

Fall 2020 SRC Chats Summary

Engaging with the counseling profession through input seeking and data gathering is part of the process for the CACREP Standards Revision Committee (SRC). During October and November 2020, the CACREP SRC hosted five virtual SRC Chat sessions which were collectively well attended. During these sessions, the SRC shared:

1. *Status update of their work.* They reiterated their [charge](#) and discussed meeting this through reviewing published research and gathering targeted data to inform revisions. They also identified the opportunities for providing feedback on revision drafts and timelines for completion of their work and submission to the CACREP Board for action, and the release of final standards by CACREP. As a consequence of the Covid-19 pandemic, the SRC timelines were revised: Board standards approval/adoption will be in spring 2023 with a release date of the new standards in July 2023 to go into effect July 2024. The SRC further reaffirmed their awareness that these next set of standards must be applicable and relevant until 2031.
2. *Preliminary considerations of their work.* They described the two overarching principles that guide their work: Quality first and a Unified counselor identity. The efforts thus far have been on reorganizing the standards around Assessment as the focal point. Attention is being given to the expectations of clinical fieldwork and modalities of program delivery. Deliberations have not yet begun on the curricula standards.
3. *Solicitation of published and on-going research.* The SRC emphasized that research which serve to inform the standards revision process is always welcomed.

The SRC will continue to host virtual presentations until it is safe to return to in-person meetings. Plans for Spring 2021 include: a targeted survey of the Counseling community and release of revisions Draft 1 of the Standards for public comment.

Questions from Participants (stated verbatim from the Zoom chat feature):

Q: What are the general thoughts about Assessment and Evaluation revisions?

A: The SRC is attempting to clarify and streamline the assessment and evaluation process. We are aiming for reorganization, intentionality, and utility of the assessment and evaluation process.

Q: Understanding that this is early ... the Assessment Focus is a good one, once you identify Assessment Goals, are your discussions relatively proscriptive or are you looking to encourage more varied approaches to Assessment and Evaluation?

A: We recognize that programs have unique structures and as such need to allow for variability in assessment and evaluation processes. There are specific areas for which all programs must provide assessment and evaluation data, consistent with previous iterations of the standards.

Q: You mentioned one of the items you are looking at is FTEs. What are the thoughts about changes regarding these?

A: The FTE requirements are under review, using data from CACREP and our initial survey. We continue to explore the concept of FTEs through review of other accreditors' requirements.

Q: Is there any considering in modifying the FTE or core faculty requirement?

A: The FTE and core faculty requirements are under review.

- Q:** Do you have any specific information to share with us on possible changes to the faculty standards?
The current standards are very restrictive for rehabilitation counseling programs.
- A:** The standards regarding faculty requirements are under review. The final decision around those standards will take into consideration effect on all specialty practice areas.
- Q:** I am new to this process, would someone mind sharing how faculty members are calculated as whole persons (or not) depending on their roles in the department?
- A:** This a question for CACREP. Please call your program's designated CACREP staff member or the CACREP office at 703-535-5990 for guidance.
- Q:** Could you explain more detail on how faculty identity will be evaluated and documented? Or, if it is too early to say, what considerations are being made?
- A:** The SRC is reviewing the faculty identity standards and expects to have these included in Draft 1 of the revisions released for public comment. However, it is the CACREP Board that determines how any standard is evaluated and the required supporting documentation.
- Q:** The most difficult aspect in the standards for me is the use of the "academic unit". We are three accredited programs operating in one department but up until the CORE/CACREP merger, we were operating separately. Has there been any discussion around strengthening guidance on what needs to be the "same" across academic unit and what is "different" based on specialty?
- A:** The glossary to the standards defines an "[academic unit](#)". [Section 1](#) state the standards applicable to all programs regardless of specialty practice area of focus. What distinguishes specialty practice areas are the foundations, contextual dimensions, and practice skills unique to each specialty practice area as defined in the respective Section 5 standards. The scenario described in the question sounds like an institutional organization matter.
- Q:** Curious if there has been any consideration for additional core areas (sec. 2) or greater expansion of topics within the core areas? I know that two content areas that have gained steam in recent years are addressing crisis and trauma more expansively or substance use more expansively in the core as opposed to specialty. I'm sure other folks have advocated for other areas...
- A:** The SRC has not yet begun deliberations on the curricula standards. The foundational counseling knowledge section of the standards are required of all programs regardless of specialty practice areas. Embedded in [Section 2](#) of the 2016 Standards are multiple areas in the foundational counseling knowledge standards that address crisis, trauma, and substance use.
- Q:** Has the revision committee considered adding specific standards around advocacy?
- A:** The SRC has not yet begun deliberations on the curricula standards. Embedded in [Section 2](#) of the 2016 Standards are multiple areas in the foundational counseling knowledge standards that address advocacy.
- Q:** Will there be standards that specifically speak to social justice and disability for all counselors?
- A:** Embedded in [Section 2](#) of the 2016 Standards are multiple areas in the foundational counseling knowledge standards that speak to social justice. As part of the CACREP-CORE merger a jointly appointed [task force was charged](#) to explore the infusion of disability concepts into the foundational counseling knowledge standards. The report from and recommendations of this task force is one of the working documents of the SRC.

