

HOOKSETT PUBLIC LIBRARY

NotebookLM Prompt Library

Ready-to-use prompts for every stage of NH library policy development

About this document

This is a working reference of prompts for using Google NotebookLM (or Anthropic Claude Projects) to develop, review, and revise New Hampshire public library policies. Each prompt is designed to be copied and pasted directly into a chat once you have loaded the appropriate source documents into your notebook or project.

Prompts are organized two ways: by the six stages of the Policy Development Lifecycle (most useful when working on a single policy), and by policy type (most useful when you have a specific policy in mind). A short section at the end covers post-adoption prompts and prompt-writing principles.

None of these prompts is a substitute for board judgment, legal review by counsel, or community input. NotebookLM accelerates the research and drafting work — it does not replace the governance work.

Quick-Start Setup

Before using any prompt in this library, set up a notebook with the right sources loaded. The same notebook can be reused across many policy reviews — you do not need to start fresh each time.

Step 1 — Create the notebook

- Open NotebookLM at notebooklm.google.com (or Claude at claude.ai → Projects).
- Create a new notebook. Title it something durable like "HPL Policy Development" — not specific to one policy, so you can reuse it.

Step 2 — Load your core sources (once, reusable for every policy)

- Your library's full current policy manual (one PDF, or individual policy PDFs).
- NHLTA Trustee Manual (2021).
- Relevant NH RSAs: 202-A, 91-A, 201-D. Copy/paste the text from the NH General Court site into a Google Doc, then add the Doc as a source.
- NHMA Right-to-Know Law guidance ("A Hard Road to Travel").
- Primex³ relevant coverage documents and risk management bulletins for your library.
- ALA Library Bill of Rights and the Interpretations relevant to the policies you work on (e.g., Meeting Rooms, Collection Development, Challenged Resources, Privacy).
- Two or three peer library policies from comparably-sized NH libraries, for tone calibration.

Step 3 — Add policy-specific sources as needed

For each policy you work on, add the specific items relevant to that policy type. See the policy-specific sections later in this document for what to load for each type.

PRO TIP — Reuse the same notebook across many policies

NotebookLM's source-grounding works better the more it sees. A notebook with 15-20 relevant sources gives much better answers than one with three. Reuse the same notebook for every policy review — you can always toggle individual sources on or off using the checkbox in the source list.

Part 1 — Prompts by Lifecycle Stage

These prompts walk a single policy through the six-stage Policy Development Lifecycle introduced in the NHLTA presentation. Use them top-to-bottom for a complete policy review, or pick the stage you need.

Stage 1 — Inventory

Goal: Know what you already have before you change anything.

Inventory all policies that touch a topic:

Looking at our current policy manual in the sources, list every policy that touches on [TOPIC, e.g., "patron data" or "meeting space" or "minors"]. For each, note when it was last revised if that is stated, and quote the specific section that addresses [TOPIC].

Summarize a specific existing policy:

Summarize the key provisions of our existing [POLICY NAME] policy in plain language. Note any provisions that seem ambiguous, outdated, or potentially in conflict with other policies in our manual.

Find conflicts between existing policies:

Compare our [POLICY A] and [POLICY B] policies. Do they make any inconsistent or conflicting statements about [SHARED TOPIC]? List any conflicts and quote the specific language.

Catalog policies by last review date:

Based on the dates noted in our policy manual, which policies have not been reviewed in more than three years? Order the list by oldest first.

Identify policies most affected by recent changes:

Which of our existing policies are most affected by [RECENT CHANGE, e.g., "the 2025 amendments to RSA 91-A" or "the addition of an AI-enabled feature to our ILS"]? Explain why each policy is affected and what specific language might need revision.

Stage 2 — Synthesize

Goal: Bring authoritative external guidance into the conversation.

Compare your policy against NH statutes:

Compare our existing [POLICY NAME] against the requirements in NH RSA [RELEVANT RSA, e.g., "91-A" or "201-D:11"]. Where does our policy align with the statute, and where does it diverge or fail to address something the statute requires?

Synthesize multiple sources on a single question:

What do the NHLTA Trustee Manual, NH RSA [RELEVANT RSA], and the ALA [RELEVANT INTERPRETATION] each say about [SPECIFIC QUESTION, e.g., "fees for meeting room use" or "confidentiality of patron records"]? Where do they agree, and where do they differ in emphasis or requirement?

