



Certification Review Committee
Friday, January 19, 2007, Sheraton Dashpoint
Sunday, January 21, 2007, Sheraton Douglas
Seattle, WA

Karen Jessee (CPC), Denise Zielinski (CRC Chair), Ted Wanner (CRC), Gladys Smiley Bell (CPC), Eva Poole (CRC), Nancy Bolt (CPC), Mario Gonzalez (Board liaison), Jenifer Grady (staff liaison)

CPC

- Harris decision
 - Nancy will write her that she can go to the Board, reluctant to encourage her to reapply until Current Issues is discussed
 - Spring Board meeting is April 13-15
- Current Issues standard too ambiguous
- YALSA, what do they plan to do?
- Support staff cert
- Seeking state recognition of CPLA – GA has certification and IL doesn't have one

Sunday

- Review of applications
 - Approved 27 new candidates, 9 additional states, 8 library schools so we have 66 candidates from 30 states and 33 library schools
 - 29 courses, added 7; and 8 providers so now have 2 divisions
- Discussion of UNT appeal
 - CPLA CRC agrees to re-review UNT course if it has more depth and includes explanation below
- CPC Suggestions for CRC – addressed below
- Grading; use of pass/fail if employers require a grade for reimbursement
 - NO CHANGE FOR NOW - use your grading system but if a candidate needs a grade, be prepared
- Schedule of deadlines and meetings for 2007-2008 – one month before the meeting, packets sent out within the week
 - Spring (Tuesday, April 24)
 - Summer (June 21-27) – ask the committee
 - Fall (October)
 - Midwinter (January 11-17)
 - Spring (April 11-13)
 - Summer (June 26-July 2)
- Review of feedback from NSLS and UIUC
- Putting curricula on Web site
 - Ask if we can and if they don't, ask inquirer to contact the instructor



Certification Review Committee
Friday, January 19, 2007, Sheraton Dashpoint
Sunday, January 21, 2007, Sheraton Douglas
Seattle, WA

- Corporate providers might consider it proprietary
- Provider Approval Process
 - Comments on review letters with only those that have to do with the RFP directly
 - Put up Provider Criteria Checklist and results
 - Approved (no fees)
 - Approved with questions (no fees)
 - Conditionally approved (no fees)
 - Denied - appeal
- Appeals
 - Appeals communication should only be handled by Chair – contact ALA-APA for committee chair information
 - What is our procedure? Who writes and signs the letter?
- Changes to the RFP for clarity
 - Put up Provider Criteria Checklist and results
 - Approved (no fees)
 - Approved with questions (no fees)
 - Conditionally approved (no fees)
 - Denied - appeal
 - course descriptions
 - require electronic copies in word
 - clarification – everything has to be in front of the committee, committee does want to look at a URL
 - All information to be considered for this application must be included. Only information included will be considered. The CRC cannot be expected to go to Web sites in order to see additional information. It is the applicant's responsibility to submit a complete and compelling application.
- Candidate changes
 - Remind them of the work involved
 - Tell them to inform instructor that they need a grade
 - Paying out of pocket is substantial
 - Course evaluation forms are feedback
- Trademark
 - We are a registered trademark – change logo
 - Adds to sustainability
 - Thank PLA staff
- Provider Renewals policy



Certification Review Committee
Friday, January 19, 2007, Sheraton Dashpoint
Sunday, January 21, 2007, Sheraton Douglas
Seattle, WA

- When was it presented
- How was it presented
- How many attended
- Verify that there are no changes in curriculum or trainer
- If there are changes to curriculum, trainer, need documentation
- \$350
- Inform them that there will be a more rigorous review every three years
- Provider fees \$350
 - Too high because CE departments are cost-recovery
 - Incentive to raise their status and get more people
- **Following up with provider changing course and vacant trainer**
- Conflict of interest with Ted & IMLS grant
- Next ALISE – how to sell this to library schools
- **Board Review – give them talking points about ALA-APA**
- Current Issues
 - We are not changing the criteria
 - The CRC interprets this to mean...
 - Is the issue what social/political/economic includes?
 - Do we want to give examples like social networking, confidentiality, library closing so it doesn't have to deal with teens
 - Dr. Harris' topics may have been more palatable if stated differently
 - The nature of this standard is such that in order to effectively review it, providers must explicitly explain how they selected the topics for Current Issues (needs assessment, literature search, etc.)
- Approved PLA Current Issues course!