



Spring 2005 volume 13 number 1

COA Announces Accreditation Actions

The Committee on Accreditation (COA) of the American Library Association has announced accreditation actions taken at the 2005 ALA Midwinter Meeting under the 1992 Standards for Accreditation of Master's Programs in Library and Information Studies.

COA has continued the accreditation of the following graduate programs leading to the first professional degree in library and information studies and has scheduled the next program review for 2011:

- Master of Science offered by the Graduate School of Library and Information Science, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.
- Master of Library and Information Science offered by the School of Library and Information Science, Kent State University.
- Master of Library Science offered by the Graduate School of Library and Information Studies, Queens College, City University of New York.

COA has granted conditional accreditation of the following program. The next program review will be no later than Spring 2008:

- Master of Library and Information Science offered by the Graduate School of Library and Information Science, Dominican University.

For information about a particular program, please contact the school.

Contact information and a complete list of programs and degrees accredited by COA can be found in the [Directory of Institutions Offering Accredited Master's Programs in Library and Information Studies](#).

The following institutions have programs being reviewed in the spring 2005 academic term:

- [Emporia State University](#)
- [Indiana University](#)
- [Louisiana State University](#)
- [University of Missouri, Columbia](#)
- [University of North Carolina, Greensboro](#)
- [University of Southern Mississippi](#)

The following institutions have programs being reviewed in the fall 2005 academic term:

- [University of Arizona](#)
- [Catholic University of America](#)
- [Dalhousie University](#)
- [Florida State University](#)
- [Long Island University](#)

The American Library Association is a leading force in accreditation, having evaluated educational programs to prepare librarians since its creation in 1924. ALA's Committee on Accreditation is recognized by the [Council for Higher Education Accreditation](#) (CHEA) as a reliable authority to determine the quality of education offered by graduate programs in the field of library and information studies.

Consider Serving As a Public Member

by [Lorna Peterson](#), University at Buffalo

Best practices in accreditation require the appointment of public members to serve on accreditation boards. These board members represent the concerns and interests of the community who use the services a profession provides. They advocate for the interests of those who seek the services of a profession (the patron of a library, the patient of a clinic, the client of a lawyer, etc.) and are the outsiders on the board completely unfamiliar with the profession's alphabet soup of acronyms. They are unbiased regarding programs. And they are unfamiliar with the politics of the association and the profession.

Although the requirements may vary from board to board, generally, a public member cannot be an employee, a member of the governing board, or consultant to an institution or program that either is accredited by the board or has applied for accreditation. A public member cannot be a member of any association or organization

related to or associated with the accrediting board, or a spouse, parent, child, or sibling of any of the individuals described above.

As a member of ALA's Committee on Accreditation from 1997-2001, I appreciated the time and attention our public members gave to our review of LIS programs and deliberations. I served with a commodities broker, history professor, english instructor, and an arts administrator—their outside viewpoint kept us honest.

How could I thank our public members for reading the program presentations, the biennial narratives, the special reports, and the statistical reports of our 62 programs? How could I thank them for attending four meetings a year when it didn't matter what city we were in because you saw none of it anyway?

I decided the best way to show gratitude was to become a public member and asked then OA Director Ann O'Neill to submit my name to the Chicago-area accreditors. The National Accrediting Agency for the Clinical Laboratory Sciences accepted my application, their board approved my appointment, and from 2001 to 2005, I have served on their board as one of two public members. I faced an array of acronyms, a profession with an identity crisis, and a board of hard-working, conscientious, intelligent, good humored individuals. I felt right at home.

This service was professionally and personally rewarding. The quality of education for those who draw our blood, test our tissues and fluids, read and analyze our test results, and more was the task at hand. And to be involved in accreditation from this vantage point is truly an honor. I hope that you will consider participating in accreditation as a public member.

Changes in Programs Indicated in Statistical Reports, 2003-2004

by [Karen L. O'Brien](#), Interim Director, ALA Office for Accreditation

Annual statistical reporting provides accredited and candidate programs with a self-monitoring mechanism. The Office uses these reports to aggregate the data and report on overall changes between years. What follows is a summary of changes between 2003 and 2004 in some of the categories of greatest interest to the COA. Programs also report this data to the Association for Library and Information Science Education ([ALISE](#)) for the annual [Library and Information Science Education Statistical Report](#).

