



PCLS BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING MINUTES

Policy Committee Meeting

5:00pm January 22, 2026

Sarlin Community Library, Liberty
15 S. Palmetto Street Liberty, SC 29657

Meeting started at 5:02 pm. Ms. Pinkerton, Mr. Aiken, and Ms. Miller of the Policy Committee were in attendance. Dr. Wheeler was in attendance at 5:36 pm.

1. Discussion of Board of Trustees Constitution and By-laws word update

Ms. Pinkerton discussed updating the Board of Trustees Constitution article V phrase “Secretary-Treasurer” to “Secretary and Treasurer” and include a line that explains what the Treasurer does. She suggested “Treasurer will do audit with the director for the budget.”

The Director explained that whatever changes you want to make to the constitution and the by-laws, it will have to be sent out two weeks before the board meeting.

Ms. Pinkerton also suggested changing the by-laws article IX “July 1 to June 30” to “January 1 to December 31” to align with the term limits for the board members. Mr. Aiken and Ms. Miller agreed with the change to “January 1 to December 31.”

Ms. Pinkerton asked if Article V should read “Treasurer will do audit with the director for the budget year.” The Director said, “No, the county does the formal audit.” Ms. Pinkerton asked, “What does the Treasurer do?” The Director explained that the Treasurer helps with the budget and suggested the phrase “The Treasurer will work with the Director in preparing the annual budget to present to the board.” The Director also suggested sending out wording options for the Treasurer responsibilities.

2. Discuss changes to Collection and Review of Material policies

Ms. Pinkerton stated that Dr. Wheeler’s suggestions were a lot. She also received Mr. Kilburn and Ms. Millers suggestions, and they are mostly grammar suggestions. Ms. Pinkerton stated that one of Mr. Kilburn’s suggestions was adding the word “educate” to the second sentence under the Objective subheading of the Collection Development Policy.

Ms. Pinkerton mentioned one of Dr. Wheeler’s questions* is why the word “diverse” was taken out of the policy, she clarified that the paragraph was rewritten, and it would mean the same thing. Taking out the word “diverse” was not purposely done. Ms. Pinkerton stated that she updated the last sentence of the first paragraph under Philosophy to read, “Classification of materials into clearly labelled age-appropriate sections of the library aid in parental determination of access of minors.” The Assistant Director pointed out that this sentence does not make sense. Ms. Pinkerton changed it to, “Classification of materials into clearly labelled age-appropriate sections of the library aid in parental determination of access to minors.”

Ms. Pinkerton continued with Dr. Wheeler's second point under Philosophy, why remove the Library Bill of Rights. She said, "Because the American Library Association does not protect minors, so I just didn't add it in there. We're still going to discuss that"

Ms. Pinkerton asked for clarification on Dr. Wheeler's first note under Selection Principles. The Director explained that by keeping the line that explains what the term "qualified staff" means could potentially help if anyone questions what makes our staff qualified. Mr. Aiken agreed that it would make sense to keep that information in there. The line use to read, "selection of materials is performed by staff members qualified for this duty through professional education, training, and job classification."

Ms. Pinkerton explained that Dr. Wheeler's next point number two under Selection Principles, about "diversity" being removed again, she stated that it was the same thing. It was just rewriting the paragraph; she did not intentionally remove the word "diversity."

Ms. Pinkerton continued with Dr. Wheeler's third point under Selection Principles, she is unsure what he meant. The Assistant Director explained that the line in bullet point four use to say "excluded or included" so we would not exclude or include material just because of the author's race, nationality, sex, or political, social or religious views. Mr. Aiken agreed that makes sense.

Ms. Pinkerton continued with Dr. Wheeler's fourth point about the use of "age-appropriate" over "age-relevant." Ms. Miller stated that the State Librarian suggested using "age-appropriate" and using the term "age-appropriate" is self-explanatory. The Director clarified that the confusion is that "age-appropriate" is different for everyone, like if your child is 7, reading on a 12 or 13-year-old level, then that is appropriate for them. So that is why it was "age relevant." Ms. Miller stated, "to me "age-appropriate" is more than just reading level." The Assistant Director said, "Yeah, but you wouldn't put books about somebody going through a divorce, that's not relevant to a teenager because they're not married." The Director further explained, "I just think there could be arguments for either of those words. What's relevant, what's appropriate. I think in terms of appropriate, you get into that bigger conversation. Is a book with a bare butt appropriate? Well, that's up to the parent. In a kid's book, is that appropriate? That's up to the parents. Some parents, "absolutely not no way", some parent, "that's fine, my kids think it's funny." It's just that bigger argument of who is controlling that, the staff or the parent. But that's that whole bigger argument that you have to make. Like, if we think that that's appropriate and that bare butt book, and I'm just using that as an example, go in with all the other books because that's what the age range it was written for, then it's up to the parent to take that book home or check it out. But if we're going to get in trouble for putting that book in the age range it was written for, that's where we have the problem if we don't have a specific, you know, sentence from the board saying, "do not put these books here.""

