

## Board Notes

1/8/2024

A special meeting of the School Board was held Monday, January 8, 2024, at 5:30 p.m. in the New Prairie United School Corporation Board Room with Mr. Phil King, Mr. Jason DeMeyer, Mrs. Jill Smith, Mr. Dale Groves and Mr. Rich Gadacz present. Dr. Paul White, Superintendent, was also present.

Mr. Phil King, Board President, stated that the purpose of this "Let's Talk Session" is to provide members of the community with the opportunity to speak to the Board regarding the appeal to the Reconsideration Committee's recommendation on the following book challenges: The Infinite Moment of Us, TILT, The Perks of Being a Wallflower, Empire of Storms, Kingdom of Ash and Rethinking Normal.

Mr. King continued that Per Board Policy 0167.3, the Let's Talk Session will last approximately one-half ( $\frac{1}{2}$ ) hour. The presiding officer may prohibit public comments which are frivolous, repetitive, or harassing and may request any individual to leave the meeting when that person behaves in a manner that is disruptive of the orderly conduct of the meeting. Remarks by any person addressing the Board which reflect adversely upon the character or motives of any other person or group are considered out of order.

Mr. King stated that as long as the conversation is productive, the Board will allow the Let's Talk session to exceed the 30 minutes allotted per board policy. To start, the challenger of the book challenges will have an opportunity to address the board not to exceed 10 minutes. From there, using the registration forms turned in, he said that he will call names in the order in which the forms were received. Forms will be accepted until the challenger has finished addressing the Board. Each community member will be limited to one appearance and three minutes. When you have 30 seconds left, Board Secretary, Mrs. Smith, will raise her hand to let you know.

Mr. King invited Mrs. Sass, NPUSC Curriculum Director, to the podium to explain the process of why the committee was formed, who made up the committee and the process of reviewing the books. Mrs. Sass said that per Board Policy there was a request to review materials so a committee was formed. The committee included a central office administrator, students, parents, teachers, retired teachers, administrators and a librarian. All the committee members were mandated to read the books and attend two meetings. At the first meeting the petitioner shared the complaint information and materials. The petitioner was allowed 15 minutes to share concerns. Statements from the committee members followed. Rebuttal can be made by both parties. At the end of the first meeting the committee members were instructed to go and think about what they heard and review the information given to them. At the second meeting the Chairperson led the discussion, then the committee members submitted a written and confidential vote to either remove the book from the collection, move it to the high school level, or leave it in the library collection. The vote reached by the committee was then submitted to Dr. White.

Mr. King explained that the reconsideration committee was directed and guided by the Board to use the following criteria: the appropriateness of the material for the age and maturity level of the students who have access to it; the accuracy of the material; the objectivity of the material; the use be made of the material and does the material submitted satisfy the definition of obscene or harmful to minors as defined by Indiana

Codes 35-49-2-1 and 35-49-2-2. Mr. King introduced the corporation council, Ms. Speichert, who gave a detailed definition of IN Codes 35-49-2-1 and 35-49-2-2.

Mr. King opened the floor to the petitioner, Ms. Heather Oake, to approach the podium who has 10 minutes.

Heather Oake, the challenger of the books, read miscellaneous pages from five of the six books she challenged. Ms. Oake explained that she brought the books to the attention of a book review committee of which the vote was to keep all these books in the New Prairie Middle School. Some of the arguments made were that the books as a whole have literary value. A few parts of the book do not ruin the entire book as some parents do not mind their children reading about sexual content. So, parents that do mind should review each book their child checks out. It has been said that a book can't be removed just because it may be offensive to some who hold different values and beliefs than the reader. She disagrees with these arguments. She believes that small parts of books, movies and music that are sexually explicit can ruin them as a whole. This is why music and movies have ratings. She is sure New Prairie United School Corporation wouldn't play a sexually explicit song over the intercom at school or let students watch movies that are rated R without parental consent. Also, these books do not tell parents anything from a summary therefore it's hard for a parent to know. Indiana enacted Public Law 154, schools are required to make two attempts to receive written parental permission in order for students to participate in sex education instruction. These books are for educational purposes so children should not be reading them without parental consent. Lastly, there are many books not allowed in school libraries due to holding different beliefs such as the bible and other religious texts. Therefore, she stated that she believes that we should respect parental rights by removing sexually explicit books from school libraries that parents would like their children educated on sexually explicit activities outside of school. Thank you.

