

A DESCRIPTIVE REVIEW OF MASTER'S LEVEL COUNSELOR EDUCATORS'  
PERCEPTIONS OF ACADEMIC AND PROFESSIONAL GATEKEEPING POLICIES

A Dissertation

by

JULIE ANN JOFFRAY

BA, Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi, 1997  
MA, Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi, 2005

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

COUNSELOR EDUCATION

Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi  
Corpus Christi, Texas

August 2017

© Julie Ann Joffray

All Rights Reserved

August 2017

A DESCRIPTIVE REVIEW OF MASTER'S LEVEL COUNSELOR EDUCATORS'  
PERCEPTIONS OF ACADEMIC AND PROFESSIONAL GATEKEEPING POLICIES

A Dissertation

by

JULIE ANN JOFFRAY

This dissertation meets the standards for scope and quality of  
Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi and is hereby approved.

Richard Ricard, Ph.D.  
Chair

Joshua Watson, Ph.D.  
Co-Chair

Yvonne Castillo, Ph.D.  
Committee Member

Lisa Comparini, Ph.D.  
Graduate Faculty Representative

August 2017

## ABSTRACT

Counselor educators serve as gatekeepers for the counseling profession by ensuring that counselors-in-training meet professional standards of counseling competence and those who do not meet these standards are remediated or prevented from entering the counseling profession. Professional associations, such as the American Counseling Association (ACA) and the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) present clear directives for gatekeeping responsibilities for counselor educators; however, each program is expected to develop performance assessments and policies to ensure that these directives are met.

The purpose of this study was to (a) investigate the consistency of policies and procedures across CACREP accredited counselor education programs; (b) explore counselor educators' perceptions about the importance of gatekeeping, the support they received from institutions and, their personal involvement in gatekeeping responsibilities in their departments/universities; (c) report the collected information from this study in an effort to increase the foundation of gatekeeping knowledge and to promote consistency in gatekeeping policies and procedures.

A content analysis was conducted on 106 CACREP accredited Master's level counseling programs' websites for gatekeeping related policies and procedures specifically related to Sections 1.M and 1.N of the 2016 CACREP Standards. The content analysis revealed inconsistencies in information content, presentation, formatting, location, and terminology.

Five hundred and eleven faculty from these 106 counselor education programs received invitations to participate in survey to ascertain their participation and perceptions regarding gatekeeping. Forty-one (8%) counselor educators completed the survey. Seventy-two percent of

survey contributors believed participating in gatekeeping activities is very important; 62% felt they received above average support from their institutions to perform in gatekeeping activities; and 46.5% participate in or are aware of gatekeeping activities. Forty-seven percent of participants supported standardized gatekeeping policies and procedures for all like programs.

## DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my family. I would have never made it this far without your belief in me and my ability to reach my ultimate goal of earning my doctorate. You all have made sacrifices for me along this many year journey, and for that, I will be eternally grateful.

My husband, Alan, has been the driving force behind my whole educational journey. You were the one that made me enroll in my first college class, and for that, I am eternally grateful. Along the way, you provided support emotionally and financially, and during times of low motivation, provided the proverbial kick in the butt to get me moving. You took over the housekeeping, laundry, and grocery shopping duties in order for me to focus on my education and ultimately this dissertation. You have earned every degree right alongside of me.

My daughter, Angel, has been one of my biggest cheerleaders. You were my ‘study-buddy,’ and when needed, my guinea pig and/or audience when I needed to practice some assignment. You never wavered in your encouragement and ‘can-do’ spirit. Your husband, Nick, and daughter, Penelope, jumped on the cheerleader bandwagon and provided me with a full pep-squad!

My mother, Valera, has been my rock and provided me with much needed emotional support. My whole life you have always been there offering support and encouragement and helping me to overcome any barriers in my way. During my educational journey, your gentle prodding and queries for status updates kept me on track and making progress. You always helped me see the light at the end of the tunnel.

I am truly blessed and eternally grateful to have these individuals in my life, for without them, I would have never become the person I am today.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

After a journey of five years, today is the day I can write this note of thanks as my finishing touch to my dissertation. Tremendous gratitude goes to all the wonderful individuals who walked beside me on this journey. I would like to reflect on a few of the individuals who have supported and helped me so much along the way.

First, I would like to thank my mentor, Dr. Mary Alice Fernandez. Your support and encouragement kept me centered and provided me with extensive personal and professional guidance that carried me over both the smooth and bumpy paths. You will always hold a special place in my heart and memories of this journey.

My Dissertation Committee was rich with talented individuals. I would like to thank my Dissertation Committee Chair, Dr. Richard Ricard. Your patience and steadfast support, especially when I floundered and lost focus, kept me on track moving down the path to this day. I would like to also thank Dr. Joshua Watson for stepping into the Co-Chair position during mid-stream. Your ability to jump right in without causing the smallest ripple in this journey was amazing and a testament to your extraordinary abilities as a Counselor Educator. I am also grateful to have had Dr. Yvonne Castillo not only as a member of my Dissertation Committee, but also as a major contributor of support during my time at the Counseling and Training Clinic. Your insight and grace provided me a model of the consummate Counselor Educator, providing guidance and moments of enlightenment to Master's level supervisees - not to mention your priceless feedback on my dissertation. Last but not least, I would like to thank Dr. Lisa Comparini. Your ability to bring an outside perspective to process and your feedback on methodology were invaluable.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

| CONTENT  | PAGE |
|--|------|
| ABSTRACT .....   | v    |
| DEDICATION .....   | vii  |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....   | viii |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS .....  | ix   |
| LIST OF TABLES .....   | xii  |
| CHAPTER I .....  | 1    |
| Introduction .....   | 1    |
| Screening applicants for admission into counselor education programs ..... | 3    |
| Student progress monitoring throughout the program .....                   | 4    |
| Statement of the Problem .....   | 8    |
| Purpose of the Study .....   | 9    |
| Research Questions .....   | 10   |
| Significance of Study .....  | 10   |
| Design of the Study .....  | 11   |
| Methodology .....  | 13   |
| Population and Sample .....  | 14   |
| Data Collection and Analysis .....   | 15   |
| Basic Assumptions .....  | 16   |
| Limitations .....  | 16   |
| Definition of Terms .....  | 17   |
| Gatekeeping .....  | 17   |
| Policies .....   | 17   |
| Archival Research .....  | 17   |
| Academic .....   | 17   |
| Non-Academic .....   | 17   |
| Remediation .....  | 18   |
| Organization of Remaining Chapters .....                                   | 18   |
| CHAPTER II .....   | 19   |
| Review of Literature .....   | 19   |
| Introduction .....   | 19   |
| Establishing training standards and elements of counseling .....           | 20   |



|  |    |
|--|----|
| Program screening, remediation, and dismissal in gatekeeping ..... | 24 |
| Due Process in Gatekeeping .....                                   | 29 |
| Standardized counseling program guidelines and accreditation ..... | 32 |
| Gatekeeping Responsibilities.....                                  | 37 |
| Summary .....  | 38 |
| CHAPTER III .....  | 40 |
| Research Design and Methodology .....                              | 40 |
| Introduction.....  | 40 |
| Research Questions .....   | 40 |
| Design of the Study.....   | 41 |
| Archival analysis.....   | 41 |
| Gatekeeping issues survey .....                                    | 42 |
| Population .....   | 44 |
| Screening Criteria .....   | 44 |
| Methodology .....  | 45 |
| Archival Analysis.....   | 45 |
| Faculty survey of gatekeeping perceptions.....                     | 46 |
| Data analysis procedure .....                                      | 47 |
| Thematic coding procedure.....                                     | 47 |
| Survey data analysis procedure.....                                | 48 |
| Summary .....  | 48 |
| CHAPTER IV .....   | 49 |
| Study Results .....  | 49 |
| Introduction.....  | 49 |
| Archival Study .....   | 49 |
| Gatekeeping Attitudinal Survey.....                                | 54 |
| Survey Results .....   | 57 |
| Summary .....  | 82 |
| CHAPTER V .....  | 84 |
| Introduction.....  | 84 |
| Summary of Findings.....   | 84 |
| Implications.....  | 86 |
| Limitations .....  | 93 |
| Delimitations.....   | 94 |

|                                       |     |
|---------------------------------------|-----|
| Suggestions for Future Research ..... | 94  |
| Conclusion .....                      | 96  |
| APPENDIX.....                         | 98  |
| REFERENCES .....                      | 120 |

## LIST OF TABLES

| TABLE  | PAGE |
|--|------|
| Table 1: 2016 CACREP Standard 1.M.....   | 50   |
| Table 2: 2016 CACREP Standard 1.N.1.....   | 50   |
| Table 3: 2016 CACREP Standard 1.N.2.....   | 51   |
| Table 4: 2016 CACREP Standard 1.N.3.....   | 51   |
| Table 5: 2016 CACREP Standard 1.N.4.....   | 51   |
| Table 6: 2016 CACREP Standard 1.N.5.....   | 52   |
| Table 7: 2016 CACREP Standard 1.N.6.....   | 52   |
| Table 8: 2016 CACREP Standard 1.N.7.....   | 53   |
| Table 9: Enrollment of Participating Institutions.....   | 55   |
| Table 10: Enrollment of Participating Departments .....  | 55   |
| Table 11: Respondent's Position with University .....  | 55   |
| Table 12: Tenure of Respondents .....  | 55   |
| Table 13: Location of Student Performance Discussions .....  | 56   |
| Table 14: Current Member of a Formal Gatekeeping Committee? .....  | 56   |
| Table 15: Former Member of a Formal Gatekeeping Committee?.....  | 56   |
| Table 16: Frequency of Formal Gatekeeping Committee Meetings.....  | 57   |
| Table 17: Frequency of Gatekeeping on Agenda .....   | 57   |
| Table 18: <i>Awareness of the roles and expectations of counselor educators as educators (ACA Code of Ethics, 2014, Section F)</i> .....                                 | 57   |
| Table 19: <i>Awareness of the roles and expectations of counselor educators as counselor-in-training supervisors (ACA Code of Ethics, 2014, Section F)</i> .....         | 58   |
| Table 20: <i>Awareness of the roles and expectations of counselor educators as gatekeepers for the counseling profession (ACA Code of Ethics, 2014, Section F)</i> ..... | 59   |
| Table 21: <i>Stay abreast with best practices in counselor education as they pertain to providing education, supervision, and gatekeeping</i> .....                      | 59   |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Table 22: Awareness of expectations to protect the reputation of the counseling profession .....  | 60 |
| Table 23: Awareness of expectations to protect the public.....  | 61 |
| Table 24: Development of counselor-in-training performance assessments and program policies (CACREP 2016 Standards, Section 1.N) .....  | 61 |
| Table 25: Conduct needs assessments in order to ascertain the effectiveness of the program in meeting goals (CACREP 2016 Standards, Section F Introduction) .....   | 62 |
| Table 26: Ensure that department/university policies and procedures are consistently applied and consistent with current accepted practices .....   | 63 |
| Table 27: The graduation of students who are adequately prepared in their knowledge, skills, and disposition for entry into the counseling profession .....   | 63 |
| Table 28: Assess potential students for their ability to meet professional competencies prior to acceptance into the program (CACREP 2016 Standards, Section 1.L).....  | 64 |
| Table 29: Intervene with potential counseling students to not allow entry of those students who exhibit characteristics and/or behaviors that would result in their inability to meet professional competencies .....   | 65 |
| Table 30: Facilitate department/program based new student orientation (CACREP 2016 Standards, Section 1.N).....   | 66 |
| Table 31: Provide transparency of the program's performance expectation (CACREP 2016 Standards, Section 1.M) .....  | 66 |
| Table 32: Provide a student handbook that contains specific programmatic training goals and objectives, as well as the retention policy that explains the procedures for student remediation and/or dismissal from the program and the academic appeal policy (CACREP 2016 Standards, Section 1.N)..... | 67 |
| Table 33: Verbally review the specific training goals and objectives they will be evaluated on, as well as the policies and procedures these evaluations are based upon.....  | 68 |
| Table 34: Verbally review the retention policy and explain procedures for student remediation and/or dismissal from the program, as well as the academic appeal policy .....  | 69 |
| Table 35: Incorporate gatekeeping awareness into academic course work.....  | 69 |
| Table 36: Facilitate class discussion on gatekeeping awareness .....  | 70 |
| Table 37: Document personal and emotional issues experiences by counselors-in-training.....   | 71 |
| Table 38: Address specific issue(s)/deficiencies with counselors-in-training .....  | 71 |
| Table 39: Provide counselors-in-training with specific expectations for improvement .....   | 72 |

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Table 40: <i>Supervise the counselors-in-training during practicum and internship in order to protect the welfare of their clients (ACA Code of Ethics, 2014, F.1.a)</i> .....   | 73 |
| Table 41: <i>Be vigilant and attentive to counselors-in-training impediments that may develop and respond accordingly</i> .....  | 73 |
| Table 42: <i>Meet regularly with faculty to discuss counselors-in-training who are experiencing personal, academic or professional issues</i> .....  | 74 |
| Table 43: <i>Provide transparency of the process and expectations of remediation</i> .....   | 75 |
| Table 44: <i>Evaluate the outcome of remediation to determine the success of the plan</i> .....  | 75 |
| Table 45: <i>Assist counselors-in-training in securing remedial assistance when needed (ACA Code of Ethics, 2014, Section F.9.b.1)</i> .....   | 76 |
| Table 46: <i>Document the decisions to dismiss or refer counselors-in-training for assistance (ACA Code of Ethics, 2014, F.5.b)</i> .....  | 77 |
| Table 47: <i>Utilize consultation when experiencing conflicts between the roles of counselor educator and gatekeeping of the counseling profession</i> .....   | 77 |
| Table 48: <i>Conduct ongoing reflection and processing of conflicts that occur between the roles of counselor educator and gatekeeper</i> .....  | 78 |
| Table 49: <i>Ensure that counselors-in-training have recourse in a timely manner to address decisions to require them to seek assistance or to dismiss them and provide the students with due process according to institutional policies and procedures (CACREP 2016 Standards, Section 1.O)</i> .....  | 79 |
| Table 50: <i>Conduct a systematic developmental assessment of each counselors'-in-training progress throughout the program, including consideration of the students' academic performance, professional development, and personal development (CACREP 2016 Standards, Section 4.F)</i> .....   | 80 |
| Table 51: <i>Provide remediation interventions to counselors-in-training as deemed necessary</i> ....  | 81 |
| Table 52: <i>Ensure remediation/interventions are not culturally biased</i> .....  | 81 |
| Table 53: <i>Overall beliefs about standardization of gatekeeping policies: There are currently general guidelines for gatekeeping set forth by governing and accrediting bodies. Each program is expected to construct its own policies and procedures to abide by these guidelines. Instead of general guidelines, do you believe that there should be standardized gatekeeping policies and procedures implemented for all like programs?</i> ..... | 82 |

## **CHAPTER I**

### **Introduction**

Individuals with impaired professional competence threaten the welfare of those receiving services. According to Brown-Rice (2012), problems with professional competence (PPC) includes behaviors that could interfere with the professional competence of a counselor-in-training (CIT) including (a) a lack of ability or opposition to acquire and integrate professional standards into one's professional counseling behavior; (b) a lack of ability to attain professional skills and reach a satisfactory level of competency; (c) a lack of ability to manage one's interpersonal stress, psychological dysfunction, or emotional responses that may impact professional performance; or (d) engagement in unethical behavior. Counselor educators are responsible for addressing problems with professional competence with CITs. Gatekeeping is one way for counselor educators to address these problems.

Gatekeeping is a process that safeguards access to the practice of a profession in order to ensure the quality of services. Brear, Dorrian, and Luscri (2008) define gatekeeping as

...the evaluation of a student's suitability for professional practice. It is a mechanism that aims to ensure the health of the profession by controlling access to it. It involves identification of evaluative criteria and process, and the accountability of the gatekeeper to apply the criteria and take responsibility for the evaluative decisions" (pp. 93-94).

Gatekeeping responsibility derives from the accreditation standards and professional codes of ethics in the counseling profession. The Standards for Supervision, Training, and Teaching (section F) of the American Counseling Association's (ACA, 2014) Code of Ethics addresses counselor supervision requirements. The 2016 Standards of the Council for Accreditation of

Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP, 2015) require a systematic assessment of each student's progress. The National Board for Certified Counselors (NBCC, 2013) Code of Ethics states in #13 of their Directives for National Certified Counselors (NCC): "NCCs who provide clinical supervision services shall intervene in situations where supervisees are impaired or incompetent and thus place client(s) at risk" (p. 2).

Dugger and Francis (2014) stated that there are three distinct responsibilities for counselor educators:

1. To prepare students to enter into the counseling profession.
2. To supervise the CITs during practicum and internship in order to protect the welfare of their clients.
3. To act as gatekeepers to the profession striving to graduate only those students who are adequately prepared in their knowledge, skills, and disposition for entry into the counseling profession.

The primary purpose of gatekeeping is to ensure that CITs are not impaired and are competent and ethically able to provide counseling services to the public (Brown-Rice, 2012). Homrich (2009) describes the function of gatekeepers as not only protecting the integrity of the profession, but also being responsible for preventing harm to future clients. Principally, counselor educators have a duty to protect the public and the reputation of the counseling profession. There are several ways in which counselor educators act on their gatekeeping responsibilities. These include, but are not limited to, screening applicants for fitness prior to admission into counselor education programs and monitoring CITs for professional fitness to practice as they progress through the program.

## **Screening applicants for admission into counselor education programs**

Starting at application to the program, counselor educators should assess potential counseling students and intervene to block the entry of students who exhibit characteristics and/or behaviors that would result in their inability to meet professional competencies (Brown-Rice, 2012). Depending on the program's procedures, the screening process could be conducted in different ways. These approaches could include submission of an essay on subject(s) which could provide counselor educators with insight into an applicant's attitude/perspective. Another screening approach could be conducting face-to-face interviews and/or assigning individual/group problem solving activities in order to observe applicants' behaviors, reasoning skills and ethical stances. A third screening approach could be to require written references from professionals/educators who have first-hand knowledge of the applicant's previous performance. Besides screening for potentially problematic behaviors and/or characteristics, applicants are also screened to ensure they meet the academic requirements of the program. Once applicants have been accepted into the program, the screening and evaluation process does not stop.

Counselor educators are required to provide current students with expectations and evaluation criteria. The ACA Code of Ethics (2014) states that students must be made aware of the skills and knowledge required to successfully complete the program. Students must also know the specific training goals and objectives they will be evaluated on, as well as the policies and procedures these evaluations are based upon (Brown-Rice, 2012). Section M of the 2016 CACREP Standards (2015) specifically lists these requirements. According to this section of the 2016 CACREP Standards (2015), students should be orientated to the academic program. Many programs use a new student orientation session in which students receive information about the program's requirements, objectives, and procedures. The 2016 CACREP Standards (2015) also



provide guidelines for communicating the program's requirements, objectives, and procedures in the form of a student handbook. According to these guidelines, the handbook is to include the program's mission statement and objectives; information about appropriate professional organizations, opportunities for professional involvement, and activities potentially appropriate for students; a written endorsement policy explaining the procedures for recommending students for credentialing and employment, as well as the program's student retention policy explaining procedures for student remediation and/or dismissal from the program and the program's academic appeal policy (CACREP, 2015).

### **Student progress monitoring throughout the program**

Counselor educators must be vigilant and attentive to CIT's possible PPCs that may develop and respond accordingly. The ACA Code of Ethics (2014) states that counselor educators engage in thorough and continuing evaluations of students. Should a counselor educator become aware of a counselor-in-training's inability to achieve the required professional competencies, then proper notice should be provided to the counselor-in-training. Proper notice includes:

1. Assist[ing] students in securing remedial assistance when needed,
2. Seek[ing] professional consultation and document[ing] their decisions to dismiss or refer students for assistance, and
3. Ensur[ing] that students have recourse in a timely manner to address decisions to require them to seek assistance or to dismiss them and provid[ing] the students with due process according to institutional policies and procedures (ACA, Section F.9.b, p. 15)

In addition to the ACA Code of Ethics, CACREP (2015) requires counselor educator program faculty to “...systematically assesses each student’s progress throughout the program by examining student learning in relation to a combination of knowledge and skills (Section 4.F, p. 17) as well as “...systematically assesses each student’s professional dispositions throughout the program” (Section 4.G, p. 18). An example of systematic assessment would be the utilization of an Individual Development Plan (IDP). The IDP is completed and revised by the students independently and in conjunction with their faculty advisor throughout their academic career in the program. The IDP focuses on the personal and professional development of the student with the goal of contributing to their success as a professional counselor. Another example of systematic assessment is regular counselor education faculty meetings to discuss students who are experiencing personal, academic or professional issues. Academic issues are easiest to define because there is usually concrete evidence to indicate a student’s deficiency, however, personal or emotional issues are more difficult and faculty members are expected to carefully document incidents (Nelson, Oliver, Reeve, & McNichols, 2010).

Nelson, et al. (2010) recommend supervisors utilize consultation, ongoing reflection and processing of the conflicts that occur between the roles of trainer and gatekeeper. In their article of culturally responsive gatekeeping practices, Ziomek-Daigle and Bailey (2009) suggested that “[d]eveloping a remediation plan related to increasing cultural awareness, knowledge, and skills entails students enrolling in additional or advanced multicultural courses, completing focused projects or directed studies, immersion experiences, or attending additional supervision” (p. 20). They further suggest the remediation contain checks and balances to ensure that remediation is not culturally biased, opens communication, and increases students’ awareness and learning.

The need for remediation interventions are addressed in the accreditation standards and professional codes (ACA, 2014; CACREP, 2015). Thus, counselor educators are required to provide these if deemed necessary. Depending on the issues presented, the faculty decides on an informal or formal plan of remediation. Ziomek-Daigle and Christensen (2010) shared some types of remediation:

- a student repeating a course and/or practicum
- a student being assigned readings on certain topics
- a student being referred to personal counseling
- a student receiving intensified supervision (i.e., additional supervision sessions, additional clinical tapes)
- a student being reassigned to another supervisor
- a student being asked to take a sabbatical from the program
- a student receiving counseling that encourages student to withdraw and pursue a different program.

Henderson and Dufrene (2011) also shared a suggested list of remediation interventions to include: personal therapy, increased supervision, repetition of academic and/or clinical course work, additional assignments, and student restrictions within the program. According to Brown-Rice (2012), remediation plans should address the specific issue(s)/deficiencies; provide specific expectations for improvement; define the training methods and/or interventions to be used; and the role expectations of the counselor educator and the CIT. The outcome of the remediation plan should be evaluated to determine the success of the plan (Brown-Rice, 2012). The remediation plan should also include the consequences/contingencies if the expectations are not met.

The ACA Code of Ethics (2014) states that counselor educators must “ensure that students have recourse in a timely manner to address decisions requiring them to seek assistance or to dismiss them and provide students with due process according to institutional policies and procedures” (F.9.b.3, p. 15). The Fourteenth Amendment of the U. S. Constitution forbids the denial of life, liberty or property without due process of law (U. S. Constitution. Amendment XIV). In counselor education, due process is the rights of students to be provided with the criteria for completion of the program and professional dispositions that they will be required to achieve (Bernard & Goodyear, 2008). In addition, due process requires counseling programs to notify CITs, in a timely manner, regarding any academic or non-academic issues/deficiencies. Depending on the issues/deficiencies presented, prior to dismissal from the counselor education program, CITs should be provided with the opportunity to rectify these problems in a remediation (Brown, 2013). Failure to do so, by counselor educators and universities, can result in potential legal action (Brown-Rice, 2012). Most importantly, this process must be explicitly stated upon admission to the academic program. Dismissal or expulsion of students from counseling programs based on the evaluation of qualified faculty has been upheld by the courts, as long as there was due process (Lumadue & Duffy, 1999). As an example, in 2002, Victoria Butler sued William and Mary’s School of Education Community Counseling Master’s Program after she was expelled from the program for deceitfully obtaining approval of her Practicum site and engaging in misconduct while at the Practicum site (Victoria M. Butler v. The College of William and Mary, 2005). According to the ruling, Ms. Butler “...received the appropriate due process because the College of William and Mary followed the procedures outlined in both the Honor Code and the Counseling Program handbooks” (Victoria M. Butler v. The College of William and Mary, 2005, p. 14).

Criteria for remediation and/or dismissal may not only fall under misconduct, it may also fall under federal law such as discrimination. In 2009, Jennifer Keeton sued Augusta State University after she was expelled for refusing to follow a remediation plan addressing her objection to counsel homosexual clients due to her religious beliefs (Shallcross, 2010). In the *Keeton v. Augusta State University* lawsuit, the judge ruled that the policies which govern the ethical conduct of counselors held by the university as the reason for the remediation and subsequent expulsion did not violate the rights of Ms. Keeton's religious beliefs. Transparency of the process and expectations are key (Foster & McAdams, 2009). The 2016 CACREP Standards require accredited counselor education programs to provide their CITs with the program's retention policy explaining procedures for remediation and/or dismissal from the program. The issue is that each program's retention policy and procedures for remediation and/or dismissal from the program is set by the program with no standardization across programs.