Pull NHMA guidance for the procedural mechanics:

Based on the NHMA Right-to-Know guidance in the sources, what specific procedural requirements does our [POLICY NAME] need to address to comply with RSA 91-A? Be specific about notice, minutes, nonpublic session, and public participation requirements.

Synthesize Primex³ risk-management guidance:

Based on Primex³ materials in the sources, what risk management or coverage considerations should be reflected in our [POLICY NAME]? What language would help the policy align with our insurance coverage and reduce liability exposure?

Cross-reference peer library policies:

Looking at the [N] peer library policies in the sources, what common provisions appear in their [POLICY NAME] that our policy does not currently include? Cite each peer library and the specific provision.

Stage 3 — Identify Gaps

Goal: Produce a working list of changes the board should consider.

Full gap analysis against authoritative sources:

Compare our existing [POLICY NAME] against all the authoritative guidance loaded in this notebook – NH statutes, NHLTA, NHMA, Primex³, and ALA. List specific gaps, ambiguities, or areas where the policy could be strengthened. For each gap, cite the source guidance that identifies it.

Risk-focused gap analysis:

What are the top five legal, operational, or reputational risks that our current [POLICY NAME] does not adequately address? For each risk, cite the source that identifies it and suggest what the policy could say.

ADA, civil rights, and accessibility gap check:

Does our [POLICY NAME] adequately address accessibility, accommodation, and equal access requirements? Identify any gaps relative to the ADA, Section 504, and applicable NH law. Cite the source for each gap.

Privacy gap check:

Does our [POLICY NAME] adequately address the patron privacy and confidentiality requirements of NH RSA 201-D:11? Identify any gaps and quote the specific statutory language that the policy should reflect.

Procedural gap check (for any policy that involves a board action):

Does our [POLICY NAME] include all the procedural steps needed for our board to act under RSA 91-A – notice, public session, minutes, opportunity for public comment, and right to appeal? List anything missing.

Stage 4 — Draft

Goal: Produce a working draft for board review.

Full policy draft from scratch:

Draft a new [POLICY NAME] for our library that:

- Aligns with [RELEVANT NH STATUTES, e.g., RSA 202-A:11 and RSA 91-A]
- Reflects [RELEVANT NHLTA / NHMA / Primex³ guidance]
- Incorporates [RELEVANT ALA INTERPRETATION] where applicable as best practice

- Matches the tone, structure, and length of our existing policies in the sources
- Is appropriate for a [SIZE, e.g., small-to-mid-sized] NH public library
- Treats this as a living document with a defined review cycle

Include sections on Purpose, Authority, Scope, Procedures, Review, and Adoption. Keep the language clear and accessible for trustees, staff, and the public.

Revise an existing policy to address identified gaps:

Based on the gap analysis above, draft a revised version of our [POLICY NAME] that addresses every gap you identified. Keep our existing language wherever possible – add or replace only what is necessary to close the gaps. Mark revised sections clearly so the board can see what changed.

Draft a specific policy section:

Draft only the [SECTION NAME, e.g., "Reconsideration of Materials"] section of our [POLICY NAME], based on the ALA Challenged Resources guidance and NH RSA 91-A. Match the tone of our other policies. Include a clear step-by-step procedure that any patron could follow.

Generate alternative language for a contested provision:

For the section of our [POLICY NAME] that addresses [CONTESTED TOPIC], draft two or three alternative wordings the board could consider. For each, note what trade-off it represents and which authoritative source it most closely follows.

Translate a model policy from another state to NH context:

Adapt this model [POLICY NAME] from [STATE/SOURCE] to NH context. Specifically:

- Replace any references to non-NH statutes with the equivalent NH RSAs
- Conform any procedural requirements to RSA 91-A
- Conform any confidentiality language to RSA 201-D:11
- Adjust tone to match our existing policies in the sources

Flag anything in the model that does not have a clear NH equivalent.

Stage 5 — Review

Goal: Test the draft against multiple lenses before adoption.

Operational feasibility check (for the director):

Read this draft [POLICY NAME] and identify any provision that would be difficult for our staff to implement consistently. Consider: workflow, training, technology requirements, staffing levels, and edge cases. Flag each potential issue and suggest a revision.

