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ALa accreditation at a glance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>ALA-accredited MLIS programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Institutions with ALA-accredited MLIS programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>U.S. states (including Washington, DC, and Puerto Rico) with ALA-accredited programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Canadian provinces with ALA-accredited programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>ALA-accredited programs offering 100% online programs †</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Programs with candidacy status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Programs with pre-candidacy status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19,128</td>
<td>Students enrolled in ALA-accredited MLIS programs in fall 2011 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,470</td>
<td>Graduates of ALA-accredited MLIS programs during the 2010-2011 academic year *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The Committee on Accreditation (COA) of the American Library Association (ALA) has announced accreditation actions taken at the 2012 ALA Annual Conference in Anaheim, CA.

Continued accreditation status was granted to the following programs:
- Master of Information Science and Master of Library Science offered by Indiana University.
- Master of Library and Information Science offered by Louisiana State University.
- Master of Library and Information Science offered by the University of Southern Mississippi.

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

Conditional accreditation status was granted to the following programs:
- Master of Library Science offered by the University at Buffalo, SUNY; A progress review visit is scheduled to occur in 2015.
- Master of Arts offered by the University of Missouri-Columbia; The next comprehensive review visit is scheduled to occur in 2015.

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

The following institutions have programs that are being visited in the fall 2012 academic term. The accreditation decisions will be made by the COA at its meeting at the 2013 ALA Midwinter Meeting in Seattle, WA.
- University of Arizona
- Dalhousie University
- Florida State University
- Long Island University

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

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.

Ubiquitous ever-emergent change

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

Nothing is more inevitable than change, but the pace of it is rarely satisfying. Seeking progress in a slowly recovering economy is proving more than a little challenging. While ALA fiscal year 2012 did not end strong, prospects for 2013 look promising with popular conference sites and the RDA (Resource Description and Access) roll out.

Fellow accreditors at the fall meeting of the Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditors (ASPA) shared their approaches to transparency as a way of managing change. A session entitled Defining Transparency - The Accréditeur's New Clothes showcased a wide range of approaches to managing trust with the entities that seek accreditation and with the public. Accreditors heard from each other and from recognizing agencies. This conversation continues as the COA prepares its program for the 2013 ALA Annual Conference in Chicago entitled Accreditation Transparency and Information Disclosure - How Bare is Fair? tentatively scheduled for Monday, July 1, 10:30 am – Noon.

Attendees at the ASPA meeting also heard from Chronicle of Higher Education reporter Libby Nelson about what is expected in the next session of the US Congress with regard to higher education. Not a lot of change is predicted—and now that we know the results of the 2012 elections, it seems likely that the legislative gridlock will continue. Not much is expected on reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

Candidate programs at East Carolina University and the University of Ottawa (Canada) are in the midst of their initial comprehensive reviews, with visits scheduled for next fall. The COA will
make initial accreditation decisions for those programs at the 2014 Midwinter Meeting. Chairs for the external review panels are set and the panelists are being seated.

The Committee on Accreditation (COA) is renewed with a fifty percent turnover this fall with six new, very accomplished members:

- Public member Laura Neumann, former Senior Vice President of Education/Professional Affairs, American Dental Association;
- Canadian Library Association designate Vicki Williamson, Dean of the University Library, University of Saskatchewan;
- Joan Giesecke, Special Assistant to the Chancellor, Professor, University Libraries, University of Nebraska-Lincoln;
- Joan Howland, Associate Dean, University of Minnesota Law School;
- Elizabeth Aversa, Professor, School of Library and Information Studies, University of Alabama;
- Barbara Moran, Wilson Distinguished Professor, School of Information and Library Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

New COA Chair Brian Andrew is in the last year of his second two-year term as a public member. His keen intelligence, wit, and careful diligence helped steer Committee proceedings from the very start of his first term. His Perspective column in this issue should not be missed.

