

CORE News

Volume 21, Number 1

Council on Rehabilitation Education

Summer 2012

President's Update



Tom Evenson, CORE President

Before reporting on anything else, I wanted to start with the area that is constantly on our minds at CORE. That is, the fact that preserving the quality and integrity of rehabilitation education programs through its accreditation process is CORE's single most important responsibility. Part of this obligation includes the goal of continually building on the established record of the CORE accreditation process by strengthening it and making it increasingly better. That responsibility is being fulfilled. CORE has completed the current cycle of program reviews using the revised standards and, with the exception of some small glitches in the graduate surveys, both the graduate and undergraduate review processes have gone smoothly. The graduate process includes reviews of student learning outcomes, an addition that allows rehabilitation counseling programs to demonstrate in measurable terms the impact they have on student learning and skills.

One of the most important things that has happened for CORE in the last six months is securing a **new Executive Director**. While this may be "old news" to many of you, Dr. Frank Lane agreed to assume the ED position on an interim basis in January to fill the vacancy resulting from Dr. Sue Ouellette's resignation in December. Frank has done an exceptional job since assuming the ED position. Of particular importance was his preparation for CORE's meeting with CHEA as part of its review process. His execution of the ED role directly

complemented the strong self-study put together by Marv Kuehn as part of the entire process. Frank has taken a hands-on approach to handling CORE's daily administrative responsibilities. In addition, he has assumed a very active role in coordinating CORE's initiatives, activities and contacts pertaining to its contributions to rehabilitation counseling's collective effort to insure parity through licensure and increased employment options for rehabilitation counselors. I'm pleased to report that the CORE Board unanimously recognized the quality of Frank's performance and his value to the organization by moving him from interim status and naming him as CORE's new Executive Director. He has agreed to the appointment and will continue as ED on a half-time basis. In addition to a new ED, the CORE Board has three new members. NRCA has appointed Dr. Beth Boland from Western Washington University; ARCA has appointed Dr. Mary Barros-Bailey, a vocational expert and life care planner in private practice in Boise, Idaho; and IARP's first Board representative is Cherie King from Central Connecticut State University.

A major initiative for CORE this year has been our application for recognition by the **Council on Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA)**. This is an area that has been discussed at length, but I wanted to report that the CHEA site visit was completed, the self-study was completed by CORE and accepted by CHEA, the request for formal review was approved, and, finally, the hearing with the CHEA Commission on Recognition was successfully completed. CORE has responded to CHEA's request for some supplementary documents and CHEA's meeting to determine final approval for a 10-year extension of our accreditation by CHEA is expected by fall. The CHEA application this year included CORE's request for "Change of Scope" that would recognize **accreditation of undergraduate rehabilitation education programs** by CORE. CHEA scrutinized this request and preliminary indications suggest that the proposed process meets CHEA's criteria. Accreditation of undergraduate programs expands CORE's scope beyond the flagship area of rehabilitation counseling to include a domain that is relevant to many direct service rehabilitation workers yet is "home" to a myriad of helping professions. Rehabilitation jobs are claimed by undergraduates

from social work, psychology, human service and a number of other social service disciplines, many of whom have no formal training in rehabilitation. With accreditation, CORE's plan calls for an increase in the number of undergraduate programs to help improve the quality of community-based services to the disability community and to prepare more students for graduate-level work in rehabilitation education. On another front, CORE plans to continue with its role in contributing to the momentum of rehabilitation education's impact on services to people with disabilities on an international level. CORE will once again be an active collaborator along with other rehabilitation practitioners, counselors, administrators and educators at the next IRCA meeting scheduled for the fall.

The first goal of CORE's strategic plan updated in July is to: *Insure parity for rehabilitation counselors as evidenced by licensure, third party reimbursement, and increased employment options.* In support of that priority CORE's Executive Committee asked its leadership to initiate communication with **CACREP** leadership to explore ways for the increased collaboration for the mutual benefit of each. Since September, CORE and CACREP leaders have met directly and by telephone six times. At an initial meeting in September, preliminary agreement was made for CORE and CACREP to maintain regular communication between their respective executive directors; to work together to explore the development of a shared, streamlined process for conducting joint site visits for programs with dual accreditation; to agree that the unification of the profession is critical and that the creation of additional accrediting bodies is not in the best interest of the discipline; and for leadership of CORE and CACREP to meet regularly to stay apprised of current activities of interest to both organizations. The TRICARE interim decision recognizing CACREP accreditation as necessary for licensure eligibility after 2014 was announced on December 27th, 2011. This announcement impacted the discussions between CORE and CACREP and so implementation of the collaboration agreements were put on hold pending formal approval by the CACREP Board.

