

President's Update

Patricia Nunez, MA, CRC, CDMS, CCM



As I begin my first President's update to you, I took a moment to review past CORE newsletters and President's messages. Linda Shaw, in her initial President message in January 2007 wondered if anyone's term as President of CORE started with as big a bang as hers did! This was during the time of the CORE-CACREP merger discussions and decision. Tom Evenson, in 2009, observed that he was relieved that he had no "bangs" of that magnitude as he began his Presidency. Well, Tom "ó" while your Presidency may have begun quietly I would say that you certainly concluded your Presidency with *quite* a bang: presiding over the CORE board as it came to a decision to become a corporate affiliate of CACREP!

I would like to offer some personal reflections on the board action taken on July 12, 2013. Tom and I were the only remaining Board members who had been on CORE at the time when the merger discussion came to an end in 2007. The Board at that time struggled with a decision that was complex and challenging,

with emotions that ran high on each side of the aisle. At the time, the CORE board chose a direction it believed was right for CORE at that time and all Board members, regardless of which side of the aisle they sat, supported that decision.

Fast forward to 2013, when a different set of board members sat around a table, and deliberated on an action that would reflect to the world an affiliation between CORE and CACREP. Not a merger, not dissolution, but an affiliation that brought unique benefits to both organizations. It was a different world now "ó" IOM, Tricare and DoD decisions were threatening to restrict access to work settings that rehabilitation counselors had unique skills to offer. The greater counseling profession, via 20/20, had been encouraging the 2 counseling accrediting bodies to "öget together" so that there would be one accreditation body for counseling. Tom Evenson outlined in his article the circumstances leading to the CORE Board decision on July 12th. Please see the joint article elsewhere in this newsletter which speaks in detail to the affiliation agreement reached by CACREP and CORE.

Additional CORE Board activity:

As you can imagine, the CORE-CACREP corporate affiliation has occupied and continues to occupy quite a bit of our time. However, we still have an accrediting body to run, so our work continues in many different areas. During our Strategic Planning session on July 13th, the CORE Board reviewed the current Commission structure, looking to determine if it is allowing us to work at peak efficiency. Knowing that there was no quick answer to this question, we agreed that a committee would be formed to study this issue. Therefore, I appointed an ad hoc Committee on Commission Structure and asked Susan Sherman to serve as chair. The ad hoc Committee has begun meeting to review our current Commission structure and make recommendations to streamline our

workflows and increase efficiencies. Also serving on the Committee are Cherie King, Lori Bruch, Penny Willmering, David Perry and Joe Kelly. Frank Lane is an ex-officio member of this committee, as is Kristie Andre, given their close involvement in the work of both Commissions.

Additionally, I appointed an Ethics Committee to review a complaint we received. Due to the nature of the complaint, an Ethics investigation seemed the most prudent way to proceed, and CORE by-laws (Article IX: Committees) has as one of five standing Committees - an Ethics Committee. I asked Tom Evenson to Chair that Committee, two former Board members of CORE served on the committee.

The Research Committee, Chaired by Mary Barros-Bailey with Beth Boland, Chuck Degeneffe, Charlie Palmer and Carrie Wilde has been very active in development of an RFP for our Standards Revision, which we will begin work on this year. Additionally, the Global Committee (chaired by Cherie King, along with Chuck Degeneffe and Mary Barros-Bailey) has been active in moving the global survey forward, strategizing on increasing responses from programs in other countries, and working to develop a proposal for a presentation at NCRE in the spring.

Based on some board changes discussed in Tom's article, we identified the need for a new standing committee: Nominations. This committee is Chaired by the Immediate Past President of CORE, and is responsible for the entire process surrounding bringing on new Board members, from the call, to candidate review and slate preparation. Since CORE now has Members-at-Large, we will be opening up nominations for anyone meeting established criteria to throw their hat in the ring for CORE Board service.

One final Committee will begin work this fall, an ad hoc committee on Marketing. This Committee will be Chaired by Beth Boland; membership on this committee is still being finalized, but this Committee will be charged with reviewing the needs of the Undergraduate Commission as well as the Graduate Commission in terms of public relations and marketing, identifying a strategic path to increasing awareness and interest in accredited programs as well as the a Global directory and the new Clinical Rehabilitation Counseling accreditation.

