

# Resources Review Request Form - Summary of Changes

---

*2024 Request for Review of Library Materials compared with proposed Version 8*

**Overview.** The newly revised proposal (version 8) broadens the form from traditional "materials" to "resources," simplifies filing and review questions, and aligns the form with the proposed Collection Development Policy. The core eligibility standard remains, while the form now gives clearer guidance on the review process, requested remedies, policy issues, legal claims, and Board appeal.

## 1. Broader terminology: "Materials" becomes "Resources"

Version 8 renames the form and generally replaces references to "materials" with "resources." It also expands format choices to include digital resources, databases, online services, games, Library of Things items, and other nontraditional formats.

**Reason:** The review process should cover the full range of resources BCLD now provides, not only traditional print and media collections.

## 2. Core eligibility requirements are retained

Both forms require the requester to be an adult Baker County resident and a registered BCLD cardholder. Version 8 places the eligibility and filing rules at the beginning so a requester can determine eligibility before completing the form.

**Reason:** The principal eligibility standard adopted in 2024 remains intact while the presentation is clearer.

## 3. Informal consultation is simplified

The 2024 form required the concern to be presented to the Library Director for discussion and written response, with documentation attached to the request. Version 8 still requires an informal discussion with the Director or designee, but no separate written response or attachment is required.

**Reason:** This preserves an opportunity for informal resolution without creating unnecessary paperwork or the appearance of two formal Director decisions.

## 4. Filing limits are clarified

Version 8 retains the limit of one formal request per person in a 30-day period and the general three-year waiting period before reconsidering a retained resource. It also states exceptions for materially different grounds, a materially changed resource, or another significant circumstance. Incomplete requests may be corrected within 30 days before being closed without a decision on the merits.

**Reason:** The rules are more precise and are stated consistently with the proposed Collection Development Policy.

## 5. The discretionary fee provision is removed

The 2024 form stated that BCLD might charge a fee after more than three requests within twelve months but did not specify the fee or method of calculation. Version 8 removes that provision.

**Reason:** The one-request-per-30-days limit provides a clear administrative mechanism for managing repeated submissions without an undefined fee.

## 6. Continued access during review is expressly protected

Version 8 states that a challenged resource ordinarily remains available under normal library rules while review is pending, unless it becomes unavailable for an unrelated reason or BCLD is required by law or court order to act otherwise.

**Reason:** Filing a complaint alone should not determine the outcome of the review or automatically restrict access.

## 7. Resource information is broader and more flexible

Version 8 uses fields such as "title/name of resource" and "author/creator/producer" and accommodates physical, digital, database, online, game, and Library of Things resources.

**Reason:** The form is usable across contemporary BCLD collections rather than being centered on books and traditional media.

## 8. The questionnaire is shorter and more focused

The 2024 form contained 14 numbered questions and treated all questions as required. Version 8 uses 11 questions and distinguishes among Required, Required if Applicable, and Optional questions. The revised questions focus on the resource, portions examined, specific concern, requested action, possible adverse effects, applicable policy, any legal claim, context, possible value to other users, supporting information, and alternative resources.

**Reason:** The form gathers information directly useful to the review while reducing unnecessary or repetitive questions.

## 9. The requested action is made more specific

Version 8 provides clear options such as relocation or audience change, cataloging or classification change, access restriction, withdrawal, or another action. When restriction, relocation, or withdrawal is requested, the requester is asked why a less restrictive alternative would not address the concern and to consider the effect on other users' continued access and individual choice.

**Reason:** Reviewers receive a clearer statement of the remedy requested and why that degree of action is considered necessary.

## 10. The harm question is broadened and made less legalistic

The 2024 form asked whether the material directly caused the requester or a family member personal or financial harm and required a causal connection. Version 8 instead asks for any specific harm or adverse effect believed to result, or reasonably be capable of resulting, from the way the resource is provided, who may be affected, and supporting evidence. The question is required only when applicable.

**Reason:** The revised wording seeks concrete facts without implying that the requester must satisfy a formal legal definition of injury.

## 11. Policy and legal concerns are separated

The 2024 form combined claims of policy violations and violations of federal, state, or local law. Version 8 asks separately whether the resource conflicts with the Collection Development Policy or another applicable BCLD policy and whether the request relies on a claim that the resource, or BCLD's provision of access, is unlawful or legally restricted. A requester may provide legal authority but is not required to interpret a legal standard.

**Reason:** This documents any legal allegation without requiring either the requester or library staff to act as legal experts.

## **12. Whole-resource and context review is strengthened**

Version 8 asks the requester to consider the resource in its full context and, for a self-contained work, the work as a whole. It also asks what positive literary, artistic, educational, scientific, cultural, recreational, practical, or other value the resource might have for other users.

**Reason:** This supports review of the complete resource rather than isolated passages or features and recognizes that different users may find different value in the same resource.

## **13. Philosophical agree/disagree questions are removed**

The 2024 form asked requesters to agree or disagree with propositions about intellectual freedom, young people's access to books, individual choice, parental authority, and representation in the collection. Version 8 removes those questions.

**Reason:** BCLD's intellectual-freedom and access principles are established by Board policy and should be applied by reviewers rather than used as an agreement test for a complainant.

## **14. Other users' interests are addressed more neutrally**

The 2024 form asked why an adult patron who disagreed with the requester should accept the requested action. Version 8 does not ask that as a separate adversarial question. Instead, the requested-action question asks the requester to consider the effect of a proposed restriction on other users' continued access and individual choice.

**Reason:** The revised approach preserves the balancing issue while reducing confrontation and repetition.

## **15. Alternative-resource language is neutralized**

The 2024 form asked for alternate material representing the same viewpoint "in a better way." Version 8 simply asks whether the requester recommends other resources on the same subject, perspective, or issue.

**Reason:** The newer wording gathers useful collection-development information without presuming another resource is objectively better.

## **16. The premature hearing election is removed**

The 2024 form asked the requester, at the initial filing stage, whether they would testify at a hearing. Version 8 removes that election.

**Reason:** A Board appeal or public meeting occurs only after administrative review and the Director's decision, so hearing participation can be addressed later if an appeal is filed.

## **17. Public-records and privacy language is more precise**

Version 8 replaces differing statements in the 2024 form with a single approach: the signed request, requester name, related correspondence, and decision may be public records, while contact information, library-account information, circulation records, and other protected information are handled under applicable law and BCLD's Privacy and Confidentiality Policy.

**Reason:** The notice is clearer and more consistent about what may be public and what information receives statutory or policy protection.

## **18. The review and appeal process is explained on the form**

Version 8 explains the steps after submission: completeness check, professional review, written Director decision, a 10-business-day Board appeal period, and Board review. It also establishes a normal 30-

calendar-day target for the Director's written decision and provides for a status update if more time is needed.

**Reason:** Requesters can see the full administrative process, expected timing, and appeal path before filing.

## Overall Effect

Proposed Version 8 is broader in scope but more focused in substance than the 2024 form. It emphasizes the specific resource and concern, the remedy requested, less restrictive alternatives, evidence of adverse effects, applicable BCLD policy, any claimed legal issue, review of the resource in context, possible value to other users, and a transparent administrative decision and appeal process.

The result is intended to be **easier to complete and administer consistently, more closely aligned with the proposed Collection Development Policy, and less likely to place either requesters or library staff in the role of resolving specialized legal questions.**