The Governing Council of the American Counseling Association (ACA) and delegates to the 20/20 Vision for the Future of Counseling Assembly have expressed support for both CORE and CACREP. However, they have recognized the advantage of a single accrediting body for the counseling profession and requested that CORE and CACREP work together in an effort to work out their differences so that a single accrediting body can come to fruition.

The questions of collaboration and merger between CORE and CACREP in 2012 have changed significantly since 2007 when the original merger initiative was discontinued. CACREP has expressed a willingness to consider any “reasonable” proposal by CORE for a merger of the organizations. Leadership of the two organizations will meet again in mid-July following the CORE annual Board meeting. Discussions with leaders of other rehabilitation organizations have resulted in identification of both advantages and disadvantages to merger with CACREP. The CORE Board has extended the schedule for its annual meeting in July to allow for a special session on this issue and on CORE’s role in collaboration with other rehabilitation organizations in ensuring the viability of the rehabilitation counseling profession.

Communication has been a priority for CORE over the last year. A key effort in this area has been the launch of a revised and expanded website. Smooth navigation and easy-to-access information are the hallmarks of the website that has been designed to meet the needs of program directors and rehabilitation faculty as well as students and prospective students who rely on the site for information on rehabilitation education. CHEA input also influenced the update of the website because of the perspective that CHEA provided on “public” expectations of an accreditation website. To accompany the improved communication efforts of the website, CORE has focused on more frequent and direct communication with rehabilitation education program directors. Increased electronic and telephone contact with program directors from the CORE office has been underway since the beginning of the year. This effort includes a new Program Director listserv that is designed to be used to provide new information as well as to exchange ideas on

common issues, questions and problems encountered by directors of rehabilitation education programs. A third communication front has been CORE’s efforts to provide presentations and information at key conferences and meetings. Special presentations on CORE issues were made at the NCRE/CSAVR/RSA conference in October and at the NCRE education conference in April. CORE also sent representatives to the American Association of State Counseling Boards (AASCB) annual conference and the American Counseling Association in the spring. While participation in these conferences addressed multiple CORE issues, primary activity related to CORE’s work related to licensure and increased employment options for rehabilitation counselors. Related to communication is CORE’s renewed emphasis on increasing the collection of program data that can be used to help advance the interests of rehabilitation counseling and rehabilitation education. While this will be a long-term process that is incorporated into CORE’s already established efforts, the Annual Program Report has expanded in ways that have already produced valuable and new information on programs, program directors, and student outcomes.

In collaboration with other rehabilitation organizations, CORE has made significant investments in work related to advancing access to employment opportunities for rehabilitation counselors. Fragmentation among rehabilitation counseling-related organizations has adversely affected those efforts in the past. A number of joint initiatives have taken place among rehabilitation groups over the last several months that may help change things. The challenge is that action must take place soon. While discussions must continue, it must be replaced with collective action that addresses professional identity, organizational fragmentation, breadth and potential of the rehabilitation field, and maximizing career opportunities for rehabilitation professionals. Counseling itself is working to establish a clear identity for the counseling profession through its 20/20 Vision for the Future of Counseling. The fact is that rehabilitation is experiencing something similar at this point in its professional history. While it may be clear for many of us, too many people outside our profession are not clear about the role of rehabilitation counselors and

other professionals. Rehabilitation educators and all rehabilitation professionals must continue to find effective ways to demonstrate the indispensability of rehabilitation counselors and professionals. Once that need is understood by decision makers outside our profession, demand will follow. It is not a simple process...but at least there is still a process to engage in. For too long, we have put off making tough decisions because we couldn't agree on what road to take. We're now running very short of time, but we have enough to engage in the kind of dialogue among ourselves that leads to decisions and actions that are going to strengthen and expand all of our profession.

