

Update: Status of the CORE Proposal to the 20/20 Workgroup

April 18th, 2013

Tom Evenson, Ph.D., CRC
CORE President

Patricia Nunez, M.A., CRC
CORE Vice President

Frank Lane, Ph.D., CRC, LCPC
CORE Executive Director

Material in this presentation is the sole property of CORE. Reproduction of any part of the material requires written permission from CORE. Responses to questions from program participants should not be interpreted as either official advice regarding a particular issue raised or as a formal opinion on behalf of CORE.

Introduction

The background is a solid blue color. At the top, there are several overlapping, wavy lines in various shades of blue, creating a decorative header effect.

What's happened since the consortium
proposal?

What was the consortium again?

- Consolidate the authority of two autonomous organizations, CORE and CACREP, for the purpose of communicating to the counseling profession, licensing boards, and other stakeholders on matters related to counselor licensure.
- Form a decision-making body that would consist of the leadership of the two accrediting organizations and will determine the criteria for membership beyond CORE and CACREP
- Advocate for the inclusion of all counseling specializations in counselor licensure laws with a scope of practice related to the training of students within that specialization.

Negotiations with CACREP

- On December 5, 2012
- In response to the CORE proposal
- CACREP's counterproposal was for CORE to merge with CACREP.
- CORE proposed we meet and find a middle ground between consortium and merger
- CACREP closed negotiations in February

AASCB Presentation

- Presentation at AASCB
 - Rehabilitation Counselors are counselors
 - What is parity and why was it established?
 - CORE believes if you train a counselor on the eight knowledge domains common to CORE and CACREP, the counselor has the potential to do harm
 - Therefore, they must be licensed
 - Challenge: rehabilitation counselors are not MHCs

Articles in Journal of Counseling and Development

- Research study that compared graduates from CACREP versus “non-CACREP” accredited programs on the issue of ethical violations
- Urofsky, Bobby and Richie article in same issue referenced the research study and concluded that CACREP graduates committed less ethical violations than graduates from the “other accredited counseling programs.”

Counseling Today

- March 2013 issue of Counseling Today
- Article titled *“It’s About All of Us, Isn’t It?”*
- Focused on how rehabilitation counselors are counselors
- Discussed how the purpose of 20/20 is to develop portability for counselor licensure for all counselors, not just mental health counselors

Governing Council

- Presented for the first time as a corporate partner
- Emphasize that CORE is one of two CHEA recognized accreditation agencies in counseling
- Focus on history of rehabilitation counseling as part of the counseling profession
- Discussed the probable future directions of CORE, including standards revision, 60 credit hours, diagnosis and treatment.
- Discussed including ACA Governing Council in future discussions about the business of accreditation

20/20 Delegation

- Met at ACA in Cincinnati, Ohio
- Reviewed proposals for scope of practice and educational requirements
- In order for the 20/20 delegates to reach consensus, they require 90% to vote in favor
- Scope of practice achieved consensus
- Educational requirements was not voted on

20/20 Delegation

- Northeast Region Rep - Concerned about the closing of schools in New England
- Southeast Region Rep - Read from the CORE proposal and recommended the consortium model as an alternative to CACREP
- CORE representative came prepared to submit an alternate recommendation that focused on knowledge domains and then mentioned CORE and CACREP as two accreditation organizations whose standards meet these knowledge domains

20/20 Delegation

- The delegates in support of CACREP only language filibustered the discussion
- At the end, no one called for or took a vote.
- The delegation was concluded
- Concluding statements:
 - Focus on the accomplishments of the group
 - Take the educational requirements recommendation to the sponsoring organizations (ACA & AASCB) and ask them to “deal with it.”

Prediction

- The 20/20 oversight committee will bring the educational requirements that was not voted on to governing council and the AASCB board of directors.
- Governing Council and the AASCB Board will likely vote on accepting or rejecting the recommendation
- Governing Council and AASCB will use a simple majority for consensus and it will pass

Prediction

- CORE has a lot of support at Governing Council--but not enough to defeat such a motion.
- CORE has support currently on the AASCB board but not enough to defeat the motion.
- Governing Council will meet in fall 2013
- AASCB will meet January 2014

Prediction

- By January 2014, the counseling profession will move forward with an agenda to have licensed professional counselors be mental health counselors
- The practice of other counseling specializations will be restricted to limited settings.
- Rehabilitation counseling, school counseling, career counseling, college counseling, and others will practice in settings where licensure is not necessary

Impact on Rehabilitation Counseling

- One 20/20 delegate said it might take 30 years to implement the recommendations from 20/20
- In the meantime, the impact of this movement on even one state could be devastating on CORE accredited programs whose graduates pursue licensure as a professional counselor.

Impact

- Rehabilitation Counseling practice could be restricted to state-federal vocational rehabilitation agency and the VR & E.
- Rehabilitation Counselors in the private sector may not be able to call themselves counselors.
- Ohio law is an example of a licensure bill where if it passes, it may be unlawful to call yourself a counselor unless you are licensed as a professional counselor.
- State VR agencies may be required to hire licensed counselors or else downgrade positions from “counselor” status.

The image features a solid blue background. At the top, there are several overlapping, wavy lines in various shades of blue, creating a decorative header effect. The text is centered in the middle of the page.

What should CORE do?

Separate licensure for vocational rehabilitation counselors

BENEFITS

- We can stop fighting for inclusion in professional counselor licensure
- Some states already have it (MA, LA, NJ, UT)
- CSAVR has said they will use state directors to influence the local legislature to get this passed

DISADVANTAGES

- If we are counselors, shouldn't we be included in professional counselor licensure?
- NJ has a bill where they are trying to eliminate the LRC because they can't get third party reimbursement
- CSAVR can only influence those states that are willing

Become included in professional counselor licensure

BENEFITS

- Our graduates will be able to practice in ALL settings in which they are trained to practice
- We protect people with disabilities by ensuring our graduates are licensed
- CORE is able to negotiate with CACREP from a position of strength

DISADVANTAGES

- We would have to find a middle ground with CACREP (e.g., there would be some changes)
- We could become more like “general counselors” and risk some dilution of our identity
- Question about programs with 2 or less faculty
- Question about non-counseling trained faculty

The image features a solid blue background. At the top, there are several overlapping, wavy lines in various shades of blue, creating a decorative header effect. Centered in the lower half of the image is the text "What do you think?" in a white, serif font.

What do you think?

Town Hall Meeting

- Thursday, 3:30-4:45 PM
- Right before the reception
- Come tell us your thoughts

Contact us:

- evenson@unt.edu
- patricia.nunez@cna.com
- lane@iit.edu