

Spring 2017, Volume 25, Number 1 • ISSN 1066-7873 • Kerri Price, editor
Comments and questions are welcomed. Please contact us at accred@ala.org.

In this issue:

- ALA accreditation at a glance
- News and announcements
- COA announces Fall 2016 and Midwinter 2017 accreditation actions
- From the Director: Outlook
- From the COA Chair: Perspective
- Spotlight on process and policy
- External Review Panelists acknowledged
- AASL-CAEP recognition news

ALA accreditation at a glance

65	ALA-accredited programs
60	Institutions with ALA-accredited programs
33	U.S. states (including Washington, DC, and Puerto Rico) with ALA-accredited programs
5	Canadian provinces with ALA-accredited programs
31	ALA-accredited programs offering 100% online programs †
1	Program with candidacy status
15,491	Total number of students enrolled in ALA-accredited programs in fall 2015 *
6,737	Graduates of ALA-accredited programs during the 2014-2015 academic year *

† As identified by the programs
* As reported by programs to the Committee on Accreditation. The 2015-2016 data is under review.

News and announcements

External Review Panel training at 2017 ALA Annual Conference in Chicago

Date: Friday, June 23, 2017

Time: 8:00am – 12:00noon

Location: Hilton Chicago (720 S. Michigan Ave.), Astoria Room

New and experienced External Review Panelist (ERP) pool members are invited and encouraged to attend a training session on the role of ERP members in the ALA accreditation process. Participation in training is a prerequisite for serving on a review panel.

Participants will learn about the comprehensive review process, hear from experienced panelists and members of the Committee on Accreditation, and work in groups to analyze a sample Self-Study. This year's training will focus on Standard II (Curriculum) of the [2015 ALA Standards for Accreditation](#). Currently assigned ERPs are especially encouraged to attend.

Program heads who want to learn more about the accreditation process, the site visit, and the role of the ERP in the review are welcome to attend as observers. If you're interested in attending, please RSVP and indicate that you'd like to observe the session.

Please RSVP to Kerri Price, kprice@ala.org, by June 2, 2017, and include "ERP Training" in the subject line. Registration is limited and is on a first-come, first-served basis.

New External Review Panelists sought

The Office for Accreditation seeks experienced library and information professionals to participate in the accreditation process as External Review Panelists. We are particularly in need of librarians and educators with specializations and experience in the following areas:

- Archives and records management
- 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 June 23 at the 2017 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 kprice@ala.org.

COA open session at 2017 ALA Annual Conference in Chicago: Effectively presenting evidence in the Self-Study (a demonstration of the JURA accreditation management system will open the session)

Date: Sunday, June 25, 2017

Time: 4:30pm—5:30pm

Location: Hilton Chicago (720 S. Michigan Ave.), Lake Erie Room

The Committee on Accreditation (COA) continues discussion on evidence presentation strategies and related tools and resources, focusing this year on Standard V: Administration, Finances, and Resources. Policy adjustments made in April 2017 to Accreditation Process, Policies, and Procedures (AP3), fourth edition, will also be presented, as will a demonstration of the JURA accreditation management system under consideration.

AASL-CAEP program review training at 2017 ALA Annual Conference in Chicago

Date: Friday, June 23, 2017

Time: 12:00noon – 4:00pm

Location: McCormick Place - West Building, Room W195

New and experienced reviewers and program 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](#), report preparation and review, and appropriate assessments. Banhi Battacharya, CAEP Sr. Director of Program Review, will present updated information on CAEP accreditation and program review. All programs submitting an initial report must now use the *2010 Standards*. Reviewers who have not been trained on using the *2010 Standards* must attend this session to be assigned to review a program using those standards.

So that we have sufficient training materials on hand, please RSVP to Kerri Price, kprice@ala.org, by June 2, 2017, and include “AASL-CAEP training” in the subject line.

Prospective reviewers can find out more about the AASL-CAEP program review process on the [AASL website](#).

