

Opponent Testimony for Senate Bill 1
Ohio House Committee on Workforce and Higher Education
March 9, 2025

Jerry Yarnetsky
Oxford, Ohio

I am Jerry Yarnetsky, a web services librarian at Miami University, testifying on my own behalf in opposition to Senate Bill 1. My background includes a decade as a government reporter and 20 years as a librarian with stints as a community college library director and as an adjunct professor teaching online interaction design and development.

When State Senator Jerry Cirino introduced SB1, he stated the bill would help focus the mission of Ohio's colleges and universities on workforce development.

Let's look at the workforce needs of the 2020s. AI is already a major disrupter. In 2019, scientists estimated human-like Artificial General Intelligence would not be attained for decades. Now AI CEOs are stating it will happen in Trump's term. OpenAI's Deep Research tool predicts AI will replace a slew of professions from tax preparers and bookkeepers to paralegals. Indeed, Elon Musk is planning to replace many of the federal jobs he has cut with AI tools.

So, if AI will be taking all these jobs in the next few years, what will humans be left with? We'll get all the messy, complicated tasks requiring the ability to evaluate multiple conflicting sources of information while presenting results back to humans with an empathy that is difficult to replicate with AI.

This is compounded by the fact that AI is faulty — regularly hallucinating answers and inventing sources. Attorneys have landed in trouble with the courts because they fell prey to AI helping them create court briefs full of hallucinated case histories. Again, where does this leave humans? We'll need the ability to assess whether sources are reputable and based in reality. We'll need to suss out truth from fiction and news from propaganda.

These are the core 21st century job skills being taught by university professors and librarians on a daily basis. The teaching of these skills will be directly undermined by SB1.

In Sec. 3345.0217, the bill mandates students be allowed to reach their own conclusions on controversial topics. This sounds nice, but in reality this ties the hands of faculty by mandating students be allowed to believe in conspiracy theories and use hallucinations and disinformation to form their academic work. This is not about student freedom of thought, this is about

recognizing reality — even if it's messy and controversial. SB1's requirements land on the side of deception.

I'll give you an example from my own course. Like every faculty member I know, I allow my students to reach their own conclusions in their work. Indeed, the capstone project in my course is entitled "Passion Project" because students were free to follow their passions and choose their own topic and their own means of fulfilling the final project's design criteria.

However, a problem I witnessed in my class parallels AI hallucination — projects frequently used propaganda/disinformation websites to prove their academic arguments. These sites were not simply conservative or liberal viewpoints. Biased sources, when you recognize the bias, have great value in broadly understanding all sides of an issue and I encourage their use. Rather these sites were created for the sole purpose of deceiving the reader. Based on made-up, deceptive evidence, their projects fall apart— just as the attorney's case fell apart based on AI fabricated case study.

Thus, please don't tie faculty hands from being able to show their students how to recognize reality. Our future workforce indeed depends on this ability.

This is just one of the massive issues with SB1— it is a poorly written bill loaded with provisions that will result in unintended consequences like the one I outlined. It's a bill that needs to be voted down. Start from scratch, talk with frontline practitioners in higher education, then write a bill based in reality for Ohio's higher education.

"With Liberty and Justice for All" —
Jerry Yarnetsky