Ms. Pinkerton said, "I mean, I'm okay with age-appropriate" Mr. Aiken said, "I like appropriate."

The Assistant Director explained Dr. Wheeler's next point under Selection Criteria has to do with the second bullet point, that it previously said, "circulation use of existing and similar materials" and that is more accurate than "circulation history." The Assistant Director explained that an item's circulation history would mean that the item is already a part of the collection, but using the criteria of "circulation use of existing and similar materials" means that we are looking at other similar item's popularity. The Director suggested reverting back to what it said before, "circulation use of existing and similar materials."

Ms. Pinkerton said, "the reason we rewrote this policy was because we did not like the other policy, correct?" Ms. Miller responded, "Correct." Ms. Pinkerton continued, "So the fact that we keep going back and saying, 'that the other policy,' I completely understand, but we did this one because we didn't like that one."

Now stuff out of the old one is incorporated in here, but to keep referring back to the old one, and ‘why is this deleted?’ and ‘why is this?’ is because, for some reason, we didn’t like it or the words were changed or something. I mean there’s a reason why there’s a new policy that we have come up with from the old one.”

The Assistant Director replied, “I think that’s what his questions are, is why didn’t you like those specific things? Ms. Miller responded, “Because we’re trying to get our state money, we’re trying to follow the proviso, pure and simple.”

The Director asked, “Did the state librarian look at this?” Ms. Pinkerton said, “Oh yeah, she did” The Director said, “That’s interesting, because she looked at ours and said it was okay and these are very different.” Ms. Pinkerton clarified, “Well, the thing is, my approach to her was, is this okay as in the minors’ guidelines to minors protecting minors, is this okay?” The Director said, “She didn’t comment on whether she thought it was legal or not legal?” Ms. Pinkerton replied, “Yes, she said it was legal. She had a paralegal look at it and she said it was legal, too.”

The Director voiced concern about making sure it says in the policy that we are providing material that represents diverse points of view and interest of patrons. The Director said, “Because if staff purchases a book that is of community interest, and if it’s not in our collection that we add things of community interest, then they could potentially be in trouble.”

Ms. Miller responded, “What? That doesn’t make sense at all.” The Director replied, “If they purchased a book that the board was offended by somehow, and they did it because of community interest in that book, then, staff could be in trouble... I just think that somewhere in there it needs to say that part of our collection is based on community interest in this subject.” Ms. Miller replied, “But we’re going to have a collection policy that tells what cannot be collected. So, I mean, they’re going to be guided by those guidelines of what they can or cannot collect so how could that be a problem?... So, if its community interests that does not violate this collection policy, that’s not even an issue!”

Mr. Aiken stated that the first paragraph under objective says, “The library seeks to respond to our community’s needs and interests through this content. This policy ensures that the library collection will reflect the experiences of the community, and provide an opportunity to explore cultures, traditions, and ideas from all different types of people. All content decisions must follow applicable specifications of Federal, State, and Local legislation.” He continued, “So it looks to me like all that we’re talking about is already found right there in that objective, right at the beginning.” Ms. Miller said, “Yeah, it states it loud and clear.”

The Director said, “I mean, I don’t have to question any of it, if it’s going to be like this, you can just vote on it. And we can go from there. If it’s going to be kind of hostile, I don’t think anything good is going to come of it. I think every time you say something I feel like I’m being attacked.” The Director continued, “I mean this is what we’re doing is discussing it because we have to implement it. And these are questions that our staff are going to have, and we have to explain it to them, and we have to explain it to them based on what you all want. So, we have to make sure that it’s stated plainly, so that we can do that.”

Dr. Wheeler arrived and joined the discussion. Ms. Pinkerton discussed that she researched that librarians do not have to read the whole book when they purchase books to add to a collection. The Director clarified that she has tried to explain this fact to them, that we cannot possibly read all the books before they go on the shelf, but because of that we have the reconsideration procedure so that somebody can bring a book to our attention.

