



THE CACREP CONNECTION

Fall 2009

CACREP Board Issues Guiding Statements on Student Learning Outcomes

Robert I. Urofsky, Director of Accreditation

July 1, 2009 has now come and gone and with it the long awaited transition to the 2009 CACREP Standards. A significant change in the 2009 Standards from the 2001 Standards is the inclusion of outcomes based program area standards. These standards represent a shift in focus from an emphasis on what is being taught to how students are absorbing what is being taught and how they are able to transfer this learning into practice.

To date, the CACREP Board has focused much of its communication on Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) on the differences between a focus on content and a focus on outcomes and the implications of this transition for counselor education. This stance was based on the Board's desire to build a baseline understanding of the shift in focus to outcomes and the Board's belief that there is not a single right way to do outcomes assessment. CACREP accredits programs that, while similar in a commitment to meeting the guidelines set by the profession, vary greatly in terms of size and type of institution, enrollment, student characteristics, composition of faculty, support resources, and missions. Because programs and institutions set their own missions and objectives, they must also determine what is important for them to assess and how these assessments interrelate with how the programs accomplish their mission and objectives.

The CACREP Board does not advocate a single model or one size fits all approach to assessment of SLOs. Development is occurring within the Counselor Education community surrounding SLOs and many different approaches will emerge. Programs that have already made significant progress in the delineation and assessment of SLOs are coming forward to share with other programs their challenges and successes. In recognition of the transitions in understanding and implementation of SLOs, the CACREP Board has issued a series of Guiding Statements on Student Learning Outcomes.

- * CACREP's focus is not to determine that every single student has obtained the knowledge and can demonstrate the skills outlined in the Standards. Rather CACREP's

Continued on page 8



Notes From the Chair

Craig Cashwell

“At the Crossroads”

*“I went down to the crossroads, fell down on my knees.
I went down to the crossroads, fell down on my knees.
Asked the lord above for mercy, save me if you please.”
- Robert Johnson*

I am a huge Robert Johnson fan. In 27 short years, a poor man from the Mississippi Delta wrote and performed music that remains popular and has influenced many blues and rock artists, including Muddy Waters, Led Zeppelin, Bob Dylan, The Rolling Stones, and Eric Clapton. Clapton once called Johnson the most important blues singer that ever lived.

There is a legend that when Johnson was a young man living in rural Mississippi, he longed to be a great blues musician. He took his guitar to a crossroads at midnight and met the Devil who tuned Johnson’s guitar, played a few songs, and then returned it to Johnson. The legend holds that Robert Johnson then created the greatest blues anyone had ever heard....in exchange for his soul.

I believe that the Counseling profession has gone down to the crossroads. The choices that have fragmented us as a profession are taking a toll. The choices we make over the next decade will shape the future of our profession. Have we sold our soul?

As a profession, we struggle with the fact that the term “counselor” has a generic quality, unlike “Psychology” or “Social Work”. This is a given that we must always strive to overcome by communicating a clear sense of who we are as *Professional Counselors*. Time and time again, however, we have gone to the crossroads as a profession and done anything *but* communicate this clearly, creating a weak professional identity in the eyes of other mental health disciplines, consumers, and even among ourselves!

Candidly, CACREP has historically been a part of the problem. Because of language in past Standards, CACREP has accredited programs where the program faculty clearly had professional identities in other mental health disciplines and, in many cases, acculturated students accordingly. Fortunately, the Standards Revision Committee and Board of Directors had the foresight to correct this with the implementation of the 2009 Standards. There remain a number of ways, however, in which our professional identity is unclear.

Robert Louis Stevenson once wrote that “To be idle requires a strong sense of personal identity.” I offer that we do not have a strong sense of personal identity, so we cannot afford to be idle. The time is *now* to make choices that will strengthen the profession of counseling. Although the task requires effort from all professional counselors, I offer here a few thoughts about ways in which we can work together to strengthen the counseling profession.

- We must emphasize what unites us rather than what divides us. Of course, many professional counselors work in different settings with different client groups and have different roles and tasks. It is certainly appropriate to emphasize what makes each of these sub-groups unique, *but not at the expense of the fact that we are, first and foremost, all professional counselors*. When any sub-group loses sight of that fact, it becomes a “weak link” and damages the counseling profession.

