Historically Black Colleges and Universities and CACREP Accreditation: Counselor
Educators' Perceptions and Barriers in Relation to Accreditation

Dissertation

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy
in the Graduate School of The Ohio State University

By

Sibyl Camille Cato, M.Ed.

College of Education and Human Ecology

The Ohio State University

2009

Dissertation Committee:

James L. Moore III, Advisor

Helen Marks

Antoinette Miranda

Abstract

This qualitative study explored counselor educators' perceptions of Council for
Accreditation of Counseling and Related Programs (CACREP) at Historically Black
Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). Specifically, this study investigated the barriers for
seeking, maintaining, and/or achieving CACREP accreditation. The researcher utilized
in-depth, individual interviews and biographical questionnaires. The sample comprised
14 HBCU counselor educators (i.e. 9 females and 5 males) at both CACREP accredited
and non-CACREP accredited institutions. Three major themes emerged from participant
responses: (a) resources needed to obtain and maintain CACREP accreditation, (b)
multiple interpretations of requirements, and (c) validation received from having
CACREP accreditation. Practical applications for counselor educators and
recommendations for future research are included.

Dedication

This study is dedicated to my phenomenal mother and grandmother, Sibyl Rhymes

Meyer and Dorothy Robinson, for their unconditional love, unlimited telephone minutes,

and knee-bent prayers. I love you both.

Acknowledgements

While there is only one name on the cover of this document, several have helped to make it happen.

There are two women who deserve my greatest appreciation, my mother and my grandmother. My mother is the strongest woman I know. I wish to thank her for continually leading me with grace. She has provided all the love, patience, and humor a daughter could ever want. She is also the most talented person I know. I always strive to emulate her strongest characteristics. Without complaint, she juggles so many things and lives her life each day to please God. Thank you for all your support through the doctoral process!

My grandmother is and has been the rock of my family. Thank you for your laughter, your prayers, and your work ethic. You have always taught me to do whatever I dreamed, and it's finally happening. Thank you for always helping me to remember the path that has led our family to where we are today. You are a woman of much wisdom, courage, and strength.

To my big brother Charles, thank you for your constant communication. If ever I needed someone to "keep it real," it was you. Thank you for your never-ending sense of humor. By your own experiences, you have taught me about perseverance and that hard work does pay off. Although you are so many miles away from me, I know you are never more than a phone call away. I love you very much.

To my father, Charles, I thank you for teaching me to never give up. Thank you for teaching me to press on even in the midst of the hardest trials and tribulations. Even at your weakest point, you have taught me that my goals are attainable. I will never forget watching you re-learn the simplest of tasks, smiling and staying strong the entire way. Your strength and support mean the world to me.

To my step-father, Roger, thank you for teaching me to keep my "eye" on the prize. From a very young age, you have always believed in me and shared God's words about pressing through life's tough journeys.

To all of my faculty mentors, I am grateful for all of your encouragement, challenging perspectives, and leadership. To my advisor, Dr. James L. Moore III: Things don't always end up the way a person thinks they will. Thank you for seeing something in me that I did not always see myself. I am so appreciative of your wisdom and your experiences. I will always remember our many conversations in your office. Your have pushed me to excel to greatness. When I did not think I had it in me, you knew I did. Thank you!

To the members of my committee, Dr. Helen Marks and Dr. Antoinette Miranda, thank you for captivating my attention through your teaching. Your engaging teaching style has given me excitement for my own classes in the future. Thank you for believing in my work and for showing an interest in this topic that I believe is important. Your support and enthusiasm for my abilities is encouraging.

To Dr. Lisa Hinkelman, thank you for helping me to realize that you can have a sense of humor and be a professor. Thank you for the lunches and dinners and knowing when I needed a happy hour to decompress. Thank you for being a mentor, being honest

about the profession, and helping me to believe in my own professional and personal characteristics. You are a Missionette of great leadership and strength, and I want to personally thank you for being a great friend and colleague.

To Dr. Chris Wood, thank you for putting a bug in my ear about continuing my education. I never imagined that I would someday become be a counselor educator. It was YOU who first helped me to realize my gifts in this field.

To Dr. Colette Dollarhide, thank you so much for teaching me about what it means to be a good teacher. I have learned so much from you about teaching and supervising, as well as staying active in the profession. Your ability to balance everything is amazing. I am blessed to have been able to work with you!

To Dr. Sheri Bauman, thank you for constantly checking on me and making sure that I was staying on track. I appreciate your cheerleading from afar, and I look forward to collaborating with you very soon!

My laughter has not ceased throughout this doctoral process and that is in large part because of my unbelievable friends. Thank you all for understanding me and for allowing me to laugh loudly and often. In particular, Maureen, supervisor-extraordinaire and friend, thank you for always knowing when I needed a home cooked meal, and a boost of encouragement. While the Tsunami never came, I thank you for listening to all of my, "what if's." I have learned so much from you about counseling, supervision, and inner-strength. Mostly though, you have taught me to trust in myself and my natural talents. You are such a giver, and I can't wait to read your book.

Caroline, thank you for the coffee shops, movies, mojitos, sushi, road trips, and hours and hours of conversations about communism and counseling. Your friendship

means more than you will ever know. You have been such a magnificent sounding board, always listening to me ramble about all the changes happening through this doctoral process. Further, I honestly do not know where I would be if it were not for your friendship. I'm excited that now it's your turn. Thankfully, I'm only three hours away.

Sarah, thank you always picking up where we left off. Jenny and Albert, thank you for making me feel welcome in Columbus from day one. Chelsea, thanks for understanding me more than most. To all my interns who are now school counselors, thank you for letting me learn from you.

Most importantly, I thank God for giving me the strength to complete this doctoral process and the wisdom to make sound decisions. I am so blessed for all that He has done for me. I know that He has directed my path.

Vita

July 6, 1978…………………………Born, Chicago, Illinois

2000………………………………….B.A. English, Truman State University

2000-2003…………………………Graduate Hall Director, The University of Arizona

2003……………………………...M.Ed. School Counseling, The University of Arizona

2003-2006…………………………School Counselor, Carson Middle School,
Tucson Unified School District

2006-present………………………School Counseling Supervisor, Counselor Education,
The Ohio State University

2006-present………………………Co-Instructor, PAES, The Ohio State University

Fields of Study

Major Field: Education

Table of Contents

Chapters

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Graduate education is beneficial and often necessary for individuals entering

professional careers, such as counseling. Over the years, higher education stakeholders

have been demanding more rigorous educational standards for counseling graduate

programs. As a way of appeasing these demands in counselor education, the Council for

Accreditation of Counseling and Related Programs (CACREP) was founded (CACREP,

2001). This organization is the largest counseling-related accreditation body and it is

independently recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) to

accredit degree programs that prepare individuals to enter entry-level counseling

positions in career counseling; college counseling and student affairs, gerontological

counseling, marital, couple, and family counseling, mental health counseling, and school

counseling.

Not only does CACREP accredit masters-level, counseling programs, it also

accredits doctoral degree programs in these areas.

Since 1981, CACREP has served as the primary accreditation body for the

counseling profession (Schmidt, 1999). Since its inception, numerous universities and

colleges with Counselor Education Programs have applied for CACREP accreditation. In 1993, Hollis and Wantz listed approximately 378 institutions that had Counselor Education Programs, and approximately 119 of these programs had CACREP accreditation. In 2008, there were 221 accredited institutions (CACREP, 2008). These programs were required to align their programs with eight core curriculum standards: professional identity, social and cultural diversity, human growth and development, career development, helping relationships, group work, assessment, and research and program evaluation (CACREP, 2001).

Historically, the perception of CACREP accreditation and the core curriculum standards has been favorable (Bobby & Kandor, 1992; Cecil & Comas, 1986; Schmidt, 1999; Smaby & D'Andrea, 1995; Vacc, 1985, 1992). These studies, however were conducted mainly by CACREP accredited institutions, which have been mainly Predominately White Institutions (PWIs). According to CACREP (2009) to date, there are thirty Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) with counseling programs and, of those, five are accredited by CACREP (e.g. North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University, North Carolina Central University, Jackson State University, and South Carolina State University, and Southern University and Agricultural and Mechanical College). There is dearth of research that focuses on the specific benefits and limitations of CACREP accreditation for universities and colleges in general. Further, there is no existing research, both quantitative and qualitative, that examines the perceived benefits and limitations of CACREP accreditation for HBCUs,

2

determining why HBCU Counselor Education Programs seek, achieve, and/or maintain CACREP accreditation.

1.2 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions of CACREP accreditation of HBCU counselor educators. The intent was to pinpoint which, if any, of the 2001 CACREP standards were considered a hindrance for HBCU Counselor Education Programs seeking, achieving, and/or maintaining CACREP accreditation. This study has many potential implications for better understanding why certain HBCU Counselor Education Programs seek, achieve, and/or maintain CACREP standards, such as better understanding the factors that contribute to why some programs obtain CACREP accreditation and others do not. To this end, the study was designed to render findings that could be used to assist more HBCU Counselor Education Programs in better understanding the CACREP accreditation process and provide these programs with information that counter barriers that may prevent them from seeking, achieving and/or maintaining CACREP accreditation.

1.3 Significance of the Study

Much of the research literature on CACREP is about accredited programs and individuals' perceptions of accreditation as beneficial and desirable (Altekruse & Wittmer, 1991; Barkley & Percy, 1984; Bobby, 1992; Bobby & Kandor, 1992). CACREP provides a continuous evaluation of program curriculum and structure allowing programs to remain current in the counseling profession (Bobby, 1992). However, there is some literature criticizing the CACREP standards, review process, and accreditation process (Engels, 1991; Lanning, 1988; Randolph, 1988; Smaby & D'Andrea, 1995;

3

Weinrach & Thomas, 1993). As a whole, the literature is absent of the voices and opinions of HBCU counselor educators, regarding CACREP.

For this study, an underlying question is "Why is it important to study this group?" For over one hundred years, HBCUs have been educating African Americans and other students of color. "Unlike other institutions, HBCUs were founded on and continue to be united by the distinct mission of positioning, preparing, and empowering African American students to succeed in what many perceive to be a hostile society" (Brown, Donahoo, and Bertrand, 2001, p. 559). In comparison to PWIs, past research indicates that HBCUs have been the primary educators of African Americans (Allen, Epps & Haniff, 1991; Garibaldi, 1984). Roebuck and Murty (1993) found that HBCUs are the undergraduate home to 75 percent of all African American PhDs, 80 percent of all African American federal judges, and 85% of all African American doctors. Based on this information, it is quite likely that HBCUs have also been preparing African American counselors at a higher rate than PWIs. Therefore, if HBCU Counselor Education Programs are not accredited by CACREP, the largest counseling accrediting agency, what are the reasons?

By focusing on HBCU counselor educators the gaps in the research literature are likely to be filled. CACREP and its many constituents are likely to learn more about the perceptions of CACREP and non-CACREP-accredited Counselor Education Programs and the identified barriers to seeking, achieving, and/or maintaining CACREP accreditation.

According to the research literature there are currently five Counselor Education Programs that are accredited by CACREP: (a) North Carolina Agricultural and Technical

University, (b) North Carolina Central University, (c) Jackson State University, (d) South Carolina State University, and (e) Southern University and Agricultural and Mechanical College (CACREP, 2009). These universities are all public, state-supported institutions and they are some of the largest HBCUs in the country.

According to CACREP (2008), there are approximately thirty HBCU Counselor Education Programs without CACREP accreditation. These included Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical University, Alabama State University, Albany State College, Bowie State University, Coppin State University, Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University, Fort Valley State College, Grambling State University, Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical University, Tennessee State University**,** Texas Southern University, University of the District of Columbia, University of Maryland—Eastern Shore, University of the Virgin Islands, Virginia State University, Clark Atlanta University, Hampton University, Howard University, Xavier University in Louisiana, Lincoln University, Norfolk State University, Winston Salem State University, Wilberforce University, Langston University and Cheyney University.

<div align="center">1.4 Research Questions</div>

Well-designed research is driven by its research questions. With this in mind, the present study explored the following questions.

1. What are the perceptions of CACREP accreditation, according to HBCU Counselor Education Program faculty?

2. What are the barriers for HBCU counselor educators seeking, achieving, and/or maintaining CACREP accreditation?

3. Which CACREP (2001) accreditation standards are considered a hindrance from seeking, achieving, and/or maintaining CACREP accreditation?

1.5 Assumptions

The following assumptions were held by the researcher:

1. Consistent with the research literature, faculty at CACREP-accredited Counselor Education Programs will hold similar beliefs and perceptions about the benefits of CACREP (Bobby & Kandor, 1992; Cecil & Comas, 1986).

2. CACREP faculty perceptions of CACREP will not differ from those individuals who are employed at non-CACREP Counselor Education Programs.

3. Because HBCUs are generally under-funded and resourced, financial resources will be one of the main barriers for not seeking, achieving, and/or maintaining CACREP.

1.6 Limitations of the Study

A major limitation of this study was the lack of participants from private HBCUs as well as CACREP accredited HBCU Counselor Education Programs. Because of the lack of participation from these Counselor Education faculties, a comparison of perceptions was not able to be adequately made. Because the focus was not on faculties' gender and racial differences, comparisons were not made. However, there is a possibility differences could exist. (Please see chapter 5 for additional limitations of the study).

1.7 Definition of Terms

- *Accreditation:* The process whereby an organization or agency recognizes a college or university or a program of study as having met certain pre-determined qualifications or standards (Seldon, 1960).

- *African American and Black:* Two terms used interchangeably to represent people of African descent.

- *American Psychological Association (APA):* Professional organization for American Psychologists.

- *Counseling:* A process of helping people by assisting them in making and changing behavior (Stone & Dahir).

- *Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP):* An independent organization which accredits degree programs that prepare individuals to enter the counseling profession.

- *Council on Rehabilitation Education (CORE):* The accrediting organization for Rehabilitation Counseling programs.

- *Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU):* Higher education institutions originally founded to education people of African descent.

- *Predominately White Institution (PWI):* Higher educational institution serving predominately Caucasian students.

- *Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS):* A regional accrediting body for colleges and schools.

Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

2.1 Introduction

To better inform the direction of this study and to understand the need for further information about this topic, a review of the existing literature is warranted. Most HBCU Counselor Education Programs are not represented by CACREP, the leading accrediting organization for counseling programs. This is disheartening since HBCUs provide an education for African Americans and other students of color at a higher rate than PWIs (Harper, 2007). To this end, there is an assumption that HBCU Counselor Education Programs produce more African American counselors than PWIs, based on figures from other fields such as medicine, law, and education (Allen, Epps & Haniff, 1991; Garibaldi, 1984). The majority of HBCU Counselor Education Programs is not accredited by CACREP and fails to reap the perceived benefits of CACREP. To this end, this chapter presents available research regarding two primary areas: (a) accreditation in higher education, specifically for the counseling profession in general and (b) accreditation in higher education, specifically for HBCUs.

2.2 Accreditation

In the United States, standards in higher education are not controlled by the federal government. The government does not have direct control over systems of higher education. The lack of centralized or direct control speaks to the inconsistencies found in the system that Seldon (1960) described. In the United States, each state has developed its

own public colleges and universities and provided regulations and oversights for private institutions. Most of the institutions of higher learning, both public and private, have a high degree of autonomy in the development of their curriculum. This trend has resulted in a variation among the institutions, particularly as it relates to the character and quality of their programs (Blauch, 1959). The process of accreditation was devised to avoid chaos among institutional communication and collaboration.

The notion of accreditation and standardized education in the United States began as early as 1787, with the University of the State of New York's reorganization. The New York Regents were required by law to visit and review the work of each college in the state to register the curriculum of each institution and report to the legislature (Harcleroad, 1980). New York institutions of higher learning were required to go through this process; however, there were no established standards that addressed the overall quality of education these institutions were providing. Other states soon followed with similar legislation, such as Iowa (1846), Utah (1896), Washington (1909), Virginia (1912), and Maryland (1914). Still, this legislation provided no definition of standards based education (Harcleroad, 1980).