### **Statement of the Problem**

"Existing studies have often expressed concern that impaired counseling students are destined to become impaired counseling professionals and as such are apt to do great harm if the issue of admitting and graduating impaired students is not addressed" (de Vries & Valadez, 2005, p. 78). The professional associations, such as the ACA and CACREP present clear directives for gatekeeping responsibilities for counselor educators. Despite specific gatekeeping obligations set forth by both CACREP and ACA, Foster and McAdams (2009) point out that each counselor education program is expected to develop performance assessments and policies to ensure that these policies and procedures are consistently applied and meet standards currently accepted practices. Regardless of the importance of defining gatekeeping, understanding and

implementing guidelines to address counselor-in-training deficiencies’, there is a lack of research in developing a model for gatekeeping (Glance, Fanning, Schoepke, Soto, & Williams, 2012). Glance, et.al., (2012) go on to say that “[t]he lack of a definition and criteria makes it even more difficult for counselor educators to address the issue of impairment and stay atop of best practices in the field” (p.2). There is a need to offer opportunities to share processes and procedures that are effective.

As counselor educators it is our responsibility to serve our students, their future clients, the communities in which we live and work, and the profession. To best facilitate these obligations we must strive for excellence and objectivity in selection, training, evaluating and mentoring CITs. According to Brear, Dorrian, and Luscri (2008) the challenge is “to develop a set of relevant and explicit criteria against which students can be measured, and to develop a fair and valid framework within which the gatekeeping mechanism can operate” (p. 94). Therefore, there is a need to facilitate the development of relevant and explicit standardized gatekeeping policies and procedures in order to effectively and fairly evaluate and intervene when students of concern are identified.

### **Purpose of the Study**

The primary purpose of gatekeeping is to ensure that CITs are not impaired and are competent and ethically able to provide counseling services to the public (Brown-Rice, 2012). The purpose of this descriptive study was to (a) investigate the consistency of policies and procedures across CACREP accredited counselor education programs; (b) explore counselor educators’ perceptions about the importance of gatekeeping, the support they received from institutions and, their personal involvement in gatekeeping responsibilities in their departments/universities; (c) report the collected information from this study in an effort to

increase the foundation of gatekeeping knowledge and to promote consistency in gatekeeping policies and procedures.

### **Research Questions**

In this study, information was gathered to answer the following questions:

1. Are counselor educators aware of their responsibilities as gatekeepers of the counseling profession?
2. Are the gatekeeping policies and procedures published by CACREP accredited counselor education programs consistent in format, terminology and presentation?
3. What are the perceptions of faculty at CACREP accredited institutions on gatekeeping in regards to:
  - a. Importance of gatekeeping procedures,
  - b. quality of support they receive from their program/university, and
  - c. frequency with which they perform gatekeeping related activities.

### **Significance of Study**

The study is significant because its focus is on collecting essential information which may enhance the development of a working model of gatekeeping in counseling programs by reviewing and identifying the programs' presentation of the requirements set by the counseling accreditation standards and professional codes of ethics (ACA Code of Ethics, 2014; CACREP Standards, 2015) . It will add to the depth of information by also exploring the attitudes of counselor educators toward gatekeeping as well as the barriers to their being able to effectively carry out the gatekeeping responsibilities.

In addition, the results of this study may support advocacy efforts for a more standardized presentation of gatekeeping terminology and information format. Researchers point to the need

for standardized definitions and criteria for gatekeeping in counselor education programs (Glance, et.al., 2012; Foster & McAdams, 2009; de Vries & Valadez, 2005; Lumadue & Duffy, 1999).

The findings of this study will provide an overview of gatekeeping policies and procedures presented by a sample of counselor education programs specifically looking at the accessibility of the information and the consistency across programs in format, presentation, and terminology. This study will also report the results of a survey which elicited responses on the beliefs, attitudes, and perceptions of the counselor educators, within those same programs, on gatekeeping related activities. It is the intent of this study to contribute to existing research on gatekeeping in counselor education and to provide information on the consistency in which the policies and procedures required by the counseling governing bodies (e.g., ACA Code of Ethics, 2014; CACREP Standards, 2015) is presented by counselor education programs

### **Design of the Study**

The study utilized two quantitative approaches in gathering information. First, a review of online archived materials (e.g., student handbooks and published criteria) was conducted to identify gatekeeping policies and procedures published by counseling programs on the Internet. Second a survey was conducted of faculty at CACREP accredited programs whose information was used in the online archival materials study was distributed. The two approaches enabled a collection of gatekeeping information from both public documents as well as the perceptions of the individuals who facilitate these gatekeeping policies and procedures.

The design of archival investigations should include: 1) a specified list of documents to be reviewed, 2) a way to sample the documents, and 3) some flexibility to allow for unexpected discoveries during the investigation (Ward, 2014). Utilizing a checklist of specific 2016



CACREP Standards (2015), the researcher conducted a review of student handbooks, university catalogs, and programs websites published by CACREP accredited Master's level Counselor Education programs around the United States and their hosting Universities to identify the accessibility of those CACREP standards. For the purpose of this study, gatekeeping policies, procedures and intervention strategies refer to the requirements, policies, procedures, and evaluations/assessments employed to ensure the integrity of the counselor education program and the professional counseling competencies of their CITs. Three online sources were primarily used: the University's catalog for Master's level Counselor Education, the program's Master's level Counselor Education Handbook, and the Counselor Education Program's website. The review results were correlated, accounting for availability, location, and consistency across programs.

In addition to the archival analysis, a survey was utilized to collect participant perceptions of gatekeeping processes at the university. The survey consisted of 35 statements developed from counseling's professional standards and codes of ethics (ACA Code of Ethics, 2014; CACREP Standards, 2015) and conversations conducted with counselor educators at Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi. An example statement is: "Evaluate the outcome of remediation to determine the success of the plan." In an effort to measure participants' attitudes, beliefs and perceptions for each main statement, there are sub-statements referring to the main statement that asked the participant to provide their opinion by rating from 1 – 5 with 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest. The first sub-statement, "My belief in the level of importance that I should do/participate in this," the participants are asked to rate how important the main statement is to them. The second statement, "The quality of support for doing this in my institution," the participants are asked to rate the quality of the support they receive from their

institution regarding the main statement. The third statement, “How frequently I actually do/participate in this,” asked the participants to rate how frequently they do/participate in the main statement. Included in the survey is one opinion question with a rating scale from 1 – 5 with 1 strongly disagree and 5 strongly agree: “There are currently general guidelines for gatekeeping set forth by governing and accrediting bodies. Each program is expected to construct its own policies and procedures to abide by these guidelines. Instead of general guidelines, do you believe that there should be standardized gatekeeping policies and procedures implemented for all like programs?” The remainder of the survey contains requests for demographic information as well as information regarding the existence of a formal gatekeeping committee and the frequency of gatekeeping related meetings.

## **Methodology**

A content analysis was conducted of the documents retrieved from universities’ and counseling programs’ websites. Content analysis refers to the process of making inferences based on objective coding of archival records. A thematic approach was utilized in the coding of the documents’ content. Thematic approach is a method of identifying, analyzing and reporting patterns (themes) within data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The coding in the content analysis involved classifying information contained in documents into clearly defined thematic categories as they related to identified requirements outlined in the 2016 CACREP Standards (2015) and recording the extent they appear in the documents.

An invitation to participate in an online Likert survey was distributed via email to the faculty and program/department chairs of the programs reviewed in the content analysis portion of the study. The email contained a hyperlink to the survey. The survey was created using Qualtrics (<https://www.qualtrics.com>), an online survey software accessible by students at Texas

A&M University-Corpus Christi. The questions were developed from requirements published by the governing bodies. Recipients of the email were provided a two week window of time to complete the survey. Multiple action statements regarding gatekeeping policies and procedures were used to ascertain counselor educators' awareness and perceptions. Each statement contains three sub-statements containing Likert scale responses: *My belief in the level of importance that I SHOULD do/participate in this; the quality of support for doing this in my institution; how frequently I actually do/participate in this.* The first asks for the respondent's belief on the level of the statement's importance. The second asks for the respondent's perception of the amount of support received from his/her department/university in regards to the statement. The third asks for the respondent's frequency of performing the action of the statement.

### **Population and Sample**

The population in this study was drawn from the availability of websites from universities that have CACREP accredited counselor education programs. For consistency, non-CACREP accredited counselor education programs were not taken into consideration for this study. The list of CACREP accredited Master's level counseling programs was obtained from the CACREP online directory. All CACREP accredited program types offering both Doctoral and Master's degrees were included. Programs that offered non-degree certifications in lieu of a Master's level degree, or did not also offer a CACREP accredited Doctoral program along with a Master's level degree program were not included in the study in order to increase like comparisons. After identifying programs that met the above criteria, each program/university website was screened for the requirement of having three core document sources: the University's catalog for Master's level Counselor Education, the Master's level Counselor Education Handbook, and a Counselor Education program's webpage(s). For consistency, only

universities that provided these document sources publically and written in the English language were utilized. No further analysis was conducted on universities/programs that did not meet the above criteria. All counselor educators from the programs chosen for the archival portion of the study received a request to participate in the study.

### **Data Collection and Analysis**

Once programs that met the criteria outlined above were identified, analysis of data for the archival portion of the study continued throughout the research process. Information on the geographic location and type of program of the chosen websites was collected for analysis purposes. A Microsoft® Excel spreadsheet was constructed and was utilized to organize the data. The first column contained the list of specific 2016 CACREP standards chosen to review for consistency. The first rows of the subsequent columns contained the name and location of each Master's level counselor education program screened to be included in the study. If there were multiple programs in the same university chosen, each program headed a column. The three core documents were reviewed for terminology, policies, and procedures that directly related to the 2016 CACREP Standards (2015). Policies and procedures, that were identified, were noted on the spreadsheet under the program's heading and across from the corresponding 2016 CACREP standard as well as the lack there of. .

A request to participate in the study, as well as a hyperlink to the survey was distributed via email to all counselor educators of the programs chosen for the archival portion of this study. The survey contained questions with Likert responses with a number assigned to each response. The Likert scale in each question has an ordered relationship to each other. Likert scales report the order of a participant's attitude (Thomas, 2011). This scale permits the measurement of a degree of difference but not the specific amount of difference. Due to these characteristics,

Likert items are considered an ordinal measurement scale. With an ordinal measurement scale, order or rank can be described, but the interval between the two ranks or order cannot be measured. The data from the survey were analyzed for central tendency and frequencies.

### **Basic Assumptions**

The researcher of the study makes basic assumptions about the archival documents employed. Since all institutions in the study are CACREP accredited counselor education programs, the first assumption is that the documents reflect current gatekeeping policies and procedures. The second assumption is that the documents are accurate representations of program and university's gatekeeping policies and procedures. The third assumption is that the documents are complete.

The researcher of the study also makes basic assumptions about the survey employed. The first basic assumption is that the statements made in the survey reflect aspects of gatekeeping in counselor education. The second basic assumption is that the respondents were open and truthful in their responses.

### **Limitations**

This study has some limitations. First is the restriction of the sample to publically accessible documents obtained from CACREP accredited programs. This limitation does not allow for non-accredited programs to be included and thus the results are not representative of all counselor education programs. The second limitation is that it cannot be assumed that all of the information reviewed is all inclusive as some information may not be publically available. The third limitation is that there may be no way of knowing if the documents used in the study are outdated or incomplete, unless it is noted on the document. However, even then, there is no way of knowing if a document is current by the date provided. The fourth limitation is that some

information may be missed as there is no standardized format for presenting/accessing or locating information on university websites, also there is no standardized use of terminology to indicate specific documents nor types of policies and procedures across universities.

### **Definition of Terms**

Within this study, specific terms are used. Definitions of selected terms are provided for clarity. The definitions set forth fall within the range of generally accepted use of the terms selected.

### **Gatekeeping**

“[T]he evaluation of a student’s suitability for professional practice. It is a mechanism that aims to ensure the health of the profession by controlling access to it. It involves identification of evaluative criteria and process, and the accountability of the gatekeeper to apply the criteria and take responsibility for the evaluative decisions” (Brear, Dorrian, & Luscri, 2008, pp. 93-94).

### **Policies**

A definite course or method of action selected from among alternatives and in light of given conditions to guide and determine present and future decisions (Merriam-Webster, 2014).

### **Archival Research**

The locating, evaluating, and systematic interpretation and analysis of sources found in documents.

### **Academic**

Educational performance, knowledge and skill acquisition

### **Non-Academic**

Personal characteristics, behavior, professional development

## **Remediation**

Serving to raise or adjust something to some standard or proper condition (Merriam-Webster, 2014). Depending on the circumstances, remediation interventions in counselor education could include: personal therapy, increased supervision, repetition of academic and clinical course work, additional assignments, and student restrictions within the program (Henderson & Dufrene, 2012).

## **Organization of Remaining Chapters**

This study is composed of five chapters. Chapter I serves as an outline and establishes the conceptual framework for the study. Chapter II provides a literature review of the history of gatekeeping in counselor education. Chapter III is focused on the design, instrumentation, data collection and analysis of the study. Chapter IV offers a detailed description of the processes as well as the results of the study. Chapter V includes a summary of the study, implications for counselor educators, counselor education programs, and the universities, and recommendations for future research.

## **CHAPTER II**

### **Review of Literature**

#### **Introduction**

Gatekeeping is a process that safeguards access to the practice of a profession in order to ensure the quality of services delivered (Brear, Dorrian & Luscri, 2008). Gatekeeping concerns emerge from a sense of professional responsibility and service to clients. Because of these concerns, we as professional counselors, design, commit and reference specific 'gatekeeping practices' including codes of professional conduct to ensure the quality and safety of our clients. For gatekeeping procedures to be consistent and trustworthy, more studies on effective counseling practices may contribute to the implementation of beneficial gatekeeping policies. Ensuring effective counseling practices is only part of gatekeeping procedures. As counselor educators we must also look for person-fit, ethical behavior, and self-monitoring skills to avoid burnout and future problems that, if not practiced, could lead to issues with personal/professional conduct. Quality training that emphasizes student professional practice and technical competence with skills is perhaps the best way to ensure the safe and ethical treatment that our clients deserve. These standards and codes have been developed from studies on counseling best practices dating back to Rogers in the late 1930s and Porter in the 1940s (Ivey & Daniels, 2016; Porter, 1943a & 1943b). This chapter reviews historic literature contributing to the foundation of gatekeeping practices today. The review consists of research related to evaluating best practices in training of counseling professionals including admission screening for counseling programs, student competency monitoring, retention, remediation and dismissal procedures, and the evolution of accreditation policies that support professional behavioral standards in the counseling profession.



## **Establishing training standards and elements of counseling**

Early research studies of counselor and counseling student competencies initially focused on the skills and techniques found in counseling sessions (Swank, 2010). *The development and evaluation of a measure of counseling interview procedures Part I*, Porter (1943a) was an early study that contributed to the evaluation of effective counseling practices. In *Part I*, Porter (1943a) conducted an analysis of publications pertaining to counseling skills and an analysis of phonographically recorded interviews. The objective of his analysis was to create a check list of processes to use in identifying the procedures used in counseling interviews. Porter (1943a) found that prior to his study there were two approaches to evaluating counseling procedures. The first approach was an attempt to itemize and describe counseling procedures or techniques which appeared to be useful and those that should be avoided. The second approach attempted to evaluate the effectiveness of counseling procedures by comparing counseling to the absence of counseling. His study attempted to develop and evaluate a means of quantitatively calculating the effectiveness of individual counseling procedures. In *Part II*, Porter (1943b) reported on the steps taken in his evaluation of the check list he developed. Utilizing his check list, Porter (1943b) reported the following results:

- different viewpoints on counseling are reflected in the patterns of procedures used
- similar viewpoints on counseling are associated with similar patterns of procedures
- a given counselor is quite consistent in the pattern of procedures he uses throughout a series of interviews with a client
- a counselor will tend to adhere more closely to a pattern of procedures consistent with his viewpoint than he will tend to vary his procedures and
- the performance of the counselor may be markedly affected by training (p. 237-238).

The efforts of Porter's study examining the counseling session process added to the foundation of the collective body of knowledge regarding principle foundations of counseling/therapeutic process. The results of Porter's study suggested that there was a difference in published viewpoints on counseling procedures used by counselors, however these counselors were consistent in the counseling patterns they used with a client (Porter, 1943b). Similarly, Carl Rogers was primarily concerned with assessing counselor skill and his/her command of "necessary and sufficient conditions" as a measure of skill that indicated competence as a counselor to effect change in clients.

In 1938, Carl Rogers began utilizing an audio recorder to document therapeutic sessions in order to identify specific skills of communication in counseling (Ivey & Daniels, 2016). Video-based recording of counseling sessions originated in 1966-68, which allowed to observe verbal as well as non-verbal communications during counseling sessions. In a 1992 reprint of Carl Rogers' 1957 seminal article on *The necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change*, Rogers proposed six conditions as being necessary and sufficient for the initiation of a process of constructive personality change. Rogers took into consideration his own clinical experience, that of his colleagues, and pertinent research when developing these conditions. These conditions (Rogers, 1957, 1992) are: a relationship between the therapist and the client; the necessity that the client be in a state of incongruence; the therapist should be a congruent, genuine, and integrated person; the therapist experiences unconditional positive regard toward the client; the therapist experiences empathy toward the client; and the client perceives the acceptance and empathy which the therapist experiences.

Rogers suggested that educational, correctional, military, or industrial programs "...which aim toward constructive changes in the personality structure and behavior of the individual [should

use these six conditions as criteria] against which to measure the[ir] program” (p. 837). Rogers proposed that these conditions needed to be tested by research before being thought of as valid criteria, however in the field of psychotherapy, these may help to stimulate critical analysis. According to Ivey and Daniels (2016), session recording can enable the “specific and observable communication units” known as the microskills approach, microcounseling, and/or microtraining model (p. 100). Counseling microskills training emphasizes the rehearsal and application of distinct attentive and facilitative skills through education, observation, and role-play. “The microcounseling/microtraining model is one of the most widely used training models in modern times” and “has demonstrated effectiveness for teaching counselors” (Ivey & Daniels, 2016, p. 114). Command of impactful counseling skills can be used by counselor educators to evaluate the fit for an individual in the counseling profession.

Looking at counselor training from a different perspective, in a historic study investigating the relationship between counselors-in-trainings’ (CIT) knowledge of counseling and their competence in conducting counseling interviews, Joslin (1965), did not find support for a positive relationship between professional training and professional skill. This lack of support led Joslin (1965) to conclude that achievement of course work alone does not indicate counseling competency and should not assume prominence when recommending CITs for graduation. He advocated that “emotional or attitudinal factors must be given greater consideration in the preparation of counselors” (Joslin, 1965, p. 794). Joslin did not elaborate on “emotional or attitudinal factors.” He proposed that programs should provide adequate opportunities for supervised counseling experiences early in trainings to foster the elimination or change of these unspecified attitudinal factors (Joslin, 1965). The 2016 CACREP Standards (2015) require counselor educator program faculty to “...systematically assesses each student’s progress

throughout the program by examining student learning in relation to a combination of knowledge and skills (Section 4.F, p. 17) as well as “...systematically assess[] each student’s professional dispositions throughout the program” (Section 4.G, p. 18). The ACA Code of Ethics (2014) also address an ongoing evaluation and appraisal to identify both academic and personal limitations of CITs that may impede performance.

Starting at application to the program, counselor educators assess potential counseling students and intervene to block the entry of students who exhibit characteristics and/or behaviors that would result in their inability to meet professional competencies (Brown-Rice, 2012). Jackson (1973) contributed to the foundation of counseling patterns and processes when he conducted a study that looked at counselor characteristics and attitudes in the selection and training of effective counselors. Jackson believed that successful counselors possessed certain characteristics and attitudes that differentiated them from less successful counselors. His study measured CIT attitudes. Jackson found support for “the view that attitudes toward self, most people, most clients, and counseling are important counselor attributes that have implications for the selection and training of potentially more effective counselors” (p. 3). He concluded that “[e]ffective counselors possess effective personalities characterized by traits as warm, serious, venturesome, realistic, trusting, analytical, and relaxed” (Jackson, 1973, p. 4). Jackson suggested that persistent attitude change is difficult to achieve, thus counselor education programs should focus more on attitudes during the selection process. He also indicated that due to a shift in the employment market there was possibly a greater concern for the quality rather than quantity of counselors.

Research on CIT personal and professional/ethical behavior continues to be an important topic. Homrich, DeLorenzi, Bloom, and Godbee (2014) conducted a study to identify a set of

prioritized standards for CITs' personal and professional conduct expectations. Eighty-two counselor educators from CACREP-accredited programs participated in the study. The participants reported the following conducts as extremely important for CITs: "...maintaining confidentiality and ethical behavior; respecting the values and beliefs of others; demonstrating cultural competence and sensitivity toward others; and cultivating awareness of how personal beliefs may influence performance" (Homrich, et.al., 2014, P. 139). The results indicated, a need for clearer definitions of specific expectations for CIT conduct would support CIT success.

### **Program screening, remediation, and dismissal in gatekeeping**

The ACA Code of Ethics (2014) provides directives for supervisors and counselor educators to assist students in securing remedial assistance when needed. Section F of the ACA Code of Ethics (2014) addresses supervision, training, and teaching: F.1 Counselor Supervision and Client Welfare; F.2 Counselor Supervision Competence; F.3 Supervisory Relationship; F.4 Supervisor Responsibilities; F.5 Student and Supervisee Responsibilities; F.6 Counseling Supervision Evaluation, Remediation, and Endorsement; F.7 Responsibilities of Counselor Educators; F.8 Student Welfare; F.9 Evaluation and Remediation; F.10 Roles and Relationships Between Counselor Educators and Students; F.11 Multicultural/Diversity Competence in Counselor Education and Training Programs. The 2016 CACREP Standards (2015) define gatekeeping as "the ethical responsibility of counselor educators and supervisors to monitor and evaluate an individual's knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions required by competent professional counselors and to remediate or prevent those that are lacking in professional competence from becoming counselors" (p. 41). "However, little guidance is provided in the ethical code or accreditation standards about which behaviors to remediate or how to execute remediation" (Henderson & Defrene, 2012).

The primary purpose of gatekeeping is to ensure that CITs are not impaired and are competent and ethically able to provide counseling services to the public (Brown-Rice, 2012). Homrich (2009) classified gatekeeping as a metaphor that identifies “the process of monitoring progression through a series of stages via critical points of entry or passage” (p. 1). She recognized educators and supervisors in the mental health profession as gatekeepers who direct the advancement of CITs while assessing their appropriateness to continue through the various stages of training. Homrich (2009) stated that the three best practices programs can use to improve their gatekeeping protocol are: 1) to establish the expectations, 2) communicate them clearly and widely, and 3) have faculty consistency in enforcement. The ACA Code of Ethics (ACA, 2014) does not endorse one specific ethical decision making model but does require that counselors use a “credible model of decision making that can bear public scrutiny of its application” (p. 3). Issues with standardized procedures for program screening, remediation, and dismissal of impaired students are not new. Bradey and Post (1991) surveyed 309 programs in the United States that had at least four full-time faculty members listed in the directory of Counselor Preparation 1986-1989 Programs, Personnel, and Trends. They found the majority of programs participating in their study on dismissal of impaired students had developed formal initial screening procedures but were less certain about implementing dismissal procedures. Of those surveyed in the study, Bradey and Post (1991) reported only 13% as using formal screening procedures to dismiss students from their programs, however, 29% indicated no response, which led them to question whether that was indicative of a lack of systematic procedures for dismissal. Bradey and Post (1991) asserted that counselor educators must not only consider academic performance, they must also assess and respond to the emotional stability of their students.

Research on applicant screening during admissions has added to the literature on effective gatekeeping best practices. Swank and Smith-Adcock (2014) surveyed CACREP-accredited counselor education programs in the United States regarding screening procedures used during the admission process. The results indicated the most commonly utilized admission criteria were: Standardized testing instruments such as the Graduate Records Examination (GRE) (70% of programs), letters of recommendation (96%), academics (95%), content of a written personal statement (89%), and conduct face-to-face interviews (82%). Of those who conducted interviews, 41% reported conducting individual interviews, 35% reported conducting group interviews, and 24% reported conducting both group and individual interviews. Swank and Smith-Adcock (2014) reported a common overarching concern, shared by counselor educators: “how to evaluate students in a fair and reliable manner, identify professional dispositions, and screen for psychological impairment” (p. 57).

Similar to current gatekeeping issues, early research on the dismissal of master’s level students by Oklin and Gaughen (1991) noted most programs reported relying heavily on academic parameters and choosing to leave internship sites to dismiss students with problems in intrapersonal or interpersonal functioning. In their discussion section Oklin and Gaughen (1991) asked if programs were unduly influenced by the fear of a court action. They went on to question if the programs were pushing dismissal responsibility to the personal therapist or internship supervisors.