- We must be clear, with ourselves and others, as to who we are. I challenge state licensing boards to review their regulations and the political climate of their state and consider how they can strengthen their regulations to promote the counseling profession. It is far too easy in some states for a professional from another discipline to become a licensed professional counselor. I respect these other disciplines immensely. At the same time, these other disciplines are not compromising their professional identity by credentialing graduates of counseling programs. How do we communicate to our public who we are when the term “licensed professional counselor” (or equivalent, if a different term is used) says little about the professional identity of a licensee?
- We must be precise in our language and challenge others to do the same. For example, the term *CACREP-equivalent* continues to be used in licensure regulations, program advertisements, and in communications between programs and potential students. It is a term that is deceptive in at least two ways. First, it is commonly used by programs that meet a subset of CACREP Standards (typically related to curriculum and field-experience requirements) but not all of the Standards. Second, it is a program that has not undergone the rigorous external review process conducted by CACREP. That is, *CACREP-equivalent* is a self-designation. The CACREP Board has adopted a position statement that holds, in essence, that *CACREP-equivalent* is a meaningless term that is deceptive and harmful to the profession. Use of this term should be discontinued.

I am a Professional Counselor. I hold great pride in my life’s calling and trust that you do as well. Unity is a clear message that is simple when all work together with one voice as Professional Counselors. How is your voice being heard?



CACREP Hires Kelleen Trauger

Kelleen joined the staff at CACREP on April 16, 2009, with a well rounded background, a BA in Political Science with a minor in Biology from Minnesota State University – Mankato. She and her husband Joe moved to the Washington, DC area in 1995, to get a year or two’s “real world” experience with the plan to move back to Minnesota eventually. CACREP is fortunate that she not only stayed, but developed deep roots in Northern Virginia!

Prior to joining CACREP, Kelleen worked for a pharmaceutical company and two other non-profits. In one position she lobbied the Federal Government on behalf of Federal Credit Unions. Before coming to CACREP she was a teacher’s assistant at her youngest daughter’s preschool. Kellen and Joe have two daughters, Kirsten who is going into second grade and Marin who will be four in December.

If you call the CACREP office, Kelleen will most likely be the friendly voice who picks up the other end of the phone line.

How CACREP Accreditation Compares to Jury Duty

by Carol L. Bobby, President & CEO

I was called for jury duty in the City of Alexandria in late August. While this was not the first time I had received a jury summons, it was the first time my assigned number was selected to show up at the Courthouse. I was actually excited that my number was picked. I wanted to be part of the civic process and I wanted to provide a service back to my local community.

On the designated day, I showed up at the Courthouse ten minutes early, signed in, and sat down. By 8:30 AM, there were probably about 60 people in the jury selection waiting room, with only three trials on the docket. I had no idea what to expect, but it was apparent to me that not everyone in the room would end up serving on a jury.

As luck would have it, I was one of the people that never made it into a courtroom, but I spent over five hours waiting for a chance to serve. Still, I learned a lot about the process during that five hour wait. And, with all that time to kill, I also began to draw parallels between my jury summons experience and, believe it or not, the experience programs have when applying for CACREP accreditation for the first time.

So what are these parallel experiences? From my perspective, there are three parallel phases: 1) Anticipation, 2) Need to Know, and 3) Dealing with the Decision.

Phase I: Anticipation

Think of this phase as being an elementary school-aged child, in August, getting ready to start a new grade and new school year. You wonder if you will like your teacher, who will be in your class, and if you will be successful. There is a sense of having a new opportunity. As noted previously, I felt this kind of reserved excitement upon receiving my jury summons. I was interested in seeing how the jury selection process would work and in being part of an actual peer review process (trial by jury) built by our founding fathers.

When program faculty decide to apply for CACREP for the first time, they probably experience the same anticipation of starting something new – something that will allow them to be part of a peer review process started by some of the founding leaders of the counseling profession.

Phase II: Need to Know

This phase is probably the most important phase for students who are starting a new school year, for potential jurors, and for programs seeking accreditation. This is where you find yourself in the classroom on the first day of school and you wonder, “Now what do I do? What are the rules? What is the order of the day? Will the teacher like me? Should I ask a question?” This is the phase where you learn what is expected of you and how you are to behave in the process.

