THE CACREP CONNECTION

WINTER 1998

Standards Revision Update

V. Skip Holmgren, Chair, Standards Revision Committee

It has been a busy summer and fall for the Standards Revision Committee! We met for four days in Vail, Colorado in August to finalize Draft #1 of the revised Standards. We also developed our strategy for presenting Draft #1 at the fall regional ACES conferences to insure that we would be "on the same page" in our presentations. Those of you who were at the fall conferences were encouraged to come to the presentations and to give your input both verbally and in writing. The two I was involved with, Rocky Mountain ACES and Western ACES, had excellent attendance and resulted in good feedback. We distributed copies of Draft #1, as well as "Feedback Forms" for your use in making suggestions for changes. We encouraged you to mail your responses to the CACREP office, to give them to us, or to send them directly to CACREP via e-mail. YOU LISTENED! We were inundated with suggestions - approximately 1,000 responses came in from those of you who wanted a voice in the process. The CACREP office sent them on to the committee, and we brought them to new Orleans for our January 9-10th meeting.

In order to make the best use of our time in New Orleans, and your many suggestions, we each took the ones that corresponded to the sections we had worked on as individuals. After compiling them, we took turns presenting the suggestions to the rest of the SRC for discussion and input. As you can well imagine, this is not an easy task as many suggestions were made - some easier to incorporate than others; also, recognizing that we already had many discussions among ourselves (some more heated than others) as we pulled together Draft #1. We were very fortunate to have the CACREP Board Chair, Mary Thomas Burke, with us in New Orleans for the entire two days of meetings. What a delightful presence she brings to a meeting - we are truly fortunate to have someone of her caliber and talent as the Chair of the CACREP Board!

CACREP Events in Indianapolis (all at the Hyatt Regency)				
CACREP Board Meeting: March 25-28	CACREP Team Member Orientation: Sunday, March 29, 9am - noon	CACREP Team Chair Renewal: Sunday, March 29, 9am - noon	CACREP Standards Revision: Progress and Feedback: Monday, March 30, 9 - 11 am	How to Write a CACREP Self-Study: Monday, March 30, 2 - 5 pm

From the Chair

Mary Thomas Burke

One of the most important activities in which CACREP is currently engaged is the revision of our current Standards. In reviewing the feedback we received from our constituents, I became aware that the topic of spirituality is a new issues being suggested for inclusion in our standards. I want to share some thoughts on this with you.

The concept of spirituality is most often thought of in a religious context, yet there is a growing body of evidence that suggests that spirituality refers to a way of being in the world that acknowledges the existence of a transcendent dimension in a person's life, while religion refers to the social or organized means by which persons express spirituality. In general, spirituality is less formal and more encompassing than religion.

Incorporating the spiritual values of clients into the counseling session is not only plausible, but very necessary since the client's spiritual values could possibly be one of the most salient cultural values that he or she holds. Counselors who take a holistic, developmental , systematic approach could assist clients in making life enhancing changes for themselves.

For years, counselors and other human service professionals neglected to address the spiritual dimension of the client's life. An emphasis on the use of the developmental model which sees spirituality as an integral part of each person rather than on the use of the medical model has gained acceptance in the last ten years. The Diagnostic and Statistic Manual of Mental Disorders (1994) code V62.898 was developed to address spiritual and religious problems which may not be related to an organized church or religious institution.

Counselors work with individuals who are wrestling with many of life's problems, including family violence, crime, mental and physical illness, teenage pregnancy, race relations, hopelessness, and a lack of meaning in life. In the developmental approach to helping clients, counseling and spirituality are seen as similar in their emphasis on 1) learning to accept one-self, 2) accepting responsibility for self, 3) forgiving self and others, and 4) modifying destructive patterns of thinking, feeling, and acting. For the most part, people come into counseling hoping to find meaning and peace in their lives. Excluding the spiritual dimension would militate against this goal.

The participants of the Summit on Spirituality endorsed by ASERVIC developed the following competencies that seem to address a need in our profession. The Summit participants decided to use the eight CACREP core areas as the format for the development of the competencies:

> In order to be competent to help clients address the spiritual dimension of their lives, a counselor needs to be able to 1) explain the relationship between religion and spirituality, including similarities and differences, 2) describe religious and spiritual beliefs and practices in a cultural context, 3) engage in self-exploration of his/her religious and spiritual beliefs in order to increase sensitivity, understanding and acceptance of his/her belief system, 4) describe one's religious and/or spiritual belief system and explain various models of religious/spiritual development across the lifespan, 5) demonstrate sensitivity to and acceptance of a variety of religious and/or spiritual expressions in the client's communication, 6) identify the limits of one's understanding of a client's spiritual expression, and demonstrate appropriate referral skills and general possible referral sources, 7) assess the relevance of the spiritual domains in the client's therapeutic issues, 8) be sensitive to and respectful of the spiritual themes in the counseling process as befits each client's expressed preference, and 9) use a client's spiritual beliefs in the pursuit of the client's therapeutic goals as befits the client's expressed preference.

It seems to me that counselors must study all of the client's support systems in order to ascertain where spirituality or lack of the same have has its origins. Counselors need to determine how the spiritual dimension is being maintained and what militates against its development. The challenge for counselors is to help clients find their own unique meaning in life. I believe that the exploration of the spiritual dimension is an effective way to accomplish this goal.

BOARD RENDERS ACCREDITATION DECISIONS

At the November 6-9, 1997 meeting, the decisions listed below were rendered. Following this meeting, there were a total of 119 institutions with CACREP accredited programs. For a complete list, see page 13. The date in parentheses is the date that the accreditation granted will expire. At that time, the program will need to submit either an interim report or an application to begin another seven year cycle.

