

# Case 7: Did one complaint get the novel banned?

## Overview

Students read a short story in which a group chat claims that one parent’s complaint got a novel “banned” from Anika’s school library. They compare the claim with the district’s reconsideration notice, the committee input form and the ALA’s example procedure. They map where the novel is in the review. They then write input to the review committee that is tied to the selection criteria.

## Before this case

Students should already be able to:

- write a clear request to a named audience
- support a point with evidence from a whole text
- acknowledge a view they disagree with

## Objectives

Students will be able to:

- anchor written input in a published selection criterion
- use evidence from the whole work, not one passage
- acknowledge the parent’s concern with respect
- make a clear request to the committee

## Materials

- This chapter, one copy per student

## Materials, continued

- Evidence A and B
- A criteria checklist, adapted from the ALA selection criteria page
- The case rubric, printed on the Check your work page

## The task in this edition

**Task:** Write input to the review committee using the published selection criteria.

**Students make:** Written input, 150–200 words

## Pacing

**Opener (page 120):** 5 min. Short on time: 4 min. Read What happened aloud and skip the list on the board.

**Key terms (pages 121 and 122):** 6 min. Short on time: skip. Define challenge and selection criteria aloud in one minute.

**Look at the evidence (pages 126 and 127):** 10 min. Short on time: 8 min. Students fill in only the What it shows boxes.

**Key idea (pages 128 and 129):** 8 min. Short on time: skip. Assign the key idea as reading for the next class.

**Sort the evidence (page 130):** 8 min. Short on time: skip.

**Practice (page 131):** 6 min. Short on time: 5 min. Do the choice and the first fix only.

## Pacing, continued

**Your task (pages 132 and 133):** 8 min. Short on time: 6 min. Read the steps aloud. Students fill in the criterion box only.

**Your draft (page 134):** 20 min. Short on time: 18 min. Students write the first half of the input in class and finish at home.

**Check your work (pages 135 and 136):** 8 min. Short on time: 4 min. Students answer the Check your work questions. Score the rubric yourself.

**Questions to discuss (pages 137 and 138):** 12 min. Short on time: 5 min. Use question 2 as an exit ticket.

**Talk about this case at home (page 139):** at home.

**Periods:** full chapter 91 minutes; one period 50 minutes.

## Standards

**RI.9-10.1** Support an analysis with solid, complete evidence from the text, both for what it states and for what it implies.

**W.9-10.2** Write an explanatory text that presents complex ideas and information clearly and accurately.

**W.9-10.5** Strengthen writing by planning, revising, editing or rewriting, focusing on what matters most for the purpose and audience.

# Case 7 plan, continued

## Standards, continued

- SL.9-10.1.c** Move a discussion forward with questions that connect it to larger ideas, bring others in and test ideas and conclusions.
- SL.9-10.1.d** Respond to different views, sum up where people agree and disagree, and adjust your view when the evidence calls for it.
- D2.Civ.10.9-12** Analyze how personal interests and perspectives affect the use of civic virtues, democratic principles and rights. In this case: Students analyze how personal perspectives shape views on constitutional rights.
- D2.Civ.12.9-12** Analyze how people use and challenge laws at different levels to address public issues. In this case: Students analyze how people use and challenge policies about school materials.
- D4.8.9-12** Use deliberative and democratic strategies and procedures to make decisions and act at school and in the community. In this case: Students apply democratic procedures by preparing input for a review.

## Codes of ethics

- **ALA Code of Ethics:** Principle 2 (of 9)
- **Code of Ethics of the Education Profession:** Principle I: Commitment to the Student, item 2

## Codes of ethics, continued

- **Credo for Ethical Communication:** “We strive to understand and respect other communicators' intent...” (one of nine unnumbered principles)

## Heat map

- ■ □ **Opener (page 120):** Medium
- □ □ **Key terms (pages 121 and 122):** Low
- □ □ **Look at the evidence (pages 126 and 127):** Low
- ■ □ **Key idea (pages 128 and 129):** Medium
- ■ □ **Sort the evidence (page 130):** Medium
- □ □ **Practice (page 131):** Low
- ■ □ **Your draft (page 134):** Medium
- □ □ **Check your work (pages 135 and 136):** Low

