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Objectives for TODAY

TOGETHER
Work in small groups to problem solve a scenario that triggers collection evaluation.
Come up with a tangible plan.
Create a document (flyer, handout, etc.) to offer faculty members encouraging them to participate in collection evaluation.
Share out scenario solutions and creations via Padlet.
Discuss what to do if faculty input is not what we expected/hoped for.

APART
Leave with ideas for practice in your own work environment.
Create a network of colleagues (pssst...get each other’s contact info!) who are interested in critically thinking through collection evaluation.
Have a rough plan in place that will help you engage the faculty on your campus.
Scenario #1
An outdated title triggers review of an entire series. Some titles are a-ok, some are...whoa. How much faculty input do you ask for?

Scenario #2
You’ve had a regular weeding schedule that Faculty are used to and trust you to make the best choices, but you want their feedback. How do you do this?

Scenario #3
In investigating the collection, you notice bi/trans/homophobic books. Your campus LGBTQ Center requests that outdated & offensive library materials be weeded. How do you proceed?

Scenario #4
A specific section needs a complete overhaul. Faculty are responding, but are very apprehensive on getting rid of anything. How do you work with them?
Discussion!

1.) Add image to Padlet
2.) List 3 best practices that came up in discussion

Padlet Board URL

https://padlet.com/valcoughah/weeding
Scenario #1: outdated titles

Institution:
- College of Charleston
- ~10,000 students, 535 FT, 355 PT faculty, public institution
- Unique to us: Liberal arts focus, located in historic downtown Charleston, with a collection that has never really been weeded on a large-scale.

Process:
- Researched book that triggered the project and found it was part of a series, many titles of which dealt with outmoded models of education/language.
- **1st weeding stage:** Pulled books from problematic series. Ran circ stats and put together a spreadsheet.
- **2nd weeding stage:** Contacted relevant faculty with spreadsheet of titles, circ stats, and pub dates.
- **3rd weeding stage:** Deaccessioned titles with no historical value, kept those flagged by faculty as important to the study of their discipline.

Next steps: Assess portions of the collection for inclusion of underrepresented groups. Begin larger scale weeding project assessing outdated content/material.
Scenario #2: not enough feedback

Institution:
- James Madison University
- ~22,700 students, ~1,375 faculty, public institution
- Health Sciences/Professions & Nursing (undergraduate & graduate programs)
- Unique to us: Transparency, trust & routine
- Unique to them: currency of information, journal-focused

Process:
- **Pre-weeding**: explanation of collection review, 10+ years
- **1st weeding stage**: excel list of potential weeds
- **2nd weeding stage**: event in library
- **3rd weeding stage**: revised list

Next steps: Items taped and reviewed and coordinate the withdrawal of items.
Scenario #3: out of date/offensive books

Institution:
- University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill
- ~30,000 students, ~4,000 faculty, public institution
- Sexuality studies program with 50+ affiliated faculty
- Unique to us: large offsite storage facility & fire safety project

Process:
- Meetings with LGBTQ Center, peer librarian, faculty member
- 1st weeding stage: publication date, circ stats, duplicates
- 2nd weeding stage (current stage): relevancy, authority, level of scholarship
- 3rd “weeding” stage: approval plan review

Next steps:
- Meet with new Sexuality Studies chair & gather wider scale faculty feedback for further weeding decision-making
Scenario #4: apprehensive faculty

Institution:
- James Madison University
- ~22,700 students, ~1,375 faculty, public institution
- Math & Stats Department with 70+ affiliated faculty
- Unique to us: Math & Stats located opposite side of campus

Process:
- Pre-weeding: explanation of collection review; parameters considered
- 1st weeding stage: excel list of potential weeds
- 2nd weeding stage: event in library & comment period
- 3rd weeding stage: revised weeding list

Next steps:
- Review saves in five years
Thank you!
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