AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

2026 COUNCIL MEETING

OPPORTUNITIES AND GUARDRAILS FOR INTEGRATING AI IN BIOLOGY

Summary Report

October 14, 2026 · 1:00–3:00 PM ET · Held via Zoom
An Annual Meeting of the AIBS Council of Member Societies and Organizations

AI Disclosure: Zoom's AI summary and transcription features were used to support note-taking, and Claude (Anthropic) was used to assist in preparing this report. All content was reviewed by AIBS organizers for accuracy.

AGENDA

1:00 PM **Welcome and Objectives**
Jyotsna Pandey, Director of Community Programs, AIBS

1:05 PM **President's Remarks**
Dr. Judy Skog, President, AIBS

1:10 PM **Session 1 — AI-Driven Biological Research and Education**
Dr. Niall Mangan · Dr. Taylor Lightner & Dr. Verónica Segarra · Dr. Nyeema Harris

1:40 PM **Audience Q&A**

1:50 PM **Session 2 — The Changing Landscape of Research in the Age of AI**
Ms. Jane Taylor (by recording) · Dr. David Resnik · Dr. Theresa Good

2:20 PM **Audience Q&A and Panel Discussion**
Moderated by Dr. Nyeema Harris, with Dr. Libby Ellwood

3:00 PM **Adjourn**

OVERVIEW

The 2026 AIBS Council Meeting convened leaders and representatives from scientific societies, museums, botanic gardens, academic institutions, and federal agencies to examine how artificial intelligence (AI) is reshaping biological research, education, scholarly publishing, and science policy. The program featured two sessions of three presentations each, followed by a moderated panel discussion. Speakers explored both the transformative potential of AI and the practical, ethical, and societal guardrails the community will need as these tools become embedded across the scientific enterprise[1].

[1] Meeting agenda and speaker details: https://www.aibs.org/news/2026/260904-2026-council-meeting

Several themes recurred across the afternoon: **keeping a human in the loop** and preserving critical thinking and domain expertise; the importance of **transparency, disclosure, and verification** of AI use and outputs; **equitable access** to tools, data, and compute; the **environmental footprint** of AI; **biosecurity and dual-use risk**; and the distinctive role of **scientific societies** in setting norms, building literacy, and sustaining public trust in science.

Note on attribution: formal presentations and panel contributions are attributed to the speakers. In keeping with the meeting's stated practice, questions and comments raised during discussion and in the chat are summarized without attribution to individual participants.

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS

Jyotsna Pandey (Director of Community Programs, AIBS) opened the meeting, reviewed housekeeping, and noted that the session was recorded and that a Zoom AI summary feature was used for note-taking, to be carefully reviewed for accuracy and with discussion comments de-identified.

AIBS President Dr. Judy Skog delivered opening remarks, framing AI as "no longer a distant horizon" but a force reshaping every corner of the biological sciences in real time. She urged the community not to forget the meaning of "artificial" —made by humans, and not itself scientific proof—invoking the adage "garbage in, garbage out." She emphasized the shared responsibility of societies, institutions, and agencies to engage thoughtfully with the technology while safeguarding the integrity, trustworthiness, and equity of science, and highlighted the distinctive role of scientific societies in setting standards, establishing community norms, and preserving public trust.

SESSION 1 — AI-DRIVEN BIOLOGICAL RESEARCH AND EDUCATION

Dr. Niall Mangan

National Institute for Theory and Mathematics in Biology (NITMB), Northwestern University
"Biology Inspiring Math and Math Inspiring Biology"

Dr. Mangan introduced NITMB (https://www.nitmb.org/)—a joint Northwestern–University of Chicago institute funded by the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the Simons Foundation—as a home for both mathematicians and biologists, with workshops, fellowships, and undergraduate research and visitor programs, and a 2027 theme on image-based scientific machine learning for biological dynamics across scales. Her research philosophy combines information from data with existing biological knowledge, using optimization and search strategies to produce interpretable models. As an example, a model-discovery algorithm applied to arctic ground squirrel body-temperature data surfaced a simple, well-fitting "thermostat" controller that could recapitulate temperature dynamics across multiple organisms. She highlighted work spanning biological scales—

single-cell transcriptomics for inferring gene-regulatory networks, functional grouping of microbiome species, reinforcement-learning comparisons with spatial learning in mice (which motivated new risk-averse algorithms), and agentic AI frameworks pairing specialist agents with antagonistic evaluators, now being linked to an automated biofoundry for closed-loop protein engineering.