## Try it at your school

### Find your library’s reconsideration policy.

- Ask your school librarian how book challenges are handled
- Find the written policy on the district website
- Learn whether students can give input during a review
- If a review is happening, read the whole book before commenting

## Try it at your school, continued

- Who to ask:** School librarian or media specialist, public library staff, school board clerk
- Safety:** Don’t post names of people who filed a challenge or who spoke at a meeting. Disagree with ideas, not individuals.

## Sources

- Penguin, “Matilda by Roald Dahl: authorized extract,” No date listed
- American Library Association, “Selection and Reconsideration Policy Toolkit: formal reconsideration,” No date listed
- American Library Association, “Selection and Reconsideration Policy Toolkit: selection criteria,” No date listed

## Case 7: Did one complaint get the novel banned?

A group chat says one parent's complaint got a novel banned, so Mari and Gia check what the school library's notice says.

**On your own** Read What happened and underline the word in the group chat that may go too far. About 5 minutes.

**Your role:** You're the one who reads the library notice before anyone replies "banned." **New skill:** Find what stage a process has reached.



Gia, Mari and Sami talk around a table on a rooftop terrace at sunset.

### What happened

On Thursday night, a message about a novel in the library at Anika's high school appears in a group chat. The message says one parent complained, so the novel is now banned and gone from the library. Gia replies that this is censorship.

On Friday, the school library posts a notice about the novel. Mari reads it and compares it with the group chat. Gia deletes her first reply, because she had not read the notice or the novel.

**Your question:** Is the novel really banned, and what can people who care about it do next?

Mari works the counter at the neighborhood bookshop. She switches between print and audio, and she is halfway through the novel on audio. Gia is planning a discussion at the bookshop. First, both of them want to know what stage the library's process has reached.

### ⌚ Pacing

Full chapter: 5 min.

✂ Short on time: 4 min. Read What happened aloud and skip the list on the board.

### 💬 Say this

"The chat says "banned." What would you need to see before you repeat that word?" — List answers on the board: stage, policy, who decides.

### 👁 Watch for

**Misconception:** Students treat a complaint as a removal.

**Listen for:** "One complaint and it's gone." **Then:** Ask which document would show the book is gone. Write "Check the stage" on the board.

### 📖 Support

- Read What happened aloud while students follow along.

### 🔥 Heat check

■ ■ □ **Medium.** Book challenges can bring up students' political or religious views.

**Cool-down:** Say: "Today we check what happened, not who is right about the book."

## Key terms

**On your own** Read each key term and its example, then write your first guess in the box. About 6 minutes.

**Challenge** A challenge is a formal request to remove or restrict a book or other library material.

En español: impugnación

**In this case:** A parent's request about a novel at Anika's school started a review. The novel stays available while the committee reads it.

**Reconsideration policy** A reconsideration policy is a library's written process for reviewing a challenge to a book.

En español: política de reconsideración

**In this case:** The library's notice follows district policy: a committee review, the selection criteria, written input by the 15th and an appeal.

**Selection criteria** Selection criteria are the written standards a library uses to decide which materials to include.

En español: criterios de selección

**In this case:** The committee judges the whole novel against the district's selection criteria. The input form asks which criteria your comment addresses.

## Who is involved



**Mari**

Works the bookshop counter

"The chat says the book is gone from the library. The notice says it stays available during the review. Those can't both be true."



**Gia**

Planning a book discussion at the bookshop

"I called it censorship before I'd read the notice. Now I'm planning a discussion at the bookshop, so I'd better get this right."

## ⌚ Pacing

Full chapter: 6 min.

✂ Short on time: skip this page. Skip this page. Define challenge and selection criteria aloud in one minute.

## 💬 Say this

"Which key term names what the parent did, and which names what the committee will use?" — Wait for "challenge" and "selection criteria."

