

Fall 2018, Volume 26, Number 2 • ISSN 1066-7873 • Kerri Price, editor  
Comments, questions, and suggestions are welcomed. Please contact us at [accred@ala.org](mailto:accred@ala.org).

## In this issue:

- ALA accreditation at a glance
- News and announcements
- COA announces 2018 Spring Meeting and Annual Conference accreditation actions
- From the Director: Outlook
- Spotlight on process and policy
- In profile: A column featuring an accreditation star
- External review panelists acknowledged
- AASL-CAEP recognition news

---

## ALA accreditation at a glance

<b>66</b>	ALA-accredited programs
<b>61</b>	Institutions with ALA-accredited programs
<b>33</b>	U.S. states (including Washington, DC, and Puerto Rico) with ALA-accredited programs
<b>5</b>	Canadian provinces with ALA-accredited programs
<b>39</b>	ALA-accredited programs offering 100% online programs †
<b>2</b>	Programs with candidacy status
<b>16,081</b>	Total number of students enrolled in ALA-accredited programs in fall 2017 *
<b>5,863</b>	Graduates of ALA-accredited programs during the 2016-2017 academic year *

† As identified by the programs  
\* As reported by programs to the Committee on Accreditation. The 2017-2018 data is under review.

---

## News and announcements

### Required interim reporting instructions

An email with instructions for this year's required interim reports was sent on September 26 to each program head, as well as those designated by the program "to be copied on accreditation-related correspondence." Program heads who have not received the emailed instructions should contact the Office right away at [accred@ala.org](mailto:accred@ala.org). The Committee on Accreditation (COA) will review the reports in preparation for its spring 2019 meeting (April 11-12, 2019) and prepare a response at that time.

Due December 1, 2018: Annual statistical data reporting (required from every program). Data collection is via the program's trend summary spreadsheet, sent as an attachment in the email referenced above. The head of the accredited program should review and verify all data prior to submitting.

Due February 15, 2019:

- **Narrative reports (biennial narrative reports and annual progress reports).** Instructions regarding format, submission, and content are on the [Required Reporting for Accreditation](#) webpage. This page also includes a schedule for biennial narrative report submission (even/odd year assignments). Programs with Conditional, Precandidacy, or Candidacy status submit annual progress reports instead of biennial narrative reports. Please note the ten-page limit (excluding appendices) on narrative reports.
- **Student achievement data weblink in the [Searchable Database of ALA-accredited Programs](#).** Each program reviews its link, ensuring that it works and contains current, relevant, and easily accessible information. This link should point towards a prominent and easy-to-find webpage on the program website where student achievement data is collected. Examples of student achievement data include attrition and retention, graduation, licensure pass rates (as applicable), job placement (as appropriate), employment advancement (as appropriate), acceptance into graduate programs (other master's, PhD), successful transfer of credit, or other reliable information.

### ERP chair training at 2019 ALA Midwinter Meeting in Seattle

Date: Friday, January 25, 2019

Time: 1:00 – 4:00pm

Location: Hyatt Olive 8 Hotel (1635 8th Avenue), Ballroom DE

External review panelists who have participated in two or more on-site visits are invited to attend training to serve as an ERP chair upon appointment by COA. The session will prepare attendees to lead an external review of programs seeking ALA accreditation. The session will include a panel discussion featuring experienced ERP chairs and Office for Accreditation (OA) staff. OA staff will present resources for chairs to use in the review process. People who are currently assigned to chair a review are strongly encouraged to attend. Program heads who

want to learn more about the comprehensive review, the site visit, and the role of the ERP chair in the review process are also encouraged to attend.

Please RSVP by January 4, 2019, to [Kerri Price](#), and include “ERP chair 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
- Cultural heritage information management
- Curricular review and redesign
- Distance education
- 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](#) on the [Resources for external review panelists](#) webpage. If you are interested and meet the qualifications, please complete the [External Review Panel Member Information Form](#), and plan to attend the training session on Friday, June 21 at the 2019 ALA Annual Conference in Washington, DC.

If you know someone who might be interested in serving as an external review panelist, please encourage that person to apply, or send a recommendation to [kprice@ala.org](mailto:kprice@ala.org).

