

CORE News

Volume 19, Number 1

Council on Rehabilitation Education

January 2009

Amendments to ADA, 2008

Since faculty of most all rehabilitation counseling programs discuss the significant federal legislation that impacts on individuals with disabilities, the following information is provided as an update for class presentations and student education and awareness.

Eighteen years ago, the Americans with Disabilities Act, or ADA, was signed into law by President George H.W. Bush. It prohibits discrimination against individuals with disabilities and requires employers to make reasonable accommodations for qualified individuals to perform the essential function of their jobs. Critics, however, complained for years that court decisions limited the ADA to the point it has never achieved its intended purpose.

On September 25, 2008, President George W. Bush signed the Americans with Disabilities Act Amendments Act (ADAAA). The amended Act makes important changes to the definition of the term “disability” by rejecting the holdings in several Supreme Court decisions and portions of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission’s (EEOC) ADA regulations. The Act retains the ADA’s basic definition of “disability” as an impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities, a record of such an impairment, or being regarded as having such an impairment. However, it changes the way that these statutory terms should be interpreted in several ways.

EEOC regulations defined “substantially limits” as “significantly restricts” which is inconsistent with the intent of Congress when it passed ADA.

To understand the changes it’s important to understand why the ADA needed to be amended in

the first place. When it was passed back in 1990, the ADA had a definition of disability that was based on the definition used in the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Two major decisions of the Supreme Court (Sutton v. United Air Lines in 1999 and Toyota v. Williams in 2002) narrowed the definition so much that most cases became more about whether a person met the definition of disability rather than focusing on access or accommodation. EEOC also had regulations that defined “substantially limits” as “significantly restricts” which is inconsistent with the intent of Congress when it passed ADA.

The most important components of the new ADAAA include the following:

- directs EEOC to revise that portion of its regulations defining the term “substantially limits”;
- expands the definition of “major life activities” by including two non-exhaustive lists:
 - The first list includes many activities that the EEOC has recognized (e.g., walking) as well as activities that EEOC has not specifically recognized (e.g., reading, bending, and communicating);
 - the second list includes major bodily functions (e.g., “functions of the immune system; normal cell growth; digestive, bowel, bladder, neurological, brain, respiratory, circulatory, endocrine, and reproductive functions”);
- states that mitigating measures other than “ordinary eyeglasses or contact lenses” shall not be considered in assessing whether an individual has a disability;

- clarifies that an impairment that is episodic or in remission is a disability if it would substantially limit a major life activity when active;
- provides that an individual subjected to an action prohibited by the ADA (e.g., failure to hire) because of an actual or perceived impairment will meet the “regarded as” definition of disability, unless the impairment is transitory and minor;
- provides that individuals covered only under the “regarded as” phrase are not entitled to reasonable accommodation; and
- emphasizes that the definition of “disability” should be interpreted broadly.

The implications of the act on employers and qualifying employees cannot be overstated. The expanded scope of the act will cover more employees and will often trigger an employer’s duty to provide reasonable accommodation to covered individuals. It will be important for employers to have well-drafted job descriptions that accurately describe their positions and documentation of legitimate, nondiscriminatory business reasons for adverse employment actions against employees with impairments.

ADAAA is not a revolutionary new law; it merely attempts to bring the law back to what Congress intended it to be when it passed the ADA in 1990. More specifics about the changes in the new Act are available from a variety of internet sources.

CORE Establishes Strategic Planning Committees

Linda R. Shaw, CORE President

On Wednesday, July 16, 2008, CORE and the Commission on Standards and Accreditation met in Schaumburg, IL, to review a variety of goals and issues and to discuss strategic planning for the future. The meeting addressed several topics and involved opportunities for significant input and participation. The result was the identification of important challenges for CORE to consider in the

future and the establishment of a few task oriented committees to respond to the challenges.

Dr. Bryan Garey, Assistant Director of Human Resource Services at the University of Florida, partnered with CORE Executive Director Dr. Marvin Kuehn to develop the agenda and to facilitate the daylong event. The result was the identification of important challenges for CORE to consider in the future and key committees that could be helpful in addressing the issues and concerns.

The final activity of the day was discussion of possible goals for the coming year. Participants were challenged to narrow the list of goals to five high priority goals. After the goals were identified five specific committees were formed to examine each goal in detail and to prepare some recommendations and actions that should be considered in the future.

