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### ALA accreditation at a glance

- **63** ALA-accredited MLIS programs
- **58** Institutions with ALA-accredited MLIS programs
- **34** U.S. states (including Washington, DC, and Puerto Rico) with ALA-accredited programs
- **5** Canadian provinces with ALA-accredited programs
- **22** ALA-accredited programs offering 100% online programs ✠
- **2** Programs with candidacy status
- **1** Programs with pre-candidacy status
- **18,116** Students enrolled in ALA-accredited MLIS programs in fall 2012 *
- **8,049** Graduates of ALA-accredited MLIS programs during the 2011-2012 academic year *

✠ As identified by the programs

* As reported by programs to the Office for Accreditation
COA announces accreditation actions

The Committee on Accreditation (COA) of the American Library Association (ALA) has announced accreditation actions taken at the 2013 ALA Midwinter Meeting in Seattle, WA.

Continued accreditation status was granted to the following programs:
- Master of Arts in Information Resources and Library Science program at the University of Arizona;
- Master of Library and Information Studies program at Dalhousie University;
- Master of Science and Master of Arts programs at the Florida State University.

The next comprehensive review visit at each institution is scheduled to occur in 2019.

Conditional accreditation status was granted to the following programs:
- Master of Science in Library and Information Science program at Long Island University.

The next comprehensive review visit is scheduled to occur in 2015.

Information on accreditation statuses and types of reviews can be found in Accreditation Process, Policies and Procedures (AP3), third edition, Section I.

The following institutions have programs that are being visited in the spring 2013 academic term. The accreditation decisions will be made by the COA at its meeting at the 2013 ALA Annual Conference in Chicago.
- University of Alberta
- University of Maryland
- University of North Texas
- University of Pittsburgh
- Southern Connecticut State University

The following institutions have programs that will be visited in the fall 2013 academic term. The accreditation decisions will be made by the COA at its meeting at the 2014 ALA Midwinter Meeting in Philadelphia.
- University of British Columbia
- East Carolina University
- University of Ottawa
- Valdosta State University
- University of Washington

ALA accreditation indicates that the program meets or exceeds the Standards for Accreditation of Master’s Programs in Library and Information Studies, established by COA and adopted by ALA Council. The accreditation process involves rigorous, ongoing self-evaluation by the program and verification of evidence through an external review. COA evaluates each program
for compliance with the *Standards*, which address mission, goals and objectives; curriculum; faculty; students; administration and financial support; and physical resources and facilities.

A complete list of programs and degrees accredited by ALA can be found at [http://www.al肇.org/accreditedprograms/directory](http://www.al肇.org/accreditedprograms/directory). Individuals who would like more information about a particular program should contact the program.

The ALA COA is a leading force in accreditation, having evaluated educational programs to prepare librarians since 1924. The Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) recognizes ALA COA as the authority for assessing the quality of education offered by graduate programs in the field of library and information studies.

---

**By Karen L. O'Brien, Director, ALA Office for Accreditation**

**Standards review**

This fifth year of Standards review culminates in a comprehensive look at commentary received, including notes taken in meetings at ALA and ALISE (Association for Library and Information Science Education) conferences. The link to the final of the planned series of web surveys focusing on Standard IV: Students, Standard V: Administration and Financial Support, and Standard VI: Physical Resources and Facilities was sent to chief program executives (deans, directors, and chairs) on March 1.

The survey was also made more widely available at the Standards Review site. The survey remained open through March 29. The Committee on Accreditation (COA) will discuss the results at the 2013 spring meeting April 12 and 13 and develop a written analysis for posting at the Standards Review site. Analysis of the results of the prior surveys is available at that link.

Additional research to inform the Standards review is underway, including comparison of the criteria of other accreditors in terms of amount of specificity, the language and terminology employed, and approaches to providing interpretative advice.

A draft revision of the Standards is planned for wide release in December 2013. Written and verbal comment on the draft will be collected through September 13, 2014, and carefully considered by COA in fall 2014.

**Annual statistical reporting**

Improvements in data collection and reporting accomplished by ALISE in the past year allowed many programs to submit the ALISE output for COA reporting requirements without submitting the Office for Accreditation questionnaire. The Office will continue to make a questionnaire available based on data collected by ALISE; however, programs are welcome to submit just their
ALISE output data to the Office for Accreditation. December 1 will remain the Office for Accreditation due date for submission of statistical data.

