

Demo Prompt Playbook

NotebookLM Demo Prompt Playbook (General Policy Development)

Purpose: Tested, ready-to-paste prompts for the live NHLTA presentation demo. The demo walks the audience through the **Policy Development Lifecycle** using a Meeting Room Policy as the worked example.

Setup before the session:

- 1. Open NotebookLM (notebooklm.google.com)
 - 2. Click "Create new notebook"
 - 3. Title it "Library Policy Development — NHLTA Demo"
 - 4. Upload the source bundle files (or as many as time permits)
 - 5. Wait for ingestion (usually under a minute)
-

Why Meeting Room Policy is the Best Demo Topic

- It's a **universally relevant** policy — virtually every NH public library has one
 - It rests on **both** ALA guidance (Library Bill of Rights Article VI, Meeting Rooms Interpretation) **and** NH law (RSA 201-D:11 for reservation records)
 - It involves **First Amendment considerations**, which makes it visually engaging for trustees
 - It's a **non-controversial demo topic** — unlike Reconsideration of Materials or AI policy, it doesn't put the audience on edge
-

Demo Arc — Six Prompts Walking Through the Lifecycle (~18 minutes total)

Stage 1 — Inventory (2 min)

Prompt 1: `` Looking at the sample existing meeting room policy in the source bundle, summarize its key provisions in plain language. Note any provisions that seem outdated or unclear. ``

What to point out:

- The model only uses the policy you uploaded
 - Inline citations link back to specific sections
 - This is the same kind of summary trustees would do manually — except in 30 seconds
-

Stage 2 — Synthesize (3 min)

Prompt 2: `` What does the ALA Library Bill of Rights and the Meeting Rooms Interpretation say about equitable access to library meeting rooms? What does NH RSA 201-D:11 say about confidentiality of reservation records? Cite each source. ``

What to point out:

- Two completely different sources (ALA professional guidance and NH state law) being synthesized
 - Each citation is clickable
 - Trustees can verify rather than trust
-

Stage 3 — Identify Gaps (3 min)

Prompt 3: `` Compare the sample existing meeting room policy against the ALA Meeting Rooms Interpretation and the NHLTA trustee policy framework. List specific gaps, ambiguities, or areas where the policy could be strengthened. Cite the relevant source guidance for each gap. ``

What to point out:

- This is the killer use case — a structured gap analysis in 60 seconds
 - The output is a policy committee agenda for the next meeting
 - Every gap is traceable
-

Stage 4 — Draft (4 min)

Prompt 4: ``` Draft a revised Meeting Room Use Policy that:

- Aligns with ALA Library Bill of Rights Article VI and the Meeting Rooms Interpretation
- Incorporates relevant requirements from NH RSA 201-D:11
- Matches the tone and structure of typical NH public library policy documents in the source bundle
- Includes clear sections on Authority, Equitable Access, Permitted/Prohibited Uses, Reservations, Fees, Privacy, and Review
- Treats fees as a content-neutral consideration consistent with ALA guidance
- Is appropriate for a small-to-mid-sized New Hampshire public library

Keep the language clear and accessible for trustees, staff, and the public. ```

What to point out:

- The output is a *draft*, not an adopted policy
 - Board review, legal review, and public input still apply
 - Compare to "ChatGPT, write a meeting room policy" — that produces something generic and ungrounded; this produces something traceable
-

Stage 5 — Review (3 min)

Action: Click "Audio Overview" in the Studio panel, customize with this focus: `` Focus on what library trustees and directors in New Hampshire need to understand about adopting an updated meeting room policy – the key principles, the legal requirements, and the practical implications for the board. ``

What to point out:

- Trustees can listen on a commute or during a walk before the next meeting
- Audio Overviews are 80+ languages — useful for diverse community outreach
- They are NOT used to train Google's models (per Google's published terms)
- Useful for board orientation, community presentations, or staff training

