



ACRL Standards for Distance and Online Learning Library Services

[Equitable Access Principle](#)

[Purpose of Standards](#)

[Standards](#)

- [1. Vision and Strategic Planning](#)
- [2. Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility \(DEIA\)](#)
- [3. Personnel](#)
- [4. Collections & Access](#)
- [5. Research & Instruction](#)
- [6. Assessment](#)
- [7. Financial Support](#)

[Appendix 1 : Meeting Library-Related Standards and Other Guidelines, Regulations and Laws](#)

[Library-Related Standards](#)

[Other Standards, Guidelines, Laws, and Regulations:](#)

[Appendix 2: History of the Document](#)

Equitable Access Principle

All distance and online members of an institution of higher education are entitled to the library services, resources, and collections of that institution. This founding principle applies to all public, private, profit, and non-profit academic institutions and it is the

Benchmarks

The library:

Understands and meets all requirements and guidelines set forth by the [Americans with Disabilities Act](#) (ADA) and Sections 504 and 508 of the Rehabilitation Act.

Utilizes Universal Design for Learning ([UDL](#)) as an approach to instructional design.

Provides resources and services in multiple formats to ensure accessibility and choice.

Regularly participates in DEIA professional development activities.

Provides equal or equivalent experiences to learners with varying levels of technological access and abilities.

3. Personnel

Standard: The library maintains sufficient personnel to support the needs of distance and online learning communities.

Benchmarks

The library:

Hires either a dedicated distance and online learning librarian, or equivalent title, or maintains personnel distributed across many departments or positions.

Provides adequate service hours and personal assistance.

Regularly reviews workloads and capacities to provide and maintain services across departments that provide support, such as:

- Strategic planning and management

- Collection development

- Information literacy

- Research services

- Resource access

- Marketing and outreach

Provides adequate and ongoing support for professional development.

Markets and promotes educational services directly to distance and online learning communities.

Appendix 1: Meeting Library-

Other Standards, Guidelines, Laws, and Regulations:

Additionally, libraries must ensure that its distance and online learning library programs meet or exceed national and regional guidelines, laws, and regulations. There may be local or national statutes, rules, requirements, or other considerations to bear in mind and include in any procedures or approaches to Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility work.

[Americans with Disabilities Act \(ADA\) homepage](#)

[ADA Design Standards](#)

[Section 508 \(Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act\)](#)

[Section 508 Design and Develop guidelines](#)

[Section 504, Rehabilitation Act of 1973](#)

[Section 504 FAQ](#)

[Web Content Accessibility Guidelines \(WCAG\)](#)

direction for their next steps. This committee also reviewed language and structure of other educational and library related guidelines and standards to gain ideas. From there, the committee identified seven Standards: Collections & Access, Personnel, Research & Instruction, Assessment, Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility, Financial Support, and Vision and Strategic Planning. From there, the committee worked to fit all the tenants of the 2016 under these Standards.

The 2021-2022 committee included chairs, Janna Mattson, George Mason University and Rachel Isaac-Menard, Adelphi University, and members Natalie Haber, University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, Kelly Diamond, West Virginia University, Marcia Keyser, Drake University, Joelle E. Pitts, Carnegie Mellon University and Sarah Lynn Simms, Louisiana State University. Jack Fritts attended several meetings as an ex-officio member. This committee finalized the draft and shared it with the DOLS Executive Committee. DOLS Members were encouraged to give feedback during an open comment period which resulted in several friendly amendments to the text, but no substantive changes. The ACRL Standards Committee voted to approve them in December 2022, and the ACRL Board of Directors voted to approve them on February 17, 2023.

2016

Buck, in her simultaneous role as Section Secretary, and by Karla Aleman, Chair of the

further ideas generated at the Annual 2015 meeting of the Standards Committee. Harvey Gover then incorporated those ideas into a final draft in July 2015. The draft was approved by the Standards Committee in late July and sent to the Distance Learning Section Executive Committee for review and approval in September 2015. The draft was unanimously approved by DLS Exec on September 30, 2015. The draft was then approved by SAC in February 2016 to move forward to the ACRL Board of Directors for their final approval and subsequent publishing in _____, and posting to the ACRL Guideing(6 (i2è S)1 (t)12 (an)10 (ar)7 (ar)3 (ar)10 Tc 0 Td

consideration by other committee members and to request email participation from individuals not on the committee and not eligible to write to the wiki. Michelle (Shelly) Drumm, Emergent Technology Trainer at BCR (Bibliographical Center for Research) and a member of the DLS Web committee, was instrumental in setting up the wiki and has both moved and maintained it since.

Members of the Guidelines Committee, who participated actively with Rob Morrison in the revision activities while he was Chair, were Betty Brice, University of Alabama; Marie Jones, East Tennessee State University; and Melissa Koenig, DePaul University.