Review and trending of 2011-2012 statistical data remains underway. With most of the data on hand, the summary of changes report is posted on the Reports and Publications page of the Office for Accreditation website. Note on that page that a link to trend data on all accredited programs is now available.

**Programs seeking initial accreditation**

Chicago State University has submitted an application for candidacy. Representatives of the program seeking candidacy will meet with the Committee on Accreditation during the COA 2013 spring meeting April 12 and 13 in Chicago. The Committee will decide following the meeting with the program whether to grant the program candidacy status. If granted, COA will set a date for an external review panel to visit the campus and verify the self study Program Presentation.

Two programs in candidacy status, East Carolina University (NC) and the University of Ottawa (ON, Canada), are set for a visit in fall 2013. COA decisions on initial accreditation will take place at the 2014 ALA Midwinter Meeting. An external review panel will visit with East Carolina University constituents on October 14 and 15. Visits with constituents of the University of Ottawa program are scheduled for September 30 and Oct 1.

**CHEA decision on ALA recognition**

Reaffirmation of ALA-COA recognition has been recommended by the Committee on Recognition of the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) to the Board of Directors. The CHEA Board is expected to make a decision at its April 29, 2013, meeting. Documentation of the three-year comprehensive review is available on the Office for Accreditation website.

**Disclosure of accreditation information**

Those versed in the profession of information provision are well aware of relevancy dilemmas—not enough information misleads and too much confuses. The two entities overseeing accreditation in the U.S., the U.S. Dept of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA), are interested in increasing public disclosure of accreditation information, while accreditors are interested in candid reporting from the entities they accredit, which can be constrained by public disclosure.

CHEA recognition standards, revised in 2010, include additional requirements to inform the public of the basis for final decisions to grant or reaffirm accreditation and, in the case of denial or withdrawal of accreditation, to provide specific reasons for the decision accompanied by a response, related to the final decision, from the institution or program. Explore this topic with the COA at the 2013 ALA Annual Conference in Chicago on Sunday, June 30 from 4:30-5:30 pm at the Hilton: “Accreditation Transparency and Information Disclosure—How Bare is Fair?”
Opportunities to connect

I invite you to give me a call at 312-280-2434 or drop me a line at kobrien@ala.org. I hope to see you in Chicago for the 2013 ALA Annual Conference -- you are welcome to get in touch to arrange a meeting with me there.

Public Disclosure and Investment in Education

By Brian Andrew, Chair, Committee on Accreditation, and Procurement Counsel, MEMC Electronic Materials, Inc.

You probably wouldn’t buy a car without researching costs, safety ratings, and professional review or make any major investment without having up-to-date information. You can certainly understand then why prospective students are interested in investigating academic programs before investing time and money. Potential “investors” want to know a whole range of information—-not only costs, ranking, and perceived prestige in the field, but also accreditation status and post-graduation employment prospects. With the information that higher education institutions and programs and accreditors are now making available to the public (voluntarily or otherwise), today’s “investors” have become much more savvy and selective. In fact, higher education is now in many ways indistinguishable from any other investment vehicle.

Public disclosure has become an integral part of everyday life, common in business operations, the world of investing, and public service work. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Glossary of Statistical Terms defines public disclosure as the act of making information or data readily accessible and available to all interested individuals and institutions. The U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) defines it as the act of releasing all relevant information pertaining to a company that may influence an investment decision. (In order to be listed on major U.S. stock exchanges, companies must follow all of the disclosure requirements and regulations.)

In every state as well as the federal government, there are specific laws that govern the process of public disclosure. These disclosure regulations not only specify what types of information must be provided to the general public, but also often define what types of information are not subject to disclosure. Corporations are the focus of much of the public disclosure activity that occurs on a daily basis. Depending on applicable laws, a business may be required to release certain information about a new product, such as a general listing of what components make up a new device or ingredients comprise a food product.

As to investments, the proper disclosure of information is an important factor in maintaining the ethics and propriety of any type of investment market. Public disclosure helps to ensure that all investors have access to the same data regarding the performance of various stocks, bonds, and other securities. As such, everyone participating in the marketplace has an equal opportunity to make use of the information as they see fit.
Finally, tax-exempt organizations such as schools and charities must make annual returns and exemption applications filed with the IRS available for public inspection upon request. This enforced disclosure is deemed to be in the public’s interest and to its benefit in order to ensure an informed decision regarding direction of one’s income.