Ms. Pinkerton said that a parent could give access to their child to check out teen books that have been moved to the adult section and if they do not want them to have access to all the adult books then they can come watch over their child at the library.

Mr. Aiken said that if we could come to an agreement about the original placement of the books then we wouldn't have 100 reconsideration requests. He went on to express that parents should be in charge and not have stuff in the teen section that should not be in the teen section.

The Director pointed out that reconsiderations can be weaponized, with a bunch of people submitting reconsiderations to move books back to the teen sections. This will tie us up to where we can't do anything else. Ms. Pinkerton stated that it would tie up the board because if they want to move a book back to the teen section, the library can say no because according to our policy it should be in the adult section. And if they appeal the decision then it goes to the board and we will have to read it.

Ms. Pinkerton stated that she has made changes to the reconsideration policy draft that includes reading the whole book. Ms. Pinkerton asked Dr. Wheeler to explain the highlights of his notes on the collection policy.

Dr. Wheeler pointed out that the current collection development policy was also sent to the State Library Director, she made a few suggestions, and we incorporated most of them, and she approved of that policy. That policy was really clear, the librarians can look at an individual book and decide where to place it based on their professional opinion and if the public disagrees with that, then we have the reconsideration request.

Ms. Pinkerton stated that she does not agree with that policy and other people do not agree with that policy, but she accepted it because it was majority vote. Ms. Pinkerton said, "I know you don't agree with it, but some people do agree with this. Your way is not pleasing the whole community... We have to come to a compromise here, to please the whole community... The book is still available, and the parent is giving the teen the right to look at that book and it's protecting other families that don't want that book to be found... I mean it's giving the parent the whole responsibility so that the librarians and staff don't have to police the library."

Mr. Aiken made the point that if we can have a section just for holiday books, it may be a good idea to have a young adult section in the adult section of the library as a compromise. This will keep the parents in the driver's seat.

The Director said that she feels we have that now because we have these categories, the children's, YA and the adult, and the parents choose what the kids have access to now, with the current policy. If we implement this new policy popular teen books will be moved to an adult section with material that is meant for adults.

The Assistant Director points out to Mr. Aiken's point of adding a section, that the holiday section or other sections that we have are based on content neutral decisions, it is separated for ease of browsing. When you move things based on the content, that's when it becomes a legal issue. The Assistant Director explained that if we have a book published by Simon Teen Publishers, it is clearly meant for teenagers. Now if we review a book, read it in its entirety and look at all the other variety of factors and we find issue with it, then, yes, we will move that book. Ms. Pinkerton asked if the library could get sued for doing that. The Assistant Director said, "You could, yeah." Ms. Miller said, "Its never happened. I keep asking for the names of these lawsuits that we're threatened with and I haven't gotten one." The Director said, "We sent you a list in August and I have a new list for you." The Assistant Director clarified that these are federal lawsuits from across the country, because they are based on the First Amendment.

Dr. Wheeler pointed out that the list of things not allowed in the section, i.e. graphic depictions of rape, pedophilia, and pervasive vulgarity; a lot of these are subjective and the concern is that for librarians to discern

if they fit these criteria, they would have to read every book. And that is an enormous, massive undertaking to read over 13,000 books in the young adult section. He pointed out that there are multiple kinds of vulgarity, librarians will have to have blow-by-blow criteria in order to go through the books and ferret out those kinds of things.

The Assistant Director pointed out that there is no guidance on when vulgarity becomes pervasive, it's just subjective.

The Director stated that this undertaking is going to be incredibly unpopular.

Ms. Pinkerton expressed that the community also feels like some of the topics and content in some of these books are very obscene and they don't want their child or teen to come across those books. She stated that the library board's current policy has limits to the number of reconsideration requests that one person can submit. She feels that this limits the community's ability to express their opinion on book placement and that one person should be allowed to submit as many requests as they want. Ms. Pinkerton spoke about the State Librarian's position over all 46 counties in South Carolina. The Director clarified that the State Librarian is not in control of any of the county libraries, the State Library is the agency used to distribute state funds to the county libraries, and the local Library Board is the entity that controls a county library.

The Director expressed that with her experience she is trying to advise the board of what is legal and believes this policy is not going to be popular.

