you provide to law faculty? (Select all that apply)	Legal research Empirical research Interdisciplinary research Literature reviews Bibliography creation Document delivery Other (please specify)
9. How have recent innovations in legal research, such as generative AI, affected the research support you provide?	
10. What types of scholarly and publishing services do you provide to law faculty? (Select all that apply)	Citation assistance Formatting assistance Research impact metrics Copyright and licensing guidance

	<p>Assistance with prepublications, scholarly profiles and author identifiers (e.g., ORCID)</p> <p>Institutional database for faculty scholarship</p> <p>Other (please specify)</p>
11. How have recent innovations in legal research, such as generative AI, affected the scholarly support you provide?	
12. What types of outreach and communication methods do you use to promote faculty services to law professors? (Select all that apply)	<p>Individual email check-ins</p> <p>Faculty-wide email newsletters</p> <p>One-on-one meetings</p> <p>Workshops & events</p> <p>Tours</p> <p>University service (academic senate, committees)</p> <p>Other (please specify)</p>
13. How do you keep faculty up to date on developments and innovations in their fields of research? (Select all that apply)	<p>Liaison communications</p> <p>Customized email alerts (bill tracking, case updates, new publications, etc.)</p> <p>Vendor communications</p> <p>Social media monitoring</p> <p>Curated newsletters or blogs</p> <p>RSS feeds</p> <p>Other (please specify)</p>
14. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about Faculty Services at your institution?	