Mr. King opened the floor to anyone who turned in a registration form then asked if anyone else would like to turn a form in.

Mr. King then called Ms. VanWanzeele to the podium to begin.

Jessica VanWanzeele didn't have anything prepared but asked the Board not to restrict what the children have access to. She stated she brought her 11-year daughter today and having her hear most of this language we are debating does not mind her daughter hearing and reading as she stated she has no problem with it because she is open and honest with her child about sexual situations and what happens. She brought up how many times these books have been checked out from the Library since they were bought. Kingdom of Ash has been checked out 7 times; Empire of Storms, 9 times; TILT only 38 times; The Infinite Moment of Us was checked out 66 times before it was lost in 2020 so we are debating a book that doesn't even exist in the library. Rethinking Normal was checked out 1 time and The Perks of Being A Wallflower 39 times and her 23-year-old daughter who read that book when she was in Middle School so that is how long that book has been in circulation and has only been checked out 39 times. Where does it stop? If we are talking about 6 books today then we will be back talking about 6 more books in 6 weeks. Then we will be talking about 39 more books. There are School Boards considering whether or not *Charlotte's Web* is appropriate because God only gave humans the ability to talk or act like humans or people and it is against religion to have animals that can talk and think. We are debating *Charlotte's Web*, that is where we are headed if we go here with these 6 books because there is no win. It is

a slippery slope. When you start banning books you may as well ban all literature. Are we gonna ban *The Cat in the Hat* because it is a talking cat. Absolutely not. This is ridiculous, if you don't want your children to read it, don't let them read it. She doesn't think you have the right to dictate what her child has access to. That is for parents to decide, not parents who don't even have kids in our school system. Jessica VanWanzele concluded by asking the Board, please do not ban books.

Tom Pietrzak stated that he is a resident of the area and the father of a New Prairie student. Reading is critical to every child. The interest in reading is critical to them to actually read. What we heard tonight to some might be a bit shocking. He isn't gonna tell you that it shouldn't be to you. At the same time my opinion of what is shocking versus your opinion, versus your opinion, versus your opinion, may be different and if you can get a child to read...he remembers in the earliest stages of learning about education that if you can get a child to read a comic book or the sports page all of that is important for their foundation in reading. He knows some of this stuff is a little over-the-top but there are also other over-the-top issues that are in books that throw people the other direction. So tonight, he stated he likes the process that has been put in place. It has protections. If you have concerns about what your child is reading you can check in with the school office and they will put you on a list so when your child checks out a book you will be notified. If you are concerned about what your child is checking out, put that concern aside. Is it shocking, ya, sure it is but at the same time fostering the will and want to read, you cannot do a better thing for your child. He will stand behind the current process and the way it works. Some big decisions are being made. He would rather have them read this than a book on how to make meth. There is a process to go through and he stated that he is here to support the process that is a good process covering many bases.

Sid Shroyer next introduced himself. He stated that he is a retired New Prairie High School teacher who is on the committee. He stated that he is not representing the committee, he is representing himself. The School Board, 23 years ago, gave him permission to teach a class on the Holocaust. At that School Board meeting when he approached the Board about teaching the class he was asked if he would be teaching and informing students about other genocides. He remembers thinking that was New Prairie right there as he had faith in the New Prairie Community and the Board doing the right thing based on his experience teaching at New Prairie. Because of that permission that the Board gave him in the year 2000, in the year 2010 along with a group of other American teachers, he stood at a memorial, in central Berlin, Germany, to book burning. In 1933 German people gathered on the very spot to burn undesirable books out of the desire, as they saw it, would make Germany great again. Local chapters of German student groups organized these book burnings. A lot of people thought they were the Nazi party but they were local student groups who were burning books that were deemed anti-family, anti-German literature. They had grand ceremonies planned with 40,000 people who showed up at this German square in 1933 for the ceremonial book burning. The goal of book bans is the numbing of the senses, seeking to destroy individuality and stifle curiosity. The numbing of the senses is a revision into an ignorance for the potential for numbering our students especially for greatness. They seek conformity, non-conformists are considered enemies of the state.