Prepare a legal review package:

Generate a memo to our legal counsel summarizing:

- The purpose of this draft [POLICY NAME]
- The authoritative sources we relied on (with citations)
- The specific questions where we would value counsel's review
- Any provisions where we are uncertain about legal compliance

Keep it under 500 words.

Generate a community input version (plain language):

Generate a one-page plain-language summary of this draft [POLICY NAME] for community members who do not have time to read the full document. Keep it to about 300 words, use short sentences, and explain why each major provision exists.

Generate a public hearing briefing:

Generate a 5-minute opening statement the board chair could use to introduce this draft [POLICY NAME] at a public hearing. Explain what the policy is, why we are considering changes, what input we are seeking, and what happens after the hearing.

Generate trustee briefing for the next board packet:

Generate a one-page briefing document summarizing this draft [POLICY NAME] for the next board packet. Include: what changed from the current policy, why, what sources we reviewed, what the operational implications are, and what the board is being asked to decide.

Audio overview for trustees who learn by listening:

(Use the Audio Overview button in the Studio panel. Customize with this focus:) Focus on what New Hampshire library trustees need to understand about this draft [POLICY NAME] – the key principles, the legal requirements, the operational implications, and the questions the board should discuss before adoption.

Stage 6 — Adopt and Plan Future Revisions

Goal: Adopt formally and set the next review date.

Generate the board adoption memo:

Generate a board memo for the adoption of this [POLICY NAME], including: a summary of what the policy does, a summary of what changed from the prior version (if applicable), the rationale for the changes, a list of authoritative sources reviewed, the date for the next scheduled review, and a recommended motion for adoption.

Generate a list of operational follow-ups:

Now that this [POLICY NAME] is being adopted, what operational follow-ups should the director ensure happen? Consider: staff training, signage, website updates, vendor notifications, forms or templates that need to be created, and any procedures that need to be written. List each item with a suggested owner and timeframe.

Set the next review trigger:

Based on this [POLICY NAME] and its subject area, what is an appropriate cadence for review (every 1, 2, 3, or 5 years)? What specific external events (a new RSA, a court decision, a new technology, etc.) should also trigger an early review? Recommend a written review schedule.

Part 2 — Prompts by Policy Type

These prompts are organized by the specific policy you are working on. Each section includes a recommended source bundle, the key prompts for that policy type, and any policy-specific cautions.

Meeting Room Use Policy

Recommended sources to load

- Your current Meeting Room Use Policy.
- NH RSA 201-D:11 (reservation records are confidential).
- ALA Library Bill of Rights Article VI and the ALA Meeting Rooms Interpretation.
- Two or three peer library Meeting Room policies.
- Your library's fee schedule (current and proposed).
- Primex³ general liability guidance (especially for after-hours use).

Key prompts

Equitable-access compliance check:

Compare our existing Meeting Room Use Policy against ALA Article VI and the Meeting Rooms Interpretation. Does our policy guarantee equitable access regardless of viewpoint? Identify any language that could be read as content-based or viewpoint-based, and suggest neutral alternatives.

Fee-structure review:

Review the fee structure in our Meeting Room Use Policy. Does the structure apply equitably regardless of the content or viewpoint of the meeting? Are there fee waivers? If so, are the criteria for waivers content-neutral? Suggest improvements.

After-hours use and liability:

If our Meeting Room Use Policy allows after-hours use, what specific liability, insurance, and access-control language should it include based on Primex³ guidance? Draft suggested language.

Reservation-records confidentiality:

Our Meeting Room Use Policy collects reservation information that contains personally identifying information. Based on RSA 201-D:11, what specific language should the policy include about the confidentiality of reservation records? Draft the language.

Collection Development Policy

Recommended sources to load

- Your current Collection Development Policy.
- ALA Library Bill of Rights Articles I and II.
- ALA Collection Development and Diverse Collections interpretations.
- CREW (Continuous Review, Evaluation, and Weeding) guidance.
- Two or three peer library Collection Development policies.
- Your library's most recent collection statistics, if available.

Key prompts

Selection-criteria review:

Review the selection criteria in our current Collection Development Policy. Are they specific enough to guide actual selection decisions? Are

they sufficiently inclusive of diverse perspectives per ALA's Diverse Collections guidance? Suggest improvements.