AASL-CAEP Coordinating Committee meeting at 2017 ALA Annual Conference in Chicago

Date: Friday, June 23, 2017

Time: 8:30am – 10:00am

Location: McCormick Place - West Building, Room W195

Members of the AASL-CAEP Coordinating Committee are strongly encouraged to attend. The meeting is also open to conference attendees interested in program review.

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 2016 Fall Meeting:

Precandidacy status was granted to the following program:

- Master of Arts in Library and Information Studies at the University College London.

At the COA's meeting at the 2017 ALA Midwinter Meeting:

Continued Accreditation status was granted to the following programs, with the next comprehensive review visit scheduled to take place in fall 2023:

- Master of Information Studies at McGill University (Quebec);
- Master of Library Science at North Carolina Central University;
- Master of Library and Information Science at Wayne State University (Michigan).

Continued Accreditation status with release from Conditional Accreditation status was granted to the following programs, with the next comprehensive review visit scheduled to take place in fall 2023:

- Master of Library and Information Studies at the University of British Columbia;
- Master of Science in Library and Information Science at Pratt Institute (New York).

Initial Accreditation status was granted to the following program, with the next comprehensive review visit scheduled to take place in fall 2023:

- Master of Management in Library and Information Science at the University of Southern California.

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 spring 2017 academic term. The accreditation decisions will be made by the COA at its meeting at the 2017 ALA Annual Conference in Chicago.

- University of Alabama
- University of Michigan
- University of South Carolina
- Texas Woman's University
- University of Toronto (ON)

The following institutions have programs that are being visited in the fall 2017 academic term. The accreditation decisions will be made by the COA at its meeting at the 2018 ALA Midwinter Meeting in Denver.

- Drexel University (PA)
- Simmons College (MA)

- St. Catherine University (MN)
- University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

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

Fortunate winds of change

Amid preparations for review of annual statistics and biennial narrative reports from programs, we welcome two key personnel changes: a new member of the Committee on Accreditation (COA) Dale McNeill, Assistant Director of Public Services for the San Antonio Public Library, and a new member of the Office, Kerri Price, Associate Director. To our good fortune, neither are new to accreditation. Dale has been involved in ALA accreditation for more than a decade, having served on ALA external review panels for programs in Canada and the US. Kerri returns to the Office after more than four years in the ALA Governance Office as Executive Board Secretariat.

Moving into the second half of ALA fiscal 2017, we in the Office take stock, make projections, and present the next year's budget. Opportunities to serve a wider variety of ALA-accredited library and information studies (LIS) programs in North America and beyond continue with the addition of five programs since 2010, one in Candidacy for Initial accreditation status (at Chicago State University), and two Precandidacy applications in review. With those opportunities come the challenge to keep up with increased demands on process.

Progress has its costs: 5% annual fee increase effective with August 2018 billing

Improvements in process are being realized in small and large ways, including requiring less review documentation. The Office is also exploring the transition to a web-based accreditation

management system that would streamline the review and reporting process. Demonstrations have been provided by Indigo Interactive and Armature.

The larger process improvements will come with increased costs that at least in part must be recouped through fee revenue. Billing of the annual fee in August 2018 will reflect a 5% increase, bringing the fee to \$1,155. The last increase of 3% was in 2015.

Still under consideration is a partnership with [Liaison International](#) to provide a centralized application management system through the ALA website. With so much traffic to the [Directory of ALA-accredited Programs](#), it could be a natural fit. Buy-in from programs would be the key to making it possible. A cross-section of LIS program personnel has met with Liaison and me to discuss the possibilities which include reduced application processing costs.

Review opportunities

With additional programs comes demand for reviewers. Recruiting for reviewers is a constant focus for the office. Reviewer recommendations are always welcomed. Details on becoming a member of the reviewer pool are available on [our website](#).

With each new reviewer placed on a panel, the knowledge base of the reviewer pool is enhanced. As LIS program faculty serve on external review panels, their knowledge base expands and deepens, and they bring that back to their own programs. Those panelists widen their network of colleagues and expand their perspective. Almost without exception, new review panelists report that they learned a great deal and forge friendships with new acquaintances while serving.