Although I had lots of waiting time during my day of jury duty, I honestly felt that the court system did a good job of orienting a diverse group of people to the process. We had a court facilitator who showed us a video. He answered questions. He even told us how to line up if our names were called. After an hour of instructions, I felt confident that if I were called into the courtroom, I would know what to expect of “voir dire.” I also knew that if my cell phone rang during court it would be taken away from me, placed on the teacher’s desk, and I would be fined \$500. Needless to say, I turned it completely off to save myself from being embarrassed.

For programs, this phase should occur before the actual self-study application is sent to the office. While

CACREP does not have a video (at least not yet) to explain the process, there are other avenues for orienting programs to the process. They include the following:

1. Order a copy of the 2009 CACREP Accreditation Manual.
2. Visit the CACREP website and read the 2009 Policy Document.
3. Attend CACREP's "How to Write Your CACREP Self-Study Workshop."
4. Call or email the CACREP Office to ask a question.
5. Hire a consultant.
6. Read the CACREP newsletter.
7. Read the CACREP Perspective column published quarterly in *Counseling Today*.
8. Attend CACREP-sponsored training sessions at counseling conferences.
9. Become trained and serve as a CACREP on-site visiting team member.

The CACREP Staff can help you find all of the information you need to help you get started. Do not hesitate to call or email. Offering assistance that can guide programs and faculty through each step of the application and review process is part of every staff member's job description.

Phase III: Dealing with the Decision

The final phase is about how decisions are handled once a review process has been conducted. In the school example, once the first week of school is over, students settle in to a routine and are ready to move on with the education process. They listen in class, they take notes, and they take some tests or write reports. The teachers use this information to decide what grade to give them.

As for my recent experience with the jury selection process, once the orientation was over, I wanted and felt ready to move into the courtroom to listen, to take notes if necessary, and to complete a group process that would result a verdict to be delivered by a judge. Of course, you first have to be selected to serve based on a number of factors including educational background, career position, answers to the questions posed by the lawyers, or even just on a feeling held by the attorneys. Potential jurors are definitely under review.

For programs seeking accreditation, once enough information is collected about the process, they are hopefully ready to draft their self-study, submit their application and receive feedback from CACREP's initial review of the documents. The initial review results will determine if the program is ready to host a site visit. If so, a whole new level of review begins which results in final accreditation decisions being rendered.

Each of these processes – going to school, jury selection, and CACREP accreditation – involves conducting reviews and making decisions. The decisions rendered usually give feedback about where the reviewees stand in relation to the objectives of the process, whether the objectives are educational in nature, selecting a fair and impartial jury, or determining if accreditation standards are being met. In fact, regardless of how one feels about the decision made, information has been shared that can be used for determining future directions.

The Decision Made About Me

Although I never made it into the courtroom and I was never asked questions by an attorney to determine my appropriateness to sit on a jury, I learned that I had probably been pre-selected to be listed as only back-up due to my being an LPC in Virginia and the nature of the case. I was in a small group of "back-ups" that included people working in the law profession or in treatment centers.

Yes, I was disappointed that I never got to experience the courtroom process, but I realized when I was dismissed that I had gained a lot of information just by sitting and listening and watching. I took this information home with me and said, "What the heck, I think I'll go swimming this afternoon!" And I did.

2009 CACREP Manual Available for Purchase

The new manual is available for \$50. To receive your copy, contact the CACREP office at cacrep@cacrep.org or call 703-535-5990 or send payment to: 1001 North Fairfax Street, Suite 510, Alexandria, VA 22314

Accreditation Decisions

The CACREP Board of Directors met July 16-18, 2009, in Madison, WI and made the accreditation decisions listed below. The next meeting of the Board of Directors is scheduled for January 2010.

*The following programs were granted accreditation
([†] indicates initial accreditation and the date in parentheses is the accreditation expiration date).*

Adams State College, online

[†]Community Counseling online program and [†]School Counseling online program (June 31, 2011). This institution also has campus-based programs accredited.

Antioch University New England, Keene, NH

[†]Mental Health Counseling (October 31, 2017)

Argosy University Atlanta, Atlanta, GA

[†]Community Counseling (October 31, 2011)

Barry University, Miami Shores and Orlando, FL

[†]Counselor Education and Supervision (June 30, 2011). This institution also has accredited masters-level programs. This institution also has previously accredited master's-level programs.