Optional alternate action: Generate a Briefing Document. `` Generate a one-page briefing document summarizing the proposed policy changes, the rationale, and the source guidance reviewed. This will be distributed in the next board packet. ``

Stage 6 — Adopt + Show the Lifecycle in Action (3 min)

Prompt 6: `` Based on the Policy Development Lifecycle described in the source bundle, what should the Board of Trustees do next to move this draft toward adoption? List the specific steps, who is responsible for each, and an appropriate timeline. ``

What to point out:

- The same framework applies to ANY library policy
- This loop is what trustees do — NotebookLM accelerates it
- Final adoption is still a public-session vote in compliance with RSA 91-A

Backup Prompts — For Other Policy Types (Use If Audience Has Specific Interests)

For Collection Development:

`` What are the essential elements of a Collection Development Policy according to ALA's Library Bill of Rights? Use the sample collection development policy in the bundle as a reference for typical structure. ``

For Reconsideration of Materials:

`` What does the ALA Challenged Resources Interpretation require of a Reconsideration of Materials Policy? How does this interact with NH RSA 91-A? ``

For Public Input / Public Comment:

`` Draft public comment guidelines for a board meeting that comply with NH RSA 91-A and remain content-neutral as required by First Amendment case law. ``

For Confidentiality:

`` What records does NH RSA 201-D:11 protect? Generate a checklist for staff that explains what they can and cannot share, with citations. ``

For Patron Conduct:

`` What does ALA's Article V of the Library Bill of Rights say about a person's right to use a library? How does that constrain a Patron Conduct Policy? ``

For AI Policy (still relevant as one example):

```
`` Based on the ALA AI Working Group guidance, what should an AI Use Policy address? How does it interact with our existing Confidentiality Policy? ``
```

Big-Picture Closer Prompt

For the end of the demo, this is a strong way to bring it back to the lifecycle:

```
`` Looking at all the sources in this notebook, generate a one-paragraph statement that the Board of Trustees could read aloud at the start of any policy review meeting, reminding everyone present of the principles that guide our policy development. Keep it under 150 words. ``
```

Common Audience Questions and Quick Answers

Q: Is this free? A: There's a free tier with daily limits. NotebookLM Plus is bundled with Google AI Premium for higher limits. NotebookLM Enterprise is available via Google Cloud for organizations needing additional compliance.

Q: Can our community see what we upload? A: No. Notebooks are private to the account holder unless you explicitly share them. In a shared notebook, your chat history is still private to you.

Q: Can we share a notebook with the whole board? A: Yes. Notebooks support multi-user collaboration.

Q: What if our library doesn't have a Workspace account? A: NotebookLM is fully usable with a personal Google account. The privacy protections (no training on your data) apply by default.

Q: Does this replace our attorney? A: Absolutely not. Every policy still needs legal review by town counsel or library counsel before adoption. NotebookLM accelerates research and drafting; it does not substitute for legal judgment.

Q: Can we upload our patron records or staff personnel files? A: **No.** NotebookLM has good privacy posture, but patron records and personnel files belong in your authorized library systems, not in a research notebook. Use NotebookLM for *policy documents and public guidance* — not patron data.

Q: Can it replace our policy committee? A: No. It accelerates their work but does not replace their judgment, their community knowledge, or the legal review your library may need.

Q: How do we keep up with changes to ALA guidance or RSAs? A: When you become aware of a change, replace the source file in the notebook. NotebookLM will use the updated version going forward. This is one reason policies should have built-in review cycles.

Presenter Notes — What to Emphasize

- **1. NotebookLM is not ChatGPT.** It only knows what you give it. That is the feature, not a limitation.
- **2. Citations matter.** Every output is traceable. Trustees can verify, not just trust.
- **3. The lifecycle is the point.** AI is the engine; the lifecycle is the steering wheel.
- **4. Boards still vote. Lawyers still review. Communities still input.** AI doesn't change governance — it improves the inputs to it.

- **5. AI policy is just one example.** The same approach works for every policy you'll ever adopt.