Through reviews, the field of study and of practice is mutually informed. Perceptions of a gap between curricula and practice are lessened. Review service is a richly immersive professional development opportunity that affords a look at the future. It's an intense learning and bonding experience with colleagues that builds teamwork and project management skills and sharpens analytical prowess. The next review training session is at the 2017 ALA Annual Conference on Friday, June 23, from 8:00am to noon.

Of great advantage to process has been LIS program administrator attendance as observers at review training sessions. It's been helpful for program personnel to meet there and to exchange ideas about review protocols and approaches to assessment and evaluation.

Late Sunday afternoon with COA at conference

Join the COA from 4:30-5:30pm on Sunday (June 25) at the ALA Annual Conference for a demonstration of the [JURA](#) accreditation management system and for continuation of guidance on transitioning to the 2015 *Standards*. [Slides from the COA presentation](#) at the last Annual Conference are available on the [Resources for LIS program administrators](#) webpage.

Changes from the 2008 *Standards* to the 2015 *Standards* have been [mapped in Excel](#) and the release notes on the changes in process with the 2015 release of the fourth edition of [Accreditation Process, Policies, and Procedures \(AP3\)](#) are available as a [PDF](#).

The first program to report to the 2015 *Standards* in a comprehensive review is McGill University, which has generously agreed to have its [self-study](#) made available on the [Sample Self-Studies](#) (previously called Program Presentations) webpage.

Task force reports

The Task Force on Accreditation Process and Communication provided its final report, [Accreditation – Recommendations for Process and Communications](#), to the ALA Executive Board in October 2016. The COA began analyzing the report at its November 2016 fall meeting and provided an initial written response prior to meeting with the Board at its January meeting.

The COA is having its first look at the [Report of the Task Force on the Context of Future Accreditation](#) (its final report), which was made available on April 3, 2017. The Committee is preparing a response to the task force reports due to the ALA Executive Board in December 2017.

Connecting

I invite you to give me a call at 312-280-2434 or drop me a line at kobrien@ala.org. I hope to see you in Chicago this summer at the [2017 ALA Annual Conference](#). You are welcome to get in touch to arrange a meeting with me there. In the meantime, if you're in Chicago let's get together!

From the COA Chair: PERSPECTIVE

By Elizabeth Aversa, 2016-17 Chair, Committee on Accreditation, and Professor Emerita, University of Alabama

Under consideration: Recommendations from two task forces on accreditation

The Committee on Accreditation (COA) is appointed “To be responsible for the 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.” (*ALA Handbook of Organization*) In addition to carrying out this charge, the COA is now reviewing and considering more than 160 recommendations that relate to structure, processes, communications, and the future of accreditation in the library and information studies (LIS) education sphere. The purpose of this column is to outline the background, essence, and current status of the task force reports in preparation for what should be widespread and public discussion of them and their anticipated effects on LIS education.

Background

Two task forces were appointed by ALA in response to an array of concerns voiced to ALA Executive Board members by a few deans and directors of accredited LIS programs. The two task forces - the Task Force on Accreditation Process and Communication and the Task Force on the Context of Future Accreditation - began their work in the summer of 2015. Their reports are

now in hand, the former having been received by the COA on October 1, 2016, and the latter on April 3, 2017.

When the task forces were appointed, the COA had already begun its own review of processes to find ways to accomplish more with limited resources. A consulting firm was hired to perform the work that the COA believed would help to identify inefficiencies and recommend ways to improve processes. After reviewing communications and process documents in the Office for Accreditation, consulting with staff, and performing some limited interviewing and surveying, the consultants made broad recommendations that were reflected, some almost verbatim, in [Accreditation – Recommendations for Process and Communications](#), the final report of the Task Force on Accreditation Process and Communication. Citing a “lack of fit,” the consultants decided not to engage further with ALA for this project beyond the first set of observations and suggestions, but their recommendations were considered and some have been implemented.