Q: And how are the disability information infused across all specialties. How is this operationalized?

A: As part of the CACREP-CORE merger a jointly appointed [task force was charged](#) to explore the infusion of disability concepts into the foundational counseling knowledge section of future CACREP Standards. The foundational counseling knowledge section is required of all programs for all students regardless of the program specialty practice area of focus.

Q: If concepts related to understanding disability are infused throughout the curriculum, how can CACREP ensure could the salience, knowledge and competence not be reduced based on the program faculty lack of familiarity of disability?

A: The basic understanding of disability concepts would be included in the section that addresses foundational counseling knowledge. As with any of the concepts in this section, it is incumbent upon the faculty to ensure that students have a basic understanding.

Q: What model is being considered for infusing diversity concepts across the curriculum? Would you use multiple frameworks focusing on cognitive and affective domains with particular emphasis on student learning.

A: The SRC has not yet begun deliberations on the curricula standards. Embedded in [Section 2](#) of the 2016 Standards are multiple areas in the foundational counseling knowledge standards that include diversity concepts.

Q: When examining field experience, is the committee factoring in increasing challenges students are having around locating placements (due to 3rd party payment, HIPAA considerations, etc....)? If so, any thoughts on how to adjust to these challenges?

A: The question above is focused on challenges students face in securing field placements. This would be a matter for programs to address in terms of what assistance and direction they provide their students. This is not a standards-related issue.

Q: Any consideration to allow programs to substitute faculty group supervision hours for individual or triadic hours when the site is doing weekly hourly individual supervision?

A: In the present deliberations, there has been no discussion to change the group and individual supervision requirements as stated in the 2016 Standards.

Q: One area of focus was the specialty practice areas. Is the committee potentially looking at adding or even removing any existing specialties?

A: The SRC has not yet begun deliberations on the curricula standards therefore no decisions have been made about adding or removing specialty practice areas.

Q: Will you be getting away from specializations?

A: While the SRC has not yet begun deliberations on the curricula standards there has been no discussion about eliminating standards for specialty practice areas.

Q: Are there other specializations up for consideration to be added for accreditation? I'm thinking specifically of Forensic Counseling as the legal aspects in our world become more unstable with policing and the push to "defund" police and include more social services within the policing realm.

A: The SRC has not yet begun deliberations on the curricula standards therefore no decisions have been made about adding a specialty practice area.

- Q:** What process will the SRC use to examine whether or not to have two separate sets of Specialty Standards for Rehabilitation Counseling?
- A:** The specialized practice areas are under review. We have access to agreements and discussions relative to the initial designation of two separate Rehabilitation Counseling specializations that we will review when we address the specialized practice areas.
- Q:** What is it looking like for clinical rehab and traditional rehab cnsl standards?
- A:** The SRC has not yet begun deliberations on the curricula standards therefore have not made any decisions about the two rehabilitation counseling specialty practice areas.
- Q:** Going back to the specialty area topic: we currently have 2 rehabilitation counseling specialty practice areas--clinical rehabilitation counseling and rehabilitation counseling. Can you share anything about merging these into one, and which one will remain as the title of this specialty area if it is merged into one?
- A:** The SRC has not yet begun deliberations on the curricula standards therefore have not made any decisions about the two rehabilitation counseling specialty practice areas.
- Q:** Clinical Rehab Counseling graduates seem to be underperforming in some of the traditional rehab measures of Rehabilitation Counselor competence, as evidenced by scores in the CRC certification exam. What changes in the standards can we expect that may improve the training of Rehab Counselors?
- A:** The SRC has not yet begun deliberations on the curricula standards therefore have not made any decisions about changes. In the 2016 Standards, the Clinical Rehabilitation Counseling and Rehabilitation Counseling standards are distinctively different specialty practice areas albeit with some overlap.
- Q:** Within the standards/specializations the clinical RC mentions ICD but not ICF. Rehabilitation Counseling mentions both, was this just oversight. Sorry for so many. Thanks. Both depends on the day.
- A:** In the 2016 Standards, the Clinical Rehabilitation Counseling and Rehabilitation Counseling standards are distinctively different specialty practice areas. The Rehabilitation Counseling standards were developed by CORE which were adopted by CACREP and added to the 2016 Standards at the time of the merger on July 1, 2017. The reason for the inclusion or omission is not known at this time.
- Q:** Are the revised standards for the RC specialty allowing its evolution to retain those credentials for which it meets under the CIRC & CIMH conversions since there will no longer be a dual counseling option in the future?
- A:** The SRC has not yet begun deliberations on the curricula standards. The question appears to be about application of the standards and should be direct to CACREP. The SRC is not able to answer this question.
- Q:** Is the SRC taking into consideration the knowledge and skills areas identified in the Role and Function Studies across all rehabilitation counseling programs. Rehabilitation counseling educational standards are based on an extensive role and function studies and analysis of professional competencies. The rehabilitation counseling curricular standards need to reflect the knowledge derived within a specialty over time and respect our need to respond to stakeholders.
- A:** Yes, when the SRC begins deliberations on the curricula standards. The SRC has received a copy of the last Role and Function study. One of the authors of the study and the Executive Director of CRCC met with the SRC in February 2020.