The following programs were granted initial accreditation:

Eastern Illinois University, Charleston, IL
Community Counseling and School Counseling (December 31, 1999)

Emporia State University, Emporia, KS
Mental Health Counseling, Student Affairs Practice in Higher Education - College Counseling and Professional Practice Emphases (December 31, 2004)
School Counseling (December 31, 1999)

Columbus State University, Columbus, GA
School Counseling (December 31, 1999) This institution already has an accredited Community Counseling program.

St. Mary's University, San Antonio, TX
Community Counseling and Counselor Education and Supervision (PhD) (December 31, 1999)

University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR
Community Counseling, School Counseling, Counselor Education and Supervision (PhD) (December 31, 1999)

University of Central Florida. Orlando, FL
Mental Health Counseling and School Counseling (December 31, 2004)

Conditions were removed from the following institutions, and their accreditation now extends
until the end of the seven year cycle:

Adams State College, Alamosa, CO
Community Counseling and School Counseling (December 31, 2002)

Ball State University, Muncie, IN
Community Counseling (December 31, 2002)

Barry University, Miami Shores, FL
Mental Health Counseling and School Counseling (December 31, 2002)

California State University Fresno, Fresno, CA
Marriage and Family Counseling/Therapy (June 30, 2002)

Mankato State University, Mankato, MN
Community Counseling, School Counseling, Student Affairs Practice in Higher Education - College Counseling Emphasis (June 30, 2000)

Plattsburgh State University of New York , Plattsburgh, NY
Community Counseling, School Counseling, and Student Affairs Practice in Higher Education - College Counseling Emphasis (June 30, 2004)

University of Maryland College Park, College Park, MD
Counselor Education and Supervision (June 31, 2001) This institution also has an accredited Community Counseling/ Career Counseling program.

The following institutions received extensions of the cycles of their currently accredited programs:

Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park, CA
Community Counseling and School Counseling
(June 30, 1999)

University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, MS
Community Counseling (June 30, 1999)

Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN
Community Counseling (June 30, 1999)

Correction:

Loyola College in Maryland was listed as a reaccreditation in the Summer 1997 *Connection*. The School Counseling program should have been listed as accredited for the first time.

Staff Notes

At the CACREP Office, we say goodbye to Accreditation Associate Debbie Jacobs. Debbie spent 6 years at CACREP handling our book-keeping and recruiting visiting team members. She left in November to become a recruiter for National Louis University's programs in Northern Virginia. We wish her luck in her new position and know she'll be successful.

In February, we welcome Nan Bayster as the new Accreditation Associate. Nan has a bachelor's degree in Family Studies from the University of Maryland in College Park. She worked as a pharmacy technician before joining CACREP. So far, Nan has been wonderful and has jumped right in and attacked the stacks of work created by the 3 month staff shortage.

New Policies

The Board adopted the following three new policies at the November meeting. They all go into effect immediately, unless otherwise stated.

In addition to the flat fee charged for the institutional review (on-site visit), for every off-campus program, the institution must incur additional real expenses for a visitor to each off-campus site. (An off-campus site is defined as where a student may complete the majority of the coursework). Additional team members may be required, as appropriate, to handle such off-campus visitations.

Students in a CACREP accredited program must graduate before or in the academic term that the accreditation is either withdrawn or denied in order for CACREP to recognize them as graduates of an accredited program.

All future team visitors must be trained on the current standards before being invited for a visit. (This policy will go into effect in the Fall of 1999). Therefore, all team members and chairs should have attended at least one training session since 1994. if you were trained before then, please come back to another session.

They also voted to approve the following charge to the Standards Revision Committee regarding the 2001 Standards:

The Standards Revision Committee (SRC) is charged by the CACREP Board to include Professional Practice as an emphasis area under Student Affairs Practice in Higher Edcaution in subsequent drafts of the 2001 CACREP Standards for Accreditation. The SRC, in revising that section of the document, must ensure that appropriate internship requirements be included.

Brokering Complaints

Carol L. Bobby, Executive Director

Have you ever considered the fact that someone may have called the CACREP office to complain about your accredited program? It is not an everyday occurrence for the CACREP staff to receive a call of complaint, but it is also not unusual or unexpected. As the number of CACREP accredited programs across the country continues to grow and as CACREP's reputation and name recognition has increased in stature, the frequency of complaints has also risen.

The types of complaints are varied and they can come from a variety of sources. Most complaints begin with a telephone call from the complainant to the CACREP office. Below are three fictional scenarios that represent the types of calls we have actually received. How would you handle these calls? How do you think CACREP should deal with these calls? If you are unsure, keep reading.

A Student Complains.....

It was the end of fall semester when Student X called the CACREP office. The student was very upset and indicated that the entire counseling faculty had conspired against her. She said she had just found out that she was not going to be allowed to register for internship for the next term, because the faculty determined that she was "not cut out for the counseling profession." She indicated that the faculty had somehow gotten together and decided that her skills were "not up to par" and that perhaps she should consider a different course of study. How could they do this to her at this point in her program! She had already completed one full year of study, and now that she was ready to register for her two semesters of half-time internship, she was being asked to drop out of the program.

Student X did not stop there. She went on to say that she believed that the faculty had been against her from the beginning. She thought it was because she was a minority student with English as a second language. Furthermore, she also wanted CACREP to know that the program was not requiring all students to receive weekly supervision.

A Faculty Member Complains......