Opportunities to connect face to face

Discussion on outcomes assessment continues with a juried panel at the ALISE Annual Conference at the Hyatt at Olive 8 on Friday, January 25, 10:30 am – Noon, entitled How Do You Know That They Know? Devising, Assessing, and Utilizing Program-Level Student Learning Outcomes.

Also on Friday, January 25, is the ERP chair training for experienced reviewers, 1:30 pm – 4:30 pm at the Grand Hyatt. Program heads are invited to attend as observers. Registration is required. See more on this in the News and Announcements section of this newsletter.

COA public member role and contribution

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

I write this column in my relatively new role as Chair of the ALA Committee on Accreditation (COA) but especially in my capacity as a public member of the COA. Although my chosen profession for 35 years has been the practice of law, I have had the honor and pleasure to serve as a public member on the governing bodies of several accreditation agencies. Learning about
and working with leaders of different professions, and being able to provide what I hope is valuable input, is an extremely rewarding experience. My membership on the COA for the past three years has been more than gratifying and I am very happy to have that privilege. Over the years, however, I have found that the role of the public member is not always very well understood. Therefore, I hope you will find my comments below to be helpful.

Several decades ago, in response to increasing public concerns that licensing and credentialing boards composed entirely of members of the relevant profession were more attuned to the interests of their licensees than to those of the public, state legislatures began to authorize the appointment of public members to the boards. It was believed that public members would strengthen public confidence in the boards, affirm their focus on public protection, and bring the voice of the consumer to matters governed by the board or committee. In addition, public members would help boards become more accountable, credible, and democratic.

Public members slowly became mandated for the vast majority of state boards, with numbers ranging anywhere from one public member per board to a majority of the board. Over the years, the concept of public membership has earned near universal acceptance and is now firmly attached to a broad spectrum of governing bodies, including those involved with accreditation. Experience has shown that public members change the dynamic of these boards and committees for the better.

The American Library Association long ago incorporated this concept. The COA’s Accreditation Process, Policies and Procedures (AP3) requires that of the twelve Committee members, two shall be public members who are appointed as follows:

Public members are appointed from the public at large and represent the public interest. They are appointed for two-year terms and may be re-appointed once. Public members may not be librarians or information professionals. A public member cannot have studied library and information studies; cannot be currently or formerly professionally employed in a library, information center, or related industry (for example, as a material or systems vendor); and cannot be a current or former member of the ALA or any other library association. Public members cannot be employed in an institution at which there is a program accredited by the ALA or in an institution that has a program with precandidacy or candidacy status (AP3, I.4.1).

One can readily see that the expectation is that COA public members are indeed not connected to the profession in any manner. This policy reflects both the historical trend described above as well as requirements of oversight agencies such as the US Department of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA).

The role that the two public members on the COA play is similar to the role of public members on other accreditation, licensing or corporate boards. We are full participants on the COA with the same responsibilities to prepare for meetings, actively engage in discussions, and participate in decision-making. We advocate for the interests of the general public and provide
new perspectives that are free of insider bias of the profession (from either the academic or practitioner perspective). While it can be challenging for a public member to understand the spectrum of personalities and programs in the field, the benefit to the COA is that public members are not easily influenced by that personal connection or history.

Although public members are fortunate not to have that potential bias, they may (at least initially) have a different challenge — to learn about the profession in a very short period of time. They clearly cannot be credible and useful public members without understanding the mission, goals, objectives, policies, processes and, of course, the programs. As public members become more oriented to and educated about the profession, they ask good questions that can lead the other members to ask the bigger questions about their current policies and procedures. A good public member can challenge the way business is done, confirm when possible that the current method of operating is consistent with good practices from other professional arenas, and continually remind the other members that the programs exist to provide a service to a broader community. In that manner, a public member can best represent the ultimate consumer of the profession’s services.

In summary, we public members strive to maintain a good level of understanding of the profession, enthusiastically participate in the COA’s deliberations, and recognize that (aside from our individual qualifications) we have been appointed to the COA precisely because we are not members of the profession. Our challenge is always how best to use our public perspective in order to effectively contribute to the mission of the COA.

