

A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF ACCREDITED COUNSELING PROGRAMS

Leah Brew, M.Ed., LPC, NCC

Dissertation Proposal Prepared for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

December 2001

APPROVED:

Cynthia K. Chandler, Major Professor

Eugena Bodenhamer-Davis, Minor Professor

Robert Berg, Committee Member

Janice Holden, Coordinator of the program in Counseling,
Development, and Higher Education

Michael K. Altekruise, Chair of the Department/Division of
Counseling, Development, and Higher Education

M. Jean Keller, Dean of the College/School of Education

C. Neal Tate, Dean of the Robert B. Toulouse School of
Graduate Studies

Brew, Leah, A descriptive study of accredited counseling programs. Doctor of Philosophy (Counselor Education), December 2001, 94 pp., 4 appendices, 7 tables, references, 36 titles.

The Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Programs (CACREP) is the accrediting body for the field of counselor education. Since the inception of the standards, several individuals have published journal articles reviewing the strengths and weaknesses of CACREP accreditation. The purpose of this study was to do a preliminary survey of the opinions of individuals within CACREP accredited programs to discover the effects of accreditation on programs.

The survey of opinions from respondent CACREP accredited programs indicated interesting results. The eleven frequently held beliefs about improvements after accreditation was substantiated by the number, the percentage, and the Chi Square results from respondent programs. Therefore, after CACREP accreditation, most programs reported the opinion that: students have higher grade point averages and test scores; students are younger, learn better, and receive more employment opportunities; a higher percentage of students pass the licensed professional counselor examination; average scores are higher on the nationally certified counselor examination; programs receive more applicants and faculty is more professionally active, publishes more, and presents more.

The second part of the survey indicated that a large percentage of respondent programs offer courses beyond the CACREP core curriculum experiences (91%) and that

a variety of courses are offered (78 courses). In addition, 91 respondent programs indicated that courses are required beyond the CACREP core curriculum experiences and that a variety of courses are required (29 courses).

Three primary limitations exist in this study. First, the eleven frequently held beliefs were marked by the opinion of one faculty member for each program. Second, the number of blanks for each item was frequently close to or sometimes exceeded the number of respondents who marked the after CACREP column. Third, the survey data collected on courses that were offered by programs beyond the core were based upon memory and/or opinion and may be inaccurate. A recommendation for future research would be to study the hard data collected prior to and after accreditation.

Copyright by

Leah Brew

2001

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge CACREP for partial funding of this research. In addition, I would like to acknowledge my committee for working so hard to help me complete this project on time, especially Dr. Cynthia Chandler and Dr. Michael Altekruise who mentored me throughout my doctoral studies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Copyright	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Tables	v
Chapter	
1. BENEFITS OF ACCREDITATION	1
Introduction.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	5
Review of the Literature	7
Purpose of the Study.....	17
2. METHODS AND PROCEDURES.....	19
Survey Development.....	19
Research Questions	20
Data Collection Procedures.....	22
Data Analysis	22
Sample.....	23
3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	25
Results.....	25
Discussion.....	33
APPENDICES	37
Appendix A: Cover Letter.....	37
Appendix B: Survey Instrument	40
Appendix C: List of Programs	43
Appendix D: Tables	77
REFERENCE LIST	90

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Frequently Held Beliefs	78
2. Chi Square Analysis on Frequently Held Beliefs	
2a Before Compared with After.....	80
2b Same Compared with After.....	81
2c Same and Before Combined Compared with After	82
3. List of Courses Offered.....	83
4. List of Courses Required	85
5. Demographics of Program Using Faculty Members	87
6. Demographics of Program Using the Number of Students Accepted Annually	88
7. Demographics of Programs by ACES Regions	89

CHAPTER 1

A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF ACCREDITED COUNSELING PROGRAMS

Introduction

According to El-Khawas (1998), accreditation has been defined as, “a process by which an educational program or institution provides information about its operations and accomplishments to an outside body that independently evaluates and judges that information in order to make a public statement about the worth or quality of the institution or program” (p. 47). Essentially, the purpose of accreditation is to assure the quality of programs within education. By creating standards of excellence, accreditation protects the students and the public that may work with those students, and it establishes credibility for a program within a university. According to Perrin (1995), students who graduate from accredited programs tend to perform better on various outcome measures than students from non-accredited programs. Furthermore, accreditation can help to reduce duplication among departments within universities to create a defined identity (Sweeney, 1995). However, accreditation is not without challenges. The process of accreditation can frequently be an ambiguous process that is time-consuming and costly (El-Khawas, 1998; Honan, 1998). In the counselor education field, these general advantages and limitations of accreditation exist.

The Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Programs (CACREP) is the accrediting body for the field of counselor education. Several articles have described the evolution and history of the development of CACREP (Altekruse &

Wittmer, 1983; Bobby & Kandor, 1992; Dill, Massy, Williams & Cook, 1996; Steinhauser, 1982; Steinhauser & Bradley, 1983; Sweeney, 1992; Wittmer, 1994).

Standards were initially developed and held separately in the 1960's and 1970's by American School Counselor Association (ASCA) that prepared counselors for school settings. In 1973, the standards were combined, and in 1978, the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision became the first national counselor education organization responsible for accreditation. However, in 1981, the American Personnel and Guidance Association (APGA) formally adopted the standards and officially formed CACREP as an accrediting body. AGPA, which later became the American Association for Counseling and Development (AACD) sponsored CACREP. In 1987, the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA), an organization that oversees various accrediting organizations, recognized CACREP. A moratorium was declared for five years allowing only minor changes to the Standards until 1986 when the new standards became official. These new standards were official in July 1988 and remained in place until July 1994 (Wittmer, 1994). Finally, the 1994 standards were effective until July 2001 (CACREP, 2001).

Since the inception of the standards, several individuals have published journal articles reviewing the strengths and weaknesses of CACREP accreditation in the form of discussions, university program case studies, and surveys. Many of the discussion articles describe how accreditation can affect programs in positive and/or negative ways and evaluate the standards either supporting them and/or making suggestions for changes (Engels, 1991; Haight, 1992; Kandor & Bobby, 1991; Sweeney, 1995; Weinrach, 1991). Specifically, programmatic concerns include the ambiguity of the self-study process, the

full-time student to full-time teacher ratio (Weinrach, 1991), and the time and expense involved in becoming accredited (Sweeney, 1995; Weinrach, 1991). Concerns that affect students directly, and possibly enrollment, include the 48-hour program minimum and the internship requirements (Engels, 1991; Weinrach, 1991). Weinrach (1991) also discussed the difficulties associated with meeting the CACREP core curricular experiences and having enough flexibility for each program to offer or require other courses that may be needed for licensure or by the students to broaden their scope of expertise in a 48-hour program. However, other studies support the program minimum of 48 hours and 600-hour internship requirements (Haight, 1992; Kandor & Bobby, 1991).

In contrast to the discussion articles, case study articles describe how the process of accreditation has impacted a particular university (Bahen & Miller, 1998; Lloyd, 1992; Morrow, 1993; Smaby & D'Andrea, 1995). These case studies also echoed the program concerns of the discussion articles such as the ambiguity of the accreditation process (Bahen & Miller, 1998; Lloyd, 1992), the full-time student to full-time teacher ratio (Smaby & D'Andrea, 1995), and the time and expense of becoming accredited (Bahen & Miller, 1998). Furthermore, meeting the 600-hour internship without decreasing enrollment was challenging but possible for one university (Smaby & D'Andrea, 1995), and this requirement was reported to have no impact on enrollment at another university (Lloyd, 1992).

Finally, the majority of the research has surveyed CACREP accredited programs to obtain information about the effects of accreditation. Morgan & Toloczko (1997) and Hunt (1996) researched the concerns of Weinrach (1991) that curricular experiences beyond the CACREP core would be difficult to address due to core requirements.

Furthermore, Cowger (1992) surveyed accredited programs to evaluate course requirement concerns and found many courses were offered as electives and/or requirements beyond the CACREP core curricular experiences. Vacc (1992) surveyed programs to evaluate the perceptions of the standards and found that most respondents to the survey supported the standards. Gordon & McClure (1994) assessed the productivity of the faculty at pre- versus post-accreditation and found a positive correlation between accreditation and increases in research publications.

Several survey studies described student-related effects within CACREP accredited programs (Scott, 2001; Wilcoxon, Cecil, & Comas, 1987; Zimpfer, Cox, West, Bubbenzer, & Brooks, 1997). For example, Wilcoxon, et al. (1987) found in a survey that students from all programs found value in accreditation, but those students in accredited programs rated accreditation as more important than those who were not in accredited programs. Furthermore, Zimpfer, et al. (1997) surveyed accredited and non-accredited doctoral programs and found that the broadness of the CACREP curriculum standards seemed to prepare doctoral students for employment better than students who graduated from non-accredited programs. Finally, in a recent dissertation by Scott (2001), National Counselor Examination (NCE) scores of students from accredited programs were higher than scores from non-accredited programs.

Several surveys focused on how CACREP accreditation standards have affected whole programs (Barkley & Percy, 1984; Bobby & Kandor, 1992; Vacc, 1985). As in the case studies (Bahen & Miller, 1998; Lloyd, 1992; Smaby & D'Andrea, 1995) and discussion articles (Engels, 1991; Haight, 1992; Kandor & Bobby, 1991; Sweeney, 1995; Weinrach, 1991), a survey by Bobby & Kandor (1992) revealed concerns with the full-

time student to full-time faculty ratios, the 48-hour program minimum requirement, and the 600-hour internship requirement in order to meet CACREP standards. However, Vacc (1985) found that accreditation helped to add faculty and improve supervision experiences without affecting admissions. In contrast, Barkley & Percy (1984) found in a survey that programs that were either accredited or had applied for accreditation showed an increase in applications to the program. Finally, Schmidt (1986) surveyed programs and reported the changes as a result of the accreditation process. More than half of the programs reported that the following changes were evidenced due to accreditation: new courses were added; communications between faculty and field professionals improved since the self-study; increased efforts were directed toward students with regards to professional issues, ethics and legal matters; and student and graduate follow-up data provided focus for program revisions. Much fewer than half of the respondents reported changes in the number of faculty publications, the quality of students, or in enrollment.

Statement of the Problem

The research to date seems to focus primarily on how CACREP accreditation has benefited or challenged programs (Bahen & Miller, 1998; Barkley & Percy, 1984; Bobby & Kandor, 1992; Lloyd, 1992; Schmidt, 1986; Smaby & D'Andrea, 1995; Sweeney, 1995; Vacc, 1985; Weinrach, 1991). In addition, a few articles have surveyed accredited programs to evaluate its effects on students and faculty (Engels, 1991; Gordon & McClure, 1994; Haight, 1992; Kandor & Bobby, 1991; Scott, 2001; Smaby & D'Andrea, 1995; Weinrach, 1991; Wilcoxon, et al., 1987; Zimpfer, et al., 1997;). However, more research is needed to compare pre- and post-accreditation changes with regard to students and faculty. For example, many faculty from accredited programs may believe that

accreditation changed student populations by: increasing grade point averages; increasing test scores; improving the way students learn; increasing student employment opportunities; increasing the percentage of students that pass licensure examinations; improvements in the average certification examination scores; and increasing the number of younger students. Furthermore, many professionals may believe that accreditation influences faculty to be more professionally active because the CACREP standards require that faculty to show evidence of publications, presentations, and service. Because of the concerns that the CACREP standards might decrease enrollment, and because the results of previous studies have been mixed (Barkley & Percy, 1984; Cecil & Comas, 1986; Engels, 1991; Weinrach, 1991), surveying how pre- and post-accreditation has changed enrollment may be important. Therefore, more information is needed to assess how CACREP accreditation changes programs.

Recently, efforts have been directed toward counselor portability with regard to the different licensure requirements from state to state (Altekruse, 2001). With the variations among state requirements for licensure, surveying curricular experiences outside of the core CACREP requirements appears to be needed. Since Cowger's (1993) study, the number of accredited programs has quadrupled, and as a result, evaluating how many accredited programs offer courses beyond the core as well as the variety offered is needed. Moreover, determining how many programs require courses beyond the core and the variety associated with those requirements should be evaluated.

Review of Literature

The 1994 CACREP Standards

The following requirements have not changed since the standards were created in 1978. According to the 1994 CACREP standards, there are seven areas with which the accredited programs must comply (CACREP, 2001). The first area addresses standards for the institution of the program. First, the Commission on Recognition for Postsecondary Accreditation (CORPA) must accredit the institution. In addition, the institution must accurately describe the program, and the program must be clearly defined as part of the graduate school. Furthermore, a cooperative relationship must exist between the program and the institution and provide support, technological capabilities, and resources, and the institution should provide personal counseling services for students in the program.

The second section or area addresses program objectives and curriculum (CACREP, 2001). Some general requirements of the program include: reflecting current knowledge and needs from a variety of groups appropriate to educating students, having opportunities for students to participate in activities that promote professional development, accommodating individual differences, and recognizing when students may be inappropriate for the program and consequently, helping those students to find more appropriate areas of study. Other more specific requirements include requiring a minimum of two full academic years with a minimum of 48-semester hour or 72 quarter hour credits required of all students and requiring students to meet a minimum of 10 clock hours in small group activity to gain experience of participating in a small group.

Finally, eight specific curricular experiences are outlined and include: human growth and development; social and cultural foundations; helping relationships; group work; career and lifestyle development; appraisal; research and program evaluation; and professional orientation.

Section three provides guidelines for clinical instruction (CACREP, 2001). The guidelines indicate the minimum standards for faculty members, on- and off-site supervisors, laboratory facilities, and support for these areas. Specific requirements are detailed for supervised clinical experiences such as 100 clock hours in practicum with a 5 student to 1 faculty member ratio and a 600-hour internship. Section four addresses faculty and staff requirements including a minimum of three full-time faculty members who each have specified roles in the program and appropriate clerical assistance for the department. Furthermore, the standards require program faculty be professionally active by engaging in development/renewal, research and scholarly activity, and service for the three-year period preceding the date of application for accreditation.

Organizational and administration issues are specified in section five (CACREP, 2001). Some of the requirements address the dissemination of graduate catalogue and descriptions of the programs. Furthermore, the program must provide a handbook to students and have an orientation. In addition, the program should also provide current professional resources, financial assistance, and graduate assistantships for students. The recommended full-time equivalent (FTE) student to FTE faculty is 10:1, and the program is encouraged to recruit a diverse student population. Finally, students should have an assigned faculty advisor and planned program of coursework developed with their advisor.

Evaluations in the program are covered in section six of the standards (CACREP, 2001). Periodically, in order to stay in accordance with pertinent professional organization positions and perspectives, the faculty is expected to review and update objectives, and reviews for students are also expected periodically. Furthermore, students are expected to be able to review faculty on a systematic basis. The final section of the standards includes requirements for specialized curricular experiences.