The New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools was established in 1885. The association defined accreditation as an "establishment of requirements for admissions, educational program needs, and degrees, and the recognition of schools and colleges that met them" (Harcleroad, 1980, p. 11). In the 1930s, the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools conducted a study of institutions and defined accreditation as:

> …the recognition accorded to an education institution in the United States by means of inclusion in a list of institutions issued by some agency or organization which sets up standards or requirements that must be complied with in order to secure approval. (Zook & Haggerty, 1936, p. 18)

Basically, accrediting is the process whereby an organization or agency recognizes a college or university or a program of study as having met certain pre-determined qualifications or standards," (Seldon, 1960, p. 5). In 1959, the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare published a collection of writings on accreditation in the United States. In his writing, Blauch (1959) noted: "accreditation, as applied in education, is the recognition accorded to an institution that meets the standards or criteria established by a competent agency or association" (p. 3). In 1968, the United States Office of Education defined accrediting as a voluntary process that grants public recognition of educational institutions or programs that meets certain qualifications and standards (Harcleroad, 1980). Judith Eaton, past president of the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) noted:

> accreditation is a process of external quality review used by higher education to scrutinize colleges, universities and educational programs for quality assurance and quality improvement…in the United States, accreditation is carried out by private, non-profit organizations designed for this specific purpose. (Eaton, 2009, p. 1)

CHEA further explained that institutions and educational programs sought accreditation as a means of demonstrating their academic quality to the public and to become eligible for public funds. Each of these definitions illustrated institution standards to be achieved and a review process for the purpose of promoting and ensuring high quality in educational programs.

2.2.1 Characteristics of Accrediting Organizations

Accrediting bodies have common characteristics and roles but differ in scope, sponsorship, and structure with the most significant difference related to their focus. The two major forms of accreditation are institutional (both regional and national) and specialized or program accreditation (Chambers, 1983). Understanding the characteristics and roles of accrediting bodies helps to understand the accreditation process for each type of accreditation.

In the ideal situation, the accrediting body establishes and maintains their reputation through a tradition of competent activities and reliable decisions for the users of its services (Chambers, 1983). For example, state-licensing bodies may use accreditation as a qualification for graduates to be considered for, or to receive, licenses to practice certain trades. In this situation, the accrediting body is linked closely to the institution in order for the graduates to receive permission to obtain licenses.

Chambers (1983) noted that an unfortunate consequence of that accrediting bodies are nongovernmental is that fraudulent activity can occur. Groups are able to create their own accrediting bodies to "accredit" their own "diploma mills." Such groups are illegal in that they operate to defraud the public and violate any corporate charter issued to them by the state.

An additional characteristic of all accrediting bodies is the establishment of a social need for the accrediting body (Chambers, 1983). On one hand, there are those who take the position that since the central purpose of accreditation is to identify where educational quality can be found, students will be best served by having a separate accrediting body for each specialty. There are also those who believe that appropriate

11

control of educational quality should be maintained through peer review within each discipline (Chambers, 1983). Depending on the viewpoint, the cost of the accrediting process is weighed differently. For some, any cost is too much and for others, no cost is too high. The desired situation is a compromise between the two viewpoints.

Each proposal for a new accrediting body or accreditation process must be examined with reference to the community of interests ultimately affected. In 1983, Chambers noted that the scope of an accrediting body is specified by characteristics, such as geographical location, degree level, or discipline or field. For specialized accreditation, the nature of the profession needs to be specified and the relationships that exist with other disciplines and professions should be considered.

Once it is decided what is going to be accredited, the next step is to identify that institutions or programs that will be eligible to apply for accreditation (Chambers, 1983). A community of interest is comprised of individuals with strong influence on this process. These individuals may include chief executive officers of institutions to be accredited, deans, directors, and faculty members of specialized programs to be accredited, professional societies and practitioners in the field to be accredited. This group addresses the appropriateness of accreditation and the appropriateness of the organization. If there are already channels to address accreditation for the program or institution, Chambers asserted the proposed accreditation may not be necessary (Chambers, 1983). Also, if the organization proposing the accreditation does not share beliefs and values with the program or institution, that accrediting body may not be the best one suited for the accreditation process. The final element in establishing social need is to determine how the actual service can be provided most effectively and efficiently.

12

For example, if there is an existing accrediting body in a closely related area, collaboration is considered to determine if the accrediting body is necessary (Blauch, 1959).

Chambers (1983) asserted that the accrediting body should have an element of autonomy and independence in making accrediting decisions. Additionally, the accrediting body must be attentive to due process for institutions and programs. In accreditation, due process relates to basic eleCments of fairness and equity between the two parties. In other words, the accrediting process should offer clear written procedures for granting, denying, reaffirming, modifying, suspending, revoking or reinstating accreditation. Chambers (1983) also asserted that, to ensure quality, the accrediting body should be accountable to the public. Public disclosure of significant information about its accreditation activities should ensure that the accrediting body is accountable to the public.

The governance of accreditation is an important element of self-regulation. The process of accrediting the accrediting bodies began by the National Commission on Accrediting (NCA). The NCA merged with the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education (FRACHE) to form the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA). COPA was dissolved in 1993 and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) was established. CHEA reviews its member accrediting bodies at least once every five years. This organization is currently supported by the postsecondary education community and is the only nongovernmental organization that an accrediting body can achieve national recognition (Eaton, 2009).

2.2.2 Counselor Education Accreditation

The establishment of CACREP was an arduous process that began decades before its recognition by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA), now CHEA. CACREP was preceded by more than two decades of extensive preparation standards development and adoption including, the *Standards for the Preparation of Secondary School Counselors* (1967), *Standards for the Preparation of Elementary School Counselors* (1968), and *Guidelines for Graduate Programs in Student Personnel Work in Higher Education* (1968) (Sweeny, 1992). Leaders of the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES), Wisconsin ACES (WACES), and California ACES (CASES) were responsible for beginning the discussion about the importance of establishing standards in the preparation of counselors. In 1976, a Commission on Standards Implementation was established within ACES. The Commission's primary goal was to develop a rationale for standards implementation and recommend procedures for the implementation of the standards. By 1978, the Commission requested that ACES begin counselor education accreditation on a voluntary basis and in that same year an ACES Committee on Accreditation was established (Sweeney, 1992).

The establishment of CACREP was not a smooth process. The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) accredited school counseling programs, and, by the late 1970s, had accredited approximately 225 school counseling programs throughout the country (Sweeney, 1992). COPA strove to minimize overlap in its membership and had specific criteria that would deny recognition of an agency that attempted to duplicate an existing member's scope of accreditation. Since CACREP included school counseling accreditation, there was the potential for such overlap. In

1978, the American Personnel and Guidance Association (APGA) now the American Counseling Association (ACA) decided to seek nonvoting status within NCATE. There was conflicting sentiment that APGA should consider NCATE as its accrediting body in lieu of a separate, more costly, accrediting body (Stripling, 1978). In order to establish communication about accreditation, Betty Knox, APGA president and past president of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) was the first APGA representative to collaborate with NCATE. The initial contacts with NCATE voiced APGA concerns for the profession, including a commitment to the profession's standards. The APGA felt that their expectations were not being addressed, so they shifted focus and proposed an organizational structure that would incorporate specialty standards and merge with other related counseling groups. CACREP's articles of incorporation and bylaws were established in 1981 (CACREP, 2001).

CACREP was incorporated in 1981. In that year, the Board of Directors granted approval to 44 counseling programs housed within 16 institutions. These programs, originally approved by ACES, were the first to become accredited by CACREP. Although CACREP experienced steady growth of the number of accredited programs, it is recognized that many Counselor Education Programs still have not applied for accreditation review. Since 1981, there have been CACREP programs in over 200 institutions (CACREP, 2008).

2.2.3 *Benefits and Limitations of CACREP Accreditation*

According to Bobby and Kandor (1992) there are several reasons Counselor Education Programs do not seek CACREP accreditation. Some of these viewpoints ranged from the high cost of the accreditation process, to a fear that enrollment will

decrease if graduates are required to complete a longer program, to a belief that the standards are too prescriptive and too unattainable.

For institutions that choose to pursue CACREP, there are process fees and annual fees. According to CACREP (2008), the fee for application for accreditation is $2,500, and the on-site visit fee is $3,800. The annual fees for the individual programs are $1,485, for one program, $1,845 for two programs, and for three or more programs $2,195.

An additional hindrance some institutions give for not seeking CACREP is a fear that student enrollment will decrease if graduates are required to complete longer programs (Bobby & Kandor, 1992). CACREP accreditation includes a core curriculum with specific courses required to be taught in the Counselor Education Program. Because of this, students in a CACREP program may be required to take additional course work to fulfill these requirements compared to a student in a non-CACREP program.

The CACREP (2001) standards are minimal criteria for the preparation of professional counselors and one of the requirements for accreditation eligibility is that entry-level degree programs have a minimum of 72-quarter hours or 48 semester hours of graduate studies. Mental health counseling and marital, couple and family counseling/therapy have a minimum of 90 quarter hours and 60 semester hours of graduate studies.

The CACREP (2009) standards require a minimum of 54 semester credit hours or 81 quarter credit hours for mental health counseling students, and by 2013, all applicant programs in mental health counseling must have a minimum of 60 semester credit hours or 90 quarter credit hours for all students (CACREP, 2008, Standards). An increase in the

number of credit hours may deter potential students from applying to their program.

Bobby and Kandor (1992) also noted that programs have stated that the standards are too prescriptive and unattainable and that is why they have not applied for CACREP accreditation. According to CACREP (2001), there are six major areas of the CACREP (2001) standards; these are referred to as the Core Areas. There are counseling specialty areas with training standards specific to that training area. They are often referred to as the Specialty Standards.

In their study, Bobby and Kandor surveyed professionals of both CACREP-accredited and non-accredited Counselor Education Programs to investigate their perceptions of a select set of standards as they relate to being a hindrance to seeking and achieving accreditation. Specifically, one survey question asked which of the standards seemed to hinder accreditation of CACREP-accredited and non-accredited programs. Their rationale for the study was that they believed there was controversy in the fact that the CACREP Board of Directors was the sole decision-making body in terms of implementing the standards revision process (Bobby & Kandor, 1992).

In their study, the authors found that non-accredited programs' requirement of a minimum of 600-clock hour internship was problematic, as well as the preferred faculty to student ratio of ten students to one faculty member (Bobby & Kandor, 1992). Both of these requirements place additional demands on faculty. Smaller programs with limited faculty possibly would have difficulty meeting these requirements. The non-accredited programs also identified the number of credit hours per program and the need for full-time faculty assigned in the program to be a concern. The accredited programs identified the 600 clock-hour internship minimum standard to be a concern. For this standard,

students fulfilling their internship requirement must be in their field placement for a minimum of 600-clock hours. Both CACREP-accredited and non-accredited programs identified the standard of a minimum of one hour per week of supervision to be a concern. The results of the study indicated that the CACREP Board of Directors only needed to make minimal revisions to the new standards, based on the thoughts of current program faculty feedback (Bobby and Kandor, 1992).

The Specialty Standards in the CACREP (2001) standards also included guidelines for school counseling programs. These include foundations of school counseling, contextual dimensions of school counseling, knowledge and skill requirements for school counselors (which includes program development, implementation, and evaluation; counseling and guidance; and consultation), and clinical instruction. In 2002, Holcomb-McCoy, Bryan, and Rahill conducted a study examining the school counseling specialty standards set by CACREP. The authors surveyed individuals from the ASCA database assessing the perceived importance of each standard in relation to the participant's role and responsibility as a professional school counselor. They set out to determine to what extent professional school counselors rate the school counseling CACREP standards to be important to their actual work as school counselors. The main difference between their study and the study conducted by Bobby and Kandor was that the Holcomb-McCoy, Bryan, and Rahill examined perceptions of current professional school counselors. On the contrary, Bobby and Kandor examined counselor educators' perceptions to determine which of the standards hindered them to achieving CACREP accreditation. It is important to note the differences in the focus of the research. The purpose of the CACREP standards is to provide quality training for counselors,

including school counselors. The standards set "define current trends and reflects future expectations for the profession" (Bobby & Kandor, 1992). Not all professional school counselors graduate from a CACREP-accredited program; however, they did notice trends in school counseling, based on their work experience. Holcomb-McCoy, Bryan, and Rahill (2002) found that the professional school counselors rated each of the standards to be nearly equally important except for the knowledge and skill requirement as they relate to program development, implementation and evaluation inferring that the school counselors surveyed do not perceive this standard to be as important as the other standards in question.

In 2004, McGlothin and Davis conducted a study that involved mental health and school counselors as well as counselor educators on the perceived benefit of CACREP (2001) core curriculum standards. In this study, the authors were able to determine which groups found particular standards more or less beneficial than others. Further, the authors examined how the perceptions of counselor educators, mental health counselors, and school counselors' opinions differed on the perceived benefits of CACREP (2001). The results of their study coincide with the findings of earlier studies that analyzed the benefits of the earlier CACREP core curriculum (Bobby & Kandor, 1992; Cecil & Comas, 1986; Vacc, 1992). The overall CACREP (2001) core curriculum standards that were perceived to be most beneficial were human growth and development and helping relationships.

Given the nature of the counseling profession focusing on developmental aspects of individuals, these findings are understandable. Career development, research and program evaluation, assessment, and professional identity were perceived as less

beneficial than the other core curriculum standards (McGlothin & Davis, 2004). These standards did not emphasize developing interpersonal skills; however, they serve as a knowledge base for counseling. An additional finding of the study was that counselor educators perceived seven of the eight CACREP (2001) core standards as more beneficial than did mental health and school counselors. Mental health and school counselors viewed all CACREP (2001) core standards in a similar fashion, with the exception of career development. School counselors work more directly with individuals in the area of career development and these issues are beneficial in preparation for college or future vocational choices. Mental health counselors, according to McGlothin and Davis, have a lower perceived benefit of career development issues, because some may view these issues as non-clinical. It is important to examine the perceived benefits of the CACREP standards for counselor educators and counseling practitioners.

Becoming a CACREP-accredited program is a process that takes time, patience, and commitment of all individuals involved. The components of CACREP accreditation include a self-study of the program, an initial review of the self-study, on-site peer evaluation, a site team report and program review, an accreditation decision and finally a periodic review. Lloyd (1992) documented the impact of the process of accrediting the Counselor Education Program at Idaho State University. Idaho State University was accredited by ACES accreditation in 1979. As noted earlier, the CACREP accreditation standards were modeled after the standards originated by ACES.

In order to meet the initial accreditation requirements, the Counselor Education Program at Idaho State University had to change several elective courses to required courses. By adding adjunct lecturers and responding to the requirements of 60 semester

hours this issue was resolved. The additional faculty members were able to teach the elective courses, and the program regained some flexibility in terms of electives. Lloyd (1992) noted that some would say that, as a result of accreditation, creativity in the curriculum was forfeited. Others would say that accreditation made the program more consistent and encouraged greater rigor in teaching and supervision.

Accreditation also had an impact on enrollment for the program at Idaho State University. Lloyd (1992) noted that the program faculty assumed that meeting the standards was supposed to decrease the enrollment because of the difficulty of completing program with the increased requirements, especially since most of the surrounding colleges at the time still offered a 30-hour program. On the other hand, faculty also assumed being accredited was going to increase the enrollment because of the greater visibility and prestige the program would have as a result of the process. Lloyd further pointed out neither of these things happened. Despite the changes to the program, they were able to enroll number of qualified students. The assumption that more students would contact the program as a result of learning that the program was accredited, for the most part the reasons for selecting the program have remained the same—the recommendation of graduates, convenience, and chance.

Administrative work increased as a result of the accreditation of Idaho State University's Counselor Education Program. In addition to the work necessary to prepare the self-studies and annual reports, the program reported having to answer outside requests to survey the program. There were additional expenses necessary to maintain the accredited program in addition to the initial fees. These included hiring adequate faculty to meet the standards and ratios, supporting faculty member's salary, travel, and research

as well as meeting the increased cost of released time for accreditation duties. Overall, there has been a significant impact, due to the accreditation of the Counselor Education Program at Idaho State University.

<center>2.3 Historically Black Colleges and Universities</center>

The impact of the education delivered at HBCUs is great. Foster (2001) noted of all African Americans who have received degrees in dentistry and medicine, 80 percent have received their professional education at Howard University or Meharry Medical College, two HBCUs. Three-fourths of all African Americans who hold doctoral degrees received their undergraduate education at HBCUs and four fifths of all African American federal judges are graduates of HBCUs. Further, HBCUs are leading institutions in awarding baccalaureate degrees to African American students in life sciences, physical sciences, mathematics, and engineering (Foster, 2001).

2.3.1 Historical Roots of HBCUs

Philadelphia Quaker, Richard Humphreys, founded the Institute for Colored Youth, originally a teacher training college, in 1837 (Gasman, 2007). The Pennsylvania school was the first historically Black college established in the United States and later became known as Cheyney University (Gasman, 2007). To date, Cheyney University, like all HBCUs, has experienced successes, challenges, triumphs, and defeats, since the early years of the institution.