It was the late in the day on a rainy Friday afternoon when the call came in. In fact, it was 4:58 pm......only a couple of minutes more and the phones would have been for-warded to voice mail, but I picked up the phone anyway. The caller was male and asked for me by name, but he said he didn't wish to give his name in return. He indicated that he was a new faculty member in a program that was currently CACREP accredited. In fact, he said that the department was just beginning to work on their renewal self-study application and had met that afternoon to discuss a rough draft of the self-study. That, in fact, is what

prompted his call. He felt that the faculty member in charge of coordinating the writing of the document was not being honest in portraying the program's student to faculty ratios and yet no one else on the faculty seemed to be bothered by the numbers being provided.

When questioned about why he thought the numbers were off, I learned that there was disagreement as to whether students receiving instruction at an off-campus program site that the faculty teach in should be counted.

A Site Supervisor Complains.....

She identified herself as a long-term on-site supervisor at a field placement setting used by a CACREP-accredited counseling program. She indicated that her counseling center had been accepting students for many years from the CACREP program and from another competing institution whose counseling program was not accredited. Her concern was that she was noticing a decline in the counsel-ing skills that students from the accredited program were bringing to the internship experience. She wondered whether CACREP should be looking into what was happening in the program.

Most complaint calls require careful listening skills. Oftentimes, when the caller is a student, it becomes immedi-ately apparent that the person feels that he or she has been treated unfairly and unjustly. Anger abounds in every statement being made regarding the alleged mistreatment of the student and often counter accusations are made about the poor quality of the program. As you can imagine, these calls also dictate careful handling and an open mind.

Usually the students will ask directly whether CACREP will intercede on their behalf and tell the program that they cannot do whatever it is that has displeased the student. It is at this point that the CACREP staff must explain what it is that CACREP does and what it is that we can do when complaints are lodged. Essentially, we explain the formal grievance procedures, adopted in 1994, that must be followed in order for CACREP to get involved. The procedures are briefly outlined to provide a synopsis of the major issues; however, the entire procedures document should be read to understand the full scope and details of the grievance process.

1. The complainant needs to be able to document that attempts to resolve the differences and/or problems at the institutional level have been made. If the complaint is already being handled by legal counsel, then CACREP will not deal with the complaint until the legal issues are resolved.

2. If no agreeable solution has been reached at the institu-tional level, the complainant must assume the responsibility of

filing a signed and written formal complaint to CACREP's Executive Director, who then forwards the complaint to the CACREP Grievance Committee.

3. The formal complaint must present a question regarding a purported violation of one or more specified CACREP accreditation standards.

4. The Committee determines if the complaint warrants further investigation and notifies both the complainant and the institution of whatever decision was rendered.

5. If the complaint is accepted for further investigation, the Committee initiates a formal review process within 30 days. The Committee holds the right to determine the appropriate mode of investigation.

6. Preliminary findings are presented to the institution and the institution has 30 days to respond.

7. Upon receipt of all information and responses, the Committee formulates a response to the complaint which then goes to the CACREP Board for consideration and action. The action of Board is final.

8. Possible actions include:
   • Dismissal of the complaint
   • Postponement of action against the institution if the institution shows evidence of responsible progress to rectify the situation
   • Notification to the institution on non-compliance with the standard(s) in question which could, in turn, lead to CACREP denying continued accreditation of the program(s) or maintaining the accreditation for the interim but requiring an on-site visit to be scheduled or requiring submission of periodic reports or plans for rectifying the problem.

Usually, the complaint process stops on the phone, because the student has not gone through the institution's grievance procedures yet and/or is unwilling to sign a formal complaint. Since the real motivation for lodging a complaint is also usually not related to a specific standard, callers often realize after a lengthy conversation with us that CACREP does not have the authority to investigate the issue and that the best route available is through their own campus's grievance procedures. Rarely do we send out the full set of grievance procedures, since the callers prefer to remain anonymous.

As for complaint calls received from faculty or site supervisors, it is important to note that they are much less common than calls from students. Often, these callers are familiar with standards and what they need is clarification of the expectations. Since the faculty member or site supervisor is also usually a trained counselor, they know that they want to handle it through direct dealings if at all possible and so they are simply calling CACREP to seek informal consultation on

the best way to approach an uncomfortable situation. They may ask us if we have ever heard of a concern similar to the one they have presented. If so, how was it handled?

What is similar in every response we make to a call of complaint is that we clarify the role that CACREP plays in an institution's counseling program. We emphasize that we must focus on how a program maintains compliance with the standards and that any formal complaint must be standards-related. We emphasize that internal channels for resolution of differences and problems must be tried first. Finally, we explain CACREP's formal grievance procedures and, if requested, mail a copy to the caller.

To date: The CACREP Grievance Committee has provided valuable assistance in suggesting how the staff could best handle some calls and letters of complaint. The Committee has never, however, had to institute an investigative process with regard to a formal complaint.

Kudos Column

ACA and CACREP encourage the use of citation of credentials in employment advertisements. This column highlights those institutions which we have noticed proudly displaying their CACREP accreditation in employment ads or which specifically name affiliation with a CACREP program as a preferred qualification in their ad. These kudos have been taken from *Counseling Today*, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, and ICN and CESNET.