Dr. Taylor Lightner & Dr. Verónica Segarra

QEM Network; Goucher College

"Designing Ethical AI Literacy Across Secondary-to-Graduate STEM Pathways: A Role for Scientific Societies"

Drs. Lightner and Segarra presented a conceptual framework for ethical AI literacy spanning secondary through graduate education. They described educators as caught in a "pedagogical balancing act"—efficiency and expanded access on one side; academic-integrity concerns, algorithmic bias, data-privacy risks, and over-reliance on the other—and warned against "techno-solutionism." They argued that shared ethical commitments manifest differently across disciplines (biology, engineering, computer science), each with distinct validation methods and consequences of error. Their framework defines six core components—attribution and citation; bias awareness and mitigation; privacy and data handling; safety and environmental care; community impact and fairness; and compliance and audit-readiness—mapped across educational levels (illustrated with a "privacy" example from high school to the workforce). Because the framework transcends disciplines and levels, they argued scientific and professional societies are well positioned to implement it through cross-disciplinary ethics committees, and invited attendees to pilot their "living toolkits."[2]

Dr. Nyeema Harris

Yale School of the Environment, National Academies New Voices Fellow

"STEM Education in the Age of AI"

Dr. Harris shared work from the National Academies New Voices working group "STEM Education in the Age of AI." She distinguished levels of AI (machine learning, deep learning, generative AI, large language models) and cited survey evidence (including an MIT survey) of rapidly growing use across coursework and research. She outlined key concerns: over-reliance and the risk of replacing critical thinking and judgment; questionable reliability of outputs (noting fabricated citations in literature searches); erosion of disciplinary expertise; and inequitable access amid regulation that cannot keep pace. She noted that writing support (spelling, grammar, language) and literature search were among the most "acceptable" uses reported, flagging both the equalizing potential for non-native English

[2] Lightner T, Schilling M, Hansberry W, Hussen S, Siam A, Segarra VA.0. Designing ethical AI literacy across secondary to graduate STEM pathways: ensuring cross-disciplinary outcomes and workforce alignment. J Microbiol Biol Educ.0:e00351-25. https://doi.org/10.1128/jmbe.00351-25

speakers and the hazard of hallucinated references. She played video testimonials from students and early-career professionals, who described AI as a tool for acceleration rather than a replacement for understanding—valuable for debugging, planning, and polishing, but requiring domain expertise to catch errors and verify outputs. She previewed next steps including a needs-assessment survey, a November webinar, and a planned decision-tree resource to help users navigate available tools.

SESSION 1 DISCUSSION

In response to a question about practical first steps for smaller, volunteer-run societies, the speakers recommended starting with existing education or pedagogy committees—surveying member needs and convening cross-disciplinary ethics committees to build adaptable "living toolkits" that can move between classroom, K-12, and workplace settings. Discussion then turned to publishing: an attendee observed that societies often receive proposed AI policies from their publishing partners but lack in-house AI expertise, raising the worry that publishers—whose priorities differ from scientists'—may end up setting ethical standards by default. Dr. Resnik responded that well-reasoned commentaries in the scientific literature do influence publishers (for example, arguments against naming AI as an author and for disclosure standards), while some publisher restrictions—such as refusing AI-generated figures—are driven by copyright and liability concerns rather than scientific ones, an area ripe for more dialogue. He pushed back on blanket publisher restrictions on AI-generated figures, arguing that while images containing data raise legitimate fabrication concerns, purely conceptual or illustrative graphics—which contain no data—should be acceptable. Additional exchanges touched on the difficulty of detecting AI-generated text (including older dissertations flagged as "AI-generated"), the poor reliability of AI detectors, and the breadth of material being ingested by AI models. Dr. Mangan offered a reassuring note that STEM still benefits from experimental and observational "ground truth"—AI output can be treated as a hypothesis to be tested—though teaching students to perform that evaluation is increasingly challenging.