Effects of Accreditation on Faculty Research and Publication Productivity

The CACREP standards require faculty to professionally active through service, research and publications, and development. Limited research exists indicating the benefits of accreditation on faculty research and publication productivity. However, two articles seem to imply that accreditation has improved the productivity of faculty (Gordon, et al., 1994; Smaby & D'Andrea, 1995). Smaby & D'Andrea (1995) conducted a self-study case to explore the effects of CACREP accreditation on their own program by sending a survey to previously graduated students and current students. Results indicated an improvement on research and service mission after accreditation, which may be due to the departmental decision and execution of securing a \$3.6 million research and training grant to support students and faculty. Gordon, et al. (1994) reviewed 78 CACREP accredited institutions to compare faculty publication productivity pre- and post-accreditation by indexing the Social Sciences Citation Index from 1974-1992. Results from this study found an increase in publications after accreditation. In contrast, Cecil & Comas (1986) received responses from 188 faculty at 25 CACREP accredited institutions and found only 29% of the respondents perceived publications in refereed journals to have increased due to accreditation efforts.

Effects of CACREP Accreditation on Programs

Potential Advantages of Accreditation

Several articles seem to indicate that CACREP accreditation has created many advantages to benefit programs. For instance, Sweeney (1995) stated that one primary benefit to accreditation is that it reduces or eliminates duplication between programs within a university. For example, overlap can exist between counseling and rehabilitation and psychology. Through the adherence of the standards, CACREP has helped to establish clear boundaries around counseling and the specialties within counseling.

Several publications have stated that accreditation improves the credibility of a program to students or the university (Bahen & Miller, 1998; CACREP manual, 2001; Haight, 1992; Lloyd, 1992). The CACREP manual (2001) indicates that one of the values of accreditation is that it provides recognition for the program and peers. Haight (1992) stated that graduates from accredited programs are increasingly becoming recognized by state legislatures to the extent that some state licensure examinations are written utilizing the CACREP standards. Furthermore, two case studies have experienced increased recognition since accreditation (Bahen & Miller, 1998; Lloyd, 1992). Through the process of accreditation, one program had increased visibility on campus and was able to secure money to improve the program (Bahen & Miller, 1998). Another institution echoed the experience of becoming more recognized by the university and by students (Lloyd, 1992).

Another potential benefit of accreditation through the self-study process is the possibility of increasing the number of faculty within a program. In a program case study by Bahen & Miller (1998), accreditation helped to clarify the need for additional faculty

members. In contrast, in a survey of accredited institutions by Vacc (1985), very few respondents were able to add faculty members. However, only 25 programs were accredited at the time, and 19 responded to the survey.

Two case studies found improvements in the admissions process after accreditation (Bahen & Miller, 1998; Morrow, 1993). Bahen & Miller (1998) reported that admissions processes were tightened because of accreditation. Morrow (1993) evaluated graduate record examination (GRE) scores of 171 graduates after accreditation. He found that the GRE analytical score, which was added to the admissions process after accreditation due to CACREP standards, was the greatest predictor of grade point average. Furthermore, other changes that were implemented due to meeting accreditation standards resulted in overall improved academic performance.

Finally, one of the values of accreditation according to the CACREP manual (2001) is that accreditation provides direction for quality education for counseling students. Bahen & Miller (1998) reported that accreditation has been helpful to improve syllabi and course objectives in one program. Lloyd (1992) stated that accreditation has increased consistency and encouraged rigor in teaching and supervision at another program. In a survey of students pre- and post-accreditation, Smaby & D'Andrea (1995) found that accreditation helped to improve curriculum and instruction as well as supervision at a third university. In 1985, Vacc's survey of 25 programs indicated that the greatest change in most programs due to accreditation was supervised experience. In the next year, Cecil & Comas (1985) surveyed the same 25 institutions and found that more than half of the programs paid greater attention to course content and sequencing of

courses, and 84% reported that new course were added since self-study. However, only 40% of these respondents reported an additional course in supervision and consultation.

Potential Challenges of Accreditation

Several challenges and concerns have been discussed and reported for programs to become accredited (Bahen & Miller, 1998; Lloyd, 1992; Sweeney, 1995; Weinrach, 1991). One set of challenges is the time, ambiguity, and cost involved in the self-study process. In an article by Sweeney (1995), he stated that the perceived time and cost associated with accreditation may outweigh the benefits. Weinrach (1991) further stated that the ambiguity and time involved in executing the self-study may need to be improved to help programs increase their chances of becoming accredited. In a case study by Bahen & Miller (1998), the self-study process was extremely ambiguous, time-consuming and costly for one program but was reported to be worth the benefits. In the case study by Lloyd (1992), increases in departmental administrative work and additional expenses were experienced. However, Lloyd stated that this program feels committed in spite of the time and expense because the program and faculty value accreditation.

Another concern that seems to be repeated in the literature is the ability of a program to meet the faculty requirements of the standards (Bobby & Kandor, 1992; Smaby & D'Andrea, 1995; Weinrach, 1991). According to the CACREP standards (CACREP, 2001), a minimum of ten full time students to one full time faculty member is required with a minimum of three full-time faculty members for the program. Weinrach (1991) stated that requiring a program to maintain at least three full time faculty may be unrealistic and discriminates against small but growing programs. In a survey of accredited and non-accredited programs the full-time student to full-time faculty ratio

was reported to be a problem for non-accredited programs and a concern for several accredited programs (Bobby & Kandor, 1992). One program, as reported by Smaby & D'Andrea (1995), dealt with this challenge by creating a ceiling on the number of students that would be accepted each year.

A final reported concern of becoming accredited is that a potential for the number of applications to a program may decrease because of the CACREP standards. Engels (1991) stated that the time, energy, and expense involved in completing a degree from an accredited institution might cause students to seek programs that are less demanding. Weinrach (1991) echoed this concern stating that the standards may be too idealistic and unattainable. However, Kandor & Bobby (1991) responded to Engels' concerns by stating that quality is most essential and that flexibility does exist in how students complete a program. Research has indicated that either no change in admissions has occurred (Cecil & Comas, 1986; Lloyd, 1992; Vacc 1985) or admissions have increased since accreditation (Barkley & Percy, 1984). Lloyd (1992) found in one program that the enrollment has remained relatively stable since becoming accredited. Vacc (1985) surveyed 25 programs and found no changes in applications or admissions due to accreditation. Cecil & Comas (1986) also found that most programs reported that enrollment has not changed for most of the 25 programs that were surveyed. Barkley & Percy (1984) found that programs that had been accredited had significantly more applications than programs that had not sought accreditation.

Effects of CACREP Accreditation on Students

Potential Advantages to Students

Wilcoxon, et al. (1987) found in a survey of 338 graduate students that students from all programs found value in CACREP accreditation, but those students from accredited programs rated accreditation as more important than those who were not in accredited programs. This may be due to several advantages that exist for students who graduate from accredited programs. For example, Morrow (1993) found that faculty members from a survey of accredited programs reported improvements in academic performance since being accredited under the new standards. Furthermore, site and university supervisors reported a consistent improvement in the performance of students during practica and internships. Moreover, Scott (2001) collected data from the National Board of Certified Counselors, Incorporated and found that graduates from accredited programs had higher means scores than non-accredited programs on the national counseling examination.

Two studies exist that reported doctoral students from accredited programs tend to have more employment opportunities (Lloyd, 1992; Zimpfer, et al., 1997). Lloyd (1992) reported in a self-study of one program that doctoral students were frequently queried about their knowledge of accreditation procedures and whether they could write an accreditation self-study, implying that programs were looking to new faculty to assist in future accreditation, therefore, helping new doctoral graduates secure employment. In a survey of accredited programs versus non-accredited doctoral programs, of those that responded, Zimpfer, et al. (1997) reported that differences exist in the value of various roles intended for graduates. Non-accredited programs placed greater emphasis on

teaching and scholarship while accredited programs rated all roles (teaching, scholarship, supervision, clinical practice, and leadership) of equal importance. Moreover, results from this study indicated that accredited programs placed a greater importance and experience of supervision than non-accredited programs. The additional emphasis of various roles within CACREP programs may improve a graduate's ability to obtain employment.

Potential Disadvantages to Students

Two primary limitations associated with CACREP accreditation are repeated in the literature. The first reported limitation is requiring students to obtain 600 hours of internship experience (Bobby & Kandor, 1992; Engels, 1991; Pate, 1990; Weinrach, 1991). According to Pate (1990), the CACREP internship requirement is difficult to meet for students who work full time and attend school part time. Engels (1991) echoed this concern stating that the majority of students attend part time and may have difficulty completing these hours. Kandor & Bobby (1991) responded to Engels' concern by stating that enough flexibility exists in the standards to accommodate student needs. However, in 1992, Bobby & Kandor revealed in a survey that the 600-hour internship was reported to be a problem for more than half of the non-accredited programs, and just under half of the accredited programs expressed concern about this requirement. Weinrach (1991) agreed that the standard may be difficult to attain, but it should also remain in place. Haight (1992) also acknowledged the difficulty of students to fulfill this requirement, but he stated that the standards are necessary and justified in order to assure quality graduates.

Another reported limitation associated with meeting CACREP standards has been the fulfillment of the 48-hour minimum for an entry-level program (Bobby & Kandor, 1992; Weinrach, 1991). Weinrach (1991) stated that the standard might inadvertently discriminate against those individuals who must work full time while attending school. He stated that the standard is difficult for some students to fulfill and that the standards should be attainable. However, he also stated that the standard should remain in place. In a survey by Bobby & Kandor (1992), a third of the respondents from non-accredited programs reported that the 48-semester hour minimum is a problem for seeking accreditation. In contrast, only twelve percent of accredited institutions indicated concern for this standard. Haight (1992) explicitly stated that the standards should be kept high, and he suggested that an increase to 60 hours might be needed in the future to meet the growing educational needs of counseling students. However, Engels (1991) stated that increasing to 60 hours could discriminate against part-time students.

Another limitation of the 48-hour program seems to be that there may be difficulty associated with meeting the core curricular experiences in a 48-hour program while meeting other course requirements either needed for licensure or for students who want to broaden their expertise (Cowger, 1992; Weinrach, 1991). According to the CACREP (2001) standards, eight core areas must be incorporated into the curriculum: human growth and development, social and cultural foundations, helping relationships, group work, career and lifestyle development, appraisal, research and program evaluation, and professional orientation. Frequently, programs meet these requirements by creating a separate course for each curricular experience (Michael Altekruze, via personal communication, June 19, 2001). With the practicum and internship minimums

the standards require, very few hours are left for electives or other required courses (Cowger, 1992; Weinrach, 1991).

According to Weinrach's (1991) article, one of the limitations of CACREP accreditation is that if all of the required curriculum experiences are met, only twelve hours are left to meet state licensure requirements. Two surveys revealed this concern as well in the areas of addictions (Morgan & Toloczko, 1997) and HIV/AIDS training (Hunt, 1996). In contrast, Cecil & Comas (1986) found that 83% of the programs that responded to their survey believed the standards provided flexibility within the curriculum to allow for individual differences in competencies among programs.

Cowger (1992) received thirty-two responses from a survey of accredited programs to explore how those core requirements were met and what additional course content areas outside of the core were either required or offered as an elective by various programs. Twenty-five of the 32 programs offered additional courses. The most frequently reported required courses were abnormal psychology, consultation skills, and ethics/professional issues in counseling. The most common electives were in marriage and/or family counseling, substance abuse counseling, counseling older adults, counseling children and adolescents, sexual behavior, and abnormal psychology.

Purpose of Study

The research exhibits the amount of variability that exists among professionals with regards to the concerns, limitations, and advantages of accreditation for faculty, programs, and students. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to do a preliminary survey of the opinions of individuals within CACREP accredited programs to discover the effects of accreditation on programs. First, the survey explored if changes occur

within a program after accreditation. The following student pre- and post-accreditation outcome measures were surveyed: grade point average, test scores, percentage of students that pass the licensing examinations, average scores on the national certification examination, student employment opportunities, students' learning ability, and if students are younger. The following faculty post-accreditation outcome measures were surveyed: professional activity, publications, and presentations. Finally, the survey assessed whether more students have applied to the program prior to or after accreditation.

The second aspect of the study was to determine if a significant number of programs offer courses that are deemed necessary in their program beyond the CACREP core curriculum experiences. A third aspect was to determine the amount of variety that exists in the courses that are offered beyond the core. A fourth aspect of the study was to determine if a significant number of programs require coursework beyond the core curricular experiences, and the fifth and final aspect of the study was to determine the amount of variety that exists in the courses that are required in addition to the core.

CHAPTER 2

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Survey Development

Cynthia Chandler and Michael Altekruise developed the survey at the University of North Texas (Appendix B). Cynthia Chandler is a full professor in and Michael Altekruise is the chair of the department of Counseling, Development, and Higher Education at the University of North Texas. Michael Altekruise developed the first portion of the survey (the introductory demographics and question 1) to assess if certain beliefs about accreditation were perceived to be true (Michael Altekruise, via personal communication July 16, 2001). The survey was developed as a preliminary opinionnaire to determine if further, more objective research would be needed. Cynthia Chandler developed the second portion of the survey (questions 2 and 3) to explore what courses are offered and required beyond the CACREP curriculum experiences and to determine types of and variety of courses other programs consider necessary for counselor preparation (Cynthia Chandler, via personal communication July 16, 2001). Therefore, the complete survey was created as a preliminary instrument to obtain the opinions from CACREP liaisons, which may be used as a guideline for a later, more objective, fact-based study of the effects of accreditation on counseling programs.

The respondents were asked to complete the following information on the introductory part of the survey into the blanks provided: name and telephone/email of person completing survey, name of institution, date completed, name of department/program, and the year in which the program was accredited (1988, 1994, or 2001) (See Appendix B). Question number 1 of the survey contained a list of the eleven

items that are frequently held beliefs about changes that occur after accreditation. The first column listed the eleven beliefs, the second column was for individuals to mark the effect before CACREP, and the third column was for individuals to mark the effect after CACREP. Respondents were requested to check all of the items that were true for their program prior to and after CACREP approval.

The second question on the survey asked respondents as to whether their program offers courses beyond the CACREP curriculum requirements as either program electives or requirements. If a “yes” response was given, the respondents were to continue to the next page.

The third question of the survey requested that respondents indicate the courses their program offered that were not required by CACREP (See Appendix B). Furthermore, the respondents were asked to indicate whether the courses were electives or required, the frequency offered, if the course was an interest area of one or more faculty, and if the course was considered necessary for counselor preparation. In the required column, the respondents were asked to use the initials of each program that has this curricular experience as a requirement (CC, MHC, SC, CA, CO, GC, MCF, SA, or CES). Several subject areas were listed. Finally, respondents were asked if any of the listed specialties were offered as a minor or major and if so, to indicate which ones.