The end of the Civil War marked a period when over four million enslaved people began to seek education. The federal government, as well as Northern church missionaries, provided a path to start this education process (Gasman, 2007).

<center>22</center>

As early as 1865, the Freedmen's Bureau began establishing Black colleges. The Freedmen's Bureau was initiated by President Abraham Lincoln and was intended to last for one year after the Civil War. This bill was established to aid freedmen (freed ex-slaves) in the South with education, health care, and employment. Due to the help of the Freedman's Bureau, Howard University was established in 1867. Howard University was named after General Oliver O. Howard, a Civil War hero and Bureau commissioner. During this period, most Black colleges were in name only; these institutions generally provided primary and secondary education, which was also true of most historically White colleges, starting with Harvard University, during the first decades of their existence (Paris & Gasman, 2006).

Religious missionary organizations worked with the Freedmen's Bureau in the establishment of Black colleges. Two of the most prominent White organizations were the American Baptist Home Mission Society and the American Missionary Association. White Northern missionary societies founded Black colleges such as Fisk University, Atlanta University (now Clark Atlanta), and Spelman College. The generosity of the missionaries was filled with the goals of Christianizing the freedmen and reducing the number of uneducated African Americans in the country. Black churches such as the African Methodist Episcopal and the African Methodist Episcopal Zion were successful in establishing Morris Brown, Paul Quinn and Allen Universities. These institutions were unique in that they were the first institutions founded by African Americans for African Americans. They relied on less support from Whites and they were able to design their own curriculum; however, they were also more vulnerable to economic instability (Paris & Gasman, 2006).

The Second Morrill Act in 1890 provided educational opportunities for African

Americans and other students of color. Under this act, states that practiced segregation in

public colleges and universities would forfeit federal funding unless they established

agricultural and mechanical institutions for African American students. As a result of the

Morrill Act of 1890, seventeen new land-grant colleges were created (Redd, 1998). By

the end of the nineteenth century, the private Black colleges had exhausted the funding

from the missionaries and needed to seek funding elsewhere. White industrial

philanthropy from donors in the North provided a solution to the potential financial

limitations. Key philanthropic leaders of this time included John D. Rockefeller, Andrew

Carnegie, Julius Rosenwald, George Peabody, and John Slater. The mission of these

leaders was to control and enhance all forms of industry. They formed the General

Education Board (GEB), the largest organized contribution to African American

education of the time (UNCF, 2007). Between 1903 and 1964 the GEB gave over

$63,000,000 to Black colleges. The funding system that the industrial individuals created

benefited them so that they were producing graduates who were skilled in the trades that

served their enterprises of industrial education. Tuskegee University, founded by Booker

T. Washington, was one of the first producers of such graduates where students learned

how to shoe horses, make dress, and cook. Washington valued hard work and education

in the industrial sciences as the direct path for "Blacks to move from impoverishment to a

suitable level of socio-economic stability" (UNCF, 2007).

During this time there were two conflicting ideologies about the education of

African Americans. For some like Washington, education was to be utilized to teach a

skill or trade in order for graduates to be able to find work after graduation. For others,

such as W.E.B. Du Bois, the first African American to receive a PhD from Harvard and co-founder of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), a liberal arts curriculum was favored. Du Bois felt that political power and civil rights were just as important as industrial education. He believed that a top tier of individuals, or a "talented tenth" of "well-educated blacks could lead the rest of the race to a more progressive place in American society" (UNCF, 2007). Industrial education posed less of a threat to the social contract on racial stratification and was embraced by both Blacks and Whites (Anderson, 1988). The liberal arts focused education had the potential of placing African Americans on the same level intellectually with Whites, and in time, challenging the inequality of the social structure (Hopps, 2006).

Realizing that industrial education could co-exist with a more academic curriculum, the GEB philanthropists began to give their money and influence throughout the educational system. Their generosity still caused further conflict and was not entirely welcomed by the students and faculty members of the liberal arts universities whose fear was that the philanthropists still had some altruistic motives. Some felt that the philanthropists were attempting to control all forms of Black education. In spite of this, their contributions helped to support private Black colleges until the 1930s. In 1935, Frederick D. Patterson became president of Tuskegee Institute in Tuskegee, Alabama. Patterson lacked the fundraising skills and personal ties of past presidents Booker T. Washington and Robert S. Moton. The trustees of the institution became accustomed to a more passive role due to the prominence of the institution's past relationship with the philanthropists. Patterson found it difficult to run Tuskegee in an efficient manner while meeting the needs of the students, many of whom did not have the resources to pay for

their tuition. He proposed that the nation's private Black colleges join together in their fund-raising efforts. In 1944, as a result of his insight, the presidents of 32 Black colleges created the United Negro College Fund (UNCF). This organization originally began as a fund-raising effort that eventually took on an advocacy role as well.

As a result of his interactions with the GEB, Patterson was able to convince John D. Rockefeller, Jr. to publicly endorse the UNCF and serve as its national chairman. This connection linked the UNCF to the corporate world. Other original members of the UNCF national board included Alfred P. Sloan of General Motors Corporation, Harvey S. Firestone of Firestone Tire and Rubber Company, and Robert Woodruff of Coca Cola Company (Gasman & Epstein, 2004). As a result of these early actions, UNCF today provides operating funds for 39 member colleges, administering 300 scholarships and internship programs and serves as a national advocate for the importance of minority higher education through the representation of public policy interests of its students (UNCF, 2007).

2.3.2 Legal Issues Influencing the Development of HBCUs

Around the same time, Black colleges and universities were discussing the future possibilities of fund raising and the future of financial operation of their institutions, the federal government was making rulings about segregation as it related to education. The first of these historic cases is *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896). *Plessy* ruled that Black and White students could receive separate accommodations in terms of educational services as long as there were equal accommodations. State laws prohibited Black and White students' attendance at the same institutions as a result of this court case. Later legislation, however, overturned this ruling.

Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka (1954) was the landmark decision that overturned decades of segregated education in the United States. The *Brown* ruling had a huge impact on the future of HBCUs. UNCF Executive Director at the time, William J. Trent, Jr. held both formal and informal discussions with leaders and supporters of Black colleges on the topic of Black higher education after desegregation. He indicated that the unique role of Black colleges made them useful in the years after Jim Crow. He predicted "integration would be slow moving and that black colleges would be needed during the transition" (Gasman, 2007, p. 91). The test of survival, according to Trent, "was the measure of an institution's usefulness to society and its standard of excellence" (Gasman, 2007, p. 91). In the times after the *Brown* decision, Black colleges would have to prove that they were indeed useful and necessary to remain operational in the wake of integration. With the general college enrollment expanding and more high school graduates seeking higher education, Trent felt, "not only will every good college in existence now be needed, but they will have to be prepared to expand their services and new ones will have to be built" (Gasman, 2007, p. 92). The UNCF leadership also felt that at this time service to a wider community which embraced white students would be necessary to entice potential future donors because some donors, including John D. Rockefeller, Jr., felt that continued funding would no longer be needed and the Black colleges should close their doors forcing all students to attend White colleges (Gasman, 2007).

While desegregation of higher education was a slow process, eventually in 1964, federal legislators crafted Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which provided:

No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, or be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance. (Pub. L. No. 88-352, 78 Stat. 241)

The importance of these rulings is monumental when thinking about the future of HBCUs. According to Paris and Gasman (2006), these decisions meant that Black and White colleges would be in competition with each other to recruit students. Students would now have the choice between colleges with more resources such as scholarships and other financial aid then those at Black colleges.

In *United States v. Fordice* (1992), HBCUs PWIs in the state of Mississippi were under examination. The previous legal rulings of *Brown* made clear that segregated public schools and schools of higher education were unconstitutional. The *Fordice* case claimed that the universities in Mississippi were not desegregated because of their easy racial identification. There were some individuals who wanted HBCUs to be dismantled and for African American students to attend the White institutions for the purposes of desegregation. There was also concern that public HBCUs provided duplicate curriculums as the public White institutions. Still others, like Norman Lockman of the *Wilmington News Journal,* believed in the values of the Black colleges. He wrote: "African American schools are among few institutions other than black churches where a young African American can be in an environment dominated by other African Americans. It can be an environment that provides shelter, comfort, and networks for blacks" (Lockman, 1991, p. 3).

The question posed before the Supreme Court in *United States v. Fordice* was whether or not Mississippi had met its duty under the Fourteenth Amendment's Equal

Protection clause to dismantle its prior dual university system. Mississippi had eight

public education institutions and the Supreme Court found that to operate all eight

universities was "wasteful and irrational" (Jackson, Snowden, & Eckes, 2002, p. 11). In

an eight to one vote, the Supreme Court Justices felt that the state did not do enough to

desegregate its dual system. The system of different admissions criteria and different

missions for university system components may have racially discriminated against

some; however, the Supreme Court Justices turned the matter back to the state officials

and told them that they must determine what must be done to fulfill its duty under the

Constitution. In response, the Mississippi Board of Trustees of State Institutions of

Higher Learning reached a solution for compliance with *Fordice*. The solution required

the closure of one HBCU (Mississippi Valley State University) and required Alcorn State

University to merge with Delta State University, a historically White institution. Jackson

State University would be the only surviving public HBCU in the state of Mississippi.

The District Court on remand did not find it necessary to approve the closure of

Mississippi Valley State University, "reserving such a ruling until the Supreme Court sets

forth precedent clarifying whether public HBCUs may be preserved under the *Fordice*

standard" (Jackson, Snowden, & Eckes, 2002, p. 11).

One impact of *Fordice* was that predominately Black colleges across the country

began various phases of transformation in terms of enrollment. Hopps (2006) noted that

at Bluefield State College in West Virginia, out of over 3,500 students, only 299 are

African American, and, at Tennessee State University, 20 percent of the total enrollment

is not African American. These institutions serve as examples of how HBCUs admittance

policies have become more liberal, as a result of the desegregation movement. The

changes across the country, due to legal action, to address segregation had profound

impacts on HBCUs. Brown, Donahoo, and Bertrand (2001) asserted that "historically

Black colleges have been pioneers in higher education. Although they were created for

the education of African Americans, HBCUs have been successful in making higher

education more accessible for all students" (p. 569).

2.3.3 Graduate Education at HBCUs

Prior to the *Brown* decision, the NAACP worked on two occasions to ensure that

education at the graduate school level was awarded to African American students. In

each case, an African American graduate applicant challenged the notion of "separate but

equal education" mandated by *Plessy v. Ferguson* (163 U). Although the states in the

South felt that an African American student could receive the same education in any field

in a separate institution, this was not illustrated for some. Two important cases

exemplifying the unfair graduate admission example are *Sipuel v. Board of Regents*

(1948) and *Sweatt v. Painter* (1950) (Gasman, 2007).

In *Sipuel*, Ada Sipuel applied to the University of Oklahoma law school and was

denied admission based on her race. With the help of the NAACP, Sipuel sued the state,

and the case eventually went to the Supreme Court. Based on the 14th amendment, the

Court decided that states must provide equal graduate education for African Americans.

Rather than admitting Ada Sipuel to the University of Oklahoma, the state's Board of

Regents created the "Negro Law School" and hired three African American lawyers to

serve as the faculty. In 1948, the Supreme Court decided that this practice was

unconstitutional and Ada Sipuel was allowed to enroll in the law school at the University

of Oklahoma. In *Sweatt v. Painter*, Heman Sweatt applied for admission to the University

of Texas law school. The school rejected his application on the basis that it was a segregated institution. Sweatt, along with the NAACP, sued the University of Texas. He lost his case at the state level but the Supreme Court forced the University of Texas to open its doors to all students, regardless of race (Gasman, 2007). In each of these cases, the court declared that the states had an obligation to provide graduate education for African Americans and that the education must replicate the intellectual level experienced by White students at White institutions.

Probably the most impressive result of the *United States v. Fordice* ruling was the implementation of additional academic programs at Jackson State University and other HBCUs. For example, the ruling allowed for the first PhD program in social work along with a host of other PhD programs. Prior to this ruling as noted earlier, states were required to provide equal graduate education for African American students. This was exemplified in the previous noted court cases. The *Fordice* case made sure that states were allocating funds fairly for the implementation of graduate programs at HBCUs.

In a report by Kenneth Redd that chronicled trends in graduate enrollment at HBCUs from 1996-2006, he noted that fewer than one-quarter of the 87 four-year public and private HBCUs awarded doctorates. By 2006, 32 percent of HBCUs had doctoral programs. During this time, there was a surge of African-Americans receiving doctoral degrees. "Between 2001 and 2006, the number of doctorates to African Americans from HBCUs gained 36%, while the overall increase in doctorates to all African Americans rose 3%" (Redd, 2008, p. 2).

In 1970, the Council of Historically Black Graduate Schools (CHBGS) was founded to support and promote graduate education at HBCUs. The mission of CHBGS

31

is to increase the enrollment, retention, and graduation of African American students in graduate programs at HBCUs and in institutions interested in graduate education for African American students, and helps to prepare them to be faculty members. The organization also seeks to enhance the number of graduate courses and programs available at HBCUs. This organization has two kinds of membership, full and associate, and currently there are 39 member institutions. The organization awards faculty and students on their scholarship and celebrates African American graduate education across the country (CHBGS, 2008).

2.3.4 Resources at HBCUs

The Southern Education Foundation (SEF) is a non-profit organization made up of individuals who desire to improved education policy and practice, as well as promote a high quality of universal education (SEF, 2008). The foundation has a clear mission of developing, promoting and implementing policies and practices that ensure the highest levels of academic excellence for African Americans. Although the oldest HBCUs (e.g., Cheyney State, Lincoln, and Wilberforce Universities) were established in the North, 77 of the country's HBCUs are located in the South, where 54 percent of the nation's African American population resides (SEF, 2008).

In 2006, Hopps wrote an SEF publication on the challenges for boards of trustees of HBCUs. The underlying message was that HBCUs lack the resources of White colleges and if this issue was not addressed or changed, HBCUs would not flourish the way they were intended. Hopps (2006) further stated: "HBCUs must demonstrate that they are capable of standing with the best of the best. Having the confidence and expertise to compete with top institutions, moving away from minority set-aside

32

grants/programs and demanding resources based on merit will be a true sign of maturing institutions" (Hopps, 2006, p. 14).

It is clear that Black colleges would not have started if it were not for the generosity of the early missionaries. The money given by the missionaries funded the institutions for many years. Frederick Patterson collaborated with Black college presidents to establish UNCF at a time when the future of HBCU finances was in jeopardy. "Although HBCUs have not received just rewards from government, foundations, philanthropists and corporations, a push for genuine financial ownership must be nourished in the culture of these institutions. It is a sure way to preserve their legacy" (Hopps, 2006, p. 14). These just rewards translate to a lack of resources that inhibit HBCUs from being compared on the same level with traditionally White colleges. Environment, faculty, and student realities demonstrate the lack of resources eventually leading to disproportionate opportunities given to students at HBCUs compared to students at majority White institutions.

While student interest in HBCUs has and continues to grow, government financial support had decreased (Hopps, 2006). In 1980, President Jimmy Carter signed Executive Order 12232, which established a federal program to strengthen and expand the capacity of HBCUs to provide quality education. In 1981, President Reagan established the White House Initiative on Historically Black Colleges and Universities, which expanded the previous order. President George Bush established a Presidential Advisory Board on Historically Black Colleges and Universities in 1989. This was established to advise the President and the Secretary of Education on strategies to strengthen the institutions. In 2002, President George W. Bush signed Executive Order 13256, which transferred the

White House Initiative on Historically Black Colleges and Universities to the office of the Secretary within the United States Department of Education. The mission of these presidential orders was to strengthen the capacity of HBCUs (U.S. Department of Education, 2008). Then, in 2006, President George W. Bush proposed a budget that would affect HBCUs and education in America as a whole.

In President Bush's proposed $2.57 trillion budget in 2006, one-third of the programs slated for elimination were in the Department of Education. Examples of education terminations included the Perkins Loan Program, the Learning Educational Assistance Partnership (LEAP) and other programs that encourage and assist lower income students' preparation for college, such as Talent Search and Upward Bound (Selingo, 2005). There was an overall decrease for students from lower income households or for students who come from educational systems that inadequately prepare them for higher education; in most cases these are African American youth. Access to higher education cannot adequately be addressed while ignoring these practices that leave too many disadvantaged and minority students grade levels behind (Jackson, Snowden, & Eckes, 2002).

The success of HBCUs has been largely due to the dedication and commitment of the faculties to address many of the deficiencies of the students. Faculty salaries at HBCUs are 20 percent lower than faculty salaries at other institutions (Provanisk, Shafer, & Snyder, 2004). It is quite likely that HBCU faculty choose to work at these institutions for more than financial gain. Race-conscious faculty members understand that many students, including some of the most talented, come to college with poorly developed skills and are inadequately prepared for college success. They understand these deficits

stem from generations of race-based under-funding of educational systems, as well as limited access to well-financed institutions (Hopps, 2006). They are willing to put in additional systems to support the students. Faculty binding together to help students rise above these deficiencies is part of the success of HBCUs. In their investigation of academic success for African American men at Black colleges, Palmer and Gasman noted: "success in college does not lie in the hand of any one person; rather, the entire university community is responsible for deploying social capital in a way that promotes student persistence and retention" (Palmer & Gasman, 2008, p. 67).

In a study about the contribution of HBCUs to the preparation of African Americans for faculty careers, Perna (2001) examined the characteristics of African American faculty who received their bachelor's and doctoral degrees from HBCUs and non-HBCUs in terms of research productivity and satisfaction with the work setting. Further, Perna found that having earned a bachelor's degree or a doctoral degree from an HBCU is unrelated to the preparation of African Americans for faculty careers, as measured by research productivity and satisfaction with the work setting. Using descriptive statistics, Perna found that similar percentages of African American full-time faculty who did and did not earn their bachelor's degrees from an HBCU attained doctoral degrees.

Further, Perna found that a high number of African Americans who were educated by HBCUs return to HBCUs as faculty members. "More than one half (55%) of African American full-time faculty with bachelor's degrees work at HBCUs, compared with only 24% of other African American full-time faculty" (Perna, 2001, p. 287). Tack

and Patitu (1992) concluded that ethnic minority faculty might prefer to work at HBCUs to assist greater numbers of ethnic minority students and more ethnic minority professors.

Perna's research also contributed to the discussion of HBCUs' lack of resources. According to her study, she found that working at an HBCU is unrelated to research productivity, after controlling for other variables; however, working at a research university is associated with a higher probability of having at least one refereed publication in a 2-year period (Perna, 2001). Adessa and Sonnenwald (2003) proposed that, while HBCUs produce a great number of doctoral degrees, they have minimal resources and infrastructure to support research in comparison to other institutions, which they label Doctoral/Research Universities, or DRUs.

In their study, Adessa and Sonnenwald conducted qualitative interviews with faculty and postdoctoral fellows who participated in collaborative research projects between HBCUs and DRUs. They found that the resources that impacted collaboration between the faculties included tangible goods and services, time available, human resources, and existing knowledge. Tangible goods and services included items that could be purchased, sold, or exchanged such as lab equipment and services. Time available referred to the amount of time the principal investigator could devote to research-related activities as opposed to teaching courses. Human resources included people contributing to the research project such as lab assistants. Finally, existing knowledge consisted of what each participant already knew about the subject for the collaboration (Adessa & Sonnenwald, 2003). In each case, the resources the two groups had at the start of the projects were out of alignment. "HBCU faculty work with ill-equipped labs, schedules crammed with teaching duties, and inexperienced student research assistant. All of these

resource shortages, in turn, tended to limit the existing knowledge base of HBCU faculty and produce feelings of frustration" (Adessa & Sonnenwald, 2003, p. 4). The authors also indicated that based on the existing literature and their findings, HBCUs lack resources that allow them to produce the quality of work that DRUs or research institutions produce. Based on Perna's research and the study by Adessa and Sonnenwald, HBCUs lack some resources that allow them to produce the quantity of work that other institutions produce.

Chapter 3: Methodology

3.1 Introduction

CACREP has operated as the primary accreditation body for the counseling

profession, since 1981 (Sweeny, 1999). Over the years, several institutions with

Counselor Education Programs have applied to, been reviewed, and accredited by

CACREP. Research surrounding the perception of CACREP accreditation and the core

curriculum standards has historically been favorable (Bobby & Kandor, 1992; Cecil &

Comas, 1986; Smaby & D'Andrea, 1995; Vacc, 1992). Negative aspects of CACREP are

time spent maintaining accreditation and preparation for self-studies, expense, and

curricular changes (Bobby & Kandor, 1992). Much of the research that has been focused

on CACREP involves CACREP-accredited Counselor Education Programs, most of

which are PWIs. There are over thirty HBCUs with counseling programs, and, of those,

only five institutions are accredited by CACREP. In the process of reviewing the

literature, there is an apparent gap in the representation of HBCUs. There is no existing

research literature that examines the perceived benefit or limitation of CACREP

accreditation for HBCUs. In this research literature, there are also no studies on why

HBCU Counselor Education Programs seek, achieve, and/or maintain CACREP

accreditation.

The purpose of this study was to determine HBCU counselor education faculty's

perceptions of CACREP accreditation and also determine which, if any, of the 2001

38

CACREP standards are considered a hindrance for Counselor Education Programs in the CACREP accreditation process. For this reason, a qualitative methodology was utilized. Further, this research study was what McMillan and Schumacher (2001) described to be an interactive, in-depth study. It utilized qualitative techniques to collect data from people in their natural settings. For this approach, the researcher has the ability to interpret phenomena according to the meanings people bring to them. To this end, qualitative research "captures the subject's interpretation of what is occurring" (Howard, 1985, p. 212) and these interpretations can be synthesized to develop a collective and complete understanding of individuals' perceptions.

3.2 Research Questions

The overall purpose of this study was to gain better understanding of the perceptions of CACREP accreditation from faculty at HBCU Counselor Education Programs. To this end, the research questions are the following:

1. What are the perceptions of CACREP accreditation, according to HBCU Counselor Education faculty members?

2. What are the barriers for HBCU counselor educators seeking, achieving, and/or maintaining CACREP accreditation?

3. Which CACREP (2001) accreditation standards are considered a hindrance for seeking, achieving, and/or maintaining CACREP accreditation?

3.3 Research Design

3.3.1 Theoretical Framework

Critical Race Theory (CRT) is the framework that guided this study. DuBois (1903)

39

predicted that racism would continue to emerge as one of the key problems in the United

States. Racism shaped social institutions in the United States in the 20th century and

continued to impact social institutions in the beginning of the 21st century (Yosso, 2005).

CRT is a paradigm used to bring insights about racial predicaments, exposing how racism

is more powerful than initially thought (Delgado & Stefanic, 2000).

CRT emerged from criticism of the Critical Legal Studies (CLS) movement,

impacted by Derrick Bell and Alan Freeman (Delgado, 1995). They believed that one

reason why the CLS critique of the law could not offer strategies for social change was

because it did not incorporate race and racism into the analysis and failed to listen to the

experiences of those affected by institutionalized racism (Delgado, 1995; Ladson-

Billings, 1998). Yosso (2005) asserted that the oppression in society could not be

completely understood in terms of only Black and White interactions, which did not

include the understandings in the ways that African Americans, Native Americans,

Asian/Pacific Islanders, Chicanos, and Latinos, continue to experience and resist racism

and oppression.

Solarzano (1995) identified five tenets of CRT that can inform research. The first

tenet is the inter-centricity of race and racism. CRT begins with the premise that race and

racism are central, permanent, and a fundamental part of how the United States society

functions (Bell, 1992). In this tenet, CRT discusses tiers of radicalized subordination

based on gender, class, accent, sexuality, immigration status, and phenotype (Crenshaw,

1989). The second tenant challenges White privilege and refutes the claims that

educational institutions make toward race neutrality and equal opportunity. CRT exposes

deficit-informed research that silences, ignores, and distorts all kinds of oppression,

including racial, gender and class oppression. This third tenet offers a social justice agenda that works to eliminate racism and sexism and strives to empower subordinated groups (Solorzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001).

The next tenet is the belief that it is appropriate for oppressed groups to analyze and teach about racial subordination (Delgado Bernal, 2002). This experiential knowledge is illustrated by storytelling, family histories, biographies, scenarios, parables, chronicles, and narratives (Bell, 1992; Solorzano & Yosso, 2000). The final tenet is the transdisciplinary perspective, which advocates researching race and racism within historical and contemporary frameworks. These come from ethnic studies, women's studies, sociology, history, law, psychology and other fields. For the present study, CRT helped to understand the evolution of HBCUs and their current state, thus providing a theoretical foundation for the discoveries uncovered in researching these particular Counselor Education Programs.

3.3.2 Participant Selection

There are currently approximately thirty HBCUs with counseling programs. Searching and contacting each of the HBCUs with graduate programs in counseling or counselor education compiled this list. It was then compared with the directory provided by CACREP of accredited institutions (CACREP, 2009). Further, there were five Counselor Education Programs that were accredited by CACREP.

The Counselor Education Program faculty members were the target participants of the study. HBCU Counselor Education Programs, both CACREP-accredited and non-CACREP accredited, were included in this study to determine if there were any differences in the perspectives and experiences with CACREP accreditation. A profile of

41

participants is listed in Appendix A.

The participants were initially sent an invitation letter to participate in the research study (Appendix B) along with a consent form to participate in the research study (Appendix C). The participants who returned the consent forms were contacted by electronic mail directing them to the biographical questionnaire (Appendix D). The researcher also made telephone calls and sent emails soliciting counselor educator participation. Following their response, they were contacted by telephone to complete a 30 to 60-minute interview about CACREP accreditation (Appendix E). The snowballing technique was utilized to increase participation. Participants who completed interviews directed the researcher to other faculty members who were willing to participate.

3.3.3 Data Collection

Every method of data collection has its individual strengths and limitations. For this reason qualitative research requires multiple methods for gathering data (Glesne, 1997; Spradley, 1979). For this study, the researcher used two methods of gathering data: (a) individual interviews and (b) biographical questionnaires. The data for this investigation came from HBCU counselor education faculty at both CACREP-accredited and non-CACREP-accredited HBCUs. All telephone interviews were audio taped, and transcribed in verbatim. The transcripts were coded and analyzed using the grounded theory approach (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). The data were reviewed and analyzed throughout the study. This process continued until saturation occurred and the research questions were answered. During this process, the data were examined for themes and sub-themes.

Research participants' names are not been associated with any material produced for this study. When writing the results, the data have been presented in aggregate format

to minimize the risks of participants being potentially identified. Pseudonyms have been associated with individual responses in writing up the study. To ensure safeguarding, the recorded audiotapes, data transcriptions, biographical questionnaires, and informed consent forms were stored in the researcher's secured file cabinet.

3.3.4 Data Analysis

As a way of analyzing data, the researcher used grounded theory, a research method in which theory is developed from the data. This approach allows themes (and subthemes) to be uncovered from a more specific idea to a more general concept (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). According to Strauss and Corbin (1998), the researcher should collect data, define key points with a series of codes, and then group key concepts. After all the interviews were audio taped and transcribed verbatim, the researcher began the analytic process by listening to the audio tapes. In qualitative research, developing a coding system is the first step of analysis (Patton, 2002). Schwandt (2001) defined coding as, "a procedure that disaggregates the data, breaks it down into manageable segments, and identifies or names those segments" (p. 26).

For this study, data analysis began with an initial examination of the biographical questionnaire by the researcher. Continual readings of the transcripts of the audio-taped interview helped to get a sense of the whole picture of each individual faculty member's view of CACREP accreditation. The data were coded broadly, according to themes and patterns that arose. Inductive coding was used based on multiple readings of the interview transcripts and the biographical information gathered. A code book was established (Appendix G) helping to document themes that arose. These codes were tracked using a coding worksheet (Appendix H). Meaningful themes were reviewed and the information

43

was shared with a knowledgeable research partner to help account for member checking. This form of parallel analysis helped to address the issue of consistency of the findings. To assist with this process and to ensure researcher subjectivity, the researcher utilized a research partner who is skilled in collecting, analyzing and writing up qualitative research (Appendix F).

Once the data was collected, the researcher and the research partner met to compare and contrast each transcription until 100% agreement was reached pertaining to the assigned codes (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). This process included a thorough discussion about the interpretation of the participants' responses compared to the codes generated.

3.4 Researcher Subjectivity

A major concern, when presenting research findings, is to ensure that the results are valid. Concerned readers of the findings may question if the results are true and what steps the researcher has taken to ensure that they are credible, transferable, dependable, and confirmable. In traditional quantitative research, statistical procedures are used to attempt to ensure reliability, validity, and objectivity of the data (Howard, 1985). In qualitative research, these procedures are not effective in working with the phenomena presented. To take the place of statistical significance, qualitative researchers determine significance through trustworthiness (Patton, 2002). Trustworthiness is defined as "that quality of an investigation (and its findings) that made it noteworthy to audiences" (Schwandt, 2001, p. 258).

In qualitative research, trustworthiness is the extent to which the researcher takes steps to increase levels of *credibility* (i.e., assurance that there is a fit between the participant's views and the researcher's views), *transferability* (i.e., the ability to

generalize information from the case presented to other similar cases), *dependability* (i.e., the understanding that the process is logical, traceable and document), and *confirmability* (i.e., the information is presented objectively and in clear, discernable ways) (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

3.4.1 Credibility

Credibility describes how the researcher is able to capture the views of the participants being researched (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). For this study, multiple methods were used to ensure credibility of the research findings; specifically, *investigator* and *methodological* triangulation were employed.

1. *Investigator triangulation* has been utilized by the following methods:

   a. *Research partner.* The researcher recruited a qualified individual who was knowledgeable about CACREP accreditation, Counselor Education Programs, and HBCUs.

   b. *Peer debriefing.* Peer debriefing involved getting support of a skilled colleague to discuss findings of the study. This allowed the researcher to probe any researcher biases, clarify thoughts, and challenge interpretations throughout the study.

   c. *Member checking.* Member checking consisted of asking the participants of the study for clarification of their interview responses to ensure adequate representation of their comments and thoughts.

2. *Methodological triangulation* techniques were used to gain information:

   a. Individual interview data

   b. Biographical questionnaires

45

      c. Literature review

      d. Internet resources

3.4.2 Transferability

Transferability refers to the steps taken by the researcher to increase the ability of the findings to be generalized to other similar cases (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). One technique of transferability is that the researcher and participants give "thick description" of the study by recording circumstances, meanings, strategies and motivations. This will allow another interested researcher to reach a conclusion if a transfer of findings can be contemplated as a possibility.

3.4.3 Dependability

In order to establish dependability, it is important that researchers demonstrate that the process is logical, traceable and documented (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Reflexive journaling helped to ensure that dependability is captured. Reflexive journaling is a method of documenting personal beliefs, attitudes and opinions of the researcher. The reflexive journal provided a record of understanding for the researcher. Further, the audit trail provided a traceable framework of the study. The following steps were utilized in creating an audit trail:

1. Raw data (i.e., interview transcripts, demographic questionnaire results).

2. Data reduction and analysis (i.e., summaries and working hypotheses).

3. Data reconstruction and synthesis (i.e., themes, definitions, interpretations, inferences).

4. Process notes (i.e., methodological notes including procedures, strategies, decisions and rationale, documentation regarding trustworthiness including peer debriefing, etc.).

5. Intentions and disposition (i.e., proposal, reflections, expectations, predictions).

6. Instrument development (i.e., protocols and demographic questionnaires).

3.4.4 Confirmability

To meet the trustworthiness standard, the researcher presented the data in a manner that was clear and discernable (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The techniques of triangulation, member checking, and reflexive journaling were used to meet this criteria.

3.5 Summary

This chapter detailed the topic of the research study and presented research questions. It also discussed the theoretical framework of the study, the research design, sample selection, data collection, data analysis, and methods for ensuring trustworthiness.

Chapter 4: Findings

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the major findings of the current study, based on the biographical questionnaires and the individual interviews completed by the participants. An overall thematic analysis of the data is also presented. As noted previously, the purpose of this study was to capture the perceptions of CACREP accreditation by counselor educators at HBCUs. Specifically, the researcher was interested in exploring which, if any, of the CACREP standards were considered a hindrance for Counselor Education Programs seeking, achieving, and/or maintaining CACREP accreditation. Again, the present study explored the following research questions:

1. What are the perceptions of CACREP accreditation, according to HBCU Counselor Education faculty members?

2. What are the barriers for HBCU counselor educators seeking, achieving, and/or maintaining CACREP accreditation?

3. Which CACREP (2001) accreditation standards are considered a hindrance for seeking, achieving, and/or maintaining CACREP accreditation?

4.2 Demographic Characteristics

This section outlines the demographic characteristics of the participants. Specifically, the demographics are delineated by gender, tenure status, rank, and if participants' program is CACREP or non-CACREP-accredited.

48

Gender

Category	Female	Male
Number	9	5
Percentage	65%	35%

Table 4.1: Frequencies and Percentages of Participants by Gender

Tenure Status

Category	Tenured	Not Tenured	N/A
Number	8	5	1
Percentage	57.1%	35.7%	7.2%

Table 4.2: Frequencies and Percentages of Participants by Tenure Status

Tables 4.1 and 4.2 show the breakdown of the participants by gender and tenure status. As you see, there were nine females who participated in the study and 35% of the participants were male. The study had 8 tenured faculty and 5 faculty members who were not tenured. There was one participant who was neither because this participant was an administrator who participated in the study. Table 4.3 shows that participants included 2

full professors, 6 associate professors and five assistant professors. One of the

participants was an administrator who wanted to speak on behalf of their university; this

participant is listed as N/A.

Professor Rank

Category	Full Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	N/A
Number	2	6	5	1
Percentage	14.2%	42.8%	35.7%	7.2%

Table 4.3: Frequencies and Percentages of Participants by Rank

4.3 Theme Emergence

As mentioned in chapter three, the primary research analysis began with the

assignment of open codes developed from a thorough review of the literature in addition

to the raw interview transcriptions and biographical questionnaires. Next, the researcher

developed and assigned codes or "tags or labels for assigning units of meaning to the

descriptive or inferential information compiled during a study" (Miles & Huberman,

1994, p. 56). Once developed, all codes were organized and kept in a codebook

(Appendix G) that included descriptions of each code, as well as examples.

The researcher developed the initial open codes and e-mailed them, along with the

interview transcriptions and biographical questionnaires to the other members of the

research team (Appendix E). Using this information, the research partner coded each transcription and recorded their findings on the coding worksheet (Appendix F). Once completed, the team met to compare and contrast each transcription until 100% agreement was reached pertaining to the assigned codes (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). This process included a thorough discussion about the interpretation of the participants' responses compared to the codes generated.

4.4 Presentation of Findings

In trustworthy qualitative research (Patton, 1990), rich, in-depth descriptions were used to capture the meanings of participants' experiences and perceptions as they were communicated in their own words. As a way of ensuring thematic analysis, the research team was guided by the direction of grounded theory approaches (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Themes were identified with 100% consensus from the researcher and her partner. At this point, the researcher sought confirmation of themes by consulting the counselor educator participants of the study via e-mail to ensure their thoughts were correctly captured. Based on these themes and the related sub-themes, the researcher developed multiple assertions explaining the experiences of the counselor educators who participated in this study. The assertions were agreed upon by the researcher, the research partner, as well as the counselor educator participants and are reported throughout this section. Again, each participant was assigned a pseudonym to preserve his or her identity.

An important aspect of qualitative research is making sure that the researcher is completely open with respect to the presentation of the findings. Chenail (1995) indicated

that researchers should be as open and honest as possible when reporting their findings.

This allows readers to decide for themselves whether the findings are trustworthy:

> A way to maintain this posture is to consider the other in the process at all times and make it a priority that you present as much of the "back stage" information of your research as possible. By back stage I mean that you communicate as clearly as you can what it was that you did to create your project, what were your choices along the way, what else did you consider doing in the project but you chose not to do. Get clear with yourself what it is that you are doing at every point along the way of doing your project. Note it and present it to your readers. (Chenail, 1995, np.)

The findings of this study were presented with particular attention paid to the identification of thoughts and actions by the researcher that may have impacted the study.

4.5 General Perceptions of CACREP Accreditation

The focal point of this study was to provide and record the perceptions about CACREP accreditation from counselor educators at HBCUs. The majority of the participants described their perceptions as positive overall. For example, Professor I who taught at a non-CACREP accredited program stated: "CACREP accreditation gives the people and the program a mark of excellence." However, based on the scientific literature, the researcher knew that there have been documented thoughts on the alternating opinion of CACREP. For this reason, the researcher probed and asked the participants questions regarding their experiences with CACREP, leading to the following emergence of benefits and barriers of seeking, achieving, and/or maintaining CACREP accreditation.

The themes and sub-themes (and their corresponding codes) are discussed throughout the remainder of this chapter. Direct excerpts from the transcripts are used to illustrate these major themes and sub-themes.

(1) *Resources Needed to Obtain and Maintain CACREP*

Several aspects are included in resources. Each participant mentioned money as a factor contributing to CACREP accreditation; either in terms of hiring faculty (FAC) or the state funding allocated to HBCUs (SAF). Resources included support (SUPP) from administrators, as well as mentoring from those knowledgeable about CACREP, either from a CACREP-accredited program or from CACREP national board members.

(2) *Multiple Interpretations of CACREP Requirements*

Throughout the interviews, many participants held assumptions and misconceptions about the requirements about CACREP. These interpretations focused on the ratio requirements (RAT). The change from the 2001 CACREP standards to the 2009 CACREP standards further added to participant's confusion (UPDATE). Many participants spoke specifically about the CACREP standards (STAND) and stated that they had aligned their current programs with CACREP (ALIGN). However, many of the same participants were unclear of the standards or were completely incorrect in the specifics of the standards. Finally some participants from programs with multiple counseling tracks believed CACREP accreditation was unattainable for each of their tracks (OSFA) and that the standards written did not fit all counseling programs. In each of these instances, participants felt there should be more of an effort to instruct/teach/help willing Counselor Education Programs through the CACREP accreditation process.

53

(3) *Validation Received from Having CACREP*

Many of the participants indicated one benefit of CACREP was that it enhanced the quality (QUAL) of the program and gave the program merit to the external world. Also, many believed that CACREP accreditation would aid students seeking jobs as counselors (JOBS) and those students wanting to further their education in doctoral school (DOC). On the other hand, some noted this seal of approval or validation as elitist (ELIT) and often times leading to a division in the definition of a counselor's identity (CI).

4.6 Resources Needed to Obtain and Maintain CACREP

The most prominent theme of this study was the fact that CACREP accreditation required specific resources in order to successfully obtain accreditation. One of the requirements of CACREP was the need for a certain number of qualified, full-time faculty. Many participants noted their budgets did not allow them to hire additional faculty to assist with the demands of the additional workload necessary to maintain CACREP accreditation. As an example of this, Professors A and G commented:

 If we were to do that [CACREP accreditation], one of our faculty members would have to be a CACREP coordinator …and that's kind of tough at an HBCU…we're a teaching university and we need faculty to teach classes. You know it's kind of difficult to pay somebody to only teach one class and do accreditation. (Professor A)

For an institution that doesn't have a very large faculty but might have a large enrollment in their programs that could present a problem because most of our classes the enrollment is much higher than that for classes. Our practicum classes are the same way. That means you'd have to hire more faculty just to supervise practicum students. (Professor G)

The need for financial resources to hire additional faculty members was a major barrier

for some participants in the study. For those without the financial resources, allowing one

faculty member to be the coordinator for CACREP accreditation is not seen as a wise use

of one faculty member's time.

   Additionally, several participants mentioned the cost of CACREP accreditation

combined with the amount of money HBCUs receive in state funding is a hindrance for

pursuing CACREP accreditation. State allocated funds are monies given to public

institutions from the state. In addition to these funds, in 2007, the College Cost Reduction

and Access Act allotted for $170 million to be given to HBCUs for a two-year period.

This money was intended to help HBCUs purchase science materials, pay for instruction,

as well as establish or enhance teaching instruction (Public Law 110-84, 2007). The

temporary funding is scheduled to end in 2009, unless President Barack Obama endorses

the allocation of funds for more years. The participants in this study noted the money

allocated to HBCUs is less than similar-sized PWIs, making it more difficult for them to

carry out the responsibilities of being educators, specifically in terms of getting CACREP

accreditation. While the College Cost Reduction and Access Act was not specifically

mentioned in this study by the participants, many did discuss the impact of funding and

the cost of CACREP accreditation as a disadvantage of seeking CACREP accreditation:

> The biggest disadvantage for us is…we are a state funded HBCU. And because we are
> a state funded HBCU there is a history that the state has with all the institutions and
> funding. We have been underfunded and faculty have been over loaded across campus.
> One disadvantage of CACREP for us…is getting the funding to get CACREP. It's
> expensive! And once you get it you have to have 3 full-time faculty members, that's a
> big cost. You have to have the application fee, and you have to have the yearly
> maintenance fee. And that doesn't count the kind of technology that a program has to
> have in order to run, so I think that's a disadvantage for many of the smaller HBCUs

because they just may not have it…that's the disadvantage, the cost and the manpower to establish the program, and then how to keep the program. (Professor J)

It's expensive. I don't have hesitations in terms of curriculum, with CACREP, I don't have issues. It's expensive and as an HBCU finances are always in question…HBCUs are extremely sensitive to the economic state of the nation and for HBCUs that is probably more so true than most other schools, other PWIs anyway. When you're talking about changes that require expenditures, it is expensive. (Professor L)

You have to have the finances. If you want to have the (CACREP) visit, you have to make sure you have the money for each person to come and you have built that into your budget and HBCUs are always fighting to get money. It's just discrimination. Your state predominately White schools will always get more money and that's one thing and then the other thing is that many of our HBCUs do not raise as much money in their alumni part, the development part where your schools can reach back and say, 'yeah we have an endowment and it's 4.5 billion or 100 million.' Most HBCUs cannot say that. They would not have that much endowment. So therefore they are so dependent on the state money that having many accreditations would be great, but sometimes it's hard because you have to have somebody willing to support it. (Professor E)

The cost of accreditation combined with the money allocated to HBCUs is a barrier for some Counselor Education Programs. As Professor E noted, financial support from administration would help overcome this barrier.

The final theme that emerged pertaining to resources was support from administrators and mentors. As previously mentioned, the cost of CACREP accreditation was a hurdle that many had to overcome when seeking accreditation. For programs in the process of accreditation, as well as for programs maintaining CACREP accreditation, the support gained from administrators was invaluable. Professor B stated: "Our Dean is fabulous, but we really have the President's support because he sees getting a CACREP program as being a sign of strength and validation of the kinds of work that we're doing." Professors L and M stated:

I have been here through changes in administration from the President to the Department Chair and the University has been pretty consistent to provide support that

we need to move forward. If you present a sound rationale, you put it in the context of what the institutional goals are and how it relates, they have been very supportive, even with every administration and with the changes. (Professor L)

When they [CACREP accreditation team] came, they talked to the Provost and the Chancellor, they were very supportive. They said, 'if you're going to be CACREP accredited, you have to have another faculty member at least.' So out of the whole process we got a faculty member. (Professor M)

Changes in administration can cause set-backs in the accreditation process. The amount of support given may change with new administrators. Previous administrators allowed Professor E's Counselor Education Program to increase the number of credit hours. They must now conduct an additional self-study under new administration. Because of budget issues, there is concern about the amount of support they will receive.

My Dean is very supportive, our faculty is very supportive and you know our President is very supportive. Unfortunately, we changed administration and so that can play a part. The Business Program has had its business accreditation for years. The Social Work Program has had their accreditation for years also and so many of our programs on campus that have accreditation have had them for a long time. When you come on as a new person trying to get the accreditation, you have to first get the money built up to guarantee that you'll have it. And we did have it, but then things went awry and we're going to revisit what the new standards are and make a presentation to our Dean so that we can try to get funding. With the economy everyone is saying, 'you have to cut here and you have to cut there.' If you haven't gotten the accreditation then he's not going to worry about saving money aside for you at this point his goal is to keep the money for the places that are already accredited. (Professor E)

Professor L who has worked in Counselor Education Programs at both PWIs and HBCUs noted: "Resources do matter in terms of the difficulty of the process. You cannot do it in the same way (at an HBCU). It can be done, it just can't be done the same [way]" (Professor L).

Resources also included either mentorship received or mentorship desired. Some participants in the study received mentorship from individuals either in a CACREP

accredited program or from individuals from CACREP. Professors A and D talked about

going to universities in their area and talking to faculty members of currently CACREP

accredited program. They believed these discussions gave them insight about the

accreditation process. Professor A mentioned that several universities in their area (both

CACREP accredited and non-CACREP accredited) meet regularly to compare programs

and departmental standards.

> Even though we're not accredited by CACREP, we follow CACREP standards if
> that makes sense. So a lot of universities around here…we're part of a consortium.
> We actually have created a school counselor leadership team. And what we all do is
> we work together…all of our school counseling professors meet every other month
> and we align all of our standards, all of our internship experiences, and things of that
> nature.

There are still other participants who have requested this type of mentorship but have not

been as successful. Professor H has attempted to find mentors from CACREP and state

counseling conferences and workshops to help with the accreditation process but has

been left with more questions than answers. "When I send e-mails to people who were

CACREP schools asking them if they would mentor me, tutor me, help me, send me

stuff, I haven't had any luck" (Professor H). She further stated:

> Where are the rules? You know? Who can tell me how to do it? And not charge me
> some kind of enormous consultant fee? And I really feel like I probably have
> everything in place…but my drawback is that I just don't know how to do it. I don't
> know how you find out how to do it. Why it's so hard to get someone that would take
> you and mentor you to do it. (Professor H)

4.7 Multiple Interpretations of CACREP Requirements

There were several interpretations of the CACREP requirements held by the

study's participants. One of the major misunderstandings surrounded the CACREP about

the number of students permitted per course taught. The actual 2001 CACREP standard, under Clinical Instruction about individual practicum and internship, stated:

 The practicum and internship experiences are tutorial forms of instruction; therefore, when the individual supervision is provided by program faculty, the ratio of 5 students to 1 faculty member is considered equivalent to the teaching of one (1) three-semester hour course. Such a ratio is considered maximum per course. (CACREP, 2001, p. 15)

For group supervision for practicum and internship students, the 2001 CACREP standard indicated it should not exceed 10 students. The 2001 CACREP standard under Organization and Administration states that the recommended student to faculty ratio in other core curriculum courses is 10:1. (CACREP, 2001). The core curriculum courses are in the areas of professional identity, social and cultural diversity, human growth and development, career development, helping relationships, group work, assessment, and research and program evaluation (CACREP, 2001). The 2009 CACREP standards became effective in July, 2009. Further, the standards focused on the number of students permitted per course changed:

The practicum and internship experiences are tutorial forms of instruction; therefore, when individual and/or triadic supervision is provided by program faculty, the ratio of six students to one faculty member is considered equivalent to the teaching of one 3-semester-hour course. Such a ratio is considered maximum per course. (CACREP, 2009, p. 4)

For group supervision for practicum and internship students, the 2009 standards increased to a maximum of 12 students. For some participants in the study, this requirement was unclear.

In Professor I's Counselor Education Program, for example, there were 100 students enrolled and only 2 faculty members. Professor I knew their ratios were not what CACREP required but could not articulate exactly what they would need to do to reach

CACREP standards. Professor F believed the faculty to student ratio was 15 students to one faculty member. Finally, adding to confusion, Professor K did not realize that the standards for 2009 allowed for an additional student in the practicum and internship courses.

The shift from the 2001 to the 2009 CACREP standards was an issue for other participants in the study as well. As noted previously, the 2009 ratio standards allowed for an increase in the number of students allowed for certain courses. The 2009 CACREP standards also included changes surrounding eligibility requirements, the learning environment, professional identity, as well as professional practice (CACREP, 2009). For counselor educators in this study, these changes created confusion where once there may have been a clear understanding. Professor K provided one example of how the new standards have been misinterpreted.

> The new standards just stick in my throat. I'm just trying to protect this counselor identity and to just go and drop student affairs all together. I know I still want to keep Student Affairs on board…but just to drop it all together? And community agency [counseling]? There are a lot of people who run non-profits in the community and don't need community mental health, but they do need community agency and how to work in the community as a change agent. (Professor K)

Professor K is under the assumption that the 2009 CACREP standards eliminate the study of Student Affairs. In actuality, the 2009 CACREP standards combine student affairs and college counseling. According to CACREP (2009), the purpose of this track is the following: "Students who are preparing to work in professional positions in higher education will demonstrate the knowledge, skills and practices necessary to promote the development of postsecondary students" (p. 46). In each of the subcategories of this track, students must possess a clear understanding in knowledge and skill of Student

Affairs, thus proving that the 2009 CACREP standards have not eliminated this category all together.

