



**MINUTES (Final)**  
**ALA Annual Conference 22-28 June 2006**  
New Orleans, Louisiana  
Bibliographic Standards:  
Saturday 24 June 2006, 8:00 a.m.-12:30 p.m. (0800-1230)  
Hilton New Orleans Riverside - Durham

1. Introduction of members and visitors
  2. Settlement of the agenda
  3. Approval of Midwinter 2006 minutes
  4. Consent Agenda
  9. Preconference seminars
  5. Thesauri
  6. DCRM(B) Status Report
  7. DCRM(M) Status Report
  8. DCRM(S) beta
  10. CC:DA
  11. ISBD(A) update
  12. New business
  13. Announcements from the floor
- Appendix A. ISB(A) report  
Appendix B. CC:DA report

#### 1. Introduction of members and visitors

Members Present: Randal Brandt, University of California, Berkeley; Ann Copeland, Pennsylvania State University (secretary); David Faulds, Emory University; Eileen Heeran, University of Michigan; Deborah J. Leslie, Folger Shakespeare Library (chair); Windy Lundy, University of Colorado, Boulder; R. Arvid Nelsen, University of California, San Diego; Beth M. Russell, Ohio State University (thesaurus editor); Nina Schneider, New York Public Library; Stephen Skuce, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Manon Th  roux, Yale University (ACRL liaison to CC:DA).

Members Excused: Alex Thurman, Columbia University (intern).

Liaisons Present: Jane Gillis, Yale University (rare serials); Juliet McLaren, ESTC (rare serials).

Visitors: Virginia Bartow, New York Public Library; Christopher Cook, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; Christine DeZelar-Tiedman, University of Minnesota; Vernica Downey, Harvard Law School; Diana Duncan, Chicago Botanic Garden; Emily Epstein, University of Colorado, Health Sciences Center; Sarah Schmidt Fisher,

University of Delaware; Ted Gemberling, University of Alabama at Birmingham, Lister Hill Library; Ryan Hildebrand, University of California, Irvine; Nancy Kandoian, New York Public Library; James Larrabee, University of California, Berkeley, Law Library; Megan Lewis, Duke University; Robert Maxwell, Brigham Young University; Kate Moriarty, Saint Louis University; John Overholt, Harvard University; Phyllis Payne, Boston University; Nancy Rubenstein, Southern Methodist University, DeGolyer Library; E.C. Schroeder, Yale University; James Stephenson, Getty Research Institute; Seanna Tsung, Library of Congress.

## 2. Settlement of the agenda

The Preconference seminars discussion, agenda item 9, was moved up to item 5.

## 3. Approval of Midwinter 2006 minutes

A motion to approve the corrected minutes passed unanimously.

## 4. Consent agenda

The Committee is required by ALA to ratify committee actions made between meetings.

Two proposals were voted on by the committee in the time between Midwinter and Annual. The proposal for the 2007 preconference seminar, "Cataloging of Special Collections Material in an Organizational Context," and the Bibliographic Standards Committee comments on the revision of ISBD(A) were both ratified.

## 9. Preconference Seminars

### **Austin 2006**

Leslie thanked Sarah Schmidt Fisher, Arvid Nelsen, and Megan Lewis, the organizers of the Seminar, Cataloging Artists' Books: Challenges and Solutions, presented in Austin. She noted that it was a big success with 77 people in attendance. Bib Standards member Nina Schneider, Librarian, Henry W. and Albert A. Berg Collection of English and American Literature, New York Public Library, gave a presentation that Leslie praised particularly for talking MARC to non-catalogers. Leslie said that Schneider's presentation should be the model for future Bib Standards sponsored talks.

Additionally, Johanna Drucker, Robertson Professor of Media Studies, University of Virginia, Book Artist, and author offered a metadata schema for artists' books and Daniel Starr, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, spoke on what a cataloger can do when you have many artists' books. Schneider's talk is available at the following url:

<http://ninaschneider.com/RBMS2006/presentation.doc>

Leslie asked if we should try to include rules for cataloging artists books in DCRM(B) or separately. Nelsen feels that since practice varies so greatly, a minimum standard would be very useful. Maxwell suggested that it is not essential that we all do the same thing since there is little demand for copy with these essentially unique works.