How does this relate to accreditation of academic programs?

In its position paper on public information, the Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditors (ASPA) provides a great summary of the challenge to accrediting bodies. “Ensuring public access to meaningful information can be a balancing act. Accreditors’ provision of public information fulfills an important accountability function that must also be structured to maintain trust with programs, allowing them to be candid about areas in which they need to improve and recognizing those improvements. Thoughtful, ongoing discussion and examination among stakeholders within accredited fields, is an optimal method for defining the scope and content of public information that best serves the public interest” (Provision of Public Information by Specialized and Professional Accreditors: Answering Calls for Transparency, October 19, 2012).

One of the primary purposes of accreditation is consumer protection. Since the public cannot investigate every aspect of an academic program or an institution, it relies on accreditation to gather and sort through information and to make that information available to consumers for their analysis. The public needs to know that the “return on its investment” will be sound.

By their very nature and purpose, accrediting bodies possess a great deal of valuable information, e.g., material regarding accreditation standards and procedures, data gathered through reports and inspection surveys, information provided by persons with an interest in influencing accreditation decisions (including administrators, faculty, staff and complainants), and decisions and reports generated by the accreditor in the accreditation process. Their primary tasks include generating information in the form of accreditation standards that define acceptable performance within a field, assembling information about institutions that seek accreditation under those standards, processing that information through various decision-making calculations, and ultimately producing information as to which programs meet or fail to meet those standards. Thus, accrediting bodies are largely in the information business.

An accrediting body is viewed as a quasi-public entity that serves the public interest. Its decisions are used in a variety of ways by several “publics,” including prospective students in selecting a program of study, employers in determining qualifications of job applicants, universities in establishing the acceptability of transfer credit, and the federal government in making funding decisions for those accreditors (primarily regional and national) who act as “gatekeepers” of federal loan dollars. These various publics have a legitimate need to know the actions of the accrediting body. Disclosure of basic and essential information is central to fulfilling the accrediting body’s responsibilities to its many public consumers.

If accreditation is in fact a valid measure of quality, the fact of accreditation should be useful for investors seeking quality services. The fact of an adverse accreditation action might be even more relevant to a decision of whether or not to enroll in a particular program. At a minimum,
the fact of accreditation or lack thereof must be readily available to the public if accreditation is to play any role at all in assisting investors.

Whether investing in the stock market or education, consumers need information they can trust to make an informed decision. Thus, accreditors and programs have a responsibility to recognize their consumers as investors and disclose information that enhances their decision-making.

Spotlight on process and policy

Program Presentation: Purpose and Process

By Laura Dare, Assistant Director, ALA Office for Accreditation

In each issue of Prism we focus on an aspect of process, policy, or procedure of ALA accreditation. This issue’s column takes a look at the Program Presentation and its role in the comprehensive review process.

If you have an idea for a future column, please send it to Laura Dare, ldare@ala.org.

Overview of the Program Presentation

An important piece – perhaps the centerpiece – of every higher-education accreditation review is the self-study document. The institution or program assesses, analyzes, and evaluates itself in relation to standards and then summarizes its findings and plans in the self study. In ALA accreditation, this document is called the Program Presentation. Section II of the ALA Accreditation Process, Policies and Procedures (AP3) is devoted entirely to the Program Presentation.

The Program Presentation serves three purposes:

• To document how the program is in compliance with the Standards;
• To describe how the school plans to maintain the accredited program and to continue compliance with the Standards;
• To serve as an ongoing planning and assessment tool for the school and program. (AP3, Section II.2)

Although the program head (usually a dean, director, or chair) is responsible for submitting the Program Presentation in the comprehensive review process, an ad-hoc committee usually plans and oversees the development of the document. The Program Presentation should reflect input from representatives of all constituents of the program: faculty, students, alumni, employers of the graduates, advisors, etc.

To ensure that the final Program Presentation will be useful to the program, the External Review Panel (ERP), and the Committee on Accreditation, the head of the program submits a plan for the Program Presentation for review 12 months in advance and a draft four months
before the final document is due. The Director of the Office for Accreditation and the Chair of the ERP review the plan and draft and provide feedback to the program head.