SESSION 2 — THE CHANGING LANDSCAPE OF RESEARCH IN THE AGE OF AI

Ms. Jane Taylor

Oxford University Press (OUP) · presented by recording

"AI in Journal Publishing: Balancing Innovation, Integrity, and Trust"

In a prerecorded presentation, Ms. Taylor described how AI is arriving amid existing pressures in publishing—complex submission requirements, rising volumes, difficult reviewer recruitment, and a shift toward AI-generated answers that may not return readers to the original article. She cited an OUP survey finding high use but low trust (only about 20% trusted AI outputs; 44% worried disclosure would harm how their work is viewed),

making clear and proportionate guidance essential. OUP's guiding principle is "solve the problem, don't just deploy the technology," illustrated by a simple submission-system change giving reviewers closure on outcomes. New tools pass a six-question due-diligence review (integrity, outcomes, transparency, user benefit, workflow fit, and credible evidence) before moving into controlled pilots with defined participants and stop criteria. A central principle is that AI surfaces signals and reduces manual effort while humans retain responsibility—"efficiency should never come at the expense of editorial ownership." A pilot of the Hum Alchemist Review triage tool (which does not make editorial decisions) showed a 33% reduction in editor handling time despite an 88% increase in submissions, and better pre-review identification of unsuitable manuscripts. She closed on OUP's evolving policy work: a recently released author policy[3] emphasizing accountability, confidentiality, transparency, and disclosure, with guidance for reviewers and editors in progress—stressing that transparency must work both ways.

Dr. David Resnik

National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS), NIH

"Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence in Research"

Speaking as an independent scholar, Dr. Resnik mapped core research-ethics principles (honesty, transparency, rigor, objectivity, accountability, protection of confidentiality and research subjects, and social responsibility) onto responsible AI use. His recommendations: examine all AI output for reasoning errors, misinterpretations, and hallucinated citations or facts (noting that subtle, probabilistically—not logically—driven reasoning errors are especially hard to catch); check for verbatim and idea plagiarism; understand and disclose bias; and validate AI analyses, including by cross-checking across models. He argued AI cannot be an author because it cannot be held morally or legally responsible, and that substantial AI use should be disclosed and documented in the research record, with the level of detail matching the nature of the use. He urged researchers never to upload confidential information—peer-review materials, identified human-subjects data, personnel or medical records, proprietary data—into commercial AI systems, noting that even behind-firewall local models carry residual risk. He voiced strong concern about the "human-in-the-loop" problem and the temptation to outsource thinking, cautioning in particular against using AI to write first drafts, which cedes too many important decisions to the model. He closed by noting NIH's intramural AI guidelines and the integration of ethical AI use into responsible-conduct-of-research training.

Dr. Theresa Good

Directorate for Biological Sciences, National Science Foundation (NSF)

"The Role of NSF in Enabling AI-Driven Advances in Biological Sciences"

[3] Oxford University Press journals ethics and authorship policy: https://academic.oup.com/pages/for-authors/journals/preparing-and-submitting-your-manuscript/ethics

Dr. Good spoke on behalf of NSF, noting that—per a recent executive order—she would use the term "superintelligence (SI)" in place of "AI." She affirmed that NSF policy is consistent with the ethics themes raised earlier and that nothing will replace the critical thinking, creativity, and deep subject-matter expertise required for science; AI/SI should serve as an enabler and accelerator. Rather than building foundation models (largely a commercial domain), NSF's strengths lie in three areas: AI-ready datasets and repositories (e.g., Protein Data Bank, NEON, data-synthesis centers in the environmental, molecular/cellular, and organismal sciences, and a new "unlocking dataset value" funding opportunity); tools and infrastructure for biological discovery (through the restructured Bioinfrastructure and Innovation section and Dear Colleague Letters at the biology–SI intersection, including participation in the DOE-led Genesis Mission and its 33 science-and-technology challenges); and workforce development spanning undergraduates, graduate students, postdocs, and early-career faculty, including a new opportunity to train researchers with deep expertise in either biology or SI to gain the complementary expertise. She emphasized democratizing access through user facilities such as biofoundries and cloud labs so that innovation can happen anywhere.

PANEL DISCUSSION

Dr. Nyeema Harris moderated a panel with all speakers, noting that the group was "only scratching the surface." Discussion was organized around several cross-cutting questions.