Frame and Stevens-Smith (1995) looked at enhancing and monitoring the dismissal processes in counselor education programs, in particular impaired student counselors’ potential for harming clients. They indicated several reasons counselor educators and supervisors need to be concerned about CIT impairments: ethical mandate of non-maleficence; the power of

therapist interpersonal influence; the obligations of counselor educators and supervisors to monitor students' personal and professional development; and legal repercussions that may transpire as a result of an impaired CIT causing harm as a result of exploitation, negligence, and/or incompetence (Frame & Stevens-Smith, 1995).

Their conclusion was that counselor education programs need to implement openly defined monitoring and dismissal procedures (Frame & Stevens-Smith, 1995).

A study by Palmer, White, and Chung (2008) looked at the perceived percentages of deficient students and faculty intervention rates with these students. Three hundred and eleven questionnaires were sent to full-time faculty members of mental health related master's level graduate programs at Christian institutions. These programs included counseling, clinical psychology, school counseling, school psychology, social work, and marriage and family therapy. One hundred and two (33%) completed the questionnaire. The questionnaire they used was a variation of one designed by Gaubatz and Vera in 2002. The researchers stated that they modified the original question to "increase clarity" and add questions unique to Christian institutions in gatekeeping such as *grace* and *gifting* (Palmer, et.al., 2008, p. 33). The researchers found that clearly established policies and procedures pertaining to gatekeeping and the faculty's ability to readily identify these policies and procedures made them more likely to intervene with CITs with deficiencies. Palmer, White, and Chung (2008) also report that faculty knowing that they have administrative support on gatekeeping, both at the program/department level and at the university level, increased faculty confidence when intervening with CITs with deficiencies.

According to Henderson and Dufrene (2012), empirical research has been focused on how students with issues are identified, such as through coursework and referrals, rather than



when concerning behaviors are first noted. They went on to state that there was a lack of research on remediation, which leaves counselor educators and supervisors without evidence-based resources to inform decisions regarding which behaviors to remediate and how to provide effective remediation. Henderson and Dufrene (2012) conducted a study exploring graduate counseling student behaviors requiring remediation. They surveyed members of ACES and identified five student behaviors, ranked by the participants, as needing remediation. They were: 1) receptivity to feedback, 2) basic counseling skills, 3) boundaries with clients, supervisors, and/or colleagues, 4) openness to self-examination, and 5) advanced counseling skills (Henderson & Dufrene, 2012, p. 2).

The majority of respondents in the study indicated that most of these behaviors were recognized during entry-level techniques/skills courses.

According to Urofsky and Bobby (2012), there has been a systematic and comprehensive concern for not only assessing the performance of CITs, but also the effectiveness of the counselor education programs. Section 4 of the 2016 CACREP Standards addresses required program evaluations, as well as assessments of students, faculty and supervisors. In an attempt to address counselor competence, performance assessment, and program evaluation, Tate, Bloom, Tassara, and Caperton (2014) reviewed psychometric instruments counselor educators could use in performance assessment and program evaluation. Their literature review identified 41 potential instruments. Nearly half of these instruments were constructed to measure some aspect of multicultural counseling competence and approximately one third assessed self-efficacy measures. The researchers reported being surprised that they found few counselor competence instruments that used expert-based ratings of counseling because “surely no counselor educator would endorse a student for licensure only using the student’s perceptions to

determine her/his ability to counsel” (Tate, Bloom, Tassara, & Capterton, 2014, p. 302). Tate, et.al., (2014) proposed utilizing instruments that use standardized, expert-based ratings which are particularly effective tools for performance assessment of counselor competence and that these instruments help ensure CITs are evaluated with standardized criteria.

Minton-Barrio, and Gibson (2012) looked at evaluating student learning outcomes in counselor education. In their literature review they noted that there were no articles regarding assessment of student learning outcomes. The authors suggest the following elements needed to develop and implement a student learning outcome evaluation plan: identifying student learning outcomes, developing assessments, creating measures, collecting and reporting data, and making meaning and implementing changes.

### **Due Process in Gatekeeping**

Due process in gatekeeping is not a recent concept. Bernard (1975) reviewed the due process of removing clinical and counseling students from programs. He stated that in the 1950s, the norm was that students could be dropped from training programs simply by the program’s director informing the student that he/she failed to live up to some vague standard. Iovacchini (1981) also wrote about the lack of due process prior to the 1960s. The doctrine of “in loco parentis” (in place of the parent) dating back to a court decision in 1913, governed most instances involving the behavioral or academic relationships between the student and the university (Iovacchini, 1981). Bernard (1975) noted the 1960s saw changes as students became less passive to what the administration and faculty dictated. Iovacchini (1981) acknowledged the shift came after a court case in 1961 where the court found that students had the right of due process of law. Faculty still retained the right to terminate students for substantiated academic

and ethical insufficiencies, however, how to handle a student judged to have personal inadequacies to pursue counseling was much more difficult to quantify (Bernard, 1975).

Baldo, Saftas-Nall, and Shaw (1997) outlined a review and retention policy that addressed the evaluation of the academic, professional, and personal development of the students in the training program at the University of Northern Colorado's Division of Professional Psychology and included an extensive and detailed due process (Baldo, et.al., 1997). According to Baldo, et.al.'s (1997) policy, due process considerations are evident through a series of implementation steps: 1) the student receives a written plan for remediation, 2) the student is asked to sign a statement indicating that he/she has been informed, 3) the student has the opportunity to present his/her case to the retention review committee, 4) the policy is detailed with clear steps to follow and specific actions to take regarding probationary remediation, voluntary resignation, and dismissal from the program, and 5) the dismissal behavior is based on professional judgment of the entire faculty (p. 247-248).

The researchers recommended the student review and retention policy should contain an extensive and detailed due process that places the responsibility on a retention review committee as well as the entire faculty (Baldo, et.al., 1997).

Keppers (1960) conducted a survey of 200 colleges and universities, possibly the first large scale empirical study on gatekeeping, offering counselor preparation programs. Keppers' study found that 33% of the respondents allowed "less desirable students" to complete their programs (p.91). Fifty-six percent of the respondents indicated that the "less desirable students" who complete the program were eliminated from the profession by employing officials' refusal to hire them. Keppers questioned this approach:

One might ask, are the professional people in counselor preparation assuming

their full responsibility in the process of preparing counselors? Are students being put through the course work by counselor educators and then screened by someone else? (p. 92).

Similarly, Freeman, Garner, Fairgrieve, and Pitts (2016) conducted a survey of field site supervisors on their perceptions and strategies for gatekeeping and remediating CITs. They surveyed 103 field site supervisors who had collectively supervised a total of 527 CITs. Of those, 63 (11.9%) were rated as unsuitable. In the survey, the field site supervisors indicated the following reasons for rating the CITs as unsuitable: lack of interpersonal skills (20.63%), inability to acquire or integrate standards (12.69%), inability to control stress (12.69%), unethical behavior (11.11%), and lack of clinic skills (11.11%) (Freeman, et.al, 2016, p. 34). They were also asked *who holds the primary responsibility for gatekeeping CITs?* Responses included: 71.3% indicated university faculty, 21.8% indicated field site supervisors, and 6.9% indicated that licensing boards (p. 34).

Bernard's (1975) survey on due process provided results similar to the practices used today by counselor educators. He surveyed the Council of University Directors of Clinical Psychology on their procedures for removing counseling students out of the program who were personally impaired to the point where no other interventions used would be effective (Bernard, 1975). Twenty-five percent of survey respondents indicated no formal policy for dealing with this problem; 39% had some formal procedures, or were attempting to do so, but indicated there might be loopholes that would prove them inadequate; and 35% had formal procedures which included routine evaluation of the student's personal functioning with the opportunity to correct the deficiency (Bernard, 1975). As a result of his research, Bernard (1975) suggested that all incoming students be presented with a written program that includes the observation that

students may be terminated for ethical and/or *personal unsuitability for the profession*; all students will be routinely evaluated; if personal inadequacies are noted, a *prescription for remediation* with clear and specific expectations for behavioral changes, as well as the consequence should these changes not occur; and specific time period allotted for these expectations to occur (Bernard, 1975, p. 277).

According to the 2016 CACREP Standards “[c]ounselor education programs have and follow a policy for student retention, remediation, and dismissal from the program consistent with institutional due process policies and with the counseling profession’s ethical codes and standards of practice” (Section 1.O., p. 6). The ACA Code of Ethics Section F.9.b.3 addresses students’ right to have recourse to address decisions requiring them to seek assistance or to dismiss them and to be provided with due process according to the policies and procedures of their institution (2014). In one of the most impactful legal cases in recent history for counselor educators, *Ward v. Wilbanks*, Ms. Ward refused to meet with a client during her practicum based on the client’s sexual orientation. The Eastern Michigan University counseling program informed her that her refusal was a violation of the code of ethics for the counselor profession citing the 2005 ACA Code of Ethics A.4.b. She was offered remediation, which she refused because she felt it violated her religious beliefs. After due process hearings, Ms. Ward was dismissed from the counseling program (Kaplan, 2014). This and other court hearings influenced the most recent revisions to the 2014 ACA Code of Ethics (Letourneau, 2016).

### **Standardized counseling program guidelines and accreditation**

Counseling and counselor education program guidelines and later accreditation standards have evolved over the years as a result of the need for professional identification as counselors, as well as a need for specification of professional standards. The foundation for the Association

for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES) began in 1940 in a meeting of the National Association for Guidance Supervisors (NAGS) in Washington, D.C. (Elmore, 1985). NAGS was a small organization consisting of ten state supervisors of guidance and occupational information that met in conjunction with the annual National Vocational Guidance Association and the American Vocational Association. Counselor trainers began attending these meetings in 1944. In 1952, counselor trainers were admitted to full membership and NAGS changed its name to the National Association of Guidance Supervisors and Counselor Trainers (NAGSCT). In 1961 NAGSCT formally changed its name to the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES). Supervisors of local city or county school counselors were accepted as members as well as the supervisors of guidance for state departments of education. Counselor trainers became known as counselor educators during this time. The organization was concerned with professional issues related to school guidance and counseling, in particular, supervision of school guidance counselor trainees. As the only organization dedicated to the preparation and supervision of school counselors at the time, ACES broadened its concern over time to encompass the preparation and supervision of counselors counseling children and adults in a variety of settings (Elmore, 1985).

In 1973, ACES adopted the *Standards for the Preparation of Counselors and Other Personnel Specialist* by combining the three previous standards into a single document (Stahl & Havens, 1978). The first set of standards were for the preparation of secondary school counselors and used experimentally for three years beginning in 1964 (Stahl & Havens, 1978). The 1964 standards were officially adopted in 1967, followed by the standards for elementary school counselors adopted in 1968, and guidelines for the preparation of student-personnel workers adopted in 1969 (Stahl & Havens, 1978). There were concerns that these standards may

suppress creativity and innovation, as well as possibly be used in a manner that was not intended by ACES (Stahl & Havens, 1978). Using the 1967 standards, ACES promoted professional self-study through a document entitled *Manual for Self-Study by a Counselor Education Staff* (Stahl & Havens, 1978). ACES encouraged the self-study using the standards so that counselor education staff could make improvements to their program as were deemed necessary (Stahl & Havens, 1978). According to Elmore (1985), in 1977, ACES' basic premise was to develop counseling into a profession. In order to do this, Elmore (1985) listed four major steps that were necessary:

1. The establishment of commonly agreed upon standards for the preparation of counselors
2. A procedure for the approval of counselor educator programs that follow these standards
3. The development of methods of credentialing or licensing graduates of approved programs
4. The establishment of ongoing professional development of continuing education programs for counselors to assure that they will continue to grow and be renewed personally and professionally (p. 411).

The first system of accreditation of counselor education programs was set forth by ACES on July 1, 1978, however, compliance was optional for counselor education programs (Elmore, 1985). Following the adoption of this system of accreditation, Stahl and Havens (1978) proposed that the decisive point for ACES would be to convince counselor education programs and their institutions that it would be in their best interest to be reviewed and accredited. In 1977 the American Personnel and Guidance Association (APGA), made a commitment to gain support

for counselor licensure (Stahl & Havens, 1978). Within section 5 of the APGA Commission on Counselor Licensure was a statement requiring completion of a program that met the standards set forth by the ACES (Stahl & Havens, 1978). Stahl and Havens (1978) suggested that the issue of counselor licensure “created a new visibility and acceptability for the ACES standards” and made it “imperative that ACES use the standards for program accreditation” (p. 186).

ACES Committee on Accreditation monitored these efforts until 1981 when the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Education Programs (CACREP) was incorporated as the accreditation body of the counseling profession by the American Personnel and Guidance Association (APGA), which changed its name in 1992 to the American Counseling Association (ACA; Urofsky, Bobby, & Ritchie, 2013). The formation of CACREP was the result of the creation of accreditation standards completed by the Association for Counselor Education and Supervision (ACES; Urofsky, et al, 2013). The primary goal of CACREP has been the development and growth of the counseling profession by promoting and administering a quality assurance process for graduate programs in the field of counseling (Honderich & Lloyd-Hazzlett, 2015). The CACREP Board adopted the 2009 CACREP Standards following reflection on how to best educate and train future professional counselors (Urofsky, et al, 2013). The 2009 CACREP Standards included greater emphases on unified counselor professional identity through specification of core faculty members requirements and increased focus on documented student learning outcomes in response to larger trends of accountability in higher education (Honderich & Lloyd-Hazzlett, 2015).

In 2014 the American Counseling Association (ACA) adopted a revised Code of Ethics. The ACA “...is an educational, scientific, and professional organization” (ACA, 2014, p. 3). The first of six main purposes of the ACA Code of Ethics is to: “...set forth the ethical obligations of



ACA members and provide guidance intended to inform the ethical practice of professional counselors” (ACA, 2014, p. 3). The ACA Code of Ethics (2014) contains more specific guidance for counselor educators and supervisors on gatekeeping than the CACREP Standards. Section F, Supervision, Training, and Teaching provides several codes related to the act of gatekeeping in the profession: Code F.1.a describes the role of counseling supervisors in monitoring client welfare and the services provided by counseling students; Code F.5.b explains how counseling supervisors must help impaired counseling students to seek remediation when needed; Code F.9.a describes the counselor educator’s role in evaluating counseling students throughout the program; Code F.9.b specifically addresses the steps counselor educators must take when an impaired student is recognized (ACA, 2014).

Codes of Ethics and accreditation standards are continuously being reviewed and improved. The CACREP Standards were revised in 2015 and adopted in 2016. “The 2016 CACREP Standards were written with the intention to simplify and clarify the accreditation requirements and to promote a unified counseling profession” (CACREP, 2015, p. 3).

Accreditation standards and Codes of Ethics both define and encourage gatekeeping. In the introduction section of the most recent 2016 CACREP Standards (2015) it is indicated that although these standards “...delineate accreditation requirements, they do not dictate the manner in which programs may choose to meet standards” (p. 3). In a study on gatekeeping by Gaubatz and Vera (2002), the researchers looked at *gateslipping* a term to describe individuals who are not suitable for the profession and are inappropriately permitted to complete graduate programs or are supported for licensure by supervisors. They found that faculty in counselor education programs accredited by CACREP seemed to be more effective at following through with concerns regarding specific students than were faculty members who “perceived institutional or

legal pressures to avoid screening questionable students” or had “greater concerns about receiving poor teaching evaluations” (Gaubatz & Vera, 2002, p. 303). Regardless of the importance of defining gatekeeping and the understanding and implementing guidelines to address CIT deficiencies, there is a lack of research in developing a model for gatekeeping (Glance, Fanning, Schoepke, Soto, & Williams, 2012). Glance, et.al., (2012) go on to say that “[t]he lack of a definition and criteria makes it even more difficult for counselor educators to address the issue of impairment and stay atop of best practices in the field” (p.2). Rust, Raskin, and Hill (2013) noted that programs may be reluctant to address problems of professional competence (PPC) issues due to a “wish to avoid cost, time demands, and documentation required for litigation that may follow dismissal and a lack of support from the college administration” (p. 42). They also suggest there may be a reluctance to remediate or dismiss students with PPC who are performing well academically, or are close to graduating, as well as the potential lack of agreement among counselor educators regarding the nature and degree of the student’s PPC (Rust; et.al., 2013). There is a need to offer opportunities to share processes and procedures that are effective.

### **Gatekeeping Responsibilities**

Dugger and Francis (2014) stated that there are three distinct responsibilities for counselor educators: 1) to prepare students to enter into the counseling profession; 2) to supervise the CITs during practicum and internship in order to protect the welfare of their clients; and 3) to act as gatekeepers to the profession striving to graduate only those students who are adequately prepared in their knowledge, skills, and disposition for entry into the counseling profession.

Despite specific gatekeeping obligations set forth by both CACREP and ACA, Foster and McAdams (2009) point out that each counselor education program is expected to develop performance assessments and policies to ensure that the policies and procedures are consistently applied and meet standards currently accepted practices. Hutchens, Block, and Young (2013) suggest that counselor educators have four primary concerns when developing gatekeeping procedures: 1) counselor education programs have a responsibility to support their students; 2) clinical supervision is subjective in nature; 3) counselor educators need to place future clients' interests first when evaluating CITs; and 4) effective gatekeeping needs to provide student with the opportunity to respond to and address concerns. These authors also stated that legal ambiguity does exist for counseling programs concerning gatekeeping and recommended a continuous review of policies, students signed statements that they have received and read program policies, and consistent application and documentation of procedures (Hutchens, et.al., 2013).

## **Summary**

Although there have been different approaches, research on the identification of the counselor competencies needed to provide effective professional counseling has been a focus for decades. Effective and consistent due process in gatekeeping has been studied and refined through research, starting with authoritarian through today's collaborative approach. Student screening, retention and dismissal procedures in counseling have also evolved as knowledge has increased through research and guidance from ACA and CACREP. All of these have contributed to the development of best practice guidelines and accreditation in the counseling profession. Accreditation is one way the profession establishes procedures for gatekeeping.

Chapter III focuses on the design, instrumentation, data collection and analysis of the study. Chapter IV offers a detailed description of the processes as well as the results of the study. Chapter V includes a summary of the study, implications for counselor educators, counselor education programs, and the universities, and recommendations for future research.

## **CHAPTER III**

### **Research Design and Methodology**

#### **Introduction**

In an effort to contribute to the ongoing research on gatekeeping, this study provides a descriptive overview of specific gatekeeping policies and procedures currently published in CACREP accredited Master's level counselor education programs, as well as the beliefs, attitudes and perceptions of counselor educators in regards to 35 gatekeeping activities. The purpose of this descriptive study is to: (a) investigate the consistency of policies and procedures across CACREP accredited counselor education programs; (b) explore counselor educators' perceptions about the importance of gatekeeping, the support they received from institutions and, their personal involvement in gatekeeping responsibilities in their departments/universities; (c) report the collected information from this study in an effort to increase the foundation of gatekeeping knowledge and to promote consistency gatekeeping policies and procedures.

#### **Research Questions**

In this study, information was gathered to answer the following questions:

1. Are counselor educators aware of their responsibilities as gatekeepers of the counseling profession?
2. Are the gatekeeping policies and procedures published by CACREP accredited counselor education programs consistent in format, terminology and presentation?
3. What are the perceptions of faculty at CACREP accredited institutions on gatekeeping in regards to:
  - a. Importance of gatekeeping procedures
  - b. quality of support they receive from their program/university, and

- c. frequency with which they perform and/or are aware of gatekeeping related activities.

### **Design of the Study**

The research for this study was done sequentially in order to first, identify potential programs that met the criteria for participation, and second, to obtain a list of counselor educator from those participating programs to solicit involvement in the survey portion of the study. First, a review of online archives was conducted to explore the accessibility and consistency of gatekeeping policies and procedures published by CACREP accredited counseling programs on the Internet followed by a survey containing statements related to gatekeeping awareness and perceptions were distributed to counselor educators of the program websites reviewed in the archival portion of the study. The two approaches enabled a collection of gatekeeping data from both publically available documents as well as the perceptions of the individuals who facilitate these gatekeeping policies and procedures.

### **Archival analysis**

An archival study should involve a specified list of documents to be reviewed, a way to sample the documents, and some flexibility to allow for unexpected discoveries during the investigation (Ward, 2014). The specified documents reviewed in the archival portion of the study were the Master's level student handbook, the university's catalog, and the counselor education program's website. All of these documents were accessed via the Internet.

In an effort to ensure the integrity of the counselor education program and the transparency in counselor education performance expectations and the students' rights to due process, Section M of the 2016 CACREP Standards (2015) specifically states that written documentation must be provided to students in the form of a student handbook and what contents

are to be included in that document. For this study, published Master's level Counselor Education Handbooks from CACREP accredited programs available online between November 22, 2015 and January 24, 2016 were the primary source of information. The University catalogs for CACREP accredited Master's level Counselor Education and the Counselor Education Programs' websites were also reviewed for potential pertinent information related to gatekeeping policies and procedures. Each archive was specifically reviewed to identify items addressed in the CACREP Standards (2015) that were specifically related to gatekeeping policies, procedures and intervention strategies. For the purpose of this study, gatekeeping policies, procedures and intervention strategies referred to the requirements, policies, procedures, and evaluations/assessments employed to ensure the integrity of the counselor education program and the professional counseling competencies of their counselors-in-training (CITs).

### **Gatekeeping issues survey**

The gatekeeping survey was designed to measure the awareness and perceptions of counselor educators on the different aspects of the gatekeeping process (see Appendix). The survey contains statements with Likert scale responses with a number assigned to each response. The Likert scale in each statement has a logical or ordered relationship to each other. Likert scales report the order of a participant's attitude (Thomas, 2011). Due to these characteristics, Likert items are considered an ordinal measurement scale. With an ordinal measurement scale, order or rank can be described, but the interval between the two ranks or order cannot be measured. This assumption allows measurement of feelings, attitudes, beliefs, and perceptions, and provides a means to quantify the data (Simon & Goes, 2013). The survey consisted of 35 statements developed from a combination of counseling's professional standards and codes of ethics (ACA Code of Ethics, 2014; CACREP Standards, 2015) as well as conversations on

gatekeeping practices with counselor education faculty at Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi. The data from the survey were analyzed for frequencies. The survey also requested demographic information and an opinion on standardization of gatekeeping policies.

Each survey statement was followed by sub-statements to examine the participants': 1) personal belief in the importance of the statement, 2) the quality of support they felt they received from their department/university in regard to the statement, and 3) how often they participated/performed the action presented in the statement. Participants were asked to rate each statement with sub-statements using a scale from one – five, with one being the lowest belief/action and five being the highest belief/action. An example statement is: "Evaluate the outcome of remediation to determine the success of the plan." The sub-statements used were: 1) "My belief in the level of importance that I should do/participate in this"; 2) "The quality of support for doing this in my institution"; and 3) "How frequently I actually do/participate in this." In addition to the thirty-five statements in the survey, there was one opinion Likert scale statement with a rating scale from one – five with one strongly disagree and five strongly agree:

"There are currently general guidelines for gatekeeping set forth by governing and accrediting bodies. Each program is expected to construct its own policies and procedures and to abide by these guidelines. Instead of general guidelines, do you believe that there should be standardized gatekeeping policies and procedures implemented for all like programs?"

The survey contained requests for demographic information as well as information regarding the existence of a formal gatekeeping committee and the frequency of gatekeeping related meetings. The request on gatekeeping related meetings was an effort to collect information of the current



practices to enhance the information collected in order to contribute to research on gatekeeping practices.

## **Population**

The population in this study was drawn from the availability of university websites that have CACREP accredited counselor education programs. The list of CACREP accredited Master's level counseling programs was obtained from the CACREP online directory on November 15, 2015 (<http://www.cacrep.org/directory/>). There were a total of 642 programs listed. All Master level program and degree types were included.

## **Screening Criteria**

In order to have homogeneity across programs, the archival analysis was limited to CACREP accredited Master's level counseling programs that also had CACREP accredited Doctoral programs, were in the United States of America and were not "online only" programs. That brought the total number of potential participating programs from 642 to 146. The next screening requirements were that these program websites contain the three core document sources: the University's catalog for Master's level Counselor Education, the Master's level Counselor Education Handbook, and a Counselor Education program's webpage(s). For consistency, only universities that provided these document sources publically and written in the English language were utilized. After all requirements were met and screened, there were 99 public and seven private qualifying programs representing 45 universities. The program types represented were: Addiction Counseling; Career Counseling; Clinical Mental Health Counseling; College/Student Affairs Counseling; Community Counseling; Marital/Marriage, Couple, and Family Counseling/Therapy; School Counseling. Five hundred and eleven counselor educators and program/department chairs from the programs chosen for the archival

portion of the study were identified and received an emailed request to complete the survey. The list of counselor educators and program/department chairs was compiled from each of the 106 qualifying program's university's directory. Twenty-one invitees declined to participate. These opt out notifications were received via email directly from the invitees. Out of the 490 potential participants, 41 (8%) completed the survey.