### **AASL-CAEP program review training at 2019 ALA Midwinter Meeting in Seattle**

Date: Saturday, January 26, 2019

Time: 3:00pm - 6:00pm

Location: Sheraton Seattle (1400 6th Street), Issaquah Room

New and experienced program reviewers and report compilers are encouraged to attend this session to learn about the AASL-CAEP program review process, the *2010 ALA/AASL Standards for Initial Preparation of School Librarians* (and an update on the *Standards* revision process), report preparation and review, and appropriate assessments.

In addition, training leaders will be available for a 20-minute consultation for those programs who are preparing program reports or who are interested in beginning the program report process. Please note that the trainers provide feedback based on their personal experience and are not acting as reviewers during this consultation time.

So that we have sufficient training materials on hand, please RSVP to [Kerri Price](#), by January 4, 2019, 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/about/ed/caep/reviewers>.

### **AASL-CAEP Coordinating Committee meeting at 2019 ALA Midwinter Meeting in Seattle**

Date: Saturday, January 26, 2019

Time: 6:00pm - 7:00pm

Location: Sheraton Seattle (1400 6th Street), Issaquah Room

Committee members are strongly encouraged to attend. Those interested in AASL-CAEP program review and the *Standards for Initial Preparation of School Librarians* (currently undergoing revision) are also encouraged to attend.

### **New standards for American Association of School Librarians (AASL)-Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) school librarianship education program review**

The draft 2018 ALA/AASL *Standards for the Initial Preparation of School Librarians* are moving forward to full implementation. The *Standards* were submitted to the CAEP Specialized Professional Associations (SPA) Standards Committee in July for one-year-out review and feedback and, overall, were well-received with most areas in full compliance with the CAEP Guidelines. The AASL/CAEP Coordinating Committee received specific feedback on areas needing more attention and is now working to comply. The *Standards* will be presented to the AASL Board of Directors for approval in June 2019 and will be submitted to the CAEP SPA Standards Committee for final approval in Fall 2019. Programs will be able to begin the implementation process in Spring 2020.

The *Standards* are aligned with the new [AASL National School Library Standards for Learners, School Librarians, and School Libraries](#) and the themes are:

- The Learner and Learning: how the library can ensure that all learners are prepared for college, career, and life.
- Instructional Practice: the responsibility of the school librarian to design and deliver instruction.
- Knowledge and Application of Content: presenting content of school librarianship based on multiple forms of literacy.
- Organization and Access: outlining the management and organizational role of school librarians.
- Leadership, Advocacy, and Professional Responsibility: focusing on the ongoing development of the librarian.

## COA announces accreditation actions

The Committee on Accreditation (COA) of the American Library Association (ALA) has announced the following accreditation decisions.

### At the COA's 2018 Spring Meeting:

Candidacy status was granted to the Master of Library and Information Science at Southern Connecticut State University

### At the COA's meeting at the 2018 ALA Annual Conference:

The April 2018 policy revision to [section I.15 \(Accreditation decisions\)](#) of [Accreditation Process, Policies, and Procedures \(AP3\)](#) has been implemented to enhance public disclosure and went into effect for all programs beginning in May 2018. The policy states that “any [standard](#) on which a program has follow-up reporting (following a comprehensive review or interim reporting review) is made public by the Office for Accreditation in the [Directory of ALA-Accredited Programs](#) and as a part of the usual means (e.g., [press release](#), [Accreditation Decisions and Actions Taken reports](#), and [Prism](#)).”

Continued Accreditation status was granted to the following programs (listed in alphabetical order by institution), with the next comprehensive review visit scheduled to take place in spring 2025:

- Master of Science in Library Science at Clarion University of Pennsylvania. Standards cited for follow-up reporting: I (systematic planning), I.4 (meaningful external and internal evaluation), II.5 (procedures for continual evaluation of curriculum), IV.6 (applies the results of evaluation of student achievement to program development), IV.7 (documented evidence to substantiate the evaluation of student learning outcomes), V.9 (access to physical and technological resources), V.10 (functional learning environment for students and faculty), V.12 (support services and facilities are appropriate), and V.13 (regular review of adequacy of access to physical resources and facilities).
- Master of Library and Information Science at the University of Denver. Standards cited for follow-up reporting: I.1 (program's mission and goals pursued through implementation of an ongoing, broad-based, systematic planning process), I.4 (meaningful external and internal evaluation), I.5 (documented evidence to substantiate evaluation of program's success in achieving its mission, goals and objectives), I.6 (results of mission, goals and objectives evaluation systematically used to improve program), II.5 (procedures for continual evaluation of curriculum), II.6 (documented evidence to substantiate evaluation of curriculum), II.7 (results of curriculum evaluation systematically used to improve program), III.1 (faculty capable of accomplishing program objectives), III.9 (documented evidence to substantiate evaluation of faculty), III.10 (results of faculty evaluation systematically used to improve program), V.5 (program staff support for administrative head and faculty), V.6 (financial support from parent institution), V.12 (support services and facilities are appropriate), V.13 (regular review of adequacy of access to physical resources and facilities), V.14 (documented

evidence to substantiate evaluation of administration, finances, and resources), and V.15 (results of evaluation of administration, finances, and resources systematically used to improve program).

- Master of Science in Library Science at the University of Kentucky. No Standards cited for follow-up reporting.
- Master of Library and Information Studies at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. No Standards cited for follow-up reporting.
- Master of Library and Information Studies at the University of Rhode Island. No Standards cited for follow-up reporting.
- Master of Library and Information Studies at the University of Western Ontario. No Standards cited for follow-up reporting.

Information on accreditation statuses and types of reviews can be found in Section I of [\*Accreditation Process, Policies and Procedures \(AP3\)\*](#), fourth edition.

The following institutions have programs that are being visited in the fall 2018 academic term. The accreditation decisions will be made by the COA at its meeting at the 2019 ALA Midwinter Meeting in Seattle.

- University of California, Los Angeles
- University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
- Kent State University
- Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey
- St. John's University

The following institutions have programs that are being visited in the spring 2019 academic term. The accreditation decisions will be made by the COA at its meeting at the 2019 ALA Annual Conference in Washington, DC.

- Chicago State University
- Indiana University – Bloomington
- Indiana University - Purdue University, Indianapolis
- Louisiana State University
- University of Southern Mississippi

ALA accreditation indicates that the program meets or exceeds the [\*Standards for Accreditation of Master's Programs in Library and Information Studies\*](#), established by the COA and approved by ALA Council. The accreditation process involves rigorous, ongoing self-evaluation by the program and verification of evidence through an external review. The COA evaluates each program for compliance with the *Standards*, which address systematic planning; curriculum; faculty; students; administration, finances, and resources.

A complete [list of programs and degrees accredited by ALA](#) can be found online. 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

the ALA COA as the authority for assessing the quality of education offered by graduate programs in the field of library and information studies.

---

## From the Director: OUTLOOK

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

New appointments to the Committee on Accreditation (the Committee/COA) bring additional executive-level academic experience to the fore:

- Appointed as Chair: Loretta R. Parham (CEO and Library Director, Atlanta University Center Woodruff Library)
- Eric D. Albright (Director, Hirsh Health Sciences Library, Tufts University)
- Linda C. Smith (Professor and Executive Associate Dean, School of Information Sciences, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign)

COA fall meetings include orientation to the responsibilities of the Committee's [charge](#): "execution of the accreditation program of ALA, and to develop and formulate standards of education for library and information studies for the approval of council." This "execution" responsibility has to do fundamentally with decision making on [accredited status](#) [PDF] in accordance with the [Standards](#) and involves oversight of [process, policies, and procedures](#). Committee work is organized for review of each program on a comprehensive overall level and on an interim basis with annual statistical reporting and narratives biennially.

### On the tech front

As the ALA 2019 budget (September 2018 – August 2019) is implemented, the Office for Accreditation pushes ahead with development of the cloud-based Jura, an [Indigo Interactive](#) accreditation management system. Programs with accreditation review visits in spring 2019 have been invited to pilot the system. Feedback from the pilot has been an instructive reminder about just how much patience technology can demand. Indigo is preparing to conduct *Welcome to Jura* webinars monthly on the last Friday, the first scheduled for November 30, 2018. Indigo has provided this advice on the webinars:

- An email update will be sent to all end-users in Jura, notifying them of upcoming webinars and allowing them to sign up to attend.
  - The first 100 people registered will be able to participate.
  - Registrations are available through the helpdesk portal [here](#).
- Webinars will take place the last Friday of each month (except December due to the holidays).
  - Webinars will be one hour long.
  - Monthly notifications will be sent by email to alert interested participants.
- Webinars will provide a general overview of the capabilities of the system.
  - Questions will be answered as time allows.

