CACREP 2008 Standards Revision
Guiding Principles

The CACREP Standards Revision Committee (SRC) recognizes the following five principles as it carries out its work of revising the CACREP Standards for 2008. They are reflective of principles put forth by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA, 2000).

• **Leadership.** The SRC will provide thoughtful leadership to formulate issues related to the standards revision process; to develop needed tools and strategies to sustain the value of quality revision that will lead to advance change and needed improvement of the CACREP Standards.

• **Advocacy.** The SRC will advocate for voluntary accreditation within counselor preparation in higher education to the public, government, and other interested individuals, groups, and countries.

• **Core Values.** The SRC will maintain the core academic values central to higher education and quality assurance as reflected by CHEA. These include, for example, the values of general education (through core counselor preparation standards) that are learning centered and promote collegiality, as well as academic freedom. In addition, the SRC will look to and formulate its process in keeping with recognized best practices of other accreditation bodies.

• **Inclusion.** The SRC will sustain an environment of active consultation with the larger counseling audience and participating organizations, as well as encourage cooperation and exchange throughout the higher education and quality assurance communities.

• **Independence.** The SRC will be an autonomous and informed voice for the strengthening the standards for accreditation for counselor education programs within higher education.

(Adopted, CACREP SRC, December 2004)

**Proposed Timeline:**
3/2005 – Public bulletin board for SRC open on the CACREP website
9/2005 – First draft of the 2008 CACREP Standards for public comment
5/2006 – Second draft of the 2008 CACREP Standards for public comment
1/2007 – Final draft of the 2008 CACREP Standards to the CACREP board

**CACREP Events at the ACA Conference in Atlanta**

Friday, April 8
For the sessions below, please register with the CACREP office.
  1-3 pm Team Member Orientation * this session is currently full
  3-6 pm Team Chair Training - for those who have been on 2 or more visits

Saturday, April 9
**10:30 - 12:30 Table Talk - New Time** Session for program liaisons by invitation only
  All events will be at the Omni
From the Chair - Susan Rachael Seem

I hope everyone is doing well and that life is good. As I write this, I am acutely aware that this is the last article that I will write for the CACREP Connection. My tenure on the CACREP Board ends on June 30 of this year. And what a time it has been. So I thought I would do a walk down memory lane – a broad review of what I have seen during my time on the board.

I came on the board during the fall meeting of 1999. Mary Alice Bruce had just started as Chair. I was both exhilarated and anxious. I had little idea of the amount of work and time to which I had made a commitment. I found out fast. I also found the Board an easy one to join. I had planned to sit and observe my first board meeting but I actually said a few things. The board was such a great combination of folks, talent and enthusiasm that I looked forward to going to Board meetings. As I leave the Board, I still see the Board as an easy one to join. Members respect each other even when we disagree. We work hard and play well together. And boy do we laugh! I know I will miss going to meetings and seeing people who have become dear to me. What I won’t miss is the amount of work and sense of responsibility I felt as a board member and especially as chair.

In spring 2000 the CACREP Board adopted the 2001 Standards. What a monumental process that was for the Standards Revision Committee and the Board. I was a fledgling member being asked to make decisions about the future of preparation standards. I worked hard to be prepared and to contribute. And I learned a great deal during the standards adoption process. And now, I am seeing the creation of the current Standard Revisions Committee charged to develop the 2008 standards. I attended the first SRC meeting held in December 2004 in order to charge the committee and to help it get started. The symmetry of this is nice.

I have seen CACREP grow and change during my six years on the Board. Below is a quick snap shot of what I have witnessed:

In April 2002, CACREP maintained CHEA (Council of Higher Education Accreditation) recognition. CHEA accredits accrediting agencies. Carol Bobby did a wonderful job of writing a report and representing CACREP to the CHEA Board.

