



THE CACREP CONNECTION

Spring 2009

Upcoming CACREP Training Opportunities

American Counseling Association (ACA) Conference, Charlotte, North Carolina

At the ACA Conference in Charlotte, CACREP will be holding Team Chair Training by invitation only.

How to Write a CACREP Self-Study Workshop, Monday, April 20, 2009; Crowne Plaza - Old Town, Alexandria, Virginia

This 1-day workshop will give you an overview of the 2009 Standards as well as strategies for dealing with administration and faculty. Participants will have an opportunity to view examples of actual self-studies in electronic format as well as ask individual questions of CACREP trainers. Participants must register in advance by March 20. Cost is \$480.00 for the first person from an institution and \$240.00 for each additional person from the same institution. Registration will be limited to the first 40 people with paid registrations.

Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) Conference, San Diego, California

- Team Chair Training/Renewal Breakfast – Thursday, October 15, 2009. 7:00 - 10:30 am.
Session for individuals who have served on multiple site teams or who have previously gone through the chair training but need to complete renewal training under the 2009 CACREP Standards. Participants must register in advance with the CACREP office.
- Team Member Training/Renewal – Wednesday, October 14, 2009. 9:00 am - 3:00 pm.
Session for individuals who want to serve on CACREP accreditation site visit teams or who have previously gone through the training but need to complete renewal training under the 2009 CACREP Standards. Participants must complete an application and register in advance with the CACREP office.
- CACREP Table Talk – Saturday, October 17, 2009. 4:30 - 6:30 pm.
Session for CACREP program liaisons and faculty from CACREP accredited programs to meet with and ask questions of CACREP Board members and staff concerning the accreditation process and/or the implementation of the 2009 CACREP standards.
- How to Write a CACREP Self-Study Workshop – Wednesday, October 14, 2009. 9:00 am - 5:00 pm
This 1-day workshop will give you an overview of the 2009 Standards as well as strategies for dealing with administration and faculty. Participants will have an opportunity to view examples of actual self-studies in electronic format as well as ask individual question of CACREP trainers. Participants must register in advance. There is an additional fee to attend this workshop.
- There will possibly be additional content sessions offered during the conference.

Please note the following:

- CACREP will be planning future training opportunities at the ACES regional conferences held in 2010.



Notes From the Chair

Craig Cashwell

Counseling ≠ counseling

Recently, I went to a major electronics store to buy a camera bag. I was greeted by a man whose nametag indicated he was a “sales counselor.” He was very competent at his job, and I left the store with a camera bag. Even more, though, I left with the reminder that the term *counselor* is used in so many contexts that it becomes almost meaningless. The man at the electronics was a helpful *consultant*, but a counselor he was not.

If we are to serve the profession of our calling, then it is imperative that we advocate for our profession in all that we do and say. One of the ways that we can all advocate for our profession is to clearly communicate to all of our constituents who we are as professional counselors. One of the ways in which advocacy efforts for the profession of counseling have been watered down is when there is a failure to distinguish between the *profession* of Counseling (with an upper case “C”) and the *process* of counseling (with a lower case “c”). The distinction is much more than semantics. *Counseling* does not equal *counseling*.

I began my journey as a Counselor 20 years ago and during that time I have proudly been a part of a unique and distinct profession that has grown in many ways. The number of accredited counselor preparation programs and states with counselor licensure laws alone indicate a period of amazing growth. It has certainly not all been positive growth, however. During the past two decades, I have watched as the profession has fragmented in many ways. Much less frequent have been those experiences where the profession became more unified. This is a serious issue that jeopardizes the evolution of the Counseling profession. If we do not unify and strengthen the *profession* of Counseling, we risk becoming irrelevant in the human service delivery system. That would be a travesty.

Recently, I have heard arguments that the 2009 CACREP standards, particularly the faculty professional identity standards, do not take into account the multidisciplinary “flavor” of counseling. Certainly, clinical social workers, psychologists, and other mental health professionals engage in practices that can be labeled counseling. That is, no single professional discipline “owns” the counseling process.

Further, the argument is commonly made that the training approaches of other mental health disciplines,

such as Psychology and Social Work, are exclusivist and that the Counseling profession should “rise above the fray” and not act in this manner. The 2009 Standards are not intended to be exclusivist. In fact, the Standards Revision Committee went to painstaking lengths to ensure that current educators could continue their positions and even move to another institution if they wished. Further, programs have until July 1, 2013 to transition to the new requirements for faculty. The sole purpose of the professional identity standards, then, is to strengthen Counseling *as a profession unique and distinct from related disciplines*.