Ms. Pinkerton stated, "Other counties are doing this... I know Greenville is. I've read their policy." The Director stated, "I'm trying to advise you to stay out of lawsuits." Ms. Pinkerton then asked, "How can that be a lawsuit? There's no censorship, there's no restricting access, because parents are giving them the right." Dr. Wheeler said, "It is considered restricting access." The Assistant Director said, "It is censorship to segregate it from a collection that it belongs in."

Ms. Pinkerton wanted to move on. Dr. Wheeler stated that another concern he had was the massive effort and result of moving this number of books is problematic and defining exactly what the criteria would be for removing a book. Ms. Pinkerton stated that if the book describes sex, then the book should be moved.

Mr. Aiken made the point that a rated R movie is rated that way for graphically showing depictions of sex. He stated, "A couple of meetings ago one lady read a portion from a book. The portion she read in that meeting that I sat in gave very graphic descriptions of the act, of all the things that went into it. It was not merely a statement of this individual had intercourse with this individual, it was a graphic depiction of that. Now, how in the world do you come up with rating systems on all of this, I'm not 100% certain."

Ms. Miller said, "Because it's very subjective and everybody has their own values and their own opinions. And that's why I think it's important to come to a happy medium, where you have graphic descriptions, like in *All Boys Aren't Blue*, where you have a very graphic description of sodomy, which I cannot get out of my mind no matter how hard I try, I can't imagine a 13-year-old reading it. Put it in the young adult section where parents know that their kids may be reading graphic depictions of all kinds of sex.... This is a big push across the whole country, to protect minors from reading this graphic material and I think it's time Pickens County joined in. We have a lot of minors. You say parents have to monitor their children. This is Pickens County, right? Parents are working hard. They have a lot of kids. They have a lot of stresses. Pickens County is not a rich county. Parents are going to leave their kids off with the library and trust, like that lady said who spoke a couple months ago, trust that their child is going to be safe in the library to pick out a book to take for a book report at the library and the poor little girl got chewed out by the teacher, because the book was graphic homosexuality from anime.

We have to protect our minors from that, because it's the real world. In the real-world parents can't always know what books their kids are checking out of the library. And I feel like it's the library's responsibility to at least provide some guardrails. Like we do for children, like children can't drive, minors can't buy cigarettes, supposedly, minors can't buy liquor. This is the same thing; they need to be protected."

The Director said, "We can't do that as a staff because there's a vast different array of what one parent thinks is okay and what this one. We could meet your standards personally, if they were specific. But we have 130,000 people. We put the books that are written for the teens right here and we say, "be with your teen, if that matters to you, these are the books written for your teen." What y'all are saying is take this collection and mix it with the adult collection, which is worse."

Ms. Miller said, "Do you know how many parents there are that are working like 40 to 50 hours a week who never hear that? Never hear what you just said, "Be with your teenage when you are picking out books." They don't hear that. This is the real world."

The Director said, "That's their responsibility, though. With their parental rights come these responsibilities. It's not the responsibility of us to be the moral police and try to judge what is appropriate for this teenager. It's the parents' responsibility to do that." Ms. Miller said, "That's why we need this policy."

The Director stated, "I think you're going to vote on what you are going to vote on. All I can do is advise you on how I think the community is going to respond, and if I think this is legal or not, that's all I can do. And then we'll have to see."

Ms. Pinkerton moved on to the Materials Policy updates. They discussed whether or not the petitioners and board members need to read the whole book. It was discussed that there is not a way of proving whether or not anyone has read the whole book, even if it is obvious that they did not.

The Assistant Director points out that in the materials policy and the collection policy is not clear on if you can move a book that was placed in the adult section to the teen section based on a reconsideration request.

Dr. Wheeler made the point that it would not be necessary to remove a book for circulation that's in the adult section while it is being reconsidered to be put in the teen section. Dr. Wheeler also cautions that if a book is removed from circulation, it is a banned book and that could be legally problematic. The Assistant Director also points out that taking a book out of circulation before you've made a ruling on it could be considered prior restraint and restricting speech. It was agreed upon that the book would remain in circulation during the review process.

3. Discuss removal of ALA – Library Bill of Rights/Keeping Freedom to Read

Ms. Pinkerton decided to table this discussion. She said, "The reason that I don't like them... because there's no parental guidelines and there's no protection for minors. But if we have a collection policy that is protecting minors, then of course I want all books to be... I just want it in the right spot. I don't want not to have the book... because the collection policy is not letting all people have access to all books, meaning it's putting a protection for minors in there under the parent guidelines"

Dr. Wheeler points out that it will look really bad for the board if we refer to the Bill of Rights, The Freedom to Read and the Constitution in our current policies, but those things are not referenced in this new policy.