Appalachian State University • Arizona State University • Auburn University Montgomery • Ball State University • Central Washington University • Clemson University • Columbus State University • Creighton University • Delta State University • Duquesne University • Edinboro University of Pennsylvania • Emporia State University • Florida Atlantic University • Fort Hays State University • George Washington University • Idaho State University • Lindsey Wilson College • Marywood University • Montana State University - Northern • Northwestern State University • Ohio University • Old Dominion University • Oregon State University • Oswego State University • Radford University • Sonoma State University • Texas A & M University Corpus Christi • University of Akron • University of Alabama • University of Florida • University of Illinois at Springfield • University of Iowa • University of Minnesota Duluth • University of Memphis • University of Montana • University of Nevada Las Vegas • University of Northern Colorado • University of Northern Iowa • University of Scranton • University of South Florida • University of Tennessee at Martin • University of Texas at San Antonio • University of Wisconsin Oshkosh • University of Wyoming • Western Connecticut State University • Western Illinois University • Wright State University

Values in Counseling: An Expanded Statement

James R. Beck, CACREP Liaison at Denver Seminary

The following paper was prepared as part of the CACREP application process when the Community Counseling program at Denver Seminary was undergoing review.

In our last exchange with the subcommittee who reviewed our self-study documents, we began to discuss the issue of values in counseling. The conversation on paper was all too short and inadequate. Both the subcommittee and our faculty agree that more information on this important topic could be very useful to our site visitors. Hence, we have prepared this additional statement for you to read before the visit actually begins. Perhaps we will have occasion to discuss it more fully in person during the upcoming days.

The subject of values in counseling is a very important issue. We have found that the issue almost inevitably arises when professionals who work in a religious framework interact with professionals who interact within a secular framework. A major and pervasive concern among those unaccustomed to the integration of religious viewpoints with mental health work is how can the counselor deal with these issues in a professionally ethical manner? More specifically, the subcommittee raised concerns about advocating religion and imposing values on clients. What follows is our approach to the issue, an approach we try to use in all of the courses we teach, especially our course in -professional ethics.

Historical Background

Two attitudes from earlier decades make this discussion more complicated. First, many advocates of psychotherapy and counseling during its beginning decades argued that counseling was a value-free exercise. The counselor, they claimed, was a trained and disciplined scientist who could be objective regarding the counselee's needs and that when therapy was conducted competently, values did not enter the picture. In more recent years, the position most frequently taken by counseling apologists is that the counseling enterprise is not value-free, ought not to be value-free, and in fact could not be value-free even if we wanted it to be. hence, the field has shifted its position now to advocate a careful acknowledgment of values and how they affect the counseling process rather than a futile denial that values are involved in the counseling enterprise.

The second historical issue that complicates this discussion comes from an alleged bias in the secular counseling arena against religion. People of many religious persuasions were convinced in the early years of the modern counseling movement that secular therapists were often biased against religion and that they sometimes worked hard to rid clients of religious convictions. The evidence for these strong convections was sometimes quite anecdotal and sometimes fueled by essays and other written material by persons like Albert Ellis. Given the widespread belief in the religious community that psychotherapy was no friend of religion, the demand for religiously affiliated counsellors and psychotherapists soon gave rise to the Christian counseling movement and other religious counseling efforts. Soon secular counselors had as much distrust regarding Christian counselors as Christian counselors had towards secular therapists. Given these historical obstacles, it is imperative that both sides of the values debate learn to interact and dialog with one another so as to minimize needless misunderstandings.

Values, World Views, and Ethics

Every counselor and therapist functions and works out of a basic world view. That world view contains an important set of ranked values which helps regulate behavior and attitude. Sometimes a personal value set is thoroughly secular, sometimes quite religious. In either case, the world view is laden with values. Sometimes professional counse-

lors have spent considerable time defining, refining, and understanding their own set of values. Corey, Corey, and Callanan write, "We do think it's crucial for counselors to be clear about their own values and how they influence their work and the directions taken by their clients." At other times, therapists might not be able to articulate with clarity the value system out of which they operate.

At the same time, every counselee also has a world view containing various values. Again, the value system of the counselee might be secular or religious, thought through or poorly understood, conscious or subconscious. Sometimes the value system of the counselee corresponds quite closely to that of the therapist, sometimes the value systems of the two differ one from the other. Given these realities, how can therapists, be they religious or non-religious, function professionally in an ethical manner when working with clients whose value systems are different or similar to that of the therapist?

We suggest that the following principles match current understanding of what professional ethics should be and give the therapist some working principles by which to operate. It is our conviction that these principles are strategic for the secular counselor working with a religious client, for a religious counselor working with a non-religious client, and even for counselors with highly value - matched clients since the potential for difficulty is great whenever the following principles are ignored.

1. **It is an important ethical responsibility of counselors to be aware of their own values, to know when those values are different from or similar to the values of the client, and to be able to monitor how those values may be enhancing or hampering the therapeutic process.** Conversely, it is unethical for counselors to be unaware of their own values and/or to be oblivious to how values may be impacting the counseling process.

2. **It is an important ethical responsibility of counselors to respect the personhood of the client at all times, most often including that client's value system.** (One can think of rare

situations in which the value system of a client is clearly abhorrent to civilized society such as the pathological values of seeking to exterminate Jews in concentration camps or to promote the sexual exploitation of minors. But even in these extreme situations, the counselor can and should forward basic human respect toward the counselee, even though the client does not do the same toward others.) Conversely, it is unethical for counselors to show disrespect for the personhood of a client whose value system differs from that of the counselor.

3. **It is an important ethical responsibility of counselors to secure informed consent from clients regarding value systems, especially when the value system of the counselor differs from that of the counselee and the value in question is germane to the focus of the counseling.** In other words, when the counselee wishes to work on a problem that touches on values that may or may not be similar between counselor and counselee, the counselor must explore that issue with the counselee, inform the counselee of the counselor's personal values regarding that matter, and make sure that the counselee knows of any potential value clash. Conversely, it is unethical for counselors to keep relevant value differences hidden from the counselee when the value difference is germane to the focus of the counseling.