I want to end this by acknowledging someone who I consider to be one of the "most valuable" among the many important people who contribute to rehabilitation education through CORE. It would be unfair to identify all of her contributions to rehabilitation or to extol her many virtues. That is not her style. Let me simply say thank you to Patty Nunez, CORE Vice President, who has been tireless in her work on CORE...and so consistently level-headed in the questions, challenges and ideas she shares. Every organization should have a person like Patty working on its behalf.



The Council on Rehabilitation Education (CORE) has a long history of accrediting graduate programs in rehabilitation counseling. As the new Executive Director of CORE, I view myself as a steward of the agency with the primary goal of conducting the business of accreditation, protecting the resources that were built over the past 40 years (since 1972), and developing the business of CORE to ensure its viability for the future. 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. In order to adapt to these changes and survive, the CORE must make some important decisions in July. My role in the decision-making process will be to insure the board has sufficient information with which to make decisions. My efforts in this area include legislative advocacy and education; increased 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 hard to develop the

*A message from the
CORE Executive
Director
Dr. Frank Lane*

accreditation process and review eligible programs. The international arena is also an opportunity for CORE. Representatives from other countries approached CORE leaders about the possibility of working collaboratively on the development of international standards at all levels of education. The CORE board will be discussing this opportunity in July and will look to position the organization to participate in this new frontier.

CORE Business

As I indicated above, the business of CORE is strong. CORE currently accredits 98 graduate programs. There are currently 5,102 students in the graduate programs and a total of 1,510 students graduated last year. A total of twelve graduate programs were reviewed this year: Western Washington University, University of Northern Colorado, San Francisco State University, Ohio University, Hofstra University, New Mexico Highlands University, South Dakota State University, California State University-Sacramento, Fort Valley State University, SUNY Buffalo, University of Arkansas-Little Rock, and University of South Carolina

Many of you know CORE transitioned to on-line surveying of students, graduates and employers this year. As with many new processes, we experienced some challenges. The surveys were sent out much later than they should have, resulting in lower than optimal response rates, and the questions on the surveys were not all linked to the standards. We were fortunate to have identified these problems early and thanks to Cherie King and Lori Bruch, the site reviewers and commissioners were trained on how to deal with the challenges. Sue Denys and I met with Planstone (the company that administers the surveys) and provided them completed questionnaires. We are planning to send them out in August so the program directors of the programs being reviewed in 2013 will have four-months to achieve an acceptable response rate.

CORE currently accredits 2 undergraduate programs and has 26 programs on the undergraduate registry. The undergraduate commission on standards and accreditation is reviewing 6 programs this year (Alabama State University, Arkansas State University, Coppin State, Southern University,

University of North Texas, and Winston-Salem State) and has a plan to review 5-6 programs each year over the next five years. In addition, the undergraduate commissioners will be working to market undergraduate accreditation to universities that have undergraduate programs that would meet the criteria for accreditation and whose graduates would benefit from an enhanced curriculum in terms of employment.

Legislation and Legislative Advocacy

There have been some significant changes in legislation over the past year that have continued to restrict the practice settings for graduates of CORE accredited programs. The Institute of Medicine (IOM) was commissioned by congress to consider the removal of the requirement of physician referral and supervision of counselors providing counseling services under TRICARE, the healthcare program that serves members of the armed forces, their beneficiaries, and retired military. The recommendation made by IOM has resulted in changes across a number of federal agencies and CORE leaders have continued to monitor their decisions and respond appropriately to advocate for the graduates of CORE accredited programs.

On February 12, 2010 the IOM recommended independent practice for licensed professional counselors, a decision that was consistent with the granting of this privilege to social workers in 1983 and marriage and family therapists in 1991. The IOM recommended independent practice by mental health counselors under TRICARE but suggested to Congress and the Department of Defense that LMHCs be permitted to practice independently under TRICARE if they have satisfied the following: (1). A Master's or higher level degree in counseling from a program in mental health counseling or clinical mental health counseling that is accredited by the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational programs (CACREP), (2). A state license in mental health counseling at the 'clinical' or the higher or highest level available in states that have tiered licensing schemes, (3). Passage of the National Clinical Mental Health Counseling Examination, (4). A well-defined scope of practice for practitioners.