For me, this is not personal. I am indebted to many professionals from different disciplines whose writings and teachings have informed and inspired my work. That will continue. I believe with every fiber of my being, though, that it is necessary for the Counseling profession to more firmly establish its professional identity to allow for clearer advocacy efforts and positive growth. The time is now.

Based on previous CACREP Standards, programs could document faculty identity in counseling *or related disciplines* in many different ways. This allowed many alternative pathways that the most recent Standards consider inadequate. For example, professional identity cannot be based solely on professional memberships, for this is occasioned by the simple payment of a fee to a professional organization. Similarly, professional identity cannot be based entirely on credentials until there is a national standard. Some state counseling licensure boards have only generic requirements for training or allow for the so-called CACREP “equivalent” program. For example, some state licensure boards determine CACREP equivalency based on a) that students have curricular experiences in the eight core areas identified by CACREP, b) a total number of hours of graduate training, and c) total number of clinical hours (i.e., practicum and internship). Issues such as professional orientation and professional identity of faculty and students, however, can never be measured by such limited benchmarks.

As one example, I have done CACREP site visits in years past where not one single member of a program faculty was eligible for membership in Chi Sigma Iota Honor Society International, not because of their talent and skills, but because of their professional identity. How, then, can this possibly not impact the acculturation of students as professional counselors?

The counseling profession is entering a new zeitgeist. There are many legs on which counselor preparation stands, including CACREP, The Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, the American Association of State Counseling Boards, the National Board for Certified Counselors, and Chi Sigma Iota. Working together, we have a unique opportunity to unify the counseling profession and grow in new and wonderful ways. Although there will be challenges along the way, growth and strength lie ahead.

Accreditation Decisions

The CACREP Board of Directors met January 8-10, 2009, in Tucson, AZ and made the accreditation decisions listed below. The next meeting of the Board of Directors is scheduled for July 2009.

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

Canisius College, Buffalo, NY

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

Fairfield University, Fairfield, CT

Community Counseling and School Counseling (March 31, 2017)

Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, GA

†Community Counseling, †School Counseling and †Student Affairs (March 31, 2011)

Indiana University, Bloomington, IN

Community Counseling, School Counseling (March 31, 2017) and Mental Health Counseling (March 31, 2011)

Marymount University, Arlington, VA

Community Counseling, †Community Counseling (Pastoral Counseling) and School Counseling (March 31, 2017)

Mercer University, Atlanta, GA

†Community Counseling (March 31, 2011)

Minnesota State University at Mankato, Mankato, MN

Community Counseling, †Mental Health Counseling, School Counseling and Student Affairs (March 31, 2011)

Monmouth University, West Long Branch, NJ

†Mental Health Counseling and †School Counseling (March 31, 2011)

Monclair State University, Montclair, NJ

†Community Counseling, †School Counseling and †Student Affairs (March 31, 2011)

Northwest Nazarene University, Nampa, ID

Community Counseling, Marital, Couple and Family Counseling/Therapy and School Counseling (March 31, 2017)

Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA

†Mental Health Counseling and †Counselor Education and Supervision (March 31, 2012). The Student Affairs program was retitled as College Counseling. This institution also has accredited Community and School Counseling programs.

Slippery Rock University, Slippery Rock, PA

Community Counseling, School Counseling, and Student Affairs (March 31, 2017)

South Dakota State University, Brookings, SD

College Counseling, Community Counseling, and School Counseling (March 31, 2011)

State University of New York, College at Brockport, Brockport, NY

College Counseling, †Mental Health Counseling and School Counseling (March 31, 2011)

Troy University, Dothan, Dothan, AL

†Community Counseling and †School Counseling (March 31, 2011)

Troy University, Southeast Region, Pensacola, FL (multiple campus sites in Florida)

†Mental Health Counseling (March 31, 2011)

University of Akron, Akron, OH

Community Counseling, Marital, Couple and Family Counseling/Therapy, School Counseling, and Counselor Education and Supervision (March 31, 2016)

University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Las Vegas, NV

Mental Health Counseling and School Counseling (March 31, 2011)

University of San Diego, San Diego, CA

†School Counseling (March 31, 2017)

Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA

†School Counseling and †Student Affairs (March 31, 2017)

Walden University, Minneapolis, MN (online program)

†Mental Health Counseling (March 31, 2011)

Winona State University, Winona, MN

Community Counseling and School Counseling (March 31, 2017)

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

Argosy University Schaumburg, Schaumburg, IL

Community Counseling (March 31, 2011)

California State University, Fullerton, Fullerton, CA

Community Counseling (March 31, 2015)

East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, TN
Community Counseling, School Counseling and Student Affairs (March 31, 2015)

Indiana Wesleyan University, Marian, IN
Community Counseling, Marital, Couple and Family Counseling/Therapy and School Counseling (March 31, 2011)

Lehman College: City University of New York, Bronx, NY
School Counseling (October 31, 2016)

Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, IL
Career Counseling, Community Counseling, School Counseling and Counselor Education and Supervision (October 31, 2011)

Plymouth State University, Plymouth, NH
Mental Health Counseling and School Counseling (March 31, 2011)

Regis University, Denver, CO
Community Counseling (March 31, 2015)

University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT
School Counseling (October 31, 2015)

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC
School Counseling (March 31, 2015)

University of North Florida, Jacksonville, FL
Mental Health Counseling and School Counseling (March 31, 2014)

University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, IA
Mental Health Counseling and School Counseling (March 31, 2014)

Walsh University, North Canton, OH
Mental Health Counseling and School Counseling (March 31, 2015)

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

University of North Texas (October 31, 2011)

The Board accepted Substantive Change Reports from the following institutions:

Lindsey Wilson College
University of North Florida

Corrections to the Fall 2008 Newsletter

Winthrop University, Rock Hill, South Carolina, was erroneously listed as being accredited through October 31, 2010, when they received 8 year accreditation through October 31, 2016.

The list of site team visitors attributed to the 2007-2008 academic year was actually for the previous academic year. Below are the team visitors we would like to thank for their participation during the 2007-2008 academic year:

Susan Adams	Amy Hittner	Paula Stanley
Patrick Akos	Rosemarie Hughes	Sue Stichel
Mike Altekruse	Bradley Janey	Mercedes terMaat
Linda Barclay	Marty Jencius	Cynthia Terres
Don Basse	Thomas Keller	Holly Thompson
James Bergin	David Kleist	Jerry Trusty
John Bloom	Kenyon Knapp	Lee Underwood
Wanda Briggs	Maura Krushinski	Susan Varhely
Matthew Buckley	Nadene L'Amoreaux	Janice Ward
Kent Butler	William Lawrence	Jane Webber
Karla Carmichael	Courtland Lee	Nona Wilson
Jack Casey	Tina Livingston	Christopher Wood
Craig Cashwell	Virginia Magnus	Geoffrey Yager
Yvonne Castillo	Jayamala Madathil	Scott Young
Kan Chandras	Joseph Maola	
Jane Chauvin	Francis Martin	
Nola Christenberry	Kenneth McCurdy	
Kelly Coker	Bill McHenry	
Jane Cox	Gary Miller	
Teddi Cunningham	Amy Milsom	
Heidi Deschamps	Judith Miranti	
Kimberly Desmond	Marianne Mitchell	
Jill Duba	Jerry Mobley	
Bruce Dykeman	Keith Mobley	
Daniel Eckstein	Joseph Morris	
Peter Emerson	Patricia Neufeld	
Lee Ann Eschbach	Nancy Nishimura	
Kathy Evans	Ken Norem	
Marchetta Evans	Betsy Page	
Kathleen Fallon	Stephen Parker	
Beverly Farrow	Quinn Pearson	
David Fenell	Nick Piazza	
M. Sylvia Fernandez	Verl Pope	
LouAnn Gilchrist	Phyllis Post	
Joshua Gold	Karen Prichard	
Lynn Guillot-Miller	Clarrice Rapisarda	
Jim Gumaer	E. H. (Mike) Robinson	
Susan Hansen	Thelma Robinson	
Paul Hartung	Nick Ruiz	
Pete Havens	Kathleen Salyers	
Lisa Hawley	Johnny Sanders	
Richard Hazler	Dale Septeowski	
Donna Henderson	Merril Simon	
Christopher Hill	Cheri Smith	
Nicole Hill	Robert Smith	
Scott Hinkle	Rebecca Stanard	

New CACREP Policy Document Available on the Web

Carol L. Bobby, Executive Director

Over three years ago, CACREP launched the standards revision process that culminated in the publication of the 2009 CACREP Standards for Accreditation. There was a lot of fanfare and excitement throughout this process. A separate committee was formed. Research was conducted. Three separate proposals were disseminated for public comment. And, open feedback sessions were offered at just about every counseling conference held across the country over this time period.