ENVIRONMENTAL FOOTPRINT OF AI

Panelists agreed the energy and compute costs of training and deploying models are substantial but that forgoing AI entirely would be self-defeating; the better path is to leverage the power of biology for more efficient computing and to design more efficient data centers (e.g. China's work with underwater data centers). One panelist urged users to weigh the real electricity cost of each query (likened to running a microwave) and to avoid trivial uses, while acknowledging that reliable, transparent data on model-by-model energy use is hard to obtain—pointing to an industry responsibility for greater disclosure.

EQUITY AND ACCESS

Panelists stressed that no individual can solve access challenges alone and that communities, societies, and federal efforts (e.g., the Genesis Mission and NSF investments) should push for more transparency and more tools in researchers' hands rather than terms set solely by large companies. One suggested being "frugal" by using the simplest adequate model and embedding expert knowledge to reduce resource demands. NSF described efforts to democratize access through user facilities, while cautioning that success is an ongoing challenge. A more philosophical note urged the community to define the actual goal:

equitable access is important but complex, and—drawing an analogy to "a laptop in every classroom"—more access is not automatically better for learning or critical thinking.

MEASURING SUCCESS OF AI-LITERACY FRAMEWORKS

Asked how to judge impact, the education speakers pointed to adaptability and flexibility across settings as primary measures—whether a framework can be adopted across a department's instructors, students, and staff—alongside academic signals such as citations, downloads, and adaptations. They emphasized providing adaptable, "fill-in" toolkits and inviting users to report back on how they are used.

AI/SI IN NSF PROPOSALS AND THE BASIC-SCIENCE MISSION

Responding to a concern that AI/SI could crowd out NSF's foundational-research mission, Dr. Good was emphatic that foundational discovery remains NSF's "bread and butter" (citing CRISPR and optogenetics as fruits of curiosity-driven work). Researchers should not insert AI/SI into every proposal if it is not relevant—write the best proposal for the best idea—and, when AI is used, describe it in established terms (machine learning, large language models) rather than newly coined language.

CONFIDENCE, DISCERNMENT, AND VERIFICATION

Building on an earlier audience question about how to gauge confidence in AI responses, the moderator described a classroom exercise giving the same prompt to multiple models (e.g., ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini) to reveal variance and build students' own discernment—preferring human judgment of confidence over the model's self-assessment. Panelists reinforced treating outputs as hypotheses requiring verification against domain knowledge.

PUBLIC TRUST

On sustaining public confidence in biological research, panelists emphasized that peer review keeps a human in the loop, and that the norms the public values—transparency, openness, acknowledgment of uncertainty, and reproducibility—must be upheld, along with clearer science communication and a more scientifically literate public. Going forward, people will expect AI uses and results that are transparent, understandable, and explainable, with sources, evidence, limitations, and biases made clear. Panelists urged drawing sharp distinctions between appropriate uses and misuse/abuse of AI (for example, using AI to polish a hand-drawn conceptual figure rather than to generate the underlying idea), and being transparent about the accountability frameworks in use. One panelist shared polling suggesting the public is relatively more positive about AI in scientific and

medical contexts than in other domains—implying science may start from a comparatively strong position of trust.[4]

BIOSECURITY AND DUAL-USE RISK

Panelists with biosecurity expertise argued that regulation should focus on the points where AI interacts with physical reality: designing a dangerous biomolecule is of limited consequence without the means to synthesize and deploy it, so AI-driven automated labs warrant the greatest caution. They noted it is notoriously difficult to constrain models from producing harmful information, and that the more tractable path is stronger oversight of biological labs, materials, and synthetic DNA—keeping humans in the loop while also using agentic methods to track and flag risks faster than humans can.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- **Human in the loop.** Across research, publishing, education, and funding, speakers converged on keeping humans accountable for direction, judgment, and verification; AI should accelerate and support, not replace, critical thinking and domain expertise.
- **Transparency and disclosure.** Substantial AI use should be disclosed and documented proportionate to the use; outputs should be verified for errors, hallucinations, and bias; and transparency should apply to publishers and reviewers as well as authors.
- **Ground truth remains.** STEM retains experimental and observational validation; AI output is best treated as a hypothesis to be tested, though teaching that evaluative skill is becoming harder.
- **Equity, access, and efficiency.** The community should push for open models, accessible compute, and shared infrastructure—while recognizing that more access is not automatically better and that resource use (and environmental cost) should be weighed deliberately.
- **Biosecurity.** Focus oversight where AI meets the physical world—labs, materials, and synthetic DNA—rather than attempting to regulate knowledge alone.
- **A distinctive role for societies.** Scientific societies are well placed to set norms, convene cross-disciplinary ethics committees, build and share AI-literacy toolkits, and represent scientists' interests in publishing standards and public trust.

