

Fall 2016, Volume 24, Number 2 • ISSN 1066-7873 • Laura Dare, editor
Comments and questions are welcomed. Please contact us at accred@ala.org.

In this issue:

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

ALA accreditation at a glance

64	ALA-accredited programs
59	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
29	ALA-accredited programs offering 100% online programs †
2	Programs 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

News and announcements

Required interim reporting instructions

An email with instructions for this year's required interim reports was sent in October to each program head, as well as those designated "to be copied on accreditation-related correspondence." Program heads who have not received the emailed instructions should contact the Office right away.

Due December 1, 2016: Annual statistical data reporting (required from every program). Data collection this year will be via the program's Trend Summary spreadsheet, sent as an attachment in the email referenced above. The head of the accredited program should review and verify all data prior to submitting.

Due February 15, 2017: Narrative reports (biennial narrative reports and annual progress reports). Instructions regarding format, submission and content are on the Required Reporting for Accreditation web page

(<http://www.ala.org/accreditedprograms/resourcesforprogramadministrators/reqreporting>).

This page also includes a schedule for biennial narrative report submission (even/odd year assignments). Programs with Conditional, Precandidacy, or Candidacy status submit annual progress reports instead of biennial narrative reports. Please note the ten-page limit (excluding appendices) on narrative reports.

ERP Chair training at 2017 ALA Midwinter Meeting in Atlanta

Date: Friday, January 20, 2017

Time: 1:00 – 4:00pm

Location: Atlanta Marriott Marquis (265 Peachtree Center Ave NE), Room A708

External Review Panelists who have participated in two or more on-site visits are invited to attend training to serve as an ERP Chair upon appointment by COA. The session will prepare attendees to lead an external review of programs seeking ALA accreditation. The session will include a panel discussion featuring experienced ERP Chairs and Office for Accreditation staff. OA staff will present resources for Chairs to use in the review process. People who are currently assigned to chair a review are strongly encouraged to attend.

Program heads who want to learn more about the comprehensive review, the site visit, and the role of the ERP Chair in the review process are also encouraged to attend.

Please RSVP by December 27 to Laura Dare, ldare@ala.org, and include "ERP Chair Training" in the subject line.

AASL-CAEP program review training at 2017 ALA Midwinter Meeting in Atlanta

Date: Friday, January 20, 2017

Time: 8:00am-11:00am

Location: Georgia World Congress Center, Building A, Room A408

New and experienced reviewers and program report writers are encouraged to attend this session to learn about the CAEP (formerly NCATE) program review process, the 2010 *ALA/AASL Standards for Initial Preparation of School Librarians*, report preparation and review, and appropriate assessments. A “homework” assignment will be sent in advance so that attendees can be familiar with some of the documents used in the training.

Reviewers who have not been trained on using the 2010 standards must attend this session in order to be assigned to review a program using those standards.

So that we have sufficient training materials on hand, please RSVP to Laura Dare, ldare@ala.org, by December 27, 2016, and include “AASL-CAEP training” in the subject line.

Prospective reviewers can find out more about the AASL-CAEP program review process at <http://www.ala.org/aasl/aasleducation/schoollibrary/informationprogram>.

AASL CAEP Coordinating Committee meeting at 2017 ALA Midwinter Meeting in Atlanta

Date: Friday, January 20, 2017

Time: 11:00am – 12noon

Location: Georgia World Congress Center, Building A, Room A408

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

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 at http://www.ala.org/accreditedprograms/resourcesforerp/ERP_service_info. If you are interested and meet the qualifications, please complete the External Review Panel Member

Information Form, available on the Office for Accreditation website, 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 the Office for Accreditation, accred@ala.org.

ALA accreditation standards and policy reminders

The Committee on Accreditation (COA) calls your attention to the following important aspects of the 2015 ALA standards and policy, as well as CHEA standards for recognition (<http://www.ala.org/offices/accreditation/chearecognition>). Contact the Office for Accreditation, accred.ala.org, if you have questions about compliance with these requirements.

Disclosure of accreditation status requirement

Accreditation Process, Policies and Procedures (AP3), fourth edition, I.7: As a public protection, including for prospective students, any reference to ALA accredited status or display of the ALA Accredited logo must include the specific status as granted by COA: Candidate, Conditional, Continued, Initial, Precandidate, or Withdrawn. Specific language to use is indicated in individual status sections of AP3: I.11.2, I.12.1, I.13.1, and I.14.