Jamie Talboom thanked the Board for allowing her to speak. She stated that she is the grandmother of 7 children, five of whom are in the school system, three are in the Middle School. She stated she is at the meeting this evening to support the committee's decision to not ban the books in question. Some common arguments for

the book ban are that material is offensive or inappropriate and by banning books what you are really doing is taking away the rights of the parents. The right to raise their child the way they see fit. Parents have a right to guide their children's reading. Other parents and the community members should not be making that decision. A small group of parents should not be permitted to dictate what books other people's children should be reading. If the real concern is children being exposed to content that some would consider offensive due to language, racial content, sexual orientation, gender identity or other sensitive topics then she would argue you're looking at the wrong media. Books are tools for understanding complex issues and limiting young people's access to books does not protect them from life's complex issues. Even if you ban books, kids can still find those books and some more content on the internet. So, what are you really accomplishing by banning books? On that note, she wants to point out that many efforts to ban books involve personal opinions instead of facts. Many times, someone will want to ban a book because of a specific passage. We heard those passages tonight. Instead of getting lost in small moments of certain passages we must look at the book as a whole and what the story was about which there was just rambled on and on of different passages nowhere did it give you that content. Even controversial books can foster important learning opportunities for many of today's teens. Teens will tend to make the correct decision when you give them the chance to review all their options. Banning books stops this process. Finally, removing or banning books is a slippery slope to government censorship and the erosion of our country's commitment to freedom of expression. As an avid reader and a grandparent, she implored the Board to follow the committee's recommendation and not ban the books. In fact, the books being talked about, she read most of those books and wishes they were around when she was a student. She asked that the Board not only not ban these books but to not ban any books in the future. She stated that she feels the group will be back again if you try to do that. She thanked the Board for their time.

Jennifer Talboom thanked the Board for allowing her to speak tonight. She stated she has a master's degree in social work. She was a skills trainer for children from 3 to 18 years old working with the children at home and in the schools in St. Joe County. She has worked for DCS, has a daughter in the 7<sup>th</sup> grade at New Prairie and a 3-year-old son. She is here tonight to support the committees' decision to not ban the books in question or any future books. People who propose banning books cite various reasons for their position. This includes the argument that said books include sexual content, that they discuss racial conflicts or they discuss the LGBTQ community along with other such reasons. She would argue that many parents want their children to read classics such as "To Kill a Mockingbird" and the "Catcher in the Rye". They also want their children to read books by different authors in order to get a different view or to support different perspectives on life. What right do these people have to ban books that other parents approve their children to read? How can they justify taking away my right as a parent and to force their ideals on me and my children? Perhaps some parents want their children to read these books so they can have an open dialogue about things that kids are facing or thinking about regularly. Her second argument is more simplistic. When my parents were children their parents monitored what they were reading at least she knows her parents did for her and her grandmother did for her mom. If they didn't approve of the books their children were reading, they took them away. Why can't we allow parents to do that now? Why would we want to let a few make that decision for all? In essence, the people asking to ban books would rather ask the school libraries to become the babysitters for their children. School librarians are not trained for this role and should not have to perform that duty. Parents are better trained to care for and make these decisions for their children based on their maturity level and beliefs and this

decision should be left to them. Finally, as an avid reader and a parent she implored the Board to follow the committee's recommendation and not ban the books in question and please reject any future efforts to ban books and allow parents to make the decision about what their children can read and believe. Thank you.

Mary Johnson thanked the Board for the opportunity to speak tonight. She stated she is the mother of two children who graduated from New Prairie and a grandmother of three who will attend New Prairie. She began by stating that it is not her argument that we should give young children books that are not age appropriate. However, she is talking about books that are widely considered by experts to be appropriate for the reading level of the students to whom they are made available. Also, she is not talking about required reading in the classroom. Her argument is focused on what is available in the school libraries. Banning books is one the most common forms of censorship that exists today. She cannot stand by and allow books to be contested without speaking up and telling you some of the reasons why books should not be banned. Books are a part of freedom of speech. Prohibiting the expression of an idea because some in society find it disagreeable or offensive goes against the wishes of our founding fathers. We shouldn't stop others from having the opportunity to read books that intrigue them. Books help students think critically. Reading can be an avenue to engage new ways of thinking. However, this is usually why people want to ban books in the first place. People often fear the unknown which means reading something that feels uncomfortable can be perceived as a threat that needs to be stopped when the reality is books can be wonderful teachers and provide access to information that may foster empathy and acceptance to others as we learn about them. Books can inspire thus having the capability of changing the world as Mr. Shroyer mentioned. There are some books that had even enriched and changed people's lives. Books also gave us a chance to confront our problems or simply learn because we are curious. Books prepare students for higher education and the real world. Where there is action to ban books, it implies that only one point of view matters to society and if your point of view differs it is just too bad. The idea that one offended person can stop others from enjoying the right to intellectual freedom is appalling. The role of banning books should stay at the family level. If you as a parent of a child who uses New Prairie libraries feels like some materials are inappropriate it is up to you to discuss that within your family unit. Finally, as a grandparent and an avid reader she asked that the Board follow the committee's recommendation and not ban books in question and reject any future efforts to ban books and allow parents to make the decisions that are best in their own homes.