### **RBMS Preconference Baltimore 2007 (ALA in Washington)**

Three events are being planned for the Preconference:

#### a) Seminar: Cataloging of Special Collections Materials in an Organizational Context

Beth Russell will be leading a seminar entitled Cataloging of Special Collections Materials in an Organizational Context. The seminar will look at the way in which recent trends have affected the cataloging of special collections material: technological changes in cataloging workflows, increased emphasis on mainstreaming special collections in larger libraries, and organizational cultures which continually seek efficiencies. Russell will introduce the issues, Margaret Nichols, Head, Special Materials Unit, Library Technical Services, Cornell University will present a case study, and William Gosling, Curator, Children's Literature Collection and former University Librarian, University of Michigan will offer an administrator's perspective. Russell has received some suggestions on improving the title, and thanks to BSC for all their help and suggestions.

#### b) Seminar: Bibliographic Databases Update

Schroeder has a panel of 3 speakers coming to present three important databases: the ESTC, soon to be available on the British Library's site; CCILA – new *Latin American Imprints to 1850*, and the Handpress Book Database. Schroeder will organize and moderate this session.

#### c) Workshop: Cataloging ephemera: options for access

The organizers of the Baltimore Preconference have asked Bib Standards to offer a cataloging workshop on ephemera. The workshop is currently being planned. Presenters will discuss various options for controlling collections of ephemera (item level vs. collection level treatment; AACR2 vs. DCRB; options for creating finding aids and digital collections). Presentations will include hands-on exercises and stress the different kinds of access each method provides for control of ephemera. This would be a substantial workshop from which someone could walk away with an understanding of the pre-cataloging decisions to be made, factors to consider in cataloging, and the value of these cataloging options for access. The format would be a combination of presentations and hands-on training sessions.

## 5. Thesauri (Russell)

Russell commented that the Thesaurus Committee Meeting was not as fruitful as it might have been due to the fact that several team members had commitments at the RBMS Preconference in Austin and were unable to leave the conference early enough to arrive in time. Scheduling of the Thesaurus Team meeting continues to be a problem.

### Part 1: Terms

#### A. Slipcases

Final version:

Thesaurus	<i>Binding Terms</i>
Term	Slipcases
Hierarchy	[Protective housing]
SN	Use for a protective container, open along one edge
UF	Slip cases
BT	[Protective housing]

The term passed unanimously.

#### B. Fanzines

Two changes to the term Fanzines have been proposed. The scope note is being changed and a UF relationship with Fan magazines is being added. Maxwell asked why we are creating terms already in LCSH. Leslie replied that while LCSH has some thesaurus-like construction, it is not a true thesaurus.

Final version:

Thesaurus	<i>Genre Terms</i>
Term	Fanzines
Hierarchy	[Condition of publication]
SN	Use for independent, self-published periodicals issued by or for enthusiasts of aspects of popular culture and entertainment, usually inexpensively produced and with small circulation
UF	Fan magazines
BT	Zines
BT	Periodicals

The proposed changes to the term passed unanimously.

The new terms posted, Paperbacks and Panel-stamped bindings, need more information before proceeding.

## Part 2: Report

Russell noted that Helena Zinkham has plans to merge the Thesaurus for Graphic Materials I : Subject Terms and Thesaurus for Graphic Materials II: Genre and Physical Characteristics. She is interested in knowing if catalogers are using these thesauri and in knowing about our experience with MultiTes. Russell asked for a show of hands of how many in the room use TGM I and II (13 raised their hands). Russell is thrilled that the editor of one thesaurus contacted the editor of another.

Russell reported that while we have had one person respond to our posting for a web designer to work with MultiTes, we can't really move ahead. Leslie said that we don't have the money to pay someone and that we don't know at this point how much time the project would require. Leslie will ask the Executive Committee of RBMS for support to update the on-line thesaurus. If we don't get support, should we ask library schools if they have students who have experience with XML output and would be interested in taking on a project? Nelsen stressed that we need to find someone who has the skills already, not someone who would see this project as an opportunity to learn. Russell agreed that we need a permanent person for continuity.