The language from the IOM recommendation was later used in 2010 by the Veterans Administration who recognized Licensed Mental health Counselors as mental health providers within the agency but required them to have a master's degree in counseling from a program accredited by CACREP. Secretary of the Army, John M. McHugh, adopted a similar decision on July 26, 2011 when they recognized licensed professional counselors as substance abuse program practitioners but required them to have graduated from a CACREP accredited program, possess a license as a professional counselor in their state and pass the National Clinical Mental Health Counselor examination (NCMHCE).

On December 27, 2011 the TRICARE management authority issues an interim ruling to accept the recommendation of IOM and adopt the suggestion that as of January 1, 2014, licensed counselors must have graduated from a CACREP accredited program and have passed the national clinical mental health counselor exam to practice independently under TRICARE.

CORE worked collaboratively with CRCC, NRCA, ARCA, and NRA leadership to respond to the decisions by the VA, Department of the Army and recently the TRICARE management authority. It's important to understand that the wording of each of these decisions is slightly different. While the differences seem slight (e.g. Department of the Army specifies CACREP accredited substance abuse program while the VA only specifies a CACREP accredited program) these slight differences in wording result in large differences in the argument we have used to address these decisions. The arguments used for each decision is too lengthy to discuss here but copies of each letter can be found on the CORE website.

Communication

The relationship between CORE and its accredited programs is important. More importantly the type of relationship we establish with you determines the type of communication. CORE leadership believes the relationship between CORE and its accredited programs should be collaborative in nature. They also believe there should be a regular exchange of information with the programs so we decided to

initiate a profession-wide informed conversation about current issues. The change of the website, establishment of a listserv, and increase in the regularity of presentations are some of the mechanisms established to accomplish this goal.

Website and Listserv. The website has undergone major revisions over the past five months. A new Webmaster was chosen from a competitive bidding process and the transfer of the website began in January 2012. The content has been updated to reflect the accreditation of undergraduate programs and the distinction between accreditation and the registry. Along with the new website, we included a Listserv for program directors of accredited programs. The purpose of the Listserv is to establish a two-way communication between CORE and the programs. Information about CHEA recognition and the training sessions at the NCRE conference are two examples of the types of information we plan to disseminate in the future.

Presentation. The second method of establishing a conversation with CORE accredited programs is the establishment of regular and customary presentations about CORE business at the fall and spring NCRE conferences. In the fall, we presented "Accreditation of Rehabilitation Counselors: Current Issues, Challenges and Actions." At the spring conference, we presented "Recent decisions by the ACA governing council's 20/20 workgroup and the impact on graduates from CORE accredited programs" with a two-hour follow-up session the same afternoon addressing recent decisions by the ACA Governing Council's 20/20 workgroup and engaged participants in an in-depth discussion focusing on the potential problems and solutions associated with the decisions. NCRE has graciously offered us a venue at the 2012 National Rehabilitation Education Conference in Washington, DC to continue the discussion.

Many faculty and program directors were unable to attend the conference in San Francisco so we disseminated an information sheet over the Listserv to program directors so they could distribute it to program faculty. In order to continue the discussion, we plan to hold a conference call for faculty to discuss issues related to the information presented.

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. Plan to see an increased emphasis in this area and additional requirements for enhancing the types of information you will be required to report.

Collaboration

CORE cannot exist without the support of its stakeholders. CORE leadership has worked hard this year to ensure its stakeholder relationships are strong and CORE leaders are meeting with representatives from partnering organizations on a consistent basis. We have worked to develop the composition of the CORE board so it reflects the cross-section of stakeholders. We have also met with stakeholders from within rehabilitation counseling and with those that represent the larger interests of the general counseling profession.

Board Development. As I said earlier, CORE will be making some important decisions in July and I am pleased that we have some new representatives joining the CORE board. Dr. Beth Boland will be the NRCA Representative to CORE. Beth has taught in multiple CORE accredited programs and is currently the program director of the rehabilitation counseling program at Western Washington University. She also served a four-year term as a Commissioner on the CORE Graduate Commission on Standards and Accreditation. Dr. Mary Barros-Bailey will be the new ARCA Representative to CORE. Mary has many years of experience as a practitioner-educator and has served as Chair of CRCC and a Commissioner on the CORE Graduate Commission on Standards and Accreditation. Dr. Chuck Degeneffe will be joining the board as the NCRE Representative to the CORE board. Chuck previously served as a Commissioner

on the Graduate Commission for Standards and Accreditation and as CORE's representative to CRCC.