Kristen Sikorski-Conklin thanked Dr. White and members of the school Board for the opportunity to speak this evening. She stated that she is here tonight as a parent of a New Prairie Middle School student and member of the New Prairie Middle School PTO. As a therapist in our local community she is here to advocate that the books that have been challenged are able to continue to remain on the shelves of the New Prairie United School Corporation. She is very grateful to have the opportunity to serve on the book challenge committee and found it to be a very enlightening process. While serving on this committee she kept in mind all the children that could have access to these books and was also mindful of some legal precedence. Books may not be removed from the library based on viewpoints containing sexual or gender identity content or controversial ideology. One of the books she read was not only insightful but also a great resource. *Rethinking Normal* addresses several challenges that a transgender individual often faces during and after their transitioning process. It provides education on this topic as well as displays the values and empathy for others. She found this to be a book that

helps promote not only understanding but a way to provide a safe place for people to be their true selves. This is a lesson that she thinks many people can take away from. She hopes this book continues to be a resource available in the library. She understands that as adults and especially as parents it is our job to ensure that our children are safe and free from exposures to dangerous situations. It is important to be mindful that we as parents have a wide variety of views and beliefs. It is equally important that we understand our beliefs may be different than others. Perhaps we can shift our focus from faulting others for their viewpoints and trying to conform them to our beliefs to focus on showing empathy and compassion. It is imperative that we're talking to our children and being aware of what they are reading, who they are interacting with and what behaviors they are displaying. If we have a concern in these areas we should be addressing the situation. If we feel that our children should not be reading certain material, we can have that conversation with them and make those expectations known. We can do this without having to take away books and literature from other students. In conclusion she appreciates the time and hard work of the volunteers that were part of the book challenge committee. She felt strongly that this group of professionals were thoughtful and diligent in their tasks to determine if these books were appropriate for our youths to read. She fully supports that parents have the right to decide what material their children are exposed to. This does not mean that parents also have the ability to determine what other children are able to read. Removing these books from the library will do just that. She asked the School Board members to take all of this into consideration when making the decision on the status of these books. Thank you.

Mr. Jason DeMeyer, Board Vice-President, interrupted the meeting telling an adult who was seated in the audience next to an NPUSC student to stop the inappropriate under-breath comments or he will recommend that she leave the meeting.

Jordan Cuadrado introduced himself saying he is a former New Prairie student and a current student at Indiana University South Bend. He stated he is speaking to reaffirm the Board's decision to keep the books in question on the shelves. One of the books in question, *Rethinking Normal*, is a memoir on the author, a trans woman named Katie Hill. Katie chronicled her life growing up as a trans woman and how it consequently impacted her life and how the world viewed her. As he read the book he went in with a question, is this a book appropriate for a middle schooler? Without a doubt there are tough materials for a middle schooler to read but nothing they haven't been taught in school or would be taught in middle school. So, then naturally he began to ask why would a book about a trans woman want to be banned. From what I've been told and what I was able to find, a member of a group called "Mom's for Liberty" put forward the motion to ban these books. So, he decided to look into what "Mom's for Liberty" stood for. He found they are an advocate group that is against school curriculum that mentions LGBT rights, race, ethnicity and discrimination.

Mr. King paused and asked Mr. Cuadrado to concentrate on the books that are challenged please.

Jordan Cuadrado agreed and continued with stating that simply put this group would like to ban books that are LGBT and to wrap up he read a quote from the book that stuck out to him personally to give context Katie Hill the author, at the age of 13 confused about her gender identity was desperately trying to find an answer as to why she felt this way. She felt trapped in her body and suffered severe depression as a result of this fact and the bullying that happened at the schools. At one point she even tried to end her own life. While reading an article about Jaz Jennings, another trans

woman, she expressed how she felt to the reader, she said as she read the book that tears of joy were steaming down her face that there was someone like her. She was not alone. Suddenly keeping this book up is about giving the kids the access and the awareness who may feel the same way and be LGBTQ themselves. To let them know that they too are not alone and they don't have to hide.

