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Rationale and Case Study

Rubric explanation

Activity 1: Identify the diverse populations you serve

Activity 2: Evaluate a policy using the rubric

Conclusion
Articulate
Articulate the value of personal identities in understanding and creating inclusive policies.

Identify and Describe
Identify and describe the diverse populations your institution serves.

Evaluate
Evaluate a library policy with a DEI lens using the rubric created at NIU Libraries.
Rationale

“Many of the policies, procedures, and norms employed and enforced in libraries are rooted in white supremacy and are often exclusionary to BIPOC individuals.” (ALA/ARL, 2022)
Draft Policy Guidelines

• What are the goals of our work?
• What do our personal lived experiences inform?
• Highlighted the importance of a diverse group: the different perspectives

Consult with Stakeholders and the Literature

• ADEI, DRC
• Don't reinvent the wheel!
• External literature
  • plainlanguage.gov
  • Other libraries' diversity audits and reviews
Our Work: Activity Timeline

Task Force Process Gantt Chart

Formed Task Force
11/2/2020

Created Policy Format Recommendations
12/22/2020

Drafted the Policy Review Rubric
2/10/2021

Evaluated Policies
4/1/2021

5/21/2021

7/10/2021

8/29/2021

10/18/2021
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## Case Study Results

### Full marks (48)
- Computers for Public Use
- Digital Preservation Implementation Plan
- Digital Preservation Policy
- Gifts Policy
- NIU These, Dissertations, Qualifying Papers, or Certificate of Advanced Studies Papers on Deposit in the University Libraries
- Periodical Services
- Reflection Room Policy
- Retention of Library Billing Records
- Scholar’s Den
- Withdrawal Policy

### High marks (45-47)
- Food and Beverage Policy
- Basement Access
- Escalator Orientation and Mobility Training Policy
- Confidentiality of Library Records
- Circulation Loan Periods
- No Smoking Policy
- Reserve Services
- Code of Conduct
- Study Room Reservation
- Visiting Scholars and Sponsored Scholars: Library Privileges

### Middling marks (42-44)
- Building Closing
- Filming and Photography in the Library
- Retirees: Faculty, SPS, and Staff Policy
- Appeals for Lost Books and Reserve Fines
- Interlibrary Loan/Information Delivery Services Policy
- Laptop Circulation Policy
- Lockers Policy
- Mathematical sciences reading room
- Media Services
- Billing Policy for Leisure Reading Book Collection

### Lowest marks (31-41)
- Theft, Mutilation, or destruction of Library Property
- Circulation Policy
- Faculty Carrels
- Internet Policy
- (Smart) Room Reservation Policy
- Children in the Library
- Noise Policy
- Hours Policy

---
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### The Rubric: Planning Ahead

| What kind of data do you want to acquire? | Qualitative and quantitative debate  
Usefulness for advocacy |
|------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| What is useful data?                     | Internally consistent data  
• Matching phrasing of questions to yield consistent numerical answers  
Quantitative result targets: “high scores mean good”  
• Likert scale questions |
<p>| What are non-optionals?                  | Yes / no questions |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;Does this policy discriminate against anyone?&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Why not just make an easy list?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What about the federal listing? Or matching university policy?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity versus demographics:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• What we don’t want to do is try to identify specific people’s demographic tags.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Let’s not say: “I saw three Black people yesterday, so we probably serve Black people.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confront bias through inquiry and specific questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluators might not personally have stake in certain identities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Specific questions can short circuit patterns that create systemic bias</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### The Rubric: Pass/Fail Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pass/Fail Questions</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy only apply to a clearly defined user group? (i.e., &quot;undergraduates,&quot; &quot;faculty,&quot; &quot;all patrons,&quot; etc.)</td>
<td>We want to make policy for user groups, not for identities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy only apply to a grouping not represented by patron classifications? (i.e., &quot;children,&quot; &quot;non-citizens,&quot; &quot;English students,&quot; et al?)</td>
<td>We want to capture if the policy is identifying a patron using some other method.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the policy available as web page body text?</td>
<td>Meets an accessibility standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the policy meet accessibility standards? (i.e., <em>can be read by screen readers</em>)?</td>
<td>Meets other relevant accessibility standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the policy still necessary?</td>
<td>Reduces clutter and redundant searching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a university policy that covers this topic already?</td>
<td>Increases clarity and usability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does it avoid jargon and undefined initialism/acronyms?</td>
<td>Increases clarity and usability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it written at an 8th grade reading level?</td>
<td>Reflects federal plain language guidelines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The policy discriminates against...

- someone from lower socio-economic status
- someone with a physical disability
- neurodivergence, including learning disabilities
- perceived race and/or ethnicity
- religious affiliation and/or practice
- an age group
- perceived sexual and/or romantic orientation
- parental status and/or family structure
- someone undergoing medical, home, and/or other life transitions
- citizenship and/or immigration status
- sex and/or gender expression

- The policy's penalties are excessive and/or inappropriate.
  - Punitive vs reparative penalties
Activity 1: Identify the Diverse Populations You Serve

Instructions:

• **Part 1:** Using the handout, list the specific identities that are most important for your policy review.

• **Part 2:** Compare the list of identities with a neighbor to see how priorities differ by institution, person, etc., and how you can learn from each other.

**Time:** 5 minutes

**Materials:** phone, handout, pencils

**Goal:** These identities can be used to form your rubric questions!
Activity 2: Evaluate a policy using the rubric

Instructions:

- **Part 1:** Use the rubric in your handout to evaluate at least one of the library policies at your table individually.

- **Part 2:** Compare and discuss your evaluations of the policy(ies) and how they differ with your neighbor/group.

**Time:** 15-20 minutes

**Materials:** rubric (*in handout*), pencil, and one of the policies below

- “Children in the Library Policy”
- “Internet Policy”
Next Steps

Get Buy-In
• Appeal to library values
• Share examples

Get Together
• Gather your team
• Collect policies and related documents

Evaluation
• Adapt rubric
• Complete evaluation
• Share out
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Thank you for participating!

Please fill out the assessment via the QR code on the handout so we can improve this workshop.

Questions?

Policy Recommendations
Rubric
Assessment:
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No holds barred: Policing and security in the public library. *In the Library with the Lead Pipe.* [https://www.inthelibrarywiththeleadpipe.org/2019/no-holds-barred/](https://www.inthelibrarywiththeleadpipe.org/2019/no-holds-barred/)