...five strategic planning committees have been established by CORE and a charge for each committee was identified.

Following is the **list of the five strategic planning committees** established by CORE. A **charge** for each committee was identified; each charge could be expanded or restated as concerns and issues emerge. At the end of the CORE meeting on July 18, another topic emerged that needed some further discussion and clarification. A **sixth committee** was formed to examine the current CORE policy on consultation to programs renewing or seeking accreditation.

1. Marketing/Branding Committee

CHARGE: to improve the recognition, relevance, and visibility of academic programs represented on CORE and to promote and support organizations and services that comprise the rehabilitation field; to create new alliances and partnerships that will foster collaboration and cooperation with other organizations.

2. Undergraduate Commission Issues Committee

CHARGE: to identify the procedures, issues, and strategies required to support the

establishment and functions of an undergraduate Commission in CORE.

3. **Program Review Committee**

CHARGE: to examine and recommend improvements to CORE's program review process; to improve the preparation of CORE peer reviewers; to enhance the quality and consistency of peer review reports; to provide appropriate recognition for those who assess program compliance with CORE accreditation standards; and to consider the possible creation of a CORE Academy of Site Peer Reviewers.

4. **Expanding the Scope of CORE Committee**

CHARGE: to explore the factors that need to be examined to support the expansion of accreditation efforts and to maintain the integrity and review procedures that have been established by CORE; to examine the administrative structure of CORE and to consider succession planning and possible organization restructuring.

5. **Program Outcomes Assessment Committee**

CHARGE: to examine the assessment trends and requirements of organizations that monitor the quality and relevance of academic programs regarding the goals and objectives of programs and the assessment of student learning expectations.

6. **CORE Consultation Policy Committee**

CHARGE: to examine the current policies of CORE regarding consultation to academic programs and the internal procedures necessary to respond to requests for consultation assistance; to define the parameters of CORE consultation and any financial considerations that should be clarified.

Committees have begun discussing issues and priorities and it is anticipated that reports will be provided by all committee chairs at the annual CORE meeting in July, 2009.

Executive Director's Report

Marvin D. Kuehn, CORE Executive Director
1/1/08 – 12/31/08

Following are several summaries of the activities and accomplishments of CORE during the last year. In general, CORE was very successful in addressing administrative concerns and updating policies and procedures related to the accreditation process. The issues discussed and the plans established have resulted in greater understanding of Standards and the concerns of accredited programs and programs interested in recognition by CORE in the future.

CORE Standards Review Project (2008-2010)

Under the leadership of Dr. Paul Leung and Dr. Amos Sales the comprehensive process and the timetable for the project were announced in October, 2008. The project invited interested individuals to complete a comprehensive survey on current CORE Standards; the survey period ended on December 15. The Committee is preparing to receive additional input at the February NCRE meeting in San Antonio. A number of important issues and standards have already been identified that need revision or clarification.

It is anticipated that the Program Outcomes Assessment Committee established by the strategic planning session will identify additional goals and provide suggestions for the re-wording and revision of Standards and their assessment. The timeline for the project is posted on the CORE website. Individuals are encouraged to provide suggestions and concerns about the accreditation standards at the meeting in San Antonio or by sending them directly to Dr. Leung or Dr. Sales as drafts of revised standards are made available during the next few months.

CRCC/CORE Partnership

Efforts continue to identify states where licensure laws appear to discriminate against professional counselors who only possess the CRC credential. In May, 2008, the Commission on Rehabilitation Counselor Certification and CORE

announced their partnership to advance the interests of the rehabilitation counseling community. It will advocate for the recognition of rehabilitation counseling in state laws and regulations governing the licensure requirements of professional counselors. This is an important effort and the collaboration is time-consuming. Linda Shaw, President of CORE, has been working closely with Cindy Chapman, Executive Director of CRCC as this project has evolved.

Establishment of Commission on Undergraduate Education

CORE, at its annual meeting in July, 2008, passed a motion to support the development of an accreditation process for undergraduate programs in rehabilitation and disability studies. This was contingent on the feasibility of expanding the scope of CORE to accredit more than just graduate programs in rehabilitation counseling by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA). It was determined that this change was possible but application will need to be made, at some future time, to change the recognized scope of CORE. CORE also approved the recognition of a second Commission of CORE to be called the Commission on Undergraduate Education.