Obtaining a permanent URL for the Thesauri continues to be a problem. For now, the Bibliographic Standards Committee website points to Russell's URL at OSU where the Thesauri reside. Russell worries that if we involve ALA, it will be harder when RBMS obtains a persistent URL. Theroux would really like to see a redirect link on the ALA/ACRL website to a standard URL.

## 6. DCRM(B) Status Report (Leslie)

Leslie reported that she and the DCRM(B) editors purposely did not ask us to bring draft texts, but that doesn't mean that their work is done. Prefatory material needs to be drafted for the introductory chapter so that all of the sections fit together. There are some editorial changes under consideration. An indexer has been lined up and the group is anxious to get the final draft to the RBMS Executive Committee for approval. If approved, the draft will then be sent to the publisher (Library of Congress Cataloging Distribution Service).

Leslie thanked those who volunteered to be close readers of DCRM(S) and she will ask for volunteers one last time for DCRM(B). She noted that the editorial meetings scheduled for DCRM(B) and DCRM(S) held on Monday and Tuesday of ALA are closed sessions.

## 7. DCRM(M) (Leslie for Fletcher)

Fletcher sent her report to Leslie. She has a Joint RBMS/MLA Task Group that has been hard at work for several years. They are no longer supporting an HTML version; they have moved to an MS word document for tracking changes, etc. They are still on schedule for a DCRM(M) public hearing at ALA Midwinter in Seattle and will have a presentation at the Music Library Association meetings in February. The questions to be addressed at Midwinter will be attached as an Appendix to these minutes.

Fletcher suggested that we organize the Appendices between the various DCRM modules by grouping those with the same name and content first, then those with the same name but different content next, leaving those unique to each module for last. For example, Music has an appendix, Standard Citations for Music, that is unique to their publication and would come last. All modules will end with glossary and index.

Maxwell and Leslie both encouraged discussion of cataloging issues on DCRM-L. Those who would like to join the list should write to Leslie saying that they want to join the list and then Bob Maxwell will add them. Maxwell has said that this could even be a place to discuss RDA now that the JSC is posting documents.

## 8. DCRM(S) (Gillis and McLaren)

Leslie announced that the editorial board for the rare serials rules (Jane Gillis, Juliet McLaren, Annie Copeland, Randy Brandt and Stephen Skuce) met in Berkeley in March to work on the DCRM(S). She thanked all of the volunteers who agreed to do close reading of the draft in preparation for the hearing during ALA.

Gillis and McLaren led a discussion of unresolved questions which were circulated prior to the meeting.

Gillis noted that we are still in need of many serial examples for the text. We have noted "Example needed" and encourage others to submit examples if they find them. In some cases we have left monographic examples that seem to fit. In other places we have removed the "example needed" because we do not believe there has ever been a serial to fit the rule.

Leslie cautioned that we shouldn't think that just because we have never seen something, that it doesn't exist. Gillis said that it is better to use modern 20<sup>th</sup> century examples if necessary and err on the side of leaving examples in, but in some cases we cannot imagine ever finding a serial example of, for instance, Latin contractions.

## Appendix I: Reprints of serials.

The appendix differs from AACR2. The editors asked if it makes sense as written. The uniform title for the original serial is used in all records to collocate all reprints. Overholt said that he thought the qualifier worked well and Russell suggested that using the uniform title, an AACR2 convention, works to highlight the fact that these are records for reprints. McLaren pointed out that a further option for distinguishing between reprints is to use the subfield f with a date in the 130. Theroux questioned having an identical 775 and 130 with a subfield f as providing double access points. McLaren said that one provides access and the other functions as a machine link. Gillis said that CONSER and Judy Kuhagen had approved this practice.

Leslie questioned the last sentence in paragraph 4 (p. 153): “Sometimes, it is not possible to verify whether or not the serial is a reprint. *In these cases, always catalog what is in hand.*” McLaren said that sometimes you don’t know if you have a geographic edition or a reprint edition, you don’t know if you are missing anything and you can’t identify it as a reprint; these might be concurrent editions, or not. Leslie suggested that we replace with: “*In case of doubt, catalog as an original issue*” - i.e., don’t assume you have a reprint. She also suggested rewording the final sentence on p. 153 to make it clear that we are talking about a reprint of a serial that is also being issued serially.

