Codifying Censorship or Reclaiming Rights? The State-by-State 2025 Legislative Landscape for Libraries

EveryLibrary, July 15, 2025

Introduction and Overview

The library sector must realize that we are well past the time when library associations could quietly monitor legislative activity and occasionally weigh in with an endorsement or opposition statement. Legislatures across the country are driven to make laws that strip away the rights of readers, the principles of free expression and academic freedom, criminalize librarianship and educators, and override decades of precedents about how libraries, schools, and higher education are structured, governed, and managed. Without a clear-eyed and consistent approach to articulating our values and engaging in the process to see these values protected or extended in law, budgets, and public policy, we stand to lose our ability to serve every reader across the nation.

In the January to July 2025 period, 133 bills we consider harmful to public libraries, school libraries, librarianship, or the rights of readers were introduced in 33 states. This represents an increase from the whole of 2024 when 121 such bills were introduced and considered. As of this writing (July 15, 2025), 14 of these harmful bills have passed while 2024 saw 8 in total pass. 8 bills passed. 7 were enacted. 1 vetoed). With several states still in session as of this writing, 15 negative bills remain in an original committee and 4 have been passed by one chamber and crossed over.

The story in 2025 is not solely about harmful legislation. We identified and tracked 76 bills in 32 states that are intended to protect or extend public library services, protect librarianship, or affirm the right to read in public and/or school libraries between January and June 2025. Of those 76 bills, 46 were right to read bills, and 6 have passed to date. In contrast, in 2024, there were 36 proposed right to read bills, with 8 being enacted. Because this report comes calendar mid-year, as of this writing, 42 positive bills remain active with 37 in an original committee and 5 have been passed by one chamber and crossed over. We did not track annual budgets.

Download a copy of EveryLibrary's December 2024 legislative report, *Wins, Warnings, and Ongoing Legislative Fights for Libraries in 2024* and our July 2023 legislative report, *Unpacking 2023 Legislation of Concern for Libraries*, to dive deeper into the trends.

This report is structured to provide a comprehensive analysis of the legislative activity that influenced libraries in the first half of 2025. It begins with an executive summary highlighting the most damaging types of legislation affecting libraries, including bills that criminalize the actions of library and school staff, restrict funding, redefine obscenity, and impose mandates on library governance.

Following this overview, a state-by-state summary details where these bills passed and the consequences they carry. In contrast, the report also emphasizes positive legislation enacted this year that upholds the right to read, protects library workers, and strengthens institutional policies. These successes are examined in terms of their content and the coalitions that contributed to their passage.

Additional sections analyze gaps and emerging needs within our coalition infrastructure, describe the evolving role of contract lobbyists, and showcase new legislative models, such as Connecticut's e-book licensing law. The report concludes with links to companion resources and model legislation, providing tools and guidance for library leaders as they prepare for the 2026 sessions.

Executive Summary of “Bad Bills” in 2025 State Legislative Sessions

Through 2025, EveryLibrary monitored legislative proposals across the country that, if enacted, could harm libraries, library workers, and the rights of readers. While each bill is influenced by local politics and priorities, they tend to fall into several common categories, reflecting a coordinated national strategy to censor content, criminalize professional judgment, dismantle library governance, and restrict access to information.

We have categorized the bills into eleven major categories of harmful legislation which includes efforts to impose civil and criminal penalties on library workers, redefine or exploit obscenity laws, restrict or eliminate library funding, mandate punitive local policies, interfere with digital access and contracts, and erode the professional standards, autonomy, and institutional independence of libraries at all levels. Understanding these categories is crucial for anticipating how these threats may evolve, spread, or resurface in future legislative sessions.

2025 Harmful Legislation Catagories and Counts

1. **Criminal or Civil Penalties** (**54** Bills Proposed; **3** Enacted; **1** Passed, waiting on Governor Action; **1** Vetoed; **45** Died; **4** Still Open). Many of these bills would eliminate existing exemptions against civil penalties and criminal prosecution under state obscenity laws, or they would eliminate the use of status as an employee or board member of a “bona fide” institution (generally, library, museum, an institution of higher education, or school) as an “affirmative defense” against prosecution. Some bills eliminated these exemptions for schools while preserving them for other institutions, while others eliminated exemptions for schools and public libraries but preserved the exemptions for institutions of higher education. Other bills created new civil or criminal penalties or created new definitions of “sensitive materials” or obscenity that put librarians, teachers, school board members and others at risk of criminal prosecution or civil penalties for providing access to constitutionally protected, non-obscene materials.

2. **Withholding, Reducing, or Eliminating Library Funding** (**17** Bills Proposed; **1** Enacted; **1** Passed, waiting on Governor Action; **15** Died; **0** Still Open). These bills defined conditions under which library funding would be withheld. Generally, these bills threatened some measure of defunding based on a library’s refusal to censor or restrict information based on content.

3. **Redefining or Exploiting Obscenity Definitions to Restrict Access** (**61** Bills Proposed; **2** Enacted; **3** Passed, waiting on Governor Action; **1** Vetoed; **49** Died; **7** Still Open). These bills sought to create new definitions related to obscenity and/or “harmful to minors” laws in ways that fall short of established state and federal constitutional standards. These bills negatively impact access to materials and information that are

protected by the First Amendment, increase the risk of criminal or civil penalties for library staff or office, and create paths for defunding or the withholding of library funds.

4. **Library Policy Mandates** (**40** Bills Proposed; **3** Enacted; **2** Passed, waiting on Governor Action; **1** Vetoed; **24** Died; **10** Still Open). These bills would make it easier to remove books through materials challenges, make it easier to prevent books from being added to library shelves by imposing new state standards on local public or school library policies, or require policies that compel libraries to remove or restrict materials based on content or complaints.

5. **Database Contracts** (**15** Bills Proposed; **3** Enacted; **1** Vetoed; **9** Died; **2** Still Open). Bills that impact a library's ability to contract with library database vendors. A number of bills specifically target contracting, requiring library vendors to provide protections against downloading or viewing of materials deemed obscene or harmful to minors.

6. **Ratings/Labeling Requirements** (**2** Bills Proposed; **0** Enacted; **1** Died; **1** Still Open). Bills that require a rating of library books or other published materials. This also includes legislation that provides for penalties when a publisher "knowingly sells" materials somehow defined as obscene.

7. **Parental Control or Notification** (**36** Bills Proposed; **2** Enacted; **1** Passed, waiting on Governor Action; **23** Died; **10** Still Open). Bills establishing the rights of parents to challenge materials leading to removal or restriction for all; access detailed information about library materials; restrict access to materials for their children.

8. **Drag Show Prohibitions** (**14** Bills Proposed; **0** Enacted; **13** Died; **1** Still Open). Bills banning attendance at drag shows which have either a direct or indirect impact on library operations or funding.

9. **Bills related to backlash against library associations** (**6** Bills Proposed; **1** Enacted; **5** Died; **0** Still Open). Removing requirements for ALA Accredited librarians; preventing tax money from being expended, etc. Attempts to take over or abolish

10. **Attempts to abolish or politicize governance of State Libraries (3** bills Proposed; **2** Enacted; 1 Died; 0 Still Open). Bills seeking to abolish or reconstitute State Libraries or significantly change the governance of State Libraries.

11. **De-professionalization / Weakening of Library Boards** (**7** Bills Proposed; **2** Enacted; **5** Died; **0** Still Open). Bills that seek to de-professionalize librarianship through loosening or eliminating licensing/certification requirements; bills that limit funding or participation in professional associations or drop requirements for professional librarians; bills that lead to defunding or closure of libraries or politicization of library boards.