## **Methodology**

### **Archival Analysis**

An analysis of the retrieved archival material content was conducted. Content analysis refers to the process of making inferences based on coding of archival records. A thematic approach was utilized in the coding of the documents' content. Thematic approach is a method of identifying, analyzing and reporting patterns (themes) within data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Thematic analysis was chosen as it seeks to describe patterns across data. The coding and content analysis involved classifying information contained in documents into clearly defined thematic categories based on requirements published in the 2016 CACREP Standards (2015) and recording the frequency of appearance in the documents.

A Microsoft® Excel spreadsheet was utilized to organize the data collected in the archival study. The spreadsheet contained the list of 2016 CACREP Standards being reviewed, a list of the individual programs in the study, and any other data deemed pertinent to the study by the researcher. Data collection for the archival portion of the study was conducted in three phases. First, a list of potential archival study websites was obtained from the CACREP directory and screened to meet the criteria explained earlier. Second, of those programs that met criteria, a review of the core documents for content that addressed the CACREP 2016 Standards were identified. The core online documents used were the University's catalog for Master's

level Counselor Education, the program's Master's level Counselor Education Handbook, and the Counselor Education Program's website. Content of the three core documents related to selected standards published by the 2016 CACREP Standards, as well as admissions criteria, minimum program requirements, and matriculation requirements were noted on the spreadsheet. Blanket statements relating to adherence to CACREP 2016 standards were not considered, only the actual policies and procedures were recognized. Third, any additional information regarding competencies scales and/or remediation processes was reviewed.

The documents for the archival study were pulled from the Internet between November 22, 2015 and January 24, 2016. To assist in the organization of the information, folders for each potential participating program were created on the computer. Downloadable documents were saved in their corresponding program's folder. If the document was only available for viewing online, a Microsoft® Word document was created that contained the hyperlink to the document. Each Microsoft® Word document was saved in the corresponding program's folder. The date of document retrieval was noted on the Microsoft® Excel spreadsheet under the corresponding program. For recordkeeping, it was also noted in the Microsoft® Excel spreadsheet when core documents were not located on the university/program's website. Programs where one, two, or all core documents could not be located were not used in the study.

### **Faculty survey of gatekeeping perceptions**

Counselor Education faculty were recruited to complete the survey via email. The email contained a short explanation of the study and a hyperlink to the online study which was housed on Qualtrics. Only faculty whose program documents were used in the archival analysis received a survey participation request. Once the counselor educators click on the hyperlink, the

first web page they viewed was a Consent Form that complied with IRB standards. If they agreed to participate, they clicked the *Yes. I will participate* button and were taken to the survey.

The survey statements were developed from reviewing the 2014 ACA Code of Ethics, the 2016 CACREP Standards, as well as conversations on gatekeeping practices with counselor education faculty at Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi. Recipients of the email were provided a two week window of time to complete the survey. Multiple action statements regarding gatekeeping policies and procedures were used to ascertain counselor educators' awareness and perceptions of their roles and duties as gatekeepers. Each statement contained three sub-statements with Likert scale responses. The first sub-statement asked for the respondent's belief on the level of the statement's importance. The second sub-statement asked for the respondent's perception of the amount of support received from his/her department/university in regards to the statement. The third sub-statement asked for the respondent's frequency of performing the action of the statement.

### **Data analysis procedure**

Analysis of data for the archival portion of the study continued throughout the research process. A Microsoft® Excel document was utilized to organize the data. Data collection for the archival portion of the study was conducted in three phases.

### **Thematic coding procedure**

First, the list of potential archival study websites was obtained from the CACREP online directory. The potential universities/programs were screened for those that met the participation criteria. Second, the initial coding involved a line-by-line review of the core documents. Words, phrases, and topics related to gatekeeping activities were highlighted, and notes were made. The coding in the content analysis involved classifying information contained in documents into

clearly defined thematic categories as they related to identified requirements outlined in the 2016 CACREP Standards (2015) and recording the extent they appear in the documents. Standards 1.M and 1.N of the 2016 CACREP Standards (2015) was used for coding consistency.

### **Survey data analysis procedure**

A hyperlink to the survey was distributed via email to 511 counselor educators of the 106 programs chosen for the archival portion of this study. Each statement and subsequent sub-statement responses were scored and treated as ordinal type data. Statements were analyzed as standalone and as they relate to each other. Each sub-statement was analyzed as it relates to the statement and was calculated as a whole to look at overall perceptions on beliefs, support, and participation.

### **Summary**

This chapter provided an introduction to the purpose of this study, as well as the research questions and in-depth explanation of participant selection; the research design; and the methodology implemented in this study. Chapter IV contains a comprehensive description of the findings obtained.

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **Study Results**

#### **Introduction**

This study approached data collection from two areas. The archival study focused on publically accessible documents from counselor education programs and their corresponding universities looking at the accessibility of specific standards published in the 2016 CACREP Standards (2015) and the consistency in which these gatekeeping policies and procedures were presented. The survey looked at counselor educator's awareness of gatekeeping activities, their participation in these activities, and the support they receive when performing these activities. These approaches provides a different perspective on gatekeeping and contributes to the growing knowledge on gatekeeping in counselor education.

#### **Archival Study**

A content analysis was conducted of the documents retrieved from universities' and counseling programs' websites. The coding in content analysis involved classifying information contained in documents into clearly defined thematic categories related to requirements published in the 2016 CAREP Standards (2015) and recording the frequency or absence of their appearance in the documents.

One hundred and six counselor education programs met the criteria to be included into the study. All 45 (100%) of the university catalogs contained admissions criteria, minimum program requirements, and matriculation requirements. The Master's level student handbook was the focus of the archival study as the 2016 CACREP Standards require accredited programs to include specific information be addressed. These specific requirements allowed the ability to ascertain consistency across programs. The Master's level student handbooks reviewed varied in

design, location accessed, terminology used, , as well as content. Only one student handbook referenced which CACREP Standard it was addressing. The adoption dates of Master’s level student handbooks ranged from 2011 to 2016. Three handbooks did not have an adoption date listed. The following are the 2016 CACREP standards used in coding and the results.

Section 1.M of the CACREP 2016 Standards states: “Before or at the beginning of the first term of enrollment of the academic unit, the program provides a new student orientation...” (p. 6).

**Table 1: 2016 CACREP Standard 1.M**

| 2016 CACREP Standard | Located |       |    |       |
|----------------------|---------|-------|----|-------|
|                      | Yes     |       | No |       |
| Section 1.M          | 13      | 12.3% | 93 | 87.7% |

The researcher was only able to find 13 (12.3%) programs that specifically addressed conducting new student orientation. Some of these included information on the date(s), time(s) and orientation agenda. There were inconsistencies in the location of the new student orientation information. Some programs included it on the program’s webpage and others included it in their student handbook.

Section 1.N of the CACREP 2016 Standards states: *The student handbook includes...*  
*(1) the mission statement of the academic unit and program objectives,*

**Table 2: 2016 CACREP Standard 1.N.1**

| 2016 CACREP Standard               | Located |       |    |       |
|------------------------------------|---------|-------|----|-------|
|                                    | Yes     |       | No |       |
| Section 1.N.1<br>Mission Statement | 95      | 12.3% | 11 | 10.4% |
| Section 1.N.1<br>Objectives        | 102     | 96.2% | 4  | 3.8%  |

Eleven handbooks (10.4%) did not contain a mission statement. However, seven of those handbooks did contain program objectives. Four (3.8%) of the 106 student handbooks reviewed

had neither a mission statement nor program objectives. All of the handbooks that contained mission statements, had an overarching mission statement and a majority of them had program specific mission statements as well.

*(2) information about professional counseling organizations, opportunities for professional involvement, and activities appropriate for students,*

**Table 3: 2016 CACREP Standard 1.N.2**

| 2016 CACREP Standard | Located |       |    |       |
|----------------------|---------|-------|----|-------|
|                      | Yes     |       | No |       |
|                      | 82      | 77.4% | 24 | 22.6% |

Twenty-four student handbooks (22.6%) did not contain any of this information. The other 82 (77.4%) contained information on their local Chi Sigma Iota chapter, as well as, information on the American Counseling Association (ACA), affiliate organizations of the ACA, and any local organizations.

*(3) matriculation requirements,*

**Table 4: 2016 CACREP Standard 1.N.3**

| 2016 CACREP Standard | Located |        |    |      |
|----------------------|---------|--------|----|------|
|                      | Yes     |        | No |      |
|                      | 106     | 100.0% | 0  | 0.0% |

All programs address matriculation requirements, however not all were addressed in the student handbook. Some programs had the matriculation requirements on their webpage and some referred the reader to the college webpage or the university's catalog.

*(4) expectations of students,*

**Table 5: 2016 CACREP Standard 1.N.4**



| 2016 CACREP Standard | Located |        |    |      |
|----------------------|---------|--------|----|------|
|                      | Yes     |        | No |      |
|                      | 106     | 100.0% | 0  | 0.0% |

All programs addressed expectations of students both academically and non-academically. The academic expectations were fairly standard across universities and programs. The non-academic expectations varied in the amount of specific detail in regards to their emotional and mental fitness/behavior. Most of the programs that contained more information on emotional and mental fitness/behavior included an expectation agreement for the student to sign that covered both academic and non-academic expectations.

*(5) academic appeal policy,*

**Table 6: 2016 CACREP Standard 1.N.5**

| 2016 CACREP Standard | Located |       |    |       |
|----------------------|---------|-------|----|-------|
|                      | Yes     |       | No |       |
|                      | 76      | 71.7% | 30 | 28.3% |

The researcher could not find an academic appeal policy in 30 (28.3%) of the student handbooks. Those that did include an academic appeal policy were fairly standard across programs/universities.

*(6) written endorsement policy explaining the procedures for recommending students for credentialing and employment, and...*

**Table 7: 2016 CACREP Standard 1.N.6**

| 2016 CACREP Standard | Located |       |    |       |
|----------------------|---------|-------|----|-------|
|                      | Yes     |       | No |       |
|                      | 72      | 67.9% | 34 | 32.1% |

The researcher located 72 (67.9%) program's written endorsement policies. However, some endorsement policies were listed on programs' websites as opposed to within the student handbooks.

(7) policy for student retention, remediation, and dismissal from the program (p. 6).

**Table 8: 2016 CACREP Standard 1.N.7**

| 2016 CACREP Standard | Located |       |    |       |
|----------------------|---------|-------|----|-------|
|                      | Yes     |       | No |       |
| Section 1.N.7        | 95      | 89.6% | 11 | 10.4% |

All but 11 (10.4%) student handbooks included their policy on student retention, remediation, and dismissal from the program. The researcher observed that of those 11, the majority also did not go into great detail on student non-academic expectations.

During the review process, additional documents related to gatekeeping activities were located in 20 programs' (18.9%) either as appendixes to the student handbook or posted on the program's webpage. These included:

- Evaluation and Retention Informed Consent Agreement
- Acknowledgement of Policies and Procedures Agreement
- Graduate Student Review and Evaluation
- Student Bi-Annual Review Process
- Adjudication Agreement
- Memos of Program Expectations
- Student Concern Report
- Samples of student evaluations
  - Learning Outcomes
  - Student Competency
  - Clinical Skills Checklist
  - Counselor Potential
  - Faculty Review of Student Performance

The appendixes listed may not be all inclusive as this list only reflects the information found during the coding process.

### **Gatekeeping Attitudinal Survey**

The survey was used to explore the attitudes of counselor educators toward gatekeeping as well as the barriers to their efforts to effectively carry out their gatekeeping responsibilities.

Of the 106 counselor education Master's level programs utilized for the archival study, 511 counselor educators were identified and invited to participate in the survey. The accuracy of identifying counselor education faculty was difficult on some university/program websites due to either a lack of clearly indicated access to their contact information or the faculty's affiliations were unclear. Twenty-one of the 511 invitees (4.1%) declined to participate. These opt out notifications were received via email directly from the invitees. Four hundred and forty-nine of invitees (87.9%) did not respond to the email or complete the survey. Forty-one of the invited counselor educators (8%) completed the survey.

Ninety-eight percent ( $n = 40$ ) of the participants were from public institutions and the other two percent ( $n = 1$ ) were from private. All participating programs were CACREP accredited at the time of the study. Other accreditations include:

- Council on Rehabilitation Education (CORE)
- Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)
- American Psychological Association (APA)
- State Accreditation
- Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS)
- Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC)

**Table 9: Enrollment of Participating Institutions**

| <b>Less than 1,000</b> | <b>1,000 to 5,000</b> | <b>5,000 to 10,000</b> | <b>10,000 to 15,000</b> | <b>15,000 to 20,000</b> | <b>20,000 to 25,000</b> | <b>25,000 to 30,000</b> | <b>30,000 to 35,000</b> | <b>35,000 to 40,000</b> | <b>40,000 +</b> |
|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| 0%                     | 2%                    | 2%                     | 17%                     | 7%                      | 24%                     | 17%                     | 10%                     | 5%                      | 15%             |

The participant's approximate enrollment of the institutions ranged from 1,000 to 40,000+ with the highest percentage (24%) ( $n = 10$ ) of them at 20,000 to 25,000.

**Table 10: Enrollment of Participating Departments**

| <b>Less than 100</b> | <b>100 - 150</b> | <b>150 - 200</b> | <b>200 - 250</b> | <b>250 - 300</b> | <b>300 - 350</b> | <b>350 - 400</b> | <b>400 +</b> |
|----------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------|
| 34%                  | 15%              | 12%              | 12%              | 10%              | 2%               | 7%               | 7%           |

The participant's approximate department enrollment ranged from less than 100 to 400+ with the highest percentage (34%) ( $n = 14$ ) of them less than 100.

**Table 11: Respondent's Position with University**

| <b>Assoc. Prof.</b> | <b>Part-time Lecturer</b> | <b>Adjunct Faculty /Prof.</b> | <b>Assist. Prof.</b> | <b>Depart. Chair</b> | <b>Lecturer</b> | <b>Professor</b> | <b>Instructor</b> | <b>Core Faculty</b> | <b>Visiting Assist. Prof.</b> | <b>Assoc. Dean / Assoc. Prof.</b> |
|---------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 22%                 | 2%                        | 10%                           | 32%                  | 5%                   | 2%              | 12%              | 7%                | 2%                  | 2%                            | 2%                                |

The highest percentage (32%) of the respondents ( $n = 13$ ) were Assistant Professors.

**Table 12: Tenure of Respondents**

| <b>Less than a</b> | <b>1 - 5 years</b> | <b>6 - 10 years</b> | <b>11 - 15 years</b> | <b>16 - 20 years</b> | <b>20 + years</b> |
|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| 17%                | 24%                | 17%                 | 20%                  | 7%                   | 15%               |

The highest percentage (24%) of the participants ( $n = 10$ ) have been counselor educators for one to five years, the second highest percentage (20%) ( $n = 8$ ) have been counselor educators for 11 to 15 years.

**Table 13: Location of Student Performance Discussions**

| <b>Formal gatekeeping committee</b> | <b>Specific faculty meeting with gatekeeping agenda</b> | <b>General faculty meeting</b> | <b>Other</b> |
|-------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|--------------|
| 10%                                 | 24%   | 46%                            | 20%          |

Respondents were asked: *Where are student performance concerns discussed?* Forty-six percent of respondents ( $n = 19$ ) indicated at general faculty meetings and 24% ( $n = 10$ ) indicating at specific faculty meetings with a gatekeeping agenda.

**Table 14: Current Member of a Formal Gatekeeping Committee?**

| <b>Yes</b> | <b>No</b> | <b>N/A</b> |
|------------|-----------|------------|
| 22%        | 37%       | 41%        |

Respondents were asked: *If there is a formal gatekeeping committee, are you a current member?* Twenty-two percent ( $n = 9$ ) indicated they were a current member of a formal gatekeeping committee.

**Table 15: Former Member of a Formal Gatekeeping Committee?**

| <b>Yes</b> | <b>No</b> | <b>N/A</b> |
|------------|-----------|------------|
| 27%        | 34%       | 39%        |

Respondents were asked: If not a current member, have you been a member of a formal gatekeeping committee? Twenty-seven percent ( $n = 11$ ) indicated they have been a member of a formal gatekeeping committee in the past.

**Table 16: Frequency of Formal Gatekeeping Committee Meetings**

| <b>Weekly</b> | <b>Monthly</b> | <b>Once a semester</b> | <b>Ad hoc</b> | <b>N/A</b> |
|---------------|----------------|------------------------|---------------|------------|
| 0%            | 2%             | 7%                     | 29%           | 61%        |

Respondents were asked: *If there is a formal gatekeeping committee, how often does it meet?* Twenty-nine percent ( $n = 12$ ) indicated their program's gatekeeping committee meets as needed. The majority (61%) of respondents ( $n = 25$ ) indicated their program does not have a formal gatekeeping committee.

**Table 17: Frequency of Gatekeeping on Agenda**

| <b>Weekly</b> | <b>Monthly</b> | <b>Once a semester</b> | <b>Ad hoc</b> | <b>N/A</b> |
|---------------|----------------|------------------------|---------------|------------|
| 12%           | 20%            | 7%                     | 12%           | 49%        |

Respondents were asked: *If there is not a formal gatekeeping committee, how often is there a meeting with gatekeeping as or on the agenda?* Twenty percent of respondents ( $n = 8$ ) indicated gatekeeping is discussed in department/program meetings.

## **Survey Results**

**Table 18: Awareness of the roles and expectations of counselor educators as educators (ACA Code of Ethics, 2014, Section F)**

| My belief in the level of importance that I should do/participate in this |    |       | The quality of support for doing this in my institution |    |       | How frequently I actually do/participate in this |    |       |
|---|----|-------|---|----|-------|--|----|-------|
| Very Important  | 33 | 80.5% | Outstanding   | 9  | 22.0% | Frequently                                       | 31 | 75.7% |
| Important   | 8  | 19.5% | Above Average   | 18 | 44.0% | Moderately                                       | 6  | 14.6% |
| Slightly Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Average   | 10 | 24.3% | Occasionally                                     | 3  | 7.3%  |
| Not Very Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Below Average   | 3  | 7.3%  | Rarely   | 1  | 2.4%  |
| Unimportant   | 0  | 0.0%  | Very Poor   | 1  | 2.4%  | Never  | 0  | 0.0%  |
| Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total  | 41 | 100%  |

Forty-one (100%) of counselor educators surveyed reported that awareness of their roles and expectations as counselor educators was important to very important, whereas 27 (66%) believed they received above average to outstanding support as counselor educators from their institution, and 31 (75.7%) were frequently aware of their roles and expectations as counselor educators.

**Table 19: Awareness of the roles and expectations of counselor educators as counselor-in-training supervisors (ACA Code of Ethics, 2014, Section F)**

| My belief in the level of importance that I should do/participate in this |    |       | The quality of support for doing this in my institution |    |       | How frequently I actually do/participate in this |    |       |
|---|----|-------|---|----|-------|--|----|-------|
| Very Important  | 34 | 82.9% | Outstanding   | 12 | 29.3% | Frequently                                       | 30 | 73.2% |
| Important   | 7  | 17.1% | Above Average   | 16 | 39.0% | Moderately                                       | 7  | 17.1% |
| Slightly Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Average   | 12 | 29.3% | Occasionally                                     | 3  | 7.3%  |
| Not Very Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Below Average   | 0  | 0.0%  | Rarely   | 1  | 2.4%  |
| Unimportant   | 0  | 0.0%  | Very Poor   | 1  | 2.4%  | Never  | 0  | 0.0%  |
| Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total  | 41 | 100%  |

Forty-one (100%) of counselor educators surveyed reported that awareness of their roles and expectations as supervisors was important to very important, whereas 28 (68.3%) believed they

receive above average to outstanding support as supervisors from their institution, and 30 (73.2%) of counselor educators participated as counselor-in training supervisors.

**Table 20: Awareness of the roles and expectations of counselor educators as gatekeepers for the counseling profession (ACA Code of Ethics, 2014, Section F)**

| My belief in the level of importance that I should do/participate in this |    |       | The quality of support for doing this in my institution |    |       | How frequently I actually do/participate in this |    |       |
|---|----|-------|---|----|-------|--|----|-------|
| Very Important  | 36 | 87.8% | Outstanding   | 11 | 26.8% | Frequently                                       | 26 | 63.4% |
| Important   | 4  | 9.8%  | Above Average   | 14 | 34.2% | Moderately                                       | 11 | 26.8% |
| Slightly Important  | 1  | 2.4%  | Average   | 11 | 26.8% | Occasionally                                     | 4  | 9.8%  |
| Not Very Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Below Average   | 4  | 9.8%  | Rarely   | 0  | 0.0%  |
| Unimportant   | 0  | 0.0%  | Very Poor   | 1  | 2.4%  | Never  | 0  | 0.0%  |
| Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total  | 41 | 100%  |

Forty (97.6%) of counselor educators surveyed believed that awareness of their roles and expectations as gatekeepers for the counseling profession was important to very important, whereas 25 (61%) felt the support they received from their institution as gatekeepers to the counseling profession was above average to outstanding, and 26 (63.4%) participated frequently as gatekeepers for the counseling profession.

**Table 21: Stay abreast with best practices in counselor education as they pertain to providing education, supervision, and gatekeeping**



| My belief in the level of importance that I should do/participate in this |    |       | The quality of support for doing this in my institution |    |       | How frequently I actually do/participate in this |    |       |
|---|----|-------|---|----|-------|--|----|-------|
| Very Important  | 33 | 80.5% | Outstanding   | 13 | 31.7% | Frequently                                       | 25 | 61.0% |
| Important   | 8  | 19.5% | Above Average   | 12 | 29.3% | Moderately                                       | 11 | 26.8% |
| Slightly Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Average   | 14 | 34.1% | Occasionally                                     | 5  | 12.2% |
| Not Very Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Below Average   | 2  | 4.9%  | Rarely   | 0  | 0.0%  |
| Unimportant   | 0  | 0.0%  | Very Poor   | 0  | 0.0%  | Never  | 0  | 0.0%  |
| Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total  | 41 | 100%  |

Forty-one (100%) of counselor educators surveyed believed it was important to very important for them to stay abreast with the best practices in counselor education as they pertained to providing education, supervision, and gatekeeping, whereas 25 (61%) felt their institutions support was above average to outstanding for this activity, and 25 (61%) indicated they frequently stayed abreast with best practices in counselor education as it pertained to providing education, supervision, and gatekeeping.

**Table 22: Awareness of expectations to protect the reputation of the counseling profession**

| My belief in the level of importance that I should do/participate in this |    |       | The quality of support for doing this in my institution |    |       | How frequently I actually do/participate in this |    |       |
|---|----|-------|---|----|-------|--|----|-------|
| Very Important  | 30 | 73.2% | Outstanding   | 10 | 24.4% | Frequently                                       | 25 | 61.0% |
| Important   | 10 | 24.4% | Above Average   | 14 | 34.2% | Moderately                                       | 7  | 17.0% |
| Slightly Important  | 1  | 2.4%  | Average   | 15 | 36.6% | Occasionally                                     | 9  | 22.0% |
| Not Very Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Below Average   | 1  | 2.4%  | Rarely   | 0  | 0.0%  |
| Unimportant   | 0  | 0.0%  | Very Poor   | 1  | 2.4%  | Never  | 0  | 0.0%  |
| Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total  | 41 | 100%  |

Forty-one (100%) of counselor educators surveyed believed it was important to very important to be aware of the expectations to protect the reputation of the counseling profession, whereas 24

(58.6%) felt the quality of support they received to perform this activity was above average to outstanding, and 25 (61%) indicated that they were frequently aware of the expectations to protect the reputation of the counseling profession.

**Table 23: Awareness of expectations to protect the public**

| My belief in the level of importance that I should do/participate in this |    |       | The quality of support for doing this in my institution |    |       | How frequently I actually do/participate in this |    |       |
|---|----|-------|---|----|-------|--|----|-------|
| Very Important  | 37 | 90.3% | Outstanding   | 11 | 26.8% | Frequently                                       | 24 | 58.6% |
| Important   | 3  | 7.3%  | Above Average   | 14 | 34.2% | Moderately                                       | 11 | 26.8% |
| Slightly Important  | 1  | 2.4%  | Average   | 13 | 31.7% | Occasionally                                     | 5  | 12.2% |
| Not Very Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Below Average   | 2  | 4.9%  | Rarely   | 1  | 2.4%  |
| Unimportant   | 0  | 0.0%  | Very Poor   | 1  | 2.4%  | Never  | 0  | 0.0%  |
| Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total  | 41 | 100%  |

Forty (97.6%) of counselor educators surveyed believed it was important to very important to be aware of the expectations to protect the public, whereas 25 (61%) felt their institution's support was above average to outstanding for them to perform this activity, and 24 (58.6%) indicated that they were frequently aware of the expectations to protect the public.