## Appendix J: Individual issues of serials

App J was originally copied from DCRB. We had coding questions and deleted MARC coding and examples except for the 245. The editors need guidance about the appendix generally and wonder specifically if we need coded examples.

Some felt that an option would be to state that individual issues of a serial may be cataloged as monographs and then direct catalogers to DCRM(B). Most felt that the Appendix is important for DCRM(S) and perhaps should even go in DCRM(B), and that the editorial committee should try to put MARC coding and examples back into the text.

### 3C3. Omitting parallel designation information

The numbering area is a transcription area. The rules right now call for omitting info and not using the mark of omission. Is this ok, with the note? Example:

May 1997-

Not

May 1997- = mai 1997-

*Note:* Designation on piece appears in English and French (i.e., May 1997 and mai 1997)

The group agreed that it was best to instruct catalogers to record all parallel information in a note, and not to use the mark of omission.

#### 0B2. Basis of description

We are using a different basis for the description from AACR2. Is this clear?

AACR2 instructs serial catalogers to base the description on the earliest issue. Often the issues are brought together in a volume with a title page that carries a new designation and a new publisher. The rare serials rules state that the cataloger in this case should use the volume title page as the chief source, rather than the earliest issue to privilege the artifact over the individual issue. The chart on page 22 says this, but there is some feeling that it is still unclear. After some discussion a suggestion was made remove the chart and just say that if there is a volume title page, use it; if not, use the first issue. Leslie encouraged the committee to draft language that would distinguish between a volume, bibliographically speaking, and a bound together volume.

#### 0G7.2. Turned letters

There is a question as to whether any serials have “turned” or approximated letters. There might be some but we are not aware of them. The group felt we should leave in but remove the first example.

#### 1D2. Other title information

Originally in DCRM(S) there was an option that would allow one to follow AACR2 and CONSER in transcribing the 245 without other title information (with some exceptions). The editors would like to remove this option, favoring transcription of other title information. The group agreed that it was permissible to remove this option.

#### 1E1&2. Statements of responsibility not on title page.

DCRM(B) advocates transcribing statements of responsibility appearing in the preliminaries or colophon in the form in which they appear, and instructs the cataloger to enclose in square brackets information not taken from the title page. For serials, we have suggested putting this kind of information in a note because the responsible parties often change throughout the life of the serial. The editors want to know if others agree.

Leslie commented that she prefers keeping the distinction between supplied information and transcribed information and may ask the (B) editors to change the wording in their draft. Our optional rule to not include editors and to mention them instead in a note is fine, but we should add “If omitted, use a mark of omission.”

#### 1E4 & 1E5. Transcribing the statement of responsibility

The editors wonder if these two rules are redundant. Theroux pointed out that the first is about a single statement of responsibility and the second is about omitting numerous names. We will leave as is.

#### 3G1. Changes in numbering or designations

Sentence is awkward even though it is AACR2. The group feels it is fine as is:

“If the numbering starts a new sequence with a different system, transcribe the designation of the first and last issues or volumes under the old system, followed by the designation of the first issue or part under the new system.”

#### 4D2.4. Julian/Old Style dating

Should we have wording here that is same as 3C2? Does wording have to match in the two areas when talking about Julian/Old Style dates?

Russell pointed out that area 3 concerns coverage whereas the rule in area 4 pertains to the date. They can refer to each other but the rules should not be replicated. Since 3C2 pertains to coverage dates we should remove the word “publication” so we don’t confuse people.

#### 5B2. Completed serials

The editors wondered if the rule as written was clear. Leslie suggested that we might flip the way it is written so that the extent comes first followed by the editorial comments, which is the general pattern in (B). Theroux noted that there are some exceptions to that pattern. The suggestion was made to add an example in which the physical units don’t match the numbers (the example is 6 volumes of 12 numbers; physical units 72). The editors will change and expand this section.

#### 5E/7B13. Accompanying material

Do we need a 5E? Can we have 7B13 without 5E?

Russell suggested that we flip a) and b) and give an example to support the rule. The rule at 5E2 to describe accompanying material in a note should be amended to read “if desired”.

Further questions were held for the Public Hearing for DCRM(S), which was announced as being held later that evening, June 24, 2006, 7:00 pm in the Hilton-Fountain Rm.