[4] A Pew Research Center poll on public perceptions of AI in medical care was shared in the chat as a reference point on public trust. https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2026/03/12/key-findings-about-how-americans-view-artificial-intelligence/

NEXT STEPS AND FOLLOW-UP

- The recording, presentation slides, and this summary report will be shared with registrants.
- The National Academies "STEM Education in the Age of AI" working group will field a needs-assessment survey and host a webinar November 17th at 12:30pm EST, and plans a decision-tree resource to help users navigate AI tools; interested members were invited to participate.
- AIBS welcomes input on future programming and topics to explore further; members may reach out at membership@aibs.org.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

AIBS thanks all speakers and panelists for sharing their time and expertise, and attendees for their engagement. Special thanks to Dr. Nyeema Harris and Dr. Libby Ellwood for helping to plan and facilitate the meeting and for reviewing this report, to the AIBS Education Committee for their guidance, and to AIBS staff—particularly Diane Bosnjak—for logistical and technical support. AIBS President Dr. Judy Skog was recognized for her many years of leadership and service as her term concludes at the end of 2026.

APPENDIX A — QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM THE CHAT

The following substantive questions and comments were raised in the meeting chat. In keeping with the meeting's stated practice, they are presented without attribution to individual participants; institutional roles are noted only where they clarify a response. Pleasantries and logistical messages are omitted.

EXPANDING WHO DOES SCIENCE

An attendee who has worked to broaden participation in science asked whether speakers see AI currently expanding who does science, and if not, what needs to happen. A panelist responded that students are communicating more clearly across language and disciplinary barriers and contributing to research projects earlier, but cautioned that AI is not a replacement for the foundational knowledge needed to evaluate it; tool paywalls are already too high for many students, underscoring the need to push for open models and accessible compute rather than relying on corporate models alone.

HANDLING HEAVILY AI-GENERATED MANUSCRIPTS

An attendee asked how OUP handles a manuscript that is heavily AI-generated and whether there are repercussions for authors. An OUP representative replied that if AI use is identified before acceptance, the work can simply be rejected; in exceptional cases (for example, a repeat offender) a journal could notify the author's institution, but only with crystal-clear author guidelines on AI use and authorship and with evidence—which remains difficult to establish for generative AI. OUP's authorship and ethics policy was shared in the chat.

COPYRIGHT AND AI-GENERATED ILLUSTRATIONS

An attendee noted that AI-generated illustrations may not be protected by copyright unless substantial human creativity is involved, and raised concerns ranging from the accuracy of such illustrations to the journal's rights over them.

DETECTING AI-GENERATED WRITING

Comments observed that human reviewers—not just automated tools—are also poor at distinguishing AI-generated from human-written text, reinforcing the limits of current detection approaches.

BUSINESS INCENTIVES VS. SCIENTIFIC VALUE

A comment highlighted a tension between business and science—for example, releasing a large volume of AI-generated papers to a preprint server may benefit an AI company without necessarily benefiting the field—and reflected on choosing which parts of scholarly work to retain versus delegate to AI.

AI/SI AND THE NSF BASIC-SCIENCE MISSION

Referring to Dr. Good's presentation, an attendee expressed concern that AI (or "SI") could detract from NSF's basic-science mission and asked whether an AI/SI statement or justification should be required in every new NSF proposal. This was addressed during the panel discussion (see "AI/SI in NSF proposals and the basic-science mission").

PUBLIC PERCEPTION OF AI IN SCIENCE AND MEDICINE

APPENDIX B — ATTENDEES

Based on the Zoom registration report, 47 of 61 registrants attended the live meeting; the two meeting hosts, Jyotsna Pandey and Diane Bosnjak, are included in the list below but were not on the registration and are not reflected in that count. Ms. Jane Taylor (Oxford University Press) contributed her presentation by recording and is not included in the attendee count. "MSO" indicates the AIBS member society or organization a participant was representing where different from their listed organization.