- Recordings of the webinars will be available on Indigo/Jura FAQ pages for those unable to attend.
- A survey will be sent out after to attendees to gain feedback on how to improve the next webinar.
- Have a quick item you want to send off to us in the meantime? Send it to [hey@getjura.com](mailto:hey@getjura.com) for collaborative ideas. It may be featured in one of our upcoming joint sessions.

Virtual reviewer training is in the final quality-review stages with the first five-week course via Moodle to kick off on February 4, 2019.

The new [ALA Connect](#) virtual work space has been implemented, which should help us move beyond email lists for committee and panel work. The platform is designed to provide a space to post, develop documents collaboratively, build group calendars, and converse in discussion forums.

### **CHEA update**

The Council on Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) Committee on Recognition ([CoR](#)) has asked to meet with the COA chair and the director of the Office for Accreditation on November 19, 2018, in Washington, DC, as it [continues to discern](#) how ALA is meeting three of its 2010 standards that require accreditors to:

- 12A5: “refer to resources [in standards and policies] only to the extent required for students to emerge from institutions or programs appropriately prepared”
- 12B1: have implemented policies or standards that require programs “routinely to provide reliable information to the public on their performance, including student achievement, as determined by the institution,” and
- 12B5 “inform the public of the bases and reasons for its final accreditation decisions.”

ALA is not alone among accreditors that the CHEA CoR has been questioning concerning its 12B1 and 12B5 standards, as reflected in its decision summaries at <https://www.chea.org/chea-recognition-decision-summaries>.

Many of the recent updates to the ALA-COA [2015 Standards and Process, Policies, Procedures \(AP3\)](#) have been in response to CoR mandates on CHEA standards, as have the disclosure enhancements to the [Directory of ALA-accredited programs](#), which now includes program weblinks on performance and student achievement and further disclosure on COA decisions.

The longer-term outlook is on a revision of the current CHEA policy and procedures which includes its standards. Innovation is a new focus in the revision. New requirements call on accreditors to provide evidence that its policies or standards support innovation. The revision includes a shortened time frame between comprehensive reviews of accreditors to seven from 10 years.

Collection of comment on the revision closed after one round and as of this writing is under legal review pending CHEA Board review for approval and is not available at its website.



## Opportunities to connect

Library and information studies (LIS) program personnel have been attending reviewer training in greater numbers. Those who haven't [applied to become a reviewer](#) attend as observers at designated tables. During the reviewer training exercises, observers have the chance to talk together and go over with me any points of review process. Program personnel are welcome to contact [Kerri Price](#) to reserve a seat. The next reviewer training session focuses on leading review panels as a chair and is scheduled for Friday afternoon during the [ALA Midwinter Meeting in Seattle](#).

Written and oral evaluation of these sessions as well as the review process evaluation surveys which program personnel complete at five points in the comprehensive review process, provide valuable feedback that improves the process on an ongoing basis.

You are invited to get in touch with me by calling 312-280-2434 or dropping a note to me at [kobrien@ala.org](mailto:kobrien@ala.org). I hope to see you in Seattle come January.

---

## Spotlight on process and policy

**By Kerri Price, Associate 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 looks at new developments in the world of external review panelist (ERP) and ERP chair training. If you have an idea for a future column, please send it to [Kerri Price](#).

### Online external review panelist training

In a few short months, the Office for Accreditation will enroll its first cohort in the online version of its ERP training (we will continue to offer in-person training at ALA conferences). This asynchronous, five-week course will be hosted in Moodle and will begin on February 4, 2019. In development over the past few months, the course is nearing completion. A group of experienced panelists and past and present COA members are currently working through the course material to provide advice and feedback.