#### 10. CC:DA (Th roux)

Th roux thanked the committee for its work in preparing responses to the draft of pt. I of *Resource Description and Access* (RDA) and the LC proposal on Family Names (5JSC/LC/6). She briefly summarized the outcomes of the April meeting of the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules (JSC), enumerated the draft documents and proposals most recently released by the JSC, and gave tentative deadlines for receiving committee responses to those documents. After the ALA conference, she will submit a fuller CC:DA report for inclusion in the committee's minutes as an appendix. She reminded committee members that an RDA Update Forum would be held during the conference and that CC:DA meetings are open to all visitors.

#### 11. ISBD(A) Update (Leslie for Robinson)

Leslie commended Alex Thurman, Eileen Heeran and Ryan Hildebrand for their comments on the ISBD(A) revision which formed the BSC response. Leslie forwarded them to the UK Bibliographic Standards Committee in time for the May 1st deadline. Comments were also sent by the National Library of China and an individual from the University of California Santa Barbara. Elizabeth Robinson will be submitting a summary progress report to be included as an appendix to these minutes on the revision.

#### 12. New Business

Nina Schneider, Larry Creider and Deborah Leslie worked on the BSC response to RDA following ALA midwinter in San Antonio. Once again the timing for comments on chapters 6 and 7 will be very tight. Leslie asked for volunteers to work on the BSC response. Schneider and Faulds volunteered.

Leslie attended an RLG members meeting and gave an update on the RLG/OCLC merger. She said that the worst case scenarios many people were imagining are probably too dark, and that she was actually encouraged by the fact that the concerns of IRLA libraries, research libraries and special collections communities were being heard. Everyone declared the importance of the existence of independent records in context and defended the need for extra tracings, descriptive conventions, provenance information and individual copy specific notes. Leslie asked if the group felt that the BSC should make a statement to give extra weight to this discussion. A show of hands in favor was unanimous. Leslie will begin working on a draft and will talk with the Executive Committee about making this an action item for Midwinter.

13. Announcements from the floor

Theroux announced that LC has posted Descriptive Cataloging Guidelines for Rare Japanese Materials (pre-1868) on their website.

Leslie thanked Annie Copeland and Manon Theroux who are rotating off the committee and welcomed Randy Brandt (for a second term), Ryan Hildebrand, Jim Stephenson, Bruce Tabb, Alex Thurman (previously intern) and Kate Moriarty (intern) onto the committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:12.

Respectfully submitted,  
Annie Copeland

## APPENDIX A: REPORT ON ISBD(A) REVISION

*Submitted by Elizabeth Robinson, LC BSC liaison*

In early May, Gunilla Jonsson (the chair of the ISBD(A) revision group) began forwarding responses from various groups and individuals to the other members of the ISBD(A) revision group. Seems like there was a flurry of comments submitted near the May 1, 2006 deadline.

Respondents include the Library of Congress, the RBMS BSC Task Force (of course), the UK BSC of the CILIP Rare Book and Special Collections Group, AFNOR Working Group "Evolution de la description bibliographique" (France), the National Library of China (!), the Swedish Committee on Cataloging, an individual at UCSB, and a group from Romania.

There were many useful suggestions that were incorporated into the proposed revision. Among the respondents were viewpoints that represented the various struggles over ideology that exists among the ISBD(A) revision group itself.

Gunilla prepared a summary progress report that she submitted to our parent IBSD Review Group in early June. She also made revisions in the draft that the rest of the ISBD(A) revision group will be discussing throughout the summer, no doubt.

Gunilla will be on vacation starting June 21 through most of July and at IFLA the first part of August. She will report on the progress of the ISBD(A) revision at IFLA. I suspect that we (the ISBD(A) revision group) won't hear from the ISBD Review Group before then. By the way, that group was formerly chaired by John Byrum (retired from LC early this year). The new chair is Elena Escolano Rodríguez (Biblioteca Nacional de España). She apparently was chair at some earlier time as well.

