

Kyra Zirlin  
6/3/24  
LIS 748

## Review of Collection Policies/Plans

### Selected Plans

- Bruce Guadalupe Elementary/Middle School (WI). [Library Collection Development Policy](#)
- Chicago Public Schools (IL). [Collection Development Policy](#)

## PART ONE

Policy Sections	Bruce Guadalupe Elementary/Middle School (WI)	Chicago Public Schools (IL)
Introduction (philosophy and mission)	Exemplary. The document outlines the mission statement for each of its purview: Overarching mission, media center mission, and community center mission.	Adequate. The document has a “purpose” section but is missing a clear mission statement. However, the “purpose” does include a brief mission statement if you know how to spot it.
Broad Goals	Adequate. The document has clear goals for their media center but not for any of the other sections mentioned in their mission statements.	Exemplary. The document, under the heading “Policy Text,” goes into detail about the purpose of their collection and how it will help students of all kinds.
Selection	Exemplary. The document lists in great detail the selection criteria that will guide their policies. It is long and comprehensive.	Exemplary. The document lists in great detail the rules and thoughts behind their selection process. It is well thought out and comprehensive.
Responsibility for Selection	Exemplary. The document	Strong. Under “Selection

	goes to great lengths to map out each and every thought, person, and tool used to make the selections. It is very comprehensive.	Tools” the document explains who and ‘what’ will be used to help make selections.
Formats	Weak. While not explicitly stated, the document does reference formatting in various spots when speaking of other policies.	Adequate. The document mentions its goal to offer various formats for all student needs.
Funding	Weak. The document briefly mentions funding but with no detail, though it also goes into donation policies.	Weak. The document briefly mentions budgets but with no detail, though it does go into donation policies.
Intellectual Freedom	Adequate. The document mentions intellectual freedom as a guiding practice and gives links to their references regarding it.	Adequate. The document mentions Intellectual Freedom as a guiding practice.
Collection Maintenance (weeding)	Exemplary. The document goes into great detail regarding their weeding process. It is lengthy and comprehensive.	Exemplary. The document goes into detail about their weeding process. It is comprehensive.
Evaluation	Exemplary. The document maps out in detail who will be evaluating the selection for learning objectives.	Adequate. I believe the Evaluation criteria is melded into the Criteria for Selection portion of the document.
Confidentiality	Weak. There is no mention of the words privacy, confidentiality, or even protection in the document. Could this be because they are both school libraries?	Weak. There is no clear mention of confidentiality or privacy in the document. No use of either of those words.
Copyright	Weak. The document	Missing. There is no

	mentions copyright a couple of times but it does not go into detail about their policies or goals regarding it.	mention of copyright in this document.
Digital Information Resources	Exemplary. This document goes into detail regarding digital information resources including all of their goals and policies surrounding the subject.	Adequate. The document briefly mentions its goals regarding digital resources.
Consortia, cooperative agreements, networking	Missing. The document does not mention a consortia, cooperative agreement, networking, or anything about this policy.	Missing. The document does not mention a Consortia, cooperative agreement, or networking, or anything about this policy.
Reconsideration of materials	Exemplary. The document goes into great detail about their policies on Reconsiderations. They even include the documents given to those who would like to put in a challenge.	Adequate. The document contains a section on reconsideration and challenge books that is comprehensive.
Revision of policy	Missing. The document does not state when the next revision will be.	Missing. The document does not state when the next revision will be.

## PART TWO

While both were created for school libraries, Bruce Guadalupe Elementary/Middle School's (BGE) Library Collection Development Policy and the Chicago Public School's Collection Development Policy have quite a few differences, going farther than just their document names. Dare I say, the detail that BGE included via the specifics of a *Library Collection Development Policy* versus the simple title that CPS favored aligns with their content decisions. As Sandra Hughes-Hassell stipulates in her book, *Collection Management for Youth : Equity, Inclusion, and Learning (2020)*, "Clear, written policy communicates the library's commitment to equity and inclusion. It creates stability and

continuity in collection activities and indicates that the library is a businesslike operation willing to be accountable for its actions,” (p. 66). Hassell makes it clear that well thought out, clear, and comprehensive policies correlate with the success of the system as well as even the ethos, or credibility, of their institution. While in some ways these two policies matched in their efforts, in many others, they were significantly different in their clarity.