The COA reviewed *Accreditation – Recommendations for Process and Communications* at its regularly scheduled meeting on November 18, 2016. At that time, the Committee voted unanimously that a responsible review would require additional time due to the sheer number of recommendations, the nature of the recommendations, and the need to know the recommendations of the Task Force on the Context of Future Accreditation before considering any process or policy changes. This was communicated in writing to the Executive Board on December 1, 2016, and again in a meeting with the Executive Board at the ALA Midwinter meeting in January 2017.

[Report of the Task Force on the Context of Future Accreditation](#) (its final report) was received by the COA on April 3, and brief discussion of it should be possible at the Committee’s 2017 spring meeting. A fuller discussion will be possible at the COA’s 2017 fall meeting, where the Committee will prepare its response to the Executive Board, which is due in December 2017.

The recommendations

There are more than 150 recommendations in *Accreditation – Recommendations for Process and Communications*. The COA has begun to categorize them into four areas:

- recommendations that have already been accomplished with release of the fourth edition of [Accreditation Process, Policies, and Procedures](#) and the 2015 [Standards for Accreditation of Master's Programs in Library and Information Studies](#);
- recommendations that are currently being addressed (developing templates for reports, improving communications);
- recommendations that cannot be accomplished without input or decisions involving the broader community (e.g., expanding the international scope of accreditation; including iSchool accreditation; accrediting bachelor’s level programs); and
- recommendations that may be wholly inappropriate to consider for implementation.

The recommendations range from the very specific to the extremely broad, for example recommendation 7.3 states, “COA should design a clear and comprehensive template for the Self Study” and recommendation 1.1 asks COA to “Reexamine the scope of the definition of LIS and align it with the current expectations of the profession of librarianship and perceptions of both graduates and employers about the emergent trajectory of the profession.”

Report of the Task Force on the Context of Future Accreditation offers only 12 recommendations and these too range widely in scope. Developed from surveys, online forums, a review of research, analysis of statements from other entities concerned with LIS education, and other interviews and discussions, the emerging recommendations address process as well as the nature of the field and accreditation matters.

For example, recommendation 1 addresses process: “External Review Panel (ERP) teams should reflect specialized areas of expertise represented in LIS programs as indicated in the report, with the ERP recruitment pool expanded to recognize members of related professional associations.”

Broader, more holistic concerns are called up in other recommendations, such as 5, which recommends that “There be better accommodation of the interdisciplinarity of LIS as it continues to expand and is reflected in programs. This also applies to the long-term tensions/differences between library science and information science. To accommodate this interdisciplinarity, the accreditation process should consult the accreditation standards put forth by similar disciplines.”

Along with the considerable number of recommendations, there are some that seem contradictory. One recommendation is that the COA be more flexible and collegial in its dealings with programs, while another (in the same report) appears to want the Committee to be more hands off and prescriptive.

Finally, some recommendations would broaden the scope of the COA’s work well beyond the capacity of a volunteer committee and two staff members. COA members give ten days a year to attend meetings and three or more days to prepare for each meeting, while also developing presentations and training, and reviewing and revising the standards. Recommendations suggesting that we “Consider expansion of the ALA/COA mandate” by adding undergraduate programs, iSchools, and international programs will need considerable attention, more person-power, and much deliberation within the LIS education and professional communities.

Status and forward movement

Anyone who reads the task force reports, much less the supporting documents and related literature, will find that, like solving the nation’s health care situation, accreditation is “complicated.”

The overarching observation from both task force reports is that LIS education is evolving and that accreditation policies, processes, procedures, and participants have to be continually monitored and updated to reflect the needs of students, employers, and ultimately, recipients of library and information services however they may be defined. The changing academic and professional landscapes beyond LIS are also at issue.

Many of the recommendations of the task forces have been referred to various entities within ALA, such as the executive director, management, and the Committee on Education. Other recommendations will need to be considered against the receiving entity’s suggestions as well. Budget requirements will need Executive Board consideration. The requirements of The Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA), the agency that essentially “accredits the

accreditors” must be considered as recommendations are reviewed for possible implementation.

The COA has committed to exercise due diligence in reviewing the recommendations in the task force reports. There is a great deal of work ahead for the COA and the profession.