Spotlight on process and policy

External Review Panel role and responsibilities

By Laura Dare, Assistant Director, ALA Office for Accreditation

In each issue we focus on an aspect of process or policy of ALA accreditation. This issue’s column provides an overview of the External Review Panel and its role in the accreditation process. If you have an idea for a future column, please send it to Laura Dare, ldare@ala.org.

A previous Spotlight column (Spring 2010) focused on how people are selected to serve on an External Review Panel (ERP). To recap, panelists are appointed for a specific review and the panel, as a whole, must have the experience and expertise to understand the complex nature of the program, from its curriculum to its governance structure (see Section III.2, Composition of the External Review Panel, AP3). This column will explore the role and responsibilities of the ERP once it is formed.

It is important to make the distinction between the Committee on Accreditation (COA or committee) and the ERP (panel). The ERP is appointed by the COA to serve as its agent for the
review to verify the assertions and evidence in the Program Presentation (often known as the “self study” by other accreditors) and to submit a report for the COA’s consideration. The ERP does not determine whether or not a program is meeting the Standards and does not make – or even recommend – an accreditation decision.

Each panel is led by an ERP chair, who is selected about a year-and-a-half before the site visit. ERP chairs are experienced reviewers who have participated in additional training on panel leadership. The ERP chair is the liaison between the panel and the program, and works closely with the Director of the Office for Accreditation and the program throughout the review process.

One of the ERP chair’s biggest responsibilities is to provide guidance to the program in its development of the Program Presentation so that the final document is useful to the ERP, the COA, and the program. This collaboration begins with review of the plan for the Program Presentation, which the program submits a year in advance of the final document deadline. The ERP chair provides feedback to the program on the plan as well as on the draft Program Presentation, which the program submits about ten weeks before the final document is due. The purpose of the feedback is to identify missing or unclear information and note inconsistencies. Since ERP chairs have experience with reading other Program Presentations, they can often provide suggestions on how best to organize the information.

The rest of the panel begins its work approximately 12 months before the site visit. During that time, panelists are expected to become familiar with the program and its context (institution, college, school, state, etc.), mostly via the website. Each panelist assumes primary responsibility for one standard and secondary responsibility for another. A relatively recent addition to the tasks of the panel is to review and provide feedback to the ERP Chair on the draft Program Presentation. For many years this was the sole task of the ERP chair.

From about six weeks before the site visit until five weeks after, the panelists work in high gear, beginning with reading and analysis of the final Program Presentation and its supporting documentation. Each panelist drafts a report section (just a few pages long) on his/her assigned standard to use on site as a guide for verification of evidence. In the weeks before the visit, the ERP chair works with the program to set an itinerary for the visit; make travel arrangements; and schedule meetings, interviews, and class observations. Panelists also use the time before the visit to virtually observe distance-education classes, survey students and employers, and solicit additional needed evidence from the program.

Although the site visit is officially scheduled for two business days, usually Monday and Tuesday, most panels arrive on Saturday to prepare together. Panelists typically spend Sunday meeting with the program head, reviewing documents only available locally, and meeting with constituent groups. On Monday and Tuesday, panelists split up to tour facilities, meet with administrators, conduct individual faculty interviews, and sit in on classes. The site visit culminates with the exit briefing, where the ERP Chair, with support from the other panelists, presents the ERP’s findings to the program head and other administrators.
After the visit, the ERP collaborates to prepare a report for the COA and the program. The report, around 20 pages, summarizes the panel’s findings on each of the six standards. Many programs find the ERP report to be invaluable for strategic planning.

These efforts require considerable juggling of personal and professional responsibilities, yet reviewers tell us that serving on a panel is one of the most rewarding experiences of their professional career. The application to become a reviewer is available from the Resources for External Review Panelists page (http://www.ala.org/accreditedprograms/resourcesforerp).