Research Questions

Five primary research questions were evaluated in a survey of CACREP accredited institutions. The following research questions for this study were:

1. Which of the eleven frequently held beliefs about improvements after accreditation can be substantiated by the opinion of the programs' CACREP liaison?
2. How many of the programs surveyed offer courses beyond the CACREP core curriculum requirements?
3. What type and variety of courses are offered beyond the CACREP core curriculum requirements?
4. How many of the programs surveyed require courses beyond the CACREP core curriculum requirements?
5. What type and variety of courses are required beyond the CACREP core curriculum requirements?

Data Collection Procedures

One copy of the survey was mailed to all 150 CACREP accredited programs as listed on the CACREP website (<http://www.counseling.org/cacrep/directory.htm>) (see Appendix C). Appendix C lists the program addresses to which the letter and survey were sent, and the mark in the received category next to the program indicates a response. Each institution received a cover letter (see Appendix A, cover letter) with the two-page survey instrument (see Appendix B) and a postage paid, self-addressed envelope. After eight weeks, a second cover letter with the survey and postage paid, self-addressed envelope was mailed, and many of the cover letters had personal notes from Michael Altekruze to politely request a response (Appendix A, follow up letter).

Data Analysis

Demographic information of the respondent programs was obtained to evaluate if the sample was representative of the full population of CACREP accredited programs using the Counselor Preparation 1999-2001: Programs, Faculty, Trends (10th ed.) book by Hollis (1999-2001). Information regarding the percentage of respondent programs as compared with the total population of programs is reported. The percentages are broken down into the sizes of the programs as measured by two factors, number of faculty and number of students as reported Hollis' (1999-2001) book. The purpose of this information is to determine if the sample was representative of all accredited programs based upon size. Additional demographic information includes geographical location for the respondent program population as compared with the total population to determine if the sample was representative of all accredited programs. A table evidences the percentage of respondents to the total population as categorized by the Association for Counselor Education regions (North Atlantic, North Central, Rocky Mountain, Southern, and Western).

Frequently Held Beliefs

Eleven frequently held beliefs about how CACREP accreditation has changed respondent programs were evaluated. The number and percentage of responses on the survey is provided for each item. In addition, a chi-square analysis is reported on all eleven items indicating whether or not accreditation has changed a statistically significant number of programs at the .05 level.

Number of Programs That Offer Courses Beyond the Core

The number of and percentage of respondent programs that offered courses beyond the CACREP core curriculum experiences is reported. In addition, the total number of elective courses is provided.

Type and Variety of Courses Offered Beyond the Core

A list of the courses offered beyond the CACREP core curriculum experiences for all respondent programs is provided to evidence the type and variety. The list includes the number of programs that offer each course. In addition, a summary indicating the total number of electives, the number of electives offered by fewer than ten programs, and a list of elective courses that are offered by more than 10 programs is provided.

Number of Programs That Require Courses Beyond the Core

The number of and percentage of respondent programs that required courses beyond the CACREP core curriculum experiences is reported. In addition, the total number of required courses is provided.

Type and Variety of Courses Required Beyond the Core

A list of the courses required beyond the CACREP core curriculum experiences for all respondent programs is provided to evidence the type and variety. The list includes the number of programs that require each course and two percentages: 1) the percentage of required course out of the number of respondent programs offering the course as an elective, and 2) the percentage of required courses out of the total number of respondent programs. In addition, a summary indicating the total number of required courses, the number of electives required by fewer than ten programs, and a list of courses that are required by more than 10 programs is provided.

Sample

The survey was distributed to CACREP accredited program directors as listed on the CACREP website (<http://www.counseling.org/cacrep/directory.htm>). This directory provided the names and addresses of 150 institutions that were accredited as of April 2001. The statistics on the specialties of the entry-level programs are as follows: 113 community counseling programs accredited under the 1988 and 1994 standards (CC); 5 community counseling with a specialization in career counseling (CA); 2 programs with a gerontological counseling specialty (GC); 1 program accredited prior to the 1988 standards; 23 programs have the specialty of marriage and family counseling/therapy (MCF); 21 programs have a mental health counseling specialty (MHC); 124 programs have the school counseling specialty (SC); and 1 program has a specialty in education with a counseling emphasis for programs accredited prior to the 1988 standards.

Under the 1988 standards, the following number of programs has specializations in student affairs practice in higher education (SA): 1 program with a counseling emphasis, 1 program with a developmental emphasis, and 1 program with a administrative emphasis. Under the 1994 standards, the following number of programs has specializations in the student affairs practice in higher education: 31 programs with a college counseling emphasis (CO) and 14 programs with a professional practice emphasis. 42 doctoral-level programs are accredited for counselor education and supervision (CES).

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

Of the 150 surveys that were sent to CACREP accredited programs, 99 (66%) were returned. One program declined to complete the survey, and the other 50 programs (33%) did not respond in any way. Results are presented in the order of the research questions listed in the procedures section.

Frequently Held Beliefs

Results of the frequently held beliefs are listed in Appendix D, Tables 1, 2a, 2b, and 2c. The opinions of eleven frequently held beliefs about how CACREP accreditation has changed respondent programs were evaluated. The number of responses on the survey in the before CACREP column was less than the number of responses in the after CACREP column for each item (Appendix D, Table 1). The percentage of marked responses on the survey in the before CACREP column ranged from 0% to 12% for all items and in the same column from 7% to 15% for all items compared to the after CACREP column which ranged from 32% to 59% for all items (Appendix D, Table 1). In addition, three separate chi-square analyses are reported on all eleven items indicating whether or not accreditation has changed a statistically significant number of programs at the .05 level. The three separate Chi Square analyses compared: (1) the before CACREP with the after CACREP column; (2) the same with the after column; and (3) the before and same columns combined with the after column. The results of the chi square analyses indicated that the number of programs that selected the after CACREP column were statistically significant more than the before CACREP column alone, the same column

alone, or the before and same columns combined at less than the .05 level (Appendix D, Table 2). Thus, the results indicate it is believed that programs are better after accreditation than before.

For the item, students have higher grade point averages, six respondent programs marked the before CACREP column and 41 respondent programs marked the after CACREP column. In addition, 15 program respondents wrote “same”, one program respondent wrote “N/A”, and 36 programs respondents left the item blank. The Chi Square statistic comparing the before CACREP column with the after CACREP column was 26.06 at less than the .05 significance level. The Chi Square statistic comparing the same column with the after CACREP column was 12.07 at less than the .05 significance level. The Chi Square statistic comparing the before CACREP column combined with the same column with the after CACREP column was 6.45 at less than the .05 significance level.

For the item, students have higher test scores, one respondent programs marked the before CACREP column and 49 respondent programs marked the after CACREP column. In addition, 13 program respondents wrote “same”, three program respondent wrote “N/A”, and 33 programs respondents left the item blank. The Chi Square statistic was 46.08 with one degree of freedom at less than the .05 significance level. The Chi Square statistic comparing the same column with the after CACREP column was 20.90 at less than the .05 significance level. The Chi Square statistic comparing the before CACREP column combined with the same column with the after CACREP column was 19.44 at less than the .05 significance level.

For the item, students are younger, three respondent programs marked the before CACREP column and 39 respondent programs marked the after CACREP column . In addition, 14 program respondents wrote “same”, three program respondent wrote “N/A”, and 42 programs respondents left the item blank. The Chi Square statistic was 30.86 with one degree of freedom at less than the .05 significance level. The Chi Square statistic comparing the same column with the after CACREP column was 11.79 at less than the .05 significance level. The Chi Square statistic comparing the before CACREP column combined with the same column with the after CACREP column was 8.64 at less than the .05 significance level.

For the item, students learn better, two respondent programs marked the before CACREP column and 32 respondent programs marked the after CACREP column. In addition, 12 program respondents wrote “same”, one program respondent wrote “N/A”, and 52 programs respondents left the item blank. The Chi Square statistic was 26.47 with one degree of freedom at less than the .05 significance level. The Chi Square statistic comparing the same column with the after CACREP column was 10.52 at less than the .05 significance level. The Chi Square statistic comparing the before CACREP column combined with the same column with the after CACREP column was 8.33 at less than the .05 significance level.

For the item, students receive more employment opportunities, zero respondent programs marked the before CACREP column and 59 respondent programs marked the after CACREP column. In addition, 10 program respondents wrote “same”, one program respondent wrote “N/A”, and 29 programs respondents left the item blank. Since no respondents marked the before CACREP column, a Chi Square was not necessary to

analyze for significance. The Chi Square statistic comparing the same column with the after CACREP column was 34.80 at less than the .05 significance level. The Chi Square statistic comparing the before CACREP column combined with the same column with the after CACREP column was 34.80 at less than the .05 significance level.

For the item, higher percentage of students pass the licensed professional counselor examination, one respondent programs marked the before CACREP column and 37 respondent programs marked the after CACREP column. In addition, eight program respondents wrote “same”, ten program respondents wrote “N/A”, and 43 programs respondents left the item blank. The Chi Square statistic was 34.11 with one degree of freedom at less than the .05 significance level. The Chi Square statistic comparing the same column with the after CACREP column was 18.69 at less than the .05 significance level. The Chi Square statistic comparing the before CACREP column combined with the same column with the after CACREP column was 17.04 at less than the .05 significance level.

For the item, average scores are higher on the national certified counselor examination, one respondent programs marked the before CACREP column and 39 respondent programs marked the after CACREP column. In addition, seven program respondents wrote “same”, six program respondents wrote “N/A”, and 46 programs respondents left the item blank. The Chi Square statistic was 36.10 with one degree of freedom at less than the .05 significance level. The Chi Square statistic comparing the same column with the after CACREP column was 22.26 at less than the .05 significance level. The Chi Square statistic comparing the before CACREP column combined with the

same column with the after CACREP column was 20.45 at less than the .05 significance level.

For the item, program receives more applicants, twelve respondent programs marked the before CACREP column and 47 respondent programs marked the after CACREP column. In addition, 10 program respondents wrote “same”, one program respondent wrote “N/A”, and 29 programs respondents left the item blank. The Chi Square statistic was 20.76 with one degree of freedom at less than the .05 significance level. The Chi Square statistic comparing the same column with the after CACREP column was 24.02 at less than the .05 significance level. The Chi Square statistic comparing the before CACREP column combined with the same column with the after CACREP column was 9.06 at less than the .05 significance level.

For the item, faculty is more professionally active, two respondent programs marked the before CACREP column and 50 respondent programs marked the after CACREP column. In addition, 13 program respondents wrote “same”, one program respondent wrote “N/A”, and 33 programs respondents left the item blank. The Chi Square statistic was 44.31 with one degree of freedom at less than the .05 significance level. The Chi Square statistic comparing the same column with the after CACREP column was 21.73 at less than the .05 significance level. The Chi Square statistic comparing the before CACREP column combined with the same column with the after CACREP column was 18.85 at less than the .05 significance level.

For the item, faculty publishes more, two respondent programs marked the before CACREP column and 45 respondent programs marked the after CACREP column. In addition, 13 program respondents wrote “same”, one program respondent wrote “N/A”,

and 38 programs respondents left the item blank. The Chi Square statistic was 39.34 with one degree of freedom at less than the .05 significance level. The Chi Square statistic comparing the same column with the after CACREP column was 17.66 at less than the .05 significance level. The Chi Square statistic comparing the before CACREP column combined with the same column with the after CACREP column was 15.00 at less than the .05 significance level.

For the item, faculty presents more, three respondent programs marked the before CACREP column and 47 respondent programs marked the after CACREP column. In addition, 12 program respondents wrote “same”, one program respondent wrote “N/A”, and 36 programs respondents left the item blank. The Chi Square statistic was 38.72 with one degree of freedom at less than the .05 significance level. The Chi Square statistic comparing the same column with the after CACREP column was 20.76 at less than the .05 significance level. The Chi Square statistic comparing the before CACREP column combined with the same column with the after CACREP column was 16.52 at less than the .05 significance level.

Number of Programs That Offer Courses Beyond the Core

Ninety-one (91.92%) of respondent programs indicated that they offered courses beyond the CACREP core curriculum experience. Six (6.06%) respondent programs indicated that they did not offer courses beyond the CACREP core curriculum experience, and two programs (2.02%) left the item blank.

Variety of Programs That Offer Courses Beyond the Core

Seventy-eight different courses are offered over the 99 respondent programs. An alphabetical list of the elective courses is in Appendix D, Table 3. Some categories were

combined including: Gender Issues with Counseling Women; Marriage and Family with Couples Counseling; Addictions and Substance Abuse with Drug and Alcohol; Consultation and/or Supervision were combined; Psychopathology and Abnormal are combined with DSM IV; and Relaxation Training with Stress Management. All other courses had either the exact same titles or similar enough titles to be grouped together. Table 4 indicates the number of programs that offer each course. Seventy-one courses were offered by ten or less programs and seven courses were offered by more than ten programs. The seven electives offered by more than ten programs are as follows: Child/Adolescent Therapy (14 programs), Transpersonal/Spiritual (17 programs), Play Therapy (33 programs), Counseling Women/Gender Issues (28 programs), Couples/Marriage and Family (55 programs), DSM IV (77 programs), and Drugs/Alcohol (81 programs).

Number of Programs that Require Courses Beyond the Core

Of the 99 respondent programs, 79 (79.8%) different respondent programs required courses beyond the CACREP accredited core curriculum. Of the 99 respondent programs, 29 different courses are required.

Variety of Programs That Require Courses Beyond the Core

Of the 78 different electives, 29 courses are required by respondent programs. An alphabetical list of the required courses is in Appendix D, Table 4. In addition, the list includes the number of programs that require each course, the percentage of required courses out of the number of respondent programs offering the course as an elective, and the percentage of required courses out of the total number of respondent programs (99). Of the required courses, 23 courses are required by less than ten programs and 3 courses

are required by more than 30 programs. The three courses are: Couples/Marriage and Family (37 programs), Drug/Alcohol (47 programs), and DSM IV (70 programs).

Demographics

Three different demographic characteristics were assessed to determine if the sample was representative of all accredited programs. First, Appendix D, Table 5 indicates the number and percentage of respondent programs to the total number of programs categorized by the number of faculty members in ranges of three. No less than 50% and as many as 100% were received for each category. Second, Appendix D, Table 6 indicates the number and percentage of respondent programs to the total number of programs categorized by the number of students accepted in the program in ranges of ten. No less than 40% and as many as 100% were received for each category. Third, Appendix D, Table 7 indicates the number and percentage of respondent programs to the total number of programs categorized by ACES regions (North Atlantic, North Central, Rocky Mountain, Southern, and Western). For this table, a university in British Columbia, Canada was not included since it is not part of any of the five regions and was not received. Between 61% and 81% of the surveys were received by each region.

Additional Results

Although not the primary focus of research, data was collected for the following information requested on question 3 of the survey: 1) courses offered that are required for what program for each course, 2) frequency offered for each course, 3) an interest area of one or more faculty member for each course, and 4) considered necessary for counselor preparation for each course. The first (required for which program) and second (frequency offered) items were not completed in a consistent and legible manner by the

respondent programs (they did not follow directions), and therefore, are not reported by the researcher. However, the third (interest area) and fourth (considered necessary) items are summarized in Appendix D, Table 3.