Last but certainly not least: CORE has been having very productive discussions with CRCC. Frank and I met with Cindy Chapman, CRCC Executive Director and Carolyn Rollins, CRCC Chair in mid-August, to

begin discussions of how our organizations can work together for the good of the profession. These meetings are sure to be productive and will allow for greater opportunity for collaboration and information exchange between CRCC and CORE.

CORE Executive Director Frank Lane will be reporting on additional activities of CORE elsewhere in this newsletter. I will say that I continue to marvel at the work that has been done at CORE since Frank was hired as our Executive Director. Frank keeps leadership continually involved in matters needing their attention, and that which does not need our attention, he handles and does so in an expeditious, professional manner. He has forged relationships with leaders within other counseling and accrediting organizations, and represents CORE well to all of our publics. Along with Kristie Andre, our Administrative Assistant at the CORE office, Frank keeps our accreditation business running smoothly. He, seemingly effortlessly, responds to inquiries from programs, from our own accrediting body (The Council for Higher Education Accreditation - CHEA), and keeps informed of changes and challenges in the world of higher education accreditation by his involvement with the Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditors (ASPA). CORE greatly appreciates the excellent work done by our staff, and recognizes the caliber of professional that we have in this team.

Let me close my first message to you with an observation, and a "thank you." Tom Evenson served as President of CORE from July 2009 to July 2013. Frank and I had the privilege of working closely with him for the last 3 years, and I will say there is no better advocate for our profession than Tom. As CORE President, he always kept the best interests of CORE as well as the rehabilitation counseling programs and its students paramount in any decisions he made, and he worked with everyone (internal to CORE and external entities as well) in a collaborative, respectful, and professional manner. In his article in this newsletter, Tom alludes to some challenges we had in the past few years, to get us to the point we are today. Challenges, there were a few, but even if circumstances led me to the point of banging my head against a table, Tom was the voice of reason and the source of humor for everything we encountered. CORE was incredibly lucky to have had such a strong leader for the past three years in Tom Evenson. So, personally and on behalf of CORE, I want to thank Tom for his friendship, for his dedicated leadership to our organization and for his continued guidance in serving as this body's Immediate Past President.

Note from Past President

Tom Evenson, Ph.D., CRC



The most important thing to report at this time is that CORE has maintained its excellence in carrying out its primary responsibilities in program accreditation at the graduate and undergraduate levels. The review processes and the support for programs preparing for or seeking accreditation have improved as well as expanded. In addition, CORE has invested significant time and resources into its targeted responsibilities of strengthening rehabilitation education, advancing rehabilitation counseling as an integral part of the counseling profession, broadening the foundation for undergraduate rehabilitation education, and working for unification within the broad field of rehabilitation. Progress has been made in all of these areas and we have moved beyond where we stood in each of them last year at this time. For this column, I will attempt to highlight some of the activities and accomplishments that have taken place in order for that progress to happen.

Among the significant efforts in terms of time, activity and outcomes was the CORE "Consortium Proposal" that was initiated at the CORE Board meeting last July. It was first developed, then formalized between July and September, and finally presented to the *20/20 Vision for the Future of Counseling*, the Board of the Council on Accreditation of Counseling and Related Programs (CACREP) as well as to the Governing Council of the American Counseling Association. The document was

widely disseminated and received positive feedback. While the 20/20 Oversight Committee declined to have the 20/20 group take action on it, the Consortium proposal was a key part of the group's discussions at its final annual meeting at the 2013 ACA Conference.

In addition, the proposal was presented and discussed at the NCRE/CSAVR/RSA conference in October, the annual conference of the American Association of State Counseling Boards in January, the American Counseling Association's national conference in March and the National Council on Rehabilitation's annual conference in April. The proposal prompted important discussions and collaborations with other rehabilitation organizations in an effort to strengthen the rehabilitation counseling profession. It is fair to say that the time and effort put into the Consortium Proposal by the CORE Board demonstrated significant leadership on their part and ultimately reflected positively on rehabilitation counseling's willingness and ability to collaborate with key counseling specializations and organizations.

The work that was done in developing and promoting the CORE Consortium proposal helped lead to direct discussions that took place between the leadership of CORE and CACREP. A series of key developments have occurred between January and June of 2013 that directly affected both CORE and CACREP. Those developments and events, culminating in the CORE Board's motion, prompted even more extensive and confidential discussions and led to decisions made at the July meeting of the CORE Board to become a Corporate Affiliate of CACREP while maintaining the independence and autonomy of CORE. This affiliation will be discussed elsewhere in this newsletter.