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

Outcomes assessment juried panel at 2013 ALISE conference

_How Do You Know That They Know? Devising, Assessing, and Utilizing Program-Level Student Learning Outcomes_

Date: Friday, January 25, 2013
Time: 10:30 am-12noon
Location: ALISE Annual Conference (Hyatt at Olive 8)

Join the continuing discussion on student learning outcome assessment with Roy Bonin, Senior Fellow, Carleton University (ON); Kristin Eschenfelder, Professor and Director, School of Library and Information Studies, University of Wisconsin-Madison; Joseph Janes, Associate Professor, MLIS Program Chair, University of Washington; and moderator Vicki Gregory, Professor, University of South Florida.

External Review Panel Chair training at 2013 ALA Midwinter Meeting in Seattle, WA

Date: Friday, January 25, 2013
Time: 1:30pm-4:30pm
Location: Grand Hyatt Seattle, Discovery

External Review Panelists who have participated in two or more on-site visits are invited to attend training for ERP Chairs. The session will prepare attendees to lead an external review of MLIS programs seeking accreditation. The session will include a panel discussion, featuring experienced ERP Chairs and Office for Accreditation 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 site visit and the role of the ERP Chair in the review process 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 by January 4 to Laura Dare, ldare@ala.org, and include “ERP Chair Training” in the subject line.

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 minimum qualifications, please complete the External Review Panel Member Information Form, available at http://www.ala.org/accreditedprograms/files/resourcesforerp/ERP_Information_Form.doc, and plan to attend the training session on June 28 at the 2013 ALA Annual Conference in Chicago.

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

AASL/NCATE program review training at 2013 ALA Midwinter Meeting in Seattle, WA

Date: Friday, January 25, 2013
Time: 8:00am-11:00am
Location: Washington State Convention Center, Room 201

New and experienced reviewers and program report writers are encouraged to attend this session facilitated by Mary Berry, Chair of the NCATE Coordinating Committee. Participants will learn about the NCATE process, the 2010 ALA/AASL Standards for School Librarian Preparation, writing and reviewing reports, and appropriate assessments. The session will feature a presentation by program report writers who recently achieved National Recognition and a presentation of reviewer tips by a member of the AASL audit team.
Special focus will be on the newly implemented 2010 Standards and their application in the review process. Reviewers who have not been trained on using the new standards are strongly encouraged to attend.

Please RSVP to Laura Dare, ldare@ala.org, by January 4 and include “AASL/NCATE training“ in the subject line.

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

**AASL/NCATE Coordinating Committee meeting**

Date: Friday, January 25, 2013  
Time: 11:00am-12noon  
Location: Washington State Convention Center, Room 201

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

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

The merger of NCATE and TEAC into the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) continues. Kaaryn Keller, NCATE Director of Communications and Public Relations, provided the Office for Accreditation with the following information in October.

What is the status of the transition to CAEP?

- CAEP is beginning to function as an accreditor, while simultaneously maintaining NCATE and TEAC accreditations
- In its initial implementation mode, CAEP is performing a small number of accreditations, which will support its application for recognition by the U.S. Department of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA). Meanwhile, TEAC’s CHEA re-recognition was approved in April, and NCATE’s is in process.

How will program review be conducted after January 1? What committees or commissions will conduct visits, review reports, and grant accreditation?

- Program review, as conducted by the specialized professional associations (SPAs), will continue to be conducted in the same way as it is within the NCATE accreditation process after January 1 and after full consolidation, subject to periodic review by the CAEP Board of Directors. SPA Program Review under CAEP is referred to as “CAEP Program Review with National Recognition” and is the only program review option that can lead to earning the status of national recognition. CAEP Program Review with National Recognition will continue to be conducted by SPA reviewers and audit teams in collaboration with CAEP staff.
• In addition to Program Review with National Recognition, the CAEP accreditation system will include provision for state review of programs where a state wishes to make that option available, as well as an additional CAEP-coordinated program review option, identified as Program Review with Feedback (a name which emphasizes that it does NOT lead to national recognition).