The course is designed to prepare panelists for their role in the comprehensive review process and will consist of presentations, quizzes, analysis of a Self-Study section, and group work. It mirrors the material presented in the in-person training, but provides more in-depth instruction on the basics of ALA accreditation and details of the comprehensive review, making it particularly valuable for new ERP pool members who may not have an extensive knowledge of higher education or accreditation.

While course content is subject to minor change, as of now, the five modules will cover the following topics:

- **Module 1: ALA Accreditation Basics** – Defines accreditation in general and provides an overview of ALA accreditation in particular; introduces the two guiding documents of ALA accreditation: [Standards for Accreditation of Master's Programs in Library and Information Studies](#) and [Accreditation Process, Policies, and Procedures \(AP3\)](#); and discusses other relevant organizations related to ALA accreditation.
- **Module 2: The Comprehensive Review** – Provides an overview of the comprehensive review, including what it is, why it's important, who is involved, and the timeline. It also defines the accreditation statuses that may be granted by the Committee on Accreditation (COA) following the comprehensive review.
- **Module 3: Role and Responsibilities of an External Review Panelist** – Covers the role of the ERP chair and the role of an ERP panelist; provides guidance on conflicts of interest; and discusses the responsibilities of panelists, including preparation and participation, professional demeanor, and the importance of maintaining confidentiality.
- **Module 4: Standard I - Systematic Planning** – This module will cycle through the five standards, beginning with Standard I for the first and second iterations of the course. It contains an in-depth overview of Standard I and the types of evidence to look for when assessing compliance with the standard. It will require an analysis of a portion of a Self-Study and participation in a group activity involving this analysis.
- **Module 5: The External Review Panel Report (ERP Report)** – Discusses the purpose and format of the ERP Report and introduces the ERP Report Template. Course participants will prepare a portion of the ERP Report using the analysis developed in Module 4.

In assembling the first group to progress through the course, the Office will reserve space for those in the ERP pool who have never participated on a panel. The first priority group will be those who have never attended training, followed by those who have only attended one training, then two trainings, etc. Invitations to these groups will be sent by the end of November and 35 respondents will be enrolled on a first-come first-served basis. However, if you are an experienced reviewer interested in taking this course, don't fret, because we'll offer the course at least one more time in 2019.

### **Brief survey on ERP chair training needs**

While we are not currently working on an online version of the ERP chair training course, we want to enhance the currently-offered in-person version offered at ALA Midwinter Meetings. For the past few years, training has focused on scheduling the site visit, which is a crucial responsibility of ERP chairs. Still, we want to ensure that chairs and prospective chairs are receiving the training they need to succeed and fill any knowledge gaps that may exist. During the week of November 19, the link to a very short online survey will be sent to ERP chairs and experienced panelists, asking them to rate their need level for training on various topics related to serving as an ERP chair. The results will be analyzed and ERP chair training will be adjusted accordingly.

### **Are you in the ERP pool yet?**

If you're interested in [serving the profession](#) as an external review panelist and meet the qualifications, please complete the [External Review Panel Member Information Form](#), and stay

tuned for announcements about online training opportunities and the in-person training session that will be held on Friday, June 21 at the 2019 ALA Annual Conference in Washington, DC.

---

## In profile: Meet Ann Carlson Weeks

Dr. Ann Carlson Weeks (Professor of the Practice, College of Information Studies, University of Maryland), longtime external review panelist/chair and former Committee on Accreditation member, discusses her past and present professional endeavors and provides valuable insight into the accreditation process, as well as the qualities that make an effective reviewer.

### **Q: Describe your career path. What led you to where you are today?**

**Weeks:** Everything sort of happened by chance, with one opportunity naturally leading into another. I started my career as a school librarian in both elementary and secondary schools in Indiana and upstate New York, before pursuing a PhD at the University of Pittsburgh. Upon receiving my PhD, I embarked on a 14-year career at the American Library Association (ALA), serving as Executive Director of the Association for Library Service to Children (ALSC), then as Executive Director of the American Association of School Librarians (AASL), and finally as Executive Director of both AASL and the Young Adult Library Services Association (YALSA). While Executive Director of AASL/YALSA, and thanks to a wonderful staff, I also coordinated the National Library Power Program, a major national initiative of the DeWitt-Wallace Reader's Digest Foundation, which focused on the creation of elementary and middle school libraries. This experience led to my next opportunity, which was serving as Director of Libraries and Information Services for the Chicago Public Schools for four years. I've been at my current position – Professor of the Practice at the University of Maryland – for 19 years. My research interests are school librarianship programs, children's information access and use, and digital libraries for children.