**Plan for the Program Presentation**

More than just an outline for development of the final document, the plan serves as a blueprint for the comprehensive review. Who is involved in the comprehensive review process and what are their roles? The plan should list the names and roles of the individuals and groups who will be providing advice, compiling evidence of compliance with the *Standards*, and writing sections of the Program Presentation. What is the schedule for developing the Program Presentation? A timeline of the program’s activities leading to the Program Presentation and the site visit is also part of the plan. How will the program indicate compliance with each standard? The plan should provide a standard-by-standard list of documents and other evidence that the program will use to indicate compliance.

The Director of the Office for Accreditation and the Chair of the ERP review the plan and provide feedback to the program head. The Director has reviewed many plans and the ERP Chair has had experience reading the Program Presentations of several different programs, so their input can be very valuable. See *AP3*, Section II.4 for more information on the plan for the Program Presentation.

**Draft Program Presentation**

The program submits a draft Program Presentation to the Office for Accreditation and the ERP Chair four months before the final Program Presentation is due. The draft Program Presentation is expected to be as close as possible in content and format to the final version. The ERP Chair shares the draft with the other panelists for their feedback. Because the Program Presentation will be read by several people who may be unfamiliar with the program, many programs have found it helpful to arrange for someone from outside the program to review the document and make editorial suggestions prior to submitting it to the Office and the ERP. An editor can help bring one coherent voice to the document.

As with the plan, a conference call is held with the program head, the ERP Chair, and the Director of the Office for Accreditation. During that call, the ERP Chair may identify missing, inconsistent, or unclear parts of the Program Presentation and provide suggestions for the organization of the material. See *AP3*, Section II.5 for more information on the draft Program Presentation.

**Final Program Presentation**

The final Program Presentation is due to each External Review Panelist and the Office for Accreditation six weeks before the site visit. *AP3*, Section II.6, provides specific instructions regarding content, format and organization of the document. Section II.6.4 provides a list of suggested evidence that might be used to indicate compliance with the *Standards*. 
As they review the Program Presentation, panelists will identify additional evidence that they will need to see either in advance of or during the site visit. Those requests will be compiled by the ERP Chair and sent to the program.

A well-written, thoughtful Program Presentation that depicts the context of the program and describes plans for reaching its mission, goals, and objectives should serve the program well through the review and into the future.

FAQs

Why must the final Program Presentation be prepared and submitted in both print and electronic formats?

The final document will be read and analyzed by a variety of people who have different reading preferences. Some need the accessibility of a printed copy; some prefer reading and taking notes on a computer. Many use both formats simultaneously.

Why is the draft Program Presentation shared with the entire ERP?

We’ve found that getting the ERP familiar with the Program Presentation at the draft stage allows them to request additional evidence earlier in the process. Programs generally appreciate having more time to respond to those requests.

How does the program know how many copies of the final Program Presentation to make and where to send them?

The Office for Accreditation provides that information after the draft Program Presentation is received.

How can the program keep track of the various due dates?

The Office for Accreditation provides each program with a timeline (in Excel) of activities and due dates for the review.

As always, we in the Office for Accreditation are happy to provide more information on the accreditation process. Contact us at accred@ala.org.

News and announcements

External Review Panel training at 2013 ALA Annual Conference in Chicago

Date: Friday, June 28, 2013
Time: 8:00am – 12noon
Location: Hilton Chicago (720 S. Michigan), Boulevard A

New and experienced External Review Panelist (ERP) pool members are invited and encouraged to attend a training session on the role of ERP members in the ALA accreditation process. Participation in training is a prerequisite for serving on a review panel.
Participants will learn about the comprehensive review process, hear from experienced panelists, and work in a group to analyze a sample Program Presentation. Special focus at this year’s training will be on Standard III: Faculty of the 2008 ALA Standards for Accreditation.

Program heads who want to learn more about the accreditation process, the site visit and the role of the ERP in the review are welcome to attend as observers. If you’re interested in attending, please RSVP and indicate that you’d like to observe the session.

Please RSVP to Laura Dare, ldare@ala.org, by June 10 and include “ERP Training” in the subject line. Registration is limited and is on a first-come, first-served basis.