The Nature of the Negative Bills in 2025

During the 2025 legislative sessions, seventeen bills specifically targeting libraries and reading were passed in eleven states. This legislation is reshaping the professional environment, altering governance structures, and accelerating censorship in these states. These new laws continue a significant shift in how policymakers view libraries, educators, and the critical concepts of free expression and access to libraries.

While a few states introduced legislation aimed at protecting the right to read or maintaining professional standards, the prevailing trend was regressive. Legislatures in eleven states enacted seventeen laws that restrict access to books, classify certain actions by library staff and educators as criminal, dismantle professional norms, or impose punitive measures on collection policies and library governance. Although a notable bill in North Dakota was ultimately vetoed by the governor, its progress through both legislative chambers highlights the substantial political momentum behind such measures, even in the face of executive opposition.

Criminalization and Legal Liability

The most alarming trend was the success of legislation that will criminalize librarians, teachers, or school personnel for making educational and literary materials accessible to students. Texas SB412 removed key legal defenses from state obscenity laws, ensuring that only law enforcement and judges, not educators or librarians, could claim exemption under a “bona fide educational purpose.” New Hampshire’s HB324 likewise removed defense from prosecution exemptions across K-12 settings and established a process for parents or the state attorney general to bring civil actions against school employees for distributing material deemed “harmful to minors.” Although North Dakota SB2307 was vetoed, its provisions would have introduced a similar criminal framework and funding penalties for non-compliant libraries and schools. Together, these bills continue a dangerous shift from professional accountability to criminal exposure, and they are likely to have a chilling effect on public education and library services for years to come.

Professional Erosion and Governance Takeover

State legislative efforts also targeted the credentials, standards, and autonomy of library professionals. In Arkansas, SB181 diminished qualification requirements for library directors and the State Librarian, allowing work experience to substitute for an accredited graduate degree. Meanwhile, SB640 restructured the Arkansas State Library Board by terminating all existing members and granting full appointment authority to the governor, politicizing what was previously a nonpartisan governance body. Idaho H212 similarly raised procedural barriers to forming new public library districts, increasing the number of signatures needed for district creation and preserving broad veto powers for existing library boards. These laws, taken together, suggest a legislative strategy to weaken or fully restructure library governance, making it more politically compliant and less professionally independent.

Infrastructure for Censorship and Surveillance

Several new laws focus not on direct book bans, but on the infrastructure that enables censorship. Arkansas HB1646 mandates that materials with “non-age-appropriate sexual content” be locked away in school libraries, accessible only with written parental permission. Nebraska’s LE390 goes further by requiring real-time notifications to parents when a child checks out a library book, complete with author, title, and return date information effectively surveilling student reading. South Dakota HB1239 mandates filtering software or restricted internet access for all public libraries and schools. Texas SB13 installs advisory councils composed primarily of parents to review and veto school library acquisitions. These mechanisms create both physical and procedural barriers to access, empowering non-professionals to make content decisions while shifting decision-making authority away from librarians and educators.

Constitutional Redefinition and Legal Outliers

The most radical departures from legal precedent emerged in Tennessee and Texas. Tennessee HB761/SB448 deleted part of the Miller Test that protects materials with serious literary, artistic, political, or scientific value from the Harmful to Minors part of state law. This change lowers the bar for censorship dramatically, opening the door to broad legal interpretations of what is “harmful to minors.” Texas mirrored this approach through its criminal code revision in SB412 and its education code changes in HB100 and SB13, together constructing an entire framework for censoring school library content, punishing staff, and empowering parents to override professional judgment.

Digital Platform Regulation

A notable development in 2025 was the extension of these restrictions to online and digital platforms. Louisiana’s HB37 and Wyoming’s HB43 both impose age verification mandates and parental oversight tools on websites and services that interact with minors or provide access to potentially explicit content. While couched in language about online safety and anti-grooming, these laws could have serious implications for library vendors, ebook platforms, and digital education tools, many of which serve minors and rely on data privacy standards incompatible with these mandates.

Free Association and Professional Memberships

Multiple states proposed laws that explicitly prohibit libraries or educational institutions from associating with the American Library Association and similar professional groups. These bills raise fundamental First Amendment concerns, especially around the freedom of association, and appear designed to punish organizations for expressing disfavored viewpoints. While they would isolate library workers from critical sources of professional support and standards, these bills are a fundamental attack on institutional integrity and could spread to other civic and societal sectors.

State By State “Bad Bills” that Passed in 2025

These legislative changes are part of a larger movement of cultural regulation, using both civil and criminal law to isolate and marginalize minority populations and weaken civic institutions. While each bill may reflect local political and social interests, taken together, the 2025 legislative cycle reveals a consistent strategy to suppress free expression, criminalize content, de-professionalize librarianship, and subordinate public library and school services to ideologically driven oversight. Whether through enhancing liability, structural governance changes, or parental veto powers, the goal is clear: to reshape public institutions to conform to narrow cultural and political ideologies.

Arkansas SB181 (Enacted 3/4/25) This Act amends Arkansas library law by changing the qualification requirements for the State Librarian and regional library system directors, permitting work experience in libraries to be substituted for a master's degree from an accredited American Library Association program.

Key provisions include:

- Allowing work experience in library operations to be considered equivalent to a master's degree in the hiring of regional library system directors, subject to approval by the system's board of trustees.
- Requiring that candidates for the State Librarian be professionals of good standing with experience in library administration, but allowing candidates to qualify through work experience instead of requiring a formal graduate degree.
- Stipulating that organizations using these alternative qualification pathways to hire a director will not impact their eligibility for state funding.

Arkansas HB1646 (Enacted 4/21/25) This act requires library media centers in schools (kindergarten through 5th grade) to store materials with “non-age-appropriate sexual content” in locked compartments within a designated area.

Key provisions include:

- Restricting students from viewing or checking out materials with “non-age-appropriate sexual content” without written approval.
- Defining "non-age-appropriate sexual content" as materials that include explicit instruction, promotion, or advocacy of sexual ideology, behaviors, or orientations not developmentally appropriate for K-5 students.
- Establishing a progressive disciplinary system for educators who fail to comply: a first violation resulting in documentation and potential unpaid suspension, a second violation leading to a potential teaching license suspension, and a third violation leading to a complete revocation of teaching license.

Arkansas SB640 (Enacted 4/21/25) This act reconstitutes the State Library Board by ending the terms of all current board members and requiring the Governor to appoint seven new members.

Key provisions include:

- Mandating that at the first meeting, board members will draw lots to determine their term lengths with one member drawing to serve one year, two members drawing to serve three years, two members drawing to serve five years, and two members drawing to serve seven years.
- Specifying that after their initial appointment, appointed board members will serve seven-year terms. The act also notes that newly appointed members serving fewer than seven years will not count as full terms for the purpose of future appointments.

Idaho H212 (Enacted 4/3/25) This act amends Idaho law to modify the requirements for creating a public library district.

Key provisions include:

- Changing the minimum number of qualified electors required to sign a petition from fifty (50) individuals to at least twenty percent of the qualified electors residing within the proposed library district's boundaries.
- Maintaining existing procedural requirements, such as filing the petition with county commissioners, providing a detailed map of the proposed district, and conducting a public hearing. The hearing process continues to allow resident electors to challenge the petition's form, signature authenticity, legal proceedings, and other aspects of the library district's creation.
- Preserving the requirement that existing library governing bodies within the proposed district's boundaries can submit a resolution opposing the district's formation.