**Table 24: Development of counselor-in-training performance assessments and program policies (CACREP 2016 Standards, Section 1.N)**

| My belief in the level of importance that I should do/participate in this |    |       | The quality of support for doing this in my institution |    |       | How frequently I actually do/participate in this |    |       |
|---|----|-------|---|----|-------|--|----|-------|
| Very Important  | 19 | 46.3% | Outstanding   | 11 | 26.8% | Frequently                                       | 15 | 36.6% |
| Important   | 20 | 48.8% | Above Average   | 17 | 41.5% | Moderately                                       | 14 | 34.2% |
| Slightly Important  | 2  | 4.9%  | Average   | 10 | 24.4% | Occasionally                                     | 11 | 26.8% |
| Not Very Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Below Average   | 2  | 4.9%  | Rarely   | 1  | 2.4%  |
| Unimportant   | 0  | 0.0%  | Very Poor   | 1  | 2.4%  | Never  | 0  | 0.0%  |
| Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total  | 41 | 100%  |

Thirty-nine (95.1%) of the counselor educators surveyed believed it was important to very important to develop counselor-in-training performance assessments and program policies, whereas 28 (68.3%) felt the quality of support from their institution was above average to outstanding for this activities, and 15 (36.6%) indicated that they frequently participated in the development of counselor-in-training performance assessments and program policies.

**Table 25: Conduct needs assessments in order to ascertain the effectiveness of the program in meeting goals (CACREP 2016 Standards, Section F Introduction)**

| My belief in the level of importance that I should do/participate in this |    |       | The quality of support for doing this in my institution |    |       | How frequently I actually do/participate in this |    |       |
|---|----|-------|---|----|-------|--|----|-------|
| Very Important  | 17 | 41.4% | Outstanding   | 7  | 17.1% | Frequently                                       | 10 | 24.4% |
| Important   | 22 | 53.7% | Above Average   | 14 | 34.1% | Moderately                                       | 7  | 17.1% |
| Slightly Important  | 2  | 4.9%  | Average   | 12 | 29.3% | Occasionally                                     | 14 | 34.1% |
| Not Very Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Below Average   | 7  | 17.1% | Rarely   | 8  | 19.5% |
| Unimportant   | 0  | 0.0%  | Very Poor   | 1  | 2.4%  | Never  | 2  | 4.9%  |
| Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total  | 41 | 100%  |

Thirty-nine (95.1%) of counselor educators surveyed believed it was important to very important to conduct needs assessments in order to ascertain the effectiveness of the program in meeting goals, whereas 21 (51.2%) felt they received above average to outstanding support from their

institution to perform these activities, and 10 (24%) indicated that they frequently participated in conducting needs assessments in order to ascertain the effectiveness of the program in meeting goals.

**Table 26: *Ensure that department/university policies and procedures are consistently applied and consistent with current accepted practices***

| My belief in the level of importance that I should do/participate in this |    |       | The quality of support for doing this in my institution |    |       | How frequently I actually do/participate in this |    |       |
|---|----|-------|---|----|-------|--|----|-------|
| Very Important  | 23 | 56.1% | Outstanding   | 10 | 24.4% | Frequently                                       | 18 | 43.9% |
| Important   | 16 | 39.0% | Above Average   | 16 | 39.0% | Moderately                                       | 13 | 31.7% |
| Slightly Important  | 2  | 4.9%  | Average   | 11 | 26.9% | Occasionally                                     | 9  | 22.0% |
| Not Very Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Below Average   | 3  | 7.3%  | Rarely   | 1  | 2.4%  |
| Unimportant   | 0  | 0.0%  | Very Poor   | 1  | 2.4%  | Never  | 0  | 0.0%  |
| Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total  | 41 | 100%  |

Thirty-nine (95.1%) of counselor educators surveyed believed it was important to very important to ensure that department/university policies and procedures are consistently applied and consistent with current accepted practices, whereas 26 (63.4%) felt they received above average to outstanding support to perform these activities, and 18 (43.9%) indicated that they frequently ensured that department/university policies and procedures are consistently applied and consistent with current accepted practices.

**Table 27: *The graduation of students who are adequately prepared in their knowledge, skills, and disposition for entry into the counseling profession***

| My belief in the level of importance that I should do/participate in this |    |       | The quality of support for doing this in my institution |    |       | How frequently I actually do/participate in this |    |       |
|---|----|-------|---|----|-------|--|----|-------|
| Very Important  | 40 | 97.6% | Outstanding   | 15 | 36.6% | Frequently                                       | 31 | 75.7% |
| Important   | 1  | 2.4%  | Above Average   | 11 | 26.8% | Moderately                                       | 8  | 19.5% |
| Slightly Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Average   | 12 | 29.3% | Occasionally                                     | 1  | 2.4%  |
| Not Very Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Below Average   | 2  | 4.9%  | Rarely   | 1  | 2.4%  |
| Unimportant   | 0  | 0.0%  | Very Poor   | 1  | 2.4%  | Never  | 0  | 0.0%  |
| Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total  | 41 | 100%  |

Forty-one (100%) of counselor educators surveyed believed the graduation of students who were adequately prepared in their knowledge, skills, and disposition for entry into the counseling profession was important to very important, whereas 26 (63.4%) felt they received above average to outstanding support for graduating students who are adequately prepared in their knowledge, skills, and disposition for entry into the counseling profession, and 31 (75.7%) indicated that they frequently graduated students who are adequately prepared in their knowledge, skills, and disposition for entry into the counseling profession.

**Table 28: Assess potential students for their ability to meet professional competencies prior to acceptance into the program (CACREP 2016 Standards, Section 1.L)**

| My belief in the level of importance that I should do/participate in this |    |       | The quality of support for doing this in my institution |    |       | How frequently I actually do/participate in this |    |       |
|---|----|-------|---|----|-------|--|----|-------|
| Very Important  | 32 | 78.0% | Outstanding   | 12 | 29.3% | Frequently                                       | 19 | 46.3% |
| Important   | 9  | 22.0% | Above Average   | 12 | 29.3% | Moderately                                       | 9  | 22.0% |
| Slightly Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Average   | 9  | 22.0% | Occasionally                                     | 6  | 14.6% |
| Not Very Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Below Average   | 4  | 9.7%  | Rarely   | 2  | 4.9%  |
| Unimportant   | 0  | 0.0%  | Very Poor   | 4  | 9.7%  | Never  | 5  | 12.2% |
| Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total  | 41 | 100%  |

Forty-one (100%) of counselor educators surveyed believed that it was important to very important to assess potential students for their ability to meet professional competencies prior to acceptance into the program, whereas 24 (58.6%) felt they received above average to outstanding support from their institutions for this activity, and 19 (46.3%) indicated that they frequently assessed potential students for their ability to meet professional competencies prior to acceptance into the program.

**Table 29: Intervene with potential counseling students to not allow entry of those students who exhibit characteristics and/or behaviors that would result in their inability to meet professional competencies**

| My belief in the level of importance that I should do/participate in this |    |       | The quality of support for doing this in my institution |    |       | How frequently I actually do/participate in this |    |       |
|---|----|-------|---|----|-------|--|----|-------|
| Very Important  | 35 | 85.4% | Outstanding   | 12 | 29.3% | Frequently                                       | 16 | 39.0% |
| Important   | 6  | 14.6% | Above Average   | 12 | 29.3% | Moderately                                       | 9  | 21.9% |
| Slightly Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Average   | 8  | 19.5% | Occasionally                                     | 7  | 17.1% |
| Not Very Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Below Average   | 6  | 14.6% | Rarely   | 5  | 12.2% |
| Unimportant   | 0  | 0.0%  | Very Poor   | 3  | 7.3%  | Never  | 4  | 9.8%  |
| Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total  | 41 | 100%  |

Forty-one (100%) of counselor educators surveyed believed it to be important to very important to intervene with potential counseling students to not allow entry of those students who exhibit

characteristics and/or behaviors that would result in their inability to meet professional competencies, whereas 24 (58.6%) felt the support from their institution was above average to outstanding to perform this activity, and 16 (39%) indicated that they frequently intervened with potential counseling students to not allow entry of those students who exhibit characteristics and/or behaviors that would result in their inability to meet professional competencies.

**Table 30: Facilitate department/program based new student orientation (CACREP 2016 Standards, Section 1.N)**

| My belief in the level of importance that I should do/participate in this |    |       | The quality of support for doing this in my institution |    |       | How frequently I actually do/participate in this |    |       |
|---|----|-------|---|----|-------|--|----|-------|
| Very Important  | 21 | 51.3% | Outstanding   | 10 | 24.3% | Frequently                                       | 18 | 43.8% |
| Important   | 19 | 46.3% | Above Average   | 17 | 41.5% | Moderately                                       | 7  | 17.1% |
| Slightly Important  | 1  | 2.4%  | Average   | 12 | 29.3% | Occasionally                                     | 9  | 22.0% |
| Not Very Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Below Average   | 0  | 0.0%  | Rarely   | 3  | 7.3%  |
| Unimportant   | 0  | 0.0%  | Very Poor   | 2  | 4.9%  | Never  | 4  | 9.8%  |
| Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total  | 41 | 100%  |

Forty (97.6%) of counselor educators surveyed believed facilitating department/program based new student orientation was important to very important, whereas 27 (65.8%) felt their institution's support was above average to outstanding to perform this activity, and 18 (43.8%) indicated that they frequently participated in the facilitation of department/program based new student orientation.

**Table 31: Provide transparency of the program's performance expectation (CACREP 2016 Standards, Section 1.M)**

| My belief in the level of importance that I should do/participate in this |    |       | The quality of support for doing this in my institution |    |       | How frequently I actually do/participate in this |    |       |
|---|----|-------|---|----|-------|--|----|-------|
| Very Important  | 32 | 78.0% | Outstanding   | 17 | 41.5% | Frequently                                       | 25 | 61.0% |
| Important   | 9  | 22.0% | Above Average   | 9  | 22.0% | Moderately                                       | 8  | 19.5% |
| Slightly Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Average   | 13 | 31.7% | Occasionally                                     | 6  | 14.6% |
| Not Very Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Below Average   | 1  | 2.4%  | Rarely   | 0  | 0.0%  |
| Unimportant   | 0  | 0.0%  | Very Poor   | 1  | 2.4%  | Never  | 2  | 4.9%  |
| Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total  | 41 | 100%  |

Forty-one (100%) of counselor educators surveyed believed it was important to very important to provide transparency of the program's performance expectation, whereas 26 (63.5%) felt their institution support was above average to outstanding to perform this activity, and 25 (61%) indicated that they frequently participated in providing transparency of the program's performance expectation

**Table 32: *Provide a student handbook that contains specific programmatic training goals and objectives, as well as the retention policy that explains the procedures for student remediation and/or dismissal from the program and the academic appeal policy (CACREP 2016 Standards, Section 1.N)***

| My belief in the level of importance that I should do/participate in this |    |       | The quality of support for doing this in my institution |    |       | How frequently I actually do/participate in this |    |       |
|---|----|-------|---|----|-------|--|----|-------|
| Very Important  | 34 | 82.9% | Outstanding   | 15 | 36.6% | Frequently                                       | 19 | 46.3% |
| Important   | 7  | 17.1% | Above Average   | 15 | 36.6% | Moderately                                       | 8  | 19.5% |
| Slightly Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Average   | 8  | 19.5% | Occasionally                                     | 9  | 22.0% |
| Not Very Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Below Average   | 2  | 4.9%  | Rarely   | 3  | 7.3%  |
| Unimportant   | 0  | 0.0%  | Very Poor   | 1  | 2.4%  | Never  | 2  | 4.9%  |
| Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total  | 41 | 100%  |

Forty-one (100%) of counselor educators surveyed believed it was important to very important to provide a student handbook that contained specific programmatic training goals and objectives,



as well as the retention policy that explained the procedures for student remediation and/or dismissal from the program and the academic appeal policy, whereas 30 (73.2%) felt they received above average to outstanding support from their institution to perform this activity, and 19 (46.3%) indicated that they frequently provided a student handbook that contained specific programmatic training goals and objectives, as well as the retention policy that explained the procedures for student remediation and/or dismissal from the program and the academic appeal policy.

**Table 33: *Verbally review the specific training goals and objectives they will be evaluated on, as well as the policies and procedures these evaluations are based upon***

| My belief in the level of importance that I should do/participate in this |    |       | The quality of support for doing this in my institution |    |       | How frequently I actually do/participate in this |    |       |
|---|----|-------|---|----|-------|--|----|-------|
| Very Important  | 25 | 61.0% | Outstanding   | 8  | 19.5% | Frequently                                       | 18 | 43.9% |
| Important   | 14 | 34.1% | Above Average   | 19 | 46.4% | Moderately                                       | 12 | 29.3% |
| Slightly Important  | 2  | 4.9%  | Average   | 12 | 29.3% | Occasionally                                     | 7  | 17.1% |
| Not Very Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Below Average   | 1  | 2.4%  | Rarely   | 3  | 7.3%  |
| Unimportant   | 0  | 0.0%  | Very Poor   | 1  | 2.4%  | Never  | 1  | 2.4%  |
| Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total  | 41 | 100%  |

Thirty-nine (95.1%) of counselor educators surveyed believed it was important to very important to verbally review the specific training goals and objectives they will be evaluated on, as well as the policies and procedures these evaluations are based upon, whereas 27 (65.9%) felt they received above average to outstanding support from their institutions to perform this activity, and 18 (43.9%) indicated that they frequently provided a verbal review the specific training goals and objectives they will be evaluated on, as well as the policies and procedures these evaluations are based upon

**Table 34: *Verbally review the retention policy and explain procedures for student remediation and/or dismissal from the program, as well as the academic appeal policy***

| My belief in the level of importance that I should do/participate in this |    |       | The quality of support for doing this in my institution |    |       | How frequently I actually do/participate in this |    |       |
|---|----|-------|---|----|-------|--|----|-------|
| Very Important  | 22 | 53.6% | Outstanding   | 10 | 24.4% | Frequently                                       | 16 | 39.0% |
| Important   | 17 | 41.5% | Above Average   | 12 | 29.3% | Moderately                                       | 8  | 19.5% |
| Slightly Important  | 2  | 4.9%  | Average   | 15 | 36.6% | Occasionally                                     | 10 | 24.4% |
| Not Very Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Below Average   | 3  | 7.3%  | Rarely   | 5  | 12.2% |
| Unimportant   | 0  | 0.0%  | Very Poor   | 1  | 2.4%  | Never  | 2  | 4.9%  |
| Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total  | 41 | 100%  |

Thirty-nine (95.1%) of counselor educators surveyed believed it was important to very important to verbally review the retention policy and explain procedures for student remediation and/or dismissal from the program, as well as the academic appeal policy, whereas 22 (53.7%) felt they received above average to outstanding support from their institution to perform this activity, and 16 (39%) indicated that they frequently participated in providing a verbal review of the retention policy and explained procedures for student remediation and/or dismissal from the program, as well as the academic appeal policy.

**Table 35: *Incorporate gatekeeping awareness into academic course work***

| My belief in the level of importance that I should do/participate in this |    |       | The quality of support for doing this in my institution |    |       | How frequently I actually do/participate in this |    |       |
|---|----|-------|---|----|-------|--|----|-------|
| Very Important  | 25 | 61.0% | Outstanding   | 10 | 24.4% | Frequently                                       | 22 | 53.7% |
| Important   | 15 | 36.6% | Above Average   | 18 | 43.9% | Moderately                                       | 12 | 29.3% |
| Slightly Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Average   | 10 | 24.4% | Occasionally                                     | 5  | 12.2% |
| Not Very Important  | 1  | 2.4%  | Below Average   | 3  | 7.3%  | Rarely   | 1  | 2.4%  |
| Unimportant   | 0  | 0.0%  | Very Poor   | 0  | 0.0%  | Never  | 1  | 2.4%  |
| Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total  | 41 | 100%  |

Forty (97.6%) of counselor educators surveyed believed it was important to very important to incorporate gatekeeping awareness into academic course work, whereas 28 (68.3%) felt they received above average to outstanding support from their institutions to perform this activity, and 22 (53.7%) indicated that they frequently incorporate gatekeeping awareness into their academic course work.

**Table 36: *Facilitate class discussion on gatekeeping awareness***

| My belief in the level of importance that I should do/participate in this |    |       | The quality of support for doing this in my institution |    |       | How frequently I actually do/participate in this |    |       |
|---|----|-------|---|----|-------|--|----|-------|
| Very Important  | 21 | 51.2% | Outstanding   | 6  | 14.6% | Frequently                                       | 13 | 31.7% |
| Important   | 17 | 41.5% | Above Average   | 16 | 39.0% | Moderately                                       | 15 | 36.6% |
| Slightly Important  | 2  | 4.9%  | Average   | 17 | 41.5% | Occasionally                                     | 10 | 24.4% |
| Not Very Important  | 1  | 2.4%  | Below Average   | 2  | 4.9%  | Rarely   | 3  | 7.3%  |
| Unimportant   | 0  | 0.0%  | Very Poor   | 0  | 0.0%  | Never  | 0  | 0.0%  |
| Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total  | 41 | 100%  |

Thirty-eight (92.7%) of counselor educators surveyed believed it was important to very important to facilitate class discussion on gatekeeping awareness, whereas 22 (53.6%) felt their

institution's provided above average to outstanding support to perform this activity, and 13 (31.7%) indicated that they frequently facilitated class discussion on gatekeeping awareness.

**Table 37: Document personal and emotional issues experiences by counselors-in-training**

| My belief in the level of importance that I should do/participate in this |    |       | The quality of support for doing this in my institution |    |       | How frequently I actually do/participate in this |    |       |
|---|----|-------|---|----|-------|--|----|-------|
| Very Important  | 21 | 51.2% | Outstanding   | 8  | 19.5% | Frequently                                       | 13 | 31.7% |
| Important   | 13 | 31.7% | Above Average   | 16 | 39.0% | Moderately                                       | 13 | 31.7% |
| Slightly Important  | 7  | 17.1% | Average   | 10 | 24.4% | Occasionally                                     | 7  | 17.1% |
| Not Very Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Below Average   | 7  | 17.1% | Rarely   | 6  | 14.6% |
| Unimportant   | 0  | 0.0%  | Very Poor   | 0  | 0.0%  | Never  | 2  | 4.9%  |
| Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total  | 41 | 100%  |

Thirty-four (82.9%) of counselor educators surveyed believed it was important to very important that they document personal and emotional issues experiences by counselors-in-training, whereas 24 (58.5%) felt they received above average to outstanding support from their institutions to perform these activities, and 13 (31.7%) indicated that they frequently documented personal and emotional issues experiences by counselors-in-training.

**Table 38: Address specific issue(s)/deficiencies with counselors-in-training**

| My belief in the level of importance that I should do/participate in this |    |       | The quality of support for doing this in my institution |    |       | How frequently I actually do/participate in this |    |       |
|---|----|-------|---|----|-------|--|----|-------|
| Very Important  | 33 | 80.5% | Outstanding   | 15 | 36.6% | Frequently                                       | 20 | 48.8% |
| Important   | 8  | 19.5% | Above Average   | 14 | 34.1% | Moderately                                       | 15 | 36.6% |
| Slightly Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Average   | 10 | 24.4% | Occasionally                                     | 5  | 12.2% |
| Not Very Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Below Average   | 2  | 4.9%  | Rarely   | 1  | 2.4%  |
| Unimportant   | 0  | 0.0%  | Very Poor   | 0  | 0.0%  | Never  | 0  | 0.0%  |
| Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total  | 41 | 100%  |

Forty-one (100%) of counselor educators surveyed believed it was important to very important to address specific issue(s)/deficiencies with counselors-in-training, whereas 29 (70.7%) felt they received above average to outstanding support from their institutions to perform this activity, and 20 (48.8%) indicated that they frequently addressed specific issue(s)/deficiencies with counselors-in-training.

**Table 39: *Provide counselors-in-training with specific expectations for improvement***

| My belief in the level of importance that I should do/participate in this |    |       | The quality of support for doing this in my institution |    |       | How frequently I actually do/participate in this |    |       |
|---|----|-------|---|----|-------|--|----|-------|
| Very Important  | 36 | 87.8% | Outstanding   | 13 | 31.7% | Frequently                                       | 23 | 56.1% |
| Important   | 4  | 9.8%  | Above Average   | 13 | 31.7% | Moderately                                       | 14 | 34.1% |
| Slightly Important  | 1  | 2.4%  | Average   | 13 | 31.7% | Occasionally                                     | 4  | 9.8%  |
| Not Very Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Below Average   | 2  | 4.9%  | Rarely   | 0  | 0.0%  |
| Unimportant   | 0  | 0.0%  | Very Poor   | 0  | 0.0%  | Never  | 0  | 0.0%  |
| Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total  | 41 | 100%  |

Forty (97.6%) of counselor educators surveyed believed it was important to very important to provide counselors-in-training with specific expectations for improvement, whereas 26 (63.4%) felt they received above average to outstanding support from their institutions to perform this activity, and 23 (56.1%) indicated that they frequently provided counselors-in-training with specific expectations for improvement.

**Table 40: Supervise the counselors-in-training during practicum and internship in order to protect the welfare of their clients (ACA Code of Ethics, 2014, F.1.a)**

| My belief in the level of importance that I should do/participate in this |    |       | The quality of support for doing this in my institution |    |       | How frequently I actually do/participate in this |    |       |
|---|----|-------|---|----|-------|--|----|-------|
| Very Important  | 37 | 90.2% | Outstanding   | 20 | 48.8% | Frequently                                       | 28 | 68.4% |
| Important   | 4  | 9.8%  | Above Average   | 12 | 29.3% | Moderately                                       | 3  | 7.3%  |
| Slightly Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Average   | 8  | 19.5% | Occasionally                                     | 6  | 14.6% |
| Not Very Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Below Average   | 1  | 2.4%  | Rarely   | 3  | 7.3%  |
| Unimportant   | 0  | 0.0%  | Very Poor   | 0  | 0.0%  | Never  | 1  | 2.4%  |
| Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total  | 41 | 100%  |

Forty-one (100%) of counselor educators surveyed believed it was important to very important to supervise the counselors-in-training during practicum and internship in order to protect the welfare of their clients, whereas 32 (78.1%) felt they received above average to outstanding support from their institutions to perform this activity, and 28 (68.4%) indicated that they frequently supervised counselors-in-training during practicum and internship in order to protect the welfare of their clients.

**Table 41: Be vigilant and attentive to counselors-in-training impediments that may develop and respond accordingly**

| My belief in the level of importance that I should do/participate in this |    |       | The quality of support for doing this in my institution |    |       | How frequently I actually do/participate in this |    |       |
|---|----|-------|---|----|-------|--|----|-------|
| Very Important  | 32 | 78.0% | Outstanding   | 13 | 31.7% | Frequently                                       | 19 | 46.4% |
| Important   | 9  | 22.0% | Above Average   | 14 | 34.2% | Moderately                                       | 18 | 43.9% |
| Slightly Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Average   | 11 | 26.8% | Occasionally                                     | 3  | 7.3%  |
| Not Very Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Below Average   | 3  | 7.3%  | Rarely   | 0  | 0.0%  |
| Unimportant   | 0  | 0.0%  | Very Poor   | 0  | 0.0%  | Never  | 1  | 2.4%  |
| Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total  | 41 | 100%  |

Forty-one (100%) of counselor educators surveyed believed it was important to very important to be vigilant and attentive to counselors-in-training impediments that may develop and respond accordingly, whereas 27 (65.9%) felt their institutions provided above average to outstanding support to perform these activities, and 19 (46.4%) indicated that they were frequently vigilant and attentive to counselors-in-training impediments that may develop and responded accordingly.

**Table 42: *Meet regularly with faculty to discuss counselors-in-training who are experiencing personal, academic or professional issues***

| My belief in the level of importance that I should do/participate in this |    |       | The quality of support for doing this in my institution |    |       | How frequently I actually do/participate in this |    |       |
|---|----|-------|---|----|-------|--|----|-------|
| Very Important  | 31 | 75.6% | Outstanding   | 17 | 41.4% | Frequently                                       | 20 | 48.8% |
| Important   | 9  | 22.0% | Above Average   | 7  | 17.1% | Moderately                                       | 10 | 24.4% |
| Slightly Important  | 1  | 2.4%  | Average   | 8  | 19.5% | Occasionally                                     | 8  | 19.5% |
| Not Very Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Below Average   | 7  | 17.1% | Rarely   | 2  | 4.9%  |
| Unimportant   | 0  | 0.0%  | Very Poor   | 2  | 4.9%  | Never  | 1  | 2.4%  |
| Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total  | 41 | 100%  |

Forty (97.6%) of counselor educators surveyed believed it was important to very important to meet regularly with faculty to discuss counselors-in-training who experience personal, academic or professional issues, whereas 24 (58.5%) felt they received above average to outstanding support from their institutions to perform this activity, and 20 (48.8%) indicated that they frequently meet regularly with faculty to discuss counselors-in-training who experience personal, academic or professional issues.

**Table 43: Provide transparency of the process and expectations of remediation**

| My belief in the level of importance that I should do/participate in this |    |       | The quality of support for doing this in my institution |    |       | How frequently I actually do/participate in this |    |       |
|---|----|-------|---|----|-------|--|----|-------|
| Very Important  | 31 | 75.6% | Outstanding   | 13 | 31.7% | Frequently                                       | 17 | 41.5% |
| Important   | 9  | 22.0% | Above Average   | 10 | 24.4% | Moderately                                       | 13 | 31.7% |
| Slightly Important  | 1  | 2.4%  | Average   | 15 | 36.6% | Occasionally                                     | 7  | 17.1% |
| Not Very Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Below Average   | 2  | 4.9%  | Rarely   | 3  | 7.3%  |
| Unimportant   | 0  | 0.0%  | Very Poor   | 1  | 2.4%  | Never  | 1  | 2.4%  |
| Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total  | 41 | 100%  |

Forty (97.6%) of counselor educators surveyed believed it was important to very important to provide transparency of the process and expectations of remediation, whereas 23 (56.1%) felt they received above average to outstanding support from their institution to perform this activity, and 17 (41.5%) indicated that they frequently provided transparency of the process and expectations of remediation.

