THE CACREP CONNECTION

CACREP's Emergency Preparedness Efforts Commended

Carolyn Beckett, CACREP Special Projects

At the fall 2007, annual conference of the Association of State Counseling Boards (AASCB), CACREP's efforts in promulgating draft disaster preparedness language for the 2009 standards was publicly acknowledged by keynote speaker, Dr. Charles Figley, President and Founder of the Green Cross Academy of Traumatology (GCAT). Dr. Figley began his presentation entitled, 'Trauma-Informed Counseling: Lessons From the Field and Applications to Licensing Boards' by awarding CACREP an A+ for developing draft standards that are responsive to the emerging roles of counselors during times of crises, disasters and other trauma-causing events.

In August, 2006, the Board of Directors determined that it was in line with CACREP's commitment to keep pace with the changing conditions in society and needs in the field to apply for a grant from the Department of Health and Human Services. The grant extended the work of CACREP's ongoing Standards Revision Committee to allow for the promulgation of an additional draft of the standards. This third draft, developed and distributed to constituents throughout 2007, included competencies needed by counselors to serve as competent members of interdisciplinary disaster response teams. The emergency preparedness language incorporated into the third draft of the standards, in alignment with the National Response Framework, reflected the knowledge and skills counselors have utilized during recent community, regional and national emergencies, including university shootings, bridge collapses, uncontrolled wildfires, hurricane devastation and terrorist attacks.

Stakeholder responses to the draft language have been very positive. Constituent feedback fully supports the inclusion of emergency preparedness language in the core counseling curriculum as well as in

From the Chair

Jack Culbreth

Greetings to you all,

It is with a great amount of mixed emotions that I write this final chair's letter for the CACREP Connection. At the end of June, I will be finishing my term as both the Chair of the Board of Directors and as a Board member. While I am looking forward to more free time in my schedule, I am going to miss a great many things about being a Board member. So, allow me a few moments in this column to update you on current events and then to reflect a bit on the past several years in my life with CACREP.

First things first. The standards revision process is still moving along very well. The SRC has met once already this semester to begin integrating final revisions to Draft 3. These revisions will be reviewed, discussed and voted upon by the Board of Directors at the July Board meeting. In addition to the new standards, an ad hoc policy review committee was established to consider revisions, reorganization, and updates to the existing CACREP policies. This committee, consisting of current Board members and the executive director, has worked hard to integrate changes to the CACREP policies that are reflective of how the organization presently operates. I hope that these revisions will provide programs with greater clarity of the overall process of CACREP accreditation.

The growth of the organization continues to remain strong. There are now 216 institutions that have over 500 CACREP accredited programs in counseling. This is a great testament to the importance of accreditation for the profession. Also, the staff has finished the move to the new offices and is settling in to the new space well. In January, CACREP welcomed its newest staff member, Dr. Robert Urofsky, director of accreditation. Robert brings a long history of work with CACREP, including initial reviewer consultant, site team member, and self-study writer as a counseling faculty member. Robert has already become a great addition to the organization, and I look forward to his work with CACREP in the future. Welcome aboard, Robert.

International efforts continue at a good pace. Our international committee chair, Dr. Becky Stanard, has been invited to attend a Latin American Counseling Congress in Nicaragua in April. She has also been asked to work with this same group to help develop accreditation in Nicaragua. This request came as a result of our trip to Argentina last spring. Carol Bobby and myself will be presenting in Florence, Italy at the end of May at another international counseling conference, sponsored by NBCC. We look forward to developing strong relationships with counseling professionals there as well. It is really fun to watch and be a part of the professional development of counseling in other countries and regions of the world.

CACREP has gone through some dramatic changes over the past several years. We have (a) begun working with counseling professionals across the globe, (b) instituted a financial independence plan, (c) moved our offices, (d) added additional professional level staff, (e) restructured the Board of Directors, (f) had serious negotiations with CORE about merger, (g) developed a new set of standards that is outcome focused, and (h) secured federal grant money to include a new area of disaster preparation training for counselors in the next set of standards. As is obvious by the list, it has been quite a time for the Board, staff, and organization as a whole.

Let me say that it has been a pleasure and an honor to be a part of this organization, especially at this time of growth and change in its development. There have been times (not many) when I asked myself "What was I thinking?" when I said yes to this Board position. But the good times with the Board and staff have far outweighed those more challenging times. I would like to say thank you to all the Board members that I have served with over the past six years. This has been one of the most enjoyable groups of people to work with that I could ever have imagined. One does not think of Board meetings as fun and something to look forward to. That is not true of the CACREP Board. We have laughed hard and worked hard. It has been a joy. And of course, CACREP would not be where it is today without the hard work and dedication of its wonderful staff. Thanks to Carol, Jenny, Carolyn, Barbara, and Robert. I appreciate all that you have done for me as a Board member and as the chair. Your support has been tremendous.