While this hubbub over the standards was occurring, there was a concurrent revision process going on in a much quieter manner. Over this same three year period, the CACREP Board was methodically and meticulously reviewing every policy created during its 25+ year history for possible revision or deletion. Primary responsibility for conducting the policy review process was assigned to an internal ad hoc committee of the Board. Members of the ad hoc committee were given a charge to review and update any and all policies to insure they were “in sync” with proposed changes in the 2009 Standards. In addition, the charge included reviewing policies for their adequacy in addressing the many changes occurring in the structure and the delivery of higher education. The Ad Hoc Policy Review Committee was expected to keep the Board posted on their progress through reports and suggested revisions.

Over this period of time, two major understandings emerged to guide the work of the Ad Hoc Committee. First, it became clear that many policy statements were embedded in the narrative of the CACREP Manual, making it difficult for the reader to discern what was actual policy and what was suggested procedure. Important policies tended to get lost in the middles of pages. Second, reviewing all of CACREP’s policies throughout the organization’s history highlighted the importance of creating a fluid and adaptable policy document to allow for future policy revisions and new policy development. Since policies serve as a guide to the Board’s actions, intent, objectives and responsibilities for examining programs against the CACREP Standards, the implementation of new standards will likely lead to new policies over time. In addition, continued changes in educational delivery systems and program structures may require the Board to develop additional new policies to serve as a guide for CACREP’s interactions with program applicants as they undergo the quality assurance review process.

The end result of these two epiphanies is the creation of an on-line policy document that should be downloaded with every copy of the 2009 Standards. This document will be dated and time-sensitive. Because the Board meets every six months, the document has the potential of being updated semiannually. All programs should check for new policy development periodically.

This document is organized into six (6) sections. The six sections are outlined below, along with a sample policy that has either been newly created, revised or maintained.

Accreditation Process Policies – policies that serve as a guide for programs in the application process.

12. On-site Visit Scheduling Requirements. CACREP prefers to schedule on-site visits when programs seeking accreditation can document graduates; however, for new master’s-degree programs seeking initial accreditation, CACREP may schedule an on-site visit when students are in the last term of their program prior to graduation. For new doctoral programs, a visit cannot be scheduled until there are students who are likely to be finished within a two-year time frame.

Accreditation Maintenance Policies – policies that serve as a guide for programs that have become accredited and are in some portion of their 8 year cycle.

2. Extension of Accreditation Status. An institution is permitted no more than eight (8) years of accreditation per cycle. The Board may choose, however, to grant a one-time extension of accredited status in situations involving unpredictable difficulties despite due diligence. Upon favorable completion of the next 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.

Board Operation Policies – policies that guide Board decision-making and operations

4. On-Site Team Findings. At the final review of an institution's application for accreditation, the Board may not reverse any site team findings of "met" without first giving the institution notice and/or an opportunity to respond.

Accreditation Fee Policies – policies that outline accreditation fees and when they are assessed

3. On-site Team Visit Fees. On-site visit fees require a flat charge for the first two (2) to four (4) visitors. When additional visitors or alternative visit structures are required in order to review distance learning programs or programs offered at multiple sites, additional fees will be assessed at a rate set by CACREP. CACREP's on-site fees will be billed to institutions in one of the following two ways, with the choice for billing option made by the institution. The institution may opt to pay a flat fee of \$2,000 per team visitor or the institution may pay CACREP \$1500 upfront and then, in addition, be billed by CACREP for the actual travel costs once the visit is completed. Furthermore, it should be noted that only those institutions seeking accreditation for a single program area at a single campus location are permitted to request a two person site team.

Integrity of Process Policies – policies that guide programs, Board members and team members in acting ethically and without conflict of interest during the accreditation review and decision-making process

5. Statement of Confidentiality. During the accreditation process all information obtained will be discussed for professional purposes only with persons directly involved in the process. All written and oral reports will present only data germane to the purposes of the accreditation. Every effort will be made to protect the confidentiality of documents and to avoid undue invasion of privacy.