Another important development during the past year was the Board's decision to move the composition of the Board from a structure of membership that is based on nominations from CORE-recognized national professional associations to a structure of independent board members. The changes are designed to increase both the effectiveness and efficiency of the CORE Board while ensuring full autonomy in its decision-making process. Current board members will continue through their current terms of appointment. These changes align

CORE and its Board more closely with the direction that an increasing number of accreditation boards have been moving. The changes did not affect appointments to the CORE Graduate Commission or to the CORE Undergraduate Commission.

The final development that I would like to highlight is the work and accomplishments of three CORE committees that were initiated during the past year. The CORE Research Committee is comprised of Mary Barros-Bailey (chair), Beth Boland and Frank Lane (ex officio). This committee, formed at the July 2012 meeting, moved quickly to establish a mechanism for reviewing requests for the use of institutional data collected by CORE or any other information/data collected by CORE as part of the transmission of its business. CORE now has in place the means to confidentially and effectively support researchers who are interested in program-related data that advances the good of rehabilitation education.

The Global Registry Committee was also initiated at last year's July meeting and is comprised of Cherie King (chair), Chuck Degeneffe, Mary Barros-Bailey and Frank Lane (ex officio). Fred McFarlane has been instrumental in helping to launch this committee. The Global Registry was similar to the Research Committee in that it immediately established momentum in responding to its purpose. The committee has short-range and long-range goals that have significant implications for rehabilitation counseling and the rehabilitation profession. It hosted a well-attended and highly interactive meeting of students and educators at the NCRE conference in April which laid the foundation for collaborative international rehabilitation education initiatives. While CORE standards fit the needs of most rehabilitation professionals in the U.S., there is a need for varied guidelines/standards in other countries. There is a particular interest in CORE's contribution to the development of international guidelines for preparing a broader range of rehabilitation professionals.

The third active committee, the Committee on CORE Board Restructuring, was established following the special meeting of the CORE Board in April. It is comprised of Patty Nunez (chair), Mary Barros-Bailey, Joe Kelley, and Fred McFarlane. The committee worked to draft

a process for Board member selection in light of the by-law changes approved by the CORE Board in April. The committee also drafted a process document for composition of a CORE nominating committee for the new appointment structure to be used by CORE. Finally, the committee prepared a draft of competencies and expertise to guide CORE in the identification and selection of new Board members. All of the drafts and proposals by the Restructuring Committee were reviewed and approved by the board in July. The committee is to be commended due to the thoroughness of its work on the assignment and the alacrity with which it completed that assignment.

This is my last "President's Report." Its comparative brevity is my parting gift to you. It has been a very, very busy final year. It has been a road of highs and lows but I believe we're finally moving toward some level ground. Still, there is a long trip ahead of us and there will undoubtedly be parts of it that will continue to try our patience. But the current CORE Board, under Patty Nunez's leadership, is going to take us much, much further. This report is not complete until I highlight the honor it has been to work with this Board. It is CORE's very good fortune to have each one of these members. Similarly, CORE is blessed to have the caliber of Commissioners that it has on its two commissions. Finally, it is simply not possible for me to describe the experience of working so closely with Patty and Frank. There was never just one of us over the past two years. It's always been all three of us together and I think that has been a very good thing for CORE during these times.

As a Board, we have had questions, healthy skepticism and clear differences but we have been united in our focus on rehabilitation education. I've never experienced pleasing everyone on everything all of the time. It certainly couldn't happen during some of the changes that we have gone through over the last year. There were just too many variables. But it has been possible to maintain our collective focus on doing what we think is right for rehabilitation--and we have done that. It is the one stable thing that we have experienced through all the hills and valleys and that CORE has experienced over the last few years. That is why we are moving forward and that is why

we are going to continue to succeed. We can all take a little pride in that.

Thank you for the opportunity to work with CORE, an organization that is one of the cornerstones of our profession.

Annual Report of the Executive Director

Frank Lane, Ph.D., CRC, LCPC



The Council on Rehabilitation Education (CORE) has a long history of accrediting graduate programs in rehabilitation counseling. While CORE's business and resources remain strong, rehabilitation counseling is currently facing and will continue to face many challenges in the general counseling area of practice, accreditation and higher education. In order to adapt to these changes and survive, the CORE has had to make some important decisions. My role in the decision-making process has been to insure the board has the most accurate, up to date, and sufficient information with which to make decisions. My efforts in this area include legislative advocacy and education; communication with stakeholders by way of the website, listserv, and regular presentations; increased collaboration with stakeholders; and increased collection of data.