**New External Review Panelists sought**

The Office for Accreditation seeks experienced library and information professionals to participate in the accreditation process as External Review Panelists. We are particularly in need of librarians and educators with specializations and experience in the following areas:

- Archives and records management
- School librarianship
- Public librarianship
- Information science
- Information technology
- LIS graduate program administration
- Service to diverse populations
- French language skills
- Spanish language skills

Find out more about what’s involved in serving on an External Review Panel at [http://www.ala.org/accreditedprograms/resourcesforerp/ERP_service_info](http://www.ala.org/accreditedprograms/resourcesforerp/ERP_service_info). If you are interested and meet the minimum qualifications, please complete the External Review Panel Member Information Form, available on the Office for Accreditation website, and plan to attend the training session on June 28 at the 2013 ALA Annual Conference in Chicago.

If you know someone who might be interested in serving as an External Review Panelist, please encourage him/her to apply, or send a recommendation to Laura Dare, ldare@ala.org.

**ALA accreditation appeal process training at 2013 ALA Annual Conference in Chicago**

Date: Friday, June 28, 2013
Time: 2:00pm-3:30pm
Location: Hilton Chicago (720 S. Michigan), PDR2

Experienced External Review Panelists (two or more on-site visits) are invited to attend training on the updated accreditation appeal process and policy. People who complete this training will be eligible to serve on an Appeal Review Committee. This training is also useful to people serving on review panels where the accreditation decision could result in an appeal (initial
accreditation review or review of program on conditional status). Program representatives are also invited to attend.


Please RSVP to Laura Dare, ldare@ala.org, by June 10 and include “ERP Appeal Process Training” in the subject line.

AASL/NCATE program reviewer training at 2013 ALA Annual Conference in Chicago

Date: Friday, June 28, 2013
Time: 12:00pm-4:00pm
Location: McCormick Place, MCP-S505b

New and experienced reviewers are encouraged to attend this session facilitated by Mary Berry, Chair of the NCATE Coordinating Committee, and Elizabeth Vilky, Director of Program Review at NCATE. Participants will learn about the NCATE process, the transition to CAEP, the ALA/AASL Standards for School Librarian Preparation, writing and reviewing reports, and appropriate assessments. Attendees will study a sample program report and participate in a review exercise. While the focus will be on preparing reviewers to write a recognition report, program report writers are welcome to attend as observers.

Reviewers who have not been trained on using the 2010 standards must attend a training in order to participate on a review team.

Please RSVP to Laura Dare, ldare@ala.org, by June 10 and include “AASL/NCATE training” in the subject line.

Prospective reviewers can find out more about the AASL/NCATE program review process at http://www.ala.org/aasl/aasleducation/schoollibrary/informationprogram.

COA program at ALA Annual Conference: Accreditation Transparency and Information Disclosure—How Bare is Fair?

Date: Sunday, June 30, 2013
Time: 4:30pm-5:30pm
Location: Hilton Chicago (720 S. Michigan), Conference Room 4M

Join the conversation about what information concerning accredited program quality should be publicly available.

AASL/NCATE Coordinating Committee meeting

Date: Friday, June 28, 2013
Time: 8:30am-10:00am
Location: McCormick Place, MCP-S505b
Members of the AASL/NCATE Coordinating Committee are strongly encouraged to attend. The meeting is also open to interested conference attendees.

**Update to the ALA policy on education for school librarianship**

At the 2013 Midwinter Meeting in Seattle, the ALA Council adopted the following update to the ALA policy on education for school librarianship:

Policy B.9.2.2 School Librarians (formerly ALA Policy #54.2.2) states: The master’s degree in library and information studies from a program accredited by the American Library Association or a master’s degree with a specialty in school librarianship from an ALA/AASL Nationally Recognized program in an educational unit accredited by the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation is the appropriate first professional degree for school librarians. (Adopted July 11, 1988, by ALA Council; revised 2008, 2013.)

**Update on the transition of NCATE and TEAC to CAEP**

On February 15 the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) Commission on Standards and Performance Reporting released for public comment its draft recommendations for the accreditation standards for educator preparation. CAEP received over 500 comments.