Q: How can a unified counselor identity address the many specialties at the doctoral level? Wouldn't this create a knowledge gap and decrease quality of education for doctoral students who would like to teach in specific areas.

A: A unified counselor identity espouses being a counselor first and the chosen specialty practice area as second. The CACREP 2016 [doctoral standards](#) are designed to prepare graduates to work as counselor educators, supervisors, researchers, and practitioners in academic and clinical settings; and are intended to accommodate the unique strengths of different programs. The 2016 Standard 6.A.4.c requires the completion of verified coursework in a CACREP entry-level specialty area as an admissions requirement. Doctoral programs may choose to develop curriculum with a specialty practice area focus and be in compliance with the Standards. Doctoral students who would like to teach in a specific practice area can be prepared to do so.

Q: Since others are asking content questions, my interest is the purpose of practicum doctoral programs given many of our students are licensed supervisors.

A: The SRC has not yet begun deliberations on the curricula standards for the doctoral program.

Q: Will there be standards related to providing telehealth/distance counseling?

A: The SRC is conscious of the current practices in counseling service delivery and will keep these in mind as the standards are being revised.

Q: How have the standards adapted to account for use of emerging technologies to deliver supervision and in the preparation of students during their placements which are actively using tele-mental health and tele-rehabilitation?

A: The use of emerging technologies for counselor preparation and counseling service delivery is under consideration. An awareness of the use of technology has been heightened with the Covid-19 pandemic. It might be worth noting that many licensing boards have not changed their position about counselor preparation and service delivery in a digital environment.

Q: Is part of the charge related to program delivery considering how online programs navigate students residing and completing their program outside of the US?

A: The charge is to "Review and revise standards with consideration of their applicability to all types of programs and delivery methods". The standards are applicable regardless of where students reside when completing their program.

Q: For online programs any consideration for requiring intensives/residencies?

A: The standards are written to be applicable to all types of programs regardless of method of program delivery. It is the prerogative of the programs to demonstrate how they are in compliance with the standards.

Q: For programs up for reaccreditation in 2023, would we have opportunity to be reviewed under 2023 new standards or stay with 2016 standards?

A: Given the delay due to the Covid-19 pandemic, the new set of Standards will not be released until July 2023 and will go into effect July 2024. The [accreditation review process](#) takes approximately 18 months. It is best to check with your program's designated CACREP staff member for further guidance.

Q: For programs up for reaccreditation in 2023, will there be enough time to navigate the new 2024 standards? If necessary, could a program request an extension?

A: The [accreditation review process](#) takes approximately 18 months. Requests for an extension are reviewed and acted upon by the CACREP Board. It is best to check with your program's designated CACREP staff member for further guidance.