### **Q: What are some interesting projects you've been involved with lately?**

**Weeks:** My primary focus is the [Lilead Project](#), which was established in 2011 to study, build community among, and offer professional development and education for district level school library supervisors and other school library leaders. Funded by three grants from the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS), the Lilead Project Team is based at the University of Maryland's iSchool, in partnership with Old Dominion University's Darden College of Education. Prior to the initial element of this project, the Lilead Survey conducted in 2012 and 2014, data concerning school library supervisors had not been collected since the 1960s. The Lilead Fellows Program and the Lilead Leaders online courses were created to provide intensive professional development opportunities, which was a need identified through the Survey.

### **Q: When, why, and/or how did you initially become interested in serving as a reviewer?**

**Weeks:** I began serving as a reviewer in the early 2000s, shortly after joining the faculty at the University of Maryland. I found it was an excellent opportunity to learn more about higher

education, which was a new work environment for me at the time. After reviewing for a few years, I was appointed to the Committee on Accreditation, which was a rewarding and valuable experience.

**Q: What do you feel is the most important aspect of reviewer preparation for the comprehensive review?**

**Weeks:** It's important to be aware that serving on a panel is a significant time commitment. Reviewers must be sure to block enough time on their calendars to ensure completion of the work that needs to be done, both before and after the site visit.

**Q: You've been a reviewer for many years. What changes or innovations have you noticed over time with regard to the accreditation process? What changes would you like to see?**

**Weeks:** I've appreciated the increased level of guidance given to reviewers over the years, both in terms of the improved communication of expectations and the development of tools for panelist use. One example of a useful tool is the relatively new ERP Report Template, which provides a guide for panelists as they write the narrative report that outlines the panel's findings with regard to evidence verification during the comprehensive review. When I was a member of COA, I noted the lack of consistency across ERP Reports and this tool helps to remedy this inconsistency.

I'm concerned about the viability of three- or two-person panels. While I recognize that accreditation is a significant expense for programs, I recently served on a three-person panel and found it extremely challenging to focus on two standards simultaneously. I find the preparation work before the site visit, the massive amount of data and significant number of people that we need to interview while on campus, and the final preparation of the report on one standard to be challenging and the requirement to address two standards effectively to be almost impossible.

**Q: What three qualities make a great reviewer?**

**Weeks:** (1) Preparation. As noted above, it's crucial to be prepared and to block enough time in your schedule to complete the work. (2) Professional Curiosity. A real interest in learning about how programs interpret the *Standards* and deliver excellent learning opportunities in a wide variety of ways. I always learn so much from reading Self-Study reports and participating in onsite visits. (3) Compassion. Realize that the comprehensive review is a high pressure and stressful time for programs. Reviewers should approach the process with a sense of compassionate collegiality and remember to note program strengths as well as limitations while on site visits.

**Q: What advice would you give to new reviewers?**

**Weeks:** Know that your first review will be a learning experience and remain open to that reality. Try to set aside your preconceived notions about how things are done at your university. In addition, get to know your fellow reviewers. Due to the nature of the review process, you spend a concentrated period of time working closely with your fellow panelists. I've had opportunities to work with extraordinary practitioners and educators from the LIS field

that I would never have known without the opportunity to serve on external review panels. It has been an extremely rewarding experience.

**Q: What are some of your hobbies and interests?**

**Weeks:** I love cooking and creating new recipes. I also love to travel and have had the opportunity to teach a number education abroad courses, taking students on trips to Nicaragua, Namibia, Germany, Russia, and England.

**Q: What are the last two good books you've read (one professional and one pleasure read)?**

**Weeks:** My professional book recommendation is [Start with Why: How Great Leaders Inspire Everyone to Take Action, by Simon Sinek](#) (Portfolio/Penguin, 2009). I believe everyone will benefit from reading this. Sinek's [TED Talks](#) are excellent as well.