Thank you.

Jack Culbreth

Accreditation Decisions

The CACREP Board of Directors met January 17-19, 2008 in Albuquerque, NM and made the accreditation decisions listed below. The next meeting of the Board of Directors is scheduled for July 2008.

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

Boise State University, Boise, ID
School Counseling (March 31, 2015)

Bradley University, Peoria, IL
Community Counseling and School Counseling (March 31, 2010)

Gallaudet University, Washington, DC
Mental Health Counsleing and School Counseling (March 31, 2010)

Gardner Webb University, Boiling Springs, NC
[†] Mental Health Counseling and [†] School Counseling (March 31, 2010)

Geneva College, Beaver Falls, PA
[†] Marital, Couple and Family Counseling/Therapy, [†] Mental Health Counseling, and [†] School Counseling (March 31, 2016)

Henderson State University, Arkadelphia, AR
[†] Community Counseling and [†] School Counseling (March 31, 2016)

Loyola College in Maryland, Columbia, MD
[†] Counselor Education and Supervision (March 31, 2010). This institution also has previously accredited programs in Community Counseling and School Counseling.

Neumann College, Aston, PA
[†] Community Counseling (March 31, 2010)

Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, IL
[†] Career Counseling (October 31, 2009). This institution also has previously accredited programs in Community Counseling, School Counseling and Counselor Education and Supervision.

Our Lady of Holy Cross College, New Orleans, LA
Community Counseling, Marital, Couple and Family Counseling/Therapy and [†] School Counseling (March 31, 2010)

Plattsburgh State University, Plattsburgh, NY
[†] Mental Health Counseling (October 31, 2012). This institution also has previously accredited programs in Community Counseling, School Counseling and Student Affairs.

Portland State University, Portland, OR
Community Counseling and School Counseling (March 31, 2016)

Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA
Community Counseling, School Counseling, and [†] Couneslor Education and Supervision (March 31, 2016)

St. John Fisher College, Rochester, NY
[†] Mental Health Counseling (March 31, 2016)

Texas State University San Marcos, San Marcos, TX
Community Counseling, Marital, Couple and Family Counseling/Therapy, and School Counseling (March 31, 2010)

Texas Woman's University, Denton, TX
Community Counseling (March 31, 2016) and School Counseling (March 31, 2010)

University of Nebraska at Kearney, Kearney, NE
Community Counseling (March 31, 2016)

University of Nebraksa at Omaha, Omaha, NE
Community Counseling and School Counseling (March 31, 2010)

University of South Dakota, Vermillion, SD
Community Counseling, School Counseling and Counselor Education and Supervision (March 31, 2016)

University of Wisconsin Whitewater, Whitewater, WI
College Counseling, Community Counseling, School Counseling and Student Affairs (March 31, 2010)

Western Carolina University, Boone, NC
Community Counseling and School Counseling (October 31, 2015)

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

Florida International University, Miami, Fl
Mental Health Counseling and School Counseling (October 31, 2012)

Mississippi State University, Mississippi State, MS
College Counseling, Community Counseling, School Counseling, Student Affairs and Counselor Educationand Supervision (March 31, 2014)

North Carolina Central University, Durham, NC
Career Counseling, Community Counseling and School Counseling (March 31, 2014)

North Georgia College and State University, Dahlonega, GA
Community Counseling and School Counseling (October 31, 2014)

Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park, CA
Community Counseling and School Counseling (October 31, 2014)

Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI
College Counseling, Community Counseling, School Counseling and Counselor Education and Supervision (March 31, 2010)

The following institutions received one year extensions of their programs' accredited statuses:

Louisiana State University (December 31, 2009)
North Carolina A & T State University (June 30, 2009)
Ohio University (June 30, 2010)
University of Akron (December 31, 2008)
University of Colorado, Colorado Springs (June 30, 2009)
Wayne State University (December 31, 2010)

Be Careful What You Ask For
(you might not get it)

by
Carol L. Bobby, Executive Director

As educators, we have all heard variations on the theme of "the dog ate my homework." Over time, we become so used to hearing excuses that even the good reasons for being late with an assignment can be discounted. Sometimes we even set penalties in advance for being late to avoid having to judge the validity of the excuse. But even with pre-announced penalties, there are bound to be late submissions.