- Q:** Good morning, can you provide some details on the survey to the counseling community?
- A:** We are working on assessment and evaluation area and will be seeking information on programs' current practices in these areas.
- Q:** How and to whom will the survey be sent?
- A:** Surveys are sent to the target audience or the groups that would be most knowledgeable about the topic for which data is being gathered. Typically, an email with the link is sent to the target audience.
- Q:** Who are the partner organizations? Is there a list of the partner organizations?
- A:** There is no published list of partner organizations. Membership and credentialing organizations in the Counseling profession who are engaged in the preparation and credentialing of counselors and that collaborate with CACREP are considered partner organizations.
- Q:** Will you be using surveys or similar evidence-based approaches to determine which curricular elements should be required?
- A:** Yes. Job analysis data from multiple sources are also used by the SRC to determine requisite counselor preparation.
- Q:** What data base will be used for the survey?
- A:** If the question is about survey dissemination, then that will be dependent on the target audience of the survey.
- Q:** Are you open to input from professionals in the field and professional organizations for specialty standards?
- A:** Yes, input from both these constituencies is an integral and typical part of the [standards revision process](#) through feedback on revision Drafts of the Standards released for public comment.
- Q:** You mentioned Try-Care: If we are seen as a profession and fall under the Profession envelop, should the specialties be acknowledged?
- A:** CACREP accredits programs by specialty practice area. External entities, like TRICARE, set their own criteria for recognition for practice and reimbursement.
- Q:** If the SRC identifies problems with current CACREP policy that are not part of the Standards themselves, what process will be used to address those problems.
- A:** The SRC's purview is solely to revise Standards as per its [charge](#) and does not review CACREP policy. It is the CACREP Board that determines policy.
- Q:** When you say as it relates to the profession, are you using profession broadly or is it the traditional meaning as Profession of Counseling?
- A:** Traditional meaning of the profession of counseling.
- Q:** Any plans to revise the approach to accreditation to be multi-phasic (e.g. phases to become fully accredited)?
- A:** This is a question for CACREP, approach to accreditation is outside the purview of the SRC. However, we are aware that the CACREP Board has approved a candidacy process.
- Q:** For such a large undertaking, I'm curious what tools you are using to write - such a google docs or good old fashioned MS Word, for instance. I'm curious about your process if you feel comfortable sharing!
- A:** CACREP uses ShareFile as the platform to share documents and collaborate. Documents are created using Microsoft products.

Q: Will this presentation be available after this meeting to share with colleagues at our institutions?

A: No, this session is not recorded.

General comments

- Thank you for your detailed update relative to technology use knowing the national standards are evolving! Will follow up w/ you!
- As for consideration of doc specialty practice areas, would it just be a choice from the 5 areas? CE/Sup/Couns/Advocacy & Leadership/Scholarship).
- Helpful conversation and update~ Thank you.
- Thanks so much to the standards review committee for all the work you are doing! Thanks for having these meetings, answering questions, and for sharing updates on next steps with the survey and public comments. Very helpful!
- Thanks for responding to both of my questions with where you all are so far. =)
- Thank you for speaking with us and for the hard work you are doing.
- Thanks to all! Look forward to more conversations...
- Thank you for all the hard work you all are doing!
- I really appreciate the work you are all doing, and the focus on purpose.
- Thank you! I just wanted to put that out there as I see more and more need in this area in my world as the state of SD is requiring counseling experience to work in probation/parole and the counseling piece isn't quite there yet.
- Thank you all so much for your investment and hard work!
- Thank you from Turkey.
- Thank you for your service.
- Hello all – just a comment. I do realize the role of liaisons and I do believe sending surveys to all faculty in accredited programs is necessary. So, I would send surveys to liaisons but ask them to share with the rest of the faculty.
- Definitely will need consumer feedback regard disability concepts.
- This is nit-picky! There are a number of current 2:F standards that are worded as “strategies ...” which make them somewhat convoluted, particularly under Career Development, k under Helping Relationships is another example of this.
- Suggestion rather than question related to the Core curricular standards ... it would help to add a preamble related to those Standards being focused on a combination of knowledge and skills-based attainment as Programs tend to lean toward “knowledge” in Section 2 and skills in Section 3...
- Consideration of more standards related to relationship building skills? Incorporating the common factors?
- Perhaps more of a CACREP question rather than SRC: How closely are we keeping watch on APA’s CoA work towards accrediting master’s degree programs in health service psychology (HSP), comprised of clinical, counseling, and school psychology programs.
- 5:C:2:f is odd ... seems like we should understand the impact of crisis/trauma not just for people with mental health diagnosis. I think the “strategies” standards seem like skills standards that are trying to be phrased as knowledge standards.
- It would be helpful if evidence-based specialty practice areas could provide training in areas of specific expertise (such as addictions counseling, MFT, rehabilitation counseling, etc.) without excluding them from job opportunities that require graduation from a clinical mental health counseling program. If programs can provide curricula and experiences designed to satisfy both clinical mental health counseling and a specialty area, that would be helpful to the profession.
- It seems that as a foundation, all counselors should be mental health counselors.

- Such cross-training considerations don't have to wait until the next set of standards are approved. If CACREP changes the Board policy requiring double-internships that could open opportunities before the new Standards are adopted.
- Don't need to respond to this... just a note. I appreciate that CACREP has never differentiated between the standards for online/on ground programs. However, if there is emerging evidence about what best practices are for online learning. I think it would be wrong to ignore. In theory a program could be designed where students and faculty never have a synchronous interaction until field experience group supervision.
- Thank you SRC for the VERY important work you are doing!
- Thank you all for this informative session.
- I agree. Thanks for the informative session and good questions from everyone.
- Thank you for the chat and sharing more information. I look forward to hearing more.