## Are the selection process and criteria clearly outlined and described?

If I were to pick which one of these documents I would like to have on my first day on the job, I would normally be inclined to choose CPS as I view it as a well-established, professional and extensive network that should therefore have an extensive policy. However, after completing our reading for the week, I am more inclined to choose BGE’s policy. Both are missing content outlines in the table, however, BGE’s contains comprehensive explanations that clearly outline and describe their criteria selections. For example, BGE has a clearly labeled section for their mission statements, and they even have a mission statement for each of their sections: overarching mission, media center mission, and community center mission. On the other hand, CPS document has interwoven, quite quickly, their mission statement into their “Purpose” sections, which contains other information besides the mission statement as well. Moreover, BGE goes into great detail for their Digital Information section with clear headings and bullet points, while CPS included their brief statement on it in another topic. For this reason, I do believe that BGE’s document would be a better outline for beginners while CPS may be useful for someone who knows selection process criterias well.

## Is the language around reconsideration sufficient?

Because it is such an important topic, both schools had clearly labeled sections pertaining to reconsideration or book challenges. As Trina Magi and Martin Garnar state in their book, *Intellectual Freedom Manual : Ninth Edition*, “In addition to outlining the process and criteria for selecting resources, the policy should describe the procedure the library staff will follow when a user requests that a resource be reconsidered,” (p. 83). Both schools adhered to this suggestion and had their steps outlined clearly. Moreover, both made the reconsideration forms easily accessible to the reader via attachments and links. Additionally, when studying the language itself used in these sections, both schools make sure to use neutral language. This is ideal as Magi and Garnar stress, “Throughout the process, it is critically important that library workers remain calm, respectful, and courteous. There is no reason to become defensive when a complaint is made. Not only is this counterproductive, but it runs counter to library

efforts to encourage user involvement,” (p. 84). Both schools made sure to keep their tones neutral and respectful when outlining their reconsideration policies.

## How is equity, diversity, and inclusion addressed?

While both schools mention diversity, BGE goes into great detail with individual headings such as, “reflective of the pluralistic nature of a global society,” and “representative of differing viewpoints on controversial subjects.” Under these subheadings are a couple of sentences mapping out their thoughts on each one. CPS, on the other hand, briefly mentions their goal of serving diverse communities and offering books by diverse authors, but they do not go into the same amount of detail as BGE. I would say that perhaps BGE has an extensive section on this because the school itself holds a diverse population, but the CPS student population is incredibly diverse as well, and should therefore have a section as fleshed out as BGE. Even a school with a less diverse population should have a fleshed out EDI section, mind you.

## What features of each policy/plan are unique or noteworthy?

What I find interesting about what each plan has that is unique to the other, is the formatting. It seems as though CPS has cinched up their content to something that is brief and palatable while BGE threw brief out the window and decided to fly into the nitty-gritty. These both have their pros and cons. While CPS concludes their selection criteria in four clear sections, BGE selection criteria goes on for about 14 ‘mini’ paragraphs. Both hold vital and well-sourced information, but one decided to cinch it up into larger paragraphs while the other delivered it in piece-mail, three to four sentence paragraphs. If I had to pick a better one, perhaps I would choose CPS, as it is easier on the eyes. Additionally, BGE has an “implementation” section where they go into detail about how they will proceed with their criteria, while CPS lacks this section. BGE lists their review sources, and CPS does not. BGE has different headers for selection processes for print materials, non print instructional materials, as well as electronic resources while CPS holds those criteria within the same paragraphs. In this case, I must say that BGE’s formatting works well because it is easy to differentiate each one.

## What are the notable gaps? Try to explain why you believe certain elements would be missing.

For both schools, they are missing some policies mentioned in the table. For example, both are missing sections mentioning copyrights, consortia, cooperative agreements, and networking, as well as mentions of confidentiality or privacy and funding. It is hard to say why these important sections would be missing, but I’ll offer my best theories. Regarding copyrights, perhaps clearly stating an objective to purchase materials that

are copyrighted--needs not be said? Perhaps to the individuals who put together these documents, purchasing copyrighted materials seems so obvious and “common sense” that they failed to include it. This is where some good editing and triple-checking would make a big difference. For consortia, cooperative agreements, and networking, perhaps they felt as though it was unnecessary to include it in their selections policy? Perhaps they put it somewhere else, like with their fleshed out budget? As for confidentiality, I wonder if it is because they are schools and therefore their students are minors and their guardians can have access to their library accounts. Even then, you’d think they would say just that to simply address it. Perhaps, though, they don’t *need* to and I am judging them harshly. These theories are not wonderful, I must admit, but they are the best I can come up with.