Demonstration of accountability to the public

Current, accurate, and easily accessible information about the program is available to students and the general public. This information includes documentation of progress toward achievement of program goals and objectives... (2015 Standards for Accreditation of Master's Programs in Library and Information Studies, IV.2)

Notification requirement of institutional or programmatic changes

As many institutions and programs are going through organizational changes, the Office for Accreditation reminds program heads of notification requirements. From AP3, I.22: Any change in executive administration must be communicated in writing to the Office for Accreditation within 30 days. Examples of executive administration changes that must be reported include, but are not limited to:

- 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.

If you have leadership update changes to report, contact the Office for Accreditation, accred@ala.org, for a Leadership Update Form.

COA announces accreditation actions

The Committee on Accreditation (COA) of the American Library Association (ALA) has announced accreditation decisions made at the 2016 ALA Annual Conference in Orlando.

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

- Master of Science in Library and Information Science at the Catholic University of America (DC);
- Master of Arts in Library and Information Science at the University of Iowa;
- Master of Arts in Library and Information Science at the University of South Florida;
- Master of Science in Information Sciences at the University of Tennessee-Knoxville.

Candidacy status was maintained for the following program, with the next comprehensive review visit scheduled to take place in spring 2019:

- Master of Science in Library and Information Science at Chicago State University (IL).

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 fall 2016 academic term. The accreditation decisions will be made by the COA at its meeting at the 2017 ALA Midwinter Meeting in Atlanta.

- University of British Columbia
- McGill University (QC)
- North Carolina Central University
- Pratt Institute (NY)
- University of Southern California
- Wayne State University (MI)

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)

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 at <http://www.ala.org/accreditedprograms/directory>. 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

Appointments to the Committee on Accreditation (COA) in 2016 are affording continuity as well as bringing fresh perspectives. Elizabeth Aversa takes the helm as COA Chair in her last year on the Committee. She brings practice, scholarship, teaching, and administrative leadership with work in public and state librarianship, in the information industry, and in academics as a faculty member, a dean, and a director at several ALA-accredited programs.

New COA members are:

- Diane Barlow (Special Assistant to the Dean, College of Information Studies, University of Maryland),
- David Eichmann (Director, School of Library and Information Science, University of Iowa),
- Loretta Parham (Chief Executive Officer and Director of the Atlanta University Center Woodruff),
- Kelvin Watson (Chief Innovation & Technology Officer at Queens Library, NY),
- David Weigle, a public member (Assistant Dean for Graduate Medical Education at the University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center) is an experienced accreditor, having recently served on the Accreditation Review Commission on Education for the Physician Assistant (ARC-PA).

Implications of new ALA standards and process and CHEA recognition

With the end of the fiscal year in August, Office for Accreditation (OA) staff assess completion of 2016 goals and set sights on 2017. Considerable focus will remain on smooth implementation of the 2015 Standards for Accreditation and the 4th edition of Accreditation Process, Policies, and Procedures (AP3).

COA provided guidance on the transition at the 2015 Annual Conference in San Francisco, the 2016 Midwinter in Boston, and the 2016 Annual Conference in Orlando, and is preparing another session for late Sunday afternoon at the 2017 Annual Conference in Chicago. Slides of the COA presentation at 2016 Annual Conference are available from the Resources for LIS Program Administrators link

(<http://www.ala.org/accreditedprograms/resourcesforprogramadministrators>) on the OA homepage at <http://www.ala.org/accreditation>.

The changes in the Standards and AP3 have implications for recognition by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA). The CHEA Committee on Recognition response to the interim report calls for follow-up reporting by March 1, 2017, in three areas:

- Public access to information on “program performance, including student achievement,”
- Public release of more information on the basis for accreditation decisions, and
- How ALA standard V.3 Administration, Finances, and Resources addresses “student preparedness and health and safety, as called for in the CHEA standard (12A.5).”

For the first point, the most direct approach taken to gaining better compliance with CHEA requirements has been to include them in COA annual letters of response to program reports and to cite the supporting ALA standard IV.2, “Current, accurate, and easily accessible information about the program is available to students and the general public.” More indirect approaches have been the additional advice provided for programs in AP3, Section II.4, on documenting Outcomes assessment, such as reporting on achievement of program goals and objectives, decisions on curricula development, admission requirements, availability of financial aid, criteria for evaluating student performance, and assistance with placement.