While the pace of change in most of these categories remains similar to last year, the largest change from 2004 to 2003 is in minority enrollment (Table 5). Only 18 schools reported increases in minority enrollment in 2004, while 34 schools reported increases in 2003. Twenty-three schools reported decreases in 2004, compared to 14 in 2003.

FACULTY

Table 1: Change in Full-Time Faculty Fall 2003 to Fall 2004			
Number	Increase	No Change	Decrease
0		20	
1	14		9
2	6		4
3	2		
4	1		
5	1		
6	1		
TOTAL	25	20	13

(There are 62 ALA-accredited programs in 57 schools;
five schools operate two ALA-accredited programs and report combined data.
One school reporting is a candidate for accreditation.)

These changes are similar to those reported last year. Between 2002-2003, 12 programs increased faculty by at least one and 11 decreased by at least one. Last year 17 programs reported no change in full-time faculty while 20 reported no change this year.

Student Enrollment in Accredited Programs

Table 2 shows little change in the total number of ALA masters students by headcount from 2003 to 2004. Tables 3 and 4 show the breakout of full-time and part-time enrollments. Table 4 shows wide fluctuations (30+) occurring in part-time enrollment.

Table 2: Change in Total ALA Headcount Enrollment Fall 2003 to Fall 2004			
Number	Increase	No Change	Decrease
		0	
1-9 Students	9		8
10-19 Students	3		5
20-29 Students	6		4
30+ Students	12		11
TOTAL	30	0	28

Full-Time Headcount Enrollment

Full-time enrollment in ALA masters programs at most schools (42) changed by 19 or fewer students. Those schools with increases of 30 or more full-time students reported very large changes, ranging from 39 to 110. This represents a widening of the change range reported for 2003, which ranged from 30 to 84 students.

Table 3: Change in Full-time Headcount Enrollment Fall 2003 to Fall 2004			
Number	Increase	No Change	Decrease
		1	
1-9 Students	10		11
10-19 Students	12		9
20-29 Students	3		3
30+ Students	4		5
TOTAL	29	1	28

Part-Time Headcount Enrollment

More than a third of the schools reported changes of over 30 students. Schools with increases of 30 or more part-time students reported a range of 44-115 additional part-time headcount students in the ALA-accredited program(s). Even greater were decreases in the 30 + category, which ranged from 35 to 405. This is greater fluctuation than reported for 2003.

Table 4: Change in Part-time Headcount Enrollment Fall 2003 to Fall 2004			
Number	Increase	No Change	Decrease
		1	
1-9 Students	6		11
10-19 Students	7		5
20-29 Students	2		6
30+ Students	9		11
TOTAL	24	1	33

Minority Enrollment

Data for minority enrollment include the following categories of students: American Indian/Alaskan Native; Asian/Pacific Islanders; Black, non-Hispanic; and Hispanic (column L taken from ALISE table II-4). International students are not included in these figures. The seven Canadian programs do not collect or report information on ethnic origin of students.

Minority enrollment increased at only 18 schools, compared to 34 schools last year. Twenty-three schools reported decreases, compared to 14 schools last year. Two schools remained the same, compared to one school last year. This is the first time in several years that decreases outpaced increases.

Table 5: Change in Minority Enrollment Fall 2003 to Fall 2004				
Number	Increase	No Change	Decrease	Not Reporting
		2		7 Canadian
1-9 Students	10		18	
10-19 Students	7		4	
20-29 Students	2		0	
30+ Students	1		1*	
TOTAL	18	2	23	

(*Clark Atlanta University, closing in May 2005.)

Income

The majority of schools reported increases in total income for ALA programs in 2004. Of the 57 schools reporting, 39 reported an increase in total income, while 18 reported a decrease. More programs (41) reported an increase in institutional support rather than a decrease (15). Last year 13 programs reported a decrease in institutional support, compared with 19 for the 2002 report.

Fourteen schools reported a decrease in institutional support, compared with 13 last year. But this is an improvement from 2002 when 19 schools reported a decrease. This year 28 schools reported an increase in Other Income, compared to 30 last year, and 36 in 2002—a downward trend. It is not clear whether these changes are due to grants ending or a reflection of continued cutbacks of “other” income from state resources.

