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ALA accreditation at a glance

- 63 ALA-accredited MLIS programs
- 58 Institutions with ALA-accredited MLIS programs
- 33 U.S. states (including Washington, DC, and Puerto Rico) with ALA-accredited programs
- 5 Canadian provinces with ALA-accredited programs
- 25 ALA-accredited programs offering 100% online programs †
- 2 Programs with candidacy status
- 1 Program with precandidacy status

† As identified by the programs
COA announces accreditation actions

The Committee on Accreditation (COA) of the American Library Association (ALA) has announced accreditation actions taken at the 2014 ALA Midwinter Meeting in Philadelphia, PA.

Accreditation decisions

Initial accreditation status was granted to the following program, with the next comprehensive review visit scheduled to take place in fall 2020:

- Master of Information Studies at the University of Ottawa

Continued accreditation status was granted to the following program, with the next comprehensive review visit scheduled to take place in fall 2020:

- Master of Library and Information Science at the University of Washington.

Continued accreditation status and release from conditional accreditation status was granted to the following program, with the next comprehensive review visit scheduled to take place in fall 2020:

- Master of Library and Information Science at Valdosta State University.

Conditional accreditation status was granted to the following program, with the next comprehensive review visit scheduled to take place in fall 2016:

- Master of Library and Information Studies at the University of British Columbia.

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


The COA approved the following policy change to AP3, effective for accreditation decisions made January 25, 2014 and thereafter:

I.11.1 Retroactive period of initial accreditation

Initial accreditation, when granted, applies retroactively for students who complete degree requirements 24 months prior to the date that initial accreditation is granted. For example, if initial accreditation is granted in January of 2015, students who complete degree requirements in January 2013 or later are considered to have graduated from an ALA-accredited program.
The following institutions have programs are being visited in the spring 2014 academic term. The accreditation decisions will be made by the COA at its meeting at the 2014 ALA Annual Conference in Las Vegas.

- University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
- University of Oklahoma
- San Jose State University
- University of Texas at Austin

The following institutions have programs that will be visited in the fall 2014 academic term. The accreditation decisions will be made by the COA at its meeting at the 2015 ALA Midwinter Meeting in Chicago.

- East Carolina University
- Université de Montréal
- Queens College, City University of New York
- University of Wisconsin - Madison

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.ala.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**

**Latest trends**

The latest data from programs, trended and summarized, is available at the Reports and Publications page of the Office for Accreditation website (www.ala.org/accreditation) under the Data on Program Performance section. See each program’s Trend Data by Program (Excel), including student-to-faculty ratios, enrollment, graduation and more. A summary tab at the far left in that file provides some overall perspective on the change that’s been underway—for
instance, while total student headcount is down, full-time enrollment is up, as is income for programs, by over $6 million.

Programs seeking initial accreditation

Three programs are seeking initial ALA-accreditation: the Master of Library Science at East Carolina University (ECU), the Master of Science in Library Science at Chicago State University (CSU), and the Master of Management in Library and Information Science program being offered by the University of Southern California (USC).

The accreditation decision on the program at ECU is scheduled for January 2015, following the review visit October 27-28, 2014. For CSU, the decision is scheduled for June 2016, following the visit during the 2016 spring academic term. USC was granted Precandidacy status in the fall of 2013.

If accreditation is granted, students who complete degree requirements in the 24 months prior to the date that accreditation is granted will be considered to hold an ALA-accredited degree (AP3 section I.11.1).

Checks and balances in public disclosure/transparency: CHEA and the ALA Executive Board

Those versed in the profession of information provision are very well aware of relevancy dilemmas: not enough information tends to mislead while too much just confuses. The Office for Accreditation (OA) and the Committee on Accreditation (COA) explored the dilemma of disclosure of accreditation information in an open session at the 2013 ALA Annual Conference in Chicago entitled “Accreditation Transparency and Information Disclosure—How Bare is Fair?” For context, ALA’s relationship to the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) was described, especially as relates to the latest CHEA Recognition Policy and Procedures, released in 2010.

ALA recognition by CHEA was reaffirmed in May 2013, under the 2006 version of the CHEA Recognition Policy and Procedures. The 2010 version and the standards therein to which ALA must now report, contain expectations of transparency and independence beyond what the 2006 standards required. According to the CHEA letter announcing the new 2010 version, “The revision includes greater scrutiny of accrediting organizations between recognition reviews,” signaling the importance of the five-year interim report.