Of the 78 courses offered, 55 courses are an interest area for at least one faculty member. Forty-nine of the 55 courses have less than 10 respondent programs that are an interest area for at least one faculty member, and the remaining six courses have more than 10 respondent programs. The six courses are: Counseling Women/Gender Issues (26 programs), Couples/Marriage and Family (42 programs), Drug/Alcohol (41 programs), DSM IV (42 programs), Play Therapy (33 programs), and Transpersonal/Spiritual (14 programs).

Of the 78 courses offered, forty-two courses are considered necessary for counselor preparation. Thirty-eight of the 42 courses are considered necessary for counselor preparation by 10 or less respondent programs, and the remaining three courses have more than 10 respondent programs. The three courses are: Couples/Marriage and Family (31 programs), Drug/Alcohol (48 programs), and DSM IV (59 programs).

Finally, respondents were asked if any of the listed specialties were offered as a minor or major and if so, to indicate which ones. Fourteen respondents indicated an affirmative response, and for those respondents that listed the specialties, marriage and family, addictions, and rehabilitation occurred as the most common answer.

Discussion

Implications of Results

The survey of opinions from respondent CACREP accredited programs indicated interesting results. The eleven frequently held beliefs about improvements after

accreditation was substantiated by the number, the percentage, and the Chi Square results from respondent programs. Compared with before accreditation, all 11 belief items were marked in the after CACREP column more frequently. Therefore, after CACREP accreditation, most programs reported the opinion that: students have higher grade point averages, students have higher test scores, students are younger, students learn better, students receive more employment opportunities, a higher percentage of students pass the licensed professional counselor examination, average scores are higher on the nationally certified counselor examination, programs receive more applicants, faculty is more professionally active, faculty publishes more, and faculty presents more. The item that was least affected by accreditation was the assumption that programs receive more applicants after accreditation. However, nearly 80% of the respondents indicated an increase as compared with before accreditation but was only 32% as compared with all columns. The item that seems most affected by accreditation is that students receive more employment opportunities. Analyzing only the before CACREP and after CACREP columns, 100% of the respondents reported an increase in this area, and comparing all columns, this area was 59%.

The second part of the survey indicated that a large percentage of respondent programs offer courses beyond the CACREP core curriculum experiences (91%) and that a variety of courses are offered (78 courses). In addition, 91 respondent programs indicated that courses are required beyond the CACREP core curriculum experiences and that a variety of courses are required (29 courses). The courses that consistently seem to be offered, required, an interest area of more than one faculty member, and considered necessary for counselor preparation are Couples/Marriage and Family, Drug/Alcohol,

DSM IV, Play Therapy, and Transpersonal/Spiritual. The Couples/Marriage and Family course and the Drug/Alcohol course were also frequently mentioned as specialties for several programs. In addition, several respondent programs indicated that these courses and several others were required for state licensure requirements. Therefore, most programs reported the necessity to add courses to the CACREP accreditation core curricular experiences in order to prepare counselors sufficiently for employment. Finally, with nearly two-thirds of the programs responding to the opinion survey, the demographic information implies that a representative sample was received from the total population of CACREP accredited programs.

Limitations of the Study and Recommendations for Future Research

Four primary limitations exist in this study. First, the eleven frequently held beliefs were marked by the opinion of one faculty member for each program. Therefore, a future study might obtain objective, fact-based data on the eleven items from as many accredited programs as possible to ascertain whether these opinions are factual.

Second, the number of blanks for each item was frequently close to or sometimes exceeded the number of respondents who marked the after CACREP column. The researcher is unable to determine whether the blank indicates that no change occurred or if the individual responding did not have an opinion. If the blank indicates no change and is combined with those items marked as the same, then only four items would be marked higher for after CACREP as compared with before CACREP or no change. These items are: students have higher test scores, students receive more employment opportunities, program receives more applicants, and faculty is more professionally active. Therefore, the other seven frequently held beliefs about accreditation may not necessarily be true.

The only way to determine the accuracy of the survey is for hard data to be collected on each item for at least a representative sample of the accredited programs. Assuming each program has maintained accurate records prior to and after accreditation, most of the eleven items should be able to be obtained for a future study.

Third, the survey data collected on courses that were offered by programs beyond the core were based upon memory and/or opinion and may be inaccurate. Fourth, the way in which programs marked the column requesting “the program specialty that each course was required for” was inconsistently marked and thus, the numbers of program specialties requiring courses may be inaccurate. Therefore, a review of program requirements, catalogues, or schedules of classes from each accredited program would be an accurate account of courses offered and required beyond the core. Finally, another recommendation for future research would be to compare CACREP accredited programs to programs that meet most of the accreditation requirements but are not accredited on these eleven items to determine whether accreditation makes a difference for students, the program, and faculty on the eleven surveyed items.

APPENDIX A
COVER LETTER

<<SURVEY LETTER>>

April 16, 2001

«Name»

«Company»

«Address1»

«Address2»

«City», «State» «PostalCode»

Dear «Name»,

I was writing to request your assistance on completing the attached survey. In 2000, I received a small grant from CACREP to research the effectiveness of CACREP accreditation. To date, I have compared student scores of the NCC from 1995 to the present from CACREP and non-CACREP approved schools. We are beginning more detailed studies that show the differences between CACREP approved programs and non-CACREP approved programs. This is not an easy task and I may be calling for your help again in the near future.

This study is a survey that is examining curricular experiences that are in addition to CACREP requirements and a simple perception survey that examines some of the myths of accreditation. You do not have to research anything to complete the perception study, just use your memory or the memory of someone who has been there before and after CACREP accreditation. I realize that this perception study is not true research and is full of limitations, but it could help us decide further research. Your participation in this study and future studies has the potential of helping non-CACREP programs make more informed decisions about CACREP and make your program even more attractive to students. Please complete the attached two pages, and return it in the self-addressed, postage paid envelope. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me. Thank you in advance for your help. Your assistance is greatly appreciated!

Sincerely,

Michael Altekruze, Ed.D., NCC
Professor and Chair

According to our records: You were first accredited in «year»
Your programs that received accreditation are: CC, SC, MHC
If this information is incorrect, please correct it here.

<<FOLLOW UP LETTER>>

June 11, 2001

«Name»
«Company»
«Address1»
«Address2»
«City», «State» «PostalCode»

Dear «Name»,

I just wanted to follow up with you on completing the attached survey. I now have a doctoral student who will be using this information for her dissertation and would greatly appreciate your participation. If you have not received this letter before, let me explain. In 2000, I received a small grant from CACREP to research the effectiveness of CACREP accreditation. To date, I have compared student scores of the NCC from 1995 to the present from CACREP and non-CACREP approved schools. We are beginning more detailed studies that show the differences between CACREP approved programs and non-CACREP approved programs. This is not an easy task and I may be calling for your help again in the near future.

This study is a survey that is examining curricular experiences that are in addition to CACREP requirements and a simple perception survey that examines some of the myths of accreditation. You do not have to research anything to complete the perception study, just use your memory or the memory of someone who has been there before and after CACREP accreditation. I realize that this perception study is not true research and is full of limitations, but it could help us decide further research. Your participation in this study and future studies has the potential of helping non-CACREP programs make more informed decisions about CACREP and make your program even more attractive to students. Please complete the attached two pages, and return it in the self-addressed, postage paid envelope. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me or my teaching assistant, Leah Brew at (940) 565-4874 or email her at brew@coefs.coe.unt.edu. Thank you in advance for your help. Your assistance is greatly appreciated!

Sincerely,

Michael Altekruise, Ed.D., NCC
Professor and Chair

According to our records: You were first accredited in «year»
Your programs that received accreditation are: CC, SC, MHC
If this information is incorrect, please correct it here.

APPENDIX B
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

SURVEY OF CACREP ACCREDITED PROGRAMS

Name and telephone/e-mail of person completing survey: _____

Name of Institution: _____ Date completed _____

Name of department/program: _____

Accredited under which CACREP Standards? 1988 1994 2001

1. The following is a comparison of your programs before CACREP approval and after CACREP approval. Please check all that are true for your programs.

	BEFORE CACREP	AFTER CACREP
Students have higher GPA's.		
Students have higher test scores.		
Students are younger.		
Students learn better.		
Students receive more employment opportunities.		
Higher percentage of students pass the LPC.		
Average scores are higher on the NCC.		
Programs receive more applicants.		
Faculty is more professionally active.		
Faculty publishes more.		
Faculty presents more.		

2. Do your programs offer courses beyond the CACREP curriculum requirements as either program electives or requirements? If "yes," please proceed to number 3. If "no," please explain below.

Continue to the next page.

3. Please indicate the curricular experiences as courses your program offers that are not required by CACREP. Indicate whether they are required or an elective, the frequency offered, and reasons offered in any or all of your approved programs. In the required/elective column use the initials of each program that has this curricular experience as a requirement. Community Counseling, CC; Mental Health Counseling, MHC; School Counseling, SC; Career Counseling, CA; College Counseling, CO; Gerontological Counseling, GC; Marital, Couple, and Family, MCF; Student Affairs, SA; Doctoral, CES.

Subject Area	Required for what programs?	Frequency Offered (yearly, every term?)	An interest area of one or more faculty.	Considered necessary for counselor preparation	Other reason. (Please explain)
Counseling Women					
Drug/Alcohol					
Biofeedback/Neurofeedback					
Dream Analysis					
Transpersonal/Spiritual					
Sports					
Health/Wellness					
Animal-Assisted Therapy					
Couples					
DSM IV					
Play Therapy					
Filial Therapy					
Other					
Other					
Other					
Other					

Are any of the above specialties offered as a minor or major? If so, which ones?

APPENDIX C
LIST OF PROGRAMS

CONTACT	RECEIVED	
<p>Dr. Debra C. Cobia Counseling & Counseling Psychology 2084 Haley Center Auburn University Auburn University, AL 36849-5222</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Kathryn Ness Department of Counseling and Psychology Troy State University-Phenix City One University Place Phenix City, AL 36869 CC (M.S.), SC (M.S.), MHC (M.S.) (2006) First Accredited: 4/99</p>	X	
<p>Dr. S. Allen Wilcoxon Program in Counselor Education P. O. Box 870231 The University of Alabama Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0231 First Accredited: 3/82 CC (M.A.), SC (M.A.), CE (Ph.D./Ed.D.) (2004)</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Sharon Robinson-Kurpius Division of Psychology in Education College of Education Box 870611 Payne Hall, Room 302 Arizona State University Tempe, AZ 85287-0611 First Accredited: 4/95 CC (M.C.) (2002) http://seamonkey.ed.asu.edu/~gail/programs/mc.htm</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Romona Mellott Center for Excellence in Education Educational Psychology Northern Arizona University Box 5774, CEE Flagstaff, AZ 86011-5774 Phone: 520/523-6534 First Accredited: 11/98 CC (M.A.), SC (M.Ed.) (2005) http://www.nau.edu/~cee/academics/EPS/</p>	X	

<p>Dr. Patrick Romine Department of Counselor Education 4615 E. Elwood Street University of Phoenix Phoenix and Tucson Campuses Phoenix, AZ 85040 Phone: 408/966-9577 First Accredited: 4/95 CC (M.C.) (2002) www.uophx.edu</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Arden U. Gale Educational leadership, Counseling and Foundations 136 Graduate Education Building University of Arkansas Fayetteville, AR 72701 Phone: 501/575-3540 First Accredited: 11/97 CC (M.S.), SC (M.S.), CE (Ph.D.) (2004) www.uark.edu/depts/cned/web/counselhome.html</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Basil Fiorito Psychology and Human Development Department California Polytechnic State University San Luis Obispo, CA 93407 Phone: 805/756-2674 First Accredited: 4/99 MFC/T (M.S.) (2006) http://www.calpoly.edu/~psychhd/masters.html</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Sari H. Dworkin Department of Counseling & Special Education School of Education and Human Development CSU/Fresno 5005 N. Maple Avenue, M/S3 Fresno, CA 93740-8025 Phone: 559/278-0328 First Accredited: 4/95 MFC/T (M.S.) (2002) beaches.soehd.csufresno.edu/soehd/cse/counsped.html</p>		
<p>Dr. Marcel Soriano Division of Administration and Counseling King Hall C-1065 CSU/Los Angeles 5151 State University Drive Los Angeles, CA 90032</p>	X	

Phone: 213/343-4253 First Accredited: 3/78 SC (M.S.), MFC/T (M.S.) (2003) web.calstatela.edu/academic/csoe/		
Dr. Rie Rogers Mitchell Educational Psychology & Counseling CSU/Northridge 18111 Nordhoff Street Northridge, CA 91330-8265 Phone: 818/677-7889 First Accredited: 3/79 CC/CrC (M.S.), MFC/T (M.S.), SC (M.S.), SAC (M.S.) (2001) http://www.csun.edu/~sch_educ/epc/epc.html	X	
Dr. Wanda Lee Department of Counseling San Francisco State University 1600 Holloway Avenue Burk Hall 524 San Francisco, CA 94132 Phone: 415/386-5822 First Accredited: 3/78 CC/GC (M.S.), CC/CrC (M.S.), MFC/T (M.S.), SC (M.S.), SACC (M.S.) (2002) www.sfsu.edu/~counsel	X	
Dr. Sandra Zimmerman and Adam Hill Counseling Department Nichols 220 Sonoma State University 1801 E. Cotati Avenue Rohnert Park, CA 94928 Phone: 707/664-2266 First Accredited: 3/84 CC (M.A.), SC (M.A.) (2006) www.sonoma.edu/counseling/		
Dr. Susan Varhely Department of Psychology ES 309 - Box J Adams State College Alamosa, CO 81102 Phone: 719/587-7626 First Accredited: 10/95 CC (M.A.), SC (M.A.) (2002)		

www.adams.edu		
<p>Dr. Rich Feller Education 215 Counseling and Career Development Colorado State University Ft. Collins, CO 80523 Phone: 970/491-6879 First Accredited: 4/97 CC (M.Ed.), CC/CrC M.Ed.), SC (M.Ed.) (2004) www.colostate.edu/Depts/SOE/</p>	X	
<p>Dr. James R. Beck Counseling Department Denver Seminary 3401 S. University Blvd. Englewood, CO 80110 Phone: 303/761-2482, ext. 1304 First Accredited: 4/97 CC (M.A.) (2004)</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Andrew Helwig Counseling Psychology and Counselor Education Campus Box 106 / P.O. Box 173364 University of Colorado at Denver Denver, CO 80217-3364 Phone: 303/556-8637 First Accredited: 4/91 CC (M.A.), SC (M.A.), MFC/T (M.A.) (2005)</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Tracy Baldo Counseling Psychology Program Division of Professional Psychology McKee Hall #248 University of Northern Colorado Greeley, CO 80639 Phone: 970/351-2544 First Accredited: 3/82 CC (M.A.), SC (M.A.), MFC/T (M.A.), CE (Ph.D) (2003) www.edtech.univnorthco.edu/coe/ppsy/ppsy.html</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Lynn Haley-Banez Counselor Education Department Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions Fairfield University Fairfield, CT 06430-7524 Phone: 203/254-4000 x 2421</p>		

