

Board Summary — Proposed 2026 Collection Development Policy & Review Forms

Purpose of the Update

The proposed 2026 **Collection Development Policy** replaces BCLD's 2019 Materials Selection and Withdrawal Policy and updates the 2024 **Request for Review of Library Materials** form. A new **Request for Review of Declined Acquisition** form is also proposed. The revisions modernize BCLD's collection standards, clarify intellectual-freedom and constitutional protections, address contemporary digital and nontraditional collections, and establish clearer and more consistent procedures for both challenges to existing materials and appeals of declined purchase requests.

The 2019 policy established strong foundations regarding free access, parental responsibility, professional selection, constitutional protection, review, and withdrawal, but was comparatively brief and oriented largely toward traditional collections.

Major Policy Changes

- **Expanded scope and modernized collection standards.** The revised policy expressly addresses physical, digital, licensed, streaming, database, game, equipment, Library of Things, and emerging formats, while clarifying that BCLD primarily maintains circulating collections for general public use rather than comprehensive academic or research collections.
- **Strengthened intellectual-freedom and constitutional protections.** The policy affirms First Amendment and Oregon constitutional protections, distinguishes professional collection development from an unlimited public forum, evaluates works in context and as a whole, and gives heightened protection to continued access when restriction is sought because of protected content, ideas, or viewpoint. As District policy, such restrictions must be required by law or serve a compelling governmental interest and be narrowly tailored, with consideration of less restrictive alternatives and other users' access rights.
- **Expanded and transparent selection criteria.** Nineteen criteria now address community needs, diversity of perspectives, intended audience, authority, value, demand, local significance, cost, accessibility, format, operational considerations, and documented censorship or attempted censorship.
- **Added specific provisions for digital resources, nontraditional collections, local materials, collection maintenance, preservation, cataloging, and placement.** The revised policy also expressly permits security or preservation restrictions for rare, fragile, difficult-to-replace, or theft-prone items when those restrictions are viewpoint-neutral.
- **Created a formal appeal process for declined acquisitions.** Eligible residents may request review of a decision not to acquire a specific resource, receive a written Director decision, and appeal to the Board on whether the policy was properly applied.
- **Clarified materials-review procedure and Board role.** Formal review now includes defined eligibility, filing limits, completeness requirements, continued availability during

review, professional evaluation, written decisions, and a limited Board appeal focused on compliance with Board policy rather than individual trustee preferences.

Materials Review Form Changes

The revised form retains the adult Baker County resident/BCLD cardholder requirement, one-resource-per-request rule, 30-day filing limitation, three-year repeat-review provision, and continued availability during review. It replaces the 2024 form's fee provision and broad philosophical questionnaire with questions directed more closely to the actual work, requested remedy, evidence of harm, policy compliance, constitutional standards, the interests of other library users, professional reviews, and alternative resources.

The revised form also expressly asks whether a challenger contends that material is unlawful or constitutionally unprotected and, where relevant, addresses recognized categories of unprotected speech and the legal standards associated with obscenity, while requiring consideration of the work as a whole.

New Declined Acquisition Review Form

The new form gives eligible BCLD users a transparent process to appeal a declined purchase suggestion under the same Board-approved collection criteria. It asks the requester to explain why the resource should be acquired, identify supporting selection criteria, and provide relevant reviews, community-interest information, local significance, availability information, or evidence of censorship. The Director reviews the acquisition decision, provides a written response, and the requester may appeal to the Board on whether the Collection Development Policy was properly applied.

Overall effect: The proposed package preserves the core intellectual-freedom principles of BCLD's prior policy while providing substantially clearer standards, stronger constitutional safeguards, modern collection guidance, and more predictable review and appeal procedures for both retained and declined materials.