



MEMO

Nick Grove

Library Director

PO Box 940

Meridian, ID 83680

director@mld.org

(208) 888-4451 x1010

TO: Jeffrey Kohler, Board Chair
FROM: Nick Grove, Library Director
CC: Meridian Library District Board of Trustees
DATE: 1/29/24
RE: Request for Reconsideration - *Prince & Knight*

Overview

On January 8, 2025, staff at Orchard Park branch received a Request for Reconsideration form regarding *Prince & Knight* by Daniel Haack. This memo provides a synopsis of the title, its circulation history, an analysis of the title through the lens of the Meridian Library District's (MLD) Collection Development Policy, and a recommendation to the Board for consideration at the February 2025 monthly Board meeting.

Synopsis of the title

In this modern fairy tale, a noble prince and a brave knight come together to defeat a terrible monster and in the process find true love in a most unexpected place.

"Thank you," he told his parents.

"I appreciate that you tried, but I'm looking for something special in a partner by my side."

Once upon a time, in a kingdom far from here, there was a prince in line to take the throne, so his parents set out to find him a kind and worthy bride. The three of them traveled the land far and wide, but the prince didn't quite find what he was looking for in the princesses they met. While they were away, a terrible dragon threatened their land, and all the soldiers fled. The prince rushed back to save his kingdom from the perilous beast and was met by a brave knight in a suit of brightly shining armor. Together they fought the dragon and discovered that special something the prince was looking for all along. This book is published in partnership with GLAAD to accelerate LGBTQ inclusivity and acceptance.

https://bookresumes.uniteagainstbookbans.org/wp-content/uploads/Haack_Prince-and-Knight_20240104.pdf

Request for Reconsideration Report

Staff Member: TG

Date: 1/16/2025

Director: Nick Grove

Formal Review Initiated

Per our [Collection Development Policy](#), when MLD receives a Request for Reconsideration for an item in our collection and staff complete a review of the item, communicate directly with the patron, and the Director will inform the Board of Trustees. This report serves as documentation of the challenge, our process, and to communicate to the Board.

Title: Prince & Knight

Call Number: ONCE UPON HAACK

Categorized in collection(i.e. Childrens, Youth, Adult):

Youth Picture Book - Once Upon a Time

Patron confirmed they read material: Yes

Patron request for material: Remove from Children's section

Reason given by patron for removal or reassignment as it relates to Section B of Collection Development policy:

Patron did not indicate whether they had read the collection development policy and did not cite any part of the policy or the material in question when they filled out the request for reconsideration form. The patron did state: *"The material was perverted and not acceptable for children."* and *"Inappropriate "queer" in children's section not acceptable for children to be unknowingly exposed to."*

Does the reasoning take into consideration the literary work as a whole? No

Explain: Patron declined to fill out this portion of the form, though they did state they read the whole work.

Research:

MLD Circulation Statistics:

Year to Date Circulation: 1

Previous Year to Date

Circulation: 9

Lifetime Circulation: 11

[Authors Website](#)

Awards:

- [Bookstagang's](#)
- Best of 2020
- Winner

Reviews:

- [Kirkus Starred Review](#)
- [School Library Journal](#)
- [Booklist](#) (review behind paywall. Can find excerpt from review [here](#))

Does the reason given by the patron justify action requested based on Section B of Collection Development Policy? No

Explain: Based on staff review of the material and the Meridia Library Collection policy the material meets the following criteria outlined in Section B:

Literary or stylistic quality	Meets criteria
Content created by and representative of marginalized and underrepresented groups	Meets criteria
Reputations, qualifications, and significance of author, producer, or publisher	Meets criteria
Accuracy, currency, timeliness, validity	Meets criteria
Attention of critics, reviewers, awards, and public	Meets criteria
Resources from self-published, independent, small, and local producers	N/A
Physical quality and effectiveness of format and appropriateness of format to subject	Meets criteria
Cost, as measured against competing materials on the same subject	Meets criteria
Resources in formats that meet the needs of users with disabilities	N/A
Availability of discounts and efficiency in vendors used for purchasing	Meets criteria
Suitability for intended audience	Meets criteria
Availability of subscriptions and standing orders for popular materials, reference, and nonfiction items published or released annually	N/A

If the patron requests alternative placement of the material, is there an option that is suitable without making the book inaccessible to other patrons? No.

Explain: The patron requested the item be removed from the children's area, the format of the material is intended for children's collections there is not another collection it would be suitable for in the library. So removing the material would make it inaccessible to patrons.

Findings:

- The material meets a majority of the criteria outlined in section B of the collection development policy
- The material was well reviewed by industry experts
- The material received an award
- Circulation statistics for the material show that the item is being well used by the community

Conclusion:

After reviewing the material as a whole, it is recommended that the material stay in its currently assigned collection and location.

This recommendation is based on the following: it does not violate the Meridian Library Collection Development policy.

It is well reviewed and has circulation statistics to support its relevance to the community. Also, the material does not meet the legal requirements of “*materials harmful to minors*” defined in Section A. under the [Reconsideration of Materials](#) policy, which cites Idaho code 18-1514.

To remove the material based on a portion of the contents that an individual finds disagreeable would be an affront to the Library Bill of Rights and the Freedom to Read statement and a violation of the First Amendment.