Nearly 60% of the ALA-accredited programs have afforded greater transparency by providing their Program Presentation (now called Self-study) publicly at the Office website and thereby also providing support to their colleagues in other programs who are involved in preparing a Self-study.

Other accreditors are addressing CHEA requirements by prompting programs to provide easy public access to program performance-related information such as:

- Attrition and retention rates
- Time to graduation
- Job placement rates
- Employment advancement

Statistical data that programs provide to COA, that the Office collects, trends and makes public, is largely input rather than outcome data. Outcomes are of greater interest to ALA and CHEA. The ALA trended statistics provide a reading on program health, but not so much on effectiveness as far as student learning outcomes. The CHEA 2006 Special Report: *Accreditation and Accountability* (http://www.chea.org/pdf/Accreditation_and_Accountability.pdf) served as a clarion call on this.

To address the second point of the CHEA concerns noted above (the “basis for accreditation decisions”), other accreditors now release decision letters, which detail the basis and reasons for the decisions, and invite programs to make a public response. Others cite the specific standards on which a program has been asked to report. Currently ALA makes only the decisions themselves public in the reports on actions taken.

On the third and final point of the CHEA concerns (how ALA Standard V.3 Administration, Finances, and Resources relate to student preparedness and safety), explanation will be made

about the assurances needed on program sustainability to ensure support of student preparedness and safety. CHEA staff and other accreditors have not up to this point dealt with questions by the CHEA Committee on Recognition regarding CHEA 12A.5. What is clear upon further analysis is that ALA standard element V.3 doesn't directly reference students, while the other elements of that standard reference students or outcomes. The COA will need to take that under advisement for the next Standards review.

Prism makeover

The Office has engaged with ALA Graphics to fulfill a long-standing desire to revitalize the look and strengthen the publication's impact. The aim is to be more transparent and, like a prism, disperse a spectrum of information for readers to stay informed about important developments in ALA accreditation.

Annual statistical reporting

Instructions to programs for annual statistical reporting to COA have been released by email from the Office. The direct entry by programs of data into the trended spreadsheet has been enabled to make better contextual sense of the information.

Upcoming opportunities

LIS program personnel attending reviewer training sessions in greater numbers has helped develop a better shared understanding of how to best use the accreditation review process. Written and oral evaluation of those sessions, as well as the written review evaluation surveys built into the comprehensive review process, have resulted in changes large and small—the bigger changes reflected in the latest edition of the AP3 process manual <http://www.ala.org/accreditedprograms/standards/AP3>.

Program personnel are welcome to attend ERP Chair Training at ALA Midwinter in Atlanta to learn more about the comprehensive review process. See the blurb in the News and Announcements section of this issue for more information.

Informing the ALA Executive Board on accreditation

The Task Force on Accreditation Communication and Process provided its report with recommendations to the Board in October. The COA will review that report at its fall 2016 meeting later in November.

The Task Force on the Future Context of Accreditation continues its work, with a white paper to be delivered to the Board for consideration at the ALA Midwinter Meeting. A panel discussion was held at the 2016 ASIS&T Annual Meeting. Those efforts are timed to align with and to further catalyze ALA president-elect Julie Todaro's initiatives, especially in professional and leadership development, a key strategic action area.

Upcoming COA decisions on Initial accreditation status

University of Southern California's Master of Management in Library and Information Science program is scheduled for a site visit in fall 2016 with the decision regarding Initial accreditation to be made in at ALA Midwinter January 2017.

Chicago State University's Master of Science in Library and Information Science program is scheduled for a site visit in spring 2019. The COA will make an Initial accreditation decision at the 2019 ALA Annual Conference in Washington, DC, in late June.

Opportunities to connect

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 Atlanta for the 2017 ALA Midwinter Meeting – you are welcome to get in touch to arrange a meeting with me there.

Colleagues from the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA) (ifla.org) and I provided a webinar on November 3 on how associations cooperating internationally could create an international quality assessment framework for LIS education. The audio recording and slides for the webinar are now available at the following links:

- Audio recording: <http://tinyurl.com/BSLISE-2016-11-audio>
- Paper and slides: <https://publish.illinois.edu/ifla-set-ltr-2016/program/>

From the COA Chair: PERSPECTIVE

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

Unraveling the need for and uses of reports to the COA (or Why does the COA call for so many statistical, narrative, and special reports?)