CHEA Recognition Standard 12B.5, for example, has been expanded to require public disclosure 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.” While the Office for Accreditation (OA) publicly releases information on COA decision actions in a press release and in this publication and on the Reports and Publications page, it doesn’t as yet disclose the specific standards not being met when a decision is made to place a program on Conditional status or to withdraw accreditation. Based on recognition decisions that CHEA has made under
the new standards thus far, OA-COA will need to disclose that information publicly if CHEA recognition is to continue.

As far as the requirements of independence under the 2010 CHEA standards, that’s not really new. Even under the prior standards, ALA was advised by CHEA to submit a Memorandum of Understanding with the application for review eligibility. That memorandum was modeled after the one in place at the American Occupational Therapy Association which CHEA recommended. The memorandum, between ALA and COA, requires that ALA Executive Board appointments to the COA be made “in consultation with the COA staff liaison... to protect the integrity of the accreditation process.” Integrity in this context refers to reliability—that the public and members of the profession, practitioners and faculty alike, can rely on a process in which the best qualified people are appointed. Quite a few factors go into those qualifications, including some working knowledge of what constitutes beneficial accreditation practice.

Standards review

Collection of comment on the draft revision of the Standards continues through October 3, 2014, both virtually and in person. Share your thoughts with the Committee on Accreditation (COA) in person during the 2014 ALA Annual Conference on Sunday afternoon, June 29, 4:30 – 5:30, Las Vegas Convention Center, N218, or send to accred@ala.org and via the Standards Review site, where the draft revision and the supporting documentation and comments by others can be found, along with a recording of the February 20, 2014, virtual Town Hall meeting.

The Committee is reviewing the commentary received and will discuss it at its 2014 spring and fall meetings and prepare a revision for ALA Council review for adoption at the 2015 Midwinter Meeting in Chicago. Visit the Standards Review site (http://www.oa.ala.org/accreditation/) on December 5 to see the revision.

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 Las Vegas for the 2014 ALA Annual Conference – you are more than welcome to get in touch to arrange a meeting with me there.
Decision making by the Committee on Accreditation

By Barbara B. Moran, Chair, Committee on Accreditation, and Louis Round Wilson
Distinguished Professor, School of Information and Library Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Why are Committee on Accreditation (COA) meetings held behind closed doors? How does COA arrive at accreditation decisions? More importantly, how can all constituents be assured that the decisions are made in a fair and non-arbitrary manner? Because I had some of these same questions before I became a member of COA, I would like to demystify the operations of COA for anyone else who might be curious.

COA meets four times a year. In addition to the meetings at ALA national conferences, there are spring and fall meetings held at ALA headquarters in Chicago. Although the agendas can vary, there is an overall pattern to these meetings. The meetings in the spring and the fall are when the members of COA examine a variety of reports from LIS programs: annual statistical reports; biennial narrative reports that address ongoing compliance with the Standards; annual progress reports for programs with Conditional, Precandidacy, or Candidacy status; and special reports that address specific issues. COA also engages in strategic planning and policy review at its spring and fall meetings.

At the COA meetings held in conjunction with the Midwinter Meeting and Annual Conference, the focus is on making accreditation decisions following the comprehensive review of a program. COA members prepare by reading all the documents for each program being reviewed: the Program Presentation self-study, the External Review Panel (ERP) report, and the program’s response to the ERP report. During the meeting, the COA meets with the program head and the ERP chair from each program being considered for accreditation. These face-to-face meetings allow COA members to ask questions regarding areas that need further exploration after the review of the written documents. After a thorough review of all the documentation and the in-person meeting, the Committee deliberates and then makes a decision about the accreditation status of a program.