Weeding procedure based on CREW:

Draft a weeding (deselection) procedure for our Collection Development Policy based on the CREW method. Include criteria for removal, frequency of review by collection area, who makes the decision, and how decisions are documented.

Reconsideration linkage:

Our Collection Development Policy should reference our Reconsideration of Materials Policy. Draft the linking language so it is clear how a challenge to a specific item is handled separately from collection development decisions.

Statement of intellectual freedom:

Draft a clear, professional statement of intellectual freedom for our Collection Development Policy that affirms our commitment to access for all patrons without being defensive or political in tone. Reference ALA Articles I and II.

Public Input / Public Comment at Meetings Policy

Recommended sources to load

- Your current Public Input or Public Comment Policy (if you have one).
- NH RSA 91-A (full text).
- NHMA Right-to-Know guidance ("A Hard Road to Travel").
- Two or three peer library or municipal Public Input policies.

Key prompts

Draft a content-neutral public comment policy:

Draft a Public Input / Public Comment at Meetings Policy for our board that:

- Complies with NH RSA 91-A
- Establishes content-neutral and viewpoint-neutral procedures
- Applies reasonable time, place, and manner limits
- Provides for both spoken and written comment
- Sets clear rules for what is in and out of scope for board action

Keep it practical and short.

Audit existing procedure against RSA 91-A:

Compare our current public comment procedure against the requirements of NH RSA 91-A and NHMA's guidance. Identify any procedural step that is missing, ambiguous, or potentially noncompliant.

Draft language for handling disruptive conduct:

Draft language for our Public Input Policy that addresses how the board chair handles disruptive conduct during the comment period. The language must respect First Amendment protections while preserving order. Reference both RSA 91-A and applicable First Amendment principles.

Patron Conduct Policy

Recommended sources to load

- Your current Patron Conduct Policy.
- ALA Library Bill of Rights Article V.
- Your municipality's trespass ordinance and applicable NH disorderly-conduct statutes.
- Two or three peer library Patron Conduct policies.
- Primex³ general liability and security guidance.

Key prompts

Conduct-policy clarity audit:

Review our Patron Conduct Policy. Are the rules specific enough that staff can apply them consistently? Are the consequences for violations clearly stated? Identify any ambiguous language and suggest revisions.

Suspension and ban procedures:

Draft the section of our Patron Conduct Policy that handles suspension or banning of patrons. Include: which violations warrant suspension, who has authority to suspend, the duration, the appeals process, and the documentation required. Reference applicable due-process considerations.

Mental-health-sensitive language:

Review the language in our Patron Conduct Policy for any wording that could disproportionately impact patrons experiencing homelessness, mental

health crises, or substance use disorders. Suggest neutral, behavior-focused alternatives.

Unattended children integration:

Our Patron Conduct Policy and our Unattended Children Policy should work together. Review both (in the sources) and identify any gaps, overlaps, or inconsistencies. Suggest a clear handoff between the two.

Reconsideration of Materials Policy

Recommended sources to load

- Your current Reconsideration of Materials Policy.
- Your Collection Development Policy.
- ALA Challenged Resources interpretation.
- NH RSA 91-A (the appeal process must comply).
- Two or three peer library Reconsideration policies.

Key prompts

Full procedure draft:

Draft a Reconsideration of Materials Policy that:

- Aligns with ALA Challenged Resources guidance
- Includes a clear written request form with specific questions
- Limits reconsideration to current library card holders (or your equivalent)
- Provides a fair appeal procedure compliant with RSA 91-A
- Sets reasonable limits on repeat or bulk requests
- Specifies a timeline for response

Keep the tone professional and avoid defensive language.

Bulk-request protection:

Recent reporting indicates that some libraries are receiving large volumes of reconsideration requests, sometimes generated using AI tools. Draft language for our Reconsideration of Materials Policy that establishes reasonable per-person and per-period limits on requests while still respecting genuine community input.

Decision communication template:

Draft a template letter from the Director to a patron who has submitted a reconsideration request, communicating the decision. Include: thanks for the input, the decision, the reasoning (referencing our Collection Development Policy), the patron's appeal rights, and information about other ways to engage with library decisions.