Transition Policies – policies to guide programs in making changes required under the 2009 CACREP Standards.

4. Transitions to Clinical Mental Health Counseling. Programs transitioning from 48 to 60 semester hours in order to meet the Clinical Mental Health Counseling program area standards, as outlined in the 2009 CACREP Standards, are not expected to file substantive change reports. The required changes will be reviewed in the program's submission of a Mid-cycle Report due at the end of the fourth year of the eight-year accreditation cycle.

These six samples represent a small fraction of the guidance that can be obtained from reviewing CACREP's new policy document. There are policies on how to 1) submit self-study documents electronically, 2) appeal decisions when accreditation is denied, 3) lose your accreditation for nonpayment of fees, 4) know when students can be considered graduates of a CACREP program, and 5) how to properly advertise your accreditation status, including the use of the CACREP logo.

It is fascinating and useful reading. Everyone is urged to get their free copy by visiting the CACREP website and clicking on Policies or visit www.cacrep.org/policydocument.

Note: A special thank you is extended to current and former members of the CACREP Board of Directors who served on the Ad Hoc Policy Review Committee - Jim Wigtil, Committee Chair; Craig Cashwell, and Lou Busacca.

Q & A on the 2009 Standards

Q. Can we establish specialty/emphasis areas within a Clinical Mental Health Counseling program (e.g., Pastoral Counseling, Rehabilitation Counseling)?

A. Yes. Programs can establish specialty areas within a Clinical Mental Health Counseling program as long as it is clearly communicated throughout program materials that program is accredited as a CMHC program and the program can document that each specialty/emphasis area within the CMHC program is in full compliance with the requirements of the CMHC standards. Programs choosing to offer specialty/emphasis areas should consider CACREP Accreditation Process Policy #4 in program planning and communications regarding the program:

Titles may not be used that have the potential of misrepresentation with regard to CACREP accreditation. Therefore, when an institution decides to seek CACREP accreditation for one or more graduate degree programs (e.g., School Counseling, Marriage, Couple and Family Counseling), the institution must use titles that 1) clearly identify the programs and degrees as counseling programs and counseling degrees, and 2) accurately reflect the CACREP program area under which accreditation is being sought.

Q. Our program exists in a blended department (e.g., Counseling and Educational Psychology). Are there considerations for us in terms of program identity and core faculty?

A. Standard I.B. references an academic unit. The academic unit is the academic unit in counseling. While blended departments are acceptable, it is necessary for the department to clearly designate what constitutes the academic unit in counseling, linked to core faculty associated with this unit. One way of determining core faculty within a joint department is to consider the following questions: Which curricula are the faculty members primarily involved in developing? Which faculty meetings do the faculty members attend? What are the faculty members' primary teaching responsibilities? How are admissions decisions being made for the counseling programs and for which programs are the faculty members involved in admissions decision-making? In making determinations about the academic unit and core faculty, programs should consider CACREP Accreditation Process Policy #5:

Programs applying for CACREP accreditation must be clearly identifiable as counseling programs. In addition to the curricular offerings, this will be determined by the terminal degrees, credentials, professional activities, and professional affiliations of those who teach in and administer the program.

Q. Standard I.G. references providing information to students in the program about personal counseling services provided by professionals other than program faculty and students. Can you provide clarification of requirements under this standard?

A. The 2001 standards required programs to make personal counseling services available to students. The requirements in the 2009 standards are somewhat different. Under the 2009 standards, programs are responsible for providing information to students about available personal counseling services. This could be done through provision of an information sheet listing on- and off-campus resources available to students. It is important to note that under both the 2001 and 2009 Standard, the intent is that students have access to counselors services provided by professionals other than program faculty and students.

Q. We will not be at the required 54 credits for our Clinical Mental Health Counseling program by the time we need to apply for reaccreditation. Can we still reapply?

A. Programs must be at the required number of semester hours by the dates cited in the standard in order to

be eligible to apply for accreditation or reaccreditation. It is not enough to provide documentation that there is a commitment to move up to the required number of hours. However, a program could perhaps apply if it was likely it would get to the required hours during the review cycle (e.g., the curricular change is in the review process and an approval was likely during the period of time during which the accreditation reviews would occur prior to an accreditation decision).