Idaho H275 (Enacted 3/31/25) This act amends Idaho law to strengthen internet filtering requirements for local school districts and public charter schools.

Key provisions include:

- Requiring that schools implement comprehensive internet content filters as a condition for receiving state general fund money, with filters designed to block access to materials deemed “harmful to minors”, “obscene content”, and materials depicting sexual exploitation of minors.
- Introducing detailed requirements for filtering schemes while allowing each school district to manage its own filtering policies
- Removing existing provisions related to digital and online library resources and wireless technology standards, and updating requirements for schools to establish disciplinary measures, integrate internet safety into instructional programs, and inform the public about their internet use policies.

Louisiana HB37 (passed 6/8/25) This act establishes the "Kids Online Protection and Anti-Grooming Act," which requires online platforms that interact with minors under 16 to implement specific privacy and safety measures.

Key provisions include:

- Mandating that covered platforms, including online services like social media, video games, and messaging applications, create default privacy settings that protect minors; prohibiting adults from connecting with or messaging minors without parental consent; restricting the sharing of a minor's precise location and limiting the visibility of their account.
- Offering parents and guardians tools to manage their child's account, such as blocking connections, viewing connected accounts, and controlling microtransactions.
- Instituting civil fines of up to $10,000 per violation if platforms violate these requirements.

Nebraska LE390 (Enacted 4/14/25) This act requires each public school district's school board to adopt a policy by the beginning of the 2026-27 school year that provides parents, guardians, or “educational decisionmakers” with increased access to information about school library materials.

Key provisions include:

- Requiring the policy to create a comprehensive, publicly viewable catalog of all books in the district's school libraries, organized by school building.
- Mandating that the policy must allow parents, guardians, or educational decisionmakers to receive notifications when a student checks out a library book, with these notifications to be delivered via a variety of channels (website, mobile app, or email) and requiring notifications to include details such as the book's title, author, and return date.
- Limiting the new policy requirement to school libraries located on school district property and exempting public libraries, even those that may have contracts with school districts for student use.

New Hampshire HB324 (Passed 5/15/25) This bill prohibits material that is obscene or harmful to minors in schools and creates a procedure for removal and cause of action.

Key provisions include:

- Criminalization of school librarians and other school personnel and boards under obscenity laws. The bill includes enforcement mechanisms that allow the Attorney General, Department of Education, or aggrieved parents to file civil actions against schools, with potential damages of at least $1,000 per violation, and provides for potential disciplinary actions against educators who knowingly provide harmful materials to students.

- Each local school board must develop a complaint process allowing parents or guardians to challenge potentially inappropriate content. The complaint process requires school principals to investigate written complaints within 14 calendar days, determine whether the material is harmful, and decide whether to remove or restrict access to the material. Parents can appeal a principal's decision to the local school board and then to the state board of education.

North Dakota SB2307 (Vetoed 4/25/25) This bill modified North Dakota's obscenity laws to establish more stringent regulations for public libraries, school districts, and state agencies regarding explicit sexual material accessible to minors.

Key provisions include:

- Requiring libraries and school districts to develop policies and procedures for evaluating and responding to requests to review materials considered "explicit sexual material" and relocate them to areas not easily accessible to minors.
- Mandating that digital and online library resources for students in kindergarten through 12th grade must have safety policies and technology protection measures that prevent access to obscene or sexually explicit content and allowing school districts to withhold payments to providers for non-compliance.
- Establishing a review process where individuals can request a state's attorney's opinion on potential violations, with potential penalties including fund withholding and prosecution for non-compliance.

South Dakota HB1239 (Enacted 3/31/25) This act requires both public schools and public libraries in South Dakota to take specific actions to restrict minors' access to obscene materials (as outlined in § 22-24-27) by January 1, 2025.

Key provisions include:

- Requires an institution with public access computer to either install filtering software that limits access to obscene content or purchase internet services with built-in filtering capabilities and mandates the development and implementation of a local policy that establishes measures to prevent minors from accessing obscene materials.
- Specifies that policies must include an appeals process that allows individuals to challenge the designation of specific materials as obscene, with the school board or library governing body making initial determinations subject to potential judicial review.
- Requires that policies be made publicly available, either by being published on the institution's website or annually in a designated legal newspaper. The bill references the definition of obscene materials.

Tennessee HB0761 / SB448 (Enacted 5/13/25) This act amends Tennessee Code Annotated, Title 39, Chapter 17, relative to the Protect Tennessee Minors Act.

- Removes the Miller test definition of “When taken as a whole, lacks serious literary, artistic, political, or scientific value for minors” from this provision of state law making prosecution easier.

Texas SB412 (Enacted 5/19/25) This act modifies two sections of the Texas Penal Code related to affirmative defenses for certain offenses involving obscene materials or conduct harmful to children.

Key provisions include:

- Removes previous language that permitted affirmative defense against prosecution for "bona fide educational, medical, psychological, psychiatric, judicial, law enforcement, or legislative purpose".
- Permitting affirmative defense for law enforcement and judicial officers performing official duties.
- The law applies to offenses committed on or after September 1, 2025, and will continue to treat previous offenses under the law as it existed at the time of the offense.

Texas HB100 (passed 5/30/25) This act modifies Texas Education Code provisions regarding the purchase, adoption, and use of instructional materials in public schools.

Key provisions include:

- Prohibiting school districts from using state-allocated funds to purchase instructional materials that contain obscene or harmful content, or materials that are on a list of rejected instructional materials maintained by the State Board of Education (SBOE).
- Requiring the SBOE to provide a 45-day notice before adding an instructional material to the rejected list, during which time the material's publisher can revise the content.
- Forbidding School districts and open-enrollment charter schools from adopting or using instructional materials on the SBOE's rejected list, including open education resources, and clarifying that local funds cannot be used to purchase materials on the rejected list.

Texas SB13 (passed 6/2/25) This act establishes comprehensive new regulations for school library materials in Texas, focusing on increasing parental oversight and control over library content.

Key provisions include:

- Requiring school districts to provide parents full access to their children's library records and allowing parents to create lists of library materials their children

cannot check out. Defining specific categories of prohibited library materials, including those with harmful, indecent, or profane content, and mandating that school districts develop collection development policies that prohibit such materials.
- Allowing districts to establish local school library advisory councils, composed primarily of parents, which will have significant input into library material acquisitions and challenges. Also creates a formal process for challenging library materials, requiring that challenges be reviewed by the advisory council and ultimately decided by the school board in an open meeting.
- Allowing parents, district employees, or district residents to submit written challenges to library materials, and mandating that the challenged materials will be inaccessible to students during the review process.

Wyoming HB43 (Enacted 3/13/25) This act establishes a comprehensive age verification system for websites that host material considered harmful to minors, and requires “covered platforms” to implement robust verification methods to prevent minors from accessing obscene or sexually explicit content

Key provisions include:

- Defining "covered platform" as a website that creates, hosts, or makes available content harmful to minors for profit, and requiring that these platforms use "reasonable age verification measures" such as government-issued IDs, credit/debit cards, or other reliable methods to determine ae.
- Requiring websites to verify users' ages and immediately delete any identifying information after access is granted.
- Providing a civil cause of action to parents or guardians of minors to sue platforms that fail to implement proper age verification, with damages of up to $5,000 per violation.