**Table 44: Evaluate the outcome of remediation to determine the success of the plan**

| My belief in the level of importance that I should do/participate in this |    |       | The quality of support for doing this in my institution |    |       | How frequently I actually do/participate in this |    |       |
|---|----|-------|---|----|-------|--|----|-------|
| Very Important  | 29 | 70.7% | Outstanding   | 14 | 34.1% | Frequently                                       | 10 | 24.4% |
| Important   | 12 | 29.3% | Above Average   | 9  | 22.0% | Moderately                                       | 14 | 34.1% |
| Slightly Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Average   | 13 | 31.7% | Occasionally                                     | 6  | 14.6% |
| Not Very Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Below Average   | 4  | 9.8%  | Rarely   | 7  | 17.1% |
| Unimportant   | 0  | 0.0%  | Very Poor   | 1  | 2.4%  | Never  | 4  | 9.8%  |
| Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total  | 41 | 100%  |

Forty-one (100%) of counselor educators surveyed believed it was important to very important to evaluate the outcome of remediation to determine the success of the plan, whereas 23 (56.1%)



felt they receive above average to outstanding support from their institution to perform this activity, and 10 (24.4%) indicated that they frequently evaluated the outcome of remediation to determine the success of the plan.

**Table 45: Assist counselors-in-training in securing remedial assistance when needed (ACA Code of Ethics, 2014, Section F.9.b.1)**

| My belief in the level of importance that I should do/participate in this |    |       | The quality of support for doing this in my institution |    |       | How frequently I actually do/participate in this |    |       |
|---|----|-------|---|----|-------|--|----|-------|
| Very Important  | 28 | 68.3% | Outstanding   | 8  | 19.4% | Frequently                                       | 13 | 31.8% |
| Important   | 12 | 29.3% | Above Average   | 13 | 31.8% | Moderately                                       | 12 | 29.3% |
| Slightly Important  | 1  | 2.4%  | Average   | 16 | 39.0% | Occasionally                                     | 12 | 29.3% |
| Not Very Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Below Average   | 4  | 9.8%  | Rarely   | 2  | 4.9%  |
| Unimportant   | 0  | 0.0%  | Very Poor   | 0  | 0.0%  | Never  | 2  | 4.9%  |
| Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total  | 41 | 100%  |

Forty (97.6%) of counselor educators surveyed believed it was important to very important to assist counselors-in-training in securing remedial assistance when needed, whereas 21 (51.2%) felt they received above average to outstanding support from their institutions to perform this activity, and 13 (31.8%) indicated that they frequently assisted counselors-in-training in securing remedial assistance when needed.

**Table 46: Document the decisions to dismiss or refer counselors-in-training for assistance (ACA Code of Ethics, 2014, F.5.b)**

| My belief in the level of importance that I should do/participate in this |    |       | The quality of support for doing this in my institution |    |       | How frequently I actually do/participate in this |    |       |
|---|----|-------|---|----|-------|--|----|-------|
| Very Important  | 28 | 68.3% | Outstanding   | 16 | 39.0% | Frequently                                       | 14 | 34.1% |
| Important   | 12 | 29.3% | Above Average   | 10 | 24.4% | Moderately                                       | 10 | 24.4% |
| Slightly Important  | 1  | 2.4%  | Average   | 12 | 29.3% | Occasionally                                     | 7  | 17.1% |
| Not Very Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Below Average   | 3  | 7.3%  | Rarely   | 7  | 17.1% |
| Unimportant   | 0  | 0.0%  | Very Poor   | 0  | 0.0%  | Never  | 3  | 7.3%  |
| Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total  | 41 | 100%  |

Forty (97.6%) of counselor educators surveyed believed it was important to very important to document the decisions to dismiss or refer counselors-in-training for assistance, whereas 26 (63.4%) felt they received above average to outstanding support from their institutions to perform this activity, and 14 (34.1%) indicated that they frequently documented the decisions to dismiss or refer counselors-in-training for assistance.

**Table 47: Utilize consultation when experiencing conflicts between the roles of counselor educator and gatekeeping of the counseling profession**

| My belief in the level of importance that I should do/participate in this |    |       | The quality of support for doing this in my institution |    |       | How frequently I actually do/participate in this |    |       |
|---|----|-------|---|----|-------|--|----|-------|
| Very Important  | 25 | 61.0% | Outstanding   | 10 | 24.4% | Frequently                                       | 15 | 36.6% |
| Important   | 14 | 34.1% | Above Average   | 18 | 43.9% | Moderately                                       | 8  | 19.5% |
| Slightly Important  | 2  | 4.9%  | Average   | 12 | 29.3% | Occasionally                                     | 11 | 26.8% |
| Not Very Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Below Average   | 0  | 0.0%  | Rarely   | 6  | 14.7% |
| Unimportant   | 0  | 0.0%  | Very Poor   | 1  | 2.4%  | Never  | 1  | 2.4%  |
| Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total  | 41 | 100%  |

Thirty-nine (95.1%) of counselor educators surveyed believed it was important to very important to utilize consultation when experiencing conflicts between the roles of counselor educator and gatekeeper of the counseling profession, whereas 23 (68.3%) felt they received above average to outstanding support from their institution to perform this activity, and 15 (36.6%) indicated that they frequently utilize consultation when experiencing conflicts between the roles of counselor educator and gatekeeping of the counseling profession.

**Table 48: *Conduct ongoing reflection and processing of conflicts that occur between the roles of counselor educator and gatekeeper***

| My belief in the level of importance that I should do/participate in this |    |       | The quality of support for doing this in my institution |    |       | How frequently I actually do/participate in this |    |       |
|---|----|-------|---|----|-------|--|----|-------|
| Very Important  | 24 | 58.6% | Outstanding   | 12 | 29.3% | Frequently                                       | 15 | 36.6% |
| Important   | 11 | 26.8% | Above Average   | 11 | 26.8% | Moderately                                       | 7  | 17.1% |
| Slightly Important  | 5  | 12.2% | Average   | 14 | 34.2% | Occasionally                                     | 10 | 24.4% |
| Not Very Important  | 1  | 2.4%  | Below Average   | 3  | 7.3%  | Rarely   | 8  | 19.5% |
| Unimportant   | 0  | 0.0%  | Very Poor   | 1  | 2.4%  | Never  | 1  | 2.4%  |
| Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total  | 41 | 100%  |

Thirty-five (85.4%) of counselor educators surveyed believed it was important to very important to conduct ongoing reflection and processing of conflicts that occurred between the roles of counselor educator and gatekeeper, whereas 23 (56.1%) felt they received above average to outstanding support from their institution to perform this activity, and 15 (36.6%) indicated that they frequently conducted ongoing reflection and processing of conflicts that occurred between the roles of counselor educator and gatekeeper.

**Table 49: *Ensure that counselors-in-training have recourse in a timely manner to address decisions to require them to seek assistance or to dismiss them and provide the students with due process according to institutional policies and procedures (CACREP 2016 Standards, Section 1.O)***

| My belief in the level of importance that I should do/participate in this |    |       | The quality of support for doing this in my institution |    |       | How frequently I actually do/participate in this |    |       |
|---|----|-------|---|----|-------|--|----|-------|
| Very Important  | 26 | 63.4% | Outstanding   | 10 | 24.4% | Frequently                                       | 13 | 31.6% |
| Important   | 15 | 36.6% | Above Average   | 17 | 41.5% | Moderately                                       | 12 | 29.3% |
| Slightly Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Average   | 11 | 26.8% | Occasionally                                     | 9  | 22.0% |
| Not Very Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Below Average   | 2  | 4.9%  | Rarely   | 4  | 9.8%  |
| Unimportant   | 0  | 0.0%  | Very Poor   | 1  | 2.4%  | Never  | 3  | 7.3%  |
| Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total  | 41 | 100%  |

Forty-one (100%) of counselor educators surveyed believed it was important to very important to ensure that counselors-in-training have recourse in a timely manner to address decisions to require them to seek assistance or to dismiss them and provide the students with due process according to institutional policies and procedures, whereas 27 (65.9%) felt they receive above average to outstanding support from their institution to perform this activity, and 13 (31.6%) indicated that they frequently ensured that counselors-in-training have recourse in a timely manner to address decisions to require them to seek assistance or to dismiss them and provide the students with due process according to institutional policies and procedures.

**Table 50: Conduct a systematic developmental assessment of each counselors'-in-training progress throughout the program, including consideration of the students' academic performance, professional development, and personal development (CACREP 2016 Standards, Section 4.F)**

| My belief in the level of importance that I should do/participate in this |    |       | The quality of support for doing this in my institution |    |       | How frequently I actually do/participate in this |    |       |
|---|----|-------|---|----|-------|--|----|-------|
| Very Important  | 30 | 73.1% | Outstanding   | 10 | 24.3% | Frequently                                       | 20 | 48.7% |
| Important   | 7  | 17.1% | Above Average   | 17 | 41.6% | Moderately                                       | 7  | 17.1% |
| Slightly Important  | 4  | 9.8%  | Average   | 11 | 26.8% | Occasionally                                     | 5  | 12.2% |
| Not Very Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Below Average   | 2  | 4.9%  | Rarely   | 7  | 17.1% |
| Unimportant   | 0  | 0.0%  | Very Poor   | 1  | 2.4%  | Never  | 2  | 4.9%  |
| Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total  | 41 | 100%  |

Thirty-seven (90.2%) of counselor educators surveyed believed it was important to very important to conduct a systematic developmental assessment of each counselors'-in-training progress throughout the program, including consideration of the students' academic performance, professional development, and personal development, whereas 27 (65.9%) felt they received above average to outstanding support from their institution to perform these activities, and 20 (48.7%) indicated that they frequently conducted a systematic developmental assessment of each counselors'-in-training progress throughout the program, including consideration of the students' academic performance, professional development, and personal development.

**Table 51: Provide remediation interventions to counselors-in-training as deemed necessary**

| My belief in the level of importance that I should do/participate in this |    |       | The quality of support for doing this in my institution |    |       | How frequently I actually do/participate in this |    |       |
|---|----|-------|---|----|-------|--|----|-------|
| Very Important  | 28 | 68.3% | Outstanding   | 8  | 19.5% | Frequently                                       | 9  | 22.0% |
| Important   | 12 | 29.3% | Above Average   | 15 | 36.6% | Moderately                                       | 18 | 43.8% |
| Slightly Important  | 1  | 2.4%  | Average   | 14 | 34.2% | Occasionally                                     | 7  | 17.1% |
| Not Very Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Below Average   | 3  | 7.3%  | Rarely   | 5  | 12.2% |
| Unimportant   | 0  | 0.0%  | Very Poor   | 1  | 2.4%  | Never  | 2  | 4.9%  |
| Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total  | 41 | 100%  |

Forty (97.6%) of counselor educators surveyed believed it was important to very important to provide remediation interventions to counselors-in-training as deemed necessary, whereas 23 (56.1%) felt they received above average to outstanding support from their institutions to perform these activities, and nine (22%) indicated that they frequently provided remediation interventions to counselors-in-training as deemed necessary.

**Table 52: Ensure remediation/interventions are not culturally biased**

| My belief in the level of importance that I should do/participate in this |    |       | The quality of support for doing this in my institution |    |       | How frequently I actually do/participate in this |    |       |
|---|----|-------|---|----|-------|--|----|-------|
| Very Important  | 35 | 85.4% | Outstanding   | 11 | 26.8% | Frequently                                       | 17 | 41.5% |
| Important   | 5  | 12.2% | Above Average   | 13 | 31.8% | Moderately                                       | 12 | 29.3% |
| Slightly Important  | 1  | 2.4%  | Average   | 11 | 26.8% | Occasionally                                     | 5  | 12.2% |
| Not Very Important  | 0  | 0.0%  | Below Average   | 5  | 12.2% | Rarely   | 4  | 9.8%  |
| Unimportant   | 0  | 0.0%  | Very Poor   | 1  | 2.4%  | Never  | 3  | 7.3%  |
| Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total   | 41 | 100%  | Total  | 41 | 100%  |

Forty (97.6%) of counselor educators surveyed believed it was important to very important to ensure remediation/interventions are not culturally biased, whereas 24 (58.6%) felt they received

above average to outstanding support from their institutions to perform these activities, and 17 (41.5%) indicated that they frequently ensured remediation/interventions were not culturally biased.

**Table 53: Overall beliefs about standardization of gatekeeping policies: There are currently general guidelines for gatekeeping set forth by governing and accrediting bodies. Each program is expected to construct its own policies and procedures to abide by these guidelines. Instead of general guidelines, do you believe that there should be standardized gatekeeping policies and procedures implemented for all like programs?**

|                   |    |       |
|-------------------|----|-------|
| Strongly Agree    | 6  | 14.6% |
| Agree             | 13 | 31.7% |
| Neutral           | 11 | 26.8% |
| Disagree          | 8  | 19.6% |
| Strongly Disagree | 3  | 7.3%  |
| Total             | 41 | 100%  |

Nineteen (46.3%) of the counselor educators surveyed agreed to strongly agreed that there should be standardized gatekeeping policies and procedures implemented for all like programs, whereas 11 (26.8%) were neutral toward standardized gatekeeping policies and procedures implemented for all like programs, and 11 (26.8%) disagreed to strongly disagreed with having standardized gatekeeping policies and procedures implemented for all like programs.

## Summary

This chapter provided a brief review of the purpose of this study and the research methods used. An introduction to the participating population and associated demographics was shared followed by the results of both the archival study and survey. The archival study focused mainly on the student handbook and the amount of participants' handbooks that contained the requirements listed in Section 1.M and Section 1.N of the CACREP 2016 Standards (2015). The survey results were shared in detail (Tables 1 through 36) with the majority of participants believing it very important (72.1%) to participate in the gatekeeping activities listed in the survey. Over half of participants also felt they received above average to outstanding (62.2%)

support from their institutions to perform in the gatekeeping activities listed in the survey. The participants frequently (46.5%) participated in or are aware of the gatekeeping activities listed in the survey. Chapter V will contain a summary of the study; implications for counselor educators, counselor education programs, and universities. A review the limitations of this study and recommendations for future research.



## **CHAPTER V**

### **Introduction**

This chapter contains information regarding gatekeeping derived from the study. Limitations of the study are listed and explained. Implications of the information and results that followed with the culmination of the study are included. Suggestions for future research are included in detail. The chapter ends with a brief discussion of conclusions drawn from the study.

### **Summary of Findings**

In an effort to contribute to a foundation of gatekeeping knowledge by providing a descriptive overview of some gatekeeping policies and procedures found in CACREP accredited programs, as well as the beliefs, attitudes and perceptions of counselor educators this study utilized an archival review approach and an attitudinal survey. The literature search revealed that there were several articles regarding aspects of effective counseling skills and calls for standardized gatekeeping policies and procedures; articles actually addressing the needed policies and procedures were limited.

The first purpose of this study was to investigate the consistency of policies and procedures across CACREP accredited counselor education programs. In the archival portion of study, it was difficult to locate and identify items used for coding as there were inconsistencies in information location, format, and terminology. There were inconsistencies in the location of the new student orientation information. Some programs included it on the program's webpage and others included it in their student handbook. Not all student handbooks contained a mission statement of academic unit and program objectives. The researcher also had difficulty locating information about professional counseling organizations, opportunities for professional involvement, or activities appropriate for student in all of the student handbooks nor

program websites. Although, all programs addressed matriculation requirements, the location of this information varied in the location they were accessed. Almost a third of the student handbooks did not contain an academic appeal policy. Almost 68% of programs presented written endorsement policies explain the procedures for recommending students for credentialing and employment, again, the location of this information varied. Policies for student retention, remediation, and dismissal from program was only located at 11 (10.4%) of the programs. And some programs provided additional documents related to gatekeeping activities such as samples of agreements, performance evaluations and acknowledgements notifications. This lack of uniformity in the presentation and formatting of the information, and terminology used across programs made it difficult to ascertain the consistency of policies and procedures across CACREP accredited counselor education programs. The second purpose of the study was to explore counselor educators' perceptions about the importance of gatekeeping, the support they received from institutions, and their personal involvement in gatekeeping responsibilities in their departments/universities. Research question three explored faculty perceptions on the importance of gatekeeping procedures; quality of support they receive from their program/university; and frequency in which they perform gatekeeping related activities. It was found that all surveyed programs reported awareness of gatekeeping in counselor education and supervision and that all programs had student handbooks, although not all student handbooks contained the same information. The first research question looked at gatekeeping policies and procedures used by the programs in the study. Academic expectations were fairly standard across universities and programs, however, non-academic expectations varied in the amount of specific detail in regards to the CITs' emotional and mental fitness/behavior. Overall, locating the information required by CACREP for the archival portion of the study was difficult as there

was much diversity in information presentation, terminology, and formatting. The researcher was able to locate the needed materials in 106 out of 146 potential participating programs.

Looking at the survey responses as a whole, the majority of survey participants' responses (97.7%) indicated that gatekeeping activities listed in the survey are important to very important; 90.7% indicated they felt they received above average to outstanding support from their institutions to perform in the gatekeeping activities listed in the survey; 41.5% indicated they frequently participate in or are aware of the gatekeeping activities listed in the survey. The opinion poll revealed that 46.3% agreed that there should be standardized gatekeeping policies and procedures implemented for all like programs, however, the other 53.7% were either neutral in regards to standardization or did not want standardization at all. Counselor educators generally reported most gatekeeping involvement with respect to academic, knowledge and skill development. Looking at responses as a whole, clearly counselor educators felt more autonomous about enforcing standards that directly related to the content they were responsible for teaching.

## **Implications**

The implications of this study touch many different aspects of gatekeeping. In regards to the archival portion of my study, Section 1.B of the 2016 CACREP Standards (2015) states:

The institutional media accurately describe the academic unit, the core counselor education program faculty, and each program and specialty area offered, including admissions criteria, accreditation status, methods of instruction, minimum degree requirements, matriculation requirements, and financial aid information (p.5).

My findings are consistent with Letourneau (2016) who reported that his literature review indicated a lack of consensus regarding gatekeeping-related terminology. The difficulties I

experienced obtaining the information for both the archival and survey portions of this study indicate a lack of consistency in information presentation and terminology. Locating the three online sources within university websites was difficult as there were many inconsistencies in document titles, information presentation, website and document formatting, as well as the terminology used. Due to the lack of uniformity in terminology and formatting, it was difficult to ascertain where to go to locate the desired sources. In some cases, each program type had its own webpage that contained information pertaining to that particular program's focus, but not all of these webpages contained the same desired sources. In most cases, once located, it was difficult to ascertain whether the information was current. Most documents did have 'revised/update' dates, but it was unclear whether it was the most recent revision/update. Some websites had broken links to the needed information. Once the programs were identified, locating the counselor education faculty and their emails for the survey portion was another difficult task as not all program websites contained a list of counselor educators, some referred the reader to the universities directory. Most university directories allowed for searching by name but not by department/program which made it difficult to locate the counselor educators' names and contact information. One program's website referred the reader to the department's website which did contain a list of faculty and staff, but did not indicate their positions or the programs they were affiliated with, making it difficult to ascertain who the counselor educators on the list were.

The professional associations, such as the ACA and CACREP present clear directives for gatekeeping responsibilities for counselor educations, but do not dictate the presentation of the information to be conveyed to the CIT. The researcher may not be the only person to have difficulty obtaining information from the websites. Faculty and students may have difficulty

locating needed information from their own university's/ program's website. This could be especially the case when university's/college's/program's websites are re-formatted. Non-standardized information presentation and terminology could also hinder applicants' progress, as well as make it difficult for accreditation reviewers to check programs for compliance with website accreditation requirements.

The 2016 CACREP Standards (2015) define gatekeeping as "the ethical responsibility of counselor educators and supervisors to monitor and evaluate an individual's knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions required by competent professional counselors and to remediate or prevent those that are lacking in professional competence from becoming counselors" (p. 41). The 2014 ACA Code of Ethics also speaks to the roles and expectations of counselor educators as educators, CIT supervisors, and gatekeepers for the counseling profession. Homrich (2009) described the function of gatekeepers as not only protecting the integrity of the profession, but also being responsible for preventing harm to future clients. Consistent with Homrich (2009) and the expectations set for by CACREP (2015) and ACA (2014), 98.5% of respondents to the following five survey statements indicated they believe awareness of their roles and expectations as educators (100%;  $n = 41$ ) (Table 18), as CIT supervisors (100%;  $n = 41$ ) (Table 19), as gatekeepers for the counseling profession (97.6%;  $n = 40$ ) (Table 20), the expectations to protect the reputation of the counseling profession (97.6%;  $n = 40$ ) (Table 22), and the expectations to protect the public (97.6%;  $n = 40$ ) Table 23) to be important to very important.

In a survey conducted by Bradey and Post (1991), only 13% of respondents reported using formal screening procedures to dismiss students from their programs, however, 29% indicated no response, leading them to question whether that was indicative of a lack of systematic procedures for dismissal. Inconsistent with the results of Bradey and Post's (1991)

study, 48.8% of respondents ( $n = 20$ ) indicated that they frequently conduct a systematic developmental assessment of each CITs' progress throughout the program, including consideration of the students' academic performance, professional development, and personal development (Table 50).

According to Brown-Rice (2012), starting at application to the program, counselor educators should assess potential counseling students and intervene to block the entry of students who exhibit characteristics and/or behaviors that would result in their inability to meet professional competencies. Consistent with Brown-Rice (2012), 100 % of survey participants ( $n = 41$ ) indicated that it is important to very important to assess potential students for their ability to meet professional competencies prior to acceptance into the program (Table 28); intervene with potential counseling students to not allow entry of those students who exhibited characteristics and/or behaviors that would result in their inability to meet professional competencies (Table 29); and provide a student handbook containing specific programmatic goals, objectives, procedures and policies (Table 31). This is also consistent with Swank and Smith-Adcock (2014) who spoke to the importance of gatekeeping during admissions.

Consistent with Bradey and Post (1991) findings that the majority of programs participating in their study had developed formal initial screening procedures but were less certain about implementing dismissal procedures, 95.1% of respondents ( $n = 29$ ) believe it was important to very important to develop CIT performance assessments and program policies, however, only 36.6% ( $n = 15$ ) frequently participated in this process (Table 24). Brown-Rice (2012) stated that students must also know the specific training goals and objectives they will be evaluated on, as well as the policies and procedures these evaluations are based upon. Consistent with Brown-Rice (2012) and Palmer, et.al., (2008) survey respondents believed it was important

to very important to ensure that department/university policies and procedures are consistently applied and consistent with current accepted practices, however, only 43.9% ( $n = 18$ ) frequently participated in this process (Table 26). The discrepancy between the number of faculty who believe this to be important and the number who frequently participate in this process could be a reflection of the faculty's inability to readily identify their policies and procedures which is line with the findings of Palmer, White, and Chung (2008).

Section 1.N in the 2016 CACREP Standards calls for accredited programs to facilitate department based new student orientation. When surveyed, 97.5% of the respondents ( $n = 40$ ) believed that new student orientation was important to very important and 82.9% ( $n = 34$ ) occasionally to frequently participate in new student orientation (Table 30).

In a study by Frame and Stevens-Smith (1995), they concluded that counselor education programs need to implement openly defined monitoring and dismissal procedures. Homrich (2009) stated that the three best practices programs can use to improve their gatekeeping protocol are to establish the expectations, communicate them clearly and widely, and have faculty consistency in enforcement. Similar to Frame and Stevens-Smith (1995) and Homrich (2009), my survey results indicated that 61% of survey respondents ( $n = 25$ ) frequently provide transparency of the program's performance expectations (Table 31) and provide transparency of the process and expectations of remediation (41.5%;  $n = 17$ ) (Table 43). Respondents also frequently verbally review the specific training goals and objectives they will be evaluated on, as well as the policies and procedures these evaluations are based upon (43.9%;  $n = 18$ ) (Table 33) and frequently verbally review the retention policy and explain procedures for student remediation and/or dismissal from the program, as well as the academic appeal policy (39%;  $n = 16$ ) (Table 34). As part of continuing gatekeeping awareness and openness, 53.7% of

respondents ( $n = 22$ ) frequently incorporate gatekeeping awareness into academic course work (Table 35); 31.7% ( $n = 13$ ) frequently facilitate class discussion on gatekeeping awareness (Table 36); and 56.1% ( $n = 26$ ) frequently provide CIT with specific expectations for improvement (Table 22). Respondents also believe it important to very important to ensure that department/university policies and procedures are consistently applied and consistent with current accepted practices (95.1%;  $n = 39$ ) (Table 26). The levels of participation differed depending on the action and may be affected by respondents' duties in the program, or as suggested by Palmer, White, and Chung (2008), their ability to readily identify policies and procedures related to gatekeeping.