The CORE board voted to change its bylaws and add two additional seats on the CORE board, increasing the number of seats from 12 to 14. The first organization to be approved for membership was IARP. I am pleased that Dr. Cherie King will be joining the board as the IARP Representative to the Board. Cherie was a Commissioner on CORE's Graduate Commission on Standards and Accreditation and served as the Chair of the Commission and member of the CORE board for the last two years of two-consecutive four-year terms. The CORE Executive Committee voted in April to approve a request from CANAR for a seat on the CORE board. CANAR is currently working to identify a representative and will be present for the July meeting.

Rehabilitation Leadership. Ken Hergenrather, current President of NCRE, held a meeting at the spring NCRE conference in San Francisco on April 11th. The purpose of the meeting was to bring leaders from rehabilitation organizations together to discuss current issues in the field and ways in which we can collaborate. The meeting was well received and the plan is to continue meeting and discussing current and relevant issues at the NCRE meetings in fall 2012 and spring 2013.

The Summit. Tom Evenson and I participated in "the summit" on May 4th and 5th sponsored by the Commission on Rehabilitation Counselor Certification (CRCC). Representatives from IARP, NRCA, ARCA, CSAVR, ADARA, NRA, RCEA, and CRCC were participated in activities designed to create a vision for the future of rehabilitation counseling and a plan for how to move the profession forward. A lot of progress was made during the meetings but a lot of work has yet to be done. CORE leaders will continue to participate in the workgroups that emerged as a result of the process and we are grateful to CRCC for facilitating the discussions.

General Counseling. Tom Evenson and I have been meeting with CACREP CEO, Carol Bobby, and CACREP Chair, Martin Ritchie, since September 2011 to discuss ways in which the two organizations

can collaborate. Among the list of CORE items was a request to form a workgroup whose purpose would be to develop a streamlined process for those programs that wish to become both CORE and CACREP accredited to reduce stress and workload of dual accreditation. We met face-to-face with CACREP leadership three times this year with additional contacts occurring by phone. The first was in September 2011 in Chicago, Illinois, the second meeting was in January 2012 at the AASCB conference in Charleston, SC, and the third meeting was in March 2012 at the ACA Convention in San Francisco, CA.

The delegates of the 20/20Vision for the Future of Counseling met at the ACA conference in San Francisco on March 22nd. The 20/20 delegates consist of 24 representatives, one from each of the 19 ACA divisions and a representative from NBCC, CACREP, CORE, CRCC, and NRCA. They recognized the advantage of a single accrediting body for the counseling profession and requested that CORE and CACREP work together to form a single accrediting body. The request will necessitate the CORE board discussing the pros and cons of a merger with CACREP in July. CORE is fortunate to have two current board members who were part of the merger discussions in 2007, Tom Evenson and Patty Nunez. Their experience and wisdom on this subject will be important during the discussions in July.

Data Collection

In order for CORE to begin making decisions about how to advocate for graduates of CORE accredited programs, it is important that additional data be collected. The restriction of practice for rehabilitation counselors who are licensed counselors is an obvious challenge for CORE leadership but it was unclear how programs were addressing this challenge, how the accredited programs would like CORE to address the issue and how many graduates were being negatively affected by these decisions. Two major initiatives were undertaken. The first was a brief, 3-item survey that was administered in September 2011. It was designed to determine how programs were addressing the challenge and what the program directors thought CORE should do to address the

challenge. The second was a major modification of the annual report of accredited programs due on April 1st. Among the many changes, the purpose of the additional of the two main sections was to determine how many graduates of CORE accredited programs become licensed within five years of graduation and how the programs are structured relative to CACREP accreditation.