CACREP has seen an increase in the number of programs gaining accreditation within the United States in the last 6 years from 133 when I came on to 188 today. Further, CACREP is becoming recognized internationally for our long history in the area of counselor preparation. This, I believe, is a result of the Board’s decision to engage in international collaboration discussions. CACREP has been present at the International Association of Counseling conferences for the last two years and will be attending this year. Additionally, Carol Bobby has been invited to speak at several international conferences this past year. In June, she was a plenary speaker at a conference co-sponsored by the World Bank, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the Secretaries of Economy and Public Education in Mexico, and the Ministers of Education and International Relations in Chile. Carol represented professional accreditation in North America at this conference entitled “Professional Accreditation and Certification: Gateways to Quality and Mobility in the Americas.” She was also a plenary speaker at a second conference held in Mexico City this past November. This conference, entitled “Counseling in the Americas,” was jointly sponsored by the Universidad Iberoamericana and the University of Scranton and was the 1st interamerican counseling congress.

CACREP’s presence at these types of conferences has spawned many international inquiries. As a result of this international initiative, CACREP was invited to visit the headquarter offices of the British Association of Counseling and Psychotherapy (BACP) in Rugby, England this past December to explore how our educational requirements are both similar and dissimilar. During our January 2005 meeting, the Board met in Vancouver, British Columbia, so that we could meet with the co-chairs of Canada’s Council on Accreditation of Counsellor Education Programs (CACEP) to discuss common accreditation issues and potential collaboration. Finally, CACREP is receiving an increasing number of contacts from other countries asking about accreditation issues.

CACREP has also made tremendous strides in terms of its own vitality and strategic planning. In the summer of 2001, the CACREP Board held its first board retreat. The purpose of this retreat was to do strategic planning for the next five years. Many items were discussed but board structure and finances were central to our discussions. As a
Accreditation Decisions

The accreditation decisions listed below were actions taken at the January 6-8, 2005 meeting of the CACREP Board. The next meeting is scheduled for July 14-16, 2005.

The following programs were granted accreditation († represents initial accreditation and the date in parentheses is the expiration date)

**Colorado State University**, Ft. Collins, Colorado
Career Counseling, Community Counseling and School Counseling (March 31, 2007)

**Gonzaga University**, Spokane, Washington
Community Counseling (March 31, 2007)

**Eastern Illinois University**, Charleston, Illinois
Community Counseling and School Counseling (March 31, 2013)

**Kent State University**, Kent, Ohio
Community Counseling, School Counseling and Counselor Education and Supervision (March 31, 2013)

**Regent University**, Northern Virginia Graduate Center, Alexandria, Virginia
† Community Counseling (March 31, 2007) There are Community Counseling and School Counseling programs already accredited at the Virginia Beach campus.

**St. Mary’s University**, San Antonio, Texas
Community Counseling, Mental Health Counseling and Counselor Education and Supervision (March 31, 2013)

**Southern University**, Baton Rouge, Louisiana
† Mental Health Counseling (March 31, 2007)

**Troy State University**, Troy, Alabama
† Community Counseling and † School Counseling (March 31, 2013)

**University of Arkansas**, Fayetteville, Arkansas
Community Counseling, School Counseling, and Counselor Education and Supervision (March 31, 2007)

**University of Central Florida**, Orlando, Florida
Mental Health Counseling, School Counseling and Counselor Education and Supervision (March 31, 2013)

**University of Hawaii at Manoa**, Honolulu, Hawaii
† Community Counseling (June 30, 2008) This institution also has an accredited School Counseling program.