4. **It is an important ethical responsibility of counselors to offer referrals to clients once a major and relevant value difference is uncovered so that the counselee is given every opportunity to work with a counselor who will be the best fit for the issues concerned.** Counselors and clients can work together even though they have major and relevant value differences only after the issue has been discussed between them and only after the client has given informed consent to continue treatment. Conversely, it is unethical for counselors not to inform the client of other counselors who might be more closely alligned to the value system of the counselee.

5. It is an important ethical responsibility of counselors to refrain from any and all instances of value imposition on clients. For example, it is unethical for a secular counselor to seek to impose the value that religion is bad for you into a counseling process just as it is unethical for a religious counselor to impose the value that religion is good for you into the counseling process. These ethical restraints do not apply, however, if both counselor and counselee have explored the issue and the counselee has given informed consent to the continued discussion of the matter. Thus, the matter becomes an example of exploration, not imposition. Conversely, it is unethical for counselors to impose their own values on the client. This principle is valid for secular counselors working with religious clients and vice versa.

Excerpts from Student Letters

The following passages have been taken verbatim (typos and all) out of letters received in the CACREP office. It's good to see such enthusiasm for the field of counseling!

"I would like to explore some potentialities in social work and counseling. I enjoy working with people of all ages, but mostly children to middle-aged adults. I would like to be able to provide mental, emotional, spiritual, or physical help to these people."

"If possible, can you send me information on current and potential schools that have accredited programs in counseling and related fields."

A Unique Method of Program Evaluation

Ed Butler, CACREP Board Member and Liaison at Emporia State University

Obtaining valid and relevant information about the effectiveness of counselor education programs can be challenging. Traditional survey type methods often yield low returns and restricted information.

To address these limitations, and in an effort to improve input from graduates and employers, the faculty in the Division of Counselor Education and Rehabilitation Programs at Emporia State University devised a plan to carry out separate evaluations of our four graduate programs on a biennial basis. The plan involves using a focus group process, which includes bringing recent graduates of a program and their employers to campus for one day, usually a Friday in the Spring. It is designed so these groups, collectively and individually, discuss and evaluate curricular offerings and the experiences of students in the program emphasis. They are also asked to make suggestions regarding the future directions for the program they are evaluating. Faculty are available during the day to answer questions and visit during the breaks and lunch, but are not present or involved during the sessions.

The evaluation program begins at 9:30 am and concludes by 3:30 pm, thus permitting participants to arrive and return on the same day. Packets of resource materials are prepared and given to persons as they arrive, although some participants have recommended sending these out in advance. One of the employers and one of the graduates are asked ahead of time to serve as facilitators for the two groups. Two current master's level students who are skilled note takers are asked to keep detailed noted of the participants' responses and suggestions to the questions as they are considered by each group. All of the participants thereby are able to devote their attention to the questions, comments, and discussion without one of them serving as a recorder.

The format for the morning, after a light continental breakfast, welcome, introductions and a general orientation for the day, involves graduates and employers meeting together in one group to discuss common type questions such as "What are the strengths of the current program?"; :What are the weaknesses of the current program?"; "In what areas do students need to receive more training?"; "What types of professional development courses and workshops/seminars would be helpful to them" and "What personal qualities should be considered in applicants seeking admission to the program?"

Following a nice luncheon, the graduates and employers meet in their respective groups, but consider similar questions. Having the graduates and employers meet separately to discuss the afternoon questions frees each group to address these questions more openly. Both the graduate and the employer groups are asked to address questions such as "What are the primary adjustments new professionals encounter?"; "What qualities do new professionals need to possess to be successful in their first year? second year? fifth year?"; "What are the major issues you believe the faculty should be addressing?"; "What do you see on the horizon for your field?" and "How prepared to assume relevant responsibilities were your first-year master level students (from ESU, or in general)?"

All persons come together (graduates, employers, faculty, and recorders) for a final 30 minute debriefing and evaluation of the day's session. The graduate and employer facilitators are given an opportunity to share very briefly their general impressions of the program being evaluated, and they often invite other participants to assist them. All participants are given an opportunity to share their experiences of the evaluation process and, as a final task, to complete a short written evaluation of the "Evaluation Day" process before leaving.

Both graduates and employers have been eager to assist us in this evaluation process, and they express much appreciation for being asked to participate. A serendipitous side benefit has been the opportunity for them to establish relationships with other professionals, since they do not necessarily know each other before they come.

Costs for the program vary, depending on the number who attend, but have averaged about $500. Expenses include postage, stationery, telephone, printing and duplication, food for breakfast, lunch, and two breaks,

and mileage for those who request reimbursement.

The employer and graduate facilitators use the notes made by the student recorders to prepare a report of the responses and comments made in the sessions. Copies of the report are duplicated and distributed to the faculty, institutional administrators, members of the evaluation team and cooperating agencies who might be interested. Multiple copies are placed in The Teachers College Resource Center to be accessible to students (who are informed through the graduate orientation session held each semester and class announcements that they are available), and to others who might be interested. Findings from the reports are used by the faculty to evaluate and modify our admission and curricular requirements as appropriate.

Ed. Note: The Division of Counselor Education and Rehabilitation Programs was just accredited by CACREP for the first time at the November 1997 meeting.