Challenges in Writing Accreditation Reviews

There have been some concerns related to the wording and interpretations in reports and the rationale and justifications provided. Some program coordinators have expressed concern with the judgments and conclusions that were stated in final reports. Often these judgments and conclusions have apparently placed coordinators in awkward positions with university administrators. These reports **may be one of the most important products or indications of CORE's mission in that they convey an image about CORE, its credibility, and the integrity of the accreditation process.** These circumstances are unfortunate.

Reviewers are not paid for their work and time, but most reviewers see the benefits of the experience and enjoy the opportunity. Preparing the first draft of the PRCR is difficult for an inexperienced reviewer. Reviewers have to work as

a team for the review report to have meaning. In the future, it is important that the Commission make clear the expectations for site visitors and that individuals understand the importance and responsibilities of their affirmative response if asked to serve on a site visit team.

Both the Commission and the CORE Board are doing a better job each year in editing reports, and CORE is doing a better job in preparing site reviewers with updated site visitor training. Unfortunately, some "older reviewers" have not participated in new training that emphasizes (1) questions/information where follow-up is needed during a site visit, and (2) the preparation (writing) of site visitor reports.

...one of the most important products or indications of CORE's mission is that accreditation review reports convey an image about CORE, its credibility, and the integrity of the accreditation process.

Occasionally program coordinators will complain about inconsistency of comments or the tone of an accreditation report they have received. Efforts continue to be expended on providing a clear understanding of what is expected in reports that will help site reviewers, the Commission, and CORE in making accreditation decisions in the future.

Developing consistency in accreditation reviews is a challenge as CORE does not want to be too prescriptive. Guidelines were approved in July 2007 to help in writing comments for Preliminary Review Committee Reports. These concerns will be a major focus of the Program Review Committee in 2009; discussion will be facilitated by Dr. Cherie King, Chair of the Commission on Standards and Accreditation.

Based on feedback during the annual meeting in July, 2008 it was decided the Commission and CORE need to re-examine several issues related to the writing of site visit reports. This is an annual problem that is a constant challenge when there is significant turnover in reviewers. The concept of developing an Academy of Site Reviewers that provides meaningful recognition to reviewers is being discussed and may have merit.

Even though there has been improvement in writing accreditation reviews there remain obstacles to writing excellent reports. ***The biggest concern relates to having sufficient TIME to discuss what to look for and how to write site review reports in a constructive way to help programs improve. Incentives need to be identified and more recognition provided for the efforts reviewers make in the review of programs.***

CORE and the Commission need to emphasize (1) the importance of making sure site reviewers prepare adequately for a program review; (2) that site reviewers review all evidence provided, or request evidence if not provided, in the self-study materials; and (3) that they write a thorough report following report guidelines established by the Commission and the CORE Board.

Contributions of Site Reviewers

The biggest concerns of site reviewers seem to involve understanding the intent of each Standard (not interpreting them too narrowly) and what is acceptable evidence that a Standard has been addressed appropriately. Training sessions focus on interpretation and how comments should and should not be written (what should be included). Of equal importance are concerns about consistency in the formats and comments provided by reviewers about program strengths and weaknesses.

Overall, efforts to correct problems have been productive; however, due to the number of programs to be reviewed, sufficient time is often not allocated to develop good strategies to minimize problems which often occur. Through site visitor training, CORE attempts to assist review teams in addressing the issues and concerns identified in review of the self-study submitted or in the actual on-site visit. Reviewers see the benefits of the experience gained during a review and enjoy the opportunity to learn how other programs address concerns. It allows reviewers to understand the value of accreditation standards and the challenges that make assessment of program activities and priorities difficult.

CORE values the efforts and commitment of reviewers who strive to be objective as they

evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of programs. Opportunities for learning experiences far outweigh the challenges that sometime present themselves to reviewers. Providing constructive feedback which assists programs in improving curriculum or resolving concerns results in satisfaction and benefit for everyone. Serving in a consultation capacity is emphasized in site reviewer training and is a much more enjoyable role than functioning as a “standards evaluator.”

Opportunities for learning experiences far outweigh the challenges that sometime present themselves to reviewers.

Individuals who may be interested in serving as an accreditation site reviewer should contact the CORE Office at 847-944-1345 to obtain information about eligibility and requirements to be selected as a reviewer.

Interpretation of Standards

An issue related to the survey instruments for graduates and current students is the rating assessment criteria for the two main sections (DEGREE OF PREPARATION and DEGREE OF EXPOSURE) of the surveys. Two review teams pointed out that an assessment of 3.0 on **preparation** does not mean the same as 3.0 on **exposure**. This is an interpretation issue, but to eliminate confusion will require a change in the format and instructions of the survey instruments as well as the computer program that is used to generate the statistical printout of the survey data. It was not possible to make the changes on the instruments for programs being reviewed in 2009. CORE will be reminding reviewers about these differences as they evaluate the survey response data for programs in 2009.

Website Update

The CORE website has been updated and a slightly different format adopted to minimize confusion in the future. It is information-driven and is not “glitzy” nor does it include pictures, etc. We have learned a little about the problems in transferring a website from one university to another and the issues that have to be resolved. A

major accomplishment was completion of the update of the Accreditation Manual on the website on January 20, 2009. Included are several new policies that have been passed in the past year.

Information About Marketing RC and CORE

Revision of two components of the Health Professions Career and Education Directory related to rehabilitation counseling were completed in September, 2008. Information was submitted on (1) the history, structure, and purpose of CORE; and (2) background about the salaries, job description, employment characteristics and outlook, and education programs that prepare professional rehabilitation counselors. Some data from old directories was almost 20 years old; it is hoped these revisions present a more up-to-date picture of CORE and rehabilitation counseling.

In June, CORE was asked to submit information to the Chronicle of Guidance about the history of CORE and the relationship to the rehabilitation counseling profession. This included job description, salaries, employment outlook, etc. Information was developed and submitted by Linda Shaw, Connie McReynolds, Linda Holloway, Marv Kuehn and others. Hopefully, the information in the final draft provides a more current overview of what rehabilitation counselors do and a more accurate explanation of what the salaries are for professional, masters level rehabilitation counselors.

Accreditation Status – On Probation

At the January mid-year CORE meeting the question was raised about creating another accreditation status for programs that should perhaps be on probation. I was asked to develop some information for CORE to consider at the July meeting; Cherie King, Chair of the Commission, volunteered to assist in the process. CORE did not have a status for this purpose nor a written process for how CORE would conduct a formal review of a program when there is information that indicates the program may not be in compliance with CORE standards. Information has been obtained from some other ASPA member organizations on how these organizations handle these types of issues.

...another accreditation status for programs that should perhaps should be on probation may be created.

This status is now included in the updated Accreditation Manual. Three policy statements were approved by CORE in July, 2008 which included: (1) thoughts on probation status, (2) complaints about accredited programs, and (3) substantive program changes.

Website Accessibility Interpretation

This year three program coordinators requested clarification on the expectations of CORE in regard to the last sentence of Standard A.1 which states: **“These statements shall be in accessible format and meet national website accessibility standards.”** The questions seemed to revolve around what evidence does the program need to provide. CORE is now sending the following in response to the inquiries each year regarding Standard A.1 and F.3. Additional suggestions for helping programs verify their program website accessibility is now also provided in the Accreditation Manual – Policies on the CORE website.

“Various website evaluation tools can be used to determine if websites are in compliance with national guidelines. The issue is whether individuals who may have a disability can access all aspects of a particular website. Some 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. Two websites/tools that are frequently used include: www.cynthiasays.com and <http://webxact.watchfire.com> . Two additional sites are: www.jimthatcher.com and www.webaim.org/standards/508.”

Electronic Self-Study Preparation

CORE adopted a policy that programs could submit the SSD electronically (on-line), but it was decided that CORE needed to develop some written guidelines to assist programs in the preparation of materials. Feedback from a few site visitors who

have reviewed CD discs indicate it saves space but in many cases “hard copy” may still be needed so materials can be compared and reviewed quickly. Information on disc only also ties a reviewer to a computer. It is hoped that tentative guidelines can be reviewed at the annual meeting in July, 2009. It is suggested that the option be permitted on a trial basis for the coming year.

Related to the Self-Study is the conversion from hard copy of survey response data to on-line survey responses to increase efficiency and save staff time and resources. The question to be resolved is when should the conversion occur in light of the Standards Review Project. Making the changes in the process will take some time and careful planning will be crucial. Until the work of the Standards Review Committee is completed, it is necessary to delay the conversion of survey responses to an on-line format.

Issues to Be Considered by CORE in 2009

1. Focus on Student Learning Objectives

A significant challenge that many of you are undoubtedly aware of is the emphasis that is being communicated to universities from national accrediting groups like CHEA, NCATE, and the Department of Education on *assessment and student learning outcomes*. In the past there has been great effort placed on establishing STANDARDS for academic programs but now the priority is changing. There has been a lot of criticism of accreditation organizations by the Department of Education about how standards are ASSESSED. Academic programs have been good at collecting data but have not been very convincing with traditional assessment approaches at measuring competency, dispositions, and outcomes.

A major focus of recent ASPA and CHEA meetings has been this assessment issue as it is such an important component (new priority) of program accreditation that will require much reflection and introspection by organizations to address the concerns. Faculty independence and autonomy and finding ways to recognize faculty who implement effective approaches to assessment will be challenges for many accrediting organizations.

CORE will need to carefully examine in the Standards Review Project what and how program standards should be revised, added, assessed, and adopted. What are students learning and how do we know that? How are critical thinking, analytical reasoning, written communication, and problem resolution concepts being emphasized in curricula? Does CORE need to re-examine the purpose of the Self-Study? Will there be a few focus on the teaching and learning of “soft skills” by graduates.

Academic programs have been good at collecting data but have not been very convincing with traditional assessment approaches at measuring competency, dispositions, and outcomes.

Should more attention be given to how CORE evaluates the performance of programs (makes assessments), particularly the Section C standards dealing with curricula? How do these assessments relate to the outcomes that programs and graduates can demonstrate? and What standards and sub-standards are really necessary? **Simply providing comprehensive syllabi that say what the objectives are or what is to be covered in a course may not be sufficient in the future.**

2. Evaluation of Site Reviewers

During the annual CORE meeting in July 2008, concerns were noted from some program coordinators about the performance/competence of some site reviewers. CORE asks program coordinators and faculty for an evaluation of the review process and the preparation and feedback provided by the site reviewers; if the recommendations received were helpful; and if the reviewers were fair, impartial, and cordial.

It was recommended that the Site Visitor Evaluation Form be reviewed and that in 2009 the Executive Director, in consultation with the CORE Administrative Assistant, provide appropriate constructive feedback to site visitors about their reports, the site visit, the evaluation comments of program faculty during the site visit, and comments from the other site reviewer on their preparation and contributions during the site visit. CORE believes strongly that the accreditation process is only effective and meaningful when all components are understood and individuals involved in the process

are provided clear expectations. CORE should be able to communicate the reasons for suggestions and the purpose of standards and their assessment to reviewers.

The goal is for the reviewer feedback process to be seen as educational and helpful rather than as criticism. Feedback will not be shared with site reviewers until after the final accreditation decision is made by CORE. Providing constructive feedback to reviewers continues to be a challenge. Making clear the expectations for reviewers and the continuation of procedural reminders to them should improve the evaluation of the process and the performance (assessment rationale) of reviewers.

3. Faculty Qualifications in Distance Education Programs

A potential issue has arisen about accredited programs advertising both on-line and campus-based degree programs at one institution (an on-campus program and a distance education program where faculty have differing qualifications based on their employment status). Should the qualifications specified by CORE for part-time or adjunct faculty teaching in both on-campus and distance education (on-line) programs be the same?

In January 2007, CORE passed a policy that all faculty teaching for a program must have obtained the CRC or provide rationale or justification for faculty not possessing the CRC. Should additional questions be asked during the site visit? If so, what? Are there other ramifications related to standards for on-line programs? Shouldn't they be the same? If CORE accredits a program, is the delivery of the program an issue? In the past, CORE has said it is not.

4. Qualifications of Program Coordinator and Adjunct Faculty

Another topic that may need some discussion is related to Standards E.4 and E.5. Two frequently asked questions about faculty are: (1) Does a program coordinator need to be a full-time faculty member working with the program? i.e., could a program have two faculty members sharing the responsibility or one part-time faculty member in

the RCE program serving as coordinator? and (2) does Standard E.5 apply to part-time or adjunct faculty? Do part-time RCE program faculty or adjunct faculty have to meet the other E.5 substandards? (CRC)

Should the qualifications specified by CORE for part-time or adjunct faculty members teaching in both on-campus and distance education (on-line) programs be the same?

The Commission has noted that more and more programs are hiring faculty who can teach in multiple programs in a department (other masters degree programs or both graduate and undergraduate rehabilitation programs). Some of the faculty appear not to be certified but are licensed, sometimes as counselors and sometimes as psychologists. Does CORE need to provide more guidance to programs and site visitors on what is expected regarding the qualifications of faculty involved in a program or do CORE Standards need revision?

5. Reorganization of RCE Programs

In the last six months, there have been inquiries asking whether a program can continue to be accredited if it becomes a track in another degree program (e.g., a track in a mental health counseling degree program). Are there any negative implications? CORE currently accredits a number of programs that do not have the words "rehabilitation counseling" in the degree. Are current eligibility requirements to be accredited by CORE appropriate or should they be re-visited? Why are institutions considering this option?

Can a program can continue to be accredited if it becomes a track in another degree program?

Is the number of students interested in rehabilitation counseling declining? With the emphasis on licensure, are employment options changing?

6. Concerns About RC Identity

During the last few months there have been various efforts to identify a process that might allow some constructive actions to occur to improve "identity issues" involving rehabilitation counseling. Some excellent questions have been

posed that directly relate to perceptions of RC. Some questions continue to arise: Are rehabilitation counselors unique? Is there value in specialization 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 have created an “identity crisis”? How can we respond to competition for students, merging departments, low salaries, what employers want to hire, interest in licensure versus certification? Are there other implications for the accreditation of programs?

New Opportunities for CORE

1. One topic that CORE may address in the future is exploration of ways to provide more consultative assistance to programs versus only program evaluation. 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 in helping programs improve the quality and scope of their programs. In the past the appropriateness of providing suggestions has been unclear, is often avoided, and not encouraged. Some feel this could be of significant value to programs who want assistance/suggestions to improve curricula and policies. The reluctance may be the lack of guidance by CORE on how constructive consultation (feedback) can be provided without invoking fear or criticism by program faculty members.

In the future CORE may address ways to provide more consultative assistance to programs versus only program evaluation.

Related to this topic is the question of who should or should not provide consultation to a program. The recently appointed Consultation Policy Committee will be examining this question and related issues this spring.

2. A challenge CORE and the Commission constantly needs to address is the identification of new interested individuals to serve on the Commission and CORE. It is crucial that CORE do all it can to promote interest by individuals who

would be outstanding applicants for the positions that open each year on the Commission and CORE or for opportunities for program faculty to become site reviewers for CORE. Providing continuing training and administrative leadership to improve the accreditation review process is obviously very important for the health of accreditation and the performance, relevance, and recognition of programs.

Current Challenge

The future of CORE will be determined by the commitment of TIME and vision by individuals that serve on the Commission and CORE. *The importance of the Standards Review Project cannot be viewed as another routine activity. The Standards which result from the project will be critical to the perception of rehabilitation counseling programs. The benefits from updated standards will result in greater acceptance by the broader counseling field and professionals that provide counseling services.*

Since the Commission and CORE Board don't meet weekly, many issues cannot be discussed or addressed in a timely manner. There is just a limited amount of time available in July and much of the time is taken up by other tasks and priorities related to program accreditation decisions. The information included in the CORE News is an attempt to help everyone understand the issues and be aware of the activities of your representatives on CORE and the Commission on the Accreditation of Rehabilitation Counseling Programs.

The success and relevance of the two Commissions and CORE are only possible if the leadership and members are provided up-to-date information and are knowledgeable of the issues facing academic programs. It is hoped the information provided in this issue of the CORE News expands your understanding of the accreditation issues that have been addressed in 2008 or will be discussed in 2009. Readers are encouraged to explore the CORE website and to communicate concerns to the members that make up CORE and the Commission on Accreditation. All representatives are listed under the Leadership link on the home page of the CORE website.

NEW POLICIES AND INTERPRETATIONS OF CORE 2006-2008

Faculty members at accredited programs often never see the Accreditation Manual that provides the policies and explains the process that programs must follow to obtain or maintain accreditation. Changes are all communicated to program coordinators and posted on the CORE website but frequently they are not discussed unless a program has been found to not be following approved Standards.

Readers are encouraged to explore the CORE website and to communicate questions and concerns to the members that make up CORE and the Commission on Accreditation.

Several policies and definitions have been revised or developed by CORE or the Commission in the last two years. All of the changes have been integrated in the Accreditation Manual or the Glossary that is included at the end of the Manual. After each addition/change a reference is provided if individuals desire to review them in more detail.

Policies/Interpretations:

Survey Response Expectations
(Section II – Introduction)

Program Coordinator Qualifications
(Section II – E.4.1)

Accreditation Extension
(Section III – Policies)

Accredited-On Probation
(Section III – Policies)

Substantive Program Changes
(Section III – Policies)

Complaints Received About Standards or
Compliance
(Section III – Policies)

Public Members of CORE
(Section III – Policies)

Attendance at Meetings
(Section III – Policies)

Confidentiality
(Section III – Policies)

Conflict of Interest
(Section III – Policies)

Expectations of CORE and Commission Members
(Section III – Policies)

Public Disclosure

(Section III – Policies)

Minutes of Meetings

(Section III – Policies)

Guidelines for Submission of CORE Self-Study in
Electronic Format

(Section III – Policies)

Vitae for All Faculty Teaching in Program

(Section III – Policies)

Web Accessibility Guidelines

(Section III – Policies)

New Organizational Membership (not RC
programs)

(Section III – Policies)

Glossary additions:

Equivalency

Waiver

Website:

Code of Ethics for CORE

Opening for Public Member on CORE

(letter of interest, resume, and recommendations due by April 1)

The by-laws of CORE require that there be two public members (at-large) on the Council. CORE needs to fill one position of one at-large (public) member. CORE is looking for someone *who has a strong interest in professional standards and accreditation in rehabilitation education and would be interested in serving on the Council.*

CORE establishes policy and standards for graduate rehabilitation counseling programs and assists in the development of university-based rehabilitation education programs. CORE also supports a Registry for undergraduate programs in Rehabilitation and Disability Studies. CORE is seeking a consumer or provider of rehabilitation services who is not directly associated with an academic program in rehabilitation at the present time. The following qualifications are important:

1. Interest in rehabilitation education standards and accreditation
2. Knowledge of academic programs in rehabilitation education
3. Understanding of credentialing issues, advocacy, and employment opportunities for graduates of recognized programs

4. Be a recipient (consumer) or provider of rehabilitation services
5. Can represent perspectives of individuals with disabilities and the public in general
6. Understands both the rehabilitation and counseling fields
7. Not currently employed in an academic rehabilitation education program

CORE is seeking a consumer or provider of rehabilitation services who is not directly associated with an academic program in rehabilitation.

If you are interested or know of individuals who you could strongly recommend, please encourage them to apply. If you have any questions feel free to contact Dr. Linda Shaw, President of CORE lshaw@email.arizona.edu, or Dr. Marvin Kuehn, Executive Director of CORE mkuehn@emporia.edu. Letters of interest, an updated resume, and two supporting recommendations should be submitted to Sue Denys, CORE administrative assistant, in the CORE Office by April 1, 2009. ALL APPLICATION MATERIALS MAY BE SUBMITTED VIA EMAIL TO: sdenys@cprecredentialing.com

CORE usually has one 2-3 day meeting the second or third week in July in Schaumburg, IL, and a 1-2 day mid-winter meeting. The appointment is a volunteer position but all travel expenses and related expenses are paid by CORE to attend annual meetings. CORE would like to find someone who would be willing to serve 4 years that would like to help continue efforts to enhance Rehabilitation Counseling and undergraduate Rehabilitation and Disability Studies programs through improved preparation standards in academic institutions.

CORE will follow-up and arrange phone interviews with applicants that are being considered. CORE would like to approve an appointment by May 1, 2009.

Council on Rehabilitation Education

*1699 Woodfield Rd., Suite 300
Schaumburg, IL 60173
Phone: 847-944-1345 Fax: 847-944-1346*

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) 944-1346

E-Mail: sdenys@cprecredentialing.com

CORE President

Dr. Linda R. Shaw

Telephone: 520-621-7822

Fax: 520-621-3821

Email: lshaw@email.arizona.edu

CORE Executive Director

Dr. Marvin D. Kuehn

Telephone: (620) 341-5795

Fax: (620) 341-6200

E-Mail: mkuehn@emporia.edu

CORE News Editor

Dr. Katrina R. Miller

Telephone: 620-341-5231

Fax: 620-341-6200

Email: kmille12@emporia.edu