Editorial: The Need for Library Sector Solidarity

State library associations are organized in various ways. Some are multi-type associations, representing members from across the library ecosystem of public, academic, and school libraries, while others are mono-type associations that focus on just one sector. As a membership organization, legislative and budget priorities naturally reflect the interests of its membership. Public library associations prioritize tax authority and local governance, school library associations focus on staffing mandates and protections against censorship, and academic associations advocate for collections budgets and research infrastructure.

This mono-focus is understandable. An association should respond to its members' priorities, especially when resources are limited. However, if the legislative sessions of 2023, 2024, and 2025 have made one thing clear, it is that every state-level anti-library, anti-reader, and anti-librarian initiative, whether budget cuts, censorship bills, or attempts to criminalize librarianship, should be of concern to every state library association regardless of who its members are.

Even if a threat originates in one sector, it will eventually affect us all. Book bans in school libraries have led to censorship and restrictions in public libraries. Legislative attacks on local library boards have employed governance tactics first tested in state university systems. The erosion of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) initiatives in K-12 has paved the way for ideological screenings in higher ed. Budget cuts and tax caps come for us all.

This reality calls for a change in mindset and, in some cases, a change in organizational culture. Previously, it may have been sufficient for mono-type associations to monitor bills outside their sectors while remaining uninvolved or silent. Today, that approach is no longer acceptable. Silence may be seen by some as complicity, but simple enlightened self-interest should inform association leaders that what begins in one sector will inevitably spread to others.

Our associations must actively build coalitions across our own sectors. This means supporting one another during legislative battles over censorship, criminalization, governance, and funding. It involves coordinating positions on legislation and on budgets, even if specific proposals do not directly impact one’s own members. It requires recalibrating budget advocacy in states where the appropriations process pits public libraries against school libraries or academic libraries. Those zero-sum funding dynamics are intentional and serve those who hope to dismantle the infrastructure of public education and public institutions.

It may feel unusual or even uncomfortable for your association to advocate for another sector’s budget request, oppose bills that do not target your own members, or join coalitions you have not traditionally engaged with. However, that discomfort can no longer be an excuse for inaction. It is now a test of our professional integrity. In a political environment where our institutions and workforce are under sustained and multifaceted attack, we cannot afford to remain fragmented or isolated.

Analysis of Good Bills in 2025 State Legislative Sessions

In 2025, several states enacted important legislation to protect the right to read in schools and public libraries, enhance civil rights protections in public libraries, and ensure libraries' continued role as spaces for diverse ideas. On this positive list, seventy-four bills aimed to improve library policies, provide access to information, or otherwise strengthen or support the institution. Among these, forty-six were focused specifically on protecting the right to read. Of those, two bills were enacted, while two additional right to read bills have been passed and are waiting to be signed into law. Please note that this report does not discuss annual state budgets, appropriations, or administrative and technical corrections.

State by State: Positive Bills that Were Enacted in 2025

Colorado SB63 (Enacted 5/1/25) This act emphasizes the importance of providing diverse perspectives through library resources and recognizes the professional expertise of teacher librarians, while seeking to prevent discriminatory challenges that limit students' access to educational materials. The act establishes comprehensive standards for library resource management in Colorado public schools, requiring local education providers to create written policies that govern the acquisition, retention, display, and reconsideration of library resources. Furthermore, the law defines library resources broadly to include both print and non-print materials, and establishes principles for their selection and potential removal.

Key provisions include:

- Asserting that public school libraries must comply with First Amendment principles, protect against harassment and discrimination, and avoid obscene materials.
- Creating a process for reconsidering library resources, limiting standing to challenge materials only to parents of enrolled students to request a review, and limiting reconsideration of the same resource to once every two years.
- Protecting library staff from retaliation for making good-faith decisions about library resources and ensuring transparency by requiring public disclosure of reconsideration decisions.

Connecticut - The Freedom to Read Act **SB1271** was incorporated and enacted in the annual budget (Passed 6/4/25). SB1271 text would require public and school libraries to develop a collection development and maintenance policy, library program and display policy, and library material review and reconsideration policy.

Key provisions include:

- Requires both public and school libraries to develop and adopt a collection development and maintenance policy, a library display and program policy, and a library material review and reconsideration policy.
- Establishes detailed requirements for each policy, including provisions that library materials cannot be removed solely because someone finds them offensive, and creates a formal process for challenging library materials. For school libraries, the policy development involves consultation with school superintendents, curriculum directors, and librarians, while public libraries' policies will be developed by their board of trustees.
- Provides protections for library staff who implement these policies in good faith, immunizing them from potential liability, and requires that these policies be reviewed and updated every five years.
- Establishes a structured review process for any challenges to library materials that involves multiple stakeholders and ensures fair consideration of such challenges.

Delaware **HB119** (Passed 6/30/25) This Act establishes the principles and procedures for reviewing challenges to materials in public libraries and school libraries:.

Key provisions include:

- In regards to public library material: (1) Library material is provided for the interest, information, and enlightenment of all persons the library serves; (2) Library material should not be excluded, removed, or prohibited from a catalogue because of the origin, background, or views of a persons who created the material; (3) Material should not be excluded, removed, or prohibited from a library because of partisan, ideological, or religious disapproval.
- This Act requires that public libraries adopt a library collection development policy consistent with those principles.
- This Act also creates similar requirements for school libraries and requires that public schools create policies and procedures for reviewing objections to school library material including (1) a uniform process to submit an objection to material in a school library; (2) a requirement that material under review due to an objection remain available for use by students and school personnel until the review process is concluded; and (3) a reasonable timeline to conduct and conclude the review process.
- An appeal of a decision determining whether school library material may remain in the school library may be made to the board of the local education agency and a final appeal to a newly established School Library Review Committee.

Maine LD1404 (Passed 5/27/25) This bill creates a comprehensive working group on the status of school and public libraries in Maine, consisting of 15 members, including representatives from library associations, school administrators, nonprofit and municipal libraries, and state agencies, and Chaired by the State Librarian.

Key provisions include:

- Requiring the working group to conduct an in-depth study of library services, focusing on specific population segments including seniors, people with disabilities, youth, immigrant communities, and remote area residents, and to examine the critical roles libraries play in emergency preparedness, cultural diversity, public health, community resilience, and economic development.
- Requiring the working group to assess library partnerships, resources, facilities, technology, and staffing, and is authorized to study regional library networks, technological resources, cybersecurity, interlibrary loan services, and staffing levels.
- Specifying that the State Librarian must submit a detailed report to the Legislature's education committee, including specific findings, recommendations for updating statutes and library governance, funding needs, and potential legislative proposals.

New Jersey A3446 (Enacted 12/9/24) This act aims to protect intellectual freedom and access to library materials in New Jersey's public school and public libraries and recognizes reading as a constitutionally protected right. The law affirms that students do not lose their freedom of expression at school and requires school boards and public library governing bodies to develop policies that prevent censorship and protect library staff from harassment.

Key provisions include:

- Establishing a formal review process for challenging library materials, requiring that challenged materials remain available during review, and mandating that materials cannot be removed solely because of their viewpoint or because someone finds the content offensive. Requires a materials review process that involves a committee with diverse representation, including educators, administrators, parents, and potentially students, who will evaluate challenged materials and make recommendations to the governing body.
- Defining "diverse and inclusive material" as content that reflects protected classes, is created by authors from those classes, or addresses contemporary issues.
- Providing immunity for library staff members who are acting in good faith when curating and maintaining library collections.

Rhode Island S0238 (Passed 6/20/25) This act would promote the free expression and free access of information by prohibiting the censorship of library materials. This act would require the creation of a model policy relative to library material within a public library and school library.