Standards Revision Update, continued from Page 1

What happens Next? We will be having a two-hour CACREP Open Forum at ACA in Indianapolis on Monday, March 30th, from 9-11:00 am. We will be giving a 30 minute general overview of where we're at; then break into Interest Groups via specialty areas for discussion/input for one hour, then back for a brief summary from each group for another 30 minutes. Please plan to be there - we really welcome your many suggestions. These Standards belong to all of us as we seek to enhance our programs.

On a personal note, after spending the past year delving deeply into the current standards I am just finishing up compiling the Self-Study at my own university (I am Department Chair) for our reaccreditation application. It is interesting what clarity I have now in comparison to when I put together our last Self-Study in 1991.

Speaking for the Standards Revision Committee, we all want to thank you for your overwhelming interest in this revision process. We will be taking the suggestions we have received so far, plus the input from the Open Forum in Indianapolis to out four day meeting next summer where we will put together Draft #2. We will keep you updated on our process and progress.

NBCC News

by Susan Eubanks, NCC, NCSC, LPC
Associate Executive Director - Professional Relations

In the spring of 1990, NBCC began offering CACREP programs the opportunity to participate in special examination administrations for their students as they apply for national certification. The benefits to students include being able to prepare for the exam as they are studying for comps, being certified upon graduation as well as having an extended application deadline and reduced application and examination fee. If your program has not previously participated and wishes to receive information for the October administration, please contact the Professional Affairs Department by email at nbcc@nbcc.org or call (336) 547-0607.

Counselor Educator Invitation: The NBCC Board of Directors has passed a motion allowing, for a limited time, Express Registration for the NCC credential to qualified faculty members in counselor preparation programs. As a special service to counselor educators, in recognition of their contribution to the counseling profession, the requirement to take the National Counselor Examination for Licensure and Certification (NCE) is waived during this time-limited offer from January 1, 1998 to December 31, 1999. Assistant, Associate or Full Professors currently employed full-time in a counselor preparation program at a regionally-accredited institution, with a minimum of five years post-doctoral teaching experience of at least 50% teaching time in counselor preparation courses are encouraged to apply. Request an application and complete requirements from NBCC or download it from our web page.

Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Examination: The Counselor Preparation Comprehensive Examination (CPCE) was developed as a graduate counseling program exit exam in response to requests from counselor educators. The examination was researched and developed by the Research and Assessment Corporation for Counseling (RACC) and is distributed by the Council for Credentialing and Education (CCE), affiliate corporations of NBCC. The questions were developed from the most frequently used textbooks in counselor preparation, and they cover the eight CACREP common-core areas. The CPCE allows master's program comprehensive exams to better meet psychometric standards, and programs which use it are able to compare their results to national data. To date, over thirty-five programs have utilized the CPCE.

NBCC Code of Ethics: The NBCC Code of Ethics, approved on July 1, 1982, amended on February 21, 1987, and January 6, 1989, was revised and amended once again on October 31, 1997. This is a living document and as such, will have constant review and updating. Call the NBCC Fax on Demand at (800) 324-NBCC and request document 1002 to receive a current copy.

BOARD MEMBER NEWS

We have several new Board Members that began their terms on July 1 of 1997.

James Bergin from Georgia Southern University became the new ASCA representative. Jim hardly feels like a new Board members since he is a Team Chair. Glenda Isenhour joins the Board as the new representative from AMHCA. Glenda is also an experienced team chair with considerable knowledge of CACREP.

Two new divisions have sent a representative to the CACREP Board for the first time! We welcome Oliver Morgan, SJ from the University of Scranton who will be representing IAAOC and Maureen Callahan from Long Island University who will represent AHEAD. Both Ollie and Maureen attended the fall meeting and by the end of it they were seasoned CACREP Board members.

We were all saddened by the death of Roger Aubrey. Dr. Aubrey was the CACREP liaison for many years at Vanderbilt University.

Congratulations to Team Chair and former liaison Nicholas Vacc on being appointed the Rosenthal Excellence Professor at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

DIRECTORY OF ACCREDITED PROGRAMS

There are currently 119 accredited institutions

Code	No. of Programs	Description

Entry-level programs *(Master's degree programs)*

CC	92	Community Counseling for programs accredited under the 1988 and 1994 Standards (48 semester hrs)
CC/CrC	5	Community Counseling with a Specialization in Career Counseling (48 semester hrs)
CC/CG	2	Community Counseling with a Specialization in Gerontological Counseling (48 semester hrs)
CCOAS	1	Counseling in Community and Other Agency Settings for programs accredited prior to the 1988 standards (48 semester hrs)
MFC/T	16	Marriage and Family Counseling/Therapy (60 semester hours)
MHC	15	Mental Health Counseling (60 semester hours)
SC	101	School Counseling (48 semester hours)
SPC	1	Student Personnel Service in Higher Education with a Counseling Emphasis for programs accredited prior to the 1988 standards (48 semester hrs)

1988 Standards

SAC	11	Student Affairs Practice in Higher Education - Counseling Emphasis (48 semester hrs)
SAD	4	Student Affairs Practice in Higher Education - Developmental Emphasis (48 semester hrs)
SAA	3	Student Affairs Practice in Higher Education - Administrative Emphasis (48 semsters hrs)

1994 Standards

SACC	19	Student Affairs Practice in Higher Education - College Counseling emphasis (48 semester hrs)
SAPP	8	Student Affairs Practice in Higher Education - Professional Practice emphasis (48 semester hrs)

Doctoral-level programs *(PhD and/or EdD degree programs)*

CE	37	Counselor Education and Supervision

* denotes accreditation for a two year period

ALABAMA

Auburn University
First Accredited: 9/86
CC, SC, SACC, CE:PhD/EdD (2001)