In reviewing the 2015-2016 annual statistical reports at its spring 2016 meeting, the Committee on Accreditation (COA) noted that a number of programs reported dramatic changes in data from previous years in enrollments, faculty sizes, and incomes and expenditures. Not knowing if the data reported were simply incorrect or due to actual changes, the COA contacted the affected programs for clarification. The exercise of reviewing all the reports and seeking so many clarifications suggested the need for a review of what is required from programs and why the data is collected. Reports from programs are important contributors to the shared goal of programs and the COA: continuity of quality.

Required Reports

The COA requires two regular reports from all programs: annual statistics and interim narrative reports.

The annual statistics provide key data on faculty, students, and financial matters. There are three notable changes for reporting in this 2016-2017 cycle.

First, collection has been simplified by having programs enter data directly into the Trend Summary spreadsheet. The act of filling in the data will make any drastic increases or decreases obvious to program personnel providing the data.

Second, the COA is asking programs for two additional data points:

- Number of FT faculty with *any* teaching responsibility in the accredited program, and
- Number of PT (FTE) faculty with *any* teaching responsibility in the accredited program.

These data points will add clarity to the faculty data as an increasing number of schools offer other degree programs along with the accredited Master's program.

A third change simply updates the instructions for completing the Annual Statistical Report to reflect the additional data points requested. The instructions now allow for an explanation to be added on the last row of the spreadsheet; this will provide both the COA and the program a record of the reason(s) for any unusual fluctuations in the data or any changes in how counts were taken.

For programs with Continued or Initial accreditation status, the Biennial Narrative Report (BNR), due February 15, is meant to keep the COA informed of changes that occur and of how the program adjusts in order to comply with each standard. Organized standard by standard, the BNR provides additional opportunities for programs to explain any dramatic changes reported in the Annual Statistical Report. The fact that the BNR is narrative does not mean that tabular presentations and numeric series are not welcome; where clarity can be enhanced, summary data or statistical points should be included. The ten-page limit to the BNR ensures that the program presents the salient points in a concise manner – a benefit to the program and to COA. BNRs provide useful information for the program's development of the self-study for the comprehensive review.

Annual Progress Reports, along with Annual Statistical Reports, are required of programs with Conditional accreditation and those with Candidacy and Precandidacy status. Progress reports inform the COA of accomplishments and challenges as programs work toward meeting the Standards. Again, clear numeric data indicating increases and decreases in elements such as faculty size, enrollment, and finances are helpful to the COA as it reviews the reports.

Finally, the COA may ask a program to submit a special report to clarify or add detail on an issue not fully explained in a BNR or progress report, or following a comprehensive review. A call for a special report should be considered simply a request for additional information and nothing more. Clarity and accuracy of regular reports will generally eliminate the need for special reports that should be reserved for the most unusual of circumstances.

While extensive details of the reporting requirements are covered on the "Required reporting for accreditation" page of the ALA website, the benefits of timely and accurate reporting, to both programs and the COA, are worth mentioning.

Benefits of Reporting

For a program, regular reports to the COA offer administrative benefits that can enhance planning, decision-making, and communication with university officials as well as external constituents.

Trended data may enable the program's administrative head to identify any areas of concern. An undesirable decrease in enrollment for a single year, for example, might beg investigation into why this occurred; local economic conditions, lack of recruiting activities, absence or decline in financial assistance for the program, or a decrease in grants and contracts that would employ research assistants could be among the reasons why enrollment is "off" and help

identify what needs to be done to turn the trend around. On the other hand, if a program's enrollment management plan calls for decreasing the number of students admitted, such a statistic would provide evidence of successful implementation of the plan.

Similarly, a series of reports showing a gradual decline in enrollment over several years might prompt a different sort of investigation into the reasons for the change. The program might look at different specializations and learn that the gradual decline was evident primarily in one specialty. Then that data could be used to determine whether or not to continue that specialization and to provide the rationale for discontinuation if such a decision were made. On the other hand, if the program learned that a particular concentration or specialty was suffering declining enrollment because graduates were unable to find employment in the specialized area, the program might be inclined to examine the curriculum and student learning in order to update or otherwise improve the specialization to the benefit of the students.