<p>First Accredited: 9/86 CC (M.A.), SC (M.A.) (2001)</p>		
<p>Dr. Judith Wilcox Southern Connecticut State University Counseling and School Psychology Department 501 Crescent Street New Haven, CT 06515 Phone: 203/392-5913 First Accredited: 4/95 CC (M.S.), SC (M.S.) (2002) www.soe.scsu.ctstateu.edu</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Kathryn Campbell Western Connecticut State University Education Department Westside Campus Danbury, CT 06810 Phone: 203/837-8512 First Accredited: 4/95 CC (M.S.), SC (M.S.) (2002) www.wcsu.ctstateu.edu</p>		
<p>Dr. Samuel Milioti, Jr. Wilmington College 320 DuPont Highway New Castle, DE 19720 Phone: 302/328-9401 First Accredited: 3/98 CC (M.S.) (2005)</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Roger Beach Department of Counseling Gallaudet University 800 Florida Avenue NE Washington, DC 20002 Phone: 202/651-5515 First Accredited: 3/93 *SC (M.A.), MHC (M.A.) (2002)</p>		
<p>Dr. Pat Schwallie-Giddis Department of Counseling/Human and Organizational Studies Graduate School of Education and Human Development 2134 G Street NW George Washington University Washington, DC 20052 Phone: 202/994-6856 First Accredited: 3/84</p>		

CC (M.A.), SC (M.A.), CE (Ed.D.) (2005) www.gwu.edu/~chaos/		
Dr. Scott Gillig ADSOE/Counseling Program Barry University 11300 NE 2nd Avenue Miami Shores, FL 33161-6695 Phone: 305/899-3711 First Accredited: 10/95 MHC (M.S.), SC (M.S.), MFC/T (M.S.) (2002) www2.barry.edu/ed/csl/	X	
Dr. F. Donald Kelly 215 Stone Building College of Education Florida State University Tallahassee, FL 32306 Phone: 850/644-9439 First Accredited: 10/95 CC/CrC (M.S./Ed.S.), SC (M.S./Ed.S), MHC (M.S./Ed.S) (2002) http://www-fsu.edu/~coe/departments/hss	X	
Dr. Judith Provost Graduate Studies in Counseling Rollins College 1000 Holt Avenue, Box 2726 Winter Park, FL 32789-4499 Phone: 407/646-1567 First Accredited: 4/94 CC (M.A.), SC (M.A.) (2001)	X	
Dr. Mike Robinson University of Central Florida Counselor Education Program Educational Services Department Orlando, Fl 32816 Phone: 407/823-5829 First Accredited: 11/97 MHC (M.A.), SC (M.A./M.Ed) (2004) http://ucfed.ucf.edu/program/cons_education.html	X	
Dr. Peter Sherrard University of Florida Counselor Education Department 1215 Norman Hall Gainesville, FL 32611		

<p>Phone: 352/392-0731x 234 First Accredited: 3/81 MFC/T (M.S./Ed.S.), MHC (M.S./Ed.S), SC (M.S./Ed.S), CE (Ph.D/Ed.D.) (2003) <a href="http://www.coe.ufl.edu/Counselor/Index~1.ht</bigger>">www.coe.ufl.edu/Counselor/Index~1.ht</bigger></p>		
<p>Dr. Lynne Carroll Counselor Education Program College of Education and Human Services University of North Florida St. Johns Bluff Road S. Jacksonville, FL 32224-2645 Phone: 904/620-2838 First Accredited: 11/98 MHC (M.Ed.), SC (M.Ed.) (2005)</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Michael L. Baltimore Department of Counseling & Educational Leadership Columbus State University 4225 University Avenue Columbus, GA 31907-5645 Phone: 208/426-1209 First Accredited: 11/94 CC (M.S.), SC (M.Ed.) (2001) http://ccp.colstate.edu</p> <p>Dr. JoAnna White Counseling and Psychological Services College of Education 30 Pryor Street, Suite 950 Georgia State University Atlanta, GA 30303-3083 Phone: 404/651-2550 First Accredited: 3/80 CC (M.S.), SC (M.S.), CE (Ph.D.) (2003) www.gsu.edu/~wwwcps</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Georgia Calhoun Counseling & Human Development Services 402 Aderhold Hall University of Georgia Athens, GA 30602-7142 Phone: 706/542-1812 First Accredited: 4/87 CC (M.A./M.Ed.), SC (M.A./M.Ed.), SAA (M.A./M.Ed.), SAC (M.A./M.Ed.), SAD (M.A./M.Ed.) (2001)</p>		

www.coe.uga.edu/echd/		
<p>Dr. Margaret J. Miller Boise State University Counseling Department Education Building, Room 604 1910 University Boise, ID 83725 Phone: 208/426-1209 First Accredited: 3/00 SC (M.A.) (2007) http://education.boisestate.edu/counseling/</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Arthur Lloyd Department of Counseling Box 8120 Idaho State University Pocatello, ID 83209-8120 Phone: 208/282-3156 First Accredited: 3/80 MHC (M.C.), SC (M.C.), SACC (M.C.), CE (Ed.D.) (2002) www.isu.edu/departments/counsel/homepage.html</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Jerry Fisher Adult, Counselor, and Technology Education College of Education, Room 209 University of Idaho Moscow, ID 83844-3083 Phone: 208/885-5947 First Accredited: 10/84 CC (M.S. & M.Ed/Ed.S), SC (M.S. & M.Ed/Ed.S), CE (Ph.D./Ed.D.) (2007) www.uidaho.edu/ed/counseling/index/html</p>		
<i>ILLINOIS</i>		
<p>Dr. Lori A. Russell-Chapin Bradley University Department of Educational Leadership and Human Development 1501 W. Bradley Avenue Westlake Hall Peoria, IL 61625 Phone: 309/677-3193 First Accredited: 3/92 CC (M.A.), SC (M.A.) (2006)</p>		
<p>Dr. Dale J. Septeowski Concordia University Psychology Department</p>	X	

<p>7400 Augusta River Forest, IL 60305-1499 Phone: 708/209-3059 First Accredited: 4/96 SC (M.A.) (2003) www.curf.edu</p>		
<p>Dr. French Fraker Department of Counseling and Student Development Eastern Illinois University 214 Buzzard Building 600 Lincoln Avenue Charleston, IL 61920 Phone: 217/581-5327 First Accredited: 11/97 CC (M.S.), SC (M.S.) (2004) www.eiu.edu/~eiu.csd</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Diane Kjos Division of Psychology & Counseling College of Education Governors State University University Park, IL 60466 Phone: 708/534-4904 First Accredited: 4/91 CC (M.A.), MFC/T (M.A.), SC (M.A.) (2005) www.govst.edu/users/gpsych/PandC.html</p>		
<p>Dr. Jeffrey Edwards Counselor Education Program Northeastern Illinois University 5500 North St. Louis Avenue Chicago, IL 60625-4699 Phone: 773/794-2785 First Accredited: 4/94 CC (M.A.), SC (M.A.) (2001) www.neiu.edu</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Francesca Giordano Department of Counseling, Adult and Health Education Graham Hall 223 Northern Illinois University DeKalb, IL 60115-2854 Phone: 815/753-8462 First Accredited: 3/89 CC (M.S.Ed.), SC (M.S.Ed.), SACC (M.S.Ed), CE (Ed.D.) (2003)</p>	X	

http://www.cedu.niu.edu/cahe/index.html		
<p>Dr. John R. Martins Counseling and Human Services College of Education Roosevelt University 430 S. Michigan Avenue Chicago, IL 60605 Phone: 312/341-3705 First Accredited: 3/98 CC (M.A.), MHC (M.A.) (2005) www.roosevelt.edu/academics/coe/chs-ma.htm</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Karen Prichard Counseling Programs Educational Psychology and Special Education Department Wham Building, Room 223 Southern Illinois University at Carbondale Carbondale, IL 62901-4618 Phone: 618/536-7763 First Accredited: 3/88 CC (M.S.), MFC/T (M.S.), SC (M.S.), CE (Ph.D.) (2002) www.siu.edu/departments/coe/epse/</p>	X	
<p>Dr. James Lauier Human Development Counseling Program University of Illinois at Springfield Brookens 359 Springfield, IL 62794-9243 Phone: 217/786-7568 First Accredited: 10/93 CC (M.A.), SC (M.A.) (2001) www.uis.edu/~bcrowley/department.html</p>	X(Larry)	
<p>Dr. Melanie Rawlins Department of Counselor Education and College Student Personnel Western Illinois University Quad Cities & Macomb Campuses Horrabin Hall 741 University Circle Macomb, IL 61455 Phone: 309/298-1529 First Accredited: 4/87 CC (M.S.Ed.), SC (M.S.Ed) (2001) www.wiu.edu</p>	X	
<i>INDIANA</i>		
Dr. Robert Hayes	X	

<p>Department of Counseling Psychology and Guidance Services Teachers College - Room 622 Ball State University Muncie, IN 47306-0585 Phone: 765/285-8040 First Accredited: 3/80 CC (M.A.) (2002) www.bsu.edu</p>		
<p>Dr. John W. Bloom Counselor Education Program JH246 Butler University 4600 Sunset Avenue Indianapolis, IN 46208 Phone: 317/940-9490 First Accredited: 11/98 SC (M.A.) (2005) www.butler.edu/www/educ/grad/scmain.html</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Judy Hoffman Graduate Counseling Indiana Wesleyan University 4201 S. Washington Street Marion, IN 46953 Phone: 800/332-6901, x2995 First Accredited: 3/98 CC (M.A.), MFC/T (M.A.) (2005)</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Jean Peterson Counseling and Development 1446 LAEB Department of Educational Studies Purdue University West Lafayette, IN 47907-1446 Phone: 765/494-9742 First Accredited: 9/86 MHC (M.Ed./M.S), SC (M.Ed./M.S.), SACC (M.Ed./M.S.), SAPP (M.Ed./M.S.), CE (Ph.D.) (2001)</p>	X	
<i>IOWA</i>		
<p>Dr. Dennis Maki Counseling, Rehabilitation and Student Development N338 Lindquist Center N The University of Iowa Iowa City, IA 52242-1529 Phone: 319/335-5288</p>	X	

<p>First Accredited: 3/89 SC (M.A.), SAPP (M.A.), CE (Ph.D.) (2003) www.uiowa.edu/~counsed</p>		
<p>Dr. Ann Vernon Educational Leadership, Counseling and Postsecondary Education University of Northern Iowa 508 Schindler Education Center Cedar Falls, IA 50614-0604 Phone: 319/273-2605 First Accredited: 10/90 MHC (M.A.), SC (M.A.E.) (2005)</p>	X	
<i>KANSAS</i>		
<p>Dr. David M. Kaplan Division of Counselor Education and Rehabilitation Programs Campus Box 4036 1200 Commercial Emporia State University Emporia, KS 66801-5087 Phone: 316/341-5790 First Accredited: 11/97 SC (M.S.), MHC (M.S.), SACC (M.S.), SAPP (M.S.) (2004)</p>		
<p>Dr. Donald E. Ward Department of Psychology & Counseling Pittsburg State University Pittsburg, KS 66762-7551 Phone: 316/235-4530 First Accredited: 10/88 CC (M.S.) (2003) www.pittstate.edu</p>	X	
<i>KENTUCKY</i>		
<p>Dr. Thomas F. Holcomb Educational Leadership & Counseling P.O. Box 9 Murray State University Murray, KY 42071 Phone: 502/762-2795 First Accredited: 3/89 CC (Ed.S.) (2004) www.murraystate.edu/coe/elc.htm</p>		
<p>Dr. John R. Rigney Lindsey Wilson College 210 Lindsey Wilson Street Columbia, KY 42728</p>		

Phone: 502/384-8121 First Accredited: 4/96 MFC/T (M.Ed.), MHC (M.Ed.) (2003)		
<i>LOUISIANA</i>		
Dr. Pamela Newman Department of Educational Leadership and Counseling University of Louisiana at Monroe 700 University Avenue Monroe, LA 71209-0230 Phone: 318/342-1256 First Accredited: 3/89 CC (M.Ed./M.A.), MFC/T (M.A.), SC (M.Ed.) (2004) www.ulm.edu	X	
Dr. Robert L. Bowman College of Education Student Personnel Services Program Northwestern State University Natchitoches, LA 71497 Phone: 318/357-5190 First Accredited: 4/95 SACC (M.A.), SAPP (M.A.) (2002) www.education.nsula.edu/sps/		
Dr. Judith G. Miranti Humanities, Education, and Counseling Our Lady of Holy Cross College 4123 Woodland Drive New Orleans, LA 70131 Phone: 504/398-2214 First Accredited: 4/99 *MFC/T (M.A.) (2001)	X	
Dr. Mary Ballard Counseling, Family Studies, and Educational Leadership Southeastern Louisiana University SLU Box 10863 Hammond, LA 70402 Phone: 504/549-2155 First Accredited: 3/98 CC (M.Ed.), SC (M.Ed.), SACC (M.Ed.) (2005) www.selu.edu/Academics/Education/cfsel/index.htm		
Dr. Theodore P. Remley Counselor Education Graduate Program Department of Educational Leadership, Counseling and Foundations	X	

<p>University of New Orleans New Orleans, LA 70148-2515 Phone: 504/280-7386 First Accredited: 10/89 CC (M.A./M.Ed.), SC (M.A./M.Ed.), SACC (M.A./M.Ed.), CE (Ph.D./Ed.D.) (2004) www.uno.edu/~edfr/</p>		
<i>MAINE</i>		
<p>Dr. John M. Sutton Jr. Department of Human Resource Development 400 Bailey Hall University of Southern Maine Gorham, ME 04038-1083 Phone: 207/780-5317 First Accredited: 10/87 MHC (M.S.), SC (M.S.), CC (M.S.) (2002) www.usm.maine.edu/~coe/hrd/ce.htm</p>	X	
<i>MARYLAND</i>		
<p>Dr. Sharon E. Chesten Pastoral Counseling Department Loyola College in Maryland 7135 Minstrel Way Columbia, MD 21045 Phone: 410/617-7620 First Accredited: 10/89 CC (M.S.) (2004) www.loyola.edu/pastoral</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Lee J. Richmond Education Department Loyola College in Maryland 4501 N. Charles Street Baltimore, MD 21210 Phone: 410/617-2667 First Accredited: 4/97 SC (M.A./M.Ed.) (2004) www.loyola.edu</p>	X	
<p>Dr. David B. Hershenson Counseling and Personnel Services College of Education University of Maryland at College Park College Park, MD 20742 Phone: 301/405-2862 First Accredited: 10/85</p>	X	