Table 6: Change in Income Sources	
Changes in Income	Number of programs
Total, Institution, & Other Increased	21
Total & Institution Increased , Other Decreased	14
Total & Other Increased , Institution Decreased	2
Total & Institution Increase , Other No Change	2
Total, Institution, & Other Decreased	5
Total & Institution Decreased , Other Increased	5
Total & Institution Decreased , Other Decreased	1
Total & Other Decreased , Institution Increased	5
Total & Other Decreased , Institution No Change	2
Total	57

(Excludes Hawaii due to records loss.)

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

For most ALA-accredited programs now undertaking comprehensive reviews, this is the second review using the [1992 Standards](#). With the second review, programs finally have the opportunity to recalibrate assessment measures using the same standards. The second application of the standards provides the kind of long-term data that enables a sensible analysis and allows the program to actually use the results for improvement. This process is key to producing an effective Program Presentation.

Programs have expressed these positive conclusions on the Program Presentation evaluation forms submitted to the Office. One of the forms asks the program to “comment on any problems experienced while preparing the Program Presentation, any changes needed to address these problems, any benefits resulting from the program presentation process, any difficulties you encountered and how you resolved them.” Happily, most comments indicate little difficulty preparing the document and a great deal of benefit derived from the process.

However, even as programs report the benefits derived from a comprehensive analysis of their system, External Review Panels report a host of achievements and challenges that the programs have inadvertently played down or buried in their Program Presentation. This gap is often the result of the program being too close to its own on-going processes. While this gap validates the need for site visits, it also points to the on-going struggle to create a document that accurately and holistically describes the program on a continuum.

COA and the Office for Accreditation are seeking to ease the struggle by offering seminars on developing the Program Presentation. Of the 41 program representatives who responded to the preferences and needs survey conducted by the Office at the 2005 ALISE and ALA Midwinter Conferences in January, 63% indicated a strong interest in attending such seminars.

The content needs portion of the survey showed that outcomes assessment is the topic of greatest interest, followed by evidence compilation.

As far as the *Standards* themselves, the results were as follows:

Standard I: Mission, Goals, and Objectives	61%
Standard II: Curriculum	59%
Standard V: Administration and Financial Support	54%
Standard III: Faculty	51%

Standard IV: Students	51%
Standard VI: Physical Resources and Facilities	41%

As for the time of year and place to offer the seminars, the strongest preference expressed is during or just before ALA Midwinter Meetings (44%); the next strongest preference (37%) is to attend a seminar in Chicago at ALA headquarters in the spring.

The Office and COA will discuss these results and devise next steps at the spring COA meeting, April 15-17, 2005. Thanks to your contributions on content, design work has already begun. Here is a proposed agenda for your comments (please send comments to me at kobrien@ala.org):

Proposed Agenda Seminars on Developing the Program Presentation

- Review of comprehensive review timeline
- Purpose of the Plan for Program Presentation
 - Developing working relationships
 - Discussing evidence that might be on-site, in appendices, electronic, etc.
 - Checking feasibility of timeline, constituent involvement, etc.
 - Developing understanding of program
 - Describing common problems in draft Program Presentation
- Ways to develop the Program Presentation
 - Committee for each chapter
 - One person responsible for coordinating overall process
 - Chapters follow order of the *Standards*
- How to address the *Standards*
 - From COA perspective (decision making)
 - From External Review Panel (ERP) perspective (evidence gathering)
- How to present evidence
 - Types of evidence COA and ERP members want and expect
- Q & A



2004-2005 COA Roster

Robert Wedgeworth, Chair

President, Proliteracy Worldwide

rwedge@proliteracy.org

Term Expires 2005

Karen Adams

Director, University Libraries

University of Alberta

Term Expires 2008

Paula J. Fenza

Grants Manager

Mather Institute on Aging

Term expires 2005

Thomas Leonhardt

Director, Scarborough-Phillips Library

St. Edward's University

Term expires 2008

Katy M. Marre

Professor of English

University of Dayton

Term expires 2006

Richard Rubin

Director, School of Library and Information Studies

Kent State University

Term Expires 2006

Nancy K. Roderer

Director, Welch Medical Library

Johns Hopkins University

Term expires 2008

Carla J. Stoffle

Director, University Libraries

University of Arizona

Term expires 2006

Danny P. Wallace
Director, School of Library and Information Studies
University of Oklahoma
Term Expires 2007