• Each state partnership agreement will specify the program review options available to institutions within that state. Program Review with National Recognition will be supported by CAEP in ALL states, whether as one of the options approved as leading to state program recognition or as an optional distinction available to programs, should any state limit its approval process to state review.

AASL/NCATE recognition news

Spring 2012 AASL recognition decisions

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

• Arkansas Tech University, College of Education, School Library Media Specialist
• East Carolina University, College of Education, Library Media Specialist
• Fairfield University, Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions, School Media Specialist Advanced
• Nova Southeastern University, Fischler School of Education and Human Service, Educational Media (M.S.)
• Salem State University, School of Education, Library Media Specialist
• Southern Arkansas University, College of Education, Library Media Science
• University of Houston-Clear Lake School of Education, School Library and Information Science
• University of Rhode Island, School of Education, School Library Media
Spring 2012 reviewers

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

- Patricia Antrim
- Mary Berry
- Judy T. Bivens
- Gayle Bogel
- Pauletta Brown Bracy
- Audrey P. Church
- Patsy Couts
- Sherry R. Crow
- Gail K. Dickinson
- Gayles Evans
- Lesley Farmer
- Dorothy Elizabeth Haynes
- Cynthia Houston
- Ramona N. Kerby
- Diane D. Kester
- Linda L. Lillard
- Janice Newsum
- Rebecca J. Pasco
- Babara Jo Ray
- Carolyn Starkey
- Linda J. Underwood
- Jan M. Yates

External Review Panelists acknowledged

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

Chairs
- Annabel Stephens, Associate Professor (retired), SLIS, University of Alabama
- Michele V. Cloonan, Dean and Professor, GSLIS, Simmons College (MA)
- Jean Donham, Associate Professor, University of Northern Iowa
- Linda Smith, Professor and Assoc. Dean, GSLIS, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
- Del Williams, Associate Professor of Education, Northcentral University (AZ)
Panelists

- Hermina Anghelescu, Associate Professor, SLIS, Wayne State University (MI)
- William E. Buchanan, Professor, DLS, Clarion University of Pennsylvania
- Clara M. Chu, Professor and Chair, DLIS, University of North Carolina at Greensboro
- Diane Covington, Chemistry and Biology Librarian, Carnegie Mellon University (PA)
- Cheryl Dee, Visiting Assistant Professor/Lecturer, Florida State University and San Jose State University
- Rene Erlandson, Director, Virtual Services, Criss Library, University of Nebraska at Omaha
- Lesley Farmer, Professor, Librarianship, California State University Long Beach
- Melissa Gross, Professor, SLIS, Florida State University
- Steven W. Hagstrom, Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Compliance, Tarrant County College (TX)
- Corinne Hill, Director, Chattanooga Public Library (TN)
- Lisa Hinchliffe, Professor, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
- Joan S. Howland, Associate Dean, Info. and Tech., University of Minnesota Law School
- Cheryl Kern-Simirenko, Dean, University Libraries, University of Akron (OH)
- Bertrum H. MacDonald, Professor, School of Information Management, Dalhousie University (NS)
- C. Allen Nichols, Director, Wadsworth Public Library (OH)
- Corinne Nyquist, Librarian, State University of New York at New Paltz
- Toby Pearlstein, Director of Global Information Services (Retired), Bain & Company
- Nancy K. Roderer, Director, Welch Medical Library, Johns Hopkins University (MD)
- Cecilia Salvatore, Associate Professor, GSLIS, Dominican University (IL)
- Barbara Spivey, Director of Library Services, Simms Library, Albuquerque Academy (NM)
- Stuart Sutton, Associate Professor Emeritus, SLIS, University of Washington
- Phil Turner, Professor, College of Information, University of North Texas
- Susan Weaver, Director of Library Services, Kent State University (OH)
- Tom Wilding, Professor of Practice, SIRLS, University of Arizona
- Elaine Yontz, Professor, DLS, East Carolina University (NC)

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