Professor K also makes mention that community agency has been removed from the 2009 CACREP standards. Much in the same way student affairs was merged with college counseling; community agency was merged with mental health counseling and clinical counseling in the 2009 CACREP standards. The word, "community," was taken out of the title of the track; however, the objective of the track was the following: "Students who are preparing to work as clinical mental health counselors will demonstrate the professional knowledge, skills, and practices necessary to address a wide variety of circumstances within the clinical mental health counseling context" (CACREP, 2009, p. 29). It would be assumed, therefore, that community agency counseling would fall under the umbrella of the "wide variety of circumstances within the clinical mental health counseling context" (CACREP, 2009, p. 29). Professor K articulated that there are community agency counselors in non-profit agencies who did not need community mental health but did need community agency, further in the clinical mental health counseling 2009 CACREP standards, one objective was for the students to "[u]nderstand the operation of an emergency management system within clinical mental health agencies and in the community" (CACREP, 2009, p. 29). Additionally, the objective for students was to "[m]aintain information regarding community resources to make appropriate referrals" (CACREP, 2009, p, 32). Though the track has changed in name, there is still a desire for this track to include the community agency population.

These misinterpretations lead to the next sub-theme. Several participants mentioned that, while their programs were not CACREP accredited, their programs were

aligned with CACREP standards. Interestingly, Professor H, who had a strong desire for

rules and mentorship through the CACREP accreditation process stated: "I did try to get a

hold of some syllabi that reflected the CACREP standards, so actually my syllabi for my

Masters seem to be aligned…seems to be a lot of the things required by CACREP."

Aligned with this, Professor E mentioned how their program conducted a self-study and

how it was aligned with the 2009 CACREP standards. This included a change from 48-

credit-semester hour program to a 54-credit-semester hour program. She went on to talk

about how the lack of financial resources was preventing them from increasing their

curriculum to the required a 600-clock hour internship. The lack in this requirement

clearly did not make their program CACREP aligned, however she stated, "Do we want

to go through it (CACREP self-study/curriculum changes) again, or do we want to just

make sure that we have adopted some things so that we can continue to say we are not

CACREP, but our program is just as reputable as any CACREP program?" Finally,

Professor F stated: "We're aligned with CACREP…we do everything in our coursework

that is aligned with CACREP because we believe in standards and if those are the

standards that other schools are following, that's great." However, he stated that his

program did not have the man-power to provide supervision for their school counseling

students the way CACREP required.

> One of the criteria for CACREP is for your practicum sight supervisors do not provide
> the supervision. The school provides it and you have to do one hour per week per
> student and you can only have 5 students in your classes. Our school is not going to
> agree that a 5 student class is going to be acceptable. (Professor F)

In each of the previous examples, the participants stated they saw their programs as being

aligned with CACREP accreditation; however, there were specific standards that, for

various reasons, they could not achieve, thus not making their programs aligned with CACREP.

The final sub-theme, under multiple interpretations of CACREP requirements, was the belief held by some participants that the requirements of CACREP did not fit each and every counseling program. This idea of one size not fitting all was expressed by Professor M of a CACREP accredited Counselor Education Program. For example, he stated:

Sometimes, I don't think they [CACREP] understand the particularities of a specific institution…everything has got to be specifically driven towards school or community agency, so like we've had to step back and within particular courses you'd think of that all tracks have to take, the assignments have to be towards school or career within those. Especially when we we're looking at the '09 standards and adjusting courses or creating courses for that. It seems clear to me that a lot of folks that were involved in creating those standards probably had one track in mind. (Professor M)

For Professor M's program, they had to be very intentional about their course assignments to make sure that each standard was met for each track, even when there were students from multiple tracks in a single course.

Professor L also illustrated the idea that not all counseling programs operated the same way, specifically in specifically to the management of their budgets. An example of this is presented in the following quote:

Probably if you look at the administration [standard] where they ask about management of budget. The structure at this particular school is that the budget is managed at a different level…That's probably the hardest one because that structure is really not consistent with CACREP when they say you need to manage the budget. (Professor L)

These instances illustrated the concept that not every counseling program is designed exactly alike and not all of the CACREP requirements are especially easy to obtain for each program.

4.8 Validation from Having CACREP

Each of the participants spoke highly of their programs. Further, many of them were willing to provide the researcher with impressive information about their graduates, regarding employment and the advancement of their education. While not every program represented was accredited by CACREP or seeking CACREP accreditation, each participant was able to name benefits of CACREP accreditation.

The most common viewpoint about the benefit of CACREP accreditation was that accreditation enhanced the quality of the Counselor Education Program and enhanced the program's status to outsiders. Professors C and N, for example are part of Rehabilitation Counseling Programs accredited by the Council on Rehabilitation Education (CORE), noted that having such accreditations provided for the standardization of curriculum. Professor M stated: "[CACREP] helps you to have well a quality program." Aligned with this statement, Professor I asserted: "CACREP accreditation gives the people and the program a mark of excellence." When asked about the benefit of CACREP accreditation, Professor B stated:

 I consider it to be a validation of the quality of the program and we want that. We want the recognition nationally and internationally. Having the standards that are consistent across programs helps people to look at you and see that your students are quality when they are applying for higher education, or honestly, even within the profession, say for instance, in school counseling.

As another example, Professor L asserted:

 Does it matter if you are CACREP accredited if you have the CACREP curriculum? In terms of substance that is getting the same thing that everyone else gets, probably not. In terms of recognition and operating within the profession, it matters.

Professor M talked about the validation of CACREP accreditation from the perspective of an HBCU. Further, he stated: "[s]ometimes folks want to use that HBCU as a stigma on

you and you can come back and say well, we're an HBCU, but we're also CACREP accredited. You make your own decision. It's been valuable for us." There were some individuals who felt that getting an education at an HBCU was not the same education at a PWI. Professor M also believed that having CACREP accreditation dispelled that myth and gave their programs the necessary validation.

Other participants in the study believed that CACREP accreditation would help their graduates secure jobs, obtain specific licensures, and gain acceptance into doctoral programs. Below are example excerpts that reflect the aforementioned points:

The benefit of CACREP is really for the student who plans on pursing their Ph.D. in counselor education. The reason I say that is that most counseling Ph.D. programs will not accept you unless you came from a CACREP master's program. (Professor A)

The biggest advantage of CACREP is that it facilitates the hiring and licensure process for our graduates…the biggest advantage is if somebody is going to a tenure track profession, it facilitates hiring and it also facilitates the licensure process. (Professor J)

There were also participants in the study who felt that CACREP accreditation was not beneficial. For some, while they saw it as a mark of excellence, they felt the profession was becoming too elitist and too much like the American Psychological Association (APA) in that only those educators with a degree in counselor education could teach counseling courses. Below is an excerpt that supports this belief:

I think it has totally become an elitist thing because…people in the program can only have counselor education [degrees] versus whether they can be counseling psychologists. As a result, schools may have been able to meet the requirements but you actually are going to lose quite a few schools who could have actually done very well. Now we've just gotten too… not only elitist, but I also think we're becoming too jaded…I love the fact that I'm a counselor educator---but I still don't see why we hate psychologists so, but then I don't see why psychologists hate us. We take on their behavior. (Professor E)

The 2009 CACREP standards state the core faculty in Counselor Education Programs

should, "[h]ave earned doctoral degrees in counselor education and supervision,

preferably from a CACREP-accredited program, or have been employed as full-time

faculty members in a counselor education program for a minimum of one full academic

year before July 1, 2013" (CACREP, 2009, p. 5). None of the faculty members in

Professor F's Counselor Education Program had degrees in Counselor Education and

Supervision. Below is an example statement:

> Everybody who is in a CACREP program has to graduate from a CACREP program and has to have a doctorate in education and supervision. Right there it's limiting your diversity. At this university we have three professors in the masters program in counseling and none of us have that degree and purposefully so, so we would get different concepts and different inputs, different perceptions in the way we provide counseling and observe our unique populations.

Aligned with this notion, Professor A also stated:

> We have people who have their master's degree in counseling but may have a PhD and it may not be in counselor education. It may be in educational leadership or policy studies, so that's limiting us. All of our faculty would not full under those guidelines.

According to the 2009 CACREP standards, the goal is for all faculty members in

CACREP-accredited programs must have a degree in Counselor Education and

Supervision from a CACREP-accredited program.

In terms of counselor identity, there were multiple views about how CACREP

accreditation contributes to helping counselors come to a firm understanding of their

identity. Below are examples of this:

> I guess we are really wanting to be identified. You know, as we read our counseling literature and we ask about identity, CACREP serves as our identification. And that way, it says 'I have met something'. We are still striving for a true identity. Because we are still striving for it we put a lot of emphasis on having that accreditation. (Professor E)

Do we need to go APA's way? Do we need that protection of our identity so much that we even get upset with people who call themselves life coaches? Do we need to do that? Life coaches can't get licensed, so why are we so concerned about that? (Professor K)

Regardless of the opinion about CACREP accreditation, it is noted that this accreditation plays a role in the discussion about counselor identity.

<div align="center">4.9 Summary</div>

The previous sections of this chapter offered a thorough description of the themes and sub-themes that developed following an analysis of the data by the researcher and the research partner. For this study, the following overarching themes emerged: (a) resources needed to obtain and maintain CACREP; (b) multiple interpretations of requirements; and (c) validation from having CACREP. A thorough discussion of the themes and sub-themes will be discussed in chapter five.

Chapter 5: Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

5.1 Overview of the Study

The purpose of this qualitative study was to determine the perceptions of CACREP accreditation from HBCU counselor educators and to determine which, if any, of the 2001 CACREP standards are considered a hindrance for Counselor Education Programs seeking and maintaining CACREP accreditation. This research investigation explored differences in the perceptions held by counselor educators at CACREP accredited HBCUs, as well as counselor educators at non-CACREP accredited HBCUs. The sample was comprised of 14 counselor educators at HBCUs, including eight females and six males. Thirteen of the participants worked at public institutions, while one of the participants worked at a private institution.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, the following overarching themes emerged: (a) resources needed to obtain and maintain CACREP, (b) multiple interpretations of requirements, and (c) validation from having CACREP. The following section discusses how the research questions set forth in the present study have been answered in relationship to these overarching themes.

5.1.1 *Research Question 1*

What are the perceptions of CACREP accreditation according to HBCU Counselor

Education Program faculty members?

There were a variety of perceptions about CACREP accreditation held by the participants. The most frequent responses were about CACREP accreditation affecting the quality of the Counselor Education Program. Several indicated that they viewed CACREP as providing national and international recognition because it was the largest accrediting organization for the counseling profession. Many of the participants believed that CACREP accreditation allowed Counselor Education Programs to stand out from programs without CACREP accreditation.

Still for others, CACREP accreditation was seen as elitist and the goals of the organization did not necessarily fit the direction the profession should be going in. Some also felt that CACREP did not allow for diversity in teaching, due to the restrictions that are placed on Counselor Educator's educational background and experience. The requirements of CACREP accreditation make the accreditation process unattainable and unrealistic for some Counselor Education Programs. For these individuals, CACREP accreditation was not the best for their program. Even though individuals in this group were not entirely keen about CACREP accreditation, they were still willing to provide suggestions to CACREP and welcome ongoing discussion surrounding the topic about accreditation.

Participants of the study also felt that accreditation, especially by CACREP, provided a layer of accountability for the Counselor Education Program. Accreditation site visits and evaluations required to maintain accreditation by CACREP were seen as positive aspects of the accreditation process. A consistent definition of the counseling

professional identity is likely to be established if more Counselor Education Programs were accredited by the same accrediting organization, in this case, CACREP.

5.1.2 Research Question 2

What are the barriers for HBCU counselor educators seeking, achieving, and/or maintaining CACREP accreditation?

Each participant was able to name a barrier for obtaining CACREP accreditation. The most frequent of these barriers was listed under resources. To this end, financial resources contributed most often to the constraints of seeking and achieving accreditation. For the programs already accredited by CACREP, the financial responsibilities of maintaining the accreditation were built into their departmental and institutional budgets, so the actual financial pressures were not as much of a hindrance for these programs.

Financial resources were also linked to a number of issues required to carry out the accreditation requirements. For example, several participants named the need to hire an addition faculty member. This additional faculty member allowed the Counselor Education Program to be in line with CACREP requirements of having the correct number of fulltime faculty members teaching core classes in the program instead of adjunct professors. CACREP accreditation required the Counselor Education Program assign the coordination responsibilities to one faculty member. Because of the intensity of this task, several of the participants felt that it would be necessary to have an additional faculty member.

The lack of effective leadership was a barrier for several of the participants in seeking and achieving CACREP accreditation. Effective leadership for some was a

simple as having someone mentor them through the process of accreditation. Further, some participants were unclear about how to get their self-study started, and others had department specific concerns that they wanted to discuss before submitting materials to CACREP.

One barrier that resonated throughout the study was the change in the CACREP standards from 2001 to 2009. Participants noted specifics listed in the 2001 CACREP standards however they were unclear of how the 2009 CACREP standards changed these requirements. The lack of knowledge of the updated CACREP standards was a large barrier for the participants; they did not know how the specific standards changed. Therefore, they could not know how the change would affect their chances of acquiring the accreditation.

5.1.3 Research Question 3

Which CACREP (2001) accreditation standards are considered a hindrance from seeking and maintaining CACREP accreditation?

The most common of the 2001 CACREP accreditation standards considered a hindrance from seeking or achieving accreditation by CACREP were the standards surrounding the number of students required for specific courses. As noted before, the course enrollment requirements differed for practicum, internship, group supervision, and core courses. Specifically, "…when the individual supervision is provided by program faculty, the ratio of 1 faculty member is considered equivalent to the teaching of one three-semester hour course" (CACREP, 2001, p. 15). For the majority of the participants, this was a barrier because of the fact that they did not have the necessary number of faculty members as noted earlier.

71

An additional barrier was the CACREP requirement for the full time faculty members to have an earned doctorate in Counselor Education and Supervision. Some of the faculty members had doctorates in counseling psychology or another area of counseling and felt that limiting the faculty to a doctorate in Counselor Education and Supervision would only lead to a lack of professional diversity the faculty would bring to the classroom. The 2001 CACREP standards required Counselor Education Programs to have a minimum of three full-time faculty members (CACREP, 2001). Further, some Counselor Education Programs did not even have the finances to hire three full-time faculty members.

Each track listed in the CACREP standards outlines the number of credit hours per quarter and per semester that Counselor Education Program are supposed to have. For some of the Counselor Education Programs, curricula did not match the number of credit hours that were required. In order to achieve accreditation, one of the participant's Counselor Education Programs had to alter the curriculum offered in order to meet this requirement.

5.2 Conclusions

Based on the findings, the following assumptions were validated in the research study:

1. Consistent with the research literature, faculty at CACREP-accredited Counselor Education Programs will hold similar beliefs and perceptions about the benefits of CACREP (Bobby & Kandor, 1992; Cecil & Comas, 1986).

72

2. CACREP faculty perceptions of CACREP will not differ from those individuals who are employed at non-CACREP Counselor Education Programs.

3. Because HBCUs are generally under-funded and resourced, financial resources will be one of the main barriers for not seeking, achieving, and/or maintaining CACREP.

Participants in the study who came from CACREP accredited programs shared similar beliefs about the benefits of CACREP-accreditation as what was mentioned in the previous literature. The literature of CACREP accredited programs found that faculty members of these programs found the accreditation desirable and favorable (Bobby & Kandor, 1992; Cecil & Comas, 1986; Schmidt, 1999). The participants from HBCU Counselor Education Programs also found the accreditation by CACREP favorable. The participants also named the challenges and barriers they faced in pursuing CACREP accreditation similar to the challenges listed in the previous literature, specifically those barriers surrounding the number of full time faculty and number of credit hours required for each program.

The perceptions of CACREP accreditation were similar for the CACREP-accredited and for the non-CACREP accredited Counselor Education Programs. While the perceptions were not all favorable, most stated accreditation by CACREP provided the program with a sense of validation and contributed to the discussion of counselor identity. As stated earlier, one of the named barriers was a lack in financial resources and the assumption was financial resources would be a named barrier in seeking and achieving CACREP. The lack in financial resources led to the inability for some

73

Counselor Education Programs to be able to fulfill some of the requirements of CACREP accreditation, mostly to be able to hire additional faculty members.

Finally, it was assumed that each Counselor Education Programs would have a clear understanding of the accrediting organization for their program. Each program was asked about the accrediting organization for their program and they were able to articulate how that organization met the needs of their program.