Eric Beebe stated that he is the father of three children within the school system, a preschooler, kindergartener and a fifth grader. He himself is a graduate of the corporation. He attended a university for mechanical engineering and is a veteran of the US Army. He spent 18 months overseas to earn the badge on his chest fighting people that wanted to ban books. Banning books is the first step to having a system which we cannot survive. He said that he saw the most horrendous things in his life in societies of which do not have the right to read. He hopes that the six books that are on a list for numerous organizations across the country are trying to ban. If you ever see a group with the name "Liberty" in their name just know that they do not stand for your liberty. Thank you.

Katrina Kennedy said that she is a New Prairie graduate who attended Mr. Shroyer's Holocaust class and has three children in the district. She has a degree in journalism, political science, before becoming an acute care nurse practitioner and wants to say that there are so many other things she would prefer to be doing with her time and this, the more she learned about the nature of this challenge the more important it became specifically for the future of my three children to stand up against censorship and hateful rhetoric. She received much of her information regarding the challenged books via booklooks.org, a website owned by a former "Moms for Liberty" member. For each book the website helpfully compiles .pdfs of offensive passages and tally's offensive words. She read the passage of concern for each book and is not particularly bothered but personally agrees with the decision to move *The Infinite Moment of Us* to the high school level. When you compare the pages of offensive content to total pages in the book it comprises less than 1.8% of the total book for all of the books. The number of offensive words compared to the total word count of each book is 0.00120.09% of all the words for all of the books. Interestingly all of the challenge books are ranked high on a scale of obscenity which was created by the operators of booklooks.org. Based on the aforementioned percentages alone she found it hard to believe they meet Indiana Code criteria for obscenity, pornography etc. She would further argue many of the books have depictions of sexual assault, rape, incest which are vital to vulnerable youth who may not understand that they have been victims of such acts. Furthermore, the book *TILT* in particular addresses topics such as HIV prevention and contraception, namely failed methods of contraception which align with district policies regarding reproductive health and family planning. The rest is a critique of "Mom's for Liberty" which is deemed an extremist group by the Southern Poverty Law Center. Katrina Kennedy thanked the committee and the Board for their work and wished that their decision be upheld.

Sara Timm introduced herself as both an educator in the field of special education and a parent of two children in this district. She strongly opposes the idea of imposing book bans in our public schools. The richness and diversity of literature are essential for fostering well rounded education and nurturing the growth of our children. Firstly, she believes in the importance of independent thinking. Banning books submits our children's exposure to various perspectives and stifles their ability to think critically. It is crucial that our children have the freedom to explore different ideas even those that may be uncomfortable because it is in those uncomfortable moments that we grow.

Secondly, literature serves as a powerful tool instilling empathy and understanding in our children. The characters and narratives within books provide invaluable insights that our children may not otherwise have exposure to. By restricting certain books, we risk depriving them the opportunity to develop empathy necessary for navigating a diverse and interconnected world. Not all people think and value the same things. Through empathy and connection, we build bridges in order to make things better for everyone, not just the few with ideas that rise to the top in popularity. As a special educator I see this first hand everyday in the way that we make accommodations for people that enact differently in the world with different levels of abilities. Their perspectives and their insights are valuable to be learned from in a world that is not built for them. She sees it everyday because it is her job but for people who do not have this level of access to those that are different from them books and stories serve the purpose of filling a void and providing a level of understanding that is otherwise not known. That small example plays out hundreds of times over for any other underserved or underrepresented group. Books are a tool for building empathy in a world of social media that provides us tailored content, narrowed to our preferences and our world views. Banning access to books only further narrows that. Lastly, literature often tackles complex and challenging topics presenting an opportunity to guide students through thoughtful discussions instead of shielding them from uncomfortable truths. We should empower students to confront and analyze these issues. Our students are more thoughtful and more capable than we adults sometimes give them credit for. That is a lesson she gets to learn every day on her job too. Banning books undermines our children and further hinders the development of critical thinking skills that are vital for success and academics and beyond the classroom. Yes, there are books with themes and topics that are not age appropriate or developmentally appropriate for our children. These are not those books. These books have been thoughtfully reviewed by a diverse committee following Board approved policy and can be considered appropriate in this public-school setting. Please consider the opinion that this committee has made a sound recommendation and book banning is a slippery slope leading to a narrowing of intellectual freedom and diverse perspectives. Thank you.