Of course, all parent institutions regularly call for reports from programs. Although the reports required by the COA may not exactly match what is required by university administrations, opportunities are there to reuse, recraft, or recycle data already gathered. The more accurate and timely evidence that is available to program administrators, the more opportunity there is to create effective arguments for financial and other resource support. It is even possible to get the attention of resource administrators by presenting data in a somewhat different form from what they encounter year after year from diverse departments and programs.

Accurate annual statistical reporting with full explanations of irregularities enable the COA to understand more of what is going on in programs between biennial reports and comprehensive reviews. The trended data allows program personnel and the COA to see key statistics "at a glance." It allows the COA to move quickly through routine reports while spending more time gaining understanding of programs that reported substantial changes.

ALA-COA will increasingly benefit from good reporting in that its own recognizing body, the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA), requires that we encourage (or even mandate) programs to provide public access to information on program performance including student achievement. It has been noted elsewhere in this issue of Prism that other accreditors are providing templates for the reporting of outcome measures of program performance that include application to acceptance rate, attrition and retention rate, time to graduation, job placement and others. The COA will continue to study the CHEA requirements and how to address them during the upcoming year.

Future of Reporting

As Chair, one of the objectives I see for COA in 2016-2017 is to routinize processes wherever possible so as to make them more efficient and cost effective. Addressing this objective will include ongoing development and refinement of the External Review Panel Report template piloted in spring 2016 using the 2015 Standards, development and piloting of a template for self-studies, and review and appropriate revision of processes that the Committee follows in carrying out its business. We will communicate with programs as we develop templates and processes, and we look forward to working together to our mutual benefit.

Another way that the COA will address reporting will be to take another look at the possibility of collaborating with the Association for Library and Information Science Education (ALISE) on

statistical reporting. As many readers know, ALISE and the COA worked together since the 1980s to collect statistics on library and information science education. The data collection process has varied over the years. While ALISE and COA are collecting separate data from two different questionnaires this year, we hope to reassess the situation and open discussions of working together again.

Regardless of whether one or two sets of data are collected, the field at large should be proud of the uninterrupted reporting on aspects of LIS education for over 35 years. The annual ALISE statistical reports and the COA's trended data provide us with a more thorough and comprehensive picture than most professions can offer.

Reporting and Accreditation: the Relationship

Between comprehensive reviews, interim reporting provides valuable evidence that enlightens findings from the external review panel and underscores findings in the program's own self-study.

The Introduction to the 2015 Standards states, "The Committee on Accreditation examines the evidence presented for each of the Standards; however, its final judgment is concerned with the totality of the accomplishment and the environment for learning." Accurate and thorough reporting to the COA – BNRs, annual statistics, progress reports and special reports – contribute substantial evidence to that totality of accomplishment and learning environment.

It is my hope that programs and the COA can cooperate on finding ways to make the reporting relationship more efficient for both parties and more informative to the field and to the public at large – all for the ultimate benefit of our primary constituents – the students in LIS degree programs.

Spotlight on process and policy

By Laura Dare, Accreditation Manager, ALA Office for Accreditation

Tips for writing narrative interim reports to COA

In each issue of Prism we focus on an aspect of process, policy, or procedure of ALA accreditation. Earlier in this issue, COA Chair Elizabeth Aversa writes on why the Committee on Accreditation requires narrative reporting between comprehensive reviews, and how the reports help COA as well as programs in the accreditation process. This issue's column features tips to help programs with writing narrative reports to the COA.

Programs with Initial or Continued accreditation status must submit biennial narrative reports to COA between comprehensive reviews. Presented here are several tips for writing a Biennial Narrative Report or Annual Progress Report. The Required Reporting for Accreditation page (<http://www.ala.org/accreditedprograms/resourcesforprogramadministrators/reqreporting>) has more detailed instructions.

Do:

- Follow the Format instructions (<http://www.ala.org/accreditedprograms/resourcesforprogramadministrators/reqreporting#format>).
- Adhere to the 10-page maximum (double-spaced) for the narrative.
- Begin the report with a brief introduction section and conclude with a brief summary section.
- Address each standard, in order. Use the report to inform COA of ongoing self-assessment, planning, and evaluation processes occurring at the school and program.
- Include:
 - Developments at the program and progress on coming into compliance with the Standards
 - Achievements
 - Concerns or challenges, either identified by COA in previous correspondence or issues that have developed since the previous reporting
- Use appendices to present more detailed information on issues mentioned in the narrative. Where possible, use tables, charts, or graphs to present a snapshot of relevant information.
- Review past correspondence from COA for issues regarding compliance with the Standards. If you need copies of letters from COA, contact the Office at accred@ala.org.
- Build on previous narrative reports. Provide updates to issues that were mentioned in previous reports.
- Submit the report to accred@ala.org by February 15, 2017. Consolidate the narrative and any appendices into a single electronic file.