Key Provisions Include:

- Requires both public and school libraries to develop model policies that recognize libraries as centers for voluntary inquiry and information dissemination, and explicitly prohibit censorship of library materials.
- Establishes detailed procedures for how library materials can be challenged, including creating a formal reconsideration process that involves a review committee, requires written justification for any potential removal, and ensures that challenged materials remain available during review.
- Protects librarians from civil and criminal liability for good faith actions and prevents government bodies from reducing library funding due to compliance with these policies.
- Provides legal protections for librarians who refuse to censor materials and allows individuals with a vested interest in a library (such as residents, parents, or students) to seek legal relief if censorship occurs.
- Adds an affirmative defense from prosecution under state obscenity law for bona fide schools or public libraries.

Virginia SJR251 (Passed 2/20/25) Directs the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC) to study the removal of books from public school libraries in the Commonwealth between July 1, 2020, and December 31, 2024.

Key Provisions Include:

- Requiring the Commission to study book removals on the basis of such books containing sexually explicit content or other content deemed objectionable for the purpose of identifying each book removed and, for each book removed.
- Directing the Commission to study the purported reason for any book removals, and the processes and procedures by which each book was identified as containing content necessitating its removal and for removing each book.
- Requiring the Commission to determine whether applicable state law directing the Department of Education to adopt model policies and each school board to adopt policies consistent with such model policies was used by any school division to justify the identification, removal, or process and procedures by which each book was identified or removed.

Bill Language About the Right to Read

In response to increasing censorship attempts, politicized book challenges, and attacks on library workers, 2025 saw a surge of new legislation across various states aimed at safeguarding readers' rights, reinforcing the role of libraries in a democratic society, and formalizing library policies in both school and public institutions. This legislative toolkit focuses on transparency, procedural fairness, the civil rights of readers, and First Amendment protections.

Connecticut, Colorado, and Delaware established comprehensive policy frameworks requiring both school and public libraries to adopt written policies governing collection development, programming, and material review. These policies must be developed in consultation with education leaders and library professionals and must undergo regular reviews for consistency and equity. New Jersey and Rhode Island went further by explicitly affirming the constitutional right to access information, mandating that challenged materials remain available during review and protecting library staff from civil and criminal liability for good-faith decisions.

Virginia and Maine adopted structural approaches. Virginia authorized a statewide study of book removals in schools between 2020 and 2024 to assess how state policies were used to justify censorship. Maine formed a statewide working group, chaired by the State Librarian, to evaluate public and school library services across demographics and to recommend legal and governance updates.

All these bills share common features: requirements for transparency, clarity on who can initiate challenges, due process for material reconsideration, and legal protections for staff. Collectively, they show that the library sector is pushing back against censorship with procedural rigor and broad coalitions.

These innovations are significant, but they also raise the question: How effective can the First Amendment lens be if it is not accompanied by an equity and civil rights framework? While the 2025 bills have strong First Amendment protections and administrative processes, they do not comprehensively address access to libraries and minority representation in the collection as a component of civil rights and public accommodation law. In contrast, the Libraries for All Act, adopted in several states in 2024, promotes a complementary framework grounded in anti-discrimination law, equity audits, and affirmative access. The Libraries for All Act affirms that public libraries may not deny access to materials or programs based on race, gender identity, disability, religion, or other protected statuses. (Connecticut’s Freedom to Read Act did not bring forward existing state-level civil rights protections, which predate the Libraries for All Act.)

The Evolution of E-Book Legislation Continues with Connecticut SB1234

In May 2025, the Connecticut General Assembly passed Senate Bill 1234, a first-in-the-nation law aimed at reshaping how public and school libraries license e-books and digital audiobooks. Based on the Library Futures Model E-book Legislation, first introduced in 2020, Connecticut's law represents the most advanced state-level regulatory response to the challenges libraries face in acquiring and managing digital content under restrictive and costly licensing terms.

SB 1234 passed with strong bipartisan support (35–1 in the Senate and 106–38 in the House). The statute, however, will not take effect immediately. A “trigger clause” delays implementation until one or more other states with a combined population of at least 7 million residents enacts similar laws. Unlike previous legislative efforts in Maryland and New York that focused on regulating publishers, Connecticut's law places restrictions on the terms libraries themselves can accept in contracts. The bill prohibits libraries from entering into agreements that impose simultaneous limits on duration and number of checkouts without offering commercially reasonable alternatives, restrict interlibrary loans or prohibit the making of preservation copies, and delays or constrain a library’s ability to purchase licenses for e-books or audiobooks. The bill prevents so-called gag clauses in contracts that prevent libraries from discussing contract terms with one another and requires that libraries maintain patron confidentiality.

The bill does not directly compel publisher behavior. Instead, it uses state-level authority to define the boundaries of permissible public contracts, placing the responsibility on libraries to avoid entering into agreements that do not meet these criteria. This is not uncommon in education settings, where the terms of sale for textbooks and other curricular materials are highly proscribed. Schools are regulated by the state in what and how they can buy. Publishers maintain their rights as copyright holders but regularly adapt their terms to the needs of the K-12 marketplace.

The bill was championed by the Connecticut Library Consortium (CLC), the Connecticut Library Association (CLA), and the Connecticut Association for School Librarians (CASL). While stakeholders see the bill as a much-needed step toward digital lending reform, critics, including some publisher-aligned voices and members of the Connecticut legislature, have expressed concerns that the law imposes new state mandates on local governments and interferes with market dynamics. Opponents warn that it could result in fewer titles being available to libraries if publishers choose not to adapt their business models.

While SB 1234 remains dormant until more states pass substantially similar legislation, it sets a policy and political precedent for other states. States like New York, Vermont, Maine, Washington, and Hawaii are considering similar bills. Massachusetts is considering legislation this session that establishes a legislative commission to bring publishers, vendors, and libraries to the same table to discuss these issues in public.

Coalitions Win: The Central Role of Cross-Sector Partnerships in 2025

A significant lesson from the 2025 legislative cycle is that pro-library coalitions are not only necessary but must also be intentionally built, strategically aligned, and flexible across ideological lines to succeed. In nearly every state where library advocates successfully resisted harmful legislation or passed protective laws this year, coalitions served as the essential infrastructure for action. Even the most active coalitions faced both breakthroughs and limitations in their ability to fend off detrimental legislation and advance positive proposals for libraries.

In Texas, the Texas Freedom to Read Project and Texas Freadom Fighters, in collaboration with the Texas Library Association, ACLU Texas, PEN America, ABA / ABFEE, EveryLibrary, and youth-led groups like Students Engaged in Advancing Texas (SEAT), devised a coordinated response strategy. This strategy included in-person testimony, grassroots organizing, committee engagement, and targeted social media efforts. Organizers mobilized more than 1,000 constituents to take action and ensured that real Texas parents, students, and librarians testified at each committee hearing, utilizing coordinated messaging and rebuttal strategies. They also partnered with organizations like the Children's Defense Fund and IDRA to create a human-centered narrative highlighting the harm caused by censorship bills.

The 89th Texas Legislative Session proved to be particularly challenging. Texans faced bills that proposed vouchers for private schools, made it easier to ban books in schools, and sought to erode the freedom to read in public libraries. Despite strong public opposition, the Texas Senate and House passed some harmful legislation that will affect school libraries statewide. The coalition coordinated a response strategy that combined in-person testimony, grassroots organizing, committee engagement, earned media, and targeted social media. They mobilized more than 1,000 constituents through the Texas Freedom to Read Project website, gathering real Texas parents, students, and librarians to testify during committee hearings with coordinated messaging and rebuttal strategies. They partnered with organizations like the Children's Defense Fund and IDRA to articulate a human-centered narrative focusing on the damage caused by censorship bills.