This is also an exciting time for CORE. The accreditation of undergraduate programs is an expansion of CORE's scope and the undergraduate commission continues to work towards developing the accreditation process and review eligible programs. The global

committee is also an opportunity for CORE. Representatives from other countries approached CORE leaders a few years ago about the possibility of working collaboratively on the development of global standards at all levels of education. The CORE board voted in July 2012 to adopt the global committee and preliminary work has been conducted over the past year.

CORE Business

Graduate Programs

The business of CORE remains strong. CORE currently accredits 96 graduate programs. There are currently 5,230 students in the 96 graduate programs currently, which is a decrease of 1% from the previous year. A total of 1,612 students graduated last year, which is an increase of 19% from the previous year. The increase in number of students graduating could be interpreted as students are graduating faster or in time with their cohort to a greater degree than before or it could also be a correction from the previous year's trend, which was a decrease of 10% from the year before. Either way, there is a significant amount of variability in the trend associated with graduating students so any interpretation should be made with caution.

Commission on Graduate Standards and Accreditation (CGSA). A total of thirteen graduate programs were reviewed this year: Michigan State University, The George Washington University, Coppin State University, Pennsylvania State University, University of Puerto Rico, University of Wisconsin-Stout, Ball State University, St. Cloud State University, Virginia Commonwealth University, Maryville University, Northern Illinois University, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey (formerly the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey), and University of Kentucky. The Commission on Graduate Standards and Accreditation (CGSA) reviewed the reports from the site review teams at their annual meeting on July 8-10 and made their recommendations regarding accreditation to the board and the decisions can be found on the CORE website.

Undergraduate Programs

CORE currently accredits 10 undergraduate programs and has 19 programs on the undergraduate registry. There are currently 1,423 students in undergraduate programs and 278 graduates over the past year.

Commission on Undergraduate Standards and Accreditation (CUSA). The undergraduate commission on standards and accreditation reviewed 2 programs this year (University of Texas-Pan American and Clarion University). The Commission on Undergraduate Standards and Accreditation (CUSA) reviewed the reports from the site review teams at their annual meeting on July 9-10 and made their recommendations regarding accreditation to the board at its annual meeting and the decisions can be found on the CORE website.

The undergraduate commission lost two of its longstanding commissioners this year, Chrisann Schiro Geist and Michelle Marmé. Michelle and Chrisann were recognized at the annual CUSA meeting in Chicago, Illinois in honor of their service and longstanding commitment to rehabilitation education. Dr. Brandi Darensbourg joined the undergraduate commission as the NAMRC representative and CORE welcomes her drive and experience on CUSA. With the transition of David Perry off CUSA in 2014, Penny Willmering, the NRA appointee to CUSA succeeded Dr. Perry as Chair of the undergraduate commission following the board meeting on July 13th. Dr. Willmering began her new duties after the July board meeting.

Global Committee

Fred McFarlane submitted a proposal at the July 2012 meeting to develop a global committee. The CORE board approved the proposal. Since that time, several activities have occurred. Mary Barros Bailey and I coordinated a meeting of what was formerly known as the International Rehabilitation Counseling Association (IRCA). The group had previously agreed to meet every two years at the International Forum on Disability Management (IFDM) conference. This year, the IFDM conference was held in London in September. Mary and I met with former IRCA delegates and two things were clear: (1) the global community is interested in

CORE taking the lead on working with representatives from other countries to develop global standards for rehabilitation and (2) meeting once every two years is insufficient to create the necessary momentum to get the work done. We agreed to hold the global committee meeting every year at the spring NCRE conference, which is held on the west coast of the United States.

CORE has begun to work more closely with the CHEA International Quality Group (CIQG) that is part of but separate from the standard CHEA recognition. CORE also became a member of GLADNET, Global Applied Disability Research and Information Network on Employment and Training. GLADNET's objective is to promote program and policy reform with an emphasis on employment for individuals with disabilities. They focus on collaborative research projects and a global exchange of information via the Internet. CORE is also working to become recognized by the International Network for Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education (INQAAHE). INQAAHE is a global organization with a mission similar to CHEA's. The intent is to focus on the development of standards and continuous improvement of quality assurance among agencies within higher education. A pre-conference workshop was held on April 17, 2013 at the spring NCRE conference in San Francisco. A total of 22 individuals from four countries were in attendance (Australia, Taiwan, Korea, and Japan).