## APPENDIX B: CC:DA REPORT

To: ACRL/RBMS Bibliographic Standards Committee  
From: Manon Th  roux, ACRL Liaison to CC:DA  
Subject: CC:DA Report for ALA Annual 2006

### 1. CC:DA Activities Before the April JSC Meeting

During the three-month period between ALA Midwinter in January 2006 and the April 2006 meeting of the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules (JSC), CC:DA activities were primarily focused on the review of documents associated with the forthcoming cataloging code *Resource Description and Access* (RDA), the successor to AACR2. Specifically, CC:DA discussed (and authorized the ALA representative to the JSC to respond to) the draft of Part I of RDA and proposals submitted by JSC members on the following topics: persistent identifiers and URLs; internationalization; family names; content and carrier terms; and the technical description of digital media. The RBMS Bibliographic Standards Committee submitted formal responses to the draft of RDA Part I and the proposal on Family Names. Many of the comments made by the committee were subsequently incorporated into the ALA responses to these documents. CC:DA also submitted a formal response on the draft of the second revision of *International Standard Bibliographic Description for Older Monographic Publications* or ISBD(A) to IFLA.

### 2. April JSC Meeting

A summary of the outcomes of the April 2006 meeting of the JSC is available on the JSC website: <http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/0604out.html>. A more detailed report by the ALA representative to the JSC is also available: <http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/jsc0604.pdf>

Outcomes of the meeting included:

- RDA Structure: RDA will now be divided into Parts A-B rather than Parts I-III. Part A will cover description, bibliographic relationships, and choice of access points. Part B will cover construction of access points. Within Part A, the elements formerly in chapter 6 (item-specific information) will be moved to chapters 2-5 as appropriate. The text slated as Part II will form chapter 6-7 of Part A and will be issued in June 2006 as planned.
- Element Structure: Relationships between elements will be specified.
- Labels: Elements will be identified as: required, required if applicable, or optional. Data within elements currently labelled as options will be relabelled: alternative, optional addition, or optional omission.

- Rule Numbering: Additional numbering at the paragraph level will be provided to facilitate citations.
- Statement of Responsibility: The option not to transcribe a statement of responsibility if access points are being provided will be retained.
- Transcription: Elements will be clearly labelled to specify whether they are to contain transcribed data or recorded data; abbreviations will not be used in elements that contain transcribed data unless the abbreviation appears on the resource being described.
- Specialist Manuals: A list of specialist cataloging manuals will be provided.
- Mapping to MARC21: A discussion paper on the mapping of RDA to MARC21 will be prepared for the MARBI meeting at ALA Midwinter 2007
- Availability: All JSC working documents will be made publicly available at: <http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/working1.html>

### 3. Recent CC:DA Activities

The full agenda for the CC:DA meetings at ALA Annual 2006 is listed here:

<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/agen0606.html>

The main agenda item was discussion of the draft of RDA Part A, chapters 6-7, issued just days before the conference: <http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/rdadraftch6-7.html>

The draft of chapter 6 provides a taxonomy of bibliographic relationships. The draft of chapter 7 addresses choice of access points and is equivalent to AACR2 chapter 21. The draft also includes a cover letter, with links to the revised prospectus and other relevant documents, and addenda to Chapters 1, 3, and 4. Of particular interest to the RBMS Bibliographic Standards Committee: provisions for access points for family names, former owners, and publishers, printers, etc., and for the designation of role in access points (i.e., relator terms).

If the committee would like to submit a response to the draft, it should be sent to me, with the comments organized by rule number whenever possible. Deadline: no later than **August 7**.

As mentioned above, RDA will include a list of specialist cataloging manuals. The committee may submit citations of relevant manuals as candidates for inclusion in this list; forthcoming standards are acceptable, as long as they are intended to be published by 2008. Deadline: send to me no later than **July 28**.

JSC members have also recently issued the following new and revised proposals of possible interest to the committee:

- Internationalization: <http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/docs/5lc5rev.pdf>
- Breton initial articles: <http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/docs/5lc7.pdf>

- Bible uniform titles: <http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/docs/51c8.pdf>

The internationalization proposal addresses nonroman scripts, dates other than those following the Gregorian/Julian calendar, and numerals other than Western-style arabic numerals. The Bible uniform title proposal calls for eliminating 'O.T.' and "N.T." in uniform titles for books of the Bible. If the committee would like to respond to any of these proposals, the deadlines for getting comments to me would be: **September 15**.

The new chair of CC:DA will be: Cheri A. Folkner, Boise State University.