In North Dakota, a robust coalition successfully secured a gubernatorial veto of a sweeping censorship bill. Here, Right to Read North Dakota worked with EveryLibrary, Prairie Action Network, the state library association, the Human Rights Coalition of North Dakota, and the State's Attorneys Association to challenge the bill's constitutionality and administrative burden. Their strategy included statewide "read-outs" in 12 cities, constituent mobilization, and targeted appeals to fiscal and procedural concerns, which proved particularly effective in the conservative Senate Finance Committee.

In Alabama, librarians asserted themselves more forcefully than in previous sessions. The coalition formed around the Read Freely Alabama initiative, supported by the Southern Poverty

Law Center (SPLC), ACLU of Alabama, and EveryLibrary, successfully halted HB4, the so-called “Jail the Librarians” bill, in the Judiciary Committee. Advocates noted that quiet one-on-one conversations, coordinated testimony, and public pressure campaigns—including a billboard targeting the Alabama Public Library Service Chair—were key tactics. Their campaign provided conservative legislators with "room to blink," allowing them to avoid publicly breaking from their base.

In Arkansas, Senate Bill 536, which proposed to abolish the Arkansas State Library and eliminate the State Library Board, was narrowly defeated in a House committee just before adjournment. This bill would have undermined statewide support for public and school libraries but failed by a single vote, 8–7, due to an intense and coordinated campaign by the Arkansas Right to Read Project and the Arkansas Library Association (ArLA). They provided crucial committee testimony and mobilized hundreds of constituents to contact their legislators. EveryLibrary played a supportive role in shaping the campaign, enhancing digital outreach, and providing rapid-response infrastructure. In the final days before the vote, the EveryLibrary Institute conducted a voter-facing poll to gather fresh, targeted data about public attitudes on the proposed legislation. The polling results directly influenced the final messages to legislators and shaped media coverage that amplified library voices throughout the state.

In New Hampshire, a coalition of civil liberties, education, and civic organizations mobilized to oppose HB 324, a bill that would criminalize educators and librarians for the content of books and teaching materials. The coalition included key partners such as MomsRising, the ACLU of New Hampshire, NEA-NH, Reaching Higher NH, EveryLibrary, the American Booksellers Association, Granite State Progress, Authors Against Book Bans NH, PEN America, and others. As of this writing, the coalition's effort combined strategic advocacy, public polling, and direct outreach to constituents to urge Governor Kelly Ayotte to veto the bill. High-profile actions included a silent read-in at the capitol, a powerful op-ed written by the ACLU-NH defending the right to read and warning against constitutional overreach, an ABA bookseller op-ed advocating for maintaining local control over library decisions, and a press conference hosted by Authors Against Book Bans featuring New Hampshire authors, including Jodi Picoult, which highlighted the bill’s chilling impact on free expression.

The coalition’s polling conducted by EveryLibrary and MomsRising NH showed bipartisan voter opposition to criminalizing school staff, along with strong support for keeping library decisions local. This campaign serves as a functional example of cross-sector coordination, grassroots engagement, and principled messaging, demonstrating how unified coalitions can defend constitutional values even in politically challenging environments.

Limits and Gaps in the 2025 Coalition Landscape

Despite these successes, stakeholders identified critical limitations in their current coalition capacity, particularly in terms of conservative alignment and demographic reach. Recognizing a "Conservative Partner Gap" is crucial because, even with a strong civil rights or civil liberties coalition, it is important to engage legitimate conservative or libertarian organizations that can provide principled, values-based support rooted in civil society issues like local control and opposition to government overreach. This also includes faith-based coalition partners. This gap can render coalition efforts politically lopsided, which could undermine credibility with lawmakers who might otherwise be persuaded by arguments related to freedom of speech, small government, or parental autonomy.

The experiences from 2025 across these various states underscore a new rule for library legislative strategy. Coalition work is not optional; it is foundational. However, it must also evolve. Coalitions in many states tend to skew older, lacking significant youth engagement. Addressing this issue is not straightforward. There is a noticeable absence of coordinated outreach to young voters and Gen Z activists, despite these demographics being increasingly vocal and politically active on issues related to libraries. Future coalition efforts should prioritize organizing strategies and outreach that resonate with and are led by younger stakeholders.

Building Coalition Infrastructure through the National Library Alliance

We are starting to see the positive impact of shared organizational coordination between states, including the creation of model legislation, production of research briefs, establishment of rapid response networks, fielding voter-facing polling about key issues, and development of legal defense strategies. This infrastructure is being built by EveryLibrary through the National Library Alliance, which has supported the launch of nine statewide “Right to Read” organizations since 2023. These include the Florida Freedom to Read Project, Texas Freedom to Read Project, Read Freely Alabama, Alliance for Georgia Libraries, Delaware Library Champions, Let Utah Read, Parents Defending Schools and Libraries Oregon, Right to Read Arkansas, and Right to Read North Dakota. Several other statewide groups are forming during the 2025 intersession to address core legislative concerns.

These volunteer-led groups receive comprehensive support from EveryLibrary and the EveryLibrary Institute, including fiscal sponsorship, compliance assistance, strategic advising, digital campaign platforms, and convenings for peer learning and coordination. This support allows them to focus on effective organizing rather than administrative barriers. The National Library Alliance model illustrates how scaled support and shared infrastructure can empower local advocates and create a coordinated national defense of libraries.

Understanding the Role of Contract Lobbyists: Cautions and Considerations for 2026

In this challenging environment, many state library associations have turned to contract lobbyists to help them navigate the increasingly hostile legislative landscape. While this can be a valuable strategy, it is not without risks. Drawing from the challenges and lessons learned during the 2023, 2024, and 2025 legislative sessions, this report offers guidance and caution to library leaders as they prepare for 2026.

First, it is important to understand that contract lobbyists work for clients, not causes. They may not inherently share a passion for libraries, the right to read, or the constitutional and civic values we uphold. Without a clear library-specific strategy and regular oversight, even a well-intentioned lobbyist may fall into transactional politics at the state capitol. In addition, contract lobbyists often have multiple clients across many sectors. The pressure to balance your library issues and principles with the needs and goals of other clients may create situations where a short-term strategic choice may come at the expense of your long-term success.

Library values like free expression, equity of access, local control, academic freedom, student agency, and civil rights do not always align neatly with the political calculations of a legislative session. Lobbyists who are unfamiliar with library ethics may suggest compromise positions on issues such as content neutrality, opt-in censorship, parents' rights, governance changes, or school funding that could jeopardize your credibility and mission. Because contract lobbyists represent multiple clients, conflicts of interest are possible, especially in states where education policy is dominated by partisan or ideological actors.

While contract lobbyists provide support by tracking bills, facilitating meetings, and drafting policy memos, they cannot replace effective state association leadership. Library associations must retain control over strategy, messaging, and coalition engagement. A lobbyist should be considered a tactical partner, while the board or legislative committee should drive the overarching strategy. A skilled lobbyist can help facilitate activity, but only if they are equipped with a robust, library-specific advocacy strategy.

This strategy should define the missions and policy goals of public, school, and academic libraries, including a commitment to the First Amendment, academic freedom, civil rights laws, and public accommodation protections. A defense of local governance and opposition to overreach or preemption, along with an expectation for funding equity, tax policy, and budget strategy, should be core deliverables.