Feedback on the proposed draft standards will be compiled and shared with the CAEP Commission at its June 10-11 meeting. The Commission will then make revisions and send the final draft document to the CAEP board for review and approval. It is expected that the review and approval by the CAEP board will occur in July or August 2013.

**External Review Panelists acknowledged**

External review panelists contribute substantial time and energy to the accreditation process to assure quality in LIS education. We extend our appreciation to the following panelists who served during the fall 2012 academic term.

**Chairs**
- Edwin M. Cortez, Director, School of Information Sciences, University of Tennessee
- Ann Curry, Professor, MA in Communication Tech Program, University of Alberta
- Brad Eden, Dean of Library Services, Valparaiso University
- Terry Weech, Associate Professor, GSLIS, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

**Panelists**
- Karen Adams, Director of Libraries, University of Manitoba
• Mary Arnold, Public Service Supervisor, Maple Heights Public Library, Cuyahoga County Library
• Frank Cervone, Vice Chancellor for Information Services, Purdue University Calumet
• Karen Cook, Assistant Professor, DLS, Clarion University of Pennsylvania
• Yolanda J. Cuesta, President, Cuesta MultiCultural Consulting
• Prudence W. Dalrymple, Director, Institute for Healthcare Informatics, Drexel University
• Mirah J. Dow, Associate Professor, SLIM, Emporia State University
• Barbara J. Ford, Director, Mortenson Center for International Library Programs, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
• Vicki L. Gregory, Professor, SLIS, University of South Florida
• Joe Janes, Associate Professor and MLIS Program Chair, University of Washington
• Andrew Large, Professor of Information Studies, McGill University
• Susan Martin, President, Find My Classmates
• Dale McNeill, Director, Public Library Services, Queens Library
• Jennifer Paustenbaugh, University Librarian, Brigham Young University
• Sheri Ross, Assistant Professor, MLIS Program, St. Catherine University
• Keith Ann Stiverson, Director, Law Library, Illinois Institute of Technology
• Jennifer Sweeney, Adjunct Faculty, College of Information Science and Technology, Drexel University
• Jerilyn Veldof, Organization Development Associate, Librarian, University of Minnesota Libraries

AASL/NCATE recognition news

Fall 2012 AASL recognition decisions

The following programs, which are part of NCATE-accredited education units, received AASL National Recognition, National Recognition with Conditions, or National Recognition with Probation during the fall 2012 semester. National Recognition is awarded to education master’s programs in school librarianship that have been reviewed and approved by AASL’s program reviewers using the ALA/AASL Standards for Initial Programs for School Library Media Specialist Preparation (2003) or the ALA/AASL Standards for Initial Preparation of School Librarians (2010).

• East Central University, Teacher Preparation Program, Library Media Specialist
• Fairfield University, Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions, School Media Specialist Advanced
• Georgia College and State University, College of Education, M.Ed. in Library Media Specialist
• Marshall University, College of Education and Human Services, School Library Media Specialist
• Notre Dame of Maryland University, Education Department, Library Media
• Oklahoma State University, Professional Education Unit, School Library Media Specialist
• Sam Houston State University, College of Education, School Librarian
• Towson University, College of Education, School Library Media
• University of Maryland College Park, College of Education, School Library Media
• University of Nebraska at Kearney, College of Education, Library Media
• Valley City State University, School of Education and Graduate Studies, M.Ed. with Library and Information Technologies Concentration
• Wright State University, College of Education and Human Services, Library/Media Education

Fall 2012 reviewers

We extend our appreciation to the following program reviewers and auditors who served during the fall 2012 semester:

• Susan Allen
• Sandra Andrews
• Patricia Antrim
• Mary Berry
• Judy T. Bivens
• Gail Bogel
• Pauletta Bracy
• Naomi Caldwell
• Rosemary Chance
• Audrey P. Church
• Patsy Couts
• Sherry Crow
• Gail Dickinson
• Lesley Farmer
• Roxanne Forgrave
• Elizabeth Haynes
• Angel Kymes
• Linda Lillard
• Cheryl McCarthy
• Andrea Miller
• Janice Newsam
• Deborah Parrott
• Rebecca J. Pasco
• Barbara Ray
• Carolyn Starkey
• Linda J. Underwood
• Holly Weimar
• Jan Yates
• Connie Zimmer

The next issue of *Prism* will be published in November of 2013. Stay tuned!