## 👁 Watch for

**Misconception:** Students hear "challenge" as "ban." **Listen for:** "A challenge means they took it." **Then:** Reread the key idea: a challenge starts a review. On its own, it does not remove a book.

## 📖 Support

- Pair students who share a language to explain each term in their own words.
- Show the process as a flowchart: request, review, decision, appeal.
- **Cognates:** reconsideration (reconsideración), criteria (criterios), committee (comité), decision (decisión), appeal (apelación), process (proceso), novel (novela), district (distrito), censorship (censura).

## 🔥 Heat check

■□□ Low.

## 🔑 Answer key

Any first guess is fine. Students return to it on the My take page.

## Your first guess

Before you look at the evidence, what do you think happened to the novel?

My first guess is \_\_\_, because \_\_\_.

➤ My first guess is that the book was pulled, because one complaint seems to have been enough.

## Notes

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is a dark vertical border on the left side, suggesting it's part of a bound notebook or folder. The paper is otherwise blank, with no handwriting or other markings.

This page continues page 121. The notes for both pages are on the sheet for page 121.

## Reading passage

### A complaint is not a decision

**On your own** Read the passage. At each Stop and think box, pause and answer the question in your head or with a partner. About 5 minutes.

#### Words to know

- **Challenge:** A challenge is a formal request to remove or restrict a book or other library material.
- **Reconsideration policy:** A reconsideration policy is a library's written process for reviewing a challenge to a book.
- **Selection criteria:** Selection criteria are the written standards a library uses to decide which materials to include.
- **Claim:** A claim is a statement that something is true. You can check a claim with evidence.
- **Correction:** A correction is a public statement that replaces wrong information with accurate information.

#### The story: Censorship, full stop?

The message appears late on Thursday. A novel in the library at Anika's high school is gone, it says, because one parent complained. The word it uses is "banned." Gia, who has strong feelings about who gets to decide what people read, replies within minutes: "censorship, full stop." It feels like the right side to be on.

On Friday, the school library posts a notice. Mari works the counter at the neighborhood bookshop, and she has been listening to the novel on audio. She switches between print and audio, and she is about halfway through. She reads the notice twice and then compares it with the chat. The chat says the book is gone from the library. The notice says it stays available during the review. Those cannot both be true.

Gia deletes her first reply. She had not read the notice, and she had not read the book. Now she is planning a discussion at the bookshop, which means she has to get the facts right. Your role in this case is to read the library notice before anyone replies "banned."

**? Stop and think.** Why was "censorship, full stop" an easy reply to send on Thursday night?

### Pacing

Reading: about 5 min (595 words). Short on time: read it aloud together, pausing at each Stop and think.

### Stop and think

1. **After "The story: Censorship, full stop?":** Why was "censorship, full stop" an easy reply to send on Thursday night?
2. **After "Reading the notice as a process map":** The input form asks whether you read the whole book. Why might a committee care?
3. **After "Why the stage matters in real disputes":** How does calling the same action a "review," a "restriction" or a "ban" change what people think happened?

**Reading the notice as a process map**

Case 1's skill, finding the original source, leads straight to the notice. It says a request for reconsideration has been received for one title. Under district policy, the title remains available during the review. A committee will read the full work and evaluate it against the district's selection criteria. Written input may be submitted by the 15th, and the committee's decision may be appealed.

Read that way, the notice is a map with a "you are here" marker. A **challenge** is a formal request to remove or restrict a book or other library material. It starts a review, but on its own it does not remove a book. A **reconsideration policy** is a library's written process for reviewing a challenge to a book. **Selection criteria** are the written standards a library uses to decide which materials to include. The process has reached the review stage. Nothing has been removed, and nothing has been decided.

That makes the chat's **claim** wrong about the present, even if people are right to care about the future. Case 3 showed you that a **correction** replaces wrong information with accurate information, where people saw the mistake. The reply the chat needs is short: the book is under review, it is still available and input is due on the 15th.