Capella University, on-line

[†] School Counseling (December 31, 2011). This institution has other accredited programs.

Eastern Mennonite University, Harrisonburg, VA

[†]Community Counseling (October 31, 2011)

Gannon University, Erie, PA

[†]Community Counseling (October 31, 2011)

Idaho State University, Pocatello, ID

Marital, Couple and Family Counseling/Therapy, Mental Health Counseling, School Counseling, Student Affairs, and Counselor Education and Supervision (October 31, 2017)

Jackson State University, Jackson, MS

[†] School Counseling (October 31, 2011). This institution also has previously accredited programs.

Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS

School Counseling and Counselor Education and Supervision (October 31, 2016).

Marywood University, Scranton, PA

Mental Health Counseling (October 31, 2017) and School Counseling (October 31, 2011)

Mississippi College, Clinton, MS

Marital, Couple and Family Counseling/Therapy, Mental Health Counseling and School Counseling (October 31, 2016)

North Carolina A&T State University, Greensboro, NC

Community Counseling and School Counseling (October 31, 2016)

Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN

School Counseling (October 31, 2017)

Universidad Iberoamericana, Mexico City, Mexico

[†]Community Counseling (October 31, 2011)

University of Colorado, Colorado Springs, Colorado Springs, CO

Community Counseling and School Counseling (October 31, 2016)

University of Georgia, Athens, GA

Community Counseling and School Counseling (October 31, 2017)

University of North Alabama, Florence, AL

[†]Community Counseling and [†]School Counseling (October 31, 2017)

West Chester University, West Chester, PA

[†]School Counseling and [†]Student Affairs (October 31, 2017)

West Virginia University, Morgantown, VA

[†]Community Counseling and [†]School Counseling (March 31, 2017)

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

Bridgewater State College, Bridgewater, MA

Mental Health Counseling, School Counseling, and Student Affairs (October 31, 2015)

Central Washington University, Ellensburg, WA

Mental Health Counseling (October 31, 2015)

Edinboro University of Pennsylvania, Edinboro, PA
College Counseling, Community Counseling, School
Counseling and Student Affairs (October 31, 2014)

George Washington University, Washington, DC
Community Counseling, School Counseling, and Coun-
selor Education and Supervision (October 31, 2013)

Jackson State University, Jackson, MS
Community Counseling (October 31, 2015)

Lynchburg College, Lynchburg, VA
Community Counseling and School Counseling (October
31, 2014)

Minnesota State University Moorhead, Moorhead, MN
College Counseling, Community Counseling, School
Counseling and Student Affairs (October 31, 2015)

Roosevelt University, Schaumburg, IL
Community Counseling and Mental Health Counseling
(October 31, 2013)

Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX
Community Counseling, School Counseling and Coun-
selor Education and Supervision (October 31, 2015)

Texas Woman's University, Denton, TX
School Counseling (March 31, 2016)

University of Nevada Las Vegas, Las Vegas, NV
Mental Health Counseling and School Counseling (Octo-
ber 31, 2015)

University of Scranton, Scranton, PA
Community Counseling and School Counseling (October
31, 2014)

University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC
Marital, Couple, and Family Counseling/Therapy, School
Counseling and Counselor Education and Supervision
(October 31, 2014)

*The Board accepted Substantive Change Reports from the
following institutions:*

Grace College
Fairfield University
University of Montana

Thank you Team Visitors

We would like to thank the following team members who
participated in CACREP accreditation onsite visits during
the 2008/2009 academic year:

Susan Adams	Bryce Hagedorn	Cheri Smith
Mike Altekruise	Richard Hazler	Sue Stickel
Kimberly	Donna Henderson	Raymond Ting
Asner-Self	Stacy Henning	Heather Trepal
Linda Barclay	Richard Henrickson	Jerry Trusty
Will Barratt	Nicole Hill	Lee Underwood
Don Basse	J. Scott Hinkle	Susan Varhely
Brooks	Glenda Isenhour	Linwood Vereen
Bastian-Hanks	Marty Jencius	Paul West
Janine Bernard	Thomas Keller	Joshua Watson
John Bloom	William Kline	Jane Webber
Susan Boes	Kenyon Knapp	Geoffrey Yager
Carla	Richard Lampe	Susan Zgliczynski
Adkison-Bradley	William Lawrence	
Wanda Briggs	Courtland Lee	
Denise	Wanda Lee	
Zirkle Brouillard	Lisa Lopez Levers	
Mary Alice Bruce	Dana Levitt	
Matthew Buckley	Arleen Lewis	
S. Kent Butler	Tina Livingston	
Karla Carmichael	Don Locke	
Jack Casey	Eugenie Looby	
Yvonne Castillo	Imelda Lowe	
Tony Cawthon	Mercedes ter Maat	
Kan Chandras	Virginia Magnus	
Ida Chauvin	Bill McHenry	
Julia Chibarro	Joe Maola	
Stephen Craig	Lynn Guillot Miller	
Nola Christenberry	Amy Milsom	
Teresa Christensen	Kirsten Murray	
Debra Cobia	Nancy Nishimura	
Kelly Coker	William Nemeck	
Jane Cox	Patricia Neufeld	
Daniel Cruikshanks	Uchenna Nwachuku	
Harry Daniels	Verl Pope	
Keith Davis	John Porter	
Joe Dear	Karen Prichard	
Shannon Dermer	Clarrice Rapisarda	
Kimberly Desmond	John Rigney	
Jan Disney	Martin Ritchie	
Thomas Dodson	E. H. Mike Robinson	
Daniel Eckstein	Chester Robinson	
Peter Emerson	Sharon	
Denny Engels	Robinson-Kurpius	
Wesley Erwin	Carolyn Rollins	
LeAnn Eschback	Nick Ruiz	
Marcheta Evans	Kathleen Salyers	
David Farrugia	Jo-Ann Lipford Sanders	
David Fenell	Johnny Sanders	
John Geisler	Thomas Scofield	
Shirley Griggs	Carl Sheperis	
Jim Gumaer	Merril Simon	
	Howard Smith	

- * focus is to verify that the program has the tools to determine that every student has either learned or not learned the necessary knowledge and skills to be an effective counselor.

A major focus of the program review will be the assessment plan a program presents indicating where and how SLOs are assessed. The assessment plans should be comprehensive in scope addressing the continuous systematic program evaluation processes detailed in Section I Standard AA and the assessment of student learning outcomes processes required for each program area for which accreditation is sought. The assessment plan should include all points throughout a student's program of study where assessment will occur; the means by which assessment will occur; the assessment measures and formats that will be utilized; processes by which remediation will occur following summative assessments; and the means by which data will be collected, analyzed, and utilized for curriculum and program improvement. Programs will be reviewed in relation to the comprehensiveness of the assessment plan and the degree to which the plan is being fully implemented. Programs which have not fully implemented their assessment plans may be eligible to receive a two-year accreditation, based on a full accreditation review in relation to all standards. If a two-year accreditation status is granted, the implementation of the assessment plan, along with any other cited standards, will be re-evaluated during the review of the Interim Report at the end of the two-year period.

- * The self-study documents should provide narrative for each and every standard listed. This narrative provides the context for the documentation that is included as evidence. Thus, even if an assessment plan is submitted as documentation for a large number of standards, the program should provide a narrative context for how the knowledge or skill area focused on in each standard is being measured across students with the assessment plan provided as documentation for how this will occur.

The role of the initial reviewers is to determine if standards appear to be met based on a paper review of the narrative responses and supporting documentation programs provide in their self-studies. One means by which initial reviewers will make this determination is by reviewing the program's assessment plan. The assessment plans programs present should be detailed at the curricular level. When addressing the program area standards in the self-study, programs should excerpt details from the assessment plan and provide additional specifics, if necessary, for each program area standard to show how it is met in relation to the specified SLOs.

- * Global assessments alone are not acceptable. Programs cannot rely on single broad measures, such as student pass rates on the National Counselor Examination, to demonstrate student learning outcomes. Assessments should be tied to specific individual standards.

Broad indicators, such as the NCE, can serve as indicators of certain types of students learning. However, the lack of specificity in the results reported limits their utility in demonstrating that the specifics of a standard have been met. One goal of the move to SLOs is for programs to put procedures in place through which direct evidence of student learning is generated. Oftentimes, programs have relied on indirect evidence, such as curriculum content, retention rates, graduation rates, and licensure exam passage rates to demonstrate that student learning has occurred. While this kind of data is ideally tied to student learning, it does provide direct and specific evidence that student knowledge and skill development has occurred.