Context of Accreditation

Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA). The CHEA Committee on Recognition recommended to the CHEA Board that CORE be recognized for a period of ten years with a report due in one year. CHEA specifically asked for an update on the steps CORE has taken to further distinguish between undergraduate programs that have been accredited and those that are still on the registry and CORE's implementation of CHEA standard 12.B.1, CORE's standard A.5 regarding public accountability.

In an attempt to standardize the outcome measures required by standard A.5, two meetings were held. The first meeting was held with the graduate commissioners. There was

general consensus among the commissioners that one of the recognized certification exams (CRCE, NCE, NCMHCE, or similar exam) is an important indicator. The commissioners also agreed on the importance of cohort performance, demographic characteristics of students, completion time, cost of attendance and employment settings where students work. A second teleconference was held with program coordinators and the information from the graduate commission meeting was presented. There was little consensus on the performance measures but a lot of good feedback.

The graduate commission met again at the annual meeting in July and revised the list of recommendations for A.5 based on input from the program coordinators. The CORE board reviewed the recommendations from the commission and made a final decision at its annual meeting. The report to CHEA is due on October 1st and programs will need to demonstrate compliance by September 16th. The importance of standardizing the performance measures is influenced largely by CHEA but also because of the role the federal government is taking with regards to accreditation.

Communication

CORE leadership, myself included, continues to believe the relationship between CORE and its accredited programs should be collaborative in nature. I have worked with Tom and Patty over the past year to focus on maintaining a regular exchange of information with the programs coordinators and to inform the conversation about current issues. The use of the website, listserv, and regular presentations and town-hall meetings, and the increase in use of teleconferencing are some of the mechanisms we have continued to utilize to accomplish this goal.

Website and Listserv. The website continues to undergo revisions over the past year. We are continuing to work with Joe Garro, the webmaster chosen from a competitive bidding process in January 2012. The content has been updated to further reflect CORE's attempt to distinguish the accreditation of undergraduate programs and programs that remain on the registry. We continue to use the listserv for program coordinators. The purpose of the Listserv is to maintain communication between

CORE and the programs. For example, information about CHEA recognition is an example of the information that has been disseminated.

While the listserv is one mechanism for communication, it has not facilitated conversation among the members. So, I have begun to utilize teleconferencing with the program coordinators. The last teleconference was held on February 15th to discuss the matter of standardizing program outcome measures for rehabilitation counseling programs. The specifics are covered in the section on program outcomes but the emphasis here is on the fact that there was a lot of discussion on the subject and I plan to utilize this method of communication more in the future.

Presentations. The second method of establishing a conversation with CORE accredited programs is the maintaining of regular and customary presentations about CORE business at the fall and spring NCRE conferences. At the fall conference, we presented "CORE Response to 20/20" on October 17, 2012 and at the spring conference, we presented "Council on Rehabilitation Response to 20/20" on April 18, 2013. Both presentations were plenary sessions and were held after the keynote address on the morning of the first day of the conference to ensure the maximum number of individuals received the information. A town-hall meeting followed the plenary session presentations at both conferences. The purpose of the town hall was to provide educators an opportunity to ask questions and express ideas to CORE leadership. Both town-hall meetings were well attended and it was standing room only at the spring conference. In addition to these sessions, I have sat on the legislative panel at fall and spring conferences to discuss legislation that is affecting rehabilitation counselors. NCRE continues to express interest in continuing the conversation at each conference and they have offered us space at the fall 2013 National Rehabilitation Education Conference in Washington, DC and the spring 2014 conference in Los Angeles, CA to continue the discussion.

Not all faculty and program directors are able to attend the fall and spring conferences in Washington, DC and San Francisco so we posted the presentations on the CORE website

under "What's New" so we can direct faculty who inquire about the presentation to the website.

Public Accountability. The input we received from the CHEA recognition process also modified the types of information we are communicating. CHEA is focused on public accountability and the new standard A.5 was developed in response to their feedback. The programs worked hard during February and March to publish information on their programs website pertaining to CRC passing rates, number of students admitted each year, CORE accreditation status, retention rate of students, and average GPA of students, to name a few. CHEA's focus on public accountability mirrors the focus of the federal government on the same issue. We will see an increased emphasis in this area and additional requirements for enhancing the types of information the programs will be required to report.