My most recent "guilty pleasure" is [Body Surfing, by Anita Shreve](#). I tend to do most of my pleasure reading on airplanes, and my iPad is ready for my next trip with three additional Shreve titles.

---

## 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 on accreditation reviews during the spring 2018 academic term.

### Chairs

- Clément Arsenault, Vice-Dean and Secretary, Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, Université de Montréal
- Mirah J. Dow, Professor, School of Library and Information Management, Emporia State University
- Joyce M. Latham, Associate Professor, School of Information Studies, University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee
- C. Allen Nichols, Executive Director, Akron Bar Association
- Philip M. Turner, Professor Emeritus, College of Information, University of North Texas
- Susan Weaver, Director of Library Services (retired), Kent State University

### Panelists

- Eric D. Albright, Director, Hirsh Health Sciences Library, Tufts University
- Rick J. Block, Metadata Librarian, Seattle University
- Cecelia M. Brown, Professor, School of Library and Information Studies, University of Oklahoma
- Heting Chu, Professor, Palmer School of Library & Information Science, Long Island University
- Gail Dickinson, Associate Dean, Darden College of Education, Old Dominion University

- Lesley Farmer, Professor, Librarianship Program, Dept. of ASEC, California State University Long Beach
- Barbara J. Ford, Mortenson Distinguished Professor, Emerita, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
- Gabriel Gomez, Professor, Professor, Library, Information & Media Studies Program, College of Education, Chicago State University
- Lynne C. Howarth, Professor, Faculty of Information, University of Toronto
- Gregory S. Hunter, Professor, Palmer School of Library and Information Science, Long Island University
- Robert H. McDonald, Associate Dean for Research and Library Technologies/Deputy Director Data, Insight Center, Indiana University - Bloomington
- Kate McDowell, Associate Professor and Interim Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, School of Information Sciences, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
- Toby Pearlstein, Director of Global Information Services (retired), Bain & Company
- Win Shih, Director, Integrated Library Systems, University of Southern California Libraries
- Linda C. Smith, Professor and Executive Associate Dean, School of Information Sciences, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
- Ann Carlson Weeks, Professor of the Practice, College of Information Studies, University of Maryland

---

## AASL-CAEP recognition news

ALA policy B.9.2.2 states: "The master's degree in librarianship 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."

### Spring 2018 AASL recognition decisions

The following programs, which are part of a CAEP-accredited education unit, received AASL National Recognition or National Recognition with Conditions during the spring 2018 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 Preparation of School Librarians* (2010).

- Arkansas Tech University, M.Ed. in Instructional Technology
- Marshall University, M.A. in Education, School Library Media Specialist Emphasis

### Spring 2018 reviewers

We extend our appreciation to the following program reviewers and auditors who served during the spring 2018 semester:

- Susan D. Ballard, Project Director, School Librarian Program, Granite State College/University System of New Hampshire
- Mary Ann Berry, Retired/Adjunct, Department of Library Science, Sam Houston State University
- Judy Bivens, Accreditation Co-Director and MLIS Program Coordinator, Trevecca Nazarene University
- Elizabeth A. Burns, Lecturer, School Library Program, Dept. of Teaching and Learning, Old Dominion University
- Kelli A. Carney, Assistant Professor of Library Media, Curriculum and Instruction Department, Northeastern State University
- Audrey P. Church, Coordinator, School Library Media Program, Longwood University
- Patsy M. Coutts, Professor, Advanced Professional Services, College of Education and Professional Studies, University of Central Oklahoma
- April M. Dawkins, Assistant Professor, Department of Library and Information Studies, University of North Carolina - Greensboro
- Gail Dickinson, Associate Dean, Darden College of Education, Old Dominion University
- Nancy J. Keane, Library Media Specialist, Rundlett Middle School
- Ramona N. Kerby, Professor, School Library Media Program, McDaniel College
- Vandy Pacetti-Donelson, Online Librarian, Ultimate Medical Academy
- Rebecca J. Pasco, Professor and Coordinator, Library Science Education Programs, University of Nebraska at Omaha
- Brenda F. Pruitt-Annisette, Coordinator, Media Services, Fulton County Schools Library

---

The next issue of *Prism* will be published in April 2019. Stay tuned!

Please send comments or feedback to [accred@ala.org](mailto:accred@ala.org).