

**ALA Executive Board  
2013 Spring Meeting**

- TOPIC:** Changes to [Accreditation Process, Policies and Procedures \(AP3\), third edition](#) (released May 2012)
- ACTION REQUESTED:** Approval
- DRAFT MOTION:** *The ALA Executive Board approves changes to the Accreditation Process, Policies and Procedures (AP3), as recommended by the ALA Committee on Accreditation, to be reflected in the 4<sup>th</sup> edition.*
- REQUESTED BY:** Mary Stansbury, Chair, ALA Committee on Accreditation  
Karen O'Brien, Director, Office for Accreditation
- DATE:** April 9, 2015

**BACKGROUND:**

The ALA Committee on Accreditation is charged: *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.*

While draft standards are approved by the ALA Council, the practices required for the “execution of the accreditation program” have historically been approved by the ALA Executive Board. The collected body of practices and operational policies are published as: *Accreditation Process, Policies and Procedures (AP3)*. The 3<sup>rd</sup> edition was published in May 2012. The 4<sup>th</sup> edition is due for publication in May 2015. In preparation for republishing, the ALA Committee on Accreditation reviewed the following proposed changes at its Fall 2014 meeting and recommends approval to the ALA Executive Board. All changes relate directly or indirectly to the process for Appeals.

(1) The COA recommends that [IV.4.2](#) be revised to read:

“A withdrawal decision is made public seven days following notification to the program or as soon as an intent to appeal is filed; if an intent to appeal is filed, the publicly listed program status will be ‘withdrawn, pending appeal’; while an appeal is in process, the program retains Conditional accreditation status.”

This will replace the following language in IV.4.2:

Section IV of AP3 covers the appeals process. The question considered by COA during their meeting was: “For protection of students and the public, should the decision to withdraw accreditation be made public?”

AP3 IV.4.2 currently reads as follows:

#### **IV.4.2 Confidentiality of program status during appeal**

The COA's accreditation decision is not made public until the deadline for the notice of intent to file an appeal has passed, or until eight (8) calendar days after the institution has received the COA decision document letter. If the institution files an appeal, the accreditation decision to either withdraw accreditation or deny initial accreditation is not made public until the final determination is made or when the ALA Executive Director and the Office for Accreditation receive a letter from the institution withdrawing the appeal.

The program maintains its accredited status until the appeal process is completed. If the COA's decision is upheld, then the date of accreditation withdrawal is the date the institution receives the ARC recommendation and report and the ALA Executive Board report and determination. If the institution withdraws its appeal, then the date of accreditation withdrawal is the date ALA receives the letter withdrawing the appeal. (See [Section IV.12.](#))

The ALA tries its best to ensure the confidentiality of the COA accreditation decision and any subsequent appeal. The ALA does not, however, assume any responsibility for unofficial or unauthorized disclosures.

- (2) COA recommends to the ALA Executive Board that section 1.23.1 include a new filing fee for appeals of \$2,500 and that IV.7.3 be revised to reflect that change. Current policy (IV.7.3) specifies that each party is responsible for all expenses that it incurs in connection with this appeal process, including the costs for its own representatives and any legal fees and expenses, but it does not address costs to the Association, such as the cost of bringing together an appeal review board.

With this change, the appealing institution would be responsible for costs it directly incurs. ALA would be responsible for legal costs and other direct costs incurred by the ALA Committee on Accreditation/ALA Office for Accreditation. The new fee would partially offset costs of convening an Appeal Review Committee (ARC), which have averaged about \$5,000. The proposed fee is in line with "filing fee" practice of other accreditors.

#### **IV.7.3 Expenses**

Each party is responsible for all expenses that it incurs in connection with this appeal process, including costs for its representatives and any legal fees and expenses.

ALA and the institution share any costs of transcription if the ARC meeting is transcribed.

#### **I.23.1 Schedule of fees**

Accredited programs are responsible for the payment of fees to support the accreditation process. Programs are notified of any fee change six (6) months before the billing date.

**Precandidacy status**

Precandidacy application fee: \$1,000.00

Annual fee: \$2,000.00

**Candidacy status**

Candidacy application fee: \$1,000.00

Candidacy annual fee, effective fall 2012 billing: \$922.88

**Continued, conditional or initial accreditation status**

Annual fee, effective for fall 2012 billing: \$922.88

**Accreditation review fees**

Comprehensive review fee: \$1,000.00

Progress review fee: \$1,000.00

**Late fee** (for any report received after the assigned deadline): \$250.00

**I.23.2 Other expenses**

If the Director or other staff member of the Office for Accreditation is invited to visit the campus for any reason, the school is responsible for all travel, lodging, and meal expenses. However, if the Director or other staff member chooses to accompany an ERP to the school as an observer, the Office pays the expenses of this visit.

- (3) The ALA Committee on Accreditation recommends to the ALA Executive Board that the size of the Appeal Review Committee (ARC) be reduced to three members and two alternates. COA also recommends removing the requirement that alternates must participate in the hearing, unless needed to replace a designated ARC member. These changes will reduce the cost to the Association of convening the ARC (currently about \$5,000 in travel/related costs). AP3 IV.6.3 would be revised to read as follows:

The ARC consists of three (3) members. Two (2) members of the ARC must be educators and one (1) must be a practitioner. A person appointed to the ARC will be told which role he or she is filling (educator or practitioner). The ARC members select their own chair.

Two (2) alternates (one educator and one practitioner) are appointed. Each alternate reviews documentation but does not attend the meeting unless needed to replace a committee member.

The language being replaced or changed is as follows:

**IV.6.3 Composition of the ARC**

The ARC consists of five (5) members and two (2) alternates. At least two (2) members of the ARC must be educators and two (2) must be practitioners. A person appointed to the ARC will be told which role he or she is filling (educator or practitioner). The ARC members select their own chair.

Each alternate reviews documentation and listens to discussions, but does not participate in the discussions unless another member cannot serve.

The process of appointing an ARC begins when ALA receives the notice of intent to file an appeal. The ALA President appoints the ARC within approximately forty-five (45) calendar days of the receipt of the notice of intent. The appointment process proceeds while the institution and the COA are preparing their documents.