The University of Alabama
First Accredited: 3/82
CC, SC, CE:PhD/EdD (2004)

ARIZONA

Arizona State University
First Accredited: 4/95
*CC (1999)

**University of Phoenix
Phoenix and Tucson Campuses**
First Accredited: 4/95
CC (2002)

ARKANSAS

University of Arkansas
First Accredited: 11/97
*CC, SC, CE:PhD (1999)

BRITISH COLUMBIA

University of British Columbia
First Accredited: 3/89
*CC, SC, SACC (1999)

CALIFORNIA

CSU/Fresno
First Accredited: 4/95
MFC/T (2002)

CSU/Los Angeles
First Accredited: 3/78
*SC, MFC/T (1998)

CSU/Northridge
First Accredited: 3/79
*CC/CrC, MFC/T SC, SAC (1998)

San Francisco State University
First Accredited: 3/78
CC/GC,CC/ CrC, MFC/T, SC, SACC (2002)

Sonoma State University
First Accredited: 3/84
CC, SC (1999)

COLORADO

Adams State College
First Accredited: 10/95
CC, SC (2002)

Colorado State University
First Accredited: 4/97
CC, CrC, SC (2004)

Denver Seminary
First Accredited: 4/97
*CC (1999)

University of Colorado at Denver
First Accredited: 4/91
CC, SC, MFC/T (1998)

University of Northern Colorado
First Accredited: 3/82
*CC, SC, MFC/T, CE:EdD (1998)

CONNECTICUT

Fairfield University
First Accredited: 9/86
CC, SC (2001)

Southern Connecticut State University
First Accredited: 4/95
CC, SC (2002)

Western Connecticut State University
First Accredited: 4/95
CC, SC (2002)

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Gallaudet University
First Accredited: 3/93
SC, MHC (2000)

George Washington University
First Accredited: 3/84
CC, SC, CE:EdD (1998)

FLORIDA

Barry University
First Accredited: 10/95
MHC, SC (2002)

Florida State University
First Accredited: 10/95
CC/CrC, SC, MHC (2002)

Rollins College
First Accredited: 4/94
CC, SC (2001)

University of Central Florida
First Accredited: 11/97
MHC, SC (2004)

University of Florida
First Accredited: 3/81
*MFC/T, MHC, SC, CE:PhD/EdD
(1998)

GEORGIA

Columbus State University
First Accredited 11/94
CC (2001) * SC (1999)

Georgia State University
First Accredited: 3/80
*CC, SC, CE:PhD (1998)

University of Georgia
First Accredited: 4/87
CC, SC, SAA, SAC, SAD (2001)

IDAHO

Idaho State University
First Accredited: 3/80
MHC, SC, SACC, CE:EdD (2002)

University of Idaho
First Accredited:10/84
CC, SC (1999)   *CE:PhD/EdD (1998)

ILLINOIS

Bradley University
First Accredited: 3/92
CC, SC (1999)

Concordia University
First Accredited: 4/96
*SC (1998)

Eastern Illinois University
First Accredited: 11/97
*CC, SC (1999)

Governors State University
First Accredited: 4/91
CC, MFC/T, SC (1998)

Illinois State University
First Accredited: 4/91
CC, SC (1998)

Northeastern Illinois University
Phone: 773/794-2785
First Accredited 4/94
CC, SC (2001)

Northern Illinois University
First Accredited: 3/89
*CC, SC, SACC, CE:EdD (1998)

Southern Illinois University at Carbondale
First Accredited: 3/88
CC, MFC/T, SC, CE:PhD (2002)

University of Illinois at Springfield
First Accredited 10/93
CC, SC (2000)

Western Illinois University
First Accredited: 4/87
CC, SC (2001)

INDIANA

Ball State University
First Accredited: 3/80
CC (2002)

Purdue University
First Accredited: 9/86
MHC, SC, SACC, SAPP, CE:PhD
(2001)

IOWA

The University of Iowa
First Accredited: 3/89
*SC, SAPP, CE:PhD (1998)

University of Northern Iowa
First Accredited: 10/90
MHC, SC (1998)

KANSAS

Emporia State University
First Accredited: 11/97
MHC, SACC, SAPP (2004)
*SC (1999)

Pittsburg State University
First Accredited:10/88
CC (2003)

KENTUCKY

Murray State University
First Accredited: 3/89
*CC (1999)

Lindsey Wilson College
First Accredited: 4/96
*MFC/T, MHC (1998)

LOUISIANA

Northeast Louisiana University
First Accredited: 3/89
*CC, MFC/T, SC (1999)

Northwestern State University
First Accredited: 4/95
SACC, SAPP (2002)

University of New Orleans
First Accredited:10/89
*CC, SC, SACC, CE:PhD/EdD (1999)

MAINE

University of Southern Maine
First Accredited:10/87
MHC, SC, CC (2002)

MARYLAND

Loyola College in Maryland
First Accredited: 10/89
*CC (1999)

Loyola College in Maryland
First Accredited: 4/97
*SC (1999)

University of Maryland at College Park
First Accredited: 10/85
CC/CrC, CE:PhD (2001)

MICHIGAN

Andrews University
First Accredited: 3/90
*CC, SC (1999)

Eastern Michigan University
First Accredited: 10/89
CCOAS (1998)

Oakland University
First Accredited: 11/94
CC, SC (2001)

Wayne State University
First Accredited: 11/94
CC, SC, CE: PhD/EdD (2001)

Western Michigan University
First Accredited: 10/83
CC, SC, SAC, SAA, CE:EdD (1998)

MINNESOTA

Mankato State University
First Accredited: 9/86
CC, SC, SAPP (2001)