Axel Schmetzke of the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point provided valuable input

2000

When reviewing the publication history of the _____, one readily notices the short span in editions from 1998 to 2000. The 1998 _____ were approved with the proviso from SAC that efforts be undertaken immediately upon their final approval to make the _____ more outcomes oriented through a minor rhetorical revision that would not require as complete a subsequent approval process as would a more thorough revision. This minor outcomes revision was actually initiated during the 1998 approval process, when the Guidelines Committee members began reviewing the draft document for possible outcomes additions and then Chair, Harvey Gover, prepared an additional precept for the then _____ Philosophy section acknowledging the importance of instilling lifelong learning skills through information literacy instruction for students in extended academic settings. With the approval of SAC, that precept was incorporated into the final draft of the 1998 _____.

The outcomes revision continued through Annual 2000, when it was approved by SAC and the ACRL Board of Directors. Those Guidelines Committee members who participated actively in the outcomes revision throughout this time included Committee Chair Jean Caspers, Oregon State University; and Geraldine Collins, University of North Florida; Linda Frederiksen, Washington State University Vancouver; Lisa Hinchliffe, Illinois State University; Mae O'Neal, Western Michigan University; Bill Parton, Oklahoma Tech University; and Bernie Sloan, University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign. Susan Maltese, Oakton Community College, then liaison from SAC to DLS, and Barton Lessin, Wayne State University, Chair of SAC, also contributed suggestions and guidance. Harvey Gover, then DLS Chair and Consultant to the Guidelines Committee, monitored the entire outcomes revision process, and prepared the final revision draft submitted to SAC just prior to Annual 2000. The final revision draft was based upon a draft insert that had been prepared by Jean Caspers and submitted to the Guidelines Committee for review on June 6. Gover's final draft consisted largely of an incorporation of Caspers' insert throughout the entire 1998 Guidelines text and was forwarded to Susan Maltese, SAC liaison to DLS, on June 9 for submission to SAC.

During the approval process for the outcomes revision, it was suggested by members of SAC that the Introduction needed strengthening and recommended that an additional minor revision be prepared, rewriting the introduction. During the process of revising the introduction, it became evident that the Revising the section would also require some corresponding strengthening and revision. These efforts, which led to approval of the 2004 edition, were initiated and prepared by Harvey Gover, then Consultant to the Guidelines Committee, with input from members of the Guidelines Committee, Linda Frederiksen, Chair, Washington State University Vancouver; Betty K. Bryce, University of Alabama Libraries; Deborah F. Cardinal, WiLS OCLC; Catharine Cebrowski, ITESM – Tec De Monterrey; Geraldine Collins, University of North Florida; Marie F. Jones, East Tennessee State University; Melissa H. Koenig, DePaul University; Debra Lamb-Deans, Cornell University; and Bernie Sloan, University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign.

1998

From the beginning, those undertaking preparation or revision of the have sought the widest possible input from everyone involved in all aspects and on all levels of distance teaching and learning in higher education. For example, the decision to revise the 1990 was made initially by DLS Guidelines Committee. Then the official mandate came from the DLS Executive Board at its final 1996 Midwinter meeting. The revision of the 1990

, which produced the 1998

, was prepared by Harvey Gover, then Chair of the DLS Guidelines Committee.

The revision was based upon input from members of the Guidelines Committee, members of the DLS Executive Board, the general membership of DLS, and other librarians and administrators involved in post-secondary distance learning programs

from across the nation and arose U0 (-g i7(G)2 (u, l)6 d (b)10 (er)) 4(nes)ernesnesnes37Tw 0.72 470.

Gordon Lynn Hufford, Indiana University East; Ruth M. Jackson, West Virginia University; Chui-Chun Lee, SUNY--New Paltz; G. Tom Mendina, University of Memphis; Virginia S. O'Herron, Old Dominion University; Mae O'Neal, Western Michigan University; Bill Parton, Arkansas Tech University; Mercedes L. Rowe, Mercy College; Dorothy Tolliver, Maui Community College Library; and Steven D. Zink, University of Nevada, Reno.

Others outside the Committee who contributed significantly to the cycle of revision of the 1990 included: Thomas Abbott, University of Maine at Augusta; Janice Bain-Kerr, Troy State University; Nancy Burich, University of Kansas, Regents Center Library; Anne Marie Casey, Central Michigan University; Tony Cavanaugh, Deakin University, Victoria, Australia; Monica Hines Craig, Central Michigan University; Mary Ellen Davis, ACRL; Tom DeLoughry, Chronicle Of Higher Education; Jill Fatzner, University of New Orleans, ACRL Board, Task Force on Outcomes; Jack Fritts, Southeastern Wisconsin Information Technology Exchange Consortium (SWITCH); Barbara Gelman-Danley of SUNY Monroe Community College, Educational Technology, and the Consortium for Educational Technology for University Systems; Kay Harvey, Penn State, McKeesport; Maryhelen Jones, Central Michigan University; Marie Kascus, Central Connecticut State University; Barbara Krauth, Student Services Project Coordinator for the Western Cooperative for Educational Telecommunication of