**Western Kentucky University**, Bowling Green, Kentucky
† Marital, Couple and Family Counseling/Therapy and † Mental Health Counseling (March 31, 2013)

The following programs submitted Interim Reports and were granted continued accreditation:

**Adams State University**, Alamosa, Colorado
Community Counseling and School Counseling (June 30, 2011)

**California State University Fresno**, Fresno, California
Marital, Couple and Family Counseling/Therapy (June 30, 2011)

*CACREP Connection*
Cleveland State University, Cleveland, Ohio  
Community Counseling and School Counseling (December 31, 2010)

Concordia University, River Forest, Illinois  
Community Counseling and School Counseling (March 31, 2007)

Eastern Kentucky University, Richmond, Kentucky  
Mental Health Counseling and School Counseling (June 30, 2011)

Eastern Washington University, Spokane, Washington  
Mental Health Counseling and School Counseling (March 31, 2007)

Fairfield University, Fairfield, Connecticut  
Community Counseling and School Counseling (March 31, 2007)

Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania  
School Counseling and Counselor Education and Supervision (June 30, 2011)

St. John’s University, Jamaica, New York  
School Counseling (December 31, 2010)

Stephen F. Austin State University, Nacogdoches, Texas  
Community Counseling and School Counseling (June 30, 2008)

University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio  
School Counseling (June 30, 2009) and Counselor Education and Supervision (March 31, 2007)

University of Detroit Mercy, Detroit, Michigan  
Community Counseling and School Counseling (March 31, 2007)

University of Illinois Springfield, Springfield, Illinois  
Community Counseling and School Counseling (March 31, 2007)

University of Toledo, Toledo, Ohio  
Community Counseling, School Counseling and Counselor Education and Supervision (October 31, 2012)

William Paterson University, Wayne, New Jersey  
School Counseling (December 31, 2010)

The following programs received a one-year extension of their accredited status:

Bradley University (June 30, 2007)  
Governors State University (December 31, 2006)  
University of North Florida (December 31, 2006)  
University of Scranton (June 30, 2007)  
University of Wisconsin Superior (December 31, 2006)

The following program was denied continued accreditation:

Texas Woman’s University, Denton, Texas  
Marriage and Family Counseling/Therapy - accreditation ended December 31, 2004

The following program had its accreditation lapse:

Murray State University, Murray, Kentucky  
Community Counseling - accreditation ended December 31, 2004
What Does John Q Public Need or Want to Know About Your Program’s Accreditation Review?

By Carol L. Bobby
CACREP Executive Director

Two years ago, I wrote an article in this newsletter entitled A Public Debate. The column asked you, the reader, to consider what types of information an accrediting agency should disclose to the public about your accreditation status and review. There was a overview of why accreditation developed as a confidential process, a description of why opponents to the “secretive nature” of the process believe that greater disclosure of accreditation information will lead to a better informed public, and a review of CACREP’s current disclosure policy.

The debate I wrote about two years ago has intensified and there is a real challenge facing accreditors who desire to be responsible partners in the quality assurance review process while simultaneously meeting demands for more information from the public sector. There is nothing surprising about the call for greater access to information. After all, we live in a world where information can be exchanged almost instantaneously through the World Wide Web. We also live in a world where accountability is demanded. Look no further than legislation such as Sarbanes-Oxley or No Child Left Behind to understand the social climate in which we work. Furthermore, there is now a proposed bill (HR 609) before the US House of Representatives with detailed requirements for what and how accreditors disclose information to the public about higher education institutions. The requirements outlined in this bill will erode the nongovernmental quality assurance role that accreditation has played for the last 100 years and largely federalizes what has been viewed as a self-regulating process. This would be a shame.

Nevertheless, as with any debate, there are pros and cons to each side of the issue. The cost of a college education is expensive. Having access to more information should lead to better decisions. Yet having the right information and using the information for the purpose it is intended is critical. Information out of context can be misunderstood and misconstrued. Therein lies the dilemma for accreditation. How much does John Q. Public need and want to know about accreditation?