Operations

Survey of Graduates, Employers, and Students. CORE transitioned to on-line surveying of students, graduates and employers last year. As with many new processes, we experienced some challenges during the first year. The surveys were sent out much later than they should have, resulting in lower than optimal response rates, and when the surveys were sent to Planstone, the questions were not properly cross-referenced to the graduate standards and there were standards for which a question was not asked for students, employers and graduates to evaluate. Planstone was provided with completed questionnaires for the 2013 cycle of reviews. Kristie Andre and I also discussed the response rates for each program on a weekly basis from January through April, communicated the response rates to coordinators, and asked for their assistance in raising the response rates to the acceptable minimum level established by CORE. The result was an overall increase in the aggregate response rates for students, graduates and employers. While there was variability across programs being reviewed, the aggregate response rates by category met minimum standard.

CORE will continue to work with Planstone to develop the online questionnaire system. Kristie and I believe the improvement in response rates

and changes Planstone made in response to the graduate commissioners feedback in July 2012 has resulted in an effective system for CORE.

Automation of the APPR. As most of you know, CORE moved to an electronic reporting system in 2013 to make it easier for program coordinators to submit their data to CORE and for the data to be compiled and analyzed. As with most new systems, there were glitches that made it challenging for a few coordinators. We will work to improve the system and address the issues from 2013 before the 2014 report is due.

Collaboration

CORE cannot exist without the support of its stakeholders. I have continued to collaborate and develop relationships with representatives from partnering organizations on a consistent basis. I have also worked with appointing organizations to develop the composition of the CORE board so it more accurately reflects the cross-section of stakeholders. I have also met with stakeholders from within rehabilitation counseling and with those that represent the larger interests of the general counseling profession. The sections below are not exhaustive but highlights from CORE's initiatives with some of the organizations.

Professional Steering

C3 Initiative. In August 2012, we formed a group consisting of the Board Chair-President, Vice-Chair /President-Elect or Vice-President, and Executive Director of CORE, CRCC and CSAVR with the intent of it becoming a steering committee for rehabilitation counseling. Following a series of phone calls, the group decided to first tackle the issue of relevance of rehabilitation counselors. A committee was formed consisting of the Chair of CORE's research committee, Mary Barros Bailey, the Chair of the CSAVR research committee, and the Representative from CRCC's Testing and Research Committee, Carolyn Rollins. Dr. Barros Bailey accompanied me to the fall CSAVR meeting and met with the CSAVR research committee to begin the discussions. The work product of this committee is contained in Dr. Barros-Bailey's report.

CRCC. Carolyn Rollins, Chair of CRCC, expressed a desire to engage in regular

collaborative talks with CORE. Cindy Chapman and I coordinated a meeting for the Board Chairø and Execs of CORE and CRCC to meet on Friday, August 16th in Chicago, IL. The meeting went well and the two organizations discussed how they could collaborate over the next year. CRCC and CORE leadership met again on September 21st and developed a joint vision, mission statement and strategic initiatives.

State-Federal Government Collaboration

Consortium for State Administrators in Vocational Rehabilitation (CSAVR). I have worked to develop the relationship between CORE and CSAVR, with strong efforts on behalf of Mike O'Brien. I attended the Fall 2012 meeting in person and the spring 2013 meeting via teleconference. My efforts have been targeted specifically on the Human Resources and Development Committee, co-chaired by Anthony Sauer of California and Kathy Levendowski of Arizona. My presentation and participation to the group has continued to focus on educating them about issues regarding licensure for rehabilitation counselors and to garner their support for our efforts in this area. CSAVR voted, unanimously, in September to recognize CORE as the accreditation for masterø level trained rehabilitation counselors.

General Counseling

American Counseling Association (ACA). For the first time, CORE was granted the same access to ACA through the ability to (1) present to ACA Governing Council and (2) publish a regular column in Counseling Today, the main publication of the American Counseling Association (ACA). Tom Evenson, Patty Nunez, and I presented to Governing Council for the first time on March 16, 2013. We presented on the history of CORE emphasizing that øwe are counselors tooø and discussed the organizationø future plans for standards revision and the organizationø intent to involve ACA in the process. We also wrote an article that appeared in the March issue of Counseling Today titled øItø about all of us, Isnø it?ø The article was intentionally submitted for publication in the March issue so it would be read right before the ACA conference.