Name	Title	Organization
Catrina Adams	Director of Education	Botanical Society of America
John Bates	Curator	Field Museum of Natural History and AIBS Board Member
Andrew Bentley	Collections Specialist	University of Kansas Biodiversity Institute
Diane Bosnjak	Membership & Senior Communications Manager	American Institute of Biological Sciences
Brett Burk	Executive Director	Society for Integrative and Comparative Biology/ American Institute of Biological Sciences / Burk and Associates, Inc
Heather Cacanindin	Executive Director	Botanical Society of America
Prosanta Chakrabarty	Professor/Director	Louisiana State University and AIBS Board Member
Sharon Collinge	Director	University of Arizona and AIBS Board Member (MSO: Ecological Society of America)
Karen Cone	Science Advisor	National Science Foundation
DaJoie Croslan	Chief Operations and Diversity Officer	American Institute of Biological Sciences
Todd Crowl	Director and Professor	Florida International University and AIBS Board Member
Johan Desaeger	Associate Professor	University of Florida (MSO: Society of Nematologists)
Elizabeth Ellwood	Director	iDigBio and AIBS Board Member
Charles Fenster	Editor in Chief	American Institute of Biological Sciences
Vincent Formica	Professor and Chair of Biology	Swarthmore College (MSO: Society for the Study of Evolution)
Scott Glisson	Chief Executive Officer	American Institute of Biological Sciences
Theresa Good	Directorate Head for the Biological Sciences	National Science Foundation
Nyeema Harris	Associate Professor	Yale University and AIBS Board Member
Tracy Heath	Associate Professor	Iowa State University (MSO: Society of Systematic Biologists)
Ian Johnson	Senior Developer	American Institute of Biological Sciences
Carrie Kiel	Conservation Geneticist	California Botanic Garden

Name	Title	Organization
Michael LeMaster	Scientific Peer Advisory & Review Services Director	American Institute of Biological Sciences
Taylor Lightner	Research Coordinator	QEM Network
Niall Mangan	Associate Professor	National Institute for Theory and Mathematics in Biology / Northwestern University
Fiona McDonald	Senior Publisher	Oxford University Press
Bishakha Mona	Advisor	Science Philanthropy Alliance and AIBS Board Member
Betsy Myers	—	Retired, AIBS Board Member
Gil Nelson	Research Associate	Florida State University and Natural Science Collections Alliance
Jyotsna Pandey	Community Programs Director	American Institute of Biological Sciences
Ann Paterson	Professor and Department Chair	Williams Baptist University (MSO: Society for the Study of Amphibians and Reptiles)
Michael Pecaut	Professor	Loma Linda University (MSO: American Society for Gravitational and Space Research)
Jennifer Petitt	Senior Program Manager	American Institute of Biological Sciences
Juan Posada	Professor	Universidad del Rosario
David Resnik	Bioethicist	National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, NIH
Alan Savitzky	Professor	Utah State University (MSO: American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists, Herpetologists' League, and Society for the Study of Amphibians and Reptiles)
Veronica Segarra	Associate Professor	Goucher College and AIBS Board Member
Judith Skog	President	American Institute of Biological Sciences
Rhonda Struminger	Co-Director	CICHAZ (MSO: Organization of Biological Field Stations)
Lisa Thompson	Senior Scientist / Program Manager	American Institute of Biological Sciences
Beth Townsend	Professor	Midwestern University (MSO: Society of Vertebrate Paleontology)
Joel Trexler	Director	Florida State University (MSO: Association of Ecosystem Research Centers)
James Verdier	Senior Editor, *BioScience*	American Institute of Biological Sciences
Lydia Villa-Komaroff	Founder & Principal	Intersections Science, Business, Diversity Consulting and AIBS Board Member
Joel Wagener	Chief Information & Technology Officer	American Institute of Biological Sciences
Lisa Wallace	Professor	Old Dominion University
Greg Watkins-Colwell	Senior Collection Manager	Yale Peabody Museum

Name	Title	Organization
Kelly Weinersmith	Faculty	Rice University (MSO: Helminthological Society of Washington)
Michael Willig	Board of Trustees Distinguished Professor Emeritus	University of Connecticut and AIBS Board Member
Annica Wu	Herbarium Collections Manager	California Botanic Garden