The input form shapes what useful input looks like. It asks for your name and role, whether you read the entire work and which selection criteria your comment addresses. Comments are limited to 300 words. Mari decides to finish the book before she writes. Her own experience with books like this is why she cares, she says, but it is not the policy. She plans to include both.

**?** **Stop and think.** The input form asks whether you read the whole book. Why might a committee care?

**Why the stage matters in real disputes**

The American Library Association recommends that libraries adopt a formal reconsideration process, with a committee that reads the whole work (American Library Association, updated January 2018). ALA's guidance is a professional recommendation, not a law, and states have taken different paths. Colorado lawmakers debated a bill requiring clear reconsideration policies (Chalkbeat Colorado, February 10, 2025). In Tennessee, a stricter law changed the review steps, and some books quietly disappeared (Chalkbeat Tennessee, September 17, 2024).

The legal question is harder still. Federal courts disagree about how the First Amendment applies when a public library removes a book (Cahill Gordon and Reindel, September 22, 2025). The answer can depend on where you live. Gia puts it plainly. Right now it is a review, and she is not calling it before it is done.

**?** **Stop and think.** How does calling the same action a "review," a "restriction" or a "ban" change what people think happened?

This page continues page 123. The notes for both pages are on the sheet for page 123.

## Sources

Real source | American Library Association | January 2018

## Selection and Reconsideration Policy Toolkit: formal reconsideration

Real source | Chalkbeat Colorado | February 10, 2025

## Colorado bill to curb school library book challenges clears first legislative hurdle

Real source | Chalkbeat Tennessee | September 17, 2024

## Under stricter Tennessee law, some school library books quietly disappear

Real source | Cahill Gordon & Reindel LLP (law-firm client alert) | September 22, 2025

## Fifth Circuit Holds That Government Speech Doctrine Applies to Public Library Book Removals, Creating Circuit Split With Eighth Circuit

## Notes

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is a vertical margin line on the left side, creating a narrow left margin. The paper appears to be from a notebook or a standard sheet of stationery.

This page continues page 123. The notes for both pages are on the sheet for page 123.

## Look at the evidence

**On your own** Read the notice and the input form, and fill in both boxes for each one. About 10 minutes.

### Evidence A | Library notice

#### Reconsideration notice, posted Friday by the school library

A request for reconsideration has been received for one title in the library collection. Under district policy, the title remains available during the review. A review committee will read the full work and evaluate it against the district's selection criteria. Written input may be submitted by the 15th. The committee's decision may be appealed.

**Look closely:** Which sentence tells you where the book is right now? Underline it.

#### What it shows

➤ The title stays available during review. Input is due by the 15th.

#### What it leaves out

➤ Which novel it is, who sits on the committee and what the criteria say.

### Evidence B | Input form

#### Review committee input form, due the 15th

Name and role (student, parent, staff or community member). Have you read the entire work? Yes or No. Which selection criteria does your input address? Comments, 300 words maximum.

**Look closely:** Who can send input? What does the form ask before your comments?

#### What it shows

➤ Students and others can comment. It asks if you read it all and which criteria apply.

#### What it leaves out

➤ How the committee weighs comments, and the full list of selection criteria.

### ⌚ Pacing

Full chapter: 10 min.

✂ Short on time: 8 min. Students fill in only the What it shows boxes.

### 💬 Say this

“Find the sentence that says where the book is now. Read it aloud.” — Wait for “the title remains available during the review.”

### 👁 Watch for

**Misconception:** Students treat a review as a ban in slow motion. **Listen for:** “They’re reviewing it, so it’s basically banned.” **Then:** Ask what the notice says comes after the review: a decision, then a possible appeal.

### 📄 Support

- Give each document on its own half-page with the key sentence enlarged.
- Offer the notice as a read-aloud.
- **Cognates:** reconsideration (reconsideración), criteria (criterios), committee (comité), decision (decisión), appeal (apelación), process (proceso), novel (novela), district (distrito), censorship (censura).

### 🔗 Stretch

- Ask why the form asks whether you read the entire work, and what that suggests about the criteria.