- * Assessment of SLOs should take a multi-pronged approach. Programs should be able to demonstrate multiple ways of measuring student knowledge and multiple ways of assessing student skills.

Best practices in assessment dictate the use of multiple measures. The use of multiple measures accommodates differences in student learning as well as the different types of desired knowledge and skills.

- * Assessment of SLOs for the program area standards (e.g., school counseling, clinical mental health counseling) will require faculty concretely defining the skills they wish to see developed and to observe in each student as they progress through the program. This will, in turn, require diligence in monitoring the placement opportunities provided to students to assure that students have appropriate opportunities to develop the required skills.

The program area standards provide statements on what students should know and be able to do in relation to the specific program areas. The next step for programs is to operationalize these concepts within the context, mission, and objectives of their individual programs. This process includes program faculty working toward agreement on the indicators that successful learning and skill development has occurred in relation to each standard and refining or developing measures that incorporate these indicators.

- * While course syllabi should document where and when student assessment will occur in the specific courses, classroom assessments are considered only one part of a program's comprehensive assessment plan. CACREP believes that assessment must be integrated across the curriculum.

This point underscores the idea that programs own the courses in their curricula. This is not meant to indicate that individual academic freedom is not important. Faculty should certainly have the freedom to bring their knowledge, skills, and creativity to bear in terms of designing and delivering a course. This delivery should occur, however, within the context of the program's overall curriculum. Program faculty should consider whether certain assessments should be embedded within particular courses, based upon the purposes of these course within the curriculum, or perhaps seek to ensure that particular topics or skills are included in the assessments faculty utilize within their courses. This consideration is especially important in instances when there are multiple sections of courses offered.

- * CACREP recognizes that there are a variety of approaches to assessment and that assessment plans should take into account a program's mission and objectives in order to be useful. Therefore, CACREP encourages programs to choose models of assessment that provide the type of feedback that will lead to continued excellence in their own programs' offerings.

Flurry of Activity Marks the End of the 2001 Standards

We received 42 self-studies postmarked between January 1 and June 30, 2009. Of those, only 5 addressed the 2009 Standards (received in February, April, May, and 2 in June). Two of the 2009ers were new applicants and three were reaccreditations.

Of those addressing the 2001 Standards, the month count is as follows:

January – 1 reapplicant

February – 1 new, 2 reapplicants

March – 3 new

April – 3 new

May – one new and one reapplicant

June – 16 new and 9 reapplicants

Q & A on the 2009 Standards

- Q. We currently have a Community Counseling (CC) program that we are transitioning to the Clinical Mental Health Counseling (CMHC) program requirements in preparation for reaccreditation. We have suspended entry into the 48 credit-hour CC program and all entering students must now complete the 60 credit-hour curriculum. We are strongly encouraging students currently in the 48 credit-hour curriculum to either transfer to the 60 credit-hour curriculum or to finish by the time we apply for reaccreditation. What happens if some of the students in the 48 credit-hour program are not able to finish by the time we apply for reaccreditation and an accreditation decision is rendered for the CMHC program? Will the last remaining students completing the 48 credit-hour program after this point be considered graduates of a CACREP accredited program?
- A. When a program is transitioning to a new accreditation program area (e.g., Community Counseling transitioning to a Clinical Mental Health Counseling), the program may request an extension of the accredited status of the former program to allow matriculated students to graduate within the program in which they were admitted. These students would then be considered graduates of a CACREP accredited program. If the program does not request an extension, any non-matriculated students remaining in the former program will not be considered graduates of a CACREP accredited program.
- Q. We have CACREP accredited master's and doctoral degree counseling programs. In the 2009 Standards, Standard III.F.3 indicates that group supervision in Practicum may be performed by a program faculty member or a student supervisor, but Standard III.G.3 indicates group supervision in Internship may only be performed by a program faculty member. Can our doctoral students provide group supervision to master's student interns?
- A. A doctoral student may only serve as the group supervisor for master's student interns if the doctoral student is co-teaching with a faculty member or if the doctoral student is listed as the faculty member on record, in which case they are serving as adjunct faculty.
- Q. In the 2009 Standards, the Preamble to the Doctoral Standards stipulates that "when programs admit doctoral students who have not graduated from a CACREP entry-level program, the program must demonstrate that the student has completed curricular experiences the equivalent of (a) the CACREP entry-level standards in Sections II and III, and (b) curricular requirements of a specific program area before beginning doctoral-level counselor education coursework." Can we allow admitted doctoral students to satisfy the requirements specified in the Preamble concurrently with the requirements for the doctoral program rather than requiring everything to be completed prior to beginning doctoral level coursework?
- A. The intent of the requirements in the Preamble is to ensure that students possessing master's degrees in other disciplines complete the equivalent of a master's degree in Counseling. All of the curricular requirements in the doctoral standards build upon the core curricular requirements in the entry-level standards. This should be the guiding principle driving all educational decisions faculty make surrounding these requirements. The norm should be that students complete the requirements prior to beginning doctoral level coursework. However, there may be valid reasons why a decision to deviate from the norm would be made, such as the number of deficiencies a student has or course scheduling conflict. In these instances, the expectation is that the program faculty will make sound educational decisions concerning which courses may be taken, keeping the stipulations above in mind, and that program faculty can provide a rationale for any decisions in which there is a deviation from the norm. As a general rule, a student should not be allowed to take more than three master's level courses concurrently with his or her doctoral level coursework as this student would not have satisfied the requirement to have completed the equivalent of a master's degree in counseling and would be lacking the core foundation upon which the doctoral curriculum is based.