The meetings of COA are closed in order to maintain an open and candid reporting relationship with the accredited programs. As part of the accreditation process, COA requests and reviews sensitive information on many topics often not made public: budgets, salaries, personnel, and parent institution support. Accrediting agencies have traditionally kept that material confidential based on the principle that accreditation is a process of peer review intended primarily for the improvement of the program being reviewed. Thus COA reviews material and makes decisions in a closed meeting, and ultimately releases to the public only the decision made about accreditation. The publicizing of any additional information is left to the discretion of the program. Some programs are very open about the entire process, posting the self-study and the ERP report on their websites, while others disclose only the decision itself.
Because COA meetings are closed, it is essential that COA have policies and procedures in place to ensure that decisions are made objectively and non-arbitrarily. These policies and procedures are detailed in Accreditation Process, Policies and Procedures (AP3). The first step in having a valid and reliable process of accreditation is to ensure that the members of the accrediting body who make the decisions are appropriately selected and trained. COA is comprised of 12 members appointed by the ALA president-elect; ten of those members are personal members of ALA who are appointed to represent educators and practitioners and two are appointed from the public at large to represent the public interest. Many appointees have extensive experience with accreditation. To ensure diversity, the members are chosen to help maintain educator-practitioner balance, to include those underrepresented in the profession, for geographic representation, and for gender balance, to name a few important considerations. In addition, careful attention is paid to any potential conflict of interest that might impede a member’s ability to carry out his or her responsibilities as a COA member fairly and objectively. COA members with any conflict of interest are recused from all discussion and decisions about that program. New members of COA are oriented to the workings of COA and the processes of ALA accreditation prior to their first meeting. Because appointments to COA are made on staggered basis, there are always a large number of experienced members to provide guidance to the newly selected members of the Committee.

To prepare for making an accreditation decision each member of COA has three primary responsibilities: 1) to read and analyze all material relating to the review of the program, 2) to enter into discussions both with the representatives of the program and the ERP chair and with other members of COA, so that all issues are aired comprehensively, and 3) to actively participate in the decision-making process that concludes each review. Each decision is based on how well a program has met the Standards for Accreditation and is only made after a careful examination of all of the evidence. The COA consults all of the interim reports and the record log of correspondence from the COA to the program since the previous review. In response to the interim reports, the COA sends letters to programs at least an annual basis. These letters detail areas of non-compliance with the Standards, so accreditation decisions should never come as a surprise. The discussions about the appropriate decision to be made are thoughtful and frank. COA members are all aware of the consequences of accreditation decisions, especially the negative decisions, and are careful to weigh all the evidence carefully. Each member of COA is cognizant of this responsibility and plays a full role in the deliberations. Decisions are made on the basis of a vote and in accordance with AP3; however, almost always the members come to a consensus about the decision.

No process is ever perfect and COA continually strives to improve the way it functions. However, since I have been a member of COA I have observed the actions of a group of carefully selected individuals who strive to make sure that the decisions made are fair—both to the programs and to the public. The members of COA take very seriously their charge, “to be responsible for the execution of the accreditation program of the ALA,” and work diligently to make the right decisions about the LIS programs that come before them for review.
Spotlight on process and policy: Evaluation in the comprehensive review process

By Laura Dare, Accreditation Manager, 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 how the Office for Accreditation uses evaluation to improve the accreditation process. If you have an idea for a future column, please send it to Laura Dare, ldare@ala.org.

Evaluation certainly plays a major role in accreditation: a program must evaluate the work it does in educating students and, in turn, the Committee on Accreditation evaluates the program. Likewise, the Office for Accreditation (Office) depends on candid evaluations of accreditation processes from those actively engaged in the comprehensive review: the program and the External Review Panelists. From early in the comprehensive review process until six months after the accreditation decision is made, the Office gathers feedback in the form of questionnaires that include statements with Likert-scale responses as well as prompts for open-ended responses.

Evaluation by representatives of the program

During panel formation, in the early stages of the review, the program is asked to evaluate the objectivity of a proposed chair and panel through identification of conflicts of interest. More structured evaluation is sought from the program at five points throughout the comprehensive review process:

After submission of the final Program Presentation, but before the site visit, the program is asked to comment on any problems experienced while preparing the program presentation and any benefits resulting from the self-study preparation process.

Immediately following the site visit, the program head submits an evaluation of the external review panel as a whole with regard to adequacy of preparation, knowledge of the Standards, panel conduct on site, communication with the panel, etc.

The third point of evaluation also occurs right after the site visit concludes. An administrator other than the program head (most typically the Dean or Provost) evaluates the work of the External Review Panel (ERP) during the site visit, specifically the panel’s knowledge of accreditation process, efficient use of time, objectivity, thoroughness in data collection, use of the Standards as the basis for gathering information, balanced view of the institutional mission and goals in relation to the program, and adherence to the mutually derived schedule.

Two weeks after the accreditation decision is made, the head of the program is requested to comment on any problems encountered with the review, changes needed to address these problems, benefits resulting from the process, and any difficulties encountered preparing for the review and how they were resolved.
The final point of feedback about the comprehensive review process comes six months after the accreditation decision. The program head is encouraged to comment on any changes that have occurred as a result of the review.

