

American Library Association
Committee on Accreditation

Accreditation Decisions and Actions Taken Spring 2018 Meeting (April 12-13, 2018) and
Conference Call (April 27, 2018)

Issued May 1, 2018

Members of the 2017-2018 ALA Committee on Accreditation: Terry Weech (Chair), Rachel
Applegate, Theresa Byrd, Kathleen D20lp, 0 Tc-71Tw 14.1 S3s(9 (,-4 h EMC)3 (s)aTc 0 8aD i (p)- (pL 0 T

and accomplishments of information professionals outside of librarianship, the accreditation process overseen by COA was entered into by ALA and COA “... in order to acknowledge the central role of the COA accreditation process to the recognition of librarianship as a distinct and autonomous profession...” (ALA-COA MOU 2010).

Rationale: To more effectively communicate the Committee on Accreditation’s mission and role in the accreditation of programs leading to the professional degree in library and information studies.

➤ **Section I.2 Accreditation terminology:**

Added the following definitions:

CHEA: The Council for Higher Education Accreditation. Officially recognizes the American Library Association as the accrediting agency for master’s-level programs in library and information studies.

COA: The Committee on Accreditation - The autonomous committee that administers the accreditation review process of educational programs for the profession of librarianship.

ERP: The External Review Panel - A group of two to six library and information faculty and practitioners appointed by the COA through the Office for Accreditation to visit a program and verify information in the Self-Study. Panelists are also vetted by the program to avoid any conflicts of interest.

LIS: Library and Information Studies - In the context of ALA-COA communications, LIS has this specific reference. In other contexts, including some ALA-accredited programs, LIS may refer to Library and Information Science, but this is not the specific meaning in the context of COA accreditation.

Rationale: To provide precise definitions for common acronyms used throughout AP3

➤ **Section I.10 Candidacy status and Initial accreditation of additional programs:**

Removed the last sentence of the first paragraph and replaced it with:

~~All candidate programs must have an on-site comprehensive review.~~ Each candidate program must be reviewed by a separate External Review Panel and undergo an on-site comprehensive review even if the reviews are scheduled concurrently with another accredited program. The school is responsible for the fees and expenses for each of the additional programs being accredited.

In the second paragraph, replaced the phrase, “from the accredited degree” with “from the accredited program.” It now reads afees ewed b t81w(a)4 (sTw 30.04 0 Td (22.36he)4 (f)

Rationale:To provide a solution to issues that arise when a school with multiple accredited programs seeks to migrate an accredited program to another campus and/or administrative structure.

➤ **Section I.15 Accreditation decisions:**

Added the bold text to the last paragraph and revised the “effective for” statement:

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).*

* ~~Effective beginning with decisions in January~~ all programs beginning in May 2018

Rationale:For fuller public disclosure on COA decision making in response to:

- Council on Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) standard 12B: Demonstrates Accountability
- ALA Task Force on Accreditation Communication and Process recommendation 16: “Make accreditation decisions and documentation publicly available.”

➤ **Section I.22 Institutional or programmatic changes:**

Added the bold text to the third paragraph:

Any change in organizational structure and/or executive administration relevant to the accredited program must be communicated in writing to the Office for Accreditation within 30 days. Examples of organizational or executive administration changes that must be reported include, but are not limited to:

- The placement of an ALA-accredited program in a different administrative unit
- Chief executive officer of the institution, e.g., president;
- Head of the accredited program, e.g., dean, director, chair;
- Chief academic officer of the institution, e.g., provost.

Rationale:To specify indicators that should initiate a notice to the Office for Accreditation and the Committee on Accreditation for enabling oversight of the impact of institutional or programmatic changes that might impact the accreditation status of a program.

During its April 27, 2018, conference call, the Committee on Accreditation (COA) took the following action:

Committee Matters

- Reviewed and approved the following policy adjustment to Accreditation Process, Policies, and Procedures (AP3), fourth edition:
 - Section II.7.4 Examples of evidence that might be used to indicate compliance with the 2015 Standards for Accreditation:

Added the bold text to section V. Administration, Finances, and Resources:

V. Administration, Finances, and Resources

- Organizational charts for the program, the school/college of which the program is a part, and the institution as a whole
- Description of relationships of program and school/college to the institution with regard to autonomy, support and resources
- Minutes of meetings of faculty, committees, advisory boards and other relevant groups that provide evidence of administrative structures, decisions made, and plans promulgated by the program
- Descriptions of institution-wide opportunities for faculty, staff, and student participation
- Documentation that leadership ensures opportunities for student involvement in the field such that each can graduate prepared for employment
- Lists of faculty, staff, and student appointment/election to school, collegiate, and university administrative and academic entities
- Materials and data on the school's financial structure: budgets, budget analyses, and data reflecting the use of the analyses for decision making
- Information on availability of funds for research, professional development, travel, leaves with pay, and student financial aid
- Criteria used to award professional development, travel, leaves, and other forms of funding to individual faculty, staff and students
- Comparative data on budgets and funding over 5 to 10 years to show trajectories of support
- Information on administrative personnel: demographics, salaries, curricula vitae, and other data comparej EMC /LpI0v (l)-2 -8 (t)-1 (h(i)-2 o(p)2 (a)6 -4h)3 .006

- Information on the library that supports the school and program: