

CORE *News*

Volume 18, Number 1

Council on Rehabilitation Education

April 2008



*Linda R. Shaw, Ph.D., LMHC, CRC
CORE President*

President's Report 2007

This was an amazing year! A year of exploring the possibilities and confirming the validity of our process; a year of progress in collaborating with other organizations to move the profession forward; and a year of continuing to honor our commitment to use the accreditation process to support the self-improvement of our accredited programs. As many of you are well aware, the past year of activity by CORE was dominated, at least in the public view, by the drafting of a merger agreement between CORE and CACREP. Ultimately, this did not come to fruition, although it followed a process of dedicated

and hard work on the part of the CORE/CACREP Merger Task Force to develop a merger agreement that would prove maximally beneficial to rehabilitation counselor education, as well as to counselor education in general. Due to the task force's diligent and dedicated efforts, they produced an agreement that had many strengths, but included some provisions related to faculty numbers and qualifications that resulted in a decision by the full CORE Board to issue a resolution to proceed only if CACREP chose to revisit the problematic faculty issues. Because CACREP felt strongly that they could not revisit these specific standards at this time, the merger plans did not proceed further. While I think it is fair to say that both CORE and CACREP were disappointed that we were not able to bridge these differences, the process itself was a good and a healthy one.

Why would I say that, when the process ended without a merger? Well, there are several very important reasons. First, and maybe foremost, I believe CORE's decision to enter into these discussions was exactly the right thing to do and the right time to do it. There was an acknowledgement among the board members that our traditional way of operating, which is separate from the rest of the counseling profession, has often resulted in an inability to position ourselves to capitalize on opportunities for the constituents we represent.

While not everyone agreed on the concept of a merger, I believe most rehabilitation counselor educators agreed that our standard way of doing things has placed us at a disadvantage. I firmly believe that CORE's willingness to explore other avenues and to look "outside the box" for ways to strengthen our position with licensure boards, third party payers, and regulators was, and still is, laudable. I very much hope that the same courage and creativity that led us down this road leads us down others that are similarly innovative and forward-looking, instead of staying mired in our historical way of doing things.

Second, the careful and responsible deliberations of the task force and the full CORE Board reaffirmed my belief that this group of professionals takes their responsibility to the profession very seriously. While they are willing to explore the possibilities, they are careful about protecting our rehabilitation counselor education programs and the consumers who ultimately benefit from the high quality of education that their counselors receive. Third, the response of the profession to the deliberations was amazing! While the merger was unquestionably controversial, it was heartening to see a level of involvement and investment in the future of the profession that was unprecedented in my memory (and I've been around awhile)!

Since our annual meeting, I've heard quite a few comments, such as "What now?" There seems to be a feeling that although the merger might not have been "the answer," the question remains. Furthermore, there seems to be recognition that there is a need for action, NOW! At our mid-year board meeting we had a lengthy discussion about the "What now?" question. The Board, I am happy to report, remains committed to tackling our difficult issues and concerns. Among the future projects discussed, the following were emphasized:

- ❖ The need to engage in a careful look at the challenges affecting rehabilitation counseling programs and to examine ways in which CORE can support strengthening those programs' positions within their institutional settings.
- ❖ The need to develop a targeted plan for enhancing access by rehabilitation counselors to the credentials and the practice settings in which they are qualified to practice, by their education in CORE-accredited programs.
- ❖ The need to develop an action-oriented strategic plan that will guide the activities of the organization in the coming months and years.
- ❖ A strong commitment to continue to collaborate with other organizations, both within rehabilitation counseling and other arenas with which we share similar goals.
- ❖ The importance of engaging in a re-examination of the role of undergraduate education in the preparation of qualified rehabilitation professionals to serve as: 1) the basis for preparing students to work in community rehabilitation programs; and, 2) a basic education upon which a masters-level rehabilitation counseling degree might be designed.
- ❖ The need to continue to strengthen the accreditation process through education, training,

and consultation, and by continually updating our standards and processes to reflect changes in the field.

- ❖ A reaffirmation of the importance of keeping all of our stakeholders informed and engaged in CORE activities.

We have already made substantial progress in many of the above areas. In January, we presented at the American Association of State Counseling Boards (AASCB) on a tool jointly developed by CORE, CRCC, and ARCA to assist State Boards in evaluating applications from graduates of CORE-accredited programs. We also presented preliminary results of a research project that examined the responses of students, graduates, and employers on the accreditation surveys at the NCRE Conference. This study will be submitted for publication in an effort to reach as many educators as possible. We have continued to work closely with the Rehabilitation Counseling Consortium and have actively participated in that group's meetings. We continue to participate in the ACA 20/20 Visioning Project. Additionally, both CORE and CACREP have committed to future collaboration in areas of mutual interest.



The Board is currently engaged in several exciting projects and activities, including a new joint project with CRCC, in which we are tracking the status of rehabilitation counseling in licensure laws, and intervening directly in those states where there are current threats and opportunities for progressive change; examining the challenges and opportunities that exist for our accredited programs; examining the ways in which we measure learning outcomes; and beginning the planning process for standards revision.

In July, we will engage in a full day of strategic planning to create a blueprint for our future activity. All in all, it's been an exciting and energizing year and I believe that we are perfectly positioned to move ahead in productive and promising new directions. It was an honor to serve as President of CORE and to work with Marv Kuehn, our Executive Director, and with this very talented and committed group of individuals.



Executive Director's Report

7/16/07 – 3/1/08

Marvin D. Kuehn, Ph.D., CRC, NCC

This report summarizes the priorities and accomplishments of CORE during the last year. It also serves as a summary of the activities of the Executive Director during the past year. In general, CORE was successful in promoting greater understanding of issues, assisting programs in improving the relevance of academic preparation, and effectively addressing administrative concerns and organizational policy.

Accomplishments and Priorities

One major task that is presently receiving needed attention is **the redesigning of the CORE website** so that timely information can be provided to individuals and institutions interested in the accreditation process of CORE. When the changes are completed this spring, the following items should be valuable additions for the CORE website:

- A listing of doctoral programs that offer training in rehabilitation, including degree and specializations offered, basic degree requirements, contact information, etc.;
- A listing of masters degree programs that offer on-line courses, including hours required, transfer work accepted, course options available, areas of concentration, etc.; and
- A list of the most frequently asked questions (FAQs) about CORE standards and the CORE review process.

In July 2008, CORE will review accreditation applications of 15 programs. CORE currently recognizes 102 programs, with six programs in candidate status and two applicants. CORE anticipates applications from 15 additional programs that wish to be reviewed or reaccredited during 2008-09.

During the last year, CORE was informed that five programs are not renewing their CORE accreditation for a variety of reasons. Those programs are University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Syracuse

University, St. John's University, Ohio State University, and Boston University. Additionally, the University of Missouri is closing its program in August of 2008. All of these programs are/were well established. The reasons for these actions are not completely clear at this time, however, funding issues and merging of academic programs within university departments appear to be two significant reasons for the decisions not to reapply. Additional follow up is occurring to acquire a clearer understanding of these decisions. It is important to note, however, that the total number of CORE accredited programs continues to increase, due to new programs applying and acquiring accreditation.

Site Visitor Training

Last year CORE revised the *Site Visitor Manual* and the reviewer training program to improve the skills of site reviewers. Site visitor training was conducted on February 14, 2008, during the NCRE Conference in San Antonio. Twenty-seven individuals participated in the training. A new mock Site Visit Report was developed to assist reviewers in identifying various strengths and weaknesses of program self-studies and to evaluate the documentation programs provide.



Due to new changes in the guidelines for writing site visit reports and assessment of standards, Commission and CORE members will participate in a training program just prior to the annual meeting in July. Because some members have not participated in a site visit using the new standards, this "refresher session" is intended to support both groups in editing the final summary reports and making consistent and justifiable decisions about new or continuing accreditation. The sessions will focus on interpretation of standards and consistency in the format and wording of comments provided by reviewers about program strengths and weaknesses. The sessions will also clarify issues related to assessment of standards that include multiple sub-standards.

Important Accreditation Meetings

During the past year I attended two important meetings that allowed me to meet the executive directors of many major accrediting organizations in the United States. I was able to attend two Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditors (ASPA) meetings, in Denver in July and in Chicago in March. Learning more about the national perspectives on accreditation and participating in meeting discussions were enlightening. The opportunity to interact with other executive directors provided tremendous opportunities for insight and comparisons; understanding how other accrediting organizations have addressed specific issues and handled administrative concerns was very valuable.



Revisions of two components of the *Health Professions Career and Education Directory* related to rehabilitation counseling were completed on October 28, 2007, and included information on the history, structure, and purpose of CORE, as well as background on the history, job description, employment characteristics and outlook, and education programs that prepare professional rehabilitation counselors. It is hoped these revisions present a more up-to-date picture of CORE, the scope of services provided by rehabilitation counseling professionals, and the breadth of settings in which rehabilitation counselors are attaining employment.

Collaboration

On November 16th, a conference call was arranged by NRA to discuss the current and future status of rehabilitation counseling and to discuss possible collaborative actions that might be appropriate in the future. Several individuals representing NRA, CRCC, NCRE, NRCA, ARCA, and CORE were involved in the call. Many questions were raised and several participants offered personal perspectives about the issues. Discussion included promoting a unified sense of identity of rehabilitation counseling, and affirmation of the value of the CRCC credential

was clear. Some excellent questions were posed that indirectly related to perceptions of rehabilitation counseling, such as: Should professional rehabilitation organizations be more proactive? Are rehabilitation counselors still viewed as unique in the counseling field? How can we effectively capture the value of both unity and diversity? What kind of coalition is needed? What are the indicators of our “health”? Is our literature being read? Who are our allies? What will the result be from recent merger discussions? What are the influences that contribute to identity confusion versus a clearly defined identity? How can we respond to competition for students, merging departments, low salaries in some employment sectors, employer needs, and the growing interest in licensure versus certification?

Linda Holloway, President of NCRE, arranged a meeting at the NCRE Conference in San Antonio for key leadership members to further expand the discussion started from this conference call. Most felt the discussion which occurred was valuable and a good beginning. Most also agreed that there is a need to move beyond discussion and to focus on action.

The importance of cooperative and collaborative efforts in all organizations concerned with improving services to individuals experiencing disability are indications of the responsiveness, viability, and the valuable contributions that occur from the existence of CORE.

Undergraduate Registry

Interest continues from the Committee on Undergraduate Education (CUE) regarding the possibility of CORE supporting the expansion of its mission and purpose to include the accreditation of undergraduate programs. Undergraduate programs continue to be concerned with recognition and acceptance of the value of undergraduate education in rehabilitation; CUE is continuing to explore recognition options both within and outside of CORE. The importance of recognition of individual competence seems to be a major concern. Meaningful dialogue about increased recognition appears to be developing within the leadership of both CUE and CORE.

Online Self-Study Document

In 2007, CORE accepted the suggestion that programs could submit the self-study document (SSD) electronically (on-line). Feedback from a few site visitors who have reviewed the first self-studies

submitted on CD indicate it saves space but in many cases a hard copy may still be needed so materials can be compared and reviewed quickly. Receiving the SSD information on a CD also ties a reviewer to a computer. The need for written guidelines will be an agenda item at the annual meeting in July 2008. Other accreditation organizations have indicated that guidelines need to be very clear with a format that makes access to information logical and easy to understand. Recent discussion at the ASPA meeting in March indicated there is growing interest by specialized accrediting organizations in data management systems to reduce the paperwork needed in self-studies and to streamline administrative procedures by accrediting organizations. The cost is still a significant issue for many accrediting organizations.

Results of Merger Discussions

Probably the most time-consuming activity of CORE during this past year was the discussion and consideration of the potential value of a merger between CORE and CACREP. Even though this merger did not occur, the discussion and interaction with the CACREP Task Force culminated in a greater understanding of the many strengths and philosophies that support the accreditation procedures of each organization. CORE chose not to support the merger as proposed in July; the deciding factors related basically to issues involving faculty qualifications and number of program faculty necessary for recognition.



The discussion of the merger possibility triggered an increased awareness of the expanding identity of rehabilitation counseling and challenges faced by graduates of these programs in obtaining employment in areas for which they are qualified. Rehabilitation counseling professionals recognize that they are fully qualified to practice as counselors and also appreciate the importance of the value of **rehabilitation** counseling and the unique role it plays in the greater arena of the counseling field. Perceptions and recognition by others in the helping/counseling field

in general may not be as clear and accepted as desired. Recent merger discussions, as well as other activities during the past year, have resulted in the identification of several new initiatives and projects for the coming year:

- Revisions of CORE standards and the establishment of a new strategic plan for CORE;
- Examination of how CORE evaluates student learning outcomes through its standards; and
- The role of undergraduate rehabilitation services and disability studies programs on masters level recruitment and preparation.

Topics/Objectives for Consideration in the Future

As we look forward to the next CORE standards revision, there are a number of questions that will need to be addressed. Some of these include:

- Does CORE need to re-evaluate the expectations (number, redundancy, etc.) of standards, particularly the Section C standards dealing with curricula?
- Should the way the standards and sub-standards are written be changed?
- Do assessments of these standards relate directly to the outcomes that programs and graduates can demonstrate?

The new emphasis on outcomes is based on perceptions from ASPA and Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) meetings, and from the reports of discussions that have been occurring in such places as the regional accrediting organizations in higher education and the U.S. Dept. of Education. Consequently, CORE will be giving more attention to “evidence-based” research on curricula.

Questions have arisen about accrediting programs advertising both on-line and campus-based degree programs at one institution (an on-campus program and a distance education program) where faculty are utilized from other institutions. Additionally, more and more programs are hiring faculty who can teach in multiple programs in a department. This includes instructors who can teach in other masters degree programs, or in both graduate and undergraduate rehabilitation programs. Many programs are also hiring part-time faculty; many are sharing a program coordinator with another department program, resulting in a part-time rehabilitation counseling program coordinator.

Some of the faculty that programs are hiring are not certified, but are licensed, sometimes as counselors and sometimes as psychologists. CORE will be considering whether there is a need to provide more guidance to programs and site visitors regarding what is expected in terms of the qualifications of faculty involved in a program. Is there a need to revise CORE standards regarding faculty qualifications? In 2007, CORE decided that all programs, including both on-campus and distance education, must submit vitae for all individuals responsible for teaching and/or supervision of students in the program. In the last six months, there have also been some inquiries asking whether a program can continue to be accredited if it becomes a track in another degree program (e.g., a rehabilitation track in a mental health counseling degree program).

Input from site reviewers and Commissioners about faculty qualifications and becoming a “program track” will be sought during the annual accreditation meeting in 2008; it is anticipated that these issues will be reviewed by CORE for policy consideration in July 2008. Comments from individuals who are interested in these issues are welcomed.

In July 2007, the CORE Board affirmed the importance of “direct service to individuals with disabilities in practica and internships.” *Direct service* means the application of counseling and case management skills with consumers, including the use of consultant and advocacy skills on behalf of consumers. In general, the term refers to time spent by practicum and internship students working with and for consumers.

Another issue that CORE may address in the future is **exploration of ways to provide additional, consultative assistance to programs versus program evaluation only.** Other national accreditation organizations are discussing this initiative as well. Efforts to provide this service would be consistent with the mission of CORE and provide substantive assistance to help universities to improve the quality and scope of their programs. In the past, the appropriateness of providing suggestions in an accreditation report was unclear and often avoided. Some feel this could be of significant value to programs that want assistance and suggestions in order to improve their curricula and policies.

The Commission and CORE Board must continue to review procedures and policies each year to maintain relevance, consistency, and credibility. Individual involvement by practitioners and educators in

supporting the importance of rehabilitation counseling services is essential to foster accreditation recognition, professional identity, and competence.

Summary

The issues facing programs accredited by CORE in the future will be most challenging. The future of CORE will be determined by the commitment and vision of the individuals that serve on the Commission and CORE. In the past, they have been very dedicated and have been responsive and willing to examine many time-consuming issues throughout the year.

Dr. Linda Shaw has been an articulate President for CORE, pursuing professional concerns and fostering relationships with other organizations. She was helpful in contacting individuals and establishing alliances with other groups as she has represented CORE and participated in various conferences and activities to enhance the understanding of accreditation standards. Dr. Carluccio was also efficient and organized as he guided the Commission in its review of site visitor reports and accreditation self-study documents. He was thorough and provided outstanding leadership as Chair of the Commission. Sue Denys, of the CORE Office, has helped in numerous ways by providing information to programs and completing administrative tasks to address the daily or weekly concerns and issues that have arisen. Sue is the glue that keeps things together, reminding leadership of the tasks or decisions that need to be addressed.

The Executive Director has an obligation to provide accredited programs and the leadership of CORE with information on national issues influencing accreditation efforts, what the major trends are, and what might need to occur to maintain a viable, proactive accreditation organization. Because there is limited time available to discuss issues at the Annual Meeting in July, as much of the time is taken up by other tasks and priorities related to program accreditation decisions, the full CORE Board and Commission will engage in a full additional day of strategic planning this year to ensure that the organization is honoring its commitment to carefully evaluate the needs, priorities, and plan of action related to its accreditation mission.

It is hoped the information provided in the *CORE News* helps rehabilitation counseling program faculty and others interested in the activities of CORE understand the issues and priorities of the accrediting

organization. The success and relevance of the Commission and CORE are only possible if the leadership and members are provided with up-to-date information and are knowledgeable regarding the issues that influence the accreditation process and recognition of quality academic programs.

CORE will respond to the issues that emerge and will establish priorities to strengthen rehabilitation counseling programs and appropriately address challenges that may appear in the future. With changes in the employment opportunities for rehabilitation counseling graduates and the current funding issues in higher education, determining the types and ways that accredited rehabilitation counseling programs can be most effective will require continuing discussion, evaluation, and reflection.



Increasing Emphasis on Student Learning Outcomes

Related to the issue of control of accreditation is the challenge (which many perceive is being communicated to Universities from national organizations like CHEA, NCATE, and the Department of Education) **to address assessment of student learning outcomes.** In the past, there has been great effort placed on ESTABLISHING standards for academic programs but now the priority is changing. The Department of Education (DOE) has criticized accreditation organizations about how standards are ASSESSED. DOE asserts that academic programs have been good at collecting data, but have not been very convincing at measuring competency, dispositions, and outcomes using traditional assessment approaches.

Recent ASPA and CHEA meetings have identified this assessment issue as an important component (new priority) of program accreditation that may require much time to articulate, justify, and implement. A major obstacle will be faculty independence and autonomy, and finding ways to recognize faculty who develop effective approaches to assessment. The challenge for many accrediting organizations will be how to define and explain the relationships among the terms *accountability, standards, and assessment.* How program standards should be revised and assessed will require a well-

thought-out plan on how assessment strategies for **the next Standards Review Project should be designed.** What should the focus of a self-study be? What are students learning and how do we know that they are learning? How are critical thinking, analytical reasoning, written communication, and problem resolution concepts being emphasized and evaluated in curricula? Will there be a new focus on the teaching and learning of “soft skills” by graduates? A proposed timeline for the CORE Standards Review Project, incorporating meaningful examples of student learning outcomes, will be developed for the CORE meeting in July 2008.

External Control of Accreditation in Higher Education

During the past six months there has been significant concern about “regulatory creep” and the perceived agenda of the U.S. Department of Education’s Commission on the Future of Higher Education. There has been much discussion about federalizing accreditation and the inability of institutions of higher education to address institutional performance issues and focus on student learning. There is a growing demand for increased accountability to consumers and the general public. The influence of distance education and the delivery of higher education is blurring traditional academic disciplines, programs, and modes of delivery, particularly as it relates to the transfer process of academic work. Discussions on this topic that have occurred within ASPA and CHEA meetings have been enlightening. Simple solutions to implementing procedures to achieve “performance outcome measures” were not readily apparent. Achieving agreement on the process and on what constitutes a measurable outcome is often not accomplished quickly. This process requires decisions about what is most important and cost effective, and which priorities must be addressed first. These issues appear to be major external influences that dictate or limit the activities of CORE and all accreditation organizations in the near future.

Importance of Site Reviewers

CORE has been fortunate over the years to have many capable and qualified individuals volunteer to serve as accreditation site reviewers. All have been expected to participate in site visitor training and to keep informed of changes in CORE standards and

policy. Most reviewers see the benefits of the experience and enjoy the opportunity to learn how other programs address concerns, approach curriculum content, and evaluate student dispositions. While reviewers are not paid for their time, their expenses are covered by the programs they review, and they do have the opportunity to earn CRCC/CEU credits for the reviews they conduct.

Through site visitor training, CORE attempts to assist review teams in addressing the challenges faced in preparing for the site visit and the concerns identified in the review of an SSD and the actual on-site visit. The CORE administrative office and the Commission make clear the expectations of site visitors, their responsibilities, and the importance of their affirmative response if asked to serve on a site team.

CORE greatly appreciates the efforts and commitment of site reviewers who strive to objectively review the strengths and weaknesses of programs during the accreditation site visit process. Most reviewers turn challenges into valuable learning opportunities and experiences; at the same time, they provide constructive feedback which assists in the improvement of the academic programs they review. Individuals who are interested in serving as accreditation site reviewers should contact the CORE office at 847-944-1345 to obtain information about eligibility to serve and the requirements necessary for selection as a reviewer.

Standards Review Project 2008-2010

As a not-for-profit 501C3 organization, CORE is charged with the responsibility of serving the public interest. As an accreditation organization recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA), CORE has indicated in its policies that it will conduct a comprehensive review of its standards every five years. One element of serving the public interest, as well as facilitation of the effectiveness of an accrediting body's own evaluations, is to increase the efficiency and consistency of the accreditation evaluation process. Although CORE attempts to avoid duplication of effort with other accrediting bodies and regulatory agencies, the right is reserved to re-examine areas that are of particular importance to the field of rehabilitation.

CORE is committed to conducting a valid and reliable accrediting process. Review and revision of the CORE standards are regular parts of its activities.

CORE is planning to initiate another standards review project beginning in September 2008. *Programs or individuals who wish to suggest changes to the standards will be invited to submit their suggestions in writing.* The procedure for revision of standards, as stated in the *CORE Accreditation Manual*, is as follows:

1. CORE will review the standards at least every five years. CORE may review, revise, delete, or add individual standards at any time it deems appropriate, provided that accredited programs and other interested parties are given an opportunity to comment before the standards are adopted.
2. As part of the standards review process, CORE will publish proposed changes to accredited programs, appointing organizations, and other interested parties.
3. Following the review of comments on the standards, CORE may elect to re-publish a revised draft for additional comments.
4. When the comment solicitation and review processes are complete, CORE will take action to adopt the standards.

CORE will seek appropriate input at various times during the next two years from interested organizations, groups, and individuals. The timeline for the project will be provided to interested organizations after it is approved in July at the CORE Annual Meeting.



What is Program Website Accessibility?

During the last year, two program coordinators have requested clarification on the expectations of CORE regarding the last sentence of Standard A.1, which states: **“These statements shall be in accessible format and meet national website accessibility standards.”** The coordinators' questions were focused around what evidence programs need to provide and which accessibility evaluation tools can be used. CORE believes it may be helpful in the future to (1) provide additional information *to program coordinators* on what would be acceptable evidence in response to the standard; and (2) provide

guidance *to site visitors* on what they should look for or suggest to programs regarding this standard. The following information has been provided to help everyone gain a basic understanding of what program website accessibility means. This reflects what CORE has been communicating to reviewers and program coordinators in response to the inquiries regarding Standard A.1.



“Various website evaluation tools can be used to determine if websites are in compliance. The specific appearance or existence of a university website is not the issue but whether individuals who may have a disability can access a specific program website. Some commercial evaluation tools are very good at identifying what is not accessible while others are very general and only tell the user what is not in compliance with Section 508.”

Websites and tools that are frequently helpful include:

- www.cynthiasays.com
- <http://webxact.watchfire.com>
- www.jimthatcher.com/websource1
- www.webaim.org/standards/508

We are learning from experts on website accessibility that this is a very complex issue, suggesting that site reviewers need considerable guidance. Program coordinators need assistance as well, to adequately meet the standard. CORE will be reviewing the wording and intent of this standard in July to help reduce confusion about website accessibility and to develop information to help reviewers and program coordinators in the future.

**Council on Rehabilitation
Education**

*300 N. Martingale Road, Suite 460
Schaumburg, IL 60173
Phone: 847-944-1345 FAX: 944-1324*

Fee Increase Implemented

Following a discussion about increased costs at its Mid-Year Meeting in January 2007, CORE approved the following fee schedule to begin with the 2008-2009 review cycle. The accreditation fee will increase 5% each year over the next five years.

APPLICATION FEES:

- Applicants for Candidate or Accreditation status: \$250 non-refundable processing fee to accompany application and a \$1,750 accreditation evaluation fee.
- Applicants currently accredited: \$1,750 due by October 1 of academic year applying

CORE OFFICE HOURS

CORE’s Administrative Office is open Monday through Thursday, from 8:00 A.M. to 1:00 P.M., Central Time. The office is equipped with voice mail so that messages can be left at anytime.

CORE Administrative Office

Ms. Sue Denys

Telephone: (847) 944-1345

FAX: (847) 944-1324

E-Mail: sdenys@foundrehab.org

CORE Executive Director

Dr. Marvin D. Kuehn

Telephone: (620) 341-5795

FAX: (620) 341-6200

E-Mail: mkuehn@emporia.edu

CORE President

Dr. Linda R. Shaw

Telephone: 352-273-6745

Fax: 352-273-6048

Email: lshaw@phhp.ufl.edu

CORE News Editor

Dr. Katrina R. Miller

Telephone: 620-341-5231

Fax: 620-341-6200

Email: kmille12@emporia.edu