University of Minnesota Duluth
First Accredited: 11/94
CC, SC (2001)

MISSISSIPPI

Delta State University
First Accredited: 4/91
CC, SC (2004)

Mississippi State University
First Accredited: 9/86
SAC, CC, SC, CE:PhD/EdD (1998)

University of Southern Mississippi
First Accredited: 10/85
CC (1999)

MISSOURI

Truman State University
First Accredited: 3/92
CC, SC, SAD (1999)

MONTANA

Montana State University - Bozeman
First Accredited: 3/93
MFC/T, MHC, SC (2000)

NEBRASKA

University of Nebraska at Omaha
First Accredited: 3/93
CC, SC (2000)

NEVADA

University of Nevada/Las Vegas
First Accredited: 3/84
CC, MFC/T, SC (1999)

University of Nevada, Reno
First Accredited: 4/94
MFC/T, SC, SACC, CE:PhD/EdD (2001)

NEW JERSEY

The College of New Jersey
First Accredited: 4/91
CC, SC (1998)

NEW MEXICO

University of New Mexico
First Accredited:10/82
CC, SC (1998)

NEW YORK

SUNY at Brockport
First Accredited: 4/87
CC, SC, SAC (2001)

Plattsburgh State University of New York
First Accredited: 3/90
CC, SC, SACC (2004)

Syracuse University
First Accredited: 4/94
SC, SAC, CE:PhD/EdD (2001)

NORTH CAROLINA

Appalachian State University
First Accredited:10/83
CC, SC, SAC, SAD, SAA (1998)

North Carolina State University
First Accredited: 3/90
SAC, CE:PhD (1998)

UNC/ Chapel Hill
First Accredited: 4/86
SC (2000)

The University of North Carolina at Charlotte
First Accredited: 4/95
CC, SC (2002)

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
First Accredited: 1981
CC, CC/GC, MFC/T, SC, SACC, CE:PhD/EdD (2002)

Wake Forest University
First Accredited: 4/95
CC, SC (2002)

Western Carolina University
First Accredited: 3/93
CC, SC (2000)

NORTH DAKOTA

North Dakota State University
First Accredited: 4/97
CC, SC (2004)

OHIO

Cleveland State University
First Accredited 11/94
CC (2001)

John Carroll University
First Accredited: 4/97
CC (2004)

Kent State University
First Accredited: 4/91
CC, CE:PhD (1998)

Ohio University
First Accredited: 9/86
CC, SC, CE:PhD (2001)

University of Akron
First Accredited:10/85
CC, MFC/T, SC, CE:PhD (2000)

University of Cincinnati,
First Accredited: 3/93
CC, SC, CE: EdD (2000)

University of Toledo
First Accredited:10/89
CC, SC, CE: PhD (2004)

Wright State University
First Accredited: 3/89
CC, SC (2003)

Youngstown State University
First Accredited: 3/86
CC, SC (1999)

OREGON

Oregon State University
First Accredited: 3/86
CC, SC, CE:PhD (2000)

Portland State University
First Accredited: 3/93
CC, SC (2000)

PENNSYLVANIA

Duquesne University
First Accredited: 3/93
CC, SC (2000)

Shippensburg University
First Accredited: 3/80
CC, MHC, SC, SACC, SAPP (2003)

University of Pittsburgh
First Accredited:10/89
CC, SC, SPC (1998)

University of Scranton
First Accredited: 3/92
SC, CC (1999)

SOUTH CAROLINA

University of South Carolina
First Accredited:10/84
SC, CE:PhD (1999)

SOUTH DAKOTA

South Dakota State University
First Accredited: 11/94
*CC, SC, SAC (1998)

University of South Dakota
First Accredited: 3/93
CC, SC, SAD, CE: EdD (2000)

TENNESSEE

The University of Memphis
First Accredited: 11/94
CC, SC, SACC, CE:EdD (2001)

The University of Tennessee
First Accredited:10/82
CC, SC, CE: PhD/EdD (1998)

Vanderbilt University
First Accredited: 3/83
CC (1999)

TEXAS

St. Mary's University
First Accredited: 11/97
* CC, CE: PhD (1999)
Stephen F. Austin State University
First Accredited: 10/93
CC, SC (2000)

**Texas A & M University - Commerce
(formerly East Texas State
University)**
First Accredited: 3/92
CC, SC, SAC, CE: EdD (1999)

University of North Texas
First Accredited: 3/80
CC, SC, SACC, SAPP, CE: EdD/PhD
(2002)

VERMONT

University of Vermont
First Accredited:10/82
*CC, SC (1999)

VIRGINIA

James Madison University
First Accredited: 3/80
*CC, SC (1998)

Lynchburg College
First Accredited: 3/92
CC, SC (1999)

Old Dominion University
First Accredited: 10/96
CC, SC, SACC (2003)

Radford University
First Accredited: 4/96
*CC, SC, SACC (1998)

University of Virginia
First Accredited: 3/80
*CC, SC, SACC, SAPP, CE:PhD/EdD
(1998)

WASHINGTON

Eastern Washington University
First Accredited: 9/86
MHC, SC (2001)

Western Washington University
First Accredited: 10/93
SC, MHC (2000)

WEST VIRGINIA

West Virginia University
Phone: 304/293-3807
First Accredited: 3/93
CC, SC (2000)

WISCONSIN

University of Wisconsin Oshkosh
First Accredited: 3/92
CC, SC, SAC (1999)

WYOMING

University of Wyoming
First Accredited: 3/82
CC, SC, SACC, CE: PhD/EdD (2003)