Over the years, CACREP has heard many sad stories about why programs have needed an extension of their accredited status. Some have been along the lines of "the dog ate my homework," while others have been based on extraordinary circumstances. For example, the Board was actually asked several years ago to extend the cycle of a currently accredited program to give it time to meet the standards! Other reasons provided to the Board have included faculty turnover due to multiple deaths, NCATE is coming this year, and "sorry, we forgot, but we're getting right on it."

At the other end of the spectrum, however, have been extension requests due to national disasters (e.g., hurricanes, earthquakes) that have shut down entire institutions. Then there are those schools that have asked for an extension to allow CORE and CACREP to conduct a joint visit process at half the cost to the institution. Both disasters and joint visits have been considered reasonable requests. In fact, the Board even created a policy in 1984 allowing the CACREP Executive Committee to authorize extensions for purposes of joint visits with CORE. Of course, the extension request for a joint visit must be within reason; that is, usually not more than a year or two added to the program's current accreditation cycle.

Unfortunately, it is not the necessary or reasonable requests that cause educators to become cynical about the value of allowing people to be late. It is the half-baked reasons that make us wary and hypercritical and CACREP has had a number of these. In fact the numbers of extension requests has been growing every year and even though this is to be expected as the number of accredited programs grows larger, it is still an added workload for both Board and staff in terms of notification requirements and record-keeping.

The Board began to recognize this growing trend in extension requests and workload issues back in 1989 when it passed the following policy:

> *An institution is permitted no more than eight (8) years of accreditation per cycle. However, the Council may choose to grant an extension of accredited status. Upon the favorable completion of the (second cycle, third cycle, etc.) accreditation review process, the institution's period of accreditation would include the extension time- for a total of no more than eight (8) additional years of accreditation.*

The intent of the policy was to include a penalty that would discourage requests unless absolutely necessary, since the next cycle of accreditation would be shorter. The intent appears to be missed by many programs.

As a result of the growing number of requests, the Board has been discussing the potential need for stricter guidelines for granting extensions. We have learned that some accrediting agencies do not entertain such requests at all and that a site visit will be scheduled whether a program is ready or not. This approach is based on the idea that accredited programs deliver quality programs and quality education to their enrolled students even under stressful circumstances. This approach is also based on the idea that standards are continuing to be met, as contracted with the student and with the accrediting organization. It is difficult, even for counselors, to find fault with this philosophical approach.

While the Board does not want to shut the door on programs that need extensions for the right reasons, there is growing sentiment on the Board that not many extension requests warrant CACREP's grace. So be careful what you ask for, because you may not get it.

(Footnotes)
♦ The original policy has been revised to reflect the change to an 8-year cycle that was implemented with the 2001 CACREP Standards. The original policy cited a seven (7) year cycle.

Ch–ch-Changes … Oh, Look Out You Rock-and-Rollers
by
Robert Urofsky, Director of Accreditation

I have been sneaking glances out my window for signs that spring will soon be here. There are subtle signs that it is around the corner. I am ready for some warmth, blooms and greenery … and word that Brett Favre will forgo retiring for one more year. We'll have to see what comes with time. These are, however, just a few of the changes that we are monitoring at the CACREP office.

In January 2008, the CACREP Board of Directors met to consider accreditation decisions and to discuss policy considerations. One result of that meeting that has significant implications for programs seeking accreditation through CACREP is a new policy on graduates of CACREP programs. The new policy reads as follows:

> *Students in a program seeking accreditation shall be considered graduates of a CACREP program if they receive their degree within one (1) academic year prior to when accreditation is conferred, and if the program can validate that the student completed the CACREP program requirements.*

This policy was passed in recognition that the accreditation process can take some time from the time a program first initiates it and that there are a number of students who are completing the same program while the program is going through the process. This policy allows for prior graduates of a program (within one academic year prior to conferral of accredited status) to receive the benefits of having graduated from a CACREP accredited program.

A key point of this policy is that the graduates MUST have completed the same program requirements as those submitted for CACREP accreditation. Let's say, for example, that a program had a 36 hour school counseling program but developed a 48 hour school counseling program that was then submitted for accreditation. If accreditation was conferred, in order for prior graduates (within one academic year) to be considered as having graduated from a CACREP accredited program, they would have had to complete all of the program requirements of the 48 hour program that was submitted for accreditation. If there were a few students finishing up the 36 hour program during that time period, they would not be considered graduates of a CACREP accredited program because they did not complete the requirements of the program that received accreditation.