5.3 Discussion and Implications

Critical Race Theory (CRT) provides this study with an understanding of HBCUs. As noted before, CRT asserts that the meanings attached to race are socially constructed and cannot be ignored as an aspect of human social life. CRT allowed for the confrontation of injustice and it aims to empower groups that have been oppressed (Ladson-Billings, 2000). As mentioned earlier, HBCUs have historically provided African Americans and other minority groups with education not afforded to them by PWIs. Since their inception, HBCUs have struggled to be considered equal to their PWI counterparts. The Second Morrill Act of 1890 assured that land-grant institutions were created for African Americans. States that practiced segregation in public colleges and universities would forfeit their federal funding if these schools were not established (Redd, 1998). The consideration of race has been at the heart of these institutions. Further, there was a need for African Americans to have a "normal" education and these institutions were the only places they could receive education. Throughout the years, HBCUs have opened their doors to other groups; however, most HBCUs still have a majority enrollment of African Americans. Funding for HBCUs has been and continues to be a critical issue as mentioned previously in Chapter 2. As a result of long-standing

state funding disparities, HBCUs find themselves more sensitive to the state of the nation's economy than their PWI counterparts.

From the research literature, HBCUs produce more African American doctors, lawyers as well as other professionals at a faster rate than PWIs (Roebuck & Murty, 1993). Based on this information, HBCU Counselor Education Programs produce more African American counselors at a rate faster than Counselor Education Programs at PWIs. The perspectives and experiences of African Americans as counselors would benefit the profession and allow for more diversity in the counseling community.

While not every counseling program is accredited by CACREP, several programs consistently say they align their programs with the organization's standards. This is true of the participants in this study. Many believe that CACREP accreditation is valuable. The philosophical roots of creating a consistent baseline for counseling training programs and streamlining the guidelines for the counseling profession are aspects of CACREP that several in this study appreciated. The challenging and opposing stances of CACREP had more to do with financial and economic pressures that the individual Counselor Education Programs were facing, due to the pending recession of the nation's economy and years of lack of state funding.

During a live address to the nation on the morning of January 18, 2008, President George W. Bush announced the details of a pending economic stimulus plan that was intended to assist America's economic troubles. According to a report by the Center for American Progress, the Bush Administration's tax policies produced the weakest economic cycle since February of 1945 (Picker, 2009). From March 2001 to December 2007, the U.S. economy added only 5.6 million jobs, the second worst average monthly

job growth since World War II. Women's job growth, during this time, was the worst on record with an employment to population ratio declining at an average annualized monthly rate of 3 percent (Picker, 2009). Additionally, African-American job growth was the worst of any economic cycle on record with an increase of only 900,000 jobs or an average of 11,000 jobs per month during Bush's economic cycle (Picker, 2009).

The nation's falling economy nearly paralyzed individuals and families. The economic struggles also created immobilizing situations for the country's colleges and universities. In an article by Jon Marcus in the *Times Higher Education,* he talked about the effect of the recession on educational institutions:

> State appropriations for higher education, which depend on tax revenue, have plummeted...and interest from endowments has fallen even faster. With their parents suffering layoffs or business reversals, more students are likely to need financial aid. And donors, their own investments drying up, have less to give. (Marcus, 2009, para 3)

The recession has created the need for individuals in higher education to rethink the way they run their institutions and become more creative in the ways they spend and make money.

The participants in this study articulated quite clearly the nation's recession has impacted their Counselor Education Programs. They have experienced budget cuts, hiring freezes, as well as countless other ways their resources have been put on hold or taken away entirely. In order to make up for the reduction in funding, several programs rely on the tuition from large enrollments and cannot afford to lose funding in that area. Some Counselor Education Programs that have not started the CACREP accreditation process say they would like to have CACREP accreditation, but the money is not available for them to do so. As a result, according to the findings, they have taken the CACREP

76

accreditation standards and shaped their program and the resources they do have to mimic a CACREP accredited Counselor Education Program.

If more HBCU Counselor Education Programs are going to be accredited by CACREP, more attention needs to be put on issues that hinder and prevent them from seeking, achieving and/or maintaining CACREP accreditation. Just as the legal system was impacted by the CLS movement, changes can happen in regards to accreditation of HBCU Counselor Education Programs. Institutionalized racism has impacted HBCUs since their inception. As explained earlier, the Second Morrill Act forced states to create HBCUs for African American education or suffer the consequences of losing federal money. While these institutions were created, they were not done so equally. Many PWIs receive more resources than HBCUs which give them advantages in terms of providing an education incomparable to that of an HBCU.

The findings of this study reiterate this point. The financial support given to HBCUs is not equal to what is given to PWIs, making it difficult specifically for HBCU Counselor Education Programs to afford requirements of CACREP.

This population also had multiple interpretations of CACREP requirements, stemming from a lack of adequate education surrounding changes in CACREP standards. There are CACREP workshops at national conferences in which counselor educators can receive updated information about changes in requirements. Additionally, CACREP will provide mentorship for programs wishing to start the accreditation process. These resources are available to programs, however, they are not free of charge, creating yet another disadvantage for HBCU Counselor Education Programs that cannot afford them.

Finally, CACREP provides a sense of validation for Counselor Education Programs. HBCUs have traditionally had a stigma of providing less quality education than their PWI counterparts, in part based on the fact that these institutions were created after PWIs and specifically for African Americans. For these reasons, the validation that comes from having CACREP accreditation reverses that stigma and legitimizes HBCU Counselor Education Programs.

5.4 Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, recommendations are provided for Counselor Educators, students, and CACREP policy makers.

5.4.1 Recommendations for HBCU Counselor Educators

1. Know the resources available in the Counselor Education Program, as well as institutional resources. There may be untapped resources in the department available for use, additionally, certain resources may be shifted around and shared with other departments or programs in order to create funding opportunities. On the same note, there may be untapped institutional funding available to those who seek it.

2. Utilize surrounding Counselor Education Programs, especially more resourced PWIs, as mentors. These individuals may have strategies that may be beneficial to other Counselor Education Programs seeking accreditation. Surrounding Counselor Education Programs may also be utilized for support through the accreditation process as well as collaborative units in fundraising opportunities for the Counselor Education Program.

3. Find creative ways to raise funds and save money in the Counselor

    Education Program. Utilize the students in the Counselor Education

    Program to creatively raise funds for special programs or projects. These

    additional funds could be used to re-shift resources for accreditation.

4. Read updated information from CACREP and learn how it relates to the

    Counselor Education Program. Monitor updates from CACREP to be sure

    the Counselor Education Program is in line with the current standards.

    Changes that occur may work in the Counselor Education Program's favor

    towards achieving accreditation.

5. Keep current and stay abreast with trends in the professional literature.

    Current literature will allow Counselor Educators to constantly be in tune

    with the direction of the counseling profession. This will also allow

    HBCU Counselor Educators to be an active change agent in the

    professional community.

5.4.2 Recommendations for HBCU Students

1. Understand the CACREP accreditation standards for the desired

    counseling track. Since CACREP is the largest accrediting organization

    for the profession, it is important to understand what the normalized

    educational standards are for each counseling track.

2. Understand the Counselor Education Program; be cautious of CACREP

    "aligned" programs. Not all programs share the same definition of

    CACREP "alignment." It should be communicated to the student what this

means for the Counselor Education Program and the student's educational experience.

3. Keep current with counseling professional literature. Counselor identity can and has been defined fluidly and broadly by Counselor Educators. For this reason, it is important to keep current with conversations in the literature surrounding this topic and have an understanding of the direction of the counseling profession.

4. Understand how CACREP accreditation affects the prospects of employment and future educational goals. Some doctoral programs look specifically for students from CACREP-accredited programs. If the student is planning on continuing their education, this could be an issue. The same is true for employment. Some employers may desire applicants only from CACREP-accredited programs.

5.4.3 Recommendations for CACREP Policy Makers

1. Consider examining the cost of CACREP accreditation. The cost of CACREP accreditation is extreme for several Counselor Education Programs. If possible, consider revising the cost to fit each Counselor Education Program based on their program budget and institutional resources. Further, consider providing grants to HBCUs applying for CACREP accreditation.

2. Consider revising certain standards. Due to the swift change in the economy, many Counselor Education Programs rely on larger student enrollments and do not have the means to decrease their student

enrollment to fit the ratio standards. Additionally, institutions with budget

cuts and hiring freezes are not able to hire the additional faculty required.

Consider revising those standards which are connected so closely to

financial resources.

3. Communicate more with Counselor Education Programs that are not

accredited by CACREP. Much of the literature is based on the opinions of

CACREP accredited programs. The programs not accredited by CACREP

are not accredited for a reason. Communication with these programs will

allow this perspective to be considered when updating the accreditation

standards.

4. Provide additional mentoring for Counselor Education Programs. There is

a lack of knowledge about how to get the accreditation process started.

While there are workshops at regional and national conferences provided

by CACREP, many Counselor Educators who cannot afford to attend

these miss out on this information. Additional mentoring would minimize

these concerns.

5.5 Limitations

This study offers the perceptions of CACREP accreditation from the perspective

of faculty members at HBCU Counselor Education Programs. One of the biggest

limitations is that not all of the HBCU Counselor Education Programs participated in this

study. Because of the location of many of the institutions compared to the location of the

researcher, most of the communication was conducted through electronic mail and

telephone communications. Face-to-face communication may have rendered more participation from faculty.

<center>5.6 Suggestions for Future Research</center>

Future research studies should focus on gaining the perspective of this entire population. Not all HBCU Counselor Education Programs are represented in this study, and the perspectives of each HBCU Counselor Education Program are important.

More research should also be conducted on HBCU administrators with Counselor Education Programs (e.g. deans, department chairs, vice presidents, etc.). Having the administration perspective would help to understand what financial responsibilities the administrators are most concerned. This would also shed light on their knowledge and perceptions of their Counselor Education Program and CACREP accreditation in general.

Students in Counselor Education Programs with and without CACREP accreditation would be an area of further research as well. It would also be interesting to know if students are as concerned, or knowledgeable about CACREP accreditation as the Counselor Education Program faculty members indicate. It would be interesting to see how much of an impact CACREP accreditation has on student selection of Counselor Education Programs, particularly at HBCUs.

Finally, further research is needed to determine how CACREP accreditation standards are formulated. For example, who determines which ratios are perfect for the greatest amount of learning in the classroom? What is the justification or rationale behind having a Counselor Education and Supervision doctorate for all faculties in Counselor Education Programs? These issues require additional investigation.

5.7 Final Thoughts

HBCUs seem to be continually trying to climb the mythical hurdle and stigma of providing a lesser quality education than their PWI counterparts. That said, the study participants boasted about their graduates' many achievements and that they are providing a quality education for students to become successful counselors, even without having CACREP accreditation. The CACREP accreditation process requires a serious examination surrounding the resources needed to gain accreditation. Without an investigation or alteration of the process, several HBCUs will continue to align their Counselor Education Programs with CACREP standards but will not be able to afford the luxuries of such an accreditation.

References

Adessa, C. & Sonnenwald, D.H. (2003). Exploring collaboration among historically black universities and doctoral/research universities in the USA. *UNESCO Conference on Teaching and Learning for Intercultural Understanding Human Rights and a Culture of Peace.* Jyvaskyal, Finland.

Allen, W.R., Epps, E.G., & Haniff, N.Z. (1991). *College in Black and White: African American students in predominately White and historically Black public universities.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

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

Anderson, J.D. (1988). *The Education of Blacks in the South, 1860-1935.* Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

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

Bell, D. (1992). *Faces at the bottom of the well: The permanence of racism.* New York: HarperCollins.

Blauch, L.E. (1959). *Accreditation in higher education.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Bobby, C. (1992). *CACREP accreditation: Setting the standard for counselor preparation.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 347 470)

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

Brown, M.C., Donahoo, S., & Bertrand, R.D. (2001). The black college and the quest for educational opportunity. *Urban Education, 36,* 553-571.

CACREP. (2007). *CACREP 2001 standards.* (2008). Retrieved September 1, 2008, from http://www.cacrep.org/2001Standards.html#3

CACREP. (2009). *CACREP 2009 standards.* (2009). Retrieved July 1, 2009, from http://www.cacrep.org/2009standards.html

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

Chambers, C. M. (1983). *Characteristics of an accrediting body.* In K.E. Young, C.M. Chambers, and H. R. Kells (Eds.), *Understanding accreditation.* (pp. 135-153). San Francisco, C. A.: Jossey-Bass.

Chenail, R.J. (1995). *Presenting qualitative data.* The Qualitative Report, 2. Retrieved July 6, 2009, from http://nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR2-3/presenting.html

Crenshaw, K. (1989) Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics, *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 1998, 139–167.

Delgado Bernal, D. (2002). An apartheid of knowledge in the academy: The struggle over "Legitimate" knowledge for faculty of color. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 35*, 169-180.

Delgado, R. ed. (1995). *Critical Race Theory: The Cutting Edge.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Delgado, R., & Stefanic, J. (2001). *Critical race theory: An introduction.* New York: New York University Press.

DuBois, W. E. B. (1903). *The souls of Black folk.* New York: Penguin.

Eaton, J.S. (2009). *An overview of U.S. Accreditation*. Council for Higher Education Accreditation. Retrieved July 20, 2009, from http://www.chea.org/pdf/2009.06_Overview_of_US_Accreditation.pdf

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

Garibaldi, A. (Ed.). (1984). *Black colleges and universities: Challenges for the future.* New York: Praeger.

Gasman, M. (2007). *Envisioning Black Colleges.* Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Glesne, C. (1997). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction* (2nd ed.). New York: NY: Longman.

Harcleroad, F.F. (1980). *Accreditation: History, process, and problems.* Washington, DC: American Association of Higher Education.

Harper, B.E. (2007). African American access to higher education: The evolving role of Historically Black Colleges and Universities. *American Academic, 3*, 109-128.

Hollis, JW. & Wantz, RA. (1993). *College preparation, 1993-1995. Volume I: programs and personnel.* Eighth Edition. Muncie, IN: Accelerated Development, Inc.

Holcomb-McCoy, C., Bryan, J., & Rahill, S. (2002). Importance of the CACREP school counseling standards: School counselors' perceptions. *Professional School Counseling, 6*, 112-130.

Hopps, J.G. (2006). Overwhelmed and under resourced, but still striving: Challenges for boards of trustees of Historically Black Colleges and Universities. *Southern Education Foundation.*

Howard, G. (1985). *Basic research methods in the social sciences.* London. Foreman and Company.

Jackson, J.F.L., Snowden, M.T., & Eckes, S.E. (2002). *Fordice* as a window opportunity. The case for maintaining historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs) as predominantly black colleges. *Education Law Reporter, 161*, 1-19.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 11*, 7-24.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2000). Racialized discourses and ethnic epistemologies. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 257-278). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lanning, W. (1988) CACREP: An elite alternative to elitism? *Counselor Education and Supervision, 27,* 295-297.

Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

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

Lockman, N. (1991, September). Ayers case is about quality. *Wilmington News Journal,* p. 3A.

Marcus, J. (2009). Financial clouds bring gloom to U.S. institutions. *Times Higher Education, 1879*, 15-17.

McGlothin, J.M., & Davis, T.E. (2004). Perceived benefit of CACREP (2001) core curriculum standards. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 43,* 274-285.

McMillian, J., & Schumacher, S. (2001). *Research in education: A conceptual introduction* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

Miles, M.B. & Huberman, A.M. (1996). *An expanded source book: Qualitative data analysis (2nd Ed.).* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Palmer, R. & Gasman, M. (2008). "It takes a village to raise a child.": The role of social capital in promoting academic success for African American men at a black college. *Journal of College Student Development, 49*, 52-70.

Paris, M.J. & Gasman, M. (2006). Researching historically black colleges: A history with archival resources. *Multicultural Review, 15,* 40-46.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishers.

Perna, L.W. (2001). The contribution of historically black colleges and universities to the preparation of African Americans for faculty careers. *Research in Higher Education, 42*, 267-294.

Picker, J. (2009). *Before the Bush recession: Supply side tax cuts failed to deliver jobs and income growth between 2001 and 2007.* Center for American Progress. Retrieved July 6, 2009, from http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2009/02/pdf/picker_jobs.pdf

Provanisk, S., Shafer, L., & Snyder, F. (2004). *Historically black colleges and universities, 1976-2001.* National Center for Education Statistics. U.S. Department of Education.

Randolph, D. (1988). The enemy is us. *Counselor Education and Supervision. 27,* 301-307.

Redd, K.E. (1998). Historically Black colleges and universities: Making a comeback. *New Directions for Higher Education, 102*, 33-43.