4. Discussing Personnel Matters Policy

Ms. Pinkerton wanted to draft a policy that would include personnel duties for board members and staff and clarification on what happens if there are issues that come up with board members and staff.

Dr. Wheeler mentioned that we have the code of conduct in the by-laws, but it was not enforced.

The Assistant Director pointed out that it wouldn't be appropriate to include staff in this policy because the board does not supervise staff, the Director does.

Ms. Pinkerton wanted clarification because board members do deal with and interact with staff. The Director clarified that during a meeting, staff interaction is necessary, but if a board member is emailing an employee one on one, that would be inappropriate. Board members should send communications through the director. Board members can send emails to the board clerk because that is part of the board clerk's duties.

Ms. Pinkerton stated that this would help clarify what is appropriate and what is not.

5. Discuss any other policies that need updated

Ms. Miller made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Aiken seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 6:57 pm.

*See attached Dr. Wheeler's notes on Collection Development Policy and Review of Materials Policy revisions

*Notes on Collection Development Policy and Review of Materials Policy revisions.

A.P. Wheeler 1/19/26

Collection Development Policy

Objective

1. Why not leave in the name Pickens County Library System?
2. Why remove the term “diverse”? Does this imply the community is not diverse?
3. The addition about content decisions following the laws should be obvious. Our problem on the board is that there are different opinions about the interpretation of the law, so this statement does not resolve anything.

Philosophy

1. The new paragraph makes some good points. However, we are calling on the library to protect minors, but it also says only individuals can determine what is most important for their needs.
2. Why remove the statement about the library subscribing to the library Bill of Rights, etc.? The inclusion of these statements is recommended by the trustees reference manual published by the State Library.

Selection Principles

1. Removing the qualifications of the library staff seemed unnecessary because it defines what the text now says as “qualified.”
2. In bullet point two, “diversity” is again removed—why? “Reflect” should be “reflects” as the subject is collection.
3. In bullet point 4 why delete “included?” We do not want either extreme, I think.
4. In bullet point 5 the use of “age-appropriate” is a different message from “age-relevant.” At least include both. Same for bullet point 7.

Selection Criteria

1. In bullet point 2 “history” would probably be interpreted differently from the current statement about referencing similar materials. Maybe combine the two terms.
2. Interest of the community was deleted—why?
3. Last two bullet points are not selection criteria—put them into a paragraph?
4. The evaluation of materials as a whole was deleted—why? This is part of the law, I believe.
5. In the last bullet point of the revised edition (again not really a criteria), some of the meaning is lost as the original pointed out that books are not to be cataloged to show approval or disapproval.

Collection Maintenance

1. It appears that the only source used to decide on collection maintenance is the State Library director’s “Guidance on Collection Development for Minors.” (By the way this should be dated).

This is one individual's response to a rather vague budget proviso. The local board and librarians should use their judgement and other sources to develop policy.

2. Children--we currently have two sections—children's (early readers/picture books) and juvenile (chapter books). I would suggest we ask the librarians if we really need four in order to avoid a great deal of what may be unnecessary work.
3. Teen—the previous criteria were simpler and clear, allowing for the librarians to place books based on their professional opinion, not relying exclusively on age ranges suggested by publishers. If the public disagrees, we have a robust reconsideration policy. **As a note, both the development policy and the reconsideration policy were submitted to the State Librarian for her review, and we included virtually all of her comments.**
4. The revised policy relies on contemporary community standards, but omits the part of court rulings and the law that suggests that materials be evaluated as a whole.
5. The revised policy introduces the term graphic which is defined as material that is prurient. Why do we need an additional term? Also it may be confused with the term for a genre (graphic novels).
6. The policy specifically uses the term “portion of material”—and then subsequently lists those specific things that a material cannot contain. Again, what happened to considering the material as a whole.
7. The list of unacceptable materials leaves a great deal open to interpretation - for example “pervasive vulgarity.” In the case of cursing, how many words would be classified as pervasive—and what category of cursing would be included. Would common and comical “vulgar” behaviors by teenage boys be included? **For all these categories librarians will have to be given very specific instructions as they review books so they are not left to second guess what the board intends.**
8. In the list of unacceptable content it states Prurient interest material -according to Provision (meaning proviso) 27.1. These are not clearly defined in the proviso—are they different from the rest of the list?
9. In one paragraph the acceptable age range for teens is 13-17, with books having a recommended upper range of 18 being located in the adult section. In a subsequent paragraph it states that 13-17 would be placed in the adult section. This is surely an error. And why not combine these two paragraphs? More importantly, It seems to me that putting material that is recommended for a 13 year old in the adult section is overly restrictive. I assume that publishers use the term “and up” as a range because they think adults might enjoy the reading the book.
10. The revision includes apologetics for changing from YA to Teen, ironically recognizing that YA is a standard term. However, despite being standard, the revision suggests that YA is confusing. Our own survey suggests that is not the case, and the majority of state libraries have YA sections. Further the revision suggests that it is commonly understood that YA means 18-25. By whom is this understood? If we add a section for 18-25 year olds, are we not just adding to confusion?
11. The act of changing YA to Teen will require an onerous undertaking by the librarians to relabel all the books in this section, not to mention the much larger task of re-evaluating all the books for re-