Brief Survey. The first survey we conducted was in September 2011. We sent it out to 98 program directors and received responses from 60, which was a 60% response rate. The purpose of the survey was to determine the impact of the IOM, VA, and Department of the Army decisions on programs and how it was being address. Also, the purpose was to determine how programs would like CORE to address the situation. The first question asked: "As a program director, where do you think CORE should focus their attention over the next year?" The responses included, in order of frequency: Leadership and establishing a direction, marketing of programs, advocacy, and work on philosophy pertaining to who we are as a profession. The second question asked: "How is your program planning to deal with the current practice restrictions on your graduates?" The responses were, again in order of frequency: Encourage licensure, advocate for the profession, already CACREP accredited, planning to pursue CACREP accreditation, educate students, close the program, no plan- feel powerless, and focus on training. The third and final question asked "CACREP leaders expressed an interest in talking with CORE about ways the two organizations can collaborate such as presenting a unified front and addressing potential threats to the profession. Do you think CORE representatives should discuss merging with CACREP as a possible option?" 81% of the respondents answered yes to the question. Given the size of the universe and response rate, the 95% confidence interval was calculated to be 72% to 90%. 19% of the respondents answered no with the 95% confidence interval being 10% to 28%.

Annual Report. The preliminary analysis of 80% of the programs that had completed the survey as of April 10th showed that only 17% of graduates from CORE programs were provisionally licensed or had

become licensed within five years of graduation. How we interpret this statistic is, of course, another matter. First, there was a lot of variability in the data. Some programs reported 40-55% of their graduates become licensed within five years whereas some programs reported a low as .7%. The statistic may also be an artifact of where rehabilitation counselors traditionally work. With 45% of graduates working for the state-federal VR system where licensure is not required, the low percentage is likely due to the fact that licensure is not required (or valued) by many employers where rehabilitation counselors work. The percentage of graduates working in state agencies must also be considered in relationship to training grant requirements. An average student completing a master's degree in two years will likely have at least four years of payback upon graduation. Therefore, a ten-year analysis of graduates may show a more realistic picture. We should, however, also consider the possibility that a small percentage of graduates (20-25%) become licensed.

I know the additional information we required this year was painful and I appreciate everyone's efforts to complete the report in a timely manner. We will continue to modify the reporting format and plan to have it in an electronic format through the CORE website so you can complete it electronically next year.

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.

I would like to thank the CORE board for their support during the past five months while I transitioned from a board member and Treasurer to Executive Director. I was to thank, in particular, Fred

McFarlane, Tom Evenson, Mike O'Brien, Marv Kuehn, and Patty Nunez for mentoring me and having the patience to work with me during the transition.

Policy Update Notice:

CORE has recently updated one of its policies that is directly relevant to all accredited programs. CORE has a policy (Policy Manual pp. 47-48) that addresses conflict of interest for members of the CORE Board, the Commissions and staff. While the Executive Director has always recused her or himself from situations that meet the conflict of interest criteria, we have decided to state it explicitly in the policy and strengthen it to acknowledge other potential conflicts of interest for the CORE Executive Director by adding the following section:

The Executive Director will recuse her or himself from any and all processing of reviews and reports if the Executive Director: (1) works in the same state as a program under review; (2) is an appointee or employee of the institution or related to an employee of the institution or program under review; (3) is a graduate of the program under review; or (4) can personally identify any potential or apparent positive or negative conflicts of interest with a program, its faculty, or staff. Further, if a program coordinator can clearly identify any apparent or potential positive or negative conflicts of interest between the Executive Director and a program, its faculty, or staff, the program coordinator may submit a request in writing to the CORE Board requesting that the Executive Director recuse her or himself from any and all processing of reviews and reports related to that program.

The activity related to the accreditation of the university program with which the CORE Executive Director is directly affiliated, which would normally be overseen by the CORE Executive Director, is to be delegated to the CORE President or their designee on the CORE board. This potential conflict of interest is to be made public to the CORE board upon hiring of the CORE Executive Director, and the process to address potential or actual conflicts will also be disclosed to the CORE board. Two years prior to the CORE Executive Director's university program's reaccreditation process, the CORE Executive Director will work with the CORE Executive Committee on the plan for program review, and obtain Executive Committee approval on the plan. The plan, as well as Executive

Committee approval of the plan, will be reflected in the Executive Committee meeting minutes.

SAVE THE DATES:

CORE Graduate Site Visitor Training
October 28, 2012
9 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.
Pre-conference in conjunction
with the NCRE/RSA/CSAVR Fall
Conference

CORE Undergraduate Site Visitor
Training
October 28, 2012
9 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.
Pre-conference in conjunction
with the NCRE/RSA/CSAVR Fall
Conference