Redd, K.E. (2008). *Data sources: Trends in graduate enrollment and doctoral degrees at historically black colleges and universities, 1996-2006.* Retrieved July 25, 2008 from http://www.cgsnet.org

Roebuck, J.B., & Murty, K.S. (1993). *Historically Black colleges and universities: Their place in American higher education.* Westport. CT: Praeger.

Schmidt, J. (1999). Two decades of CACREP and what do we know? *Counselor Education and Supervision, 39*, 35-45.

Schwandt, T. A. (2000). Three epistemological stances for qualitative inquiry: Interpretivism, hermeneutics, and social constructivism. In N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 189-214). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Seldon, W. K. (1960). *Accreditation: A struggle over standards in higher education.* New York: Harper & Brothers.

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

Solarzano, D. G. (1995). The doctorate production and baccalaureate origins of African Americans in the sciences and engineering. *Journal of Negro Education, 64,* 15-32.

Solorzano, D.G. & Delgado Bernal, D. (2001). Examining transformational resistance through a critical race and latcrit theory framework: Chicana and Chicano students in an urban context. *Urban Education, 36,* 308-342.

Solorzano, D.G., & Yosso, T.J. (2000). Toward a Critical Race Theory of Chicana and Chicano Education. In, C.Tejada, C. Martinez, & Z. Leonardo. (eds.). *Charting New Terrains of Chicana(o), Latina(o) Education,* (pp. 33-65) Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Southern Education Foundation (n.d.). Publications. Retrieved July 22, 2008, from http://www.sefatl.org/showpublications.asp

Spradley, J. P. (1979). *The ethnographic interview.* New York, NY: Rinehart and Winston.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: grounded theory procedures and techniques.* (2nd ed). Newbury Park: Sage.

Stone, C.B. & Dahir, C.A. (2006). *The transformed school counselor.* New York: Lahaska Press.

Stripling, R.O. (1978). Standards and accreditation in counselor education: A proposal. *Personnel and Guidance Journal, 56*, 608-611.

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

Tack, M.W. & Paitu, C.L. (1992). *Faculty job satisfaction: Women and minorities in peril* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 4). Washington, D.C.: George Washington University.

United Negro College Fund (2007). Special Programs. Retrieved July 22, 2008, from http://www.uncfsp.org/spknowledge/default.aspx?page=home.default

United States Department of Education (2008). White house initiative on historically black colleges and universities. Retrieved July 20, 2008, from http://www.ed.gov/about/inits/list/whhbcu/edlite-index.html

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 & Development, 69,* 491-494.

Weinrach, S., & Thomas, K. (1993). The national board for certified counselors: The good, the bad, and the ugly. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 72,* 105-109.

Yosso, T.J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 8*, 69-91.

Zook, G.F. & Haggerty, M.E. (1936). *Principles of accrediting in higher institutions: The evaluation of higher institutions.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

APPENDIX A:

PROFILE OF PARTICIPANTS

Profile of Participants

Professor	Gender	Tenure Status	Rank	Representing CACREP Program
A	Male	Tenured	Associate	No
B	Female	Not Tenured	Assistant	No
C	Female	Tenured	Associate	No
D	Female	Tenured	Full	Yes
E	Female	Tenured	Associate	No
F	Male	Not Tenured	Assistant	No
G	Male	Not Tenured	Assistant	No
H	Female	Tenured	Associate	No
I	Female	N/A	N/A	No
J	Female	Not Tenured	Assistant	No
K	Male	Tenured	Associate	No
L	Female	Tenured	Associate	No
M	Male	Tenured	Full	Yes
N	Female	Not Tenured	Assistant	No

Profile of Participants' HBCUs

Professor	Graduate Enrollment	Number of Faculty	Public/Private	% Student African American
A	800-900	285	Public	86
B	0-100	360	Public	95
C	300-400	400	Public	83
D	2,000-2,100	450	Public	97
E	2,000-2,100	350	Public	91
F	1,000-1,100	300	Private	91
G	2,000-2,100	422	Public	97
H	1,900-2,000	434	Public	75
I	200-300	111	Public	68
J	400-500	142	Public	90
K	1,000-1,100	300	Private	91
L	400-500	142	Public	90
M	300-400	319	Public	78
N	0-100	50	Private	93

APPENDIX B:

INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN STUDY

December 2008

Dear Counselor Educator:

I invite you to participate in our research project entitled, "Historically Black Colleges and Universities and CACREP Accreditation". You are one of many counselor educators who are being asked to share their perceptions, attitudes, and experiences with the CACREP accreditation process.

Participating in this study will take between 1 hour to 1.5 hours of your time. Your participation will help counselor educators and the council to understand factors that inhibit or benefit programs maintaining or seeking the accreditation process. I am requesting that you complete a short demographic questionnaire and participate in one telephone individual interview. The interview will be audio taped and transcribed in verbatim.

Your participation in this research project is strictly voluntary. Therefore, you may discontinue your participation in this research project, at any time, without penalty. Please also note that all information generated will be treated confidentially. All information obtained from your participation in the study will be stored in a secured file cabinet in an office at The Ohio State University.

If you are interested in participating, please review the attached informed consent form. If you don't have any reservations about you participating in this research project, please sign your name on the informed consent form. Please feel free to contact me via telephone (614-688-4294) or email (moore.1408@osu.edu), if you need additional information.

I look forward to hearing back from you!

Respectfully,

James L. Moore III, Ph.D.   Sibyl Camille Cato, M.Ed
Director, Todd Anthony Bell   Doctoral Candidate, Counselor Education
National Resource Center on the African   The Ohio State University
American Male
The Ohio State University
Associate Professor, Counselor Education
Coordinator, School Counseling Program

APPENDIX C: CONSENT FORM

CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH
CONSENT TO INVESTIGATIONAL TREATMENT OR PROCEDURE

Protocol title: HBCU Counselor Education and CACREP Accreditation

Principal Investigator: James L. Moore III, Ph.D.
Co-Investigator: Sibyl Camille Cato, M.Ed.

DESCRIPTION OF THE RESEARCH:

The purpose of this consent form is to explain to me what will be asked of me to participate in this study. I understand that my participation is strictly voluntarily.

I am being asked to participate in the research project entitled, "HBCU Counselor Education and CACREP Accreditation". The focus of this research project is to determine why Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) Counselor Education programs do or do not pursue CACREP accreditation. I have been asked to participate in the study because I meet the criteria for participating.

I understand that my participation in this research project – which is expected to last from 1 hour to 1.5 hours in length – will involve completing a short demographic questionnaire and participating in one telephone individual interview. I also understand that the interview will be recorded on audiotape.

I am also aware that some people are naturally uncomfortable talking about themselves or sharing personal information. If I should experience any discomfort and/or would like to discontinue from participating in the research project, I can withdraw from the study without penalty and prejudice.

Participation in this study gives me the unique opportunity to share my perspective of the CACREP accreditation process. In addition, my story will help to expand understanding of the factors that contribute to certain why some programs do achieve CACREP accreditation and others do not.

Again, I understand that my participation in this research project is strictly voluntary and that the information obtained from this will be treated confidentially. My name will not be connected with any materials produced for this research project. Only Dr. James L. Moore III and Sibyl C. Cato will have access to the individual data. After the recorded audiotapes are transcribed, the recorded audiotape, demographic questionnaire, informed consent form, and audiotape transcripts will be kept in a secured file cabinet in Dr. James L. Moore III's office.

CONSENT:

I consent to my participation in the research being conducted by Dr. James L. Moore III of The Ohio State University and his assistants.

The investigators and/or research assistants have explained the purpose of the study, the procedures that will be followed, and the amount of time it will take. I understand the possible benefits of my participation.

The investigators and/or research assistants have explained the risks, if any, and I understand what they are. No guarantees have been made regarding the effectiveness of this treatment or procedure.

I know that I can choose not to participate without penalty. If I give my consent to participate, I can withdraw from the study at any time, and there will be no penalty.

I consent to the use of audiotapes. I understand how the audiotapes will be used for this study. Also, I have had a chance to ask questions and to obtain answers to my questions. If I have any additional questions, I

can contact the principal investigator via telephone (614-688-4294) or email (james.moore@admin.ohio-state.edu). Also, if I have questions about my rights as a research participant, I can call the Office of Research Risks Protection at (614) 688-4792.

I understand in signing this form that, beyond giving consent, I am not waiving any legal rights that I might otherwise have. My signature on this form does not release the investigator, the sponsor, the institution, or its agents from any legal liability for damages that they might otherwise have.

I have read this form or I have had it read to me. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Print the name of the participant: _____

Date: _____   Signed: _____
                                                                                              (Participant)

Signed: _____   Signed: _____
(Principal Investigator or his/her authorized   *(Person authorized to consent for participant, if*
representative)   *required)*

Witness: _____
                    (When required)

Phone:_____

E-Mail address: _____

Best time to contact you: _____

APPENDIX D: BIOGRAPHICAL QUESTIONNAIRE

HBCU Counselor Educator and Counselor Education Program: Biographical Questionnaire

Directions: Please answer each question to the best of your ability and comfort.

Counselor Educator

First and last name:

Mailing address: Office phone:

Email address: Institution: (public or private?)

Tenure status: ____Tenured _____On tenure track but not tenured _____Not on tenure track
What is your year of birth? _____
Which race or ethnicity best describes your heritage? _____

What is your gender? _____
Number of years you have been program director at this institution:

Number of years you have been teaching in higher education institutions:_____

What other institutions have you taught at prior to this institution? _____

Have you won any awards for your teaching and/or research? If yes, please name them.

Number of refereed publications: _____
Number of conference presentations: _____

What professional memberships do you subscribe to? _____

Do you hold elected offices in any professional organizations? _____

What degree best describes your highest level of education? _____

At what institution did you receive your doctorate? _____
Was this program accredited by CACREP? _____

What area of counselor education is your specialty? _____

Counselor Education Program Faculty

Total number of faculty in your department: _____
Number of full time faculty:_____
Number of part time faculty:_____
Number of visiting faculty:_____
Number of tenured faculty: _____

What are the degrees of the faculty? (counselor education, etc.) _____
Gender of faculty: _____
Ethnicity of faculty:_____
How many years has each faculty member been at the university?_____
What professional organizations are the faculty part of? _____
Number of refereed publications for faculty?
Number of conference presentations for faculty?

Counselor Education Program

What is the name of your program?

How long has the program been in existence?_____

What college or school does the program fall under? (ex: college of education, school
of…)_____

Is the program master's degree only or master's degree plus doctorate? _____

What are the various tracks in the program? (clinical, school, etc.) _____

How many total credit hours is your program (i.e., master's or doctorate)? _____

How many master's level students are enrolled the program? Doctorate? _____

What is the enrollment breakdown of each track? _____

What is the percentage of students who receive jobs upon graduation? _____

What is the average student to faculty class ratio? _____

What is the mission of your Counselor Education Program? _____

Who facilitates supervision of students during practicum and internship experience?
(faculty, doctorate students…) ___

APPENDIX E:

HBCU COUNSELOR EDUCATOR AND COUNSELOR EDUCATION

PROGRAM

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

CACREP Accredited Programs

How long has your program been accredited by CACREP?

When does the accreditation expire? Will you seek renewal? Why or why not?

What have been the benefits of being accredited?
Prompts: students, faculty, resources, other?

What are the limitations or drawbacks of accreditation?
Prompts: students, faculty, resources, other?

Which CACREP standard do you believe is the biggest hindrance for programs not achieving accreditation?

What advice would you give to programs seeking accreditation?

What are your colleagues' perceptions about CACREP?

How many full-time faculty do you have in your counseling or Counselor Education Program? Part-time?

Non-CACREP Accredited Programs

Has your program ever been accredited by CACREP? If not, why?

What barriers prevent the accreditation from being obtained?
Prompts: students, faculty, resources, other?

What are the benefits of being accredited by CACREP?
Prompts: students, faculty, resources, other?

What are the limitations or drawbacks of accreditation by CACREP?
Prompts: students, faculty, resources, other?

Specifically, which CACREP standard do you believe is the biggest hindrance for programs not achieving accreditation?

Who is the accrediting body for your program?

What are the benefits of this accrediting body for your program?

What are the limitations or drawbacks of this accrediting body?

In the future, will you pursue CACREP accreditation? Why or why not?

What advice would you give to programs seeking CACREP accreditation?

What are your colleagues' perceptions about CACREP?

APPENDIX F: RESEARCH PARTNER DESCRIPTIONS

Researcher: Sibyl Camille Cato

The researcher of the current study is an African-American female. She is a doctoral candidate at The Ohio State University (OSU). She is a Licensed Professional School Counselor and has been a school counselor in the Tucson Unified School District (TUSD) in Tucson, Arizona. She has supervised master's level school counseling interns and practicum students for the past three consecutive years in the Columbus City Schools (CCS). In addition, she has co-instructed the internship course and basic counseling skills and techniques course at OSU. She has taken extensive courses in both qualitative and quantitative research methodologies. Her major academic area is Counselor Education, and her cognate is Urban Education Administration.

Research Team Member #1:

Research Team Member #1 is a Caucasian female. She is a doctoral student at The Ohio State University and is a Licensed Professional School Counselor. She has been a school counselor for the Knox County Schools in Knoxville, Tennessee. She has supervised master's level school counseling interns and practicum students for the past two consecutive years in the Columbus City Schools (CCS). She has taken extensive courses in both qualitative and quantitative research methodologies. In addition, she has co-instructed the internship and practicum courses at The Ohio State University.

APPENDIX G:

CODEBOOK

Emerging Codes: Categories and Sub-code Definitions

Resources:

FAC: Responses pertaining to the need to hire additional faculty

SAF: Responses pertaining to State Allocated Funding

SUPP: Responses pertaining to support either desired or received

Multiple Interpretations of CACREP Requirements:

RAT: Responses pertaining to ratios

UPDATE: Responses pertaining to the change in updated standards

STAND: Responses pertaining to specific CACREP standards

ALIGN: Responses pertaining to aligning program with CACREP standards

OSFA: Responses pertaining to 'one size fits all" accreditation process

Validation:

QUAL: Responses pertaining to the quality of the Counselor Education Program

JOBS: Responses pertaining to students receiving jobs after graduation

DOC: Responses pertaining to students continuing for doctoral education

ELIT: Responses pertaining to CACREP being an elitist organization

CI: Responses pertaining to counselor identity

APPENDIX H:

CODING WORKSHEET

Coding Worksheet

Participant	Category/Sub-code	Page Number	Key Quote

APPENDIX I:

PLEDGE OF CONFIDENTIALITY

Statement Of Confidentiality
As a member of this project research team, I understand that I will be reading transcriptions of confidential interviews. The information in these transcriptions has been revealed by research participants in this project who agreed in good faith that their interviews would remain strictly confidential. I understand that I have a responsibility to honor this confidentiality agreement. I hereby agree not to share any information in these transcriptions with anyone except the primary researcher of this project, Sibyl Camille Cato, and other members of this research team. Any violation of this agreement would constitute a serious breach of ethical standards, and I pledge not to do so.

Research Team Member: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX J:

IRB APPROVAL

November 21, 2008

Protocol Number:	**2008E0798**
Protocol Title:	**HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES AND CACREP ACCREDITATION, James L. Moore III, Sibyl Cato, School of Physical Activities & Education Services**
Type of Review:	Request for Exempt Determination
ORRP Staff Contact:	Cheri M. Pettey
	Phone: 614-688-0389
	Email: pettey.6@osu.edu

Dear Dr. Moore,

The Office of Responsible Research Practices has determined the above referenced protocol **exempt from IRB review.**

Date of Exempt Determination:	11/21/2008
Qualifying Exemption Category:	**2**

Please note the following:

- Only OSU employees and students who have completed CITI training and are named on the signature page of the application are approved as OSU Investigators in conducting this study.

- No procedural changes may be made in exempt research (e.g., recruitment procedures, advertisements, instruments, enrollment numbers, etc.).

- Per university requirements, all research-related records (including signed consent forms) must be retained and available for audit for a period of at least three years after the research has ended.

- It is the responsibility of the Investigator to promptly report events that may represent unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects or others.

This determination is issued under The Ohio State University's OHRP Federalwide Assurance #00006378.

All forms and procedures can be found on the ORRP website – www.orrp.osu.edu. Please feel free to contact the ORRP staff contact listed above with any questions or concerns.

Cheri Pettey, MA, Certified IRB Professional
Senior Protocol Analyst—Exempt Research