Q. We have a certification-only option for students who complete either the school or community tracks that allows them to take additional credits for licensure/certification as a school counselor or licensed professional counselor. Can you please clarify for me if there are any particular requirements we need to consider in offering such a program?

A. CACREP Accreditation Process Policy #9 stipulates:

If an institution offers a CACREP accredited program, any other program options offered to students seeking endorsement for certification or licensure in the same program area must be substantially equivalent to the requirements of the accredited program.

Therefore, if there is an accredited program in a particular program area (e.g., SC, CMHC), then students completing a certification-only option in that area would need to complete a 600 hour internship and any additional required coursework in that area to satisfy the substantial equivalency requirement.

Q. We have an existing Mental Health Counseling program that is not due for reaccreditation for several years. As part of that program, we require a 900 hour internship. In the 2009 standards, CMHC programs require a minimum of 600 hours of internship. Do we need to maintain the 900 hour internship for students in our program?

A. After July 1, 2009, existing accredited Mental Health Counseling programs are no longer required to maintain the 900 hours of internship, although programs, of course, may continue to offer or require internship hours that exceed the CACREP requirements. After July 1, 2009, accredited Mental Health Counseling programs may reduce their required number of internship hours to 600 if the program faculty desire to do so.

Q. Standard I.M. indicates, "For any calendar year, the number of credit hours delivered by noncore faculty must not exceed the number of credit hours delivered by core faculty." Our program is unique in that students take a certain number of counseling courses as well as a certain number of courses outside counseling (e.g., theology). Does this requirement apply to the entire number of credits in the program or just to the required counseling courses?

A. The requirements of this standard apply to the entire program for which accreditation is sought, not just a counseling component of the program.

Q. Can you provide clarification on how to calculate the FTE student to FTE faculty ratio?

A. The student side of the ratio is based on how each institution defines full-time graduate credit load for students. In order to determine the student side of the equation, the program should obtain institutional data on the number of credit hours generated in a semester by counselor education students and divide this number by the number of credit hours that constitute a full-time graduate credit load at the institution.

The faculty side of the equation is based on the full-time teaching load for program faculty. Each full-time program faculty member teaching a full course load would count into the equation as 1.0 FTE faculty. If a full-time faculty teaching load is 3 courses over an academic term, then each adjunct and affiliate

faculty member's load should be calculated against this same standard. For instance, if an adjunct taught 1 course over the academic term, they would count as .33 FTE for the term. If full-time program faculty maintain teaching and/or administrative responsibilities in program areas other than those for which accreditation is sought, this should be reflected in the percentages in which they are included in the calculation (e.g., a full-time faculty member whose teaching load is 3 courses but receives a 1 course reduction for administrative responsibilities during a particular term would count as .66 FTE for that term).

It is necessary to provide data and calculations for several semesters to demonstrate the stability or fluctuations that exist in this ratio over time.

- Q. Standard I.R. indicates "Group supervision for practicum and internship should not exceed 12 students." I notice there is no equivalent course credit associated with this supervision like there is stipulated for instances when program faculty are conducting individual supervision (Standard I.Q.). What information can you provide about the group supervision requirement?
- A. Standard I.Q. exists for the protection of program faculty to ensure that faculty are receiving appropriate credit for the amount of work and time involved in providing intensive individual clinical supervision. There is no credit load in the standards attached to providing group supervision so institutions can determine the appropriate level of credit to award.

The intent of the group supervision standard is that there should be no more than 12 students in any group supervision group. It is permissible for a faculty member to supervise multiple groups of students within a single section of practicum or internship, providing that none of the groups consist of more than 12 students.

- Q. Standard I.S indicates that we must provide evidence that students are covered by professional liability insurance while enrolled or participating in practicum, internship, or other field experiences. Is university coverage acceptable?
- A. Yes, university coverage is acceptable as long as program can provide details of the coverage and that students are aware of its presence, how it applies, and where there are limitations (if appropriate).
- Q. Can you clarify the difference between core and noncore faculty?
- A. Programs accredited by CACREP must be clearly identifiable as counseling programs. Such an identity is established through the degrees, licenses/certifications, and professional memberships held by faculty members, the professional activities of faculty and students, and the understanding and messages communicated about professional identity by faculty and students and in program related literature. As part of the establishment of counseling program identity, it is expected that programs will have a clearly identified group of core faculty who identify with the counseling profession and who have and maintain control of the functions of the counseling program, including curriculum, admissions, enrollment, advising, strategic planning, and evaluation. While the standards call for there to be a minimum of three core faculty, this number will be examined in relation to the requirement that the academic unit in counseling "has faculty resources of appropriate quality and sufficiency to achieve its mission and objectives" (I.W.)