## Works Cited

BGCS. (2006). Selection Policy. Retrieved from <https://www.bgcsedu.org/media/w4sbljiu/selectionpolicy-bgcs.pdf>

Chicago Public Schools. (2022). Policy 604-7: Collection Development. Retrieved from <https://www.cps.edu/sites/cps-policy-rules/policies/600/604/604-7/>

Hughes-Hassell, S. (2020). *Collection management for youth : Equity, inclusion, and learning*. American Library Association.

Magi, T., Garnar, M., Magi, & Garnar (Eds.). (2015). *Intellectual freedom manual : Ninth edition*. American Library Association.

## PART THREE

Chosen Section (Changes made in red)

From the Chicago Public School Collection Development Policy

### A. Weeding

1. Weeding is essential to maintaining a culturally relevant and responsive collection. Professional library staff should ~~periodically review the collection~~ **continuously review the collection throughout the year** to determine which materials should be removed or replaced. ~~In an effort to maintain equitable access, library professional staff should consider digital materials as an investment for their library collection whenever possible, particularly digital texts that have perpetual or long-term licensing models.~~ Materials to consider for weeding include items that:

- i. Are in poor physical condition;
  - ii. Have been superseded by more current information;
  - iii. Contain subject matter no longer needed to support the curriculum;
  - iv. Receive little use;
  - v. Are inappropriate in reading level;
  - vi. Duplicate information that is no longer in heavy demand;
  - vii. Provide wrong, inaccurate or dated information;
  - viii. Encourage stereotypes or biases;
  - ix. Contain information that is inaccessible because they lack a table of contents, adequate indexing, and searching capabilities;
  - x. Are not selected in accordance with general selection criteria;
  - xi. Have few circulations;
  - xii.
2. In an effort to maintain equitable access, library professional staff should consider digital materials as an investment for their library collection whenever possible, particularly digital texts that have perpetual or long-term licensing models.
3. The CPS Central Office Libraries Team maintains guidelines for weeding on its public-facing and internal websites. Weeding decisions should be made by the school's professional library staff, in consultation with school administrators, other teacher-librarians, and CPS Central Office Libraries Team. If the school does not have a certified librarian, the school will contact CPS Central Office Libraries Team to support the weeding of school collections.
4. Weeded materials will be addressed in accordance with CPS Central Office Library guidelines. Often, materials will either be donated, discarded if deteriorated beyond use, or sold at book sales.

## Explanation

I chose this section to edit because it seemed much shorter than many of the other weeding sections I saw throughout the provided policy list. I added to the section using suggestions from other policies such as BGE, Mesa Community College, and the University of Montana-Missoula. I separated CPS's comment about digital materials into its own paragraph for clarity, as I felt it got lost in the first paragraph. Moreover, at the bottom I added some additional sentences about what happens to weeded materials, as I saw this done in other policies and it seems like a great preventative measure for those in the audience who get peeved at the idea of "throwing out" books. Finally, I

added “continuously review the collection throughout the year” for clarity and some specification I felt the explanation lacked.

## Works Cited

BGCS. (2006). Selection Policy. Retrieved from <https://www.bgcsedu.org/media/w4sbljiu/selectionpolicy-bgcs.pdf>

Chicago Public Schools. (2022). Policy 604-7: Collection Development. Retrieved from <https://www.cps.edu/sites/cps-policy-rules/policies/600/604/604-7/>

Mesa Community College Library. (2019). Collection Development Policy. Retrieved from <https://www.mesacc.edu/library/services/acquisitions-collection-development/collection-development-policy>

University of Montana Library. (2021). Collection Development Policy. Retrieved from [https://www.umt.edu/library/about/policies/collection-development/cd-policy-final-28june2021\\_jjb\\_accessibilitycheckerok.pdf](https://www.umt.edu/library/about/policies/collection-development/cd-policy-final-28june2021_jjb_accessibilitycheckerok.pdf)

## PART FOUR

### Conclusion

While it makes total sense that libraries need comprehensive plans and policies for collection management, for some reason, I was surprised by said comprehensiveness. Some libraries' policies were so well thought out, it was like they could predict every single issue they may run into, and had thought of a plan to solve it. Of course, some other policies were lacking--but they were all planned to with the same guiding “best-practices”. That is something I have realized about the library world that I didn't necessarily know before starting school. Almost every aspect of a library is done via standardized “best practices” that have been honed for, sometimes, hundreds of years and reviewed constantly in order to maintain the best possible ways to help communities. It's pretty amazing, and it makes me feel special to be able to be a part of such an ancient and respected world.