The Office maintains a database of this feedback and uses it to make changes to and improve the comprehensive review process and training of reviewers. For example, several programs had noted in their evaluations that requests from the panel for additional evidence made close to the site visit placed a burden on the program’s resources at the last minute. This feedback resulted in a process change to have the entire panel review the Program Presentation at the draft stage to identify the need for additional information. This change allows the program more time to gather the requested additional evidence. The vast majority of programs report that the External Review Panels have been well-prepared and knowledgeable about both the program and about ALA accreditation.

**ERP peer evaluations**

After the External Review Panel submits the final report to complete its work, panel members are requested to evaluate the other members of the team. Because panels work together beginning about a year before the site visit through submission of the final ERP report, panelists are able to provide a level of feedback that is invaluable to the Office.

ERP members are evaluated on their qualifications as a panel member (knowledge of the Standards, higher education, and accreditation policy/procedures, as well as skill in analyzing data and identifying problems areas to investigate), teamwork, productive interactions on site, and effectiveness in completing assigned tasks. In addition to these areas of evaluation, ERP chairs are evaluated on their organization of the site visit, panel leadership and communication, problem solving, communication with all constituents involved in the review, and coordination of the ERP report.

The Office reviews the ERP peer evaluations carefully and takes them into consideration when forming panels for COA approval for future reviews. For example, when several panel members give a fellow ERP member high ratings and write that the panelist showed much initiative and would make a great ERP chair, the Office will encourage that person to pursue ERP chair training. Likewise, when a panelist receives negative evaluations, the Office takes action to place that person on an inactive status pending further training or remove from the reviewer pool altogether.

ERP members do not formally evaluate themselves, but we often receive feedback from panelists. A recent panelist wrote, “Serving on an external review panel is one of the most rewarding professional activities I do.”

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

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


The COA approved the following policy change to AP3, effective for accreditation decisions made January 25, 2014 and thereafter:

I.11.1 Retroactive period of initial accreditation

Initial accreditation, when granted, applies retroactively for students who complete degree requirements 24 months prior to the date that initial accreditation is granted. For example, if initial accreditation is granted in January of 2015, students who complete degree requirements in January 2013 or later are considered to have graduated from an ALA-accredited program.

Required LIS program leadership update now in progress

An email regarding the mandatory leadership update was sent to each LIS program head on April 4 from accreditation@ala.org. Please follow the instructions in the email to complete the required updates by April 25, 2014. As part of the accreditation process, the Office for Accreditation requires updating of contact information for the program and institutional leadership, as well as review of the program’s listing in the Directory of ALA-Accredited MLIS Programs. If you did not receive the email, please contact the Office for Accreditation as soon as possible (accred@ala.org).

Draft revised Standards update

The Committee on Accreditation (COA) continues to seek comments on the DRAFT revised Standards for Accreditation of Master’s Programs in Library and Information Studies. Comments will be accepted from December 6, 2013, through October 24, 2014. Read the draft revised Standards for Accreditation and provide comment at http://www.oa.ala.org/accreditation/?page_id=326.

On February 20, the Committee on Accreditation held a virtual town hall on the draft revised Standards for Accreditation of Master’s Programs in Library and Information Studies. Joan Giesecke and Mary Stansbury presented information about proposed changes to the Standards and the Standards review process, including the research methodology. Participants had the opportunity make comments and ask questions regarding the draft Standards. A recording of the webinar is available at http://ala.adobeconnect.com/p7rd84ts16n/.

Reminder: new email address for the Office for Accreditation!

Accreditation@ala.org is the new general email address for the Office for Accreditation. Due to a shrinking budget, we’re relying on temporary workers to help with administrative tasks, including sending email reminders and requests for information updates. Because those messages may be sent by several different people, we thought it best to have a recognizable
“sent-from” email address. Please be sure to add accreditation@ala.org to your list of safe senders. Of course, you can still reach Karen O’Brien at kobrien@ala.org and Laura Dare at ldare@ala.org, and the entire office staff at accred@ala.org.

External Review Panel training at 2014 ALA Annual Conference in Las Vegas
Date: Friday, June 27, 2014
Time: 8:00am – 12:00noon
Location: Caesars Palace, Milano VII room

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 IV: Students 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 6 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. If you are interested and meet the qualifications, please complete the External Review Panel Member Information Form, available at (on the Office for Accreditation website) http://www.ala.org/accreditedprograms/files/resourcesforerp/ERP_INFO_Form.doc, and plan to attend the training session on June 27 at the 2014 ALA Annual Conference in Las Vegas.
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 2014 ALA Annual Conference in Las Vegas**
Date: Friday, June 27, 2014  
Time: 2:00pm – 3:30pm  
Location: Caesars Palace, Anzio room

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 6 and include “ERP Appeal Process Training” in the subject line.