### 🔥 Heat check

■□□ Low.

This page continues page 126. The notes for both pages are on the sheet for page 126.

## Key idea: book challenges

**On your own** Read the key idea and the code of ethics, then answer the question in the box. About 8 minutes.

A **challenge** is a formal request to remove or restrict a book or other library material. A challenge starts a review. On its own, it does not remove a book. A complaint, a temporary change and a final decision can happen at different times. Check which stage a process has reached before you repeat a claim.

A **reconsideration policy** is a library's written process for reviewing a challenge to a book. The American Library Association (ALA) recommends that libraries adopt one, and its example has a committee read the whole work. **Selection criteria** are the written standards a library uses to decide which materials to include. ALA's guidance is a professional recommendation, not a law. Each district's adopted policy and the applicable law govern its own process.

Whether removing a book breaks the law is a harder question. Federal courts disagree about how the First Amendment applies when a library removes a book. The answer can depend on where you live. Right now, the notice at Anika's school describes a review, and the novel is still available.

### Professional standards

**Real source** | American Library Association (ALA)

#### ALA Code of Ethics: Principle 2 (of 9)

"We uphold the principles of intellectual freedom and resist all efforts to censor library resources."

**In plain words:** Library workers who follow the ALA code support people's freedom to read and oppose censorship of library materials.

**Question:** The district notice says the title stays available during review. Does that match the group chat's claim that it's "gone"?

### Your answer

The notice says \_\_\_\_, which contradicts \_\_\_\_.

➞ The notice says "the title remains available during the review," which contradicts the chat's claim that it is gone.

### ⌚ Pacing

Full chapter: 8 min.

✂ Short on time: skip this page. Assign the key idea as reading for the next class.

### 💬 Say this

"ALA's code says to resist efforts to censor library resources. Does keeping the book available during review fit that?" — Wait for evidence from the notice.

### 👁 Watch for

**Misconception:** Students treat the ALA code as a law.

**Listen for:** "The school is breaking the ALA law." **Then:** Say: "ALA's code is a framework for library workers. District policy and the applicable law govern the process."

### 📖 Support

- Read the quotation aloud. Point out the label: a real source, quoted word for word.

### 🔗 Stretch

- Use the NEA row. Ask how reading the whole work tests whether a reason to remove a book is reasonable.

### 🔥 Heat check

■ ■ □ **Medium.** The word "censorship" can start a debate about real books or groups.

**Cool-down:** Keep the talk on this notice. Ask what the notice says, not which side is right.



A state debated requiring clear reconsideration policies, showing a challenge is a process, not an instant ban.



A state law changed the review steps, so you have to check which rules and stage actually applied.

## This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no handwriting or other markings on the paper.

This page continues page 128. The notes for both pages are on the sheet for page 128.

## Sort the evidence

**On your own** Fill in the diagram to show who decides at each stage, which rules apply and where input goes. About 8 minutes.

Replace “banned” with the real chain of decisions. Who decides at each stage, which rules bind them, and where can a student’s input land?

### Keep, restrict or remove the novel after review

#### Who decides

The school review committee, which reads the whole work and votes  
District-level appeal and, finally, the school board

#### Under which rule

District reconsideration policy and selection criteria  
State law and unsettled First Amendment case law (Pico had no majority opinion)

#### Who lives with it

|  |
|--|
|  |
|  |
|  |

#### Your way in

➤ Written input on the committee form by the 15th

## Whose perspective is missing?

Whose view is missing from these documents? What would you ask them?

The view that is missing is \_\_\_\_\_. I would ask \_\_\_\_\_.

➤ The parent who filed the request is missing. I would ask which part of the book concerns them and why.

### Pacing

Full chapter: 8 min.

✂ Short on time: skip this page.

### Say this

“Replace “banned” with the real chain of decisions. Who decides first?” — Model the first decider together: the review committee.

### Watch for

**Misconception:** Students name the parent as the decider.

**Listen for:** “The parent decided.” **Then:** Point to the diagram: the parent can ask, the committee decides and the board hears appeals.