Adrian Henrich began saying that she agrees with Heather that these books are not appropriate for middle schools as young as eleven years old. Talking animals is completely different than borderline pornography. Comic books are totally different than borderline pornography. Taking away the rights of parents, she doesn't really see it as taking a right. Adrian Henrich directed her question to Mr. King, right now, the parents don't have any knowledge unless they say that they want to be put on, is that correct? To know about these books? Mr. King responded, "he believes so, yes". Adrian Henrich went on that many parents don't even know that these books are in the library. But, if you feel so inclined to have your children read these books (paused by Mr. King to make a clarification)

Mr. King paused for a moment to add a clarification that there is access to all of our books in the libraries by going to our website. He explained that to be notified you would need to be signed up at the school.

Adrian Henrich continued that if you want your child to read these books there is Amazon and there is the public Library if you want your children to read those books; but for parents who don't know about this option which she didn't know about until today or that don't know that their children are checking out these books that don't want their children to read these materials at the very least she doesn't even think that they belong in the high school but at the very least she thinks they should be moved to the high



school. All of these books are rated young adult which she did a lot of research for that is geared for ages 14-17. Books that are supposed to be in a middle school are called middle grade books and those are appropriate for ages 11 – 13 years old. A lot of what is in these books goes against what the schools stand for. Drugs, alcohol, racism, zero tolerance on bullying, foul language. She stated she felt she needed to come speak.

Brianna Evans stated that she has never attended a School Board meeting until now. She is a high school graduate here and has been in the New Prairie School system since Kindergarten. She has a child and a soon to be second child who she had hoped would come here but hearing about some of these things that are in the school especially in the middle school, she stated that she worked in the middle school library, and didn't even know the books were there. She said it breaks her heart. She knows some parents are for it and agree with letting their children read sexual content. But, she knows that some of those words, and even just a passage can impact somebody whether its sexual abuse, whether they are in high school and things happen, and they take those passages and think its ok because they read it and the school has allowed them to read it, they have seen it. As Adrian has said, she did not know this system existed. So that is a very good thing to know that parents can see what their children are checking out but again if parents don't know about it they can't see it. She doesn't agree with banning books, and she doesn't agree with banning books forever but she does agree with making sure they are age appropriate and at such a young age there is so much sexual immorality happening in our country, in our homes, and that are just happening and if it's one thing we can do to prevent that and help prevent future sexual abuse or rape by removing some of these books until they are actually age appropriate that's what she agrees with. Thank you for your time.

Mr. King asked if the Board members had anything to say? There were no comments from the Board.

Mr. King explained that at this time the Board will vote on each title challenge separately. Mr. King stated that the voting will be as follows: he will ask those in favor of accepting the reconsideration committee's recommendation for the continued use of the library material in question and its current location and signify by raising your hand or the other question would be those in favor of further evaluating the reconsideration committee's recommendation and bring it to a vote at a future regular Board meeting signify by raising your hand. The Board will not be voting whether to remove any library materials tonight. If the Board chooses to further reevaluate a library material which may or may not lead to removal a future date will be set so the Board may read the material in full in order to make a determination.

**Action Items:**

- (A) The first book: *The Infinite Moment of Us*

Note: The reconsideration committee has recommended that this book stay at its present location by a majority vote. Dr. White is recommending that it be moved to the high school.

The Board voted 5-0 to accept the reconsideration committee's recommendation for the continued use of the material, *The Infinite Moment of Us*, with the further recommendation of Dr. White's that it be moved to New Prairie High School Library.

- (B) The second book: *TILT*

The Board voted 5-0 to accept the reconsideration committee's recommendation for the continued use of *TILT* at its current location

- (C) The third book: *Kingdom of Ash*  
The Board voted 5-0 to accept the reconsideration committee's recommendation for the continued use of *Kingdom of Ash* at its current location
- (D) The fourth book: *Perks of Being a Wallflower*  
The Board voted 5-0 to accept the reconsideration committee's recommendation for the continued use of *Perks of Being a Wallflower* at its current location
- (E) The fifth book: *Empire of Storms*  
The Board voted 5-0 to accept the reconsideration committee's recommendation for the continued use of *Empire of Storms* at its current location
- (F) The sixth book: *Rethinking Normal*  
The Board voted 5-0 to accept the reconsideration committee's recommendation for the continued use of *Rethinking Normal* at its current location

Mr. King stated the next regular Board meeting will be Monday, January 22, 2024 at Prairie View Elementary School in the Library.

Mr. King asked if the Board had any further business. There was no further business from the Board. Mr. King adjourned the meeting.