TO: ALA Executive Board

RE: Deadline extension for both Executive Board task forces on accreditation

ACTION REQUESTED/INFORMATION/REPORT:

ACTION REQUESTED BY:
Peter Hepburn, Executive Board and chair, Task Force on the Context of Future Accreditation

CONTACT PERSON:
Peter Hepburn
661.362.3758
Peter.hepburn@canyons.edu

DRAFT OF MOTION:
That the Executive Board extend the deadline for the Task Force on the Accreditation Process and Communications to the Fall meetings of the Executive Board in October 2016, and the deadline for the Task Force on the Context of Future Accreditation to the ALA Midwinter Meeting in January 2017.

DATE: May 16, 2016

BACKGROUND:
The attachment that follows includes information on task force activities to date as well as indication of next steps.
The two task forces were charged with bringing forward finished white papers to the Executive Board by the ALA Annual Conference in June 2016. As work progressed, it has become clear that the scope of the work is larger than expected. In addition, the work of the two task forces needs to be connected, with the work of the one informing the work of the other.

The Task Force on the Accreditation Process and Communications has implemented a survey of LIS program leaders and is currently processing the results. More recently, it has learned the results of the consultation work done with the Committee on Accreditation. The Task Force on the Context of Future Accreditation, meanwhile, has implemented a pair of surveys to gain feedback from LIS students and from practitioners. There are plans afoot for the TF to reach out to additional stakeholder bodies and interested parties such as the Committee on Accreditation, the Committee on Education, and the Canadian libraries.

In their regular phone calls, the task force chairs have come to realize that the work of the Task Force on the Accreditation Process and Communications will need to be completed so that the Task Force on the Context of Future Accreditation can build upon and harmonize with its findings. As a result, the chairs agreed that a proposal to have two different deadlines, one earlier than the other, would be helpful to a coordinated process.