American Association of State Counseling Boards (AASCB). This past year was an important year for rehabilitation counselors at AASCB. Bill Green, a rehabilitation counselor educator from UMDNJ-now Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, was the President of the association and exercised his right to set the conference theme, which was unification. CORE was offered the option of presenting sessions to the membership and elected to discuss the issue of parity and why CORE believes that counselors who are trained in core knowledge domains have the potential to commit harm and, as a result, their practice must be regulated.

20/20 Vision for the Future of Counseling (Co-sponsored by AASCB and ACA). The 20/20 group ended at the ACA conference in Cincinnati, Ohio, having reached consensus on a title for licensed professional counselors and a scope of practice. The proposal put forth by the educational requirements committee that licensure should only be granted to graduates of CACREP accredited Clinical mental Health Counseling programs was hotly debated and, in the end, not voted on. What appeared to be a disappointing end to an eight year process did, however, provide the impetus for renewed discussions with CACREP.

Professional Rehabilitation Associations

National Council on Rehabilitation Education (NCRE). NCRE has been very gracious in working with CORE over the past year to ensure we have sufficient space at their fall and spring conferences to present current and relevant information about the issue of the federal recognition of CACREP graduates and the movement to restrict graduates from CORE programs for counselor licensure. CORE leadership has presented at a plenary session, concurrent session dealing with current legislation and a town hall meeting at both the fall and spring conferences over the past year. The town hall sessions have been well attended with the spring meeting being standing room only. The plan is to continue presenting both plenary and town hall sessions for the upcoming year.

National Rehabilitation Association (NRA). I have continued to stay in communication with Patricia Leahy who is also functioning as the interim executive director of the association. I

attended the governmental affairs summit in March and continue to work collaboratively with her, particularly over matters concerning the reauthorization of the rehab act.

International Association of Rehabilitation Professionals (IARP). I have focused a significant amount of my attention to developing the relationship between CORE and IARP. This has much to do with the fact that IARP was a recent addition to the CORE board and there have been a number of significant changes that were misinterpreted by their leadership. I have spoken to their board, along with Cherie King who has been instrumental at keeping their board informed. I have also been working closely with Lynne Tracy their current President to keep her informed. Cherie and I will be presenting a plenary session and a town hall meeting to inform their membership at the annual IARP Forensic conference in November 2013.

Conclusion

The business of CORE, the accreditation of graduate programs in rehabilitation counseling and now undergraduate programs in rehabilitation education, is strong. Along with our partner stakeholders, rehabilitation education will face significant challenges that have and will likely continue to impact graduates from the rehabilitation counseling programs, in particular. CORE has a board that is comprised of strong leaders in the field who are committed to guiding CORE through the current challenges and developing the business to ensure its viability in the future.

An Historic Agreement:

By Frank Lane & Carol Bobby:

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). CACREP and CORE entered into an historic affiliation agreement on July 12, 2013 and a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) on October 6, 2013 whereby CORE will become a corporate affiliate of CACREP. The agreement includes a process whereby programs that wish to apply for accreditation under CACREP's newly developed and adopted Clinical Rehabilitation Counseling program standards (to be implemented by CORE) will undergo a review process conducted jointly by CACREP and CORE. As part of this agreement, CORE and CACREP will also continue to accredit other programs within their respective scopes of practice.

Background:

On July 12, both CORE and CACREP Boards voted in favor of a document which outlined the parameters of our corporate affiliation. The basis for our agreement was a desire to affiliate to create a unified accreditation process for the counseling profession. Some elements of the agreement are:

- This affiliation will exist for a minimum of 5 years, and will be reviewed periodically to ensure we are working together effectively.
- Each board will have one seat designated for an individual nominated by the other board.
- CORE and CACREP will develop a joint process for implementing CACREP's Clinical Rehabilitation Counseling Standards.
- Until January 1, 2018, graduates of doctoral level RCE programs who graduate before this date will be eligible to serve as core faculty in CACREP accredited programs for life, including programs dually accredited by CORE and CACREP.