CC/CrC (M.S./M.Ed.), SC (M.S./M.Ed.), CE (Ph.D.) (2002)		
<i>MICHIGAN</i>		
Dr. Frederick Kosinski, Jr Educational & Counseling Psychology Bell Hall 160 Andrews University Berrien Springs, MI 49104-0104 Phone: 616/471-3466 First Accredited: 3/90 CC (M.A.), SC (M.A.) (2004) www.educ.andrews.edu		
Dr. Irene Mass Ametrano Department of Leadership and Counseling John W. Porter Building Suite 304 Eastern Michigan University Ypsilanti, MI 48197 Phone: 734/487-0255 First Accredited: 10/89 CC (M.A.), SC (M.A.) (2005) www.emich.edu/public/leadcons/home.html		
Dr. Lisa Hawley Department of Counseling Room 478 O'Dowd Hall Oakland University Rochester, MI 48309-4494 Phone: 248/370-2841 First Accredited: 11/94 CC (M.A.), SC (M.A.) (2001) www.oakland.edu/sehs/organi/depts/cns/index.html	X	
Dr. Daisy B. Ellington Counselor Education College of Education Wayne State University 311 Education Building 5429 Gullen Mall Detroit, MI 48202 Phone: 313/577-2435 First Accredited: 11/94 CC ((M.A.), SC (M.Ed.), CE (Ph.D./Ed.D.) (2001) http://www.coe.wayne.edu/org/TBF/tbf.html		
Dr. John Geisler Counselor Education and	X	

<p>Counseling Psychology 3102 Sangren Hall Western Michigan University Kalamazoo, MI 49008-5195 Phone: 616/387-5110 First Accredited: 10/83 CC (M.A.), SC (M.A.), SACC (M.A.), SAPP (M.A.), CE (Ph.D) (2005) www.wmich.edu/cecp</p>		
<i>MINNESOTA</i>		
<p>Dr. Diane Coursol Counseling and Student Personnel, Box 52 Minnesota State University at Mankato Mankato, MN 56002-8400 Phone: 507/389-2423 First Accredited: 9/86 CC (M.S.), SC (M.S.), SAPP (M.S.) (2001) www.mankato.msus.edu/dept/DeptCSP/</p>	X	
<p>Dr. William Packwood Minnesota State University at Moorhead Counseling and Student Affairs 211C Lommen Hall Moorhead, MN 56563 Phone: 218/236-2044 First Accredited: 3/00 CC (M.S.), SAPP (M.S.), SACC (M.S.) (2006) www.moorhead.msus.edu/counsel2/</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Jane Hovland Department of Psychology and Mental Health 320 Bohannon Hall 10 University Drive University of Minnesota Duluth Duluth, MN 55812 Phone: 218/726-7118 First Accredited: 11/94 CC (M.A.), SC (M.A.) (2001)</p>	X	
<i>MISSISSIPPI</i>		
<p>Dr. Marilyn S. Snow Division of Behavioral Sciences Ewing 335 P.O. Box 3142 Delta State University Cleveland, MS 38733 Phone: 601/846-4357</p>		

<p>First Accredited: 4/91 CC (M.Ed.), SC (M.Ed.) (2004) http://www.deltast.edu/academics/educ/behavsci/public_html/index.html</p>		
<p>Dr. Katherine Dooley Counselor Education & Educational Psychology Box 9727 Mississippi State University Mississippi State, MS 39762 Phone: 601/325-3426 First Accredited: 9/86 SACC (M.S.), CC (M.S.), SC (M.S.), CE (Ph.D/Ed.D.) (2005) www.msstate.edu/Dept/COE/CEdEPy/cedepy.html</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Catherine Campbell Department of Psychology Southern Station Box 5025 University of Southern Mississippi Hattiesburg, MS 39406-5025 Phone: 601/266-4598 First Accredited: 10/85 CC (M.S.) (2001)</p>	X	
<i>MISSOURI</i>		
<p>Dr. Verl Pope Educational Administration and Counseling Southeast Missouri State University Mail Stop 5550 One University Plaza Cape Girardeau, MO 63701-4799 Phone: 573/651-2123 First Accredited: 3/98 CC (M.A.) (2005) http://www4.semo.edu/counsel/</p>		
<p>Dr. Christopher J. Maglio Counselor Preparation Division of Social Science 100 East Normal Truman State University Kirksville, MO 63501 Phone: 816/785-4403 First Accredited: 3/92 CC (M.A.), SC (M.A.), SAPP (M.A.) (2006) www.truman.edu/academics/ss/home.html#counseling</p>	X	
<i>MONTANA</i>		

<p>Dr. Jill Thorngren Health and Human Development Montana State University - Bozeman 218 Herrick Hall Bozeman, MT 59717 Phone: 406/994-3299 First Accredited: 3/93 *MFC/T (M.S.), MHC (M.S.), SC (M.S.) (2002) www.montana.edu/wwwhhhd</p>	X	
<i>NEBRASKA</i>		
<p>Dr. Marlene Kuskie University of Nebraska at Kearney Department of Counseling and School Psychology Founders Hall Kearney, NE 68849 Phone: 308/865-8361 First Accredited: 3/00 *CC (M.S.Ed.) (2002) www.unk.edu/acad/csp</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Scott Harrington Counseling Department University of Nebraska at Omaha Kayser Hall 421 College of Education Omaha, NE 68182-0167 Phone: 402/554-2618 First Accredited: 3/93 CC (M.A./M.S.), SC (M.A./M.S.) (2007)</p>		
<i>NEVADA</i>		
<p>Dr. Karin Jordan Department of Counseling University of Nevada/Las Vegas 4505 Maryland Parkway Box 453045 Las Vegas, NV 89154-3045 Phone: 702/895-3398 First Accredited: 3/84 *CC (M.S.), MFC/T (M.S.) (2001) www.unlv.edu/colleges/urban/counseling/</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Paul Jones Educational Psychology & School Counseling University of Nevada/Las Vegas 4505 S. Maryland Parkway Las Vegas, NV 89154-3003</p>	X	

<p>First Accredited: 3/84 SC (M.S.Ed.) (2001) www.unlv.edu/colleges/urban/counseling/</p>		
<p>Dr. Marlowe Smaby Counseling & Educational Psychology Department / 281 University of Nevada, Reno Reno, NV 89557-0213 Phone: 702/784-1772 First Accredited: 4/94 MFC/T (M.A./M.Ed.), SC (M.A./M.Ed.), SACC (M.A./M.Ed.), CE (Ph.D./Ed.D) (2001) unr.edu/homepage/smaby/smabyindex.html</p>	X	
<i>NEW JERSEY</i>		
<p>Dr. Mark S. Kiselica Department of Counselor Education Forcina Hall 337 P.O. Box 7718 The College of New Jersey Ewing, NJ 08620-0718 Phone: 609/771-2119 First Accredited: 4/91 CC (M.A.), SC (M.A.) (2005) www.tcnj.edu</p>		
<p>Dr. Jesse B. DeEsch Department of Graduate Education and Human Services/Counseling Services Program Rider University 2083 Lawrenceville Road Lawrenceville, NJ 08648-3099 Phone: 609/895-5487 First: Accredited 4/99 *CC (M.A.), SC (M.A.) (2001)</p>	X	
<i>NEW MEXICO</i>		
<p>Dr. Rod Merta Counseling and Educational Psychology New Mexico State University P.O. Box 30001 MSC 3CEP Las Cruces, NM 88003 Phone: 505/646-2121 First accredited: 10/99 *MHC (M.A.) (2001)</p>		

<p>Dr. Deborah Rifienbary Counselor Education Program College of Education Simpson Hall University of New Mexico Albuquerque, NM 87131-1246 Phone: 505/277-8933 First Accredited: 10/82 CC (M.A.), SC (M.A.), CE (Ph.D.) (2004)</p>		
<i>NEW YORK</i>		
<p>Dr. Susan Seem Department of Counselor Education 184 Faculty Office 350 New Campus Drive SUNY at Brockport Brockport, NY 14420-2953 Phone: 716/395-2258 First Accredited: 4/87 CC (M.S.), SC (M.S.), SAC (M.S.) (2001) www.brockport.edu/~counsele.htm</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Donald A Haight Plattsburgh State University of New York 101 Broad Street Ward Hall, Draper Avenue Plattsburgh, NY 12901 Phone: 518/564-4178 First Accredited: 3/90 CC (M.S.), SC (M.S.Ed), SACC (M.S.) (2004) www.plattsburgh.edu/clg/</p>		
<p>Dr. Janine Bernard Counseling and Human Services 259 Huntington Hall Syracuse University Syracuse, NY 13244-3240 Phone: 315/443-2266 First Accredited: 4/94 SC (M.S.), SAC (M.S.), CE (Ph.D/Ed.D) (2001)</p>	X	
<i>NORTH CAROLINA</i>		
<p>Dr. Lee Baruth Human Development and Psychological Counseling Appalachian State University Boone, NC 28608 Phone: 828/262-3133</p>		

<p>First Accredited: 10/83 CC (M.A.), SC (M.A.), SACC (M.A.) (2005) www.hpc.appstate.edu/</p>		
<p>Dr. Stanley B. Baker Counselor Education Department 520 Poe Hall Box 7801 North Carolina State University Raleigh, NC 27695-7801 Phone: 919/515-6360 First Accredited: 3/90 *CC (M.Ed./M.S.), SC (M.Ed./M.S.), SACC (M.Ed./M.S.), CE (Ph.D) (2002) www2.ncsu.edu/ncsu/cep/</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Duane Brown School Counseling Program CB #3500 Peabody Hall University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3500 Phone: 919/962-7846 First Accredited: 4/86 SC (M.A./M.Ed.) (2007) http://www.unc.edu/depts/ed/counseling</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Mary Thomas Burke Counselor Education The University of North Carolina at Charlotte 9201 University City Blvd. Charlotte, NC 28223-0001 Phone: 704/547-4718 First Accredited: 4/95 CC (M.A.), SC (M.A.) (2002) http://www.uncc.edu/colleges/education/spc</p>		
<p>Dr. L. DiAnne Borders Department of Counseling & Educational Development P.O. Box 26171 The University of North Carolina at Greensboro Greensboro, NC 27402-6171 Phone: 336/334-3434 First Accredited: 1981 CC (M.Ed./Ed.S.), CC/GC (M.Ed./Ed.S.), MFC/T (M.Ed./Ed.S.), SC (M.Ed./Ed.S.), SACC(M.Ed./Ed.S.), CE (Ph.D./Ed.D.) (2002) www.ncg.edu/ced/</p>	X	

<p>Pamela Karr Counselor Education Programs Box 7266 Wake Forest University Winston-Salem, NC 27109 Phone: 336/758-4921 First Accredited: 4/95 CC (M.A.Ed.), SC (M.A.Ed) (2002)</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Mary Deck Department of Human Services 204 Killian Building Western Carolina University Cullowhee, NC 28723 Phone: 704/227-3292 First Accredited: 3/93 CC (M.S.), SC (M.A.Ed) (2007) www.crap.wcu.edu/schwiebert/counseling/index.htm</p>		
<i>NORTH DAKOTA</i>		
<p>Dr. J. Wade Hannon Counselor Education Program School of Education 210 FLC North Dakota State University Fargo, ND 58105 Phone: 701/231-7204 First Accredited: 4/97 CC (M.S./M.Ed.), SC (M.S./M.Ed.) (2004)</p>		
<i>OHIO</i>		
<p>Dr. Elizabeth R. Welfel CASAL Department Cleveland State University 1983 East 24th Street 1419 Rhodes Tower Cleveland, OH 44115 Phone: 216/687-4605 First Accredited: 11/94 CC (M.Ed.) (2001) www.csuohio.edu/casa/</p>		
<p>Dr. Paula Britton Counseling & Human Services Program Department of Education & Allied Studies John Carroll University 20700 North Park Boulevard</p>		

<p>University Heights Cleveland, OH 44118-4581 Phone: 216/397-1710 First Accredited: 4/97 CC (M.A.) (2004) www.jcu.edu</p>		
<p>Dr. Dale Pietrzak Counseling & Human Development Services 310 White Hall Kent State University Kent, OH 44242-0001 Phone: 330/672-2662 First Accredited: 4/91 CC (M.A./M.Ed.), CE (Ph.D) (2005) www.educ.kent.edu/Frames/ACVE/Programs/CDS/</p>		
<p>Dr. Thomas E. Davis Counselor Education 201 McCracken Hall Ohio University Athens, OH 45701 Phone: 614/593-4402 First Accredited: 9/86 CC (M.Ed.), SC (M.Ed.), CE (Ph.D) (2001) www.Ohiou.EDU</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Patricia Parr Counseling and Special Education 127 Carroll Hall University of Akron Akron, OH 44325-5007 Phone: 330/972-8151 First Accredited: 10/85 CC (M.A./M.S.Ed.), MFC/T (M.A./M.S.Ed), SC (M.A./M.S.Ed.), CE (Ph.D) (2002)</p>		
<p>Dr. Geoffrey G. Yager Counseling Program Division of Human Services P.O. Box 210002 University of Cincinnati Cincinnati, OH 45221-0002 Phone: 513/556-3347 First Accredited: 3/93 CC (M.A.), SC (M.A./M.Ed.), CE (Ed.D) (2001)</p>	X	

www.education.uc.edu/programs/counsel/index.html		
<p>Dr. Martin Ritchie Department of Counseling and Mental Health Services University of Toledo Toledo, OH 43606-3390 Phone: 419/530-4775 First Accredited: 10/89 CC (M.Ed.), SC (M.Ed.), CE (Ph.D) (2004) http://cmhs.utolrdo.edu/</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Patrick Taricone Department of Human Services M052 Creative Arts Center Wright State University Dayton, OH 45435-0001 Phone: 937/775-2075 First Accredited: 3/89 CC (M.A./M.S.), SC (M.A.&M.S./M.Ed.) (2003)</p>	X (Stephen Fortson)	
<p>Dr. Don Martin Department of Counseling Youngstown State University One University Plaza Youngstown, OH 44555-0001 Phone: 330/742-3257 First Accredited: 3/86 CC (M.S.Ed.), SC (M.S.Ed.) (2006) www.yzu.edu/colleges/coll_edu/counsel/index.htm</p>	X	
<i>OREGON</i>		
<p>Dr. Liz Gray Counselor Education Program School of Education Oregon State University Corvallis, OR 97331 Phone: 541/737-5968 First Accredited: 3/86 *CC (M.S.), SC (M.S.), CE (Ph.D) (2002) osu.orst.edu/dept/soe/</p>	X(Jim Firth)	
<p>Dr. Dave Capuzzi Department of Special Education and Counselor Education Portland State University P.O. Box 751 Portland, OR 97207-0751 Phone: 503/725-4741</p>		