Confidentiality of Library Records Policy

Recommended sources to load

- Your current Confidentiality of Library Records Policy.
- NH RSA 201-D:11 (full text).
- ALA Library Bill of Rights Article VII.
- ALA Privacy interpretation.
- Two or three peer library Confidentiality policies.
- Primex³ cyber-liability and data-breach guidance.
- Your library's current vendor list with data-handling notes (if available).

Key prompts

Full policy aligned with RSA 201-D:11:

Draft a Confidentiality of Library Records Policy that:

- Implements NH RSA 201-D:11
- Defines what counts as a "library record" in modern terms (including digital, AI-tool inputs, and database queries)
- Establishes the three statutory exceptions clearly
- Provides a procedure for handling court orders and subpoenas
- Establishes vendor and contract requirements
- Addresses staff training and disclosure obligations

Reference both the statute and ALA Article VII.

AI-tool boundary on patron data:

Draft a specific provision for our Confidentiality of Library Records Policy that establishes a boundary on staff use of AI tools. The provision should make clear that patron personally identifying information may not be entered into any AI tool, including general-purpose tools like ChatGPT and source-grounded tools like NotebookLM, without specific authorization and contractual confidentiality protections.

Vendor contract language:

Draft the section of our Confidentiality of Library Records Policy that

establishes our standard expectations for vendors that handle patron data. The language should require vendors to maintain confidentiality consistent with RSA 201-D:11, limit data retention, notify the library promptly of breaches, and not use patron data for purposes beyond providing the contracted service.

Court-order handling procedure:

Draft a step-by-step procedure for handling any subpoena, court order, or law enforcement request for patron records. Include: who receives the request, who notifies counsel, when the patron is notified (if ever), and what is documented. Reference both RSA 201-D:11 and ALA guidance on responding to law enforcement.

Part 3 — Post-Adoption Prompts

Once a policy is adopted, NotebookLM is useful for generating the public-facing materials that help the community understand and use the policy. These prompts are the "deliverables" your board and director will be asked for after the vote.

Generate a public FAQ

FAQ from an adopted policy:

Now that the board has adopted this [POLICY NAME], generate a one-page public-facing FAQ. Include 6-10 of the questions a typical patron or community member is most likely to ask, with plain-language answers grounded in the adopted policy text. Avoid jargon and avoid restating the policy verbatim — translate it.

FAQ targeted to a specific audience:

Generate a FAQ about our adopted [POLICY NAME] specifically for [AUDIENCE, e.g., "community organizations that want to reserve our meeting room" or "patrons whose request for reconsideration of a book was denied"]. Anticipate their specific concerns and address them respectfully.

Rewrite at 8th-grade reading level

Plain-language version for posting alongside the official text:

Adapt the adopted [POLICY NAME] to an 8th-grade reading level. Keep all the substantive requirements intact, but use shorter sentences, simpler

words, active voice, and concrete examples where they help. Keep the original (legal) version on file; this is a plain-language companion document to post alongside it.

Reading-level check:

Estimate the reading level of this [POLICY NAME or section]. If it is above an 8th-grade level, suggest specific sentence-by-sentence revisions to bring it down while preserving meaning.

PRO TIP — Keep both versions on file

The plain-language version supports accessibility and community understanding, but the legal version remains the official policy. Post them together (e.g., the legal version as the primary, with a "plain-language summary" link). Never replace the legal version — only supplement it.

Other post-adoption materials

Staff training memo:

Generate a staff training memo for the adopted [POLICY NAME]. Explain what changed (if anything), what staff need to know, what they need to do differently starting [DATE], and where they can ask questions. Keep it under 400 words.

Website-friendly policy summary:

Generate a short summary of the adopted [POLICY NAME] suitable for our website's policy page. Include: a one-sentence purpose, the key things patrons need to know, a link reference for the full text, and a contact for questions. About 150 words.

Social media announcement:

Generate three short social media posts announcing our newly adopted [POLICY NAME] — one for Facebook (about 80 words, friendly tone), one for Instagram (about 50 words, visual-friendly), and one as a short newsletter blurb (about 100 words). Each should explain what the policy is and where to read more.

Part 4 — Cross-Policy and General Prompts

These prompts cut across individual policies and are useful for periodic governance work: full-manual reviews, board orientations, annual reporting, and so on.