Both Boards voted in favor of the corporate affiliation proposal, contingent upon a review by CORE of CACREP's Clinical Rehabilitation Counseling standards that CORE would implement as part of the agreement. CORE appointed a team to conduct this review and the group recommended that CORE implement the CACREP Clinical Rehabilitation Counseling standards. The group concluded the Clinical Rehabilitation Counseling standards are very similar to CACREP's Clinical Mental Health Counseling standards, with an added disability focus. This speaks to a difference between

CORE standards and these new standards, adopted by CACREP. Note that the CACREP Clinical Rehabilitation Counseling standards have been included in CACREP's Draft 2 of the Standards Revision process, and can be accessed and commented upon by going to the CACREP website, or at this link: <http://www.cacrep.org/template/page.cfm?id=141>. We encourage all Rehabilitation Counseling professionals to review the standards and provide direct feedback to CACREP.

We finalized a press release that went out to our various publics within rehabilitation counseling as well as the larger counseling field to announce this affiliation on July 31st. CORE held calls with strategic partners at the time of the public notice, such as CRCC and ACA. CORE also conducted two informational calls open to the Program Directors as well as leaders of the Rehabilitation Counseling related professional associations on the afternoon of July 31st. While we did not have all the answers at that time, it was important to CORE to communicate with the rehabilitation counseling community.

CORE's Executive Director Frank Lane, Patty Nunez, CORE Board President, Carol Bobby, CACREP CEO and the CACREP Board Chair, Sylvia Fernandez met on August 3rd and began to develop the framework for our work together, specifically the conversion policy, joint advocacy efforts, framework/parameters of selection of board members/liaisons and clarification of their roles, and reviewing joint presentations we will be conducting in the fall and spring.

Work has continued through August and into September, and we just finalized a conversion policy for programs that can meet the criteria to convert from a CORE-accredited Rehabilitation Counseling program to a dually accredited Clinical Rehabilitation Counseling and Clinical Mental Health Counseling program. We also finalized a Memorandum of Agreement that memorializes this affiliation. We will be presenting jointly with CACREP at the following conferences: ACES in October, AASCB in January, NCRE as well as ACA in March. CORE will also be providing an update on status of this agreement to NCRE and IARP in November.

Accreditation Decisions from July 2013 Annual Meeting

Graduate

Ball State University ó 8 year accreditation
Coppin State University ó 8 year accreditation
The George Washington University ó 8 year accreditation
Maryville University ó 8 year accreditation
Michigan State University ó 8 year accreditation
Northern Illinois University ó 8 year accreditation
Pennsylvania State University ó 8 year accreditation
Saint Cloud State University ó 8 year accreditation
University of Kentucky ó 8 year accreditation
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey ó 8 year accreditation
University of Puerto Rico ó 8 year accreditation
University of Wisconsin-Stout ó 8 year accreditation
Virginia Commonwealth University ó 8 year accreditation
Adler School of Professional Psychology ó On Probation

Undergraduate

Clarion University ó 8 year accreditation
University of Texas-Pan American ó 8 year accreditation

CORE Executive Committee

Patricia Nunez, President
Mary Barros-Bailey, President-Elect
Susan Sherman, Secretary/Treasurer
Tom Evenson, Past President
Lori Bruch, Chair of Graduate Commission
Penny Willmering, Chair of Undergraduate Commission
Frank Lane, Executive Director, (Ex-Officio, Non-Voting)

CORE Board Members

Mary Barros-Bailey	Charles Degeneffe	Cherie King	Caroline Wilde
David Beach	Tom Evenson	Patricia Nunez	Penny Willmering
Elizabeth Boland	William Gibson	Charles Palmer	
Lori Bruch	Joe Kelley	Susan Sherman	

Graduate Commission Members

Scott Beveridge	Yolanda Edwards	John Meltzer
Lori Bruch, Chairperson	Juliet Fried	Michelle Pointer
J. Patrick Decoteau	Debra Harley	Aimee Speers
Chandra Donnell	Connie McReynolds	Michelle Wilson

Undergraduate Commission Members

Karen Barrett	David Perry	Penny Willmering,
Brandi Darensbourg	Regina Robertson	Chairperson
J. Chad Duncan	Tom Shefcik	

CORE Staff

Kristie Andre, Administrative Office
Phone: (847) 944-1345 Fax: (847) 944-1346
Email: kandre@core-rehab.org

Frank Lane, Executive Director
Phone (847) 944-1345 Direct Line: (773) 250-4983
Fax: (847) 944-1346
Email: lane@iit.edu

Patricia Nunez, President
Phone: (714) 674-5728 Fax: (714) 256-7906
Email: patricia.nunez@cna.com

1699 E. Woodfield Road, Suite 300
Schaumburg, IL 60173
Phone: (847) 944-1345
Fax: (847) 944-1346