### Support

- Let students write D, R or A (decider, rule, affected) before they write sentences.

### Heat check

**Medium.** The missing-perspective question can invite personal reasons a book matters.

**Cool-down:** No student has to share why a book matters to them. Answer about the characters.

## Practice: choose a response

**On your own** Choose what to check first and explain why, then fix the two marked lines. About 6 minutes.

A group chat says, “One parent complained, so that novel is banned.” What should you check first?

☒ **A** Find the library’s policy and where the review stands.

☐ **B** Ask everyone in the chat whether they like the book.

☐ **C** Read the passage people are upset about, then decide.

Why I chose it

➤ **A. A complaint, a temporary change and a final removal are different stages. B measures popularity, and C judges one passage.**

## Improve a draft

**A student’s first draft**

This is so messed up. One parent complains and **1** now the whole school can’t read the book?? That’s literally censorship and it’s illegal because of the First Amendment. **2** Whoever complained is a terrible person and should mind their own business. Everyone should go to the board meeting and yell at them until they put it back. Books like this are the only ones some of us actually finish. I read part of it last year and it was actually really good. I’m so done with this school honestly.

Rewrite each marked phrase so it says only what the evidence supports.

Rewrite phrase 1

➤ **The book stays available during the review, so everyone can still read it.**

Rewrite phrase 2

➤ **The parent used the district’s process. We can send our own input by the 15th.**

## Case 7 | Practice | Grades 9–10 educator edition

### ⌚ Pacing

Full chapter: 6 min.

✂ Short on time: 5 min. Do the choice and the first fix only.

### 💬 Say this

“The chat says one parent got the novel banned. What do you check first?” — Hold a quick vote before any discussion.

### 👁 Watch for

**Misconception:** Students choose to read the disputed passage and decide. **Listen for:** “Just read the bad part.” **Then:** Point to the notice: the committee reads the full work.

### 📖 Support

- Read the three options aloud before students choose.

### 🔥 Heat check

■□□ Low.

### ➤ Answer key

**A revised version:** Update on the novel: it isn’t banned. A parent filed a reconsideration request, which starts a review under the district’s policy. The book stays on the shelf while a committee reviews the whole work against the selection criteria, and there’s an appeal step after the decision. If you care about it, you can send written input to the committee by the 15th; the librarian has the form. Tie it to the criteria and your own reading, and please don’t go after the parent who asked. People are allowed to use the process too.

## Grades 9–10

## Your task

**On your own** Read the steps and fill in the planner boxes before you start your draft. About 8 minutes.

Write input to the review committee using the published selection criteria.

**Use:** District policy excerpt, ALA criteria page and the case conversation.

**You'll make:** Written input, 150–200 words

**Time:** 50 minutes

- 1 Reread Evidence A and B. Note what the committee will do and what the form asks.
- 2 Choose one selection criterion from the checklist to anchor your input.
- 3 Plan one piece of evidence from the whole work, not one passage.
- 4 Write one sentence that acknowledges the parent's concern with respect.
- 5 Write your input, 150 to 200 words, in the Your draft box.
- 6 Check your input with the questions on the Check your work page.



Prefer typing? Scan to open the online workspace.

The criterion I will use

➤ The committee judges each book as a whole, not by one passage.

Evidence from the whole work

➤ The novel follows a character dealing with isolation who slowly finds people she can trust.

## Case 7 | Your task | Grades 9–10 educator edition

## ⌚ Pacing

Full chapter: 8 min.

✂ Short on time: 6 min. Read the steps aloud. Students fill in the criterion box only.

## 💬 Say this

“The committee has to use the criteria. Which criterion gives your input the most weight?” — Model one criterion from the checklist before students choose.

## 👁 Watch for

**Misconception:** Input argues from one passage. **Listen for:** “One part is really good.” **Then:** Point to the notice: the committee reads the full work. Ask for evidence from the whole story.

## 📄 Support

- Criteria checklist
- Model comment
- Frame: “The criteria ask \_\_\_\_\_. Read as a whole, this book \_\_\_\_\_.”