Ziomek-Daigle and Bailey (2009) suggested that the remediation contain checks and balances to ensure that remediation is not culturally biased, opens communication, and increases students' awareness and learning. In line with Ziomek-Daigle and Bailey's (2009) suggestions, 100% of survey respondents ( $n = 41$ ) believe in important to very important to address specific issue(s)/deficiencies with CITs (Table 38) and to evaluate the outcome of remediation to determine the success of the plan (100%;  $n = 41$ ) (Table 44). Also, 97.6% of respondents ( $n = 40$ ) believe it important to very important to assist CITs in securing remedial assistance when needed (Table 45) and provide remediation interventions to CITs as deemed necessary (97.6%;  $n = 40$ ) (Table 51). Consistent with Ziomek-Daigle and Bailey (2009) 97.6% of respondents ( $n = 40$ ) believed it important to very important to ensure remediation/interventions are not culturally biased (Table 52).

Section F in the Introduction of the 2016 CACREP Standards addresses required program evaluations, as well as assessments of students, faculty and supervisors. According to Urofsky and Bobby (2012), there has been a systematic and comprehensive concern for not only



assessing the performance of CITs, but also the effectiveness of the counselor education programs. Addressing this concern, 95.2% of respondents ( $n = 39$ ) believe it important to very important to conduct needs assessments in order to ascertain the effectiveness of the program in meeting goals (Table 25).

Baldo, Saftas-Nall, and Shaw (1997) recommended the student review and retention policy should contain an extensive and detailed due process that places the responsibility on a retention review committee as well as the entire faculty. Consistent with Baldo, et.al., (1997) recommendation, 100% ( $n = 41$ ) survey respondents believed it important to very important to ensure that CITs have recourse in a timely manner to address decisions to require them to seek assistance or to dismiss them and provide the students with due process according to institutional policies and procedures, with 82.9% ( $n = 34$ ) occasionally to frequently participated in this process (Table 49).

Overall, survey responses regarding the amount of institutional support they received was consistent with Palmer, White, and Chung's (2008) research findings that counselor educator's ability to readily identify policies and procedures related to gatekeeping is positively correlated with their willingness to perform gatekeeping activities. However, two statements had the highest negative responses regarding institutional support. Survey respondents indicated they felt they received below average to very poor support from their institutions for: intervening with potential counseling students (22%;  $n = 9$ ) (Table 29) and meeting regularly with faculty to discuss CIT who are experiencing personal, academic or professional issues (22%;  $n = 9$ ) (Table 42).

Although researchers point to the need for standardized definitions and criteria for gatekeeping policies, procedures, and terminology in counselor education programs (Homrich,

2014; Glance, et.al., 2012; Henderson & Defrene, 2012; Foster & McAdams, 2009; de Vries & Valadez, 2005; Lumadue & Duffy, 1999), my archival study shows there is a lack of consistency in information presentation, formatting of websites and forms, as well as terminology. My survey opinion poll indicated that the majority of participants were either neutral or disagreed with standardization.

### **Limitations**

The chief limitation was the lack of continuity and consistency across university/department/program websites. Archival data collection was hampered by this consistency and information was possibly missed. Also due to the lack of consistency in information presentation, it was difficult to glean from the materials retrieved whether additional information missing from the online materials was available and/or distributed to counselors-in-training (CITs) by another means (i.e. by paper in person). The fact that the sample was exclusively CACREP accredited programs might have facilitated a ‘ceiling effect’ on gatekeeping as it is inherent within the CACREP Standards. One might have expected more diversity in responses in a mixed CACREP/non-CACREP sample of universities.

The accuracy of the identification of potential participants in the survey was also a limitation. The response rate to the survey may have been affected as it was difficult to identify potential participants on some university websites due to a lack of clearly indicated access or unclear faculty affiliations. According to Fryear (2015) response rates can be low when the contact information is unreliable, or there is less incentive or little motivation to respond.

The survey was a self-report measure. Although faculty identities were kept anonymous, the possibility of participants’ biases toward presenting themselves and their programs favorably or unfavorably in their responses may be present. In addition, the demographic profiles of

individual respondents (e.g., years teaching; level of tenure at the university, assigned duties, etc...) might have had an impact on their perceptions of gatekeeping issues and level of participation in gatekeeping activities.

Finally, the response rate to the survey was 8% ( $n = 41$ ). Fan and Yan (2010) looked at factors affecting response rates of Internet based surveys. From their research, they estimated that the average response rate of Internet based surveys is 11% lower than that of other survey modes. The low response rate may indicate that the results may not be representative of the majority of counselor educators at CACREP accredited Master's level programs.

### **Delimitations**

The survey was an original design and not tested prior to utilization. The wording of the survey statements may have caused difficulty interpreting the meaning's intent by the participants. Some statements may not coincide with the sub-statements; in particular, the statements addressing 'awareness.' Two of the sub-statements use terms such as "do/participate." Also, the sub-statement 'The quality of support for doing this in my institution' may be been interpreted to mean the university, or college, or program, which could have skewed their responses depending on their interpretation. These wording awkwardness's may have affected the participants' responses.

### **Suggestions for Future Research**

Although the 2016 CACREP Standards (2015) put forth requirements, within the *Introduction to the 2016 CACREP Standards* states:

Although the 2016 CACREP Standards delineate accreditation requirements, they do not dictate the manner programs may choose to meet standards.

Program innovation is encouraged in meeting both the intent and spirit of

the 2016 CACREP Standards. Program faculty and reviewers should understand that counselor education programs can meet the accreditation requirements in a variety of ways. Providing evidence of meeting or exceeding the standards is the responsibility of the program (p. 3).

Key issues impeded the research in this study. First, there was a lack of definition clarity relating to gatekeeping terminology such as when describing students whom gatekeeping intervention/remediation is needed, terms such as ‘problematic,’ ‘deficient,’ ‘troublesome,’ ‘incompetent/incompetence,’ ‘unsuitable,’ ‘impaired/impairment,’ ‘diminished professional functioning,’ ‘unethical,’ and ‘problems with professional competence’ making clarity of meaning difficult to ascertain. Second, there was a lack of uniformity in the presentation, title, and location of gatekeeping policies and procedures across university/counseling program websites. Brown-Rice (2012) suggested that it is essential to examine the terms utilized in gatekeeping and remediation to ensure that gatekeeping terminology is clear to all parties. CACREP accredits counselor education programs and provides clear directives for gatekeeping responsibilities, and reviews these programs regularly for adherence to the accreditation standards, perhaps CACREP should also provide standardized outlines for information presentation and formatting, to include standardized terminology, how/where it is accessed via the university’s/program’s website. Specifically, standardized format for student handbooks and program websites could lead to improved access for potential applicants when comparing programs, as well as make it easier for accreditation reviewers to find the needed/required information. Perhaps the ACA and/or CACREP could conduct a survey of their members to determine a standardized terminology to use for policies, procedures, and to identify students who have problems with professional competency.

The ACA and CACREP both set forth gatekeeping obligations, however each counselor education program is expected to develop performance assessments and policies to ensure that the policies and procedures are consistently applied and meet standards currently accepted practices. An in-depth investigation of effective gatekeeping processes and procedures would be useful to inform best practices. Also, an investigation of comprehensive demographic data on student dismissals and/or withdrawals from counseling programs could inform evaluation of how current gatekeeping efforts are being applied. A more representative sampling of universities could support more ecologically validated conclusions about the nature and investment of gatekeeping policies.

## **Conclusion**

This study provided a review of the accessibility and consistency of selected CACREP accreditation requirements (2016 CAREP Standards, 2015). According to *The Introduction to The 2016 CACREP Standards* (2015), “Although the 2016 CACREP Standards delineate accreditation requirements, they do not dictate the manner in which programs may choose to meet standards...[p]roviding evidence of meeting or exceeding the standards is the responsibility of the program” (p. 3). The archival portion of the study had difficulty acquiring ‘evidence’ that these programs were meeting or exceeding the standards published by CACREP (2015).

This study also provided a descriptive review of Master’s level counselor educators’ perceptions of academic and professional gatekeeping policies. As expected, the majority of counselor educators from CACREP accredited programs, reported awareness of gatekeeping issues and activities and rated these activities as important. Not surprisingly, the counselor educator’s commitment and participation in issues related to the preparation, education, and direct assessment of student knowledge of counseling skills was highest. Despite these expected

results, there were interesting patterns of diversity in implementation, perceptions of administrative support, and personal involvement in gatekeeping related activities. Accordingly, these results add to existing counseling literature.

## APPENDIX

Please evaluate each concept/statement using the following three (3) questions:

- Your belief in the level of the concept's/statement's importance.
- Your perception of the quality of support you receive from you institution in regards to the concept/statement.
- How frequently you actually do/participate in facilitating the concept/statement.

### **Statements**

#### **1. Awareness of the roles and expectations of counselor educators as educators.**

|   |                    |                    |           |                |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------|
| <i>My belief in the level of importance that I SHOULD do/participate in this:</i> |                    |                    |           |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>  | <b>5</b>       |
| Unimportant   | Not very important | Slightly important | Important | Very important |

  

|   |               |          |               |             |
|---|---------------|----------|---------------|-------------|
| <i>The quality of support for doing this in my institution:</i> |               |          |               |             |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>      | <b>3</b> | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>    |
| Very poor   | Below average | Average  | Above average | Outstanding |

  

|  |          |              |            |            |
|--|----------|--------------|------------|------------|
| <i>How frequently I actually do/participate in this:</i> |          |              |            |            |
| <b>1</b>   | <b>2</b> | <b>3</b>     | <b>4</b>   | <b>5</b>   |
| Never  | Rarely   | Occasionally | Moderately | Frequently |

2. **Awareness of the roles and expectations of counselor educators as counselor-in-training supervisors.**

|   |                    |                    |           |                |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------|
| <i>My belief in the level of importance that I SHOULD do/participate in this:</i> |                    |                    |           |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>  | <b>5</b>       |
| Unimportant   | Not very important | Slightly important | Important | Very important |

|   |               |          |               |             |
|---|---------------|----------|---------------|-------------|
| <i>The quality of support for doing this in my institution:</i> |               |          |               |             |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>      | <b>3</b> | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>    |
| Very poor   | Below average | Average  | Above average | Outstanding |

|  |          |              |            |            |
|--|----------|--------------|------------|------------|
| <i>How frequently I actually do/participate in this:</i> |          |              |            |            |
| <b>1</b>   | <b>2</b> | <b>3</b>     | <b>4</b>   | <b>5</b>   |
| Never  | Rarely   | Occasionally | Moderately | Frequently |

3. **Awareness of the roles and expectations of counselor educators as gatekeepers for the counseling profession.**

|   |                    |                    |           |                |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------|
| <i>My belief in the level of importance that I SHOULD do/participate in this:</i> |                    |                    |           |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>  | <b>5</b>       |
| Unimportant   | Not very important | Slightly important | Important | Very important |

|   |               |          |               |             |
|---|---------------|----------|---------------|-------------|
| <i>The quality of support for doing this in my institution:</i> |               |          |               |             |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>      | <b>3</b> | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>    |
| Very poor   | Below average | Average  | Above average | Outstanding |

|  |          |              |            |            |
|--|----------|--------------|------------|------------|
| <i>How frequently I actually do/participate in this:</i> |          |              |            |            |
| <b>1</b>   | <b>2</b> | <b>3</b>     | <b>4</b>   | <b>5</b>   |
| Never  | Rarely   | Occasionally | Moderately | Frequently |



4. **Stay abreast with best practices in counselor education as they pertain to providing education, supervision, and gatekeeping.**

|   |                    |                    |           |                |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------|
| <i>My belief in the level of importance that I SHOULD do/participate in this:</i> |                    |                    |           |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>  | <b>5</b>       |
| Unimportant   | Not very important | Slightly important | Important | Very important |

|   |               |          |               |             |
|---|---------------|----------|---------------|-------------|
| <i>The quality of support for doing this in my institution:</i> |               |          |               |             |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>      | <b>3</b> | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>    |
| Very poor   | Below average | Average  | Above average | Outstanding |

|  |          |              |            |            |
|--|----------|--------------|------------|------------|
| <i>How frequently I actually do/participate in this:</i> |          |              |            |            |
| <b>1</b>   | <b>2</b> | <b>3</b>     | <b>4</b>   | <b>5</b>   |
| Never  | Rarely   | Occasionally | Moderately | Frequently |

5. **Awareness of expectation to protect the reputation of the counseling profession.**

|   |                    |                    |           |                |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------|
| <i>My belief in the level of importance that I SHOULD do/participate in this:</i> |                    |                    |           |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>  | <b>5</b>       |
| Unimportant   | Not very important | Slightly important | Important | Very important |

|   |               |          |               |             |
|---|---------------|----------|---------------|-------------|
| <i>The quality of support for doing this in my institution:</i> |               |          |               |             |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>      | <b>3</b> | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>    |
| Very poor   | Below average | Average  | Above average | Outstanding |

|  |          |              |            |            |
|--|----------|--------------|------------|------------|
| <i>How frequently I actually do/participate in this:</i> |          |              |            |            |
| <b>1</b>   | <b>2</b> | <b>3</b>     | <b>4</b>   | <b>5</b>   |
| Never  | Rarely   | Occasionally | Moderately | Frequently |

6. **Awareness of expectation to protect the public.**

|   |                    |                    |           |                |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------|
| <i>My belief in the level of importance that I SHOULD do/participate in this:</i> |                    |                    |           |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>  | <b>5</b>       |
| Unimportant   | Not very important | Slightly important | Important | Very important |

  

|   |               |          |               |             |
|---|---------------|----------|---------------|-------------|
| <i>The quality of support for doing this in my institution:</i> |               |          |               |             |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>      | <b>3</b> | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>    |
| Very poor   | Below average | Average  | Above average | Outstanding |

  

|  |          |              |            |            |
|--|----------|--------------|------------|------------|
| <i>How frequently I actually do/participate in this:</i> |          |              |            |            |
| <b>1</b>   | <b>2</b> | <b>3</b>     | <b>4</b>   | <b>5</b>   |
| Never  | Rarely   | Occasionally | Moderately | Frequently |

7. **Development of counselors-in-training performance assessments and program policies.**

|   |                    |                    |           |                |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------|
| <i>My belief in the level of importance that I SHOULD do/participate in this:</i> |                    |                    |           |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>  | <b>5</b>       |
| Unimportant   | Not very important | Slightly important | Important | Very important |

  

|   |               |          |               |             |
|---|---------------|----------|---------------|-------------|
| <i>The quality of support for doing this in my institution:</i> |               |          |               |             |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>      | <b>3</b> | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>    |
| Very poor   | Below average | Average  | Above average | Outstanding |

  

|  |          |              |            |            |
|--|----------|--------------|------------|------------|
| <i>How frequently I actually do/participate in this:</i> |          |              |            |            |
| <b>1</b>   | <b>2</b> | <b>3</b>     | <b>4</b>   | <b>5</b>   |
| Never  | Rarely   | Occasionally | Moderately | Frequently |

**8. Conduct needs assessments in order to ascertain the effectiveness of the program in meeting goals.**

|   |                    |                    |           |                |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------|
| <i>My belief in the level of importance that I SHOULD do/participate in this:</i> |                    |                    |           |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>  | <b>5</b>       |
| Unimportant   | Not very important | Slightly important | Important | Very important |

|   |               |          |               |             |
|---|---------------|----------|---------------|-------------|
| <i>The quality of support for doing this in my institution:</i> |               |          |               |             |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>      | <b>3</b> | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>    |
| Very poor   | Below average | Average  | Above average | Outstanding |

|  |          |              |            |            |
|--|----------|--------------|------------|------------|
| <i>How frequently I actually do/participate in this:</i> |          |              |            |            |
| <b>1</b>   | <b>2</b> | <b>3</b>     | <b>4</b>   | <b>5</b>   |
| Never  | Rarely   | Occasionally | Moderately | Frequently |

**9. Ensure that department/university policies and procedures are consistently applied and consistent with currently accepted practices.**

|   |                    |                    |           |                |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------|
| <i>My belief in the level of importance that I SHOULD do/participate in this:</i> |                    |                    |           |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>  | <b>5</b>       |
| Unimportant   | Not very important | Slightly important | Important | Very important |

|   |               |          |               |             |
|---|---------------|----------|---------------|-------------|
| <i>The quality of support for doing this in my institution:</i> |               |          |               |             |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>      | <b>3</b> | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>    |
| Very poor   | Below average | Average  | Above average | Outstanding |

|  |          |              |            |            |
|--|----------|--------------|------------|------------|
| <i>How frequently I actually do/participate in this:</i> |          |              |            |            |
| <b>1</b>   | <b>2</b> | <b>3</b>     | <b>4</b>   | <b>5</b>   |
| Never  | Rarely   | Occasionally | Moderately | Frequently |

**10. The graduation of students who are adequately prepared in their knowledge, skills, and disposition for entry into the counseling profession.**

|   |                    |                    |           |                |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------|
| <i>My belief in the level of importance that I SHOULD do/participate in this:</i> |                    |                    |           |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>  | <b>5</b>       |
| Unimportant   | Not very important | Slightly important | Important | Very important |

|   |               |          |               |             |
|---|---------------|----------|---------------|-------------|
| <i>The quality of support for doing this in my institution:</i> |               |          |               |             |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>      | <b>3</b> | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>    |
| Very poor   | Below average | Average  | Above average | Outstanding |

|  |          |              |            |            |
|--|----------|--------------|------------|------------|
| <i>How frequently I actually do/participate in this:</i> |          |              |            |            |
| <b>1</b>   | <b>2</b> | <b>3</b>     | <b>4</b>   | <b>5</b>   |
| Never  | Rarely   | Occasionally | Moderately | Frequently |

**11. Assessment potential students for their ability to meet professional competencies prior to acceptance into the program.**

|   |                    |                    |           |                |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------|
| <i>My belief in the level of importance that I SHOULD do/participate in this:</i> |                    |                    |           |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>  | <b>5</b>       |
| Unimportant   | Not very important | Slightly important | Important | Very important |

|   |               |          |               |             |
|---|---------------|----------|---------------|-------------|
| <i>The quality of support for doing this in my institution:</i> |               |          |               |             |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>      | <b>3</b> | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>    |
| Very poor   | Below average | Average  | Above average | Outstanding |

|  |          |              |            |            |
|--|----------|--------------|------------|------------|
| <i>How frequently I actually do/participate in this:</i> |          |              |            |            |
| <b>1</b>   | <b>2</b> | <b>3</b>     | <b>4</b>   | <b>5</b>   |
| Never  | Rarely   | Occasionally | Moderately | Frequently |

**12. Intervene with potential counseling students to not allow entry of those students who exhibit characteristics and/or behaviors that would result in their inability to meet professional competencies.**

|   |                    |                    |           |                |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------|
| <i>My belief in the level of importance that I SHOULD do/participate in this:</i> |                    |                    |           |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>  | <b>5</b>       |
| Unimportant   | Not very important | Slightly important | Important | Very important |

  

|   |               |          |               |             |
|---|---------------|----------|---------------|-------------|
| <i>The quality of support for doing this in my institution:</i> |               |          |               |             |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>      | <b>3</b> | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>    |
| Very poor   | Below average | Average  | Above average | Outstanding |

  

|  |          |              |            |            |
|--|----------|--------------|------------|------------|
| <i>How frequently I actually do/participate in this:</i> |          |              |            |            |
| <b>1</b>   | <b>2</b> | <b>3</b>     | <b>4</b>   | <b>5</b>   |
| Never  | Rarely   | Occasionally | Moderately | Frequently |

**13. Facilitate department/program based new student orientation.**

|   |                    |                    |           |                |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------|
| <i>My belief in the level of importance that I SHOULD do/participate in this:</i> |                    |                    |           |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>  | <b>5</b>       |
| Unimportant   | Not very important | Slightly important | Important | Very important |

  

|   |               |          |               |             |
|---|---------------|----------|---------------|-------------|
| <i>The quality of support for doing this in my institution:</i> |               |          |               |             |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>      | <b>3</b> | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>    |
| Very poor   | Below average | Average  | Above average | Outstanding |

  

|  |          |              |            |            |
|--|----------|--------------|------------|------------|
| <i>How frequently I actually do/participate in this:</i> |          |              |            |            |
| <b>1</b>   | <b>2</b> | <b>3</b>     | <b>4</b>   | <b>5</b>   |
| Never  | Rarely   | Occasionally | Moderately | Frequently |

**14. Provide transparency of the program's performance expectations.**

|   |                    |                    |               |                |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| <i>My belief in the level of importance that I SHOULD do/participate in this:</i> |                    |                    |               |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>       |
| Unimportant   | Not very important | Slightly important | Important     | Very important |
| <i>The quality of support for doing this in my institution:</i>                   |                    |                    |               |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>       |
| Very poor   | Below average      | Average            | Above average | Outstanding    |
| <i>How frequently I actually do/participate in this:</i>                          |                    |                    |               |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>       |
| Never   | Rarely             | Occasionally       | Moderately    | Frequently     |

**15. Provide a student handbook that contains specific programmatic training goals and objectives, as well as the retention policy that explains the procedures for student remediation and/or dismissal from the program and the academic appeal policy.**

|   |                    |                    |               |                |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| <i>My belief in the level of importance that I SHOULD do/participate in this:</i> |                    |                    |               |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>       |
| Unimportant   | Not very important | Slightly important | Important     | Very important |
| <i>The quality of support for doing this in my institution:</i>                   |                    |                    |               |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>       |
| Very poor   | Below average      | Average            | Above average | Outstanding    |
| <i>How frequently I actually do/participate in this:</i>                          |                    |                    |               |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>       |
| Never   | Rarely             | Occasionally       | Moderately    | Frequently     |

**16. Verbally review the specific training goals and objectives they will be evaluated on, as well as the policies and procedures these evaluations are based upon.**

|   |                    |                    |           |                |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------|
| <i>My belief in the level of importance that I SHOULD do/participate in this:</i> |                    |                    |           |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>  | <b>5</b>       |
| Unimportant   | Not very important | Slightly important | Important | Very important |

|   |               |          |               |             |
|---|---------------|----------|---------------|-------------|
| <i>The quality of support for doing this in my institution:</i> |               |          |               |             |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>      | <b>3</b> | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>    |
| Very poor   | Below average | Average  | Above average | Outstanding |

|  |          |              |            |            |
|--|----------|--------------|------------|------------|
| <i>How frequently I actually do/participate in this:</i> |          |              |            |            |
| <b>1</b>   | <b>2</b> | <b>3</b>     | <b>4</b>   | <b>5</b>   |
| Never  | Rarely   | Occasionally | Moderately | Frequently |

**17. Verbally review the retention policy and explain procedures for student remediation and/or dismissal from the program, as well as the academic appeal policy.**

|   |                    |                    |           |                |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------|
| <i>My belief in the level of importance that I SHOULD do/participate in this:</i> |                    |                    |           |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>  | <b>5</b>       |
| Unimportant   | Not very important | Slightly important | Important | Very important |

|   |               |          |               |             |
|---|---------------|----------|---------------|-------------|
| <i>The quality of support for doing this in my institution:</i> |               |          |               |             |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>      | <b>3</b> | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>    |
| Very poor   | Below average | Average  | Above average | Outstanding |

|  |          |              |            |            |
|--|----------|--------------|------------|------------|
| <i>How frequently I actually do/participate in this:</i> |          |              |            |            |
| <b>1</b>   | <b>2</b> | <b>3</b>     | <b>4</b>   | <b>5</b>   |
| Never  | Rarely   | Occasionally | Moderately | Frequently |

**18. Incorporate gatekeeping awareness into academic course work.**

|   |                    |                    |               |                |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| <i>My belief in the level of importance that I SHOULD do/participate in this:</i> |                    |                    |               |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>       |
| Unimportant   | Not very important | Slightly important | Important     | Very important |
| <i>The quality of support for doing this in my institution:</i>                   |                    |                    |               |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>       |
| Very poor   | Below average      | Average            | Above average | Outstanding    |
| <i>How frequently I actually do/participate in this:</i>                          |                    |                    |               |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>       |
| Never   | Rarely             | Occasionally       | Moderately    | Frequently     |

**19. Facilitate class discussion on gatekeeping awareness.**

|   |                    |                    |               |                |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| <i>My belief in the level of importance that I SHOULD do/participate in this:</i> |                    |                    |               |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>       |
| Unimportant   | Not very important | Slightly important | Important     | Very important |
| <i>The quality of support for doing this in my institution:</i>                   |                    |                    |               |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>       |
| Very poor   | Below average      | Average            | Above average | Outstanding    |
| <i>How frequently I actually do/participate in this:</i>                          |                    |                    |               |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>       |
| Never   | Rarely             | Occasionally       | Moderately    | Frequently     |