Once a program can document a group of core faculty that is sufficient in numbers, qualifications, and engagement in programmatic decision making, the CACREP Board believes that additional adjunct and affiliate faculty from allied mental health professions, who have been determined to have specific expertise in a subject area and will complement and not distract from a professional counselor identity, can be used to train counseling students. For example, an appropriately trained social statistician teaching a statistics course, an educational researcher teaching a research course with appropriate professional counseling literature, or a recognized practitioner with significant expertise in a counseling

modality or population such as substance abuse, couples and family counseling or psychopharmacology could be used to teach a course within the counseling program. It would be expected that these adjunct or affiliate (noncore) faculty would work closely with the counseling program coordinator and the core counseling faculty to maintain the course objectives, maintain counselor identity within the students and verify that accreditation standards regarding course content are strictly adhered to.

The terms core faculty and noncore faculty are standards-specific terms and different from the terminologies and faculty designations utilized at different institutions. While a faculty member may hold a full-time, tenure- or non-tenure track position within the counseling unit, she may not be considered a core faculty member according to the standards. This does not mean that this faculty member is not an integral member of the counseling unit. It simply means that she does not satisfy the definitions of core faculty as utilized in the standards and so certain other factors come into play when considering the overall unit, such as the requirement that “for any calendar year, the number of credit hours delivered by noncore faculty must not exceed the number of credit hours delivered by core faculty” (I.M.)*.

* CACREP appreciates the assistance of Dr. Verl Pope in the writing of this response

Q. Can our students bank hours from practicum to internship?

A. No. CACREP Accreditation Process policy #11 stipulates:

The duration of a student’s supervised practicum experience is to extend across a full academic term to allow for the development of basic counseling skills and the integration of knowledge. Practicum is completed prior to internship. Therefore, CACREP standards do not allow for extra hours obtained during the practicum to be counted toward the 600 clock hour internship requirements.

Q. Can you provide some examples of acceptable and unacceptable activities in relation to the direct service with client requirements in practica and internships?

A. Some examples of acceptable direct service activities include: individual counseling, group counseling, consultation with parents or administrators on student issues, and classroom guidance. Some examples of activities that are not considered direct service with client activities include: client staffings, meetings, supervision. These types of activities can count be counted as indirect hours.

Q. Does the bi-weekly consultation between faculty and site supervisors required in Standard III.F.2 have to be face-to-face?

A. No. The bi-weekly consultation does not have to be face-to-face, but can utilize electronic forms of communication (e.g., e-mail, phone, videoconferencing). The intent of the bi-weekly supervision is that it is regular and substantive in nature, focused on student development, rather than just periodic check-ins to ensure things are going okay.

Congratulations to the following Counselor Educators who were selected to serve on the CACREP Board beginning July 1, 2009:

Nancy Nishimura, The University of Memphis

Rhonda Paul, The University of Phoenix, Metro Detroit Campuses

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, Executive Director
Jenny Gunderman, Editor

CACREP Board of Directors:

Craig Cashwell, Chair

Bryce Hagedorn, Vice Chair

Sue Strong, Treasurer

Judy Bowers

Stephen Feit

Charles F. (Rick) Gressard

Anita Engstrom Jones

Judith Nix

Donna Gooden Payne

Estela Pledge

Clarrice Rapisarda

Martin Ritchie

Brent Snow

Jim Wigtil

Please Remember! All self-studies
addressing the 2001 Standards must be postmarked
on or before June 30, 2009.

If you send it on July 1 and it does not address the
2009 Standards, we will have to return it to you.



Congratulations to the following successful proposals
for the CACREP Research Grants:

Faculty Grant: Dana Heller Levitt, at Montclair State University,
for her project titled, *Outcomes-Based Assessment in Counselor
Education: A Proposed Model for New Standards*

Student Grant: The Master's/Doctoral Collaborative Research
Group at the College of William and Mary for their project titled,
*Perceptions of Preparedness Among Graduates of CACREP
Programs and Their Employers: Using Program Evaluation to
Assess Outcomes of the CACREP Model.*



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