## 🔗 Stretch

- Acknowledge the parent's concern while arguing your position.

## 📋 Standards

**Common Core:** RI.9-10.1; W.9-10.2; W.9-10.5; SL.9-10.1.c; SL.9-10.1.d.

**C3 Framework:** D2.Civ.10.9-12; D2.Civ.12.9-12; D4.8.9-12.

The Case plan sheet gives each code in plain words.

## This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no handwriting or other markings on the paper.

## Your draft

**On your own** Write your draft in the boxes, using your planner from the page before. About 20 minutes.

Your input, 150 to 200 words

To the Review Committee:

 **To the Review Committee:** I'm a student at this school, and I'm writing about the novel under review. I have read the entire work. The district's selection criteria ask the committee to judge each book as a whole, not by one passage. Read as a whole, this book follows a character dealing with isolation and slowly finding people she can trust. That is why readers my age connect with it. I understand that the parent who filed the request is worried about one scene with mature content, and that concern deserves a real answer. The criteria ask about the whole work, and that scene is part of how the story shows the character's isolation. I ask the committee to keep the novel available. If the concern is about age level, please consider an age note in the catalog rather than removal. Thank you.

## Case 7 | Your draft | Grades 9–10 educator edition

### Pacing

Full chapter: 20 min.

 Short on time: 18 min. Students write the first half of the input in class and finish at home.

### Say this

“Read your input as a committee member who agrees with the parent. Which sentence would you weigh most?” — Partners play that committee member.

### Watch for

**Misconception:** Input guesses at the parent's motive.

**Listen for:** “They just want to control what we read.” **Then:** Point to the Audience row: a guess about a person keeps the input from counting.

### Heat check

 **Medium.** Arguing for a book can turn into arguing against a group of people.

**Cool-down:** Say: “Argue about the book, not the people.” Return to the criteria checklist.

### Answer key

**What to notice in the sample:**

1. Anchors the input in the committee's own criterion.
2. Acknowledges another reader with respect.
3. Keeps the disagreement about the book, not the parent.
4. Makes a clear, specific request.

## Check your work

**On your own** Answer the Check your work questions, mark your level in each rubric row and write one change you made. About 8 minutes.

|                                             |                                                                     |
|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Does your input name a selection criterion? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Do you use evidence from the whole work?    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Do you acknowledge another perspective?     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Do you make a clear request?                | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |

### How your work is scored

Mark one box in each row.

| Skill                         | Beginning                                          | Developing                                                   | Proficient                                                         | Advanced                                                                                      |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Evidence</b>               | <input type="checkbox"/> Repeats “banned.”         | <input type="checkbox"/> Mentions a complaint without stage. | <input type="checkbox"/> States the current stage from the policy. | <input type="checkbox"/> States stage, next steps and input route.                            |
| <b>Reasoning</b>              | <input type="checkbox"/> Declares a legal verdict. | <input type="checkbox"/> Treats outrage as the argument.     | <input type="checkbox"/> Separates complaint, review and decision. | <input type="checkbox"/> Connects input to criteria and notes legal uncertainty.              |
| <b>Audience &amp; purpose</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> Attacks people.           | <input type="checkbox"/> Rallies without direction.          | <input type="checkbox"/> Gives a useful participation route.       | <input type="checkbox"/> Invites participation while respecting other readers and the parent. |
| <b>Revision</b>               | <input type="checkbox"/> No change.                | <input type="checkbox"/> Tone only.                          | <input type="checkbox"/> Corrects the stage and removes attacks.   | <input type="checkbox"/> Explains how each change helps the chat act accurately.              |

## Pacing

Full chapter: 8 min.

 Short on time: 4 min. Students answer the Check your work questions. Score the rubric yourself.

## Say this

“Mark your level honestly. Then make one change and say why.” — Ask for one corrected stage or one removed attack.

## Watch for

**Misconception:** Students keep a legal verdict in their reply.

**Listen for:** “It’s illegal, period.” **Then:** Point to the Reasoning row: the law here is unsettled and varies.

## Heat check

 Low.