In 2026 and beyond, working with a contract lobbyist can be a wise decision, but it must be approached with intention, clarity, and integrity, aligning with the mission that libraries serve and the rights we are committed to protecting. Without a clear and consistent approach to articulating our values and actively engaging in the legislative process to protect or expand these values in laws and budgets, we risk losing our ability to serve every reader.

EveryLibrary's Resources for State Legislative Advocacy

- EveryLibrary's December 2024 legislative report, "**Wins, Warnings, and Ongoing Legislative Fights for Libraries in 2024"** at https://www.everylibrary.org/wins_warnings_ongoing_legislative_fights_2024 and the July 2023 report, "**Unpacking 2023 Legislation of Concern for Libraries**" at https://www.everylibrary.org/unpacking_2023_legislation_concern_report dive deeper into the trends.

- EveryLibrary Institute's 2023 "**Opposing Attempts to Criminalize Librarianship**" Policy Brief continues to be a helpful resource to state library associations and right-to-read groups opposing politicized changes to state obscenity laws. Download a copy at https://www.everylibraryinstitute.org/opposing_attempts_policy_brief_2023

- The model "**Libraries for All Act**" was introduced, advanced, and passed in Delaware (HB299) and Vermont (in S220). The bill language is designed to improve civil rights protections for readers by incorporating state public accommodations laws alongside the First Amendment's limited public forum protections into public library policies. https://www.everylibraryinstitute.org/model_libraries_for_all_act_released

- The EveryLibrary Institute offers insights on "**Weathering the Attacks on State Library Database Contracts**" model legislation developed with George Washington University's IP Clinic at https://www.everylibraryinstitute.org/state_lib_db_contracts_report_2022

- The recent "**Rethinking Legislative Advocacy**" paper from EveryLibrary provides practical insights into pre- and post-legislative session actions by state organizations. Available at https://www.everylibrary.org/rethink_legislative_advocacy.

- State school library stakeholders will gain valuable insights into developing a proactive legislative agenda on "**Seven Bills to Safeguard the Future of School Libraries,**" co-published by EveryLibrary and School Library Journal on Politics in Practice at https://politicsinpractice.slj.com/2024/10/13/the-seven-bill-that-will-safeguard-the-future-of-school-librarianship/

- The recent article in Katina magazine, "**Public Libraries at the Intersection of the First, Tenth, and Fourteenth Amendments**" discusses the importance of a state legislative focus broader that First Amendment concerns when crafting legislation. https://katinamagazine.org/content/article/future-of-work/2024/public-libraries-intersection-first-tenth-fourteenth

APPENDIX A TABLE - Legislation Negatively Affecting Libraries https://www.everylibrary.org/billtracking

State	Bill	Status	Crim or Civil Penalties	Database Contracts	Reduce Funding	Redefine Obscenity	Ratings / Labeling	Parental Control	Policy Mandates	Prohibit Drag	Prof Assoc.	Deprofes sionalize	Politicize Boards	Weaken/Abolish State Library
AR	SB181	Enacted									X	X		
AR	HB1646	Enacted	X			X		X	X					
AR	SB640	Enacted												X
ID	H275	Enacted		X					X					
ID	H212	Enacted												
LA	HB37	Enacted	X	X		X								
NE	LB390	Enacted						X	X					
SD	HB1239	Enacted	X											
SD	HB1041	Enacted			X							X		X
TN	HB761	Enacted				X								
TX	SB412	Enacted	X											
WY	HB43	Enacted		X										
TX	HB100	Passed			X	X			X					
TX	SB13	Passed				X		X	X					
ND	SB2307	Vetoed	X	X		X			X					
CT	HB5898	Open				X			X					
CT	HB5858	Open				X			X					
IL	HB2817	Open		X										
IL	SB1783	Open								X				
NC	H595	Open	X					X	X					
NC	H636	Open	X			X		X	X					
NH	HB273	Open						X						
NH	SB33	Open				X		X	X					
NH	HB324	Open	X			X		X	X					

State	Bill	Status	Crim or Civil Penalties	Database Contracts	Reduce Funding	Redefine Obscenity	Ratings / Labeling	Parental Control	Policy Mandates	Prohibit Drag	Prof Assoc.	Deprofes sionalize	Politicize Boards	Weaken/Abolish State Library
NJ	S4086	Open												
NJ	A708	Open						X						
NJ	A1059	Open						X	X					
NJ	A4609	Open				X								
NJ	S3547	Open												
NJ	S508	Open						X	X					
NY	S4680	Open						X	X					
OR	SB212	Open					X							
PA	HB236	Open	X											
PA	SB230	Open		X		X		X	X					
AL	HB4	Dead	X			X				X				
AL	SB6	Dead											X	
AL	HB67	Dead						X		X				
AL	HB560	Dead				X		X	X					
AR	SB536	Dead												X
AR	HB1977	Dead	X			X		X	X					
AR	SB184	Dead												
AZ	SB1090	Dead	X			X								
AZ	SB1099	Dead	X			X								
CO	HB1231	Dead	X			X				X				
CO	HB1158	Dead		X										
FL	H1011	Dead			X	X					X			
FL	S1524	Dead			X	X					X			
FL	H1539	Dead			X	X		X						
FL	S1692	Dead			X	X		X						
GA	SB74	Dead	X											

State	Bill	Status	Crim or Civil Penalties	Database Contracts	Reduce Funding	Redefine Obscenity	Ratings / Labeling	Parental Control	Policy Mandates	Prohibit Drag	Prof Assoc.	Deprofes sionalize	Politicize Boards	Weaken/Abolish State Library
GA	SB248	Dead				X		X	X					
GA	HB483	Dead	X											
IA	SBF238	Dead									X			
IA	HF274	Dead	X											
IA	SF347	Dead	X			X								
IA	HF521	Dead	X											
IA	HF558	Dead	X			X		X						
IA	HF284	Dead			X									
IA	HB880	Dead			X									
IA	SF181	Dead		X										
IA	HF666	Dead	X											
IA	HF51	Dead	X							X				
IA	SF116	Dead	X							X				
IN	HB1195	Dead				X			X					
IN	SB283	Dead			X									
KY	HB653	Dead	X			X								
KY	HB207	Dead				X		X	X					
MD	HB5	Dead				X			X					
MD	HB282	Dead				X			X					
MN	HF235	Dead				X			X					
MN	SF716	Dead								X				
MN	SF797	Dead				X								
MN	HF564	Dead				X								
MO	SB765	Dead			X	X								
MO	SB159	Dead		X					X					
MO	HB462	Dead	X			X		X	X					

State	Bill	Status	Crim or Civil Penalties	Database Contracts	Reduce Funding	Redefine Obscenity	Ratings / Labeling	Parental Control	Policy Mandates	Prohibit Drag	Prof Assoc.	Deprofes sionalize	Politicize Boards	Weaken/Abolish State Library
MO	HB483	Dead	X		X									
MO	HB1146	Dead							X					
MO	SB486	Dead											X	
MO	HB557	Dead											X	
MO	SB276	Dead	X	X				X						
MT	SB396	Dead		X		X		X	X					
MT	HB675	Dead								X				
NM	HB558	Dead				X								
OK	SB19	Dead			X			X	X					
OK	SB348	Dead				X			X					
OK	SB550	Dead	X							X				
OK	SB593	Dead	X			X								
SC	S484	Dead									X			
SC	S104	Dead			X	X		X						
SC	H4045	Dead										X		
SC	H4123	Dead	X			X								
SC	H3185	Dead		X				X	X					
SC	H3381	Dead	X							X				
SC	H3850	Dead			X	X		X						
TX	HB2572	Dead									X			
TX	HB2030	Dead	X											
TX	HB2710	Dead	X											
TX	HB3225	Dead	X			X								
TX	HB3160	Dead		X		X								
TX	SB18	Dead			X					X				
TX	HB4198	Dead	X			X		X	X					