In moving forward, it is my personal hope as COA chair that diverse constituents will read and study the reports. Only then will we be able to think before acting, determine the resource needs for the implementation of any recommendations, and establish reasonable timelines. In the end, this will enhance our collective ability to fulfill the charge to execute the accreditation program of ALA.

Spotlight on process and policy

By Kerri Price, Associate Director, ALA Office for Accreditation

Committee on Accreditation (COA): Composition and the appointments process

In each issue of *Prism* we focus on an aspect of process, policy, or procedure of ALA accreditation. Past Spotlight columns examined COA’s work: [The Committee on Accreditation: What goes on behind those closed doors?](#) (*Prism*, Spring 2011) and [Meeting with the Committee on Accreditation to close the comprehensive review](#) (*Prism*, Spring 2015). This issue’s column describes COA’s composition and provides an overview of the appointments process, focusing on both a recent COA composition revision, and the [Memorandum of Understanding](#) between the ALA and COA, an important document that informs the appointments process.

COA composition

The COA, one of 21 standing committees of the Association (also referred to as ALA committees), consists of twelve members: 10 ALA members with four-year, staggered terms who may not be reappointed and two public members with two-year, staggered terms who may be reappointed once. A chair is selected from among the 12 members (preferably an experienced member). The chair serves a one-year term and may be reappointed once, if eligible.

The Committee’s two public members serve a vital role. Selected from outside the community of library and information professionals, they represent the public interest. Policy dictates that public members “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*, Section I.4.1)

The Committee's 10 ALA members represent library and information studies (LIS) educators and practitioners and are selected from among current ALA personal members. One ALA member is appointed in consultation with the Canadian Federation of Library Associations and represents the interests of the Canadian LIS community. Another ALA member is selected from a list of recommended nominations submitted by the Association for Library and Information Science Education (ALISE) Council of Deans/Directors/Chairs and must be a dean/director/chair (program head) of a library or information studies program. The addition of this position designation from among the 10 ALA members occurred at the 2016 ALA Midwinter Meeting, when the ALA Council voted to formally approve the composition revision, which was brought forward by the ALA Committee on Organization after approval by the ALA Executive Board at the 2015 ALA Annual Conference. Creation of the position was a result of meetings between ALISE and ALA Executive Board members in 2014-2015, which also resulted in the formation of the two accreditation task forces discussed in COA Chair Elizabeth Aversa's column in this issue.

Appointment to COA

The ALA president-elect chairs the ALA Committee on Appointments, which appoints members and chairs to 20 of the 21 committees of the Association (the 21st committee is the Committee on Appointments itself, which consists of the presidents-elect of the 11 ALA divisions, serving in an ex officio capacity). The Committee on Appointments works each fall to assemble a slate of committee nominees and presents that slate to the ALA Executive Board for approval at the ALA Midwinter Meeting. As one of the committees of the Association, COA typically requires three to four position appointments each year.

Due to the unique status of COA within the larger Association, in 2010 ALA and COA agreed upon a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that "serves to recognize the mutually supporting activities of the ALA and COA and delineates the commitments of the parties to each other." The impetus to draft the Memorandum arose from the [Council for Higher Education Accreditation's \(CHEA\)](#)* recognition criteria that states, "To be eligible for CHEA recognition, the accreditation organization demonstrates independence from any parent entity, or sponsoring entity, for the conduct of accreditation activities and determination of accreditation status..." (2010 *CHEA Recognition Policy and Procedures*, 9G) In addition, COA operates in accordance with the [Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditors' \(ASPA\)](#) Code of Good Practice. Office for Accreditation staff participate actively with fellow accreditors as members of ASPA, attending conferences and sharing best practices.

To meet the CHEA recognition criteria, the MOU notes that the ALA president-elect will "appoint members of COA in consultation with the COA staff liaison, the ALA director of the Office for Accreditation, to protect the integrity of the accreditation process." To promote adherence to the MOU, the OA director sends a list of suggested nominees to the ALA president-elect each fall, highlighting their qualifications and experience. Consultation between the OA director and the ALA president-elect also results in the selection of COA members who possess the relevant expertise and background knowledge to carry out the demanding (yet rewarding) and time intensive work of the Committee.