First Accredited: 3/93 CC (M.A./M.S.), SC (M.A./M.S.) (2007)		
<i>PENNSYLVANIA</i>		
Dr. Joseph F. Maola Department of Counseling, Psychology and Special Education Duquesne University School of Education Pittsburgh, PA 15282 Phone: 412/396-6099 First Accredited: 3/93 CC (M.S.Ed.), SC (M.S.Ed.), CE (Ed.D.) (2001) www.education.duq.edu/counselored	X	
Dr. Salene Cowher Counseling and Human Development Department Edinboro University of Pennsylvania 128 Butterfield Hall Edinboro, PA 16444 Phone: 814/732-2421 First Accredited: 4/99 SC (M.Ed.), SACC (M.Ed.), SAPP (M.Ed.) (2006) www.edinboro.edu	X	
Dr. Thomas L. Hozman Department of Counseling Shippensburg University 1871 Old Main Drive Shippensburg, PA 17257 Phone: 717/532-1668 First Accredited: 3/80 CC (M.S.), MHC (M.S.), SC (M.Ed.), SACC (M.S.), SAPP (M.S.) (2003) www.ship.edu/~counsel	X	
Dr. Louis A. Chandler Dept of Psychology in Education 5C01 WWPH University of Pittsburgh Pittsburgh, PA 15260 Phone: 412/624-7226 First Accredited: 10/89 SC (M.A.), CC (M.A.) (2005) www.pitt.edu/~soeforum/new/dept_pie.html	Declines	
Dr. Thomas M. Collins Department of Counseling and Human Services	X	

University of Scranton Scranton, PA 18510-4523 Phone: 717/941-4129 First Accredited: 3/92 SC (M.S.) (2006) *CC (M.S.) (2001) academic.uofs.edu/~department/CHS/		
<i>PUERTO RICO</i>		
Dr. Katherine Dooley Counselor Education & Educational Psychology Box 9727 Mississippi State University Roosevelt Roads Campus Mississippi State, MS 39762 Phone: 601/325-3426 First Accredited: 9/86 *CC (M.S.), SC (M.S.) (2001) http://www.msstate.edu/Dept/COE/CEdEPy/cedepy.html		
<i>SOUTH CAROLINA</i>		
Dr. Barbara Griffin Clemson University Department of Counseling and Educational Leadership College of Health, Education and Human Development 330 Tillman Hall, Box 340710 Clemson, SC 29634-0710 Phone: 864/657-5113 First Accredited: 3/00 *CC (M.Ed.), SC (M.Ed.), SAPP (M.Ed.), SACC (M.Ed.) (2002) www.hehd.clemson.edu/c&el		
Dr. Joe Rotter Counselor Education Department of Educational Psychology College of Education University of South Carolina Columbia, SC 29208 Phone: 803/777-6585 First Accredited: 10/84 *SC (Ed.S.), MFC/T (Ed.S.), CE (Ph.D.) (2002) www.ed.sc.edu/edpy/counsed/counsed.htm		
<i>SOUTH DAKOTA</i>		
Dr. Francis A. Martin College of Education and Counseling Box 507 Wenona Hall	X(Marla Muxen)	

<p>South Dakota State University Brookings, SD 57007-0095 Phone: 605/688-5883 First Accredited: 11/94 CC (M.S.), SC (M.S.), SAC (M.S.) (2001) www.sdstate.edu/~wedc/http/CHRD.htm</p>		
<p>Dr. Frank Main Division of Counseling and Psychology in Education University of South Dakota Delzell School of Education Vermillion, SD 57069 Phone: 605/677-5257 First Accredited: 3/93 *CC (M.A.), SC (M.A.), SACC (M.A.), CE (Ph.D.) (2002)</p>	X	
<i>TENNESSEE</i>		
<p>Dr. Clifton Mitchell Counseling Program in Department of Human Development and Learning East Tennessee State University P.O. Box 70548 College of Education Johnson City, TN 37614-0548 Phone: 423/439-4197 First Accredited: 4/99 CC (M.Ed./M.A.), SC (M.Ed./M.A.) (2006) www.coe.etsu.edu/counseling/index.htm</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Keith Carlson Middle Tennessee State University Department of Psychology P.O. Box 87 Murfreesboro, TN 37132 Phone: 615/898-2007 First Accredited: 3/00 *SC (M.Ed.) (2002)</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Ronnie Priest Counseling, Educational Psychology, and Research Ball Hall, Room 100 The University of Memphis Memphis, TN 38152-0001 Phone: 901/678-4479 First Accredited: 11/94 CC (M.S.), SC (M.S.), SACC (M.S.), CE (Ed.D) (2001)</p>		

<p>Dr. Charles L. Thompson Counselor Education and Counseling Psychology College of Education The University of Tennessee Knoxville, TN 37996-3400 Phone: 423/974-5131 First Accredited: 10/82 *MHC (M.S.), SC (M.S.) (2002) www.coe.utk.edu/units/counselor.html</p>		
<p>Dr. Richard L. Percy Human Development Counseling Program P.O. Box 322-GPC Vanderbilt University Nashville, TN 37203 Phone: 615/322-8484 First Accredited: 3/83 *CC (M.A.), SC (M.A.) (2001) Peabody.vanderbilt.edu/hdc/</p>		
<p><i>TEXAS</i></p>		
<p>Dr. Robert B. Babcock Department of Counseling and Human Services St. Mary's University One Camino Santa Marie San Antonio, TX 78228 Phone: 210/436-3226 First Accredited: 11/97 CC (M.A.), CE (Ph.D.) (2004) www.stmarytx.edu</p>		
<p>Dr. Linda Homeyer Southwest Texas State University Department of Educational Administration & Psychology Services 601 University Drive San Marcos, TX 78666-4615 Phone: 512/245-3757 First Accredited: 3/00 CC (M.A.), MFC/T (M.A.), SACC (M.A.) (2007) www.eaps.swt.edu/counseling.html</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Jane A. Holland Department of Counseling and Special Educational Programs Stephen F. Austin State University P.O. Box 13019 Nacogdoches, TX 75962-3019</p>		

<p>Phone: 409/468-1065 First Accredited: 10/93 CC (M.A.), SC (M.A.) (2001) www.sfasu.edu/csped/</p>		
<p>Dr. Richard E. Lampe Department of Counseling Texas A & M University - Commerce Commerce, TX 75429-3011 Phone: 903/886-5637 First Accredited: 3/92 *CC (M.S.), SC (M.S./M.Ed.), SACC (M.S.), CE (Ph.D.) (2001) Research2.TAMU-Commerce.edu/counseling</p>		
<p>Dr. JoLynne Reynolds Department of Family Sciences Texas Women's University P.O. Box 425769 Denton, TX 76204-5769 Phone: 940/898-2685 First accredited: 10/00 CC (M.S.), SC (M.S.) (2007) *MFC/T (M.S) (2002)</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Camille DeBell Counselor Education Program Texas Tech University Box 41071 Administration Building College of Education Lubbock, TX 79409-1071 Phone: 806/742-1997 x272 First Accredited: 4/99 *CC (M.Ed.), SC (M.Ed.), CE (Ed.D.) (2001)</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Michael Altekruze Program in Counselor Education P.O. Box 311337 University of North Texas Denton, TX 76203-1337 Phone: 940/565-2910 First Accredited: 3/80 CC (M.Ed./M.S.), SC (M.Ed./M.S.), SACC (M.Ed./M.S.), SAPP (M.Ed./M.S.), CE (Ed.D./Ph.D.) (2002) www.coe.unt.edu/cdhe/cnslored.htm</p>	X	

<i>VERMONT</i>		
<p>Dr. Eric Nichols Counseling Program 405 Waterman Building University of Vermont Burlington, VT 05405-0160 Phone: 802/656-3888 First Accredited: 10/82 CC (M.S.), SC (M.S.), MHC (M.S.) (2004) www.uvm.edu/~cslgprog</p>		
<i>VIRGINIA</i>		
<p>Dr. Charles Gressard and Dr. Charles McAdams School of Education The College of William and Mary P.O. Box 8795 Williamsburg, VA 23187-8795 Phone: 757/221-2352 or 757/221-2238 First Accredited: 10/99 *CC (M.Ed.), SC (M.Ed.), CE (Ph.D./Ed.D.) (2001)</p>		
<p>Dr. Lennis G. Echterling Counseling Psychology Program School of Psychology MSC 7401 James Madison University Harrisonburg, VA 22807 Phone: 540/568-6522 First Accredited: 3/80 CC (M.A./Ed.S.), SC (M.Ed.) (2003) Cep.jmu.edu/counselpsyc/</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Steven K. Nielsen Department of Counselor Education School of Education and Human Development 1501 Lakeside Drive Lynchburg College Lynchburg, VA 24501-3199 Phone: 804/544-8150 First Accredited: 3/92 *CC (M.S.Ed.), SC (M.S.Ed.) (2001) www.lynchburg.edu/public/academic/adhd/counselored/counsel.htm</p>		
<p>Dr. Ed Neukrug Counseling Program College of Education</p>	X	

<p>Old Dominion University Norfolk, VA 23529 Phone: 757/683-3221 First Accredited: 10/96 CC (M.S.Ed.), SC (M.S.Ed.), SACC (M.S.Ed.) (2003) Web.odu.edu/webroot/orgs/educ/elc/elc.nsf/pages/home</p>		
<p>Dr. Donald Anderson Counselor Education Department P.O. Box 6994 Radford University Radford, VA 24142 Phone: 540/831-5835 First Accredited: 4/96 CC (M.S.), SC (M.S.), SACC (M.S.) (2003) www.runet.edu</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Stephen Parker School of Counseling and Human Services Regent University 1000 Regent University Drive Virginia Beach, VA 23464-9800 Phone: 757/226-4293 First accredited: 10/00 *CC (M.A.), SC (M.A.) (2002) www.regent.edu</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Robert (Bob) Pate Curry School of Education 405 Emmet Street 169 Ruffner Hall University of Virginia Charlottesville, VA 22903-2495 Phone: 804/924-0774 First Accredited: 3/80 CC (M.Ed.), SC (M.Ed.), SACC (M.Ed.), SAPP (M.Ed.), CE (Ph.D./Ed.D) (2003) curry.edschool.Virginia.EDU/curry/dept/edhs/counsel/</p>	X	
<p>Dr. Claire Cole Vaught Counselor Education Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University 210 East Eggleston Blacksburg, VA 24061-0302 Phone: 540/231-9718 First Accredited: 3/00</p>	X	

*CC (M.A.), SC (M.A.), CE (Ph.D./Ed.D.) (2002) http://www.chre.vt.edu/thohen/index.html		
<i>WASHINGTON</i>		
Dr. Valerie E. Appleton Department of Applied Psychology 668 N. Riverpoint Blvd. MS 3 Eastern Washington University Spokane, WA 99202-1660 Phone: 509/359-6662 First Accredited: 9/86 MHC (M.S.), SC (M.S.) (2001) www.apliedpsyc.ewu.edu/	X	
Dr. Arlene C. Lewis Department of Psychology MS 9089 Western Washington University Bellingham, WA 98225-9089 Phone: 360/650-3523 First Accredited: 10/93 SC (M.Ed.) (2007), *MHC (M.S.) (2002) www.wvu.edu/~psych/graduate.html	X	
<i>WEST VIRGINIA</i>		
Dr. Jeffrey K. Messing Department of Counseling, Rehabilitation Counseling, and Counseling Psychology West Virginia University 502 Allen Hall P.O. Box 6122 Morgantown, WV 26506-6122 First Accredited: 3/93 Phone: 304/293-3807 CC (M.A.), SC (M.A.) (2001) www.wvu.edu/~crc/couns/	X	
<i>WISCONSIN</i>		
Dr. Robert (Pete) Havens Counselor Education Department University of Wisconsin Oshkosh 800 Algoma Boulevard Oshkosh, WI 54901 Phone: 920/424-1475 First Accredited: 3/92 CC (M.S.Ed.), SC (M.S.Ed.), SACC (M.S.Ed.) (2006) www.coehs.uwosh.edu/counselored/main/home.htm	X	

<p>Dr. James A. Holter Department of Counseling & Psychological Professions University of Wisconsin Superior McCaskill Hall 102 Belknap & Catlin P.O. Box 2000 Superior, WI 54880 Phone: 715/394-8151 First Accredited: 11/98 *CC (M.S.), SC (M.S.) (2001)</p>		
<p>Dr. David Van Doren Counselor Education Department University of Wisconsin — Whitewater 800 West Main Street Whitewater, WI 53190 Phone: 262/472-1035 First Accredited: 10/00 *CC (M.S.), SC (M.S.), SACC (M.S.), SAPP (M.S.) (2002)</p>		
<i>WYOMING</i>		
<p>Dr. Michael Loos Counselor Education College of Education P.O. Box 3374 University Station University of Wyoming Laramie, WY 82071 Phone: 307/766-2366 First Accredited: 3/82 CC (M.A./M.S.), SC (M.A./M.S.), SACC (M.A./M.S.), CE (Ph.D./Ed.D.) (2003) http://ed.uwyo.edu/Departments/depcounsel/index.htm</p>	X	
INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS		
BRITISH COLUMBIA		
<p>Dr. Bill Borgen Department of Counselling Psychology University of British Columbia Faculty of Education 2125 Main Mall Vancouver, B.C. CANADA V6T 1Z4 Phone: 604/822-6380 First Accredited: 3/89 CC (M.A./M.Ed.), SC (M.A./M.Ed.), SACC (M.A./M.Ed.) (2004)</p>		

APPENDIX D

TABLES

Table 1

Frequently Held Beliefs

Belief No.	Before	After	Same	N/A	Blank
1 #	6	41	15	1	36
Percent	6%	41%	15%	1%	36%
2 #	1	49	13	3	33
Percent	1%	49%	13%	3%	33%
3 #	3	39	14	1	42
Percent	3%	39%	14%	1%	42%
4 #	2	32	12	1	52
Percent	2%	32%	12%	1%	53%
5 #	0	59	10	1	29
Percent	0%	60%	10%	1%	29%
6 #	1	37	8	10	43
Percent	1%	37%	8%	10%	43%
7 #	1	39	7	6	46
Percent	1%	39%	7%	6%	46%
8 #	12	47	10	1	29
Percent	12%	47%	10%	1%	29%
9 #	2	50	13	1	33
Percent	2%	51%	13%	1%	33%
10 #	2	45	13	1	38
Percent	2%	45%	13%	1%	38%
11 #	3	47	12	1	36
Percent	3%	47%	12%	1%	36%

1 Students have higher GPAs

= Number reporting in this category

2 Students have higher test scores

- 3 Students are younger
- 4 Students learn better
- 5 Students receive more employment opportunities
- 6 Higher percentage of students pass LPC
- 7 Average scores are higher on NCC
- 8 Programs receive more applicants
- 9 Faculty is more professionally active
- 10 Faculty publishes more
- 11 Faculty presents more

Table 2a

Chi Square Analysis on Frequently Held Beliefs:

Before Compared with After

Belief	Chi Square	Sig.
1 Students have higher GPAs	26.06	.000
2 Students have higher test scores	46.08	.000
3 Students are younger	30.86	.000
4 Students learn better	26.47	.000
5 Students receive more employment opportunities	Not needed with 100%	
6 Higher percentage of students pass LPC	34.11	.000
7 Average scores are higher on NCC	36.10	.000
8 Programs receive more applicants	20.76	.000
9 Faculty is more professionally active	44.31	.000
10 Faculty publishes more	39.34	.000
11 Faculty presents more	38.72	.000

Table 2b

Chi Square Analysis on Frequently Held Beliefs:

Same Compared with After

Belief	Chi Square	Sig.
1 Students have higher GPAs	212.07	.001
2 Students have higher test scores	44.08	.000
3 Students are younger	20.90	.001
4 Students learn better	11.79	.001
5 Students receive more employment opportunities	34.80	.000
6 Higher percentage of students pass LPC	18.69	.000
7 Average scores are higher on NCC	22.26	.000
8 Programs receive more applicants	24.02	.000
9 Faculty is more professionally active	21.73	.000
10 Faculty publishes more	17.66	.000
11 Faculty presents more	20.76	.000

Table 2c

Chi Square Analysis on Frequently Held Beliefs:

Same and Before Combined Compared with After

Belief	Chi Square	Sig.
1 Students have higher GPAs	6.45	.011
2 Students have higher test scores	19.44	.000
3 Students are younger	8.64	.003
4 Students learn better	8.33	.004
5 Students receive more employment opportunities	34.80	.000
6 Higher percentage of students pass LPC	17.43	.000
7 Average scores are higher on NCC	20.45	.000
8 Programs receive more applicants	9.06	.003
9 Faculty is more professionally active	18.85	.000
10 Faculty publishes more	15.00	.000
11 Faculty presents more	16.52	.000

Table 3

List of Courses Offered

Elective Course	Offered	Necessary	Interest Area
Adult/Gerontology	5		3
Advanced Abnormal (psychopathology)	1		
Advanced Assessment	2	1	2
Advanced Group	4	3	3
Advanced Marriage and Family	3		3
Advanced Play	2		2
Advanced Techniques	1	1	
Advanced Testing	2	1	
Advanced Theories	2	1	
Adventure Counseling	1		1
Animal-Assisted Therapy	1		1
Biofeedback/Neurofeedback	5	1	4
Brief Counseling	5	2	3
Cognitive Behavioral Therapy Seminar	1		1
Chemical Dependent Family	2	1	2
Child/Adolescent	14	9	7
Child Psychopathology	1	1	
Conflict	1		1
Consultation/Supervision	9	4	4
Counseling AIDS Patients	1		
Counseling and Technology	2		2
Counseling Gifted Students	2		2
Counseling in the Classroom	1	1	1
Counseling Victims	1	1	1
Counseling Women/Gender	28	3	26
Couples (Or marriage and family)	55	31	42
Crisis/Disaster	7	2	3
Dream Analysis	7	0	7
Drug/Alcohol	81	48	41
DSM-IV/Abnormal/Psychopathology	77	59	42
Employee Assistance Programs	1		1
Eating Disorders	1		1
Elementary School Counseling	1	1	
EMDR (Eye Movement)	1		1
Ethics	2	2	1
Expressive Arts (Art Therapy)	4	1	4
Extra Career (Practicum)	4	1	1
Extra Field Experience	1	1	1
Filial Therapy	4		3
Gay, Lesbian, and Bi-sexual	2		2

Gestalt	1		1
Grief counseling	6	1	4
Health Service Administration	1	1	1
Health/Wellness	9	5	8
Hypnosis	2		2
IQ Assessment	2	1	2
Middle School Counseling	1	1	
Parent Education	1		1
Personality	1	2	2
Persons with Disabilities	1	1	
Play Therapy	33	13	33
Professional Publication	1	1	1
Psycho-oncology	1	1	1
Psychopharmacology	1	1	
Rehabilitation	1	1	2
Relational Therapy	1		1
Sand Tray	1		1
School Intervention/Prevention	1		1
Secondary School Counseling	1	1	
Sexual Abuse	3	2	1
Sexuality	5	3	2
Sign Language	1		1
Soc. And Psy. Of Crime and Delinquency	1		
Solution Focused	1		
Special Education	1	1	
Sports	3		2
Stress Management/Relaxation	3		
Student Assistance	1		
The Resilient Family	1		
Transpersonal/Spiritual	17	6	14
Violent Families	1	1	1
Women and Careers	1		1

Offered = The number of programs that offer this course

Necessary = The number of programs that consider this course necessary for counselor preparation

Interest Area = The number of programs that have this course as an interest area for at least one faculty member

Table 4

List of Courses Required

Courses	O	R	R/O	R/Total
Adult/Gerontology	5		0.00%	0.00%
Advanced Abnormal (psychopathology)	1	0	0.00%	0.00%
Advanced Assessment	2	1	100.00%	1.01%
Advanced Group	4	2	50.00%	2.02%
Advanced Marriage and Family	3	2	66.67%	2.02%
Advanced Play	2		0.00%	0.00%
Advanced Techniques	1		0.00%	0.00%
Advanced Testing	2	1	50.00%	1.01%
Advanced Theories	2		0.00%	0.00%
Adventure Counseling	1		0.00%	0.00%
Animal-Assisted Therapy	1		0.00%	0.00%
Biofeedback/Neurofeedback	5	1	20.00%	1.01%
Brief Counseling	5		0.00%	0.00%
Cognitive Behavioral Therapy Seminar	1		0.00%	0.00%
Chemical Dependent Family	2		0.00%	0.00%
Child/Adolescent	14	7	50.00%	7.07%
Child Psychopathology	1	1	100.00%	1.01%
Conflict	1	0	0.00%	0.00%
Consultation/Supervision	9	4	44.44%	4.04%
Counseling AIDS Patients	1		0.00%	0.00%
Counseling and Technology	2		0.00%	0.00%
Counseling Gifted Students	2	2	100.00%	2.02%
Counseling in the Classroom	1		0.00%	0.00%
Counseling Victims	1		0.00%	0.00%
Counseling Women/Gender	28	5	17.86%	5.05%
Couples (Or marriage and family)	55	37	67.27%	37.37%
Crisis/Disaster	7		0.00%	0.00%
Dream Analysis	7	0	0.00%	0.00%
Drug/Alcohol	81	47	58.02%	47.47%
DSM-IV/Abnormal/Psychopathology	77	70	90.91%	70.71%
Employee Assistance Programs	1		0.00%	0.00%
Eating Disorders	1		0.00%	0.00%
Elementary School Counseling	1	1	100.00%	1.01%
EMDR (Eye Movement)	1		0.00%	0.00%
Ethics	2	1	50.00%	1.01%
Expressive Arts (Art Therapy)	4		0.00%	0.00%
Extra Career (Practicum)	4	1	25.00%	1.01%
Extra Field Experience	1	1	100.00%	1.01%
Filial Therapy	4		0.00%	0.00%
Gay, Lesbian, and Bi-sexual	2		0.00%	0.00%

Gestalt	1		0.00%	0.00%
Grief counseling	6		0.00%	0.00%
Health Service Administration	1	1	100.00%	1.01%
Health/Wellness	9	2	22.22%	2.02%
Hypnosis	2		0.00%	0.00%
IQ Assessment	2		0.00%	0.00%
Middle School Counseling	1	1	100.00%	1.01%
Parent Education	1		0.00%	0.00%
Personality	1		0.00%	0.00%
Persons with Disabilities	1		0.00%	0.00%
Play Therapy	33	7	21.21%	7.07%
Professional Publication	1	1	100.00%	1.01%
Psycho-oncology	1	0	0.00%	0.00%
Psychopharmacology	1		0.00%	0.00%
Rehabilitation	1		0.00%	0.00%
Relational Therapy	1		0.00%	0.00%
Sand Tray	1		0.00%	0.00%
School Intervention/Prevention	1	1	100.00%	1.01%
Secondary School Counseling	1	1	100.00%	1.01%
Sexual Abuse	3	1	33.33%	1.01%
Sexuality	5	5	100.00%	5.05%
Sign Language	1		0.00%	0.00%
Soc. And Psy. Of Crime and Delinquency	1		0.00%	0.00%
Solution Focused	1		0.00%	0.00%
Special Education	1	1	100.00%	1.01%
Sports	3		0.00%	0.00%
Stress Management/Relaxation	3		0.00%	0.00%
Student Assistance	1		0.00%	0.00%
The Resilient Family	1		0.00%	0.00%
Transpersonal/Spiritual	17	5	29.41%	5.05%
Violent Families	1	1	100.00%	1.01%
Women and Careers	1		0.00%	0.00%

O = The number of programs that offer this course

R = The number of programs that require this course

R/O = (Required/Offered) Of the programs that offer this course, the percentage that also require this course

R/Total = (Required/Total Respondents) Of all 99 programs, the percentage that require this course

Table 5

Demographics of Programs by Faculty Members

Number of Faculty	u/k	0-3	4-6	7-9	10-12	13-15	16-18	19-21	22+
Received	15	4	24	26	14	6	6	0	4
Total Sent	25	6	41	35	21	8	9	0	5
% Received	60%	67%	59%	74%	67%	75%	67%	0%	80%

u/k unknown

Table 6

Demographics of Programs by The Number of Students Accepted Annually

Students u/k	0-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	61-70	71-80	81+	Total
Received	14	3	10	8	8	15	11	12	4	14
Total Sent	24	3	12	13	20	19	15	17	6	21
% Received	61%	100%	83%	62%	40%	79%	73%	71%	67%	67%

u/k unknown

Table 7

Demographics of Programs by ACES Regions

Region	NA	NC	RM	S	W	Total
Received	10	31	8	37	13	99
Total Sent	15	46	12	60	16	149
% Received	67%	67%	67%	62%	81%	66%

- NA North Atlantic
- NC North Central
- RM Rocky Mountain
- S Southern
- W Western

REFERENCES

Altekruse, M. (2001). Counselor portability. Keynote address at the American Association for State Counseling Board, North Reddington Shores, Florida.

Altekruse, M. & Wittmer, J. (1991). Accreditation in counselor education. In F. Bradley (Ed.), Credentialing in Counseling (pp. 53-62). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Bahen, S. & Miller, K. (1998). CACREP accreditation: A case study. Journal of Humanistic Education & Development, 37, 117-127.

Barkley, W., & Percy, R. (1984). Accreditation status, credit hours, and enrollments in master's degree programs in counseling. Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Association for Counseling and Development, Houston, TX.

Bobby, C. & Kandor, J. (1992). Assessment of selected CACREP standards by accredited and nonaccredited programs. Journal of Counseling and Development, 70, 677-684.

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) Manual (2001). Retrieved June 26, 2001 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.counseling.org/cacrep.htm>.

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP). (2001). Retrieved June 26, 2001 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.counseling.org/cacrep/directory.htm>

Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CAREP). (2001). Retrieved June 26, 2001, from the World Wide Web:

http://www.counseling.org/cacrep_standards.htm

Cecil, J. & Comas, R. (1986). Faculty perceptions of CACREP accreditation. Counselor Education and Supervision, 25, 237-245.

Cowger, E. (1993). Course characteristics of CACREP community counseling entry-level areas. CACD Journal, 13, 39-46.

Dill, Massy, Williams, & Cook (1996).

El-Khawas, E. (1998). Accreditation's role in quality assurance in the United States. Higher Education Management, 10, (3), 43-56.

Engels, D. (1991). Some questions and concerns about counselor preparation and accreditation and standards revision. Counselor Education and Supervision, 31, 11-21.

Gordon, R., McClure, B., Petrowski, E., & Willroth, L. (1994). Research productivity in CACREP accredited programs. Duluth, MN: University of Minnesota. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 412 490)

Haight, D. (1992). The pursuit of quality: A look into the future of CACREP. Journal of Counseling and Development, 70, 688-694.

Hollis, J. (1999-2001). Counselor preparation 1999-2001: Programs, faculty, trends (10th ed.). Ann Arbor, MI: Taylor & Francis and the National Board for Certified Counselors.

Honan, W. (1998). Some say college accreditation is out of control. New York Times, p. N32.

Hunt, B. (1996). HIV/AIDS training in CACREP-approved counselor education programs. Journal of Counseling and Development, 74, 295-299.

Kandor, J., and Bobby, C. (1991). Accreditation standards revision: Democratic, unilateral, or dictatorial? Counselor Education and Supervision, 31, 22-31.

Lloyd, A. (1992). The impact of the accreditation movement on one counselor education program: Idaho State University. Journal of Counseling and Development, 70, 673-676.

Morgan, O., and Toloczko, A. (1997). Graduate training of counselors in the addictions: A study of CACREP-approved programs. Journal of Addictions & Offender Counseling, 17, (2), 66-76.

Morrow, J. (1993). Revision, validation, and follow-up of admissions standards in counselor education. Paper presented at the Southern Association for Counselor Education and Supervision Convention, Charleston, SC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 388 893)

Pate, R. (1990). The potential effects of accreditation standards on the type of student who will enter counselor education programs. Counselor Education and Supervision, 29, 179-186.

Perrin, K. (1995). Accreditation: A personal odyssey. Educational Record, 66, 32-35.

Scott, S. (2001). Analysis of the impact of CACREP accreditation of counselor education programs on student knowledge outcomes. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas, Denton.

Smaby, M. & D'Andrea, L. (1995). 1994 CACREP standards: Will we make the grade? Journal of Counseling and Development, 74, 105-109.

Steinhauser, L. (1982). The accreditation story in counselor education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Delaware, Newark.

Steinhauser, L. & Bradley, R. (1983). Accreditation of counselor education programs. Counselor Education and Supervision, 23, 98-108.

Sweeney, T. (1992). CACREP: Precursors, promises, and prospects. Journal of Counseling and Development, 70, 667-672.

Sweeney, T. (1995). Accreditation, credentialing, professionalization: The role of specialties. Journal of Counseling and Development, 74, 117-125.

Vacc, N. (1985). CACREP-accredited programs: survey results. Counselor Education and Supervision, 24, 384-391.

Vacc, N. (1992). An assessment of the perceived relevance of the CACREP standards. Journal of Counseling and Development, 70, 685-687.

Weinrach, S. (1991). CACREP: The need for a mid-course correction. Journal of Counseling and Development, 69, 491-494.

Wilcoxon, S., Cecil, J., & Comas, R. (1987). Students perceptions of accreditation of programs in counseling. Counselor Education and Supervision, 27, 184-189.

Wittmer, J. (1994). Evolution of the CACREP standards. In J. Myers (Ed.), Developing and directing counselor education laboratories, pp. 17-26. Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Zimpfer, D., Cox, J., West, J., Bubenzer, D., & Brooks, D. (1997). An examination of counselor preparation doctoral program goals. Counselor Education and Supervision, 36, 318-331.