placement. This will undoubtedly result in a loss of services. Again, what specific process will be used, and what time frame are these changes expected. I suggest that a large percentage of the YA books will be moved and there may be little left of interest for many of the 13-17 year-olds to read, thus resulting in most of them going to the adult section, which this revision is trying to prevent.

12. Moving books intended for this age group is of questionable legality, which has been pointed out repeatedly.

Library of Things

1. Did the revisionists intend to leave out the sentence on hotspots and adventure passes?

Review of Materials Policy

Introduction

1. Why not combine the first paragraphs of the previous and revised versions? I think that it is important that it be pointed out that the library supports Constitutional rights and those espoused by the ALA. Removing these will send a very negative message about the library board.
2. How can the petitioner not be required to read the book in order to make informed commentary? Failing to do so then allows the reviewer to fall back on only onselected portions that others may have provided from elsewhere,.
3. By eliminating the prohibition of submitting on behalf of another person or organization seems inappropriate. This, combined with eliminating the multiple submission clause, would allow one person's voice to dominate.
4. Why is the principal reasons (sexual orientation or preference, gender, race, religious or political belief) not to consider a request eliminated? Is this not commonly accepted parlance in legal documents to avoid inappropriate restrictions and surely are not reasons to move a book or keep it out of the library.
5. Why would we take a book out of circulation while under reconsideration? Since there is no limit on the number of books a petitioner can submit, this could lead to major holes in the holdings. Also, it strikes me that this procedure suggests a material is guilty until proven innocent. And would such a policy make sense for a book under reconsideration for movement from the adult section to the YA/Teen section? If a book is taken out of circulation, it is effectively banned, even if on a temporary basis.

Guiding Principles

1. Adding that Proviso 27.1 will be followed in every reconsideration request is problematic. The policy is vague and it subverts the authority of the board.
2. Again, removing the first amendment rights statement could bring the board under legal scrutiny and, in general, is very poor optics.
3. Removing the statement that parents have the right to guide the reading, etc. of their own children and must allow those rights for other parents is a needed warning that one parent does not speak for all parents.

4. Removing the statement that a work must be considered in its entirety continues the pattern that only part of the law must be adhered to.

Factors for Reconsideration

1. The removal of the disqualification of arguments based on the fact that public funds were used to buy a book that the reviewer does not believe the library should have purchased indicates that one reviewer may speak for all taxpayers or indicates that only certain taxpayers count.
2. The removal of the disqualification of arguments based on the fact that a book does not fit with majority ideologies, etc. is essentially allowing discrimination of minorities.

Procedure

1. Asking one librarian rather than two to evaluate a reconsideration may put undue process on the one librarian. And isn't a diversity of opinions a good idea?
2. Librarians and the Director have 10 days (not working days) to review a request and make a final decision. This seems a bit draconian, especially since the preliminary paperwork is allowed 5 days. So, librarians are selected, make an evaluation, send them to the director who studies all the materials and who makes an evaluation and notifies the petitioner of her decision, all in as few as 5 days.
3. The removal of the requirement for the board to read the book essentially takes valuable tools out of the board's decision process; that is, does the book as a whole have merit in their opinion and are claims of obscenity valid. And what of the reverse; that is, how can you judge whether or not a book in the adult section should be in the YA/Teen section unless one reads the whole book.