A policy that has significant implications for accredited programs is the Substantive Change policy passed by the Board of Directors in January 2007. The Substantive Change policy pertains to changes that accredited programs make during an accreditation cycle, between periods of accreditation review, which affect significantly the nature of the program. The CACREP Board of Directors recognize that change is ongoing and that many of the changes programs make, such as routine personnel changes or modifying a course, fall within the nature and scope of the program. These types of changes typically do not affect accreditation status. Other types of changes, however, affect significantly the nature of the counseling program and do have the potential to affect accreditation status. In relation to these types of changes, CACREP has the obligation to determine their effect on the validity of a program's accreditation.

The Substantive Change policy entails, but is not limited to, the following types of changes:
1. changes in management, oversight, and/or ownership of the program, including merging with another program;
2. changes in geographical setting, including moving a program to a new location, or establishment of a branch campus or an off-campus cohort program;
3. establishing electronically offered degree programs after on-campus programs have been accredited;
4. dropping or modifying programs to an extent that the program's mission is not being accomplished;
5. adding or modifying courses that represent a significant departure in terms of either the content or method of delivery from those that were offered when the institution was most recently evaluated, such as distance learning or correspondence courses (here a substantive change is operationally defined as 25% or more of the credit hours of the accredited curriculum);
6. significantly departing from the stated mission, population served, objectives, or educational programs operative at the time of the most recent evaluation;
7. substantial turnover of core faculty, operationally defined as 51% or more within an academic year.

(continued)

The decision as to whether a change is substantive is a judgment specific to an individual program, since the change must be considered in the context of the whole program and institution. Questions as to whether a substantive change report is required should be directed to the CACREP staff.

Programs considering instituting a substantive change should contact the CACREP office prior to implementing the change to receive consultation about the effects of the change and procedures to follow. If a decision is made to proceed with the substantive change, the program must submit a substantive change report to the CACREP office *at least 90 days prior* to the implementation of the change. The report should detail the justification for the change, including the following:

1. authorization for the change by the appropriate institutional authorities;
2. a comparison between the existing and proposed changed program;
3. purpose of the change, relationship of change to development of the program in terms of need and clientele to be served , and timetable for implementing the change;
4. descriptions of changes in program design; faculty and staff needs for initiation of changes and qualifications of faculty;
5. library and other learning resources and facilities required for change;
6. physical plant expansion and equipment required for the change; and
7. indication of financial support available and projection of needs over the next few years, including estimates of additional costs resulting from the substantive change in the program.

The report should also include a projection on future developments section that includes a description of general developments anticipated in terms of the program and/or the substantive change.

Once the report has been received, the CACREP Board will schedule a review. Possible outcomes of that review may include: requiring a site visit or other measures to ensure adequacy of information on which to base a decision; approving the change without conditions; approving the change with conditions specified; disapproving the change; and/or initiating additional actions as deemed necessary. The Board will make a determination as to the acceptability of the proposed plans and the level of impact on the program's accreditation status. If the Board does not approve a proposed plan, it will provide feedback to the program. If the program chooses to proceed with the plan even though it was not approved, then it must notify the CACREP office of this decision. A program should be aware that such a decision can put its accreditation status at risk.

The Substantive Change policy is detailed on the CACREP website at http://www.cacrep.org/substantivechangepolicy.doc. Please direct any questions you have regarding these or other policies and procedures to the CACREP staff.

Board Notes

Elections for Board officers were held at the January meeting. Beginning July 1, 2008, the new Chair will be Craig Cashwell, the new Vice-chair will be Bryce Hagedorn, and the new Treasurer will be Sue Strong.

Sad News

CACREP was sad to hear of the sudden death of Tom Hosie. Dr. Hosie was a faculty member at Mississippi State University, a Board member appointed by the American Counseling Association, and a long time Team Chair. We have benefitted from his knowledge, experience and years of dedication to the field of counselor education.

Emergency Preparedness *continued*

the specific counseling program areas of the standards. In July 2008, the Board of Directors will vote on the final version of the 2009 standards and will subsequently publish them on the CACREP website. As of July 1, 2009, all programs submitting an application for accreditation to CACREP will be required to apply under the 2009 standards. CACREP's existing accredited programs, currently 470 counseling programs housed in 216 institutions, will transition to the new standards when their current or eight-year accreditation cycles end and they apply for re-accreditation after July 1, 2009. In this way, over time, the emergency preparedness competencies incorporated into the 2009 standards will be integrated into the curricula of all CACREP masters and doctoral level programs. And graduates of these CACREP accredited programs will possess the requisite knowledge and professional identities to serve on interdisciplinary response teams, including, according to Dr. Figley, deployment with the Green Cross Assistance Program to disaster sites within the United States and throughout the world.