Full-manual review

Audit the whole policy manual:

Audit our entire policy manual against the authoritative sources in this notebook. List every policy that is out of date, missing, internally inconsistent, or out of step with current NH law and NH-specific guidance. Prioritize the list by risk.

Identify missing policies:

Based on the NHLTA Trustee Manual's list of standard NH library policy categories, which standard policies does our library not currently have? List the missing ones and explain why each might matter for our library.

Board orientation

Generate a new-trustee briefing:

Generate a briefing document for a new member of our Board of Trustees. Cover: what library policy is (vs. procedures and rules), the trustee's statutory authority under RSA 202-A, the role of RSA 91-A in board meetings, the role of RSA 201-D:11 in patron confidentiality, the place of NHLTA/NHMA/Primex³/ALA in the source hierarchy, and what to read first. Keep it under 1,200 words.

Generate a board-orientation Audio Overview:

(Use the Audio Overview button.) Focus on what a brand-new trustee needs to understand about their policy responsibility under NH law. Cover: the trustee's statutory authority, the difference between bylaws/personnel/library policies, what RSA 91-A requires of board meetings, what RSA 201-D:11 protects, and where to turn for help (NHLTA, NHMA, Primex³, counsel).

Annual review and reporting

Annual policy review summary:

Generate a one-page summary for our annual report describing the policy work the board completed this year: which policies were reviewed, which

were revised, what authoritative sources we consulted, and what is on the schedule for the coming year.

Risk-based policy priority list:

Looking at our full policy manual and recent NH developments (new RSAs, court decisions, technology changes), what are the top three policies that should be prioritized for review in the coming year? For each, explain why it is a priority.

Inter-policy consistency

Cross-cutting topic search:

Search across all our policies for any mention of [TOPIC, e.g., "patron data" or "fees" or "AI"]. Identify any inconsistencies in how the topic is treated and suggest harmonized language.

Statute citation audit:

Search across all our policies for citations to NH statutes (RSAs). List every citation, identify any that are outdated or incorrect, and suggest corrections.

Part 5 — Prompt-Writing Principles

If a prompt in this library does not quite fit your situation, modify it. Good NotebookLM prompts share three properties — and any prompt that fails one of them tends to produce weaker output.

1. Name what to look at

Tell the model which sources to consider, especially when you have many loaded. For example, "Looking at our existing Meeting Room Policy and the ALA Meeting Rooms interpretation in the sources..." works much better than "What does ALA say about meeting rooms?"

2. Name what to produce

Specify the format and length of the output. "List specific gaps with citations" is better than "Tell me what is wrong." "Draft a 400-word memo" is better than "Write a memo." "Generate three alternative wordings" is better than "Suggest improvements."

3. Name what is traceable

Ask for citations explicitly. "Cite the source for each claim" or "Quote the specific passage" is what triggers NotebookLM's inline-citation behavior and what makes the output trustworthy for trustees.

Quick anti-patterns to avoid

- **Asking the model to predict the future.** It only knows what is in your sources. "What will happen if we adopt this?" produces speculation, not analysis.
- **Asking the model for legal advice.** It can summarize what statutes say and compare your policy to them, but it cannot replace counsel. Use it to prepare for legal review, not to bypass it.
- **Loading the question.** "Why is our policy wrong?" assumes the policy is wrong. "Compare our policy to [source] and identify gaps" is more useful and more honest.
- **Entering patron data.** Never enter patron personally identifying information into NotebookLM, Claude, or any other AI tool. Even when the privacy posture is good, patron records belong in your authorized library systems, not in a research notebook.

Final reminders

- Boards still vote. Counsel still reviews. Communities still input. These prompts accelerate the research; they do not replace governance.
- NotebookLM's outputs are drafts. Always review citations, check facts against the original sources, and apply trustee judgment before adopting any AI-generated language.
- Update the source bundle as NH law and authoritative guidance change. A notebook loaded with stale sources will confidently produce stale answers.
- Never enter patron records into any AI tool. The convenience is not worth the confidentiality risk under RSA 201-D:11.
- If a prompt is not producing useful output, the prompt is usually the problem, not the tool. Revise the prompt to be more specific about what to look at, what to produce, and what to cite.

Hooksett Public Library · NHLTA Spring Conference 2026 · Companion to the "From Draft to Decision" presentation