The CACREP Board has been holding an internal debate on this issue and the discussions have not always been easy. The Board reviewed our current policy, which does not allow us to release any information about new institutions that are in the application review process with us. The rationale for this restriction is that if we do not release the names of new applicants, then we do not have to publish their names if they are ultimately denied accreditation. Unfortunately, this has caused a great deal of stress for prospective students who have been told by a program that they are in the process of seeking CACREP accreditation, but when they call, CACREP cannot confirm this. How do these students make a wise decision, if they want to attend a program that is CACREP-accredited?

The Board has also debated the ramifications of releasing summaries of program decisions, including which, if any, standards may be cited as conditions of the accreditation status. This discussion has always resulted in concerns about understanding the citation in a context. Would John Q. Public understand a citation of Standard VI.C.4 for one institution and how it might differ from a citation of II.K.2e for another institution? In the end, the Board has recognized that it never makes its decisions out of the context of the entire review process (which involves volumes of documents and a team visit) and that it might be difficult to capture this process in an executive summary. There is a real fear that listings of conditions might begin to look like a ranking, system, which is an anathema to accreditors.

In the end, CACREP realizes that the debate will continue over the next couple of years. Clearly the federal government’s call for greater public disclosure by accreditors will influence revisions to both the US Department of Education’s and the Council on Higher Education Accreditation’s (CHEA’s) recognition criteria by which accreditors are judged. When this happens, CACREP will need to comply, if we want to meet the standards for continued recognition.

Continued
2008 Standards Review Committee Begins Work

Dr. Tom Davis, Chair, Standards Revision Committee

The Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) has begun the process of review and revision of the 2001 accreditation standards. The Board of Directors has selected six individuals to serve on the Standards Revision Committee (SRC) with the responsibility for assimilation of the 2008 CACREP Standards. The SRC consists of the following members:

- Dr. Patrick Akos, University of North Carolina Chapel Hill
- Dr. Mary Alice Bruce, The University of Wyoming
- Dr. Harry Daniels, The University of Florida
- Dr. Rick Gressard, The College of William and Mary
- Dr. Jo-Ann Lipford Sanders, Vice-Chair, Heidelberg College
- Dr. Tom Davis, Chair, Ohio University

The charge from the CACREP Board of Directors includes the following areas: 1) develop and facilitate a plan for collecting feedback and data to support potential revisions to the CACREP Standards, 2) meet a minimum of two times per year through the completion of the revision process; 3) draft and disseminate proposed revisions in a manner which allows ample time for comment, and 4) provide regular updates to the CACREP Board regarding the work being accomplished.

The review and revision process will seek participation from the broadest group of relevant stakeholders. The SRC will welcome public input including a “CACREP 2008 Revision Questionnaire” which will be posted on the CACREP website beginning in March, 2005. The SRC will concurrently conduct a validation study of the 2001 CACREP.

The SRC will compile and review the data received from stakeholder questionnaires, and anticipate constructing a first draft by the fall of 2005, and a second draft of the standards being developed by late spring or early summer, 2006. The SRC plans to submit a final draft of the 2008 CACREP Standards to the CACREP board by January, 2007.

It is anticipated that the 2008 CACREP Accreditation Standards will be finalized and adopted by the CACREP Board at their January, 2007 meeting with implementation in 2008. Further information on the CACREP Standards Revision process can be found on the CACREP Website standards revision link (http://www.cacrep.org). Additional questions about the revision process can be sent to the CACREP office at cacrep@cacrep.org.

In the meantime, CACREP did decide that it was time to release information when a new program had submitted an application. Hence, at its January 2005 meeting, the CACREP Board passed the following policy:

As of July 1, 2005, the accreditation status and dates thereof will be made public once the institution has been notified. The information to be made public will consist of the name and address of the institution, the program(s) included in the accreditation process, the current accreditation status and the dates thereof. The steps to be reported in the accreditation process are 1) application in process, 2) application voluntarily withdrawn, and 3) accreditation decisions. The decisions shall be reported as accredited (through a specific date), accreditation voluntarily withdrawn, or accreditation denied. The accreditation status will be made public through CACREP’s website, newsletter, or other publications, and upon direct request. The denials and withdrawals will remain posted to the web for a period of six months.