Don't:

- Don't submit the report to a specific person in the Office for Accreditation. Use of an address other than accred@ala.org may result in delayed receipt.
- Don't submit a narrative longer than 10 double-spaced pages.
- Don't shy away from reporting on challenges the program is facing. COA is most interested in what the program is doing to address the issues and making sure that decisions are being made in a systematic manner.

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 the Office for Accreditation, accred@ala.org.

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 spring 2016 academic term.

Chairs

- Eileen G. Abels, Dean and Professor, School of Library and Information Science, Simmons College
- Rachel Applegate, Chair, Department of Library and Information Science, Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis
- Prudence W. Dalrymple, Professor and Director, Institute for Health Informatics, College of Computing & Informatics, Drexel University
- Mirah J. Dow, Associate Professor, School of Library and Information Management, Emporia State University
- Linda Lillard, Associate Professor and Chair, Department of Library Science, Clarion University of Pennsylvania

Panelists

- George Abbott, Librarian Emeritus, Syracuse University Library Syracuse University
- H. Frank Cervone, Director of Information Technology, School of Public Health, University of Illinois at Chicago
- Karen J. Cook, Recorder of Documents, State Library of Louisiana
- Rene Erlandson, former Director, Virtual Services, Criss Library, University of Nebraska Omaha
- Barbara J. Ford, Mortenson Distinguished Professor Emerita, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
- Deborah S. Greal, Associate Dean, School of Business and Professional Studies, St. Catherine University
- Meghan Harper, Associate Professor, School of Library and Information Science, Kent State University
- Mary E. Helms, Head, Strategic Initiatives, McGoogan Library of Medicine, University of Nebraska Medical Center
- Marilyn Irwin, Associate Professor Emerita, School of Informatics and Computing, Indiana University, Indianapolis
- Jami L. Jones, Associate Professor, Department of Information and Library Science, East Carolina University
- Iris Lee, Head of Collection Services, Burns Law Library, George Washington University
- Stephen Matthews, Library Director, Audrey Bruce Currier Library, Foxcroft School
- Edna Reid, Associate Professor, Department of Integrated Science & Technology, Intelligence Analysis Program, James Madison University
- Athena Salaba, Associate Professor and Associate Director, School of Library and Information Science, Kent State University
- Deborah Swain, Associate Professor, School of Library and Information Sciences, North Carolina Central University
- Jennifer K. Sweeney, Adjunct Faculty, College of Information Science and Technology, Drexel University

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."

Spring 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 spring 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)*.

Old Dominion University (VA), M.S. in Education, Library Science

Spring 2016 reviewers

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

Brenda Pruitt-Anisette, Coordinator, Media Services, Fulton County Schools Library

Susan Ballard, Project Director, School Librarian Program, Granite State College/University System of NH

Cassandra Barnett, Program Advisor for School Libraries, Arkansas Department of Education

Mary Ann Berry, Retired/Adjunct, Department of Library Science, Sam Houston State University

Audrey Church, Coordinator, School Library Media Program, Longwood University

Sherry Crow, Assistant Professor of School Library Science/Educational Media, College of Education, University of Nebraska at Kearney

Roxanne Forgrave, MLIS Program Coordinator and Professor, Olivet Nazarene University

Liz Haynes, Director (retired), School of Library and Information Science, University of Southern Mississippi

Cynthia Keller, Adjunct professor, School Library Media Program, McDaniel College

Ramona Kerby, Professor, School Library Media Program, McDaniel College

Johan Koren, Associate Professor, Dept. of Early Childhood & Elementary Education, Murray State University

Rebecca Pasco, Professor and Coordinator, Library Science Education Programs, Library Science Education Programs

Vandy Pacetti-Donelson, Library Media Specialist, Poinciana High School

The next issue of *Prism* will be published in April of 2017. Stay tuned!
Please send comments or feedback to accred@ala.org.