Study Reinforces Benefits of Accreditation

An article appeared in the Texas Counseling Association's Journal where Dr. Susan Adams updated her earlier research study on whether CACREP accreditation makes a difference in how graduates score on the NCE. The updated research again clearly demonstrates that graduates of CACREP programs score higher on the test, used for national certification and also for counseling licensure in many states.The full article can be accessed on the CACREP website at www.cacrep.org where it is available with permission of the Texas Counseling Association.

CACREP Logo Available for Use by Accredited Programs

Postsecondary institutions with programs accredited by CACREP must display integrity and responsibility when publicizing their accredited status in promotional literature, brochures, student catalogues, and other official publications. Accreditation is program specific and any listing regarding accreditation should include only those programs for which accreditation decisions have been rendered. Programs not reviewed by CACREP, even within the same department, should not be represented as accredited. Statements suggesting future accreditation of programs when decisions have not been rendered by CACREP are not permissible. Accredited programs may obtain permission to use the CACREP logo, which is trademarked, in promotional materials by submitting a written request to the CACREP office. Unauthorized use of the logo is subject to legal action.

If you are interested in using the CACREP logo, please send an e-mail to cacrep@cacrep.org.

ACES Survey Regarding CACREP Revision

In a survey developed by Dale Pehrsson (ACES Governing Council Rep) and Leah Brew (WACES President elect) in collaboration with Harriet Glosoff, ACES Past President, and following the direction of the ACES Executive Council, data was collected that showed strong support for CACREP's move toward a more concrete counselor identity in the 2009 Standards. Sample information, quantitive data, and qualitative data are included below.

Sample

Seven hundred twenty one ACES members responded to the on-line survey (33% of ACES members). Following is a summary of demographic data reported.

ACES Region in Which Employed: North Atlantic, 16.72%; North Central, 25.66%; Rocky Mountain, 6.30%; Southern, 42.23%, and WACES, 9.09%.

Sex: The majority of respondents (58.68%) identified as themselves as female, 41.12% were male, and .15% identified as "other."

Primary Position of Practice: The majority or respondents (62.94%) were full-time faculty members and 4.8% were part-time faculty or adjuncts, while 14.10% of participants noted that they were students, 7.70% were counselors or site-supervisors, 2.62% identified their primary position as supervisor, 5.23% were administrators, and 2.61% marked that they were retired or "other."

Highest Degree Earned: Over one-half (58.1%) of the respondents who reported their highest degree noted that the have a doctorate in "Counseling, Counselor Education, or Counseling and Human Development;" 14.7% reported that have a doctorate in a "related field;" 15.72% noted that they have master's degree; a "post-master's credential;" 8.3% reported having a post-master's credential, and 3.2% marked "other."

Quantitative Results

Participants were asked whether they were in support of the principle that new hires for full-time faculty positions who have not taught before must have earned degrees in counselor education. The following note was included on the survey: "According to CACREP, this is to advocate for and require a counseling degree but is not meant to require an exact title. For example, faculty may have a doctorate in `Counseling' or in `Counseling and Human Development,' not that all faculty must have degrees with the specific title of `Counselor Education' or ``Counselor Education and Supervision.'"

In Support: Of the 721 individuals who responded to the survey, 439 (60.89%) reported that they supported the principle that new hires for full-time faculty positions who have not taught before must have earned degrees in counselor education by the timeline of 2013 as proposed by CACREP in Standard V.2. Of these, 53 stipulated that they support the proposed standard but believe that the timeline should be changed so that it goes into effect 2015 or later.

Not in Support: Two hundred thirty eight respondents (33.01%) noted that they are not in support of the proposed CACREP standard V.2.regarding new hires for full-time faculty positions regardless of when that might be implemented.

Undecided: Finally, 44 (6.10%) of participants checked that they were undecided about the principle regarding requirements as proposed by CACREP in Standard V.2

Qualitative Results

Participants were offered an opportunity to give additional commentary in the form of narrative statements provided in an open-ended comment section of the survey. We received a total of 232 comments. Two members of the ACES Executive Council independently reviewed these comments and agreed that there were three overall themes represented: (a) support for the principle underlying the proposed CACREP standard in question; (b) concerns about the standard in question; and (c) other comments. Following is a summary of the threads expressed in the comments received.