If you have a topic related to process or policy that you'd like to see addressed in a future column, please send it to Kerri Price kprice@ala.org.

*ALA-COA is recognized by CHEA and adheres to its *Recognition Policy and Procedures*. More information on institutional and programmatic accrediting agency recognition can be found on the [CHEA website](#).

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 fall 2016 academic term.

Chairs

- Denice Adkins, Associate Professor and Library and Information Science Program Chair, School of Information Science and Learning Technologies, University of Missouri
- Richard AmRhein, Chief Information Officer, Valparaiso University
- Kenneth-Roy Bonin, Senior Fellow, Faculty of Public Affairs, Carleton University
- Lynne C. Howarth, Professor, Faculty of Information, University of Toronto
- Margaret Maes, Executive Director, Legal Information Preservation Alliance
- Herman L. Totten, Professor and Dean, College of Information, University of North Texas

Panelists

- Eileen G. Abels, Dean and Professor, School of Library and Information Science, Simmons College
- Clément Arsenault, Professeur agrégé, Directeur de l'EBSI, École de bibliothéconomie et des sciences de l'information, Université de Montréal
- Rick J. Block, Metadata Librarian, Seattle University
- Cecelia M. Brown, Professor, School of Library and Information Studies, University of Oklahoma
- Mary Cavanagh, Associate Professor and Acting Director, School of Information Studies, University of Ottawa
- Clara M. Chu, Director and Mortenson Distinguished Professor, Mortenson Center for International Library Programs, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
- Karen J. Cook, Recorder of Documents, State Library of Louisiana
- Linda C. Cook, Chief Executive Officer (retired), Edmonton Public Library
- Diane Covington, Chemistry and Biology Librarian (retired), Carnegie Mellon University
- Nancy Everhart, Professor, School of Library and Information Studies, Florida State University
- Christine Jacobs, Chair, Information and Library Technologies Department, John Abbott College
- Joseph W. Janes, Associate Professor, Information School, University of Washington
- Bruce R. Kingma, Professor of Entrepreneurship, Syracuse University
- Joyce Latham, Associate Professor, School of Information Studies, University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee

- Bertrum H. MacDonald, Professor, School of Information Management, Dalhousie University
- Joanne Gard Marshall, Professor, School of Information and Library Science, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
- Dale McNeill, Assistant Director for Public Service, San Antonio Public Library
- Toby Pearlstein, Director of Global Information Services (retired), Bain & Company
- Win Shih, Director, Integrated Library Systems, University of Southern California Libraries
- Vivian R. Wynn, President, Wynn Library Consulting

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."

Fall 2016 AASL recognition decision

The following program, which is part of an NCATE- or CAEP-accredited education unit, received AASL National Recognition or National Recognition with Conditions during the fall 2016 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)*.

- William Paterson University (NJ), Master in Education, School Library Media Specialist

Fall 2016 reviewers

We extend our appreciation to the following program reviewers and auditors who served during the fall 2016 semester:

- 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, Department of Teaching and Learning, Old Dominion University
- Sherry Crow, Associate Dean and Associate Professor of School Library Science, College of Education, University of Nebraska at Kearney
- Gail Dickinson, Associate Dean, Darden College of Education, Old Dominion University
- Cynthia Keller, Adjunct Professor, School Library Media Program, McDaniel College
- Ramona Kerby, Professor, School Library Media Program, McDaniel College

- Johan Koren, Associate Professor, Department of Early Childhood and Elementary Education, Murray State University
 - Kimberly McFall, School Library Program Coordinator, Assistant Professor, College of Education and Professional Development, Marshall University
 - Vandy Pacetti-Donelson, Library Media Specialist, Poinciana High School
 - Barbara Ray, Professor (retired), Northeastern State University
 - Terri Toland, Assistant Professor of Curriculum and Instruction/Library Media, Arkansas Tech University
-

The next issue of *Prism* will be published in November of 2017. Stay tuned!

Please send comments or feedback to accred@ala.org.