Virginia Walter
Chair, Department of Information Studies
University of California, Los Angeles
Term expires 2007

Ann C. Weeks
Professor, College of Information Studies
University of Maryland
Term expires 2006

Mary Elizabeth (Ma'lis) Wendt
Associate Director
The New York Public Library
Term Expires 2005

From the COA Chair: **PERSPECTIVE**

Letter from the COA Chair, Robert Wedgeworth

Over the past two years the Committee on Accreditation (COA) has concentrated its efforts in the following areas.

- Reviewing External Review Panelists' (ERP) training
- Coordinating due dates for statistical reports with ALISE
- Developing public information programs
- Providing advice for preparing the Program Presentation
- Advising programs seeking initial accreditation

However, we should note that the primary agenda for COA continues to be driven by its cycle of comprehensive program reviews, annual statistical reports and biennial narrative reports (BNR). Review of these reports for each accredited program represents a continual accreditation process.

Perhaps, the most important recent development in ALA accreditation has been the departure of Ann O'Neill as Director of the Office for Accreditation, prompting a search for her successor. That process should be completed by the 2005 ALA Annual Conference.

ERPs extend the capabilities of COA by functioning as its eyes and ears during site visits to programs under review. The quality of ERP reports depends largely upon a clear understanding of their role and how they can best be of assistance to the Committee. The Committee has recently re-committed itself to direct involvement in these training sessions, supplemented by the work of the Office of Accreditation staff.

In consultation with COA, the deadline for the ALISE statistical reports (on which the COA annual statistical reports are based) has been changed from October 15 to December 1 annually. This change provides more time for programs to compile the required data before submission to both COA and ALISE. The impact on COA is that it shifts the review of the annual statistics and the BNRs from the fall meeting of COA to the spring meeting.

Efforts to make the Standards for Accreditation understood by a broader constituency than those directly involved in LIS education has led to the development of COA-sponsored programs at the ALA Midwinter Meetings and Annual Conferences. Although attendance at these sessions has been sparse, COA will continue to use these and other reporting media to promote the significance of ALA accreditation in order to increase understanding of the role and significance of accreditation for Master's programs in the LIS field.

More emphasis on planning, which has been a natural outgrowth of the concept of continual accreditation, has brought recognition of the need to provide more advice to programs preparing Program Presentations for comprehensive reviews. Without being prescriptive, COA has initiated seminars to clarify COA's expectations and to discuss challenges that programs face in preparing these documents.

Finally, current discussion of the future of education for librarians and information specialists will, undoubtedly raise questions as to when it is likely that the Standards will be revised. COA welcomes these discussions and will participate and monitor them in order to use them to guide and inform the Standards review process.

Robert Wedgeworth is President of Proliteracy Worldwide <http://www.proliteracy.org> in Syracuse, New York. He can be reached by phone at 315-422-9121 or at rwedge@proliteracy.org.

External Review Panelists Acknowledged

External review panelists contribute a substantial amount of their time and energy participating in the accreditation process to assure quality in LIS education. We extend our appreciation to the following panelists who served during the spring 2005 academic term.

Chairs:

- **James A. Benson**, CIO, Dean-University Libraries, Associate Professor, St. John's University
- **Jean Donham**, Library Director, Cole Library, Cornell College
- **Barbara Moran**, Professor, School of Information and Library Science, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
- **C. James Schmidt**, Associate Professor, School of Library and Information Science, San José State University
- **Annabel K. Stephens**, Associate Professor, School of Library and Information Studies, The University of Alabama
- **Delmus E. Williams**, Dean of University Libraries, University of Akron

Panelists:

- **Richard AmRhein**, University Librarian, Valparaiso University
- **Mary Arnold**, Regional Teen Services Manager, Cuyahoga County Public Library
- **Gail Avery**, Exec. Assistant to the Director, Washington D.C. Public Library
- **Daniel D. Barron**, Director, School of Library and Information Science, University of South Carolina
- **Stephen T. Bajjaly**, Associate Professor, University of South Carolina
- **Rosann Bazirjian**, Assistant Dean for Technology and Access, Paterno Library, Pennsylvania State University
- **Maria T. Chavez-Hernandez**, Associate in Information Studies, School of Information Studies, Florida State University
- **Charles W. Conaway**, Professor Emeritus, School of Information Studies, Florida State University
- **Carol Doll**, Professor, School of Information Science and Policy, University of Albany, SUNY
- **Brad Eden**, Head, Bibliographic and Metadata Services, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
- **Judith J. Field**, Senior Lecturer, School of Library and Info. Science, Wayne State University
- **William Fisher**, Professor, San Jose State University

- **Barbara Ford**, Director, Mortenson Center, University of Illinois
- **Susan Frieband**, Professor, Graduate School of Library Sciences and Technologies, University of Puerto Rico
- **Jennifer Jung Gallant**, Manager of Branches and Community Services, Elyria Public Library (Ohio)
- **Joan Giesecke**, Dean of Libraries, University of Nebraska-Lincoln
- **Adán Griego**, Curator for Latin American & Iberian Collections, Stanford University Libraries
- **José-Marie Griffiths**, Dean, School of Information and Library Science, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
- **Dottie Hiebling**, Executive Director, Metropolitan New York Library Council
- **Lisa Hinchliffe**, Library Instruction Coordinator/Assoc. Professor, University of Illinois
- **Joan S. Howland**, Associate Dean, Information and Technology, University of Minnesota Law School
- **Barbara Immroth**, Professor, University of Texas
- **Debra Kalvee**, Associate University Librarian, Brock University (St. Catherine, Ontario)
- **Andrea L. Miller**, Chair, Department of Library Science, Clarion University of Pennsylvania
- **Zary Mostashari**, Dean, Library and Learning Services, Marymount University
- **Jerry Saye**, Professor, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
- **Tim Sineath**, Director, School of Library and Information Science, University of Kentucky
- **Mary Stansbury**, Assistant Professor, Kent State University
- **Jana Varlejs**, Associate Professor, Rutgers University
- **Terry Weech**, Associate Professor, GSLIS, University of Illinois at Urbana-Campaign

News and Announcements

COA Welcomes a New Member

Richard Rubin, Director of the School of Library and Information Studies at Kent State University, has joined the ALA Committee on Accreditation. Dr. Rubin has a long history of academic service and research in public libraries. His term expires in 2006 and is not renewable.

ALA-Accredited Programs Can Make Changes to The Directory of Accredited Programs Online

Since 2003, each ALA-accredited program has had an authorized person with permission to make changes for their program to the online LIS Directory. The

authorized person has a login (email address) and password (chosen by the authorized person). Login to make changes at http://www.ala.org/cfapps/lis_edit/login/index.cfm. Programs may also request a password reminder from this URL. The Office uploads changes to the Directory within 24 business hours of submission and the searchable directory is changed immediately. The PDF is updated semi-annually—the next update is scheduled for September 2005. Please contact the Office (accred@ala.org) if you need a reminder of who has authorization to make changes for your program.

External Review Panel Training at 2005 Annual Conference in Chicago

Current External Review Panelists and interested LIS practitioners and educators are invited to attend a general training for members of the Committee on Accreditation's External Review Panel pool. External Review Panelists are volunteer reviewers of candidate and accredited LIS programs. The training will be held on Friday, June 24, 2005, 2:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. at the Chicago Hilton and Towers in the Joliet Room. Please contact the Office (accred@ala.org) to reserve your seat.

COA Program at 2005 Annual Conference in Chicago: Initial Program Accreditation

An increasing number of programs in the U.S. and Canada are expressing interest in seeking initial ALA accreditation. To aid these programs in their efforts COA will offer a program on initial program accreditation at the 2005 ALA Annual Conference in Chicago on Sunday, June 26, 2005, 4:00-5:30 p.m. at the Chicago Hilton and Towers in the Lake Ontario Room. This program is open to all.

PRISM Spring 2005 volume 13 number 1
Copyright ©2005 American Library Association