1.   **Support** (52 comments)
     a.   There was much support expressed regarding the notion that the new standards would preserve and strengthen Counselor Education (CE) identity and also comments expressed that the standardization of training would help deal with the issue of professional counselor identity
     b.   These standards give the profession voice and help put us in charge of our professional destiny and standards
     c.   Comments discussed how lack of counselor identity in a program could eventually lead to the "demise" of a CE program so the new standards we viewed as beneficial
     d.   The new standards helps to better define the hiring process thus impacting departmental cohesiveness and goals
     e.   APA discriminates in the hiring process, and therefore we should be demanding and selective as well
     f.   This process will advocate for CACREP students to be the premier hires for counselor education positions, thus impacting positive hiring practices and marketability of new hires
     g.   Psychologists and APA trained PhDs don't have training in pedagogy and aren't as prepared to teach and CE graduates are very well prepared for teaching, supervision, research and service
     h.   Comments suggested this standard should be implemented by 2011, some by 2013, many suggested later due to inability of profession to move this quickly to fill academic positions

2.   **Concerns** (145 comments)
     a.   There was considerable discussion regarding the ability of programs to recruit new faculty from under represented and minority populations
     b.   Fear was expressed that the applicant pool would be limited, and as a result, many programs would suffer, possibly to the extent of being dropped by a university that also has a psych program or related program
     c.   Discussion over support a student's choice (if degree in both psych and CE is part of the program) – Some students have no choice but to get a psych degree based on what's available in state, concern that CACREP and individual university hiring practices can not address this concern
     d.   Concern expressed that programs would lose diversity in thinking to be most beneficial for clinical practice, and students will not be as holistically trained. If CACREP makes this change in language, there is a potential for some programs to have limitations in courses taught. In addition, narrowing the field to only counselor educators increases interdisciplinary infighting
     e.   Expression that this new standard is discriminatory, the teaching position should go to most qualified person and excludes fields like Student Affairs; excludes people from other countries; psychologists who teach in CE programs feel hurt and rejected
     f.   CE identity can be developed in more ways than simply one's degree; identity doesn't stop with degree; there are many active people in ACES and ACA who graduated with psych degrees
     g.   Concern that there is no empirical data to support this change by CACREP

3.   **Other** (35 comments)
     a.   Support idea, but suggest change language from "degree" to "identity"
     b.   Modify to some percentage rather than 100% CE degrees
     c.   Need some evidence-based practice before making this decision
     d.   Thanks for conducting the survey

Team Member Update

Many of our team members are changing institutions, retiring, and making other life changes without notifying us of where to find them. We would like all team members to take a minute to fill out the information below and return it to the CACREP office by mail, fax (703-739-6209) or provide the information in e-mail to cacrep@cacrep.org.

Name _____ E-mail _____

Professional Address _____

_____

_____

Phone _____ Fax_____

Home Adress _____

Home phone _____

Areas of Expertise (please rank three of the areas below with 1 for highest, 2 for next. and 3 for the third)

_____ Addictions Counseling

_____ Career Counseling

_____ Clinical Mental Health Counseling

_____ Marriage and Family Counseling

_____ School Counseling

_____ Student Affairs and College Counseling

_____ Counselor Education and Supervision (doctoral)

Have you had experience teaching a course by distance education technology? _____

Are you fluent in a language other than English? If so, which _____

Have you served as a consultant for any programs undergoing the application process? _____

CACREP Seeking Board Applicants

The Nominations Committee of the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) is seeking nominations and applications for positions on the Board of Directors. Elections to fill the positions will be held by the CACREP Board at its January 2009 meeting. Successful applicants will begin their terms on July 1, 2009.

The Board openings are for two (2) counselor educator positions. Board members are elected to one 5-year term and are expected to attend the semiannual meetings in entirety. The meetings generally run three full days, not including travel time, and are held in January and July.

Prospective candidates are requested to read the full text of the CACREP Board Member Position Announcement and Application document posted at www.cacrep.org under Site News. Completed application packets must be received no later than July 15, 2008 and mailed or e-mailed to the CACREP office c/o ERC – Nominations Committee, 1001 North Fairfax Street, Suite 510, Alexandria, VA 22314 or cacrep.@cacrep.org.

1001 N. Fairfax Street, Suite 510
Alexandria, VA 22314
703/535-5990