Credit Hour Data from CACREP-accredited Programs

The following data was collected from 2008 Vital Statistics forms and current websites for accredited programs. If a range of required hours was listed, the lowest possible was used. All College Counseling/Student Affairs program titles were combined in the fourth category. "Other" includes Gerontological and Career Counseling programs.

Hours (Semester)	Number of programs	Percentage of Total Program Area
<u>Community Counseling</u>		
48 hours	81	51.9 %
49-53 hours	18	11.4 %
54-59 hours	8	5.2 %
60 hours and over	<u>49</u>	<u>31.5 %</u>
	156	100
<u>Marital, Couple, and Family Counseling/Therapy</u>		
60	21	68 %
Over 60	<u>10</u>	<u>32 %</u>
	31	100
<u>Mental Health Counseling</u>		
60	45	73.8 %
Over 60	<u>16</u>	<u>26.2 %</u>
	61	100
<u>Student Affairs/College Counseling</u>		
48	31	73.8 %
49-53	2	4.8 %
54-59	0	0.0%
60 and over	<u>9</u>	<u>21.4 %</u>
	42	100.
<u>School Counseling</u>		
48	105	54.7 %
49-53	36	18.7 %
54-59	12	6.3 %
60 and over	<u>39</u>	<u>20.3 %</u>
	192	100.
<u>Other</u>		
48	3	27.3 %
49-59	1	9.1 %
60 and over	<u>7</u>	<u>63.6 %</u>
	11	100.

Published biannually by the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs, a specialized accrediting body recognized by CHEA.

Publishing address:

1001 North Fairfax Street, Suite 510
Alexandria, VA 22314.

Telephone: (703) 535-5990

Fax: (703) 739-6209.

E-mail: cacrep@cacrep.org

Web: www.cacrep.org

Carol L. Bobby, President/CEO
Jenny Gunderman, Editor

CACREP Board of Directors:

Craig Cashwell, Chair

Martin Ritchie, Vice Chair

Clarrice Rapisarda, Treasurer

Stephen Feit

Charles F. (Rick) Gressard

Anita Engstrom Jones

Nancy Nishimura

Judith Nix

Rhonda Paul

Donna Gooden Payne

Estela Pledge

Brent Snow

Sue Strong

Counselor Educators Needed for the CACREP Board

Applications are now being accepted for two (2) Counselor Educator positions on the CACREP Board of Directors beginning July 1, 2010. Each successful applicant will serve a five-year term on the Board. Details and the application form can be found on the website at www.cacrep.org. The deadline to submit an application is midnight Eastern Time on October 31, 2009 (postmark/e-mail/fax).

A committee will review applications and make a final recommendation to the CACREP Board at the January 2010 meeting. All candidates whose applications were complete will be notified by the end of February 2010.



1001 N. Fairfax Street, Suite 510
Alexandria, VA 22314