**20. Document personal and emotional issues experienced by counselors-in-training.**

|   |                    |                    |               |                |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| <i>My belief in the level of importance that I SHOULD do/participate in this:</i> |                    |                    |               |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>       |
| Unimportant   | Not very important | Slightly important | Important     | Very important |
| <i>The quality of support for doing this in my institution:</i>                   |                    |                    |               |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>       |
| Very poor   | Below average      | Average            | Above average | Outstanding    |
| <i>How frequently I actually do/participate in this:</i>                          |                    |                    |               |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>       |
| Never   | Rarely             | Occasionally       | Moderately    | Frequently     |

**21. Address specific issue(s)/deficiencies with counselors-in-training.**

|   |                    |                    |               |                |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| <i>My belief in the level of importance that I SHOULD do/participate in this:</i> |                    |                    |               |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>       |
| Unimportant   | Not very important | Slightly important | Important     | Very important |
| <i>The quality of support for doing this in my institution:</i>                   |                    |                    |               |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>       |
| Very poor   | Below average      | Average            | Above average | Outstanding    |
| <i>How frequently I actually do/participate in this:</i>                          |                    |                    |               |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>       |
| Never   | Rarely             | Occasionally       | Moderately    | Frequently     |

**22. Provide counselors-in-training with specific expectations for improvement.**

|   |                    |                    |           |                |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------|
| <i>My belief in the level of importance that I SHOULD do/participate in this:</i> |                    |                    |           |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>  | <b>5</b>       |
| Unimportant   | Not very important | Slightly important | Important | Very important |

|   |               |          |               |             |
|---|---------------|----------|---------------|-------------|
| <i>The quality of support for doing this in my institution:</i> |               |          |               |             |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>      | <b>3</b> | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>    |
| Very poor   | Below average | Average  | Above average | Outstanding |

|  |          |              |            |            |
|--|----------|--------------|------------|------------|
| <i>How frequently I actually do/participate in this:</i> |          |              |            |            |
| <b>1</b>   | <b>2</b> | <b>3</b>     | <b>4</b>   | <b>5</b>   |
| Never  | Rarely   | Occasionally | Moderately | Frequently |

**23. Supervise the counselors-in-training during practicum and internship in order to protect the welfare of their clients.**

|   |                    |                    |           |                |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------|
| <i>My belief in the level of importance that I SHOULD do/participate in this:</i> |                    |                    |           |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>  | <b>5</b>       |
| Unimportant   | Not very important | Slightly important | Important | Very important |

|   |               |          |               |             |
|---|---------------|----------|---------------|-------------|
| <i>The quality of support for doing this in my institution:</i> |               |          |               |             |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>      | <b>3</b> | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>    |
| Very poor   | Below average | Average  | Above average | Outstanding |

|  |          |              |            |            |
|--|----------|--------------|------------|------------|
| <i>How frequently I actually do/participate in this:</i> |          |              |            |            |
| <b>1</b>   | <b>2</b> | <b>3</b>     | <b>4</b>   | <b>5</b>   |
| Never  | Rarely   | Occasionally | Moderately | Frequently |

**24. Be vigilant and attentive to counselors-in-training impediments that may develop and respond accordingly.**

|   |                    |                    |           |                |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------|
| <i>My belief in the level of importance that I SHOULD do/participate in this:</i> |                    |                    |           |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>  | <b>5</b>       |
| Unimportant   | Not very important | Slightly important | Important | Very important |

|   |               |          |               |             |
|---|---------------|----------|---------------|-------------|
| <i>The quality of support for doing this in my institution:</i> |               |          |               |             |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>      | <b>3</b> | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>    |
| Very poor   | Below average | Average  | Above average | Outstanding |

|  |          |              |            |            |
|--|----------|--------------|------------|------------|
| <i>How frequently I actually do/participate in this:</i> |          |              |            |            |
| <b>1</b>   | <b>2</b> | <b>3</b>     | <b>4</b>   | <b>5</b>   |
| Never  | Rarely   | Occasionally | Moderately | Frequently |

**25. Meet regularly with faculty to discuss counselors-in-training who are experiencing personal, academic or professional issues.**

|   |                    |                    |           |                |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------|
| <i>My belief in the level of importance that I SHOULD do/participate in this:</i> |                    |                    |           |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>  | <b>5</b>       |
| Unimportant   | Not very important | Slightly important | Important | Very important |

|   |               |          |               |             |
|---|---------------|----------|---------------|-------------|
| <i>The quality of support for doing this in my institution:</i> |               |          |               |             |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>      | <b>3</b> | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>    |
| Very poor   | Below average | Average  | Above average | Outstanding |

|  |          |              |            |            |
|--|----------|--------------|------------|------------|
| <i>How frequently I actually do/participate in this:</i> |          |              |            |            |
| <b>1</b>   | <b>2</b> | <b>3</b>     | <b>4</b>   | <b>5</b>   |
| Never  | Rarely   | Occasionally | Moderately | Frequently |

**26. Provide transparency of the process and expectations of remediation.**

|   |                    |                    |               |                |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| <i>My belief in the level of importance that I SHOULD do/participate in this:</i> |                    |                    |               |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>       |
| Unimportant   | Not very important | Slightly important | Important     | Very important |
| <i>The quality of support for doing this in my institution:</i>                   |                    |                    |               |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>       |
| Very poor   | Below average      | Average            | Above average | Outstanding    |
| <i>How frequently I actually do/participate in this:</i>                          |                    |                    |               |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>       |
| Never   | Rarely             | Occasionally       | Moderately    | Frequently     |

**27. Evaluate the outcome of remediation to determine the success of the plan.**

|   |                    |                    |               |                |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| <i>My belief in the level of importance that I SHOULD do/participate in this:</i> |                    |                    |               |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>       |
| Unimportant   | Not very important | Slightly important | Important     | Very important |
| <i>The quality of support for doing this in my institution:</i>                   |                    |                    |               |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>       |
| Very poor   | Below average      | Average            | Above average | Outstanding    |
| <i>How frequently I actually do/participate in this:</i>                          |                    |                    |               |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>       |
| Never   | Rarely             | Occasionally       | Moderately    | Frequently     |

**28. Assist counselors-in-training in securing remedial assistance when needed.**

|   |                    |                    |               |                |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| <i>My belief in the level of importance that I SHOULD do/participate in this:</i> |                    |                    |               |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>       |
| Unimportant   | Not very important | Slightly important | Important     | Very important |
| <i>The quality of support for doing this in my institution:</i>                   |                    |                    |               |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>       |
| Very poor   | Below average      | Average            | Above average | Outstanding    |
| <i>How frequently I actually do/participate in this:</i>                          |                    |                    |               |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>       |
| Never   | Rarely             | Occasionally       | Moderately    | Frequently     |

**29. Document the decisions to dismiss or refer counselors-in-training for assistance.**

|   |                    |                    |               |                |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| <i>My belief in the level of importance that I SHOULD do/participate in this:</i> |                    |                    |               |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>       |
| Unimportant   | Not very important | Slightly important | Important     | Very important |
| <i>The quality of support for doing this in my institution:</i>                   |                    |                    |               |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>       |
| Very poor   | Below average      | Average            | Above average | Outstanding    |
| <i>How frequently I actually do/participate in this:</i>                          |                    |                    |               |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>       |
| Never   | Rarely             | Occasionally       | Moderately    | Frequently     |

**30. Utilize consultation when experiencing conflicts between the roles of counselor educator and gatekeeper of the counseling profession.**

|   |                    |                    |           |                |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------|
| <i>My belief in the level of importance that I SHOULD do/participate in this:</i> |                    |                    |           |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>  | <b>5</b>       |
| Unimportant   | Not very important | Slightly important | Important | Very important |

|   |               |          |               |             |
|---|---------------|----------|---------------|-------------|
| <i>The quality of support for doing this in my institution:</i> |               |          |               |             |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>      | <b>3</b> | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>    |
| Very poor   | Below average | Average  | Above average | Outstanding |

|  |          |              |            |            |
|--|----------|--------------|------------|------------|
| <i>How frequently I actually do/participate in this:</i> |          |              |            |            |
| <b>1</b>   | <b>2</b> | <b>3</b>     | <b>4</b>   | <b>5</b>   |
| Never  | Rarely   | Occasionally | Moderately | Frequently |

**31. Conduct ongoing reflection and processing of conflicts that occur between the roles of counselor educator and gatekeeper.**

|   |                    |                    |           |                |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------|
| <i>My belief in the level of importance that I SHOULD do/participate in this:</i> |                    |                    |           |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>  | <b>5</b>       |
| Unimportant   | Not very important | Slightly important | Important | Very important |

|   |               |          |               |             |
|---|---------------|----------|---------------|-------------|
| <i>The quality of support for doing this in my institution:</i> |               |          |               |             |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>      | <b>3</b> | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>    |
| Very poor   | Below average | Average  | Above average | Outstanding |

|  |          |              |            |            |
|--|----------|--------------|------------|------------|
| <i>How frequently I actually do/participate in this:</i> |          |              |            |            |
| <b>1</b>   | <b>2</b> | <b>3</b>     | <b>4</b>   | <b>5</b>   |
| Never  | Rarely   | Occasionally | Moderately | Frequently |

- 32. Ensure that counselors-in-training have recourse in a timely manner to address decisions to require them to seek assistance or to dismiss them and provide the students with due process according to institutional policies and procedures.**

|   |                    |                    |           |                |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------|
| <i>My belief in the level of importance that I SHOULD do/participate in this:</i> |                    |                    |           |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>  | <b>5</b>       |
| Unimportant   | Not very important | Slightly important | Important | Very important |

  

|   |               |          |               |             |
|---|---------------|----------|---------------|-------------|
| <i>The quality of support for doing this in my institution:</i> |               |          |               |             |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>      | <b>3</b> | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>    |
| Very poor   | Below average | Average  | Above average | Outstanding |

  

|  |          |              |            |            |
|--|----------|--------------|------------|------------|
| <i>How frequently I actually do/participate in this:</i> |          |              |            |            |
| <b>1</b>   | <b>2</b> | <b>3</b>     | <b>4</b>   | <b>5</b>   |
| Never  | Rarely   | Occasionally | Moderately | Frequently |

- 33. Conduct a systematic developmental assessment of each counselors'-in-training progress throughout the program, including consideration of the student's academic performance, professional development, and personal development.**

|   |                    |                    |           |                |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|-----------|----------------|
| <i>My belief in the level of importance that I SHOULD do/participate in this:</i> |                    |                    |           |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>  | <b>5</b>       |
| Unimportant   | Not very important | Slightly important | Important | Very important |

  

|   |               |          |               |             |
|---|---------------|----------|---------------|-------------|
| <i>The quality of support for doing this in my institution:</i> |               |          |               |             |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>      | <b>3</b> | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>    |
| Very poor   | Below average | Average  | Above average | Outstanding |

  

|  |          |              |            |            |
|--|----------|--------------|------------|------------|
| <i>How frequently I actually do/participate in this:</i> |          |              |            |            |
| <b>1</b>   | <b>2</b> | <b>3</b>     | <b>4</b>   | <b>5</b>   |
| Never  | Rarely   | Occasionally | Moderately | Frequently |

**34. Provide remediation interventions to counselors-in-training as deemed necessary.**

|   |                    |                    |               |                |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| <i>My belief in the level of importance that I SHOULD do/participate in this:</i> |                    |                    |               |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>       |
| Unimportant   | Not very important | Slightly important | Important     | Very important |
| <i>The quality of support for doing this in my institution:</i>                   |                    |                    |               |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>       |
| Very poor   | Below average      | Average            | Above average | Outstanding    |
| <i>How frequently I actually do/participate in this:</i>                          |                    |                    |               |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>       |
| Never   | Rarely             | Occasionally       | Moderately    | Frequently     |

**35. Ensure remediation/interventions are not culturally biased.**

|   |                    |                    |               |                |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
| <i>My belief in the level of importance that I SHOULD do/participate in this:</i> |                    |                    |               |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>       |
| Unimportant   | Not very important | Slightly important | Important     | Very important |
| <i>The quality of support for doing this in my institution:</i>                   |                    |                    |               |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>       |
| Very poor   | Below average      | Average            | Above average | Outstanding    |
| <i>How frequently I actually do/participate in this:</i>                          |                    |                    |               |                |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>2</b>           | <b>3</b>           | <b>4</b>      | <b>5</b>       |
| Never   | Rarely             | Occasionally       | Moderately    | Frequently     |



## **Opinion**

*There are currently general guidelines for gatekeeping set forth by governing and accrediting bodies. Each program is expected to construct its own policies and procedures to abide by these guidelines. Instead of general guidelines, do you believe that there should be standardized gatekeeping policies and procedures implemented for all like programs?*

| 1                 | 2        | 3       | 4     | 5              |
|-------------------|----------|---------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree |

## **Demographics**

*Type of institution:*

- ☐ State Institution
- ☐ Private Institution

*Physical type of institution:*

- ☐ Brick & Mortar
- ☐ Online

*Approximate enrollment of institution.*

- ☐ Less than 1,000
- ☐ 1,000 – 5,000
- ☐ 5,000 – 10,000
- ☐ 10,000 – 15,000
- ☐ 15,000 – 20,000
- ☐ 20,000 – 25,000
- ☐ 25,000 – 30,000
- ☐ 30,000 – 35,000
- ☐ 35,000 – 40,000
- ☐ 40,000 +

***Approximate department enrollment.***

- ☐ Less than 100
- ☐ 100 – 150
- ☐ 150 – 200
- ☐ 200 – 250
- ☐ 250 – 300
- ☐ 300 – 350
- ☐ 350 – 400
- ☐ 400 +

***Counseling programs offered within department. (please indicate all that apply)***

- ☐ Addiction Counseling
- ☐ Career Counseling
- ☐ Clinical Mental Health Counseling
- ☐ Community Counseling
- ☐ Gerontological Counseling
- ☐ Marriage, Couple and Family Counseling
- ☐ School Counseling
- ☐ Student Affairs / College Counseling
- ☐ Counselor Education and Supervision (doctorate)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Course are taught: (please indicate all that apply)***

- ☐ In-class only
- ☐ Online only
- ☐ Hybrid – Course taught as a combination of in-class and online
- ☐ Option of either in-class or online courses

***Programs' Accreditations:***

- ☐ Council for Accreditation of Counseling & Related Education Programs (CACREP)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_ (program specific)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_ (program specific)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_ (program specific)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_ (program specific)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_ (program specific)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_ (program specific)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_ (program specific)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_ (program specific)
- ☐ None

***Your position at the university:***

\_\_\_\_\_ (fill in the blank)

***How many years have you been a counselor educator?***

- ☐ Less than a year
- ☐ 1 – 5 years
- ☐ 6 – 10 years
- ☐ 11 – 15 years
- ☐ 16 – 20 years
- ☐ 20+ years

***Where are student performance concerns discussed?***

- ☐ Formal gatekeeping committee
- ☐ Specific faculty meeting with gatekeeping agenda
- ☐ General faculty meeting
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***If there is a formal gatekeeping committee, are you a current member?***

Yes    No

***If not a current member, have you been a member of a formal gatekeeping committee?***

Yes    No

***If there is a formal gatekeeping committee, how often does it meet?***

- ☐ Weekly
- ☐ Monthly
- ☐ Once a semester
- ☐ Ad hoc
- ☐ N/A

***If there is not a formal gatekeeping committee, how often is there a meeting with gatekeeping as or on the agenda?***

- ☐ Weekly
- ☐ Monthly
- ☐ Once a semester
- ☐ Ad hoc
- ☐ N/A

## REFERENCES

- American Counseling Association (2014). *ACA code of ethics*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Baldo, T. D., Softas-Nall, B. C., & Shaw, S. F. (1997). Student review and retention in counselor education: An alternative to Frame and Stevens-Smith. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 36*, 245-253.
- Barrio-Minton, C. A. & Gibson, D. M. (2012). Evaluating student learning outcomes in counselor education: Recommendations and process consideration. *Counseling Outcome Research and Evaluation, 3*, 73-91.
- Bernard, J. L. (1975). Due process in dropping the unsuitable clinical student. *Professional Psychology, 6*, 274-278.
- Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (2008). *Fundamentals of clinical supervision* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Allyn and Bacon.
- Bradey, J., & Post, P. (1991). Impaired students: Do we eliminate them from counselor education programs? *Counselor Education and Supervision, 31*, 100-108.
- Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*, 77-101.
- Brear, P., Dorrian, J., & Luscri, G. (2008). Preparing our future counseling professionals: Gatekeeping and the implications for research. *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research, 8*, 93-101.
- Brown, M. (2013). A content analysis of problematic behavior in counselor education programs. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 52*, 179-192.

- Brown-Rice, K. (2012). Examining counselor educators' use of impairment in gatekeeping terminology. *American Counseling Association's Vistas Online*, 21, Retrieved from: [http://www.counseling.org/docs/vistas/vistas\\_2012\\_article\\_21](http://www.counseling.org/docs/vistas/vistas_2012_article_21).
- Caruth, G. D. (2013). Demystifying mixed methods research design: A review of the literature. *Mevlana International Journal of Education*, 3, 112-122.
- Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs [CACREP]. (2015). *2016 standards for accreditation*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- de Vries, S. R. & Valadez, A. A. (2005). Counseling students' mental health status and attitudes toward counseling. *Journal of Professional Counseling, Practice, Theory, & Research*, 33, 77-87.
- Dugger, S. M. & Francis, P. C. (2014). Surviving a lawsuit against a counseling program: Lessons learned from Ward v. Wilbanks. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 92, 135-141.
- Elmore, T. M. (1985). The era of ACES: Tradition, transformation, and the possible dream. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 63, 411-415.
- Fan, W. & Yan, Z. (2010). Factors affecting response rates of the web survey: A systematic review. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26, 132-139.
- Foster, V. A., & McAdams, C.R. (2009). A framework for creating a climate of transparency for professional performance assessment: Fostering student investment in gatekeeping. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 48, 271-284.

- Frame, M. W., & Stevens-Smith, P. (1995). Out of harm's way: Enhancing monitoring dismissal processes in counselor education programs. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 35*, 118-129.
- Freeman, B. J., Garner, C. M., Fairgrieve, L. A., & Pitts, M. E. (2016). Gatekeeping in the field: Strategies and practices. *Journal of Professional Counseling: Practice, Theory, and Research, 43*, 28-41.
- Fryear, A. (2015). Survey response rates. *SurveyGizmo*. Retrieved from:  
<https://www.surveygizmo.com/survey-blog/survey-response-rates/>
- Gaubatz, M. D., & Vera, E. M. (2002). Do formalized gatekeeping procedures increase programs' follow-up with deficient trainees? *Counselor Education and Supervision, 41*, 294-305.
- Glance, D., Fanning, G., Schoepke, A., Soto, W., & Williams Sr., M. A. (2012). Gatekeeping in counselor education. *American Counseling Association's Vistas Online, 11*, Retrieved from: [http://www.counseling.org/docs/vistas/vistas\\_2012\\_article\\_11](http://www.counseling.org/docs/vistas/vistas_2012_article_11).
- Henderson, K. L., & Dufrene, R. L. (2011). Student remediation: Practical considerations for counselor educators and supervisors. *American Counseling Association's Vistas Online, 45*, Retrieved from [http://counselingoutfitters.com/vistas/vistas11/Article\\_45.pdf](http://counselingoutfitters.com/vistas/vistas11/Article_45.pdf).
- Henderson, K. L., & Dufrene, R. L. (2012). Student behaviors associated with remediation: A content analysis. *Counseling Outcome Research and Evaluation, 3*, 48-60.
- Homrich, A. M., (2009). Gatekeeping for personal and professional competence in graduate counseling programs. *Counseling and Human Development, 41*, 22.

- Homrich, A. M., DeLorenzi, L. D., Bloom, Z. D., & Godbee, B. (2014). Making the case for standards of conduct in clinical training. *Counselor Education & supervision, 53*, 126-144.
- Honderich, E., & Lloyd-Hazlett, J. (2014). Promoting moral development growth in students and supervisees: A theoretical and practical primer for psychotherapists. *Postconventional: Ethics, University Democracy, 7-8*, 110-125.
- Hutchens, N., Block, J., & Young, M. (2013). Counselor educators' gatekeeping responsibilities and students' first amendment rights. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 52*, 82-95.
- Iovacchini, E. V. (1981). The impact of recent academic due process decisions on counselor education programs. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 20*, 163-171.
- Ivey, A. E., & Daniels, T. (2016). Systematic interviewing microskills and neuroscience: Developing bridges between the fields of communication and counseling psychology. *International Journal of Listening, 30*, 99-199.
- Jackson, M. V. (1973). Counselor characteristics and attitudes: Implications for the selection and training of effective counselors. Unpublished manuscript. ED 076913. CG 008 065. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Joslin, L. C. Jr., (1965). Knowledge and counseling competence. *Personnel and Guidance Journal, 43*, 790-795.
- Kaplan, D. M. (2014). Ethical implications of a critical legal case for the counseling profession: Ward v. Wilbanks. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 92*, 142-146.
- Keppers, G. (1960). Selection of graduate students in guidance and counseling. *Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 9*, 90-94.



- Letourneau, J. L. H. (2016). A decision-making model for addressing problematic behaviors in counseling students. *Counseling and Values, 61*, 206-222.
- Lumadue, C.A. & Duffey, T. H. (1999). The role of graduate programs as gatekeepers: A model for evaluating student counselor competence. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 39*, 101-109.
- Mason, M. (2010). Sample size and saturation in PhD studies using qualitative interviews. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 11*, (web-based journal). Retrieved from: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1428/3027>.
- National Board for Certified Counselors. (2013). NBCC Code of Ethics. Greensboro, NC: Author.
- Nelson, K. W., Oliver, M., Reeve, J., & McNichols, C. (2010). Gatekeeping and supervision intervention: Complex ethical processes. *American Counseling Association's Vistas Online, 42*, Retrieved from: [http://counselingoutfitters.com/vistas/vistas10/Article\\_42.pdf](http://counselingoutfitters.com/vistas/vistas10/Article_42.pdf).
- Oklin, R., & Gaughen, S. (1991). Evaluation of dismissal of students in master's level clinical programs: Legal parameters and survey results. *Counselor Education and Supervision, 30*, 275-282.
- Palmer, R. B., White, G., & Chung, W. (2008). Deficient trainees: Gatekeeping in christian practitioner programs. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 27*, 30-40.
- Policy. (2014). Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary. Retrieved from: <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/policy>.

- Porter, E. H. (1943a). The development and evaluation of a measure of counseling interview procedures. Part I: The development. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 3, 105-126.
- Porter, E. H. (1943b). The development and evaluation of a measure of counseling interview procedures. Part II: The evaluation. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 3, 215-238.
- Procedures. (2014). Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary. Retrieved from:  
<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/procedures>.
- Remediation. (2014). Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary. Retrieved from:  
<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/remediation>.
- Rogers, C. R. (1957, 1992). The necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 60, 827-832.
- Rust, J. P., Raskin, J. D., & Hill, M. S. (2013). Problems of professional competence among counselor trainees: Programmatic issues and guidelines. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 52, 30-42.
- Shallcross, Lynne. (2010). Putting clients ahead of personal values. *Counseling Today*, Retrieved from: <http://ct.counseling.org/2010/11/putting-clients-ahead-of-personal-values/>
- Simon, M. K. & Goes, J. (2013). *Dissertation and scholarly research: Recipes for success*. (2013 Ed.). Seattle, WA, Dissertation Success, LLC.
- Stahl, E. & Havens, R. I. (1978). The case for ACES program accreditation. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 17, 180-187.

- Swank, J. (2010). Assessing the psychometric properties of the Counseling Competencies Scale: A measure of counseling skills, dispositions, and behaviors (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest at <http://proquest.umi.com/>
- Swank, J. M., & Smith-Adcock, S. (2014). Gatekeeping during admissions: A survey of counselor education programs. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 53*, 47-61.
- Tate, K. A., Bloom, M. L., Tassara, M. H., & Capterton, W. (2014). Counselor competence, performance assessment, and program evaluation: Using psychometric instruments. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 47*, 291-306.
- Thomas, J. (2011). Analysing thurstone and likert attitude scales as data collection methods. *Journal of Paramedic Practice, 3*, 250-254.
- United States Constitution. Amendment XIV.
- Urofsky, R. I., Bobby, C. L. (2012). The evolution of a student learning outcomes focus in the CACREP standards in relation to accountability in higher education. *Counseling Outcome Research and Evaluation, 3*, 63-72.
- Urofsky, R. I., Bobby, C. L., & Ritchie, M. (2013). CACREP: 30 years of quality assurance in counselor education. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 91*, 3-5.
- Victoria M. Butler v. Rector and Board of Visitors of The College of William and Mary, 03-2119 (U.S. 4th Cir. App., 2005), Retrieved from: <http://www.ca4.uscourts.gov/Opinions/Unpublished/032119.U.pdf>
- Ward, S. V. (2014). Archival Research. In K. Ward (Ed.) *Researching the city*. (pp. 24-37). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.
- Ziomek-Daigle, J., & Bailey, D. F. (2009). Culturally responsive gatekeeping practices in counselor education. *Journal of Counseling Research & Practice, 1*, 14-22.

Ziomek-Daigle, J., & Christensen, T.M. (2010). An emergent theory of gatekeeping practices in counselor education. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 88, 407-415.