To see how this new policy will be implemented, please visit the CACREP website, www.cacrep.org, after July 1.
Chair’s Column, continued
result of that retreat, continued board discussion and planning, and a mini-retreat, the CACREP voted to transition to a
new board structure. The impetus of this move was the Board’s desire to have input into board membership so that the
we could thoughtfully fill a vacancy with someone who has the expertise and skills needed at the time. Further, the
Board wanted to allow for full representation of the counseling profession. Currently, the board is in its transition
phase with the new board structure to be completely in place by 2007.

Finally, the CACREP Board is moving toward financial independence. There were two important issues that
resulted in the Board’s decision regarding its finances. First, CHEA recognition requires the accreditation body to
demonstrate independence from its professional organizations in order to avoid any conflicts of interest. While
CACREP has always appreciated ACA’s financial support of its endeavors, CACREP realized it was put in a precarious position
by depending on ACA for support. Thus we voted to decrease our reliance on ACA subsidy while finding ways to
support our functioning. This will allow the Board to be largely independent and self-directing. I believe that by being
financially responsible for itself, the Board is more willing to fund important initiatives such as our international
presence.

So I say goodbye to the CACREP Board. I will miss many things – the members, the staff, our discussions,
our laughter, our ability to think with both our heads and our hearts, and the important and necessary work that we do
for counselor preparation. I have learned so much. Most importantly, I have learned to trust the wisdom of the Board.
The Board truly has the best interest of programs and the profession of counseling at heart. I also want to express my
sense of honor and humbleness about being the Board’s chair for three years. It’s been quite a journey. I feel confi-
dent that the Board will continue its excellent work under the guidance of the new chair, Jack Culbreth and new vice-
chair, Becky Stanard.

So thank you all: Jack, Becky, Richard, Joe, Lou, Bryce, Craig, Carla, Suzan, Eli, Jim, Joe, Alan, Brandon,
Gary, John, Bill, Carol, Jenny and Nan.

Team Visitor Column
Dr. Carla Bradley, CACREP Training Committee Chair
New Changes to the Team Member Application

The application for CACREP Team Member training now requires applicants who do
not hold degrees in Counseling/Counselor Education to provide a description and
supporting documentation of their counselor identity. This information should be
included in a curriculum vitae and the vita should be submitted along with the application. Counselor
identity can be demonstrated or supported by the following activities:

1. Journal articles published in American Counseling Association publications
2. Teaching in Counseling/Counselor Education Programs
3. Membership in the American Counseling Association and divisions
4. Licensure as a Professional Counselor

If you have questions related to this recent revision, please contact Carla Bradley, Chair of the
CACREP Training Committee by sending an e-mail to cacrep@cacrep.org.

Upcoming Training Sessions

If you were not able to attend team training in Atlanta, Team Member Orientation and Team Chair Training
will be held at the ACES National Conference in Pittsburgh in October.
How to Write Your CACREP Self-Study Workshop

October 1, 2005  9:00 am - 5:00 pm  
Location: Northern Virginia Hotel to be determined  
Cost: $400.00 for the first attendee from an institution  
$200.00 for each additional attendee  

Call the office at 703/823-9800 x301 or see the website www.cacrep.org for a registration form.

Here is what past participants have said about this hands-on workshop:

The examples of other self-studies was helpful in getting a conceptual understanding of the structure and layout of the self-study.

Using the self-study reports was crucial to my learning. This was great.

Being able to ask questions was very useful - as we went along, I made a list of things my program needs to do.

Review of self-studies of other institutions was definitely helpful.

I (and my faculty peers) can do this!  Thanks.

I enjoyed this workshop and wished we could have discussed more. We need to take in all we can.  Thank you for doing this.  It makes our jobs easier and less anxious.

Thanks for this opportunity and your patience with questions.