II.1 The comprehensive review process

From the early planning stages to consideration and a decision by the Committee on Accreditation, the comprehensive review process lasts approximately two years. This section provides an overview of the entire process. The comprehensive review includes the development of a Plan for Self-Study, preparation of the Self-Study document, review by an External Review Panel (ERP), and an accreditation decision by the COA. Details regarding the work of the ERP can be found in section III.

The COA schedules the next comprehensive review as part of its accreditation decision. For Continued and Initial accreditation, the next comprehensive review is normally scheduled seven years after the last comprehensive review, unless evidence or circumstance in the interim necessitates other action by COA. For conditional accreditation, the next comprehensive review or progress review is normally scheduled for three years after the last comprehensive review, unless evidence or circumstance in the interim necessitates other action by COA.

The Director of the Office for Accreditation serves as the primary contact for the program with

interest. The OA Director is the final authority on the size and composition of the panel. See section III.2: Composition of the External Review Panel.

One representative of the Canadian Federation of Library Associations (or an alternative professional library and information organization) is permitted to observe reviews of Canadian programs. His or her role is to observe how the panel operates, not to influence its evaluation of the program.

A comprehensive review includes a visit and report by an ERP. Panel visits occur over two business days; typically, the panel arrives one or two days early to review on-site documentation and to tour facilities.

The ERP submits a draft ERP Report due three weeks after the visit. The final ERP Report is due five weeks after the visit. The ERP Chair is responsible for overseeing the development of the panel's report and editing it for consistency. The Program Head should submit factual corrections to the draft ERP Report and may submit an optional response to the final ERP Report. Specific details on the responsibilities of the ERP Chair and members and development of the panel's reports are found in section III: Guidelines for the External Review Panel.

Revised June 3, 2019

II.1.1 Conflicts of interest

The COA seeks to avoid any and all conflicts of interest (see section I.4.2) that may compromise the integrity of its accreditation process. To this end, ERP Chairs, ERP members, and any observers are asked to provide information regarding potential conflicts of interest (see section III.4). Information regarding such conflicts is also sought from the Program Head and faculty of the program under review.

II.1.2 Change in review dates

The next comprehensive review visit is scheduled for seven (for Initial or Continued accreditation) or three years (for Conditional accreditation) following the previous review, or a progress review in three years may be scheduled upon conferring Conditional or Initial accreditation. The COA will consider requests to change a comprehensive o:26 0 Td -0.00bonfei, or a

II.1.3 Comprehensive review timeline

24 months before the visit	- The Office sends a letter to the Program Head advising of the scheduled visit and requesting a letter of invitation from the CEO of the institution seeking review of the program; - The Program Head provides the Office with a set of three dates of two-day duration (usually Monday-Tuesday) for a potential on-site visit by the External Review Panel; - The Program Head may identify areas that will be the focus of the Self-Study and/or suggest specializations of the ERP members.
18 months before the visit	- The COA selects the ERP Chair; - The OA Director informs the Program Head of the selection; - The Program Head evaluates the selected ERP Chair with the faculty for potential conflicts of interest; - If no conflicts are identified the Program Head approves the Chair. If a conflict is identified, the OA Director submits an alternate name to the Program Head; - The OA Director discusses potential dates for the on-site review with the appointed Chair. Having selected dates from those put forth by the school, the OA Director notifies the school of the dates for the on-site review. These dates are firm; - The school begins development of a plan for its Self-Study.
12 months before the visit	- The school submits its Plan for the Self-Study to the OA Director and the Chair; - The OA Director, Chair, and Program Head review the plan during a conference call. At this time the ERP Chair helps identify additional sources of evidence beyond those put forth in the plan. - The OA Director presents COA-approved reviewers for the panel to the Program Head for clearance of conflicts of interest.
4 months before the visit	The school submits a draft of the Self-Study for review by the OA Director and ERP members. The OA Director, ERP Chair, and Program Head review the draft through a conference call.

Accreditation Process, Policies, and Procedures, fourth edition