State	Bill	Status	Crim or Civil Penalties	Database Contracts	Reduce Funding	Redefine Obscenity	Ratings / Labeling	Parental Control	Policy Mandates	Prohibit Drag	Prof Assoc.	Deprofes sionalize	Politicize Boards	Weaken/Abolish State Library
TX	HB5021	Dead				x		x	x					
TX	HB5460	Dead	x			X								
TX	HB5485	Dead	x			x								
TX	SB2101	Dead	x		X	X			X					
TX	HB177	Dead		x										
TX	HB183	Dead					x	x	x					
TX	HB267	Dead	x											
TX	SB242	Dead	x											
TX	HB947	Dead	x											
TX	HB995	Dead	x											
TX	SB89	Dead	x											
TX	HB1012	Dead				x								
TX	SB88	Dead				x								
TX	HB1025	Dead	x					x						
TX	HB1358	Dead				x			x					
TX	SB451	Dead				x			x					
TX	HB1434	Dead	x											
TX	HB4056	Dead				x		x	x					
TX	HB4579	Dead	x											
UT	HB473	Dead	x	x		x								
VA	SB931	Dead	x			x								
VA	HB2400	Dead				x		x	x					
WV	SB202	Dead	x			x								
WV	SB276	Dead								x				
WV	SB278	Dead	x		x			x		x				
WV	HB2272	Dead	x			x		x						

State	Bill	Status	Crim or Civil Penalties	Database Contracts	Reduce Funding	Redefine Obscenity	Ratings / Labeling	Parental Control	Policy Mandates	Prohibit Drag	Prof Assoc.	Deprofes sionalize	Politicize Boards	Weaken/Abolish State Library
WV	HB2396	Dead	x											
WV	SB452	Dead										x		
WV	SB539	Dead	x											
WV	SB507	Dead								x				
WY	HB194	Dead	x			x			x					
TOTALS			54	15	17	61	2	36	40	14	6	4	3	3
State	Bill	Status	Crim or Civil Penalties	Database Contracts	Reduce Funding	Redefine Obscenity	Ratings / Labeling	Parental Control	Policy Mandates	Prohibit Drag	Prof Assoc.	Deprofes sionalize	Politicize Boards	Weaken/Abolish State Library

APPENDIX B: TABLE: Legislation Positively Affecting Libraries - https://www.everylibrary.org/positivebills

Status	Legislature	Bill	Relevance to Libraries
Enacted	CO	SB63	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Enacted	ME	LD1404	Establish Working Group for Assessment and Planning of Statewide Services
Enacted	NJ	A3446	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Enacted	OR	S1098	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Enacted	VA	HJ 440 / SJR251	Requires study to the removal of books in libraries
Passed	CT	HB7287	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Vetoed	NV	AB445	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Vetoed	NV	AB416	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Open	CA	SB478	Support Literacy and support the employment of fully credentialed teacher librarians
Open	CA	AB1185	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Open	CT	SB1271	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Open	CT	HB7014	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Open	CT	SB523	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Open	CT	HB5508	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Open	CT	HB5867	Mandates collection development and reconsideration policies
Open	CT	HB5865	Mandates collection development and reconsideration policies
Open	CT	HB5862	Mandates collection development and reconsideration policies
Open	CT	HB6958	Makes certain ebook licensing terms unenforceable
Passed	DE	HB119	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Open	IL	HB2685	Creates task force to study library funding and employing licensed school librarians
Open	IL	SB2124	Mandates collection development and reconsideration policies
Open	IL	SB1741	Creates task force to study library funding and employing licensed school librarians
Open	MA	H3591	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Open	MA	H3598	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Open	MA	H3594	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship

Status	Legislature	Bill	Relevance to Libraries
Open	**MA**	S2328	Primary Relevance to Libraries
Open	**MA**	H3595	Establishes special commission to investigate ebook and digital resource licensing
Open	**MA**	S2330	Establish a study of the employment of school librarians and best practices
Open	**MI**	HB4250	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Open	**MI**	HB4521	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Open	**MN**	HF2484	Provides funding for capital investment in library construction
Open	**NC**	H902	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Open	**NH**	SB208	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Open	**NY**	S2423	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Open	**NY**	A3368	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Open	**NY**	S8116	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Open	**NY**	A4859	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Open	**NY**	A5464	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Open	**NY**	A5995	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Open	**NY**	A7568	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Open	**NY**	S1099	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Open	**NY**	A5416	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Open	**NY**	A7353	Establishes civil and criminal protections for librarians
Open	**NY**	A7777	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Open	**NY**	A1030	Eliminates sales tax on materials sold at school book fairs
Open	**PA**	HB860	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Open	**RI**	H5488	Ensure that every public school has a school library in a permanent and dedicated space
Open	**RI**	S639	Ensure that every public school has a school library in a permanent and dedicated space
Open	**RI**	S238	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Open	**RI**	H5726	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Dead	**AR**	HB1028	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Dead	**FL**	H6037	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship

Status	Legislature	Bill	Relevance to Libraries
Dead	FL	S930	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Dead	HI	SB799	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Dead	HI	SB757	Establish fair and reasonable licensing terms for digital materials
Dead	IA	HF196	Allowing cities to certify taxes for a general fund levy for libraries
Dead	MD	SB378	Establishes a family literacy pilot program for incarcerated parents administered by the State Library
Dead	MO	HB95	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Dead	MT	SB507	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Dead	MT	LC1403	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Dead	ND	HB1013	Provides funding for state library and other educational services
Dead	ND	HB1254	Allow all North Dakotans to apply for a State Library card
Dead	NM	HB27	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Dead	NM	HB139	Specifically exempts library usage records from public information requests
Dead	SC	H4059	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Dead	TN	HB715	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Dead	TN	HB701	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Dead	TN	HB1051	Enhancing laws and programs related to broadband access and digital inclusion
Dead	TN	SB1130	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Dead	TX	HB5635	Right to Read / Prohibiting Censorship
Dead	TX	HB527	Requires all school to have a librarian present for at least half of the school day
Dead	TX	HB781	Reverses previously passed restrictions on teaching divisive concepts
Dead	VT	H168	Protects academic freedom;prohibits adverse action against teachers for performing their work
Dead	WA	HB1503	Enhancing laws and programs related to broadband access and digital inclusion
5	32	74	
Bills Enacted	No. of States	No. of Bills	

Please Cite this Report as:

EveryLibrary. 2025. *Are We Codifying Censorship or Reclaiming Rights? The State-by-State 2025 Legislative Landscape for Libraries.* July 15, 2025. *Riverside, IL.* https://www.everylibrary.org

Looking to 2026, EveryLibrary and the EveryLibrary Institute are committed to helping state library associations and state right-to-read stakeholder groups build positive momentum for public libraries, school libraries, and academic libraries in their state legislatures. If your organization would like assistance preparing your legislative agenda or responding to negative policy proposals, please reach out to our Executive Director, John Chrastka, at [redacted] or [redacted].