## Answer key

**How to assess:** The input is scored with the case rubric, with a check that a named selection criterion anchors the argument.

**Proficient looks like:**

- **Evidence:** States the current stage from the policy.
- **Reasoning:** Separates complaint, review and decision.
- **Audience & purpose:** Gives a useful participation route.
- **Revision:** Corrects the stage and removes attacks.

## Check your work, continued

### One change I made after feedback

I changed \_\_\_ because \_\_\_.

Q. I replaced a sentence about the parent's motive with a reason tied to the criteria, because the committee cannot weigh a guess about a person.

## Notes

[illegible]

This page continues page 135. The notes for both pages are on the sheet for page 135.

## Questions to discuss

**On your own** Write a short answer to each question, then complete the sentence frames below. About 12 minutes.

- 1 Whose reading experience is missing from the crew’s discussion of the novel?

➤ The parent’s and other students’ readings are missing. Mari is only halfway through, and Gia hasn’t read it yet.

- 2 Gia says nobody should go after the parent who asked for the review. Why might that matter for her bookshop discussion?

➤ The parent used the same process the crew wants to use. Attacking them would pull people away from the form Gia wants them to fill out.

- 3 How does calling the same action a “review,” a “restriction” or a “ban” change what people think happened?

➤ Each word names a different stage. “Ban” makes people think it is over, so they may not send input.

## My take

My claim: \_\_\_\_.

➤ My claim: the novel is under review, not banned, and people can send input by the 15th.

The best evidence is \_\_\_\_, because \_\_\_\_.

➤ The best evidence is the notice, because it says the title remains available during the review.

## ⌚ Pacing

Full chapter: 12 min.

✂ Short on time: 5 min. Use question 2 as an exit ticket.

## 💬 Say this

“Answer with a detail from the notice or the form, not a feeling about the parent.” — Post the question numbers and hear one answer per question.

## ➤ Stretch

- Ask how Gia’s bookshop invitation could name the book, the stage and the deadline without naming the parent.
- Going further: Find the institution, its written policy and the decision process before you make a claim about rights. Which of the three does the district notice tell you about?
- Going further: What problem does a proposed restriction on a book claim to solve? Which readers’ experiences or other options are missing from that proposal?
- Going further: Design a library notice that explains where a book review stands, and write a short guide for interviewing a librarian. Test whether a student can name the next document to ask for.
- Going further: Ask your school librarian how book challenges are handled. Find the written policy on the district website, and learn whether students can give input during a review. If a review is happening, read the whole book before you comment.
- Find your district’s reconsideration policy and summarize its stages
- Research how your state’s laws about school library materials have changed recently

## My take, continued

Someone who disagrees might say \_\_\_\_.

Someone who disagrees might say a review is the first step toward a ban.

I would change my mind if \_\_\_\_.

Q I would change my mind if the library pulled the book before the committee decided.

## Notes

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no handwriting or other markings on the paper.

This page continues page 137.

### Heat check

**Question 1: Medium.** Students may feel pressed to share why a book matters to them personally.

**Cool-down:** Say: “Answer about the characters, not yourself.” Nobody has to share a personal reason.

**Question 2 cool-down:** Say: “We discuss the request, not the person.” Return to what the notice says.

## Talk about this case at home

### Case 7: Did one complaint get the novel banned?

In this case, a group chat claims one parent's complaint got a novel banned from a school library. Your student compared that claim with the library's notice and learned how a book review works.

#### Questions to talk about

- 1 What is the difference between a book being reviewed and a book being removed?
- 2 Where could someone find out how a library decides which books to keep?
- 3 How can people disagree about a book without attacking each other?

Nobody needs to share personal stories or private information to talk about this case.



See the case online.

## Case 7 | Talk about this case at home | Grades 9–10 educator edition

### ⌚ Pacing

At home: this page takes no class time.

### 💬 Say this

“Bring this page home, or read it with someone you trust.”  
— Nobody needs to share their views on any real book.