

Summary of Changes — Resources Review Request Form

Version 7 to Version 8

Version 8 renames the form and replaces references to “**materials**” with “**resources**” to reflect the wider range of library items and services that may be reviewed. It also simplifies the questions while retaining the information needed for a fair and useful review.

The basic process remains unchanged. A requester must be an adult Baker County resident and BCLD cardholder, first discuss the concern with the Director or designee, submit one resource per request, and provide all required information. Filing limits, the three-year repeat-review provision, and continued availability of the resource during review are also retained.

1. Shorter Questionnaire

The form is reduced from **15 questions to 11**. Several overlapping or highly legalistic questions are removed or combined.

Reason: The shorter form is easier to complete and focuses on information directly useful to the review.

2. Requested Action and Less Restrictive Alternatives

The question asking what action the requester wants BCLD to take is moved earlier in the form. If 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: This connects the concern directly to the remedy being requested and reflects the Collection Development Policy.

3. Harm Question Simplified

Version 7 asked who had been or would be “**directly harmed.**” Version 8 instead asks what specific harm or adverse effect results, or could reasonably result, from the resource’s availability and what evidence supports the concern. The question is now **Required if Applicable** rather than required in every case.

Reason: The revised language asks for specific facts without suggesting that the requester must meet a legal definition of injury.

4. Policy Question Broadened

The form now asks whether the resource conflicts with the **Collection Development Policy or another applicable BCLD policy**, rather than limiting the question to the Collection Development Policy alone.

Reason: Some concerns may involve another District policy, such as technology use, circulation, privacy, or displays.

5. Legal Questions Simplified

Version 7 asked the requester to select among legal categories such as obscenity, incitement, threats, fraud, defamation, and other forms of allegedly unprotected speech. Version 8 replaces this checklist with one question asking whether the request relies on a claim that the resource—or BCLD’s provision of access to it—is unlawful or legally restricted. The requester may describe the concern and provide supporting authority but is not required to interpret a legal standard.

The three separate questions applying elements of the legal obscenity test are also removed.

Reason: The form should gather the facts and legal concerns raised by a requester without asking patrons, library staff, or a review committee to make specialized legal judgments.

6. Whole-Work and Context Review Clarified

Version 8 clarifies that all resources should be considered in context and that a self-contained work should also be considered as a whole.

Reason: BCLD collections include not only books and films but also databases, online resources, games, equipment, and Library of Things items. Not every resource is a discrete work.

7. Other Users’ Interests Incorporated More Efficiently

Version 7 separately asked why continued access should be limited for other Baker County taxpayers. Version 8 removes that standalone question and incorporates the issue into the requested-action question.

The form still asks the requester to consider the resource’s possible value to other users.

Reason: This preserves an important consideration while reducing repetition and making the form less confrontational.

8. Alternative Resources Question Clarified

The form continues to ask whether the requester recommends other resources on the same subject, perspective, or issue. Version 8 explains that this information may help BCLD consider the breadth of subjects and perspectives in the collection.

Reason: The explanation makes clear why the question is relevant without suggesting that every challenged resource requires an opposing or replacement title.

9. Appeal Language Strengthened

Version 8 requires an appeal to identify the policy or procedure believed to have been incorrectly applied **and explain the basis for that claim**.

Reason: This gives the Board a clearer statement of the alleged error when reviewing an appeal.

10. Administrative Section Simplified

The **Library Use Only** section retains the key tracking dates but replaces separate prior-review and disposition fields with a more flexible Notes area.

Overall Effect

Version 8 is a **simplification and clarification**, not a major change in the review process. Eligibility, filing limits, public-records provisions, continued availability during review, professional review, decision timelines, and Board appeal remain substantially the same.

The main change is that the form now focuses more directly on the **concern, requested action, supporting evidence, applicable District policy, any claimed legal issue, the resource in context, and its possible value to other users**. It also more clearly separates professional library review from legal determinations.