**COA program at ALA Annual Conference: Draft revised Standards for Accreditation of LIS Master’s Programs**
Date: Sunday, June 29, 2014  
Time: 4:30pm-5:30pm  
Location: Las Vegas Convention Center, N218

Join the Committee on Accreditation (COA) in a discussion of the draft revised *Standards for Accreditation of Master’s Programs in Library and Information Studies*. Members of the COA will highlight changes in the proposed draft and will present information on the standards review process, including the research methodology. Attendees will be encouraged to comment on and ask questions about the draft standards. The COA expects to present a final draft to ALA Council for approval at the 2015 Midwinter Meeting.

**AASL/CAEP (formerly NCATE) program reviewer training at 2014 ALA Annual Conference in Las Vegas**
Date: Friday, June 27, 2014  
Time: 12:00noon-4:00pm  
Location: Caesars Palace, Messina room

New and experienced reviewers are encouraged to attend this session facilitated by Sherry Crow, Chair of the NCATE (CAEP) Coordinating Committee, and Elizabeth Vilky, Director of Program Review at CAEP. Participants will learn about the CAEP process, the transition from NCATE 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 6 and include “AASL/CAEP training” in the subject line.

Prospective reviewers can find out more about the AASL/CAEP program review process at http://www.ala.org/aasl/education/ncate/reviewers.

AASL/NCATE (CAEP) Coordinating Committee meeting
Date: Friday, June 27, 2014
Time: 8:30-10:00am
Location: Caesars Palace, Siena room

Members of the AASL/NCATE (CAEP) Coordinating Committee are strongly encouraged to attend. The meeting is also open to interested conference attendees.

External Review Panelists acknowledged

External review panelists contribute substantial time and effort to the accreditation process to assure quality in LIS education. We extend our appreciation to the following panelists who served during the fall 2013 academic term.

Chairs
- Diane L. Barlow, Special Assistant to the Dean, College of Information Studies, University of Maryland
- Alvan Bregman, Head, Technical Services, UBC Library, University of British Columbia
- Kathleen Burnett, Professor and Interim Director, College of Communication and Information, Florida State University
- Lynne McKechnie, Professor, University of Western Ontario

Panelists
- Jennifer Weil Arns, Associate Professor, SLIS, University of South Carolina
- Roy Bonin, Senior Fellow, Faculty of Public Affairs, Carleton University
- William Buchanan, Professor and Chair, DLS, Clarion University of Pennsylvania
- Joseph Busch, Principal, Taxonomy Strategies
- Karen J. Cook, Recorder of Documents, State Library of Louisiana
- Bryan Corbett, Manager, Private Records (Retired), University of Alberta
- Diane Covington, Chemistry and Biology Librarian, Carnegie Mellon University
AASL/CAEP recognition news

Fall 2013 AASL recognition decisions

The following programs, which are part of NCATE- or CAEP-accredited education units, received AASL National Recognition, National Recognition with Conditions, or National Recognition with Probation during the fall 2013 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).

- McDaniel College, Education Department, M.S. in School Librarianship
- Notre Dame of Maryland University, School of Education, Master of Arts: Leadership in Teaching: Library Media Specialist
- Oklahoma State University, College of Education, M.S. in Teaching, Learning, and Leadership, School Library Media Specialist emphasis
- Trevecca Nazarene University, School of Education, Master of Library and Information Science
- University of Central Missouri, College of Education, M.S. in School Library Media
- Valley City State University, School of Education and Graduate Studies, M.Ed. with Library and Information Technologies Concentration
**Fall 2013 reviewers**

We extend our appreciation to the following program reviewers and auditors who served during the fall 2013 semester:

- Patricia Antrim
- Mary Anne Berry
- Judy Bivens
- Audrey Church
- Patsy Couts
- Sherry Crow
- Roxanne Forgrave
- Elizabeth Haynes
- Ramona Kerby
- Angel Kymes
- Johan Koren
- Janice Newsum
- Deborah Parrott
- Rebecca Pasco
- Barbara Jo Ray
- Linda Underwood
- Jan Yates
- Connie Zimmer

The next issue of *Prism* will be published in November of 2014. Stay tuned!